

Continuum asymptotics for tree growth models

David Geldbach

September 11, 2023

Abstract

We classify the forward dynamics of all (plane) tree-valued Markov chains $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ with uniform backward dynamics. Every such Markov chain is classified by a decorated planar real tree. We also show that under an inhomogeneous rescaling after trimming leaves $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ converges to a random real tree in the Gromov–Prokhorov metric. This generalises and sheds some new light on work by Evans, Grübel and Wakolbinger (2017) on the binary special case.

1 Introduction

We study tree-valued Markov chains $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ where T_n is a plane tree with n leaves, a root r_n and no vertices with degree 2. We consider a broad class of such tree-valued Markov chains. We do not make any assumptions of the forward dynamics, we only assume that $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ has *uniform backward dynamics*, see also Figure 1 for an illustration.

Definition 1.1. The Markov chain $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ is said to have *uniform backward dynamics* if for all $n \geq 2$ the following procedure yields a tree with the same distribution as T_{n-1} .

- 1.) Choose a leaf uniformly of T_n ,
- 2.) remove this leaf and its associated edge,
- 3.) remove any vertex with degree 2 and replace it and its two edges by a single edge.




Figure 1: An example for the uniform backward dynamics. The red circle indicates which leaf has been uniformly chosen.

The goal of this article is to classify all tree-valued Markov chains with uniform backward dynamics. We want to understand the different possible forward dynamics. We use the classification of forward dynamics to show a scaling limit. Another viewpoint is that we characterise the *Doob–Martin* boundary of these Markov chains. This is the goal of Evans, Grübel and Wakolbinger [8], they characterise the Doob–Martin boundary of Rémy’s tree growth chain which corresponds to the special case of binary trees. We comment on the relation to their work in Remark 1.11.

One well-studied one-parameter family of Markov chains that has uniform backward dynamics is Marchal’s tree growth $(T_n^M(\alpha), n \geq 1)$ with $\alpha \in (1, 2]$. We construct $T_{n+1}^M(\alpha)$ recursively from $T_n^M(\alpha)$:

- 1.) Assign weight $\alpha - 1$ to each edge of $T_n^M(\alpha)$ and weight $k - 1 - \alpha$ to each branchpoint of $T_n^M(\alpha)$ with degree $k \geq 3$. Choose an edge or a branchpoint according to these weights.
- 2.) If an edge e has been chosen, split it into two edges e_1, e_2 and attach a new leaf to the new vertex.
- 3.) If a branchpoint v has been chosen, attach a new leaf to this branchpoint.
- 4.) The new planar order of $T_{n+1}^M(\alpha)$ is chosen uniformly at random, consistently with the planar order of $T_n^M(\alpha)$.

This has been introduced by Marchal [19] and generalises Rémy's tree growth [20] which only grows binary trees, here $\alpha = 2$. The fact that the backward dynamics of Marchal's tree growth are uniform goes back to Haas, Miermont, Pitman and Winkel [15].




Figure 2: A realisation of Marchal's tree growth after 25000 growth steps for different values for $\alpha = 2$ (left) and $\alpha = 1.4$ (right). These trees approximate the Brownian continuum random tree (left) and the 1.4-stable tree (right).

The uniform backward dynamics have an interesting consequence if we want to condition the Markov chain: let T be a tree such that the event $\{T_{n+m} = T\}$ has positive probability for $n, m \geq 1$. Consider a conditional distribution of the form

$$\mathbb{P}(T_m \in \cdot | T_{n+m} = T). \quad (1.1)$$

We then have a very explicit way of describing the distribution of T_m^M : we just need to choose $n - m$ distinct uniform leaves of T , remove them iteratively and any vertices of degree 2 that turn up in the process of removing leaves. There is another interesting property of Marchal's tree growth chain. Let d_n^{gr} be the graph metric on $T_n^M(\alpha)$ and $d_n = n^{-1+1/\alpha} d_n^{gr}$, a rescaled metric where every edge has length $n^{-1+1/\alpha}$. Consider $(T_n^M(\alpha), d_n)$ as a random metric space, then there exists a random metric space $(\mathcal{T}_\alpha, d_\alpha)$ such that

$$(T_n^M(\alpha), d_n) \xrightarrow{a.s.} (\mathcal{T}_\alpha, d_\alpha), \quad (1.2)$$

in the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov topology, for details we refer to the literature. The statement in this form goes back to Curien and Haas [4, Theorem 5]; related statements are [15, Corollary 24], [19, Theorem 3.2] and [5, Theorem 3.3.3]. The metric space $(\mathcal{T}_\alpha, d_\alpha)$ is a (random) real tree, we require these to be rooted.

Definition 1.2 (Real trees). A real tree (\mathbb{R} -tree) is a complete, separable metric space $(\mathbf{T}, d_{\mathbf{T}})$ with the property that for each $x, y \in \mathbf{T}$, there is a unique non-self-intersecting path from x to y , denoted by $[x, y]_{\mathbf{T}}$. This path is isometric to a closed real interval. We require \mathbf{T} to have a marked point $r \in \mathbf{T}$ which we call its root.

A prominent example of a random real tree is the Brownian continuum random tree introduced by Aldous [1, 2]. This was later generalised by Duquesne and Le Gall [5] to a family of stable trees $(\mathcal{T}_\alpha, 1 < \alpha \leq 2)$

with \mathcal{T}_2 being the Brownian continuum random tree. For an introduction to real trees, see for example the book by Evans [7]. Often we leave the metric $d_{\mathbf{T}}$ implicit. Further, if the tree \mathbf{T} is clear from the context, we write d instead of $d_{\mathbf{T}}$. Similarly, we often write $[x, y]$ instead of $[x, y]_{\mathbf{T}}$ for the path between two points. We also want to make precise what we mean when we speak of subtrees.

Definition 1.3 (Real subtrees). Let (\mathbf{T}, r) be a real tree. Given $x \in \mathbf{T}$, we define two notions of subtrees:

- 1.) The *fringe subtree* rooted at x is

$$F_{\mathbf{T}}(x) = \{y \in \mathbf{T} : x \in [r, y]_{\mathbf{T}}\}.$$

- 2.) The *subtrees of x* are the connected components of $F_{\mathbf{T}}(x) \setminus \{x\}$. To each of them, we add x and root them at x .

Note that if $x \neq r$, then $r \notin F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)$ and r is not contained in any subtree of x .

We also consider a special class of real trees, so called interval partition trees (IP-trees), introduced by Forman [9]. There, distances in the real tree relate to masses of a probability measure μ . When we want to stress the fact that if a real tree \mathbf{T} has an associated probability measure μ defined on the Borel σ -algebra, we speak of a *weighted real tree*. We denote by $\text{supp}(\mu)$ the closed support of μ .

Definition 1.4 (IP-tree). A rooted, weighted real tree (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) is an *interval-partition tree* if it possesses the following properties.

- 1.) *Spanning*. Every leaf is in the support of μ , i.e. $\mathbf{T} = \text{span}(\text{supp}(\mu))$.
- 2.) *Spacing*. For $x \in \mathbf{T}$, if x is either a branch point or lies in the support of μ , then

$$d(r, x) + \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) = 1. \tag{1.3}$$

Remark 1.5. The name originates from a so-called bead crushing construction of IP-trees, see Forman [9]. There, they consider a leaf $x \in \mathbf{T}$ and project μ onto the interval $[r, x]$ – this gives rise to an interval partition. The masses of the blocks are given by $\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(y)) - \mu(\mathbf{S}_y)$ for $y \in [r, x]$ and where \mathbf{S}_y is the subtree of y containing x . We will not use these interval partitions.

To construct forward dynamics of $(T_n, n \geq 1)$, we need to endow real trees with additional structure. In particular we introduce a notion of planarity for real trees as well as decorating functions.

For a real tree (\mathbf{T}, d, r) we call a family of maps $\psi = (\psi_n, n \geq 2)$ a *planar order* for \mathbf{T} if ψ_n maps a tuple $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{T}^n$ to a combinatorial, partially labelled, plane tree consistently when going from ψ_n to ψ_{n+1} . We specify the details of this definition and the consistency relations of ψ in Definition 2.2. Most importantly, we require $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ to be the combinatorial tree corresponding to $\text{span}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ as non-plane trees for every $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{T}^n$. If \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 are both subtrees of $x \in \mathbf{T}$, we say that \mathbf{S}_1 is to the left of \mathbf{S}_2 if for two arbitrary points $y_1 \in \mathbf{S}_1 \setminus \{x\}, y_2 \in \mathbf{S}_2 \setminus \{x\}$ the image of y_1 is to the left of y_2 in $\psi_2(y_1, y_2)$ – see Definition 2.5.

Next, assume that (\mathbf{T}, d, r) is equipped with a probability measure μ . Decompose $\mu = \mu_{atoms} + \mu_s + \mu_\ell$ where μ_{atoms} is supported on the atoms of μ , μ_s is supported diffusely on $\mathbf{T} \setminus \{\text{leaves}\}$ and μ_ℓ is supported diffusely on the leaves of \mathbf{T} . We can choose the supports of $\mu_{atoms}, \mu_s, \mu_\ell$ to be disjoint. Further, we can choose $\text{supp}(\mu_s)$ in such a way that for every $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_s)$ we have $\text{deg}(x) = 2$.

We then call a measurable function $\lambda : \mathbf{T} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ a *branch weight function* when viewed as an element of $L^1(\mu_s)$. We call B a *branchpoint weight function* if B maps every element a of $\text{supp} \mu_{atoms}$ to a function $\beta_a : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ – note that $\text{supp} \mu_{atoms}$ is an at most countable set. For each $a \in \text{supp}(\mu_{atoms})$, we require that β_a is non-decreasing, right-continuous and the cardinality of the range of β_a is at most $\text{deg} a$. The degree $\text{deg} a$ is defined as the number of connected components of $\mathbf{T} \setminus \{a\}$. Also, we want β_a to be piece-wise constant in the following sense. First, enumerate the connected components of $F_{\mathbf{T}}(a) \setminus \{a\}$ by $\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2, \dots$: we require that $\mu(\mathbf{S}_1) \geq \mu(\mathbf{S}_2) \geq \dots$ – if two subtrees have the same mass, then we enumerate them in such a way that for $i < j$, \mathbf{S}_i is to the left of \mathbf{S}_j . We implicitly include the case that there are only finitely many subtrees.

Secondly, let $c_i = \sum \mu(\mathbf{S}_j) / \sum_{k \geq 1} \mu(\mathbf{S}_k)$ where the first sum ranges over all j such that \mathbf{S}_j is left of \mathbf{S}_i and $\mathbf{S}_j \neq \mathbf{S}_i$. We then impose that β_a is constant on $[c_i, \inf_{c_j > c_i} c_j)$ for every i .

Definition 1.6. We call a collection of objects $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$ with the above properties a *decorated planar real tree*. If (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) is an IP-tree, we speak of decorated planar IP-trees.

Furthermore, we call (\mathbf{T}, d, r, ψ) a *planar real tree*. This notion is discussed in detail in Section 2.1. With these definitions in hand, we can construct the forward dynamics for the tree growth process $(T_n, n \geq 1)$. See Figure 3 for an illustration.




Figure 3: an example for sampling T_{13} . First, we sample $(\xi_i, i \leq 13)$ from \mathbf{T} ; secondly we apply ψ_{13} to obtain S_{13} and thirdly we add leaves to some interior vertices (in red) to obtain T_{13} . In the last step, the planar order is determined by λ and B as well as some additional randomness.




Figure 4: an illustration of how to use the branchpoint weight function B for a given atom a . If U_i is between two thresholds corresponding to two different subtrees of a , then we attach a leaf between the different subtrees in the discrete tree T_n .

Construction 1.7. Assume we are given a decorated planar real tree $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$. To construct a plane tree T_n , we proceed as follows:

- 1.) Sample $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n \in \mathbf{T}$ *i.i.d.* from μ .
- 2.) Consider the associated plane, partially labelled tree $S_n = \psi_n(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$. By the properties imposed on ψ_n , S_n will contain n vertices labelled by $[n]$, including all leaves.
- 3.) For every vertex in S_n that is labelled but not a leaf, we attach a new leaf to it and move the label to the new leaf. Call the combinatorial tree obtained this way T_n^* . We determine the planar order of the new leaves as follows. Suppose we have attached in T_n^* a leaf labelled i to the vertex corresponding to ξ_i in the real tree \mathbf{T} . We need to distinguish two cases: $\xi_i \in \text{supp } \mu_{atoms}$ and $\xi_i \in \text{supp } \mu_s$.
 - (a) If $\xi_i \in \text{supp } \mu_s$, recall that for $x \in \text{supp } \mu_s$ we have $\deg(x) = 2$. Let X_i be a conditionally independent Bernoulli random variable with parameter $\lambda(\xi_i)$. If $X_i = 1$, we orient the leaf labelled i to the left of the subtree of the vertex that was labelled i in S_n and otherwise to the right.
 - (b) If $\xi_i = a \in \text{supp } \mu_{atoms}$, we do the following. Enumerate the subtrees of a and write $\mathbf{S}_j < \mathbf{S}_k$ if \mathbf{S}_j is to the left of \mathbf{S}_k . Now, let U_i be an independent $[0, 1]$ uniform random variable. In the combinatorial tree T_n^* , we consider the subtrees of the parent of the leaf i , each of these

corresponds naturally to some subtree \mathbf{S}_j in the real tree. By abuse of notation, we now orient the leaf labelled i to the left of every subtree such that $U_i < \beta_a(\mathbf{S}_j)$ and to the right of every subtree with $U_i \geq \beta_a(\mathbf{S}_j)$ where we write

$$\beta_a(\mathbf{S}_j) = \beta_a \left(\frac{1}{Z_a} \sum_{k: \mathbf{S}_k < \mathbf{S}_j} \mu(\mathbf{S}_k) \right),$$

with the normalising constant $Z_a = \sum_k \mu(\mathbf{S}_k)$.

- (c) If we have $\xi_i = \xi_j = a \in \text{supp } \mu_{\text{atoms}}$, i.e. we attach two leaves to the same branchpoint, then we reuse the uniform random variables U_i, U_j of the previous step. If $U_i < U_j$ we orient the leaf labelled i to the left of the leaf j and vice versa.

4.) Delete the leaf labels to obtain a plane tree T_n .

Remark 1.8. When constructing T_n and T_m for $n < m$, we reuse the random variables $(\xi_i, X_i, U_i; i \leq n)$ in the construction of T_m . This results in the sequence $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ being a tree-valued Markov chain with uniform backward dynamics. Indeed, this is true because a backward step corresponds to removing ξ_n from the construction. Once the labels are removed, this corresponds to uniformly choosing a point from ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n which in turn means choosing a leaf of T_n uniformly.

We could keep the leaf labels in step 4.) to obtain a Markov chain of labelled trees.

Definition 1.9. Let $\rho_{\mathbf{T}}$ denote the law of $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ constructed from $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$ by the above Construction 1.7.

We can now state our main theorem. The theorem states that the law of $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ can be expressed as a mixture of extremal measures which are of the form of $\rho_{\mathbf{T}}$. This is made rigorous in Section 2.3: the measure ν in the following theorem is defined on the Doob-Martin boundary of the Markov chain $(T_n, n \geq 1)$. Indeed, this theorem characterises the Doob-Martin boundary.

Theorem 1.10. *For every tree-valued Markov chain $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ with uniform backward dynamics there exists a unique probability measure ν such that*

$$\mathbb{P}((T_n, n \geq 1) \in \cdot) = \int \rho_{\mathbf{T}}((T_n, n \geq 1) \in \cdot) \nu(d\mathbf{T}). \quad (1.4)$$

Here we \mathbf{T} is an abbreviation for the decorated planar IP-tree $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$.

This theorem is very similar in spirit to a long list of theorems that seek to classify exchangeable random objects. The most classical one is de-Finetti's theorem that states that the distribution of every sequence of exchangeable real random variables is a mixture of the distribution of sequences of *i.i.d.* random variables. Another notable one is Kingman's paintbox theorem that describes every exchangeable partition of \mathbb{N} as a mixture of paintboxes. The article [10] by Forman et al. also classifies a family of exchangeable objects, hierarchies in their case, by sampling from real trees and the work [11] of Foutel-Rodier et al. classifies various exchangeable objects via combs which are tree-like as well. Gerstenberg [12] classifies exchangeable interval hypergraphs, trees are a special case here, by sampling from a random subset of $[0, 1]^2$. See Kallenberg [17] for the classical theorems, and in [10] there is a good list of references to similar, modern theorems.

Remark 1.11. The work [8] of Evans, Grübel and Wakolbinger forms a basis for a lot of the ideas in this article, in particular Proposition 3.6 corresponds to their main theorem [8, Theorem 8.2]. In their article, the authors study Rémy's tree growth [20] – the case of $\alpha = 2$ in Marchal's tree growth – and binary tree-valued Markov chains with the same backwards dynamics. They place a great emphasis on the Doob-Martin boundary of Rémy's tree growth chain and the topological properties of the boundary, we discuss these concepts in Section 2.3. This article extends their work as our framework allows for multi-furcating trees instead of binary trees just like α -stable trees extend the Brownian continuum random tree or like Marchal's tree growth extends Rémy's tree growth. Further, even in the case $\alpha = 2$ we believe that our variation of their construction is more descriptive in the form of our decorated planar real trees.

Remark 1.12. If μ is supported on the leaves of \mathbf{T} , then λ and B are trivial. Hence, it would suffice to specify $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi)$ in these cases. This in particular is almost surely the case for the Brownian continuum random tree and α -stable trees.

Example 1.13. Assume the decorated planar real tree is given by $\mathbf{T} = [0, 1], r = 0$, the usual Euclidean distance $d = |\cdot|$ and with μ, ψ, λ, B arbitrary. We observe:

- 1.) For (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) to be an IP-tree, if $\mu(x) > 0$ for $x \in [0, 1]$ then $\mu((x, x + \mu(x))) = 0$. Further, if for $x, y \in [0, 1]$ the interval $[x, y]$ does not contain any atoms and $\mu([x, y]) = y - x$, then μ restricted to $[x, y]$ is the Lebesgue measure.
- 2.) There is only one choice for ψ , given n distinct points ψ_n maps them to a line graph with n edges while keeping the order of labels.
- 3.) Here $\lambda : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is an arbitrary function viewed as element of $L^1(\mu_s)$ where μ_s is the diffuse part of μ . For ξ_i in $\text{supp}(\mu_s)$ we orient the corresponding leaf in T_n to the left with probability $\lambda(\xi_i)$ and to the right otherwise.
- 4.) For any atom a , β_a is determined by a single threshold $\beta_a(1) \in [0, 1]$. If we then sample a uniform $[0, 1]$ random variable U_i , we orient the corresponding leaf to the left if $U_i \leq \beta_a(1)$ and to the right otherwise. If $\xi_i = \xi_j = a$ for $i \neq j$, we orient the leaf i to the left of j if $U_i < U_j$ and to the right otherwise.

Let us construct T_n in this case: after sampling n points from \mathbf{T} and applying ψ_n we receive a line graph of length $k \leq n$ where k is the number of distinct points sampled. To every vertex of the line graph – the spine of T_n – except for the two endpoints we attach a one or multiple leaves. For every leaf corresponding to a point $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_s)$ we flip a coin with parameter $\lambda(x)$ to decide if we attach to the left or to the right of the spine. Similarly, we flip a coin with parameter $\beta_a(1)$ for every leaf attached to an atom a to decide if we attach the leaf on the left or on the right. This results in $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ being a sequence of growing spines with leaves hanging off on the sides, see Figure 5 for an illustration.




Figure 5: an example for T_{11} if $\mathbf{T} = [0, 1]$. The red crosses stand for $(\xi_i, i \leq 11)$. The red number next to them states the outcome of the coin-flip that determines if the leaf is attached left or right of the spine. The blue circle indicates an atom a . Here, we have $\beta_a(1) = 1/2$ which means that if $U_i > 1/2$ (in red), we orient the corresponding leaf to the right and to the left otherwise.

Example 1.14. This is the main object of study of [6]: Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}, \ell \geq 2$ and consider S_n^ℓ to be the ℓ -ary plane tree of height n , here every vertex has ℓ offspring. Turn S_n^ℓ into a real tree \mathbf{S}_n^ℓ by assigning intervals of length 2^{-k} to the edges at distance k to the root, gluing them at the branchpoints. Let \mathbf{T}^ℓ be the completion of $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} \mathbf{S}_n^\ell$. Consider now any diffuse probability measure μ on the leaves of \mathbf{T}^ℓ , [9, Theorem 1.5] states that there exists a choice of metric d_μ on \mathbf{T}^ℓ that renders $(\mathbf{T}^\ell, d_\mu, r, \mu)$ an IP-tree. Note that μ can be thought of as a distribution on $[0, 1]$ by considering ℓ -adic expansions. Because $(S_n^\ell, n \geq 1)$ are plane trees, this induces a natural choice of planar order for $(\mathbf{S}_n^\ell, n \geq 1)$ which induces maps $(\psi_n, n \geq 1)$ for \mathbf{T}^ℓ .

This corresponding Markov chain is also called the PATRICIA chain, see [6] for a study of this in the case of binary trees. PATRICIA stands for "practical algorithm to retrieve information coded in alphanumeric". Given $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \{0, \dots, \ell - 1\}^\infty$, words of infinite length in the alphabet $\{0, \dots, \ell - 1\}$, we can construct words $y_i, i \leq n$, of finite length such that y_i is an initial segment of z_i for all $i \leq n$, all y_i are distinct and that y_1, \dots, y_n are the minimal length words with this property. These y_1, \dots, y_n form a tree with n leaves, the so-called radix sort tree. Consider now μ as measure on $\{0, \dots, \ell - 1\}^\infty$ and let Z_1, \dots, Z_n be *i.i.d.* μ -samples. Then T_n is the radix sort tree corresponding to Z_1, \dots, Z_n . See Figure 6 for an illustration.




Figure 6: an example for T_9 if \mathbf{T}^3 is a 3-ary tree. The red crosses stand for $(\xi_i, i \leq 9)$, sampled from the leaves of \mathbf{T}^3 .

Recall from (1.2) that Marchal's tree growth, once properly rescaled, converges to a random real tree. We show that the same is true for any tree-valued Markov chain with uniform backward dynamics but we need to change the rescaling and the topology. We use the Gromov-Prokhorov topology. It was introduced by Gromov [13], see also the survey by Janson [16].

Definition 1.15. Let $(\mathbf{T}_1, d_1, r_1, \mu_1)$ and $(\mathbf{T}_2, d_2, r_2, \mu_2)$ be two IP-trees. The Gromov-Prokhorov distance $d_{\text{GP}}(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$ is the infimum of $\varepsilon > 0$ such that exists a measurable subset $R \subseteq \mathbf{T}_1 \times \mathbf{T}_2$ and a coupling ν of μ_1 and μ_2 , such that

$$\nu(R) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{(x,y), (x',y') \in R} |d_1(x, x') - d_2(y, y')| \leq \varepsilon.$$

The map d_{GP} is indeed a metric on isometry classes of weighted, complete, separable metric spaces. Further, we want to note that the induced topology is Polish, see [16, Theorem 3.9]. The induced topology is sometimes also called Gromov-weak topology and has an alternative formulation using sampling test-functions, more on this can be found in Athreya et al. [3].




Figure 7: an example of the trimming and rescaling. On the left, there is T_{13} ; in the middle is T_{13}^{trim} with a number k indicating an atom of weight $k/13$ and on the right T_{13}^{trim} is drawn to scale after the rescaling. The marked edge has length $3/13$.

Next, we define the rescaling. Instead of assigning a length $n^\beta, \beta < 0$ to every edge, we rescale T_n inhomogeneously. Before we do this, we trim the tree: remove every leaf and its corresponding edge. This

results in a new tree T_n^{trim} which is a subtree of T_n . For every leaf $x \in T_n$ we distribute mass $1/n$ to the vertex in T_n^{trim} that is connected to x in T_n , this defines a probability measure μ_n^{trim} on T_n^{trim} . Now, we rescale T_n^{trim} . We do this by defining edge lengths according to an *inhomogenous IP-rescaling*. This means for an edge (x, y) of T_n^{trim} we set its length to

$$d_n^{\text{trim}}(x, y) = \left| \mu_n^{\text{trim}} \left(F_{T_n^{\text{trim}}}(x) \right) - \mu_n^{\text{trim}} \left(F_{T_n^{\text{trim}}}(y) \right) \right|. \quad (1.5)$$

See Figure 7 for an example. We extend this to a metric d_n^{trim} on T_n^{trim} by adding edge lengths along the unique path between two vertices. Let r_n be the root of T_n^{trim} . In this setting, $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ satisfies a scaling limit.

Theorem 1.16. *Let $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ be a tree-valued Markov chain with uniform backward dynamics. Then there exists a random IP-tree (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) such that*

$$(T_n^{\text{trim}}, d_n^{\text{trim}}, r_n, \mu_n^{\text{trim}}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu), \quad (1.6)$$

almost-surely in the Gromov-Prokhorov topology. Further, the law of (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) is given by

$$\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu) \in \cdot) = \int \rho_{\mathbf{T}}((\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu) \in \cdot) \nu(d\mathbf{T}), \quad (1.7)$$

where ν is determined by Theorem 1.10.

This answers a question of Forman [9, Question 2] if IP-trees arise as scaling limits of suitably rescaled discrete random trees.

Remark 1.17. This theorem is in a sense optimal: both homogeneous rescaling as well as the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov topology are unsuitable in general. To see why a homogeneous rescaling does not work, join two typical realisations of an α -stable tree \mathcal{T}_α and an α' -stable tree $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha'}$ at the root with $\alpha > \alpha'$. If we were to rescale by n^β , then we would need both $\beta = -1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}$ and $\beta = -1 + \frac{1}{\alpha'}$ according (1.2) for the correct convergence. This is of course not possible. To see why the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov topology is too strong, construct a real tree \mathbf{T} in the following way: for $k \geq 1$, let a_k be an atom of weight 2^{-k} . Connect a_k to the root r by an interval segment of length $1 - 2^{-k}$. One can see that for all $n \geq 1$ we have $d_{GHP}(T_n, \mathbf{T}) \geq 1/2$. This is because there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $i \leq n$ we have $\xi_i \neq a_k$. This implies that T_n will not converge after rescaling, in essence this is due to \mathbf{T} not being a compact metric space.

The structure of this paper is as follows: in Section 2 we introduce an encoding for tree-valued Markov chains, namely dendritic systems. Further, we discuss our notion of planarity for real trees and some of the measure theoretic aspects associated with the extremal decomposition of tree-valued Markov chains. In Section 3 we prove Theorem 1.10 and in Section A we prove an important auxiliary statement. Lastly in Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.16.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Planar real trees

In this section we introduce a notion of planarity for real trees. Let \mathbb{T} be the space of finite plane trees. Let \mathbb{T}^ℓ be the space of finite plane trees with leaves labelled by $[n]$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Internal vertices are allowed to be labelled but do not have to be, in this case there will be fewer than n leaves so that the total number of labelled vertices is n .

While the definition of planar real trees may seem complicated, the idea is simple. For a given real tree (\mathbf{T}, r) , there already exists a natural map which takes a sequence $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbf{T}$ to a combinatorial tree by *discretizing* the subtree spanned by x_1, \dots, x_n . We will now enhance these trees to be plane trees and require the planarity to be suitably consistent as x_1, \dots, x_n vary. Further, we want to keep track which x_i corresponds to which vertex in the combinatorial tree. This is done by labelling some of the vertices. See Figure 8 for an illustration of these ideas which we formalise in the following definitions.

Definition 2.1. Let (\mathbf{T}, r) be a real tree and x_1, \dots, x_n a finite sequence in \mathbf{T} . In the following, $<$ denotes the genealogical partial order in \mathbf{T} induced by $x < y$ if $[r, x] \subsetneq [r, y]$.

- 1.) We call $(x_i, i \leq n)$ totally unordered if for any $i \neq j$ we have $x_i \not\prec x_j$ and $x_j \not\prec x_i$.
- 2.) $\text{span}(x_1, \dots, x_n, r)$ denotes the minimal connected subset of \mathbf{T} which includes $\{r, x_i; i \leq n\}$. We view $\text{span}(x_1, \dots, x_n, r)$ as a real tree rooted at r .

Definition 2.2. We call (\mathbf{T}, r, ψ) a planar real tree if (\mathbf{T}, r) is a rooted real tree and $\psi = \{\psi_n, n \geq 2\}$ is a family of measurable maps $\psi_n : \mathbf{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^\ell$ satisfying the following properties:

- 1.) As unlabelled non-plane tree, the tree $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is the combinatorial tree corresponding to $\text{span}(x_1, \dots, x_n, r)$.
- 2.) The vertex of $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ corresponding to x_i is labelled i .
- 3.) ψ is consistent in the sense that for every $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and every totally unordered $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m \in \mathbf{T}$ we have that $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ embeds into $\psi_{n+m}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m)$ respecting the planar order and leaf labels.
- 4.) We extend ψ_n to sequences that are not unordered. First, we apply $\psi_k, k < n$ to the totally unordered sequence $(x_i, i \in I)$ with $k = |I|$ that maximises $\text{span}(r, x_i; i \in I)$. Then, for each $i \notin I$ we split the edge corresponding to x_i into two edges and label the middle vertex i . If x_i is already a branchpoint in the span, we label the corresponding vertex i . See Figure 8 for an example.




Figure 8: an example for a planar real tree with 13 marked points and their image under ψ_{13} . Note that not all internal points are labelled.

Besides generalising combinatorial labelled trees, there is another reason for why this is a fairly natural notion which will be the following proposition. Recall that a continuous function $g : [0, t] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $g(0) = g(t) = 0$ describes a real tree \mathbf{T}_g via a quotient space construction. For $s \leq u$ set

$$s \sim_g u \quad \text{iff} \quad g(s) = \inf_{r \in [s, u]} g(r) = g(u).$$

Define $\mathbf{T}_g = [0, t] / \sim_g$. The metric is then given by

$$d_{\mathbf{T}_g}(x, y) = g(x) + g(y) - 2 \inf_{z \in [x, y]} g(z),$$

for $x, y \in [0, t]$. Here, we abuse notation in this regards to view elements of $[0, t]$ as elements of \mathbf{T}_g , otherwise we write $x^* \in [0, t]$ for a representative of $x \in \mathbf{T}_g$. See for example Evans [7, Example 3.14] for more details of this construction.

An example for such a function g is the contour function C_T of a finite plane tree. Informally, this can be defined by a particle tracing the contour of the tree at unit speed, $C_T(t)$ measures the distance to the root at time t . Given C_T we can retrieve the planar order: take two leaves $x, y \in \mathbf{T}$, x, y correspond to two unique maxima of C_T , say $C_T(u) = x, C_T(v) = y$. If $u < v$, then the leaf in T corresponding to x is to the left of the leaf corresponding to y . This determines the planar order on T uniquely.

Proposition 2.3. *For a given leaf-labelled plane tree T without vertices of degree 2 there is a choice of maps $(\psi_n)_{n \geq 2}$ such that if T has k leaves, then (after deleting leaf labels) $\psi_k(\text{leaves of } \mathbf{T}_{C_T}) = T$. This renders \mathbf{T}_{C_T} into a planar real tree.*

We remark that we can do the same for trees with vertices of degree 2 and retrieve the information about vertices with degree 2 by inspecting the metric on \mathbf{T}_{C_T} .

Proof. We first describe the maps ψ_n . Denote the leaves of \mathbf{T}_{C_T} by y_1, \dots, y_k and denote the root of \mathbf{T}_{C_T} by ρ . Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbf{T}_{C_T}$ be totally unordered.

For $x, y \in \mathbf{T}_{C_T}$, we denote $x \leftarrow y$ if for all representatives $x^*, y^* \in [0, t]$ of x and y we have $x^* < y^*$. This can only be the case if x and y are unordered in \mathbf{T}_{C_T} . Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbf{T}_{C_T}$ be totally unordered and let T_n be the leaf-labelled non-plane tree corresponding to $\text{span}(x_1, \dots, x_n, r)$.

We need to equip T_n with a planar structure to make it into a plane tree. Because $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbf{T}_{C_T}$ is totally unordered, x_i is a leaf of $\text{span}(x_1, \dots, x_n, r)$ for every i and corresponds to a leaf in T_n . Furthermore, this implies that there is a permutation σ on $[n]$ such that $x_{\sigma(1)} \leftarrow x_{\sigma(2)} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow x_{\sigma(n)}$. We use this permutation to determine the planar order of leaves of T_n , for all $i, j \in [n]; i \neq j$ if $\sigma(i) < \sigma(j)$ then we set the leaf labelled i to be on the left of the leaf j . The tree structure of T_n determines the planar order of all other vertices, we choose $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ to be the resulting plane tree.

From this we can immediately see that $\psi_k(\text{leaves of } \mathbf{T}_{C_T}) = T$. Indeed, if x and y are two leaves of T such that x is to the left of y , then $x \leftarrow y$ by perceiving them as elements of \mathbf{T}_{C_T} . Because the left-right ordering of the leaves of T determines planar structure uniquely, and because the combinatorial tree corresponding to \mathbf{T}_{C_T} is T without the planar order, we have that $T = \psi_k(\text{leaves of } \mathbf{T}_{C_T})$ – after we have deleted the leaf labels.

Lastly, we need to show that if $x_1, \dots, x_n, y \in \mathbf{T}_{C_T}^{n+1}$ is totally unordered, then $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ embeds into $\psi_{n+1}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$. This follows from two facts: Firstly, the combinatorial tree corresponding to $\text{span}(x_1, \dots, x_n, r)$ embeds naturally into the combinatorial tree corresponding to $\text{span}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y, r)$. Secondly, this embedding respects the planar order of $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\psi_{n+1}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$. Indeed if $\sigma^{(n)}$ and $\sigma^{(n+1)}$ are the two permutations used in the construction of the trees, then $\sigma^{(n+1)}$ restricted to $[n]$ is $\sigma^{(n)}$ in the sense that if $\sigma^{(n+1)}(i) < \sigma^{(n+1)}(j)$ then $\sigma^{(n)}(i) < \sigma^{(n)}(j)$. □

Remark 2.4. This construction can be extended to any real tree \mathbf{T}_g encoded by some function g . This includes continuum random trees like the Brownian continuum random tree.

In the above proof we made use of referring to leaves being *left or right* of one another. We introduce a similar notation for subtrees at a given point in \mathbf{T} , recall our definition of subtrees from Definition 1.3.

Definition 2.5. For a planar real tree (\mathbf{T}, r, ψ) , a point $x \in \mathbf{T}$ and any two subtrees $\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2$ attached to x we say that \mathbf{S}_1 is *to the left* (respectively to the right) of \mathbf{S}_2 if this is the case for the labelled leaves of $\psi_2(s_1, s_2)$ for arbitrary $s_1 \in \mathbf{S}_1 \setminus \{x\}, s_2 \in \mathbf{S}_2 \setminus \{x\}$. We will write $\mathbf{S}_1 < \mathbf{S}_2$ to denote that \mathbf{S}_1 is to the left of \mathbf{S}_2 .

Note that the choice of $s_1 \in \mathbf{S}_1 \setminus \{x\}$ does not matter due to the consistency properties of ψ .

2.2 Dendritic systems

In this section we introduce the notion of dendritic systems. These objects aim to generalise finite leaf-labelled plane trees to infinitely many labels with a strong focus on the leaves. The reason for considering dendritic systems is that they allow us to encode a tree-valued Markov chain as a more static object. This notion is similar to that of didendritic systems of [8, Def. 5.8] which was introduced to generalise binary trees. Our notion has the advantage of accommodating multi-furcating trees as well.

We will surrender the notion of edges and keep only the ancestral relation. By ancestral relation we mean that x precedes y in a combinatorial tree T , $x \preceq y$, if the path from the root to y contains x . Any vertex will be thought of as a most recent common ancestor of two leaves.

In the following definition, these ideas result in conditions (C1)–(C4). There, (i, j) denotes the most recent common ancestor of two leaves labelled i, j . We require that leaves do not precede any other vertices (C1) and that leaves are descendants of their ancestors (C2). For two vertices, (i, j) and (k, ℓ) , we require

that there is another vertex which acts as most recent common ancestor, phrased a minimal element with respect to \preceq , (C4). (C3) and (C4) act as analogues of the *no-cycles* condition of combinatorial trees.

Further, we want to be able to encode the planar order of combinatorial trees as well. This is again done by specifying a left–right ordering of vertices. Recall that in the combinatorial tree the left–right order is derived from its Ulam–Harris encoding, *for example the word (0, 1, 1, 5, 3) is to the left of the word (0, 1, 2, 1)*. We encode this left–right ordering by introducing a planarity function p where $p(x, y) = 1$ signifies that y is to the right of x , respectively $p(x, y) = -1$ means that y is to the left of x . If x and y are ordered by the ancestral relation, we do not assign any left–right ordering. These ideas result in conditions (P1)–(P4): (P1) states that if x is to the right of y , then y is to the left of x . (P2) states that there is no left–right relation between vertices that satisfy $x \preceq y$ or $y \preceq x$. (P3) states that if y is to the right of x and z is to the right of y then z is also to the right of x . Lastly, (P4) states that if y is to the right of x then also any descendant of y is to the right of x .

In Lemma 2.8 we will show that this does indeed generalise plane, leaf–labelled, combinatorial trees.

Definition 2.6 (Dendritic system). Let $L \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a finite or countably infinite set of leaf labels. A planar dendritic system $\mathcal{D} = (L, \sim, \preceq, p)$ is the collection of the following objects: an equivalence relation \sim on $L \times L$, we denote the space of equivalence classes as T ; a genealogical partial order \preceq on T and a planarity function $p : T \times T \rightarrow \{0, 1, -1\}$ satisfying the following properties for all $i, j, k, \ell \in L$:

- (C1) $(i, j) \sim (j, i)$, and $(i, j) \sim (k, k)$ if and only if $i = j = k$.
- (C2) $(i, j) \preceq (i, i)$.
- (C3) $(i, j) \preceq (k, \ell)$ and $(k, \ell) \preceq (i, j)$ if and only if $(i, j) \sim (k, \ell)$.
- (C4) $a((i, j), (k, \ell)) = \min_{\preceq} \{(i, j), (k, \ell), (i, \ell), (i, k), (j, \ell), (j, k)\}$ exists in T .

Further, the planarity function p satisfies for all $x, y, z \in T$:

- (P1) $p(x, y) = -p(y, x)$.
- (P2) $p(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x \preceq y$ or $y \preceq x$.
- (P3) If $p(x, y) = 1$ and $p(y, z) = 1$ then $p(x, z) = 1$.
- (P4) If $p(x, y) = 1$ and $y \preceq z$ then $p(x, z) = 1$.

Here $x \prec y$ corresponds to $x \preceq y$ and $x \neq y$. We will always refer to $\{(i, i); i \in L\}$ as the leaves of \mathcal{D} . Moreover, consider two arbitrary vertices (i, j) and (k, ℓ) . Unless there is an ancestral relationship between (i, j) and (k, ℓ) , (P4) allows us to determine $p((i, j), (k, \ell))$, namely $p((i, j), (k, \ell)) = p(i, k) = p(j, k) = p(i, \ell) = p(j, \ell)$ where we abuse notation to write $i = (i, i)$. We can rephrase this as follows.

Lemma 2.7. *For a dendritic system (L, \sim, \preceq, p) , p is uniquely determined by \preceq and $\{p(i, j); i, j \in L\}$ where we write $i = (i, i)$.*

In the case where L is finite, dendritic systems precisely correspond to rooted plane trees:

Lemma 2.8. *If L is finite, there is a natural bijection between the set of dendritic systems $\mathcal{D} = (L, \sim, \preceq, p)$ and the set of leaf–labelled rooted plane trees (T, r) without vertices of degree 2 (except for possibly the root) and leaves labelled by L .*

Remark 2.9. Similarly to the space of trees, we equip the space of dendritic systems with the σ –algebra that is generated by finite projections. In the case of trees, we project onto a finite ball around the root and in the case of dendritic systems we restrict the dendritic system to to $[n] \cap L$.

Proof of Lemma 2.8. On the one hand, let (T, r) be a leaf–labelled rooted plane tree, we can assume that every edge is directed towards the root. For two leaves labelled $i, j \in T$, we let $b(i, j) \in T$ be their most recent common ancestor. Define a dendritic system as follows: $(i, j) \sim (k, \ell)$ if $b(i, j) = b(k, \ell)$, $(i, j) \preceq (k, \ell)$ if there is a directed path from $b(k, \ell)$ to $b(i, j)$, and $p(i, j) = 1$ for two leaves labelled i, j if i precedes j in lexicographic order of the Ulam–Harris encoding. By Lemma 2.7, this determines p uniquely.

On the other hand, let $\mathcal{D} = (L, \sim, \preceq, p)$ be a dendritic system. We want to define a plane leaf-labelled tree (T, r) . The equivalence classes of $(L \times L, \sim)$ are the vertices and we add an edge between x and y if there is no z such that $x \prec z \prec y$. Because L is finite, this yields a tree. We direct an edge (x, y) to x if $x \prec y$ and to y otherwise. The root r is now the minimal element of this directed tree, it exists due to (C3) and (C4). Lastly, we need to impose a planar order on T , i.e. a valid Ulam–Harris encoding of the vertices. This is done iteratively from the root r , encoded by \emptyset . Then every vertex has finitely many children x_1, \dots, x_n . Due to (P3) there is a permutation σ such that $p(x_{\sigma(i)}, x_{\sigma(j)}) = 1$ if $i < j$. x_i is then encoded by its parents encoding appended with $\sigma(i)$. Loosely speaking, p determines a permutation at each branchpoint of T which we use to obtain a planar order.

One can see that the two procedures described above are inverse to each other. \square

This allows us to illustrate a link between dendritic systems and planar real trees. Let (\mathbf{T}, r, ψ) be a planar real tree.

Corollary 2.10. *For any totally unordered sequence $(x_1, x_2, \dots) \in \mathbf{T}$ there is a dendritic systems \mathcal{D} on \mathbb{N} such that the restriction of \mathcal{D} to $[n]$ is isomorphic to $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ as rooted plane leaf-labelled trees.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.8 there exists a dendritic system $\mathcal{D}^{(n)}$ with leaves labelled $[n]$ such that the plane leaf-labelled tree corresponding to $\mathcal{D}^{(n)}$ is $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Because (\mathbf{T}, r, ψ) is a planar real tree $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ embeds into $\psi_{n+m}(x_1, \dots, x_{n+m})$ which means that we have that $\mathcal{D}^{(n+m)}$ restricted to $[n]$ is $\mathcal{D}^{(n)}$. This implies the existence of a dendritic system \mathcal{D} with the desired property. \square

The corollary above directly yields a method to construct random dendritic systems: assume (\mathbf{T}, d, r, ψ) is endowed with a diffuse probability measure μ that puts all mass on the leaves. Sample (ξ_1, ξ_2, \dots) *i.i.d.* from μ , then (ξ_1, ξ_2, \dots) gives rise to a random dendritic system.

In light of the main theorem, Theorem 1.10, this already foreshadows how we want to use dendritic systems:

Proposition 2.11. *Any tree-valued Markov chain $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ with uniform backward dynamics corresponds to an exchangeable dendritic system and vice versa.*

We should specify precisely how we define exchangeability for dendritic systems. Given a finite permutation σ on the leaf labels and a dendritic system $\mathcal{D} = (L, \sim, \preceq, p)$ we define the dendritic system $\mathcal{D}^\sigma = (L, \sim^\sigma, \preceq^\sigma, p^\sigma)$ by

- 1.) $(i, j) \sim^\sigma (k, \ell)$ if and only if $(\sigma(i), \sigma(j)) \sim (\sigma(k), \sigma(\ell))$,
- 2.) $(i, j) \preceq^\sigma (k, \ell)$ if and only if $(\sigma(i), \sigma(j)) \preceq (\sigma(k), \sigma(\ell))$,
- 3.) $p^\sigma(i, j) = p(\sigma(i), \sigma(j))$.

Definition 2.12. For a random dendritic system \mathcal{D} we say that \mathcal{D} is

- 1.) exchangeable, if \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}^σ have the same distribution for every finite permutation σ on the leaf labels;
- 2.) ergodic, if we have that for any event A we have $\mathbb{P}(\{\mathcal{D} \in A\}) \in \{0, 1\}$ whenever $\mathbb{P}(\{\mathcal{D} \in A\} \Delta \{\mathcal{D}^\sigma \in A\}) = 0$ for every finite permutation σ on the leaf labels.

Proof of Proposition 2.11. We will write $\mathcal{D}|_{[n]}$ if we restrict a dendritic system to the leaves labelled by $[n]$, respectively the equivalence classes of $[n] \times [n]$.

Let us describe how to encode $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ in a dendritic system. To this end, we define a sequence of dendritic systems $(\mathcal{D}_n = ([n], \sim_n, \preceq_n, p_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. For fixed n , label the leaves of T_n uniformly by $[n]$ and let \mathcal{D}_n be the corresponding dendritic system by Lemma 2.8. Note that \mathcal{D}_n and $\mathcal{D}_{n+m}|_{[n]}$ agree in law. Indeed, this is true because of the uniform backward dynamics as restricting \mathcal{D}_{n+m} to $[n]$ corresponds to m steps backwards in the Markov chain. Hence $(\mathcal{D}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ forms a consistent family and by the Daniell–Kolmogorov extension theorem there exists a dendritic system \mathcal{D} such that $\mathcal{D}|_{[n]} = \mathcal{D}_n$ in distribution, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

On the other hand, if we are given a dendritic system \mathcal{D} , then $(\mathcal{D}|_{[n]}, n \geq 1)$ corresponds to a sequence of plane leaf-labelled trees by Lemma 2.8. Remove the labels to obtain a sequence of plane leaf-labelled trees $(T_n, n \geq 1)$. Because \mathcal{D} is exchangeable, we can see that the backward dynamics of $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ are uniform by considering a uniform permutation of the leaf labels. \square

In the proof of Theorem 1.10 we will decompose the law of $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ into extremal measures. This is in the sense of convex combinations of distributions of $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ for different choices of $(T_n, n \geq 1)$. Call $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ *extremal* if its distribution is extremal in the space of probability measures of tree-valued Markov chains with uniform backward dynamics. These are precisely the tree growth processes that correspond to ergodic dendritic systems.

Proposition 2.13. *The Markov chain $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ is extremal if and only if the associated dendritic system is ergodic.*

The proof of this proposition is a straightforward generalisation of [8, Proposition 5.19] and we refer to the book of Kallenberg [18, Theorem A1.4] for background on ergodic decompositions. Due to the above propositions we will study exchangeable, ergodic dendritic systems instead of tree-valued Markov chains with uniform backward dynamics.

2.3 Doob–Martin boundary viewpoint

Let us elaborate on the connection of (1.1) and the Doob–Martin boundary. In the case of Marchal’s tree growth, we neglect the dependence on α . If we consider a conditioned version of Marchal’s tree growth of the form

$$\mathbb{P}(T_m^M \in \cdot | T_n^M = T), \quad (2.1)$$

for $m < n$, then we do not need to know how exactly the tree growth is defined to construct T_m^M . Instead, we only need to know that Marchal’s tree growth possesses uniform backward dynamics. This means iteratively remove uniform leaves to obtain $(T_m^M, 1 \leq m \leq n)$ under the conditioned measure. This means that under the conditioned measure $(T_m^M, 1 \leq m \leq n)$ is a tree-valued Markov chain with uniform backward dynamics with finite time horizon. If we can find a sequence of trees $(T^{(n_k)}, k \geq 1)$ such that $n_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(T_m^M \in \cdot | T_{n_k}^M = T^{(n_k)}) \quad \text{exists,} \quad (2.2)$$

then we obtain a tree-valued Markov chain with infinite time horizon.

The procedure above is related to the Doob–Martin boundary of the Markov chain $(T_n^M, n \geq 1)$. Our references here are the book of Woess [21, Chapter 7] for the general case and [8, Section 2 and 3] for tree-valued Markov chains, see also [8] for more references. Recall that we write \mathbb{T} for the space of plane trees so that $(T_n^M, n \geq 1)$ is a \mathbb{T} -valued Markov chain. In the following we abbreviate $e = T_1^M$, the unique tree consisting of a single edge. We also write \mathbb{P}^S for the probability measure under which $(T_n^M, n \geq 1)$ is Marchal’s tree growth with $T_1^M = S$, \mathbb{P}^S -almost surely. For two trees S, T with $m < n$ leaves respectively we define the probability that starting from S we will ever see T

$$p(S, T) := \mathbb{P}^S(T_\ell^M = T \text{ for some } \ell) = \mathbb{P}^S(T_{n-m+1}^M = T).$$

Indeed, because we add a leaf in every step of the Markov chain, this can only happen after $n - m$ steps. We use this to define the Doob–Martin kernel K of T^M for $S, T \in \mathbb{T}$ by

$$K(S, T) := \frac{p(S, T)}{p(e, T)}$$

whenever $p(e, T) > 0$. Implicitly we now restrict our space \mathbb{T} to $\{T \in \mathbb{T} : p(e, T) > 0\}$, if $p(e, T) = 0$ we define $K(S, T) = 0$ for all S . Let Π be the transition matrix of Marchal’s tree growth. We then have for $S \neq T$,

$$\sum_{T' \in \mathbb{T}} \Pi(S, T') K(T', T) = K(S, T). \quad (2.3)$$

This is not true for $S = T$. Hence, $K(\cdot, T)$ is almost a harmonic function. Observe for S with m leaves and T with $n > m$ leaves:

$$K(S, T) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}^e(T_m^M = S | T_n^M = T)} \mathbb{P}^e(T_m^M = S | T_n^M = T) = \frac{1}{C(S)} \mathbb{P}^e(T_m^M = S | T_n^M = T),$$

where the constant $C(S)$ depends on S but not on T . This illustrates the connection between the kernel K and (2.1).

One can then show that $K(\cdot, T) \neq K(\cdot, T')$ whenever $T \neq T'$. Indeed, if S has the same number of leaves as T then $K(S, T) \neq 0$ if and only if $S = T$. This yields a bijection between \mathbb{T} and $\{K(\cdot, T), T \in \mathbb{T}\}$. The advantage is that $\{K(\cdot, T), T \in \mathbb{T}\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{T}}$ and that it turns out to be precompact under the induced topology. We let $\overline{\mathbb{T}}$ be the closure of \mathbb{T} in $\mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{T}}$, the so-called *Doob–Martin compactification* of \mathbb{T} . The set $\partial\mathbb{T} = \overline{\mathbb{T}} \setminus \mathbb{T}$ is called the *Doob–Martin boundary* of the Markov chain T^M . We equip $\overline{\mathbb{T}}$ with its Borel– σ –algebra. We write $K(\cdot, b)$ for an element $b \in \partial\mathbb{T}$ of the boundary. These considerations lead to the following statement, for more details see [8, Section 2 and 3].

Proposition 2.14. [8, Corollary 3.10] *For a sequence of trees $(T^{(n_k)}, k \geq 1)$ where $T^{(n_k)}$ has n_k leaves and $n_k \rightarrow \infty$, the limit in (2.2) exists if and only if $(T^{(n_k)}, k \geq 1)$ converges in the Doob–Martin boundary $\partial\mathbb{T}$.*

By choosing $T^{(n)} = T_n$ where $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ has uniform backward dynamics, we immediately obtain the following consequence.

Theorem 2.15 (Boundary convergence). *A tree-valued Markov chain $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ with uniform backward dynamics converges almost surely in $\overline{\mathbb{T}}$, the limit is supported in $\partial\mathbb{T}$. In particular this is the case for Marchal’s tree growth.*

This is true because $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ has the same backwards dynamics as Marchal’s tree growth and hence the same Doob–Martin boundary. This is a general fact in the abstract setting, see [21, Theorem 7.19].

A natural consequence of this statement is that we want to identify the limiting distribution in a more tractable object. This is done in our main theorem, Theorem 1.10. There is a second, general statement related to the Doob–Martin boundary. It concerns itself with Π –harmonic functions, recall from (2.3) that K is closely connected to harmonic functions. In fact, for fixed $b \in \partial\mathbb{T}$ the function $K(\cdot, b)$ is harmonic. Every other harmonic function can be decomposed as follows, in the general setting this is [21, Theorem 7.45].

Theorem 2.16 (Integral representation). *For a harmonic function $h : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ with $h(e) = 1$ there exists an unique probability measure ν^h on $\partial\mathbb{T}$ such that for every $T \in \mathbb{T}$ we have*

$$h(T) = \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}} K(T, b) \nu^h(db).$$

Recall that the set of probability distributions of tree growth processes is a convex set. A distribution is called extremal if it cannot be written as a non-trivial convex combination of two other distributions. To conclude this section, we state that any probability measure on tree-valued Markov chains can be decomposed into its extremal elements. Due to this statement, it suffices to consider tree growth processes $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ whose distribution is extremal.

Corollary 2.17. *The set of extremal distributions can be parameterised by $\{\mu^b, b \in \partial\mathbb{T}\}$. Further, for any Markov chain $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ with uniform backward dynamics there exists a probability measure $\hat{\nu}$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}((T_n, n \geq 1) \in \cdot) = \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}} \mu^b((T_n, n \geq 1) \in \cdot) \hat{\nu}(db).$$

Proof. This will follow from Theorem 2.16 once we show that there is a correspondence between harmonic functions and Markov chains.

Given $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ denote its limit in $\partial\mathbb{T}$ by B , according to Theorem 2.15 this exists almost surely. We define a harmonic function by

$$h(T) = \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}} K(T, b) \mathbb{P}(B \in db). \tag{2.4}$$

On the other hand, given a harmonic function h' , we define a new Markov chain on the set $\{T \in \mathbb{T} : h'(T) > 0\}$ by its transition matrix,

$$\Pi^{h'}(S, T) = \frac{1}{h'(S)} \Pi(S, T) h'(T),$$

where Π is the transition matrix of Marchal's tree growth. This is a Doob h -transform. If we now choose $h' = h$ as in (2.4), we obtain the distribution of the Markov chain $(T_n, n \geq 1)$. This follows from a computation that when we condition on $\{T_N = T\}$, the distribution of the initial segment $(T_n, n \leq N)$ is given by an h -transform with $K(\cdot, T)$. This computation is straight-forward and can be found in [8, Chapter 2]. By then taking the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ and Theorem 2.15 we obtain the correspondence between Markov chains and harmonic functions. We leave it to the reader to check that a convex combination of harmonic functions translates to a convex combination of the distributions associated to the Markov chains.

The corollary now follows from Theorem 2.16, h corresponds to an extremal distribution if and only if $\nu^h = \delta_b$ for some $b \in \partial\mathbb{T}$. \square

3 Proof of Theorem 1.10

Recall that we can encode a tree-valued Markov chain $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ with uniform backward dynamics in an exchangeable dendritic system in Proposition 2.11, recall the definition of dendritic systems from Definition 2.6. Recall also that extremal tree growth processes correspond to ergodic dendritic systems. The proof of Theorem 1.10 consists of three steps: we decompose the distribution of $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ into extremal measures with Corollary 2.17, we then show that for every extremal distribution there is *some* decorated planar real tree and lastly we show that this can be chosen to be a IP-tree. The latter two steps are made up of Propositions 3.3 and 3.4.

First, we will state how to sample a dendritic system $\mathcal{D} = (\mathbb{N}, \sim, \preceq, p)$ from a decorated planar real tree $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$. Recall that ψ is a planar order for the rooted, weighted real tree (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) , λ a branch weight function and B a branchpoint weight function. We split the construction into two parts, sampling $(\mathbb{N}, \sim, \preceq)$ from the tree and determining the planarity function p using (ψ, λ, B) and extra randomness.

Construction 3.1. Sample a sequence $\{\xi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ *i.i.d.* from μ . We then define for $i, j, k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$:

- 1.) $(i, i) \sim (k, \ell)$ if and only if $i = k = \ell$.
- 2.) $(i, j) \sim (k, \ell)$ for $i \neq j, k \neq \ell$ if and only if $[r, \xi_i] \cap [r, \xi_j] = [r, \xi_k] \cap [r, \xi_\ell]$.
- 3.) A partial order \preceq on \mathbb{N}^2 / \sim is inherited from the genealogical partial order $<$ on \mathbf{T} and adding $(i, j) \prec (i, i)$ for $i \neq j$. This means for distinct $i, j, k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ we set

$$(k, \ell) \prec (i, j) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad [r, \xi_k] \cap [r, \xi_\ell] \subsetneq [r, \xi_i] \cap [r, \xi_j].$$

Construction 3.2. In the setting of Construction 3.1, we now sample $\{U_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ *i.i.d.* uniform random variables from $[0, 1]$ independently from $\{\xi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$.

- 1.) To determine the planarity function p , we distinguish four cases. Recall that we decomposed $\mu = \mu_{atoms} + \mu_s + \mu_\ell$ into the mass on the atoms, the skeleton (diffusely) and the leaves (diffusely).
 - (a) If neither $\xi_i < \xi_j$ nor $\xi_j < \xi_i$, then p is determined by $\psi_2(\xi_i, \xi_j)$, see Figure 9 for an illustration. More precisely, there is a unique plane tree with two leaves and one root, we need to check which of the two leaves is labelled i and which is labelled j . We set

$$p(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the left leaf is labelled } i \text{ and the right leaf is labelled } j \text{ in } \psi_2(\xi_i, \xi_j), \\ -1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- (b) If $\xi_i < \xi_j$ we distinguish two cases.
 - i. In the case that $\xi_i \in \text{supp } \mu_s$, we set

$$p(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } U_i < \lambda(\xi_i), \\ -1 & \text{if } U_i \geq \lambda(\xi_i). \end{cases}$$

- ii. In the case that $\xi_i \in \text{supp } \mu_{\text{atoms}}$, we first need to identify the subtree of ξ_i in which ξ_j is located – see Definition 1.3 for our notion of subtree and Definition 2.5 for subtrees being left or right of each other. Denote by \mathbf{S}_j the unique subtree which contains ξ_j . Let

$$\beta_{\xi_i}(\mathbf{S}_j) = \beta_{\xi_i} \left(\mu(\mathbf{S}_j) + \sum_{\mathbf{S}' < \mathbf{S}_j} \mu(\mathbf{S}') \right).$$

We then set

$$p(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } U_i < \beta_{\xi_i}(\mathbf{S}_j), \\ -1 & \text{if } U_i \geq \beta_{\xi_i}(\mathbf{S}_j). \end{cases}$$

(c) If $\xi_i > \xi_j$, we do the same as above with reversed roles for i and j .

(d) If $\xi_i = \xi_j$, we set

$$p(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } U_i < U_j, \\ -1 & \text{if } U_i \geq U_j. \end{cases}$$

Note that the value of $p((i, j), (k, \ell))$, where $(i, j), (k, \ell)$ are not leaves, is uniquely determined by the values of p on the leaves by imposing the consistency relations (P1)–(P4), see Lemma 2.7.




Figure 9: How ψ is used to determine p in the sampling construction. Given two (random) points ξ_i and ξ_j which do not satisfy $\xi_i < \xi_j$ nor $\xi_j < \xi_i$, ψ_2 maps these points to the unique tree with two leaves. The two options to label the leaves correspond to $p(i, j) = \pm 1$ respectively.

In the following sections we will show these two propositions.

Proposition 3.3. *For every ergodic dendritic system \mathcal{D} there exists a deterministic decorated planar real tree $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$ such that the distribution of \mathcal{D} equals the one sampled from Constructions 3.1 and 3.2.*

Proposition 3.4. *The decorated planar real tree $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$ in Proposition 3.3 can be uniquely chosen as a decorated planar IP–tree up to measure and root preserving isometry of (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) .*

We prove Theorem 1.10 from these propositions.

Proof of Theorem 1.10. Let $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ be a tree–valued Markov chain with uniform backward dynamics.

Suppose that $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ is extremal in the sense of Section 2.3. Then by Proposition 2.13 it corresponds to an ergodic dendritic system \mathcal{D} . By Propositions 3.3 and 3.4 there exists a decorated planar IP–tree $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$ – unique up to measure and root preserving isometry of (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) – such that \mathcal{D} has the same distribution as the dendritic system obtained through Constructions 3.1 and 3.2. By Proposition 2.13 the same is true for the Markov chain $(T_n, n \geq 1)$.

In the case that $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ is not extremal, the desired statement follows from the decomposition into extremal distribution in Corollary 2.17 and the above considerations for extremal tree–growth chains. \square

3.1 Existence of a sampling representation

In this section we will prove Proposition 3.3. A key step in this proof is the following Proposition 3.6. The proposition deals with the following construction.

Construction 3.5. Assume that we are given a weighted, rooted real tree (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) and a function $F : (\mathbf{T} \times [0, 1])^2 \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$. Let Leb be the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$. Assume that F satisfies the following consistency relations for μ -almost every x, y, z and Leb -almost every u, v, w, a, b, c .

- (F1) $F(x, u, y, v, a) = -F(y, v, x, u, a)$,
- (F2) if $F(x, u, y, v, a) = F(y, v, z, w, b)$ then also $F(x, u, z, w, c) = F(x, u, y, v, a)$,
- (F3) if $[r, x] \cap [r, y] \notin \{[r, x], [r, y]\}$ and $[r, y] \subsetneq [r, z]$ then $F(x, u, y, v, a) = F(x, u, z, w, b)$,
- (F4) if $[r, x] \subsetneq [r, y] \subsetneq [r, z]$ then $F(x, u, y, v, a) = F(x, u, z, w, c)$.

Then, in the context of Construction 3.1, sample *i.i.d.* uniform random variables $\{U_i, U_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}, i < j}$ from $[0, 1]$. We define a planarity function p by

$$p(i, j) = F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_j, U_j, U_{i,j}),$$

abusing notation to write $i = (i, i)$. The value of $p((i, j), (k, \ell))$, where $(i, j), (k, \ell)$ are not leaves, is uniquely determined by the values of p on the leaves by imposing the consistency relations (P1)–(P4), see Lemma 2.7.

Proposition 3.6. *Every ergodic, exchangeable dendritic system \mathcal{D} can be represented by a real tree (\mathbf{T}, d, r) , a probability measure μ on \mathbf{T} and a measurable function $F : (\mathbf{T} \times [0, 1])^2 \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ in such a way that we have $\mathbf{T} = \text{span}(\text{supp}(\mu))$, F satisfies the consistency relations stated in Construction 3.5 and \mathcal{D} is then equal in distribution to the dendritic system constructed through Constructions 3.1 and 3.5.*

Its proof is analogous to the proof of [8, Theorem 8.2] but makes use of the full generality of a theorem of Gufler [14]. We will prove Proposition 3.6 in Section A. The consistency conditions on F correspond naturally to the consistency conditions of p , see Section A.3. We also note that in Theorem [8, Theorem 8.2] similar consistency relations are imposed.

Remark that it suffices to describe the dendritic system restricted to $[n]$ for every n to determine the distribution of the dendritic system uniquely. We prove Proposition 3.3 assuming that Proposition 3.6 is given. This means that this proposition provides the tree \mathbf{T} and the measure μ , hence we can consider specific trees and measures. We first consider three special cases for \mathbf{T} as a warm-up: when the mass is distributed diffusely on the skeleton, when it is supported diffusely on the leaves and when it has atoms. Note that these cases arise naturally as we can decompose $\mu = \mu_{\text{atoms}} + \mu_\ell + \mu_s$ into measures that place mass only on atoms, diffusely on leaves and diffusely on the branches (the tree without the leaves) respectively.

Before doing that, we will state an elementary lemma.

Lemma 3.7. *Assume X, Y, Z are independent random variables with laws $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ respectively and f a measurable function. If $f(X, Y) = f(X, Z)$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. then $f(x, Y)$ is \mathbb{P} -a.s. constant for λ_1 -a.e. x . We then have $f(X, Y) = g(X)$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for some measurable function g .*

Proof. Note first that $f(x, Y) = g(x, Z)$ for λ_1 -a.e. x , \mathbb{P} -almost surely. Fix x such that $f(x, Y) = f(x, Z)$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. and let $f_x(\cdot) = f(x, \cdot)$. Then $f_x(Y) = f_x(Z)$ almost surely. Because $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp Z$, $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp f_x(Y)$ and hence $f_x(Y) \perp\!\!\!\perp f_x(Y)$ which implies that $f_x(Y)$ is \mathbb{P} -a.s. constant – define $g(x)$ to be this constant, i.e. $g(x) = \int f(x, y) \lambda_2(dy)$ which is measurable. This completes the proof because $\lambda_1(\{x : f(x, Y) = f(x, Z)\}) = 1$. \square

Lemma 3.8. *Assume that from Proposition 3.6 we get $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, F)$ so that $\mathbf{T} = [0, 1]$, $r = 0$, $\mu = Leb$ with F being arbitrary. Then there exists a decorated planar real tree $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$ so that the dendritic systems constructed by Constructions 3.2 and 3.5 have the same distribution. Here, ψ is the only possible planar order for $[0, 1]$ and λ is determined by F . Because Leb has no atoms, B is trivial.*

Note that in this case μ is supported diffusely on branches. There is only one planar order for this tree in this case: given n distinct points and the root in \mathbf{T} , ψ_n maps them to a discrete line segment of length n .

Here the sampling representation is very concise: sample n uniform *iid* points ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n on $[0, 1]$. For each ξ_i , sample a Bernoulli random variable with parameter $\lambda(\xi_i)$ independently and attach a leaf labelled i to the left of ξ_i – if the Bernoulli random variable equals 1 – or to the right of ξ_i otherwise. T_n is then the plane combinatorial tree spanned by r and the added leaves. This means that T_n is a binary tree consisting of a spine with leaves hanging off the spine left and right.

Proof of Lemma 3.8. Due to the special structure of the tree and the probability measure we are almost surely always in the case where $\{\xi_i < \xi_j\}$ or $\{\xi_i > \xi_j\}$. This leaves us to show that on the event $\{\xi_i < \xi_j\}$ we have almost surely

$$p(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } U_i < \lambda(\xi_i), \\ -1 & \text{if } U_i \geq \lambda(\xi_i) \end{cases}$$

for a suitable branch weight function λ .

Without loss of generality we always condition on the event $\{\xi_i < \xi_j\}$ in the following. By Proposition 3.6 we have:

$$p(i, j) = F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_j, U_j, U_{ij}).$$

We sample a second copy of (ξ_j, U_j, U_{ij}) independently of $(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_j, U_j, U_{ij})$ and denote it by $(\xi_j^*, U_j^*, U_{ij}^*)$ and we restrict ourselves to the event $\{\xi_i < \xi_j^*\}$. Due to the consistency properties of F , more precisely (F4), we almost surely have

$$F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_j, U_j, U_{ij}) = F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_j^*, U_j^*, U_{ij}^*).$$

Consider the family of regular conditional distribution $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | \xi_i = x, \xi_j > \xi_i, \xi_j^* > \xi_i)$ under which for all $x \in (0, 1)$, both ξ_j and ξ_j^* are *Uniform* $((x, 1))$ distributed and $U_i, \xi_j, U_j, U_{ij}, \xi_j^*, U_j^*, U_{ij}^*$ are independent of each other. This means we can apply Lemma 3.7 which tells us that there exists some measurable function $V' : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ such that $F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_j, U_j, U_{ij}) = V'(x, U_i)$, $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | \xi_i = x, \xi_j > \xi_i, \xi_j^* > \xi_i)$ –almost surely for *Leb*–almost every x . Integrating over x and reversing the roles for i and j already gives us the following description of p :

$$p(i, j) = \begin{cases} V'(\xi_i, U_i) & \text{if } \xi_i < \xi_j, \\ V'(\xi_j, U_j) & \text{if } \xi_j < \xi_i. \end{cases}$$

Let us now define the branch weight function λ by $\lambda(x) = \mathbb{P}(V'(x, U) = 1)$ for $x \in [0, 1]$. We use this to define:

$$\tilde{p}(i, j) = \begin{cases} V(\xi_i, U_i) & \text{if } \xi_i < \xi_j, \\ V(\xi_j, U_j) & \text{if } \xi_j < \xi_i. \end{cases}$$

where $V(x, u) = \mathbb{1}_{\lambda(x) < u} - \mathbb{1}_{\lambda(x) > u}$. If we manage to show

$$\{p(i, j) : 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{\tilde{p}(i, j) : 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n\} \quad (3.1)$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then we have completed the proof the lemma. To this end, fix $2 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | \xi_1 < \dots < \xi_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ by \mathbb{P}^ξ and let $a_1, \dots, a_{n-1} \in \{\pm 1\}^{n-1}$. To show (3.1), it suffices to show that we \mathbb{P}^ξ –a.s. have

$$\mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i < n : p(i, i+1) = a_i) = \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i < n : \tilde{p}(i, i+1) = a_i). \quad (3.2)$$

Indeed, assume we are given $b = \{b_{ij}\}_{i, j \leq n, i \neq j} \in \{\pm 1\}^{n(n-1)}$ with $b_{ij} = -b_{ji}$ and $b_{ij} = b_{in}$ for $i < n$. If we are given b that does not satisfy these assumptions, then

$$\mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \leq n, i \neq j : p(i, j) = b_{ij}) = 0,$$

due to b violating the consistency properties required in (P1) or (P4). The same holds for \tilde{p} . Now if b satisfies the assumptions stated above, we then have

$$\mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \leq n, i \neq j : p(i, j) = b_{ij}) \stackrel{(P1)}{=} \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \leq n, i < j : p(i, j) = b_{ij}) \stackrel{(P4)}{=} \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i < n : p(i, i+1) = b_{in}),$$

where both equalities hold \mathbb{P} -almost surely. We can apply (P4) here because for $i+1 < j$ we have $(j, (i+1)) \prec (j, j)$ due to $\xi_i < \xi_{i+1} < \xi_j$, hence $p(i, i+1) = p(i, (j, i+1)) = p(i, j)$. The same is true for \tilde{p} , which means that it suffices to only check (3.2). Consider now (3.2), due to our definition of λ and the independence of U_1, \dots, U_n , we \mathbb{P} -almost surely have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i < n : p(i, n) = a_i) &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i < n : V'(\xi_i, U_i) = a_i) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{P}^\xi(V'(\xi_i, U_i) = a_i) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\lambda(\xi_i)\mathbb{1}_{a_i=1} + (1 - \lambda(\xi_i))\mathbb{1}_{a_i=-1}) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{P}^\xi(V(\xi_i, U_i) = a_i) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i < n : \tilde{p}(i, n) = a_i). \end{aligned}$$

This implies (3.1) which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

As the second warm-up case, we consider the case where \mathbf{T} is arbitrary but μ is supported only on the leaves of \mathbf{T} . In this case λ and B are trivial, but we do need to define ψ .

Lemma 3.9. *Assume that from Proposition 3.6 we get $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, F)$ so that μ is supported diffusely on the leaves of \mathbf{T} . Then there exists a decorated planar real tree $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$ so that the dendritic systems constructed by Constructions 3.2 and 3.5 have the same distribution. λ and B are trivial.*

Proof. Our main concern is to define the planar order ψ , recall the definition from Definition 2.2. More concretely, we need to define $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for any totally unordered $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{T}^n$. Note that we need to do this for all (x_1, \dots, x_n) and not just on the support of μ . Hence we fix totally unordered $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{T}^n$.

We let \mathbf{S}_i be the subtree corresponding to x_i in the following sense: let \bar{x}_i be the most recent branchpoint in $\text{span}(r, x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Let y_i be the middle point of the segment $[\bar{x}_i, x_i]_{\mathbf{T}}$. We set $\mathbf{S}_i = F_{\mathbf{T}}(y_i)$, the fringe subtree of y_i , see Figure 10 for an illustration. The reason for using $F_{\mathbf{T}}(y_i)$ instead of $F_{\mathbf{T}}(x_i)$ is that we always have $\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(y_i)) > 0$ but not necessarily $\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x_i)) > 0$. This is true because we have $\mathbf{T} = \text{span}(\text{supp}(\mu))$ by Proposition 3.6. Note that if x_i is a leaf, then $\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x_i)) = \mu(\{x_i\}) = 0$ because we assumed μ to be diffuse.

Define now $\mathbb{P}^x = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\mu(\mathbf{S}_i)} \mu|_{\mathbf{S}_i}$. Sampling (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n) from \mathbb{P}^x is equivalent to sampling (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n) from \mathbb{P} and conditioning on $\{\xi_i \in \mathbf{S}_i\}$ for every i . Using (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n) sampled from \mathbb{P}^x in Construction 3.1 and 3.5 (instead of *i.i.d.* μ samples) yields a random dendritic system $\mathcal{D}_n = ([n], \sim_n, \preceq_n, p_n)$ with leaves labelled by $[n]$. We claim that \mathcal{D}_n is in fact almost surely constant. If this is the case, then \mathcal{D}_n will correspond to a non-random tree T_n by Lemma 2.8 which is a combinatorial, leaf-labelled and plane tree. We then set

$$\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = T_n.$$

Next we need to prove the claim than \mathcal{D}_n is almost surely constant. Let $(\xi_i, U_i, U_{ij}; i, j \leq n)$ be the random variables involved in the construction of \mathcal{D}_n , let $(\xi_i^*, U_i^*, U_{ij}^*; i, j \leq n)$ be an independent copy with the same distribution, extending the probability space. For every $i \neq j$ we have

$$F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_j, U_j, U_{ij}) = F(\xi_i^*, U_i^*, \xi_j^*, U_j^*, U_{ij}^*)$$

due to the consistency properties (F2) and (F3) of Proposition 3.6 and the fact that $\xi_i, \xi_i^* \in \mathbf{S}_i$ whereas $\xi_j, \xi_j^* \in \mathbf{S}_j$. Informally, sampling once from \mathbf{S}_i and \mathbf{S}_j already determines which subtree is to the left of the other subtree, hence the second sample must agree with the left-right prescription of the first sample. More formally, $(\xi_i, U_i, U_{ij}; i, j \leq n)$ and $(\xi_i^*, U_i^*, U_{ij}^*; i, j \leq n)$ are independent and hence F restricted to $\mathbf{S}_i \times [0, 1] \times \mathbf{S}_j \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ is \mathbb{P}^x -almost surely constant for any $i \neq j$ by Lemma 3.7. This proves the claim that \mathcal{D}_n is constant and thus yields the map ψ_n . By construction we also have the property that $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ as non-plane combinatorial tree is the combinatorial tree corresponding to $\text{span}(r, x_1, \dots, x_n)$.




Figure 10: The subsets of \mathbf{T} involved in the proof of Lemma 3.9.

What remains to be shown is that $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ embeds into $\psi_{n+1}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$ for any $y \in \mathbf{T}$ such that (x_1, \dots, x_n, y) is still totally unordered. Let $(\mathbf{S}_1, \dots, \mathbf{S}_n)$ denote the trees used in the construction of $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $(\mathbf{S}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{S}'_n, \mathbf{S}_y)$ the trees used in the construction of $\psi_{n+1}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$.

We need to observe that in general we have $\mathbf{S}_i \neq \mathbf{S}'_i$. This is because either $y \in \mathbf{S}_i$ for some i or because including y introduces new branchpoints in $\text{span}(r, x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$ which change \bar{x}_i and hence \mathbf{S}_i . Nevertheless, we always have

$$\mathbf{S}'_i \subseteq \mathbf{S}_i \quad \forall i \leq n.$$

Recall that in the first part of the proof we sampled ξ_i from μ_i , i.e. from μ conditioned on $\xi_i \in \mathbf{S}_i$ to determine $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. It is easy to see that we can a posteriori replace \mathbf{S}_i with \mathbf{S}'_i in the construction and still obtain the same $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. This is because we concluded that $F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_j, U_j, U_{ij})$ is almost surely constant for every $i, j \leq n$ so we can condition $\xi_i, i \leq n$ to be in the smaller sets \mathbf{S}'_i for every $i \leq n$ and deduce the required constancy on these sets.

There is a distinct advantage to using $(\mathbf{S}'_i, i \leq n)$ instead of $(\mathbf{S}_i, i \leq n)$ as these are the subsets of \mathbf{T} used in the construction of $\psi_{n+1}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$. This then yields the embedding of $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ into $\psi_{n+1}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$. There is a unique edge or branchpoint in $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ to which we attach the leaf corresponding to y , determined by where \bar{y} is located in $\text{span}(r, x_1, \dots, x_n)$ because Definition 2.2 requires that $\psi_{n+1}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$ without the planar order is the combinatorial tree corresponding to $\text{span}(r, x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$. There also is a determined way for the planar order of the new leaf corresponding to y which is compatible with the planar order of $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ because we used the same sets $\mathbf{S}_i, i \leq n$, respectively identically distributed random variables, to construct the planar orders.

To conclude the proof of this lemma, note that the choice of λ is trivial. Indeed, recall that we view λ as an element of $L^1(\mu_s)$. Here $\mu_s = 0$, so $L^1(\mu_s)$ contains only a single element. Similarly, we need not define B as μ does not have any atoms, hence B is trivial.

We have to check that the distribution of the dendritic system constructed via Constructions 3.1 and 3.2 using ψ is the same as the distribution of the dendritic system in Proposition 3.6. By construction of ψ , this is the case on the event where $(\xi_i, i \geq 1)$ is a totally unordered sequence in \mathbf{T} . Because μ is diffusely supported on the leaves of \mathbf{T} , this happens with probability 1. This concludes the proof. \square

It is important to note that we used the fact that μ is supported diffusely on the leaves only in the conclusion of the proof but not in the construction of ψ . Hence we can also repeat this construction in the general setting of Proposition 3.6.

Corollary 3.10. *In the setting of Proposition 3.6, F induces a deterministic planar order ψ for \mathbf{T} . In the context of Construction 3.1, consider the event that $(\xi_i; i \in I)$ are totally unordered for some finite set $I \subset \mathbb{N}$. Then on this event the planarity function p constructed in Construction 3.2 (which uses this ψ) restricted to I has the same distribution as the planarity function of Construction 3.5 restricted to I .*

As the third warm-up case, we consider the case where \mathbf{T} is a single point. Note that in that case λ and B are necessarily trivial and there is again only one choice for the planar order ψ .

Lemma 3.11. *Assume that from Proposition 3.6 we get $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, F)$ so that $\mathbf{T} = \{0\}$, $r = 0$ and $\mu = \delta_0$. Then there exists a decorated planar real tree $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$ so that the dendritic systems constructed by*

Constructions 3.2 and 3.5 have the same distribution. ψ, λ and B need not be specified due to the special structure of \mathbf{T} .

Proof. The only tree with n leaves that can arise in this case is the tree where all n leaves are attached directly to the root. This tree also has a unique planar order. We are left with distributing the leaf labels, but due to exchangeability they form a uniform permutation on $\{1, \dots, n\}$. This means we have to assign them in a consistent way which can be realised by $p(i, j) = \mathbb{1}_{U_i < U_j} - \mathbb{1}_{U_j > U_i}$. \square

Finally, we will prove Proposition 3.3 in the general case by combining the ideas of the preceding lemmas.

Proof of Proposition 3.3. Let $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, F)$ as in Proposition 3.6. The proof consists of two steps: constructing the planar order ψ , the branch weight function λ , the branchpoint weight function B , and then checking that the distribution of the sampled dendritic system agrees with the distribution of Proposition 3.6.

Step 1: constructing (ψ, λ, B) . First, we define $\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for any totally unordered $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{T}$ as in the proof of Lemma 3.9 and Corollary 3.10. This is then extended to arbitrary (x_1, \dots, x_n) by part 4 of Definition 2.2.

Recall the definition of a branch weight function λ from the introduction. Hence, fix $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_s)$, i.e. x is located on the diffuse mass on the branches. By our convention, we can assume $\deg(x) = 2$. Define $\mu^x = \frac{1}{\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x))} \mu|_{F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)}$, μ restricted to $F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)$ and normalised. Let U_1, U_2, U_3 be independent, uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables and let ξ be an independent μ^x -distributed random variable. ξ can also be seen as a μ -distributed random variable conditioned on $\xi \in F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)$. We can now define $\lambda(x)$,

$$\lambda(x) = \mathbb{P}(F(x, U_1, \xi, U_2, U_3) = 1). \quad (3.3)$$

Note that this defines a measurable function λ because F is measurable. On an informal level, $\lambda(x)$ is the probability that a leaf attached to x will be to the left of the subtree $F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)$ of x .

Recall the definition of branchpoint weight function B from the introduction. Fix an atom a of μ . We need to define $\beta_a : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ so that β_a is non-decreasing, right-continuous and the cardinality of the range of β_a is at most $\deg a \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Also, we want β_a to be piece-wise constant in the following sense: enumerate the connected components of $F_{\mathbf{T}}(a) \setminus \{a\}$ by $\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2, \dots$ and let $c_i = \sum \mu(\mathbf{S}_j) / \sum_{k \geq 1} \mu(\mathbf{S}_k)$ where the first sum ranges over all j such that \mathbf{S}_j is left of \mathbf{S}_i (see Definition 2.5) and $\mathbf{S}_j \neq \mathbf{S}_i$. We then impose that β_a is constant on $[c_i, \inf_{c_j > c_i} c_j)$ for every i .

Fix i and consider $\mu^i = \frac{1}{\mu(\mathbf{S}_i)} \mu|_{\mathbf{S}_i}$, i.e. μ restricted to \mathbf{S}_i and normalised. Let U_1, U_2, U_3 be independent, uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables and let ξ^i be an independent μ^i -distributed random variable. ξ can also be seen as μ -distributed random variable conditioned on $\xi^i \in \mathbf{S}_i$. We can now define

$$b_i = \mathbb{P}(F(a, U_1, \xi^i, U_2, U_3) = 1). \quad (3.4)$$

On an informal level, this corresponds to the probability that a leaf attached to a is left of the subtree \mathbf{S}_i . We use this to define β_a . On the interval $[c_i, \inf_{c_j > c_i} c_j)$, we set β_a to be b_i ,

$$\beta_a|_{[c_i, \inf_{c_j > c_i} c_j)} = b_i.$$

For completeness, we set $\beta_a(1) = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} b_j$ and $\beta_a(x) = \lim_{z \downarrow x} \beta_a(z)$ for every $x \in [0, 1]$ where $\beta_a(x)$ has not been defined yet. All the claimed properties of β_a (as described in Construction 1.7) follow from this construction, in particular note that β_a is non-decreasing due to the consistency property (F2).

Step 2: equivalence in distribution. We need to check that the dendritic system $\mathcal{D}^* = (\mathbb{N}, \sim^*, \prec^*, p^*)$ constructed by Constructions 3.1 and 3.2 using (ψ, λ, B) constructed in steps 1–3 has the same distribution as the dendritic system $\mathcal{D} = (\mathbb{N}, \sim, \prec, p)$ constructed by Constructions 3.1 and 3.5. We consider them under a partial coupling which is obtained by using the same sequence $(\xi_i, i \leq 1)$ of *i.i.d.* μ -random variables for Construction 3.1. This means that $\sim = \sim^*$ and $\preceq = \preceq^*$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. Condition on $(\xi_i, i \leq n)$, let \mathbb{P}^ξ be a regular conditional probability of \mathbb{P} given $(\xi_i, i \geq n)$. It now suffices to check that the restrictions of \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}^* to the leaves labelled by $[n]$ have the same distribution for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Due to the coupling, it suffices to

show that $\{p(i, j) : i \neq j \in [n]\}$ and $\{p^*(i, j) : i \neq j \in [n]\}$ have the same distribution under \mathbb{P}^ξ , \mathbb{P} -almost surely.

We partition $[n]$: Choose a set $I_1 \subset [n]$ such that $(\xi_i, i \in I_1)$ is totally unordered and such that $\text{span}(r, \xi_i, i \in I_1) = \text{span}(r, \xi_i, i \in [n])$. Next, let

$$I_2 = \{i \in [n] : \xi_i \in \text{supp}(\mu_s) \text{ and } i \notin I_1\}.$$

Lastly, for every atom a of μ , we let

$$I_3^a = \{i \in [n] : \xi_i = a \text{ and } i \notin I_1\}.$$




Figure 11: The three sets I_1, I_2 and I_3 . The big, blue circles signify atoms of \mathbf{T} .

By construction, I_1, I_2 and $(I_3^a, a \text{ atom})$ are disjoint and $I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \bigcup_a I_3^a = [n]$. See Figure 11 for an illustration of these sets. We show

$$\{p(i, j) : i, j \in [n]; i \neq j\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{p^*(i, j) : i, j \in [n]; i \neq j\} \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s. \quad (3.5)$$

in three steps. First with $[n]$ replaced by I_1 , then by $I_1 \cup I_2$ and lastly for $[n]$ itself. We do these in three steps – a, b, c – for $I_1, I_1 \cup I_2$ and $[n]$ respectively.

Step 2a. By construction, $\{\xi_i, i \in I_1\}$ is a totally unordered set and hence

$$\{p(i, j) : i, j \in I_1; i \neq j\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{p^*(i, j) : i, j \in I_1; i \neq j\} \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s. \quad (3.6)$$

by Corollary 3.10.

Step 2b. Consider now I_2 . For $i \in I_2$ we let $s(i) = \min\{i' : i' \in I_1, \xi_i < \xi_{i'}\}$ – by construction of I_2 the set $\{i' : i' \in I_1, \xi_i < \xi_{i'}\}$ is never empty for every $i \in I_2$ and thus $s(i)$ is well-defined. The idea behind considering $\xi_{s(i)}$ is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.8, it suffices to consider only one other leaf to determine the orientation of leaf i . Here we use $s(i)$, in the lemma we used the smallest leaf above. Let $i, j \in I_2$ with $i \neq j$. We then have 3 cases: either $\xi_i < \xi_j$, $\xi_j < \xi_i$ or $\xi_i \not\leq \xi_j, \xi_j \not\leq \xi_i$. If $\xi_i < \xi_j$, then $(i, j) = (i, s(i)) \prec (j, s(i))$. By (P4) we then almost surely have

$$p(i, j) = p(i, (j, s(i))) = p(i, s(i)). \quad (3.7)$$

Similarly, if $\xi_j < \xi_i$ we almost surely have $p(i, j) = p(s(j), j) = -p(j, s(j))$ where the second equality follows from (P1). If $\xi_i \not\leq \xi_j$ and $\xi_j \not\leq \xi_i$ we have $(i, j) = (s(i), s(j)) \prec (i, s(i))$ and $(i, j) \prec (j, s(j))$. Hence we almost surely have

$$p(i, j) = p(i, s(j)) = p(s(i), s(j)), \quad (3.8)$$

again by (P4). The same reasoning works for p^* as well, so that we have analogues of (3.7) and (3.8) for p^* as well. This implies that to show

$$\{p(i, j) : i, j \in I_1 \cup I_2; i \neq j\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{p^*(i, j) : i, j \in I_1 \cup I_2; i \neq j\} \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \quad (3.9)$$

it suffices to show that

$$\{p(i, j) : i, j \in I_1 : i \neq j \text{ or } i \in I_2, j = s(i)\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{p^*(i, j) : i, j \in I_1 : i \neq j \text{ or } i \in I_2, j = s(i)\} \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.. \quad (3.10)$$

Consider now $i \in I_2$ and $j = s(i) \in I_1$. Let $\pi(\xi_j)$ be either the branchpoint in $\text{span}(r, \xi_\ell; \ell \in I_1)$ closest to ξ_j or the closest $\xi_k, k \in [n]$ – whichever is closer. Denote by $\tilde{\xi}_j$ the midpoint of the interval $[\pi(\xi_j), \xi_j]$. Let $\mathbf{S}_j = F_{\mathbf{T}}(\tilde{\xi}_j)$, by construction $\xi_j \in \mathbf{S}_j$ and $\xi_i \notin \mathbf{S}_j$. Now let ζ_j, ζ'_j be sampled from $\frac{1}{\mu(\mathbf{S}_j)}\mu|_{\mathbf{S}_j}$ – we assume that they are all independent under \mathbb{P}^ξ and independent of all uniform variables. Here we note again that $\mu(\mathbf{S}_j) > 0$, but not necessarily $\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\xi_j)) > 0$. Let $V_j, V'_j, V_{ij}, V'_{ij}$ be additional uniform random variables. We then \mathbb{P}^ξ -almost surely have

$$p(i, j) = F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_j, U_j, U_{ij}) = F(\xi_i, U_i, \zeta_j, V_j, V_{ij}) = F(\xi_i, U_i, \zeta'_j, V'_j, V'_{ij}).$$

The first equality is how $p(i, j)$ is constructed, the other two inequalities follow from $\xi_i, \zeta_i, \zeta'_i \in \mathbf{S}_i$ and the consistency properties (F3) and (F4). By Lemma 3.7, this means that there is a function G_i such that

$$p(i, s(i)) = G_i(\xi_i, U_i). \quad (3.11)$$

Note that this is how we have defined $\lambda(\xi_i)$ in (3.3), $\lambda(\xi_i) = \mathbb{P}^\xi(G_i(\xi_i, U_i) = 1)$. Now let $\gamma = (\gamma_{ij})_{i, j \in I_1 \cup I_2} \in \{\pm 1\}^{I_1 \cup I_2}$ be in such a way that

$$\mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_1 \cup I_2 : i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) > 0.$$

Informally, this means we only consider c which does not break the consistency relations of p in an obvious way, for example by not satisfying $\gamma_{ij} = -\gamma_{ji}$. Any such γ would have probability 0, both for the above expression and the same expression with p replaced by p^* . Using the observations we have made so far, i.e. we only need to show (3.10) for (3.9) and (3.11), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_1 \cup I_2; i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i \in I_2 : p(i, s(i)) = \gamma_{i, s(i)}; \forall i, j \in I_1; i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i \in I_2 : p(i, s(i)) = \gamma_{i, s(i)} | \forall i, j \in I_1; i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_1; i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i \in I_2 : G_i(\xi_i, U_i) = \gamma_{i, s(i)} | \forall i, j \in I_1; i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_1; i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &= \left(\prod_{i \in I_2} \mathbb{P}^\xi(G_i(\xi_i, U_i) = \gamma_{i, s(i)}) \right) \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_1; i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &= (*). \end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we have used the independence of the $U_i, i \in I_2$. As we have noted above, the distribution of $G_{i, s(i)}(\xi_i, U_i)$ is the same as the distribution of $p^*(i, j)$. Combining this with (3.6), we have

$$(*) = \prod_{i \in I_2} \mathbb{P}^\xi(p^*(i, s(i)) = \gamma_{i, s(i)}) \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_1; i \neq j : p^*(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) = (**).$$

We reduce this expression with the same reasoning as above, this time for p^* instead of p ,

$$\begin{aligned} (**) &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i \in I_2 : p^*(i, s(i)) = \gamma_{i, s(i)} | \forall i, j \in I_1; i \neq j : p^*(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_1; i \neq j : p^*(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i \in I_2 : p^*(i, s(i)) = \gamma_{i, s(i)}; \forall i, j \in I_1; i \neq j : p^*(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_1 \cup I_2; i \neq j : p^*(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}). \end{aligned}$$

Because γ was arbitrary, we have shown (3.9).

Step 2c. Lastly, we want to show (3.5), given (3.9). Fix an atom a such that $I_3^a \neq \emptyset$. Note there can be the case where there is $i \in I_1$ with $\xi_i = a$. To deal with this case and to include this index, we define $\tilde{I}_3^a = \{i : \xi_i = a\}$. Further, there are $d(a) \geq 1$ and $i_1^a, \dots, i_{d(a)}^a \in I_1$ such that $a \leq \xi_{i_j^a}$ for $1 \leq j \leq d(a)$ and

such that $\text{span}(r, \xi_i; i \in [n])$ and $\text{span}(r, \xi_{i_1^a}, \dots, \xi_{i_{d(a)}^a})$ are the same in a small neighbourhood of a . This means that we choose as many of the leaves in $\text{span}(r, \xi_i; i \in I_1)$ that sit above a as needed to realise the degree of a in $\text{span}(r, \xi_i; i \in [n])$. The case of $d(a) = 1$ can also happen if there is $i \in I_1$ with $\xi_i = a$. We can choose them in such a way that $p(i_k^a, i_{k+1}^a) = 1$ for $k \leq d(a) - 1$, i.e. they are indexed from left to right in an increasing manner. Let now be $i \in \tilde{I}_3^a$ and $j \in [n]$, i.e. a leaf which is attached to a and another leaf. We consider $p(i, j)$. There are three cases, $\xi_j < a$, or $a < \xi_j$, or $a \not< \xi_j$ and $\xi_j \not< a$. We show that in all three cases we have

$$p(i, j) = p(i_k^a, j), \quad (3.12)$$

\mathbb{P}^ξ -almost surely for an appropriate choice of $1 \leq k \leq d(a)$. If $\xi_j < a$ or if $a \not< \xi_j, \xi_j \not< a$, we choose $i_k^a = i_1^a$ – (3.12) then holds by the consistency property (P4) of p . If $a < \xi_j$, then there exists some k such that ξ_j and $\xi_{i_k^a}$ are in the same subtree of a . (3.12) again holds by (P4). This means that for an appropriate $\gamma = (\gamma_{ij})_{i \neq j \in [n]} \in \{\pm 1\}^{n(n-1)}$ that does not violate the consistency conditions we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in [n], i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_1 \cup I_2, i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}; \\ &\forall a \forall i \in \tilde{I}_3^a \forall k \leq d(a) : p(i, i_k^a) = \gamma_{i, i_k^a}; \forall a \forall i, j \in \tilde{I}_3^a, i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

The same statement holds if we replace p by p^* . Note that in the case where there is $i \in I_1$ with $\xi_i = a$ there is some redundancy in the above statement. There we have $d(a) = 1$ and $i_1^a \in \tilde{I}_3^a$.

Consider the case where $a < \xi_{i_k^a}$ for all $k \leq d(a)$ (this is true for all k unless $d(a) = 1$ and $\xi_{i_1^a} = a$). Then every k corresponds to a subtree \mathbf{S}_k of a , see Definition 1.3 for the relevant definition. We necessarily have $\mu(\mathbf{S}_k) > 0$ for every $1 \leq k \leq d(a)$. Let ζ_k, ζ'_k be sampled from $\frac{1}{\mu(\mathbf{S}_k)}\mu|_{\mathbf{S}_k}$ and let $V_k, V'_k, V_{ik}, V'_{ik}$ be uniform random variables, all of them are assumed to be independent under \mathbb{P}^ξ and independent of any other uniform random variables. Let $i \in I_3^a$, we then \mathbb{P}^ξ -almost surely have

$$p(i, i_k^a) = F(a, U_i, \xi_{i_k^a}, U_{i_k^a}, U_{i, i_k^a}) = F(a, U_i, \zeta_k, V_k, V_{ik}) = F(a, U_i, \zeta'_k, V'_k, V'_{ik}).$$

The first equality is Construction 3.5, the latter two equalities follow from the consistency properties (F3) and (F4). By Lemma 3.7 we get that there is a function G_k^a such that \mathbb{P}^ξ -almost surely

$$p(i, i_k^a) = G_k^a(U_i).$$

Using this, we continue the considerations of (3.13). We restrict ourselves to the case where $I_3^a = \tilde{I}_3^a$.

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in [n], i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_1 \cup I_2, i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}; \forall a \forall i \in I_3^a \forall k \leq d(a) : p(i, i_k^a) = \gamma_{i, i_k^a}; \\ &\quad \forall a \forall i, j \in I_3^a, i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall a \forall i \in I_3^a \forall k \leq d(a) : p(i, i_k^a) = \gamma_{i, i_k^a}; \forall a \forall i, j \in I_3^a, i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij} | \\ &\quad \forall i, j \in I_1 \cup I_2, i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_1 \cup I_2, i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &= \prod_a \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i \in I_3^a \forall k \leq d(a) : G_k^a(U_i) = \gamma_{i, i_k^a}; \forall i, j \in I_3^a, i \neq j : F(a, U_i, a, U_j, U_{ij}) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_1 \cup I_2, i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

For the last equality, we have used that due to (3.5), the uniform variables used at different atoms are independent because for $a \neq a'$ the sets I_3^a and $I_3^{a'}$ are disjoint. Consider now

$$\mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i \in I_3^a \forall k \leq d(a) : G_k^a(U_i) = \gamma_{i, i_k^a}; \forall i, j \in I_3^a, i \neq j : F(a, U_i, a, U_j, U_{ij}) = \gamma_{ij}),$$

for a fixed atom a .

Note that we have defined the thresholds of β_a exactly so that $\mathbb{P}(G_k^a(U_i) = 1) = b_k$, compare to (3.4). Let $b_{d(a)+1} = 1$. For every $i \in I_3^a$ there is a unique $k(i)$ such that $a_{ki} = 1$ for $k \leq k(i)$ and $a_{ki} = -1$ for $k > k(i)$. The possible values for $k(i)$ reach from 0 to $d(a)$ where 0 and $d(a)$ correspond to the extremal

cases where the leaf i is to the left or to the right of all subtrees. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i \in I_3^a \forall k \leq d(a) : G_k^a(U_i) = \gamma_{i, i_k^a}; \forall i, j \in I_3^a, i \neq j : F(a, U_i, a, U_j, U_{ij}) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &= \left(\prod_{i \in I_3^a} (b_{k(i)+1} - b_{k(i)}) \right) \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_3^a, i \neq j : F(a, U_i, a, U_j, U_{ij}) = \gamma_{ij} | \forall i \in I_3^a \forall k \leq d(a) : G_k^a(U_i) = \gamma_{i, i_k^a}) \\ &= \left(\prod_{i \in I_3^a} (b_{k(i)+1} - b_{k(i)}) \right) \left(\prod_{k=0}^{d(a)} \frac{1}{|\{i \in I_3^a : k(i) = k\}|!} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds because the leaves with indices in the set $\{i \in I_3^a : k(i) = k\}$ form a uniform random permutation by exchangeability. We have chosen Construction 3.2 in such a way that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\prod_{i \in I_3^a} (b_{k(i)+1} - b_{k(i)}) \right) \left(\prod_{k=0}^{d(a)} \frac{1}{|\{i \in I_3^a : k(i) = k\}|!} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i \in I_3^a \forall k \leq d(a) : p^*(i, i_k^a) = \gamma_{i, i_k^a}; \forall i, j \in I_3^a, i \neq j : p^*(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}). \quad (3.15) \end{aligned}$$

Before (3.14) we assumed $I_3^a = \tilde{I}_3^a$. Consider now the case where $I_3^a \neq \tilde{I}_3^a$ which happens when there is $i \in I_1$ with $\xi_i = a$. In this case the computations (3.14) – (3.15) become easier. The reason for this is that we do not need to consider the terms of the form

$$\left\{ \forall i \in I_3^a \forall k \leq d(a) : p(i, i_k^a) = \gamma_{i, i_k^a} \right\}.$$

This is because $d(a) = 1$ and $\xi_{i_1^a} \in \tilde{I}_3^a$. Besides that we consider \tilde{I}_3^a instead of I_3^a . The computations then proceed as above.

Recall that we have already shown (3.9), this means that

$$\mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i \neq j \in I_1 \cup I_2 : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) = \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i \neq j \in I_1 \cup I_2 : p^*(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}). \quad (3.16)$$

Going back to (3.14), with (3.16) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in [n], i \neq j : p(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in I_1 \cup I_2, i \neq j : p^*(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}; \forall a \forall i \in I_3^a \forall k \leq d(a) : p^*(i, i_k^a) = \gamma_{i, i_k^a}; \\ & \quad \forall a \forall i, j \in I_3^a, i \neq j : p^*(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^\xi(\forall i, j \in [n], i \neq j : p^*(i, j) = \gamma_{ij}). \end{aligned}$$

This completes showing that p and p^* have the same distribution under \mathbb{P}^ξ which completes the proof. \square

3.2 Uniqueness of a canonical representation

So far we have proven Proposition 3.3 which states that there is *some* decorated planar real tree that corresponds to our dendritic system. This means we have the following collection of objects: a rooted, weighted real tree (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) , a planar order ψ on \mathbf{T} , a branch weight function λ and a branchpoint weight function B . In this section we want to find a more canonical representation for this in the form of IP–trees, see Definition 1.4. This will lead to us proving Proposition 3.4. The notion of IP–trees has been introduced by Forman [9].

Definition 3.12 (Special points). For a weighted, rooted real tree (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) the special points are

- 1.) the locations of atoms of μ ,
- 2.) the branch points of \mathbf{T} , and
- 3.) the isolated leaves of $\text{span}(\text{supp}(\mu))$, by which we mean leaves of $\text{span}(\text{supp}(\mu))$ that are not limit points of the branch points of $\text{span}(\text{supp}(\mu))$.

Definition 3.13 (mass-structural isomorphism). Let \mathcal{S}_i be the sets of special points of weighted, rooted real trees $(\mathbf{T}_i, d_i, r_i, \mu_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. A measurable map $\phi : \mathbf{T}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_2$ is a *mass-structural isomorphism* if it has the following properties.

- 1.) *Mass preserving.* For every $x \in \mathcal{S}_1$, $\mu_1([r_1, x]_{\mathbf{T}_1}) = \mu_2([r_2, \phi(x)]_{\mathbf{T}_2})$, $\mu_1(\{x\}) = \mu_2(\{\phi(x)\})$, and $\mu_1(F_{\mathbf{T}_1}(x)) = \mu_2(F_{\mathbf{T}_2}(\phi(x)))$.
- 2.) *Structure preserving.* For $x, y \in \mathcal{S}_1$ we have $x \in [r_1, y]_{\mathbf{T}_1}$ if and only if $\phi(x) \in [r_2, \phi(y)]_{\mathbf{T}_2}$.

We call two rooted, weighted real trees mass-structurally equivalent if there exists a mass-structural isomorphism between the two. This is an equivalence relation. We then have the following two theorems of Forman [9], the second one concern itself with hierarchies. A hierarchy on \mathbb{N} ($\mathcal{H}_n, n \geq 1$) [9, Definition 1.6] is an object such that for every $n \geq 1$, \mathcal{H}_n is a collection of subsets of $[n]$ satisfying certain consistency assumptions – we do not recall these here. To every IP-tree (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) we associate a hierarchy, $(\xi_i, i \geq 1)$ are *i.i.d.* μ -random variables,

$$\mathcal{H}_n = \left\{ \{i \in [n] : \xi_i \in F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)\} : x \in \mathbf{T} \right\} \cup \{ \{i\} : i \in [n] \} \quad \text{for } n \geq 1. \quad (3.17)$$

Observe that this is very similar to the first two steps of Construction 1.7. For a given n , \mathcal{H}_n as above can be represented as a discrete tree, therefore we can think of a hierarchy $(\mathcal{H}_n, n \geq 1)$ as a sequence of growing trees.

Theorem 3.14. [9, Theorem 1.5] *Each mass-structural equivalence-class of rooted, weighted real trees contains exactly one isomorphism class of IP-trees.*

Theorem 3.15. [9, Theorem 1.7] *Two IP-trees are mass-structurally equivalent if and only if the induced hierarchies in (3.17) have the same law.*

Before we can apply this to our setting, we make sure that we can also pass the planar order ψ , the branch weight function λ and the branchpoint weight function B through a mass-structural isomorphism.

Lemma 3.16. *A mass-structural isomorphism ϕ induces a new planar order $\phi(\psi)$, a new branch weight function $\phi(\lambda)$ and a new branchpoint weight function $\phi(B)$.*

Proof. Assume we have $\phi : (\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu) \rightarrow (\mathbf{T}', d', r', \mu')$ and that ψ , λ and B are a planar order, branch weight function and branchpoint weight function for (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) .

For a totally unordered sequence $x'_1, \dots, x'_n \in \mathbf{T}'$, we define

$$\phi(\psi)_n(x'_1, \dots, x'_n) = \psi_n(\phi^{-1}(x'_1), \dots, \phi^{-1}(x'_n)).$$

Because ϕ is structure preserving in the sense of Definition 3.13 we obtain a totally unordered sequence $\phi^{-1}(x'_1), \dots, \phi^{-1}(x'_n)$. The same property and the fact that ψ is a planar order also implies that we can embed $\phi(\psi)_m(x'_1, \dots, x'_m)$ into $\phi(\psi)_n(x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$ for $m < n$ respecting the planar structure.

For any $x' \in \mathbf{T}'$, define $\phi(\lambda)(x') = \lambda(\phi^{-1}(x'))$ which is again a branch weight function. Similarly, if $a' \in \mathbf{T}'$ is an atom of μ' , then $a = \phi^{-1}(a')$ is an atom of μ because ϕ is mass-preserving. We can then define $B(a') = \beta_a$. Because ϕ is structure-preserving, this is a valid branchpoint weight function which is compatible with $\phi(\psi)$. \square

With Lemma 3.16 in hand, we can prove Proposition 3.4.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Let $(\mathbf{T}_i, d_i, r_i, \mu_i, \psi^{(i)}, \lambda_i, B_i), i \in \{1, 2\}$ be two decorated planar real trees such that the induced Markov chains $(T_n^{(i)}, n \geq 1), i \in \{1, 2\}$ have the same distribution. We show the uniqueness of $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$ in multiple steps.

Uniqueness of (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) : Observe that applying a mass-structural isomorphism using the induced maps of Lemma 3.16 does not change the distribution of the sampled dendritic system: More precisely, assume we are given a mass-structural isomorphism $\phi : (\mathbf{T}_1, d_1, r_1, \mu_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{T}_2, d_2, r_2, \mu_2)$ and a planar order ψ , branch weight function λ and branchpoint weight function B for \mathbf{T}_1 . Sample $\{\xi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ independently from μ_1 in \mathbf{T}_1 , then $\{\phi(\xi_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an *i.i.d.*- μ_2 sequence. Using these random variables and the same sequence of

independent uniform random variables $\{U_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ we can construct two dendritic systems $\mathcal{D}_1 = (\mathbb{N}, \sim_1, \prec_1, p_1)$ and $\mathcal{D}_2 = (\mathbb{N}, \sim_2, \prec_2, p_2)$ via Construction 1.7. Because ϕ is structure preserving, \sim_1 and \sim_2 , respectively \prec_1 and \prec_2 , are almost surely the same. Further, because we defined $\phi(\psi)$, $\phi(\lambda)$ and $\phi(B)$ by pullback, p_1 and p_2 are almost surely the same. In particular, the distribution of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 is identical.

On the other hand, observe that if in Construction 1.7 we do not add planarity to T_n and keep the leaf labels, we retrieve the hierarchy given by (3.17). Now, by Theorem 3.15 and because the induced Markov chains $(T_n^{(i)}, n \geq 1), i \in \{1, 2\}$ have the same distribution, the trees $(\mathbf{T}_1, d_1, r_1, \mu_1)$ and $(\mathbf{T}_2, d_2, r_2, \mu_2)$ are mass-structurally isomorphic. Having also shown that the distribution of a dendritic system is invariant under mass-structural isomorphism of the decorated planar real tree, this and Theorem 3.14 then yield the desired uniqueness of (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) .

Uniqueness of ψ : Assume now that (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) is fixed and that we are given two planar orders $\psi^{(1)}$ and $\psi^{(2)}$ with the distribution of the Markov chain being the same. In particular, we assume that the distributions of $(\psi_n^{(1)}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n), n \geq 2)$ and $(\psi_n^{(2)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n), n \geq 2)$ are the same where $(\xi_i, i \geq 1)$ and $(\zeta_i, i \geq 1)$ are *i.i.d.* μ -random variables. We will show that there is an isometry $\varphi : \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}$ such that $\varphi(\psi^{(1)}) = \psi^{(2)}$.

By [17, Theorem 3.4 (i)] there exists a kernel K_1 such that for appropriate events A, B we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left((\xi_i, i \geq 1) \in A, (\psi_n^{(1)}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n), n \geq 2) \in B\right) \in \int_B K_1(S, A) \mathbb{P}\left((\psi_n^{(1)}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n), n \geq 2) \in dS\right)\right).$$

The same is true for $\psi^{(2)}$ with another kernel K_2 . This means that we can work on a probability space such that $\psi_n^{(1)}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) = \psi_n^{(2)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)$ for all $n \geq 2$ while keeping the joint distribution of $(\xi_i, i \geq 1)$ and $(\psi_n^{(1)}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n), n \geq 2)$ the same. Abbreviate $S_n = \psi_n^{(1)}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$. We use this to define a map $\varphi : \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}$. First, for all $i \geq 1$ we define $\varphi(\xi_i) = \zeta_i$. For any $i \geq 1$ and $n \geq i$, ξ_i and $\varphi(\xi_i)$ correspond to the same vertex x_i^n in S_n . Next, let $\xi_i \wedge \xi_j$ be the most recent common ancestor of ξ_i and ξ_j and similarly let $x_i^n \wedge x_j^n$ be the most recent common ancestor of x_i^n and x_j^n . Define $\varphi(\xi_i \wedge \xi_j) = \varphi(\xi_i) \wedge \varphi(\xi_j)$, both $\xi_i \wedge \xi_j$ and $\varphi(\xi_i \wedge \xi_j)$ correspond to $x_i^n \wedge x_j^n$ in S_n . Observe that for $i, j, k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ if $\xi_i \wedge \xi_j = \xi_k \wedge \xi_\ell$ then $\varphi(\xi_i) \wedge \varphi(\xi_j) = \varphi(\xi_k) \wedge \varphi(\xi_\ell)$, hence $\varphi(\xi_i \wedge \xi_j)$ is well defined. This defines φ on $\{\xi_i, i \geq 1\}$ as well as all branchpoints of \mathbf{T} . Let $\mu_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i^n}$ on S_n and we observe that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mu_n(F_{S_n}(x_i^n)) = \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\xi_i))$, almost-surely by the strong law of large numbers applied to $\{\xi_j, j > i\}$. Similarly, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mu_n(F_{S_n}(x_i^n \wedge x_j^n)) = \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\xi_i \wedge \xi_j))$ for all i and j . This allows us to show that φ restricted to $\{\xi_i, i \geq 1\}$ is an isometry, we use the IP-spacing (1.3),

$$\begin{aligned} d(\varphi(\xi_i), \varphi(\xi_j)) &= \left| \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}_2}(\varphi(\xi_i \wedge \xi_j))) - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\varphi(\xi_i))) \right| + \left| \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\varphi(\xi_i \wedge \xi_j))) - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\varphi(\xi_j))) \right| \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left| \mu_n(F_{S_n}(x_i^n \wedge x_j^n)) - \mu_n(F_{S_n}(x_i^n)) \right| + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left| \mu_n(F_{S_n}(x_i^n \wedge x_j^n)) - \mu_n(F_{S_n}(x_j^n)) \right| \\ &= \left| \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\xi_i \wedge \xi_j)) - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\xi_i)) \right| + \left| \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\xi_i \wedge \xi_j)) - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\xi_j)) \right| \\ &= d(\xi_i, \xi_j). \end{aligned}$$

The same is true for branchpoints. In particular, this means that φ maps Cauchy-sequences to Cauchy-sequences. Hence, assume that for $y \in \text{supp } \mu$ there is a sequence $y_k, k \geq 1$ with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_k = y$ and for every k we have either $y_k \in \{\xi_i, i \geq 1\}$ or y_k is a branchpoint in \mathbf{T} . We then define $\varphi(y) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(y_k)$. Due to the aforementioned properties of φ and because \mathbf{T} is a complete metric space, this limit exists and is well-defined, i.e. does not depend on the choice of sequence $(y_k)_k$.

The map φ can be extended to an isometry. Indeed, because \mathbf{T} is an IP-tree, it suffices to show that φ restricted to special points ($\text{supp } \mu$ and branchpoints) is a mass-structural isomorphism. Theorem 3.14 then tells us that there is an isometry, and by checking the proof in [9] we can see that this isometry is an extension of the underlying mass-structural isomorphism between special points. Let us now check that φ is a mass-structural isomorphism. Clearly, φ is structure preserving because $\psi_n^{(1)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ corresponds to $\text{span}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ as combinatorial trees. Further, φ is mass preserving: consider $z \in \mathbf{T}$, both z and $\varphi(z)$ correspond to the same point in S_n , call it z_n . We then have

$$\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(z)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mu_n(F_{S_n}(z_n)) = \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\varphi(z))), \quad \text{almost-surely,}$$

where we applied the strong law of large numbers twice. The same approach works for atoms and segments. Hence the φ is a mass-structural isomorphism and thus can be extended to an isometry on the whole tree \mathbf{T} .

Next, we show that $\varphi(\psi^{(1)}) = \psi^{(2)}$. For this, let $n \geq 2$ and let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \{\zeta_i, i \geq 1\} \cup \{\text{branchpoints}\}$ and therefore also $\varphi^{-1}(x_1), \dots, \varphi^{-1}(x_n) \in \{\xi_i, i \geq 1\} \cup \{\text{branchpoints}\}$. Observe that for N large enough $\varphi(\psi^{(1)})_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\psi_n^{(2)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ are subtrees of S_N . Moreover due to the coupling they are the same, i.e. $\varphi(\psi^{(1)})_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \psi_n^{(2)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. This can be extended to $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \text{supp } \mu$ by density of $\{\zeta_i, i \geq 1\}$. Because $\text{span}(\text{supp}(\mu)) = \mathbf{T}$ this is also true for all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbf{T}$. Indeed, it suffices to specify $\varphi(\psi^{(1)})_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for totally unordered x_1, \dots, x_n . If for some $i \in [n]$, $x_i \notin \text{supp}(\mu)$, then we can choose any leaf x'_i with $x_i < x'_i$ to obtain $\varphi(\psi^{(1)})_n(x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n) = \varphi(\psi^{(1)})_n(x_1, \dots, x'_i, \dots, x_n)$. Because all leaves are in the support of μ , this determines $\varphi(\psi^{(1)})_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ – the same argument works for $\psi_n^{(2)}$. Hence we have shown that $\varphi(\psi^{(1)})_n = \psi_n^{(2)}$, doing this for all n shows that $\varphi(\psi^{(1)}) = \psi^{(2)}$. This completes showing the uniqueness of ψ .

Uniqueness of λ : Assume now that $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi)$ is fixed and we are given two different branch weight functions $\lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)} \in L^1(\mu_s)$. Let $T_n^{(1)}$ and $T_n^{(2)}$ be the trees obtained from using $\lambda^{(1)}$ and $\lambda^{(2)}$ respectively while sampling from (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) . There exists a segment $[x, y] \subset \mathbf{T}$ such that $\int_{[x,y]} \lambda^{(1)} d\mu_s \neq \int_{[x,y]} \lambda^{(2)} d\mu_s$. The segment $[x, y] \subset \mathbf{T}$ corresponds to segments $[x_n^{(1)}, y_n^{(1)}]$ and $[x_n^{(2)}, y_n^{(2)}]$ in $T_n^{(1)}$ and $T_n^{(2)}$ respectively. Let $L_n^{(1)}$ be the proportion of leaves directly attached to the left of $[x_n^{(1)}, y_n^{(1)}]$ – here we only count vertices of degree 2 in \mathbf{T} to avoid counting atoms. Define $L_n^{(2)}$ similarly. By the strong law of large numbers, we almost surely have as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$L_n^{(1)} \longrightarrow \int_{[x,y]} \lambda^{(1)} d\mu_s \quad \text{and} \quad L_n^{(2)} \longrightarrow \int_{[x,y]} \lambda^{(2)} d\mu_s.$$

By assumption, these two integrals are different and thus the distributions of $(T_n^{(1)}, n \geq 1)$ and $(T_n^{(2)}, n \geq 1)$ are different. This shows the uniqueness of λ .

Uniqueness of B : Assume now that $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi)$ is fixed and we are given two different branchpoint weight functions $B^{(1)}, B^{(2)}$. Then there exists an atom a such that $\beta_a^{(1)} \neq \beta_a^{(2)}$. Hence there is $t \in (0, 1)$ such that $\beta_a^{(1)}(t) \neq \beta_a^{(2)}(t)$ and such that – by the requirements that we pose on branchpoint weight functions – this t without loss of generality corresponds to one subtree \mathbf{S} of a . Let $T_n^{(1)}$ and $T_n^{(2)}$ be the trees obtained from using $B^{(1)}$ and $B^{(2)}$ respectively. For n sufficiently large, the atom a corresponds to $a_n^{(1)} \in T_n^{(1)}$ and to $a_n^{(2)} \in T_n^{(2)}$ respectively, similarly \mathbf{S} corresponds to subtrees $S_n^{(1)}, S_n^{(2)}$ of $a_n^{(1)}$ and $a_n^{(2)}$ respectively. Let $K_n^{(1)}$ be the proportion of leaves directly attached to $a_n^{(1)}$ on the left of $S_n^{(1)}$, as compared to the right of $S_n^{(1)}$. Define $K_n^{(2)}$ similarly. By the strong law of large numbers, we almost surely have as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$K_n^{(1)} \longrightarrow \beta_a^{(1)}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad K_n^{(2)} \longrightarrow \beta_a^{(2)}(t).$$

By assumption, these two values are different and thus the distributions of $(T_n^{(1)}, n \geq 1)$ and $(T_n^{(2)}, n \geq 1)$ are different. This shows the uniqueness of B . \square

4 Scaling Limits

In the following, let $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ be an extremal tree-valued Markov chain with uniform backward dynamics corresponding to the decorated planar real tree $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$ where (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) is an IP-tree. The goal of this section is to show that T_n – trimmed and appropriately rescaled – converges to \mathbf{T} almost surely in the Gromov–Prokhorov topology. Recall the rescaling from (1.5) and the Gromov–Prokhorov metric from Definition 1.15.

Remark 4.1. One might ask why it is necessary to trim T_n before rescaling it. Consider the decorated planar real tree that is made up from a single atom a of weight 1, here d, ψ, λ, B are all trivial. For any $n \geq 2$ the tree T_n is a star tree with n leaves directly connected to the root. In the IP-rescaling (1.5), all these edges have length $1 - 1/n$. From Definition 1.15 we can see that $d_{\text{GP}}(\mathbf{T}, T_n) = 1$ for all $n \geq 2$, hence we have no convergence. This problem is solved by trimming.

An important idea in the proof will be that T_n^{trim} corresponds to a subtree of \mathbf{T} . Recall that T_n is constructed by sampling (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n) from \mathbf{T} and that T_n corresponds to $\text{span}(r, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ plus additional

leaves added through B and λ . The trimming removes all additional leaves but also leaves which were not added through B and λ . Let us define a function $\eta^n : \mathbf{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{T}^n$ which corresponds to trimming on the level of real trees. First, consider the set of all most recent common ancestors of ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n :

$$M_n = \{\xi_i \wedge \xi_j, 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n\}.$$

where $\xi_i \wedge \xi_j$ is the most recent common ancestor of ξ_i and ξ_j . We then set

$$\eta_i^n(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) = \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in M_n, y \in [r, \xi_i]} d_{\mathbf{T}}(y, \xi_i); \quad \forall i \leq n, \quad (4.1)$$

which is the closest element of M_n that is an ancestor of ξ_i . We write $\eta_i^n(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ for the i -th coordinate of $\eta^n(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ and we will abuse notation by writing $\eta^n(\xi_i) = \eta_i^n(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$. Equip $\operatorname{span}(r, \eta^n(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n))$ with a probability measure μ_n^η by placing weight $1/n$ on $\eta^n(\xi_i)$ for every $i \leq n$ and with a metric d^η according to an IP-rescaling as in (1.5). By construction, we then have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *As rooted, weighted metric spaces, $(T_n^{\operatorname{trim}}, d_n^{\operatorname{trim}}, r_n, \mu_n^{\operatorname{trim}})$ and $(\operatorname{span}(r, \eta^n(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)), d_n^\eta, r, \mu_n^\eta)$ are isomorphic.*

We will implicitly use this representation of $(T_n^{\operatorname{trim}}, d_n^{\operatorname{trim}}, r_n, \mu_n^{\operatorname{trim}})$.




Figure 12: The different operations involved in trimming, this diagram commutes. The double-headed arrow is the correspondence of Lemma 4.2. A number k next to a vertex signifies an atom of weight $k/13$ for μ_{13}^η and $\mu_{13}^{\operatorname{trim}}$ respectively.

We can now state the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ be an extremal tree-valued Markov chain corresponding to the decorated planar real tree $(\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu, \psi, \lambda, B)$ where (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) is an IP-tree. Let $(T_n^{\operatorname{trim}}, d_n^{\operatorname{trim}}, r_n, \mu_n^{\operatorname{trim}})$ be the trimmed and rescaled version of T_n . We then have*

$$(T_n^{\operatorname{trim}}, d_n^{\operatorname{trim}}, r_n, \mu_n^{\operatorname{trim}}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu),$$

almost surely in the Gromov-Prokhorov topology.

From this we prove Theorem 1.16.

Proof of Theorem 1.16. This follows immediately from Theorem 4.3, the decomposition into extremal distribution in Corollary 2.17 and the classification of tree-valued Markov chains with uniform backward dynamics in Theorem 1.10. \square

The proof of the above theorem proceeds by comparing T_n^{trim} and \mathbf{T} with $\text{span}(r, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$. For this purpose, let $\mathbf{S}_n = \text{span}(r, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ and choose $\mu_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\xi_i}$. We then construct a metric d_n for \mathbf{S}_n by again considering the inhomogenous IP-rescaling (1.5) with respect to the root r . The proof of Theorem 4.3 consists of showing that both $d_{\text{GP}}(T_n^{\text{trim}}, \mathbf{S}_n)$ and $d_{\text{GP}}(\mathbf{S}_n, \mathbf{T})$ are small for n sufficiently large.

Before we can do this, we will show some general statements about IP-trees. In Lemma 4.4 we show some small auxiliary statements and in Lemma 4.5 we construct a partition of \mathbf{T} that helps us to approximate subtrees, i.e. sets of the form $F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)$ for $x \in \mathbf{T}$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) be an IP-tree.*

(i) *For all $x \in \mathbf{T}$ we have*

$$d(r, x) \leq 1 - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)).$$

(ii) *For any $c < 1$ the set*

$$\{x \in \mathbf{T} : d(r, x) = c\},$$

is at most countably infinite.

(iii) *Suppose $(\mathbf{T}', d', r', \mu')$ is another IP-tree and $\varphi : \text{dom } \varphi \rightarrow \text{supp}(\mu')$ is an injective map respecting the tree structure with $\text{dom } \varphi \subseteq \text{supp}(\mu)$. This means $\varphi(x) \wedge \varphi(y) = \varphi(x \wedge y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbf{T}$ and if $y \in [r, x]$ then $\varphi(y) \in [r', \varphi(x)]$ for all $x, y \in \mathbf{T}$. We then have*

$$\sup_{x, y \in \text{dom } \varphi} |d(x, y) - d'(\varphi(x), \varphi(y))| \leq 4 \sup_{x \in \mathbf{T}} |\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu'(F_{\mathbf{T}'}(\varphi(x)))|.$$

Proof. Recall the definition of IP-tree from Definition 1.4.

(i) If x is either a branch point, a leaf or lies in the support of μ we have $d(r, x) = 1 - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x))$. If that is not the case, consider

$$x^* = \inf\{y \in \mathbf{T} : x < y \text{ and } y \text{ is a branchpoint, a leaf or in the support of } \mu\}, \quad (4.2)$$

where the infimum is taken with respect to the ancestral order of \mathbf{T} . This may be closest descendant of x for which the IP-tree property holds. We then have $\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) = \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x^*))$ and hence

$$d(r, x) \leq d(r, x^*) = 1 - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x^*)) = 1 - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)).$$

It may happen that the infimum in (4.2) is not a branchpoint, a leaf or in the support of μ . In that case the argument is easily adapted by considering a sequence that converges to x^* .

(ii) Let $x \in \mathbf{T}$ be so that $d(r, x) = c$. Due to the spanning property of IP-trees, i.e. $\text{span}(\text{supp}(\mu)) = \mathbf{T}$, we necessarily have that $\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) > 0$. Indeed, if we had $\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) = 0$ then x would need to be a leaf of \mathbf{T} contained in the support of the diffuse part of μ . In this case we would have $d(r, x) = 1$ which contradicts $d(r, x) = c < 1$. Because this is true for all x in $\{y \in \mathbf{T} : d(r, y) = c\}$, this set has to be at most countably infinite.

(iii) Note that for $x, y \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ we have

$$d(x, y) = \begin{cases} |\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(y))| & \text{if } y \in [r, x] \text{ or } x \in [r, y], \\ 2\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x \wedge y)) - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(y)) & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

An analogous statement holds for $\varphi(x), \varphi(y)$ with respect to d' and μ' . We then have for $x, y \in \text{dom } \varphi$ with $y \in [r, x]$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |d(x, y) - d'(\varphi(x), \varphi(y))| &= \left| (\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(y)) - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x))) - (\mu'(F_{\mathbf{T}'}(\varphi(y))) - \mu'(F_{\mathbf{T}'}(\varphi(x)))) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{z \in \mathbf{T}} 2 |\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(z)) - \mu'(F_{\mathbf{T}'}(\varphi(z)))|, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the triangle inequality. Similarly, if $y \notin [r, x]$ and $x \notin [r, y]$ then

$$|d(x, y) - d'(\varphi(x), \varphi(y))| \leq \sup_{z \in \mathbf{T}} 4 |\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(z)) - \mu'(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\varphi(z)))|. \quad \square$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let (\mathbf{T}, d, r, μ) be an IP-tree. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and measurable sets $A_1, \dots, A_{m_1}, B_1, \dots, B_{m_2}, S \subset \mathbf{T}$ such that*

- 1.) *the sets $A_1, \dots, A_{m_1}, B_1, \dots, B_{m_2}, S \subset \mathbf{T}$ partition \mathbf{T} ,*
- 2.) *we have $\mu(S) \leq \varepsilon$ and for all $i \in [m_1], j \in [m_2]$ with*

$$\text{diam}(A_i) \leq \varepsilon, \quad \mu(A_i) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \#B_j = 1,$$

- 3.) *and the closure of $\bigcup_{i=1}^{m_1} A_i \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m_2} B_j$ is connected,*
- 4.) *for every $x \in \mathbf{T}$ there are $I_x \subseteq [m_1], J_x \subseteq [m_2]$ and $k_x \in [m_1]$ we have*

$$F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)\Delta \left(\bigcup_{i \in I_x} A_i \cup \bigcup_{j \in J_x} B_j \right) \subset A_{k_x} \cup S,$$

where Δ denotes the symmetric difference of two sets.

Proof. First, we consider the atoms of μ . Enumerate them by $\{a_j, 1 \leq j \leq J\}$ with $J \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$ so that $\mu(a_j) \geq \mu(a_{j+1})$. Choose m_2 in such a way that

$$\sum_{j=m_2+1}^J \mu(a_j) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (4.3)$$

Note that if μ has no atoms we have $m_2 = 0$. We then define

$$B_j = \{a_j\},$$

for all $j \in [m_2]$. Next, we construct A_1, \dots, A_{m_1} . For this, let $L = \lfloor 2/\varepsilon \rfloor$. For a given $0 \leq c < 1$ consider the set

$$D(c) = \{x \in \mathbf{T} : d(r, x) = c\}.$$

By Lemma 4.4 (ii), this is always at most a countable set. Without loss of generality assume $L2/\varepsilon < 1$. Define $D = \bigcup_{\ell=0}^L D(\ell\varepsilon/2)$ which is also a countable set. For $x \in D$ we set

$$T(x) = \{y \in F_{\mathbf{T}}(x) : 0 \leq d(x, y) < \varepsilon/2\}.$$

Note that $\{T(x) : x \in D\}$ is a partition of \mathbf{T} and $\text{diam}(T(x)) \leq \varepsilon$. Choose a finite subset $C \subset D$ such that $r \in C$, $\bigcup_{x \in C} T(x)$ is connected and such that

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{x \in D \setminus C} T(x) \right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (4.4)$$

This is always possible because μ is a probability measure. Further, we choose C so that $C \neq \emptyset$. For every $x \in C$ we set

$$A(x) = T(x) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{m_2} \{a_j\},$$

this means we remove any atoms from $T(x)$ that are already included in $\{B_j\}_j$. Observe that $\mu(A(x)) \leq \varepsilon$: Indeed, assume we had $\mu(A(x)) > \varepsilon$, then there would exist $y \in F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)$ with $d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon/2$ and $\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(y)) < \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \varepsilon/2$. Because of the IP-tree property this would imply $d(x, y) > \varepsilon/2$ which is a contradiction.

Choosing y precisely is tedious as the IP–tree property does not necessarily apply to any $z \in F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)$ with $d(x, z) = \varepsilon/2$, we leave the details to the reader.

Now, let $m_1 = |C|$ and enumerate $\{A(x), x \in C\}$ by A_1, \dots, A_{m_1} . Lastly, we define

$$S = \bigcup_{x \in D \setminus C} T(x) \cup \bigcup_{\substack{j=m_2+1 \\ \forall i \leq m_1: j \notin A_i}}^J \{a_j\}.$$

We include all atoms that are not in $\bigcup_{i=1}^{m_1} A_i \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m_2} B_j$. By combining (4.3) and (4.4) we can see that $\mu(S) \leq \varepsilon$.

Finally, to complete the proof of the lemma, for a given $x \in \mathbf{T}$ we specify $I_x \subseteq [m_1], J_x \subseteq [m_2]$ and $k_x \in [m_1]$ with the required properties. If $x \in S$, then we set $I_x = J_x = \emptyset$ and we choose k_x arbitrarily, say $k_x = 1$.

Assume that $x \notin S$. Then there is $z \in C$ such that $x \in T(z)$. Choose k_x so that $A_{k_x} = A(z)$. For every $i \in [m_1] \setminus \{k_x\}$ we have either $A_i \subset F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)$ or $A_i \cap F_{\mathbf{T}}(x) = \emptyset$. Based on this, we set

$$I_x = \{i \in [m_1] : A_i \cap F_{\mathbf{T}}(x) = A_i\}.$$

Similarly, we set $J_x = \{j \in [m_2] : B_j \cap F_{\mathbf{T}}(x) = B_j\}$. This is the set of atoms a_j with $j \leq m_2$ that are contained in $F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)$. By construction, we have

$$F_{\mathbf{T}}(x) \Delta \left(\bigcup_{i \in I_x} A_i \cup \bigcup_{j \in J_x} B_j \right) \subset A_{k_x} \cup S.$$

Property 3.) follows from the fact that if we take the closure, we have that $T(x) \subseteq \overline{A(x)}$ and that $\bigcup_{x \in C} T(x)$ is connected. \square




Figure 13: The partition of \mathbf{T} in Lemma 4.5.

Now that we have shown some general properties of IP–trees we show that for large n μ_n approximates μ well in the following sense.

Lemma 4.6. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a random variable $N_1 = N_1(\varepsilon)$ such that for $n \geq N_1$ we have almost surely*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbf{T}} |\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x))| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. We make use of Lemma 4.5 with constant $\varepsilon/5$. For $x \in S$, we set $I_x = \emptyset, J_x = \emptyset$ and by abuse of notation $A_{k_x} = \emptyset$. For all $x \in \mathbf{T}$ we let

$$\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{T}}(x) = \bigcup_{i \in I_x} A_i \cup \bigcup_{j \in J_x} B_j \cup S. \quad (4.5)$$

By use of the triangle inequality we get

$$|\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x))| \leq |\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu(\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{T}}(x))| + |\mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu_n(\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{T}}(x))| + |\mu(\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu_n(\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{T}}(x))|.$$

We then have by Lemma 4.5

$$|\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu(\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{T}}(x))| \leq \mu(A_{k_x}) + \mu(S) \leq \frac{2}{5}\varepsilon,$$

as well as

$$|\mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu_n(\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{T}}(x))| \leq \mu_n(A_{k_x}) + \mu_n(S),$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Using the definition of $\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{T}}(x)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu(\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu_n(\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{T}}(x))| &\leq |\mu(S) - \mu_n(S)| + \sum_{i \in I_x} |\mu(A_i) - \mu_n(A_i)| + \sum_{j \in J_x} |\mu(B_j) - \mu_n(B_j)| \\ &\leq |\mu(S) - \mu_n(S)| + \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} |\mu(A_i) - \mu_n(A_i)| + \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} |\mu(B_j) - \mu_n(B_j)|. \end{aligned}$$

And lastly, using the bound

$$\mu_n(A_{k_x}) \leq \mu(A_{k_x}) + |\mu(A_{k_x}) - \mu_n(A_{k_x})| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{5} + \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} |\mu(A_i) - \mu_n(A_i)|,$$

and similarly

$$\mu_n(S) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{5} + |\mu(S) - \mu_n(S)|,$$

we obtain

$$|\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x))| \leq \frac{4}{5}\varepsilon + 2|\mu(S) - \mu_n(S)| + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} |\mu(A_i) - \mu_n(A_i)| + \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} |\mu(B_j) - \mu_n(B_j)|. \quad (4.6)$$

Note that this estimate is uniform in $x \in \mathbf{T}$. By the strong law of large numbers the family of random variables $\{|\mu(S) - \mu_n(S)|, (|\mu(A_i) - \mu_n(A_i)|)_{i=1, \dots, m_1}, (|\mu(B_j) - \mu_n(B_j)|)_{j=1, \dots, m_2}\}$ converges jointly \mathbb{P} -almost surely to 0. Applying this to (4.6) this yields the existence of a random variable N_1 such that for every $n \geq N_1$ we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbf{T}} |\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x))| \leq \frac{4}{5}\varepsilon + \frac{1}{5}\varepsilon.$$

□

After having established control over μ_n , we can show that $d_{\text{GP}}(\mathbf{S}_n, \mathbf{T})$ and $d_{\text{GP}}(T_n^{\text{trim}}, \mathbf{S}_n)$ are small.

Lemma 4.7. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a random variable $N_2 = N_2(\varepsilon)$ such that for $n \geq N_2$ we have almost surely*

$$d_{\text{GP}}((\mathbf{S}_n, d_n, r, \mu_n), (\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu)) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Recall the defining property of the metric of IP-trees. For $x \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ we have

$$d(r, x) = 1 - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)).$$

An analogous statement holds for \mathbf{S}_n and d_n with μ_n . This means that to understand the metric, we only need to understand the measure. Note that for every $x \in \mathbf{S}_n$ we have

$$\mu_n(F_{\mathbf{S}_n}(x)) = \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)), \quad (4.7)$$

by extending μ_n to \mathbf{T} . Lemma 4.6 allows us to control the expressions above.

To use Definition 1.15 to estimate $d_{\text{GP}}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{S}_n)$, we need to couple μ and μ_n . To do this, we apply Lemma 4.5 with parameter $\varepsilon/12$. Note that $\text{supp}(\mu_n) \subset \text{supp}(\mu)$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. Conditional on ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n , consider any coupling ν_n of μ and μ_n such that for every $i \in [m_1], j \in [m_2]$

$$\nu_n(A_i \times A_i) = \min\{\mu(A_i), \mu_n(A_i)\}, \quad \nu_n(B_j \times B_j) = \min\{\mu(B_j), \mu_n(B_j)\}.$$

Note that such a coupling always exists. Consider the following subset of $\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{T}$,

$$R = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_1} (A_i \times A_i) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m_2} (B_j \times B_j),$$

here we again use that \mathbf{S}_n is a subset of \mathbf{T} . By the strong law of large numbers the family of random variables $\{|\mu(S) - \mu_n(S)|, (|\mu(A_i) - \mu_n(A_i)|)_{i=1, \dots, m_1}, (|\mu(B_j) - \mu_n(B_j)|)_{j=1, \dots, m_2}\}$ converges jointly \mathbb{P} -almost surely to 0. Hence, there exists a random variable $N_2^*(\varepsilon)$ such that for every $n \geq N_2^*$ we have

$$\nu_n(R) \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

By Definition 1.15, it suffices to show for n sufficiently large that

$$\sup_{(x,y),(x',y') \in R} |d(x, x') - d_n(y, y')| \leq \varepsilon.$$

First, for $x \in A_i$ and $y \in A_j$, we want to decompose $d(x, y)$. We implicitly restrict ourselves to $x, y \in \text{supp}(\mu_n) \subset \text{supp}(\mu)$ so that we can later apply Lemma 4.4 (iii). For every $i \in [m_1]$, choose $r_i \in A_i$ arbitrarily. In fact, if we look into the proof of Lemma 4.5, we see that we can choose r_i to be the root of A_i but we will not use this here. By the triangle inequality we have

$$d(r_i, r_j) - d(x, r_i) - d(y, r_j) \leq d(x, y) \leq d(r_i, r_j) + d(x, r_i) + d(y, r_j),$$

and by using that $\text{diam}(A_i) \leq \varepsilon/12$ and $\text{diam}(A_j) \leq \varepsilon/12$ we get

$$d(r_i, r_j) - \frac{1}{6}\varepsilon \leq d(x, y) \leq d(r_i, r_j) + \frac{1}{6}\varepsilon.$$

Next, we must show a similar statement for d_n . For this we need to estimate $\text{diam}_n A_i$, the diameter of A_i under the metric d_n . We apply Lemma 4.6, for $n \geq N_1(\varepsilon/48)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{diam}_n(A_i) &\leq 2 \sup_{x \in A_i} d_n(r_i, x) \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{x \in A_i} d(r_i, x) + 2 \sup_{x \in A_i} |d(r_i, x) - d_n(r_i, x)| \\ &\leq 2 \text{diam}(A_i) + 8 \sup_{z \in \mathbf{T}} |\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(z)) - \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(z))| \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{6} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \end{aligned}$$

where we also applied Lemma 4.4 (iii); the map φ here is the inclusion $\mathbf{S}_n \hookrightarrow \mathbf{T}$. This yields that for $x \in A_i$ and $y \in A_j$ we have

$$d_n(r_i, r_j) - \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon \leq d_n(x, y) \leq d_n(r_i, r_j) + \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon.$$

The same reasoning works if $x \in A_i$ and $y \in B_j$ for some $i \in [m_1], j \in [m_2]$. In that case we have also

$$|d(x, y) - d(r_i, y)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{12},$$

and

$$|d_n(x, y) - d_n(r_i, y)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

As a consequence, for $(x, y), (x', y') \in R$ we have

$$|d(x, x') - d_n(y, y')| \leq \frac{5}{6}\varepsilon + \max \left\{ |d(r', r'') - d_n(r', r'')|; r', r'' \in \{r_i, i \in [m_1]\} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m_2} B_j \right\}.$$

And by Lemma 4.4 (iii) and Lemma 4.6 as above,

$$|d(x, x') - d_n(y, y')| \leq \frac{5}{6}\varepsilon + 4 \sup_{z \in \mathbf{T}} |\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(z)) - \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(z))| \leq \frac{5}{6}\varepsilon + \frac{1}{12}\varepsilon < \varepsilon,$$

for $n \geq N_1(\varepsilon/48)$.

We now have

$$\sup_{(x, y), (x', y') \in R} |d(x, x') - d_n(y, y')| \leq \varepsilon$$

Recall that $\nu_n(R) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. With Definition 1.15 this yields $d_{\text{GP}}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{S}_n) \leq \varepsilon$, \mathbb{P} -almost surely for $n \geq N_2 := \max\{N_1(\varepsilon/48), N_2^*\}$. \square

Lemma 4.8. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a random variable $N_3 = N_3(\varepsilon)$ such that for $n \geq N_3$ we have almost surely*

$$d_{\text{GP}}\left((T_n^{\text{trim}}, d_n^{\text{trim}}, r_n, \mu_n^{\text{trim}}), (\mathbf{S}_n, d_n, r, \mu_n)\right) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ small. First, we need to understand η^n better, recall the definition of η^n from (4.1). To this end, consider the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B} &= \{x \in \mathbf{T} : d(r, x) = 1 - \varepsilon/16\}, \\ \mathbf{C} &= \{x \in \mathbf{T} : \mu(\{x\}) > \varepsilon/16 \text{ and } F_{\mathbf{T}}(x) = \{x\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

This means that \mathbf{B} is the level set at height $1 - \varepsilon/16$ and \mathbf{C} is the set of atoms with mass greater than $\varepsilon/16$ that are also leaves. By Lemma 4.4 (ii) the set \mathbf{B} is at most countably infinite and \mathbf{C} is clearly finite. Enumerate $\mathbf{B} \cup \mathbf{C}$ by $\{z_i, i \geq 1\}$,

$$\mathbf{B} \cup \mathbf{C} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{z_i\}.$$

Observe that

$$\mathbf{T} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} [r, z_i] \cup F_{\mathbf{T}}(z_i) = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \left([r, z_i] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} [r, z_j] \right) \right) \cup F_{\mathbf{T}}(z_i),$$

where \bigsqcup is a disjoint union. This implies that we can choose K large enough such that

$$\mu\left(\mathbf{T} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^K [r, z_i] \cup F_{\mathbf{T}}(z_i)\right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

Such a K exists because for every $z \in \mathbf{B}$ we have $\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(z)) \leq 1 - d(r, z) \leq \varepsilon/16$ by Lemma 4.4 (i) and the definition of \mathbf{B} . We now define the sets

$$\mathbf{L} = \bigcup_{i=1}^K F_{\mathbf{T}}(z_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{D} = \bigcup_{i=1}^K [r, z_i].$$

Note that \mathbf{L} and \mathbf{D} are disjoint and $\mu(\mathbf{L}) + \mu(\mathbf{D}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon/2$ due to our choice of K . We think of \mathbf{L} as the part of \mathbf{T} that is close to the leaves and of \mathbf{D} as the skeleton of the tree that leads to \mathbf{L} .

Observe that for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have $\eta^n(\xi_i) = \xi_i$ if

$$\left| F_{\mathbf{T}}(\xi_i) \cap \{\xi_j; 1 \leq j \leq n\} \right| \geq 2.$$

This leads us to consider the event

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \left\{ \forall 1 \leq j \leq K : |F_{\mathbf{T}}(z_j) \cap \{\xi_i; 1 \leq i \leq n\}| \geq 2 \right\}.$$

On the event \mathcal{A}_n we have for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ with $\xi_i \in \mathbf{D} \cup \mathbf{L}$ that

$$\begin{cases} \eta^n(\xi_i) = \xi_i & \text{if } \xi_i \in \mathbf{D}, \\ \eta^n(\xi_i) \in F_{\mathbf{T}}(z_j) & \text{if } \xi_i \in F_{\mathbf{T}}(z_j) \text{ for some } j \leq K. \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

Next, we want to start estimating $d_{\text{GP}}((T_n^{\text{trim}}, d_n^{\text{trim}}, r_n, \mu_n^{\text{trim}}), (\mathbf{S}_n, d_n, r, \mu_n))$. We use Definition 1.15 to compute d_{GP} . Consider the following subset of $\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{T}$

$$R_n = \bigcup_{i \in [n]: \xi_i \in \mathbf{D} \cup \mathbf{L}} \{\xi_i\} \times \{\eta^n(\xi_i)\}.$$

We choose the natural coupling ν_n of μ_n and μ_n^{trim} , that places mass $1/n$ on $(\xi_i, \eta^n(\xi_i))$,

$$\nu_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \delta_{(\xi_i, \eta^n(\xi_i))}.$$

Note that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(R_n) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(\mathbf{D} \cup \mathbf{L}) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad (4.9)$$

\mathbb{P} -almost surely. Further, note that $\mathcal{A}_{n-1} \subset \mathcal{A}_n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n) = 1$. Hence, there is a random variable $N_3^* = N_3^*(\varepsilon)$ such that for all $n \geq N_3^*$ we have $\nu_n(R_n) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$.

Let us now estimate

$$\sup_{(x,y),(x',y') \in R_n} \left| d_n(x, x') - d_n^{\text{trim}}(y, y') \right|,$$

on the event \mathcal{A}_n . Let $I_n = \{i \in [n] : \xi_i \in \mathbf{D} \cup \mathbf{L}\}$. Note that by the definition of R_n we have

$$\sup_{(x,y),(x',y') \in R_n} \left| d_n(x, x') - d_n^{\text{trim}}(y, y') \right| = \sup_{i,j \in I_n} \left| d_n(\xi_i, \xi_j) - d_n^{\text{trim}}(\eta^n(\xi_i), \eta^n(\xi_j)) \right|. \quad (4.10)$$

We now apply Lemma 4.4 (iii) where φ is given by η^n restricted to $\{\xi_i, i \in I_n\}$. We combine this with (4.8) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(x,y),(x',y') \in R_n} \left| d_n(x, x') - d_n^{\text{trim}}(y, y') \right| &\leq 4 \sup_{i \in I_n} \left| \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\xi_i)) - \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(\eta^n(\xi_i))) \right| \\ &\leq 4 \sup_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq K \\ z_j \in \mathbf{B}}} \sup_{x,y \in F_{\mathbf{T}}(z_j)} \left| \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(y)) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By using the triangle inequality twice we have

$$\begin{aligned} 4 \sup_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq K \\ z_j \in \mathbf{B}}} \sup_{x,y \in F_{\mathbf{T}}(z_j)} \left| \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(y)) \right| &\leq 8 \sup_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq K \\ z_j \in \mathbf{B}}} \sup_{x \in F_{\mathbf{T}}(z_j)} \left| \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) \right| \\ &\quad + 4 \sup_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq K \\ z_j \in \mathbf{B}}} \sup_{x,y \in F_{\mathbf{T}}(z_j)} \left| \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(y)) \right| \\ &\leq 8 \sup_{x \in \mathbf{T}} \left| \mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) \right| + 8 \sup_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq K \\ z_j \in \mathbf{B}}} \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(z_j)). \end{aligned}$$

By construction, we have $\mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(z_j)) \leq \varepsilon/16$ for every $z_j \in \mathbf{B}$. The other term, $\sup_{x \in \mathbf{T}} |\mu_n(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x)) - \mu(F_{\mathbf{T}}(x))|$, is controlled by Lemma 4.6 – we apply it with parameter $\varepsilon/16$. This means that for $n \geq N_3 := \max\{N_1(\varepsilon/16), N_3^*\}$ we have

$$\sup_{(x,y),(x',y') \in R_n} \left| d_n(x, x') - d_n^{\text{trim}}(y, y') \right| \leq 8 \frac{\varepsilon}{16} + 8 \frac{\varepsilon}{16}. \quad (4.11)$$

Recall that for $n \geq N_3^*$ we have $\nu_n(R_n) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. This implies that for $n \geq N_3$

$$d_{\text{GP}} \left((T_n^{\text{trim}}, d_n^{\text{trim}}, r_n, \mu_n^{\text{trim}}), (\mathbf{S}_n, d_n, r, \mu_n) \right) \leq \varepsilon,$$

which is the statement of the lemma. \square

Finally, we prove Theorem 4.3.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. This now follows straight away from Lemmas 4.7 and 4.8. We have by the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{GP}} \left((T_n^{\text{trim}}, d_n^{\text{trim}}, r_n, \mu_n^{\text{trim}}), (\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu) \right) \\ \leq d_{\text{GP}} \left((T_n^{\text{trim}}, d_n^{\text{trim}}, r_n, \mu_n^{\text{trim}}), (\mathbf{S}_n, d_n, r, \mu_n) \right) + d_{\text{GP}} \left((\mathbf{S}_n, d_n, r, \mu_n), (\mathbf{T}, d, r, \mu) \right) \\ \leq 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

A Appendix: proof of Proposition 3.6

Here we will sketch the proof of Proposition 3.6. Large parts of it are analogous to arguments seen in Evans, Grübel, Wakolbinger [8, Sections 6 and 7] with the difference being that the authors of [8] consider only binary trees. We present the proof to give the reader a more complete picture.

The proof consists of three steps: First, we go from the dendritic system to an ultra-metric on \mathbb{N} which can be represented in a coalescent. Secondly, we apply a theorem of Gufler [14] to derive a sampling procedure for the ultra-metric. The ultra-metric can be represented by sampling points from a real tree. In doing this, we lose information about the planar structure. We recover the planar structure in a third step by use of the Aldous–Hoover–Kallenberg theory of exchangeable arrays, see the book of Kallenberg [17, Chapter 28] for a general reference.

In the following sections we encode a given exchangeable, ergodic dendritic system $\mathcal{D} = (\mathbb{N}, \sim, \preceq, p)$. This dendritic system was obtained from a tree-valued Markov chain $(T_n, n \geq 1)$ with uniform backward dynamics. We will end up with the objects of Proposition 3.6: a rooted real tree $(\mathbf{T}, d_{\mathbf{T}}, r)$, a probability measure μ and a function F which encodes the planarity function p of \mathcal{D} .

A.1 From the dendritic system to a first real tree

The first thing we need to do is to derive an ultra-metric. To this end, given $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ and any leaf $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we set

$$I_k := \mathbf{1}\{(i, j) \preceq k\}.$$

By exchangeability of \mathcal{D} the sequence $(I_k)_{k > \max\{i, j\}}$ is also exchangeable. Hence the limit

$$d(i, j) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n I_k$$

exists almost surely by de Finetti's theorem.

Lemma A.1. *d is almost surely an ultra-metric on \mathbb{N} , that is for all $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have:*

- 1.) $d(i, j) \geq 0$, and $d(i, j) = 0 \Leftrightarrow i = j$.
- 2.) $d(i, j) = d(j, i)$.
- 3.) $d(i, k) \leq \max\{d(i, j), d(j, k)\}$.

Proof. The proof of this lemma is analogous to the proof of [8, Lemma 6.1], we repeat it for the reader's convenience. Notice that little changes in going from the binary trees of [8] to multi-furcating in our setting.

The symmetry of d and $d(i, i) = 0$ follow readily from the definition of I_k . We show that $i \neq j$ implies $d(i, j) > 0$ almost surely. To this end, we first observe that the events $\{d(i, j) = 0\}$ and $\{\forall k \notin \{i, j\} : I_k = 0\}$

agree almost surely. Indeed, if we had $\mathbb{P}(I_k = 1) > 0$ for some k , then this would be true for infinitely many k , by exchangeability, and then by de–Finetti’s theorem we would then have $d(i, j) > 0$. Hence, we almost surely have

$$\{d(i, j) = 0\} = \{\forall k \notin \{i, j\} : I_k = 0\} = \{\nexists k \notin \{i, j\} : (i, j) \preceq k\}$$

where the second equality follows from the definition of I_k . On the level of trees this means that for all $n \geq \max\{i, j\}$, the leaves labelled i and j are attached to the same vertex in T_n and no other leaves or subtrees are attached to the same vertex. The authors of [8] call this a *cherry*.

We now want to estimate the probability of the event that i and j are part of the same cherry in T_n , equivalently in the dendritic system restricted to $[n]$. Because T_n has n leaves, the number of cherries is at most $\frac{n}{2}$. Recall that the leaves are labelled exchangeably. This means that we can relabel the leaves of T_n uniformly without changing the distribution. The probability that the labels i and j are part of the same cherry is at most $\frac{n}{2} \frac{2}{n(n-1)}$. This allows us to conclude

$$\mathbb{P}(d(i, j) = 0) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(i \text{ and } j \text{ form a cherry}) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{2} \frac{2}{n(n-1)} = 0$$

which is equivalent to $d(i, j) > 0$ almost surely for $i \neq j$.

Lastly, by consider the subtree spanned in T_n by the leaves labelled i, j, k . We see that we have either $(i, k) = (j, k) \preceq (i, j)$ or a permutation thereof for all $n \geq \max\{i, j, k\}$. In the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ this entails $d(i, k) = d(j, k) \geq d(i, j)$ or a permutation thereof. In any case, the ultra–metric inequality $d(i, k) \leq \max\{d(i, j), d(j, k)\}$ is satisfied. \square

Given an ultra–metric d on \mathbb{N} that is bounded above by 1, we can associate a coalescent and a real tree to it in a canonical way, see for example Evans [7, Example 3.41]

We explain this procedure here. Define a family of equivalence relations $(\equiv_t, t \in [0, 1])$ on \mathbb{N} by declaring $i \equiv_t j$ if and only if $d(i, j) \leq t$. Notice that elements of \mathbb{N} can be identified with equivalence classes of \equiv_0 and that all elements of \mathbb{N} are equivalent under \equiv_1 . Now, we extend d to a metric of pairs of the form (A, t) where A is an equivalence class of \equiv_t , call this set \mathbf{S}° . Given (A, t) and (B, s) we set

$$H((A, t), (B, s)) = \inf \{u \geq \max\{s, t\} : k \equiv_u \ell, \forall k \in A, \ell \in B\}$$

and

$$d((A, t), (B, s)) = H((A, t), (B, s)) - \frac{s + t}{2}.$$

One can check that $d(\{\{i\}, 0\}, \{\{j\}, 0\}) = d(i, j)$, so d is an extension of the previous metric. Further, one can check that d is indeed a metric and that the metric completion of (\mathbf{S}°, d) is a real tree, call it (\mathbf{S}, d) . \mathbf{S} can be endowed by an ancestral order $<$ by setting $(A, t) < (B, s)$ if $s < t$ and $B \subset A$. Root \mathbf{S} at the minimal element of $<$, call the root r .

Recall that we obtained the dendritic system $\mathcal{D} = (\mathbb{N}, \sim, \preceq, p)$ from a tree–valued Markov chain $(T_n, n \geq 1)$. \mathcal{D} restricted to $[n]$ corresponds to T_n^+ via Lemma 2.8 where the $+$ signifies that we have added leaf labels. Remove the planar order from T_n but keep the leaf labels and call the resulting tree $T_n^{\text{unordered}}$. Similarly to Lemma 2.8, $T_n^{\text{unordered}}$ corresponds to $([n], \sim, \preceq)$.

Further, we can consider \mathbf{S} restricted to the set spanned by $\{(\{1\}, 0), \dots, (\{n\}, 0), r\}$. This corresponds to a combinatorial, leaf–labelled tree S_n . Write $(i, j) \approx_n (k, \ell)$ if the most recent common ancestor of i and j is also the most recent common ancestor of k and ℓ in S_n .

Lemma A.2. *As leaf–labelled, non–plane trees, we have $S_n = T_n^{\text{unordered}}$ almost surely.*

Proof. Recall that $T_n^{\text{unordered}}$ corresponds to $([n], \sim, \preceq)$ and that S_n corresponds to $([n], \approx_n, <)$ where $<$ is induced by the ancestral order on \mathbf{S} . Hence it suffices to check that $([n], \sim, \prec)$ and $([n], \approx_n, <)$ have the same distribution.

Fix distinct $i, j, k \in [n]$. Observe that $(i, k) \approx_n (j, k) < (i, j)$ if and only if $d(i, j) < d(i, k) = d(j, k)$, and $(i, j) \approx_n (i, k) \approx_n (j, k)$ if and only if $d(i, j) = d(i, k) = d(j, k)$. This holds because S_n is derived from \mathbf{S} .

We will prove that $(i, k) \sim (j, k) \prec (i, j)$ if and only if $d(i, j) < d(i, k) = d(j, k)$ as well as $(i, j) \sim (i, k) \sim (j, k)$ if and only if $d(i, j) = d(i, k) = d(j, k)$. Because trees are uniquely determined by the relationship

between triples of vertices, this will imply that $S_n = T_n^{\text{unordered}}$. To show this, we use ideas of [8, Lemma 6.2] which are similar to ideas used in the above proof of Lemma A.1.

Note that $(i, k) \sim (j, k)$ if and only if we do not have $(i, k) \prec (j, k)$ or $(j, k) \prec (i, k)$. Similarly, $d(i, k) = d(j, k)$ if and only if we do not have $d(i, k) < d(j, k)$ or $d(j, k) < d(i, k)$. By contraposition it thus suffices to show that $(j, k) \prec (i, j)$ if and only if $d(j, k) > d(i, j)$.

On the one hand, $d(j, k) > d(i, j)$ implies $(j, k) \prec (i, j)$ in \mathcal{D} and this does not change when we restrict \mathcal{D} to $[n]$. On the other hand, $(j, k) \prec (i, j)$ clearly implies $d(j, k) \geq d(i, j)$. The crucial part is to show that $(j, k) \prec (i, j)$ implies $d(j, k) \neq d(i, j)$.

Similar to Lemma A.1, by exchangeability and de–Finetti’s theorem we almost surely have

$$\{(j, k) \prec (i, j)\} \cap \{d(j, k) = d(i, j)\} = \{(j, k) \prec (i, j)\} \cap \{\nexists \ell \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{k\} : (j, k) \prec \ell, (i, j) \not\prec k\}.$$

We now want to estimate the probability of the latter event for the tree $T_m^{\text{unordered}}$ where $m > n$. Here, the event corresponds to the vertices (j, k) and (i, j) being connected by a single edge and further (j, k) has only one other offspring, namely the leaf labelled k . Call this event \mathcal{A} .

We now proceed similarly to Lemma A.1. Recall that the leaves are labelled exchangeably. This means that we can relabel the leaves of $T_n^{\text{unordered}}$ uniformly without changing the distribution. We do this, and condition on $(j, k) \prec (i, j)$. The conditional probability of \mathcal{A} then is 0 if (j, k) has more than two children or if the child of (j, k) which is not an ancestor of (i, j) has children on its own. If this is not the case, i.e. when the only child of (j, k) besides (i, j) is a single leaf, then the probability that that leaf is labelled k is $\frac{1}{m-2}$ which converges to 0 as $m \rightarrow \infty$. This yields

$$\mathbb{P}(\{(j, k) \prec (i, j)\} \cap \{d(j, k) = d(i, j)\}) = 0,$$

which implies $(j, k) \prec (i, j)$ implies $d(j, k) \neq d(i, j)$. □

The considerations of this section lead us to the following statement, an analogue of [8, Proposition 6.3]. This proposition states that we can encode all information contained in \mathcal{D} except for the planar order in the real tree \mathbf{S} .

Proposition A.3. *There is a rooted real tree (\mathbf{S}, d, r) and an injective map $\iota : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow (\mathbf{S}, d, r)$ such that the span of $\iota([n])$ corresponds to $T_n^{\text{unordered}}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as combinatorial tree. Further, the ancestral order \preceq of \mathcal{D} coincides with the natural partial order of \mathbf{S} .*

Proof. By Lemma 2.8 ($\mathbb{N}, \sim, \preceq$) restricted to $[n]$ stands in correspondence to $T_n^{\text{unordered}}$. By Lemma A.2 T_n and S_n are almost surely the same tree. We constructed S_n from a subset of \mathbf{S} which implies the existence of $\iota \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$. □

Note that \mathbf{S} is random because \mathcal{D} is random. In the next section we encode its distribution.

A.2 From the first real tree to a sampling from a real tree

We have encoded the dendritic system in an ultra–metric d which we represented as a real tree. This coalescent tree is random and we want to find a more algorithmic representation for it. This is done by applying Gufler [14, Theorem 3.9], we state this theorem in our notation.

Assume we are given a rooted real tree $(\mathbf{T}, d_{\mathbf{T}}, r)$ and a probability measure m on $\mathbf{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Consider a sequence of *i.i.d.* samples $(\xi_i, v_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ where (ξ_i, v_i) is distributed according to m for every i . Define

$$\delta(i, j) = (d_{\mathbf{T}}(\xi_i, \xi_j) + v_i + v_j) \mathbb{1}_{i \neq j},$$

which can be shown to be a pseudo–metric. The idea behind this construction is that we attach a leaf labelled i with a branch of length v_i to the point ξ_i in \mathbf{T} . δ is then the induced path metric on \mathbf{T} with the added branches restricted to the leaves.

Let $(\mathbf{S}, d_{\mathbf{S}}, r)$ be the real tree of Proposition A.3. Let d be the induced ultra–metric on \mathbb{N} by restricting \mathbf{S} to $\iota(\mathbb{N})$. This is the ultra–metric which we used to construct \mathbf{S} . Let π be the map that maps isolated leaves, i.e. leaves that are not accumulation points of other leaves, to the closest branchpoint. If x is a leaf but not isolated, we set $\pi(x) = x$.

Theorem A.4. [14, Theorem 3.9] *There exists a rooted real tree $(\mathbf{T}, d_{\mathbf{T}}, r)$ and a probability measure m on $\mathbf{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\delta = d$ where d is the ultra-metric of the coalescent and δ is constructed as above. More precisely, we can choose \mathbf{T} to be the span of $\{\pi(\iota(i))\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Moreover under the assumption of ergodicity on d , $(\mathbf{T}, d_{\mathbf{T}}, r)$ and m are deterministic. Denote the marginal distribution of m on \mathbf{T} by μ .*

Alternatively, this means that \mathbf{S} equals \mathbf{T} with additional leaves attached: we attach a leaf of length v_i to ξ_i for every i . In our setting, v_i is simply a function of ξ_i as we need to have $d_{\mathbf{T}}(r, \xi_i) + v_i = 1$.

Let us comment on how this theorem is proved. Define \mathbf{T} to be closure of the smallest subtree of \mathbf{S} that contains $(\pi(y_i))_{i \geq 1}$. Next, let $m_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(\pi(y_i), d_{\mathbf{S}}(y_i, \pi(y_i)))}$ the empirical measure on $\pi(y_i)$ with the associated leaf lengths. m then is the weak limit of m_n as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Gufler's proof makes use of exchangeability and de Finetti-style theorems which are used to show that the weak limit exists as well as that ergodicity implies that \mathbf{T} is deterministic.

At this point we have successfully encoded (C1)–(C4) in a real tree (\mathbf{T}, r) with associated probability measure μ , the distribution m does not matter if we only want to retrieve the dendritic system. Let us explain how to obtain $(\mathbb{N}, \sim, \preceq)$ of our dendritic system from (\mathbf{T}, r, μ) . Given (\mathbf{T}, r, μ) , sample $(\xi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ i.i.d. from μ . We define a random equivalence relation \sim^* and a random ancestral order \preceq^* on $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$.

- 1.) $(i, i) \sim^* (k, l)$ if and only if $(i, i) = (k, l)$.
- 2.) $(i, j) \sim^* (k, l)$ for $i \neq j, k \neq l$ if and only if $[r, \xi_i] \cap [r, \xi_j] = [r, \xi_k] \cap [r, \xi_l]$.
- 3.) The partial order \preceq^* is inherited from the partial order on S and adding $(i, j) \preceq^* (i, i)$ for $i \neq j$. This means for distinct $i, j, k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(k, \ell) \prec^* (i, j) \quad \text{if} \quad [r, \xi_k] \cap [r, \xi_\ell] \subsetneq [r, \xi_i] \cap [r, \xi_j].$$

Proposition A.5. *The above-defined random relations $(\mathbb{N}, \sim^*, \preceq^*)$ have the same distribution as $(\mathbb{N}, \sim, \preceq)$ of the dendritic system $\mathcal{D} = (\mathbb{N}, \sim, \preceq, p)$.*

Proof. This is a combination of Theorem A.4 and Proposition A.3. □

This means we have almost proven Proposition 3.6, except for the representation of the planarity function p . We will do this in the next section.

A.3 Encoding the planar structure

We complete the proof of Proposition 3.6 by encoding the planar structure, i.e. the planarity function p .

Proof of Proposition 3.6. Recall Proposition A.3 and let π be the map that maps a leaf of \mathbf{S} to the closest branchpoint. Set $\xi_i = \pi(\iota(i))$. By Theorem A.4 and Proposition A.5, $(\xi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an exchangeable sequence of μ -distributed random variables on \mathbf{T} .

Consider the array

$$\{(\xi_i, \xi_j, p(i, j))\}_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j}.$$

This array takes values in sequences of $\mathbf{T}^2 \times \{\pm 1\}$ -valued random variables and is jointly exchangeable.

This implies that there is a measurable function $F : (\mathbf{T} \times [0, 1])^2 \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ with

$$\{\xi_i, \xi_j, p(i, j)\}_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j} \stackrel{d}{=} \{\xi_i, \xi_j, F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_j, U_j, U_{ij})\}_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $(U_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, (U_{ij})_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j}$ are independent uniform random variables on $[0, 1]$ with $U_{ij} = U_{ji}$ which are independent of $(\xi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. This is a general result from the Aldous–Hoover–Kallenberg theory for exchangeable arrays that we state and deduce as Lemma A.6 later.

The function F satisfies some consistency relations which we will state and prove here. Let Leb be the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$. For μ -almost every $x, y, z \in \mathbf{T}$ and Leb -almost every u, v, w, a, b, c we the following consistency relations.

$$(F1) \quad F(x, u, y, v, a) = -F(y, v, x, u, a),$$

- (F2) if $F(x, u, y, v, a) = F(y, v, z, w, b)$ then also $F(x, u, z, w, c) = F(x, u, y, v, a)$,
- (F3) if $[r, x] \cap [r, y] \notin \{[r, x], [r, y]\}$ and $[r, y] \subsetneq [r, z]$ then $F(x, u, y, v, a) = F(x, u, z, w, b)$,
- (F4) if $[r, x] \subsetneq [r, y] \subsetneq [r, z]$ then $F(x, u, y, v, a) = F(x, u, z, w, c)$.

Let us prove these claims. Recall the consistency relations of p as defined in Definition 2.6. Let ξ_i, ξ_j, ξ_k be *i.i.d.* μ -random variables and let $U_i, U_j, U_k, U_{ik}, U_{ij}, U_{jk}$ be independent *i.i.d.* uniform random variables on $[0, 1]$. By Skorokhod's representation theorem, we can work on a probability space where the (A.1) is an almost-sure equality. The statements in the new probability will translate back to the claimed distributional statements claimed above.

(F1) Firstly, by (P1), we have

$$p(i, j) = -p(i, j) \quad a.s. \implies F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_j, U_j, U_{ij}) = -F(\xi_j, U_j, \xi_i, U_i, U_{ij}) \quad a.s..$$

(F2) Secondly, consider the event $A_{ijk} = \{F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_j, U_j, U_{ij}) = F(\xi_j, U_j, \xi_k, U_k, U_{jk}) = 1\}$. By (P3) we have

$$\begin{cases} p(i, j) = 1 \\ p(j, k) = 1 \end{cases} \xrightarrow{(P3)} p(i, k) = 1 \quad a.s. \implies F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_k, U_k, U_{ik}) = 1 \quad \text{on } A_{ijk}.$$

By (P1) and (F1), the same works if we replace 1 by -1 .

(F3) Thirdly, consider the event $B_{ijk} = \{[r, \xi_i] \cap [r, \xi_j] \notin \{[r, \xi_i], [r, \xi_j]\}$ and $[r, \xi_j] \subsetneq [r, \xi_k]\}$. This implies that in the dendritic system we have $(i, j) \prec (j, k)$. Then on the intersection of B_{ijk} and $\{p(i, j) = 1, p((i, i), (j, k)) = 1\}$, we have by (P4) that $p(i, k) = 1$ which in turn is equivalent to $F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_k, U_k, U_{ik}) = 1$ on these events. The same works if we replace 1 by -1 by (P1) and (F1).

(F4) Fourthly, consider the event $\{[r, \xi_i] \subsetneq [r, \xi_j] \subsetneq [r, \xi_k]\}$. On this event we have that $(i, j) \prec (j, k)$. In this case (P4) states that $p(i, j) = 1$ implies that $p((i, i), (j, k)) = 1$ which in turn implies $p(i, k) = 1 = F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_k, U_k, U_{ik})$. The same works if we replace 1 by -1 by (P1) and (F1).

□

Lastly, let us comment on why there is no consistency relation for F which is derived from (P2). To apply (P2), we need two vertices of our dendritic system $x, y \in \mathcal{D}$ which satisfy $x \prec y$. This will never be the case for leaves of \mathcal{D} and F is only used to determine the planar relation between leaves.

Finally, we prove a lemma that we skipped earlier. Assume we work on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$.

Lemma A.6. *Assume we have a jointly exchangeable, ergodic array $\{\xi_i, \xi_j, \zeta_{ij}\}_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}; i \neq j}$ of random variables taking values in $S_1 \times S_1 \times S_2$ where S_1 and S_2 are some Borel spaces. We can enlarge the probability space so that there exists an array $\{U_i, U_{ij}\}_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}; i < j}$ of *i.i.d.* uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables which is independent of $\{\xi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Set $U_{ji} = U_{ij}$ for $i < j$. We then have*

$$\{\xi_i, \xi_j, \zeta_{ij}\}_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}; i \neq j} \stackrel{d}{=} \{F(\xi_i, U_i, \xi_j, U_j, U_{ij})\}_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}; i \neq j},$$

for some measurable function $F : S_1 \times [0, 1] \times S_1 \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow S_2$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume that $S_1 = S_2 = [0, 1]$. We use the Aldous–Hoover–Kallenberg theory of exchangeable arrays.

The representation theorem [18, Theorem 7.22] for arrays of exchangeable random variables yields the existence of a measurable function $G' : [0, 1]^4 \rightarrow [0, 1]^3$ such that

$$\{(\xi_i, \xi_j, \zeta_{ij})\}_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}; i \neq j} \stackrel{d}{=} \{G'(V_i, V_i, V_j, V_{ij})\}_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}; i \neq j}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $V_i, (V_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, (V_{ij})_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}; i < j}$ are independent uniform random variables on $[0, 1]$ and we set $V_{ij} = V_{ji}$.

Recall our assumption of ergodicity of the exchangeable array $\{(\xi_i, \xi_j, \zeta_{ij})\}$. [18, Lemma 7.35] now yields that our representation (A.2) does not depend on V . More precisely, there is a measurable function $G : [0, 1]^3 \rightarrow [0, 1]^3$ such that

$$\{(\xi_i, \xi_j, \zeta_{ij})\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j} \stackrel{d}{=} \{G(V_i, V_j, V_{ij})\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We can work in a probability space where (A.3) is a \mathbb{P} -almost sure equality. We now condition on $\{\xi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} = \{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ for some sequence in $[0, 1]$. Choose a family of regular conditional distributions \mathbb{P}^x under which the $\{V_i, V_{ij}\}$ are still all independent of each other, $\{V_{ij}\}$ is still uniformly distributed but $\{V_i\}$ are not necessarily uniformly distributed. For $t \in [0, 1]$, consider

$$\Phi_{x_i}(t) = \mathbb{P}^x(V_i \leq t).$$

Observe that $\Phi_{x_i}(t)$ and $\Phi_{x_i, x_j}(t)$ depend measurably on x_i and x_j for any i, j . Enlarge the probability space again so that there is $\{U_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}; i}$, an array of *i.i.d.* uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables. We then have the distributional equality under \mathbb{P}^x ,

$$\{\zeta_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j} \stackrel{d}{=} \{G_3(\Phi_{x_i}^{-1}(U_i), \Phi_{x_j}^{-1}(U_j), V_{ij})\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j}.$$

Here G_3 is the third coordinate of G , i.e. $G(\cdot) = (G_1(\cdot), G_2(\cdot), G_3(\cdot)) \in [0, 1]^3$. This means that there exists a measurable function $F : [0, 1]^5 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ so that

$$\{\zeta_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j} \stackrel{d}{=} \{F(x_i, U_i, x_j, U_j, U_{ij})\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j}.$$

Because we are using the same random variables $(U_i, U_{ij})_{i,j}$ regardless of the choice of $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, we have that $\{U_i, U_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j}$ is independent of $\{\xi_i, \xi_j\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j}$. \square

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank his PhD-supervisor Matthias Winkel for many useful discussions and for reading countless drafts. He would also like to acknowledge the support of EPSRC grant EP/W523781/1.

References

- [1] David Aldous. “The Continuum Random Tree III”. *The Annals of Probability* 21.1 (1993), pp. 248–289.
- [2] David Aldous. “The Continuum Random Tree. I”. *The Annals of Probability* 19.1 (1991), pp. 1–28.
- [3] Siva Athreya, Wolfgang Löhner, and Anita Winter. “The gap between Gromov-vague and Gromov–Hausdorff-vague topology”. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 126.9 (2016), pp. 2527–2553.
- [4] Nicolas Curien and Bénédicte Haas. “The stable trees are nested”. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 157.3-4 (2013), pp. 847–883.
- [5] Thomas Duquesne and J. F. Le Gall. *Random trees, Lévy processes, and spatial branching processes*. Paris: Société mathématique de France, 2002.
- [6] Steven N. Evans and Anton Wakolbinger. “PATRICIA Bridges”. *Lecture Notes Series, Institute for Mathematical Sciences, National University of Singapore*. Vol. 38. World Scientific, 2020, pp. 231–265.
- [7] Steven Neil Evans. *Probability and Real Trees*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2008.
- [8] Steven Neil Evans, Rudolf Grübel, and Anton Wakolbinger. “Doob-Martin boundary of Rémy’s tree growth chain”. *The Annals of Probability* 45 (2017), pp. 225–277.
- [9] Noah Forman. “Exchangeable hierarchies and mass-structure of weighted real trees”. *Electronic Journal of Probability* 25 (2020), pp. 1–28.
- [10] Noah Forman, Chris Haulk, and Jim Pitman. “A representation of exchangeable hierarchies by sampling from random real trees”. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 172.1-2 (2018), pp. 1–29.

- [11] Félix Foutel-Rodier, Amaury Lambert, and Emmanuel Schertzer. “Exchangeable coalescents, ultrametric spaces, nested interval-partitions: A unifying approach”. *The Annals of Applied Probability* 31.5 (2021).
- [12] Julian Gerstenberg. “Exchangeable interval hypergraphs and limits of ordered discrete structures”. *The Annals of Probability* 48.3 (2020), pp. 1128–1167.
- [13] Mikhail Gromov. *Metric Structures for Riemannian and Non-Riemannian Spaces*. Boston: Birkhäuser, 2007.
- [14] Stephan Gufler. “A representation for exchangeable coalescent trees and generalized tree-valued Fleming-Viot processes”. *Electronic Journal of Probability* 23 (2018), pp. 1–42.
- [15] Bénédicte Haas, Grégory Miermont, Jim Pitman, and Matthias Winkel. “Continuum tree asymptotics of discrete fragmentations and applications to phylogenetic models”. *The Annals of Probability* 36.5 (2008), pp. 1790–1837.
- [16] Svante Janson. “On the Gromov-Prohorov distance”. *arXiv preprint* (2020). arXiv:2005.13505v2.
- [17] Olav Kallenberg. *Foundations of Modern Probability*. Cham: Springer, 2021.
- [18] Olav Kallenberg. *Probabilistic Symmetries and Invariance Principles*. New York: Springer, 2005.
- [19] Philippe Marchal. “A note on the fragmentation of a stable tree”. *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science Proceedings* (2008), pp. 489–499.
- [20] Jean-Luc Rémy. “Un procédé itératif de dénombrement d’arbres binaires et son application à leur génération aléatoire”. *RAIRO. Informatique théorique* 19.2 (1985), pp. 179–195.
- [21] Wolfgang Woess. *Denumerable Markov Chains: Generating Functions, Boundary Theory, Random Walks on Trees*. Zürich: European Mathematical Society Publishing House, 2009.