

SPACETIME LIMIT SHAPES OF THE KPZ EQUATION IN THE UPPER TAILS

YIER LIN AND LI-CHENG TSAI

ABSTRACT. We consider the n -point, fixed-time large deviations of the KPZ equation with the narrow wedge initial condition. The scope consists of concave-configured, upper-tail deviations and a wide range of scaling regimes that allows time to be short, unit-order, and long. We prove the n -point large deviation principle and characterize, with proof, the corresponding spacetime limit shape. Our proof is based on the results — from the companion paper [Tsa23] — on moments of the stochastic heat equation and utilizes ideas coming from a tree decomposition. Behind our proof lies the phenomenon where the major contribution of the noise concentrates around certain corridors in spacetime, and we explicitly describe the corridors.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper studies the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang (KPZ) equation [KPZ86]

$$\partial_t h = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{xx} h + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_x h)^2 + \eta, \quad h = h(t, x), \quad (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\eta = \eta(t, x)$ denotes the spacetime white noise. The equation describes the evolution of a randomly growing interface $h(t, x)$, is a central model in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics, and has been widely studied in mathematics and physics; we refer to [Qua11, Cor12, QS15, CW17, CS19] for reviews on the mathematical literature related to the KPZ equation.

We prove the n -point, fixed-time Large Deviation Principle (LDP) for the KPZ equation with the narrow wedge initial condition and characterize, with proof, the spacetime limit shape. Let h_{nw} be the solution of (1.1) with the narrow wedge initial condition, defined in Section 1.1. Let T be the scale of time, let N be another scaling parameter, and scale h_{nw} as

$$h_N(t, x) := \frac{1}{N^2 T} (h_{\text{nw}}(Tt, NTx) + \log \sqrt{T}). \quad (1.2)$$

This scaling is natural, as will be explained in Section 1.1. The only assumptions on N and T are

$$N \rightarrow \infty, \quad N^2 T = N^2 T_N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1.3)$$

We take $T = T_N$ for the convenience of notation; our results actually hold for $T = A/N^2$ with $(N, A) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$. Note that (1.3) allows $T_N \rightarrow 0$, $T_N \rightarrow 1$, and $T_N \rightarrow \infty$; see Section 1.1 for a discussion on the scaling regimes. Fix $\mathbf{x}_1 < \dots < \mathbf{x}_n$ and consider the event

$$\mathcal{E}_{N, \delta}(\vec{\mathbf{r}}) = \mathcal{E}_{N, \delta}(1, \vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\mathbf{r}}) := \{ |h_N(1, \mathbf{x}_c) - \mathbf{r}_c| \leq \delta, \mathbf{c} = 1, \dots, n \}. \quad (1.4)$$

Postpone the definitions of the space of n -point deviations $\mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}$, the rate function I_{KPZ} , and the limit shape \mathbf{h}_* to Section 1.2. Roughly speaking, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}$ consists of concave-configured, upper-tail deviations. Let $\|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Omega)} := \sup_{(t, x) \in \Omega} |f(t, x)|$. We state the main result now.

Theorem 1.1. *Notation as above and under (1.3). For any $\vec{\mathbf{r}} \in (\mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}})^\circ$ and $R < \infty$,*

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N^3 T_N} \log \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}_{N, \delta}(\vec{\mathbf{r}})] - I_{\text{KPZ}}(\vec{\mathbf{r}}) \right| = 0, \quad (1.5)$$

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^3 T_N} \log \mathbf{P} \left[\|h_N - \mathbf{h}_*\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty([\frac{1}{R}, 1] \times [-R, R])} > \frac{1}{R} \mid \mathcal{E}_{N, \delta}(\vec{\mathbf{r}}) \right] < 0. \quad (1.6)$$

1.1. Scaling, SHE, initial condition. Let us explain the scaling (1.2). Common wisdom in the study of the KPZ equation says that the quadratic term $(\partial_x h)^2$ in (1.1) dominates the large-scale behaviors of the equation. We take the scaling (1.2) to satisfy the relation (height scale) $\cdot T = (\text{space scale})^2$, which ensures that the quadratic term remains invariant after scaling: $\partial_t h_N = \frac{1}{2N^2T} \partial_{xx} h_N + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_x h_N)^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N^5 T^2}} \eta$. The relation fixes the relative scaling between height and space, and N parameterizes an additional degree of freedom.

Let us examine the conditions in (1.3) in short, unit, and long time. In short time, the regime given by $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $N^2 T = 1$ correspond to the Freidlin–Wentzell or weak-noise LDP for the KPZ equation; see Section 1.7 for a literature review. The deviations probed under (1.3) are those (much) larger than the Freidlin–Wentzell ones. In unit-order time, $T \rightarrow 1$, (1.3) covers the deviations at *all* scales much larger than one. In long time, $T \rightarrow \infty$, the commonly consider **hyperbolic scaling regime** corresponds to $N = 1$, and the deviations probed under (1.3) are those (much) larger than the hyperbolic ones.

Hereafter, we write $T_N = T$ to simplify notation and assume $N \rightarrow \infty$ is taken under (1.3).

We work with the Hopf–Cole solution of (1.1). Consider the Stochastic Heat Equation (SHE)

$$\partial_t Z = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{xx} Z + \eta Z, \quad (1.7)$$

and define the Hopf–Cole solution as $h := \log Z$. The narrow-wedge initial condition for the KPZ equation is defined as $h_{\text{nw}} := \log Z_{\text{delta}}$, where Z_{delta} solves the SHE (1.7) with $Z_{\text{delta}}(0, \cdot) = \delta_0$, and $Z_{\text{delta}}|_{(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}} > 0$ thanks to [Mue91, MF14]. In short time, Z_{delta} is controlled by the heat kernel $\mathbf{q}(t, x) := (1/\sqrt{2\pi t}) \exp(-x^2/(2t))$. Under the scaling of consideration, it becomes $(N^2 T)^{-1} \log \mathbf{q}(Tt, NTx) = -x^2/(2t) - (N^2 T)^{-1} \log \sqrt{2\pi t} - (N^2 T)^{-1} \log \sqrt{T}$. The second last term tends to zero, while the last term is countered in (1.2).

1.2. Rate function, space of n -point deviations, limit shape. We begin by recalling the hydrodynamic limit of h_N . Let $\mathfrak{p}(t) = \mathfrak{p}(t, x) := -x^2/(2t)$. In the hyperbolic scaling regime ($N = 1$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$), $h_N(t, x)$ converges (say, in probability) to $\mathfrak{p}(t, x) - t/24$ [ACQ11]. Under (1.3), applying the scaling in (1.2) gives $(\mathfrak{p}(Tt, NTx) - Tt/24)/(N^2 T) = \mathfrak{p}(t, x) + o_N(1)$, so the hydrodynamic limit of h_N should just be \mathfrak{p} .

Let us define the rate function and space of n -point deviations. To streamline notation, we consider a general $t \in (0, 1]$, though Theorem 1.1 takes $t = 1$ only. For $\mathbf{r}_c \geq \mathfrak{p}(t, \mathbf{x}_c)$, $\mathbf{c} = 1, \dots, n$, let $\mathfrak{f}_{\star, t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\mathbf{r}}} = \mathfrak{f}_{\star}$ be the piecewise \mathcal{C}^1 function on \mathbb{R} characterized by the properties: $\mathfrak{f}_{\star}(\mathbf{x}_c) = \mathbf{r}_c$, for all \mathbf{c} ; $\mathfrak{f}_{\star} \geq \mathfrak{p}(t)$; $\mathfrak{f}_{\star}(x) = \mathfrak{p}(t, x)$ for all $|x|$ large enough; $\partial_x \mathfrak{f}_{\star}$ is constant on $\{\mathfrak{f}_{\star} > \mathfrak{p}(t)\} \setminus \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$; \mathfrak{f}_{\star} is \mathcal{C}^1 except at $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$. See Figure 1. The rate function is

$$I_{\text{KPZ}}(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\mathbf{r}}) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx \left(\frac{1}{2} (\partial_x \mathfrak{f}_{\star, t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\mathbf{r}}})^2 - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_x \mathfrak{p}(t))^2 \right). \quad (1.8)$$

This rate function coincides with that of a Brownian Motion (BM) that evolves in x conditioned to stay above the parabola $\mathfrak{p}(t, x) = -x^2/(2t)$. Such a coincidence can be understood from the perspective of Gibbs line ensembles [CH14, CH16], though we arrive at (1.8) through taking the Legendre transform of the moment Lyapunov exponents. Evaluating I_{KPZ} at one point recovers the $3/2$ power law: $I_{\text{KPZ}}(t, 0, \mathbf{r}) = (4/3)(2/t)^{1/2} \mathbf{r}^{3/2}$, for $\mathbf{r} \geq 0$. This rate function should describe all upper-tail deviations in

$$\mathcal{R}(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}) := \{\vec{\mathbf{r}} = (\mathbf{r}_c)_{c=1}^n : \mathbf{r}_c \geq \mathfrak{p}(t, \mathbf{x}_c), \forall \mathbf{c}\}. \quad (1.9)$$

Our method relies on *positive* moments and can access the subspace

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}) := \{\vec{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathcal{R}(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}) : \mathfrak{f}_{\star, t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\mathbf{r}}} \text{ is concave}\}, \quad (1.10)$$






 FIGURE 1. $f_\star = f_{\star, t, \vec{x}, \vec{r}}$

 FIGURE 2. Limit shape h_\star


FIGURE 3. Shocks, aka noise corridors, (thick solid lines); characteristics (thin solid lines)


 FIGURE 4. Intermediate time configuration. In this figure, $\mathfrak{C}(1) = \{1\}$, $\mathfrak{C}(2) = \{2\}$, $\mathfrak{C}(3) = \{3\}$, and $\mathfrak{C}(4) = \{4, 5\}$.

whose interior is $\mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{x})^\circ = \{\vec{r} : r_c > p(t, \mathbf{x}_c), \forall c; f_{\star, t, \vec{x}, \vec{r}} \text{ is strictly concave}\}$. When $t = 1$ and \vec{x} has been fixed, we write $I_{\text{KPZ}}(\vec{r})$ and $(\mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}})^\circ$ to simplify notation, like in Theorem 1.1.

To define the limit shape, consider the integral of Burgers equation and its backward version

$$\partial_t h = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_x h)^2, \quad (t, x) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.11)$$

$$\partial_s h(1 - s, x) = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_x h(1 - s, x))^2, \quad (s, x) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.12)$$

Being fully nonlinear, (1.11) can have multiple weak solutions under a given initial condition, but has a unique entropy solution, and similarly for (1.12). Fix $\vec{r} \in (\mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}})^\circ = \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(1, \vec{x})^\circ$ and let $f_\star := f_{\star, 1, \vec{x}, \vec{r}}$ be as before. The limit shape h_\star is the entropy solution of the *backward* equation (1.12) with the terminal condition $h_\star(1, \cdot) = f_\star$. It is readily checked that a weak solution of (1.12) is automatically a weak solution of (1.11). On the other hand, an entropy solution of (1.12) is in general *not* an entropy solution of (1.11). In particular, h_\star is a non-entropy solution of (1.11). See the second last paragraph in Section 1.3 for a heuristic explanation why the limit shape should be a non-entropy solution of (1.11).

Let us describe a few properties of h_* , which are not hard to verify; see [Tsa23, Section 8.3] for example. The (trajectories of the) shocks are piecewise linear; when viewed in *backward* time, they start at the x_c s, can merge, but never branch. Let $\xi_c = \xi_c(s)$ denote the shocks, in *backward* time s . Partition $\{1, \dots, n\}$ into intervals \mathfrak{b} such that $c, c' \in \mathfrak{b}$ if and only if ξ_c and $\xi_{c'}$ merge within $s \in [0, 1)$. There exist $y_{\triangleleft}^{\mathfrak{b}} < y_{\triangleright}^{\mathfrak{b}}$ such that each shock ξ_c with $c \in \mathfrak{b}$ is contained in the cone $\{(t, x) : y_{\triangleleft}^{\mathfrak{b}} t \leq x \leq y_{\triangleright}^{\mathfrak{b}} t\}$; the cones themselves are disjoint. Outside the cones, $h_* = p$. Within each cone, h_* is piecewise linear, and the kinks occur exactly along the shocks. See Figure 2. Recall that the characteristics are lines, in spacetime, along which $\partial_x h_*$ is constant. Outside the cones, the characteristics are lines emanating from $(t, x) = (0, 0)$. Within each region where h_* is linear, the characteristics are parallel lines. Further, when viewed in forward (resp. backward) time, the characteristics always emerge from (resp. merge into) the shocks. See Figure 3.

1.3. Mechanism of the LDP, noise corridors. Let us explain the physical mechanism behind the LDP. The explanation is not fully rigorous and intended to give an overall understanding only.

Consider first the case $n = 1$ and $x_1 = 0$. Use the Feynman–Kac formula to express h_N as

$$h_N(t, x) = \frac{1}{N^2 T} \log \mathbb{E}_{\text{BM}} \left[e^{\int_0^{Tt} ds \eta(Tt-s, X(s))} \delta_0(X(Tt)) \right], \quad (1.13)$$

where $X = (\text{standard BM}) + NTx$, and the exponential is in the Wick sense. The formula (1.13) suggests that the “larger” the noise η is, the larger h_N becomes. Note that this description is not rigorous because η is not function-valued. The target value $r_1 = r$ for $h_N(1, 0)$ exceeds the typical value $p(1, 0)$. Hence the noise would make itself anomalously large so that $h_N(1, 0)$ reaches r , and, in doing so, the noise would seek the “most efficient strategy”. The most efficient strategy should be having η anomalously large in a small region around $[0, 1] \times \{0\} = \{(t, x) : x = 0\}$ in spacetime. This strategy is efficient because η needs only to perform anomaly in a small region; this strategy is effective because, in (1.13), those realizations of the BM that stay around $x = 0$ will pick up this anomaly and make $h_N(1, 0)$ large. We call $[0, 1] \times \{0\}$ the **noise corridor** and call the phenomenon that the noise localizes around the noise corridor the **noise-corridor effect**.

At the level of *one-point* LDPs, the noise-corridor effect has been observed and noted. The use of subadditive structures in proving upper-tail LDPs [Sep98, DZ99, GS13, Jan15, Jan19] (implicitly) demonstrated the noise-corridor effect. The effect was pointed out under the name of the weak-coupling LDP regime in [LDMS16]. The analysis of the upper-tail asymptotics of the most probable shapes in the Freidlin–Wentzell LDP for the KPZ equation [KK07, KK09, KMS16, MKV16, KLD21, KLD22, Tsa22b, GLLT23] also demonstrated the noise-corridor effect.

Here, we take one step further and consider n -point deviations. A similar noise-corridor effect would occur: The noise would become anomalously large only in small regions around $\{(t, \xi_c(1-t))\}_{t \in [0, 1], c=1, \dots, n}$. We call (the trajectories of) ξ_c , $c = 1, \dots, n$, the **noise corridors**. The noise corridors are defined as the shocks in this paper, which is convenient but perhaps not intuitive. In [Tsa23], an alternative definition (via certain attractive Brownian particles) was offered and shown to be equivalent to the shock definition. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to describe the noise-corridor effect beyond one-point LDPs.

The noise-corridor effect offers a heuristic explanation why h_* should be a non-entropy solution of (1.11). The effect says that the noise η should be dormant in most of spacetime. Informally removing η from (1.1) and performing the scaling $h_N(t, x) = (N^2 T)^{-1} (h_{\text{nw}}(Tt, NTx) + \log \sqrt{T})$ give (1.11). The solution h_* is non-entropic because of the behaviors of η around the noise corridors, and the behaviors produce artificial/non-entropy shocks along the corridors. Put it differently, even though the noise disappears in the limiting equation (1.11), it leaves a lasting effect by producing

non-entropy shocks. This explanation comes from the picture given by Jensen and Varadhan [Jen00, Var04].

We emphasize that our approach is *very different* from that of Jensen and Varadhan. In the Jensen–Varadhan picture, the space of process-level deviations consists of weak solutions of (1.11), and the process-level rate function measures how “non-entropic” a solution is. The major challenge in implementing the Jensen–Varadhan picture is to understand the space of all weak solutions of (1.11). Due to this challenge, the proof of the full LDP remains largely open and has only been achieved for the TASEP by the use of exact formulas [QT21]. Our approach, on the other hand, is to postulate what the limit shape is and to verify the postulate, by using a tree structure (described in Section 1.4) and information extracted from the moments of the SHE. In doing so, we *bypass* the need to consider general — potentially pathological — weak solutions. Our approach does not rely on integrability or explicit formulas. Part of the reason is technical: The explicit formulas of the moments of the SHE do not seem to provide information for proving localization results such as Property (D) in Section 2.1. More importantly, we hope that our approach can shed light on the physical mechanism of forming the deviations and limit shape.

1.4. Ingredients of the proof, tree decomposition. The starting point of our proof is the fixed-time, n -point moment Lyapunov exponent of the SHE. Recall that $\exp(h) = Z$, so the n -point moment Lyapunov exponent of the SHE is exactly the n -point moment generating function of h . The results from [Tsa23] show that the exponent exists for all positive powers and characterize it. Thanks to the condition $N \rightarrow \infty$ in (1.3), characterizing the exponent for all positive powers reduces to the same task for positive *integer* powers only (see (2.1) and the discussion after it). Via the Legendre transform, the results on the n -point moment Lyapunov exponent immediately give the n -point LDP for the KPZ equation.

To obtain the *spacetime* limit shape requires going beyond fixed-time LDPs. The main novelty of our proof is a way of leveraging the fixed-time moment Lyapunov exponents to the spacetime limit shape. We accomplish this through the idea of a tree decomposition, which is described next.

To describe the decomposition, we associate the moment $\mathbf{E}[\prod_{c=1}^n Z_{\text{delta}}(T, NT\mathbf{x}_c)^{N m_c}]$ with the tree given by the trajectories of the noise corridors. The root of the tree is at $(t, x) = (0, 0)$, which corresponds to the delta initial condition. The leaves are at $(t, x) = (1, \mathbf{x}_1), \dots, (1, \mathbf{x}_n)$, which correspond to the points where we probe the deviations. The leaf $(1, \mathbf{x}_c)$ carries mass m_c , which is the power of the moment at $(1, \mathbf{x}_c)$, in the post-scale units. Any other node on the tree carries the sum of the masses of its children. Let $0 \xrightarrow{1} (\vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\mathbf{m}})$ denote this weighted tree. Take any intermediate time $t' \in (0, 1)$, let $\vec{\mathbf{x}}' = (\mathbf{x}'_a)_a$ denote the nodes of the tree at time t' , let m'_a denote the mass of (t', \mathbf{x}'_a) , and let $\mathcal{C}(a)$ be the set of indices of those leaves that are the offspring of (t', \mathbf{x}'_a) ; see Figure 4. The tree decomposition says that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\text{moment of } 0 \xrightarrow{1} (\vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\mathbf{m}}) \right) \text{ should be approximately equal to} \\ & \left(\text{moment of } 0 \xrightarrow{t'} (\vec{\mathbf{x}}', \vec{\mathbf{m}}') \right) \cdot \prod_a \left(\text{moment of } \mathbf{x}'_a \xrightarrow{1-t'} (\vec{\mathbf{x}}_c, \vec{\mathbf{m}}_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(a)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is natural in light of the noise-corridor effect. This decomposition is useful because it allows us to access the information at any intermediate time t' through the right hand side, which involves fixed-time moments only.

The idea of the tree decomposition enters the first and most important step of our proof of the limit shape, which is carried out in Section 3.1. In this step, we prove that h_N concentrates around h_\star at any (t, x) along the noise corridors, namely $(t, x) = (t', \mathbf{x}'_a)$, for some a . Roughly speaking,

we use the idea to argue that, if one removes the contribution (within an n -point moment of the SHE) of $h_N(t, \mathbf{x}')$ around the value $h_\star(t, \mathbf{x}')$, the result becomes exponentially smaller. We will not attempt to formulate the tree decomposition itself precisely, but rather *use the idea* to carry out the proof only.

Once the first step is accomplished, in Section 3.2, we infer the value of h_N outside the noise corridor from its value along the noise corridors and its increment along the characteristics.

1.5. Hyperbolic scaling regime: discussions and potential extensions. In long time, $T \rightarrow \infty$, perhaps the most natural scaling regime is $N = 1$, which we call the hyperbolic scaling regime.

In the hyperbolic regime, the one-point upper-tail LDP and tail bounds have been obtained for various initial and boundary conditions in [CG20b, CG20a, DT21, Lin21, GL23]; the bounds in the first two works actually holds for all time larger than any given positive threshold. The recent work [GH22] went beyond one-point deviations and studied the terminal-time limit shape. This work gave many detailed and sharp bounds that hold for all time larger than any given positive threshold. When specialized into the hyperbolic regime and $\vec{r} \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}$, their results would produce the fixed-time, n -point LDP and give one-sided bounds for the terminal-time limit shape. (When $n = 1$, their results give the full terminal-time limit shape; see Theorem 9 there.) For comparison, our result gives the full *spacetime* limit shape $h_\star = h_\star(t, x)$ but does not cover the hyperbolic regime, because of the condition $N \rightarrow \infty$ in (1.3).

Let us point out the potential of combining our methods and the results in [GH22] to study the limit shapes in the hyperbolic regime. Recall the Legendre duality between the rate functions and log moment generating functions. In the hyperbolic regime, one can seek to infer from the results in [GH22] the n -point LDP and to turn the LDP into the n -point moment Lyapunov exponent for *all positive powers*. As said, our proof can be viewed as a way of leveraging the fixed-time moment Lyapunov exponents to the spacetime limit shape. Hence, in the hyperbolic regime, one can use these positive-power moment Lyapunov exponents as the input (that replaces Property (A) in Section 2.1) to run our proof. A careful examination of our proof reveals that the proof goes through except where we use Property (D). The property is used to argue for the localization of the contribution of the noise in the moments and is currently only known to hold under (1.3). If one can extend or replace this property, Theorem 1.1 for $N = 1$ will follow.

1.6. Beyond Theorem 1.1, discussions and conjectures. First, we conjecture that the results of Theorem 1.1 hold for all $\vec{r} \in \mathcal{R}$ under $N \geq 1$ and $N^2T \rightarrow \infty$. The limit shape should still be given by the entropy solution of the *backward* equation (1.12) with the terminal condition $f_\star = f_{\star,1,\vec{x},\vec{r}}$, which was defined for a general $\vec{r} \in \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}(1, \vec{x})$ in Section 1.2. The (conjectural) limit shape for $\vec{r} \notin \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}$ looks more complicated than that for $\vec{r} \in \mathcal{R}$. For example, the shocks of the former are not piecewise linear.

Conjecture 1.2. The results of Theorem 1.1 hold for all $\vec{r} \in \mathcal{R}$ under $N \geq 1$ and $N^2T \rightarrow \infty$.

Next, let us consider initial conditions other than the narrow-edge/delta one. Since the SHE (1.7) is linear, the solution with a general initial condition can be written as the convolution of the delta-initial-condition solution with the initial condition. This property has been used to derive one-point rate functions and tail probability bounds for general initial conditions in [CG20a, GH22, GL23]. The situation becomes more intriguing for questions about limit shapes. As seen in the study of the Freidlin–Wentzell LDP for the KPZ equation, the most probable shapes came exhibit symmetry breaking under the Brownian initial condition [JKM16, SKM18, KLD17, KLD22].

To illustrate the symmetry breaking in a cleaner fashion, we consider the two-delta initial condition. First, if the initial condition is $Z(0, \cdot) = \delta_{NT\mathbf{x}_0}$, the LDP and limit shape follow the

same description in Section 1.2 with suitable adaptations. Namely, we should replace $f_{x,1,\vec{x},\vec{r}}$ with $f_{x,\mathbf{x}_0;1,\vec{x},\vec{r}}(t,x) := f_{x,1,\vec{x}-(\mathbf{x}_0,\dots,\mathbf{x}_0),\vec{r}}(x-\mathbf{x}_0)$, replace \mathbf{p} with $\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{x}_0}(t,x) := \mathbf{p}(t,x-\mathbf{x}_0)$, and define the rate function $I_{\text{KPZ}}(\mathbf{x}_0; t, \vec{x}, \vec{r})$ and limit shape h_{x,\mathbf{x}_0} similarly. Now, consider the two-delta initial condition $Z(0, \cdot) = \delta_{-NT} + \delta_{+NT}$ and probe the upper tails of $h_N(1, x)$ at $x = 0$. More precisely, consider the event $\mathcal{E}_{N,\delta}(1, 0, \mathbf{r})$ for $\mathbf{r} > \mathbf{p}_{-1}(1, 0) = \mathbf{p}_{+1}(1, 0)$. Under $\mathcal{E}_{N,\delta}(1, 0, \mathbf{r})$, we expect to see a competition between the two deltas. Let $h_{x,\pm 1}$ be the limit shape when there is only one delta at $\mathbf{x}_0 = \pm 1$ (and for $\mathbf{x} = 0$ and the given \mathbf{r}). Set $\mathbf{g}_- := \max\{h_{x,-1}, \mathbf{p}_{+1}\}$ and $\mathbf{g}_+ := \max\{h_{x,+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-1}\}$. Note that $\mathbf{g}_- \neq \mathbf{g}_+$, $\mathbf{g}_-(t, x) = \mathbf{g}_+(t, -x)$, and $I_{\text{KPZ}}(-1; 1, 0, \mathbf{r}) = I_{\text{KPZ}}(+1; 1, 0, \mathbf{r})$.

Conjecture 1.3. Under the two-delta initial condition and (1.3) (or more generally $N \geq 1$ and $N^2T \rightarrow \infty$), for any $\mathbf{r} > \mathbf{p}_{-1}(1, 0) = \mathbf{p}_{+1}(1, 0)$ and $R < \infty$,

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N^3T} \log \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}_{N,\delta}(1, 0, \mathbf{r})] + I_{\text{KPZ}}(\pm 1; 1, 0, \mathbf{r}) \right| = 0, \quad (1.14)$$

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \mathbf{P} \left[\left\| h_N - \mathbf{g}_- \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty\left(\left[\frac{1}{R}, 1\right] \times [-R, R]\right)} \leq \frac{1}{R} \mid \mathcal{E}_{N,\delta}(1, 0, \mathbf{r}) \right] - \frac{1}{2} \right| = 0, \quad (1.15)$$

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \mathbf{P} \left[\left\| h_N - \mathbf{g}_+ \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty\left(\left[\frac{1}{R}, 1\right] \times [-R, R]\right)} \leq \frac{1}{R} \mid \mathcal{E}_{N,\delta}(1, 0, \mathbf{r}) \right] - \frac{1}{2} \right| = 0. \quad (1.15')$$

In Appendix B, we analyze the one-point moments under the two-delta(-like) initial condition. The analysis shows that the moments are dominated by the contribution of either of the deltas, which support the symmetry breaking stated in (1.15).

1.7. Literature. Recently, there has been much interest in the LDPs of the KPZ equation in mathematics and physics. Several strands of methods produce detailed information on the one-point tail probabilities and the one-point rate function. This includes the physics works [LDMRS16, LDMS16, KLD17, SMP17, CGK⁺18, KLD18a, KLD18b, KLDP18, KLD18b, Kra19, KLD19, LD20], the simulation works [HLDM⁺18, HMS19, HKLD20, HMS21], and the mathematics works [CG20a, CG20b, CCR21, DT21, DG21, Kim21, Lin21, CC22, GL23, GH22, Tsa22a]. For the Freidlin–Wentzell/weak-noise LDP, behaviors of the one-point rate function and the corresponding most probable shapes for various initial conditions and boundary conditions have been predicted [KK07, KK08, KK09, MKV16, KMS16, MS17, MV18, SM18, SMS18, ALM19, SMV19], some of which have been proven [LT21, LT22, GLLT23]; an intriguing symmetry breaking and second-order phase transition has been discovered in [JKM16, SKM18] via numerical means and analytically derived in [KLD17, KLD22]; and a connection to integrable PDEs is established and explored in [Kra20, KLD21, KLD22, Tsa22b, KLD23]. The one-point upper-tail of the KPZ equation and the SHE have been studied in [Che15, CG20a, DT21, DG21, Lin21] for large time or all time larger than any given positive threshold, and in [GLLT23] for short time. For the nonlinear generalizations of the SHE, finite-time upper tails have been obtained in [CJK13, CD15, KKX17]. The work [GH22] gave detailed and sharp bounds on the n -point upper tails and estimates of the terminal-time limit shape, for all time larger than any given positive threshold.

1.8. Notation. Let us introduce the various versions of Z and h that we will work with. Below, we will use the Feynman–Kac formula to introduce the Z s, with $X = (\text{standard BM}) + NTx$. For any initial time $t_0 \in [0, 1]$ and initial location $x' \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$Z_N(t_0, x'; t, x) := \mathbb{E}_{\text{BM}} \left[e^{\int_0^{T(t-t_0)} ds \eta(Tt-s, X(s))} \delta_{NTx'}(X(T(t-t_0))) \right], \quad (1.16)$$

$$Z_{N,\alpha}(t_0, x'; t, x) := \mathbb{E}_{\text{BM}} \left[e^{\int_0^{T(t-t_0)} ds \eta(Tt-s, X(s))} \mathbf{1}_{[-\alpha+x', x'+\alpha]} \left(\frac{1}{NT} X(T(t-t_0)) \right) \right]. \quad (1.17)$$

Namely, $Z(Tt_0, NTx'; t, x) := Z_N(t_0, x'; t/T, x/(NT))$ solves the SHE on $(t, x) \in [Tt_0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ with the initial condition $Z(Tt_0, NTx'; Tt_0, \cdot) = \delta_{NTx'}$. The same holds for $Z_{N,\alpha}(t_0, x'; t, x)$, except that the initial condition is now changed to $Z_{N,\alpha}(t_0, x'; t_0, \cdot) = \mathbf{1}_{[-\alpha+x', x'+\alpha]}$, which we call the **delta-like** initial condition. Recall the noise corridors ξ_c from Sections 1.2–1.3. Let $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ denote the space of real-valued continuous functions on Ω . Set

$$\text{Dist}_{N,[0,s']}(f, \xi) := \sup_{s \in [0,s']} \min_{c=1,\dots,n} \left| \frac{1}{NT} f(Ts) - \xi_c(s) \right|, \quad f \in \mathcal{C}[0, Ts'], \quad (1.18)$$

$$Z_N^{\beta\text{-loc}}(t_0, x'; t, x) := \mathbb{E}_{\text{BM}} \left[(\text{same as (1.16)}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\text{Dist}_{N,[0,t-t_0]}(X, \xi(\cdot+1-t)) \leq \beta\}} \right], \quad (1.19)$$

$$Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}}(t_0, x'; t, x) := \mathbb{E}_{\text{BM}} \left[(\text{same as (1.17)}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\text{Dist}_{N,[0,t-t_0]}(X, \xi(\cdot+1-t)) \leq \beta\}} \right]. \quad (1.20)$$

These β -localized Z s have their BMs stay within distance β (in the post-scale units) from the noise corridors. When $(t_0, x') = (0, 0)$, we write

$$Z_N(t, x) := Z_N(0, 0; t, x), \text{ and the same for } Z_{N,\alpha}, Z_N^{\beta\text{-loc}}, Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}}, \quad (1.21)$$

$$h_N(t, x) := \frac{1}{N^2T} (\log Z_N(t, x) + \log \sqrt{T}), \quad h_{N,\alpha}(t, x) := \frac{1}{N^2T} \log Z_{N,\alpha}(t, x), \quad (1.22)$$

which is consistent with (1.2). Recall from Section 1.1 that $\log \sqrt{T}$ counters the contribution from the delta initial condition, so is not needed for $h_{N,\alpha}$.

Throughout the paper, α denotes be width of the delta-like initial condition, δ denotes the parameter in the event (1.4) and similar events, N is the scaling parameter,

$$A \lesssim B \text{ means } \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (N^3T)^{-1} \log(A/B) \leq 0, \quad (1.23)$$

$$A \ll B \text{ means } \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (N^3T)^{-1} \log(A/B) < 0, \quad (1.24)$$

and $A \sim B$ means $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$.

Outline. In Section 2, we recall the relevant results from [Tsa23] on the moments of the SHE and use them to obtain the n -point LDP. In Section 3, we prove that the KPZ height function follows the limit shape at any given point in $(0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, up to an exponentially small probability. In Section 4, we develop certain continuity estimates, which turns the pointwise result in Section 3 to a result that holds on any compact subset of $(0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, whereby completing the proof of Theorem 1.1. For technical reasons, we will consider $Z_{N,\alpha}$ and $h_{N,\alpha}$ instead of Z_N and h_N in Sections 2–3. Then, in Section 4, we use the continuity estimates to approximate the latter by the former.

Acknowledgments. The work was initiated during ‘‘PNW Integrable Probability Conference’’ at Oregon State University. We thank the conference organizer, Axel Saenz, for their hospitality. We thank Sayan Das for helpful discussions. The research of Tsai was partially supported by the NSF through DMS-2243112 and the Sloan Foundation Fellowship.

2. MOMENTS AND n -POINT LDP

Here we introduce some properties of the moments of the SHE and use them to obtain the LDP.

The relevant initial condition for the SHE in Theorem 1.1 is the delta initial condition, but for technical reasons we will first consider the delta-like initial condition. Namely, we will work with $Z_{N,\alpha}$ and $h_{N,\alpha}$ hereafter until the end of Section 3. Later, in Section 4.2, we will argue that they well approximate Z_N and h_N .

2.1. Results from [Tsa23]. Let us recall the relevant results from [Tsa23]. For $\vec{x} = (x_1 < \dots < x_n)$ and $\vec{m} = (m_c)_{c=1}^n \in [0, \infty)^n$, the moment Lyapunov exponents of interest is the limit of

$$\frac{1}{N^3 T} \log \mathbf{E} \left[\prod_{c=1}^n Z_{N,\alpha}(t_0, \mathbf{x}'; t, \mathbf{x}_c)^{Nm_c} \right], \quad (2.1)$$

with $N \rightarrow \infty$ first (with $T = T_N$ and under (1.3)) and $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ later. The results from [Tsa23] are for integer moments, so an integer part is implicitly taken whenever needed; for example, $Nm_c := \lceil Nm_c \rceil$ in (2.1). As will be seen later, the limit of (2.1) is continuous in $\vec{m} \in [0, \infty)^n$, so obtaining the limit for $\lceil Nm_c \rceil \in (\mathbb{Z}_{>0})^n$ automatically gives the limit for $Nm_c \in [0, \infty)^n$.

Describing the limit of (2.1) requires considering measure-valued functions. Set $\mathfrak{m} = m_1 + \dots + m_n$ and let $(\mathfrak{m}\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))$ denote the space of positive Borel measures on \mathbb{R} with total mass \mathfrak{m} . For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{m}\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$, write $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \lambda(dx) f(x) =: \langle \lambda, f \rangle$ and let $\mathfrak{X}[\lambda](a) := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \langle \lambda, \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, x]} \rangle \geq a\}$ denote the quantile function or inverse CDF. Endow the space $\mathfrak{m}\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ with the weak* topology, and, for $\mu \in \mathcal{C}([s', s''], \mathfrak{m}\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))$, set

$$\mathbb{L}_{[s', s'']}(\mu) := \int_{s'}^{s''} ds \left(\sum_x \frac{1}{24} \langle \mu, \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}} \rangle^3 - \int_0^{\mathfrak{m}} da \frac{1}{2} (\partial_s \mathfrak{X}[\mu])^2 \right). \quad (2.2)$$

Hereafter, we adopt shorthand notation such as $\mu := \mu(s)$ and $\mathfrak{X}[\mu] := \mathfrak{X}[\mu(s)](a)$. In (2.2), the sum runs over all atoms of $\mu(s)$, and the integral is interpreted as ∞ when $\partial_s \mathfrak{X}[\mu] \notin \mathcal{L}^2([s', s''] \times [0, \mathfrak{m}])$. Let us briefly explain how the above objects are related to (2.1). With the aid of the Feynman–Kac formula, one can express the moment in (2.1) in terms of the exponential moments of the localtimes of Nm independent BMs. The limit of (2.1) is then controlled by the large deviations of these BMs and their localtimes. An element $\mu \in \mathcal{C}([s', s''], \mathfrak{m}\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))$ describes a deviation of the empirical measure of the BMs. Note that $\mu = \mu(s)$ uses the *backward* time s since the Feynman–Kac formula involves a time reversal; see (1.13). The quantity (2.2) encodes the contribution of the localtimes (in the first term in the integral) and of the sample-path LDP for the BMs (in the second term).

The limit of (2.1) is described by

$$L_{\text{SHE}}(\mathbf{x}' \xrightarrow{t} (\vec{x}, \vec{m})) := \sup \left\{ \mathbb{L}_{[0, t]}(\mu) : \mu(0) = \sum_{c=1}^n m_c \delta_{x_c}, \mu(t) = \mathfrak{m} \delta_{x'} \right\}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\mathfrak{m} = m_1 + \dots + m_n$. In light of the time reversal mentioned in the last paragraph, $\mu(0) = \sum_{c=1}^n m_c \delta_{x_c}$ corresponds to the points probed in (2.1) at time $t = t + t_0$, while $\mu(t) = \mathfrak{m} \delta_{x'}$ corresponds to the initial condition of $Z_{N,\alpha}$ at time t_0 .

The following properties are proven in [Tsa23, Cor. 2.4 and Thm. 2.5]. Recall \lesssim , \ll , and \sim from Section 1.8.

(A) (2.1) $\sim L_{\text{SHE}}(\mathbf{x}' \xrightarrow{t-t_0} (\vec{x}, \vec{m}))$

(B) For fixed \vec{x} and t , view $I_{\text{KPZ}}(t, \vec{x}, \vec{r}) =: I_{\text{KPZ}}(\vec{r})$ as a function on $\mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{x})$ and view $L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{t} (\vec{x}, \vec{m})) =: L_{\text{SHE}}(\vec{m})$ as a function on $[0, \infty)^n$. These functions are continuous, strictly convex, and the Legendre transform of each other. Further, $\nabla I_{\text{KPZ}} = \nabla_{\vec{r}} I_{\text{KPZ}} : \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{x}) \rightarrow [0, \infty)^n$ is a homeomorphism, so the following relation characterizes Legendre dual variables (\vec{r}, \vec{m}) :

$$(\nabla_{\vec{r}} I_{\text{KPZ}})(t, \vec{x}, \vec{r}) = (\nabla I_{\text{KPZ}})(\vec{r}) = \vec{m}. \quad (2.4)$$

(C) Let us prepare the notation for Property (C). Fix $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and consider a Legendre pair (\vec{r}, \vec{m}) as in (2.4) at time 1, namely $(\nabla_{\vec{r}} I_{\text{KPZ}})(1, \vec{x}', \vec{r}') = \vec{m}'$. Take any intermediate time $t' \in (0, 1]$. Evolving in backward time, some of the noise corridors may have merged by time $s = 1 - t'$. Let $\{\xi_c(1 - t')\}_{c=1}^n = \{x'_1 < \dots < x'_{n'}\}$ denote the distinct positions of the clusters at that

time. Accordingly, let $\vec{r}' := (\mathbf{h}_*(t', \mathbf{x}'_a))_{a=1}^{n'}$, $\mathfrak{C}(a) := \{c : \xi_c(1 - t') = \mathbf{x}'_a\}$, $\mathbf{m}'_a := \sum_{c \in \mathfrak{C}(a)} \mathbf{m}_c$, and $\vec{m}' := (\mathbf{m}'_a)_{a=1}^{n'}$; see Figure 4 for an illustration.

(C) Notation as in (C)'.

$$(\nabla_{\vec{r}} I_{\text{KPZ}})(t', \vec{x}', \vec{r}') = \vec{m}', \quad (2.5)$$

$$L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{1} (\vec{x}, \vec{m})) = L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{t'} (\vec{x}', \vec{m}')) + \sum_{a=1}^{n'} L_{\text{SHE}}(\mathbf{x}'_a \xrightarrow{1-t'} (\mathbf{x}_c, \mathbf{m}_c)_{c \in \mathfrak{C}(a)}). \quad (2.6)$$

(D) Recall $Z_{N,\alpha}$ and $Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}}$ from (1.21). For any nonempty $A \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\beta > 0$,

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\prod_{c \in A} (Z_{N,\alpha} - Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}})(1, \mathbf{x}_c)^{N\mathbf{m}_c} \cdot \prod_{c \notin A} Z_{N,\alpha}(1, \mathbf{x}_c)^{N\mathbf{m}_c} \right] \ll \exp(N^3 T L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{1} (\vec{x}, \vec{m}))).$$

2.2. From moments to n -point LDP. Properties (A)–(B) immediately give the n -point LDP for $h_{N,\alpha}$. Recall $h_{N,\alpha}(t, x)$ from (1.21) and let

$$\mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}(t, \vec{x}, \vec{r}) := \{ |h_{N,\alpha}(t, \mathbf{x}_c) - r_c| \leq \delta, c = 1, \dots, n \}. \quad (2.7)$$

Since $Z_{N,\alpha}(t, x) = \exp(N^2 T h_{N,\alpha}(t, x))$, Property (A) gives the limit of the n -point log moment generating function of $h_{N,\alpha}(t, \cdot)$. Further, by Property (B), the limit is strictly convex in $\vec{m} \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{x})$. Hence the n -point LDP of $h_{N,\alpha}(t, \cdot)$ follows.

Corollary 2.1. *For any $t \in (0, 1]$, $\vec{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1 < \dots < \mathbf{x}_n)$, and $\vec{r} \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{x})^\circ$,*

$$\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}_{N,r,\delta}(t, \vec{x}, \vec{r})] \sim \exp(-N^3 T I_{\text{KPZ}}(t, \vec{x}, \vec{r})). \quad (2.8)$$

Next, let us state an LDP upper bound that holds for all $\vec{r} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The bound will serve as a technical tool in Section 3.1, is suboptimal on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}$, but suffices for our purpose. Recall $f_\star = f_{\star,t,\vec{x},\vec{r}}$ from Section 1.2 and recall that $p(t, x) := -x^2/(2t)$. Consider the convex-hull analog of it: Let $\mathbf{g}_\star = \mathbf{g}_{\star,t,\vec{x},\vec{r}} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$ be the function whose hypograph $\{(x, r) : r \leq \mathbf{g}_\star(x), x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is the convex hull of $\{(x, p(t, x))\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \cup \{(\mathbf{x}_c, r_c)\}_{c=1}^n$. Indeed, when $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{x})$, $f_{\star,t,\vec{x},\vec{r}} = \mathbf{g}_{\star,t,\vec{x},\vec{r}}$, but they differ when $\mathbf{r} \notin \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{x})$. Set

$$(I_{\text{KPZ}} \circ \mathbf{g}_\star)(t, \vec{x}, \vec{r}) := I_{\text{KPZ}}(t, \vec{x}, (\mathbf{g}_{\star,t,\vec{x},\vec{r}}(t, \mathbf{x}_c))_{c=1}^n). \quad (2.9)$$

Lemma 2.2. *Fix t and \vec{x} .*

(a) *Take any Legendre-dual variables (\vec{r}, \vec{m}) in $\mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{x})^\circ \times (0, \infty)^n$. The map $\vec{r}' \mapsto (\vec{r}' \cdot \vec{m} - (I_{\text{KPZ}} \circ \mathbf{g}_\star)(t, \vec{x}, \vec{r}'))$ is concave and continuous on \mathbb{R}^n and has a unique maximum at $\vec{r}' = \vec{r}$.*

(b) *For any closed $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$\mathbf{P}[(h_{N,\alpha}(t, \vec{x}_c))_{c=1}^n \in F] \lesssim \exp\left(-N^3 T \inf_F (I_{\text{KPZ}} \circ \mathbf{g}_\star)\right). \quad (2.10)$$

Lemma 2.2 is proven in Appendix A.

3. LIMIT SHAPE AT ONE POINT

Given the n -point LDP in Corollary 2.1, we move on to the limit shape. Hereafter, we fix \vec{x} and $\vec{r} \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(1, \vec{x})^\circ$. Recall $\mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}(1, \vec{x}, \vec{r})$ from (2.7). With \vec{x} and \vec{r} being fixed, hereafter we write $\mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}(1, \vec{x}, \vec{r}) = \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}$. The goal of this section is to prove the proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *Notation as above. For any $(t, x) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$ and $R \in (0, \infty)$,*

$$\mathbf{P}\left[\left\{ |h_{N,\alpha}(t, x) - \mathbf{h}_*(t, x)| \geq \frac{1}{R} \right\} \mid \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta} \right] \ll \exp(-N^3 T \cdot 0) = 1. \quad (3.1)$$

We call Proposition 3.1 a one-point result because the event involves one (t, x) . By the union bound, the one-point result automatically extends to finitely many points in $(0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$. Going from finitely many points to a compact subset of $(0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$ requires certain continuity estimates, which will be done in Section 4.

Actually, the proof of Proposition 3.1 itself requires certain continuity estimates. We state them here and defer the proof to Section 4. Hereafter we write $c(v_1, v_2, \dots) \in (0, \infty)$ for a generic constant that depends only on the designed variables v_1, v_2, \dots .

Lemma 3.2.

(a) Take any $(t, y) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$. There exists $c = c(t, y)$ such that, for all $r \geq \beta^{1/9}$,

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{x \in [-\beta+y, y+\beta]} |h_{N,\alpha}(t, x) - h_{N,\alpha}(t, y)| \geq r \right] \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T r^{3/2} \beta^{-1/6}}. \quad (3.2)$$

(b) For every $(t_1, y_1), (t_2, y_2) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$ with $t_1 < t_2$ and every $\beta, R \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{x \in [-\beta+y_1, y_1+\beta]} \left| \frac{1}{N^2 T} \log(Z_N(t_1, x; t_2, y_2) \sqrt{T}) + \frac{(y_2 - x)^2}{2(t_2 - t_1)} \right| \geq \frac{1}{R} \right] \ll e^{-N^3 T \cdot 0}. \quad (3.3)$$

To understand where the factor $(y_2 - x)^2 / (2(t_2 - t_1))$ in Lemma 3.2(b) came from, refer to the Feynman–Kac formula (1.16). There, if we replace η with zero, the result becomes the heat kernel, which reads $q(T(t_2 - t_1), NT(y_2 - x))$ here. Applying $(N^2 T)^{-1} \log(\cdot \sqrt{T})$ to the heat kernel gives $-(y_2 - x)^2 / (2(t_2 - t_1))$ plus a negligibly term. Put it differently, Lemma 3.2(b) says that $Z_N(t_1, x; t_2, y_2)$ typically behaves as if the spacetime white noise did not contribute at all.

3.1. Limit shape along the noise corridors. Here we prove Proposition 3.1 when (t, x) lies on a noise corridor. More precisely, letting $\vec{x}, \vec{r}, \vec{m}, \ell, \vec{x}', \vec{r}', \vec{m}'$, and $\mathfrak{C}(\alpha)$ be as in (C)' in Section 2.1, we assume $(t, x) = (\ell, \mathbf{x}'_{\alpha_0})$ for some α_0 . We write t as ℓ to be consistent with the notation in (C)'.

The first step is to perform localization. Let $\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha} := \{|h_{N,\alpha}(\ell, \mathbf{x}'_{\alpha_0}) - h_\star(\ell, \mathbf{x}'_{\alpha_0})| > 1/R\}$ be the first event in (3.1). Recall that the event $\mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}$ controls the value of $h_N(1, \mathbf{x}_c)$, $c = 1, \dots, n$, and use this fact to write $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha} \cap \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}] \lesssim \exp(-N^3 T \vec{m} \cdot \vec{r}) \cdot \mathbf{E}[\prod_{c=1}^n Z_{N,\alpha}(1, \mathbf{x}_c)^{N m_c} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha}}]$. Within the last expectation, write $Z_{N,\alpha}$ as the sum of $Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}}$ and $(Z_{N,\alpha} - Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}})$, note that the both are non-negative, and use the inequality $(A + B)^{N m_c} \leq 2^{N m_c} A^{N m_c} + 2^{N m_c} B^{N m_c}$. The result gives

$$\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha} \cap \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}] \lesssim 2^{N m} e^{-N^3 T \vec{m} \cdot \vec{r}} \left(\mathbf{E} \left[\prod_{c=1}^n Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}}(1, \mathbf{x}_c)^{N m_c} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha}} \right] + (\text{remainder}) \right), \quad (3.4)$$

where the remainder is given by summing the expectation in Property (D) over all nonempty $A \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$. Under (1.3), the factor $2^{N m}$ is negligible, so we absorb it into \lesssim . By Property (D), the remainder is $\lesssim \exp(N^3 T (L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{1} (\vec{x}, \vec{m})) - f_1(\beta)))$, for some $f_1 : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. Recall that \vec{m} was chosen to be the Legendre-dual variable of \vec{r} . Multiply both sides of the last bound by the factor $\exp(-N^3 T \vec{m} \cdot \vec{r})$ and recognize that $(\vec{m} \cdot \vec{r} - L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{1} (\vec{x}, \vec{m})))$ is $I_{\text{KPZ}}(1, \vec{x}, \vec{r})$ with the aid of Property (B). Doing so gives

$$\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha} \cap \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}] \lesssim e^{-N^3 T \vec{m} \cdot \vec{r}} \mathbf{E} \left[\prod_{c=1}^n Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}}(1, \mathbf{x}_c)^{N m_c} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha}} \right] + e^{-N^3 T (I_{\text{KPZ}}(1, \vec{x}, \vec{r}) + f_1(\beta))}. \quad (3.5)$$

Next, we decompose the expectation in (3.5) at time ℓ . Recall $Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}}(t, x)$ and $Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}}(t_0, x', t, x)$ from Section 1.8 and invoke the semigroup identity

$$Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}}(1, \mathbf{x}_c) = \int NT dx Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}}(\ell, x) Z_N^{\beta\text{-loc}}(\ell, x; 1, \mathbf{x}_c). \quad (3.6)$$

Take any $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{a})$ and $\mathfrak{c}' \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{a}')$ with $\mathfrak{a} \neq \mathfrak{a}'$. By the definition of $\mathfrak{C}(\cdot)$, $\inf_{1-s \in [\ell', 1]} |\xi_{\mathfrak{c}}(s) - \xi_{\mathfrak{c}'}(s)| > 0$. Take β small enough such that $\inf_{1-s \in [\ell', 1]} |\xi_{\mathfrak{c}}(s) - \xi_{\mathfrak{c}'}(s)| > 2\beta$, for all such $\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{c}'$. Under this condition, the sets of random variables $\{\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha}}, Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}}(\mathfrak{t}, x)\}$ and $\{Z_N^{\beta\text{-loc}}(\mathfrak{t}, x; 1, \mathbf{x}_{\mathfrak{c}})\}_{\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{C}(1)}$... and $\{Z_N^{\beta\text{-loc}}(\mathfrak{t}, x; 1, \mathbf{x}_{\mathfrak{c}})\}_{\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{C}(n')}$ are independent, because they are measurable with respect to the noise over disjoint regions in spacetime. Using this property to evaluate the moment gives

$$(\text{expectation in (3.5)}) = \left(\prod_{\mathfrak{a}=1}^{n'} \prod_{\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{a})} \prod_{i=1}^{N m_{\mathfrak{c}}} \int_{-\beta + \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}}}^{\mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}} + \beta} NT dx_{\mathfrak{c},i} \right) \cdot E_0 \cdot \prod_{\mathfrak{a}=1}^{n'} E_{\mathfrak{a}}, \quad (3.7)$$

where $E_0 := \mathbf{E}[\prod_{\mathfrak{a}=1}^{n'} \prod_{i=1}^{N m'_{\mathfrak{a}}} Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}}(\mathfrak{t}, x_{\mathfrak{a},i}) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha}}]$ and $E_{\mathfrak{a}} := \mathbf{E}[\prod_{\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{a})} \prod_{i=1}^{N m_{\mathfrak{c}}} Z_N^{\beta\text{-loc}}(\mathfrak{t}, x_{\mathfrak{c},i}; 1, \mathbf{x}_{\mathfrak{c}})]$, and the bounds of the integrals come from the constraints on the BMs in $Z_N^{\beta\text{-loc}}(\mathfrak{t}, x_{\mathfrak{c},i}; 1, \mathbf{x}_{\mathfrak{c}})$.

Next we bound E_0 . First, write $Z_{N,\alpha}^{\beta\text{-loc}}(\mathfrak{t}, x) \leq Z_{N,\alpha}(\mathfrak{t}, x) = \exp(N^2 T h_{N,\alpha}(\mathfrak{t}, x))$. In light of (3.7), we consider $x \in [-\beta + \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}}, \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}} + \beta]$ only. Set $A_{N,\alpha} := \max_{\mathfrak{a}=1}^{n'} \sup_{x \in [-\beta + \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}}, \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}} + \beta]} |h_{N,\alpha}(\mathfrak{t}, x) - h_{N,\alpha}(\mathfrak{t}, \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}})|$, which controls the error when one approximates the last exponential by its value at $x = \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}}$. We have $E_0 \leq \mathbf{E}[\exp(N^3 T (\sum_{\mathfrak{a}} m'_{\mathfrak{a}} h_{N,\alpha}(\mathfrak{t}, \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}}))) \exp(N^3 T m A_{N,\alpha}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha}}]$. Invoke a small parameter $\gamma > 0$ and decompose the last expectation into $\{A_{N,\alpha} \leq \gamma\}$ and $\{A_{N,\alpha} > \gamma\}$:

$$E_{0,1} := \mathbf{E}[e^{N^3 T \sum_{\mathfrak{a}} m'_{\mathfrak{a}} h_{N,\alpha}(\mathfrak{t}, \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}})} e^{N^3 T m A_{N,\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{A_{N,\alpha} \leq \gamma\}}], \quad (3.8)$$

$$E_{0,2} := \mathbf{E}[e^{N^3 T \sum_{\mathfrak{a}} m'_{\mathfrak{a}} h_{N,\alpha}(\mathfrak{t}, \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}})} e^{N^3 T m A_{N,\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{A_{N,\alpha} > \gamma\}}]. \quad (3.9)$$

In $E_{0,1}$, bound the second exponential by $\exp(N^3 T m \gamma)$ and apply Lemma 2.2(b). Doing so gives $E_{0,1} \lesssim \exp(N^3 T (m \gamma + \sup\{\vec{r}' \cdot \vec{m}' - (I_{\text{KPZ}} \circ \mathbf{g}_{\star})(\mathfrak{t}, \vec{\mathbf{x}}', \vec{r}')\}))$, where the supremum runs over all $\vec{r}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n'}$ with the constraint $|r_{\mathfrak{a}0} - \mathbf{r}'_{\mathfrak{a}0}| \geq 1/R$. Had it been without the constraint, by Lemma 2.2(a) and (2.5), the supremum would be achieved uniquely at $\vec{r}' = \vec{r}'$, and be equal to $L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{\ell'} (\vec{\mathbf{x}}', \vec{m}'))$. With the constraint, the supremum is strictly smaller than that, so $E_{0,1} \lesssim \exp(N^3 T (m \gamma + L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{\ell'} (\vec{\mathbf{x}}', \vec{m}')) - 1/c_2))$. As for $E_{0,2}$, forgo the indicator $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha}}$ and apply the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to separate the two exponentials

$$E_{0,2} \leq \left(\mathbf{E}[e^{2N^3 T \sum_{\mathfrak{a}} m'_{\mathfrak{a}} h_{N,\alpha}(\mathfrak{t}, \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}})}] \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbf{E}[e^{2N^3 T m A_{N,\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{A_{N,\alpha} > \gamma\}}] \right)^{1/2}. \quad (3.10)$$

By Property (A), the first expectation on the right hand side is $\lesssim \exp(c_3 N^3 T)$. By Lemma 3.2(a), the second expectation on the right hand side is $\lesssim \exp(-N^3 T f_4(\beta, \gamma))$ for some $f_4 : (0, \infty)^2 \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} f_4(\beta, \gamma) = \infty$ for each $\gamma > 0$. Altogether,

$$E_0 \lesssim \exp(N^3 T (m \gamma + L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{\ell'} (\vec{\mathbf{x}}', \vec{m}')) - 1/c_2)) + \exp(\frac{1}{2} N^3 T (c_3 - f_4(\beta, \gamma))). \quad (3.11)$$

Let us complete the proof. Insert the bound (3.11) into (3.7), observe that the bound does not depend on the integration variables, and factor it out of the integrals. Next, rewrite the remaining integrals as $\prod_{\mathfrak{a}=1}^{n'} \mathbf{E}[\prod_{\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{a})} (\int_{-\beta + \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}}}^{\mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}} + \beta} NT dx_{\mathfrak{c}} Z_N^{\beta\text{-loc}}(\mathfrak{t}, x_{\mathfrak{c},i}; 1, \mathbf{x}_{\mathfrak{c}}))^{N m_{\mathfrak{c}}}]$, recognize the last integral as $Z_{N,\beta}^{\beta\text{-loc}}(\mathfrak{t}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathfrak{a}}; \mathfrak{t}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathfrak{c}})$, and bound it by $Z_{N,\beta}(\mathfrak{t}, \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}}; 1, \mathbf{x}_{\mathfrak{c}})$. Doing so gives

$$\prod_{\mathfrak{a}=1}^{n'} \mathbf{E} \left[\prod_{\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{a})} Z_{N,\beta}(\mathfrak{t}, \mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}}; 1, \mathbf{x}_{\mathfrak{c}})^{N m_{\mathfrak{c}}} \right]. \quad (3.12)$$

Applying Property (A) to each of the last expectations gives

$$(3.12) \lesssim \exp \left(N^3 T \left(\sum_{\mathfrak{a}=1}^n L_{\text{SHE}}(\mathbf{x}'_{\mathfrak{a}} \xrightarrow{1-\ell'} (\mathbf{x}_{\mathfrak{c}}, \mathbf{m}_{\mathfrak{c}})_{\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{a})}) + f_5(\beta) \right) \right), \quad (3.13)$$

where $f_5(\beta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\beta \rightarrow 0$. Combine the preceding results with the aid of (2.6). We arrive at

$$\text{(the expectation in (3.5))} \lesssim \exp\left(N^3 T(L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{1}(\vec{x}, \vec{m})) + m\gamma - 1/c_2 + f_5(\beta))\right) \quad (3.14a)$$

$$+ \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}N^3 T(c'_3 - f_4(\beta, \gamma))\right). \quad (3.14b)$$

Set $\gamma := 1/(2mc_2)$ and fix a small enough $\beta > 0$ such that $-1/(2c_2) + f_5(\beta) < 0$ and that $c'_3 - f_4(\beta, 1/(2mc_2)) < -L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{1}(\vec{x}, \vec{m}))$. Then, insert (3.14) into (3.5) and recognize $(-\vec{r} \cdot \vec{m} + L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{1}(\vec{x}, \vec{m})))$ as $-I_{\text{KPZ}}(1, \vec{x}, \vec{m})$. Doing so gives

$$\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{D}_{N,\alpha} \cap \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}] = \mathbf{P}\left[\left\{|h_{N,\alpha}(t', \mathbf{x}'_{a_0}) - h_*(t', \mathbf{x}'_{a_0})| > \frac{1}{R}\right\} \cap \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}\right] \ll e^{-N^3 T I_{\text{KPZ}}(1, \vec{x}, \vec{m})}. \quad (3.15)$$

By Corollary 2.1, the right hand side is $\sim \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}]$, so the desired result follows.

3.2. Limit shape outside the noise corridors. To complete the proof of Proposition 3.1, we now consider any (t, x) outside the noise corridors.

The key is to examine the increments of h_* and of $h_{N,\alpha}$ along the characteristics. Recall the characteristics of h_* from Section 1.2, take any $(t_1, y_1), (t_2, y_2) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, with $t_1 < t_2$, that are connected by a characteristic, and let Chara_{12} denote the open segment of the characteristic between (t_1, y_1) and (t_2, y_2) , excluding the endpoints. We assume that Chara_{12} does not intersect any noise corridor.

To analyze the increment of h_* along chara_{12} , note that h_* solves (1.11) *classically* away from the noise corridors, so $\frac{d}{dt} h_*|_{\text{Chara}_{12}} = (\partial_t h_* + \partial_x h_* \cdot v)|_{\text{Chara}_{12}} = (\frac{1}{2}(\partial_x h_*)^2 + \partial_x h_* \cdot v)|_{\text{Chara}_{12}}$, where $v := (x_2 - x_1)/(t_2 - t_1)$ is the velocity when one travels along the characteristics in forward time. Also, $(\partial_x h_*)|_{\text{Chara}_{12}} = -v$, so the differentiation evaluates to $-v^2/2$, whereby

$$h_*(t_2, x_2) - h_*(t_1, x_1) = -(x_2 - x_1)^2 / (2(t_2 - t_1)). \quad (3.16)$$

Next, let us analyze the increment of $h_{N,\alpha}$. Hereafter, we say an event \mathcal{A} holds **up to an \mathcal{E} -small probability** if $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{A}^c] \ll \exp(-N^3 T I_{\text{KPZ}}(1, \vec{x}, \vec{r}))$, which implies $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{A}^c | \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}] \ll \exp(-N^3 T \cdot 0)$. We only need a lower bound on the increment. Write $\exp(N^2 T h_{N,\alpha}(t_2, y_2)) = Z_{N,\alpha}(t_2, y_2)$, assume $t_1 > 0$, invoke the semigroup identity $Z_{N,\alpha}(t_2, y_2) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} NT dx Z_{N,\alpha}(t_1, x) Z_N(t_1, x; t_2, y_2)$, take a small parameter $\beta > 0$, forgo the integral outside $[-\beta + y_1, y_1 + \beta]$, and write the result as

$$\exp(N^2 T h_{N,\alpha}(t_2, y_2)) \geq \int_{|x-y_1| \leq \beta} dx \exp(N^2 T h_{N,\alpha}(t_1, x)) NT Z_N(t_1, x; t_2, y_2). \quad (3.17)$$

Recall R from (3.1) and apply Lemma 3.2(a) with a small enough β such that, up to an \mathcal{E} -small probability, $\inf_{[-\beta+y_1, y_1+\beta]} h_{N,\alpha}(t_1, x) \geq h_{N,\alpha}(t_1, y_1) - 1/(4R)$. Insert this inequality into (3.17) and take the logarithm. Doing so gives, up to an \mathcal{E} -small probability,

$$h_{N,\alpha}(t_2, y_2) - h_{N,\alpha}(t_1, y_1) + \frac{1}{4R} \geq \frac{1}{N^2 T} \log \int_{|x-y_1| \leq \beta} dx NT Z_N(t_1, x; t_2, y_2). \quad (3.18)$$

Next, we seek to bound the last term in (3.18) from below by Lemma 3.2(b). As explained after that lemma, it concerns the *typical* behaviors of $Z_N(t_1, x; t_2, y_2)$. In particular, the bound in Lemma 3.2(b) is only $\ll \exp(-N^3 T \cdot 0)$, not necessarily \mathcal{E} -small. To leverage Lemma 3.2(b) into a result that holds up to an \mathcal{E} -small probability, we invoke the following inequality, which is proven in Appendix A,

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_N^c} \prod_{c=1}^n Z_{N,\alpha}(1, \mathbf{x}_c)^{N m_c}\right] \leq \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{A}_N^c] \mathbf{E}\left[\prod_{c=1}^n Z_{N,\alpha}(1, \mathbf{x}_c)^{N m_c}\right], \quad (3.19)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_N := \left\{ \inf_{x \in [-\beta + y_1, y_1 + \beta]} \left(\frac{1}{N^2 T} \log (Z_N(t_1, x; t_2, y_2) \sqrt{T}) + \frac{(y_2 - x)^2}{2(t_2 - t_1)} \right) \geq -\frac{1}{4R} \right\}. \quad (3.20)$$

Consider $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{A}_N^c \cap \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}]$, recall that $\mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}$ controls the value of $h_{N,\alpha}(1, \mathbf{x}_c)$, and use this property to bound the last probability by $\lesssim \exp(-N^3 T \bar{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{m}}) \cdot$ (left hand side of (3.19)). Then, bound the two terms on the right hand side of (3.19) by Lemma 3.2(b) and Property (A), respectively. Doing so gives $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{A}_N^c \cap \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}] \ll \exp(N^3 T (-\bar{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{m}} + L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{1} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{m}})))$. Recognizing the last expression as $\exp(-N^3 T I_{\text{KPZ}}(1, \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{r}}))$, we conclude that $(\mathcal{A}_N \cap \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta})$ holds up to an \mathcal{E} -small probability. This result holds for all $t_1 < t_2 \in [0, 1]$, including $t_1 = 0$, because Lemma 3.2(b) and (3.19) do.

Let us now derive lower bounds on the increment of $h_{N,\alpha}$. Consider first $t_1 > 0$, whence (3.18) holds. Apply the inequality in (3.20) to (3.18). In the result, take β to be small enough such that, for all $x \in [-\beta + y_1, y_1 + \beta]$, the term $(y_2 - x)^2 / (2(t_2 - t_1))$ approximates $(y_2 - y_1)^2 / (2(t_2 - t_1))$ to within $1/R$. Also, note that $(N^2 T)^{-1} \log \sqrt{N^2 T} \rightarrow 0$ under (1.3). Doing so gives, under the assumption that $t_1 > 0$ and up to an \mathcal{E} -small probability,

$$h_{N,\alpha}(t_2, y_2) - h_{N,\alpha}(t_1, y_1) \geq -(y_2 - y_1)^2 / (2(t_2 - t_1)) - 3/(4R). \quad (3.21)$$

Next, consider $(t_1, y_1) = (0, 0)$. Write $h_{N,\alpha}(t_2, y_2) := (N^2 T)^{-1} \log \int_{|x| \leq \alpha} dx NT Z_N(0, x; t_2, y_2)$, apply the inequality in (3.20) with $(t_1, y_1) = (0, 0)$ to the last integral, and follow the same procedure to simplify the result. The result gives, up to an \mathcal{E} -small probability,

$$h_{N,\alpha}(t_2, y_2) \geq -y_2^2 / (2t_2) - 3/(4R). \quad (3.22)$$

Let us prove the upper-half of (3.1): Up to an \mathcal{E} -small probability, $h_{N,\alpha}(t, x) \leq h_\star(t, x) + 1/R$. With (t, x) being outside the noise corridors, there exists a unique $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (t, x) and $(1, y)$ is connected by a characteristic; see Figure 3 and the last paragraph in Section 1.2. The points (t, x) and $(1, y)$ satisfy the conditions on (t_1, x_1) and (t_2, x_2) in the second paragraph. At time 1, Corollary 2.1 gives the multipoint LDP for $h_{N,\alpha}(1, \cdot)$. Apply Corollary 2.1 at the $(n+1)$ points $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, y$ to get $\mathbf{P}[\{|h_{N,\alpha}(1, y) - r| \leq \delta\} \cap \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}] \sim \exp(-N^3 T I_{\text{KPZ}}(1, \bar{\mathbf{x}} \cup \{y\}, \bar{\mathbf{r}} \cup \{r\}))$, for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{r}} \cup \{r\} \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(1, \bar{\mathbf{x}} \cup \{y\})^\circ$. Referring back to (1.10) and Figure 1, we see that the last condition is equivalent to $r > f_{\star,1,\bar{\mathbf{x}}}(y) = h_\star(1, y)$. For all such r , as is readily checked from (1.8), $I_{\text{KPZ}}(1, \bar{\mathbf{x}} \cup \{y\}, \bar{\mathbf{r}} \cup \{r\}) < I_{\text{KPZ}}(1, \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{r}})$. Hence $\{|h_{N,\alpha}(1, y) - r| \leq \delta\} \cap \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}$ holds up to an \mathcal{E} -small probability. Since this holds for all $r > h_\star(1, y)$ and since $\delta \rightarrow 0$, the event $\{|h_{N,\alpha}(1, y) - r| \leq \delta\} \cap \mathcal{E}_{N,\alpha,\delta}$ holds up to an \mathcal{E} -small probability. Combining this with (3.21) for $(t_1, y_1, t_2, y_2) = (t, x, 1, y)$ and with (3.16) gives, up to an \mathcal{E} -small probability, $h_{N,\alpha}(t, x) \leq h_\star(t, x) + 1/R$, which is the desired result.

Finally, we prove the lower-half of (3.1): Up to an \mathcal{E} -small probability, $h_{N,\alpha}(t, x) \geq h_\star(t, x) - 1/R$. With (t, x) being outside the noise corridors, there exists a unique (t', \mathbf{x}') along the noise corridors such that (t', \mathbf{x}') and (t, x) are connected by a characteristic; see Figure 3 and the last paragraph in Section 1.2. The points (t', \mathbf{x}') and (t, x) satisfy the conditions on (t_1, x_1) and (t_2, x_2) in the second paragraph. When $t' > 0$, the result of Section 3.1 gives, up to an \mathcal{E} -small probability, $h_{N,\alpha}(t', \mathbf{x}') \leq h_\star(t', \mathbf{x}') + 3/(4R)$. Combining this inequality with (3.21) and (3.16) for $(t_1, y_1, t_2, y_2) = (t', \mathbf{x}', t, x)$ gives the desired result $h_{N,\alpha}(t, x) \geq h_\star(t, x) - 1/R$. When $t' = 0$, necessarily $\mathbf{x}' = 0$, and $h_\star(0, 0) = 0$. Combining (3.22) and (3.16) for $(t_1, y_1, t_2, y_2) = (t', \mathbf{x}', t, x)$ gives the desired result.

4. CONTINUITY ESTIMATES

The main task in this section is to prove the result. Recall h_N from Section 1.8.

Proposition 4.1. *Given any $R < \infty$, there exists a $c = c(R)$ such that, for all $(t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2) \in [1/R, 1] \times [-R, R]$ and $u \geq c$,*

$$\mathbf{P} \left[|h_N(t_2, x_2) - h_N(t_1, x_1)| \geq (|t_2 - t_1|^{1/13} + |x_2 - x_1|^{1/7}) u \right] \leq \exp(-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T u^{3/2}). \quad (4.1)$$

After proving this, we will use it and Proposition 3.1 to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

4.1. Proof of Proposition 4.1. Let us outline the proof. Fix $R < \infty$, assume $t_1 \leq t_2$, write $c = c(R)$ to simplify notation, and call a probability **affordable** if it is $\leq c \exp(-N^3 T u^{3/2}/c)$. As will be seen, the proof below works for all $u \geq c$, for some c . We seek to show that, up to an affordable probability,

$$Z_N(t_1, x_1) \leq \exp(c N^2 T (|t_2 - t_1|^{1/13} + |x_2 - x_1|^{1/7}) u) Z_N(t_2, x_2) \quad (4.2a)$$

$$+ \exp(-N^2 T u / (c (|t_2 - t_1|^{6/13} + |x_2 - x_1|^{6/7}))) Z_N(t_1, x_1). \quad (4.2b)$$

Once this is done, half of the desired bound $h_N(t_1, x_1) \leq (|t_2 - t_1|^{1/13} + |x_2 - x_1|^{1/7}) c u + h_N(t_2, x_2)$ follows. The other half can be proven similarly, which we omit. To obtain (4.2), we start from the semigroup identity $Z_N(t_1, x_1) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} N T dx Z_N(t_0, x) Z_N(t_0, x; t_1, x_1)$ and divide the integral into two, one within and one outside a closed interval. We will bound the integral outside the closed interval by the last term in (4.2). For the integral within the close interval, we will argue that $Z_N(t_0, x; t_1, x_1)$ is approximately (at the exponential scale) bounded by $Z_N(t_0, x; t_2, x_2)$ and use the semigroup identity in reserve to obtain the second last term in (4.2).

We need some tools. Let $q(t, x) := \exp(-x^2/(2t))/\sqrt{2\pi t}$ denote the heat kernel and set

$$W_N(t, x; t', x') := Z_N(t, x; t', x')/q(T(t' - t), NT(x' - x)). \quad (4.3)$$

Namely, W_N is given by the Feynman–Kac formula (1.16) with $\mathbb{E}_{\text{BM}}[\dots \delta_{NTx'}(X(T(t - t_0)))]$ replaced by the law of a Brownian bridge that starts from NTx' and ends at NTx . The Feynman–Kac formula shows that $W_N(0, 0; \cdot, \cdot)$ and $W_N(t_0, x_0; \cdot + t_0, \cdot + x'_0)$ have the same law — which we call the **shift invariance** — and that $W_N(0, 0; t_0, \cdot)$ and $W_N(0, \cdot; t_0, 0)$ have the same law — which we call the **time-reversal symmetry**. The following bounds can be derived from existing one-point tail bounds of the KPZ equation through the line-ensemble arguments in [CGH21]. For the sake of completeness, we present the argument in Appendix A. For all $u, \gamma \geq 1$ and $t \in (0, 1]$,

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{|x| \leq \gamma \sqrt{u}} \left| \frac{1}{N^2 T} \log W_N(0, 0; t, x) \right| > t^{1/6} u \right] \leq c \gamma^2 e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T u^{3/2}}, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \frac{1}{N^2 T} \log W_N(0, 0; t, x) - |x| \right\} > u \right] \leq c e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T u^{3/2}}. \quad (4.5)$$

We proceed to implement the steps outlined above. Invoke the semigroup identity mentioned above and divide the result into $|x| \leq \gamma \sqrt{u}$ and $|x| > \gamma \sqrt{u}$, for some γ to be specified later:

$$Z_N(t_1, x_1) = \left(\int_{|x| \leq \gamma \sqrt{u}} dx NT + \int_{|x| > \gamma \sqrt{u}} dx NT \right) Z_N(t_0, x) Z_N(t_0, x; t_1, x_1). \quad (4.6)$$

Let us bound the last integral in (4.6). Write $Z_N(t_0, x) = Z_N(0, 0; t_0, x) = W_N(0, 0; t_0, x) q(T t_0, NT x)$ and apply (4.5). As for $Z_N(t_0, x; t_1, x_1)$, note that $W_N(t_0, \cdot; t_1, x_1)$ has same law as $W_N(0, 0; t_1 - t_0, \cdot)$ by the shift invariance and time-reversal symmetry; then apply (4.5). The result shows that, up to an affordable probability, the last integral in (4.6) is bounded by

$$e^{N^2 T \cdot 2u} \int_{|x| > \gamma \sqrt{u}} dx NT e^{N^2 T (|x| + |x_1 - x|)} q(T t_0, NT x) q(T(t_1 - t_0), NT(x_1 - x)). \quad (4.7)$$

Recognize the last integral as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{BM}} \left[e^{N(|X(Tt_0)| + |NTx_1 - X(Tt_0)|)} \mathbf{1}_{\{|X(Tt_0)| > NT\gamma\sqrt{u}\}} \delta_0(X(Tt_1) - NTx_1) \right], \quad (4.8)$$

where $X =$ (standard BM). Given that $|x_1| \leq R$, that R is fixed, and that $u \geq 1$, we fix a large enough γ such that (4.8) is bounded by $\mathfrak{q}(Tt_1, NTx_1) \exp(-N^2Tu/((t_1 - t_0)c_1))$, where we labeled the constant by c_1 for future references. Recall that $Z_N(t_1, x_1) = W_N(t_1, x_1)\mathfrak{q}(Tt_1, NTx_1)$ and that $W_N(t_1, x_1)$ has the same law as $W_N(t_1, 0)$. These properties and (4.4) give, up to an affordable probability, $\mathfrak{q}(Tt_1, NTx_1) \leq \exp(N^2Tu)Z_N(t_1, x_1)$. We will choose t_0 in the next paragraph such that $t_1 - t_0 \leq 1/(4c_1)$. Hence, up to an affordable probability,

$$(\text{last integral in (4.6)}) \leq \mathfrak{q}(Tt_1, NTx_1) e^{N^2Tu(2 - \frac{1}{(t_1 - t_0)c_1})} \leq e^{-\frac{N^2Tu}{(t_1 - t_0)^4 c_1}} Z_N(t_1, x_1). \quad (4.9)$$

Let us bound the first integral in (4.6). Use (4.4) for $t = t_1$ and for $t = t_2$, together with the time-reversal symmetry and shift invariance. The result gives, up to an affordable probability, $Z_N(t_0, x; t_1, x_1) \leq \exp(N^2Tu(t_1 - t_0)^{1/6})\mathfrak{q}(T(t_1 - t_0), NT(x_1 - x))$ and $\exp(-N^2Tu(t_2 - t_0)^{1/6})\mathfrak{q}(T(t_2 - t_0), NT(x_2 - x)) \leq Z_N(t_0, x; t_2, x_2)$. Combining these bounds shows that the first integral in (4.6) is bounded by

$$e^{2N^2Tu(t_2 - t_0)^{1/6}} \int_{|x| \leq \gamma\sqrt{u}} dx NT Z_N(t_0, x) \frac{\mathfrak{q}(T(t_1 - t_0), NT(x_1 - x))}{\mathfrak{q}(T(t_2 - t_0), NT(x_2 - x))} Z_N(t_0, x; t_2, x_2). \quad (4.10)$$

Fix t_0 by setting $(t_1 - t_0) := \min\{1/R, 1/(4c_1), (t_2 - t_1)^{6/13} + |x_2 - x_1|^{6/7}\}$. The term $1/R$ ensures $t_0 \geq 0$. The term $1/(4c_1)$ fulfills the requirement $(t_1 - t_0) \leq 1/(4c_1)$ from the previous paragraph. The term $(t_2 - t_1)^{6/13} + |x_2 - x_1|^{6/7}$ ensures that the ratio of heat kernels in the last integral is bounded by $\exp(N^2Tcu(|t_2 - t_1|^{1/13} + |x_2 - x_1|^{1/7}))$, which is straightforward (though tedious) to verify. Use the last bound in the integral, factor the bound out of the integral, release the integral to $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and use the semigroup identity to rewrite the integral as $Z_N(t_2, x_2)$. Doing so gives

$$(\text{first integral in (4.6)}) \leq e^{cN^2T(|t_2 - t_1|^{1/13} + |x_2 - x_1|^{1/7})u} Z_N(t_2, x_2). \quad (4.11)$$

Given our choice of $(t_1 - t_0)$, the right hand side of (4.9) is bounded by the last terms in (4.2). Hence, inserting (4.9)–(4.11) into (4.6) gives the desired result (4.2).

4.2. Completing the proof of Theorem 1.1. First, Proposition 4.1 can be leveraged into a stronger result: Given any fixed $(v, v') \in (0, 1/13) \times (0, 1/7)$, the event that

$$|h_N(t_1, x_1) - h_N(t_2, x_2)| \leq (|t_2 - t_1|^v + |x_2 - x_1|^{v'}) u, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\left| \frac{1}{N^2T} \log \left(Z_N(0, x_0; t_1, x_1) / Z_N(0, 0; t_1, x_2) \right) \right| \leq (|x_0|^{v'} + |x_2 - x_1|^{v'}) u, \quad (4.13)$$

for all $t_1, t_2 \in [1/R, 1]$ and $x_0, x_1, x_2 \in [-R, R]$, holds up to an affordable probability. This result is stronger than Proposition 4.1 because the conditions (4.12)–(4.13) are required to hold *simultaneously* for all t_1, t_2, x_0, x_1, x_2 in their designated ranges. One can use the standard argument in the proof of Kolmogorov's continuity theorem to derive the stronger result from Proposition 4.1. We refer to the proof of Proposition 3.4 in [LT21] for an instance of such a derivation and omit it here.

Based on (4.12)–(4.13), let us show that $h_N(t, x)$ and $h_{N,\alpha}(t, x)$ approximate each other. Write the latter as $(N^2T)^{-1} \log \int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} dx_0 NT Z_N(0, x_0; t, x)$ and apply (4.13) with $t_1 = t$, $x_1 = x_2 = x$, and $v' = 1/9$. Up to an affordable probability, the integrand is sandwiched between $\exp(\pm N^2Tu\alpha^{1/9})Z_N(0, 0; t, x) = \exp(N^2T(h_N(t, x) \pm u\alpha^{1/9}))/\sqrt{T}$. The last expression does not depend on x_1 ; factor it out of the integral. After being simplified, the result gives

$|h_{N,\alpha}(t, x) - h_N(t, x)| \leq (N^2T)^{-1} \log(\alpha\sqrt{N^2T}) + u\alpha^{1/9}$. Set $r = u\alpha^{1/9}$. We have, for every $t \in [1/R, 1]$ and $r \geq \alpha^{1/9}$,

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{x \in [-R, R]} |h_{N,\alpha}(t, x) - h_N(t, x)| > r + \frac{1}{N^2T} \log(\alpha\sqrt{N^2T}) \right] \leq c e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T r^{3/2} \alpha^{-1/6}}. \quad (4.14)$$

Lemma 3.2, which was used in Section 3, follows immediately from the preceding results. Part (a) follows from (4.12) and (4.14). Part (b) follows from (4.4), the identity $Z_N(t_1, x; t_2, y_2) = W_N(t_1, x; t_2, y_2) \mathfrak{q}(T(t_2 - t_1), NT(y_2 - x))$, the time-reversal symmetry, and the shift invariance.

Let us finish the rest of the proof of Theorem 1.1. By (4.14), Corollary 2.1 and Proposition 3.1 hold with $h_{N,\alpha}$ being replaced by h_N . They give (1.5) and the one-point version of (1.6), respectively. By the union bound, the one-point version automatically extends into a multipoint version: For any $(t_1, x_1), \dots, (t_k, x_k) \in [-1/R, 1] \times [-R, R]$,

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\max_{j=1, \dots, k} |h_N(t_j, x_j) - h_*(t_j, x_j)| > \frac{1}{R} \mid \mathcal{E}_{N,\delta}(\vec{\mathbf{r}}) \right] \ll e^{-N^3 T \cdot 0}. \quad (4.15)$$

Combining (4.12) and (4.15) gives (1.6).

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF TECHNICAL TOOLS

Proof of Lemma 2.2. (a) It is straightforward to check from the definition of \mathfrak{g}_* that the map $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}) : \vec{\mathbf{r}} \mapsto (\mathfrak{g}_{*,t,\vec{\mathbf{x}},\vec{\mathbf{r}}}(t, \mathbf{x}_c))_{c=1}^n$ is continuous and agrees with the identity map on $\mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}})$. Also, recall from Property (B) that $I_{\text{KPZ}}(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}, \cdot) : \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is convex and continuous. Next, let us verify that $(I_{\text{KPZ}} \circ \mathfrak{g}_*)(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is convex. Take any $\vec{\mathbf{r}}, \vec{\mathbf{r}}' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u \in [0, 1]$, and set $\mathfrak{g}_{*,1} := u\mathfrak{g}_{*,t,\vec{\mathbf{x}},\vec{\mathbf{r}}} + (1-u)\mathfrak{g}_{*,t,\vec{\mathbf{r}}}'$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{*,2} := \mathfrak{g}_{*,t,\vec{\mathbf{x}},u\vec{\mathbf{r}}+(1-u)\vec{\mathbf{r}}}'$. Note that $\mathfrak{g}_{*,1}(\mathbf{x}_c) \geq \max\{u\mathbf{r}_c + (1-u)\mathbf{r}'_c, \mathfrak{p}(t, \mathbf{x}_c)\}$, for all \mathbf{c} . Since the hypograph of $\mathfrak{g}_{*,2}$ is the convex hull of $\{(x, \mathfrak{p}(t, x))\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \cup \{(\mathbf{x}_c, \mathbf{r}_c)\}_{c=1}^n$, we have $\mathfrak{g}_{*,1} \geq \mathfrak{g}_{*,2}$. From this property and the fact that $\mathfrak{g}_{*,1}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{*,2}$ are concave, it is not hard to verify that $I_{\text{KPZ}}((\mathfrak{g}_{*,1}(\mathbf{x}_c))_{c=1}^n) \geq I_{\text{KPZ}}((\mathfrak{g}_{*,2}(\mathbf{x}_c))_{c=1}^n)$, which gives the convexity of $(I_{\text{KPZ}} \circ \mathfrak{g}_*)(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}, \cdot)$. Collecting the preceding properties gives that $(I_{\text{KPZ}} \circ \mathfrak{g}_*)(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is convex and continuous on \mathbb{R}^n , and is strictly convex and agrees with I_{KPZ} on $\mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}$. The desired result hence follows.

(b) First, note that \mathfrak{g}_* and $(I_{\text{KPZ}} \circ \mathfrak{g}_*)$ can be realized as \mathfrak{f}_* and I_{KPZ} through a reduction procedure. For $\vec{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, consider $\text{Redu}(\vec{\mathbf{r}}) := \{\mathbf{c} \in \{1, \dots, n\} : \mathfrak{g}_{*,t,\vec{\mathbf{x}},\vec{\mathbf{r}}}(\mathbf{x}_c) = \mathbf{r}_c\}$, which reduces the full index set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ to a subset that suffices for characterizing \mathfrak{g}_* . For $\vec{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $C \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$, write $\vec{\mathbf{x}}_C := (\vec{\mathbf{x}}_a)_{a \in C} \in \mathbb{R}^C$ and similarly for $\vec{\mathbf{r}}_C$. It is not hard to check that, for all $\vec{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\vec{\mathbf{r}}_{\text{Redu}(\vec{\mathbf{r}})} \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{Redu}(\vec{\mathbf{r}})}), \quad (I_{\text{KPZ}} \circ \mathfrak{g}_*)(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\mathbf{r}}) = I_{\text{KPZ}}(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{Redu}(\vec{\mathbf{r}})}, \vec{\mathbf{r}}_{\text{Redu}(\vec{\mathbf{r}})}). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We now prove (2.10). The first step is to truncate the set F . By Properties (A)–(B) in Section 2.1, for every \mathbf{c} and $R > 1 + \mathbf{x}_c^2/(2t)$, $\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (N^3 T)^{-1} \log \mathbf{P}[h_{N,\alpha}(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}_c) \geq R] < -I_{\text{KPZ}}(t, \mathbf{x}_c, R - 1, \dots, R - 1)$. The last quantity tends to $-\infty$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$. Consider the truncated set $F' := \cap(-\infty, R]^n$. Once we have proven (2.10) with F' replacing F , sending $R \rightarrow \infty$ recovers (2.10) itself. Next, for each nonempty $C \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$, consider $F'_C := \{\vec{\mathbf{r}}_C : \vec{\mathbf{r}} \in F', \text{Redu}(\vec{\mathbf{r}}) = C\}$, and define $F'_\emptyset := \{\vec{\mathbf{r}} : \vec{\mathbf{r}} \in F', \text{Redu}(\vec{\mathbf{r}}) = \emptyset\}$. We have $F' \subset (\cup_{\emptyset \neq C \subset \{1, \dots, n\}} (F'_C \times \mathbb{R}^{\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus C})) \cup F'_\emptyset$. If F'_\emptyset is nonempty, F' contains an $\vec{\mathbf{r}}$ such that $\mathbf{r}_c < -\mathbf{x}_c^2/(2t)$ for all \mathbf{c} . In this case, $\inf_{F'} (I_{\text{KPZ}} \circ \mathfrak{g}_*) = 0$, so the desired result follows trivially. We assume $F'_\emptyset = \emptyset$ hereafter. Under this assumption, the last inclusion relation gives

$$\mathbf{P}[(h_{N,\alpha}(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}_c))_{c=1}^n \in F'] \leq \sum_C \mathbf{P}[(h_{N,\alpha}(t, \vec{\mathbf{x}}_c))_{c \in C} \in F'_C], \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where the sum runs over all nonempty subset C of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Note that F'_C is closed (because F' is), is contained in $\mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{x}_C)$ (because of the first relation in (A.1)), and is bounded (thanks to the truncation). Hence F'_C is a compact subset of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{conc}}(t, \vec{x}_C)$. Given this property, Corollary 2.1 together with the continuity of I_{KPZ} gives

$$\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^3 T} \mathbf{P}[(h_{N,\alpha}(t, \vec{x}_c))_{c \in C} \in F'_C] \leq - \inf_{F'_C} I_{\text{KPZ}}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

From the second relation in (A.1) and the definition of F'_C , it is not hard to verify the identity $\min_C \inf_{F'_C} I_{\text{KPZ}} = \inf_{F'}(I_{\text{KPZ}} \circ \mathbf{g}_\star)$. Combining this identity with (A.2)–(A.3) gives (2.10) with F' in place of F . This completes the proof. \square

Proof of (3.19). Let us prove the analog of (3.19) where $Z_{N,\alpha}$ is replaced by Z_N ; the proof of (3.19) is the same but requires heavier notation. The scaling by N, T is irrelevant, so consider $Z(t, x) := Z_N(t/N, x/(NT))$ and $Z(t_0, x_0; t, x)$ similarly. By the FKG inequality, for any $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\mathbf{P}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\inf_{x \in [y, y']}(Z(t_1, y_1; t_2, x) - f(x)) \geq 0\}} \cdot \prod_j \mathbf{1}_{\{Z(t, x_j) \geq r_j\}}] \quad (\text{A.4a})$$

$$\geq \mathbf{P}[\inf_{x \in [y, y']}(Z(t_1, y_1; t_2, x) - f(x)) \geq 0] \cdot \mathbf{P}[\prod_j \mathbf{1}_{\{Z(t, x_j) \geq r_j\}}]. \quad (\text{A.4b})$$

To see why this follows from FKG, pretend for a moment that the spacetime white noise η is function-valued and observe, from the Feynman–Kac formula (1.16), that Z appears to be a monotone function of η . To make this observation rigorous, recall from [AKQ14] that Z can be obtained as the continuum limit of the partition function of a discrete polymer. In the discrete polymer, the spacetime white noise η is replaced by an iid field over $\mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}$, and the partition function is truly an increasing function of the iid field. By the FKG inequality, the analog of (A.4) for the discrete polymer holds, and taking the continuum limit of the analog gives (A.4). Now, assume that x_1, \dots, x_m are distinct and integrate (A.4) over $r_1, \dots, r_m \in (0, \infty)$. The result gives $\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\inf_{x \in [y, y']}(Z(t_1, y_1; t_2, x) - f(x)) \geq 0\}} \cdot \prod_j Z(t, x_j)] \geq \mathbf{P}[\inf_{x \in [y, y']}(Z(t_1, y_1; t_2, x) - f(x)) \geq 0] \cdot \mathbf{E}[\prod_j Z(t, x_j)]$. By the continuity of $Z(t, x)$ in x , the same inequality holds even when x_1, \dots, x_m are not distinct. Taking the complement of the inequality gives the desired result. \square

Proof of (4.4)–(4.5). Write $W_N(t, x) := W_N(0, 0; t, x)$ to simplify notation. We begin by establishing the point-to-point tail bounds: For all $(t, x) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbf{P}\left[\frac{1}{N^2 T} \log W_N(t, x) > u\right] \leq c e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T u^{3/2} t^{-1/2}} \leq c e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T u^{3/2} t^{-1/3}}, \quad u \geq t, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\mathbf{P}\left[\frac{1}{N^2 T} \log W_N(t, x) < -u\right] \leq c e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T u^2 t^{-1/2}} \leq c e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T u^{3/2} t^{-1/3}}, \quad u \geq t^{1/3}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

First, by the shift invariance of W_N , we may assume $x = 0$. The bound (A.6) follows by combining [DG21, Thm. 1.7] and [CGH21, Prop. 2.11]. For $Tt \leq$ (fixed constant), the bound (A.5) is proven in [DG21, Thm. 1.4, Prop. 3.1] by bounding the positive-integer moments. Here, we need (A.5) to hold for all $t \in (0, 1]$, which we achieve by deriving a moment bound that holds for all time. Let $W(t, x) := W_N(t/T, x/(NT))$ and use the Feynman–Kac formula (1.13) to get $\mathbf{E}[W(t, 0)^k] = \mathbb{E}_{\text{BB}}[\exp(\int_0^t ds \sum_{i < j} \delta_0(X_i - X_j))]$, where, under \mathbb{E}_{BB} , X_1, \dots, X_k are independent Brownian Bridges (BBs) connecting $(0, 0)$ and $(t, 0)$. The BBs are semimartingales, with $dX_i = -(X_i/(t-s)) ds + dB_i$, where B_1, \dots, B_k are independent BMs, so by the Itô–Tanaka–Meyer formula,

$$\int_0^t ds \sum_{i < j} \delta_0(X_i - X_j) = \int_0^t ds \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{X_i}{t-s} \sum_{j: j \neq i} \frac{1}{2} \text{sgn}(X_i - X_j) \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$- \int_0^t \sum_{i=1}^k dB_i \sum_{j:j \neq i} \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{sgn}(X_i - X_j), \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where $\operatorname{sgn}(x) := (x/|x|)\mathbf{1}_{x \neq 0}$. Insert the last identity into the last expectation and use the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to separate the contribution of the two integrals. For the integral wrt to ds , bound the sum over j by $2 \cdot k/2$, use the independence of the BBs, and perform a time reversal to turn $1/(t-s)$ into $1/s$. For the integral wrt to $\sum_i dB_i$, note that the integral is a martingale of quadratic variation $k(k^2 - 1)t/3$. Doing so gives $\mathbf{E}[W(t, 0)^k] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\text{BB}}[\exp(k \int_0^t ds |X|/s)]^{k/2} \exp(k^3 t/12)$. Replace \mathbb{E}_{BB} with \mathbb{E}_{BM} in the last expectation; doing so only makes the result larger. It is not hard to show that $\mathbb{E}_{\text{BM}}[\exp(k \int_0^t ds |X|/s)] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\text{BM}}[\exp(2k|X(t)|)]$, for example by Taylor expanding the left hand side and bounding the resulting terms with the aid of Minkowski’s inequality. Bound the last expectation by $2\mathbb{E}_{\text{BM}}[\exp(2kX(t))] = 2 \exp(2k^2 t)$. Altogether, $\mathbf{E}[W(t, 0)^k] \leq 2 \exp((13/12)k^3 t)$, for all $t > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Using this and the exponential Chebyshev inequality gives (A.5).

The next step is to leverage the point-to-point bounds (A.5)–(A.6) into the point-to-line bounds (4.4)–(4.5) by the arguments in [CGH21]. We begin with (4.4). By the shift invariance of W_N , we replace the interval in (4.4) with $[0, 2\gamma\sqrt{u}]$ and call it $[0, K]$. Divide the interval into equally spaced subintervals of length ζ , to be specified later, and write $\zeta_j := j\zeta$. Given (A.6), we apply the coupling argument in [CGH21] that leads to Eq. (20) there (in the proof of Prop. 4.2, see Figure 1 there). When applied to the intervals $[\zeta_{j-1}, \zeta_j]$ and $[\zeta_j, \zeta_{j+1}]$, the argument gives, for all $u \geq t^{1/3}$,

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{[\zeta_j, \zeta_{j+1}]} \frac{1}{N^2 T} \log W_N(t, x) \geq u \right] \leq 2\mathbf{P} \left[\frac{1}{N^2 T} \log W_N(t, \zeta_j) \geq A_1 \right] + c e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T u^{3/2} t^{-1/3}}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where $A_1 := u/4 + (\zeta_j^2 - \zeta_{j+1}^2)/(2t)$. Apply (A.5) to bound the second last term in (A.10) to get

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{[\zeta_j, \zeta_{j+1}]} \frac{1}{N^2 T} \log W_N(t, x) \geq u \right] \leq c e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T (A_1) + t^{-1/3}} + c e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T u^{3/2} t^{-1/3}}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Next, for the lower-tail bound, we apply the stochastic monotonicity in [CGH21, Lem. 2.4], which is based on [CH16, Lem. 2.6–2.7]. When applied to the interval $[\zeta_j, \zeta_{j+1}]$, the monotonicity together with (A.6) gives, for all $u \geq t^{1/3}$,

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\inf_{[\zeta_j, \zeta_{j+1}]} \frac{1}{N^2 T} \log W_N(t, x) \leq -u \right] \leq c e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T (A_2)_+ / \zeta} + c e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T u^{3/2} t^{-1/3}}, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where $A_2 := u/2 - (\zeta_{j+1}^2 - \zeta_j^2)/(2t)$. Now, choose $\zeta = (100K)^{-1} t^{4/3}$. This way, the terms A_1 and A_2 are at least u/c . Take the union bound of (A.10)–(A.11) over $j = 0, \dots, K/|\zeta|$. Doing so gives, for all $u' \geq t^{1/3}$ and $K \geq 1$,

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{|x| \leq K} \left| \frac{1}{N^2 T} \log W_N(0, 0; t, x) \right| > u' \right] \leq c K^2 t^{-4/3} e^{-\frac{1}{c} N^3 T u'^{3/2} t^{-1/3}}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

This gives (4.4) by substituting $u' = t^{1/6} u$ and $K = \gamma\sqrt{u}$. The proof of (4.5) proceeds similarly, by dividing the whole \mathbb{R} into subintervals of length $\zeta = (100)^{-1} t^{4/3}$. \square

APPENDIX B. A SIGN OF SYMMETRY BREAKING

Here we consider the two-delta-like initial condition $Z_{N,\alpha}(0, \bullet) = \mathbf{1}_{[-\alpha-1, -1+\alpha]} + \mathbf{1}_{[-\alpha+1, 1+\alpha]}$ and analyze the moments $\mathbf{E}[Z_{N,\alpha}(1, 0)^{Nm}]$ under (1.3). By the linearity of the SHE,

$$\mathbf{E}[Z_{N,\alpha}(1, 0)^{Nm}] = \sum_{\mathbf{m}_- \in [0, m] \cap \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{Z}} \binom{Nm}{N\mathbf{m}_-} \mathbf{E}[Z_{N,\alpha}(0, -1; 1, 0)^{Nm-} Z_{N,\alpha}(0, +1; 1, 0)^{N(m-\mathbf{m}_-)}]. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Recall W_N and its time-reversal symmetry from Section 4.1. Use the symmetry to turn the last expectation into $\mathbf{E}[Z_{N,\alpha}(0, -1)^{Nm-} Z_{N,\alpha}(0, 1)^{N(m-\mathbf{m}_-)}]$, apply Property (A) in Section 2.1, and note that the binomial factor in (B.1) is negligible compared to $\exp(O(N^3T))$ under (1.3). We have

$$\mathbf{E}[Z_{N,\alpha}(1, 0)^{Nm}] \sim \sup L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{1} ((-1, 1), (\mathbf{m}_-, \mathbf{m}_+))), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where the supremum runs over all $\mathbf{m}_-, \mathbf{m}_+ \in [0, m]$ with $\mathbf{m}_- + \mathbf{m}_+ = m$. As will be shown in the next paragraph, the supremum is achieved at $\mathbf{m}_- = m$ and $\mathbf{m}_+ = m$ and at these two places only. Looking back at (B.1), we see that the moment is dominated by the contribution from either one of the deltas, which hints at the symmetry breaking stated in (1.15).

Let us analyze the supremum in (B.2). Recall Property (B), let $(\mathbf{r}_-, \mathbf{r}_+)$ be the Legendre-dual variable of $(\mathbf{m}_-, \mathbf{m}_+)$, and let ξ_1, ξ_2 be the corresponding noise corridors, namely the corridors for $\{(\mathbf{x}_c, \mathbf{r}_c)\}_c = \{(-1, \mathbf{r}_-), (+1, \mathbf{r}_+)\}$. In the extreme case $(\mathbf{m}_-, \mathbf{m}_+) = (m, 0)$, there is only one corridor, which is the line that connects $(t, x) = (1, -1)$ and $(t, x) = (0, 0)$. We let ξ_- denote this linear corridor, and do similarly for ξ_+ . Recall \mathbb{L} from (2.2). By [Tsa23, Thm. 2.3], $L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{1} ((-1, 1), (\mathbf{m}_-, \mathbf{m}_+))) = \mathbb{L}_{[0,1]}(\mathbf{m}_- \delta_{\xi_1} + \mathbf{m}_+ \delta_{\xi_2})$. More explicitly,

$$L_{\text{SHE}}(0 \xrightarrow{1} ((-1, 1), (\mathbf{m}_-, \mathbf{m}_+))) = \frac{1}{24} \left((1 - s_{\text{merge}}) ((\mathbf{m}_+)^3 + (\mathbf{m}_-)^3) + s_{\text{merge}} m^3 \right) \quad (\text{B.3a})$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{m}_+ \int_0^1 ds \left(\frac{d}{ds} \xi_1 \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{m}_- \int_0^1 ds \left(\frac{d}{ds} \xi_2 \right)^2, \quad (\text{B.3b})$$

where s_{merge} is the first time when ξ_1 and ξ_2 merge, viewed in backward time. Indeed, the right hand side of (B.3a) is $\leq m^3/24$. Given that $\xi_1(0) = -1$, $\xi_1(1) = 0$, $\xi_2(0) = 1$, and $\xi_2(1) = 0$, we have (B.3b) $\leq -\frac{1}{2} m \int_0^1 ds \left(\frac{d}{ds} \xi_- \right)^2 = -\frac{1}{2} m \int_0^1 ds \left(\frac{d}{ds} \xi_+ \right)^2$. These inequalities are strict except in the extreme cases $(\mathbf{m}_-, \mathbf{m}_+) = (m, 0)$ and $(\mathbf{m}_-, \mathbf{m}_+) = (0, m)$. Therefore, the supremum in (B.2) is achieved at $\mathbf{m}_- = m$ and $\mathbf{m}_+ = m$ and at these two places only.

REFERENCES

- [ACQ11] Gideon Amir, Ivan Corwin, and Jeremy Quastel. Probability distribution of the free energy of the continuum directed random polymer in 1+1 dimensions. *Comm Pure Appl Math*, 64(4):466–537, 2011.
- [AKQ14] Tom Alberts, Konstantin Khanin, and Jeremy Quastel. The intermediate disorder regime for directed polymers in dimension 1+1. *Ann Probab*, 42(3):1212–1256, 2014.
- [ALM19] Tomer Asida, Eli Livne, and Baruch Meerson. Large fluctuations of a Kardar–Parisi–Zhang interface on a half line: The height statistics at a shifted point. *Phys Rev E*, 99(4):042132, 2019.
- [CC22] Mattia Cafasso and Tom Claeys. A Riemann–Hilbert approach to the lower tail of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation. *Comm Pure Appl Math*, 75(3):493–540, 2022.
- [CCR21] Mattia Cafasso, Tom Claeys, and Giulio Ruzza. Airy kernel determinant solutions to the KdV equation and integro-differential Painlevé equations. *Commun Math Phys*, 386(2):1107–1153, 2021.
- [CD15] Le Chen and Robert C Dalang. Moments and growth indices for the nonlinear stochastic heat equation with rough initial conditions. *Ann Probab*, 43(6):3006–3051, 2015.
- [CG20a] Ivan Corwin and Promit Ghosal. KPZ equation tails for general initial data. *Electron J Probab*, 25, 2020.
- [CG20b] Ivan Corwin and Promit Ghosal. Lower tail of the KPZ equation. *Duke Math J*, 169(7):1329–1395, 2020.
- [CGH21] Ivan Corwin, Promit Ghosal, and Alan Hammond. KPZ equation correlations in time. *Ann Probab*, 49(2):832–876, 2021.
- [CGK⁺18] Ivan Corwin, Promit Ghosal, Alexandre Krajenbrink, Pierre Le Doussal, and Li-Cheng Tsai. Coulomb-gas electrostatics controls large fluctuations of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation. *Phys Rev Lett*, 121(6):060201, 2018.

- [CH14] Ivan Corwin and Alan Hammond. Brownian Gibbs property for Airy line ensembles. *Invent Math*, 195(2):441–508, 2014.
- [CH16] Ivan Corwin and Alan Hammond. KPZ line ensemble. *Probab Theory Related Fields*, 166:67–185, 2016.
- [Che15] Xia Chen. Precise intermittency for the parabolic anderson equation with an $(1 + 1)$ -dimensional time–space white noise. In *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, volume 51, pages 1486–1499, 2015.
- [CJK13] Daniel Conus, Mathew Joseph, and Davar Khoshnevisan. On the chaotic character of the stochastic heat equation, before the onset of intermittency. *Ann Probab*, 41(3B):2225–2260, 2013.
- [Cor12] Ivan Corwin. The Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation and universality class. *Random Matrices: Theory Appl*, 1(01):1130001, 2012.
- [CS19] Ivan Corwin and Hao Shen. Some recent progress in singular stochastic PDEs. *Bull Amer Math Soc*, 57:409–454, 2019.
- [CW17] Ajay Chandra and Hendrik Weber. Stochastic PDEs, regularity structures, and interacting particle systems. In *Annales de la faculté des sciences de Toulouse Mathématiques*, volume 26, pages 847–909, 2017.
- [DG21] Sayan Das and Promit Ghosal. Law of iterated logarithms and fractal properties of the KPZ equation. *arXiv:2101.00730*, 2021.
- [DT21] Sayan Das and Li-Cheng Tsai. Fractional moments of the stochastic heat equation. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 57(2):778–799, 2021.
- [DZ99] Jean-Dominique Deuschel and Ofer Zeitouni. On increasing subsequences of IID samples. *Comb Probab Comput*, 8(3):247–263, 1999.
- [GH22] Shirshendu Ganguly and Milind Hegde. Sharp upper tail estimates and limit shapes for the KPZ equation via the tangent method. *arXiv:2208.08922*, 2022.
- [GL23] Promit Ghosal and Yier Lin. Lyapunov exponents of the SHE under general initial data. In *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probabilités et statistiques*, volume 59, pages 476–502. Institut Henri Poincaré, 2023.
- [GLLT23] Pierre Yves Gaudreau Lamarre, Yier Lin, and Li-Cheng Tsai. KPZ equation with a small noise, deep upper tail and limit shape. *Probab Theory Related Fields*, pages 1–36, 2023.
- [GS13] Nicos Georgiou and Timo Seppäläinen. Large deviation rate functions for the partition function in a log-gamma distributed random potential. *Ann Probab*, 41(6):4248–4286, 2013.
- [HKLD20] Alexander K Hartmann, Alexandre Krajenbrink, and Pierre Le Doussal. Probing large deviations of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation at short times with an importance sampling of directed polymers in random media. *Phys Rev E*, 101(1):012134, 2020.
- [HLDM⁺18] Alexander K Hartmann, Pierre Le Doussal, Satya N Majumdar, Alberto Rosso, and Gregory Schehr. High-precision simulation of the height distribution for the KPZ equation. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)*, 121(6):67004, 2018.
- [HMS19] Alexander K Hartmann, Baruch Meerson, and Pavel Sasorov. Optimal paths of nonequilibrium stochastic fields: The Kardar–Parisi–Zhang interface as a test case. *Physical Review Research*, 1(3):032043, 2019.
- [HMS21] Alexander K Hartmann, Baruch Meerson, and Pavel Sasorov. Observing symmetry-broken optimal paths of the stationary Kardar–Parisi–Zhang interface via a large-deviation sampling of directed polymers in random media. *Phys Rev E*, 104(5):054125, 2021.
- [Jan15] Chris Janjigian. Large deviations of the free energy in the O’Connell–Yor polymer. *J Stat Phys*, 160(4):1054–1080, 2015.
- [Jan19] Christopher Janjigian. Upper tail large deviations in Brownian directed percolation. *Electron Commun Probab*, 24, 2019.
- [Jen00] Lief Jensen. *The asymmetric exclusion process in one dimension*. PhD thesis, New York Univ., New York, 2000.
- [JKM16] Michael Janas, Alex Kamenev, and Baruch Meerson. Dynamical phase transition in large-deviation statistics of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation. *Phys Rev E*, 94(3):032133, 2016.
- [Kim21] Yujin H Kim. The lower tail of the half-space KPZ equation. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 142:365–406, 2021.
- [KK07] IV Kolokolov and SE Korshunov. Optimal fluctuation approach to a directed polymer in a random medium. *Phys Rev B*, 75(14):140201, 2007.
- [KK08] IV Kolokolov and SE Korshunov. Universal and nonuniversal tails of distribution functions in the directed polymer and Kardar–Parisi–Zhang problems. *Phys Rev B*, 78(2):024206, 2008.
- [KK09] IV Kolokolov and SE Korshunov. Explicit solution of the optimal fluctuation problem for an elastic string in a random medium. *Phys Rev E*, 80(3):031107, 2009.
- [KKX17] Davar Khoshnevisan, Kunwoo Kim, and Yimin Xiao. Intermittency and multifractality: A case study via parabolic stochastic pdes. *Ann Probab*, 45(6A):3697–3751, 2017.
- [KLD17] Alexandre Krajenbrink and Pierre Le Doussal. Exact short-time height distribution in the one-dimensional Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation with Brownian initial condition. *Phys Rev E*, 96(2):020102, 2017.
- [KLD18a] Alexandre Krajenbrink and Pierre Le Doussal. Large fluctuations of the KPZ equation in a half-space. *SciPost Phys*, 5:032, 2018.
- [KLD18b] Alexandre Krajenbrink and Pierre Le Doussal. Simple derivation of the $(-\lambda H)^{5/2}$ tail for the 1D KPZ equation. *J Stat Mech Theory Exp*, 2018(6):063210, 2018.
- [KLD19] Alexandre Krajenbrink and Pierre Le Doussal. Linear statistics and pushed Coulomb gas at the edge of β -random matrices: Four paths to large deviations. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)*, 125(2):20009, 2019.
- [KLD21] Alexandre Krajenbrink and Pierre Le Doussal. Inverse scattering of the Zakharov–Shabat system solves the weak noise theory of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation. *Phys Rev Lett*, 127(6):064101, 2021.
- [KLD22] Alexandre Krajenbrink and Pierre Le Doussal. Inverse scattering solution of the weak noise theory of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation with flat and Brownian initial conditions. *Phys Rev E*, 105:054142, 2022.
- [KLD23] Alexandre Krajenbrink and Pierre Le Doussal. Crossover from the macroscopic fluctuation theory to the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation controls the large deviations beyond Einstein’s diffusion. *Physical Review E*, 107(1):014137, 2023.
- [KLDP18] Alexandre Krajenbrink, Pierre Le Doussal, and Sylvain Prolhac. Systematic time expansion for the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation, linear statistics of the GUE at the edge and trapped fermions. *Nucl Phys B*, 936:239–305, 2018.
- [KMS16] Alex Kamenev, Baruch Meerson, and Pavel V Sasorov. Short-time height distribution in the one-dimensional Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation: Starting from a parabola. *Phys Rev E*, 94(3):032108, 2016.
- [KPZ86] Mehran Kardar, Giorgio Parisi, and Yi-Cheng Zhang. Dynamic scaling of growing interfaces. *Phys Rev Lett*, 56(9):889, 1986.
- [Kra19] Alexandre Krajenbrink. *Beyond the typical fluctuations: a journey to the large deviations in the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang growth model*. PhD thesis, PSL Research University, 2019.

- [Kra20] Alexandre Krajenbrink. From Painlevé to Zakharov–Shabat and beyond: Fredholm determinants and integro-differential hierarchies. *J Phys Math Theor*, 54(3):035001, 2020.
- [LD20] Pierre Le Doussal. Large deviations for the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation from the Kadomtsev–Petviashvili equation. *J Stat Mech Theory Exp*, 2020. 043201.
- [LDMRS16] Pierre Le Doussal, Satya N Majumdar, Alberto Rosso, and Grégory Schehr. Exact short-time height distribution in the one-dimensional Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation and edge fermions at high temperature. *Phys Rev Lett*, 117(7):070403, 2016.
- [LDMS16] Pierre Le Doussal, Satya N Majumdar, and Grégory Schehr. Large deviations for the height in 1D Kardar–Parisi–Zhang growth at late times. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)*, 113(6):60004, 2016.
- [Lin21] Yier Lin. Lyapunov exponents of the half-line SHE. *J Stat Phys*, 183(3):1–34, 2021.
- [LT21] Yier Lin and Li-Cheng Tsai. Short time large deviations of the KPZ equation. *Commun Math Phys*, 386(1):359–393, 2021.
- [LT22] Yier Lin and Li-Cheng Tsai. A lower-tail limit in the weak noise theory. *arXiv:2210.05629*, 2022.
- [MF14] Gregorio R Moreno Flores. On the (strict) positivity of solutions of the stochastic heat equation. *Ann Probab*, 42(4):1635–1643, 2014.
- [MKV16] Baruch Meerson, Eytan Katzav, and Arkady Vilenkin. Large deviations of surface height in the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation. *Phys Rev Lett*, 116(7):070601, 2016.
- [MS17] Baruch Meerson and Johannes Schmidt. Height distribution tails in the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation with brownian initial conditions. *J Stat Mech Theory Exp*, 2017(10):103207, 2017.
- [Mue91] Carl Mueller. On the support of solutions to the heat equation with noise. *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, 37(4):225–245, 1991.
- [MV18] Baruch Meerson and Arkady Vilenkin. Large fluctuations of a Kardar–Parisi–Zhang interface on a half line. *Physical Review E*, 98(3):032145, 2018.
- [QS15] Jeremy Quastel and Herbert Spohn. The one-dimensional KPZ equation and its universality class. *J Stat Phys*, 160(4):965–984, 2015.
- [QT21] Jeremy Quastel and Li-Cheng Tsai. Hydrodynamic large deviations of TASEP. *arXiv:2104.04444*, 2021.
- [Qua11] Jeremy Quastel. Introduction to KPZ. *Current developments in mathematics*, 2011(1), 2011.
- [Sep98] Timo Seppäläinen. Large deviations for increasing sequences on the plane. *Probab Theory Related Fields*, 112(2):221–244, 1998.
- [SKM18] Naftali R Smith, Alex Kamenev, and Baruch Meerson. Landau theory of the short-time dynamical phase transitions of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang interface. *Phys Rev E*, 97(4):042130, 2018.
- [SM18] Naftali R Smith and Baruch Meerson. Exact short-time height distribution for the flat Kardar–Parisi–Zhang interface. *Phys Rev E*, 97(5):052110, 2018.
- [SMP17] Pavel Sasorov, Baruch Meerson, and Sylvain Prolhac. Large deviations of surface height in the 1+1-dimensional Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation: exact long-time results for $\lambda h < 0$. *J Stat Mech Theory Exp*, 2017(6):063203, 2017.
- [SMS18] Naftali R Smith, Baruch Meerson, and Pavel Sasorov. Finite-size effects in the short-time height distribution of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation. *J Stat Mech Theory Exp*, 2018(2):023202, 2018.
- [SMV19] Naftali R Smith, Baruch Meerson, and Arkady Vilenkin. Time-averaged height distribution of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang interface. *J Stat Mech Theory Exp*, 2019(5):053207, 2019.
- [Tsa22a] Li-Cheng Tsai. Exact lower-tail large deviations of the KPZ equation. *Duke Math J*, 1(1):1–44, 2022.
- [Tsa22b] Li-Cheng Tsai. Integrability in the weak noise theory. *arXiv:2204.00614*, 2022.
- [Tsa23] Li-Cheng Tsai. High moments of the SHE in the clustering regimes. *preprint*, 2023.
- [Var04] S.R.S. Varadhan. Large deviations for the asymmetric simple exclusion process. In *Stochastic analysis on large scale interacting systems*, volume 39 of *Adv Stud Pure Math*, pages 1–27, Tokyo, 2004. Math Soc Japan.

(Yier Lin) DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

(Li-Cheng Tsai) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH