

Viscous shock fluctuations in KPZ

Alexander Dunlap*

Evan Sorensen†

June 11, 2024

Abstract

We study “V-shaped” solutions to the KPZ equation, those having opposite asymptotic slopes θ and $-\theta$, with $\theta > 0$, at positive and negative infinity, respectively. Answering a question of Janjigian, Rassoul-Agha, and Seppäläinen, we show that the spatial increments of V-shaped solutions cannot be statistically stationary in time. This completes the classification of statistically time-stationary spatial increments for the KPZ equation by ruling out the last case left by those authors.

To show that these V-shaped time-stationary measures do not exist, we study the location of the corresponding “viscous shock,” which, roughly speaking, is the location of the bottom of the V. We describe the limiting rescaled fluctuations, and in particular show that the fluctuations of the shock location are not tight, for both stationary and flat initial data. We also show that if the KPZ equation is started with V-shaped initial data, then the long-time limits of the time-averaged laws of the spatial increments of the solution are mixtures of the laws of the spatial increments of $x \mapsto B(x) + \theta x$ and $x \mapsto B(x) - \theta x$, where B is a standard two-sided Brownian motion.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Long-time behavior of V-shaped solutions	5
1.2	The reference frame of the shock	7
1.3	Comparison with previous work on ASEP	8
1.4	Organization of the paper	9
1.5	Acknowledgments	10
2	Preliminaries	10
2.1	Notational conventions	10
2.2	Function spaces	10
2.3	The KPZ dynamics	12
2.4	Stationarity properties	14
2.5	The shock reference frame	16
3	Fluctuations of differences of KPZ solutions at the origin	18
3.1	Stationary case (static reference frame)	18
3.2	Stationary case (shock reference frame)	19
3.3	Flat case	22

*Department of Mathematics, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, USA. Email: dunlap@math.duke.edu.

†Department of Mathematics, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA. Email: evan.sorensen@columbia.edu.

4	V-shaped solutions	28
5	Fluctuations of the shock location	34
5.1	Using the asymptotic slope	34
5.2	Flat initial data	35
A	Technical lemmas	40
	References	41

1 Introduction

We consider the KPZ equation formally given by

$$dh(t, x) = \frac{1}{2}[\Delta h(t, x) + (\partial_x h(t, x))^2]dt + dW(t, x), \quad (1.1)$$

where dW is a space-time white noise. Classically, this equation is ill-posed; indeed, one must go through a limiting argument and subtract off an infinite renormalization term on the right-hand side to make proper sense of the equation. As is standard in the study of the KPZ equation, we avoid this issue by considering the Cole–Hopf (physical) solutions to (1.1). These are given by $h = \log \phi$, where ϕ solves the stochastic heat equation

$$d\phi(t, x) = \frac{1}{2}\Delta\phi(t, x)dt + \phi(t, x)dW(t, x). \quad (1.2)$$

The long-time behavior of solutions to (1.1) has been the subject of significant study in the past several decades. It is now known that the KPZ equation is a member of the KPZ universality class [SS10a; SS10b; SS10c; CDR10; Dot12; BQS11; ACQ11; BCFV15; QS23; Vir20; Wu23], and in particular that it exhibits nontrivial fluctuations under the “1 : 2 : 3 scaling.” In other words, the rescaled function $\varepsilon h(\varepsilon^{-3}t, \varepsilon^{-2}x)$ converges to a nontrivial limit, called the KPZ fixed point [MQR21], as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Implicit in this scaling is that the fluctuations of the solutions to (1.1) grow as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and in particular there are no invariant measures for this equation.

On the other hand, the *recentered* process $h(t, x) - h(t, 0)$ is known to have $O(1)$ fluctuations as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and indeed to admit invariant measures. For $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$, if we let μ_θ denote the law of standard two-sided Brownian motion with drift θ , then μ_θ is invariant under the dynamics of $h(t, x) - h(t, 0)$ [BG97; FQ15; JRAS22]. We note that if $\tilde{f} \sim \mu_\theta$, then, according to a standard property of Brownian motion with drift, we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{\tilde{f}(x)}{x} = \theta.$$

It has been conjectured that this one-parameter family $(\mu_\theta)_{\theta \in \mathbf{R}}$ in fact comprises *all* invariant measures for the recentered process; see e.g. [FQ15, Remark 1.1]. Great progress on this question has been made in [JRAS22], in which it was shown that if μ is an extremal invariant measure for the recentered process, then either there is some $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $\mu = \mu_\theta$, or else if $\tilde{f} \sim \mu$, there exists $\theta > 0$ so that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{\tilde{f}(x)}{|x|} = \theta \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (1.3)$$

We call functions satisfying (1.3) “V-shaped” since they asymptotically look like the shape of a capital letter “V.” The condition $\theta > 0$ is significant. Indeed, [JRAS22, Theorem 3.23] shows that, if

started from an initial condition satisfying (1.3) a.s. for $\theta \leq 0$, then the recentered solution to the KPZ equation converges to Brownian motion with zero drift. (Such initial conditions correspond to rarefaction fans.) In particular, it is already known that there are no extremal invariant measures μ supported on functions satisfying (1.3) for $\theta < 0$.

In [JRS22, Open Problem 1], the authors asked whether invariant measures supported on functions satisfying (1.3) for $\theta > 0$ actually exist. One of the main results of the present work is that the answer is no. In the following theorem statement, $C_{\text{KPZ};0}$ is the natural function space for the recentered KPZ equation; see (2.5) below and the discussion in [JRS22, Section 2.3].

Theorem 1.1. *For $\theta > 0$, there does not exist an invariant measure for the recentered process of the KPZ equation on $C_{\text{KPZ};0}$ that is supported on functions satisfying (1.3).*

As a corollary of this and [JRS22, Theorem 3.26(ii)], we obtain the complete characterization of extremal invariant measures for the recentered KPZ equation:

Corollary 1.2. *If μ is an extremal invariant measure on $C_{\text{KPZ};0}$ for the recentered KPZ equation, then there is some $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $\mu = \mu_\theta$.*

Previous results on asymmetric simple exclusion processes (ASEP) have obtained complete understandings of the invariant measures; see Section 1.3 below. We emphasize, however, that while properly-rescaled ASEP converges to the KPZ equation, the characterization of invariant measures in ASEP does not immediately pass to the limit. Indeed, one must rule out invariant measures that do not arise as scaling limits of invariant measures for ASEP. This question of characterizing the stationary measures in the context of the KPZ equation had previously been conjectured and discussed in several works [FQ15; JRS22; KMH92; Spo14] before its final resolution here.

The first author and Ryzhik studied V-shaped solutions to the KPZ equation, but with dW replaced by a noise that is spatially smooth and white in time, in [DR21]. In fact, that paper worked with the *gradient* of the KPZ equation, the stochastic Burgers equation. This is equivalent to the setting we have been considering since studying the gradient is equivalent to subtracting the value at 0. The starting point of the analysis in [DR21] was the observation (at the level of the stochastic Burgers equation) that V-shaped solutions to (1.1) can be constructed from two solutions to (1.1), with stationary spatial increments, that are driven by the same noise. (In the smooth-noise setting, the ergodic behavior of such solutions was studied in [DGR21].) Specifically, if h_+ and h_- are two solutions to (1.1) driven by the same noise, then

$$h_V(t, x) = V[h(t, \cdot)](x) := \log \frac{e^{h_+(t,x)} + e^{h_-(t,x)}}{2} \quad (1.4)$$

is also a solution to (1.1). If $\theta > 0$ and $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_\pm(t,x)}{x} = \pm\theta$, then it is clear from (1.4) that $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_V(t,x)}{|x|} = \theta$, which means that h is a V-shaped solution.

To study potential V-shaped *stationary* solutions, we write a centered version of (1.4) as

$$\begin{aligned} h_V(t, x) - h_V(t, 0) &= \log \frac{e^{h_+(t,x)} + e^{h_-(t,x)}}{e^{h_+(t,0)} + e^{h_-(t,0)}} \\ &= \log \frac{e^{h_+(t,x)-h_+(t,0)} + e^{h_-(t,x)-h_-(t,0)-(h_+(t,0)-h_-(t,0))}}{e^{h_+(t,0)-h_+(t,0)} + e^{-(h_+(t,0)-h_-(t,0))}}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

This formula depends only on $h_+(t, x) - h_+(t, 0)$, $h_-(t, x) - h_-(t, 0)$, and $h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0)$. The first two quantities have stationary versions, but we will see that the last one in fact grows in time and does not have a stationary distribution. Informally speaking, this is the “reason” for the lack of V-shaped stationary solutions claimed in Theorem 1.1.

The jointly stationary solutions of the process $(h_-(t, x) - h_-(t, 0), h_+(t, x) - h_+(t, 0))$, were recently described in the work [GRASS23] by Groathouse, Rassoul-Agha, Seppäläinen, and the second author. More generally, there is an explicit description of the law of the jointly invariant measures for the recentered solutions of (1.1), with k solutions driven by the same noise (but with different asymptotic slopes) for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We restrict our present discussion to $k = 2$, as that is what we will use in the present paper. We also restrict to the case of opposite drifts, noting there is also a description for general choice of drifts. Let B_1, B_2 be two independent standard two-sided Brownian motions (with $B_1(0) = B_2(0) = 0$), and define

$$f_-(x) = B_1(x) - \theta x, \quad (1.6)$$

$$f_+(x) = B_2(x) + \theta x + \mathcal{S}_\theta(x) - \mathcal{S}_\theta(0), \quad (1.7)$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_\theta(x) = \log \int_{-\infty}^x \exp\{(B_2(y) - B_2(x)) - (B_1(y) - B_1(x)) + 2\theta(y - x)\} dy. \quad (1.8)$$

We define

$$\nu_\theta = \text{Law}((f_-, f_+)). \quad (1.9)$$

It is shown in [GRASS23, Theorem 1.1] that if h_- and h_+ are two solutions to (1.1) with initial data $(h_-, h_+)(0, x) \sim \nu_\theta$ independent of the noise, then $(h_-, h_+)(t, x) - (h_-, h_+)(t, 0) \sim \nu_\theta$ as well. Also, we have $\text{Law}(h_\pm(t, \cdot)) = \mu_{\pm\theta}$; i.e., the marginals of ν_θ are the laws of two-sided Brownian motions with opposite drifts. Key to the proof of Theorem 1.1 will be the following theorem on the fluctuations of $(h_+ - h_-)(t, 0)$:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\theta > 0$, and let h_+ and h_- solve (1.1) with initial data $(h_-, h_+)(0, x) \sim \nu_\theta$ independent of the noise. Then we have the convergence in distribution*

$$\frac{h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0)}{t^{1/2}} \implies \mathcal{N}(0, 2\theta) \quad (1.10)$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

We emphasize that Theorem 1.3 is sensitive to the choice of initial data, even at the level of the scaling exponent. Indeed, by contrast, we have the following analogous result for flat initial data.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\theta > 0$, and let h_+ and h_- solve (1.1) with initial data $h_\pm(0, x) = \pm\theta x$. Let X_1 and X_2 denote two independent Tracy–Widom GOE random variables. Then we have the convergence in distribution*

$$\frac{h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0)}{t^{1/3}} \implies \frac{X_1 - X_2}{2} \quad (1.11)$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

The limiting objects obtained in Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 have previously been obtained in [FF94a] and [FGN19], respectively, as limits of certain roughly-analogous quantities related to ASEP; see Section 1.3 for a discussion. There, we also discuss the method of proof and contrast from the methods used for ASEP.

Remark 1.5. One may ask about the joint solutions to the KPZ equation with asymptotic drifts that are not opposite. Indeed, [GRASS23] studies more general measures ν_{θ_1, θ_2} , which are jointly invariant and have marginals of Brownian motions with drift $\theta_1 < \theta_2$. By [GRASS23, Theorem 2.11(ii)], if $(f_-, f_+) \sim \nu_\theta$ with $\theta = \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{2}$, then $(f_1(x) + \frac{\theta_1 + \theta_2}{2}x, f_2(x) + \frac{\theta_1 + \theta_2}{2}x) \sim \nu_{\theta_1, \theta_2}$. Using this

fact and the shear invariance in (2.16), if $(h_-, h_+)(0, x) \sim v_{\theta_1, \theta_2}$, then we have the convergence in distribution

$$\frac{h_+\left(t, \frac{\theta_1 + \theta_2}{2}t\right) - h_-\left(t, \frac{\theta_1 + \theta_2}{2}t\right)}{t^{1/2}} \implies \mathcal{N}(0, \theta_2 - \theta_1).$$

Also, if we start from the initial condition $h_-(0, x) = \theta_1 x$ and $h_+(0, x) = \theta_2 x$, then

$$\frac{h_+\left(t, \frac{\theta_1 + \theta_2}{2}t\right) - h_-\left(t, \frac{\theta_1 + \theta_2}{2}t\right)}{t^{1/3}} \implies \frac{X_1 - X_2}{2}.$$

In this more general setting, the term $\frac{\theta_1 + \theta_2}{2}$ represents the asymptotic velocity of the shock (which is zero if $\theta_1 = -\theta_2$); see also Remark 1.10.

1.1 Long-time behavior of V-shaped solutions

Given that Theorem 1.1 tell us that there are no spacetime-stationary V-shaped solutions, it is natural to ask about the behavior of solutions that are started with V-shaped initial data. The following theorem says that if a solution to the KPZ equation starts with V-shaped initial data with slopes $-\theta$ and θ at $-\infty$ and $+\infty$, then the laws of its recentered versions are tight, and any subsequential limits must be mixtures of $\mu_{-\theta}$ and μ_θ . In the statement, C_{KPZ} is the natural function space for the KPZ equation without recentering; see (2.4) below.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $\theta > 0$ and suppose that h_V is a solution to (1.1) with initial condition $h_V(0, \cdot) \in C_{\text{KPZ}}$ satisfying*

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_V(0, x)}{|x|} = \theta. \quad (1.12)$$

Then the following properties hold:

1. *The family of random variables $(h_V(t, \cdot) - h_V(t, 0))_{t \geq 0}$ is tight with respect to the topology of $C_{\text{KPZ}; 0}$.*
2. *Let $U_T \sim \text{Uniform}([0, T])$ be independent of everything else. If m is a probability measure on $C_{\text{KPZ}; 0}$ and $T_k \uparrow \infty$ is a sequence such that*

$$\text{Law}(h_V(U_{T_k}, \cdot) - h_V(U_{T_k}, 0)) \rightarrow m \quad (1.13)$$

weakly as $k \rightarrow \infty$, then there exists a $\zeta \in [0, 1]$ (possibly depending on the choice of subsequence) such that $m = (1 - \zeta)\mu_{-\theta} + \zeta\mu_\theta$.

Basins of attraction of the invariant measures of the KPZ equation have been a topic of great interest in the literature. Extensive results were obtained in [JRS22], where it was shown that, for $\theta > 0$, if an initial condition satisfies

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{h(0, x)}{x} = \theta \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{h(0, x)}{x} > -\theta,$$

then $x \mapsto h(t, x) - h(t, 0)$ converges in distribution to a two-sided Brownian motion with drift θ . There are similar descriptions of the basin of attraction in cases when $\theta = 0$ and $\theta < 0$. This is analogous to the ergodic theorems of Liggett [Lig75] for ASEP, where descriptions of the basin of attraction are described depending on the asymptotic density of particles to the left and right of the origin. Descriptions of basins of attraction have been obtained for the Burgers equation

with various types of non-integrable forcing in [BCK14; Bak16; BL18; BL19; DGR21], and for the KPZ fixed point in [BSS24]. However, left open in all of these works is the limiting behavior of the increment process when started from an initial condition satisfying (1.3), which is what is considered in Theorem 1.6.

One may ask, in relation to Theorem 1.6, whether a stronger result is possible. That is, does there exist a universal value of ζ for all subsequential limits. Without further assumptions on the rate of convergence to the slopes $\pm\theta$ at $\pm\infty$, one does not expect obtain such a statement. In the setting of ASEP, Liggett [Lig75] demonstrated the existence of initial V-shaped configurations such that the analogues of the extremal measures $\mu_{-\theta}$ and μ_θ are both seen as subsequential limits. In the setting of ASEP, one considers configurations $\eta \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of particles and holes having asymptotic densities λ and ρ to the left and right of the origin, respectively, and the case $\lambda + \rho = 1$ is the analogue of the V-shaped solution. On the other hand, it was conjectured in [Lig75] and proved in [ABL88] that, for $\lambda + \rho = 1$, if μ is a product measure on the space of configurations, and the restrictions of μ to the left and right of the origin are close enough to i.i.d. Bernoulli measures, in the sense that

$$\sum_{x=-\infty}^0 |\mu(\eta : \eta(x) = 1) - \lambda| + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} |\mu(\eta : \eta(x) = 1) - \rho| < \infty,$$

then the process converges in law to the symmetric mixture of the two i.i.d. Bernoulli measures with intensities λ and ρ . This condition can be thought of as an approximate symmetry between the configurations on the left and right, leading to a symmetric mixture. Of course, in the setting of Theorem 1.6, if the initial V-shaped data $h_V(0, \cdot)$ satisfies $h_V(0, \cdot) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} h_V(0, -\cdot)$, then the symmetry must pass to the limit, and $\zeta = 1/2$. In particular, for the two cases considered in this paper, namely $(h_-(0, x), h_+(0, x)) \sim \nu_\theta$ and $(h_-(0, x), h_+(0, x)) = (-\theta x, \theta x)$, we have $\zeta = \frac{1}{2}$ for all subsequential limits. We leave the precise study of the dependence of the possible subsequential limits on the initial data to future work.

We can also study the behavior of V-shaped solutions started at a large negative time and considered at time 0. In this case, we can study almost-sure limiting behavior, rather than behavior in law. For each $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$, it was shown in [JRAS22] that, there is a random process $\bar{\mathbf{f}} = (\bar{f}_-, \bar{f}_+)$ (on the same probability space as the noise) such that, if $\mathbf{h}^T = (h_-^T, h_+^T)$ is a vector of solutions to (1.1) with initial condition $h_\pm^T(-T, \cdot)$ in the basin of attraction for ν_θ , then $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} [\mathbf{h}^T(0, \cdot) - \mathbf{h}^T(0, 0)] = \bar{\mathbf{f}}$ almost surely. (See Proposition 2.11 below for the precise statement we will use.) We can use this theorem to prove the following, which is a partial solution to [JRAS22, Open Problem 6].

Theorem 1.7. *There exists an event of probability one on which the following holds. Let f_V be a continuous function satisfying $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_V(x)}{|x|} = \theta$. Let h_V^T be a solution to (1.1) with initial condition $h_V^T(-T, x) = f_V(x)$. For any sequence $T_k \uparrow \infty$, there exists a (possibly random) subsequence $T_{k_\ell} \uparrow \infty$ and a $\xi \in [0, 1]$ such that*

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} [h^{T_{k_\ell}}(0, \cdot) - h^{T_{k_\ell}}(0, 0)] = \log(\xi e^{\bar{f}_-} + (1 - \xi) e^{\bar{f}_+}) \quad (1.14)$$

in the topology of $C_{\text{KPZ};0}$.

In this theorem, we expect that in general ξ will depend on the choice of subsequence. Indeed, we expect there will be subsequences with $\xi \notin \{0, 1\}$, even though Theorem 1.6 suggests that ξ should be either 0 or 1 for “typical” sequences. This is because, even though we expect the shock location to typically be large, it may oscillate from large negative to large positive, and hence there may be infinite sequences of times for which it is of order 1.

1.2 The reference frame of the shock

While the paper [DR21] does not consider the existence of V-shaped stationary solutions in the smooth-noise setting, it does show that there are invariant measures for V-shaped solutions if they are recentered not just vertically but also horizontally. More precisely, in that paper the following process was considered: for solutions h_+ and h_- to (1.1) with different asymptotic slopes, if we define h_V by (1.4), then there is a process $(b_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that the process

$$x \mapsto (h_-, h_+, h_V)(t, b_t + x) - (h_-, h_+, h_V)(t, b_t).$$

admits an invariant measure. In other words, the *shape* of the V-shaped solution is preserved in time, even if the *location* of the center of the V moves as time advances. The shock location b_t interacts with the local geometry of h_- and h_+ , so the projection of this invariant measure onto the first two coordinates is not the same as ν_θ . The following theorem gives this tilt and the precise statement of the stationarity. It is the spacetime-white-noise analogue of [DR21, Theorem 1.1]. It is also analogous to the result [FKS91, Theorem 2.3] for ASEP. There, the description of the stationary measure is much more complicated; it is constructed as an average of empirical measures seen from a second-class particle.

Theorem 1.8. *We define the measure $\hat{\nu}_\theta$ that is absolutely continuous with respect to ν_θ with Radon–Nikodym derivative*

$$\frac{d\hat{\nu}_\theta}{d\nu_\theta}(f_-, f_+) = \frac{1}{2\theta} \partial_x (f_+ - f_-)(0). \quad (1.15)$$

Let (h_-, h_+, h_V) be a vector of solutions to (1.1) with initial condition $(h_-, h_+)(0, \cdot) \sim \hat{\nu}_\theta$ and $h_V(0, \cdot) = V[(h_-, h_+)(0, \cdot)]$. Then the following statements hold.

1. *There is a random process $(b_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that, for each $t \geq 0$, b_t is the unique $x \in \mathbf{R}$ such that*

$$h_-(t, x) = h_+(t, x). \quad (1.16)$$

2. *For each $t \geq 0$, we have*

$$\text{Law}((h_-, h_+, h_V)(t, b_t + \cdot) - (h_-, h_+, h_V)(t, \cdot)) = \hat{\nu}_\theta.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.8 follows that of [DR21, Theorem 1.1]. The only technical point in this case is that, because $(f_-, f_+) \sim \nu_\theta$ are not differentiable processes, one may ask whether the Radon–Nikodym derivative (1.15) is well-defined. This is in fact not an issue since the difference $f_+ - f_-$ is differentiable almost surely, even though f_- and f_+ are individually not differentiable. This can be seen from the formulas (1.6–1.8): we can write

$$\begin{aligned} (f_+ - f_-)(x) &= B_2(x) - B_1(x) + 2\theta x + \mathcal{S}_\theta(x) - \mathcal{S}_\theta(0) \\ &= B_2(x) - B_1(x) + 2\theta x \\ &\quad + \log \frac{\int_{-\infty}^x \exp\{(B_2(y) - B_2(x)) - (B_1(y) - B_1(x)) + 2\theta(y - x)\} dy}{\int_{-\infty}^0 \exp\{B_2(y) - B_1(y) + 2\theta y\} dy} \\ &= \log \frac{\int_{-\infty}^x \exp\{B_2(y) - B_1(y) + 2\theta y\} dy}{\int_{-\infty}^0 \exp\{B_2(y) - B_1(y) + 2\theta y\} dy}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.17)$$

which is evidently differentiable in x .

The work [DR21] did not address the fluctuations of b_t . In the present setting, by contrast, we are able to do this. In fact, because h_- and h_+ both look linear on large scales, the fluctuations of b_t are closely related to the fluctuations of $h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0)$ discussed in Theorems 1.3 and 1.4. We state the following theorem on the location of the shock for both the stationary and flat initial conditions covered in those two theorems, as well as the shock-reference-frame-stationary initial condition discussed in Theorem 1.8.

Theorem 1.9. *Let $\theta > 0$.*

1. *Let h_+ and h_- solve (1.1) with initial data $(h_-, h_+)(0, x) \sim v_\theta$ independent of the noise. For each $t \geq 0$, there is a unique $b_t \in \mathbf{R}$ such that (1.16) holds, and we have the convergence in distribution*

$$t^{-1/2}b_t \implies \mathcal{N}(0, (2\theta)^{-1}). \quad (1.18)$$

2. *Let h_+ and h_- solve (1.1) with initial data $h_\pm(0, x) = \pm\theta x$. For each $t \geq 0$, there is a unique $b_t \in \mathbf{R}$ such that (1.16) holds, and we have the convergence in distribution*

$$t^{-1/3}b_t \implies \frac{1}{4\theta}(X_1 - X_2), \quad (1.19)$$

where X_1 and X_2 are independent Tracy–Widom GOE random variables.

3. *Let h_+ and h_- solve (1.1) with initial data $(h_-, h_+)(0, x) \sim \hat{v}_\theta$ independent of the noise. For each $t \geq 0$, there is a unique $b_t \in \mathbf{R}$ such that (1.16) holds. We have the convergence in distribution*

$$t^{-1/2}[h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0)] \implies \mathcal{N}(0, 2\theta) \quad (1.20)$$

and

$$t^{-1/2}b_t \implies \mathcal{N}(0, (2\theta)^{-1}). \quad (1.21)$$

Remark 1.10. As in Remark 1.5, the shear invariance of the KPZ equation allows us to immediately derive the asymptotics of the shock when started from initial conditions with non-opposite slopes. For $\theta_1 < \theta_2$, if $(h_-, h_+)(0, x) \sim v_{\theta_1, \theta_2}$ or $\hat{v}_{\theta_1, \theta_2}$ (defined analogously as in Theorem 1.8), we have

$$t^{-1/2}\left(b_t - \frac{\theta_1 + \theta_2}{2}t\right) \implies \mathcal{N}(0, (\theta_2 - \theta_1)^{-1}).$$

For $h_-(0, x) = \theta_1 x$ and $h_+(0, x) = \theta_2 x$, we have

$$t^{-1/3}\left(b_t - \frac{\theta_1 + \theta_2}{2}t\right) \implies \frac{1}{2(\theta_2 - \theta_1)}(X_1 - X_2).$$

From these expressions we see that $(\theta_1 + \theta_2)/2$ is the asymptotic velocity of b_t .

1.3 Comparison with previous work on ASEP

Given a Markov process, it is natural to try to characterize all of its extremal (time-ergodic) invariant measures. This question has been studied in depth in the context of the simple exclusion process first introduced by Spitzer [Spi70]. Early works by Spitzer and Liggett provided proofs that i.i.d. Bernoulli measures are the only extremal stationary measures for the simple exclusion process in the case when the transition rates are symmetric in space [Lig73; Lig74a; Spi74], and in the case when the Markov chain is positive recurrent and reversible [Lig74b]. The symmetries assumed in those settings substantially simplified the problem. Another case that is particularly

relevant to the present work is that of the asymmetric simple exclusion process (ASEP) on \mathbb{Z} , where Liggett showed in [Lig76] that the only extremal stationary measures are the i.i.d. Bernoulli measures and a family of measures that are supported on configurations with only finitely many holes on the line. The ASEP case is particularly relevant because it is known to converge to the KPZ equation under the weak asymmetry scaling [BG97] (see also [Par23]). Under this scaling limit, one centers around a fixed characteristic direction, and the height functions of the i.i.d. Bernoulli measures converge to Brownian motion with drift, while the height functions for the other invariant measures explode.

The methods of proof in the present paper are quite different from those for ASEP. Indeed, the work of [Lig76] makes heavy use of local and discrete arguments. However, there are similarities in the broad approach, in the sense that we use couplings of invariant measures that are jointly invariant for the process. In the particle systems context, the natural joint evolution is known as the basic coupling [Lig74b; Lig75; Spi74]. The proof in [Lig76] heuristically proceeds by showing that, when comparing any two invariant measures κ_1 and κ_2 , they can be coupled together with a sample configuration $(\eta, \zeta) \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ in such a way that $x \mapsto \eta(x) - \zeta(x)$ changes sign at most once. Comparison to the known invariant measures allows the characterization to go through. In a somewhat similar fashion, our Theorem 1.1 relies on (1.10) for the jointly stationary initial condition.

There are also analogies between our Theorem 1.9 (along with the related results in Theorems 1.3 and 1.4) and previous work in ASEP. The shock location b_t is analogous to the location of a second-class particle in ASEP; this connection was first shown at the level of hydrodynamic limits in [Fer92]. Later, Ferrari and Fontes showed in [FF94a] that the trajectory of the second-class particle in a shock-like configuration converges, after a diffusive scaling, to Brownian motion. This is related to our result (1.18). We note that it is not an exact analogue, since our initial shock profile is a transformation of jointly invariant measures with different drifts, so the configurations to the left and right of the origin are not independent. Our proof is also quite different: we use explicit calculations from the description of the jointly invariant measures for the KPZ equation given in [GRASS23], while [FF94a] uses combinatorial calculations that are accessible only in the discrete setting. Many of these combinatorial calculations come from the earlier work [FF94b].

In the case of flat initial data, an analogue of (1.19) was proved in [FGN19]. The analogy is again not perfect, since that work considered a zero-temperature/inviscid setting (TASEP), but in this case the proof techniques are more similar. Those authors started from the distributional equality between the trajectory of the second-class particle in TASEP and the competition interface in exponential last-passage percolation [FP05]. They then used the known convergence of the one-point distribution of TASEP from flat initial condition to the Tracy–Widom GOE distribution proved in [FO18], although with decorrelation results [CFP12; Fer08; FN15] to get independence of the GOE random variables. In our setting, we use convergence of the KPZ equation to the KPZ fixed point [QS23; Vir20] to get the GOE convergence, and then use localization estimates from [DZ24] to obtain the independence. An additional important ingredient is an identity for the weight function of the continuum directed random polymer in the half space in terms of the stochastic heat equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions (Lemma 3.4), which is intuitive but which we could not find in the literature.

1.4 Organization of the paper

In Section 2, we introduce some notation and function spaces, and then summarize results from the literature that are important to our techniques. In Section 3, we consider the fluctuations of $h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0)$, proving Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 as well as (1.20) of Theorem 1.9(3). In Section 4,

we study the behavior of V-shaped solutions, proving Theorems 1.1 and 1.6. Finally, in Section 5, we study the fluctuations of b_t , completing the proof of Theorem 1.9.

1.5 Acknowledgments

E.S. wishes to thank Timo Seppäläinen for several helpful discussions, Márton Balázs for helpful discussions and pointers to the literature, and Ivan Corwin for pointers to the literature, several general discussions, and helpful discussions related to the proof of Lemma 5.4. A.D. would like to thank Yu Gu for encouragement and helpful discussions. The authors also thank Sayan Das for helpful comments on an early version of the manuscript. E.S. is partially supported by the Fernholz Foundation. Part of this work was completed during the workshop “Universality and Integrability in KPZ” at Columbia University, March 15–19, 2024, which was supported by NSF grants DMS-2400990 and DMS-1664650.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we review known results on the solution theory of the KPZ equation on the whole line, and in particular introduce some notation we will use. We use the framework of [AJRAS22], and we will largely follow their notation. In addition, we will introduce some function spaces related to V-shaped solutions adapted from [DR21] (which works in terms of the derivative process and so uses somewhat different, although largely equivalent, notations).

2.1 Notational conventions

1. We write $G(t, x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t}} e^{-x^2/(2t)}$ for the standard heat kernel.
2. For a topological space \mathcal{Z} , we write $C_b(\mathcal{Z})$ for the set of bounded continuous functions on \mathcal{Z} .
3. We denote equality in distribution by $\stackrel{\text{law}}{=}$.
4. For a function $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, we define the spatial translation

$$\tau_x f(y) = f(x + y).$$

We also define the horizontal centering

$$\pi_x f(y) = f(x + y) - f(x). \tag{2.1}$$

5. For a k -tuple of functions $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$, we define $\tau_x \mathbf{f}$ and $\pi_x \mathbf{f}$ to be the coordinatewise applications of τ_x and π_x , respectively.

2.2 Function spaces

Here we define the spaces in which we solve the KPZ equation, following [AJRAS22, (1.4), (1.6), and (1.11)]. We define

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{HE}} := \left\{ \mu \text{ a positive Borel measure on } \mathbf{R} : \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-ax^2} \mu(dx) < \infty \text{ for all } a > 0 \right\}, \tag{2.2}$$

$$C_{\text{HE}} := \left\{ f \in C(\mathbf{R}; (0, \infty)) : \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-ax^2} f(x) dx < \infty \text{ for all } a > 0 \right\}, \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$C_{\text{KPZ}} := \{\log \circ f : f \in C_{\text{HE}}\} = \left\{ f \in C(\mathbf{R}) : \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{f(x)-ax^2} dx < \infty \text{ for all } a > 0 \right\}. \quad (2.4)$$

We use the topology on C_{HE} induced by uniform convergence on compact sets as well as convergence of integrals of the form $\int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-ax^2} f(x) dx$. The topology on C_{KPZ} is such that the map $(\log \circ): C_{\text{HE}} \rightarrow C_{\text{KPZ}}$ is a homeomorphism. It was shown in [AJRAS22] that C_{KPZ} is a Polish space.

As we have noted in the introduction, there are no invariant probability measures for the KPZ dynamics on C_{KPZ} , since the fluctuations of $h(t, 0)$ will grow as $t \rightarrow \infty$. To consider invariant measures, we define the space

$$C_{\text{KPZ};0} := \{f \in C_{\text{KPZ}} : f(0) = 0\}. \quad (2.5)$$

Recalling the definition (2.1), we note that, for each $x \in \mathbf{R}$, the map π_x maps C_{KPZ} to $C_{\text{KPZ};0}$.

We have also noted in the introduction that, in studying V-shaped solutions to the KPZ equation, it is helpful to construct them from pairs of solutions. We now introduce some useful function spaces for considering pairs of solutions and V-shaped solutions to the KPZ equation. For $\theta > 0$, we define

$$\mathcal{Y}(\theta) := \left\{ (f_-, f_+) \in C_{\text{KPZ}}^2 : \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_{\pm}(x)}{x} = \pm\theta \right\} \quad (2.6)$$

and

$$\mathcal{Y}_0(\theta) := \mathcal{Y}(\theta) \cap C_{\text{KPZ};0}^2. \quad (2.7)$$

We further define

$$\mathcal{X}(\theta) := \{(f_-, f_+) \in \mathcal{Y}(\theta) : f_+ - f_- \text{ is strictly increasing}\} \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\mathcal{X}_0(\theta) := \mathcal{X}(\theta) \cap C_{\text{KPZ};0}^2. \quad (2.9)$$

Finally, we define a space of V-shaped functions with asymptotic slopes $\pm\theta$:

$$\mathcal{V}(\theta) := \left\{ f \in C_{\text{KPZ}} : \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{|x|} = \theta \right\}. \quad (2.10)$$

As in (1.4), we define the map $V: \mathcal{Y}(\theta) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(\theta)$ by

$$V[f_-, f_+](x) := \log \frac{e^{f_+(x)} + e^{f_-(x)}}{2}. \quad (2.11)$$

It is straightforward to check that the spaces $\mathcal{Y}(\theta)$, $\mathcal{Y}_0(\theta)$, $\mathcal{X}(\theta)$, and $\mathcal{X}_0(\theta)$ are all Borel-measurable subsets of the space C_{KPZ}^2 , and that $\mathcal{V}(\theta)$ is a Borel-measurable subset of C_{KPZ} . We equip all of these spaces with the subspace topologies induced by the respective inclusions.

2.3 The KPZ dynamics

We let $Z(t, x|s, y)$ denote the fundamental solution to the multiplicative stochastic heat equation (1.2). It satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} d_t Z(t, x|s, y) &= \frac{1}{2} \Delta_x Z(t, x|s, y) dt + Z(t, x|s, y) dW(t, x), & -\infty < s < t < \infty \text{ and } x, y \in \mathbf{R}; \\ Z(t, x|t, y) &= \delta(x - y), & t, x, y \in \mathbf{R}. \end{aligned}$$

This process was constructed (simultaneously for all t, x, s, y on a single event of probability 1) in [AKQ14]; see also [AJRAS22]. We define the (“physical”) solution to (1.1) with initial data $h(s, \cdot) \in C_{\text{KPZ}}$ at time s by

$$h(t, x) = \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} Z(t, x|s, y) e^{h(s, y)} dy, \quad t > s.$$

Then $h(t, \cdot) \in C_{\text{KPZ}}$ for all $t > s$ according to the results of [AJRAS22, §2.1].

For our applications, it will be important that certain projections of the KPZ dynamics are Markov processes whose semigroups satisfy the Feller property.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $g: C_{\text{KPZ}}^N \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^N$ be a linear map such that $g[x \mapsto g[\mathbf{f}]] \equiv g[\mathbf{f}]$ for all $\mathbf{f} \in C_{\text{KPZ}}^N$. (Here, $x \mapsto g[\mathbf{f}]$ denotes the constant function with value $g[\mathbf{f}]$.) Define $\pi: C_{\text{KPZ}}^N \rightarrow C_{\text{KPZ}}^N$ by $\pi[\mathbf{f}](x) = \mathbf{f}(x) - g[\mathbf{f}]$.*

1. *For any vector $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_N)$ of solutions to (1.1), the process $(\pi[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)])_{t \geq 0}$ is a Markov process with state space C_{KPZ}^N .*
2. *For $F \in C_b(C_{\text{KPZ}}^N)$, $t \geq 0$, and $\mathbf{f} \in C_{\text{KPZ}}^N$, let $P_t^\pi F(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbb{E}[F[\pi[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)]]]$, where \mathbf{h} is a vector of solutions to (1.1) with initial condition $\mathbf{h}(0, x) = \mathbf{f}(x)$. Then the Markov semigroup $(P_t^\pi)_{t \geq 0}$ has the Feller property.*

Proof. We fix $s < t$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}(t, x) &= \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} Z(t, x|s, y) \exp(\mathbf{h}(s, y)) dy \\ &= \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} Z(t, x|s, y) \exp(\pi[\mathbf{h}(s, \cdot)](y) + g[\mathbf{h}(s, \cdot)]) dy \\ &= \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} Z(t, x|s, y) \exp(\pi[\mathbf{h}(s, \cdot)](y)) dy + g[\mathbf{h}(s, \cdot)], \end{aligned}$$

where \log and \exp act on vectors componentwise. Therefore, using the assumptions on g , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)](z) &= \pi \left[x \mapsto \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} Z(t, x|s, y) \exp(\pi[\mathbf{h}(s, \cdot)](y)) dy + g[\mathbf{h}(s, \cdot)] \right](z) \\ &= \pi \left[x \mapsto \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} Z(t, x|s, y) \exp(\pi[\mathbf{h}(s, \cdot)](y)) dy \right](z). \end{aligned}$$

From this we see that $\pi[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)]$ depends only on $\pi[\mathbf{h}(s, \cdot)]$ and the noise between s and t , and conclude that $(\pi[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)])_t$ is a Markov process. The fact that $(P_t^\pi)_{t \geq 0}$ has the Feller property is then an immediate consequence of the same statement for $(P_t^{\text{id}})_{t \geq 0}$, which was shown in [AJRAS22, Remark 2.12]. \square

Recall the definition (2.11) of V .

Proposition 2.2. *If h_- and h_+ are solutions to (1.1), and we define $h_V(t, x) := V[(h_-, h_+)(t, \cdot)](x)$, then h_V is also a solution to (1.1).*

Proof. We note that $e^{h_V(t, x)} = \frac{1}{2}(e^{h_-(t, x)} + e^{h_+(t, x)})$, and the conclusion follows from the linearity of the multiplicative stochastic heat equation. \square

The following proposition, which plays a role similar to that of [DR21, Lemma 2.2], shows that the space $\mathcal{X}(\theta)$ is preserved by the KPZ dynamics.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\theta > 0$ and let h_- and h_+ be solutions to (1.1) with initial data $(h_-, h_+)(s, \cdot) \in \mathcal{X}(\theta)$. Then we have $(h_-, h_+)(t, \cdot) \in \mathcal{X}(\theta)$ for all $t > s$.*

Proof. Fix $t > s$. The fact that $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{h_{\pm}(t, x)}{x} = \pm\theta$ is proved as [AJRAS22, Proposition 2.13], so it remains to prove that $(h_+ - h_-)(t, \cdot)$ is strictly increasing. Let $x_1 < x_2$. Define

$$z_{ij}(y_1, y_2) := Z(t, x_i | s, y_1)Z(t, x_j | s, y_2) \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$k(y_1, y_2) := \exp\{h_-(s, y_1) + h_+(s, y_2)\},$$

so we can write

$$\begin{aligned} h_+(t, x_2) - h_-(t, x_2) - (h_+(t, x_1) - h_-(t, x_1)) &= \log \frac{\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} z_{12}(y_1, y_2)k(y_1, y_2) dy_1 dy_2}{\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} z_{21}(y_1, y_2)k(y_1, y_2) dy_1 dy_2} \\ &= \log \frac{\iint_{y_1 < y_2} [z_{12}(y_1, y_2)k(y_1, y_2) + z_{12}(y_2, y_1)k(y_2, y_1)] dy_1 dy_2}{\iint_{y_1 < y_2} [z_{21}(y_1, y_2)k(y_1, y_2) + z_{21}(y_2, y_1)k(y_2, y_1)] dy_1 dy_2} \\ &= \log \frac{\iint_{y_1 < y_2} [z_{12}(y_1, y_2)k(y_1, y_2) + z_{12}(y_2, y_1)k(y_2, y_1)] dy_1 dy_2}{\iint_{y_1 < y_2} [z_{12}(y_2, y_1)k(y_1, y_2) + z_{12}(y_1, y_2)k(y_2, y_1)] dy_1 dy_2}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

where in the last identity we used that

$$z_{21}(w_1, w_2) = z_{12}(w_2, w_1)$$

for any $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ by the definition (2.12). Now we have, whenever $y_1 < y_2$, that

$$z_{12}(y_1, y_2) > z_{12}(y_2, y_1)$$

by [AJRAS22, Theorem 2.17] and

$$k(y_1, y_2) > k(y_2, y_1)$$

by the assumption that $(h_+ - h_-)(s, \cdot)$ is strictly increasing. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &z_{12}(y_1, y_2)k(y_1, y_2) + z_{12}(y_2, y_1)k(y_2, y_1) - [z_{12}(y_2, y_1)k(y_1, y_2) + z_{12}(y_1, y_2)k(y_2, y_1)] \\ &= [z_{12}(y_1, y_2) - z_{12}(y_2, y_1)] \cdot [k(y_1, y_2) - k(y_2, y_1)] > 0 \end{aligned}$$

whenever $y_1 < y_2$, and so the right side of (2.13) is positive, which is what we wanted to show. \square

In the following sections, we will also make frequent use of the scaling relations of the KPZ equation, or equivalently of the stochastic heat equation. We cite a result from [AJRAS22], which gives a full distributional equality for the four-parameter process Z . At the level of the KPZ equation, these have been previously well-known. We only state the invariances we need for our purposes.

Proposition 2.4 ([AJRAS22, Lemma 3.1]). *The process $Z(t, x|s, y)$ satisfies the following scaling invariances as a process in the space $C(\mathbf{R}_\dagger^4; \mathbf{R})$, where $\mathbf{R}_\dagger^4 := \{(t, x, s, y) \in \mathbf{R}^4 : s < t\}$.*

(Shift) For $u, z \in \mathbf{R}$, we have

$$\{Z(t+u, x+z|s+u, y+z)\}_{(t,x,s,y) \in \mathbf{R}_\dagger^4} \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \{Z(t, x|s, y)\}_{(t,x,s,y) \in \mathbf{R}_\dagger^4}. \quad (2.14)$$

(Reflection) We have

$$\{Z(t, x|s, y)\}_{(t,x,s,y) \in \mathbf{R}_\dagger^4} \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \{Z(t, -x|s, -y)\}_{(t,x,s,y) \in \mathbf{R}_\dagger^4} \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \{Z(-s, y| -t, x)\}_{(t,x,s,y) \in \mathbf{R}_\dagger^4}. \quad (2.15)$$

(Shear) For each $r, v \in \mathbf{R}^2$, we have

$$\left\{ e^{v(x-y) + \frac{v^2}{2}(t-s)} Z(t, x + v(t-r)|s, y + v(s-r)) \right\}_{(t,x,s,y) \in \mathbf{R}_\dagger^4} \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \{Z(t, x|s, y)\}_{(t,x,s,y) \in \mathbf{R}_\dagger^4}. \quad (2.16)$$

Remark 2.5. It is a consequence of (2.16) that, if $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$ and h_θ and h_0 each solve (1.1) with $h_\theta(0, x) = h_0(0, x) + \theta x$, then

$$\{h_\theta(t, x - \theta t)\}_{(t,x) \in \mathbf{R}_+ \times \mathbf{R}} \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \left\{ h_0(t, x) + \theta x - \frac{\theta^2}{2} t \right\}_{(t,x) \in \mathbf{R}_+ \times \mathbf{R}}. \quad (2.17)$$

To see this from (2.16), note that

$$\begin{aligned} h_\theta(t, x - \theta t) &= \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} Z(t, x - \theta t|0, y) e^{h_0(0,y) + \theta y} dy \\ &\stackrel{\text{law}}{=} -\frac{\theta^2}{2} t + \theta x + \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} Z(t, x|0, y) e^{h_0(y)} dy = -\frac{\theta^2}{2} t + \theta x + h_0(t, x), \end{aligned}$$

and indeed the distributional equality holds as processes in $(t, x) \in \mathbf{R}_+ \times \mathbf{R}$.

Finally, we will use the following estimate from [JRAS22]:

Lemma 2.6 ([JRAS22, Lemma 6.6]). *The following holds with probability 1. For all $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$, all $-\infty \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \leq \infty$, and all $C < \infty$,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{r, y \in [-C, C]} \left| \frac{1}{t} \log \int_{\lambda_1 t}^{\lambda_2 t} Z(t+r, y|0, x) e^{\theta x} dx - \sup_{\lambda_1 < \lambda < \lambda_2} \left\{ \theta \lambda - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} - \frac{1}{24} \right\} \right| = 0.$$

2.4 Stationarity properties

We now turn our attention to what is known about the ergodic theory of the KPZ equation. First we recall the single- θ stationary solutions.

Definition 2.7. For $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$, we let μ_θ be the law of $x \mapsto B(x) + \theta x$, where B is a standard two-sided Brownian motion with $B(0) = 0$.

It is clear from the definitions and standard properties of Brownian motion that

$$\mu_\theta(C_{\text{KPZ};0}) = 1$$

(recalling the definition (2.5)). The law μ_θ is invariant for the recentered KPZ dynamics, as we state in the following proposition. Recall the definition (2.1) of π_0 .

Proposition 2.8. *If h solves (1.1) with initial condition $h(0, \cdot) \sim \mu_\theta$ independent of the noise, then $\pi_0[h(t, \cdot)] \sim \mu_\theta$ for each $t > 0$ as well.*

Proposition 2.8 was proved for $\theta = 0$ in [BG97, Proposition B.1], and the result for general θ follows from the shear-invariance (2.17). See also [FQ15, Theorem 1.2] and [JRAS22, Theorem 3.26(i)].

Next, we consider jointly stationary solutions to (1.1). These were considered in [GRASS23], and we now review the results proved there that we will need.

Let $\theta > 0$. Consider the mapping $\mathcal{D}: \mathcal{Y}_0(\theta) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_0(\theta)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{D}[f_-, f_+](x) := \left(f_-(x), f_+(x) + \log \frac{\int_{-\infty}^x e^{(f_+(y)-f_+(x))-(f_-(y)-f_-(x))} dy}{\int_{-\infty}^0 e^{f_+(y)-f_-(y)} dy} \right). \quad (2.18)$$

That the function \mathcal{D} in fact takes $\mathcal{Y}_0(\theta)$ to $\mathcal{X}_0(\theta)$ is proved in [GRASS23, Lemmas 2.2–2.3]. The following is a restatement of the definition (1.9) of ν_θ given in the introduction.

Definition 2.9. We denote by ν_θ the law of $\mathcal{D}[B_1(\cdot) - \theta \cdot, B_2(\cdot) + \theta \cdot]$, where B_1, B_2 are independent two-sided Brownian motions with $B_1(0) = B_2(0) = 0$.

Since $(B_1(\cdot) - \theta \cdot, B_2(\cdot) + \theta \cdot)$ is evidently an element of $\mathcal{Y}_0(\theta)$ with probability 1, and \mathcal{D} maps $\mathcal{Y}_0(\theta)$ to $\mathcal{X}_0(\theta)$ as observed above, we have

$$\nu_\theta(\mathcal{X}_0(\theta)) = 1. \quad (2.19)$$

We also note that

$$\mathcal{D}[B_1(\cdot) - \theta \cdot, B_2(\cdot) + \theta \cdot](x) = (B_1(x) - \theta x, B_2(x) + \theta x + \mathcal{S}_\theta(x) - \mathcal{S}_\theta(0)), \quad (2.20)$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_\theta(x) = \log \int_{-\infty}^x \exp\{(B_2(y) - B_2(x)) - (B_1(y) - B_1(x)) + 2\theta(y - x)\} dy. \quad (2.21)$$

We further observe that the process $(\mathcal{S}_\theta(x))_x$ is stationary in space.

We now recall the result of [GRASS23] that ν_θ is an invariant measure for the spatial increments of the KPZ equation.

Proposition 2.10 ([GRASS23, Theorem 1.1]). *Suppose that $\mathbf{h} = (h_-, h_+)$ is a vector of two solutions to (1.1) for $t > s$ with $\mathbf{h}(s, \cdot) \sim \nu_\theta$ (independent of the noise). Then, for each $t > s$, we have $\pi_0[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)] \sim \nu_\theta$ as well.*

Finally, we address the stability/convergence properties of the measures ν_θ . Again, we only state the convergence result that we need.

Proposition 2.11 ([JRAS22; GRASS23]). *For any $\theta > 0$, there is a random process $\bar{\mathbf{f}} = (\bar{f}_-, \bar{f}_+) \sim \nu_\theta$ such that the following holds with probability one. For any $\mathbf{f} = (f_-, f_+) \in \mathcal{Y}(\theta)$, let \mathbf{h}^T be a vector of solutions to (1.1) with initial data $\mathbf{h}^T(-T, \cdot) = \mathbf{f}$. Then we have the convergence*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \pi_0[\mathbf{h}^T(0, \cdot)] = \bar{\mathbf{f}}. \quad (2.22)$$

in the topology of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{KPZ};0}$.

As a consequence of this and the temporal invariance of the KPZ equation, we see that if \mathbf{h} is a vector of solutions to (1.1) with initial data $\mathbf{h}(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{f}$, then $\pi_0[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)]$ converges in distribution to $\bar{\mathbf{f}}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. The existence of an $\bar{\mathbf{f}}$ such that the convergence (2.22) holds uniformly on compact sets is [JRS22, Theorem 3.23]. That the convergence in fact holds in the topology of $C_{\text{KPZ},0}$ (i.e. that all integrals of the form $\int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-ax^2+h_{\pm}^T(0,x)} dx$, with $a > 0$, converge) is then a consequence of the dominated convergence theorem and [JRS22, Lemma 7.6]. Since the Markov process has the Feller property (Proposition 2.1), a Krylov–Bogoliubov argument (see e.g. [DPZ96, Theorem 3.1.1]) shows that the limit \mathbf{f} must be distributed according to a jointly invariant measure for (1.1). Also, its two components must have asymptotic slopes $\pm\theta$ by [JRS22, Theorem 3.1(d)]. But ν_{θ} is the unique such jointly invariant measure by [GRSS23, Theorem 1.1], and so in fact we have $\bar{\mathbf{f}} \sim \nu_{\theta}$. \square

Remark 2.12. In fact, the basin of attraction of the measure ν_{θ} is larger than $\mathcal{Y}(\theta)$; see the discussion after Theorem 1.6 and also [JRS22, Lemma 2.22 and Theorem 3.23].

2.5 The shock reference frame

In this section we prove Theorem 1.8, closely following the proof of [DR21, Theorem 1.1]. We first introduce some notation. For $\mathbf{f} = (f_-, f_+) \in \mathcal{X}(\theta)$, we define

$$\mathbf{b}[\mathbf{f}] := (f_+ - f_-)^{-1}(0). \quad (2.23)$$

Then we can define

$$\pi_{\text{Sh}}[\mathbf{f}](x) = \pi_{\mathbf{b}[\mathbf{f}]}[\mathbf{f}](x) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}[\mathbf{f}] + x) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}[\mathbf{f}]).$$

The map π_{Sh} translates the graph of \mathbf{f} horizontally and vertically so that the intersection point of the graphs of f_- and f_+ is moved to the origin. Recall the definitions (2.1) of π_x and (2.18) of \mathcal{D} . We need a result on how these maps intertwine.

Lemma 2.13. *For each $(f_-, f_+) \in \mathcal{Y}_0(\theta)$ and $x \in \mathbf{R}$, we have*

$$\pi_x[\mathcal{D}[f_-, f_+]] = \mathcal{D}[\pi_x[(f_-, f_+)]].$$

Proof. We write

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi_x[\mathcal{D}[f_-, f_+]](y) \\ &= \left(f_-(x+y) - f_-(x), f_+(x+y) - f_+(x) + \log \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{x+y} e^{(f_+(w)-f_+(x+y))-(f_-(w)-f_-(x+y))} dw}{\int_{-\infty}^x e^{(f_+(w)-f_+(x))-(f_-(w)-f_-(x))} dw} \right) \\ &= \left(f_-(x+y) - f_-(x), f_+(x+y) - f_+(x) + \log \frac{\int_{-\infty}^y e^{(f_+(x+w)-f_+(x+y))-(f_-(x+w)-f_-(x+y))} dw}{\int_{-\infty}^0 e^{(f_+(x+w)-f_+(x))-(f_-(x+w)-f_-(x))} dw} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{D}[\pi_x[f_-, f_+]](y). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Now we can prove the following using ergodicity.

Lemma 2.14. *Let $F \in C_b(C_{\text{KPZ},0}^2)$. Let $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_{\theta}}$ denote expectation under which $\mathbf{f} = (f_-, f_+) \sim \nu_{\theta}$ and let $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\nu}_{\theta}}$ denote expectation under which $\mathbf{f} = (f_-, f_+) \sim \hat{\nu}_{\theta}$. Then we have*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^L \mathbb{E}_{\nu_{\theta}}[F(\pi_{\text{Sh}}[f_-, f_+ - \zeta])] d\zeta = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\nu}_{\theta}}[F(\mathbf{f})]. \quad (2.24)$$

In (2.24), we use the notation $f_0^L := \frac{1}{L} \int_0^L$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{f}_\zeta = (f_-, f_+ - \zeta)$. We have

$$\pi_{\text{Sh}}[\mathbf{f}_\zeta] = \pi_0[\tau_{\mathbf{b}[\mathbf{f}_\zeta]} \mathbf{f}_\zeta] = \pi_0[\tau_{(f_+ - f_-)^{-1}(\zeta)} \mathbf{f}],$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^L F(\pi_{\text{Sh}}[\mathbf{f}_\zeta]) \, d\zeta &= \int_0^L F(\pi_0[\tau_{(f_+ - f_-)^{-1}(\zeta)} \mathbf{f}]) \, d\zeta \\ &= \int_0^{(f_+ - f_-)^{-1}(L)} F(\pi_0[\tau_z \mathbf{f}]) \partial_x(f_+ - f_-)(z) \, dz, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last identity we made the change of variables $\zeta = (f_+ - f_-)(z)$ and used that $f_+(0) = f_-(0)$ since $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{X}_0(\theta)$. Dividing by L , we obtain

$$\int_0^L F(\pi_{\text{Sh}}[\mathbf{f}_\zeta]) \, d\zeta = \frac{(f_+ - f_-)^{-1}(L)}{L} \int_0^{(f_+ - f_-)^{-1}(L)} F(\pi_0[\tau_z \mathbf{f}]) \partial_x(f_+ - f_-)(z) \, dz. \quad (2.25)$$

Now as $L \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(f_+ - f_-)^{-1}(L)}{L} = \frac{1}{2\theta}$$

since $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{X}_0(\theta)$. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{(f_+ - f_-)^{-1}(L)} F(\pi_0[\tau_z \mathbf{f}]) \partial_x(f_+ - f_-)(z) \, dz \\ &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^M F(\pi_0[\tau_z \mathbf{f}]) \partial_x(f_+ - f_-)(z) \, dz \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\nu_\theta}[F(\mathbf{f}) \partial_x(f_+ - f_-)(0)] \end{aligned}$$

ν_θ -a.s. by the ergodic theorem. To be precise, we use the spatial ergodicity of the spatial increments of the process \mathbf{f} , which follows from the spatial ergodicity of Brownian motion, the definition (1.9) of ν_θ , and the shift-covariance proved in Lemma 2.13. Using these limits in (2.25), we see that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \int_0^L F(\pi_{\text{Sh}}[\mathbf{f}_\zeta]) \, d\zeta = \frac{1}{2\theta} \mathbb{E}_{\nu_\theta}[F(\mathbf{f}) \partial_x(f_+ - f_-)(0)] \stackrel{(1.15)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\nu}_\theta}[F(\mathbf{f})], \quad \nu_\theta\text{-a.s.},$$

and then the bounded convergence theorem implies (2.24). \square

Now we can prove Theorem 1.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Let $F \in C_b(C_{\text{KPZ},0}^2)$. Let \mathbb{E} and $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$ denote expectation under which $\mathbf{h}(0, \cdot)$ is distributed according to ν_θ and $\hat{\nu}_\theta$, respectively, in both cases independent of the noise. We seek to prove that, for any $t > 0$, we have

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}[F(\mathbf{h}(0, \cdot))] = \hat{\mathbb{E}}[F(\pi_{\text{Sh}}[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)])].$$

We can compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathbb{E}}[F(\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot))] &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^L \mathbb{E}[F(\pi_{\text{Sh}}[h_-(t, \cdot), h_+(t, \cdot) - \zeta])] d\zeta \\
&= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^L F(\pi_{\text{Sh}}[\pi_0[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)] + (0, h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0) - \zeta)]) d\zeta \right] \\
&= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-(h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0))}^{L - (h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0))} F(\pi_{\text{Sh}}[\pi_0[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)] + (0, -\zeta)]) d\zeta \right] \\
&= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^L \mathbb{E}[F(\pi_{\text{Sh}}[\pi_0[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)] + (0, -\zeta)])] d\zeta \\
&= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^L \mathbb{E}[F(\pi_{\text{Sh}}[\mathbf{h}(0, \cdot) + (0, -\zeta)])] d\zeta \\
&= \hat{\mathbb{E}}[F(\mathbf{h}(0, \cdot))].
\end{aligned}$$

The first identity is by Lemma 2.14 and the fact that the KPZ dynamics is invariant under height shifts, the second is by the fact that $\pi_{\text{Sh}}[\mathbf{f}] = \pi_{\text{Sh}}[\mathbf{f} + (c, c)]$ for any scalar constant $c \in \mathbf{R}$, the third is by a change of variables, the fourth is by the ergodic theorem, the fifth is by Proposition 2.8, and the last is by Lemma 2.14 again. \square

3 Fluctuations of differences of KPZ solutions at the origin

The results of Section 2.4 described the (stationary) fluctuations of $\pi_0[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)] = \mathbf{h}(t, \cdot) - \mathbf{h}(t, 0)$ for \mathbf{h} a vector of solutions to (1.1). Not captured in these results is the behavior of $\mathbf{h}(t, 0)$, as this is exactly what is forgotten by π_0 . In this section, we consider these results both in the setting of stationary initial data and of flat initial data.

3.1 Stationary case (static reference frame)

In this section we prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The proof proceeds in two steps. First, we will show that

$$t^{-1/2}[h_+(t, -\theta t) - h_-(t, \theta t)] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability.} \quad (3.1)$$

Then, we will argue that, as $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$t^{-1/2}[h_+(t, -\theta t) - h_+(t, 0) - (h_-(t, \theta t) - h_-(t, 0))] \implies \mathcal{N}(0, 2\theta). \quad (3.2)$$

Of course, (1.10) follows immediately from these two convergences.

Using the shear invariance (2.17), we know that

$$h_+(t, -\theta t) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} h_0(t, 0) - \frac{\theta^2}{2}t \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} h_-(t, \theta), \quad (3.3)$$

where h_0 solves (1.1) started from a two-sided Brownian motion with zero drift. From this we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[h_+(t, -\theta t) - h_-(t, \theta t)] = 0.$$

Moreover, it was shown in [BQS11, Theorem 1.3] that the variance of $h_0(t, 0)$ is bounded by $Ct^{2/3}$ for a constant $C < \infty$, and thus (3.3) implies that

$$\text{Var}(h_+(t, -\theta t) - h_-(t, \theta t)) \leq Ct^{2/3}$$

for a new constant $C < \infty$. The limit (3.1) then follows from Chebyshev's inequality.

Next, using the joint stationarity established in Proposition 2.10 and recalling (2.20) and (2.21), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & (h_+(t, -\theta t) - h_+(t, 0), h_-(t, \theta t) - h_-(t, 0)) \\ & \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} (B_2(-\theta t) - \theta^2 t + \mathcal{S}_\theta(\theta t) - \mathcal{S}_\theta(0), B_1(\theta t) - \theta^2 t), \end{aligned}$$

and hence that

$$h_+(t, -\theta t) - h_+(t, 0) - (h_-(t, \theta t) - h_-(t, 0)) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} B_2(-\theta t) - B_1(\theta t) + \mathcal{S}_\theta(\theta t) - \mathcal{S}_\theta(0).$$

Since \mathcal{S}_θ is a stationary process, we see that $t^{-1/2}[\mathcal{S}_\theta(\theta t) - \mathcal{S}_\theta(0)]$ converges to 0 in distribution as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Then (3.2) follows from the scaling properties of Brownian motion. \square

3.2 Stationary case (shock reference frame)

In this section, we consider the case of initial data distributed according to $\hat{\nu}_\theta$ and prove (1.20) of Theorem 1.9.

Although the statement of Theorem 1.9(3) is in terms of the tilted measure $\hat{\nu}_\theta$, we will work with the tilt explicitly; see (3.5) below. Therefore, in this section we will consider $(h_-, h_+)(0, \cdot) \sim \nu_\theta$. There are two processes B_1 and B_2 , which, under \mathbb{E} , are standard independent two-sided Brownian motions, such that $(h_+, h_-)(0, \cdot) = (f_-, f_+)$, with (f_-, f_+) as in (1.6–1.7). In particular, we have as in (1.17) that

$$(h_+ - h_-)(0, x) = \log \frac{\int_{-\infty}^x \exp\{B_2(y) - B_1(y) + 2\theta y\} dy}{\int_{-\infty}^0 \exp\{B_2(y) - B_1(y) + 2\theta y\} dy},$$

so

$$\frac{1}{2\theta} \partial_x (h_+ - h_-)(0, 0) = \frac{1}{2\theta} \left(\int_{-\infty}^0 \exp\{B_2(y) - B_1(y) + 2\theta y\} dy \right)^{-1} =: R. \quad (3.4)$$

From the expression (3.4), we see that $2\theta R$ is a Gamma distributed random variable with shape 2θ and rate 1 (see [Duf90], [RY99, p. 452], or [MY05, Theorem 6.2]). To prove (1.20), it suffices to show that, for any $F \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[F \left(t^{-1/2} (h_- - h_+)(t, 0) \right) R \right] = \mathbb{E}[F(Z)], \quad (3.5)$$

where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 2\theta)$. If R and $t^{-1/2}(h_- - h_+)(t, 0)$ were independent, then (3.5) would simply be a consequence of Theorem 1.3. For finite t , the random variables R and $t^{-1/2}(h_+ - h_-)(t, 0)$ are not independent, but the main idea of the argument is to show that they decouple as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Fix $\eta \in (0, \theta \wedge 1)$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. By definition, we have

$$h_\pm(t, 0) = \log \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z(t, 0 | 0, y) e^{h_\pm(0, y)} dy.$$

We make the following definitions:

$$\tilde{h}_-(t, 0) := \log \int_{(-\theta-\eta)t}^{(-\theta+\eta)t} Z(t, 0) | 0, y e^{B_1(y) - B_1(-t^\alpha) + \theta y} dy; \quad (3.6)$$

$$\tilde{h}_+(t, 0) := \log \int_{(\theta-\eta)t}^{(\theta+\eta)t} Z(t, 0 | 0, y) e^{B_2(y) + \theta y} dy; \quad (3.7)$$

$$\tilde{R}_t := \left(\int_{-t^\alpha}^0 e^{B_2(y) - B_1(y) + 2\theta y} dy \right)^{-1}. \quad (3.8)$$

We note that, for sufficiently large t , we have $-t^\alpha > (-\theta + \eta)t$, so by the independence of Brownian increments,

$$(\tilde{h}_-(t, 0), \tilde{h}_+(t, 0)) \text{ is independent of } \tilde{R}_t. \quad (3.9)$$

We will show below that

$$t^{-1/2} [h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0)] - t^{-1/2} [\tilde{h}_+(t, 0) - \tilde{h}_-(t, 0)] \rightarrow 0 \quad (3.10)$$

in probability as $t \rightarrow \infty$. First we show how this implies (3.5).

Proof of (3.5) given (3.10). By (1.20), for $\iota \in \{0, 1\}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[F(t^{-1/2} [h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0)]) R_t^\iota - F(t^{-1/2} [\tilde{h}_+(t, 0) - \tilde{h}_-(t, 0)]) \tilde{R}_t^\iota \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.11)$$

Here we have used the continuity and boundedness of F and the fact that $(\tilde{R}_t)_{t \geq 1}$ is uniformly integrable, which follows from the facts that R_t is positive and decreasing in t and $\mathbb{E}[R_1] < \infty$ (see Lemma A.2). But we have by the independence (3.9) that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[F(t^{-1/2} [\tilde{h}_+(t, 0) - \tilde{h}_-(t, 0)]) \tilde{R}_t \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[F(t^{-1/2} [\tilde{h}_+(t, 0) - \tilde{h}_-(t, 0)]) \right] \mathbb{E}[\tilde{R}_t].$$

Now using (3.11) with $F \equiv 1$ and $\iota = 1$, we get $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{R}_t] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[R] = 1$, and using (3.11) with $\iota = 0$, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[F(t^{-1/2} [\tilde{h}_+(t, 0) - \tilde{h}_-(t, 0)]) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[F(t^{-1/2} [h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0)]) \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

But we also know by Theorem 1.3 that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[F(t^{-1/2} [h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0)]) \right] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[F(Z)] \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 2\theta)$. Combining all of these limits, we conclude that (3.5) holds. \square

Now we prove (3.10).

Proof of (3.10). We recall that

$$\begin{aligned} h_-(0, x) &= B_1(x) - \theta x, \\ h_+(0, x) &= B_2(x) + \theta x + \mathcal{S}_\theta(x) - \mathcal{S}_\theta(0), \\ \mathcal{S}_\theta(x) &= \log \int_{-\infty}^x e^{B_2(y) - B_2(x) - (B_1(y) - B_1(x)) + 2\theta(y-x)} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Using these facts along with the definitions (3.6–3.7), we see that

$$\tilde{h}_-(t, 0) = -B_1(-t^{-\alpha}) + \log \int_{(-\theta-\eta)t}^{(-\theta+\eta)t} Z(t, 0|0, y) e^{h_-(0, y)} dy$$

and

$$\tilde{h}_+(t, 0) = \log \int_{(\theta-\eta)t}^{(\theta+\eta)t} Z(t, 0|0, y) e^{h_+(0, y) - S_\theta(y) + S_\theta(0)} dy.$$

Now since $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$t^{-1/2} B_1(-t^{-\alpha}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty \text{ in probability.} \quad (3.12)$$

We will show that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{(-\theta-\eta)t}^{(-\theta+\eta)t} Z(t, 0|0, y) e^{h_-(0, y)} dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} Z(t, 0|0, y) e^{h_-(0, y)} dy} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{(\theta-\eta)t}^{(\theta+\eta)t} Z(t, 0|0, y) e^{h_+(0, y)} dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} Z(t, 0|0, y) e^{h_+(0, y)} dy} = 1 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (3.13)$$

and that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-1/2} \sup_{y \in [(\theta-\eta)t, (\theta+\eta)t]} |S_\theta(y)| = 0 \quad \text{in probability.} \quad (3.14)$$

Then (3.12) and (3.13) will imply that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-1/2} [h_-(t, 0) - \tilde{h}_-(t, 0)] = 0 \quad \text{in probability,}$$

and (3.13) and (3.14) imply that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-1/2} [h_+(t, 0) - \tilde{h}_+(t, 0)] = 0 \quad \text{in probability,}$$

so once we prove (3.13) and (3.14) then we can conclude (3.10) and complete the proof.

We first turn to the proof of (3.13). We prove the second limit, the first being analogous. Choose $\delta \in (0, \eta)$ small enough that

$$0 < 2\sqrt{(2\theta+1)\delta - \delta^2/2} < \eta. \quad (3.15)$$

Since $h_+(0, \cdot)$ is a Brownian motion with drift θ , there is a random constant $C_\delta \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$(\theta - \delta)x - C_\delta \leq h_+(0, x) \leq (\theta + \delta)x + C_\delta \quad \text{for all } x \geq 0$$

and

$$(\theta + \delta)x - C_\delta \leq h_+(0, x) \leq (\theta - \delta)x + C_\delta \quad \text{for all } x \leq 0.$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Because we chose $\delta \in (0, \eta)$, by Lemma 2.6 and the last two displays, we may choose a random T sufficiently large that for all $t \geq T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z(t, 0|0, y) e^{h_+(0, y)} dy &\geq \exp\left\{\left((\theta - \delta)^2/2 - \frac{1}{24} - \varepsilon\right)t - C_\delta\right\}, \\ \int_{(\theta+\eta)t}^{\infty} Z(t, 0|0, y) e^{h_+(0, y)} dy &\leq \exp\left\{\left((\theta + \delta)(\theta + \eta) - \frac{(\theta + \eta)^2}{2} - \frac{1}{24} + \varepsilon\right)t + C_\delta\right\}, \quad \text{and} \\ \int_{-\infty}^{(\theta-\eta)t} Z(t, 0|0, y) e^{h_+(0, y)} dy &\leq \exp\left\{\left((\theta + \delta)(\theta - \eta) - \frac{(\theta - \eta)^2}{2} - \frac{1}{24} + \varepsilon\right)t + C_\delta\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It can quickly be checked by expanding that the right side on the third line is less than the right side on the second line, which is equal to

$$\exp\left\{\left(\frac{\theta^2}{2} + (\theta + \eta)\delta - \frac{\eta^2}{2} - \frac{1}{24} + \varepsilon\right)t + C_\delta\right\}.$$

Therefore, for $t \geq T$, we have

$$\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [(\theta-\eta)t, (\theta+\eta)t]} Z(t, 0 | 0, y) e^{h_+(0, y)} dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} Z(t, 0 | 0, y) e^{h_+(0, y)} dy} \leq 2 \exp\left\{\left((2\theta + \eta)\delta - \frac{\eta^2}{2} - \frac{\delta^2}{2} + 2\varepsilon\right)t + 2C_\delta\right\}. \quad (3.16)$$

By the assumptions (3.15) and that $\eta < 1$, we have

$$(2\theta + \eta)\delta - \frac{\eta^2}{2} - \frac{\delta^2}{2} + 2\varepsilon < (2\theta + 1)\delta - \frac{\eta^2}{2} - \frac{\delta^2}{2} + 2\varepsilon < 0,$$

as long as ε is chosen sufficiently small. Hence, for such small ε , the right side of (3.16) goes to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This completes the proof of (3.13).

It remains to prove (3.14). We start by writing

$$\mathcal{S}_\theta(x) = B_1(x) - B_2(x) - 2\theta x + \mathcal{Q}_\theta(x),$$

with

$$\mathcal{Q}_\theta(x) := \log \int_{-\infty}^x e^{B_2(y) - B_1(y) + 2\theta y} dy.$$

Now Morrey's inequality gives us, for any $p \in (1, \infty)$, a constant $C_p < \infty$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq y \leq 1} |\mathcal{Q}_\theta(y)|^p \right] \leq C_p \left(\int_0^1 \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{Q}_\theta(y)|^p dy + \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{Q}'_\theta(y)|^p dy \right),$$

and it is easy to calculate that the right side is finite for any $p < \infty$. Since the maximum of Brownian motion on the unit interval also has all moments, we conclude that there is a constant $C < \infty$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq y \leq 1} |\mathcal{S}_\theta(y)|^p \right] < C.$$

Using the spatial stationarity of \mathcal{S}_θ , we therefore have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(t^{-1/2} \sup_{y \in [(\theta-\eta)t, (\theta+\eta)t]} |\mathcal{S}_\theta(y)| \right)^p \right] \leq C t^{-p/2} (2\eta t + 1).$$

Choosing $p > 2$, we conclude (3.14) by Markov's inequality. \square

3.3 Flat case

In this section, we consider the case of flat initial data and prove Theorem 1.4. The proof proceeds through several lemmas. We make use of the following celebrated convergence of the KPZ equation to the KPZ fixed point. To avoid unnecessary technical details, we state the result we will use only for flat initial data, noting that convergence is also known to hold for much more general initial data.

Proposition 3.1 ([MQR21; QS23; Vir20]; see also [Wu23]). *Let h solve (1.1) started from $h(0, \cdot) \equiv 0$. Then, as $T \rightarrow \infty$, the process*

$$\left\{ 2^{1/3} T^{-1/3} \left[h(Tt, 2^{1/3} T^{2/3} x) + \frac{Tt}{24} \right] \right\}_{(t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times \mathbf{R}}$$

converges in law in the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets of $(0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}$ to a continuous-time Markov process, the KPZ fixed point $\{\mathfrak{h}(t, x)\}_{(t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times \mathbf{R}}$ started from zero initial data. The process \mathfrak{h} has continuous sample paths.

The KPZ fixed point \mathfrak{h} was constructed in [MQR21], and the convergence described in Proposition 3.1 was proved independently in [QS23; Vir20]; see e.g. [QS23, Theorem 2.2(3)]. The spatial continuity of the KPZ fixed point was shown in [MQR21, Theorem 4.13]

We now use Proposition 3.1 and shear-invariance to state the following.

Lemma 3.2. *For $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$, suppose that h solves (1.1) with initial data $h(0, x) = \theta x$. Then we have the distributional convergence*

$$\frac{h(t, 0) + \left(\frac{1}{24} - \frac{\theta^2}{2} \right) t}{t^{1/3}} \implies \frac{X}{2}, \quad (3.17)$$

where X is a Tracy–Widom GOE random variable.

Proof. For $\theta = 0$, Proposition 3.1 implies the convergence as $t \rightarrow \infty$ of the rescaled process

$$x \mapsto t^{-1/3} \left[h(t, 2^{1/3} t^{2/3} x) + \frac{t}{24} \right]$$

to the KPZ fixed point at time 1, $x \mapsto 2^{-1/3} \mathfrak{h}(1, x)$, in the sense of uniform convergence on compact sets. By [MQR21, (4.15)], the process $x \mapsto 2^{-1/3} \mathfrak{h}(1, x)$ has the law of $x \mapsto \mathcal{A}_1(2^{2/3} x)$, where \mathcal{A}_1 is the Airy₁ process. And it is known [FS05; Sas05] (see also [WFS17]) that \mathcal{A}_1 is a stationary process whose marginals are distributed according to 1/2 times the Tracy–Widom GOE distribution. This implies the convergence (3.17) in the case $\theta = 0$.

The case $\theta \neq 0$ then follows from the shear-invariance of the KPZ equation and the stationarity of the increments of $x \mapsto h(t, x)$ given the flat initial condition θx . To be precise, the shear invariance stated in (2.17) implies that $h(t, 0)$ has the same distribution as $h_0(t, \theta t) + \frac{\theta^2}{2} t$, where h_0 solves (1.1) started from 0 initial data. Also, the shift invariance of Z stated in (2.14) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} h_0(t, \theta t) &= \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} Z(t, \theta t | 0, y) dy \\ &\stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} Z(t, 0 | 0, y - \theta t) dy = \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} Z(t, 0 | 0, y) dy = h_0(t, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $h(t, 0) - \frac{\theta^2}{2} t \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} h_0(t, 0)$. Using this identity in law, the convergence (3.17) in the general θ case follows from the $\theta = 0$ case. \square

Lemma 3.2 will be the ingredient yielding the Tracy–Widom GOE random variables in claimed in Theorem 1.4. To complete the proof of Theorem 1.4, we also need to know that the Tracy–Widom GOE random variables coming from $h_+(t, 0)$ and $h_-(t, 0)$ are independent. That is the task of the rest of this section.

The idea of the proof of independence is that, due to the shear-invariance (2.17), the contribution of the space-time white noise to $h_+(t, 0)$ mostly comes from the right of the t -axis, while

the contribution to $h_-(t, 0)$ mostly comes from the left of the t -axis (here we represent the time t as the vertical coordinate). The fact that the noises in these regions are independent yields the independence of the limits.

To carry out this argument, we use the continuum directed random polymer constructed in [AKQ14], as well as estimates on the behavior of this polymer proved in [DZ24]. For $t > 0$ and $\theta, x \in \mathbf{R}$, we let $Q_{\theta, t, x}$ denote the random measure of the point-to-line polymer, with mean slope $-\theta$, from $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}$ to (t, x) . If $Y \in C([0, T])$ denotes the random polymer path, this means that, for any $0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n \leq t$ and $y_1, \dots, y_n \in \mathbf{R}$, we have

$$Q_{\theta, t, x}(Y_1 \in dx_1, \dots, Y_n \in dx_n) = \frac{\int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{\theta x_0} \prod_{j=0}^n Z(t_{j+1}, x_{j+1} | t_j, x_j) dx_0}{\int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{\theta y} Z(t, x | 0, y) dy} dx_1 \cdots dx_n, \quad (3.18)$$

where $t_0 = 0$, $t_{n+1} = t$, and $x_{n+1} = x$.

Now define

$$A_{t, \pm} = \{Y \in C([0, t]) : \pm Y(s) > 0 \text{ for all } s \in [0, t]\}.$$

Our first lemma says that if a polymer starts at distance $t^{1/2}$ to the right of the origin and has a positive drift, then it is unlikely to ever cross to the left of the origin. Note that the typical annealed displacement of the polymer is on the order $t^{2/3}$, so the positive drift is really required for this statement to be true. The power $1/2$ is rather arbitrary; the lemma holds with any power strictly greater than $1/3$, but we want the initial displacement to be $o(t^{2/3})$ so that the value of h is close to $h(t, 0)$, as shown in (3.41) below.

Lemma 3.3. *If $\theta > 0$ is fixed, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Q_{\pm\theta, t, \pm t^{1/2}}(A_{t, \pm}) = 1 \quad \text{in probability.} \quad (3.19)$$

Proof. We prove the $+$ case, as the $-$ case is symmetrical. We note that

$$Q_{\theta, t, x}(dY) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \overleftarrow{Q}_t(d(s \mapsto Y(t-s) - x + \theta s)), \quad (3.20)$$

where \overleftarrow{Q}_t is the random measure of a point-to-line continuum directed random polymer from $(0, 0)$ to $\{t\} \times \mathbf{R}$, without drift. If we set $Y(s) = X(t-s) + x + \theta(t-s)$, then we have for any $s \in [0, t]$ and $x \geq 0$ that

$$Y(t-s) \geq 0 \iff X(s) \geq -x - \theta s \iff |X(s)| \leq x + \theta s. \quad (3.21)$$

Now we apply [DZ24, Proposition 3.3-(point-to-line)], with $\varepsilon \leftarrow t^{-1}$ and $t \leftarrow 0$, to obtain, for every $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, constants $C_1, C_2 < \infty$ depending only on δ such that, for all $m \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\overleftarrow{Q}_t\left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} \frac{|X(s)|}{t^{1/6+\delta} s^{1/2-\delta}} \geq m\right) \geq C_1 e^{-m^2/C_1}\right) \leq C_2 e^{-m^3/C_2}, \quad (3.22)$$

where we use X for the continuum directed random polymer under the measure \overleftarrow{Q}_t . By Young's inequality, we have a constant $C_3 < \infty$, depending only on δ and θ , such that

$$m t^{1/6+\delta} s^{1/2-\delta} \leq C_3 (m t^{1/6+\delta})^{2/(1+2\delta)} + \theta s. \quad (3.23)$$

Taking $m = t^{1/12 - \delta/2}/C_3^{1/2 + \delta}$ and $\delta = 1/12$, the right side of (3.23) becomes $t^{1/2} + \theta s$, and then from (3.22) we obtain constants $C_4, C_5 < \infty$, depending only on θ , such that for sufficiently large t , we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\overleftarrow{Q}_t\left(\exists s \in [0, t] \text{ s.t. } |X(s)| \geq t^{1/2} + \theta s\right) \geq C_4 e^{-t^{1/2}/C_4}\right) \leq C_5 e^{-t^{1/8}/C_5}.$$

Using this along with (3.20) and (3.21), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Q_{\theta, t, t^{1/2}}(A_{t,+}) \leq 1 - C_4 e^{-t^{1/2}/C_4}\right) \leq C_5 e^{-t^{1/8}/C_5},$$

which implies (3.19). \square

Lemma 3.4. *If we define*

$$\phi_{\pm}(t, x) = Q_{\pm\theta, t, x}(A_{t,\pm}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z(t, x | 0, y) e^{\pm\theta y} dy, \quad (3.24)$$

then ϕ_{\pm} solves the half-line stochastic heat equation

$$d\phi_{\pm}(t, x) = \frac{1}{2} \Delta \phi_{\pm}(t, x) dt + \phi_{\pm}(t, x) dW(t, x), \quad t, \pm x > 0; \quad (3.25)$$

$$\phi_{\pm}(0, x) = e^{\pm\theta x}, \quad \pm x > 0; \quad (3.26)$$

$$\phi_{\pm}(t, 0) = 0, \quad t > 0. \quad (3.27)$$

Before we prove Lemma 3.4, we state the following corollary, which is clear from Lemma 3.4 and the well-posedness of the stochastic heat equation on the half-line.

Corollary 3.5. *The process $(\phi_+(t, x))_{t, x \geq 0}$ is measurable with respect to the restriction of dW to $[0, \infty)^2$, and the process $(\phi_-(t, x))_{t \geq 0, x \leq 0}$ is measurable with respect to the restriction of dW to $[0, \infty) \times (-\infty, 0]$, and hence these two processes are independent of each other.*

We will prove the + case of Lemma 3.4; the – case is symmetrical. We use an approximation argument. For $\varepsilon > 0$, define

$$A_{t,+}^{(\varepsilon)} := \{Y(s) > 0 \text{ for all } s \in [0, t] \cap \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}\}$$

and

$$\phi_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x) = Q_{\theta, t, x}(A_{t,+}^{(\varepsilon)}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z(t, x | 0, y) e^{\theta y} dy.$$

For $t, x > 0$, we have by (3.18) that

$$\phi_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x) = \int_{(0, \infty)^{J+1}} e^{\theta x_0} \prod_{j=0}^J Z(t_{j+1}, x_{j+1} | t_j, x_j) dx_0 \cdots dx_J, \quad (3.28)$$

where we have defined

$$t_0 = 0, \quad (t_{j+1}, x_{j+1}) = (t, x), \quad \{t_1 \leq \cdots \leq t_J\} = (0, t) \cap \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}.$$

Now, recalling that G is the standard heat kernel, we also define, for $s < t$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | s, y) = \int_{(0, \infty)^J} \prod_{k=0}^K G(s_{k+1} - s_k, x_{k+1} - x_k) dx_1 \cdots dx_K, \quad (3.29)$$

where, here, we use the notation

$$(\mathfrak{s}_0, x_0) = (s, y), \quad (\mathfrak{s}_{K+1}, x_{K+1}) = (t, x), \quad \{\mathfrak{s}_1 \leq \dots \leq \mathfrak{s}_K\} = (s, t) \cap \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}.$$

We also note that

$$\frac{G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | s, y)}{G(t-s, x-y)} = \mathbb{P}_{t, x | s, y}(X_{\mathfrak{s}_k} \geq 0 \text{ for all } k \in \{1, \dots, K\}), \quad (3.30)$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{t, x | s, y}$ is the probability measure under which X is Brownian bridge with unit quadratic variation such that $X_s = y$ and $X_t = x$. We note here that K depends on ε . It follows from (3.30) and the continuity of Brownian bridge that, for each t, s, x, y , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | s, y) &= G(t-s, x-y) \mathbb{P}_{t, x | s, y}(X_r \geq 0 \text{ for all } r \in (s, t)) \\ &= [G(t-s, x-y) - G(t-s, x+y)] \mathbf{1}\{x, y \geq 0\} =: G_+(t, x | s, y). \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

The second identity is the formula for the transition density of Brownian motion killed at the origin, which is obtained by the reflection principle; see e.g. [KS88, (2.8.9)].

It also follows from the definition (3.29) that, if $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $s \leq k\varepsilon \leq t$, and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\int_{(0, \infty)} G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | k\varepsilon, z) G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(k\varepsilon, z | s, y) dz = G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | s, y). \quad (3.32)$$

The following lemma says that the approximation $\phi^{(\varepsilon)}$ solves an approximation of the mild solution formula for (3.25)–(3.27):

Lemma 3.6. *We have*

$$\phi_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | 0, y) e^{\theta y} dy + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | s, y) \phi_+^{(\varepsilon)}(s, y) dW(s, y). \quad (3.33)$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on t . First suppose that $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$. Then we have $J = 0$ and

$$\phi_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x) = \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{\theta x_0} Z(t, x | 0, x_0) dx_0.$$

Also, for all $s \in [0, t]$, we have in this case

$$G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | s, y) = G(t-s, x-y).$$

Thus, in this case, (3.33) is simply the mild solution formula for the stochastic heat equation.

Now suppose that (3.33) for all $t \leq k\varepsilon$. We will use this inductive hypothesis to prove (3.33) for $t \in (k\varepsilon, (k+1)\varepsilon]$. So let $t \in (k\varepsilon, (k+1)\varepsilon]$. Since $G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(s', x | s, y) = G(s'-s, x-y)$ for all $k\varepsilon < s \leq s' \leq (k+1)\varepsilon$, and $\phi^{(\varepsilon)}$ satisfies the stochastic heat equation on $(k\varepsilon, (k+1)\varepsilon]$ with initial condition $\phi^{(\varepsilon)}(k\varepsilon, x) = \phi^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x) \mathbf{1}\{x \geq 0\}$, the mild solution formula for the stochastic heat equation again tells us that

$$\phi_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x) = \int_{(0, \infty)} G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | k\varepsilon, y) \phi_+^{(\varepsilon)}(k\varepsilon, y) dy + \int_{k\varepsilon}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | s, y) \phi_+^{(\varepsilon)}(s, y) dW(s, y).$$

By the inductive hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{(0,\infty)} G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | k\varepsilon, y) \phi_+^{(\varepsilon)}(k\varepsilon, y) dy \\
&= \int_{(0,\infty)} G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | k\varepsilon, y) \int_{\mathbf{R}} G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(k\varepsilon, y | 0, y') e^{\theta y'} dy' dy \\
&\quad + \int_{(0,\infty)} G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | k\varepsilon, y) \left(\int_0^t \int_{\mathbf{R}} G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(k\varepsilon, y | s, y') \phi_+^{(\varepsilon)}(s, y') dW(s, y') \right) dy \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{\theta y} G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | 0, y) dy + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbf{R}} G_+^{(\varepsilon)}(t, x | s, y) \phi_+^{(\varepsilon)}(s, y) dW(s, y),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last identity we used (3.32) on each term. This completes the inductive step and hence the proof. \square

Now we can complete the proof of Lemma 3.4.

Proof of Lemma 3.4. The sequence of sets $(A_{t,+}^{2^{-n}})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is decreasing, and the continuity of Y implies that $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_{t,+}^{2^{-n}} = A_{t,+}$. By the definitions (3.24) and (3.28), this means that the sequence $(\phi_+^{2^{-n}})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is almost-surely decreasing in n and that, for each t, x , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_+^{2^{-n}}(t, x) = \phi_+(t, x) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (3.34)$$

Using (3.30), we have

$$0 \leq G_+^{(2^{-n})}(t, x | 0, y) \leq G(t-s, x-y) \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 0\}, \quad (3.35)$$

and thus, we have by (3.31) and the dominated convergence theorem that that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbf{R}} G_+^{(2^{-n})}(t, x | 0, y) e^{\theta y} dy = \int_{(0,\infty)} G_+(t, x | s, y) e^{\theta y} dy. \quad (3.36)$$

Moreover, we have by the Itô isometry that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbf{R}} \left(G_+^{(2^{-n})}(t, x | s, y) \phi_+^{(2^{-n})}(s, y) - G_+(t, x | s, y) \phi_+(s, y) \right) dW(s, y) \right|^2 \\
&= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbf{R}} \mathbb{E} \left| G_+^{(2^{-n})}(t, x | s, y) \phi_+^{(2^{-n})}(s, y) - G_+(t, x | s, y) \phi_+(s, y) \right|^2 dy ds.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.37)$$

Standard moment estimates for the stochastic heat equation on the line (see e.g. [Kho14]), along with the fact that $\phi_+^{(2^{-n})}(s, y)$ is decreasing in n , show that

$$\mathbb{E} |\phi_+^{(2^{-n})}(s, y)|^4 \vee \mathbb{E} |\phi_+(s, y)|^4 \leq C e^{4\theta y}$$

for some constant $C < \infty$ independent of n . This and (3.35) allow us to use uniform integrability and the dominated convergence theorem with (3.31) and (3.34) in (3.37) to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbf{R}} G_+^{(2^{-n})}(t, x | s, y) \phi_+^{(2^{-n})}(s, y) dW(s, y) \\
&= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbf{R}} [G(t-s, x-y) - G(t-s, x+y)] \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 0\} \phi_+(s, y) dW(s, y)
\end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

in probability. Now using (3.34), (3.36), and (3.38) in (3.33), we see that

$$\phi_+(t, x) = \int_0^\infty G_+(t, x|0, y)e^{\theta y} dy + \int_0^t \int_0^\infty G_+(t, x|s, y)\phi_+(s, y) dW(s, y),$$

and hence that ϕ_+ is a mild solution to (3.25)–(3.27). \square

Now we can complete the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We note that

$$h_-(t, x) = \log \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z(t, x|0, y)e^{-\theta y} dy \quad \text{and} \quad h_+(t, x) = \log \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z(t, x|0, y)e^{\theta y} dy. \quad (3.39)$$

Comparing (3.39) with (3.24) and using Lemma 3.3, we see that

$$|h_-(t, -t^{1/2}) - \log \phi_-(t, -t^{1/2})| + |h_+(t, t^{1/2}) - \log \phi_+(t, t^{1/2})| \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} 0. \quad (3.40)$$

Also, by Proposition 3.1, the rescaled KPZ equation converges to the KPZ fixed point (which has continuous sample paths), in the sense of uniform convergence on compact sets. Using this and noting that $t^{1/2} = o(t^{2/3})$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$t^{-1/3}|h_-(t, 0) - h_-(t, -t^{1/2})| + t^{-1/3}|h_+(t, 0) - h_+(t, t^{1/2})| \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} 0. \quad (3.41)$$

Next, by Lemma 3.2, we know that

$$\frac{h_-(t, 0) + \left(\frac{1}{24} - \frac{\theta^2}{2}\right)t}{t^{1/3}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{h_+(t, 0) + \left(\frac{1}{24} - \frac{\theta^2}{2}\right)t}{t^{1/3}}$$

each converge in distribution, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, to $X/2$, where X is a Tracy–Widom GOE random variable. Combining this observation with (3.40) and (3.41), we see that

$$t^{-1/3} \left[\log \phi_+(t, t^{1/2}) + \left(\frac{1}{24} - \frac{\theta^2}{2}\right)t \right] \quad \text{and} \quad t^{-1/3} \left[\log \phi_-(t, -t^{1/2}) + \left(\frac{1}{24} - \frac{\theta^2}{2}\right)t \right]$$

each converge in distribution to $X/2$. On the other hand, Corollary 3.5 tells us that $\phi_-(t, -t^{1/2})$ and $\phi_+(t, t^{1/2})$ are independent of one another, and so in fact we have

$$\left(t^{-1/3} \left[\log \phi_-(t, -t^{1/2}) + \left(\frac{1}{24} - \frac{\theta^2}{2}\right)t \right], t^{-1/3} \left[\log \phi_+(t, t^{1/2}) + \left(\frac{1}{24} - \frac{\theta^2}{2}\right)t \right] \right) \Longrightarrow \left(\frac{X_1}{2}, \frac{X_2}{2} \right),$$

where X_1 and X_2 are independent Tracy–Widom GOE random variables. Subtracting, and then applying (3.40) and (3.41) again, yields (1.11). \square

4 V-shaped solutions

In this section we complete the proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.6, and 1.7. The idea of the proof is to write a V-shaped solution using the V function from two solutions with asymptotic slopes (Lemma 4.1). The convergence of these asymptotically sloped solutions described in Proposition 2.11 will then let us consider these sloped solutions as stationary.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\theta > 0$. There is a (deterministic) measurable function $A: \mathcal{V}(\theta) \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}(\theta)$ such that, for all $f_V \in \mathcal{V}(\theta)$, we have*

$$V[A[f_V]] = f_V. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. We recall the definition (2.11) that

$$V[f_-, f_+](x) = \log \frac{e^{f_-(x)} + e^{f_+(x)}}{2}.$$

Let $f_V \in \mathcal{V}(\theta)$. The definition of $\mathcal{V}(\theta)$ implies that f_V is continuous, $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f_V(x) > -\infty$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} f_V(x) = +\infty$. Thus, f_V achieves its minimum on a compact set, and so there is a rightmost minimizer x_{\min} of f_V . We observe that

$$\inf_{x \leq x_{\min}} e^{f_V(x) - \theta(x - x_{\min})} > 0$$

since $e^{f_V(x) - \theta(x - x_{\min})} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $x \rightarrow -\infty$. Thus, we can choose $C_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$- \inf_{x \leq x_{\min}} e^{f_V(x) - \theta(x - x_{\min})} < \frac{1}{2} e^{C_1} - e^{f_V(x_{\min})} < 0 \quad (4.2)$$

and $C_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$e^{C_1} + e^{C_2} = 2e^{f_V(x_{\min})}. \quad (4.3)$$

Now for $x \geq x_{\min}$, set

$$f_-(x) := -\theta(x - x_{\min}) + C_1 \quad \text{and} \quad f_+(x) := \log(2e^{f_V(x)} - e^{-\theta(x - x_{\min}) + C_1}), \quad (4.4)$$

and, for $x < x_{\min}$, set

$$f_+(x) := \theta(x - x_{\min}) + C_2 \quad \text{and} \quad f_-(x) := \log(2e^{f_V(x)} - e^{\theta(x - x_{\min}) + C_2}). \quad (4.5)$$

To ensure that these definitions produce real-valued functions, we must check that the terms inside the logs are strictly positive. For $x \geq x_{\min}$, observe that, because $e^{C_1} < 2e^{f_V(x_{\min})}$ by (4.2), we have

$$2e^{f_V(x)} - e^{-\theta(x - x_{\min}) + C_1} \geq 2e^{f_V(x)} - e^{C_1} > 0,$$

and so (4.4) is well-defined. Next, since (4.2) also implies that

$$e^{C_1} > 2e^{f_V(x_{\min})} - \inf_{x \leq x_{\min}} 2e^{f_V(x) - \theta(x - x_{\min})},$$

we have for $x < x_{\min}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} 2e^{f_V(x)} - e^{\theta(x - x_{\min}) + C_2} &\stackrel{(4.3)}{=} 2e^{f_V(x)} - e^{\theta(x - x_{\min})} \left(2e^{f_V(x)} - e^{C_1} \right) \\ &= e^{\theta(x - x_{\min})} \left(2e^{f_V(x) - \theta(x - x_{\min})} - 2e^{f_V(x_{\min})} + e^{C_1} \right) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

and hence (4.5) is well-defined. We further observe that the relation (4.3) implies that f_+ and f_- are continuous at $x = x_{\min}$.

Now we can see directly from the definitions (4.4–4.5), along with the assumption that $f_V \in \mathcal{V}(\theta)$, that $(f_-, f_+) \in \mathcal{Y}(\theta)$, and also that $V[f_-, f_+] = f_V$. Thus we can define $A[f_V] := (f_-, f_+)$, noting that the arbitrary constants C_1 and C_2 can be chosen in a measurable way, and complete the proof. \square

Lemma 4.2. Let $\theta > 0$ and suppose that $(f_-, f_+) \in \mathcal{Y}(\theta)$. Let $f_V = V[f_-, f_+]$.

1. If $f_+(0) \geq f_-(0)$, then for all $x \geq 0$, we have $|f_V(x) - f_V(0) - (f_+(x) - f_+(0))| \leq \log 2$.
2. If $f_+(0) \leq f_-(0)$, then for all $x \leq 0$, we have $|f_V(x) - f_V(0) - (f_-(x) - f_-(0))| \leq \log 2$.
3. In either case, we have for all $x \geq 0$ that

$$\min\{|f_V(x) - f_V(0) - (f_+(0) - f_+(0))|, |f_V(-x) - f_V(0) - (f_-(-x) - f_-(0))|\} \leq \log 2. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. We prove the first assertion; the proof of the second is similar, and the third follows immediately from the first two. So suppose that $f_+(0) \geq f_-(0)$. Then we have, for all $x \geq 0$, that

$$f_V(x) - f_V(0) = \log \frac{e^{f_+(x)} + e^{f_-(x)}}{e^{f_+(0)} + e^{f_-(0)}} \geq \log \frac{e^{f_+(x)}}{2e^{f_+(0)}} = f_+(x) - f_+(0) - \log 2.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_V(x) - f_V(0) &= \log \frac{e^{f_+(x)}(1 + e^{f_-(x) - f_+(x)})}{e^{f_+(0)} + e^{f_-(0)}} \leq f_+(x) - f_+(0) + \log(1 + e^{f_-(x) - f_+(x)}) \\ &\leq f_+(x) - f_+(0) + \log 2, \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete. \square

The following proposition is a more precisely stated version of Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 4.3. There is no probability measure ν_V on $C_{\text{KPZ},0}$ such that $\nu_V(\mathcal{V}(\theta) \cap C_{\text{KPZ},0}) = 1$ and such that, if h_V solves (1.1) with initial data $h_V(0, \cdot) \sim \nu_V$ (independent of the noise), then

$$h_V(t, \cdot) - h_V(t, 0) \sim \nu_V \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there does exist such a measure ν_V . Let h_-, h_+, h_V each solve to (1.1), with initial conditions $h_V \sim \nu_V$ and $\mathbf{h}(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{A}[h_V(0, \cdot)]$. Here, \mathbf{A} is defined as in Lemma 4.1. Define $\mathbf{h} = (h_-, h_+)$. Recalling (4.1), this means that $V[\mathbf{h}(0, \cdot)] = h_V(0, \cdot)$, and hence by Proposition 2.2 we in fact have

$$V[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)](x) = h_V(t, x) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0 \text{ and } x \in \mathbf{R}. \quad (4.7)$$

Let $U_T \sim \text{Uniform}([0, T])$ be independent of everything else. By Proposition 2.11, we have

$$\text{Law}(\pi_0[\mathbf{h}(U_T, \cdot)]) \rightarrow \nu_\theta \quad \text{weakly w.r.t. the topology of } C_{\text{KPZ},0}^2 \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.8)$$

We now show that

$$\text{for all } \varepsilon > 0, \text{ there exists } K < \infty \text{ such that } \sup_{T \in (0, \infty)} \mathbb{P}(h_+(U_T, 0) - h_-(U_T, 0) > K) < \varepsilon. \quad (4.9)$$

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there is some $\varepsilon > 0$ and a sequence $T_k \uparrow \infty$ such that

$$\inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}((h_+ - h_-)(U_{T_k}, 0) > k) \geq \varepsilon. \quad (4.10)$$

Recalling (4.7) and the definition (2.11) of V , we have

$$h_V(t, x) - h_V(t, 0) - (h_+(t, x) - h_+(t, 0)) = \log \frac{e^{-((h_+ - h_-)(t, x) - (h_+ - h_-)(t, 0))} + e^{(h_+ - h_-)(t, 0)}}{1 + e^{(h_+ - h_-)(t, 0)}} \quad (4.11)$$

For any $x \in (-\infty, 0)$, the tightness implied by (4.8) means that there is some $A(x) \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| (h_+ - h_-)(U_{T_k}, x) - (h_+ - h_-)(U_{T_k}, 0) \right| > A(x) \right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}. \quad (4.12)$$

Also, by the convergence Law $(\pi_0[\mathbf{h}(t, \cdot)]) \rightarrow \nu_\theta$ in (4.8) and since the second marginal of ν_θ is a Brownian motion with drift θ , there is an $M_0 < \infty$ such that, if $x < -M_0$, then there is a $C(x) < \infty$ such that

$$\sup_{k \geq C(x)} \mathbb{P} \left(h_+(U_{T_k}, x) - h_+(U_{T_k}, 0) > \frac{1}{2}\theta x \right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}. \quad (4.13)$$

Now combining (4.10), (4.12), and (4.13), we see that for all $x \leq -M_0$ and $k \geq C(x)$, with probability at least $\varepsilon/2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (h_+ - h_-)(U_{T_k}, 0) > k, \quad h_+(U_{T_k}, x) - h_+(U_{T_k}, 0) \leq \frac{1}{2}\theta x, \quad \text{and} \\ \left| (h_+ - h_-)(U_{T_k}, x) - (h_+ - h_-)(U_{T_k}, 0) \right| \leq A(x). \end{aligned}$$

This means that with probability at least $\varepsilon/2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_V(U_{T_k}, x) - h_V(U_{T_k}, 0) &\stackrel{(4.11)}{=} h_+(U_{T_k}, x) - h_+(U_{T_k}, 0) \\ &\quad + \log \frac{e^{-((h_+ - h_-)(U_{T_k}, x) - (h_+ - h_-)(U_{T_k}, 0))} + e^{(h_+ - h_-)(U_{T_k}, 0)}}{1 + e^{(h_+ - h_-)(U_{T_k}, 0)}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\theta x + \log \frac{e^{A(x)} + e^k}{1 + e^k}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality, we have used the fact that the function $y \mapsto \log \frac{e^{A+y}}{1+y}$ is decreasing for positive y as long as $A > 0$. By taking k sufficiently large, we can make this last term as small as we like, so we conclude that, for each $x \leq -M_0$, there is a $C'(x) > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{k \geq C'(x)} \mathbb{P}(h_V(U_{T_k}, x) - h_V(U_{T_k}, 0) \leq 0) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

But by the assumed stationarity of h_V , the law of $h_V(U_{T_k}, x) - h_V(U_{T_k}, 0)$ does not depend on k , so in fact we have

$$\mathbb{P}(h_V(U_{T_k}, x) - h_V(U_{T_k}, 0) \leq 0) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \quad \text{for all } x \leq -M_0.$$

This contradicts the fact that $h_V(0, \cdot) \in \mathcal{V}(\theta)$ a.s., since the latter implies that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} h_V(U_{T_k}, x) = +\infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Therefore, we have shown (4.9). A similar argument works for $h_-(U_T, 0) - h_+(U_T, 0)$, so in fact we have

$$\sup_{T \in (0, \infty)} \mathbb{P}(|h_+(U_T, 0) - h_-(U_T, 0)| > K) < \varepsilon,$$

and hence that the family of random variables $(h_+(U_T, 0) - h_-(U_T, 0))_T$ is tight.

Combined with (4.7) and (4.8), this implies that if we define

$$J_t := \frac{1}{2}(h_+(t, 0) + h_-(t, 0))$$

and

$$\underline{\mathbf{h}}(t, x) = \mathbf{h}(U_T, x) - (J_{U_T}, J_{U_T}),$$

then the family of random variables $(\underline{\mathbf{h}}(U_T, \cdot))_T$ is also tight in the topology of C_{KPZ}^2 . Hence, there is a sequence $T_k \uparrow \infty$ and a measure ψ on C_{KPZ}^2 such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Law}(\underline{\mathbf{h}}(U_{T_k}, \cdot)) = \psi \quad (4.14)$$

weakly. Now the process $(\underline{\mathbf{h}}(t, \cdot))_t$ is a Markov process with the Feller property by Proposition 2.1. Specifically, we apply the proposition with the linear operator $g : C_{\text{KPZ}}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^2$ defined by $g[f_1, f_2] = \left(\frac{1}{2}(f_2(0) - f_1(0)), \frac{1}{2}(f_2(0) - f_1(0))\right)$. Thus we can apply the Krylov–Bogoliubov theorem (see e.g. [DPZ96, Theorem 3.1.1]) to conclude that, if $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = (\tilde{h}_-, \tilde{h}_+)$ is a vector of solutions to (1.1) with initial data $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}(0, \cdot) \sim \psi$, and we define

$$\tilde{J}_t := \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{h}_+(t, 0) + \tilde{h}_-(t, 0))$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{h}}(t, x) := \tilde{\mathbf{h}}(U_T, x) - (\tilde{J}_{U_T}, \tilde{J}_{U_T}),$$

then $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}(t, \cdot) \sim \psi$ for each $t \geq 0$. In particular, $(\tilde{h}_+(t, 0) - \tilde{h}_-(t, 0))$ is a tight family of random variables. But (4.8) and (4.14) imply that $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}(0, \cdot) - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}(0, 0) \sim \nu_\theta$, and then Theorem 1.3 implies that the family of random variables $(\tilde{h}_+(t, 0) - \tilde{h}_-(t, 0))_t$ is not tight, which is a contradiction. \square

Using the tools developed in this section, we can also prove Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let h_- and h_+ be solutions to (1.1) with initial condition $(h_-, h_+)(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{A}[h_V(0, \cdot)]$, with \mathbf{A} defined as in Lemma 4.1. By (4.1) and Proposition 2.2 as in the proof of Proposition 4.3, we see that $h_V(t, \cdot) = V[(h_-, h_+)(t, \cdot)]$ for all $t \geq 0$. We see that $(\pi_0[(h_-, h_+)(t, \cdot)])_{t \geq 0}$ is a tight family of random variables in C_{KPZ}^2 by Proposition 2.11. Now we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0[h_V(t, \cdot)](x) &= h_V(t, x) - h_V(t, 0) \stackrel{(2.11)}{=} \log \frac{e^{h_-(t,x)} + e^{h_+(t,x)}}{e^{h_-(t,0)} + e^{h_+(t,0)}} \\ &= \log \frac{e^{h_-(t,x) - h_-(t,0)} + e^{h_+(t,x) - h_+(t,0) + h_+(t,0) - h_-(t,0)}}{1 + e^{h_+(t,0) - h_-(t,0)}}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that, if we define the map $\tilde{V} : [0, 1] \times C_{\text{KPZ}}^2 \rightarrow C_{\text{KPZ}}$ by

$$\tilde{V}[\xi, f_-, f_+] := \log(\xi e^{f_-} + (1 - \xi)e^{f_+}) \quad (4.15)$$

(which generalizes the map V since $V = \tilde{V}[1/2, \cdot, \cdot]$), then

$$\pi_0[h_V(t, \cdot)] = \tilde{V}[(1 + e^{h_+(t,0) - h_-(t,0)})^{-1}, \pi_0[(h_-, h_+)(t, \cdot)]]. \quad (4.16)$$

Now the map \tilde{V} is continuous, so since $(\pi_0[(h_-, h_+)(t, \cdot)])_t$ is tight and $[0, 1]$ is compact, we can conclude that $(\pi_0[h_V(t, \cdot)])_t$ is tight as well, and thus complete the proof of part 1.

Now we proceed to part 2. Let $U_T \sim \text{Uniform}([0, T])$ be independent of everything else. A Krylov–Bogoliubov argument shows that any subsequential limit m of $\pi_0[h_V(U_T, \cdot)]$ is an invariant measure for the spatial increments of the KPZ equation. The ergodic decomposition theorem and the characterization of the extremal invariant measures given in Corollary 1.2 mean that there is some probability measure η on \mathbf{R} such that $m = \int \mu_\rho d\eta(\rho)$. We claim that η is a linear combination of the point masses $\delta_{-\theta}$ and δ_θ . Suppose not, so there is a probability measure η' and a $\kappa > 0$ such that $\{\pm\theta\} \cap \text{supp } \eta' = \emptyset$ and

$$\eta - \kappa\eta' \text{ is a (nonnegative) measure.} \quad (4.17)$$

This implies that there is an $\varepsilon \in (0, \kappa)$ and an $M < \infty$ such that, if $|x| > M$, $(f_-, f_+) \sim \nu_\theta$, and $g \sim m$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{g(x)}{x} + \theta\right| \wedge \left|\frac{g(x)}{x} - \theta\right| > \varepsilon\right) > \frac{\kappa}{2} \quad (4.18)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{f_+(x)}{x} - \theta\right| \vee \left|\frac{f_-(x)}{x} + \theta\right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{8}\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{8}. \quad (4.19)$$

Fix

$$x = \frac{4 \log 2}{\varepsilon}, \quad (4.20)$$

assuming that ε is sufficiently small to guarantee $|x| > M$. Now (1.13) and (4.18) imply that, if k is chosen sufficiently large, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{h_V(U_{T_k}, x) - h_V(U_{T_k}, 0)}{x} - \theta\right| \wedge \left|\frac{h_V(U_{T_k}, -x) - h_V(U_{T_k}, 0)}{-x} + \theta\right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) > \frac{\kappa}{2}. \quad (4.21)$$

On the other hand, we have by Proposition 2.11 and (4.19) that, if k is sufficiently large, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{h_+(U_{T_k}, x) - h_+(U_{T_k}, 0)}{x} - \theta\right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{4} < \frac{\kappa}{4} \quad (4.22)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{h_-(U_{T_k}, -x) - h_-(U_{T_k}, 0)}{-x} + \theta\right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{4} < \frac{\kappa}{4} \quad (4.23)$$

(with the latter inequalities because we assumed that $\varepsilon < \kappa$). Now, continuing from (4.21), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\kappa}{2} &< \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{h_V(U_{T_k}, x) - h_V(U_{T_k}, 0)}{x} - \theta\right| \wedge \left|\frac{h_V(U_{T_k}, -x) - h_V(U_{T_k}, 0)}{-x} + \theta\right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(h_+(U_{T_k}, 0) \geq h_-(U_{T_k}, 0) \text{ and } \left|\frac{h_V(U_{T_k}, x) - h_V(U_{T_k}, 0)}{x} - \theta\right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(h_+(U_{T_k}, 0) \leq h_-(U_{T_k}, 0) \text{ and } \left|\frac{h_V(U_{T_k}, -x) - h_V(U_{T_k}, 0)}{-x} + \theta\right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

If $h_+(U_{T_k}, 0) \geq h_-(U_{T_k}, 0)$ and $\left|\frac{h_V(U_{T_k}, x) - h_V(U_{T_k}, 0)}{x} - \theta\right| > \varepsilon/2$, then by Lemma 4.2(1), we have

$$\left|\frac{h_+(U_{T_k}, x) - h_+(U_{T_k}, 0)}{x} - \theta\right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \frac{\log 2}{x} \stackrel{(4.20)}{=} \frac{\varepsilon}{4},$$

and similarly if $h_+(U_{T_k}, 0) \leq h_-(U_{T_k}, 0)$ and $\left|\frac{h_V(U_{T_k}, -x) - h_V(U_{T_k}, 0)}{-x} + \theta\right| > \varepsilon/2$, then by Lemma 4.2(1), we have

$$\left|\frac{h_-(U_{T_k}, -x) - h_+(U_{T_k}, 0)}{-x} + \theta\right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

Using these observations in (4.24), we obtain

$$\frac{\kappa}{2} < \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{h_+(U_{T_k}, x) - h_+(U_{T_k}, 0)}{x} - \theta\right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{h_-(U_{T_k}, -x) - h_+(U_{T_k}, 0)}{-x} + \theta\right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) < \frac{\kappa}{2},$$

with the last inequality by (4.22) and (4.23). But this is a contradiction, and so the proof is complete. \square

Finally, we prove Theorem 1.7 in a similar way.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Let $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{A}[f_V]$ and let $\mathbf{h}^T = (h_-^T, h_+^T)$ solve (1.1) with initial condition $\mathbf{h}^T(-T, \cdot) = \mathbf{f}$. By (4.1) and Proposition 2.2, this means that $h_V^T(0, \cdot) = V[\mathbf{h}^T(0, \cdot)]$. Defining \tilde{V} as in (4.15), we have in the same way as (4.16) that $\pi_0[h_V^T(0, \cdot)] = \tilde{V}[(1 + e^{h_+^T(0,0) - h_-^T(0,0)})^{-1}, \pi_0[\mathbf{h}^T(0, \cdot)]]$. By Proposition 2.11, we have $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \pi_0[\mathbf{h}^T(0, \cdot)] = \bar{\mathbf{f}}$ almost surely. Now for any sequence $T_k \uparrow \infty$, we can find a subsequence $T_{k_\ell} \uparrow \infty$ such that $\xi := \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} (1 + e^{h_+^T(0,0) - h_-^T(0,0)})^{-1}$ exists, and then (1.14) follows from the continuity of \tilde{V} . \square

5 Fluctuations of the shock location

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.9, we need to relate the statistics of b_t to the statistics $h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0)$ that have been studied in Section 3. The fact that $h_+(t, 0) - h_-(t, 0)$ is asymptotically linear with slope 2θ means that these quantities should be approximately related.

5.1 Using the asymptotic slope

The following lemma will help us make this intuition precise. In the application, we will take $\mathcal{J}(t, x) = h_+(t, x) - h_-(t, x)$.

Lemma 5.1. *Fix $\theta > 0$. Let $\{\mathcal{J}(t, x) : t \geq 0, x \in \mathbf{R}\}$ be a real-valued stochastic process such that the following hold.*

1. *For each fixed $t \geq 0$, with probability 1, $x \mapsto \mathcal{J}(t, x)$ is continuous and strictly increasing.*
2. *For each fixed $t \geq 0$, $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{J}(t, x)}{x} = 2\theta$. In particular, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} \mathcal{J}(t, x) = \pm\infty$, which together with Assumption 1 means that $x \mapsto \mathcal{J}(t, x)$ is a bijection $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$.*
3. *For some exponent $\alpha > 0$, $t^{-\alpha} \mathcal{J}(t, 0)$ converges in distribution to an almost-surely finite random variable Y .*
4. *Given the exponent α from Assumption 3, for each $t \geq 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 2\theta)$, the random variable $t^{-\alpha} M_{t, \varepsilon, \theta}$ converges to 0 in probability, where*

$$M_{t, \varepsilon, \theta} := \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}} [|\mathcal{J}(t, x) - \mathcal{J}(t, 0) - 2\theta x| - \varepsilon|x|]. \quad (5.1)$$

Note that $M_{t, \varepsilon, \theta}$ is almost-surely finite by Assumption 2.

Now let b_t be the unique $x \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $\mathcal{J}(t, x) = 0$. Then, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $t^{-\alpha} b_t$ converges in distribution to $-\frac{Y}{2\theta}$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 2\theta)$. By the definition of $M_{t, \varepsilon, \theta}$, we have

$$-M_{t, \varepsilon, \theta} + (2\theta - \varepsilon)x \leq \mathcal{J}(t, x) - \mathcal{J}(t, 0) \leq M_{t, \varepsilon, \theta} + (2\theta + \varepsilon)x, \quad x \geq 0; \quad (5.2)$$

$$-M_{t, \varepsilon, \theta} + (2\theta + \varepsilon)x \leq \mathcal{J}(t, x) - \mathcal{J}(t, 0) \leq M_{t, \varepsilon, \theta} + (2\theta - \varepsilon)x, \quad x \leq 0. \quad (5.3)$$

We consider two cases. If $\mathcal{J}(t, 0) < 0$, then since $x \mapsto \mathcal{J}(t, x)$ is strictly increasing, we have $b_t > 0$. By (5.2), this means that

$$-M_{t, \varepsilon, \theta} + (2\theta - \varepsilon)b_t \leq -\mathcal{J}(t, 0) \leq M_{t, \varepsilon, \theta} + (2\theta + \varepsilon)b_t,$$

and so

$$\frac{-M_{t,\varepsilon,\theta} - \mathcal{J}(t, 0)}{2\theta + \varepsilon} \leq b_t \leq \frac{M_{t,\varepsilon,\theta} - \mathcal{J}(t, 0)}{2\theta - \varepsilon}.$$

Similarly, if $\mathcal{J}(t, 0) > 0$, then we have

$$\frac{-M_{t,\varepsilon,\theta} - \mathcal{J}(t, 0)}{2\theta - \varepsilon} \leq b_t \leq \frac{M_{t,\varepsilon,\theta} - \mathcal{J}(t, 0)}{2\theta + \varepsilon}.$$

Thus, in either case, we have

$$\frac{-M_{t,\varepsilon,\theta}}{2\theta + \varepsilon} + \min\left\{\frac{-\mathcal{J}(t, 0)}{2\theta - \varepsilon}, \frac{-\mathcal{J}(t, 0)}{2\theta + \varepsilon}\right\} \leq b_t \leq \frac{M_{t,\varepsilon,\theta}}{2\theta - \varepsilon} + \max\left\{\frac{-\mathcal{J}(t, 0)}{2\theta - \varepsilon}, \frac{-\mathcal{J}(t, 0)}{2\theta + \varepsilon}\right\}. \quad (5.4)$$

Now Assumption 4 states that $t^{-\alpha}M_{t,\varepsilon,\theta}$ converges to 0 in probability for each fixed ε , and Assumption 3 states that $t^{-\alpha}\mathcal{J}(t, 0)$ converges in distribution to Y . Using these assumptions in (5.4), we see that the family of random variables $(t^{-\alpha}b_t)_{t \geq 1}$ is tight, and for each $\varepsilon > 0$, any subsequential limit \bar{Y} must be stochastically bounded above and below by $\min\left\{\frac{-Y}{2\theta - \varepsilon}, \frac{-Y}{2\theta + \varepsilon}\right\}$ and $\max\left\{\frac{-Y}{2\theta - \varepsilon}, \frac{-Y}{2\theta + \varepsilon}\right\}$, respectively. Letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, we obtain the claimed convergence in distribution. \square

We now use Lemma 5.1 to prove part 1, and complete the proof of part 3, of Theorem 1.9.

Proof of (1.18) and (1.21). We apply Lemma 5.1 with $\mathcal{J}(t, x) = h_+(t, x) - h_-(t, x)$. We simply need to check the assumptions. Assumptions 1 and 2 are verified in each case by (2.19) (which holds for $\hat{\nu}_\theta$ as well by absolute continuity) and Proposition 2.3. Assumption 3 is proved in the two cases by Theorems 1.3 and 1.4, with $\alpha = 1/2$ and $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 2\theta)$ in both cases.

We now verify Assumption 4. In the ν_θ case, the joint stationarity in Proposition 2.10 shows that the law of $M_{t,\varepsilon,\theta}$ does not depend on t , and hence

$$t^{-1/2}M_{t,\varepsilon,\theta} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.5)$$

For the $\hat{\nu}_\theta$ case, we use the ν_θ case and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. Let \mathbb{E} and $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$ denote expectation under which $\mathbf{h}(0, \cdot)$ is distributed according to ν_θ and $\hat{\nu}_\theta$, respectively, independent from the noise. Define the Radon–Nikodym derivative R as in (3.4). Then we have, for any $\delta > 0$, that

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}[1\{M_{t,\varepsilon,\theta} > \delta t^{1/2}\}] = \mathbb{E}[1\{M_{t,\varepsilon,\theta} > \delta t^{1/2}\}R] \leq \left(\mathbb{E}[1\{M_{t,\varepsilon,\theta} > \delta t^{1/2}\}]\right)^{1/2} (\mathbb{E}[R^2])^{1/2},$$

and the right side goes to zero by (5.5) and since R is a multiple of a Gamma-distributed random variable (as noted after (3.4)) and hence has finite second moment. \square

5.2 Flat initial data

The proof of Theorem 1.9(2) is more technical than Theorem 1.9(1), since understanding the dependence of the law of $M_{t,\varepsilon,\theta}$ on t is much less trivial. We make the definition

$$\mathcal{H}_t(x|y) = \frac{\log Z(t, t^{2/3}x|0, t^{2/3}y) + \frac{t}{24}}{t^{1/3}}$$

and set $\mathcal{H}_t(x) = \mathcal{H}_t(x|0)$. We also define $H_t(x|y) = \mathcal{H}_t(x|y) + \frac{(x-y)^2}{2}$ and $H_t(x) = H_t(x|0) = \mathcal{H}_t(x) + \frac{x^2}{2}$. We first recall a tail bound on the one-point statistics of $\mathcal{H}_t(x|y)$.

Lemma 5.2. *There exist constants $C < \infty$ and $c > 0$ such that, for all $y \in \mathbf{R}$, $t \geq 1$, $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$, and $m \geq 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(|H_t(x|y)| > m) \leq Ce^{-cm^{3/2}}. \quad (5.6)$$

Proof. By [CG20a, Theorem 1.11] and [CG20b, Theorem 1.1], we have constants $C < \infty$ and $c > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{H}_t(0)| > m) \leq Ce^{-cm^{3/2}} \quad (5.7)$$

for all $m \geq 0$. (In fact, the lower tail of $\mathcal{H}_t(0)$ is steeper, but we do not need this.) Using the translation invariance (2.14) and shear invariance (2.16) of Z , we see that

$$\mathcal{H}_t(0) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \mathcal{H}_t(x|y) + \frac{(x-y)^2}{2} = H_t(x|y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbf{R},$$

and hence (5.7) becomes (5.6). \square

Now we quote a result on the increments of $H_t(x)$.

Lemma 5.3 ([CGH21]). *There exist constants $c > 0$ and $C < \infty$ such that, for all $y \in \mathbf{R}$, $t \geq 1$, $m \geq 0$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in [y, y+\varepsilon]} |H_t(x) - H_t(y)| \geq \varepsilon^{1/2} m\right) \leq Ce^{-cm^{3/2}}.$$

The preceding two lemmas combined with a chaining argument will let us establish the following lemma on the maximum of the KPZ solution on a compact domain.

Lemma 5.4. *Let h solve the KPZ equation (1.1) with $h(0, \cdot) \equiv 0$. Then, for each compact set $K \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, there exist constants $C < \infty$ and $c > 0$ such that for all $t > 1$ and $m \geq 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in K} \left| \frac{h(t, t^{2/3}x) + \frac{t}{24}}{t^{1/3}} \right| \geq m\right) \leq Ce^{-cm^{3/4}}. \quad (5.8)$$

Proof. The proof proceeds in several steps.

Step 1. By definition, we have $h(t, t^{2/3}x) = \int_{\mathbf{R}} Z(t, t^{2/3}x|0, y) dy$, so after a change of variables, we get

$$\frac{h(t, t^{2/3}x) + \frac{t}{24}}{t^{1/3}} = t^{-1/3} \log t^{2/3} + t^{-1/3} \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{t^{1/3} \mathcal{H}_t(x|y)} dy. \quad (5.9)$$

The first term on the right side goes to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$, so it suffices to obtain tail bounds on the random variable $t^{-1/3} \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{t^{1/3} \mathcal{H}_t(x|y)} dy$.

Step 2. We claim that it suffices to show that there exist constants $C < \infty$ and $c > 0$ such that, for $t \geq 1$ and $m \geq 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in K, y \in \mathbf{R}} \frac{|H_t(x|y)|}{[\log(|y| + 2)]^{2/3}} \geq m\right) \leq Ce^{-cm^{3/2}}. \quad (5.10)$$

First, we assume (5.10) and show how it implies (5.8). Then we will prove (5.10) in Step 3 below. Assume that for some $s \geq 0$, the event in (5.10) fails, i.e. for some $m \geq 0$, we have

$$\sup_{x \in K, y \in \mathbf{R}} \frac{|H_t(x|y)|}{[\log(|y| + 2)]^{2/3}} \leq m. \quad (5.11)$$

We will show, given (5.11), there exist constants $C_1, C_2 < \infty$, independent of m , such that

$$\sup_{x \in K} \left| t^{-1/3} \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{t^{1/3} \mathcal{H}_t(x|y)} dy \right| \leq C_1 m^2 + C_2, \quad (5.12)$$

which will imply (5.8) by (5.9). Thus we now prove (5.12) assuming (5.11). We first note that there is a constant $A > 0$ such that for all $x \in K$ and $y \in \mathbf{R}$, we have

$$[\log(|y| + 2)]^{2/3} \leq |x - y| + A.$$

Then, since we are assuming that (5.11) holds, we see that

$$|H_t(x|y)| \leq m(|x - y| + A) \quad \text{for all } x \in K, y \in \mathbf{R}.$$

Then, for $x \in K$, we obtain the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} t^{-1/3} \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{t^{1/3} \mathcal{H}_t(x|y)} dy &\leq mA + t^{-1/3} \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} \exp \left\{ -t^{1/3} \left(\frac{(x-y)^2}{2} - m|x-y| \right) \right\} dy \\ &= mA + t^{-1/3} \log \left(2 \int_0^\infty \exp \left\{ -t^{1/3} \left(\frac{y^2}{2} - my \right) \right\} dy \right) \\ &\leq mA + \frac{m^2}{2} + t^{-1/3} \log \left(2 \int_{\mathbf{R}} \exp \left\{ -t^{1/3} y^2 / 2 \right\} dy \right), \end{aligned}$$

and the last term on the right side is independent of m and goes to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, for $x \in [0, 1]$ and $m > t^{-1/6}$, we have the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} t^{-1/3} \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{t^{1/3} \mathcal{H}_t(x|y)} dy &\geq -mA + t^{-1/3} \log \int_{\mathbf{R}} \exp \left\{ -t^{1/3} \left(\frac{(x-y)^2}{2} + m|x-y| \right) \right\} dy \\ &= -mA + t^{-1/3} \log \left(2 \int_0^\infty \exp \left\{ -t^{1/3} \left(\frac{y^2}{2} + my \right) \right\} dy \right) \\ &= -mA + \frac{m^2}{2} + t^{-1/3} \log(2t^{-1/6}) + t^{-1/3} \log \int_{mt^{1/6}}^\infty e^{-y^2/2} dy \\ &\geq -mA + t^{-1/3} \log \left(\frac{m^2 t^{1/3} - 1}{m^3 t^{1/2}} \right) - 1 \\ &\geq -mA - \frac{m^3 t^{1/6}}{m^2 t^{1/3} - 1} - 1, \end{aligned}$$

and this is greater than $-C_1 m^2 - C_2$ for constants $C_1, C_2 < \infty$, which completes the proof of (5.12). In the penultimate step, we used the standard Gaussian tail bound (see e.g. [Dur19, Theorem 1.2.6])

$$\int_z^\infty e^{-y^2/2} dy \geq (z^{-1} - z^{-3}) e^{-z^2/2},$$

and in the last step, we used the bound $\log z \geq -z^{-1}$.

Step 3. Now we prove (5.10). First, let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, and assume that

$$|y_1 - y_2| \vee |x_1 - x_2| \leq \varepsilon. \quad (5.13)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(|H_t(x_2|y_2) - H_t(x_1|y_1)| \geq m\varepsilon^{1/2}\right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}\left(|H_t(x_2|y_2) - H_t(x_1|y_2)| \geq \frac{m\varepsilon^{1/2}}{2}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(|H_t(x_1|y_2) - H_t(x_1|y_1)| \geq \frac{m\varepsilon^{1/2}}{2}\right) \\
& = \mathbb{P}\left(|H_t(x_2 - y_2) - H_t(x_1 - y_2)| \geq \frac{m\varepsilon^{1/2}}{2}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(|H_t(x_1 - y_2) - H_t(x_1 - y_1)| \geq \frac{m\varepsilon^{1/2}}{2}\right) \\
& \leq Ce^{-cm^{3/2}}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

for constants $C < \infty$ and $c > 0$. In the first inequality we used a union bound, in the identity we used translation-invariance, and in the last inequality we used Lemma 5.3 twice.

Now partition the rectangle $K \times [-b, b]$ into $N(b)$ squares of side length 1, enumerated as $S_1, \dots, S_{N(b)}$, and let (x_i, y_i) be the center point of S_i . We note that $N(b) = O(b)$. For each i , the bound (5.14) implies that the assumptions of Lemma A.1 hold with $d = 2$, $\alpha_i = 1/2$, $\beta_i = 3/2$, $r_i = 1$, and $T = S_i$, and so we obtain constants $C < \infty$ and $c > 0$ (independent of i, t , and b) such that, for each $m \geq 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)) \in S_i^2} \left[\frac{|H_t(x_2|y_2) - H_t(x_1|y_1)|}{g(|y_2 - y_1|) + g(|x_2 - x_1|)} \right] \geq m\right) \leq Ce^{-cm^{3/2}}, \tag{5.15}$$

where we have defined the nonnegative continuous function

$$g(z) = \begin{cases} z^{1/2} (\log \frac{2}{z})^{2/3}, & z \in (0, 1]; \\ 0, & z = 0. \end{cases}$$

Now, if we let

$$A := 1 + 2 \sup_{z \in (0, 1]} g(z).$$

then we obtain using (5.15) and Lemma 5.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in K, y \in [-b, b]} |H_t(x|y)| \geq Am\right) \\
& \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N(b)} \left(\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{(x, y) \in S_i} \frac{|H_t(x|y) - H_t(x_i|y_i)|}{g(|y - y_i|) + g(|x - x_i|) + 1} \geq \frac{m}{2}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(|H_t(x_i|y_i)| \geq \frac{m}{2}\right) \right) \\
& \leq Cbe^{-cm^{3/2}}
\end{aligned}$$

for new constants $C < \infty$ and $c > 0$ that do not depend on b or t . Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in K, y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|H_t(x|y)|}{A(\log(|y| + 1))^{2/3}} \geq m\right) & \leq \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in K, b-1 \leq |y| < b} |H_t(x|y)| \geq Am(\log(b+1))^{2/3}\right) \\
& \leq \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} Cbe^{-cm^{3/2}(b+1)} \leq C'e^{-c'm^{3/2}}
\end{aligned}$$

for new constants $C', c' > 0$. This completes the proof of (5.10). \square

The following lemma is the key to checking Assumption 4 in Lemma 5.1.

Lemma 5.5. *Let h solve the KPZ equation (1.1) with $h(0, \cdot) \equiv 0$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have the convergence*

$$t^{-1/3} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} [|h(t, x) - h(t, 0)| - \varepsilon|x|] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. By the spatial reflection invariance (2.15), it suffices to prove that

$$t^{-1/3} \sup_{x \geq 0} [|h(t, x) - h(t, 0)| - \varepsilon x] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

We write

$$\begin{aligned} t^{-1/3} \sup_{x \geq 0} [|h(t, x) - h(t, 0)| - \varepsilon x] &= \sup_{x \geq 0} \left[\left| \frac{h(t, t^{2/3}(t^{-2/3}x)) - h(t, 0)}{t^{1/3}} - \varepsilon t^{-1/3}x \right| \right] \\ &= \sup_{y \geq 0} \left[\left| \frac{h(t, t^{2/3}y) - h(t, 0)}{t^{1/3}} - \varepsilon t^{1/3}y \right| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

Choose an integer $K > \varepsilon^{-1}$. Note that the supremum in (5.16) is nonnegative because the quantity is 0 when $y = 0$. Hence, for the supremum in (5.16) to not be obtained in $[0, k]$, the supremum over $y \in [k, \infty)$ must be positive. Then, for $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(t^{-1/3} \sup_{x \geq 0} [|h(t, x) - h(t, 0)| - \varepsilon x] > \delta \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| h(t, 0) + \frac{t}{24} \right| > t^{2/3} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in [0, k]} \left[\left| \frac{h(t, t^{2/3}y) - h(t, 0)}{t^{1/3}} - \varepsilon t^{1/3}y \right| > \delta \right] \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in [i, i+1]} \left| \frac{h(t, t^{2/3}y) + \frac{t}{24}}{t^{1/3}} \right| > t^{1/3}(\varepsilon i - 1) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

We consider each of the terms on the right side of (5.17) in turn. The first term goes to 0 because of the convergence in law of $t^{-1/3}(h(t, 0) + \frac{t}{24})$ to a Tracy–Widom GOE random variable. (See Lemma 3.2.)

The second term of (5.17) goes to zero by the convergence of the KPZ equation to the KPZ fixed point uniformly on compact sets (see Proposition 3.1). Specifically, we can couple h to the KPZ fixed point \mathfrak{h} started from $\mathfrak{h}(0, \cdot) \equiv 0$ such that, with probability 1,

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{y \in [0, k]} \left[\left| \frac{h(t, t^{2/3}y) - h(t, 0)}{t^{1/3}} - \varepsilon t^{1/3}y \right| \right] \\ &\leq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{y \in [0, k]} \left[\left| \frac{h(t, t^{2/3}y) - h(t, 0)}{t^{1/3}} - \varepsilon T^{1/3}y \right| \right] \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{y \in [0, k]} \left[\left| 2^{-1/3}\mathfrak{h}(0, 2^{-1/3}y) - 2^{-1/3}\mathfrak{h}(t, 0) - \varepsilon T^{1/3}y \right| \right] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used the continuity of the process \mathfrak{h} .

For the third term of (5.17), we use Lemma 5.4, along with the spatial homogeneity of h , to show that there is a constant C such that

$$\sup_{i \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{y \in [i, i+1]} \left| \frac{h(t, t^{2/3}y) + \frac{t}{24}}{t^{1/3}} \right| \right)^2 \leq C.$$

This means that

$$\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in [i, i+1]} \left| \frac{h(t, t^{2/3}y) + \frac{t}{24}}{t^{1/3}} \right| > t^{1/3}(\varepsilon i - 1) \right) \leq \frac{C}{t^{2/3}} \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(\varepsilon i - 1)^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

This completes the proof. \square

We have now assembled all of the necessary ingredients to prove Theorem 1.9(2).

Proof of Theorem 1.9(2). We again use the general framework of Lemma 5.1 applied to $\mathcal{J}(t, x) = h_+(t, x) - h_-(t, x)$, and we have to check the assumptions. Assumptions 1 and 2 are direct consequences of Proposition 2.3. We take $\alpha = 1/3$ and $Y = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{2}$, where X_1 and X_2 are independent Tracy–Widom GOE random variables. Then Theorem 1.4 implies that says that $t^{-1/3}\mathcal{J}(t, 0)$ converges in distribution to Y as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and so Assumption 3 is satisfied with these choices. To check Assumption 4, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} t^{-1/3} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} [|\mathcal{J}(t, x) - \mathcal{J}(t, 0) - 2\theta x| - \varepsilon|x|] &\leq t^{-1/3} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left[|h_+(t, x) - h_+(t, 0) - \theta x| - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}|x| \right] \\ &\quad + t^{-1/3} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left[|h_-(t, x) - h_-(t, 0) - \theta x| - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}|x| \right], \end{aligned}$$

so it suffices to show the convergence of each of the two terms on the right to zero in probability. We prove the first, as the second is symmetrical. By the shear-invariance (2.17), we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left[|h_+(t, x) - h_+(t, 0) - \theta x| - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}|x| \right] \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left[|h_0(t, x) - h_0(t, 0)| - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}|x| \right],$$

and then Lemma 5.5 implies that Assumption 4 holds. With the assumptions verified, Lemma 5.1 implies (1.19) and the proof is complete. \square

A Technical lemmas

Here we state a few technical lemmas that are useful at various points in our arguments. The following chaining result is due to Dauvergne and Virág; for simplicity, we state a version somewhat specialized to our needs.

Lemma A.1 ([DV21, Lemma 3.3]). *Let $T = I_1 \times \cdots \times I_d$ be a product of bounded real intervals of lengths $b_1, \dots, b_d > 0$. Let $\mathcal{H}: T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a random continuous function. Assume that, there are constants $C < \infty$ and $c > 0$ such that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, there exist $\alpha_i \in (0, 1)$, $\beta_i, r_i > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{H}(x + e_i u) - \mathcal{H}(x)| \geq mu^{\alpha_i}) \leq Ce^{-cm^{\beta_i}}$$

for every unit coordinate vector e_i , every $m \geq 0$, and every $x, x + ue_i \in T$ with $u \in (0, r_i]$. Set $\beta = \min_i \beta_i$, $\alpha = \max_i \alpha_i$, and $r = \max_i r_i^{\alpha_i}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\sup \left\{ \frac{|\mathcal{H}(x + y) - \mathcal{H}(x)|}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^d |y_i|^{\alpha_i} \left(\log \left(\frac{2r^{1/\alpha_i}}{|y_i|} \right) \right)^{1/\beta_i} \right)} : \begin{array}{l} x, y + x \in T \text{ and} \\ 0 < |y_i| \leq r_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d \end{array} \right\} \geq m \right) \\ &\leq CC_0 e^{-c_1 m^\beta} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{b_i}{r_i} \end{aligned}$$

for constants $C_0 < \infty$ and $c_1 > 0$ depending only on $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_d, d, c$, and in particular not on $b_1, \dots, b_d, C, r_1, \dots, r_d$.

We also use the following simple lemma.

Lemma A.2. *Let B be a two-sided Brownian motion, with arbitrary diffusivity, and let $\alpha, \lambda > 0$. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{-1}^0 e^{B(y)+\lambda y} dy \right)^{-\alpha} \right] < \infty.$$

Proof. For $z > 0$, if $\min_{y \in [-1,0]} B(y) > -z$, then $\int_{-1}^0 e^{B(y)+\lambda y} dy \geq ce^{-z}$, where $c = \frac{1-e^{-\lambda}}{\lambda} > 0$. Hence, for $x > 1/c$, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\left(\int_{-1}^0 e^{B(y)+\lambda y} dy \right)^{-1} > x \right) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\min_{-1 \leq y \leq 0} B(y) \leq -\log(cx) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(|B(-1)| > \log(cx)) \leq \frac{2e^{-(\log cx)^2}}{\log cx}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows by standard Gaussian tail bounds. (See e.g. [Dur19, Theorem 1.2.6].) We see that the right side is smaller than any positive power of x^{-1} . In particular, all of the positive moments of the random variable $\left(\int_{-1}^0 e^{B(y)+\lambda y} dy \right)^{-1}$ are finite. \square

References

- [ABL88] E. D. Andjel, M. D. Bramson, and T. M. Liggett. Shocks in the asymmetric exclusion process. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 78(2):231–247, 1988.
- [ACQ11] Gideon Amir, Ivan Corwin, and Jeremy Quastel. Probability distribution of the free energy of the continuum directed random polymer in 1 + 1 dimensions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 64(4):466–537, 2011.
- [AJRAS22] Tom Alberts, Christopher Janjigian, Firas Rassoul-Agha, and Timo Seppäläinen. The Green’s function of the parabolic Anderson model and the continuum directed polymer, 2022. arXiv: [2208.11255v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.11255v2).
- [AKQ14] Tom Alberts, Konstantin Khanin, and Jeremy Quastel. The continuum directed random polymer. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 154(1-2):305–326, 2014.
- [Bak16] Yuri Bakhtin. Inviscid Burgers equation with random kick forcing in noncompact setting. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 21:Paper No. 37, 50, 2016.
- [BCFV15] Alexei Borodin, Ivan Corwin, Patrik Ferrari, and Bálint Vető. Height fluctuations for the stationary KPZ equation. *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.*, 18(1):Art. 20, 95, 2015.
- [BCK14] Yuri Bakhtin, Eric Cator, and Konstantin Khanin. Space-time stationary solutions for the Burgers equation. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 27(1):193–238, 2014.
- [BG97] Lorenzo Bertini and Giambattista Giacomin. Stochastic Burgers and KPZ equations from particle systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 183(3):571–607, 1997.
- [BL18] Yuri Bakhtin and Liying Li. Zero temperature limit for directed polymers and inviscid limit for stationary solutions of stochastic Burgers equation. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 172(5):1358–1397, 2018.
- [BL19] Yuri Bakhtin and Liying Li. Thermodynamic limit for directed polymers and stationary solutions of the Burgers equation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 72(3):536–619, 2019.

- [BQS11] M. Balázs, J. Quastel, and T. Seppäläinen. Fluctuation exponent of the KPZ/stochastic Burgers equation. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 24(3):683–708, 2011.
- [BSS24] Ofer Busani, Timo Seppäläinen, and Evan Sorensen. The stationary horizon and semi-infinite geodesics in the directed landscape. *Ann. Probab.*, 52(1):1–66, 2024.
- [CDR10] P. Calabrese, P. Le Doussal, and A. Rosso. Free-energy distribution of the directed polymer at high temperature. *Euro. Phys. Lett.*, 90(2):20002, 2010.
- [CFP12] Ivan Corwin, Patrik L. Ferrari, and Sandrine Péché. Universality of slow decorrelation in KPZ growth. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 48(1):134–150, 2012.
- [CG20a] Ivan Corwin and Promit Ghosal. KPZ equation tails for general initial data. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 25:Paper No. 66, 38, 2020.
- [CG20b] Ivan Corwin and Promit Ghosal. Lower tail of the KPZ equation. *Duke Math. J.*, 169(7):1329–1395, 2020.
- [CGH21] Ivan Corwin, Promit Ghosal, and Alan Hammond. KPZ equation correlations in time. *Ann. Probab.*, 49(2):832–876, 2021.
- [DGR21] Alexander Dunlap, Cole Graham, and Lenya Ryzhik. Stationary solutions to the stochastic Burgers equation on the line. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 382(2):875–949, 2021.
- [Dot12] Victor Dotsenko. Bethe ansatz replica derivation of the GOE Tracy-Widom distribution in one-dimensional directed polymers with free endpoints. *J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp.*, (11):P11014, 18, 2012.
- [DPZ96] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Ergodicity for infinite-dimensional systems*, volume 229 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996. xii+339.
- [DR21] Alexander Dunlap and Lenya Ryzhik. Viscous shock solutions to the stochastic Burgers equation. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 242(2):937–971, 2021.
- [Duf90] Daniel Dufresne. The distribution of a perpetuity, with applications to risk theory and pension funding. *Scand. Actuar. J.*, (1-2):39–79, 1990.
- [Dur19] Rick Durrett. *Probability—theory and examples*, volume 49 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2019. xii+419.
- [DV21] Duncan Dauvergne and Bálint Virág. Bulk properties of the Airy line ensemble. *Ann. Probab.*, 49(4):1738–1777, 2021.
- [DZ24] Sayan Das and Weitao Zhu. Short- and long-time path tightness of the continuum directed random polymer. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 60(1):343–372, 2024.
- [Fer08] Patrik L. Ferrari. Slow decorrelations in Kardar–Parisi–Zhang growth. *J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp.*, 2008(07):P07022, 2008.
- [Fer92] Pablo A. Ferrari. Shock fluctuations in asymmetric simple exclusion. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 91(1):81–101, 1992.
- [FF94a] P. A. Ferrari and L. R. G. Fontes. Current fluctuations for the asymmetric simple exclusion process. *Ann. Probab.*, 22(2):820–832, 1994.
- [FF94b] P. A. Ferrari and L. R. G. Fontes. Shock fluctuations in the asymmetric simple exclusion process. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 99(2):305–319, 1994.

- [FGN19] P. L. Ferrari, P. Ghosal, and P. Nejjar. Limit law of a second class particle in TASEP with non-random initial condition. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 55(3):1203–1225, 2019.
- [FKS91] P. A. Ferrari, C. Kipnis, and E. Saada. Microscopic structure of travelling waves in the asymmetric simple exclusion process. *Ann. Probab.*, 19(1):226–244, 1991.
- [FN15] Patrik L. Ferrari and Peter Nejjar. Anomalous shock fluctuations in TASEP and last passage percolation models. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 161(1-2):61–109, 2015.
- [FO18] Patrik L. Ferrari and Alessandra Occelli. Universality of the GOE Tracy-Widom distribution for TASEP with arbitrary particle density. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 23:Paper No. 51, 24, 2018.
- [FP05] Pablo A. Ferrari and Leandro P. R. Pimentel. Competition interfaces and second class particles. *Ann. Probab.*, 33(4):1235–1254, 2005.
- [FQ15] Tadahisa Funaki and Jeremy Quastel. KPZ equation, its renormalization and invariant measures. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comp.*, 3(2):159–220, 2015.
- [FS05] Patrik L. Ferrari and Herbert Spohn. A determinantal formula for the GOE Tracy-Widom distribution. *J. Phys. A*, 38(33):L557–L561, 2005.
- [GRASS23] Sean Groathouse, Firas Rassoul-Agha, Timo Seppäläinen, and Evan Sorensen. Jointly invariant measures for the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation, 2023. arXiv: [2309.17276v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.17276v2).
- [JRAS22] Christopher Janjigian, Firas Rassoul-Agha, and Timo Seppäläinen. Ergodicity and synchronization of the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation, 2022. arXiv: [2211.06779v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.06779v1).
- [Kho14] Davar Khoshnevisan. *Analysis of stochastic partial differential equations*, volume 119 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2014. viii+116.
- [KMHH92] Joachim Krug, Paul Meakin, and Timothy Halpin-Healy. Amplitude universality for driven interfaces and directed polymers in random media. *Phys. Rev. A*, 45(2):638–653, 1992.
- [KS88] Ioannis Karatzas and Steven E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988. xxiv+470.
- [Lig73] Thomas M. Liggett. A characterization of the invariant measures for an infinite particle system with interactions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 179:433–453, 1973.
- [Lig74a] Thomas M. Liggett. A characterization of the invariant measures for an infinite particle system with interactions. II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 198:201–213, 1974.
- [Lig74b] Thomas M. Liggett. Convergence to total occupancy in an infinite particle system with interactions. *Ann. Probab.*, 2(6), 1974.
- [Lig75] Thomas M. Liggett. Ergodic theorems for the asymmetric simple exclusion process. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 213:237–261, 1975.
- [Lig76] Thomas M. Liggett. Coupling the simple exclusion process. *Ann. Probab.*, 4(3):339–356, 1976.
- [MQR21] Konstantin Matetski, Jeremy Quastel, and Daniel Remenik. The KPZ fixed point. *Acta Math.*, 227(1):115–203, 2021.

- [MY05] Hiroyuki Matsumoto and Marc Yor. Exponential functionals of Brownian motion. I. Probability laws at fixed time. *Probab. Surv.*, 2:312–347, 2005.
- [Par23] Shalin Parekh. Convergence of ASEP to KPZ with basic coupling of the dynamics. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 160:351–370, 2023.
- [QS23] Jeremy Quastel and Sourav Sarkar. Convergence of exclusion processes and the KPZ equation to the KPZ fixed point. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 36(1):251–289, 2023.
- [RY99] Daniel Revuz and Marc Yor. *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, volume 293 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 1999. xiv+602.
- [Sas05] T. Sasamoto. Spatial correlations of the 1D KPZ surface on a flat substrate. *J. Phys. A*, 38(33):L549–L556, 2005.
- [Spi70] Frank Spitzer. Interaction of Markov processes. *Adv. Math.*, 5(2):246–290, 1970.
- [Spi74] Frank Spitzer. Recurrent random walk of an infinite particle system. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 198:191–191, 1974.
- [Spo14] Herbert Spohn. KPZ scaling theory and the semidiscrete directed polymer model. In *Random matrix theory, interacting particle systems, and integrable systems*. Volume 65, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ. Pages 483–493. Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 2014.
- [SS10a] Tomohiro Sasamoto and Herbert Spohn. Exact height distributions for the KPZ equation with narrow wedge initial condition. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 834(3):523–542, 2010.
- [SS10b] Tomohiro Sasamoto and Herbert Spohn. One-dimensional kardar-parisi-zhang equation: an exact solution and its universality. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 104(23), 2010.
- [SS10c] Tomohiro Sasamoto and Herbert Spohn. The crossover regime for the weakly asymmetric simple exclusion process. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 140(2):209–231, 2010.
- [Vir20] Bálint Virág. The heat and the landscape I, 2020. arXiv: [2008.07241v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.07241v1).
- [WFS17] Thomas Weiss, Patrik Ferrari, and Herbert Spohn. *Reflected Brownian motions in the KPZ universality class*, volume 18 of *SpringerBriefs in Mathematical Physics*. Springer, Cham, 2017. vii+118.
- [Wu23] Xuan Wu. The KPZ equation and the directed landscape, 2023. arXiv: [2301.00547v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.00547v2).