

Scaling limit of first passage percolation geodesics on planar maps

Emmanuel Kammerer *

December 4, 2024

Abstract

We establish the scaling limit of the geodesics to the root for the first passage percolation distance on random planar maps. We first describe the scaling limit of the number of faces along the geodesics. This result enables to compare the metric balls for the first passage percolation and the dual graph distance. It also enables to upperbound the diameter of large random maps. Then, we describe the scaling limit of the tree of first passage percolation geodesics to the root via a stochastic coalescing flow of pure jump diffusions. This stochastic flow also enables us to construct some random metric spaces which we conjecture to be the scaling limit of random planar maps with high degrees. The main tool in this work is a time-reversal of the uniform peeling exploration.




Figure 1: Simulation of four trajectories of the stochastic coalescing flow of diffusions with jumps which arises as the scaling limit of first-passage percolation geodesics.

*CMAP, École polytechnique, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, 91120 Palaiseau, France, emmanuel.kammerer@polytechnique.edu

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Random Boltzmann maps	2
1.2	Main results	4
1.3	Plan of the paper	6
2	The time reversal of the uniform peeling exploration	7
2.1	The uniform peeling exploration	7
2.2	The law of the peeling exploration of Boltzmann planar maps	8
2.3	Reversing the uniform exploration	9
3	Number of faces in the geodesics	11
3.1	Preliminaries on random walks conditioned to stay positive	11
3.2	Number of faces in the geodesics	14
3.2.1	Dilute case	14
3.2.2	Critical case	15
3.2.3	Dense case	17
3.3	Application: comparison of fpp and graph distance in the dilute case	20
3.4	Second application: the diameter of dense maps is logarithmic for the dual graph distance	22
4	Scaling limit of the coalescing flow of geodesics	25
4.1	The self-similar Markov process arising as the scaling limit of the perimeter process	25
4.2	A family of coalescing diffusions with jumps	26
4.3	The discrete coalescing flow of fpp geodesics	29
4.4	Recovering the fpp geodesics from the discrete coalescing flow	31
4.5	Scaling limit of the flow of geodesics	33
5	Scaling limit of the tree of geodesics	38
5.1	The tree of the positive jumps via the stochastic flow	38
5.2	The tree of geodesics via the discrete coalescing flow	42
5.3	Scaling limit of the tree of geodesics to the root	45
6	Conjectures	48

1 Introduction

1.1 Random Boltzmann maps

We study the first-passage percolation distance on random Boltzmann planar maps of type $a \in (3/2, 5/2]$ which correspond to the dual of the stable maps of [LGM11] when $a \in (3/2, 5/2)$ and to random planar maps in the universality class of the Brownian sphere when $a = 5/2$. We give applications to the (dual) graph distance and establish the scaling limit of geodesics to the root.

A planar map is a connected planar graph which is embedded in the sphere and seen up to orientation-preserving transformations. Our planar maps are equipped with a distinguished oriented edge which is called the root edge. The face f_r which is on the right of the root edge is called the

root face. We restrict our attention to bipartite planar maps, i.e. such that each face has an even degree. We denote by \mathcal{M} the set of finite bipartite planar maps and for all $\ell \geq 1$ we denote by $\mathcal{M}^{(\ell)}$ the set of bipartite planar maps whose root face has degree 2ℓ . See Figure 2 for an example.

A general way to pick a map at random consists in assigning positive weights to each face according to its degree. Following [MM07], let $\mathbf{q} = (q_k)_{k \geq 1}$ be a non-zero sequence of non-negative real numbers. The weight of a map $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}$ is defined by

$$w_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{m}) = \prod_{f \in \text{Faces}(\mathbf{m}) \setminus \{f_r\}} q_{\deg(f)/2}.$$

We then define the partition function for all $\ell \geq 1$

$$W^{(\ell)} = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^{(\ell)}} w_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{m}).$$

When the partition function is finite, the sequence \mathbf{q} is called admissible. We require \mathbf{q} to be critical of type $a \in (3/2, 5/2]$, which is characterized by the fact that

$$W^{(\ell)} \underset{\ell \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{p_{\mathbf{q}}}{2} c_{\mathbf{q}}^{\ell+1} \ell^{-a}, \quad (1.1)$$

for some constants $p_{\mathbf{q}}, c_{\mathbf{q}} > 0$. See Proposition 5.10 of [Cur23]. The case $a = 5/2$ is called generic while the other values of a are called non-generic. Examples of such sequences \mathbf{q} are exhibited in Lemma 6.1 of [BC17]. We define the Boltzmann probability measure $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ on $\mathcal{M}^{(\ell)}$ by setting

$$\forall \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^{(\ell)}, \quad \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}(\{\mathbf{m}\}) = \frac{w_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{m})}{W^{(\ell)}}.$$

A random map of law $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ is called a random Boltzmann map of perimeter 2ℓ . If one conditions a random map of law $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ on having n vertices and let $n \rightarrow \infty$, then the law of the local limit given by Theorem 7.1 of [Cur23] is denoted by $\mathbb{P}_{\infty}^{(\ell)}$. A random map of law $\mathbb{P}_{\infty}^{(\ell)}$ is called an infinite random Boltzmann map of perimeter 2ℓ .

The object of our study is the dual map \mathbf{m}^{\dagger} associated with a map \mathbf{m} under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\infty}^{(\ell)}$, which is obtained by switching the roles of the faces and vertices and saying that two vertices of \mathbf{m}^{\dagger} are connected by an edge if the corresponding faces of \mathbf{m} are adjacent.

We focus on the first passage percolation (fpp) distance d_{fpp}^{\dagger} on the dual map \mathbf{m}^{\dagger} under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\infty}^{(\ell)}$ which is obtained by assigning i.i.d. exponential random edge lengths of parameter 1 to the dual edges. For every face f, f' of \mathbf{m} , the shortest path for the fpp distance from f to f' is unique since the exponential distribution has no atom. It does not necessarily correspond to a shortest path for the dual graph distance (see e.g. Figure 2). The main focus of this work is the study of the shortest paths to the root face f_r and their scaling limits. These shortest paths actually form a tree which is denoted by $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m})$. This study also has applications to the dual graph distance d_{gr}^{\dagger} , which corresponds to the graph distance on \mathbf{m}^{\dagger} , where each edge has length one.

The geometry of infinite random maps under $\mathbb{P}_{\infty}^{(\ell)}$ was first studied in the case of the uniform infinite planar quadrangulation (which is a particular case of the case $a = 5/2$) in [CLG17] and [CC18], then in [BC17] in the cases $a \in (3/2, 5/2) \setminus \{2\}$ and in [BCM18] in the critical case $a = 2$. The scaling limit of the distances to the root under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ or $\mathbb{P}_{\infty}^{(\ell)}$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ was established using the framework of growth-fragmentations in [BCK18] in the case of triangulations (corresponding




Figure 2: Left: a planar map $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^{(4)}$. The root edge is marked with an arrow and the root face corresponds to the outer face. Right: illustration for the tree $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m})$ in dashed green lines of fpp geodesics to the root face f_r . Note that $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m})$ is not a deterministic function of \mathbf{m} but depends on the random exponential edge lengths.

informally to the case $a = 5/2$), then in [BBCK18] in the case $a \in (2, 5/2)$ and in [Kam23a] in the case $a = 2$.

An important tool in the study of distances on random planar maps is the peeling exploration. See Subsection 2.1 for more details, as well as the lecture notes [Cur23] or [Bud] for a detailed presentation of this technique. It consists in a step by step exploration of the map \mathbf{m} starting from the root face, where at each step we discover what is behind an edge on the boundary of the unexplored region. This edge is called the peeled edge. The explored region at step $n \geq 0$ is denoted by $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$. We denote by $(P(n))_{n \geq 0}$ the perimeter process which is defined as half of the number of edges on the boundary of the explored region $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$ at time $n \geq 0$. Under $\mathbb{P}_\infty^{(\ell)}$, the perimeter process is a Markov chain which is a random walk on \mathbb{Z} of step distribution ν conditioned to stay positive, whose scaling limit is described by a stable Lévy process conditioned to stay positive Υ_a^\uparrow . See Subsection 2.2 for the definition of ν and Subsection 3.1 for the definition of Υ_a^\uparrow . The choice of the peeled edge enables to study different properties of the map. In this work, the peeled edge is chosen uniformly at random on the boundary of $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$ for all $n \geq 0$ so that the explored region $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$ follows the growth of the fpp balls of center f_r .

1.2 Main results

Our results can be divided into two parts. We first focus on the scaling limit of the number of faces along the geodesics, hence relating the fpp distance with the dual graph distance on the geodesics. This scaling limit enables to compare the growth of fpp and dual graph balls and also to obtain an upperbound for the diameter of large random planar maps for the dual graph distance. Then, we describe the scaling limit of the fpp geodesics to the root in large random planar maps.

Number of faces. We first give the scaling limit of the number of faces in the fpp geodesics to the root and give applications to the dual graph distance. We choose to state these results for infinite Boltzmann planar maps of law $\mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)}$. When $a \in (2, 5/2]$, as in Definition 11.1 in [Cur23], we

let $e_{\mathbf{q}} = \sum_{k \geq 0} (2k + 1)\nu(k)$ be the so-called mean exposure. Recall the constant $p_{\mathbf{q}}$ from (1.1).

Theorem 1.1. *For all $n \geq 0$, let Γ_n be the shortest path for d_{fpp}^\dagger from f_r to some face of $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_n$ adjacent to the boundary which is chosen arbitrarily. Then we have the following convergences:*

- If $a \in (2, 5/2]$, then for the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets,

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)}, \quad \left(n^{-\frac{a-2}{a-1}} \#\text{Faces}(\Gamma_{\lfloor nt \rfloor}) \right)_{t \geq 0} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(\frac{e_{\mathbf{q}}}{2} \int_0^t \frac{ds}{\Upsilon_a^\dagger(p_{\mathbf{q}}s)} \right)_{t \geq 0};$$

- If $a = 2$, then

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)}, \quad (\log n)^{-2} \#\text{Faces}(\Gamma_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(L^1)} \frac{1}{\pi^2};$$

- If $a \in (3/2, 2)$, then

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)}, \quad (\log n)^{-1} \#\text{Faces}(\Gamma_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(L^1)} \frac{2}{\pi \tan((2-a)\pi)}.$$

This result has some applications to the dual graph distance d_{gr}^\dagger . Namely, in the cases $a \geq 2$ it enables to compare the distances d_{fpp}^\dagger and d_{gr}^\dagger , improving the results of [CM20] in the case of the uniform exploration. When \mathbf{m} is an infinite (one-ended) planar map, for all $r \geq 0$, we denote by $\overline{\text{Ball}}_r^{\text{fpp}}(\mathbf{m})$ the hull of the ball with center f_r of radius r for the fpp distance obtained from the ball of radius r by filling in the holes which contain finite portions of \mathbf{m} . Similarly, for all $r \geq 0$, we denote by $\overline{\text{Ball}}_r^\dagger$ the hull of the ball with center f_r of radius r for the dual graph distance obtained by filling in the holes which contain finite portions of \mathbf{m} .

Corollary 1.2. *Suppose \mathbf{q} of type $a \in (2, 5/2]$. Under $\mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)}$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, almost surely, for all r large enough,*

$$\overline{\text{Ball}}_r^{\text{fpp}}(\mathbf{m}) \subset \overline{\text{Ball}}_{\lfloor (1+\varepsilon)e_{\mathbf{q}}r \rfloor}^\dagger(\mathbf{m}).$$

An analogous result holds in the case $a = 2$.

Corollary 1.3. *Suppose \mathbf{q} of type $a = 2$. Under $\mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)}$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, with probability $1 - o(1)$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\overline{\text{Ball}}_r^{\text{fpp}}(\mathbf{m}) \subset \overline{\text{Ball}}_{\lfloor (1+\varepsilon)\pi^2 p_{\mathbf{q}}^2 r^2 \rfloor}^\dagger(\mathbf{m}).$$

A last consequence of Theorem 1.1 which is obtained using the martingale techniques introduced in [Kam23b] is an upperbound for the diameter $\text{Diam}_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(\mathbf{m})$ of (finite) random maps \mathbf{m} in the case $a \in (3/2, 2)$ when they are equipped with the dual graph distance. This completes the results of [BCM18], [BBCK18] and [Kam23b] which were obtained in the respective cases $a = 5/2$, $a \in (2, 5/2)$ and $a = 2$.

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose \mathbf{q} is of type $a \in (3/2, 2)$. Then, there exists a constant $C_{\mathbf{q}} > 0$ such that under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, we have with probability $1 - o(1)$*

$$\text{Diam}_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(\mathbf{m}) \leq C_{\mathbf{q}} \log \ell.$$

The main tool for obtaining the above results is a backward exploration of the map, obtained by reversing time in the uniform peeling exploration, which enables to keep track of the geodesic Γ_n .

Scaling limit of the tree of geodesics. If \mathbf{m} is a planar map, recall that $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m})$ is the random tree of fpp geodesics from the root. Its vertices are the faces of \mathbf{m} and its edges are the dual edges which appear in the shortest paths for d_{fpp}^\dagger from each face to the root f_r . See e.g. Figure 2. We equip each edge of $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m})$ with the random fpp length of the associated dual edge of \mathbf{m} . We denote by $d_{\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m})}$ the corresponding distance on $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m})$. Let $(f_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the family of the faces of \mathbf{m} in the non-increasing order of degrees.

Theorem 1.5. *Assume \mathbf{q} is of type $a \in (3/2, 5/2)$. Then,*

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad (\ell^{2-a} d_{\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m})}(f_i, f_j))_{i,j \geq 1} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(\frac{1}{2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}}} d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(w_i, w_j) \right)_{i,j \geq 1},$$

for the product topology, where $c_a := \pi/\Gamma(a)$ and $\mathcal{T}_a = (\{w_i; i \geq 1\}, d_{\mathcal{T}_a})$ is a random countable metric space.

Let us give some insight into this scaling limit. Using the time reversal of the uniform peeling exploration, we describe the geodesics to the root using a family of coalescing processes. We prove that these processes converge towards a flow of coalescing diffusions with jumps. The metric space $\mathcal{T}_a = (\{w_i; i \geq 1\}, d_{\mathcal{T}_a})$ is then defined using this flow of diffusions and we show that it is indeed the scaling limit of $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m})$. The exact definition of the limit can be found in Section 5.1. The stochastic flow of coalescing diffusions with jumps is driven by the jumps of the self-similar growth-fragmentation corresponding to the scaling limit of the slicing by heights as shown in [BCK18] in the generic case $a = 5/2$, [BBCK18] in the dilute case $a \in (2, 5/2)$ and [Kam23a] in the critical case $a = 2$ and by independent uniform random variables which arise from the uniform peeling exploration. We do not rely on the theory of coalescing flows developed in [LJR04]. The set $\{w_i; i \geq 1\}$ corresponds to the set of positive jumps of the growth-fragmentation, plus an additional point corresponding to the root face. One can then focus on the trajectories of the flow which “start from” the positive jumps and their coalescences give the genealogical structure of \mathcal{T}_a . Finally, the distances on \mathcal{T}_a are measured using a Lamperti transform.

The scaling limit of the coalescing processes also holds in the case $a = 5/2$. This should give a new description of the geodesics to the root in the Brownian disk as a flow of diffusions with jumps. However, due to the absence of high degree vertices, the scaling limit of the tree of fpp geodesics cannot be stated in the same way as in Theorem 1.5 in this case so that another approach is needed in the case $a = 5/2$.

1.3 Plan of the paper

We define the time reversal of the uniform peeling exploration in Section 2. Then, Section 3, which is independent of the next sections, is devoted to the scaling limit of the number of faces along the geodesics and its applications, namely to the proof of Theorem 1.1, Corollaries 1.2 and 1.3 and Theorem 1.4. Next, in Section 4, we define a coalescing flow of pure jump diffusions and prove that it arises as the scaling limit of a discrete coalescing flow which encodes the fpp geodesics to the root. Based on the coalescing flow, in Section 5, we define a random countable metric space and we prove that it is the scaling limit of the tree of fpp geodesics in Theorem 1.5. Finally, in Section 6 we define a random countable metric space which we believe to be the scaling limit of large random planar maps with high degrees.

2 The time reversal of the uniform peeling exploration

In this section, we present a time-reversal of the uniform exploration of a random Boltzmann map conditionally on the perimeter process. This reversed uniform exploration is the central tool of this work. But first, we recall the definition of the uniform peeling exploration.

2.1 The uniform peeling exploration

We say that a map \mathfrak{e} is a map with one hole if \mathfrak{e} has a distinguished face with simple boundary which is different from f_r . Moreover, we say that \mathfrak{e} is a submap of a map \mathfrak{m} if one can obtain \mathfrak{m} by gluing a map in the hole of \mathfrak{e} . The boundary $\partial\mathfrak{e}$ of a map with one hole is the set of edges on the boundary of its hole. A peeling algorithm \mathcal{A} is a function which takes a map with one hole \mathfrak{e} and returns an edge of $\partial\mathfrak{e}$. The algorithm \mathcal{A} may be random.

Let \mathfrak{m} be a map which is possibly infinite. A peeling exploration of \mathfrak{m} following the peeling algorithm \mathcal{A} is an increasing sequence of submaps $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_0 \subset \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_1 \subset \dots \subset \bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n \subset \dots \subset \mathfrak{m}$ such that $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_0$ is the map formed by gluing the root face f_r of \mathfrak{m} to a hole of the same degree, and such that for all $n \geq 0$, the submap $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_{n+1}$ is obtained from $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$ in the following way:

- If the face f behind the edge $\mathcal{A}(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n)$ in \mathfrak{m} is not in $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$, then we “discover” this face by gluing f to $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$ on the edge $\mathcal{A}(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n)$. See the two peeling steps on the right of the first row in Figure 3.
- If the face behind $\mathcal{A}(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n)$ in \mathfrak{m} is already in $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$, then it is necessarily adjacent to the hole. Then we glue the edge $\mathcal{A}(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n)$ to the edge in $\partial\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$ following the adjacency in \mathfrak{m} . The hole then splits into two holes. When \mathfrak{m} is infinite, we choose to fill in the hole which contains only a finite number of faces in \mathfrak{m} . When \mathfrak{m} is finite, we choose to fill in the hole which has the smallest perimeter (and in case of equality we fill in one of the two holes chosen arbitrarily in a deterministic way). See the left of the first row and the second row in Figure 3 for such peeling steps.

We denote by $(P(n))_{n \geq 0}$ the perimeter process which is defined as half of the number of edges in $\partial\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$. When \mathfrak{m} is finite, the exploration stops when P reaches zero.

Now, let us describe a peeling exploration which is very useful in the study of the fpp distance, which is the uniform peeling exploration. See Section 13.1 of [Cur23] for more details. For all $t \geq 0$, let $\text{Ball}_t^{\text{fpp}}(\mathfrak{m})$ be the closed ball centered at f_r of radius $t \geq 0$ for the fpp distance d_{fpp}^\dagger . It is defined as the submap whose faces are at fpp distance at most t to the root face and containing only the dual edges whose points are at fpp distance at most t from the root.

Note that $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_0 = \text{Ball}_0^{\text{fpp}}$. Next, for some step $n \geq 0$ of the exploration, assume that the submap $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$ can be obtained from $\text{Ball}_{T_n}^{\text{fpp}}(\mathfrak{m})$ for some $T_n \geq 0$ by filling in all the holes except one. By the absence of memory of the exponential distribution, we know that the lengths of the dual edges on the boundary of $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$ are i.i.d. exponential random variables of parameter 1. We choose the next edge to peel to be the edge of $\partial\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$ whose dual edge has the smallest length. By well-known properties of the exponential distribution, this edge is actually chosen uniformly at random and the fpp length of the corresponding dual edge is an exponential random variable of expectation $1/\#\partial\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$ conditionally on $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$ and on the fpp lengths of the dual edges of $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$. This edge length can then be written $\mathcal{E}_n/(2P(n))$, where \mathcal{E}_n is an exponential r.v. of parameter 1. Let $T_{n+1} = T_n + \mathcal{E}_n/(2P(n))$. Then $\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_{n+1}$ is obtained from the ball $\text{Ball}_{T_{n+1}}^{\text{fpp}}(\mathfrak{m})$ by filling in all the holes, except one.




Figure 3: The first five steps of the exploration of the map \mathbf{m} from Figure 2. From left to right on the first row: $\bar{\epsilon}_0$, $\bar{\epsilon}_1$, $\bar{\epsilon}_2$, $\bar{\epsilon}_3$. From left to right on the second row: the submap obtained after gluing two edges on $\partial\bar{\epsilon}_3$, $\bar{\epsilon}_4$ after filling-in the hole with minimal perimeter, the submap obtained after gluing two edges on $\partial\bar{\epsilon}_4$, $\bar{\epsilon}_5$ after filling-in the hole with minimal perimeter.

In a word, using the uniform peeling algorithm which chooses at each step an edge on the boundary uniformly at random, we have for all $n \geq 0$,

$$\bar{\epsilon}_n = \overline{\text{Ball}}_{T_n}^{\text{fpp}}(\mathbf{m}) \quad \text{with} \quad T_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{\mathcal{E}_i}{2P(i)},$$

where the \mathcal{E}_i 's for $i \geq 0$ are i.i.d. exponential r.v. of parameter 1 and where for all t , the submap $\overline{\text{Ball}}_{T_n}^{\text{fpp}}(\mathbf{m})$ is obtained by filling in all the holes of \mathbf{m} except one, which corresponds to the infinite hole when \mathbf{m} is infinite.

2.2 The law of the peeling exploration of Boltzmann planar maps

Under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ (respectively $\mathbb{P}_\infty^{(\ell)}$) the peeling exploration has several nice features, which do not depend on the peeling algorithm. It is a Markov chain and its transitions can be described using the perimeter process.

First, the peeling exploration satisfies a spatial Markov property, stating that at each step $n \geq 0$, conditionally on $\bar{\epsilon}_n$, the map which fills the hole in \mathbf{m} is a random map of law $\mathbb{P}^{(p)}$ (resp. $\mathbb{P}_\infty^{(p)}$), where $p = P(n)$. Moreover, at each time n such that $P(n+1) < P(n)$, the map in the hole which is filled-in after gluing the two edges is a random map of law $\mathbb{P}^{(p)}$ with $p = -\Delta P(n) - 1$. See Propositions 4.6 and 6.3 of [Cur23] for a detailed statement.

Moreover, the perimeter process itself is a Markov chain, whose transition probabilities are better written using the distribution ν defined by

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \nu(k) = \begin{cases} q_{k+1} c_{\mathbf{q}}^k & \text{if } k \geq 0 \\ 2W^{(-1-k)} c_{\mathbf{q}}^k & \text{if } k < 0, \end{cases}$$

where we recall that $(q_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is the weight sequence, $W^{(\ell)}$ is the partition function of maps of perimeter 2ℓ for all $\ell \geq 1$, and $c_{\mathbf{q}}$ appears in (1.1). It is known that ν is a probability measure (see e.g. Lemma 5.2 of [Cur23]). Under $\mathbb{P}_{\infty}^{(\ell)}$, the perimeter process $(P(n))_{n \geq 0}$ is the Doob h -transform of the ν -random walk starting at ℓ , using the harmonic function h^{\uparrow} on $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ defined by

$$\forall \ell \geq 1, \quad h^{\uparrow}(\ell) = 2\ell 2^{-2\ell} \binom{2\ell}{\ell}. \quad (2.1)$$

See e.g. Remark 7.5 of [Cur23]. This Doob h -transform can be interpreted as a conditioning of the ν -random walk to always stay positive. Besides, under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$, the perimeter process $(P(n))_{n \geq 0}$ is a Markov chain starting at ℓ , which is absorbed at zero with transition probabilities for all $n \geq 0, p \geq 1, k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}(P(n+1) = p+k | P(n) = p) = \nu(k) c_{\mathbf{q}}^{-k} \frac{W^{(p+k)}}{W^{(p)}} \left(\mathbf{1}_{p+k > (p-1)/2} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}_{p+k = (p-1)/2} \right). \quad (2.2)$$

See the second display of page 53 of [BBCK18] coming from Proposition 6.3 of [BBCK18].

The tail behavior of ν is well understood for \mathbf{q} of type a thanks to Propositions 5.9 and 5.10 of [Cur23]. We have, when $a \in (3/2, 5/2)$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\nu(-k) \sim p_{\mathbf{q}} k^{-a} \quad \text{and} \quad \nu([k, \infty)) \sim p_{\mathbf{q}} \cos(a\pi) \frac{1}{a-1} k^{1-a}, \quad (2.3)$$

where the constant $p_{\mathbf{q}}$ comes from (1.1). When $a = 5/2$, only the first asymptotic holds and the second one becomes $\nu([k, \infty)) = o(k^{-3/2})$.

2.3 Reversing the uniform exploration

Let \mathbf{m} be a planar map. Let P be the perimeter process associated with the uniform peeling exploration of \mathbf{m} . Let us define the decreasing sequence of submaps $\mathbf{u}_0^n \supset \mathbf{u}_1^n \supset \dots \supset \mathbf{u}_n^n$ as follows: let \mathbf{u}_n^n be the map made of only one distinguished face of degree $2P(n)$ glued to one hole of the same degree. For all $k \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket$, we obtain \mathbf{u}_k^n from \mathbf{u}_{k+1}^n by distinguishing two cases:

- If $\Delta P(k) < 0$ then \mathbf{u}_k^n is obtained by inserting $-2\Delta P(k)$ consecutive edges in the boundary of the distinguished face at a position which is chosen uniformly at random. The two extremal inserted edges are glued and we fill in the hole delimited by the $-2\Delta P(k) - 2$ remaining edges with a Boltzmann map of law $\mathbb{P}^{(p)}$, where $p := -\Delta P(k) - 1$. See the first row of Figure 4 and the rightmost figure in the second row for such exploration steps.
- If $\Delta P(k) \geq 0$, then \mathbf{u}_k^n is obtained by gluing a new face f of degree $2\Delta P(k) + 2$ to $2\Delta P(k) + 1$ consecutive edges where the position of the first of these consecutive edges is chosen uniformly at random on the boundary of the distinguished face. See the exploration steps \mathbf{u}_2^5 and \mathbf{u}_1^5 in the second row of Figure 4 for this case.

Conditionally on the perimeter process, let us relate this backward exploration to the uniform peeling exploration $(\bar{\mathbf{e}}_k)_{k \geq 0}$. For all $n \geq 0$, for all $k \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$, let $\bar{\mathbf{e}}_n \setminus \bar{\mathbf{e}}_k$ be the submap of $\bar{\mathbf{e}}_n$ obtained by identifying the explored region $\bar{\mathbf{e}}_k$ at time k to one (non-simple) distinguished face of degree $2P(k)$.

Proposition 2.1. *For all $n \geq 0$, under either $\mathbb{P}_{\infty}^{(\ell)}$ or $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}(\cdot | P(n) > 0)$, conditionally on $(P(k))_{0 \leq k \leq n}$, the sequence $(\mathbf{u}_k^n)_{0 \leq k \leq n}$ has the same distribution as $(\bar{\mathbf{e}}_n \setminus \bar{\mathbf{e}}_k)_{0 \leq k \leq n}$. In particular, conditionally on $(P(k))_{0 \leq k \leq n}$, the map \mathbf{u}_0^n has the same law as $\bar{\mathbf{e}}_n$.*




Figure 4: The five steps of the reversed uniform exploration $u_5^5 \subset u_4^5 \subset u_3^5 \subset u_2^5 \subset u_1^5 \subset u_0^5$ of the map \mathfrak{m} starting from time $n = 5$. They correspond to the time-reversal of the exploration depicted in Figure 3. From left to right on the first row: u_5^5 , the map obtained by inserting 4 edges at a position chosen uniformly at random and gluing the two extremal edges, hence creating a hole of perimeter 2, the map u_4^5 obtained by filling in the hole, the map obtained by inserting 6 edges at a position chosen uniformly at random and gluing the two extremal edges, hence creating a hole of perimeter 4. From left to right on the second row: the submap u_3^5 obtained after filling in the hole, u_2^5 , u_1^5 and u_0^5 .

Proof. Let us prove the result by induction on n . The result is obvious for $n = 0$ since \bar{e}_0 is the map consisting of the root face f_r and one hole. Assume that the statement holds for n . By definition of the uniform peeling exploration, \bar{e}_{n+1} is obtained after peeling an edge of $\partial\bar{e}_n$ uniformly at random. Let us check that under $\mathbb{P}_\infty^{(\ell)}$ (or $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ under the event “ $P(n) > 0$ ”), conditionally on $(P(k))_{0 \leq k \leq n}$ and on $(\bar{e}_k)_{0 \leq k \leq n}$, the map u_n^{n+1} has the same law as $\bar{e}_{n+1} \setminus \bar{e}_n$ obtained by identifying all the explored region \bar{e}_n to one non-simple face. To do this we reason differently according to the sign of $\Delta P(n)$.

- If $\Delta P(n) < 0$, then the uniform exploration glues in the hole the peeled edge to another edge of $\partial\bar{e}_n$ hence creating a hole of degree $-2\Delta P(n) - 2$ and then fills in this hole with a Boltzmann map of law $\mathbb{P}^{(p)}$, where $p := -\Delta P(n) - 1$.
- If $\Delta P(n) \geq 0$, then the uniform exploration glues in the hole a new face f of degree $2\Delta P(n) + 2$ to the peeled edge.

In both cases, it is clear that the map $\bar{e}_{n+1} \setminus \bar{e}_n$ has the same law as u_n^{n+1} . To conclude, it suffices to notice that the u_k^{n+1} for $k \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$ are obtained by gluing the boundary of the hole of u_k^n in the distinguished face of u_n^{n+1} in a uniformly chosen way. Similarly, since the peeled edge is chosen uniformly at random, $\bar{e}_{n+1} \setminus \bar{e}_k$ is obtained by gluing the boundary of the hole of $\bar{e}_n \setminus \bar{e}_k$ in the distinguished face of $\bar{e}_{n+1} \setminus \bar{e}_n$ in a uniformly chosen way. \square

For all $n \geq 0$, let us denote by Γ_n the fpp geodesic from f_r to the already explored face next to the peeled edge at time n by the uniform peeling exploration. The geodesic Γ_n only contains faces corresponding to the positive jumps of $(P(i))_{0 \leq i \leq n}$. Moreover, conditionally on P , independently for each $i \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket$ such that $\Delta P(i) \geq 0$, the face f_i discovered at time i belongs to Γ_n with probability

$$\theta_i := \mathbb{P}(f_i \in \Gamma_n | P) = \frac{2\Delta P(i) + 1}{2P(i+1)} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta P(i) \geq 0}. \quad (2.4)$$

Indeed, this can be checked by induction using Proposition 2.1 and the fact that two adjacent faces are in the same fpp geodesic to the root if and only if they share an edge which has been peeled by the uniform exploration (and in that case there is a shared edge corresponding to the discovery of one of the two faces). The same holds for the fpp geodesic from the root face to any edge of \mathfrak{u}_0^n (i.e. any edge of $\partial \bar{\epsilon}_n$).

3 Number of faces in the geodesics

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1 which gives the scaling limit of the number of faces along the fpp geodesics to the root for infinite Boltzmann planar maps of law $\mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)}$. We start by stating some useful results on random walks conditioned to be positive. Then we enter the proof of the theorem. Finally, we prove the applications to the dual graph distance: the comparison between the dual graph distance and the fpp distance and the upperbound on the diameter.

3.1 Preliminaries on random walks conditioned to stay positive

We first state some useful scaling limit and local limit theorems for the perimeter process $(P(n))_{n \geq 0}$ under $\mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)}$ which can be viewed as the ν -random walk starting at 1 and conditioned to stay always positive and whose law is described in Subsection 2.2. We will often add a subscript ∞ to P in order to underline the fact that we work under $\mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)}$. Thanks to (2.3), the scaling limit of a ν -random walk starting at zero $(S_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is given by the $(a-1)$ -stable Lévy process Υ_a starting at zero with Lévy measure $\cos(a\pi)(dx/x^a)\mathbf{1}_{x>0} + (dx/|x|^a)\mathbf{1}_{x<0}$. It is known that $(S_{\lfloor nt \rfloor}/n^{1/(a-1)})_{t \geq 0}$ converges in distribution towards $(\Upsilon_a(p_{\mathbf{q}}t))_{t \geq 0}$. See e.g. Proposition 10.1 of [Cur23]. The Lévy process starting at $x > 0$ conditioned to stay always positive \mathcal{S}_x^\uparrow is defined as the Doob h -transform of $x + \Upsilon_a$ using the harmonic function $y \mapsto \mathbf{1}_{y \geq 0} \sqrt{y}$. By letting $x \downarrow 0$, one obtains the Lévy process Υ_a starting at zero and conditioned to stay always positive which is denoted by Υ_a^\uparrow . The scaling limit of the perimeter process is stated in Proposition 10.3 in [Cur23]:

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)}, \quad \left(\frac{P_\infty(nt)}{n^{1/(a-1)}} \right)_{t \geq 0} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(\Upsilon_a^\uparrow(p_{\mathbf{q}}t) \right)_{t \geq 0} \quad (3.1)$$

for the Skorokhod J_1 topology. We then state a local limit theorem which is proven in the case $a = 2$ in [BCM18]. The same proof actually works for all $a \in (3/2, 5/2]$. Let f_a^\uparrow be the density of $\Upsilon_a^\uparrow(1)$.

Lemma 3.1. (Lemma 3 of [BCM18]) For all $n, x, y \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\eta_n(x, y) = \sqrt{\frac{n^{1/(a-1)}}{y}} \left((np_{\mathbf{q}})^{1/(a-1)} \frac{2\sqrt{y}}{h^\uparrow(y)\sqrt{\pi}} \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(x)}(P_\infty(n) = y) - f_a^\uparrow \left(\frac{y}{(p_{\mathbf{q}}n)^{1/(a-1)}} \right) \right).$$

Then

- Uniformly in $y \geq 1$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we have $\eta_n(1, y) \rightarrow 0$.
- For every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every sequence $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, uniformly in $x \in [1, n^{1/(a-1)}\delta_n]$ and uniformly in $y \in [\varepsilon n^{1/(a-1)}, \varepsilon^{-1}n^{1/(a-1)}]$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we have $\eta_n(x, y) \rightarrow 0$.

The above lemma has the following direct corollary:

Corollary 3.2. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every sequence $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$n^{1/(a-1)} \left| \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(x)}(P_\infty(n) = y) - \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(x')}(P_\infty(n) = y) \right| \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$$

uniformly in $x, x' \in [1, n^{1/(a-1)}\delta_n]$ and uniformly in $y \in [\varepsilon n^{1/(a-1)}, \varepsilon^{-1}n^{1/(a-1)}]$.

Besides, the following lemma is proven in the case $a = 2$ but the same proof works for all $a \in (3/2, 5/2]$.

Lemma 3.3. (Lemma 4 of [BCM18]) For all $0 < r < 3/2$, we have

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\left(\frac{n^{1/(a-1)}}{P_\infty(n)} \right)^r \right) < \infty.$$

Remark 3.4. By Lemma 3.3 and by (3.1), if \mathbf{q} is of type $a < 5/2$, then $(n/P_\infty(n)^{a-1})_{n \geq 0}$ is uniformly integrable and converges in distribution. Hence

$$\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\frac{n}{P_\infty(n)^{a-1}} \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{\Upsilon_a^\uparrow(p_{\mathbf{q}})^{a-1}} \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{p_{\mathbf{q}} \Upsilon_a^\uparrow(1)^{a-1}} \right) = \frac{2\Gamma(a)}{p_{\mathbf{q}}(a-1)\pi^{3/2}\Gamma(a-3/2)}.$$

where the last equality comes from the end of the proof of Proposition 2.7 in [Kam23b].

From the previous lemma, as shown in [BCM18], one can deduce that the perimeter process decorrelates at different scales, in the following sense:

Lemma 3.5. (Lemma 5 of [BCM18]) Let A_n be a sequence tending to ∞ . For all $\varepsilon > 0$, for all $i \geq 1$, let $I(i, \varepsilon) = [\varepsilon i^{1/(a-1)}, \varepsilon^{-1}i^{1/(a-1)}]$ and let

$$X_i^{(\varepsilon)} := \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i) \in I(i, \varepsilon)} - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i) \in I(i, \varepsilon)} \right).$$

If \mathbf{q} is of type $a < 5/2$, then

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sup_{A_n i \leq j \leq n} \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(i X_i^{(\varepsilon)} j X_j^{(\varepsilon)} \right) \right| = 0.$$

Proof. The proof follows the same lines as in the case $a = 2$ treated in [BCM18], but let us write it for completeness. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(i X_i^{(\varepsilon)} j X_j^{(\varepsilon)} \right) \right| &\leq \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(i X_i^{(\varepsilon)} j X_j^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i) \notin I(i, \varepsilon)} \right) \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(i X_i^{(\varepsilon)} j X_j^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(j) \notin I(j, \varepsilon)} \right) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(i X_i^{(\varepsilon)} j X_j^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i) \in I(i, \varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(j) \in I(j, \varepsilon)} \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Let $K_i^{(\varepsilon)} = \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}\left(\frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i) \in I(i, \varepsilon)}\right)$. Note that on the event $\{P_\infty(i) \notin I(i, \varepsilon)\}$, we have $X_i^{(\varepsilon)} = -K_i^{(\varepsilon)}$, so the first term can be written

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(iX_i^{(\varepsilon)} jX_j^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i) \notin I(i, \varepsilon)} \right) \right| = (iK_i^{(\varepsilon)}) \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(jX_j^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i) \notin I(i, \varepsilon)} \right) \right|,$$

which converges to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ uniformly in $i, j \geq 1$ since $(iK_i^{(\varepsilon)})_{i \geq 1, \varepsilon > 0}$ is upperbounded by some constant $C > 0$ by Remark 3.4, since $(jX_j^{(\varepsilon)})_{j \geq 1, \varepsilon > 0}$ is uniformly integrable by Lemma 3.3 using that $a - 1 < 3/2$ and since $(P_\infty(i)/i^{1/(a-1)})_{i \geq 1}$ is tight by (3.1). The second term is handled in the same way. Thus, it only remains to show that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sup_{A_n i \leq j \leq n} \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(iX_i^{(\varepsilon)} jX_j^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(j)/j^{1/(a-1)}, P_\infty(i)/i^{1/(a-1)} \in [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon]} \right) \right| = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Notice that for n large enough, for all $A_n i \leq j \leq n$ we have $j - i \geq j/2$, so that $(2(j - i))/A_{j-i} \geq i$. Therefore, by Corollary 3.2 with ε, n, δ_n replaced by $\varepsilon/2^{1/(a-1)}, j - i, (2/A_{j-i})^{1/(a-1)}/\varepsilon$, we know that for n large enough, for all $A_n i \leq j \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\substack{1 \leq x \leq i^{1/(a-1)}/\varepsilon \\ \varepsilon j^{1/(a-1)} \leq y \leq j^{1/(a-1)}/\varepsilon}} \left| \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(x)}(P_\infty(j - i) = y) - \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)}(P_\infty(j - i) = y) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\substack{1 \leq x \leq (j-i)^{1/(a-1)}(2/A_{j-i})^{1/(a-1)}/\varepsilon \\ (\varepsilon/2^{1/(a-1)})(j-i)^{1/(a-1)} \leq y \leq (2^{1/(a-1)}/\varepsilon)(j-i)^{1/(a-1)}}} \left| \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(x)}(P_\infty(j - i) = y) - \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)}(P_\infty(j - i) = y) \right| \\ & \leq \varepsilon^a / j^{1/(a-1)} \end{aligned}$$

and so by the Markov property

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i) \leq i^{1/(a-1)}/\varepsilon} \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(jX_j^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(j) \in I(j, \varepsilon)} \middle| P_\infty(i) \right) - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(jX_j^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(j) \in I(j, \varepsilon)} \middle| P_\infty(i) = 1 \right) \right| \\ & \leq \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i) \leq i^{1/(a-1)}/\varepsilon} \sum_{j^{1/(a-1)\varepsilon} \leq y \leq j^{1/(a-1)}/\varepsilon} \left| \frac{j}{y^{a-1}} - jK_j^{(\varepsilon)} \right| \frac{\varepsilon^a}{j^{1/(a-1)}} \\ & \leq \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i) \leq i^{1/(a-1)}/\varepsilon} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{a-1}} + C \right) \varepsilon^{a-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for n large enough, for all $A_n i \leq j \leq n$,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(jX_j^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(j) \in [j^{1/(a-1)\varepsilon}, j^{1/(a-1)}/\varepsilon]} \middle| P_\infty(i) = 1 \right) \right| \leq \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(|jX_{j-i}^{(\varepsilon)}| \right) \leq 4C.$$

Besides, using the fact that $\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} X_i^{(\varepsilon)} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(iX_i^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i) \in I(i, \varepsilon)} \right) \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(iX_i^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i) \notin I(i, \varepsilon)} \right) \right| \\ &= iK_i^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)}(P_\infty(i) \notin I(i, \varepsilon)) \\ &\leq C \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\Upsilon_a^\uparrow(p_{\mathbf{q}}) \notin [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon] \right), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(iX_i^{(\varepsilon)} jX_j^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i)/i^{1/(a-1)}, P_\infty(j)/j^{1/(a-1)} \in [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon]} \right) \right| \\ & \leq C \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\Upsilon_a^\uparrow(p_{\mathbf{q}}) \notin [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon] \right) (4C + (1/\varepsilon^{a-1} + C)\varepsilon^{a-1}), \end{aligned}$$

which converges towards zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

3.2 Number of faces in the geodesics

We are now well equipped to deal with the proof of Theorem 1.1. For sake of readability, we treat separately the dilute case $a \in (2, 5/2]$, the critical case $a = 2$ and the dense case $a \in (3/2, 2)$.

3.2.1 Dilute case

Proof of Theorem 1.1 in the dilute case. For all $i \geq 0$, let f_i be the face of degree $2\Delta P_\infty(i) + 2$ which is discovered at time i of the exploration when $\Delta P_\infty(i) \geq 0$. By (2.4), we know that conditionally on P_∞ , the $X_i := \mathbf{1}_{f_i \in \Gamma_{\lfloor nt \rfloor}}$'s for $i \in \llbracket 0, \lfloor nt \rfloor - 1 \rrbracket$ are independent Bernoulli random variables of parameters θ_i .

Let us start with the case $a \in (2, 5/2]$. Notice that it suffices to check that

$$\left(n^{-\frac{a-2}{a-1}} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \theta_i \right)_{t \geq 0} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(\frac{e_{\mathbf{q}}}{2} \int_0^t \frac{ds}{\Upsilon_a^\uparrow(p_{\mathbf{q}}s)} \right)_{t \geq 0} \quad (3.3)$$

for the topology of uniform convergence on compact sets, which is equivalent to the convergence in terms of finite dimensional distributions since the limiting process is a continuous increasing process.

Indeed, if we suppose (3.3), then we deduce that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\left(n^{-\frac{a-2}{a-1}} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} (X_i - \theta_i) \right)^2 \middle| P_\infty \right) = n^{-2\frac{a-2}{a-1}} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} (\theta_i - \theta_i^2) \leq n^{-2\frac{a-2}{a-1}} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \theta_i \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(\mathbb{P})} 0.$$

In order to prove (3.3), it suffices to show that

$$\left(n^{-\frac{a-2}{a-1}} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) \right)_{t \geq 0} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(\frac{e_{\mathbf{q}}}{2} \int_0^t \frac{ds}{\Upsilon_a^\uparrow(p_{\mathbf{q}}s)} \right)_{t \geq 0}. \quad (3.4)$$

Indeed, by a straightforward computation, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} (\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i))) \right)^2 \right) = \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left((\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)))^2 \right) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i^2),$$

and we have $\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i^2) = O(i^{-1/(a-1)})$ due to the fact that, thanks to (2.3) and since $h^\uparrow(p) \sim 2\sqrt{p/\pi}$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i^2 | P_\infty(i) = p) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \left(\frac{2k+1}{2(p+k)} \right)^2 \frac{h^\uparrow(p+k)}{h^\uparrow(p)} \nu(k) = O \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{k^{2-a}}{(p+k)^{3/2}} \right) = O \left(\frac{1}{p^{a-1}} \right) \quad (3.5)$$

and to the fact that $a - 1 > 1$ and $\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(1/P_\infty(i)) = O(i^{-1/(a-1)})$ by Equation (18) of [BC17]. As a result,

$$n^{-2\frac{a-2}{a-1}} \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} (\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i))) \right)^2 \right) = O \left(n^{-\frac{a-2}{a-1}} \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad (3.6)$$

so that (3.4) implies (3.3).

Now, since $h^\uparrow(p) \sim 2\sqrt{p/\pi}$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$ and since $ph^\uparrow(p+k)/(h^\uparrow(p)(p+k))$ is upperbounded by a constant, we have

$$p \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i) = p) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{2k+1}{2} \nu(k) \frac{p}{p+k} \frac{h^\uparrow(p+k)}{h^\uparrow(p)} \xrightarrow{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e_{\mathbf{q}}}{2}. \quad (3.7)$$

Therefore, by (3.1), to show (3.4) it suffices to see that

$$n^{-\frac{a-2}{a-1}} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \int_0^t \frac{1}{\Upsilon_a^\uparrow(p_{\mathbf{q}}s)} ds,$$

which is a consequence of the end of the proof of Proposition 4.1 in [BC17]. \square

3.2.2 Critical case

Proof of Theorem 1.1 in the case $a = 2$. By the same reasoning as in the dilute case, it is enough to prove that

$$\frac{1}{(\log n)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(L^1)} \frac{1}{\pi^2}. \quad (3.8)$$

Let us first show that

$$\frac{1}{(\log n)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(L^1)} \frac{1}{\pi^2}. \quad (3.9)$$

For all $i \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2k+1}{2(P_\infty(i)+k)} \frac{h^\uparrow(P_\infty(i)+k)}{h^\uparrow(P_\infty(i))} \nu(k). \quad (3.10)$$

So, by (2.3) and the fact that $h^\uparrow(p) \sim 2\sqrt{p/\pi}$, as $p \rightarrow \infty$, the expectation $\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i) = p)$ is upperbounded by

$$O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right) + O\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k\sqrt{p(p+k)}}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{1/p}^{\infty} \frac{1}{x\sqrt{1+x}} dx\right) = O\left(\frac{\log p}{p}\right).$$

Moreover, by the end of the proof of Proposition 5 in [BCM18], we know that the sequence $((i \log P_\infty(i))/(P_\infty(i) \log i))_{i \geq 2}$ is uniformly integrable, so that $((i/\log i) \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)))_{i \geq 1}$ is also uniformly integrable. Besides, using (2.3), (3.1) and the fact that $h^\uparrow(p) \sim 2\sqrt{p/\pi}$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$, it is easy to see that $\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i))$ is equivalent in probability to

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{p_{\mathbf{q}}}{k\sqrt{P_\infty(i)(P_\infty(i)+k)}} \underset{i \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)} \int_{1/P_\infty(i)}^{\infty} \frac{p_{\mathbf{q}}}{u\sqrt{1+u}} du \underset{i \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{p_{\mathbf{q}} \log P_\infty(i)}{P_\infty(i)} \underset{i \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{p_{\mathbf{q}} \log i}{P_\infty(i)}.$$

Thus, by (3.1),

$$\frac{i \log P_\infty(i)}{P_\infty(i) \log i} - \frac{i}{\log i} \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) \xrightarrow{i \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

As a consequence, in order to show (3.9) it suffices to prove that

$$\frac{1}{(\log n)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{p_{\mathbf{q}} \log i}{P_\infty(i)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi^2}.$$

By Remark 3.4 (or by Remark 3 of [BCM18] for this precise case), we know that

$$\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \frac{i}{P_\infty(i)} \xrightarrow{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{\Upsilon_2^\uparrow(p_{\mathbf{q}})} = \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{p_{\mathbf{q}} \Upsilon_2^\uparrow(1)} = \frac{2}{\pi^2 p_{\mathbf{q}}}. \quad (3.11)$$

Hence, since $\sum_{i=1}^n (\log i)/i \sim (\log n)^2/2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, to show (3.9) it remains to check that

$$\frac{1}{(\log n)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\log i) \left(\frac{1}{P_\infty(i)} - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\frac{1}{P_\infty(i)} \right) \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (3.12)$$

We prove (3.12) using the same techniques as in the proof of Proposition 3 in [BCM18]. For all $i \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, as in [BCM18], we set

$$\begin{aligned} X_i^{(\varepsilon)} &:= \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)} \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon \leq P_\infty(i)/i \leq 1/\varepsilon} - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\frac{1}{P_\infty(i)} \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon \leq P_\infty(i)/i \leq 1/\varepsilon} \right) \\ Y_i^{(\varepsilon)} &:= \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i)/i \notin [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon]} - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\frac{1}{P_\infty(i)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i)/i \notin [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon]} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, to prove (3.12) it is sufficient to show that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\left(\frac{1}{(\log n)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\log i) X_i^{(\varepsilon)} \right)^2 \right) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left| \frac{1}{(\log n)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\log i) Y_i^{(\varepsilon)} \right| = 0 \quad (3.13)$$

The second term is zero since

$$\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} |i Y_i^{(\varepsilon)}| \leq 2 \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\frac{i}{P_\infty(i)} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i)/i \notin [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon]} \right)$$

and since $(i/P_\infty(i))_{i \geq 1}$ is uniformly integrable by Lemma 3.3 and is tight in \mathbb{R}_+^* by (3.1). For the first term of (3.13), let A_n be an increasing sequence tending to infinity such that $\log A_n = o(\log n)$.

We compute

$$\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\left(\frac{1}{(\log n)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\log i) X_i^{(\varepsilon)} \right)^2 \right) \leq \frac{1}{(\log n)^4} \sum_{i=1}^n (\log i)^2 \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\left(X_i^{(\varepsilon)} \right)^2 \right) \quad (3.14)$$

$$+ \frac{2}{(\log n)^4} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i+1}^{A_n i} (\log i)(\log j) \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(X_i^{(\varepsilon)} X_j^{(\varepsilon)} \right) \right| \quad (3.15)$$

$$+ \frac{2}{(\log n)^4} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=A_n i+1}^n (\log i)(\log j) \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(X_i^{(\varepsilon)} X_j^{(\varepsilon)} \right) \right|. \quad (3.16)$$

The quantity on the right of the first line (3.14) is a $O(1/(\log n)^4)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ since $|X_i^{(\varepsilon)}| \leq 2/(\varepsilon i)$ by definition. Using that $\sum_{j=i+1}^{A_n i} (\log j)/j \leq C(\log(A_n i)^2 - \log(i)^2) = C((\log A_n)^2 + 2(\log A_n)(\log i))$ for some constant $C > 0$, the second line (3.15) is upperbounded by

$$O\left(\frac{1}{(\log n)^4} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i+1}^{A_n i} (\log i)(\log j) \frac{1}{ij}\right) = O\left(\frac{\log A_n}{(\log n)^4} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2(\log i)^2 + (\log A_n)(\log i)}{i}\right) = O\left(\frac{\log A_n}{\log n}\right).$$

To deal with the third line (3.16), it suffices to combine Lemma 3.5 together with the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^n (\log i)/i = O((\log n)^2)$. This proves the convergence (3.13), hence (3.12) and thus the convergence (3.9).

To conclude the case $a = 2$ it remains to prove (3.8) which is implied by the following convergence:

$$\frac{1}{(\log n)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_{\infty}^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_{\infty}(i))\right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(L^2)} 0. \quad (3.17)$$

To prove (3.17), by a straightforward computation, one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\infty}^{(1)} \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_{\infty}^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_{\infty}(i)) \right) \right)^2 \right) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\infty}^{(1)} \left(\left(\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_{\infty}^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_{\infty}(i)) \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{E}_{\infty}^{(1)}(\theta_i^2) - \mathbb{E}_{\infty}^{(1)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\infty}^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_{\infty}(i))^2 \right) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\infty}^{(1)}(\theta_i^2) \\ &= O(\log n), \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where the last line comes from the fact that, by (2.3) and the fact that $h^{\uparrow}(p) \sim 2\sqrt{p/\pi}$, as $p \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\infty}^{(1)}(\theta_i^2 | P_{\infty}(i) = p) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \binom{2k+1}{2(p+k)} \frac{h^{\uparrow}(p+k)}{h^{\uparrow}(p)} \nu(k) = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(p+k)^{3/2}}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right),$$

and from the fact that $\mathbb{E}_{\infty}^{(1)}(1/P_{\infty}(i)) = O(1/i)$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ by (3.11). \square

3.2.3 Dense case

Proof of Theorem 1.1 in the dense case. For the dense case $a \in (3/2, 2)$, the proof is analogous to the case $a = 2$. By the same reasoning as in the dilute case, it is enough to prove that

$$\frac{1}{\log n} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(L^1)} \frac{2}{\pi \tan((2-a)\pi)}. \quad (3.19)$$

Let us first show that

$$\frac{1}{\log n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\infty}^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_{\infty}(i)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(L^1)} \frac{2}{\pi \tan((2-a)\pi)}. \quad (3.20)$$

By splitting the sum in (3.10) before and after $\log i$ and using the fact that $h^\uparrow(p) \sim 2\sqrt{p/\pi}$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$, we get that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $i \geq 0$ for all $p \geq 1$,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i) = p) - \sum_{k=\lfloor \log i \rfloor}^{\infty} \frac{2k+1}{2(p+k)} \frac{h^\uparrow(p+k)}{h^\uparrow(p)} \nu(k) \right| \leq C \frac{(\log i)^2}{p}.$$

As a result, by Lemma 3.3, as $i \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) - \sum_{k=\lfloor \log i \rfloor}^{\infty} \frac{2k+1}{2(P_\infty(i)+k)} \frac{h^\uparrow(P_\infty(i)+k)}{h^\uparrow(P_\infty(i))} \nu(k) \right| \leq C \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\frac{(\log i)^2}{P_\infty(i)} \right) = O \left(\frac{(\log i)^2}{i^{1/(a-1)}} \right). \quad (3.21)$$

Moreover, by (2.3), since $h^\uparrow(p) \sim 2\sqrt{p/\pi}$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$, since $P_\infty(i)$ goes to ∞ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ in probability and using a Riemann sum, we have

$$\sum_{k=\lfloor \log i \rfloor}^{\infty} \frac{2k+1}{2(P_\infty(i)+k)} \frac{h^\uparrow(P_\infty(i)+k)}{h^\uparrow(P_\infty(i))} \nu(k) \stackrel{(\mathbb{P})}{\underset{i \rightarrow \infty}{\sim}} \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \int_0^\infty \frac{u}{\sqrt{1+u}} \frac{p_{\mathbf{q}} \cos(a\pi)}{u^a} du. \quad (3.22)$$

By (2.3) and since $h^\uparrow(p) \sim 2\sqrt{p/\pi}$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$, we can also upperbound for all $i, p \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2k+1}{2(P_\infty(i)+k)} \frac{h^\uparrow(P_\infty(i)+k)}{h^\uparrow(P_\infty(i))} \nu(k) \leq \frac{C_{\mathbf{q}}}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \int_0^\infty \frac{u}{\sqrt{1+u}} \frac{p_{\mathbf{q}} \cos(a\pi)}{u^a} du, \quad (3.23)$$

for some constant $C_{\mathbf{q}} > 0$, so that by applying Lemma 3.3 and (3.21) we obtain that $(i \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)))_{i \geq 1}$ is uniformly integrable. Thus, by (3.22) and (3.1), we deduce that

$$i \left(\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) - \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} p_{\mathbf{q}} \cos(a\pi) \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{u^{a-1} \sqrt{1+u}} du \right) \underset{i \rightarrow \infty}{\xrightarrow{(L^1)}} 0. \quad (3.24)$$

Moreover, by the change of variable $t = 1/(1+u)$, the relation between the Beta and the Gamma functions and the fact that $\Gamma(1/2) = \sqrt{\pi}$,

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{u^{a-1} \sqrt{1+u}} du = \frac{\Gamma(2-a)\Gamma(a-3/2)}{\sqrt{\pi}}.$$

By Euler's reflection formula,

$$\frac{2\Gamma(a)}{(a-1)\pi^{3/2}\Gamma(a-3/2)} \frac{\Gamma(2-a)\Gamma(a-3/2)}{\sqrt{\pi}} = \frac{-2}{\pi \sin(\pi a)}.$$

So by Remark 3.4 and (3.24), we obtain that

$$i \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i) \underset{i \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} i \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} p_{\mathbf{q}} \cos(a\pi) \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{u^{a-1} \sqrt{1+u}} du \right) \underset{i \rightarrow \infty}{\rightarrow} \frac{2}{\pi \tan((2-a)\pi)}. \quad (3.25)$$

Hence, by (3.24), to show (3.20) it remains to check that

$$\frac{1}{\log n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \right) \right) \underset{n \rightarrow \infty}{\xrightarrow{(L^1)}} 0, \quad (3.26)$$

which follows from truncations which are similar to the case $a = 2$. To prove (3.26), for all $i \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, similarly to [BCM18], we set

$$\begin{aligned} X_i^{(\varepsilon)} &:= \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon \leq P_\infty(i)^{a-1}/i \leq 1/\varepsilon} - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon \leq P_\infty(i)^{a-1}/i \leq 1/\varepsilon} \right) \\ Y_i^{(\varepsilon)} &:= \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}/i \notin [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon]} - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}/i \notin [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon]} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, to prove (3.26) it is sufficient to show that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\left(\frac{1}{\log n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{(\varepsilon)} \right)^2 \right) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left| \frac{1}{\log n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i^{(\varepsilon)} \right| = 0 \quad (3.27)$$

The second term of (3.27) is zero since

$$\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left| i Y_i^{(\varepsilon)} \right| \leq 2 \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\frac{i}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}/i \notin [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon]} \right)$$

and since $(i/P_\infty(i)^{a-1})_{i \geq 1}$ is uniformly integrable by Lemma 3.3 and is tight by (3.1). For the first term of (3.27), let A_n be an increasing sequence tending to infinity such that $\log A_n = o(\log n)$. One upperbounds

$$\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\left(\frac{1}{\log n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{(\varepsilon)} \right)^2 \right) \leq \frac{1}{(\log n)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\left(X_i^{(\varepsilon)} \right)^2 \right) \quad (3.28)$$

$$+ \frac{2}{(\log n)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i+1}^{A_n i} \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(X_i^{(\varepsilon)} X_j^{(\varepsilon)} \right) \right| \quad (3.29)$$

$$+ \frac{2}{(\log n)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=A_n i+1}^n \left| \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(X_i^{(\varepsilon)} X_j^{(\varepsilon)} \right) \right|. \quad (3.30)$$

Since for all $i \geq 1$ we have $|X_i^{(\varepsilon)}| \leq 2/(i\varepsilon)$, the first term (3.28) is a $O(1/(\log n)^2)$, the second line (3.29) is a $O((\log A_n)/(\log n))$ and the third one is controlled using Lemma 3.5. This proves (3.27), hence (3.26) and thus (3.20). To end the proof of Theorem 1.1, it is enough to check that

$$\frac{1}{\log n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(L^2)} 0, \quad (3.31)$$

which implies (3.19). By (3.18) and by (3.25), we know that

$$\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) \right) \right)^2 \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i^2) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \theta_i = O(\log n),$$

hence (3.31), thus ending the proof. \square

3.3 Application: comparison of fpp and graph distance in the dilute case

We apply our results on the fpp geodesics to show Corollary 1.2 which states that in the dilute case, fpp balls are included in balls for the graph distance with a suitable radius.

Proof of Corollary 1.2. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. We reason conditionally on the perimeter process P_∞ . Let e be an edge on $\partial\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n$, then, by (2.4), the number of faces in the fpp geodesic from e to the root face f_r in \mathfrak{m}_∞ has the same law as $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} X_i$ where the X_i 's are i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables of parameters θ_i . Thus, by a union bound on e ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n \not\subseteq \overline{\text{Ball}}_{\lfloor (1+\varepsilon) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \theta_i \rfloor}^\dagger(\mathfrak{m}_\infty) \middle| P_\infty \right) \\ & \leq 2P_\infty(n) \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} X_i \geq (1+\varepsilon) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \theta_i \middle| P_\infty \right) \\ & \leq 4P_\infty(n) \exp \left(-c\varepsilon^2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \theta_i \right) \quad (\text{Chernoff}) \\ & \leq 4P_\infty(n) \exp \left(-c\varepsilon^2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{2P_\infty(i) + 1} \right) \\ & \leq 4n^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{a-1}} \exp \left(-\frac{c\varepsilon^2}{3} n^{\frac{a-2-\varepsilon}{a-1}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

a.s. for all n large enough, where c is some absolute constant from Chernoff's inequality and where the last inequality comes from the fact that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, a.s. for n large enough we have

$$n^{\frac{1-\varepsilon}{a-1}} \leq P_\infty(n) \leq n^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{a-1}} \quad (3.32)$$

by Lemma 10.9 of [Cur23].

By summing over n , by Borel-Cantelli's lemma, we deduce that almost surely, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, for all n large enough, we have

$$\bar{\mathfrak{e}}_n \subseteq \overline{\text{Ball}}_{\lfloor (1+\varepsilon) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \theta_i \rfloor}^\dagger(\mathfrak{m}_\infty).$$

Next, let us prove that almost surely,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \theta_i \underset{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{e_{\mathbf{q}}}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)} \underset{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} e_{\mathbf{q}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{\mathcal{E}_i}{2P_\infty(i)}. \quad (3.33)$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For the first equivalent of (3.33), one can see that we have uniformly in $i \geq 0$, for all $p \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\exp \left(\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) \right) \middle| P_\infty(i) = p \right) & \leq 1 + C \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\left(\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) \right)^2 \middle| P_\infty(i) = p \right) \\ & \leq 1 + C' \frac{1}{p^{a-1}} \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $C, C' > 0$, where the first inequality comes from the fact that $\theta_i \in [0, 1]$ and the second one stems from (3.5). As a result,

$$\mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\exp \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) - C' \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \right) \right) \right) \leq 1$$

Thus, for all $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) - C' \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \right) \geq \delta n^{\frac{a-2}{a-1}-\varepsilon} \right) \leq \exp \left(-\delta n^{\frac{a-2}{a-1}-\varepsilon} \right).$$

So, taking $\varepsilon < (a-2)/(a-1)$, by Borel-Cantelli's lemma, we have a.s. as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) - C' \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)^{a-1}} \right) \leq o \left(n^{\frac{a-2}{a-1}-\varepsilon} \right).$$

Then, applying (3.32), we deduce that a.s. $\sum_{i=0}^n 1/P_\infty(i)^{a-1} = O(\sum_{i=1}^n 1/i^{1-\varepsilon}) = O(n^\varepsilon)$, so

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) \right) \leq o \left(n^{\frac{a-2}{a-1}-\varepsilon} \right).$$

By the same reasoning, we also get almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$- \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\theta_i - \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) \right) \leq o \left(n^{\frac{a-2}{a-1}-\varepsilon} \right).$$

Besides, by (3.32), we have a.s. $\sum_{i=0}^\infty 1/P_\infty(i) = \infty$ so that by (3.7), we deduce that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_\infty^{(1)}(\theta_i | P_\infty(i)) \stackrel{\text{(a.s.)}}{\underset{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{e_{\mathbf{q}}}{2} \frac{1}{P_\infty(i)},$$

hence the first asymptotic in (3.33) using that $n^{\frac{a-2}{a-1}-\varepsilon} = o(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1/P_\infty(i))$ a.s. by applying (3.32) once more. For the second asymptotic in (3.33), we apply Bernstein's concentration inequality for exponential random variables (see e.g. Corollary 2.10 of [Tal94]) and get that for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, a.s. for all $\delta > 0$, for n large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\infty^{(1)} \left(\left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{\mathcal{E}_i - 1}{P_\infty(i)} \right| > \delta n^{\frac{a-2}{a-1}-\varepsilon} \middle| P_\infty \right) &\leq 2 \exp \left(-C'' \min \left(\frac{\delta^2 n^{2\frac{a-2}{a-1}-2\varepsilon}}{\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1/P_\infty(i)^2}, \frac{\delta n^{\frac{a-2}{a-1}-\varepsilon}}{\max_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} 1/P_\infty(i)} \right) \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left(-C'' \delta n^{\frac{a-2}{a-1}-\varepsilon} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $C'' > 0$ is an absolute constant and where the second inequality comes from (3.32) and from the fact that $2/(a-1) \geq 4/3 > 1$ since $a \leq 5/2$ so that a.s. $\sum_{i=0}^\infty 1/P_\infty(i)^2 < \infty$, hence the second equivalent of (3.33) by Borel-Cantelli's lemma and by (3.32). The almost sure asymptotic (3.33) ends the proof since $\bar{\varepsilon}_n$ is the hull of the fpp ball of radius $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{E}_i / (2P_\infty(i))$. \square

We next turn to the proof of Corollary 1.3

Proof of Corollary 1.3. Recall that $\bar{\varepsilon}_n$ is the hull of the fpp ball of radius $T_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{E}_i / (2P_\infty(i))$. The result follows from the same lines as in the beginning of the proof of Corollary 1.2, using (3.8) and using the fact that $T_n / \log n$ converges in probability towards $1/(p_{\mathbf{q}} \pi^2)$ by Proposition 3 of [BCM18]. \square

3.4 Second application: the diameter of dense maps is logarithmic for the dual graph distance

We prove in this subsection Theorem 1.4 which states that in the case $a \in (3/2, 2)$, the diameter of random maps of law $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ grows at rate at most $\log \ell$. It is not a consequence of Theorem 1.1, but it relies on its proof, more precisely on the inequality (3.23). The proof relies on the martingales introduced in [Kam23b]. Before entering the proof of the theorem, we recall the notion of maps with a target face. A planar map with a target face \mathbf{m}_\square is a planar map with a distinguished face \square which is not the root face f_r . For all $\ell, p \geq 1$, we denote by $\mathcal{M}_p^{(\ell)}$ the set of planar maps of perimeter 2ℓ with a target face of degree $2p$. The weight $w_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{m}_\square)$ of a map $\mathbf{m}_\square \in \mathcal{M}_p^{(\ell)}$ is defined by

$$w_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{m}_\square) = \prod_{f \in \text{Faces}(\mathbf{m}_\square) \setminus \{f_r, \square\}} q_{\deg(f)/2}.$$

The partition function of such maps is given by Equation (3.9) of [Cur23] for all $\ell, p \geq 1$:

$$W_p^{(\ell)} := \sum_{\mathbf{m}_\square \in \mathcal{M}_p^{(\ell)}} w_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{m}_\square) = \frac{1}{2} h_p^\downarrow(\ell) c_{\mathbf{q}}^{\ell+p},$$

where

$$h_p^\downarrow(\ell) = h^\downarrow(\ell) h^\downarrow(p) \frac{\ell}{\ell+p} \quad \text{with} \quad h^\downarrow(\ell) = \frac{1}{2^{2\ell}} \binom{2\ell}{\ell}. \quad (3.34)$$

We also set by convention $h_p^\downarrow(\ell) = \mathbf{1}_{\ell=-p}$ for all $\ell \leq 0$. We denote by $\mathbb{P}_p^{(\ell)}$ the associated Boltzmann probability measure. The peeling exploration of a map with a target face is defined in the same way as for maps without target face except that at each gluing event, we choose to fill in the hole which does not contain the target face. When we discover the target face, the exploration ends and by convention, we say that the perimeter is absorbed at $-p$. The perimeter process under $\mathbb{P}_p^{(\ell)}$, which is denoted by $(P_p(n))_{n \geq 0}$ is then a Doob h_p^\downarrow -transform of the ν random walk starting at ℓ which is absorbed when it reaches $-p$ by Proposition 4.7 of [Cur23]. Its law can also be interpreted as a ν -random walk starting at ℓ conditioned to stay positive until it jumps and dies at $-p$ by Proposition 5.3 of [Cur23].

Next, we introduce two supermartingales.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose \mathbf{q} is of type $a \in (3/2, 2)$. Let $\ell \geq 1$. Under $\mathbb{P}_\ell^{(1)}$, conditionally on P_ℓ , let $(X_i)_{i \geq 0}$ be a family of independent Bernoulli random variables of parameters $(2\Delta P_\ell(i)+1)/(2(P_\ell(i)+1)) \mathbf{1}_{\Delta P_\ell(i) \geq 0}$ and $P_\ell(i) \geq 1$. Then, there exists a constant $C_{\mathbf{q}}'$ such that for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, the process $(M_n^{(\ell, \lambda)})_{n \geq 0}$ defined by*

$$\forall n \geq 0, \quad M_n^{(\ell, \lambda)} = \exp \left(\lambda \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} X_i - C_{\mathbf{q}}' \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{P_\ell(i)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{P_\ell(i) \geq 1} \right) \right)$$

is a supermartingale with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{G}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ defined by

$$\forall n \geq 0, \quad \mathcal{G}_n = \sigma((P_\ell(i))_{0 \leq i \leq n}, (X_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n-1}).$$

Proof. The process is clearly adapted. Moreover, by (3.34) and (2.1), for all $p \geq 1$, we have $h_\ell^\downarrow(p) = h^\downarrow(\ell)h^\uparrow(p)/(2(\ell + p))$, so that for all $n \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_\ell^{(1)}(\exp(\lambda X_n) | \mathcal{G}_n) &= \mathbb{E}_\ell^{(1)}\left((e^\lambda - 1) \frac{2\Delta P_\ell(n) + 1}{2P_\ell(n) + 1} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta P_\ell(n) \geq 0 \text{ and } P_\ell(n) \geq 1} + 1 \middle| \mathcal{G}_{n-1}\right) \\
&= 1 + (e^\lambda - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2k + 1}{2P_\ell(n) + 2k} \frac{h_\ell^\downarrow(P_\ell(n) + k)}{h_\ell^\downarrow(P_\ell(n))} \nu(k) \mathbf{1}_{P_\ell(n) \geq 1} \\
&\leq 1 + (e^\lambda - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2k + 1}{2P_\ell(n) + 2k} \frac{h^\uparrow(P_\ell(n) + k)}{h^\uparrow(P_\ell(n))} \nu(k) \mathbf{1}_{P_\ell(n) \geq 1} \\
&\leq 1 + C'_\mathbf{q} \frac{\lambda}{P_\ell(n)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{P_\ell(n) \geq 1} \quad \text{by (3.23)} \\
&\leq \exp\left(C'_\mathbf{q} \frac{\lambda}{P_\ell(n)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{P_\ell(n) \geq 1}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $C'_\mathbf{q} > 0$ is a constant which depends on \mathbf{q} , hence the desired result. \square

We then introduce a second supermartingale, which is closely related to the martingale (6.1) in [Kam23b] and corresponds to the supermartingale of Lemma 6.2 in [Kam23b] in the case $a = 2$.

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose \mathbf{q} is of type $a \in (3/2, 5/2]$. Let $\lambda > 0$ such that $\lambda < \min_{k, \ell \geq 1} k^{a-1}(\nu((-\infty, -k]) - \nu(-k - \ell))$ (such a λ exists thanks to (2.3)). Then the process $(\widetilde{M}_n^{(\ell, \lambda)})_{n \geq 0}$ defined by*

$$\forall n \geq 0, \quad \widetilde{M}_n^{(\ell, \lambda)} = \frac{1}{h_\ell^\downarrow(P_\ell(n))} \exp\left(\lambda \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{P_\ell(i)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{P_\ell(i) \geq 1}\right)$$

is a supermartingale with respect to the natural filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ associated with the process P_ℓ .

Proof. The proof is the same as the proof of Lemma 6.2 in [Kam23b] and boils down to the fact that for all $n \geq 0$, by definition of λ and since $\exp(x) \leq 1/(1-x)$ for all $x \in [0, 1)$, on the event $\{P_\ell(n) \geq 1\}$, we have

$$\exp\left(\frac{\lambda}{P_\ell(n)^{a-1}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \lambda/P_\ell(n)^{a-1}} \leq (\nu([-P_\ell(n) + 1, \infty)) + \nu(-P_\ell(n) - \ell))^{-1}.$$

It then suffices to use that P_ℓ is a Doob h_ℓ^\downarrow -transform of the ν -random walk. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. It suffices to prove that there exists a constant $C_\mathbf{q} > 0$ large enough such that if E is a uniform random edge of the map, then

$$\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}\left(d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_r, E) \geq C_\mathbf{q} \log \ell\right) \leq \ell^{-2}, \tag{3.35}$$

where $d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_r, E)$ is defined as the smallest dual graph distance from f_r to a face which is adjacent

to E . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)} \left(\exists e \in \text{Edges}(\mathbf{m}), d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_r, e) \geq C_{\mathbf{q}} \log \ell \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)} \left(\exists e \in \text{Edges}(\mathbf{m}), d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_r, e) \geq C_{\mathbf{q}} \log \ell \text{ and } \#\text{Edges}(\mathbf{m}) \leq \ell^a \right) + \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)} (\#\text{Edges}(\mathbf{m}) \geq \ell^a) \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\#\{e \in \text{Edges}(\mathbf{m}), d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_r, e) \geq C_{\mathbf{q}} \log \ell\} \mathbf{1}_{\#\text{Edges}(\mathbf{m}) \leq \ell^a} \right) + \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)} (\#\text{Edges}(\mathbf{m}) \geq \ell^a) \\
& \leq \ell^a \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)} \left(d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_r, E) \geq C_{\mathbf{q}} \log \ell \right) + \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)} (\#\text{Edges}(\mathbf{m}) \geq \ell^a) \xrightarrow{\ell \rightarrow \infty} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the convergence comes from (3.35) and from the fact that $\#\text{Edges}(\mathbf{m})/\ell^{a-1/2}$ converges in distribution under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ by Proposition 10.4 of [Cur23]. In order to prove (3.35), one can see that by unzipping the uniform random edge, using Equation (3.4) of [Kam23b], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)} \left(d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_r, E) \geq C_{\mathbf{q}} \log \ell \right) &= \frac{W_1^{(\ell)}}{W^{(\ell)}} \mathbb{E}_1^{(\ell)} \left(\frac{1}{\#\text{Edges}(\mathbf{m}_\square) - 1} \mathbf{1}_{d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_r, \square) \geq C_{\mathbf{q}} \log \ell} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{W_1^{(\ell)}}{W^{(\ell)}} \mathbb{P}_1^{(\ell)} \left(d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_r, \square) \geq C_{\mathbf{q}} \log \ell \right) \\
&= O(\ell^{a-1/2}) \mathbb{P}_\ell^{(1)} \left(d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_r, \square) \geq C_{\mathbf{q}} \log \ell \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line, we used that $W_1^{(\ell)}/W^{(\ell)} = \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \#\text{Edges}(\mathbf{m}) = O(\ell^{a-1/2})$ by Proposition 10.4 and Equation (10.8) of [Cur23]. Note also that in the last line, we have exchanged the root and the target face. Thus, it is enough to show that

$$\mathbb{P}_\ell^{(1)} \left(d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_r, \square) \geq C_{\mathbf{q}} \log \ell \right) = O(\ell^{-4}). \tag{3.36}$$

By the reversed uniform exploration, we know that the length of the fpp geodesic from f_r to \square has $\sum_{i=0}^{\tau_\ell-1} X_i$ faces, where the X_i 's are independent from the perimeter process and are independent Bernoulli random variables of parameters $\mathbf{1}_{\Delta P_\ell(i) \geq 0} (2\Delta P_\ell(i) + 1)/(2P_\ell(i+1))$ by (2.4), hence

$$d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_r, \square) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\tau_\ell-1} X_i.$$

Let $\lambda > 0$ satisfying the hypothesis of Lemma 3.7 and such that $\lambda/C_{\mathbf{q}}' < 1$, where $C_{\mathbf{q}}'$ appears in Lemma 3.6. Then, applying successively Markov's inequality, the fact that $h_\ell^\dagger(-\ell) = 1$ and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_\ell^{(1)} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\tau_\ell-1} X_i \geq C_{\mathbf{q}} \log \ell \right) &\leq \ell^{-\lambda C_{\mathbf{q}}/(2C_{\mathbf{q}}')} \mathbb{E}_\ell^{(1)} \exp \left(\frac{\lambda}{2C_{\mathbf{q}}'} \sum_{i=0}^{\tau_\ell-1} X_i \right) \\
&= \ell^{-\lambda C_{\mathbf{q}}/(2C_{\mathbf{q}}')} \mathbb{E}_\ell^{(1)} \sqrt{M_{\tau_\ell}^{(\ell, \lambda/C_{\mathbf{q}}')} \widetilde{M}_{\tau_\ell}^{(\ell, \lambda)}} \\
&\leq \ell^{-\lambda C_{\mathbf{q}}/(2C_{\mathbf{q}}')} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\ell^{(1)} \left(M_{\tau_\ell}^{(\ell, \lambda/C_{\mathbf{q}}')} \right) \mathbb{E}_\ell^{(1)} \left(\widetilde{M}_{\tau_\ell}^{(\ell, \lambda)} \right)} \\
&\leq \ell^{-\lambda C_{\mathbf{q}}/(2C_{\mathbf{q}}')} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\ell^{(1)} \left(M_0^{(\ell, \lambda/C_{\mathbf{q}}')} \right) \mathbb{E}_\ell^{(1)} \left(\widetilde{M}_0^{(\ell, \lambda)} \right)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 and from the fact that $\tau_{-\ell}$ is a stopping time for the filtrations $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ and $(\mathcal{G}_n)_{n \geq 0}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}_\ell^{(1)} \left(d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_r, \square) \geq C_{\mathbf{q}} \log \ell \right) \leq \ell^{-\lambda C_{\mathbf{q}} / (2C'_{\mathbf{q}})} \frac{1}{\sqrt{h_\ell^\downarrow(1)}} = O \left(\ell^{-\lambda C_{\mathbf{q}} / (2C'_{\mathbf{q}}) + 1/2} \right).$$

This proves (3.36) by taking $C_{\mathbf{q}}$ large enough and thus completes the proof. \square

4 Scaling limit of the coalescing flow of geodesics

This section and the next one describe the scaling limit of the fpp geodesics to the root under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$.

4.1 The self-similar Markov process arising as the scaling limit of the perimeter process

We recall the scaling limit of the perimeter process which is given in terms of positive self-similar Markov processes. These positive self similar Markov processes were first introduced and studied in [BBCK18]. As in p. 40 of [BBCK18], let Λ be the image by $x \mapsto \log x$ of the measure

$$\lambda(dx) := \frac{\Gamma(a)}{\pi} \left(\frac{1}{(x(1-x))^a} \mathbf{1}_{1/2 < x < 1} + \cos(a\pi) \frac{1}{(x(x-1))^a} \mathbf{1}_{x > 1} \right) dx.$$

Let ξ be the Lévy process with no Brownian part, with Lévy measure Λ and with drift

$$\frac{\Gamma(3-a)}{2\Gamma(4-2a)\sin(\pi(a-1))} + \frac{\Gamma(a)B_{1/2}(1-a, 3-a)}{\pi}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $B_{1/2}(x, y) = \int_0^{1/2} t^{x-1}(1-t)^{y-1} dt$ is the incomplete Beta function. As in [BBCK18], for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the Lamperti time substitution

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \tau_\alpha(t) = \inf \left\{ r \geq 0, \int_0^r e^{-\alpha \xi(s)} ds \geq t \right\}.$$

For all $x > 0$, the self-similar Markov process $X_a^{(\alpha)}$ associated with ξ of index α is defined by

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad X_a^{(\alpha)}(t) = x e^{\xi(\tau_\alpha(tx^\alpha))}.$$

Note that $X_a^{(0)}(t) = x e^{\xi(t)}$. We can now describe the scaling limit of the perimeter process under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ by Proposition 6.6 of [BBCK18]:

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(\frac{P(\ell^{a-1}t)}{\ell} \right)_{t \geq 0} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \left(X_a^{(1-a)}(c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} t) \right)_{t \geq 0}, \quad (4.2)$$

for the Skorokhod J_1 topology, where $c_a := \pi/\Gamma(a)$. Recall the notation $T_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{E}_i / (2P(i))$ for all $n \geq 0$ from Subsection 2.1 where the \mathcal{E}_i 's are i.i.d. exponential random variables of parameter 1. Then, jointly with (4.2), for the topology of uniform convergence on compact sets,

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(\frac{T_{\lfloor \ell^{a-1}t \rfloor}}{\ell^{a-2}} \right)_{t \geq 0} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(\frac{1}{2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}}} \int_0^{c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} t} \frac{1}{X_a^{(1-a)}(s)} ds \right)_{t \geq 0}. \quad (4.3)$$

In particular, combining (4.2) with (4.3) gives the scaling limit of the perimeter of the fpp balls. For all $r \geq 0$, let $\Theta(r) = \inf\{n \geq 0, T_n \geq r\}$. Then we have jointly with (4.2) and (4.3)

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(\frac{1}{2\ell} \left| \partial \overline{\text{Ball}}_{\ell^{a-2}r}^{\text{fpp}}(\mathbf{m}) \right| \right) = \left(\frac{P(\Theta(\ell^{a-2}r))}{\ell} \right)_{r \geq 0} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(X_a^{(2-a)}(2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} r) \right)_{r \geq 0}.$$

Actually, in order to introduce our coalescing flow of diffusions, we will also work at a different time-scale, so that the scaling limit of the perimeter process is $X_a^{(0)}$. Let $(\tilde{P}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ be the continuous time Markov process constructed from P under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ where at each step n we wait a time $\mathcal{E}_n/(2P(n)^{a-1})$, where $\mathcal{E}_n/(2P(n)) = T_{n+1} - T_n$. We have the scaling limit jointly with the previous ones

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor \ell^{a-1}t \rfloor} \frac{\mathcal{E}_n}{2P(n)^{a-1}} \right)_{t \geq 0} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(\frac{1}{2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}}} \int_0^{c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} t} \frac{1}{X_a^{(1-a)}(s)^{a-1}} ds \right)_{t \geq 0},$$

and therefore we have the convergence for the Skorokhod J_1 topology jointly with the previous ones

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(\frac{\tilde{P}(t)}{\ell} \right)_{t \geq 0} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(X_a^{(0)}(2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} t) \right)_{t \geq 0} = \left(e^{\xi(2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} t)} \right)_{t \geq 0}. \quad (4.4)$$

Note that in the case $a = 2$, the process \tilde{P} is parametrized by the fpp distance to the root.

4.2 A family of coalescing diffusions with jumps

We denote by $\{x\} := x - \lfloor x \rfloor$ the fractional part and by $x_+ = x \mathbf{1}_{x > 0}$ the positive part of a real number x . For every integer $d \geq 1$, we denote by $C_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the set of continuous non-negative bounded functions f on \mathbb{R}^d which are zero on a neighbourhood of zero. For all $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, $u \in [0, 1]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we set

$$g(x, z, u) = \left(\{x - u\} - \left(\frac{z - 1}{z} \right)_+ \right)_+ z - \{x - u\} + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{z} \wedge z \right) \right).$$

Note that the function g is 1-periodic in x . Moreover, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $u \in [0, 1]$ we have

$$g(x, z, u) \leq 3|1 - z| \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$\int_0^1 g(x, z, u) du = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Let N be a Poisson point process (PPP) of intensity $2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} dt \lambda(dz) du$. Let \tilde{N} be the associated compensated Poisson point process. For all $v \in \mathbb{R}$, let us consider the SDE with jumps

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad X_t(v) = v + \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 g(X_{s-}(v), z, u) \tilde{N}(ds, dz, du). \quad (4.7)$$

The process $(X_t(v))_{t \geq 0}$ can also be seen as a time homogeneous jump diffusion with kernel K defined by for all $f \in C_1(\mathbb{R})$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(y) K(x, dy) = 2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} \int_0^\infty \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du f(g(x, z, u)).$$

See e.g. [JS87] Chapter III Paragraph 2c. We will only rely on [JS87] and on a general result of Li and Pu [LP12] but one can also see for instance the books [Jac79], [IW89] and [App09] for more details on the theory of stochastic differential equations with jumps.

Lemma 4.1. *The existence and uniqueness (up to undistinguishability) of strong solutions to (4.7) holds.*

Proof. In the case $a \in (3/2, 2] \cup \{5/2\}$, the above result could be shown using the classical result under Lipschitz type assumptions which can be found e.g. in Theorem 9.1 of Chapter IV of [IW89].

However, in order to cover the whole range $a \in (3/2, 5/2]$, we use Theorem 5.1 of [LP12]. To apply this theorem, we need to check the conditions (3.a), (3.b) and (5.a) of [LP12]. The condition (3.a) of [LP12] is automatically satisfied by our SDE (4.7) since the corresponding coefficients are zero. Moreover, for our SDE (4.7),

- The condition (3.b) of [LP12] is equivalent to the fact that $x \mapsto x + g(x, z, u)$ is non-decreasing for all $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, $u \in [0, 1]$ and that for all $m \geq 1$, there exists $C_m \geq 0$ such that

$$\forall x, y \in [-m, m], \quad \int_0^\infty \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du |g(x, z, u) - g(y, z, u)|^2 \leq C_m |x - y|; \quad (4.8)$$

- The condition (5.a) of [LP12] is equivalent to the fact that there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{(0, \infty) \setminus \{1\}} \lambda(dz) \int_{[0, 1]} dug(x, z, u)^2 \leq C(1 + x^2).$$

Let us start with the condition (5.a). Using (4.5), we have for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{(0, \infty) \setminus \{1\}} \lambda(dz) \int_{[0, 1]} dug(x, z, u)^2 \leq 9 \int_{(1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)} (z - 1)^2 \lambda(dz) < \infty \quad (4.9)$$

since the integral on the right is finite by definition of λ . Thus, the condition (5.a) of [LP12] is satisfied.

To conclude, it now remains to check condition (3.b) of [LP12].

It is easy to see that for all $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, for all $u \in [0, 1]$, the function $x \mapsto x + g(x, z, u)$ is non-decreasing. Indeed, the points $n + u$ are fixed points of $x \mapsto x + g(x, z, u) - g(0, z, 0)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, on any interval of the form $[n + u, n + 1 + u]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the function $x \mapsto x + g(x, z, u)$ is constant on the interval $[n + u, n + u + ((z - 1)/z)_+]$ and is then linearly increasing on $[n + u + ((z - 1)/z)_+, n + 1 + u]$ with slope z .

To check condition (3.b), it remains to prove (4.8). Actually, it suffices to show that there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_0^\infty \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du |g(x, z, u) - g(y, z, u)|^2 \leq C|x - y| \quad (4.10)$$

By symmetry, we may assume that $x < y$ and, by (4.9), we may assume that $y - x < 1/2$. Using the inequality $(r + s)^2 \leq 2(r^2 + s^2)$, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_0^\infty \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du |g(x, z, u) - g(y, z, u)|^2 \leq 2 \int_0^\infty \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du |(z - 1) (\{x - u\} - \{y - u\})|^2 \quad (4.11)$$

$$+ 2 \int_0^\infty \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du \left| \left(\left(\frac{z - 1}{z} \right)_+ - \{x - u\} \right)_+ - \left(\left(\frac{z - 1}{z} \right)_+ - \{y - u\} \right)_+ \right|^2. \quad (4.12)$$

The integral on the right of the first line (4.11) is upperbounded by $8 \int_0^\infty \lambda(dz)(z-1)^2|x-y|$ using the fact that, since $x < y$ and $y-x < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 |\{x-u\} - \{y-u\}| du &= \int_0^1 |u - \{y-x+u\}| du \\ &= \int_0^1 |y-x| \mathbf{1}_{y-x+u \leq 1} du + \int_0^1 |1 - (y-x)| \mathbf{1}_{y-x+u \geq 1} du \\ &\leq y-x + \int_0^1 \mathbf{1}_{u \geq 1-(y-x)} du \leq 2(y-x). \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

For the second line (4.12) we split the integral between $z < 3/2$ and $z \geq 3/2$. The part of the integral in (4.12) for $z > 3/2$ is upperbounded by

$$4 \int_{3/2}^\infty \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du |\{x-u\} - \{y-u\}| \leq C'|x-y|$$

for some constant $C' > 0$ which does not depend on x, y , using that $t \mapsto t_+$ is 1-Lipschitz, then (4.13) and that $\int_{3/2}^\infty \lambda(dz) < \infty$. The part of the integral in (4.12) for $z < 3/2$ can be rewritten

$$\int_1^{3/2} \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du \left(\left(\frac{z-1}{z} - u \right)_+ \right)^2 \quad (4.14)$$

$$- \int_1^{3/2} \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du \left(\frac{z-1}{z} - \{x-u\} \right)_+ \left(\frac{z-1}{z} - \{y-u\} \right)_+. \quad (4.15)$$

The first line (4.14) equals $(1/3) \int_1^{3/2} \lambda(dz) ((z-1)/z)^3$. The second line (4.15) can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_1^{3/2} \lambda(dz) \int_0^{(z-1)/z} w \left(\frac{z-1}{z} - \left\{ y-x + \frac{z-1}{z} - w \right\}_+ \right) dw \\ &= - \int_1^{3/2} \lambda(dz) \int_0^{(z-1)/z} w(w+x-y)_+ dw \\ &\leq - \int_1^{3/2} \lambda(dz) \int_{y-x}^{(z-1)/z} (w+x-y)^2 dw \\ &= -\frac{1}{3} \int_1^{3/2} \lambda(dz) ((z-1)/z + x-y)^3, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first equality we used that $0 < y-x < 1/2$ and $(z-1)/z < 1/2$. Hence, by the mean value inequality,

$$\int_1^{3/2} \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du \left| \left(\frac{z-1}{z} - \{x-u\} \right)_+ - \left(\frac{z-1}{z} - \{y-u\} \right)_+ \right|^2 \leq |x-y| \int_1^{3/2} \lambda(dz) ((z-1)/z)^2.$$

This proves (4.10). Thus, we can apply Theorem 5.1 of [LP12]. \square

Finally, note that the integral in (4.7) can be seen for all $t \geq 0$ as the limit of the martingale

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus (1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon)} \int_0^1 g(X_{s-}(v), z, u) \tilde{N}(ds, dz, du) \xrightarrow[\varepsilon \rightarrow 0]{(L^2)} \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 g(X_{s-}(v), z, u) \tilde{N}(ds, dz, du),$$

and that, since for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the bijection $u \mapsto \{x - u\}$ preserves the uniform measure on $[0, 1]$, for all $v \in \mathbb{R}$, the process $(X_t(v))_{t \geq 0}$ is a Lévy process with no drift, no Brownian part, whose Lévy measure is the image by $(z, u) \mapsto g(0, z, u)$ of $\lambda(dz)du$.

4.3 The discrete coalescing flow of fpp geodesics

Recall that $(\tilde{P}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is the continuous time Markov process constructed from P under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ where at each step n we wait a time $\mathcal{E}_n/(2P(n)^{a-1})$. For every time $t \geq 0$ of jump of \tilde{P} we sample a random variable $V_t^{(\ell)}$ which is uniform in $\{0, 1/(2\tilde{P}(t)), \dots, (2\tilde{P}(t) - 1)/(2\tilde{P}(t))\}$. This random variable corresponds to the position where we glue a new face or where we insert edges in the reversed uniform exploration. For all $t \geq 0$, we set

$$R_t^{(\ell)} = - \sum_{\substack{0 \leq s < t \\ \Delta \tilde{P}(s) \neq 0}} \left(V_s^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{2} \max \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{P}(s-)}{\tilde{P}(s)}, \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\tilde{P}(s)} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{P}(s)}{\tilde{P}(s-)} \right) \right) \right).$$

The quantity $R_t^{(\ell)}$ is introduced for technical reasons in order to compensate the jumps in the processes which are defined below. For every time $t \geq 0$ of jump of \tilde{P} , we write $U_t^{(\ell)} := \{V_t^{(\ell)} + R_t^{(\ell)}\}$. Let $T > 0$. We define the random measure $N^{(\ell), T}$ by

$$N^{(\ell), T} = \sum_{0 \leq t \leq T; \Delta \tilde{P}(t) > 0} \delta_{(T-t, \tilde{P}(t)/\tilde{P}(t-), U_t^{(\ell)})}.$$

The measure $N^{(\ell), T}$ gives the (translated) position at which we glue the face or insert edges and also the degree of the glued face or the number of inserted edges via the jump of \tilde{P} .

For all $t \leq 0$, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, let

$$g_t^{(\ell)}(x, z, u) = \left(\{x - u\} - \left(\frac{z-1}{z} \right)_+ \right)_+ z - \{x - u\} + \frac{1}{2} \max \left(1 - \frac{1}{z}, \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\tilde{P}(-t)} \right) (1 - z) \right)$$

and for all $t \in [0, T]$, let $g_t^{(\ell), T} = g_{t-T}^{(\ell)}$. Note that g is 1-periodic in x . By construction, note that, by a simple computation, for all $t \in [0, T]$ such that $\Delta \tilde{P}(T-t) \neq 0$, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\tilde{P}(T-t)/z \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $2\tilde{P}(T-t)(x - R_{T-t}^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(g_t^{(\ell), T}(x, z, U_{T-t}^{(\ell)}) \Big| \tilde{P} \right) = 0. \quad (4.16)$$

Indeed, if we write $p = \tilde{P}(T-t)$ and $k = p(z-1)/z$ then, when $k \geq 0$ (i.e. $z \geq 1$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\left(\{x - U_{T-t}^{(\ell)}\} - \frac{z-1}{z} \right)_+ z - \{x - U_{T-t}^{(\ell)}\} \Big| \tilde{P} \right) &= \frac{1}{2p} \sum_{i=0}^{2p-1} \left(\left(\frac{i}{2p} - \frac{k}{p} \right)_+ \frac{p}{p-k} - \frac{i}{2p} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{p-k}{p} - 1 \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{z} - 1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

and a similar calculation proves (4.16) when $k \leq 0$ (i.e. $z \leq 1$). Besides, we again have for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, $u \in [0, 1]$,

$$g_t^{(\ell), T}(x, z, u) \leq 3|z-1|. \quad (4.17)$$

The coalescing flow $(X_t^{(\ell),T}(v))_{v \in \mathbb{R}, 0 \leq t \leq T}$ associated with $N^{(\ell),T}$ is defined by

$$\forall v \in \mathbb{R}, \forall t \in [0, T], \quad X_t^{(\ell),T}(v) = v + \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 g_s^{(\ell),T}(X_{s-}^{(\ell),T}(v), z, u) N^{(\ell),T}(ds, dz, du). \quad (4.18)$$

Notice that the above process is not a diffusion with jumps since the Markov process \tilde{P} is not reversible. This coalescing flow gives the genealogy of the fpp geodesics to the root face under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ and, when $a = 2$, it is parametrized by the fpp distance.

Let us state the following useful lemma which is a direct consequence of (4.16).

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{F}^{(\ell),T}$ be the filtration defined by*

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathcal{F}_t^{(\ell),T} = \sigma \left(\tilde{P}((T-s)-), U_{T-s}^{(\ell)}; s \in [0, t] \right).$$

Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$, for all $v \in \mathbb{R}$, the process $(M_t^{(\ell),T,\varepsilon})_{t \in [0,T]}$ defined by

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad M_t^{(\ell),T,\varepsilon} = \int_0^t \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1+\varepsilon} \int_0^1 g_s^{(\ell),T}(X_{s-}^{(\ell),T}(v), z, u) N^{(\ell),T}(ds, dz, du)$$

is a martingale with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{F}^{(\ell),T}$.

Finally, let us state a lemma which controls the small jumps of \tilde{P} .

Lemma 4.3. *We have the uniform convergence*

$$\sup_{\ell \geq 1} \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\sum_{s \in [0, T]} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{P}(s)/\tilde{P}(s-) \in [1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon] \setminus \{1\}} \left(\frac{\Delta \tilde{P}(s)}{\tilde{P}(s-)} \right)^2 \right) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

Proof. Using the law of the peeling exploration described in Subsection 2.2, one can upperbound

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\sum_{s \in [0, T]} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{P}(s)/\tilde{P}(s-) \in [1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon] \setminus \{1\}} \left(\frac{\Delta \tilde{P}(s)}{\tilde{P}(s-)} \right)^2 \right) \\ & \leq C \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\sum_{s \in [0, T]} \mathbf{1}_{\frac{\tilde{P}(s)}{\tilde{P}(s-)} \neq 1} \sum_{-\varepsilon \tilde{P}(s-) \leq k \leq \varepsilon \tilde{P}(s-)} \frac{W^{(\tilde{P}(s-)+k)} c_{\mathbf{q}}^{-\tilde{P}(s-)-k}}{W^{(\tilde{P}(s-))} c_{\mathbf{q}}^{-\tilde{P}(s-)}} \nu(k) \left(\frac{k}{\tilde{P}(s-)} \right)^2 \right) \\ & \leq C' \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\sum_{s \in [0, T]} \mathbf{1}_{\frac{\tilde{P}(s)}{\tilde{P}(s-)} \neq 1} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \varepsilon \tilde{P}(s-)} k^{-a} \left(\frac{k}{\tilde{P}(s-)} \right)^2 \right) \quad \text{by (1.1) and (2.3)} \\ & \leq \varepsilon^{3-a} C'' \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\sum_{s \in [0, T]} \mathbf{1}_{\frac{\tilde{P}(s)}{\tilde{P}(s-)} \neq 1} \frac{1}{\tilde{P}(s-)^{a-1}} \right) \\ & \leq \varepsilon^{3-a} C''', \end{aligned}$$

where C, C', C'', C''' are positive constants which do not depend on ℓ, ε . The last inequality comes from the fact that if we denote the exponential clocks defining \tilde{P} by $\mathcal{E}_n / (2P(n)^{a-1})$ for all integer

$n \geq 0$, where the \mathcal{E}_n for $n \geq 0$ are i.i.d. exponential random variables of parameter 1 independent from P , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\sum_{s \in [0, T]} \mathbf{1}_{\frac{\tilde{P}(s)}{\tilde{P}(s-)} \neq 1} \frac{1}{\tilde{P}(s-)^{a-1}} \right) &\leq \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{P(n)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{E}_k / (2P(k)^{a-1}) \leq T} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_n}{P(n)^{a-1}} \mathbf{1}_{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{E}_k / (2P(k)^{a-1}) \leq T} \right) \\ &\leq 2T + 1. \end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof of the lemma. \square

4.4 Recovering the fpp geodesics from the discrete coalescing flow

This subsection aims at making explicit the correspondence between the discrete coalescing flow and the fpp geodesics to the root via the reversed uniform exploration introduced in Subsection 2.3.

Let $T > 0$. Let $t_1 < \dots < t_n$ be the times of jumps of \tilde{P} in $[0, T]$. We set $t_0 = 0$. Let \mathbf{u}_n^n be the map made of one distinguished face of degree $2P(n)$ glued to one hole of the same degree. For all $k \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$, the edges on the inner boundary of \mathbf{u}_k^n are encoded modulo \mathbb{Z} in the clockwise order by the real numbers

$$R_{t_k}^{(\ell), T} + \frac{i}{2P(k)}$$

for $i \in \llbracket 0, 2P(k) - 1 \rrbracket$. See Figure 5.

For all $k \in \llbracket 0, n - 1 \rrbracket$, we relate the edges on the inner boundary of \mathbf{u}_k^n to the edges on the inner boundary of \mathbf{u}_{k+1}^n as follows:

- If $\Delta P(k) \geq 0$, we glue a new face of degree $2\Delta P(k) + 2$ to the edges encoded by

$$U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)}, U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{2P(k+1)}, \dots, U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)} + \frac{2\Delta P(k)}{2P(k+1)},$$

and the non-glued edge of the face is encoded by

$$\begin{aligned} &U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)} + \frac{i}{2P(k+1)} + g_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell), T} \left(U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)} + \frac{i}{2P(k+1)}, \frac{P(k+1)}{P(k)}, U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)} \right) \\ &= U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)} + \frac{i}{2P(k+1)} + \left(\frac{i}{2P(k+1)} - \frac{\Delta P(k)}{P(k+1)} \right) \frac{P(k+1)}{P(k)} - \frac{i}{2P(k+1)} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \max \left(1 - \frac{P(k)}{P(k+1)}, \left(1 - \frac{1}{2P(k+1)} \right) \left(1 - \frac{P(k+1)}{P(k)} \right) \right) \\ &= U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{2} \max \left(1 - \frac{P(k)}{P(k+1)}, \left(1 - \frac{1}{2P(k+1)} \right) \left(1 - \frac{P(k+1)}{P(k)} \right) \right) \\ &= R_{t_k}^{(\ell)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the result does not depend on $i \in \llbracket 0, 2\Delta P(k) \rrbracket$. Note that by this computation, the trajectories of $X^{(\ell), T}$ which were in $[U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)}, U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)} + \frac{2\Delta P(k)}{2P(k+1)}]$ in the time interval $[T - t_{k+1}, T - t_k]$ then coalesce in $R_{t_k}^{(\ell)}$ at time t_{k+1} . By a similar computation, the other edges of \mathbf{u}_{k+1}^n , which

are encoded by $U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell),T} + (2\Delta P(k) + j)/(2P(k))$ modulo \mathbb{Z} for $j \in \llbracket 1, 2P(k) - 1 \rrbracket$ correspond in \mathbf{u}_k^n respectively to the edges $R_{t_k}^{(\ell),T} + j/(2P(k))$ modulo \mathbb{Z} for $j \in \llbracket 1, 2P(k) - 1 \rrbracket$, and the corresponding trajectories do not coalesce at time t_{k+1} . See Figure 5.

- If $\Delta P(k) < 0$, then we insert the edges

$$R_{t_k}^{(\ell)} - \frac{1}{2P(k)}, R_{t_k}^{(\ell)} - \frac{2}{2P(k)}, \dots, R_{t_k}^{(\ell)} - \frac{-2\Delta P(k)}{2P(k)},$$

we glue the first to the last edge and we fill in the hole which is hence created with a Boltzmann random map. For all $i \in \llbracket 0, 2P(k+1) - 1 \rrbracket$, the edge on the inner boundary of \mathbf{u}_{k+1}^n which is encoded by $U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)} + i/(2P(k+1))$ then corresponds to the edge encoded by

$$\begin{aligned} U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)} + \frac{i}{2P(k+1)} + g_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell),T} \left(U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)} + \frac{i}{2P(k+1)}, \frac{P(k+1)}{P(k)}, U_{t_{k+1}}^{(\ell)} \right) &= R_{t_k}^{(\ell)} + \frac{i}{2P(k+1)} \frac{P(k+1)}{P(k)} \\ &= R_{t_k}^{(\ell)} + \frac{i}{2P(k)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the trajectories do not coalesce at time t_{k+1} . See Figure 5.




Figure 5: The embedding of the reversed uniform exploration $\mathbf{u}_5^5 \subset \mathbf{u}_4^5 \subset \mathbf{u}_3^5 \subset \mathbf{u}_2^5 \subset \mathbf{u}_1^5 \subset \mathbf{u}_0^5$ of the map \mathbf{m} depicted in Figure 4 into the discrete coalescing flow. Since the flow is 1-periodic in space, we only draw what happens on $[0, 1]$. The trajectories of the flow are drawn in black: for sake of visibility, they are interpolated by lines between each jump times. The orange triangles mark the coalescence events which correspond to the gluing of a face. The empty dots correspond to the edges which are inserted when \bar{P} makes a negative jump. The coordinates of the trajectories before they coalesce are in red and the coordinate of the point where they coalesce is in blue.

4.5 Scaling limit of the flow of geodesics

In this subsection, we prove that the discrete coalescing flow of Subsection 4.3 converges to the family of coalescing diffusions with jumps introduced in Subsection 4.2 if one looks at a finite (or countable) number of trajectories. Let $T > 0$. Let us introduce the restriction N^T of N to subsets of $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+^* \times [0, 1]$.

Theorem 4.4. *For all $\ell \geq 1$, let $v_1^{(\ell)}, v_2^{(\ell)}, \dots, v_d^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $v_1, \dots, v_d \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $i \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, we have $v_i^{(\ell)} \rightarrow v_i$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. Then*

$$\left(X_t^{(\ell), T}(v_i^{(\ell)}) \right)_{1 \leq i \leq d, t \in [0, T]} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} (X_t(v_i))_{1 \leq i \leq d, 0 \leq t \leq T},$$

in the space $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathbb{R})^d$, where each coordinate is equipped with the J_1 Skorokhod topology. Moreover, jointly with the above convergence, $N^{(\ell), T}$ converges in distribution towards N^T for the topology of weak convergence of measures on $[0, T] \times ((0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)) \times [0, 1]$.

In order to prove the above result, we denote by N_ε^T (resp. N_ε) the restriction of N to subsets of $[0, T] \times (\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus (1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)) \times [0, 1]$ (resp. $\mathbb{R}_+ \times (\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus (1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)) \times [0, 1]$). Note that the Poisson point process N_ε^T has a finite intensity. Similarly, for all $\ell \geq 1$, we denote by $N_\varepsilon^{(\ell), T}$ the restriction of $N^{(\ell), T}$ to the subsets of $[0, T] \times (\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus (1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)) \times [0, 1]$.

Let $X^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}$ be the approximation of the discrete coalescing flow defined using $N_\varepsilon^{(\ell), T}$ by

$$\forall v \in \mathbb{R}, \forall t \in [0, T], \quad X_t^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v) = v + \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 g_s^{(\ell), T}(X_{s-}^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v), z, u) N_\varepsilon^{(\ell), T}(ds, dz, du),$$

and let X^ε be the process defined using N_ε by

$$\forall v \in \mathbb{R}, \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad X_t^\varepsilon(v) = v + \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 g(X_{s-}^\varepsilon(v), z, u) N_\varepsilon(ds, dz, du).$$

The above integral is actually a finite sum since $\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus (1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)) < \infty$. Moreover, the integral with respect to the compensated PPP would be the same thanks to (4.6). We define $X^{T, \varepsilon}$ as the restriction of X^ε to the time interval $[0, T]$. Note that $X^{T, \varepsilon}$ can also be defined using N_ε^T .

By (4.4), we get the convergence of $g_t^{(\ell), T}$ towards g :

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T], z \in \mathbb{R}_+^*, u \in [0, 1], x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| g_t^{(\ell), T}(x, z, u) - g(x, z, u) \right| \leq \frac{|1 - z|}{\inf_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{P}(t)} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(\mathbb{P})} 0. \quad (4.19)$$

We can then state the following scaling limit result:

Lemma 4.5. *Let $d \geq 1$. For all $\ell \geq 1$, let $v_1^{(\ell)}, v_2^{(\ell)}, \dots, v_d^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $v_1, \dots, v_d \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $i \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, we have $v_i^{(\ell)} \rightarrow v_i$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. Then*

$$\left(X_t^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v_i^{(\ell)}) \right)_{1 \leq i \leq d, t \in [0, T]} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} (X_t^{T, \varepsilon}(v_i))_{1 \leq i \leq d, 0 \leq t \leq T},$$

in the space $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathbb{R})^d$.

The above lemma is a direct consequence of (4.19), of the following lemma and of the fact that N_ε^T has a finite number of atoms.

Lemma 4.6. *For every continuous function on $[0, T] \times ((0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)) \times [0, 1]$ with compact support,*

$$\int_0^T \int_{(0,1) \cup (1,\infty)} \int_0^1 f(t, z, u) N^{(\ell), T}(dt, dz, du) \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \int_0^T \int_{(0,1) \cup (1,\infty)} \int_0^1 f(t, z, u) N^T(dt, dz, du).$$

In other words, $N^{(\ell), T}$ converges in distribution towards N^T for the topology of weak convergence of measures on $[0, T] \times ((0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)) \times [0, 1]$.

Proof. The convergence (4.4) implies that

$$\sum_{t \geq 0; \Delta \tilde{P}(t) > 0} \delta_{(t, \tilde{P}(t)/\tilde{P}(t-))} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \text{PPP}(2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} dt \lambda(dz)),$$

for the topology of weak convergence of measures on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times (\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus \{1\})$. This concludes the proof by reversing time and using that $\ell / \inf_{[0, T]} \tilde{P}$ under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ is tight by (4.4) so that the random variables $U_t^{(\ell)}$ converge in distribution towards independent uniform random variables in $[0, 1]$. \square

Next, we can approximate $X^{(\ell), T}$ using an appropriate coupling with $X^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}$.

Lemma 4.7. *For every sequence of real numbers $(v^{(\ell)})_{\ell \geq 1}$, there exist couplings of $(X_t^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)}))_{t \in [0, T]}$ with $(X_t^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v^{(\ell)}))_{t \in [0, T]}$ for all $\ell \geq 1$ and for all $\varepsilon > 0$, denoted by $X^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)})$, $\bar{X}^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v^{(\ell)})$ such that*

$$\sup_{\ell \geq 1} \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| X_t^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)}) - \bar{X}_t^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v^{(\ell)}) \right|^2 \right) \xrightarrow[\varepsilon \rightarrow 0]{} 0.$$

Proof. Let $(v^{(\ell)})_{\ell \geq 1}$ be a sequence of real numbers. The coupling of the two processes is defined using the same perimeter process P , the same exponential random variables for \tilde{P} but the random variables $\bar{U}^{(\ell), T}$ defining $\bar{X}_t^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v^{(\ell)})$ are defined inductively by the relations

$$\bar{U}_{T-t}^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon} = \left\{ \bar{X}_{t-}^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v^{(\ell)}) - X_{t-}^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)}) + U_{T-t}^{(\ell)} \right\}, \quad (4.20)$$

$$\bar{N}_{|[0, t] \times (\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus \{1\}) \times [0, 1]}^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon} = \sum_{s \in [T-t, T]; \tilde{P}(s)/\tilde{P}(s-) \in \mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus (1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon)} \delta_{(T-s, \tilde{P}(s)/\tilde{P}(s-), \bar{U}_s^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon})}, \quad (4.21)$$

$$\bar{X}_t^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v^{(\ell)}) = v + \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 g_s^{(\ell), T}(\bar{X}_{s-}^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v^{(\ell)}), z, u) \bar{N}_\varepsilon^{(\ell), T}(ds, dz, du), \quad (4.22)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$ such that $\Delta \tilde{P}(t) \neq 0$. Then one can see that $\bar{X}^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v^{(\ell)})$ has the same law as $X^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v^{(\ell)})$ and that by construction, for all $t \in [0, T]$ such that $\Delta \tilde{P}(t) \neq 0$, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus \{1\}$,

$$g_t^{(\ell), T}(\bar{X}_{t-}^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v^{(\ell)}), z, \bar{U}_{T-t}^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}) = g_t^{(\ell), T}(X_{t-}^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)}), z, U_{T-t}^{(\ell)}). \quad (4.23)$$

Using the coupling, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| X_t^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)}) - \overline{X}_t^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon}(v^{(\ell)}) \right|^2 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1+\varepsilon} \int_0^1 g_s^{(\ell), T}(X_{s-}^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)}), z, u) N^{(\ell), T}(ds, dz, du) \right|^2 \right) \quad \text{by (4.23).} \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, thanks to Lemma 4.2, the process

$$(M_t^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon})_{t \in [0, T]} = \left(\int_0^t \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1+\varepsilon} \int_0^1 g_s^{(\ell), T}(X_{s-}^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)}), z, u) N^{(\ell), T}(ds, dz, du) \right)_{t \in [0, T]}$$

is a martingale. So by Doob's martingale inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (M_t^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon})^2 \right) \leq 4 \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left((M_t^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon})^2 \right).$$

Moreover, by (4.17), one can upperbound for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left((M_t^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon})^2 \right) &= \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\int_0^t \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1+\varepsilon} \int_0^1 g_s^{(\ell), T}(X_{s-}^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)}), z, u)^2 N^{(\ell), T}(ds, dz, du) \right) \quad (\text{quadratic variation}) \\ &\leq 9 \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\int_0^t \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1+\varepsilon} \int_0^1 |z - 1|^2 N^{(\ell), T}(ds, dz, du) \right) \\ &\leq 9 \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\sum_{s \in [0, T]} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{P}(s)/\tilde{P}(s-) \in [1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon] \setminus \{1\}} \left(\frac{\Delta \tilde{P}(s)}{\tilde{P}(s-)} \right)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 4.3 one concludes that

$$\sup_{\ell \geq 1} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left((M_t^{(\ell), T, \varepsilon})^2 \right) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0. \quad (4.24)$$

This ends the proof. \square

We will need this last lemma:

Lemma 4.8. *We have for all $v_1, \dots, v_d \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$(X_t^\varepsilon(v_i))_{1 \leq i \leq d, t \geq 0} \xrightarrow[\varepsilon \rightarrow 0]{(d)} (X_t(v_i))_{1 \leq i \leq d, t \geq 0}$$

in the space $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})^d$.

Proof. It is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.15 of Chapter IX of [JS87]. Indeed, for all $v_1, \dots, v_d \in \mathbb{R}$, the process $(X_t^\varepsilon(v_i))_{i \in [1, d], t \geq 0}$ (resp. $(X_t^\varepsilon(v_i))_{i \in [1, d], t \geq 0}$) is the time homogeneous jump diffusion starting from (v_1, \dots, v_d) with kernel $K^{d, \varepsilon}$ (resp. K^d) defined by the fact that for all $f \in C_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y) K^{d, \varepsilon}(x, dy) = 2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} \int_{(0, \infty) \setminus (1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon)} \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du f(g(x_1, z, u), \dots, g(x_d, z, u)),$$

and respectively

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y) K^d(x, dy) = 2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} \int_{(0, \infty) \setminus \{1\}} \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du f(g(x_1, z, u), \dots, g(x_d, z, u)).$$

We denote by $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ the infinite norm on \mathbb{R}^d . Then, by (4.9), for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|_{\infty}^2 K^{d, \varepsilon}(x, dy) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|_{\infty}^2 K^d(x, dy) \leq 9 \int_{(1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)} \lambda(dz) |z - 1|^2 < \infty,$$

and

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|_{\infty}^2 \mathbf{1}_{|y|_{\infty} > b} K^d(x, dy) \leq 9 \int_{(1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)} \lambda(dz) |z - 1|^2 \mathbf{1}_{3|z-1| > b} \xrightarrow{b \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Besides, for all $x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $\lambda(dz)du$ almost every $(z, u) \in \mathbb{R}_+^* \times [0, 1]$, the function $x \mapsto (g(x_i, z, u))_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ is continuous at x' , so that by dominated convergence, for all $f \in C_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\int_0^{\infty} \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du f(g(x_1, z, u), \dots, g(x_d, z, u)) \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow x'} \int_0^{\infty} \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du f(g(x'_1, z, u), \dots, g(x'_d, z, u)),$$

where we use the domination

$$f(g(x_1, z, u), \dots, g(x_d, z, u)) \leq \mathbf{1}_{3|z-1| > r} \sup(f),$$

where $r > 0$ is such that $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^d; |y|_{\infty} < r\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \text{Supp}(f)$. Therefore, the function $x \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K^d(x, dy) f(y)$ is continuous. By the same reasoning, it is also true for $x \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K^{d, \varepsilon}(x, dy) f(y)$.

Furthermore, by the Beppo Levi lemma, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for all $f \in C_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y) K^{d, \varepsilon}(x, dy) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y) K^d(x, dy),$$

and this convergence holds locally uniformly on x by Dini's theorem. Moreover, by (4.5), we have for all $i, j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, uniformly on x ,

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} y_i y_j K^{d, \varepsilon}(x, dy) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} y_i y_j K^d(x, dy) \right| \leq \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1+\varepsilon} \lambda(dz) \int_0^1 du \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} g(x_i, z, u)^2 \leq 9 \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1+\varepsilon} |1-z|^2 dz,$$

which goes to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Finally, the last condition to check before applying Theorem 4.15 of Chapter IX is the ‘‘uniqueness-measurability hypothesis’’ 4.3 of Chapter IX. It is a consequence of the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions to (4.7) which is provided by Lemma 4.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.4. By combining the results of Lemmas 4.5, 4.7 and 4.8, we obtain that for every converging sequence $v^{(\ell)} \rightarrow v \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\text{Under the law } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(X_t^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)}) \right)_{t \in [0, T]} \xrightarrow{\ell \rightarrow \infty}^{(d)} \left(X_t(v) \right)_{t \in [0, T]}.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 4.6, we know that jointly with (4.4),

$$\text{Under the law } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad N^{(\ell), T} \xrightarrow{\ell \rightarrow \infty}^{(d)} N^T$$

for the topology of weak convergence of measures on $[0, T] \times (\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus \{1\}) \times [0, 1]$.

Assume that, along some subsequence $(\ell_k)_{k \geq 0}$, we have

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell_k)}, \quad \left(X^{(\ell_k), T}(v^{(\ell_k)}), N^{(\ell_k), T}, \frac{\tilde{P}}{\ell_k} \right) \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(\check{X}^T(v), N^T, (\exp(\xi_a(2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} t)))_{t \geq 0} \right), \quad (4.25)$$

where $\check{X}^T(v)$ has the same law as $X^T(v)$. Then, to end the proof of Theorem 4.4, it suffices to show that

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad \check{X}_t^T(v) = v + \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 g(\check{X}_{s-}^T(v), z, u) \tilde{N}^T(ds, dz, du), \quad (4.26)$$

where \tilde{N}^T is the compensated Poisson process associated with N^T . By Skorokhod's representation theorem, we assume that (4.25) holds almost surely. For all $\ell \geq 1$, let ψ_ℓ be an increasing homeomorphism from $[0, T]$ to $[0, T]$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| X_t^{(\ell_k), T}(v^{(\ell_k)}) - \check{X}_{\psi_{\ell_k}(t)}^T(v) \right| + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\psi_{\ell_k}(t) - t| \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{(a.s.)} 0 \quad (4.27)$$

Using (4.19) and the fact that $(N^{(\ell), T}([0, T] \times ((1/2, 1 - \varepsilon) \cup (1 + \varepsilon, \infty)) \times [0, 1]))_{\ell \geq 1}$ is bounded for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have for all $t \in [0, T]$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, a.s. along the subsequence $(\ell_k)_{k \geq 0}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \int_{(1/2, 1 - \varepsilon) \cup (1 + \varepsilon, \infty)} \int_0^1 \left(g_s^{(\ell), T}(X_{s-}^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)}), z, u) - g(\check{X}_{\psi_\ell(s)-}^T(v), z, u) \right) N^{(\ell), T}(ds, dz, du) \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{(1/2, 1 - \varepsilon) \cup (1 + \varepsilon, \infty)} \int_0^1 \left(g(X_{s-}^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)}), z, u) - g(\check{X}_{\psi_\ell(s)-}^T(v), z, u) \right) N^{(\ell), T}(ds, dz, du) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

and by taking (4.27) into account, using that for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, for $\lambda(dz)du$ almost all $(z, u) \in \mathbb{R}_+^* \times [0, 1]$, the function $x \mapsto g(x, z, u)$ is continuous at x_0 , we deduce by dominated convergence (with domination by a constant) that along $(\ell_k)_{k \geq 0}$,

$$\int_0^t \int_{(1/2, 1 - \varepsilon) \cup (1 + \varepsilon, \infty)} \int_0^1 \left(g_s^{(\ell), T}(X_{s-}^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)}), z, u) - g(\check{X}_{\psi_\ell(s)-}^T(v), z, u) \right) N^{(\ell), T}(ds, dz, du) \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(a.s.)} 0.$$

In addition to that, thanks to the convergence of $N^{(\ell), T}$ towards N^T (and since λ has no atom), we have the convergence of finite sums for all $t \geq 0$.

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus (1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)} \int_0^1 g(\check{X}_{s-}^T(v), z, u) N^{(\ell), T}(ds, dz, du) \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(a.s.)} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus (1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)} \int_0^1 g(\check{X}_{s-}^T(v), z, u) N^T(ds, dz, du).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus (1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)} \int_0^1 g_s^{(\ell), T}(X_{s-}^{(\ell), T}(v^{(\ell)}), z, u) N^{(\ell), T}(ds, dz, du) \\ & \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(a.s.)} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus (1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)} \int_0^1 g(\check{X}_{s-}^T(v), z, u) N^T(ds, dz, du). \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

Moreover, by (4.24),

$$\sup_{\ell \geq 1} \mathbb{E}^{(\ell)} \left(\left| \int_0^t \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1+\varepsilon} \int_0^1 g_s^{(\ell),T}(X_{s-}^{(\ell),T}(v^{(\ell)}), z, u) N^{(\ell),T}(ds, dz, du) \right|^2 \right) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0. \quad (4.29)$$

Besides, using (4.6), one can see that we know that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus (1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon)} \int_0^1 g(\check{X}_{s-}^T(v), z, u) N^T(ds, dz, du) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus (1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon)} \int_0^1 g(\check{X}_{s-}^T(v), z, u) \tilde{N}^T(ds, dz, du).$$

Finally, we have the convergence of martingale

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus (1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon)} \int_0^1 g(\check{X}_{s-}^T(v), z, u) \tilde{N}^T(ds, dz, du) \xrightarrow[\varepsilon \rightarrow 0]{(L^2)} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus \{1\}} \int_0^1 g(\check{X}_{s-}^T(v), z, u) \tilde{N}^T(ds, dz, du).$$

Combining this with (4.28) and (4.29) gives (4.26). This concludes the proof. \square

5 Scaling limit of the tree of geodesics

In this section, we define a random infinite countable metric space \mathcal{T}_a associated with the stochastic flow arising from the coalescing diffusions with jumps and we prove that it is the scaling limit of the tree of fpp geodesics of random maps of type $a \in (3/2, 5/2)$.

5.1 The tree of the positive jumps via the stochastic flow

Let N be a PPP on $(-\infty, 0] \times (\mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus \{1\}) \times [0, 1]$ of intensity $dt\lambda(dz)du$. For all $v \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s \leq 0$, let $(X_{s,t}(v))_{v \in \mathbb{R}, t \in [s, 0]}$ be the solution starting from $v \in \mathbb{R}$ at time $s \leq 0$ of the SDE

$$\forall t \in [s, 0], \quad X_{s,t}(v) = v + \int_s^t \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 g(X_{s'-}(v), z, u) \tilde{N}(ds', dz, du), \quad (5.1)$$

where \tilde{N} is the compensated PPP associated with N . Note that $(X_{s,t}(v))_{v \in \mathbb{R}, s \leq t \leq 0}$ is a stochastic flow, and more precisely a Lévy flow in the terminology of [App09] Section 6.4.1 thanks to Lemma 4.1. It is also easy to see that X is a stochastic coalescing flow on the torus \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} in the sense that for all $s_1, s_2 < 0$, for all $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\exists t \in [s_1 \vee s_2, 0], \{X_{s_1,t}(v_1)\} = \{X_{s_2,t}(v_2)\}) > 0$ and if we set $T = \inf\{t \in [s_1 \vee s_2, 0], \{X_{s_1,t}(v_1)\} = \{X_{s_2,t}(v_2)\}\}$ then on the event $\{T < \infty\}$, for all $t \in [T, 0]$, we have $\{X_{s_1,t}(v_1)\} = \{X_{s_2,t}(v_2)\}$.

Let $\mathbb{U} = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{N}^n$ be the Ulam tree, where \mathbb{N}^0 has only one element which is the empty word \emptyset . For all $v, w \in \mathbb{U}$, we write $v \prec w$ if v is a prefix of w . Let N_w for $w \in \mathbb{U}$ be independent copies of N . Let ∂ be a cemetery point. For convenience, we will also denote N_w in the form $(Z_t^w, U_t^w)_{t \leq 0}$, where $Z_t^w = \partial$ when there is no atom of N_w at time t , so that

$$N_w = \sum_{t \leq 0} \mathbf{1}_{Z_t^w \neq \partial} \delta_{(t, Z_t^w, U_t^w)}.$$

For all $w \in \mathbb{U}$, $s \leq 0$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}$, let $(X_{s,t}^w(v))_{t \in [s, 0]}$ be the solution of the SDE (5.1) where N is replaced by N_w . By analogy with the discrete coalescing flow, for all $t \leq 0$ such that $Z_t^w \neq \partial$ we set

$$R_t^w := U_t^w + g(U_t^w, Z_t^w, U_t^w)$$

and when $Z_t^w = \partial$ we set $R_t^w = \partial$. Then R_t^w represents the position at which the trajectories which were in $[U_t^w, U_t^w + (Z_t^w - 1)/Z_t^w]$ at time $t-$ coalesce when $Z_t^w > 1$ and R_t^w represents the position on the right of the empty hole of size $1 - Z_t^w$ created when $Z_t^w < 1$.

Let $(\mathcal{X}_w(t), b_w)_{w \in \mathbb{U}, t \geq 0}$ be the cell system which is constructed as in Section 2.2 of [BBCK18] as follows using the N_w 's:

- For all $w \in \mathbb{U}$, let ξ_w be the Lévy process with no Brownian part, whose jumps are given by the Poisson point process $\Delta\xi_w$ on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^*$ which is defined as the image measure of N_w by $(t, z, u) \mapsto (-t, \log z)$, i.e. $(\Delta\xi_w(t))_{t \geq 0} = (\log Z_{-t}^w)_{t \geq 0}$, and whose drift is given by (4.1).
- We set $\mathcal{X}_\emptyset = \exp(\xi_\emptyset)$, with birth time $b_\emptyset = 0$.
- Assume by induction that we have defined \mathcal{X}_w and its birth time b_w for some $w \in \mathbb{U}$. Let $(x_{wi})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the collection of negative jumps of \mathcal{X}_w , ordered in the decreasing order of absolute value. Let $(\beta_{wi})_{i \geq 1}$ be the times at which they occur. For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $\mathcal{X}_{wi} = |x_{wi}| \exp(\xi_{wi})$, where wi is the finite sequence obtained by adding i at the end of the sequence w . We define the birth time of the cell wi by setting $b_{wi} = b_w + \beta_{wi}$.

For all $w \in \mathbb{U}$, let $(\Delta_{wi})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the collection of the positive jumps of \mathcal{X}_w in the decreasing order, with by convention $\Delta_\emptyset = 1$ and let $(\tau_{wi})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the times at which they occur. We define the times $(t_w)_{w \in \mathbb{U}}$ by setting $t_\emptyset = 0$ and for all $w \in \mathbb{U}$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$t_{wi} = b_w + \tau_{wi}.$$

When $a \neq 2$, it is useful to introduce the Lamperti transformed birth times and jump times $(\tilde{b}_w)_{w \in \mathbb{U}}$, $(\tilde{t}_w)_{w \in \mathbb{U}}$, $(\tilde{\beta}_w)_{w \in \mathbb{U} \setminus \{\emptyset\}}$ and $(\tilde{\tau}_w)_{w \in \mathbb{U} \setminus \{\emptyset\}}$ by setting for all $w \in \mathbb{U}$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\tilde{\beta}_{wi} = \int_0^{\beta_{wi}} e^{(2-a)\xi_w(t)} dt \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\tau}_{wi} = \int_0^{\tau_{wi}} e^{(2-a)\xi_w(t)} dt,$$

then setting $\tilde{t}_\emptyset = \tilde{b}_\emptyset = 0$ and for all $w \in \mathbb{U}$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\tilde{b}_{wi} = \tilde{b}_w + \tilde{\beta}_{wi} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{t}_{wi} = \tilde{b}_w + \tilde{\tau}_{wi}.$$

Let \mathcal{T}_a be the countable metric space whose underlying set is $\mathcal{T}_a := \mathbb{U}$. Each $w \in \mathcal{T}_a$ corresponds to either a positive jump Δ_w when $w \neq \emptyset$ or to the root. To each $w = i_1 \cdots i_k \in \mathcal{T}_a \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, we associate a trajectory $(Y^{z,w})_{z \prec w}$ in the Lévy flows X^z for $z \prec w$. Let $\emptyset = w_0 \prec w_1 \prec \dots \prec w_k = w$ be the prefixes of w , so that for all $j \in \llbracket 0, k-1 \rrbracket$, we have $w_{j+1} = w_j i_{j+1}$. The idea is to follow the trajectory starting from the jump Δ_w (which corresponds to a coalescence event) in the Lévy flow $X^{w_{k-1}}$, and when we reach time 0 we continue the trajectory in the flow $X^{w_{k-2}}$ starting from the negative jump arising at time $-\beta_{w_{k-1}}$ in this flow, etc.

More precisely, we set

$$(Y_t^{w_{k-1}, w})_{-\tau_w \leq t \leq 0} := (X_{-\tau_w, t}^{w_{k-1}}(R_{-\tau_w}^{w_{k-1}}))_{-\tau_w \leq t \leq 0}.$$

Note that the starting point of the above process corresponds to the point where previous trajectories of the flow $X^{w_{k-1}}$ coalesce due to the positive jump Δ_w . See the left-hand side of Figure 6.

Next, for all $j \in \llbracket 1, k-1 \rrbracket$, we define inductively

$$(Y_t^{w_{j-1}, w})_{-\beta_{w_j} \leq t \leq 0} := \left(X_{-\beta_{w_j}, t}^{w_{j-1}} \left(R_{-\beta_{w_j}}^{w_{j-1}} - (1 - Z_{-\beta_{w_j}}^{w_{j-1}}) + (1 - Z_{-\beta_{w_j}}^{w_{j-1}}) Y_0^{w_j, w} \right) \right)_{-\beta_{w_j} \leq t \leq 0}.$$

Here, the starting point corresponds to a point chosen in the ‘‘gap’’ created by the negative jump x_{w_j} , and it is chosen according to the ending point $Y_0^{w_j, w}$ of the previous trajectory. See the right-hand side of Figure 6.




Figure 6: The trajectory associated with a positive jump Δ_w . The trajectory is in red and is represented in $[0, 1]$ since the flow is 1-periodic in space. On the left, the trajectory starts at the point $R_{-\tau_w}^{w_{k-1}}$ where there is a coalescence in the flow at time $-\tau_w$ due to the positive jump. The segment of the positions at time $(-\tau_w)-$ which coalesce in $R_{-\tau_w}^{w_{k-1}}$ is drawn in black. The first part of the trajectory then ends at $Y_0^{w_{k-1}, w}$. On the right the next parts of the trajectories for $j \in \llbracket 0, k-1 \rrbracket$ start at a position corresponding to the end of the previous part of the trajectory in the ‘‘gap’’ of size $1 - Z_{-\beta_{w_j}}^{w_{j-1}}$ created at time $-\beta_{w_j}$.

Let us denote by \mathcal{J}_a the (random) set of sequences of positive jumps $(\Delta_{wi_n})_{n \geq 0}$ such that the sequence of times of jump τ_{wi_n} is increasing and converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For all $u = (wi_n)_{n \geq 0} \in \mathcal{J}_a$, we define τ_u (resp. $t_u, \tilde{\tau}_u, \tilde{t}_u$) as the limit of τ_{wi_n} (resp. $t_{wi_n}, \tilde{\tau}_{wi_n}, \tilde{t}_{wi_n}$) as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

According to the value of a , we describe differently the way two trajectories coalesce modulo \mathbb{Z} .

Lemma 5.1. *Let $v \neq w \in \mathcal{T}_a \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. Let z be a common prefix of v and w . Assume that $\{Y_{t_0}^{z, v}\} \neq \{Y_{t_0}^{z, w}\}$ for some fixed $t_0 < 0$. Let*

$$\sigma := \inf\{t \in [t_0, 0], \{Y_t^{z, v}\} = \{Y_t^{z, w}\}\},$$

with $\inf \emptyset = \infty$ by convention. Then, on the event $\sigma < \infty$,

- If $a \in (3/2, 2)$, then a.s. $\Delta \xi_z(-\sigma) > 0$.
- If $a \in [2, 5/2)$, then there exists a sequence of positive jumps $u = (\Delta_{zi_n})_{n \geq 0} \in \mathcal{J}_a$ such that $\tau_u = -\sigma$ and such that for all $n \geq 0$, we have $\{Y_{-\tau_{zi_n}}^{z, w} - U_{-\tau_{zi_n}}^z\} \leq (Z_{-\tau_{zi_n}}^z - 1)/Z_{-\tau_{zi_n}}^z$.

Proof. Let us start with the case $a \in (3/2, 2)$. Note that $\int_0 x^{1-a} dx < \infty$ and $\int^\infty x^{1-2a} < \infty$, so that

$$\int_{(1/2, \infty) \setminus \{1\}} |x - 1| \lambda(dx) < \infty.$$

Therefore, almost surely we have

$$\sum_{t \in [t_0, 0]} \mathbf{1}_{Z_t^z \neq 1} |Z_t^z - 1| < \infty. \quad (5.2)$$

By Borel-Cantelli lemma, we deduce that almost surely there is a finite number of times $t \in [t_0, 0]$ such that $Z_t^z > 1$ and $\{Y_t^{z,w} - U_t^z\} \leq (Z_t^z - 1)/Z_t^z$ or $\{Y_t^{z,v} - U_t^z\} \leq (Z_t^z - 1)/Z_t^z$. We denote those times by $s_1 < \dots < s_N$. Furthermore, by (5.2), we have a.s.

$$\sum_{t \in [t_0, 0]} \mathbf{1}_{1/2 < Z_t^z < 1} \log Z_t^z > -\infty,$$

so that between two consecutive coalescence times $s_i < s_{i+1} < 0$ such that $\{Y_{s_i}^{z,w}\} \neq \{Y_{s_i}^{z,v}\}$, the distance between $Y_t^{z,w}$ and $Y_t^{z,v}$ in the torus \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} cannot converge to zero since it is lower bounded by $\prod_{s_i < t < s_{i+1}; 1/2 < Z_t^z < 1} Z_t^z > 0$ times the distance between $\{Y_{s_i}^{z,w}\}$ and $\{Y_{s_i}^{z,v}\}$ in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} . Thus, the coalescence can only take place during a time s_i for some $i \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$. This means that $Z_\sigma^z > 1$, i.e. $\Delta \xi_z(-\sigma) > 0$.

Now let us treat the case $a \in [2, 5/2)$. Note that $\int_0 x^{1-a} dx = \infty$ and hence

$$\int_{(1, \infty)} \frac{x-1}{x} \lambda(dx) = \infty.$$

Therefore, by Campbell's theorem, a.s.

$$\sum_{t \in [t_0, 0]} \mathbf{1}_{Z_t^z > 1} \frac{Z_t^z - 1}{Z_t^z} = \infty.$$

By the second Borel-Cantelli lemma, using the independence of the U_t^z 's, we deduce that a.s. almost surely the set of times $t \in [\sigma, 0]$ such that $Z_t^z > 1$ and $\{Y_{t-}^{z,w} - U_t^z\} \leq (Z_t^z - 1)/Z_t^z$ is dense in $[\sigma, 0]$. In particular, there exists a sequence $(\Delta_{z_{i_n}})_{n \geq 0} \in \mathcal{J}_a$ of positive jumps such that $\tau_{z_{i_n}} \uparrow -\sigma$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and such that for all $n \geq 0$, we have $\{Y_{-\tau_{z_{i_n}}}^{z,w} - U_{-\tau_{z_{i_n}}}^z\} \leq (Z_{-\tau_{z_{i_n}}}^z - 1)/Z_{-\tau_{z_{i_n}}}^z$. \square

For all $v, w \in \mathcal{T}_a$, their nearest common ancestor $c(v, w)$ in $\mathcal{T}_a \cup \mathcal{J}_a$ is defined as follows:

- If $v = \emptyset$ or $w = \emptyset$, then $c(v, w) = \emptyset$.
- If $v = w$, then $c(v, w) = v = w$.
- If $v \neq w \in \mathcal{T}_a \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, then let z be their largest common prefix. Let $\emptyset = z_0 \prec z_1 \prec \dots \prec z_k = z$ be the sequence of prefixes of z . Let

$$\sigma_{v,w}(z_k) := \inf \{t \leq 0, Y_t^{z_k,v} \text{ and } Y_t^{z_k,w} \text{ are defined and } \{Y_t^{z_k,v}\} = \{Y_t^{z_k,w}\}\}.$$

If $\sigma_{v,w}(z_k) < \infty$, then the trajectories $Y^{z_k,w}$ and $Y^{z_k,v}$ coalesce at time $\sigma_{v,w}(z_k)$. We distinguish two subcases:

- If $a \in (3/2, 2)$, then by Lemma 5.1, we have $\Delta\xi_{z_k}(-\sigma_{v,w}(z_k)) > 0$, so that there exists a unique $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Delta\mathcal{X}_{z_k}(-\sigma_{v,w}(z_k)) = \Delta_{z_k i}$. Then we set $c(v, w) = z_k i$.
- Otherwise, when $a \in [2, 5/2)$, by Lemma 5.1 there exists a sequence $(\Delta_{z_k i_n})_{n \geq 0} \in \mathcal{J}_a$ of positive jumps such that $\tau_{z_k i_n} \uparrow -\sigma_{v,w}(z_k)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and such that for all $n \geq 0$, we have $\{Y_{-\tau_{z_k i_n}}^{z_k, w} - U_{-\tau_{z_k i_n}}^{z_k}\} \leq (Z_{-\tau_{z_k i_n}}^{z_k} - 1)/Z_{-\tau_{z_k i_n}}^{z_k}$. Then we set $c(v, w) = (\Delta_{z_k i_n})_{n \geq 0}$.

When $\sigma_{v,w}(z_k) = \infty$, we set

$$\sigma_{v,w}(z_{k-1}) := \inf \{t \leq 0, \{Y_t^{z_{k-1}, v}\} = \{Y_t^{z_{k-1}, w}\}\}$$

and we do as above. If $\sigma_{v,w}(z_{k-1}) < \infty$, then the trajectories $Y^{z_{k-1}, w}$ and $Y^{z_{k-1}, v}$ coalesce at time $\sigma_{v,w}(z_{k-1})$. Then when $a \in (3/2, 2)$, we have $\Delta\xi_{z_{k-1}}(-\sigma_{v,w}(z_{k-1})) > 0$, so that there exists a unique $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Delta\mathcal{X}_{z_{k-1}}(-\sigma_{v,w}(z_{k-1})) = \Delta_{z_{k-1} i}$. Then we set $c(v, w) = z_{k-1} i$. When $a \in [2, 5/2)$ there exists a sequence $(\Delta_{z_{k-1} i_n})_{n \geq 0}$ such that $\tau_{z_{k-1} i_n} \uparrow -\sigma_{v,w}(z_{k-1})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and such that for all $n \geq 0$, we have $\{Y_{-\tau_{z_{k-1} i_n}}^{z_{k-1}, w} - U_{-\tau_{z_{k-1} i_n}}^{z_{k-1}}\} \leq (Z_{-\tau_{z_{k-1} i_n}}^{z_{k-1}} - 1)/Z_{-\tau_{z_{k-1} i_n}}^{z_{k-1}}$. Then we set $c(v, w) = (\Delta_{z_{k-1} i_n})_{n \geq 0}$, etc. Finally, if for all $j \in \llbracket 0, k \rrbracket$ the trajectories do not coalesce, i.e. $\sigma_{v,w}(z_j) = \infty$ (this happens with positive probability), then we set $c(v, w) = \emptyset$.

The space \mathcal{T}_a is equipped with the distance $d_{\mathcal{T}_a}$ defined as follows.

For all $w \in \mathcal{J}_a \cup \mathcal{T}_a$, we set

$$d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, w) := \tilde{t}_w \tag{5.3}$$

Note that in the case $a = 2$, the above expression can also be written $d_{\mathcal{T}}(\emptyset, w) = t_w$. Besides, for future use, we stress that, thanks to the absence of atom in the intensity of the PPPs N_w 's, the function $w \mapsto d_{\mathcal{T}}(\emptyset, w)$ is a.s. injective. For all $w, v \in \mathcal{T}_a$, we set

$$d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(w, v) := d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, w) + d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, v) - 2d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, c(v, w)). \tag{5.4}$$

It is easy to check that $d_{\mathcal{T}_a}$ is a distance on \mathcal{T}_a . Indeed, positivity and symmetry are obvious. For the triangle inequality, by (5.4) it suffices to check that for all $u, v, w \in \mathcal{T}_a$, we have

$$d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, v) + d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, c(u, w)) \geq d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, c(u, v)) + d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, c(v, w)).$$

This holds clearly since:

- If the trajectories of u and v coalesce before those of u and w , then $c(v, w) = c(u, w)$, and one can see that $d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, v) \geq d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, c(u, v))$;
- Otherwise, $d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, c(u, w)) \geq d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, c(u, v))$ and one can see that $d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, v) \geq d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, c(v, w))$.

5.2 The tree of geodesics via the discrete coalescing flow

We recall the branching peeling exploration of a map \mathbf{m} via discrete cell-systems from [BCM18, BBCK18]. One can then perform the time-reversed uniform exploration on each branch via the discrete coalescing flow thanks to the encoding presented in Subsection 4.4.

The branching peeling exploration of a map \mathbf{m} , contrary to the filled-in peeling exploration, does not fill-in the holes which are created when we identify two edges (i.e. when the perimeter process has a negative jump) but instead starts another process which explores this hole. Thanks to the spatial Markov property, under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$, this new exploration is independent conditionally on the

perimeter of the hole and has the same law as the exploration of a Boltzmann map of perimeter corresponding to the perimeter of the hole.

Under $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}$, the perimeter processes of this branching exploration are described by a cell-system $((P_w(n))_{n \geq 0})_{w \in \mathbb{U}}$ which is defined as follows: $P_\emptyset = P$ is the perimeter process of the exploration of \mathfrak{m} following the locally largest component. Recall that it is a Markov chain whose probability transitions are given by (2.2). We define the birth-time of the cell \emptyset by $B_\emptyset = 0$. Then, assume inductively that $(P_w(n))_{n \geq 0}$ and its birth-time B_w are defined for some $w \in \mathbb{U}$. Let ℓ_{wi} for $i \geq 1$ be the sizes in absolute value of the negative jumps, ranked in the non-increasing order and let $(n_{wi})_{i \geq 1}$ be the times at which they occur. For all $i \geq 1$ we define $(P_{wi}(n))_{n \geq 0}$ as the exploration of the independent Boltzmann map of law $\mathbb{P}^{(\ell_{wi})}$ which fills the hole created by the associated negative jump. Then conditionally on the ℓ_{wi} 's (and on all the branches $P_{w'}$ for $w' \in \mathbb{U}$ such that w is not a strict prefix of w'), the processes $(P_{wi}(n))_{n \geq 0}$'s for $i \geq 1$ are independent Markov chains whose transitions are given by (2.2). This property is called the branching Markov property. For all $i \geq 1$, birth-time of the cell wi is defined by $B_{wi} = B_w + n_i$.

On each branch corresponding to a cell P_w for $w \in \mathbb{U}$, we define the associated discrete coalescing flow which gives the fpp geodesics in \mathfrak{m} . Let us denote by $(\mathcal{E}_n^w)_{n \geq 0}$ the i.i.d. exponential random variables arising in the uniform peeling exploration of the map filling in the corresponding hole (note that $\mathcal{E}_n^\emptyset = \mathcal{E}_n$ for all $n \geq 0$). Let $(\tilde{P}_w(t))_{t \geq 0}$ be the continuous time process obtained by waiting a time $\mathcal{E}_n^w / (2P_w(n)^{a-1})$ at $\tilde{P}_w(n)$ before jumping at $\tilde{P}_w(n+1)$ for all $n \geq 0$. We define $U_t^{(\ell),w}, g_t^{(\ell),w}$ as in Subsection 4.3 using \tilde{P}_w in place of \tilde{P} . We define the random measure

$$N_w^{(\ell)} = \sum_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta \tilde{P}_w(t) \neq 0} \delta_{(-t, \tilde{P}_w(t) / \tilde{P}_w(t-), U_t^{(\ell),w})}.$$

We denote by $(X_{s,t}^{(\ell),w}(v))_{v \in \mathbb{R}, s \leq t \leq 0}$ the discrete coalescing flow defined by setting

$$\forall v \in \mathbb{R}, \forall s \leq t \leq 0, \quad X_{s,t}^{(\ell),w}(v) = v + \int_s^t g_{s'}^{(\ell),w}(X_{s,s'}^{(\ell),w}(v), z, u) N_w^{(\ell)}(ds', dz, du).$$

Notice that at each time of creation of a hole, conditionally on the already explored region and on the fpp lengths of the inner dual edges, the dual edges on the boundary of the hole are i.i.d. exponential random variables of parameter one. Therefore, the fpp geodesic in the map filling the hole from a face f to the boundary of the hole is a part of the fpp geodesic from f to f_r in \mathfrak{m} .

For all $w \in \mathbb{U}$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\partial \mathfrak{h}_w$ be the boundary of the hole corresponding to the cell P_w and let f_{wi} be the face created by the i -th largest positive jump of P_w which occurs at time m_i . By convention, we set $f_\emptyset = f_r$. We can thus record the fpp distances

$$d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(\partial \mathfrak{h}_w, \partial \mathfrak{h}_{wi}) = \sum_{n=0}^{n_i-1} \frac{\mathcal{E}_n^w}{2P_w(n)} \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(\partial \mathfrak{h}_w, f_{wi}) = \sum_{n=0}^{m_i-1} \frac{\mathcal{E}_n^w}{2P_w(n)} \quad (5.5)$$

and then we have

$$d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(f_r, \partial \mathfrak{h}_{wi}) = d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(f_r, \partial \mathfrak{h}_w) + d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(\partial \mathfrak{h}_w, \partial \mathfrak{h}_{wi}) \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(f_r, f_{wi}) = d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(f_r, \partial \mathfrak{h}_w) + d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(\partial \mathfrak{h}_w, f_{wi}). \quad (5.6)$$

We also denote the associated times of negative and positive jumps in \tilde{P}_w by

$$\beta_{wi}^{(\ell)} := \sum_{n=0}^{n_i-1} \frac{\mathcal{E}_n^w}{2P_w(n)^{a-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_{wi}^{(\ell)} := \sum_{n=0}^{m_i-1} \frac{\mathcal{E}_n^w}{2P_w(n)^{a-1}}$$

and we set

$$b_{w_i}^{(\ell)} := b_w^{(\ell)} + \beta_{w_i}^{(\ell)} \quad \text{and} \quad t_{w_i}^{(\ell)} := b_w^{(\ell)} + \tau_{w_i}^{(\ell)}.$$

In order to understand the distances between two faces in the tree of geodesics to the root, we describe the trajectories associated with the fpp geodesics in the discrete coalescing flows. Let $w = i_1 \cdots i_k \in \mathbb{U} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. Let $\emptyset = w_0 \prec w_1 \prec \cdots \prec w_k = w$ be the prefixes of w . The face f_w corresponds to the i_k -th largest positive jump of $\tilde{P}_{w_{k-1}}$. We follow the fpp geodesic from f_w to the root f_r in the flows $X^{(\ell), w_k}, X^{(\ell), w_{k-1}}, \dots, X^{(\ell), w_0}$. More precisely, we set

$$(Y_t^{(\ell), w_{k-1}, w})_{-\tau_w^{(\ell)} \leq t \leq 0} := \left(X_{-\tau_w^{(\ell)}, t}^{(\ell), w_{k-1}} \left(R_{\tau_w^{(\ell)}}^{(\ell), w} \right) \right)_{-\tau_w^{(\ell)} \leq t \leq 0}$$

Note that the starting point of the above process corresponds to the point where previous trajectories of the flow $X^{(\ell), w_{k-1}}$ coalesce due to the positive jump $\Delta \tilde{P}_{w_{k-1}}(\tau_w^{(\ell)})$.

Next, for all $j \in \llbracket 1, k-1 \rrbracket$, we define inductively $Y_t^{(\ell), w_{j-1}, w}$ of every $t \in [-\beta_{w_j}^{(\ell)}, 0]$ by

$$Y_t^{(\ell), w_{j-1}, w} := X_{-\beta_{w_j}^{(\ell)}, t}^{(\ell), w_{j-1}} \left(R_{\beta_{w_j}^{(\ell)}}^{(\ell), w} - \frac{-\Delta \tilde{P}_{w_{j-1}}(\beta_{w_j}^{(\ell)})}{\tilde{P}_{w_{j-1}}(\beta_{w_j}^{(\ell)})} + \frac{-\Delta \tilde{P}_{w_{j-1}}(\beta_{w_j}^{(\ell)})}{\tilde{P}_{w_{j-1}}(\beta_{w_j}^{(\ell)})} Y_0^{(\ell), w_j, w} \right)$$

Let us then describe the nearest common ancestor of two faces f and f' of \mathfrak{m} in the tree of fpp geodesics to the root using the above-defined trajectories. When $f \neq f_r$ (resp. $f' \neq f_r$), the face f (resp. f') corresponds to the i -th (resp. i' -th) largest positive jump of P_w (resp. $P_{w'}$), i.e. $f = f_{w_i}$ (resp. $f' = f_{w'_i}$). Note that the fpp geodesics from f and f' to the root cannot coalesce until they lie in the same branch. See Figure 7.




Figure 7: Coalescence of the fpp geodesics from f_1 and f_2 to the root face f_r .

The nearest common ancestor $c^{(\ell)}(f, f')$ in the tree of fpp geodesics to the root is characterized as follows:

- If $f = f_r$ or $f' = f_r$, then $c^{(\ell)}(f, f') = f_r$;

- If $f = f'$, then $c^{(\ell)}(f, f') = f = f'$;
- If $f \neq f'$ and $f, f' \neq f_r$, then let z be the largest prefix of $wi, w'i'$. Let $\emptyset = z_0 \prec z_1 \prec \dots \prec z_k = z$ be the sequence of the prefixes of z . Let

$$\sigma_{wi, w'i'}^{(\ell)}(z_k) := \inf\{t \leq 0, Y_t^{(\ell), z_k, wi}, Y_t^{(\ell), z_k, w'i'} \text{ are defined and } \{Y_t^{(\ell), z_k, wi}\} = \{Y_t^{(\ell), z_k, w'i'}\}\}.$$

If $\sigma_{wi, w'i'}^{(\ell)}(z_k) < \infty$, then the trajectories $Y^{(\ell), z_k, wi}$ and $Y^{(\ell), z_k, w'i'}$ coalesce at time $\sigma_{wi, w'i'}^{(\ell)}(z_k)$. Then $\Delta_{\tilde{P}_{z_k}}(-\sigma_{wi, w'i'}^{(\ell)}(z_k)) > 0$, so that there exists a unique $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Delta_{\tilde{P}_{z_k}}(-\sigma_{wi, w'i'}^{(\ell)}(z_k))$ is the j -th largest positive jump of P_{z_k} . In other words, the fpp geodesics coalesce at the face $f_{z_k j}$. Then we have $c^{(\ell)}(f, f') = f_{z_k j}$. Otherwise, we set

$$\sigma_{wi, w'i'}^{(\ell)}(z_{k-1}) := \inf\{t \leq 0, \{Y_t^{(\ell), z_{k-1}, wi}\} = \{Y_t^{(\ell), z_{k-1}, w'i'}\}\}.$$

If $\sigma_{wi, w'i'}^{(\ell)}(z_{k-1}) < \infty$, then the trajectories $Y^{(\ell), z_{k-1}, wi}$ and $Y^{(\ell), z_{k-1}, w'i'}$ coalesce at time $\sigma_{wi, w'i'}^{(\ell)}(z_{k-1})$, so that there exists a unique $j \geq 1$ such that $\Delta_{\tilde{P}_{z_{k-1}}}(-\sigma_{wi, w'i'}^{(\ell)}(z_{k-1}))$ is the j -th largest positive jump of $P_{z_{k-1}}$. In other words, the fpp geodesics coalesce at the face $f_{z_{k-1} j}$. Then we have $c^{(\ell)}(f, f') = f_{z_{k-1} j}$, etc. Finally, if for all $m \in \llbracket 0, k \rrbracket$ the trajectories do not coalesce, i.e. $\sigma_{wi, w'i'}^{(\ell)}(z_m) = \infty$, then the fpp geodesics coalesce at $c^{(\ell)}(f, f') = f_r$.

Furthermore, the distance $d_{\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m})}$ induced by the fpp lengths on the tree $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m})$ of fpp geodesics to the root is characterized by the relation

$$d_{\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m})}(f, f') = d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(f_r, f) + d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(f_r, f') - 2d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(f_r, c^{(\ell)}(f, f')). \quad (5.7)$$

5.3 Scaling limit of the tree of geodesics to the root

In this subsection, assuming $a \in (3/2, 5/2)$, we prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. By (4.4) and by the branching Markov property, one can check the joint convergence for all $w \in \mathbb{U}$,

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(\frac{\tilde{P}_w(t)}{\ell} \right)_{t \geq 0} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(e^{\xi_w(2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} t)} \right)_{t \geq 0}. \quad (5.8)$$

Notice that the above convergence entails the scaling limit of the degrees of the faces, i.e. jointly with the above convergence, $\deg(f_w)/\ell$ converges in law towards Δ_w jointly for all $w \in \mathbb{U}$. Furthermore, the fact that one can enumerate the Δ_w 's in the decreasing order comes from Proposition 3 of [CCM20], which, combined with (5.8), shows in particular that the law of the family of the Δ_w 's is absolutely continuous with respect to the jumps of a stable Lévy process with no negative jump stopped when it reaches -1 .

By (4.4), jointly with the above convergence, we have the joint convergence of the jump times for all $w \in \mathbb{U}$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(\beta_{wi}^{(\ell)}, \tau_{wi}^{(\ell)} \right)_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \xrightarrow{(d)} \frac{1}{2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}}} (\beta_{wi}, \tau_{wi}),$$

hence the convergence of the times

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(b_w^{(\ell)}, t_{wi}^{(\ell)} \right) \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \frac{1}{2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}}} (b_w, t_{wi}).$$

Moreover, thanks to (4.3) and (5.5), using a Lamperti transform, jointly with the previous convergences, for all $w \in \mathbb{U}$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(\frac{1}{\ell^{a-2}} d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(\partial \mathfrak{h}_w, \partial \mathfrak{h}_{wi}), \frac{1}{\ell^{a-2}} d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(\partial \mathfrak{h}_w, f_{wi}) \right) \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \frac{1}{2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}}} \left(\tilde{\beta}_{wi}, \tilde{\tau}_{wi} \right),$$

Therefore, by (5.6), we have for all $w \in \mathbb{U}, i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(\frac{1}{\ell^{a-2}} d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(f_r, \partial \mathfrak{h}_w), \frac{1}{\ell^{a-2}} d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(f_r, f_{wi}) \right) \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \frac{1}{2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}}} \left(\tilde{b}_w, \tilde{t}_{wi} \right), \quad (5.9)$$

Moreover, for all $d \geq 1$, for every sequences $s_i^{(\ell)} \rightarrow s_i < 0$ and $v_i^{(\ell)} \rightarrow v_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, for all $w_1, \dots, w_d \in \mathbb{U}$, jointly with the previous convergences, a consequence of Theorem 4.4 is the joint convergence for all $i \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$,

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(\begin{array}{c} \left(X_{s_i^{(\ell)}, t}^{(\ell), w_i}(v_i^{(\ell)}) \right)_{t \in [s_i^{(\ell)}, 0]} \\ \left(\frac{\tilde{P}_{w_i}(t)}{\tilde{P}_{w_i}(t-)}, U_t^{(\ell), w_i} \right)_{t \geq 0} \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(\begin{array}{c} \left(X_{2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} s_i, 2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}} t}(v_i) \right)_{t \in [s_i, 0]} \\ \left(Z_{-t}^{w_i}, U_{-t}^{w_i} \right)_{t \geq 0} \end{array} \right), \quad (5.10)$$

where the first coordinate converges for the Skorokhod J_1 topology while the second coordinate converges for the topology of weak convergence of measures on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+^* \setminus \{1\} \times [0, 1]$. The above convergence for the Skorokhod topology is written on an interval $[s_i^{(\ell)}, 0]$ whose length varies as ℓ varies but is simply defined as the convergence for the Skorokhod topology on $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_-, \mathbb{R})$ where we extend the process on $(-\infty, s_i^{(\ell)})$ with its value at $s_i^{(\ell)}$. In particular, we get the convergence of the trajectories jointly with the previous ones: for all $w \in \mathbb{U}$,

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad (Y^{(\ell), z, w})_{z \prec w} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} (Y^{z, w})_{z \prec w}. \quad (5.11)$$

By Skorokhod's representation theorem, we may assume that the above convergences hold almost surely and we add a superscript (ℓ) to \tilde{P}_w and to the faces f_w to distinguish them in the same probability space. Let $w \neq w' \in \mathbb{U}$.

Let us first focus on the dense case $a \in (3/2, 2)$, where by definition $c(w, w')$ is an element of \mathbb{U} . By Equations (5.7) and (5.4), it suffices to prove that almost surely for ℓ large enough,

$$c^{(\ell)}(f_w^{(\ell)}, f_{w'}^{(\ell)}) = f_{c(w, w')}^{(\ell)}. \quad (5.12)$$

In order to check this, we use the convergence (5.10).

If $c(w, w') = \emptyset$, then the trajectories $(Y^{z, w})_{z \prec w}$ and $(Y^{z, w'})_{z \prec w'}$ do not coalesce. Then by (5.11) we know that for all ℓ large enough the trajectories $(Y^{(\ell), z, w})_{z \prec w}$ and $(Y^{(\ell), z, w'})_{z \prec w'}$ do not coalesce, hence (5.12).

Otherwise, if $c(w, w') \neq \emptyset$, then one can write $c(w, w') = zj$ for some $z \in \mathbb{U}, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, by (5.10), we have a.s. the convergence of the jump

$$\left(\frac{\tilde{P}_z^{(\ell)}(\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)})}{\tilde{P}_z^{(\ell)}(\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)} -)}, U_{\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)}}^{(\ell), z} \right) \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{\text{(a.s.)}} \left(Z_{-\tau_{zj}}^z, U_{-\tau_{zj}}^z \right). \quad (5.13)$$

But by taking (5.11) into account, one obtains (5.12). Indeed, by the convergence of the trajectories, we know that a.s. for ℓ large enough, the two trajectories will not coalesce until the jump associated with the face $f_{c(w, w')}^{(\ell)}$. But at the same time, by the convergence of the trajectories and by the convergence of the jump, a.s. for ℓ large enough they have to coalesce due to this jump. See Figure 8. Let us turn the idea on Figure 8 into a rigorous proof. Let $T < -\tau_{zj}$. By (5.11), for all $\ell \geq 1$, let $\psi_w^{(\ell)}$ and $\psi_{w'}^{(\ell)}$ be increasing homeomorphisms from $[T, 0]$ to $[T, 0]$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in [T, 0]} \left| Y_{\psi_w^{(\ell)}(t)}^{(\ell), z, w} - Y_t^{z, w} \right| + \sup_{t \in [T, 0]} \left| \psi_w^{(\ell)}(t) - t \right| + \sup_{t \in [T, 0]} \left| Y_{\psi_{w'}^{(\ell)}(t)}^{(\ell), z, w'} - Y_t^{z, w'} \right| + \sup_{t \in [T, 0]} \left| \psi_{w'}^{(\ell)}(t) - t \right| \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{\text{(a.s.)}} 0. \quad (5.14)$$

Almost surely for ℓ large enough, we have

$$\psi_w^{(\ell)}(-\tau_{zj}) = \psi_{w'}^{(\ell)}(-\tau_{zj}) = -\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)}. \quad (5.15)$$

Indeed, by (5.14),

$$\left(Y_{\psi_w^{(\ell)}(-\tau_{zj})}^{(\ell), z, w}, Y_{\psi_w^{(\ell)}(-\tau_{zj})-}^{(\ell), z, w}, Y_{\psi_{w'}^{(\ell)}(-\tau_{zj})}^{(\ell), z, w'}, Y_{\psi_{w'}^{(\ell)}(-\tau_{zj})-}^{(\ell), z, w'} \right) \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{\text{(a.s.)}} \left(Y_{-\tau_{zj}}^{z, w}, Y_{-\tau_{zj}-}^{z, w}, Y_{-\tau_{zj}}^{z, w'}, Y_{-\tau_{zj}-}^{z, w'} \right),$$

and using that the jumps of $Y^{z, w}$ are a.s. distinct given that the image of $\lambda(dz)du$ by $(z, u) \mapsto g(0, z, u)$ has no atom (and the same holds for $Y^{z, w'}$), we deduce (5.15) from (5.13). Therefore,

$$\left(Y_{-\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)}}^{(\ell), z, w}, Y_{-\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)}-}^{(\ell), z, w}, Y_{-\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)}}^{(\ell), z, w'}, Y_{-\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)}-}^{(\ell), z, w'} \right) \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{\text{(a.s.)}} \left(Y_{-\tau_{zj}}^{z, w}, Y_{-\tau_{zj}-}^{z, w}, Y_{-\tau_{zj}}^{z, w'}, Y_{-\tau_{zj}-}^{z, w'} \right),$$

But since $Y^{z, w}$ and $Y^{z, w'}$ coalesce, and since the law of $U_{-\tau_{zj}}^z$ has no atom,

$$\{Y_{-\tau_{zj}-}^{z, w} - U_{-\tau_{zj}}^z\} < (Z_{-\tau_{zj}}^z - 1)/Z_{-\tau_{zj}}^z \quad \text{and} \quad \{Y_{-\tau_{zj}-}^{z, w'} - U_{-\tau_{zj}}^z\} < (Z_{-\tau_{zj}}^z - 1)/Z_{-\tau_{zj}}^z.$$

Thus, by (5.13), a.s. for ℓ large enough,

$$\{Y_{-\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)}-}^{(\ell), z, w} - U_{\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)}}^{(\ell), z}\} \vee \{Y_{-\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)}-}^{(\ell), z, w'} - U_{\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)}}^{(\ell), z}\} \leq \left(\frac{\tilde{P}_z^{(\ell)}(\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)})}{\tilde{P}_z^{(\ell)}(\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)} -)} - 1 \right) / \left(\frac{\tilde{P}_z^{(\ell)}(\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)})}{\tilde{P}_z^{(\ell)}(\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)} -)} \right).$$

So, a.s. for ℓ large enough, the trajectories $Y^{(\ell), z, w}, Y^{(\ell), z, w'}$ coalesce at time $-\tau_{zj}^{(\ell)}$, hence (5.12).

Next, we deal with the case $a \in [2, 5/2)$. If $c(w, w') = \emptyset$, then we conclude as before. When $c(w, w') \neq \emptyset$, then by definition $c(w, w') = (\Delta_{z i_n})_{n \geq 0} \in \mathcal{J}_a$ for some common prefix $z \prec w, w'$, where $\tau_{z i_n}$ is an increasing sequence which converges towards the time $-\sigma_{w, w'}(z)$ which is the time at which the trajectories coalesce. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Let n large enough such that $t_{z i_n} \geq \tilde{t}_{c(w, w')} - \varepsilon$. Then,




Figure 8: Sketch of the end of the proof of Theorem 1.5 in the case $a \in (3/2, 2)$: the two trajectories $Y^{z,w}$ and $Y^{z,w'}$ for some $z \prec w, w'$ in red coalesce due to the jump $\Delta_{c(w,w')}$ in blue. A neighbourhood of the trajectories is drawn in pink and a neighbourhood of the jump is in light blue.

by the same reasoning as in the case $a \in (3/2, 2)$, by (5.11) we know that a.s. for ℓ large enough, $f_{z_{in}}^{(\ell)}$ is a common ancestor of $f_w^{(\ell)}, f_{w'}^{(\ell)}$. As a result,

$$d_{\mathcal{T}(m)}(f_w^{(\ell)}, f_{w'}^{(\ell)}) \leq d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(f_r^{(\ell)}, f_w^{(\ell)}) + d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(f_r^{(\ell)}, f_{w'}^{(\ell)}) - 2d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(f_r^{(\ell)}, f_{z_{in}}^{(\ell)}).$$

Consequently, a.s.

$$\limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell^{a-2}} d_{\mathcal{T}(m)}(f_w^{(\ell)}, f_{w'}^{(\ell)}) \leq \frac{1}{2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}}} (\tilde{t}_w + \tilde{t}_{w'} - 2\tilde{t}_{z_{in}}) \leq \frac{1}{2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}}} (d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(w, w') + 2\varepsilon).$$

One can then let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Finally the almost sure inequality

$$\liminf_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell^{a-2}} d_{\mathcal{T}(m)}(f_w^{(\ell)}, f_{w'}^{(\ell)}) \geq \frac{1}{2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}}} d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(w, w')$$

comes directly from (5.11) since if at some time the trajectories $(Y^{z,w})_{z \prec w}$ and $(Y^{z,w'})_{z \prec w'}$ have not yet coalesced, then for ℓ large enough the same holds for the trajectories $(Y^{(\ell),z,w})_{z \prec w}$ and $(Y^{(\ell),z,w'})_{z \prec w'}$. This ends the proof. \square

6 Conjectures

Our choice of topology for Theorem 1.5 comes from the fact that \mathcal{T}_a is non-compact as soon as $a \leq 2$. Still, in the dilute case $a \in (2, 5/2)$, we expect that the scaling limit of Theorem 1.5 holds in the sense of Gromov-Hausdorff, after taking the completion of \mathcal{T}_a . We also expect a Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov scaling limit in the dilute case when we equip the map with the uniform measure on the vertices/faces/edges.

Next, we state a few conjectures on the scaling limit of the map itself. We first define a random countable metric space which is conjecturally the scaling limit of large planar maps with high degrees. Let us define another distance by inserting shortcuts in the metric space \mathcal{T}_a . To introduce our shortcuts, it will be more convenient to focus on the macroscopic positive jumps. For all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we define $(\mathcal{T}_a^\varepsilon, d_{\mathcal{T}_a^\varepsilon})$ as the subspace of \mathcal{T}_a consisting of the elements $w \in \mathcal{T}_a$ such that $\Delta_w > \varepsilon$. We now modify the distance $d_{\mathcal{T}_a^\varepsilon}$ using the negative jumps of the ξ_w 's for $w \in \mathbb{U}$.

Let $w \in \mathbb{U} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. Let us denote by $\emptyset = w_0 \prec w_1 \prec \dots \prec w_k = w$ its prefixes. From the negative jump x_w of $\mathcal{X}_{w_{k-1}}$, we define two trajectories: one starting on the left of the ‘‘gap’’ created by the jump, one starting from the right. Set $\mathcal{Y}_L^{w,w}(0) = 0$ and $\mathcal{Y}_R^{w,w}(0) = 1$. For all $i \in \{L, R\}$, for all $j \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket$, we define inductively

$$(\mathcal{Y}_i^{w_{j-1},w}(t))_{-\beta_{w_j} \leq t \leq 0} := \left(X_{-\beta_{w_j},t}^{w_{j-1}} \left(R_{-\beta_{w_j}}^{w_{j-1}} - (1 - Z_{-\beta_{w_j}}^{w_{j-1}}) + (1 - Z_{-\beta_{w_j}}^{w_{j-1}}) \mathcal{Y}_i^{w_j,w}(0) \right) \right)_{-\beta_{w_j} \leq t \leq 0}.$$

For all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $i \in \{L, R\}$, let $J_i^{w,\varepsilon}$ be the largest $j \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket$ such that there exists $t \in [-\beta_{w_j}, 0]$ satisfying $\Delta \mathcal{X}_{w_{j-1}}(-t) > \varepsilon$ and $\{\mathcal{Y}_i^{w_{j-1},w}(t-) - U_t^{w_{j-1}}\} \leq (Z_t^{w_{j-1}} - 1)/Z_t^{w_{j-1}}$. When it exists, we also define $V_i^{w,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{T}_a^\varepsilon \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ as the index of the positive jump such that $-\tau_{V_i^{w,\varepsilon}}$ is the smallest $t \in [-\beta_{w_j}, 0]$ to satisfy the above conditions. If $J_i^{w,\varepsilon}$ does not exist, then we set $J_i^{w,\varepsilon} = 0$ and $V_i^{w,\varepsilon} = \emptyset$. In other words, $V_L^{w,\varepsilon}$ (resp. $V_R^{w,\varepsilon}$) corresponds to the first coalescence corresponding to a positive jump of size larger than ε happening in the trajectory $(\mathcal{Y}_L^{w',w})_{w' \prec w}$ (resp. $(\mathcal{Y}_R^{w',w})_{w' \prec w}$).

For all $w \in \mathbb{U} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, we define the length $\mathcal{L}_w^\varepsilon$ of the shortcut between $V_L^{w,\varepsilon}$ and $V_R^{w,\varepsilon}$ associated with the negative jump x_w by $\mathcal{L}_w^\varepsilon = \tilde{b}_w - \tilde{t}_{V_L^{w,\varepsilon}} + \tilde{b}_w - \tilde{t}_{V_R^{w,\varepsilon}}$. In the case $a = 2$, the expression simplifies to $\mathcal{L}_w^\varepsilon = b_w - t_{V_L^{w,\varepsilon}} + b_w - t_{V_R^{w,\varepsilon}}$. Moreover, for all $u, v \in \mathcal{T}_a^\varepsilon$, we define the length of the smallest shortcut between u and v by setting

$$\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(u, v) := \inf \left\{ \mathcal{L}_w^\varepsilon; w \in \mathbb{U} \setminus \{\emptyset\} \text{ s.t. } (u, v) = (V_L^{w,\varepsilon}, V_R^{w,\varepsilon}) \text{ or } (u, v) = (V_R^{w,\varepsilon}, V_L^{w,\varepsilon}) \right\} \in [0, \infty].$$

We set $\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon := \mathcal{T}_a^\varepsilon$ and we equip \mathcal{D}^ε with the distance $d_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}$ defined for all $v, w \in \mathcal{D}^\varepsilon$ by

$$d_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}(v, w) = \inf \left\{ d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(v, v_1) + \sum_{k=1}^n (\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(v_k, w_k) + d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(w_k, v_{k+1})); n \in \mathbb{N}, v_1, \dots, v_{n+1}, w_1, \dots, w_n \in \mathcal{D}^\varepsilon, v_{n+1} = w \right\}.$$

Note that by definition of the shortcuts we have $d_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}(v, w) \geq |d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, v) - d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, w)|$, so that positivity is preserved since $d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, v) \neq d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, w)$ as soon as $v \neq w$.

Lemma 6.1. *For all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\varepsilon' \in (0, \varepsilon)$ and $v, w \in \mathcal{D}^\varepsilon$, $d_{\mathcal{D}^{\varepsilon'}}(v, w) \leq d_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}(v, w)$.*

Proof. It suffices to check that for all $w \in \mathbb{U} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, we have $d_{\mathcal{D}^{\varepsilon'}}(V_L^{w,\varepsilon}, V_R^{w,\varepsilon}) \leq \mathcal{L}_w^\varepsilon$. But

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{D}^{\varepsilon'}}(V_L^{w,\varepsilon}, V_R^{w,\varepsilon}) &\leq d_{\mathcal{D}^{\varepsilon'}}(V_L^{w,\varepsilon}, V_L^{w,\varepsilon'}) + \mathcal{L}_w^{\varepsilon'} + d_{\mathcal{D}^{\varepsilon'}}(V_R^{w,\varepsilon}, V_R^{w,\varepsilon'}) \\ &= (\tilde{t}_{V_L^{w,\varepsilon'}} - \tilde{t}_{V_L^{w,\varepsilon}}) + (\tilde{b}_w - \tilde{t}_{V_L^{w,\varepsilon'}} + \tilde{b}_w - \tilde{t}_{V_R^{w,\varepsilon'}}) + (\tilde{t}_{V_R^{w,\varepsilon'}} - \tilde{t}_{V_R^{w,\varepsilon}}) \\ &= \mathcal{L}_w^\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we used the fact that $V_L^{w,\varepsilon}$ (resp. $V_R^{w,\varepsilon}$) is an ancestor of $V_L^{w,\varepsilon'}$ (resp. $V_R^{w,\varepsilon'}$) in \mathcal{T}_a , in the sense that $c(V_L^{w,\varepsilon}, V_L^{w,\varepsilon'}) = V_L^{w,\varepsilon}$ (resp. $c(V_R^{w,\varepsilon}, V_R^{w,\varepsilon'}) = V_R^{w,\varepsilon}$). \square

Notice also that the sets \mathcal{D}^ε 's increase as ε decreases. One can thus define $\mathcal{D}_a = \mathcal{T}_a$ and the distance $d_{\mathcal{D}_a}$ on \mathcal{D}_a by writing for all $v, w \in \mathcal{D}_a$,

$$d_{\mathcal{D}_a}(v, w) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} d_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}(v, w),$$

where the term on the right is well defined for ε small enough. The function $d_{\mathcal{D}_a}$ satisfies the triangle inequality and symmetry since it is a limit of distances. Moreover, it also satisfies positivity since $d_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}(v, w) \geq |d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, v) - d_{\mathcal{T}_a}(\emptyset, w)|$.

Conjecture 6.2. *Suppose $a \in (3/2, 5/2)$. Then, for the product topology,*

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(\ell^{2-a} d_{\text{fpp}}^\dagger(f_i, f_j) \right)_{i,j \geq 1} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(\frac{1}{2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}}} d_{\mathcal{D}_a}(w_i, w_j) \right)_{i,j \geq 1}.$$

Conjecture 6.3. *Suppose $a \in (2, 5/2)$. Then, for the product topology,*

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(\ell^{2-a} d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_i, f_j) \right)_{i,j \geq 1} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(\frac{1 + e_{\mathbf{q}}}{2c_a p_{\mathbf{q}}} d_{\mathcal{D}_a}(w_i, w_j) \right)_{i,j \geq 1},$$

\mathcal{D}_a has a compact completion and this convergence of metric spaces also holds in the sense of Gromov-Hausdorff for this completion of \mathcal{D}_a .

Conjecture 6.4. *Suppose $a = 2$. Then, for the product topology,*

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{P}^{(\ell)}, \quad \left(\frac{1}{\log \ell} d_{\text{gr}}^\dagger(f_i, f_j) \right)_{i,j \geq 1} \xrightarrow[\ell \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left(\frac{1}{2} d_{\mathcal{D}_a}(w_i, w_j) \right)_{i,j \geq 1}.$$

Acknowledgements. I am grateful to Cyril Marzouk and Nicolas Curien their insightful suggestions and comments. I also acknowledge the support of the ERC consolidator grant 101087572 “SuPer-GRandMa”.

References

- [App09] David Applebaum. *Lévy processes and stochastic calculus.*, volume 116 of *Camb. Stud. Adv. Math.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed. edition, 2009.
- [BBCK18] Jean Bertoin, Timothy Budd, Nicolas Curien, and Igor Kortchemski. Martingales in self-similar growth-fragmentations and their connections with random planar maps. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 172(3-4):663–724, 2018.
- [BC17] Timothy Budd and Nicolas Curien. Geometry of infinite planar maps with high degrees. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 22:37, 2017. Id/No 35.
- [BCK18] Jean Bertoin, Nicolas Curien, and Igor Kortchemski. Random planar maps and growth-fragmentations. *Ann. Probab.*, 46(1):207–260, 2018.
- [BCM18] Timothy Budd, Nicolas Curien, and Cyril Marzouk. Infinite random planar maps related to Cauchy processes. *J. Éc. Polytech., Math.*, 5:749–791, 2018.
- [Bud] Timothy Budd. *Peeling random planar maps (lecture notes)*. <http://hef.ru.nl/tbudd/docs/mappeeling.pdf>.
- [CC18] Alessandra Caraceni and Nicolas Curien. Geometry of the uniform infinite half-planar quadrangulation. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 52(3):454–494, 2018.
- [CCM20] Linxiao Chen, Nicolas Curien, and Pascal Maillard. The perimeter cascade in critical Boltzmann quadrangulations decorated by an $O(n)$ loop model. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré D, Comb. Phys. Interact.*, 7(4):535–584, 2020.

- [CLG17] Nicolas Curien and Jean-François Le Gall. Scaling limits for the peeling process on random maps. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Probab. Stat.*, 53(1):322–357, 2017.
- [CM20] Nicolas Curien and Cyril Marzouk. Markovian explorations of random planar maps are roundish. *Bull. Soc. Math. Fr.*, 148(4):709–732, 2020.
- [Cur23] Nicolas Curien. *Peeling random planar maps. École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XLIX – 2019*, volume 2335 of *Lect. Notes Math.* Cham: Springer, 2023.
- [IW89] Nobuyuki Ikeda and Shinzo Watanabe. *Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes.*, volume 24 of *North-Holland Math. Libr.* Amsterdam etc.: North-Holland; Tokyo: Kodansha Ltd., 2nd ed. edition, 1989.
- [Jac79] Jean Jacod. *Calcul stochastique et problèmes de martingales*, volume 714 of *Lect. Notes Math.* Springer, Cham, 1979.
- [JS87] Jean Jacod and Albert N. Shiryaev. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*, volume 288 of *Grundlehren Math. Wiss.* Springer, Cham, 1987.
- [Kam23a] Emmanuel Kammerer. Distances on the CLE_4 , critical Liouville quantum gravity and $3/2$ -stable maps, 2023. arXiv:2311.08571.
- [Kam23b] Emmanuel Kammerer. On large $3/2$ -stable maps, 2023. arXiv:2304.01167.
- [LGM11] Jean-François Le Gall and Grégory Miermont. Scaling limits of random planar maps with large faces. *Ann. Probab.*, 39(1):1–69, 2011.
- [LJR04] Yves Le Jan and Olivier Raimond. Flows, coalescence and noise. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(2):1247–1315, 2004.
- [LP12] Zenghu Li and Fei Pu. Strong solutions of jump-type stochastic equations. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 17:13, 2012. Id/No 33.
- [MM07] Jean-François Marckert and Grégory Miermont. Invariance principles for random bipartite planar maps. *Ann. Probab.*, 35(5):1642–1705, 2007.
- [Tal94] Michel Talagrand. The supremum of some canonical processes. *Am. J. Math.*, 116(2):283–325, 1994.