

Cutoff for mixtures of permuted Markov chains: reversible case

Bastien Dubail *

KTH, Stockholm, Sweden

Abstract

We investigate the mixing properties of a model of reversible Markov chains in random environment, which notably contains the simple random walk on the superposition of a deterministic graph and a second graph whose vertex set has been permuted uniformly at random. It generalizes in particular a result of Hermon, Sly and Sousi, who proved the cutoff phenomenon at entropic time for the simple random walk on a graph with an added uniform matching. Under mild assumptions on the base Markov chains, we prove that with high probability the resulting chain exhibits the cutoff phenomenon at entropic time $\log n/h$, h being some constant related to the entropy of the chain. We note that the results presented here are the consequence of a work conducted for a more general model that does not assume reversibility, which will be the object of a companion paper. Thus, most of our proofs do not actually require reversibility, which constitutes an important technical contribution. Finally, our argument relies on a novel concentration result for "low-degree" functions on the symmetric group, established specifically for our purpose but which could be of independent interest.

1 Models and main results

1.1 Cutoff for mixtures of reversible permuted Markov Chains

This paper establishes a cutoff phenomenon at entropic time for a model of Markov chain in random environment. In the simplest case, think of two multi-graphs, allowed to contain self-loops and multi-edges, which are superpositioned one on top of the other. What can be said about the simple random walk on the resulting graph ? Does it mix faster ? In general nothing can be said, as the two graphs could be equal and give the same resulting random walk. On the opposite, if the two graphs are not perfectly aligned but rather superpositioned in a complementary way the random walk can be expected to behave much differently. In this paper we consider a random version of this process, where the vertices of the second graph are permuted uniformly at random. This model is inspired by the work [39] of Hermon, Sousi and Sly, who proved the cutoff phenomenon at entropic time for the simple random walk on a sequence of deterministic graphs to which is added a random uniform matching of the vertices or a configuration model. In this

*Correspondence to be sent to: bastdub@kth.se

paper we consider a more general model which goes in fact beyond the case of the simple random walk on the superposition of graphs and considers mixtures of reversible Markov chains. To define this model, we use the well-known theory of representing reversible Markov chains by electrical networks.

First recall that a chain on state space S with transition kernel P is reversible if there exists a measure π on S such that $\pi(x)P(x, y) = \pi(y)P(y, x)$ for all $x, y \in S$. An electrical network is a pair (G, c) consisting in a weighted non-directed graph $G = (V, E)$ equipped with non-negative weights $c = (c(e))_{e \in E}$, called conductances, on the edges. Any reversible Markov chain can be represented as a random walk on an electrical network, defining conductances as

$$c(x, y) := \pi(x)P(x, y) \tag{1}$$

which are symmetric by assumption. Conversely, any electrical network gives rise to a reversible Markov chain whose transition probabilities are proportional to conductances. We refer to [49] for a detailed account of this theory. The particular case of the simple random walk on a multi-graph is obtained by taking all conductances equal to 1. For more general reversible chains, the electrical network theory provides a natural and generic way to mix together two reversible chains by superpositionning the corresponding electrical networks, that is taking a linear positive combination of the conductances.

Let us introduce some notation to state our main result. Given two measures μ, ν on a countable set S , their total variation distance is defined as

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} := \sup_{A \subseteq S} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in S} |\mu(x) - \nu(x)|.$$

If P is the transition kernel of a positive recurrent, irreducible and aperiodic Markov chain on S , it admits a unique invariant measure π . In that case, given a starting vertex $x \in S$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, the mixing time is defined as

$$t_{\text{mix}}(x, \varepsilon) := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|P^t(x, \cdot) - \pi\|_{\text{TV}} < \varepsilon\}.$$

If the chain is not irreducible or aperiodic, we consider the mixing time to be infinite. An event $A = A(n)$ is said to occur with high probability, if it has limiting probability 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Given an integer $n \geq 1$, we write $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer, σ a permutation of n elements chosen uniformly at random, $(G_1, c_1), (G_2, c_2)$ two electrical networks with common vertex set $[n]$ and $\alpha, \beta > 0$. Then consider the Markov chain on $[n]$ defined by the electrical network (G^*, c) with conductances*

$$\forall x, y \in [n] : c^*(x, y) := \alpha c_1(x, y) + \beta c_2(\sigma(x), \sigma(y)). \tag{2}$$

Suppose

(H1) *The degrees and conductances of (G_1, c_1) and (G_2, c_2) all bounded uniformly in n , from above and below.*

(H2) *α, β are constants in n .*

(H3) *The connected components of G_1 have size at least 3 and that of G_2 size at least 2.*

Then there exists $h = h(n)$ bounded from above and away from 0 for which the following holds. For all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant $C(\varepsilon)$ such that with high probability,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in [n]} t_{\text{mix}}(x, 1 - \varepsilon) &\geq \frac{\log n}{h} - C(\varepsilon) \sqrt{\log n}, \\ \max_{x \in [n]} t_{\text{mix}}(x, \varepsilon) &\leq \frac{\log n}{h} + C(\varepsilon) \sqrt{\log n}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the chain is irreducible and aperiodic with high probability and exhibits a uniform cutoff phenomenon: for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\max_{x \in [n]} t_{\text{mix}}(x, \varepsilon)}{\min_{x \in [x]} t_{\text{mix}}(x, 1 - \varepsilon)} = 1$$

in probability.

Remark 1.1. Being defined with conductances, the chain considered in the theorem is thus automatically reversible. Letting $c_1, c_2 \equiv 1$ take the value 1 on every edge and setting $\alpha = \beta = 1$ as well, we obtain the particular case of the superposition of two multi-graphs. The case of a graph with an added random matching analog to the case studied in [39] can then be obtained by taking for G_2 a sequence of edges if n is even. A little difference lies however in the fact that the authors consider there simple graphs while we consider multi-graphs, thus edges of G_1, G_2 that align under the permutation σ would result in a transition with a higher probability. To obtain rigorously the case of simple graphs, it would in theory be necessary to adjust α, β to make them $1/2$ when edges of the two networks are aligned. However a close inspection at the proof shows this makes no difference (see Remark 3.4), so our result is also true when superpositioning simple graphs and discarding multi-edges in the resulting graph.

About reversibility The previous theorem was obtained as the consequence of a work conducted for more general chains than those considered here, that does not assume reversibility. The general model is the following: let P_1, P_2 be two $n \times n$ stochastic matrices, $p_1, p_2 : M_n([0, 1])$ two $n \times n$ matrices with entries in $[0, 1]$ satisfying $p_1 + p_2 \equiv 1$ and consider the stochastic matrix

$$\mathcal{P}(x, y) := p_1(x, \sigma(x)) P_1(x, y) + p_2(x, \sigma(x)) P_2(\sigma(x), \sigma(y)). \quad (3)$$

The reversible model considered in this paper is a particular case of (3): supposing P_1, P_2 are reversible and correspond to electrical networks $(G_1, c_1), (G_2, c_2)$ respectively, $P_i(x, y) = c_i(x, y)/c_i(x)$ where $c_i(x) := \sum_{z \in V} c_i(x, z)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Hence the reversible model is realized as (3) taking

$$p_1(x, y) := \frac{\alpha c_1(x)}{\alpha c_1(x) + \beta c_2(y)}.$$

The general model (3) is studied in the companion paper [30]. We chose here to focus first on the reversible case as it simplifies several aspects of the proof. Our proof adapts the strategy used for non-backtracking chains [8, 14, 15] to handle backtracking chains as well, including reversible ones, but reversibility is by far not essential. Thus an important goal of this paper is to provide a unified approach to prove cutoff for Markov chains in random environment using the "entropic method", with or without reversibility. Nevertheless, the absence of reversibility brings real additional difficulties and incidentally makes the conclusion Theorem 1.1 false: for some choices of P, Q, p_1, p_2

the worst-case mixing time is of order $(\log n)^a$ with $a > 1$. What remains true however is that cutoff occurs at entropic time if the chain is started from a typical state. This phenomenon is similar for instance to the case of random walks on the giant component of Erdős-Renyi graphs: with high probability these contain segments of length of order $\log n$, resulting in the worst-case mixing time being of order $(\log n)^2$ [9, 34], while the typical mixing time is $O(\log n)$ [10].

1.2 A concentration inequality for low-degree functions on the symmetric group

A core argument in the proof is a concentration inequality for the uniform measure on the symmetric group, which as far as we know is new and might be of independent interest. It generalizes an inequality of Chatterjee [23, Prop. 1.1], which was already used in previous works about cutoff for non-backtracking walks [8, 14]. The original inequality takes the form of a Bernstein-like bound for random variables of the form

$$Z = \sum_i A_{i\sigma(i)} \quad (4)$$

where $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and σ is a uniform permutation of n elements. Namely, for all $t \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{P}[|Z - \mathbb{E}[Z]| \geq t] \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-t^2}{2\|A\|(t + 2\mathbb{E}[X])}\right), \quad (5)$$

where $\|A\| = \max_{i,j \in [n]} A_{i,j}$. The random variable Z can be seen as arising from a linear function on the symmetric group, in the sense that it is a linear combination of indicators $\mathbb{1}_{\sigma(i)=j}$, which are the entries of the matrix representation of σ . With this point of view, it seems natural to inquire about more general polynomial functions. Of course any function on the symmetric group can be represented as a polynomial of degree n and in fact $n - 1$. Furthermore there already exist concentration results for generic functions on the symmetric group, regardless of the degree: Maurey's inequality [50] (see also Thm. 2.14 in [21]), Talagrand's inequality [57][Thm 5.1], and Proposition 4.8 in [21] are such examples. Our motivation is thus mainly to investigate whether an additional assumption of "low degree" can yield better concentration inequalities.

Some notations are necessary to state our result. Let \mathfrak{S}_n denote the symmetric group on n elements. Permutations $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ are identified with permutation matrices S defined by $S_{ij} := \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(i)=j}$. Let us remark first that there is no unique representation of a function on \mathfrak{S}_n as a polynomial. In the following result, particular representations are considered, but some more intrinsic notion of degrees will be discussed in Remark 1.4. We can without loss of generality suppose that the constant term is zero. Furthermore, since we are restricting to permutation matrices it is enough to consider the set of functions

$$\mathfrak{F} := \{\phi : M_n(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \forall i, j, k \in [n] : \partial_{ij}\partial_{ik}\phi \equiv \partial_{ji}\partial_{ki}\phi \equiv 0\}, \quad (6)$$

where ∂_{ij} denotes the partial derivative with respect to the entry (i, j) . Functions of \mathfrak{F} are called multilinear, as the degree is at most one in each entry. In particular, these are polynomial functions on $M_n(\mathbb{R})$, which we identify with polynomials in indeterminates $X_{ij}, i, j \in [n]$. By restriction to the set of permutations, each function $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}$ induces a map on \mathfrak{S}_n . Conversely, any map on \mathfrak{S}_n can be written as $\phi|_{\mathfrak{S}_n}$ for some $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}$ of degree at most $n - 1$, however this representation is in general not unique.

The vector space \mathfrak{F} can be decomposed as

$$\mathfrak{F} = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} \mathfrak{F}_{=d}$$

where for each $d \geq 0$, $\mathfrak{F}_{=d}$ is the vector space of homogeneous polynomials of degree d . Let $\mathfrak{F}_d = \bigoplus_{k=0}^d \mathfrak{F}_{=k}$ be the vector space of polynomials of degree at most d . If $d \geq 1$, a convenient way to write $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}_{=d}$ is given by Euler's theorem:

$$\phi(X) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j \in [n]} X_{ij} \partial_{ij} \phi(X).$$

In particular, evaluating ϕ at $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ yields

$$\phi(\sigma) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j \in [n]} \partial_{i,\sigma(i)} \phi(\sigma), \quad (7)$$

which can be seen as a generalization of (4). To state our result, we need the following linear operators on \mathfrak{F} . Given an homogeneous function $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}_{=d}$, let

$$D\phi := \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{i,j \in [n]} \partial_{ij} \phi \quad U\phi(X) := \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{i,j,k,l \in [n]} X_{il} X_{kj} \partial_{ij} \partial_{kl} \phi(X).$$

Finally, for a function $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}$, let

$$\|\phi\|_\infty := \max_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n} |\phi(\sigma)|, \quad \|\nabla\phi\|_\infty := \max_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n} \max_{i,j \in [n]} |\partial_{ij} \phi(\sigma)|.$$

In this context, we write $\mathbb{E}[\phi] := \mathbb{E}[\phi(\sigma)]$ for the expectation with respect to a uniformly distributed $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $n \geq 1$, $d \in [n]$, σ a uniform permutation of n elements and $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}_d$ a polynomial map of degree d with non-negative coefficients. Suppose there exist $C_D, C'_D, C_U \geq 0$ such that for all $k \in [0, d]$,*

$$\|D^k \phi\|_\infty \leq C_D, \quad \|\nabla D^k \phi\|_\infty \leq C'_D \quad \text{and} \quad \|D^k U\phi\|_\infty \leq C_U. \quad (8)$$

Then for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\phi(\sigma) - \mathbb{E}[\phi] \geq t] \leq \exp\left(\frac{-t^2}{2(\gamma_\phi + \beta_\phi t)}\right), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}[\phi(\sigma) - \mathbb{E}[\phi] \leq -t] \leq \exp\left(\frac{-t^2}{2\gamma_\phi}\right)$$

where

$$\beta_\phi := 6dC'_D \left(\log\left(\frac{4C_D n}{C'_D}\right)^+ + \frac{(2/n)(2 - e^{-2/n})}{1 - e^{-2/n}} \right)$$

$$\gamma_\phi := \frac{2\beta_\phi}{3} (2\mathbb{E}[\phi] + C_U)$$

Remark 1.2. If $\phi(X) = \sum_{i,j} A_{i,j} X_{i,j}$, then $\nabla\phi \equiv A^\top$. Therefore, the condition required on $\|\nabla\phi\|_\infty$ generalizes the control needed on $\|A\|$ in (5). Up to the logarithmic term and multiplicative constants, Theorem 1.2 thus really aims to generalize Chatterjee's inequality to higher degrees.

Remark 1.3. As was mentioned earlier, the finiteness of \mathfrak{S}_n implies that any function can in fact be seen as a polynomial function of degree at most $n - 1$, so Theorem 1.2 provides in theory a concentration inequality for any non-negative random variable defined by a uniform permutation. It is likely however that this bound becomes irrelevant when $d/n \rightarrow 0$. In this paper, Theorem 1.2 will be applied with $d = O(\sqrt{\log n})$.

Remark 1.4. There are intrinsic notions of degree for functions on \mathfrak{S}_n . A natural notion of degree is as follows: given $k \geq 1$, a k -coset of \mathfrak{S}_n is a subset of the form

$$E_{\substack{i_1 \dots i_k \\ j_1 \dots j_k}} := \{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n \mid \forall m = 1, \dots, k \quad \sigma(i_m) = j_m\}.$$

where $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$, $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_k) \in [n]^k$ are multi-indices of length k . If $k = 0$, we consider the whole set \mathfrak{S}_n to be a 0-coset. Given a function $f : \mathfrak{S}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the degree of f can be defined as the least integer $d \geq 0$ such that f writes as a linear combination of k -coset indicator functions with $k \leq d$. With this definition the degree of f is the minimal degree of a polynomial representation of ϕ .

The previous notion of degree is also intimately related to Fourier analysis: from [32][Thm. 7], it coincides with the *Fourier degree* of f , which is the least integer $d \geq 0$ such that all Fourier coefficients of f corresponding to irreducible representations of dimension $k > d$ are zero. We do not know whether the considerations of these notions of degree could lead to better concentration inequalities. The use of Fourier analysis, in particular character theory could definitely be of help at some point in the proof but other arguments seem to require more than the sole use of the characters. See Remark 9.1.

The presence of the operators D and U is a consequence of the proof. It follows the method of exchangeable pairs used by Chatterjee in the one-dimensional case to bound the log-Laplace transform, which can be done in terms of the functions $D^k \phi, UD^k \phi$. In the degree one case, these operators are trivial and thus need not be considered, but in the more general case an induction argument on the degree seems necessary, which is the reason why one needs to bound $\|D^k \phi\|_\infty, \|\nabla D^k \phi\|_\infty, \|D^k U \phi\|_\infty$ for all $k \leq d$. These quantities seem to lack good monotonicity properties that could simplify the bounds. However if we can control the coefficients of the polynomial directly as well as the number of monomials that do not evaluate to zero, the following proposition provides some control on the constants C_D, C'_D, C_U . These are rough bounds but can be sufficient for small degree functions, which is how the theorem is intended to be used.

Proposition 1.1. *Let ϕ be a polynomial in the indeterminates $(X_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$ of degree $d \geq 1$. Let $M(\phi)$ be the maximal coefficient of ϕ . Given $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ let $N(\phi, \sigma)$ be the number of monomials in ϕ which are non-zero when evaluated at σ and $N(\phi) := \max_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n} N(\phi, \sigma)$. For all $k \geq 0$*

$$\|D^k \phi\|_\infty \leq 2^k M(\phi) N(\phi), \quad \|U \phi\|_\infty \leq \frac{d-1}{n} M(\phi) N(\phi).$$

Plugging the previous estimates into Theorem 1.2 yields the following corollary.

Corollary 1.1. *Let $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}_d$ be a polynomial function of degree at most $d \geq 1$. Using the notations of the previous proposition, let $A_\phi := M(\phi) N(\phi)$ and $A_{\nabla \phi} := \max_{i,j \in [n]} A_{\partial_{ij} \phi}$. For all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}[|\phi(\sigma) - \mathbb{E}[\phi]| \geq t] \leq 2 \exp \left(\frac{-t^2}{2\alpha_\phi \left(\frac{4}{3} \mathbb{E}[\phi] + \frac{2^{d+1}(d-1)}{3n} A_\phi + t \right)} \right).$$

with

$$\alpha_\phi := 6 d 2^d A_{\nabla \phi} \left(\log \left(\frac{4A_\phi n}{A_{\nabla \phi}} \right)^+ + \frac{(2/n)(2 - e^{-2/n})}{1 - e^{-2/n}} \right)$$

1.3 Related works

Discovered by Diaconis, Shahshahani and Aldous [29, 1, 2], the cutoff phenomenon is a famous feature observed in a large number of Markov chains. Not all Markov chains exhibit cutoff and it remains an open question to determine a characterization of this intriguing phenomenon. To this date, the sufficient condition given by Salez in [53] is certainly the closest result one has ever been from a full characterization. This sufficient condition expresses an entropic concentration phenomenon, which has been at the heart of many important achievements on cutoff over the last decade. While the initial focus was on specific, explicit Markov chains with high degrees of symmetry, like random walks on groups (see [28, 54] for global references on the subject), the seminal work of Lubetzky and Sly [47] on random walks on random regular graphs initiated a series of papers studying instead generic Markov chains. In that regard, a lot of attention was drawn on Markov chains in random environment, which showed that cutoff is actually quite common and often the result of an entropic concentration phenomenon, leading to an *entropic mixing time* $\log n/h$, where n is the size of the state space and h can be interpreted as an entropy rate.

After Lubetzky and Sly proved the cutoff for simple and non-backtracking random walks on random regular graphs, Ben Hamou and Salez proved the cutoff for the non-backtracking walk on random graphs with a given degree sequence, ie the configuration model [8]. This case is also considered in [10], in which Berestycki, Lyons, Peres and Sly prove the cutoff, for both the simple and non-backtracking walks on the giant component of an Erdős Renyi random graph as well as for the configuration model. In the case of the simple random walk, the starting point is not uniform but needs to be typical. For Erdős Renyi random graphs, the worst-case mixing time had been established to be $O((\log n)^2)$ by Fountoulakis and Reed [34] and Benjamini, Kosma and Wormald [9], while in the configuration model cutoff was obtained subsequently by Ben Hamou, Lubetzky and Peres in [6]. Models of random non-backtracking chains have also been considered by Bordenave, Caputo and Salez: [14] considers the non-backtracking walk on directed configuration models, while [15] considers the case of a stochastic matrix in which the entries of each row are permuted uniformly at random. In [27], Conchon-Kerjan considers random walks on random lifts of weighted graphs which are not reversible. Let us also mention the work of Hermon and Olesker-Taylor [37, 38] on random walks on random Cayley graphs of Abelian groups. A model similar to ours is the *PS* model, introduced by Chatterjee and Diaconis [25] and shown to exhibit cutoff at entropic time by Ben Hamou and Peres [7].

Some recent works investigate the case of random graphs with community structures: in [5], Ben Hamou proves a phase transition for the cutoff of the non-backtracking random walk on a random graph with two communities. An extension of this result for the simple random walk was obtained by Hermon, Šarković and Sousi [40] who also consider a second model of random graphs allowing more communities.

While the previously cited works consider the case of an essentially totally random Markov chains, cutoff was also shown to occur when randomizing a given chain, where the final environment still keeps a lot of the structure of the initial chain. We already cited the work of Hermon, Sly and Sousi [39] as the main inspiration of this work, where cutoff is proved for the simple random walk on a graph to which is added a uniform matching. This model was extended by Baran, Hermon, Šarković and Sousi [4] who prove a phase transition when weights are added on the

random matching.

Another direction of recent works is the competition between different mechanisms such as having a dynamic environment: see the papers by Avena, Güldaş, van der Hofstad and den Hollander [3] and Caputo and Quattropiani [20]. A related work is [19] by Caputo and Quattropiani on PageRank random walks on random digraphs.

Let us mention that cutoff at entropic phenomenon is not bound to random Markov chains: it can also arise in deterministic settings, such as Ramanujan graphs [46, 51] or environments with a Ramanujan property [16]. In fact from the work of Friedman [36] (see also [13]) it is known that that random regular graphs are Ramanujan with high probability, so the above results can be interpreted as cutoff phenomena in pseudo-deterministic settings. The paper by Eberhard and Varjù [31] falls in that category, which can also be interpreted as a deterministic realization of the *PS* model studied in [7]. Finally, the sufficient condition of Salez [53] allows him to deduce cutoff for a large family of chains satisfying a non-negative curvature criterion, not necessarily random.

When it comes to the concentration result, random variables of the form (4) were introduced in the "combinatorial central limit theorem" by Hoeffding [41]. Since then, they have been one of the main motivations for the developments of Stein's method, which is at the basis of the concentration inequality (5) and our result. Early applications of Stein's method for such random variables are found in the works of Bolthausen and Goetze [11, 12] who obtained error bounds on the normal approximation.

Introduced by Stein in [55] to give a new proof of the classical CLT, Stein's method of exchangeable pairs rapidly became an important tool to prove limit theorems that go way beyond the setting of the CLT, we refer to Stein's paper [56] and to the survey [24] of Chatterjee and [26] of Chatterjee, Diaconis and Meckes which focuses more closely on the subject of Poisson approximation. The first concentration inequalities using Stein's method are due to Chatterjee in his PhD Thesis [21], see also [23]. The inequality (5) can also be interpreted as the concentration of the uniform measure on the symmetric group. Generally, the subject of concentration for the Haar measure is considered by Chatterjee in [22], where he establishes a connection between concentration and the rate of convergence of some random walks on groups.

1.4 Proof outline

Knowledge of the invariant measure: as our model is reversible, the electrical network analogy provides an expression for the invariant measure. Indeed we can infer from (1) that

$$\pi(x) = \frac{c^*(x)}{\sum_{y,z \in [n]} c^*(y,z)} = \frac{\sum_{z \in [n]} c^*(x,z)}{\sum_{y,z \in [n]} c^*(y,z)}$$

is an invariant probability measure. From the boundedness Assumptions (H1), (H2) we immediately see this implies $\pi(x) = \Theta(1/n)$ for all $x \in [n]$. In general, this knowledge about the invariant measure is sufficient to make a lot of arguments much simpler. We will for instance use it in the proof of the lower bound of Theorem 1.1. However as mentioned after Theorem 1.1, most of our arguments do not require reversibility and thus will not use this knowledge about the invariant measure. Instead, we follow the strategy used in [14, 15] of proving convergence towards an approximate invariant measure $\hat{\pi}$. Letting \mathcal{P} be the transition matrix of the chain studied, if $\|\mathcal{P}^t(x, \cdot) - \hat{\pi}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$ holds uniformly in x for a given time t , then the invariance property implies

that a true invariant measure π satisfies automatically $\|\pi - \hat{\pi}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$, establishing in particular the uniqueness of the invariant measure.

The entropic method: the entropic method has become over the last years quite a standard technique to prove cutoff, proof being that it is common to almost all previous works on cutoff for randomized Markov chains cited above. It is essentially made of two arguments: first an entropic concentration is shown to occur at the entropic time $\log n/h$, which is shown to imply cutoff in the second part of the proof. These arguments come with different variations, depending on whether reversibility is supposed or not. We follow the approach originally designed for non-backtracking random walks [8, 14, 15], which can be thought of as the complete opposite of reversibility. A main contribution of this paper is thus to extend this approach to backtracking chains as well, including reversible chains. First we prove a quenched entropic concentration property for trajectories, namely we prove a statement of the form $\mathcal{P}(X_0 \cdots X_t) \simeq e^{-th+O(\sqrt{t})}$, where we write $\mathcal{P}(X_0 \cdots X_t) = \prod_{i=0}^{t-1} \mathcal{P}(X_i, X_{i+1})$. This statement is given here as a rough heuristic, which would be correct in the non-backtracking case. In general, what we prove in practice is rather concentration of the probability to follow the *loop-erased trace* of X , so we are back at studying non-backtracking trajectories. This concentration phenomenon is proved by a coupling with another Markov chain lying on an infinite random state space. We call this environment a quasi-tree in reference to [39], as this object is similar to theirs. Basically, it is designed to be a stationary approximation of the universal cover of the finite chain, in the same way Erdős-Renyi random graphs can be approximated by infinite Galton-Watson trees.

Analysis on the quasi-tree: this part is essentially the only one where reversibility comes into play. In the reversible case, a comparison argument will show that conditional on the environment, from any vertex, the probability to escape to infinity along the neighbouring "branch" of the quasi-tree is lower bounded by a constant. This may not be true in the general model (3). Once this is proved, the rest of analysis can be conducted pretty much as is done in [39, 40, 4].

The proof of the entropic concentration notably relies on the use of *regeneration times*, which are times where the chain in the quasi-tree makes a transition for the first and last time. In fact, the use of these times goes beyond the entropic concentration phenomenon, so we will spend some time studying the regeneration process. In particular, as in [40], our model requires the consideration of an underlying Markov chain. We thought useful to introduce the setting of Markov renewal processes to formalize these arguments in a generic way. An important requirement for the proof is the fast mixing of the Markov chain underlying the regeneration process. In our case, the law of the environment presents enough independence so that the regeneration chain satisfies Doeblin's condition, which implies the mixing time is $O(1)$.

Argument for the lower bound: the lower bound in the mixing time is based on a simple coverage argument. From the concentration of entropy, at time $t = O(\log n)$ the chain is necessarily confined in a set of size $e^{th+O(\sqrt{t})}$ at most. This becomes $o(n)$ for $t \leq \log n/h - C\sqrt{\log n}$ and a large constant $C > 0$, which is sufficient to conclude using that the invariant measure satisfies $\pi(x) = \Theta(1/n)$.

Concentration of nice trajectories: the second part of the argument uses the entropic concentration to show a second concentration phenomenon. Specifically, for all $x, y \in V$, we define a set $\mathfrak{N}^t(x, y)$ of "nice" trajectories between x, y , of length t , which will have the property that: 1. they are typical, that is the trajectory of the chain is likely to be nice, 2. the probability $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}^t}^t(x, y)$ of following a nice trajectory concentrates around its mean, which is shown to be independent of the starting point. From these properties we deduce that $\mathcal{P}^t(x, \cdot)$ mixes towards a proxy stationary distribution $\hat{\pi}$.

Nice paths are basically defined by splitting a path in three components $\mathfrak{p}_1, \mathfrak{p}_2, \mathfrak{p}_3$ and restricting $\mathfrak{p}_1, \mathfrak{p}_3$ to be contained in a nice quasi-tree-like neighbourhood around x and y respectively. Thanks to the entropic concentration, paths can be restricted to have probability $e^{-th+O(\sqrt{t})}$, which allows to use the concentration result of Theorem 1.2 conditional on the two neighbourhoods. The notable difference with the case of non-backtracking chains [8, 14, 15] comes from the path \mathfrak{p}_2 . In the case of non-backtracking chains, it merely consisted in one edge so only the concentration for degree 1 functions was needed. When backtracking is allowed, trajectories could bounce back and forth between the two neighbourhoods, so taking just one edge is not sufficient. Our strategy is here to reduce as much as possible the setting to the non-backtracking case. To that end, we can use concentration of the speed (or drift), which is proved in the same time as for the entropy: the distance traveled by the chain at time t is shown to be $\mathcal{A}t + O(\sqrt{t})$. On the other hand, using the lower bound on escape probabilities, we can argue that the chain is unlikely to backtrack over more than $L = \Theta(\log \log n)$ steps on a time scale $t = O(\log n)$. Thus by allowing the distance between the two neighbourhoods to be of order \sqrt{t} , we can ensure the chain does not backtrack from one neighbourhood to the other and discard trajectories which have intermediate length much smaller or much larger than \sqrt{t} . In the end, the estimate on the traveled distance leads us to consider neighbourhoods of variable size, with a variable distance between them, but with bounded windows on these parameters. Concentration is thus proved using Theorem 1.2 for fixed parameters and extended by union bound. When realized as a multilinear function, the probability to follow a nice path between x and y will have degree the length of the path \mathfrak{p}_2 between the two neighbourhoods. Since this is $O(\sqrt{t}) = O(\sqrt{\log n})$, the exponential factors in Corollary 1.1 remain sufficiently small to obtain exponential concentration bounds.

Computation of $\hat{\pi}$: the last difficulty is to compute the expectation precisely enough to get the probability measure $\hat{\pi}$. To that end, we use regeneration times for the finite chain, essentially defined to be times at which the chain makes a transition and does not backtrack before it has traveled distance $L = \Theta(\log \log n)$. From the non-backtracking property mentioned above, this essentially amounts to consider transitions which are made only once on the time scale $t = O(\log n)$. Furthermore, such regeneration times can of course be coupled with those defined in the quasi-tree setting. From this, we can use the mixing results proved for the regeneration chain in the quasi-tree to deduce similar mixing properties in the finite setting, which yields the expression of the limiting measure $\hat{\pi}$ (Proposition 3.2).

1.5 Organisation of the paper

In Section 2 we give material that will be used throughout the paper, including the definition of quasi-trees. In Section 3, we give in detail the main technical arguments of the paper that sum up

the arguments of the entropic method, from which we will be able to deduce Theorem 1.1. The three next sections deal with the analysis of the quasi-tree: Section 4 establish the lower bound on escape probabilities, Section 5 proves the main results about the regeneration structure while Section 6 basically establishes "nice properties" in the quasi-tree setting, including in particular the concentration of the speed and entropy. These nice properties are then transferred back to the finite setting in Section 7, to be used in Section 8 where nice paths are properly defined and shown to have their probability concentrate around the mean. Finally Section 9 proves the concentration result, Theorem 1.2, and is independent of the rest of the paper.

2 First moment argument, quasi-trees

Basic notations: throughout the paper, all quantities involved may have an implicit dependency in n and the term constant will refer to quantities that are independent of n and of the randomness. Given a set S , $|S|$ denotes its cardinality, $\mathbb{1}_S$ is the indicator of S . Given $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $x \wedge y := \min(x, y)$, $x \vee y := \max(x, y)$. We use the standard Landau notations o, O for deterministic sequences: $f(n) = O(g(n))$ if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $|f(n)| \leq Cg(n)$ for all n , $f = o(g)$ if $f(n)/g(n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$. We may write $O_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ to precise a potential dependence of the implicit constant in ε . We also write $f = \Theta(g)$ if $f = O(g)$ and $g = O(f)$, and $f \gg g$ if $g = o(f)$. When it comes to randomness, all the random variables considered in this paper are defined on an implicit probability space with measure \mathbb{P} . If Y_n, Z_n, Z are random variables, we write $Z_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} Z$ for convergence in probability and $Z_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(Y_n)$ if $Z_n/Y_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. In particular $Z_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ if $Z_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. An event $A = A(n)$ is said to occur with high probability, if its probability is $1 - o(1)$.

2.1 Quenched vs annealed probability, first moment argument

Consider $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ a Markov chain in random environment, ie with random transition probabilities, such as the one defined by (2). There are two laws naturally associated with the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$. The probability \mathbb{P} , which averages over both the random walk and the environment, gives rise to the *annealed* law of the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under which it is not a Markov chain. It is however a Markov chain under the *quenched* law, which conditions on the environment. To emphasize the distinction, it is written using a different font, namely \mathbf{P} will denote the quenched distribution. For all state x , we write $\mathbb{P}_x := \mathbb{P}[\cdot \mid X_0 = x]$, $\mathbf{P}_x := \mathbf{P}[\cdot \mid X_0 := x]$. Of course taking the expectation of the quenched law gives back the annealed law. This is the basis of the following first moment argument that will be used throughout the article, whose phrasing is taken from [15]. To prove a trajectorial event A has quenched probability vanishing to 0 in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$, it suffices to prove A has annealed vanishing probability, as Markov's inequality implies for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{P}[A] \geq \varepsilon] \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}[A]}{\varepsilon}. \quad (9)$$

In most of this paper we will first prove statements valid for fixed starting states, chosen independently of the environment, such as $\mathbb{P}_x[A] = o(1)$, to obtain $\mathbf{P}_x[A] = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. These can be interpreted as conditional statements for the case where the starting state is also random, with a law which is independent of the environment. Results for fixed starting states thus extend automatically to *typical states*, for instance taken uniformly at random in the case the state space is

$[n]$. To obtain stronger results valid for all states simultaneously, union bound shows it suffices to improve the annealed error bounds to $\mathbb{P}_x[A] = o(1/n)$. This strategy will be used in Section 7 to extend results from typical to all vertices.

2.2 The two-lift chain and half-integer time steps

We start by rewriting the model (2) further, which lacks symmetry in the roles of the two electrical networks $(G_1, c_1), (G_2, c_2)$. To obtain a model that is more symmetric, we can construct the chain as a projection of its two-lift: this consists in seeing G_1, G_2 as two disjoint components of one electrical network on a twice larger state space, which can be projected back to obtain the original model. This is essentially a matter of unifying notation and recover a setting which is somewhat similar to that of [39], but it can also prove useful on its own. All in all, the model we will work with in this paper is the following.

Let $V := [2n], V_1 := [n], V_2 := [n+1, 2n]$. Let σ be now a uniform bijection from V_1 to V_2 , which can be extended as a matching, or involution, η on V by

$$\eta|_{V_1} := \sigma, \quad \eta|_{V_2} := \sigma^{-1}.$$

This matching defines an equivalence relation, namely $x \sim \eta(x)$. For all $x \in V$, define $V(x) = V_1 \mathbb{1}_{x \in V_1} + V_2 \mathbb{1}_{x \in V_2}$. Consider (G, c) to be an electrical network with two disjoint components V_1, V_2 , which can themselves have several connected components. We can consider conductances to be defined on all pairs of $V \times V$, but equal to 0 on edges not present in G , and we recall $c(x) := \sum_y c(x, y)$. Let $\alpha, \beta > 0$ be two constants and $\gamma : V^2 \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a map such that $\gamma|_{V_1 \times V_2} \equiv \alpha, \gamma|_{V_2 \times V_1} \equiv \beta$. Since we will rarely resort to the reversibility of the chains considered, we use most of the time the notations of the general model (3): for all $x, y \in V$ let $P(x, y) := c(x, y)/c(x)$ be the transition matrix of the chain corresponding to the conductances c , and

$$p(x, u) := \frac{\gamma(x, u)c(x)}{\gamma(x, u)c(x) + \gamma(u, x)c(u)}, \quad q(x, u) := 1 - p(x, u)$$

for all $x, u \in V$. Notice that by construction $q(x, u) = p(u, x)$ for all $x, u \in V$. Then consider the Markov chain on V defined by the transition probabilities

$$\forall x, y \in V : \mathcal{P}(x, y) := \begin{cases} p(x, \eta(x))P(x, y) & \text{if } i(x) = i(y) \\ q(x, \eta(x))P(\eta(x), y) & \text{if } i(x) \neq i(y). \end{cases}$$

We will work with this Markov chain most of the time, which may not be reversible, however the main object of interest of this paper is rather its projection to the quotient $V/\sim = [n]$. As can be checked, the fact that $q(x, u) = p(u, x)$ implies that $\mathcal{P}(x, y) + \mathcal{P}(x, \eta(y)) = \mathcal{P}(\eta(x), y) + \mathcal{P}(\eta(y), \eta(y))$. This condition ensures the projection is itself a Markov chain, with transition matrix given by

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x, y \in [n], \bar{\mathcal{P}}(x, y) &:= \mathcal{P}(x, y) + \mathcal{P}(x, \eta(y)) \\ &= p(x, \eta(x))P(x, y) + q(x, \eta(x))P(\eta(x), \eta(y)). \end{aligned}$$

By construction $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$ is reversible, corresponding to the conductances

$$\bar{c}(x, y) := \alpha c(x, y) + \beta c(\eta(x), \eta(y))$$

The original chain (2) is recovered if one sets $c := c_1 \mathbb{1}_{V_1 \times V_1} + c_2 \mathbb{1}_{V_2 \times V_2}$, identifying V_2 with $[n]$ through $x \mapsto x - n$.

Given a probability measure μ on V , its projection $\bar{\mu}$ on $[n]$ is defined by $\bar{\mu}(x) = \mu(x) + \mu(\eta(x))$ for all $x \in [n]$. Notice that if π is invariant for \mathcal{P} , then $\bar{\pi}$ is invariant for $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$. Furthermore, total variation distance is non-increasing under projections, so

$$\|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^t(x, \cdot) - \bar{\pi}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \|\mathcal{P}^t(x, \cdot) - \pi\|_{\text{TV}}. \quad (10)$$

Therefore to obtain the upper bound in Theorem 1.1, which is the most difficult part of the argument, it suffices to prove an upper bound for the two-lift. In fact, our arguments show both chains exhibit cutoff at entropic time.

Now let us introduce another characteristic of the two-lift. The two-lift is by construction made of two disjoint subspaces V_1, V_2 : when at x the Markov chain stays in the same subspace with probability $p(x, \eta(x))$, and change with probability $q(x, \eta(x))$, after which it takes a step independent of η . Because of this, it may be convenient to actually distinguish between these two steps, adding transitions at half integer times, defining transition probabilities

$$\mathbf{P} [X_{t+1/2} = y \mid X_t = x] = \begin{cases} p(x, \eta(x)) & \text{if } y = x \\ q(x, \eta(x)) & \text{if } y = \eta(x) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } t = 0 \pmod{\mathbb{Z}} \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{P} [X_{t+1} = y \mid X_{t+1/2} = x] = P(x, y) \quad \text{for } t = 1/2 \pmod{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

As is easily checked, the Markov chain $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ evaluated at integer times exactly has the transition matrix \mathcal{P} .

Small-range vs long-range: From now on let G denote the deterministic graph underlying the electrical network of the chain P and let G^* be the graph obtained after adding the edges $(x, \eta(x))$ of the random matching. Using the terminology introduced in [39], call the latter *long-range* edges. By opposition, the deterministic edges of G are called *small-range*. If one takes the half-integer time steps above into account, the random graph G^* exactly supports the Markov chain X , whereas if one considers only integer time steps the chain moves along a long-range and a small-range edge at once or along a small-range edge only. We will consider different metrics on these graphs defined in terms of Markov kernels. To start with, we consider the \mathcal{P} -distance d defined by \mathcal{P} : given $x, y \in V$, $d(x, y) := \inf\{k \geq 0 : \mathcal{P}^k(x, y) > 0\}$, which is symmetric by the reversibility of \mathcal{P} . The corresponding (closed) ball of radius $r \geq 0$ is written $B_{\mathcal{P}}(x, r) := \{y \in V \mid d(x, y) \leq r\}$ to highlight the role of \mathcal{P} . Paths can be made of either vertices or oriented edges. If e is an oriented edge, e^-, e^+ denote respectively the initial and terminal endpoint of e . Given a path \mathfrak{p} , we write $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{p})$ for the product of transition probabilities along the edges of this path. These notations will extend for other transition kernels as well. In particular, we can also consider the ball $B_P(x, r)$ which discards long-range edges. For this reason it will also be written $B_{\text{SR}}(x, r)$ and called the *small-range* ball around x .

2.3 Quasi-trees

We now define quasi-trees, which are designed to be an infinite approximation of the graph G^* . The same terminology and notation is used as in the finite setting to emphasize analogies. This

abuse is justified by the fact that later, both settings will be coupled so that quantities with matching terminology or notation will be equal. If necessary, we will introduce distinct notation.

Definition 2.1. A rooted quasi-tree is a 4-tuple $(\mathcal{G}, O, \eta, \iota)$ where $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is an non-oriented graph, $O \in \mathcal{V}$ is a distinguished vertex and ι is a map $\iota : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow V$ that labels vertices of \mathcal{G} with states in V . We call $\iota(x)$ the type of the vertex $x \in V$. Finally η is a map $\eta = \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$, which satisfies:

- (i) η is an involution either of \mathcal{V} or of $\mathcal{V} \setminus \{O\}$ with no fixed point. The quasi-tree is called respectively *two-sided* or *one-sided* in these cases.
- (ii) For all $x \in \mathcal{V}$, the edge $(x, \eta(x))$ is present in \mathcal{E} . Such edges are called long-range edges, others are called small-range edges.
- (iii) for all $x, y \in \mathcal{V}$, there is a unique family, possibly empty, of long-range edges e_1, \dots, e_k such that all paths between x and y of minimal length contain the edges e_1, \dots, e_k .

In particular, there must exist a unique sequence of long-range edges joining the root O to x . If this sequence is non-empty let x° be the the endpoint of these long-range edges which is the furthest from O . We call such a vertex a *center*. If this sequence is empty, let $x^\circ := O$, however the root is not considered a center.

The two types of edges lead in turn to two additional types of paths and distances.

1. A *small-range path* is a path made exclusively of small-range edges. Given $x, y \in V$, the *small-range distance* $d_{\text{SR}}(x, y)$ is the minimal number of edges in small-range path from x to y . The corresponding *small-range balls* are written $B_{\text{SR}}(x, r)$.
2. A *long-range path* is a sequence $e = (e_i)_{i=1}^k$ of long-range edges such that for all $i \leq k - 1$ $d_{\text{SR}}(e_i, e_{i+1}) < \infty$ (so e could be completed with small-range paths between long-range edges to obtain a genuine path in \mathcal{G}). The length $|e|$ of e is the number of edges it contain. It joins two vertices $x, y \in \mathcal{V}$ if $d_{\text{SR}}(x, e_1) < \infty$ and $d_{\text{SR}}(e_k, y) < \infty$. Given $x, y \in V$, the *long-range distance* $d_{\text{LR}}(x, y)$ is the minimal length of a long-range path between x and y . We write $B_{\text{LR}}(x, r)$ for the corresponding *long-range balls*.

From the definition, for any $x \in \mathcal{V}$, $B_{\text{SR}}(x, \infty) = B_{\text{LR}}(x, 0)$ is the set of vertices which can be joined from x by a small-range path. We call the subgraph spanned by this set the *small-range component* of x . We can now state a fourth property we require for quasi-trees:

- (iv) for all $x \in \mathcal{V}$, $B_{\text{LR}}(x, 0)$ is isomorphic to $B_P(\iota(x^\circ), \infty)$,

that is, the small-range component of x is the communicating class of $\iota(x)$ in the graph G .

In the sequel we will refer to quasi-trees by their graph component only while keeping the other parameters implicit.

One-sided quasi-trees and subquasi-trees We introduced one-sided quasi-trees to consider subquasi-trees. If x is a center, the subquasi-tree \mathcal{G}_x of x is the graph spanned by the vertices y for which all paths between O and y pass through x . If x is not a center, $\eta(x)$ is and we set $\mathcal{G}_x := \mathcal{G}_{\eta(x)}$, so \mathcal{G}_x does not in fact contain x in that case. Finally the complement subgraph $\mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_x$ is the graph spanned by vertices which can be reached from O by a long-range path that does not use the long-range edge $(x, \eta(x))$.

Non-backtracking paths, loop-erased paths, deviation, regeneration One main interest of having a genuine tree structure is the consideration of loop-erased trajectories. We thus introduce the following definitions.

Definition 2.2. Let \mathcal{G} be a quasi-tree. A long-range path $e = (e_1, \dots, e_k)$ backtracks over a distance $l \geq 1$ if it contains a subpath of distinct edges and of length l immediately followed by the reversed path, that is there exists $i \leq k - 2l + 1$ such that $e_{i+l+j} = \overline{e_{i+l-1-j}}$ for all $j \in [0, l-1]$, where $\overline{e_j}$ denotes the edge e_j with reversed orientation. The loop-erased path $\xi(e)$ is the path obtained after erasing all backtracking steps. The long-range path e is called *non-backtracking* if $\xi(e) = e$.

To previous definition is extended to general paths by extracting the long-range path: given a general path \mathbf{p} , let $\xi(\mathbf{p})$ denote the loop-erased path formed by the long-range edges crossed by \mathbf{p} . This is a non-backtracking path, which we call the loop-erased path or loop-erased trace of \mathbf{p} . The long-range distance crossed by \mathbf{p} is the length of $\xi(\mathbf{p})$, or equivalently the long-range distance between its endpoints.

The last two definitions require integer parameters. Given $R \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{G}^{(R)}$ be the connected component of O of the subgraph of \mathcal{G} spanned by the set

$$\mathcal{V}^{(R)} := \{x \in \mathcal{V} \mid d_{\text{SR}}(x^\circ, x) < R\}. \quad (12)$$

A path \mathbf{p} is said to *deviate* from a small-range distance R if it is not included in $\mathcal{G}^{(R)}$.

Finally, the following notion of *regeneration edges* will be used in several places: let $L \geq 1$ be an integer and consider a path \mathbf{p} . A long-range edge e crossed by \mathbf{p} is said to be a regeneration edge for \mathbf{p} with horizon L if after the first time going through e the path crosses a long-range distance L or ends before going back to the endpoint of e which was first visited by \mathbf{p} .

Markov chains on quasi-trees Given a quasi-tree \mathcal{G} , it is naturally the underlying graph of the Markov chain $(\mathcal{X}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on \mathcal{G} which has transition probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} [\mathcal{X}_{t+1/2} = y \mid \mathcal{X}_t = x] &= \begin{cases} p(\iota(x), \iota(\eta(x))) & \text{if } y = x \\ q(\iota(x), \iota(\eta(x))) & \text{if } y = \eta(x) \end{cases} \\ \mathbf{P} [\mathcal{X}_{t+1} = y \mid \mathcal{X}_{t+1/2} = x] &= \begin{cases} P(\iota(x), \iota(y)) & \text{if } y^\circ = x^\circ \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The kernel of this Markov chain will be written \mathcal{P} . As for the chain X in finite environment, this chain may not be reversible but can be projected to the quotient \mathcal{G}/\sim , which identifies each $x \sim \eta(x)$. The projection is then a reversible chain.

2.4 The covering quasi-tree

Among all quasi-trees, one is very natural to consider: this is the quasi-tree obtained by using the random matching $\eta : V \rightarrow V$ to define the matching on the quasi-tree. Given $x \in V$, this is the quasi-tree $(\mathcal{G}^*(x), O, \iota, \tilde{\eta})$ defined by $\iota(O) = x$ and

$$\forall y \in \mathcal{V} : \iota(\tilde{\eta}(y)) = \eta(\iota(y)).$$

The fact that this defines a unique quasi-tree is the consequence from property (iv) in Definition 2.1, which imply the quasi-tree can be built iteratively. Starting from the small-range of O , which

is necessarily $B_P(x, \infty)$, the previous equation uniquely determines the long-range edges at long-range distance 0 from O and thus the whole ball $B_{\text{LR}}(O, 1)$. The process iterates to infinity to yield an infinite quasi-tree \mathcal{G}^* .

This quasi-tree has the property that it covers exactly G^* : the map ι is a surjective graph morphism of \mathcal{G}^* onto G^* which preserves the transition probabilities, so the Markov chain \mathcal{X} defined above projects exactly onto the chain X : for all $t \geq 0$ $\iota(\mathcal{X}_t) = X_t$ in distribution, conditional on $X_0 = x, \mathcal{X}_0 = O$.

The chain \mathcal{X} on \mathcal{G}^* will not be studied per se. We introduced it mainly to obtain easier definitions in the finite setting of objects and quantities that are naturally considered in the idealized setting of quasi-trees. First notice that the notions of long-range and small-range edges defined in the finite setting coincide with the projections under ι of the corresponding edges in the covering quasi-tree. Thus we can extend notions of small-range, long-range paths, backtracking, etc. defined above to G^* by taking their projections under ι . An exception is the long-range distance, which in the finite setting will make sense only if restricting the quasi-tree: let $R \geq 1$ and recall the definition of the restricted quasi-tree $\mathcal{G}^{(R)}$ (12). Given $x \in V$ and $l \geq 0$, we define $B_{\text{LR}}^{(G^*, R)}(x, r)$ in G^* as the projection

$$B_{\text{LR}}^{(G^*, R)}(x, r) := \iota \left(B_{\text{LR}}(O, r) \cap \mathcal{G}^{(R)}(x) \right).$$

The exponent (G^*, R) is used to distinguish between the two settings. When not necessary, we may drop it from notation and also keep this parameter R implicit. Note from the definition that in G^* , for any vertices $x, y \in V$, $d_{\text{LR}}(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $d_{\text{SR}}(x, y) < R$.

Finally, we introduce a last definition which is specific to G^* : a *long-range cycle* is a non-deviating non-backtracking long-range path whose starting and ending point are at small-range distance at most R from each other. A subgraph of G^* is said to be *quasi-tree-like* if it does not contain any long-range cycle. A quasi-tree-like subgraph can thus be identified with a neighbourhood of the root in the covering quasi-tree. Lemma 2.1 below will establish that typical and hence most vertices have in fact a quasi-tree-like neighbourhood. This relies on a bounded degree property, which is the object of the following paragraph.

Bounded degrees and transition probabilities: Assumption (H1) implies that all graphs considered in this paper, G, G^*, \mathcal{G} have bounded degrees. Together with Assumption (H2), it also implies all transition probabilities are bounded away from 0 uniformly in n . Consequently, let Δ denote a uniform bound on all the degrees, and $\delta > 0$ a uniform bound on transition probabilities, which will serve throughout the paper. It gives in particular the growth of balls in G^* and any quasi-tree \mathcal{G} : for all $x \in V$ and $l \geq 0$

$$|B_{\text{SR}}(x, l)| \leq |B_{\mathcal{G}}(x, l)| \leq \frac{\Delta^{l+1} - 1}{\Delta - 1}, \quad \left| B_{\text{LR}}^{(G^*, R)}(x, l) \right| \leq \Delta^R \frac{\Delta^{R(l+1)} - 1}{\Delta^R - 1}. \quad (14)$$

In particular, Δ^R can be thought of as the "long-range" degree.

2.5 Coupling and sequential generation

The above definitions should make pretty clear that the forthcoming proofs are based on a coupling between the finite chain X and the chain \mathcal{X} on an infinite quasi-tree. The quasi-tree in question

is similar to the covering quasi-tree but contains much more independence, allowing basically to resample the matching η at each new long-range edge. It can be constructed iteratively as follows: $\iota(O)$ is taken uniformly at random in V , which determines the small-range component around O by point (iv) of the definition. Then to every vertex x whose type $\iota(x)$ is known, adjoin a long-range edge $(x, \eta(x))$ to x , with $\iota(\eta(x))$ being taken uniformly in $V \setminus V(\iota(x))$. In words, each new center added to the quasi-tree is taken uniformly at random in the component of V that maintains the alternation between V_1 and V_2 . We now explain how one can couple the Markov chain $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on G^* with the Markov chain $(\mathcal{X}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on \mathcal{G} .

The following procedure generates the neighbourhood of a vertex in either G^* or \mathcal{G} up to some given long-range distance.

Let $x \in V$ be the point whose long-range neighbourhood is to be explored up to long-range distance $L \geq 0$. For $t \geq 1$ we write EQ_t for the exploration queue, that is the set of vertices which remain to be explored, and D_t for the set of explored vertices. The initiation is similar for G^* and quasi-trees: $D_0 := \emptyset$; $EQ_0 := B_{\text{SR}}(x, R)$ in G , $EQ_0 := B_{\text{SR}}(x, \infty)$ in \mathcal{G} . The procedure repeats then the following steps. If one wants to explore a neighbourhood in G^* sampling is performed without replacement:

Sequential generation of G^* , sampling without replacement: for $t \geq 0$,

1. pick $y \in EQ_t$: sample $\eta(y)$ uniformly at random in $(V \setminus V(y)) \setminus D_t$,
2. add $y, \eta(y)$ to D_{t+1} and remove them from EQ_{t+1} ,
3. add all vertices $z \in B_{\text{SR}}(\eta(y), R) \setminus \{\eta(y)\}$ such that $z \notin D_t$ and $d_{\text{LR}}(x, z) < L$ to EQ_{t+1} .

If performed with replacement, each new value $\eta(y)$ is picked uniformly in $V \setminus V(y)$ independently of previous draws and considered a new vertex in a set \mathcal{V} . Specifically the procedure becomes:

Sequential generation of the quasi-tree \mathcal{G} , sampling with replacement: for $t \geq 0$,

- 1'. pick $y \in EQ_t$: sample $\eta(y)$ uniformly at random in $V \setminus V(y)$,
- 2'. add $y, \eta(y)$ to D_{t+1} and remove y from EQ_{t+1} ,
- 3'. add all vertices $z \in B_{\text{SR}}(\eta(y), R) \setminus \{\eta(y)\}$ such that $d_{\text{LR}}(x, z) < L$ to EQ_{t+1} .

Since the constraint $z \notin D_t$ has been removed in step 3', vertices which would in G be already explored are here added to the exploration queue and thus considered new vertices. The environment explored is the L long-range ball of a quasi-tree as in Definition 2.1. Taking $L = \infty$ would thus yield a realization of the infinite random quasi-tree \mathcal{G} . Finally, the analog procedures can be adapted to explore balls $B_{\mathcal{P}}$ in G^* and $B_{\mathcal{P}}$ in \mathcal{G} .

Sequential generation along trajectories Under the annealed law, the two processes can be generated together with the environment. Later our goal will be to couple weights, which require the exploration of the whole L -long range neighbourhood around the trajectory. The sequential generation of the environment along trajectories thus consists in the following steps. Consider for

instance the finite setting G : let the chain be started at $X_0 := x \in V$, and $D_0 := \emptyset$. Then for all $t \geq 0$:

- a. Explore the long-range L -neighbourhood of X_t with the first procedure described above.
- b. This determines completely the transition probabilities (11) at the state X_t , allowing to sample X_{t+1} .

If one considers the second procedure one obtains instead $(\mathcal{X}_t)_{t \geq 0}$. One can very naturally couple the two procedures and hence both processes using rejection sampling: for each $y \in EQ_t$ sample $\eta(y)$ uniformly in $V \setminus V(y)$ and use it for step 1' in the generation of \mathcal{G} . If in addition $B_{\text{SR}}(\eta(y), R) \cap D_t = \emptyset$, it can also be used for step 1 in the generation of G^* . Otherwise, make a second draw with the first procedure. This rejection sampling scheme yields a coupling of $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(\mathcal{X}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ until the first time a newly revealed small-range balls $B_{\text{SR}}(\eta(y), R)$ contain vertices that have already been explored, that is when a long-range cycle appears around the trajectory:

$$\tau_{\text{coup}} := \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 \mid \bigcup_{k=0}^t B_{\text{LR}}(X_k, L) \text{ contains a long-range cycle} \right\}.$$

The following lemma will be not be used but justifies that trajectories of subpolynomial length started at typical vertices can be coupled exactly with trajectories on a quasi-tree.

Lemma 2.1. *For all constants $C_R, C_L > 0$, $R = C_R \log \log n$, $L = C_L \log \log n$, for all $x \in V, \varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ and $t = O(n^{1/2-\varepsilon})$,*

$$\mathbf{P}_x \left[\exists s \leq t : B_{\text{LR}}^{(G^*, R)}(X_s, L) \text{ is not quasi-tree-like} \right] = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$$

Thus $\mathbf{P}_x [\tau_{\text{coup}} \leq t] = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$.

Proof. Let the chain be started at $x \in V$ and $t = o(n^{3/10-\varepsilon})$ for $\varepsilon \in (0, 3/10)$. By (14), the number of vertices contained in a long-range ball of radius L is $O(\Delta^R(L+1))$. This implies $\bigcup_{s \leq t} B_{\text{LR}}^{(G^*, R)}(X_s, L)$ contains $m = O((t+1)\Delta^{R(L+1)})$ vertices. Therefore, the exploration procedure along the path $X_0 \cdots X_t$ up to long-range distance L requires at most m draws of values $\eta(y)$, each having probability at most $m\Delta^R/n$ that the small-range ball $B_{\text{SR}}(\eta(y), R)$ contains already explored vertices. Hence the number of long-range cycles in $\bigcup_{s \leq t} B_{\text{LR}}^{(G^*, R)}(X_s, L)$ is stochastically upper bounded by a binomial $\text{Bin}(m, m\Delta^R/n)$ so that by Markov's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_x \left[\exists s \leq t : B_{\text{LR}}^{(G^*, R)}(X_s, L) \text{ is not quasi-tree-like} \right] &\leq \frac{m^2 \Delta^R}{n} = O\left(\frac{(t+1)^2 \Delta^{2RL+3R}}{n}\right) \\ &= O\left(t^2 n^{-1+o(1)}\right) = o(1) \end{aligned}$$

by the choice of $t = O(n^{1/2-\varepsilon})$ and $R, L = O(\log \log n)$. This bound on the annealed probability implies the quenched result by the first moment argument (9). \square

3 The entropic method: main arguments

3.1 Nice trajectories

Our application of the entropic method consists in finding a definition of nice trajectories designed to be typical trajectories and have their probability concentrating around the mean. The latter will

come from a constraint about an entropy-like quantity for the chain, which arises from comparing the trajectories of the finite chain X with the loop-erased trace of \mathcal{X} in the (infinite) quasi-tree setting. Other properties will thus be required from nice paths, whose goal is basically to make them close to being non-backtracking trajectories in a quasi-tree. All in all, the defining properties of a nice trajectory will essentially be that:

- (i) it is contained in a quasi-tree-like portion of the graph, the endpoint having a quasi-tree-like neighbourhood up to \mathcal{P} -distance $\lfloor \alpha \log n \rfloor$ for some $\alpha > 0$ (Lemma 3.1),
- (ii) it does not deviate or backtrack too much, and contains sufficiently many regeneration edges (Lemma 3.2),
- (iii) the drift and entropy concentrate on this trajectory (Proposition 3.1).

The first part of the argument will consist in proving that the chain is likely to follow nice trajectories. However this may not be true for arbitrary starting vertices, but only for typical ones. For an arbitrary starting vertex, we prove the trajectory becomes nice after some time $s = O(\log \log n)$. Since this is $o(\sqrt{\log n})$, the contribution of these initial steps will be negligible.

Lemma 3.1. (i) *For all $C_R, C_L > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that for $R := C_R \log \log n, L := C_L \log \log n, s \geq C \log \log n$ and all $t = o(n^{1/16})$,*

$$\max_{x \in V} \mathbf{P}_x \left[\exists t' \in [s, s+t] : B_{LR}^{(G^*, R)}(X_{t'}, L) \text{ is not quasi-tree-like} \right] = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

(ii) *For all $C > 0$, there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that for any $t \geq C \log n$,*

$$\max_{x \in V} \mathbf{P}_x [B_{\mathcal{P}}(X_t, \lfloor \alpha \log n \rfloor) \text{ is not quasi-tree-like}] = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$$

For the second property we recall the notions of deviation, backtracking and regeneration edges are given in Definition 2.2.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\Gamma(R, L, M)$ denote the set of paths \mathbf{p} in G^* such that \mathbf{p} does not deviate from a small-range distance more than R , backtrack over a long-range distance L or contain a subpath of length M without a regeneration edge. There exist constants $C_R, C_L, C_M, C > 0$ such that for $L = C_L \log \log n, R = C_R \log \log n$ and $M = C_M \log \log n$, for all $s \geq C \log \log n$ and $t = O(\log n)$:*

$$\min_{x \in V} \mathbf{P}_x [(X_s \cdots X_{s+t}) \in \Gamma(R, L, M)] = 1 - o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Remark 3.1. Notice that for any trajectorial event A

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_x [(X_s, X_{s+1}, \dots) \in A] &= \sum_{y \in V} \mathbf{P}_x [X_s = y] \mathbf{P}_y [(X_0, X_1, \dots) \in A] \\ &\leq \max_{y \in V} \mathbf{P}_y [(X_0, X_1, \dots) \in A]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus if we prove A holds from time s with probability $1 - o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ uniformly over the starting state this automatically extends to larger times $t \geq s$.

3.2 Concentration of drift and entropy

The third and main property of nice trajectories consists in the concentration of an entropy-like quantity for the finite chain. To that end, we define weights as follows.

Throughout the paper, we will use the letter τ for a variety of stopping times. It should be clear from the context what the notation refers to. If x is an element or a set τ_x will generally denote the hitting time of x . If $l \geq 0$, τ_l will generally denote the time a certain distance l is reached. For all $l \geq 0$, consider here

$$\tau_l := \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid |\xi(X_0 \cdots X_t)| = l\}$$

and fix $R, L \geq 1$ for the rest of this section. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\text{SR}}^{(R)} &:= \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid (X_0 \cdots X_t) \text{ deviates from a small-range distance } R\} \\ \tau_{\text{NB}}^{(L)} &:= \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid (X_0 \cdots X_t) \text{ backtracks over a long-range distance } L\}. \end{aligned}$$

These are stopping times which depend on R, L . By construction if \mathbf{p} is a path in $\Gamma(R, L, M)$ as defined in Lemma 3.2, the stopping $\tau_{\text{SR}}^{(R)} \wedge \tau_{\text{NB}}^{(L)}$ does not occur on the trajectory \mathbf{p} . Given an oriented long-range edge e and $x \in V$ such that $d_{\text{SR}}(x, e^-) < R$, define the weights

$$\begin{aligned} w_{x,R,L}(e) &:= \mathbf{P}_x \left[\xi(X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_L})_1 = e, \tau_L < \tau_{\text{SR}}^{(R)} \right] \\ w_{R,L}(e \mid x) &:= \mathbf{P}_x \left[\xi(X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_L})_1 = e \mid \tau_L < \tau_{\eta(x)} \wedge \tau_{\text{SR}}^{(R)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Here $\xi(X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_L})_1$ denotes the first edge of $\xi(X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_L})$. Then for a non-backtracking long-range path $\xi = \xi_1 \cdots \xi_k$, set

$$w_{x,R,L}(\xi) := w_{x,R,L}(\xi_1) \prod_{i=2}^k w_{R,L}(\xi_i \mid \xi_{i-1}^+)$$

where empty products are by convention equal to 1. The notation is consistent with the identification of edges with paths of length 1.

Remark 3.2. Note that for fixed $x \in V$, $\sum_e w_{x,R,L}(e) \leq 1$ and $\sum_e w_{R,L}(e \mid x) \leq 1$ where the sum is over all long-range edges. By extension the sum of weights over all non-backtracking paths starting from x is at most 1.

Given a sequence $u = (u_i)_{i \leq l}$ of length l and $k \geq 1$, we write $(u)_{\leq k} := (u_i)_{i \leq k}$ for the sequence truncated at length k . The following lemma show that weights are good proxies for measuring the probability that the loop-erased trace follows a given non-backtracking path. We will only need the lower bound.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $x \in V$ and $k \geq 1$ be an integer. Suppose that $B_{\text{LR}}^{(G^*, R)}(x, k)$ is quasi-tree-like. Then for all non-backtracking long-range path ξ of length k , started in $B_{\text{SR}}(x, R)$*

$$\mathbf{P}_x \left[\begin{array}{l} \xi(X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_{k+L-1}})_{\leq k} = \xi, \\ \tau_{k+L-1} < \tau_{\text{SR}}^{(R)} \wedge \tau_{\text{NB}}^{(L)} \end{array} \right] \leq w_{x,R,L}(\xi) \leq \mathbf{P}_x \left[\begin{array}{l} \xi(X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_{k+L-1}})_{\leq k} = \xi, \\ \tau_{k+L-1} < \tau_{\text{SR}}^{(R)} \wedge \tau_{\text{NB}}^{(L)} \end{array} \right] + u(\xi) \quad (16)$$

where $u(\xi) \geq 0$ is such that

$$\sum_{\xi} u(\xi) \leq \mathbf{P}_x \left[\tau_{\text{SR}}^{(R)} \wedge \tau_{\text{NB}}^{(L)} \leq \tau_{k+L-1} \right],$$

the sum being over non-backtracking long-range paths of length k from x .

Proof. The proof is by induction on $k \geq 1$. For $k = 1$ the inequalities are in fact equalities by definition, since $\tau_{\text{NB}}^{(L)} > \tau_L$ necessarily.

To ease notation, drop the parameters R, L from the stopping times and weights for the rest of the proof. Suppose that the result holds for $k \geq 1$ and let ξ be of length $k+1$. Let $e := \xi_k, f := \xi_{k+1}$ and write L_k for the last time t that $|\xi(X_0 \cdots X_t)| = k$ after τ_k and before τ_{k+L} or coming back to e^- . Then having $\xi(X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_{k+L-1}})_{\leq k} = (\xi)_{\leq k}$ requires that $X_{L_k} = e^+$, after which the chain crosses a long-range distance $L-1$ without backtracking to e^- . Thus by the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} w_x((\xi)_{\leq k}) &\geq \mathbf{P}_x [\xi(X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_{k+L-1}})_{\leq k} = \xi, \tau_{k+L-1} < \tau_{\text{SR}} \wedge \tau_{\text{NB}}] \\ &= \mathbf{P}_x [X_{L_k} = e^+, L_k < \tau_{\text{SR}} \wedge \tau_{\text{NB}}] \mathbf{P}_{e^+} [\tau_{L-1} < \tau_{e^-} \wedge \tau_{\text{SR}}]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$w(f | e^+) = \frac{\mathbf{P}_{e^+} [\xi(X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_L})_1 = f, \tau_L < \tau_{e^-} \wedge \tau_{\text{SR}}]}{\mathbf{P}_{e^+} [\tau_L < \tau_{e^-} \wedge \tau_{\text{SR}}]}.$$

Since $\mathbf{P}_{e^+} [\tau_{L-1} < \tau_{e^-} \wedge \tau_{\text{SR}}] \geq \mathbf{P}_{e^+} [\tau_L < \tau_{e^-} \wedge \tau_{\text{SR}}]$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} w_x(\xi) &= w_x((\xi)_{\leq k}) w(f | e^+) \\ &\geq \mathbf{P}_x [X_{L_k} = e^+, \tau_{\text{SR}} \wedge \tau_{\text{NB}} > L_k] \mathbf{P}_{e^+} [\xi(X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_L})_1 = f, \tau_L < \tau_{\text{SR}} \wedge \tau_{e^-}]. \end{aligned}$$

This is the probability that after L_k , the chain directly crosses a long-range distance L using the edge f , without reaching the boundary of a small-range ball of radius R and without coming back to e^- . Hence on this event $\xi(X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_{k+L}})_{k+1} = f$, with $\tau_{k+L} < \tau_{\text{SR}} \wedge \tau_{\text{NB}}$, which proves the lower bound.

For the upper bound, the induction hypothesis yields this time

$$w_x((\xi)_{\leq k}) \leq \mathbf{P}_x [X_{L_k} = e^+, L_k < \tau_{\text{SR}} \wedge \tau_{\text{NB}}] \mathbf{P}_{e^+} [\tau_{L-1} < \tau_{e^-} \wedge \tau_{\text{SR}}] + u((\xi)_{\leq k}).$$

Then use that

$$\mathbf{P}_{e^+} [\tau_{L-1} < \tau_{e^-} \wedge \tau_{\text{SR}}] \leq \mathbf{P}_{e^+} [\tau_L < \tau_{e^-} \wedge \tau_{\text{SR}}] + \mathbf{P}_{e^+} [\tau_{L-1} < \tau_{e^-} \wedge \tau_{\text{SR}} \leq \tau_L]$$

to bound

$$\begin{aligned} w_x(\xi) &\leq \mathbf{P}_x [X_{L_k} = e^+] \mathbf{P}_{e^+} [\xi(X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_L})_1 = f, \tau_L < \tau_{\text{SR}} \wedge \tau_{e^-}] \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P}_x [X_{L_k} = e^+] \mathbf{P}_{e^+} [\tau_{L-1} < \tau_{e^-} \wedge \tau_{\text{SR}} \leq \tau_L] w(f | e^+) + u((\xi)_{\leq k}) w(f | e^+). \end{aligned}$$

The first term is that of the lower bound. Regroup the two other terms as $u(\xi)$. Since weights sum to 1, summing over ξ , which involves in particular summing over e and f , yields that

$$\sum_{\xi} u(\xi) \leq \sum_e \mathbf{P}_x [X_{L_k} = e^+] \mathbf{P}_{e^+} [\tau_{L-1} < \tau_{e^-} \wedge \tau_{\text{SR}} \leq \tau_L] + \mathbf{P}_x [\tau_{\text{SR}} \wedge \tau_{\text{NB}} \leq \tau_{k+L-1}].$$

Observe now the first term corresponds to backtracking or deviating after reaching level $k+L-1$ but before reaching level $k+L$ from x . Thus the two terms correspond to disjoint events which both imply $\tau_{\text{SR}} \wedge \tau_{\text{NB}} \leq \tau_{k+L}$, hence the upper bound. \square

The first part of the proof of Theorem 1.1 consists in proving the following quenched concentration phenomenon.

Proposition 3.1. *There exists $d, h = \Theta(1)$ and large constants $C_R, C_L, C > 0$ such that the following holds. Letting $R := C_R \log \log n, L := C_L \log \log n$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist constants $C_{LR}(\varepsilon), C_h(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for all $s \geq C \log \log n, t \gg 1, t = O(\log n)$ with high probability,*

$$\min_{x \in V} \mathbf{P}_x \left[\begin{array}{l} |\xi(X_s \cdots X_{s+t})| - dt \leq C_{LR} \sqrt{t} \\ |-\log w_{X_s, R, L}(\xi(X_s \cdots X_{s+t})) - ht| \leq C_h \sqrt{t} \end{array} \right] \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

3.3 Concentration of nice paths

The second part of the argument uses the properties of nice paths to show that the probability of following a nice trajectory concentrates around its mean. The latter can be computed, providing an approximate stationary distribution $\hat{\pi}$ for \mathcal{P} on V .

Given $u \in V, L \geq 1$ consider again $\tau_L := \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid |\xi(X_0 \cdots X_t)| = L\}$ and

$$\mathbf{Q}_u^{(L)} := \mathbf{P}[\cdot \mid X_{1/2} = u, \tau_{\eta(u)} > \tau_L] \quad (17)$$

In words, this measure considers trajectories immediately after a regeneration time, ie a time at which a regeneration edge is crossed (with horizon L). By Lemma 3.2, if one takes $L = \Theta(\log \log n)$, the conditioning by $\tau_L < \tau_{X_0}$ essentially forbids the chain to come back at all to u on a time scale $O(\log n)$. If ν is a probability measure on V , write $\mathbf{Q}_\nu^{(L)} := \sum_{u \in V} \nu(u) \mathbf{Q}_u^{(L)}$ and $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_\nu^{(L)}}$ for the expectation with respect to this measure. All in all, the whole argument of this paper is summarized in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *There exist a deterministic probability measure ν on V , a deterministic $s_0 = \Theta(\log n)$, constants $C_L, C_M, C > 0$ and for all $x, y \in V, t \in \mathbb{N}$ a set $\mathfrak{N}^t(x, y)$ of length t paths between x and y for which the following holds. Let $L := C_L \log \log n, M := C_M \log \log n$ and write $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}}^t(x, y) := \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathfrak{N}^t(x, y)} \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{p})$. Consider the random probability measure*

$$\hat{\pi}(v) := \frac{1}{\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_\nu^{(L)}}[T_1 \wedge M]} \sum_{r=0}^M \mathbf{Q}_\nu^{(L)}[X_{r+s_0} = v, r < T_1 \leq M] \quad (18)$$

where T_1 denotes the first regeneration time with horizon $L = C_L \log \log n$. For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C(\varepsilon) > 0$ constant in n , such that for $t = \log n/h + C(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\log n}$,

(i) for all $s \geq C \log \log n$, with high probability

$$\min_{x \in V} \sum_{y \in V} \mathcal{P}^s \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}}^t(x, y) \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

(ii) there exists $c = (c_v)_{v \in V}$ such that $\sum_{v \in V} c_v = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and with high probability, for all $x, y \in V$,

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}}^t(x, y) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\hat{\pi}(y) + c(y) + \frac{\varepsilon}{n},$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Recall \mathcal{P} is the transition matrix of the two-lift chain on V , which projects to a transition matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ on $[n]$.

Start with the upper bound on the mixing time. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and consider $s = C \log \log n, t := \log n/h + C(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\log n}$. Since $\mathcal{P} \geq \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}}$ entry-wise, for all $x \in V$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\pi} - \mathcal{P}^{s+t}(x, \cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} &= \sum_{z \in V} [\hat{\pi}(z) - \mathcal{P}^{s+t}(x, z)]_+ \leq \sum_{y, z \in V} \mathcal{P}^s(x, y) [\hat{\pi}(z) - \mathcal{P}^t(y, z)]_+ \\ &\leq \sum_{y, z \in V} \mathcal{P}^s(x, y) \left[(1 + \varepsilon)\hat{\pi}(z) + c(z) + \frac{\varepsilon}{n} - \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}}^t(y, z) \right]_+. \end{aligned}$$

Point (ii) of the above proposition implies that with high probability, the right hand side summands are non-negative for all $x \in V$, so the sum can be computed to obtain that with high probability, for all $x \in V$,

$$\|\hat{\pi} - \mathcal{P}^{s+t}(x, \cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 1 - \mathcal{P}^s \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}}^t(x, y) + 3\varepsilon.$$

Using point (i), with high probability

$$\max_{x \in V} \|\mathcal{P}^{s+t}(x, \cdot) - \hat{\pi}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 4\varepsilon$$

which projects by (10) to

$$\max_{x \in V} \|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{s+t}(x, \cdot) - \bar{\pi}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 4\varepsilon.$$

with $\bar{\pi}$ the projection onto $[n]$ of $\hat{\pi}$. Since this estimate is uniform in the starting state, it extends to any starting distribution and in particular to a stationary distribution. Thus for any stationary distribution π of $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$,

$$\|\pi - \bar{\pi}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 4\varepsilon. \quad (19)$$

and from triangular inequality we obtain that with high probability

$$\max_{x \in [n]} \|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{s+t}(x, \cdot) - \pi\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 8\varepsilon.$$

Since this is valid for any invariant measure, the latter must be unique and the chain irreducible and aperiodic. Noticing that $s = o(\sqrt{\log n})$, this proves the upper bound of Theorem 1.1.

For the proof of the lower bound we make use of the explicit knowledge of the invariant measure, although this is not necessary, see Remark 3.3. Without loss of generality, suppose π is the unique invariant measure of \mathcal{P} , which was anyway proved above to be true with high probability.

For all $t \geq 0, \theta > 0$ and $x, y \in [n]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{P}}^t(x, y) &= \mathcal{P}^t(x, y) + \mathcal{P}^t(x, \eta(y)) \\ &\geq \mathbf{P}_x [X_t \in \{y, \eta(y)\}, w_{x, R, L}(\xi(X_0 \cdots X_t)) \leq \theta]. \end{aligned}$$

If equality holds, then

$$\bar{\pi}(y) - \mathbf{P}_x [X_t \in \{y, \eta(y)\}, w_{x, R, L}(\xi(X_0 \cdots X_t)) \leq \theta] \leq [\bar{\pi}(y) - \bar{\mathcal{P}}^t(x, y)]_+$$

If equality does not hold, there must exist a non-backtracking long-range path ξ between x and y or x and $\eta(y)$ for which $w(\xi) > \theta$, in which case

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\pi}(y) - \mathbf{P}_x [X_t \in \{y, \eta(y)\}, w_{x, R, L}(\xi(X_0 \cdots X_t)) \leq \theta] &\leq \pi(y) \mathbb{1}_{\exists \xi: w_{x, R, L}(\xi) > \theta} \\ &\quad + \pi(\eta(y)) \mathbb{1}_{\exists \xi: w_{x, R, L}(\xi) > \theta}. \end{aligned}$$

We did not precise where ξ lies to ease notation in the indicator functions but it depends on y and $\eta(y)$ respectively. Combining the two inequalities we obtain that in either case

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\pi}(y) - \mathbf{P}_x [X_t \in \{y, \eta(y)\}, w_{x,R,L}(\xi(X_0 \cdots X_t)) \leq \theta] &\leq [\bar{\pi}(y) - \bar{\mathcal{P}}^t(x, y)]_+ + \pi(y) \mathbb{1}_{\exists \xi: w_{x,R,L}(\xi) > \theta} \\ &\quad + \pi(\eta(y)) \mathbb{1}_{\exists \xi: w_{x,R,L}(\xi) > \theta}. \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\sum_{y \in V} \pi(y) \mathbb{1}_{(\exists \xi : w_{x,R,L}(\xi) > \theta)} \leq \left(\sum_{y \in V} \pi(y)^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{\xi} \mathbb{1}_{(w_{x,R,L}(\xi) > \theta)} \right)^{1/2},$$

where the second sum is over non-backtracking long-range paths from x . By Remark 3.2 weights sum up to at most 1 hence so this sum contains at most θ^{-1} positive terms and

$$\mathbf{P}_x [X_t = y, w_{x,R,L}(\xi(X_0 \cdots X_t)) > \theta] \leq \|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^t(x, \cdot) - \bar{\pi}\|_{\text{TV}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{\theta} \sum_{y \in V} \pi(y)^2}. \quad (20)$$

To complete the proof, let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and specialize to $t := \log n/h - C_1 \sqrt{\log n}$ and $\theta := n^{-1} \exp(C_2 \sqrt{\log n})$ for some $C_1(\varepsilon), C_2(\varepsilon) > 0$. Choosing the constant C_1 large enough, $\exp(-th - C_h(\varepsilon)\sqrt{t}) = n^{-1} \exp((C_1 - C_h/\sqrt{h})\sqrt{\log n} - o(\sqrt{\log n})) > \theta$ for large enough n , hence Proposition 3.1 implies that the left hand-side of (20) is at least $1 - \varepsilon$ with high probability. On the other hand, as explained in the proof outline (Section 1.4) the boundedness assumptions (H1), (H2) imply that $\pi(x) = \Theta(1/n)$ for all $x \in V$. Hence the square-root term in the right hand side is $o(1)$. All in all, this proves that with high probability,

$$\|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^t(x, \cdot) - \bar{\pi}\|_{\text{TV}} \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

□

Remark 3.3. From the explicit formula for the measure $\hat{\pi}$ (18), we can show it can be decomposed as $\hat{\pi} = \hat{\pi}_1 + \hat{\pi}_2$ with

$$\sum_{x \in V} \hat{\pi}_1^2 = o_{\mathbb{P}}((\log n)^b/n), \quad \hat{\pi}_2(V) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$$

for some $b > 0$. This is sufficient to prove the lower bound on the mixing time without resorting to the explicit knowledge of the invariant measure π , as we know $\hat{\pi}$ is close to π in total variation (19) and the proof only used the fact that π has a small ℓ^2 norm.

Remark 3.4. Let us comment on how the proof also accomodates the superposition of simple graphs. Observe that if two edges are aligned under the matching η , ie if there exist $x, y \in V$ such that $P(x, y) > 0$ and $P(\eta(x), \eta(y)) > 0$, these constitute an obstruction to the quasi-tree likeness of the neighbourhood of x . As the nice trajectories considered in Proposition 3.2 require having a quasi-tree-like neighbourhood, they avoid in particular these edges, so it makes no difference in the end to adjust the conductances of these edges or not.

4 Analysis on the quasi-tree on quasi-trees I: escape probabilities

The objective of the three following sections is to prove the concentration of the drift and entropy, along with the other nice properties of Section 3, for the Markov chain $(\mathcal{X}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on a random infinite

quasi-tree \mathcal{G} , that will allow us to deduce the corresponding statements thanks to the coupling presented in Section 2.5. As in [10, 39], the argument is based on the existence of regeneration times, which in the infinite setting can be defined as times at which \mathcal{X}_t visits a long-range edge for the first and last time. A first step towards this objective is to lower bound the probability of escaping to infinity in the quasi-tree, which is the object of this whole section.

4.1 Escape probabilities

The following notations will be used for the three next sections. \mathcal{G} will denote a random quasi-tree, which under \mathbb{P} has the law of the quasi-tree described in Section 2.5. Its vertex set is \mathcal{V} .

Definition 4.1. Given a non-center vertex $x \in \mathcal{V}$, let

$$q_{\text{Esc}}(x) := \mathbf{P}_x [\forall t \geq 1 : \mathcal{X}_t \in \mathcal{G}_x].$$

be the quenched probability that the chain enters the subquasi-tree of x and never leaves it. If x is a center, it is useful to also consider starting at time 1/2 and let

$$q_{\text{Esc}}(x) := \mathbf{P}_x [\forall t \geq 0 : \mathcal{X}_t \in \mathcal{G}_x] \wedge \mathbf{P} [\tau_{\eta(x)} = \infty \mid \mathcal{X}_{1/2} = x].$$

We call these quantities the *escape probability* at x .

Remark 4.1. Note that if x is not a center,

$$q_{\text{Esc}}(x) \geq q(x, \eta(x)) \mathbf{P} [\tau_x = \infty \mid \mathcal{X}_{1/2} = \eta(x)].$$

Similarly, if x is a center, Assumption (H3) asserts there exists $y \neq x$ in the same small-range component as x , so that

$$\mathbf{P}_x [\forall t \geq 0 : \mathcal{X}_t \in \mathcal{G}_x] \geq p(x, \eta(x)) P(x, y) q_{\text{Esc}}(y).$$

By Assumptions (H1) and (H2) the entries of p and q are bounded. Thus to lower bound escape probabilities, it matters little to consider a center vertex or not, and to start at integer or half-integer time.

In [39], the authors prove in their model that the escape probability is lower bounded uniformly in n , conditional on \mathcal{G} . This extends to the reversible case thanks to a comparison argument.

Proposition 4.1. *There exists a constant $q_0 > 0$ such that for all realization of \mathcal{G} , for all $x \in \mathcal{V}$ $q_{\text{Esc}}(x) \geq q_0$.*

4.2 Lower bound on escape probabilities

We now establish Proposition 4.1. The proof is based on ideas to prove transience of a Markov chain, which is fundamental for our purpose and is already not clear in our model. The reversibility assumption augments considerably the available toolbox. In particular Rayleigh's monotonicity principle is a well-known result which states that the effective conductance to infinity increases monotonically with individual conductances (see [49][Chapter 2]). While this result is generally used qualitatively to establish transience or recurrence of a given chain, it is used here to obtain a quantitative comparison between escape probabilities.

Let us recall briefly the notions we are going to use. We refer to [49][Chapters 2, 3, 5] for a detailed account. Let $(\mathcal{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be an irreducible, reversible Markov chain on a state space W , with reversible measure μ , represented as a random walk on an electrical network with vertex set W and c a family of conductances on the edges of this graph. We write hitting times as τ , return times as τ^+ , with the corresponding subset or vertex as index. A classical result for reversible chains is that for $a \in W$ and $Z \subset W$, the probability to reach before Z before returning to a can be expressed as

$$\mu(a)\mathbb{P}_a[\tau_Z < \tau_a^+] = \mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow Z)$$

where $\mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow Z)$ is the effective conductance between a and Z , which can be computed using network reductions. If W is infinite, we can very well take $Z = \{\infty\}$ thanks to a limit argument, to obtain

$$\mu(a)\mathbb{P}_a[\tau_a^+ = \infty] = \mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow \infty) \quad (21)$$

In particular the chain is transient if and only if $\mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow \infty) > 0$. Effective conductances satisfy a simple yet powerful monotonicity property, in that they are monotonous with respect to individual conductances. This is called Rayleigh's monotonicity principle, see p.35 of [49]. This monotonicity can be made quantitative as follows. The proof is identical to that of [49][p.35].

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be an infinite connected graph with vertex set W and two sets of conductances c_1, c_2 . Suppose there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $c_1 \geq \lambda c_2$ edge-wise. Then for all $a \in W$*

$$\mathcal{C}_1(a \leftrightarrow \infty) \geq \lambda \mathcal{C}_2(a \leftrightarrow \infty).$$

Remark 4.2. If $G' \subset G$ is a subgraph, one can always consider the Markov chain on G to have state space W as well by setting zero conductances outside G . The lemma thus gives in particular quantitative comparisons between a reversible chain and the chain restricted to a subnetwork.

The last required notion is that of branching number. The branching number $\text{br } T$ is a parameter that can be associated to any tree T that basically counts the average number of children per vertex. For instance for a d -regular tree, $d \geq 1$, the branching number is $d - 1$. We refer to [49] for a more general definition. We will only need the following facts, which can be found in Chapters 3 and 5 of the same reference (the first point is not proved but follows from the definition on the branching number):

- Proposition 4.2.**
1. *Given a tree T and $k \geq 1$, let $T^{(k)}$ be the tree obtained by keeping only the vertices of T which are at depth a multiple of k from the root, and where vertices are joined by an edge if one is the ancestor of the other in T . Then $\text{br } T^{(k)} = (\text{br } T)^k$.*
 2. *The simple random walk on a tree T is transient if and only if $\text{br } T > 1$*
 3. *Conditional on non-extinction, the branching number of a supercritical Galton-Watson tree is a.s. equal to its average offspring.*

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We prove that the root has uniformly lower bounded escape probability, but the same arguments can be applied to any vertex of the quasi-tree. Recall the equivalence relation $x \simeq \eta(x)$ on \mathcal{V} which identifies the endpoints of each long-range edge. Note that the chain \mathcal{X} is not reversible but only its projection $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$ to \mathcal{V}/\simeq . Clearly, lower bounding the escape probabilities of \mathcal{X} or $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$ is equivalent. Consider the graph obtained by pruning the long-range

edges of \mathcal{G}_O and adding an edge (\dagger, O) between an extra vertex \dagger and the root. Then consider the Markov chain $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ which goes from \dagger to O with probability 1 and otherwise has the same transition probabilities as $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$, with the probability of going from O to \dagger being that of $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$ leaving the image of \mathcal{G}_O in the quotient. Since $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$ is reversible, the chain $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ is also a reversible chain. Letting $\tau_{\dagger}, \tau_{\dagger}^+$ denote the hitting and return time to \dagger of the chain $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, (21) implies

$$\mathbf{P}_O[\tau_{\dagger} = \infty] = \mathbf{P}_{\dagger}[\tau_{\dagger}^+ = \infty] = \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}}(\dagger \leftrightarrow \infty)}{\mu(\dagger)}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}}(\dagger \leftrightarrow \infty)$ is the effective conductance for the chain $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, and μ is the invariant measure defined by the conductances \tilde{c} of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, that is $\mu(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{V}} \tilde{c}(x, y)$ (μ does not need to be a probability measure here). By assumptions (H1) and (H2), conductances and degrees are bounded uniformly in n thus so is $\mu(\dagger)$ and it suffices to lower bound the effective conductance. Now let \mathcal{V}' be the set of vertices in \mathcal{G}_O that are at distance at most 2 from their centers and consider any spanning tree \mathcal{T} of the subgraph spanned by \mathcal{V}' . Let $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ be the graph spanned by its projection in \mathcal{V}/\sim together with the edge (\dagger, O) , which remains a tree, and $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}}(\dagger \leftrightarrow \infty)$ the effective conductance of the simple random walk on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$. Then as conductances of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ are bounded Lemma 4.1 implies that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}}(\dagger \leftrightarrow \infty) \geq \lambda \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}}(\dagger \leftrightarrow \infty)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a constant independent of n .

We claim now $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}}(\dagger \leftrightarrow \infty)$ is bounded away from 0 by a universal constant, which will prove the result. Observe that the tree \mathcal{T} must contain every long-range edge leaving from a vertex of \mathcal{V}' . Hence \mathcal{T} has no leaves and every vertex other than O has degree at least 2. Furthermore, from Assumption (H3), each small-range component in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ contains at least two vertices and every other which identifies with a component of V_1 actually contains at least three vertices. In these V_1 components, there is thus a vertex which is connected to a long-range edge and at least two other vertices. Consequently, we can see that every sequence of three consecutive vertices in $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ contains at least one vertex with degree more than 3. This implies that the power tree $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{(3)}$, as defined in Proposition 4.2, contains the 2-forward regular tree T_2 , ie the tree where every vertex has 2 children. From Proposition 4.2 $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ contains thus a subtree with branching number $2^{1/3} > 1$, so the simple random walk on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ is transient. Using again Lemma 4.1, we can in the end lower bound $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}}(O \leftrightarrow \infty)$ by a universal constant. \square

Remark 4.3. The proof shows more generally that any reversible Markov chain supported by a quasi-tree, (whether it makes half-integer time steps or not) is transient and has uniformly lower bounded escape probabilities, provided the quasi-tree is sufficiently branching.

5 Analysis on the quasi-tree II: Markovian regeneration structure

Propositions 4.1 implies in particular that the Markov chain $(\mathcal{X}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is almost surely transient. As a consequence, the shortest path from O to \mathcal{X}_t eventually has to go through a unique sequence of long-range edges $(\xi_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$, which is called the *loop-erased chain*. Among the edges of the loop-erased chain, some have the property to be crossed only once. Thanks to this property, these so-called

regeneration edges yield a Markov decomposition of the quasi-tree which we will use in the next section to prove concentration of the drift and entropy. The regeneration process will also be used later to compute the approximate invariant measure $\hat{\pi}$.

5.1 Markov renewal processes

We start with general results about Markov renewal processes that will be necessary in the sequel. The theory of Markov renewal processes is certainly not new, however we could not find references proving the results established in this section.

Definition 5.1. Let S be a countable state space and E a Polish space. Consider a process $(Y, Z) = (Y_k, Z_k)_{k \geq 0}$ taking values in $S \times E$, satisfying for all $k \geq 1$, $x, y \in S, z \in E$,

$$\mathbb{P}[Y_k = y, Z_k = z \mid Y_{k-1} = x, Z_{k-1}, \dots, Y_0, Z_0] = \mathbb{P}[Y'_1 = y, Z'_1 = z \mid Y_0 = x], \quad (\text{M1})$$

where (Y'_1, Z'_1) is an independent copy of (Y_1, Z_1) . This process is thus a Markov chain with a stronger Markov property than the usual one, in that the time dependence occurs only through the Y -coordinate. In particular $Y = (Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is a Markov chain on S .

A *Markov renewal process* is a process $(Y_k, T_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is a process taking values in $S \times \mathbb{N}$ such that $(Y_k, T_k - T_{k-1})_{k \geq 0}$ satisfies (M1) and $T_k - T_{k-1} \geq 1$ a.s. for all $k \geq 1$, taking $T_{-1} := 0$. The delay T_0 can have arbitrary distribution. We call transition kernels of (Y, T) the family of kernels $(Q_t)_{t \geq 1}$, where for each $t \geq 1$,

$$Q_t(x, y) := \mathbb{P}[Y_1 = y, T_1 = t \mid Y_0 = x, T_0 = 0] = \mathbb{P}[Y_1 = y, T_1 - T_0 = t \mid Y_0 = x].$$

Notice then that Y has transition kernel $Q := \sum_{t \geq 1} Q_t$.

Remark 5.1. If (Y, Z) satisfies (M1), the initial pair (Y_0, Z_0) can have an arbitrary law. As usual, if ν is a probability measure on $S \times E$ we write

$$\mathbb{P}_\nu := \sum_{y \in S} \int \mathbb{P}[\cdot \mid Y_0 = y, Z = z] \nu(y, dz).$$

On the other hand, the (M1) implies that $(Y_k, Z_k)_{k \geq 1}$ conditional on Y_0 is independent of Z_0 . Thus if we are interested in a quantity that is measurable only with respect to $(Y_k, Z_k)_{k \geq 1}$, we will slightly abuse notation by writing $\mathbb{P}_u := \mathbb{P}[\cdot \mid Y_0 = u]$ (and write similarly for expectation), and by extension $\mathbb{P}_\mu := \sum_{y \in S} \mu(y) \mathbb{P}_y$ for a measure μ on S . In particular, note that if μ is an invariant measure for Y , the process $(Y_k, Z_k)_{k \geq 1}$ becomes stationary under \mathbb{P}_μ . In the sequel if Y is positive recurrent, we only consider invariant measures which are probability distributions.

The next results specify to the setting where the process Z takes integer values. In particular we state analogs of classical renewal theorems in the context of a Markov renewal process (Y, T) . The following generalizes the so-called elementary renewal theorem and can be proved in the same way.

Proposition 5.1. *Let (Y, T) be a Markov renewal process with state space S . Suppose Y is positive recurrent with stationary distribution μ and $\max_{u \in S} \mathbb{E}_u [T_1] < \infty$. Given $t \geq 0$ let*

$$N_t := \sup\{k \geq 0, T_k \leq t\}.$$

Then a.s.

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_k}{k} = \mathbb{E}_\mu [T_1]$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_t}{t} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_\mu [T_1]}.$$

Proof of Proposition 5.1. The laws of large numbers are consequences of the ergodic theorem applied to two different Markov chains.

For T_k , consider the pair $(Y_k, T_k - T_{k-1})_{k \geq 0}$, with $T_{-1} := 0$, which by definition satisfies (M1). It was noted in Remark 5.1 that \mathbb{P}_μ is a stationary distribution for this chain. Hence the law of large numbers follows from the ergodic theorem applied to the ergodic averages of the projection onto the second coordinate.

Let us move to N_t . Consider the Markov chain $(U_k)_{k \geq 0}$ on $S \times \mathbb{N}$ defined by the transition probabilities

$$K((x, 0), (y, t - 1)) = Q_t(x, y) \quad K((x, t), (x, t - 1)) = 1$$

for all $t \geq 1$ and $x, y \in S$. This chain can be thought of as representing Y together with the waiting time until the next renewal: letting τ_k be the k -th successive hitting time of $S \times \{0\}$, the S -coordinate of $(U_{\tau_k})_{k \geq 1}$ has the distribution of $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$, given $Y_0 = U_0$. The number of jumps N_t made before time $t \geq 0$ is thus the number of such hitting times that occurred before t . By the ergodic theorem for Markov chains, one immediately gets

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_t}{t} = \tilde{\mu}(S \times \{0\})$$

where $\tilde{\mu}$ is the unique stationary measure of the Markov chain $(U_k)_{k \geq 0}$. As can be checked easily, it is given by:

$$\tilde{\mu}(x, t) = \frac{\mathbb{P}_\mu [X_1 = y, T_1 > t]}{\mathbb{E}_\mu [T_1]} \quad (22)$$

for all $x \in S, t \geq 0$. In particular $\tilde{\mu}(S \times \{0\}) = \mathbb{E}_\mu [T_1]^{-1}$. \square

The two following Propositions establish mixing results for a Markov renewal process (Y, T) . These are not necessary for the asymptotic analysis on the quasi-tree but will be used to essentially compute the annealed laws of \mathcal{X} and X and obtain the value of the limiting measure $\hat{\pi}$ in Proposition 3.2. Proposition 5.3 is an analog of the classical renewal theorem, with a quantitative bound on the speed of convergence. To prove it, we establish first a stronger result in Proposition 5.2, namely a mixing property for the whole process (Y, T) , where T is allowed here to take negative values. Since T is unbounded mixing is here understood as the fact that the process forgets about its starting state.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $(Y_k, T_k - T_{k-1})_{k \geq 0}$ satisfy (M1), with $T_{-1} := 0$ and $T_k - T_{k-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ a.s. for all $k \geq 0$. Suppose Y is positive recurrent, irreducible and aperiodic. Let $Q_t(x, y) := \mathbb{P}[Y_1 = y, T_1 - T_0 = t \mid Y_0 = x]$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and*

$$\alpha := \min_{x \in S} \sum_{\substack{t \in \mathbb{Z} \\ y \in S}} (Q_t(x, y) \wedge Q_{t+1}(x, y)).$$

Consider two starting probability distributions ν_1, ν_2 on $S \times \mathbb{Z}$. Given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let $t_{\text{mix}}^{(Y)}(\varepsilon)$ denote the ε -mixing time of $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$ and $K(\varepsilon) \geq 0$ be the minimal integer such that

$$\sup_{\nu} \mathbb{P}_{\nu} [|T_0 - T'_0| > K(\varepsilon)] \leq \varepsilon,$$

where the supremum is over all couplings $((Y_0, T_0), (Y'_0, T'_0))$ of ν_1 and ν_2 . Then for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $C(\varepsilon) \geq 0$ such that

$$\|\mathbb{P}_{\nu_1} [(Y_k, T_k) = \cdot] - \mathbb{P}_{\nu_2} [(Y_k, T_k) = \cdot]\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$$

for all

$$k \geq \frac{C(\varepsilon)}{\alpha} \left(t_{\text{mix}}^{(Y)}(\varepsilon) \max_{u \in S} \mathbb{E}_u |T_1| + K(\varepsilon) \right)^2. \quad (23)$$

Proof of Proposition 5.2. The proof is based on coupling arguments. If the Y_k are iid, T_k becomes the sum of iid random variables on \mathbb{Z} , ie a random walk on \mathbb{Z} . Two random walks on \mathbb{Z} identically distributed but started apart from a distance A can be coupled to meet at a random time τ which satisfies $\mathbb{P}[\tau > k] \leq CA/\sqrt{k}$ for some constant $C > 0$. The argument can be found in [45] and [44][II.14], where the coupling is called Mineka coupling. In the general case where Y_k are not iid, the idea is to first couple the chains Y_k started at different states to make them coincide, after which one can adapt the Mineka coupling to make the subsequent variables T_k coalesce.

Suppose $((Y, T), (Y', T'))$ is a coupling of two versions of the process $(Y_k, T_k)_{k \geq 0}$ started at ν_1 and ν_2 respectively. Let $\tau := \inf\{k \geq 0 : (Y_k, T_k) = (Y'_k, T'_k)\}$. If the coupling is such that the two processes coincide after the coalescence time τ , one has

$$\|\mathbb{P}[(Y_k, T_k) = \cdot] - \mathbb{P}[(Y'_k, T'_k) = \cdot]\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \mathbb{P}[\tau > k].$$

We now precise such a coupling. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $k_0 := t_{\text{mix}}^{(Y)}(\varepsilon)$. The coupling is actually started at k_0 : couple (Y_{k_0}, T_{k_0}) and (Y'_{k_0}, T'_{k_0}) in order to have an optimal coupling of Y_{k_0} and Y'_{k_0} . Thus

$$\mathbb{P}[Y_{k_0} \neq Y'_{k_0}] = \|\mathbb{P}[Y_{k_0} = \cdot] - \mathbb{P}[Y'_{k_0} = \cdot]\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 2\|\mathbb{P}[Y_{k_0} = \cdot] - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 2\varepsilon, \quad (24)$$

where μ is the stationary measure of Y . Then for all $k \geq k_0$, conditional on $Y_k = Y'_k$ draw $Y_{k+1}, Y'_{k+1}, S_{k+1}, S'_{k+1}$ according to the distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[Y_{k+1} = Y'_{k+1} = y, S_{k+1} = t-1, S'_{k+1} = t \mid Y_k = Y'_k = x] &= \alpha_{t-1}(x, y) \\ \mathbb{P}[Y_{k+1} = Y'_{k+1} = y, S_{k+1} = t, S'_{k+1} = t-1 \mid Y_k = Y'_k = x] &= \alpha_{t-1}(x, y) \\ \mathbb{P}[Y_{k+1} = Y'_{k+1} = y, S_{k+1} = t, S'_{k+1} = t \mid Y_k = Y'_k = x] &= Q_t(x, y) - \alpha_{t-1}(x, y) - \alpha_t(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

writing $\alpha_t(x, y) := Q_t(x, y) \wedge Q_{t+1}(x, y)$. It is readily seen that

$$\mathbb{P}_x [Y_{k+1} = y, S_{k+1} = t \mid Y_k = x] = Q_t(x, y) = \mathbb{P}_x [Y'_{k+1} = y, S'_{k+1} = t \mid Y'_k = x].$$

Therefore if $Y_k = Y'_k$ setting $T_{k+1} := T_k + S_{k+1}$, $T'_{k+1} := T'_k + S'_{k+1}$ yields a coupling of $(Y_{k+1}, T_{k+1}), (Y'_{k+1}, T'_{k+1})$ with $Y_{k+1} = Y'_{k+1}$. Consequently, this can be used to couple the two processes $(Y, T), (Y', T')$ for every step after the coalescence of Y and Y' , so that the Y -coordinate stays identical. Once the T -coordinate coalesce, we couple the two processes so that they coincide indefinitely. We now bound the tail of the stopping time τ under this coupling.

Let $\tau_1 := \inf\{k \geq k_0 : Y_k = Y'_k\}$ and for all $k \geq 0$, $Z_k := \sum_{i=\tau_1}^k S_k - S'_k$. Observe that $(Y_{\tau_1+k}, Z_k - Z_{k-1})_{k \geq 0}$ (with $Z_{-1} := 0$) satisfies the (M1) property. In addition, for every $k \geq 0$, conditional on $Y_{\tau_1+k} = x$, $Z_{k+1} - Z_k$ has symmetric distribution in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ a.s. and

$$\mathbb{P}[Z_{k+1} - Z_k = 1 \mid Y_k = x] = \sum_{t \geq 1} \sum_{y \in S} \alpha_t(x, y) \geq \alpha. \quad (25)$$

On the event $\{\tau_1 = k_0\}$, for all $k \geq 0$ we can decompose

$$T_{k_0+k} - T'_{k_0+k} = T_{k_0} - T'_{k_0} + Z_k$$

which implies that $\tau = k_0 + \inf\{k \geq 0 : Z_k = T'_{k_0} - T_{k_0}\}$. Letting $\tilde{\tau}_a$ be the hitting time of $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ by the process Z , we deduce from Markov's property that for all $k \geq 0$ and $A > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\tau > k_0 + k] \leq \mathbb{P}[Y_{k_0} \neq Y'_{k_0}] + \mathbb{P}[|T_{k_0} - T'_{k_0}| > A] + \max_{a \in [-A, A]} \max_{u \in S} \mathbb{P}_{(u,0)}[\tilde{\tau}_a > k].$$

By (24) the first term is smaller than 2ε . For the second term, bound

$$\mathbb{P}[|T_{k_0} - T'_{k_0}| > K(\varepsilon) + A] \leq \mathbb{P}[|T_0 - T'_0| > K(\varepsilon)] + \mathbb{P}[|(T_{k_0} - T_0) - (T'_{k_0} - T'_0)| > A].$$

By definition of $K(\varepsilon)$ the first term is bounded by ε . The second can be bounded by triangle inequality and Markov's inequality to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}[|T_{k_0} - T'_{k_0}| > K(\varepsilon) + A] \leq \varepsilon + \frac{2k_0 \max_u \mathbb{E}_u [T_1]}{A} \leq 2\varepsilon$$

for $A := 2k_0 \max_{u \in S} \mathbb{E}_u [T_1] / \varepsilon$. The last term is bounded as follows. First, notice that since the variables Z_k are bounded by 1 in absolute value, the maximal probability is obtained for $a = \pm A$, and from the symmetry of $Z_{k+1} - Z_k$ we can suppose $a = A$. Then we claim that there exists a constant $C \geq 1$, such that for all $k \geq 0$

$$\max_{u \in S} \mathbb{P}_{(u,0)}[\tilde{\tau}_A > k] \leq \frac{CA}{\sqrt{\alpha k}}.$$

Provided the claim holds, we get that the right-hand side is below ε for $k \geq C^2 A^2 / (\alpha \varepsilon^2)$. Combining with the previous choices of k_0 and A , this yields eventually that

$$\|\mathbb{P}[(Y_k, T_k) = \cdot] - \mathbb{P}[(Y'_k, T'_k) = \cdot]\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 5\varepsilon$$

for

$$k \geq t_{\text{mix}}^{(Y)}(\varepsilon) + \frac{C^2(K(\varepsilon) + 2t_{\text{mix}}^{(Y)}(\varepsilon) \max_{u \in S} \mathbb{E}_u [T_1])^2}{\alpha \varepsilon^4},$$

proving the result.

Let us now prove the claim: for all $k \geq 1$, let $N_k := |\{i \leq k : Z_i - Z_{i-1} \neq 0\}|$ and define \tilde{Z}_k as the sum of the first k non zero variables $Z_i - Z_{i-1}$. By (25), for all $u \in S$, N_k dominates stochastically a binomial random variable $\text{Bin}(k, 2\alpha)$ and from the symmetry of the increments the process \tilde{Z} is the simple random walk on \mathbb{Z} . Letting $\tau_A^{(\text{SRW})}$ denote the hitting time of A by \tilde{Z} , [33][III 7.5] shows

$$\mathbb{P}_0 \left[\tau_A^{(\text{SRW})} = k \right] = \frac{A}{n} \binom{k}{\frac{A+k}{2}} 2^{-k} \leq C \frac{A}{k^{3/2}},$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of k and A . Summing over k implies

$$\mathbb{P}_0 \left[\tau_A^{(\text{SRW})} > k \right] \leq \frac{C'A}{\sqrt{k}}$$

for some other constant $C' > 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{(u,0)} [\tilde{\tau}_A > k] &\leq \mathbb{P}_u [\tilde{\tau}_A > k, N_k \geq \alpha k] + \mathbb{P}_u [N_k < \alpha k] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_0 \left[\tau_A^{(\text{SRW})} > \lfloor \alpha k \rfloor \right] + \mathbb{P} [|\text{Bin}(k, 2\alpha) - 2\alpha k| > \alpha k] \\ &\leq \frac{C' A}{\sqrt{\alpha k}} + \frac{2(1 - 2\alpha)}{\alpha k} \end{aligned}$$

using Chebychev's inequality, which proves the claim. \square

Proposition 5.3. *Let (Y, T) be a Markov renewal process with state space S , such that Y is positive recurrent with stationary distribution μ , irreducible and aperiodic, and $\max_{u \in S} \mathbb{E}_u [T_1^2] < \infty$. Let α be as in Proposition 5.2 and suppose that $\alpha > 0$. For all probability distribution ν on $S \times \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\sum_{y \in S} \left| \mathbb{P}_\nu [\exists k \geq 0 : Y_k = y, T_k = t] - \frac{\mu(y)}{\mathbb{E}_\mu [T_1]} \right| \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

More precisely, given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let $K_\nu(\varepsilon)$ be the minimal integer such that

$$\mathbb{P}_\nu [T_0 > K_\nu(\varepsilon)] \leq \varepsilon.$$

There exists $C(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for all probability distribution ν on $S \times \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sum_{y \in S} \left| \mathbb{P}_\nu [\exists k \geq 0 : Y_k = y, T_k = t] - \frac{\mu(y)}{\mathbb{E}_\mu [T_1]} \right| \leq \varepsilon$$

for all

$$t \geq \frac{C(\varepsilon)}{\alpha} \left(t_{\text{mix}}^{(Y)}(\varepsilon) \max_{u \in S} \mathbb{E}_u [T_1] + K_\nu(\varepsilon) + \frac{\mathbb{E}_\mu [T_1^2]}{\mathbb{E}_\mu [T_1]} \right)^2 \max_v \mathbb{E}_v [T_1] \quad (26)$$

where $t_{\text{mix}}^{(Y)}(\varepsilon)$ denotes the ε -mixing time of Y .

Proof of Proposition 5.3. Consider the Markov chain $(U_k)_{k \geq 0}$ on $S \times \mathbb{N}$ considered in the proof of Proposition 5.1. Then for all starting measure ν and $t \geq 0$

$$u_t(\nu, y) := \mathbb{P}_\nu [\exists k \geq 0 : Y_k = y, T_k = t] = \mathbb{P}_\nu [U_t = (y, 0)] \quad (27)$$

It was proved in the proof of Proposition 5.1 that U has unique invariant measure given by $\tilde{\mu}(x, t) = \mathbb{P}_\mu [Y_1 = y, T_1 > t] / \mathbb{E}_\mu [T_1]$. Thus if one can prove that U is aperiodic, the convergence theorem for Markov chains directly implies that $u_t(\nu, y) \rightarrow \tilde{\mu}(y, 0) = \mu(y) / \mathbb{E}_\mu [T_1]$. It is easily proved that U is aperiodic from the assumptions that Y converges to μ and $\alpha > 0$. Actually, we do not need even to check aperiodicity. The coupling argument that we use afterwards implies the convergence, which implies in turn aperiodicity.

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Let $k_0 = k_0(\varepsilon)$ be the right-hand side of (23). By Proposition 5.2 there exists a coupling of two versions of (Y, T) started at ν and $\tilde{\mu}$, with coalescence time κ such that

$$\mathbb{P} [\kappa > k_0] \leq \varepsilon.$$

These processes can in turn be coupled in an obvious way with two versions $U^{(\nu)}, U^{(\tilde{\mu})}$ of U started with distributions ν and $\tilde{\mu}$ respectively. Then notice that the two processes $U^{(\nu)}, U^{(\tilde{\mu})}$ coincide after time T_κ , therefore T_κ is a coupling time and we deduce

$$\|\mathbb{P}_\nu [U_t = \cdot] - \tilde{\mu}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \mathbb{P} [T_\kappa > t].$$

Since the sequence $(T_i)_{i \geq 0}$ is increasing, the previous tail probability can be bounded as

$$\mathbb{P}[T_\kappa > t] \leq \mathbb{P}[\kappa > k_0] + \mathbb{P}_\nu[T_{k_0} > t].$$

The first term is bounded by ε . The second term can be bounded by Markov's inequality as

$$\mathbb{P}_\nu[T_{k_0} > t] \leq \frac{k_0 \max_{u \in S} \mathbb{E}_u[T_1]}{t} \leq \varepsilon$$

for $t \geq k_0 \max_{u \in S} \mathbb{E}_u[T_1] / \varepsilon$. Let us now explicit the value of k_0 . We first bound for the worst possible coupling of ν and $\tilde{\mu}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[|T_0 - T'_0| > K_\nu(\varepsilon) + k] &\leq \mathbb{P}_\nu[T_0 > K_\nu(\varepsilon)] + \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mu}}[T_0 > k] \\ &\leq \varepsilon + \mathbb{E}_\mu[(T_1 - k - 1)_+] / \mathbb{E}_\mu[T_1] \end{aligned}$$

using the definition of $K_\nu(\varepsilon)$ and the expression of $\tilde{\mu}$. Then by Markov's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu[(T_1 - k - 1)_+] &= \sum_{t \geq k+1} \mathbb{P}_\mu[T_1 > t] \\ &\leq \sum_{t \geq k+1} \frac{\mathbb{E}_\mu[T_1^2]}{t^2} \leq \frac{C \mathbb{E}_\mu[T_1^2]}{k} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Thus $\mathbb{P}[|T_0 - T'_0| > K_\nu(\varepsilon) + k] \leq 2\varepsilon$ for all $k \geq C \mathbb{E}_\mu[T_1^2] / (\mathbb{E}_\mu[T_1] \varepsilon)$, which gives the value of $K(\varepsilon)$ in (23) and

$$k_0 \leq \frac{C(\varepsilon)}{\alpha} \left(t_{\min}^{(Y)}(\varepsilon) \max_{u \in S} \mathbb{E}_u|T_1| + K_\nu(\varepsilon) + \frac{\mathbb{E}_\mu[T_1^2]}{\mathbb{E}_\mu[T_1]} \right)^2.$$

We deduce eventually that taking t as (26) yields

$$\|\mathbb{P}_\nu[U_t = \cdot] - \tilde{\mu}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon$$

for large enough $C(\varepsilon)$. Finally using (27) yields

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{y \in S} \left| u_t(\nu, y) - \frac{\mu(y)}{\mathbb{E}_\mu[T_1]} \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

□

The last tool we introduce about Markov renewal processes is a variance bound that uses spectral arguments. Let us gather a few known facts about spectral theory for Markov chains. Consider a Markov chain $Y = (Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$ on a countable state space S with transition kernel Q , which is irreducible, positive recurrent with stationary distribution μ .

Let $\ell^2(\mu)$ be the Hilbert space of real-valued functions on S which are square-integrable with respect to the measure μ , equipped with the inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle_\mu := \sum_{x \in S} \mu(x) f(x) g(x).$$

Q defines a contracting linear operator on $\ell^2(\mu)$ by $Qf(x) := \sum_{y \in S} Q(x, y) f(y)$. Its spectrum is defined as

$$\text{Spec}(Q) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid \lambda I - Q \text{ is not invertible as a bounded linear operator}\}.$$

The adjoint operator of Q^* is given by

$$Q^*(y, x) = \frac{\mu(x)Q(x, y)}{\mu(y)}$$

for all $x, y \in S$. Reversibility of Q with respect to μ is equivalent to self-adjointness of Q . In this case, the spectrum of Q is included the interval $[-1, 1]$. Writing $\mathbb{1}$ for the constant function equal to 1, the fact that μ is a probability measure implies that $\mathbb{1} \in \ell^2(S)$ and is an eigenvector of Q associated with the eigenvalue 1. The absolute spectral gap of Q is the defined as

$$\gamma := 1 - \sup\{|\lambda|, \lambda \in \text{Spec}(Q)\}.$$

if 1 has multiplicity 1 and $\gamma := 0$ otherwise. It is well known that the absolute spectral gap is related to mixing properties of Y , see for instance [43, Chap. 12]. In the non-reversible case, spectral arguments can be applied by considering reversibilizations of the chain. From a theoretical point of view, the optimal parameter to consider is the so-called *pseudo spectral gap*, defined as

$$\gamma_{ps} := \max_{k \geq 1} \left\{ \frac{\gamma((Q^*)^k Q^k)}{k} \right\}.$$

If Q is reversible obviously $1 - \gamma_{ps} = (1 - \gamma)^2$. The pseudo spectral gap is a rather natural quantity introduced in [52] but it may have appeared before-hand in other places under different names. In [16], the quantity $1 - \gamma_{ps}$ is considered under the name singular radius.

As for the classical spectral gap, the pseudo spectral gap is intimately related with the mixing properties of the chain, as shown by the following proposition.

Proposition 5.4 ([52, Prop. 3.4]). *Let $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be an irreducible, positive recurrent Markov chain on a countable state space S , with stationary distribution μ and ε -mixing time $t_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon)$. Suppose it is uniformly ergodic, in the sense that there exists $C > 0$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\sup_{x \in S} \|\mathbb{P}_x [Y_t = \cdot] - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq C\rho^t.$$

Then for all $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$,

$$\gamma_{ps} \geq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{t_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon)}.$$

Furthermore if S is finite,

$$t_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) \leq \frac{1 + 2 \log((2\varepsilon)^{-1}) + \log(\mu_{\min}^{-1})}{\gamma_{ps}}$$

where $\mu_{\min} := \min_{x \in S} \mu(x)$.

The pseudo spectral gap can also be used to precisely handle correlations between different steps of a Markov chains. Thus we obtain the following variance bound for Markov processes with the (M1) Markov property.

Proposition 5.5. *Let S be countable and E a Polish space. Let $(Y_k, Z_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be a process on $S \times E$ satisfying (M1). Suppose that Y is irreducible, positive recurrent, with invariant measure μ and pseudo spectral gap γ_{ps} . Let $(f_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be a family of functions such that for all $i \geq 1$, $f_i : S \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\max_{u \in S} \mathbb{E}_u [f_i(Y_1, Z_1)^2] < \infty$. Then for all $k \geq 1$*

$$\text{Var}_\mu \left[\sum_{i=1}^k f_i(Y_i, Z_i) \right] \leq \frac{6}{\gamma} \sum_{i=1}^k \text{Var}_\mu [f_i(Y_1, Z_1)].$$

The previous result can be applied to the case of a Markov renewal process $(Y_k, T_k)_{k \geq 0}$, to get that

$$\text{Var}_\mu [T_k] \leq \frac{6}{\gamma_{ps}} k \text{Var}_\mu [T_1]. \quad (28)$$

for all $k \geq 1$.

Proof. First, observe that if (Y, Z) satisfies (M1) so does $(Y, (Y, Z))$. Thus up to changing the second coordinate of the process considered it suffices to prove the result for functions f_i of Z_i only.

We use the same arguments as in [52]. Let Q denote the transition kernel of the chain Y and given $i \in [m]$, $x, y \in S$ let

$$Q_i(x, y) := \mathbb{E}_x [f_i(Z_1) \mathbb{1}_{Y_1=y}].$$

Using matrix notations, for all $i \in [m]$, $x \in S$, $Q_i \mathbb{1}(x) = \sum_{y \in S} Q_i(x, y) = \mathbb{E}_x [f_i(Z_1)]$. We can suppose without generality that $\mathbb{E}_\mu [f_i(Z_i)] = \mathbb{E}_\mu [f_i(Z_1)] = 0$, which can be written matricially as

$$\mu Q_i \mathbb{1} = 0. \quad (29)$$

The random variable $\sum_{i=1}^m f_i(Z_i)$ is thus also centered and from stationarity one has

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_\mu \left[\sum_{i=1}^m f_i(Z_i) \right] &= \sum_{i,j=1}^m \mathbb{E}_\mu [f_i(Z_i) f_j(Z_j)] \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^m \mathbb{E}_\mu [f_i(Z_1) f_j(Z_{|j-i|+1})]. \end{aligned}$$

For any $l \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu [f_i(Z_1) f_j(Z_{l+1})] &= \sum_{x,y \in S} \mu(x) Q_i(x, y) \mathbb{E}_y [f_j(Z_{l+1})] \\ &= \sum_{x,y,z \in S} \mu(x) Q_i(x, y) Q^l Q_j(y, z) \\ &= \langle Q_i Q^l Q_j \mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1} \rangle_\mu \\ &= \langle Q_i (Q^l - \mathbb{1}\mu) Q_j \mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1} \rangle_\mu \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used (29). For any $l \geq 1$, since μ is stationary one has $Q^l - \mathbb{1}\mu = (Q - \mathbb{1}\mu)^l$, thus by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Q_i (Q - \mathbb{1}\mu)^l Q_j \mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1} \rangle_\mu &= \langle (Q - \mathbb{1}\mu)^l Q_j \mathbb{1}, Q_i^* \mathbb{1} \rangle_\mu \\ &\leq \| (Q - \mathbb{1}\mu)^l \| \| Q_j \mathbb{1} \| \| Q_i^* \mathbb{1} \|. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Jensen's inequality,

$$\| Q_j \mathbb{1} \|^2 = \sum_{x \in S} \mu(x) |\mathbb{E}_x [f_j(Z_1)]|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_\mu [f_j(Z_1)^2] = \text{Var}_\mu (f_j(Z_1)).$$

Similarly,

$$Q_i^* \mathbb{1}(y) = \sum_{x \in S} \frac{\mu(x) Q_i(x, y)}{\mu(y)} = \mathbb{E}_\mu [f_i(Z_1) \mid Y_1 = y]$$

so

$$\|Q_i^* \mathbb{1}\|^2 \leq \sum_{y \in S} \mu(y) \mathbb{E}_\mu [f_i(Z_1)^2 \mid Y_1 = y] = \mathbb{E}_\mu [f_i(Z_1)^2] = \text{Var}_\mu [f_i(Z_1)^2].$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu [f_i(Z_1) f_j(Z_{t+1})] &\leq \|(Q - \mathbb{1}\mu)^t\| \text{Var}_\mu [f_i(Z_1)]^{1/2} \text{Var}_\mu [f_j(Z_1)]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|(Q - \mathbb{1}\mu)^t\| (\text{Var}_\mu [f_i(Z_1)] + \text{Var}_\mu [f_j(Z_1)]). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to sum over i, j . Let $k \geq 1$ be such that $\gamma(Q^k(Q^k)^*) = \gamma_{ps}k$. Then by observing that $\|(Q - \mathbb{1}\mu)^k\|^2 = 1 - \gamma(Q^k(Q^k)^*)$ one can deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|(Q - \mathbb{1}\mu)^t\| &\leq \|(Q - \mathbb{1}\mu)^k\|^{[t/k]} \\ &= (1 - k\gamma_{ps})^{[t/k]/2} \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \neq j=1}^m \mathbb{E}_\mu [f_i(Z_1) f_j(Z_{|j-i|+1})] &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j=1}^m \|(Q - \mathbb{1}\mu)^{|j-i|-1}\| (\text{Var}_\mu [f_i(Z_1)] + \text{Var}_\mu [f_j(Z_1)]) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \|(Q - \mathbb{1}\mu)^l\| \text{Var}_\mu [f_i(Z_1)] \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Var}_\mu [f_i(Z_1)] \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (1 - k\gamma_{ps})^{[l/k]/2} \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Var}_\mu [f_i(Z_1)] \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (1 - k\gamma_{ps})^{[l/k]} \\ &= \frac{4}{\gamma_{ps}} \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Var}_\mu [f_i(Z_1)] \end{aligned}$$

and combining with the diagonal terms $i = j$ the result follows as $\gamma_{ps} \leq 2$. \square

5.2 Regeneration structure

Let us come back to the setting of quasi-trees.

Definition 5.2. A time $t \in \mathbb{N} + 1/2$ is called a regeneration time if $(\mathcal{X}_{t-1/2}, \mathcal{X}_t)$ is a long-range edge crossed for the first and last time at time t .

From the uniform lower bound on escape probabilities, it is easy to deduce there is an infinity of regeneration times and levels, and that these have exponential tails conditional on the environment.

Lemma 5.1. For any realization of \mathcal{G} , for any starting vertex of the chain \mathcal{X} , L_1 and T_1 have quenched exponential tails (independent of n).

From now on, let $T_0 := 0, Y_0 := \iota(O), L_0 := 0$ and $(T_k)_{k \geq 1}$ be the sequence of successive regeneration times of \mathcal{X} . For all $k \geq 1$, define

$$Y_k := \iota(\mathcal{X}_{T_{k-1/2}}) \quad L_k := d(O, \mathcal{X}_{T_k}).$$

$(Y_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is the Markov chain on V that dictates the law of the environments between successive regeneration times. To describe this Markov chain, introduce the measures

$$\mathbb{Q}_u = \mathbb{P}[\cdot \mid \mathcal{X}_{1/2} = \eta(O), \iota(O) = u, \tau_O = \infty]$$

for all $u \in V$.

Remark 5.2. Obviously, the lower bound on escape probabilities of Proposition 4.1 also holds under the law \mathbb{Q}_u , for any $u \in V$. Furthermore, the law of the centers added to the quasi-trees remains essentially uniform in the sense that for all $v \in V$ such that $V(v) \neq V(u)$

$$\mathbb{Q}_u[\iota(\eta(O)) = v] = \Theta(1/n). \quad (30)$$

Indeed if $q_0 > 0$ is a constant such that all escape probabilities are lower bounded by q_0 for any realization of the quasi-tree then

$$\mathbb{Q}_u[\iota(\eta(O)) = v] \leq q_0^{-1} \mathbb{P}[\eta(O) = v \mid \iota(O) = u] = q_0^{-1}/n$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}_u[\iota(\eta(O)) = v] &\geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\iota(\eta(O))=v} \mathbb{1}_{\tau_O=\infty} \mid \iota(O) = u, \mathcal{X}_{1/2} = \eta(O)] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\iota(\eta(O))=v} q_0 \mid \iota(O) = u] \\ &\geq q_0/n. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.3. Section 5.1 only considered integer valued processes for the time component of Markov renewal processes. To apply the results of this section we will thus implicitly identify regeneration times with an integer-valued process.

The following lemma is the analog of Lemma 3.6 in [39] and is proved in a similar way.

Lemma 5.2. • *The sequences $(Y_k, T_k)_{k \geq 1}$ and $(Y_k, L_k)_{k \geq 1}$ are Markov renewal processes.*

- *The sequence $(Y_{k+1}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{X}_{T_k}} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{X}_{T_{k+1}}}, (\mathcal{X}_t)_{T_k \leq t < T_{k+1}})_{k \geq 0}$ is a Markov chain whose transition probabilities only depend on the first coordinate Y_k , i.e. the law of this triplet at time $k+1$ conditional on time k is only measurable with respect to Y_k .*
- *For all $k \geq 1$, conditional on Y_k , the pair $(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{X}_{T_k}}, (\mathcal{X}_t)_{t \geq T_k})$ has the law of $(\mathcal{G}_O, \mathcal{X})$ under the probability \mathbb{Q}_{Y_k} .*

Remark 5.4. Note that although (Y, T) starts at time 0, it is a Markov renewal process from time 1, and the delay is thus T_1 . However by the lemma, under the measure \mathbb{Q}_u , for any $u \in V$, T_1 has distribution given by a transition probability and thus (Y, T) becomes a Markov renewal process already from time 0, with 0 delay. We will use this observation often in the sequel.

5.3 Mixing of the regeneration chain

We now investigate the mixing properties of the Markov chain Y underlying the regeneration process, which we call the regeneration chain. Lemma 5.3 below will establish that Y has mixing time of constant order, allowing us later to get moment bounds similar to the iid case. The lemma actually proves a stronger mixing property of both the chain Y and the time process T that will be used to derive an approximation of the invariant measure of X .

Lemma 5.3. Let $(Q_t)_{t \geq 1}$ denote the transition kernels of the Markov renewal process (Y, T) and $Q := \sum_{t \geq 1} Q_t$, after identification of T with a process in \mathbb{N} .

(i) For all $u, v \in V$,

$$Q(u, v) = \Theta(1/n). \quad (31)$$

As a consequence for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, the chain Y has mixing time $O_\varepsilon(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(ii) for all $u \in V$,

$$\sum_{t \geq 1} \sum_{v \in V} Q_t(u, v) \wedge Q_{t+1}(u, v) = \Theta(1). \quad (32)$$

Proof of Lemma 5.3. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. The statement about the mixing time of Y is easily deduced from (31), as summing on v yields the following Doeblin's condition for Y : there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\|Q(u, \cdot) - Q(u', \cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 1 - c - o(1),$$

for all $u, u' \in V$. It is then easy to obtain from Doeblin's condition that Y has mixing time $t_{\text{mix}}^{(Y)}(\varepsilon) \leq (c^{-1} + o(1)) \log \varepsilon^{-1}$.

Let us now prove (31). Reversibility will here simplify the argument. Consider $u, v \in V$ with $v \in S$. By definition for all $t \geq 1$

$$Q_t(u, v) = \mathbb{Q}_u [Y_1 = v, T_1 = t] = \mathbb{P} [T_1 = t, \iota(\mathcal{X}_{t-1/2}) = v \mid \tau_O = \infty, \iota(O) = u, \mathcal{X}_{1/2} = \eta(O)].$$

Probabilistic statements below will thus be made with respect to \mathbb{Q}_u unless stated otherwise.

Observe that if $V(u) \neq V(v)$, it is possible to realize $Y_1 = v$ with regeneration occurring at the first long-range edge crossed by the chain, which can be reached in half a step from $\eta(O)$ by Assumption (H3). Let $w \in V$ such that $P(w, v) > 0$. From Remark 5.2, $\mathbb{Q}_u [\iota(\eta(O)) = w] = \Theta(1/n)$. Using that transition probabilities are bounded uniformly in n by (H1), (H2), we deduce that $\mathbb{Q}_u [Y_1 = v] \geq \Theta(1/n)$. On the other hand, if $V(u) = V(v)$ the alternation between V_1 and V_2 forbids a regeneration at the first long-range edge. Thanks to reversibility the chain can backtrack and prevent regeneration at the first long-range. Thus using the above arguments we can lower bound by $\Theta(1/n)$ the probability that the chain goes from $\eta(O)$ to a vertex y with $\iota(y) = v$ using one long-range edge, comes back to $\eta(O)$, which ensures no regeneration occurred on the long-range edge, and returns to y , all that within a bounded number of steps. The chain can then escape in \mathcal{G}_y with lower bounded probability by Proposition 4.1 which will imply $Y_1 = v$.

The proof of (32) is similar but requires taking time into account. Suppose $u \in V_1$ and let $v \in V_2$. Our argument is illustrated in Figure 1. The idea is to use an intermediary component of V_1 to make the regeneration time shift by 1. Consider the set

$$S_1 := \{x \in V \mid \exists y \neq x \in V : P^2(x, y) > 0\}.$$

From Assumption (H3) communicating classes of V_1 have size at least 3. Consequently if $x \in V_1$, either $x \in S_1$ or x is in a communicating class $\{x, y, z\}$ of size exactly 3 with $P^2(x, x) = 1$. However in that case $P^2(y, z), P^2(z, y) > 0$, so $y, z \in S_1$. Thus S_1 has size at least $2n/3 - o(n)$ and probability $\Theta(1)$ under the uniform law on V_1 or \mathbb{Q}_w for any $w \in V_2$ by Remark 5.2.

For any realization of \mathcal{G} , there exists a path $(\eta(O), x, \eta(x), y, \eta(y), z)$ with two long-range edges $(x, \eta(x))$ and $(y, \eta(y))$ whereas $(\eta(O), x)$, $(\eta(x), y)$, $(\eta(y), z)$ are small-range edges with distinct




Figure 1: Argument of the proof of Lemma 5.3

endpoints. If $\iota(\eta(x)) \in S_1$ there exists $y' \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $P(\iota(y), \iota(y')) > 0$, as in Figure 1. Thanks to reversibility, the chain started at time $1/2$ can go from $\eta(O)$ to z in $2 + 1/2$ steps, from z to y' in 2 steps and from y' to $\eta(O)$ in 3 steps. This will ensure none of the long-range edges $(x, \eta(x)), (y, \eta(y))$ are regeneration edges. Then from $\eta(O)$ the chain can go back to z in 3 more steps and escape to infinity with lower bounded probability, yielding $Y_1 = \iota(z)$ and $T_1 = 10 + 1/2$.

On the other hand, instead of y the chain could have gone through y' to some z' reachable from $\eta(O)$ in just one additional step, while the loop around $\eta(O)$ which passes through z' takes the same number of steps. Thus the previous argument can be applied similarly with just one time step difference to obtain $Y_1 = \iota(z'), T_1 = 11 + 1/2$. This holds for all values of $\iota(\eta(O)) \in V, \iota(\eta(x)) \in S$. Since $\iota(\eta(x)) \in V_1$ if $u \in V_1$, it is in S with probability $\Theta(1)$ by what precedes while $\iota(z) = v$ with probability $\Theta(1/n)$. Hence summing on the values of $\iota(\eta(O)), \iota(\eta(x))$, we obtain that

$$\sum_{t \geq 1} Q_t(u, v) \wedge Q_{t+1}(u, v) \geq \Theta(1/n).$$

The case where $u \in V_2$ is similar, with one less necessary long-range edge to cross to reach a component of V_1 so this case is simpler. The bound applies thus to all $u \in V$. Summing over $v \in V_2$ yields (32). \square

Let μ denote the stationary distribution of the Markov chain $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$ and

$$\mathbb{Q}_\mu := \sum_{u \in V} \mu(u) Q_u.$$

In the sequel $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_\mu}$ denotes the expectation with respect to μ . Later, we use similar notations for variance, covariance, etc.

The mixing of the regeneration chain will be used conditional on some already revealed parts of the environment, which in turn requires conditioning by a neighbourhood of the root. From the previous lemma, we can prove the following.

Proposition 5.6. *Let ν be the law of $\iota(\eta(O))$ under \mathbb{Q}_μ . Given $Lt \geq 0$, let $\tilde{T}_1 = \tilde{T}_1(L)$ be the first regeneration time outside $B_{LR}(O, L)$, while for $k \geq 2$ let \tilde{T}_k be the first regeneration time after \tilde{T}_{k-1} . For all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ there exists a constant $C(\varepsilon)$ such that for all $L \geq 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}/2$, for all*

$x \in B_{\text{LR}}(O, L)$, $d_{\text{LR}}(O, x) = L$, if $t \geq C(\varepsilon)m^2$ then

$$\sum_{v \in V} \left| \mathbb{P}_x \left[\exists k \geq 0 : \tilde{T}_k = t, \iota(\mathcal{X}_t) = v \mid B_{\text{LR}}(O, L) \right] - \frac{\nu(v)}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_\mu} [T_1]} \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

and

$$\sum_{v \in V} \left| \mathbb{P} \left[\exists k \geq 0 : \tilde{T}_k = t, \iota(\mathcal{X}_t) = v \mid \mathcal{X}_{1/2} = x, B_{\text{LR}}(O, L) \right] - \frac{\nu(v)}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_\mu} [T_1]} \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $t \geq 1$. For all $k \geq 1$ let $\tilde{Y}_k := \iota(\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{T}_k - 1/2})$. Apply Proposition 5.3 with the Markov renewal process of regeneration times considered here. Note that by the Markov property of (Y, T) conditioning by $B_{\text{LR}}(O, L)$ yields the same transition kernels as (Y, T) and only affects the law of $(\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{T}_1)$. Lemmas 5.3 and 5.1 imply that the two quantities α and $\max_{u \in S} \mathbb{E}_u [T_1]$ in this Proposition are bounded uniformly in n , as is the mixing time $t_{\text{mix}}^{(Y)}(\varepsilon)$ of Y for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. On the other hand, note that if x is started precisely at the boundary of the ball $B_{\text{LR}}(O, L)$, the lower bound on escape probabilities provided by Proposition 4.1 implies \tilde{T}_1 has (quenched) exponential tail independent of L and n . Thus for some $C_1(\varepsilon) > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}_x \left[\tilde{T}_1 \geq C_1(\varepsilon) \mid B_{\text{LR}}(O, L) \right] \leq \varepsilon.$$

This gives the value of the quantity $K_\nu(\varepsilon)$ considered in Proposition 5.3, which thus proves that there exists $C(\varepsilon)$ such that for $t \geq C(\varepsilon)$,

$$\sum_{u \in V} \left| \mathbb{P}_x \left[\exists k \geq 0 : \tilde{T}_k = t - 1/2, \tilde{Y}_k = u \mid B_{\text{LR}}(O, L), U_t(L) \leq m \right] - \frac{\mu(u)}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_\mu} [T_1]} \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Then note that conditional on $\tilde{T}_k = t - 1/2, \tilde{Y}_k = u$, $\iota(\mathcal{X}_t)$ is distributed as $\iota(\eta(O))$ under \mathbb{Q}_u . Finally the arguments apply in the same way if the chain is started at time x at time $1/2$ instead of 0. \square

6 Analysis on the quasi-tree III: concentration of drift and entropy

In this section we finally establish "nice properties" for the chain \mathcal{X} , proving in particular concentration of the drift and entropy. We only sketch some of the proofs, or do not give a proof at all, as once a uniform bound on escape probabilities is established the arguments are similar to those used in [39].

6.1 Typical paths in quasi-trees

We can start with an analog of Lemma 3.2. As usual, we make a slight abuse of notations to emphasize analogies.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\Gamma(R, L, M)$ denote the set of paths \mathbf{p} in G^* such that \mathbf{p} does not deviate from a small-range distance more than R , backtrack over a long-range distance L or contain a subpath of length M without a regeneration edge. There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $R, L, M \geq 0$, for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbf{P}_O [\mathcal{X}_s \cdots \mathcal{X}_{s+t} \notin \Gamma(R, L, M)] \leq (s+t)e^{-C(R \wedge L \wedge M)}.$$

Proof. We only sketch the proof: as escape probabilities are everywhere lower bounded by a constant $q_0 > 0$ by Proposition 4.1, it should be clear that the probability to reach small-range distance R or backtrack over long-range distance L from a fixed starting state which is center is exponentially small in R or L respectively, while Lemma 5.1 established the regeneration times have quenched exponential tails. The additional factor t comes from union bound, as at most t centers are visited by time t . \square

6.2 Concentration of the drift

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\mathcal{d} := \frac{\mathbb{E}_{Q_\mu}[L_1]}{\mathbb{E}_{Q_\mu}[T_1]}$. Then for all $s \geq 0$, a.s.*

$$\frac{d_{\text{LR}}(\mathcal{X}_s, \mathcal{X}_{s+t})}{t} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathcal{d}. \quad (33)$$

Furthermore, there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ for which the following holds. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a constant $C = C(\varepsilon)$ such that for all $s, t \geq 0$, for all values of $\iota(O), \iota(\eta(O))$

$$\mathbb{P}_O \left[|d_{\text{LR}}(\mathcal{X}_s, \mathcal{X}_{s+t}) - \mathcal{d}t| > C\sqrt{t} \mid O, \eta(O) \right] \leq \varepsilon + C\sqrt{s}\varepsilon^{-c_0 t}. \quad (34)$$

Proof. For notational simplicity we omit writing the conditioning by $\iota(O)$ and $\iota(\eta(O))$. As can be checked this conditioning does not affect the proof as the technical results that will be used hold even conditional on the long-range edge at the root. For all $t \geq 0$, let

$$N_t := \max\{k \geq 0 \mid T_k \leq t\}.$$

Then

$$L_{N_t} \leq d_{\text{LR}}(O, \mathcal{X}_t) \leq L_{N_t} + T_{N_t+1} - T_{N_t}.$$

It is easy to prove that $(T_{N_t+1} - T_{N_t})/t \rightarrow 0$, hence the law of large numbers (33) follows from Lemma 5.2 and Proposition 5.1 which prove $N_t/t \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} 1/\mathbb{E}_\mu[T_1]$ and $L_k/k \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathbb{E}_\mu[L_1]$ a.s..

We only sketch the proof of (34), which come from fluctuation bounds for the processes (L_t) and (T_k) : for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $t, k \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_O \left[\left| N_t - \frac{t}{\mathbb{E}_\mu[T_1]} \right| > C\sqrt{t} \right] &\leq \varepsilon \\ \mathbb{P}_O \left[|L_k - \mathbb{E}_\mu[L_1]k| > C\sqrt{k} \right] &\leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

These bounds are then easily combined, using also the monotonicity of regeneration levels, to obtain the result for $s = 0$. The above estimates come themselves from Bienaymé-Chebychev bounds for the processes (L_k) and (T_k) . These require to show that $\text{Var}(L_k) = O(k)$, which is the consequence of the variance bound for Markov chains (28) combined with Proposition 5.4 and the fact that the regeneration chain Y mixes in $O_\varepsilon(1)$ steps (Lemma 5.3).

Finally the case $s > 0$ is obtained from applying the same arguments to a shifted version of the process. For $s \geq 0$ fixed, consider

$$T_k^{(s)} := T_{N_s+k} - s, \quad L_k^{(s)} := L_{N_s+k} - d_{\text{LR}}(O, \mathcal{X}_s)$$

if $k \geq 1$ and $T_0^{(s)} := 0, L_0^{(s)} := 0$. These processes still satisfy the conclusions of Lemma 5.2 and have the same increments as the usual regeneration times. Thus the only thing to be careful is

the law of the first regeneration time that now depends on s . Using the concentration (35) for N_s , union bound and Lemma 5.1, we have for all $m \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[T_1^{(s)} > m \right] &= \sum_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{P} [N_s = k, T_{k+1} - s > m] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left[|N_s - s/\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_\mu} [T_1]| > C\sqrt{s} \right] + \mathbb{P} \left[\exists k : |k - s/\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_\mu} [T_1]| \leq C\sqrt{s}, T_{k+1} - T_k > m \right] \\ &\leq \varepsilon + 2C\sqrt{s}e^{-c_0 m}. \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_0 > 0$. □

6.3 Concentration of the entropy

The concentration of the entropy in Proposition 3.2 is based on the convergence of the entropy for the loop-erased chain in the quasi-tree, that is the convergence of $-\log \mathbf{P} [\xi'_k = \xi_k \mid \mathcal{X}] / k$ towards a deterministic quantity, the entropic rate of the chain. Such convergence is well-known in the context of groups or random walks on Galton-Watson trees, see [42, 48]. We will however not prove this result but establish concentration directly for a notion of weights similar to those of (15). Of course, these are designed to mimick the law of the loop-erased chain, so the argument is similar. In fact the first step is to prove the convergence and concentration of the loop-erased chain when restricted to regeneration steps.

Lemma 6.2. *Let ξ' be an independent copy of the loop-erased chain ξ . There exists a constant $h' = \Theta(1)$ such that*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log \mathbf{P} [\xi'_{L_k} = \xi_{L_k} \mid \mathcal{X}]}{k} = h'.$$

Furthermore, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for all $k, l \geq 1$, for all values of $\iota(O), \iota(\eta(O))$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[\left| -\log \mathbf{P} [\xi'_{L_k} = \xi_{L_k} \mid \mathcal{X}] - h'k \right| > C(\varepsilon)\sqrt{k} \mid \iota(O), \iota(\eta(O)) \right] &\leq \varepsilon, \\ \mathbb{P} \left[\left| -\log \mathbf{P} [\xi'_{L_{k+l}} = \xi_{L_{k+l}} \mid \mathcal{X}, \xi'_{L_k} = \xi_{L_k}] - h'l \right| > C(\varepsilon)\sqrt{l} \mid \iota(O), \iota(\eta(O)) \right] &\leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

We do not give a proof, but refer to that of Lemma 3.14 in [39] as it uses similar arguments. The only difference lies in the additional Markovian property of the regeneration, which is dealt with as for the drift using the variance bound (28).

To relate the previous concentration with the weights (15), we define similar weights in the quasi-tree. Let τ_l denote here the first time t such that $d_{\text{LR}}(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{X}_t) = l$. For all long-range edge $e \in \mathcal{G}$, write \mathcal{G}_e for the subquasi-tree at any endpoint of e (they give the same quasi-tree). Given $R, L \geq 0$, $x \in \mathcal{V}$ and a long-range edge e at long-range distance 0 from x

$$\begin{aligned} w_{x,R,L}(e) &:= \mathbf{P}_x \left[\mathcal{X}_{\tau_L} \in \mathcal{G}_e, \tau_L < \tau_{\text{SR}}^{(R)} \right] \\ w_{R,L}(e \mid x) &:= \mathbf{P} \left[\mathcal{X}_{\tau_L} \in \mathcal{G}_e, \tau_L < \tau_{\text{SR}}^{(R)} \mid \mathcal{X}_{1/2} = x, \tau_L < \tau_{\eta(x)} \right] \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Then if $e = (e_i)_{i=1}^k$ is a long-range non-backtracking path starting from $B_{\text{LR}}(x, 0)$, set

$$w_{x,R,L}(e) := w_{x,R,L}(\xi_1) \prod_{i=2}^k w_{R,L}(\xi_i \mid \xi_{i-1}^+)$$

where the product is taken equal to 1 if empty.

Consider the measure

$$\mathbf{Q}_{u,g} := \mathbb{P}[\cdot \mid \mathcal{X}_{1/2} = \eta(O), \iota(O) = u, \tau_O = \infty, \mathcal{G}_O = g].$$

where $u \in V$ and g is a possible realization of the subquasi-tree \mathcal{G}_O . We use a notation which may be reminiscent of (17) as these two measures are very similar, although note that here u is not the type of the starting state of the chain but its long-range neighbour. There should be no risk of confusion as the measure of (17) will not be used until Section 8. It is easily seen that

$$\mathbf{P}_x[\xi_1 = e_1, \dots, \xi_k = e_k] = \mathbf{P}_x[\xi_1 = e_1] \prod_{i=2}^k \mathbf{Q}_{\iota(e_{i-1}^+), \mathcal{G}_{e_{i-1}}}[\xi_1 = e_i]. \quad (38)$$

The following Lemma establishes thus a bound on individual weights.

Lemma 6.3. *There exist constants $C_0, C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for all $R, L > 0$ the following holds:*

(i) *for all long-range edge e such that $d_{\text{SR}}(O, e^-) < R$,*

$$|\log w_{O,R,L}(e) - \log \mathbf{P}_O[\xi_1 = e]| \leq C_0 e^{-C_1 L + C_2 R},$$

(ii) *for all $x \in \mathcal{V}$, for all long-range edge e of \mathcal{G}_x such that $d_{\text{SR}}(x, e^-) < R$*

$$|\log w_{R,L}(e \mid x) - \log \mathbf{Q}_{e, \mathcal{G}_e}[\xi_1 = e]| \leq C_0 e^{-C_1 L + C_2 R}.$$

Proof. We only prove the first bound in detail. Notice that to have one of the two events $e \in \xi$ or $\mathcal{X}_{\tau_L} \in \mathcal{G}_e$ realized exclusively, the chain needs to backtrack from level L to level 0. Thus by Lemma 6.1

$$|w_{O,R,L}(e) - \mathbf{P}_O[\xi_1 = e]| \leq \mathbf{P}_O[\tau_{\text{SR}}^{(R)} \wedge \tau_{\text{NB}}^{(L)} < \infty] \leq e^{-C(R \wedge L)}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. On the other hand, recall that all transition probabilities of the chains X, \mathcal{X} are lower bounded by some constant $\delta > 0$. Hence if e has one endpoint in $B_{\text{SR}}(O, R)$,

$$w_{O,R,L}(e) \wedge \mathbf{P}_O[\xi_1 = e] \geq \delta^R q_0$$

as the right-hand side is a lower bound on the probability to go from O to e and then escape to infinity, which forces both $e \in \xi$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\tau_L} \in \mathcal{G}_e$. Using the inequality $|\log x - \log y| \leq |x - y| / (x \wedge y)$, we deduce

$$|\log w_{O,R,L}(e) - \log \mathbf{P}_O[\xi_1 = e]| \leq C_0 e^{-C_1 L + C_2 R}$$

for some $C_0, C_1, C_2 > 0$. □

Our final entropic concentration result in the quasi-tree is the following. Note that for $R, L = O(\log \log n)$ and $t = \Theta(\log n)$ the right hand side of (39) is $O(\sqrt{t})$ if the implicit constant of L is large enough.

Lemma 6.4. *There exist constants $C, C_1, \dots, C_3 > 0$ such that the following holds. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $C_0 = C_0(\varepsilon), C_h = C_h(\varepsilon)$ such that for all $s, t \geq 0$, for all $R, L > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon - 2(s+t)e^{-C(R \wedge L)}$ conditional on $\iota(O), \iota(\eta(O))$,*

$$|-\log w_{\mathcal{X}_s, R, L}(\xi(\mathcal{X}_s \cdots \mathcal{X}_{s+t})) - ht| \leq C_h \sqrt{t} + C_0 t e^{-C_1 L + C_2 R} + C_3 R L. \quad (39)$$

Proof. Fix R, L for the rest of the proof. For notational simplicity, we drop subscripts R, L from the weights and omit writing the conditioning by $\iota(O), \iota(\eta(O))$ but the probabilistic statements below should be interpreted conditional on these. Recall $\mathcal{G}^{(R)}$ is the quasi-tree truncated at the R -boundary of small-range components. Note that that weights are positive only for edges in $\mathcal{G}^{(R)}$.

Given $t \geq 0$, let

$$N_t := \max\{k \geq 0 \mid T_k \leq t\}.$$

We first argue there exists a constant $C_3 > 0$ such that for all $s, t \geq 0$ if $\mathcal{X}_0 \cdots \mathcal{X}_{s+t}$ is included in $\mathcal{G}^{(R)}$ then

$$\left| \log w_{\mathcal{X}_s}(\xi(\mathcal{X}_s \cdots \mathcal{X}_{s+t})) - \log w(\xi_{L_{N_{s+2}}} \cdots \xi_{L_{N_{s+t}}} \mid \xi_{L_{N_{s+1}}}) \right| \leq C_3 R (T_{N_{s+2}} - T_{N_s} + T_{N_{s+t+1}} - T_{N_{s+t}}). \quad (40)$$

Note first that $\xi_{L_{N_{s+1}}} \cdots \xi_{L_{N_{s+t}}}$ is necessarily part of the path $\xi(\mathcal{X}_s \cdots \mathcal{X}_{s+t})$. Since weights are below one, we can easily lower bound

$$-\log w_{\mathcal{X}_s}(\xi(\mathcal{X}_s \cdots \mathcal{X}_{s+t})) \geq -\log w(\xi_{L_{N_{s+2}}} \cdots \xi_{L_{N_{s+t}}} \mid \xi_{L_{N_{s+1}}}).$$

On the other hand the path $\xi(\mathcal{X}_s \cdots \mathcal{X}_{s+t})$ contains at most $T_{N_{s+2}} - s \leq T_{N_{s+2}} - T_{N_s}$ edges until it reaches $\xi_{L_{N_{s+2}}}$ and similarly it contains at most $T_{N_{s+t+1}} - T_{N_{s+t}}$ after it leaves $\xi_{L_{N_{s+t}}}$. Then we bound the weights of these edges. If $x \in \mathcal{V}$ and e is a long-range edge such that $d_{\text{SR}}(x, e^-) < R$, δ^R lower bounds the probability the chain goes from x to e and leaves by this edge. As the transition and the quenched escape probabilities are all uniformly bounded away from 0, there exists $C_3 > 0$ such that $-\log w_x(e) \leq C_3 R$ for all x, e in $\mathcal{G}^{(R)}$, for any realization of the quasi-tree. We deduce that

$$-\log w_{\mathcal{X}_s}(\xi(\mathcal{X}_s \cdots \mathcal{X}_{s+t})) + \log w_{\mathcal{X}_s}(\xi_{L_{N_{s+2}}} \cdots \xi_{L_{N_{s+t}}}) \leq C_3 R (T_{N_{s+2}} - T_{N_s} + T_{N_{s+t+1}} - T_{N_{s+t}}).$$

Next fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let $s, t \geq 0$. Suppose $C_0, C_1, C_2 > 0$ are such that the bounds of Lemma 6.3 hold. Consider the following events:

$$E_1 := \{\tau_{\text{SR}}^{(R)} > s + t\}$$

$$E_2 := \{|L_{N_{s+t}} - L_{N_s} - \mathcal{A}t| \leq C_{\text{LR}}\sqrt{t}\}$$

with $C_{\text{LR}} = C_{\text{LR}}(\varepsilon) > 0$ to determine, and write $E := E_1 \cap E_2$. By Lemma 6.1 there exists $C_4 > 0$ such that $\mathbf{P}_O[E_1^c] \leq (s+t)e^{-C_4 R}$, whereas from the fluctuation bounds (35), $C_{\text{LR}}(\varepsilon)$ can be taken so that $\mathbb{P}_O[E_2^c] \leq \varepsilon$. Hence $\mathbb{P}_O[E^c] \leq \varepsilon + (s+t)e^{-C_4 R}$.

Then let $l_+ := \lceil \mathcal{A}t + C_{\text{LR}}\sqrt{t} \rceil$. On the event E , using (38) and Lemma 6.3

$$\left| \log w(\xi_{L_{N_{s+2}}} \cdots \xi_{L_{N_{s+t}}} \mid \xi_{L_{N_{s+1}}}) - \log \mathbf{P} \left[\xi_{L_{N_{s+2}}} \cdots \xi_{L_{N_{s+t}}} \in \xi' \mid \mathcal{X}, \xi'_{L_{N_{s+1}}} = \xi_{L_{N_{s+1}}} \right] \right| \leq C_0 l_+ e^{-C_1 L + C_2 R}.$$

Letting h' be the constant of Lemma 6.2, we claim then that for $h = h'/\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_\mu}[T_1]$ and some constant $C_h = C_h(\varepsilon)$

$$\left| -\log \mathbf{P} \left[\xi_{L_{N_{s+2}}} \cdots \xi_{L_{N_{s+t}}} \in \xi' \mid \mathcal{X}, \xi'_{L_{N_{s+1}}} = \xi_{L_{N_{s+1}}} \right] - ht \right| \leq C_h \sqrt{t}$$

with probability at least ε . This can be done using the same arguments as to prove Proposition 6.1, combining the fluctuations for N_{s+t} (35) with Lemma 6.2.

Finally, we are left with bounding the right hand side of (40). Using again the fluctuations for N_{s+t} (35) with the exponential tail of regeneration times, there exists $C_5 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} [T_{N_{s+1}} - T_{N_s} + T_{N_{s+t+1}} - T_{N_{s+t}} > L] \leq \varepsilon + \sqrt{s+t} e^{-C_5 L}.$$

All in all, we have thus proved that for some $C > 0$, with probability at least $1 - 2\varepsilon - 2(s+t)e^{-C(R \wedge L)}$,

$$|\log w_{\mathcal{X}_s}(\xi(\mathcal{X}_s \cdots \mathcal{X}_{s+t})) - ht| \leq C_h \sqrt{t} + C_0 l_+ e^{-C_1 L + C_2 R} + C_3 R L.$$

Since $l_+ = O_\varepsilon(\sqrt{t})$ this proves the result. □

7 First steps towards nice trajectories

In this section we come back to the finite setting and prove Lemmas 3.1, 3.2 and Proposition 3.1. These will be used in the next section to establish that if one looks the chain at time $s+t$ with $s = C \log \log n$ and $t = \log n/h + C_0 \sqrt{\log n}$, the last t steps form a nice path with high probability, for large enough C . At this stage if one gathered all the observations made so far about the trajectories of \mathcal{X} on a quasi-tree we could use the coupling with the finite setting of Section 2.5 to prove that for a fixed and hence typical starting state x , X_t is likely to follow a nice trajectory. To obtain results for arbitrary starting vertices, we need to strengthen the bounds on the annealed probability of bad events to $o(1/n)$, as explained in Section 2.1.

7.1 From $o(1)$ to $o(1/n)$: bootstrapping annealed bounds with parallel chains

The basic strategy is again to relate the quenched and annealed laws by means of Markov's inequality. By union bound, to show that a trajectorial event holds with high probability uniformly over the starting point under the quenched law, it suffices to show the complement event has annealed probability $o(1/n)$. Arguments used so far only established error in $o(1)$. Following ideas from [14, 15], one strategy to improve these error bounds to $o(1/n)$ consists in using higher order moments in Markov's inequality, which leads to an argument of "parallelizing chains" on the same environment. Namely for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \geq 1$, for any trajectorial event A

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[\max_{x \in V} \mathbf{P}_x [A] > \varepsilon \right] &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^k} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{x \in V} \mathbf{P}_x [A]^k \right] \\ &\leq \frac{n}{\varepsilon^k} \max_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_x \left[\bigcap_{i=1}^k \{X^{(i)} \in A\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(k)}$ are k versions of the chain X generated independently conditional on the same environment. These k trajectories can be generated sequentially with the environment, sampling the environment only when exploring parts of the environment not already visited by the previous chains. These annealed trajectories can then be studied thanks to a coupling with a quasi-tree, or rather a generalization of it, allowed to contain a cycle.

7.2 A more faithful coupling: quasi-trees with a cycle

The first error bound that need to be strengthened is in the coupling with a quasi-tree (Lemma 2.1). From the comparison with a binomial variable, we see that one long-range cycle must be allowed to obtain a $o(1/n)$ error bound. We thus need to consider a quasi-tree model which contains at most one long-range cycle.

Let $(u_i)_{i=0}^l, (v_i)_{i=0}^l, l \geq 1$ be two sequences of vertices in V such that $u_{i+1} \in B_{\text{SR}}(v_i, \infty)$ for all $i \in [0, l-1]$ and $B_{\text{SR}}(v_l, R) \cap B_{\text{SR}}(u_0, R) \neq \emptyset$. For every i and vertex $z \in B_{\text{SR}}(u_i, \infty) \setminus \{u_i, v_i\}$, add an edge $(z, \eta(z))$ and grow a one-sided quasi-tree rooted at $\eta(z)$. We call the oriented graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ obtained a quasi-tree with a cycle $((u_i, v_i))_{i=0}^l$. As a usual quasi-tree, it is given by maps ι, η such that ι identifies vertices of \mathcal{V} with vertices in V , while $\eta : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ is an involution. Here η is obtained by the corresponding maps in the quasi-trees outside the cycle whereas for the cycle we set $\eta(u_i) := v_{i+1}$ for all $i = 0, \dots, l-1$. A root O can be chosen, which does not to be on the cycle. The definition of the Markov chain \mathcal{X} (13) extends directly to this setting.

The coupling of Section 2.5 gives a natural way to couple \mathcal{X} on a random realization of \mathcal{G} with the Markov chain X : the rejection scheme is used until the first occurrence of a cycle, after which cycles are ignored in the construction of \mathcal{G} . The stochastic comparison in the proof of Lemma 2.1 still holds, but using now that

$$\mathbb{P}[Z \geq 2] \leq \frac{m^4 \Delta^{2R}}{n^2} \quad (42)$$

if Z is a binomial $\text{Bin}(m, m\Delta^R/n)$, we deduce that for $t = n^{o(1)}$, chains X and \mathcal{X} can be coupled so that the chains coincide and $B_{\text{LR}}(X_s, L)$ and $B_{\text{LR}}(\mathcal{X}_s, L)$ are isomorphic for all $s \leq t$, with probability $1 - o(1/n)$. More generally, let $k \geq 1$ and $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(k)}$, resp. $\mathcal{X}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{X}^{(k)}$, k versions of the chain X , resp. \mathcal{X} generated independently conditional on the same environment. Letting $G^*(k, t), \mathcal{G}(k, t)$ be the environments generated explored by these trajectories up to time t along with their L -long-range neighbourhoods, the same arguments as above implies that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\begin{array}{l} G^*(k, t) \text{ and } \mathcal{G}(k, t) \text{ are isomorphic} \\ \forall i \in [1, k], \forall s \leq t : X_s^{(i)} = \iota(\mathcal{X}_s^{(i)}) \end{array} \right] = 1 - o((kt)^4/n^{7/4}) = o(\varepsilon^k/n) \quad (43)$$

if for instance $k = \lfloor \log n / 2 \log \varepsilon^{-1} \rfloor$ and $t = o(n^{1/16})$.

7.3 Quasi-tree-like trajectories

Consider \mathcal{G} to be a random realization of a quasi-tree with a cycle as described above and \mathcal{X} the associated Markov chain. Conditional on the cycle, the quasi-trees that are added to it are generated according to the model studied in Sections 4 - 6, therefore the asymptotic analysis of the chain \mathcal{X} directly extends to that case, conditional on the cycle. The chain ultimately leaves the cycle, after which it stays in a genuine quasi-tree. Given a vertex x which is not on the cycle, let $q_{\text{Esc}}(x)$ denote the probability to escape in the corresponding quasi-tree. If x is on the cycle, there is no quasi-tree at x , so let $q_{\text{Esc}}(x)$ denote the probability of escaping through one of the vertices that are in the same component as x . Using that components of V_1 have size at least 3 (H3), these escape probabilities can be bounded exactly as in Section 4, up to a change of constants, conditional on the cycle. Thus from Proposition 4.1, all escape probabilities can be lower bounded by a constant q_0 regardless of the realization of \mathcal{G} . From this we can now prove Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Start with the first point. By Remark 3.1 we need only to establish the result for $s = C \log \log n$, $C > 0$ being a constant to determine. Let $L = C_L \log \log n$ for a fixed constant $C_L > 0$ and $t \ll n^{1/16}$. We use the strategy of "parallelized chains". Consider $k \geq 1$ chains $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(k)}$ and for all $i \in [k]$ consider the event

$$A_i := \{\exists t' \in [s, s+t] : B_{\text{LR}}(X_{s'}^{(i)}, L) \text{ is not quasi-tree-like}\}.$$

As explained above, the chains $X^{(i)}$ can be coupled with k chains $\mathcal{X}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{X}^{(k)}$ evolving independently on a quasi-tree with a cycle \mathcal{G} . Let

$$B_i := \{\exists t' \in [s, s+t] : B_{\text{LR}}(\mathcal{X}_{s'}^{(i)}, L) \text{ is not quasi-tree-like}\}.$$

Taking $k := \lfloor \log n / 2 \log(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor$ and given our choice of s, t , (43) holds and the trajectories can be coupled up to time $s+t$ along with their depth L long-range neighbourhood. Combined with (41), we deduce it suffices to show $\mathbb{P}_O \left[\bigcap_{i=1}^k B_i \mid \iota(O) = x \right] = o(\varepsilon^k/n)$, for any $x \in V$. We can actually prove a quenched statement, which is stronger: we claim that for any realization of \mathcal{G} , $\mathbf{P}_O[B_1] = o(1)$. Since the chains are independent conditional on \mathcal{G} , this implies $\mathbf{P}_O[B] = o(1)^k = o(\varepsilon^k/n)$. The claim is based on the fact that escape probabilities are lower bounded uniformly by some constant by Proposition 4.1. Using that s and L are of the same order, there exists a value of C and $C' > 0$ such for any starting vertex, by time s , the chain already has made L steps of the loop-erased chain with quenched probability at least $1 - e^{-C'L} = 1 - o(1)$. The chain is thus confined to stay at a distance at least L from the cycle, which obviously implies having a quasi-tree-like neighbourhood as \mathcal{G} contains no other cycle.

Let us prove the second point. Consider $t = C_0 \log n$ for some arbitrarily small constant $C_0 > 0$ and let $l = \lfloor \log n / 10 \log \Delta \rfloor$. Using the same coupling as above and a comparison with a binomial random variable we deduce that with high probability the neighbourhood $B_{\mathcal{G}}(x, 2l)$ around any vertex x in G^* contains at most one long-range cycle. It is thus a potential realization of a $2l$ neighbourhood of a point O in a quasi-tree with a cycle \mathcal{G} . The two chains X and \mathcal{X} can then be coupled until they exit this neighbourhood, which cannot occur before time t if for instance $C_0 < (10 \log \Delta)^{-1}/2$. Considering any such realization of \mathcal{G} , all escape probabilities are lower bounded by some constant $q_0 > 0$. Using Chernoff's bound we deduce that for some constant $\alpha = \alpha(q_0, C_0) > 0$, the quenched probability that \mathcal{X}_t , and consequently X_t , is at distance less than αl from the cycle is exponentially small in l . □

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and a starting state $u \in V$. Let $s = \log \log n$, $t = \Theta(\log n)$. By a slight abuse of notation, let $\Gamma(R, L, M)$ denote also the set of paths in a quasi-tree with a cycle \mathcal{G} that satisfy the same requirements, regeneration being here understood as having infinite horizon. Clearly regeneration times for \mathcal{X} with infinite horizon are also regeneration times with L horizon. Thus under the coupling described above, a sufficient condition to have $X_s \cdots X_{s+t} \in \Gamma(R, L, M)$ is that the coupling did not fail by time $s+t$ and $\mathcal{X}_s \cdots \mathcal{X}_{s+t} \in \Gamma(R, L, M)$. Let $k := \lfloor \log n / 2 \log(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor$ and consider k independent versions $\mathcal{X}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{X}^{(k)}$ of the chain \mathcal{X} evolving on \mathcal{G} . For all $i \in [k]$ consider the event

$$B_i := \{(\mathcal{X}_s^{(i)} \cdots \mathcal{X}_{s+t}^{(i)}) \notin \Gamma(R, L, M)\}.$$

The choice of k implies $\varepsilon^k = \Theta(n^{-1/2})$ so (43) holds, hence by (41) it suffices to show

$$\mathbb{P}_O \left[\bigcap_{i=1}^k B_i \mid \iota(O) = u \right] = o(\varepsilon^k/n).$$

As in the previous proof, the independence of the chains conditional on \mathcal{G} makes it suffices to prove $\mathbf{P}_O [B_1] = o(1)$, for all realization of \mathcal{G} .

Let us prove this claim. For large enough constants C_R, C_L , paths that are not in $\Gamma(R, L, M)$ because they hit the boundary of a small-range ball or because of backtracking have quenched probability $o(1)$ by Lemma 6.1. On the other hand, from the quenched exponential tails of regeneration times (Lemma 5.1), there exists $C_M > 0$ large enough such that if $M \geq C_M \log \log n$, for all $k \geq 1$, $\mathbf{P}_O [T_{k+1} - T_k \geq M] = o(1/\log n) = o((s+t)^{-1})$. Thus by union bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_O [\exists t' \leq s+t : [t', t'+M] \cap \{T_k, k \geq 1\} = \emptyset] \\ \leq \mathbf{P}_O [\exists k \leq s+t : T_{k+1} - T_k \geq M] \\ \leq (s+t) \max_{k \leq s+t} \mathbf{P}_O [T_{k+1} - T_k \geq M], \end{aligned}$$

which is $o(1)$ by what precedes. \square

7.4 Concentration of drift and entropy from an arbitrary vertex

The next step is to prove concentration of the drift and entropy.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let $L := C_L \log \log n$, $R = C_R \log \log n$, $s = C_0 \log \log n$ for some $C_R, C_L, C_0 > 0$ to determine, and $t = O(\log n)$, $t \rightarrow \infty$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and a starting state $u \in V$. Let $k := \lfloor \log n / 2 \log(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor$ and consider k independent versions $\mathcal{X}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{X}^{(k)}$ of the chain \mathcal{X} evolving on the same quasi-tree with a cycle \mathcal{G} , started at some vertex O such that $\iota(O) = u$. For constants $C_{\text{LR}} = C_{\text{LR}(\varepsilon)}$, $C_h = C_h(\varepsilon)$ to determine, let

$$\Gamma_{\text{Ent}} := \left\{ \mathbf{p} \mid \begin{array}{l} \|\xi(\mathbf{p})\| - \mathcal{d} \|\mathbf{p}\| \leq C_{\text{LR}} \sqrt{|\mathbf{p}|} \\ |-\log w_{\mathbf{p}_0, R, L}(\xi(\mathbf{p})) - h \|\mathbf{p}\| \leq C_h \sqrt{|\mathbf{p}|} \end{array} \right\}$$

where \mathbf{p}_0 denotes the starting vertex of the chain. This definition can be applied to both paths in G^* and \mathcal{G} , using the two notions of weights in G^* (15) and \mathcal{G} (37). Furthermore long-range distances and weights computed on a trajectory up to time $s+t$ are measurable with respect to the graphs $G^*(k, s+t)$ and $\mathcal{G}(k, s+t)$ and give the same quantity if computed on a common path, when these graphs are isomorphic. Using the coupling described in this section, the choice of k implies $\varepsilon^k = \Theta(n^{-1/2})$ so (43) holds, the two graphs are isomorphic and the trajectories $(X_{t'}^{(i)})_{t' \leq s+t} = \left(\iota(\mathcal{X}_{t'}^{(i)}) \right)_{t' \leq s+t}$ coincide with probability $1 - o(\varepsilon^k/n)$. For all $j \in [k]$, consider the event

$$B_j := \bigcap_{i=1}^j \{ \mathcal{X}_s^{(i)} \dots \mathcal{X}_{s+t}^{(i)} \notin \Gamma_{\text{Ent}} \}.$$

Combining (41) and (43) it is sufficient to prove $\mathbb{P}_O [B_k \mid \iota(O) = u] = o(\varepsilon^k/n)$. We claim that for adequate constants $C_{\text{LR}}(\varepsilon), C_h(\varepsilon)$,

$$\mathbb{P}_O [B_1 \mid \iota(O) = u] \leq \varepsilon^3/2 + o(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}_O [B_j \mid \iota(O) = u, B_{j-1}] \leq \varepsilon^3/2 + o(1)$$

for all $j \in [2, k]$. Noting that

$$\mathbb{P}_O [B_k \mid \iota(O) = u] = \mathbb{P}_O [B_1 \mid \iota(O) = u] \prod_{j=2}^k \mathbb{P}_O [B_j \mid \iota(O) = u, B_{j-1}],$$

the claims imply that $\mathbb{P} [B_k \mid \iota(O) = u] = (\varepsilon^3/2 + o(1))^k = o(\varepsilon^k/n)$ as desired.

Let us prove the claims. As mentioned already, results proved for genuine quasi-trees extend to the case where an additional cycle is present. In particular, the first regeneration time and level, defined to occur outside the cycle, have stretched exponential or exponential tail respectively, conditional on the cycle, while the remaining regenerations occurs on genuine quasi-trees. This is sufficient to establish that Proposition 6.1 and Lemma 6.4 still hold in this case, implying that $\mathbb{P} [B_1 \mid \iota(O) = u] \leq \varepsilon^3/2$ for a good choice of $C_h, C_{LR}(\varepsilon)$.

Let us prove the second claim. Let $j \geq 2$, suppose B_{j-1} holds and let $(\xi_m^{(j)})_m$ denote the loop-erased chain obtained from $\mathcal{X}^{(j)}$. Consider two long-range edges e, f that have an endpoint in a common small-range component. Then using that the escape probability is everywhere lower bounded by some constant $q_0 > 0$, there exists $c = c(q_0)$

$$\mathbf{P} [\xi_{m+1} = f \mid \xi_m = e] \leq 1 - c,$$

unless f is the only long-range edge accessible from e . Since components corresponding to a communicating class of V_1 have at least three vertices, we deduce the existence of a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that for all long-range path ζ of length l

$$\mathbf{P} [\xi_l^{(j)} = \zeta_l] \leq e^{-C_1 l}$$

provided l is large enough. Now since $\mathcal{G}(j-1, s+t)$ contains at most one long-range cycle this subgraph contains at most $2k(s+t)$ long-range paths. By union bound the probability that the loop-erased trace $\xi^{(j)}$ follows one of these paths up to length l is thus bounded by $2k(s+t)e^{-C_2 l} = o(1)$ if $l > 2C_2^{-1} \log \log n$.

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{X}^{(j)}$ does not have its loop-erased trace follow one of these paths, then it must exit $\mathcal{G}(j-1, s+t)$ for the last time before the chain reaches distance l . We need to relate this distance with a time. We already used the argument in the proof of Lemma 3.1: the lower bound on escape probabilities implies that for some constants $C_3, C_4 > 0$,

$$\mathbf{P}_O [d_{LR}(O, \mathcal{X}_s^{(j)}) \leq l] \leq e^{-C_4 l}.$$

if $s \geq C_3 l$. All in all taking the constant $C_0 > 2C_3 C_2^{-1}$ yields that with high probability the trajectory $(\mathcal{X}_{t'}^{(j)})_{t' \leq s+t}$ contains at least t steps after the last exit of $\mathcal{G}(j-1, s+t)$. Let $L^{(j)}$ denote now this last exit time. Conditional on $L^{(j)}$, the quasi-tree that contains the subsequent trajectory needs then to be generated conditional on the chain not going back. Since the latter probability is lower bounded by q_0 , this only affects by a constant factor the usual law the quasi-tree. Thus an appropriate choice of the constants $C_h, C_{LR}(\varepsilon)$ yields $\mathbb{P}_O [B_j \mid \iota(O) = u, B_{j-1}] \leq \varepsilon^3/2 + o(1)$, using the Proposition 6.1 and Lemma 6.4 with the fact that the trajectory outside $\mathcal{G}(j-1, s+t)$ contains at least t steps. \square

8 Approximation by nice paths: proof of Proposition 3.2

We now move to proof of Proposition 3.2: the approximation of the Markov kernel by nice paths. For earlier works that used this argument, see for instance [8, 14].

8.1 Forward neighbourhood

Nice paths between x and y have their first steps and last steps contained respectively in some quasi-tree-like neighbourhoods of x and y . We define here the forward neighbourhood of x .

Let $x \in V$, $l \geq L$ an integer and $w_{\min} \geq 0$. The forward graph $K(x, l, w_{\min})$ is designed essentially as a "spanning quasi-tree" of the ball $B_{\text{LR}}(x, l)$, obtained by exploring this ball algorithmically, giving priority to paths with large weights and truncating whenever cycles are encountered. This process will thus build iteratively a sequence $(K_m)_{m=0}^\tau$ of subsets of $B_{\text{LR}}(x, l)$, until it stops at a random time τ to yield $K(x, l, w_{\min}) := K_\tau$. Unless the procedure is initiated at a vertex x whose ball $B_{\text{LR}}(x, L)$ is not quasi-tree-like, K_m remains at all time quasi-tree-like. In this case for every long-range edge $e \in E_m$ there exists a unique long-range path $\xi(e)$ from x to e contained in K_m . Define its cumulative weight as $\hat{w}(e) := w_x(\xi(e))$. Because weights require the knowledge of $(L - 1)$ -neighbourhoods, the exploration queue will consist in subsets E_m of long-range edges for which the whole long-range $(L - 1)$ -neighbourhood is contained in K_m , so that cumulative weights can be computed from K_m only. Finally, a constraint of minimal weights is added during the procedure, in order to keep the number of vertices explored as $o(n)$.

Exploration of the forward neighbourhood The procedure is initiated with $K_0 := B_{\text{LR}}(x, L)$. If K_0 contains a long-range cycle, $E_0 := \emptyset$ and the procedure stops. Otherwise let E_0 be the set of long-range edges at distance 0 from x . Then for all $m \geq 0$ the $(m + 1)$ -th step goes as follows:

1. Among all long-range edges e in E_m at long-range depth at most $l - L$ from x in K_m and such that $\hat{w}(e) \geq w_{\min}$, pick the edge e_{m+1} with maximal cumulative weight, using an arbitrary ordering of the vertices to break ties. If there is no such edge, the procedure stops.
2. Explore the depth- L neighbourhood of e_{m+1} : for each descendant $z \in \partial K_m$ at long-range distance $L - 1$ from e_{m+1} , reveal $\eta(z)$. This exploration phase stops if a revealed edge violates the quasi-tree structure: this occurs if for some z the small-range ball $B_{\text{SR}}(\eta(z), R)$ has a non-empty intersection with K_m or one of the previously revealed balls.
3. If the previous exploration phase stopped because of intersecting small-range balls, then $E_{m+1} := E_m \setminus \{e_{m+1}\}$ and $K_{m+1} := K_m$. If it stopped because of an intersection with K_m , let Z_m be this intersection. Then E_{m+1} is obtained by deleting from E_m every long-range edge which has either a descendant or an ancestor in Z_m , as well as the edge e_{m+1} , and set $K_{m+1} := K_m$. Finally, if the exploration ended without a violation of the quasi-tree structure, add the subsequent long-range edges of e_{m+1} to E_{m+1} , whereas the newly revealed vertices are added to K_{m+1} .

When the procedure ends, the set E_τ consists by construction of edges at long-range distance $l - L$ from x , which contain no long-range cycles in their $(L - 1)$ -neighbourhood and whose weights are measurable with respect to $K(x, l, w_{\min})$.

Lemma 8.1. *Let κ_m denote the number of long-range edges revealed during the first m steps and $\kappa(x, l, w_{\min}) := \kappa_\tau$ the total number of long-range edges revealed during the construction of $K(x, l, w_{\min})$. Suppose $B_{\text{LR}}(x, L)$ is quasi-tree-like so that $\tau \geq 1$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $m \in [1, \tau]$*

$$\hat{w}(e_m) \leq C \frac{l \Delta^{RL}}{\kappa_m}. \quad (44)$$

In particular

$$\kappa(x, l, w_{\min}) \leq C \frac{l \Delta^{RL}}{w_{\min}}. \quad (45)$$

Proof. The set $E_{\leq m} := \bigcup_{k \leq m} E_k$ is the set of all long-range edges contained in K_m which have their L long-range neighbourhood contained in K_m . Furthermore, at time m the procedure did not explore beyond long-range distance $(L - 1)$ from these edges. Since long-range balls of radius L contain $O(\Delta^{R(L+1)})$ vertices, one has $\kappa_m \leq C |E_{\leq m}| \Delta^{RL}$ for some constant $C > 0$.

The quasi-tree structure implies the set E can be arranged as a rooted tree, where long-range edges are linked to a same vertex if they are at long-range distance 0 from each other. The set E_m is the set of edges furthest from the root, that is edges that lead to leaves. For every $e \in E_m$, there is a unique shortest path from the root to e , and conversely every edge is on such a path. These paths correspond to long-range paths in K_m from x to e , which have long-range length at most l , so we can deduce $|E_{\leq m}| \leq l |E_m|$.

On the other hand, the sum of weights over all shortest long-range paths from the root to E_m is bounded by 1. Furthermore, the choice of a maximal weight in step 1 ensures that the weights consecutively chosen are non-increasing. Therefore every shortest path from the root to E_m has weight at least $\hat{w}(e_m)$, so we deduce $|E_m| \hat{w}(e_m) \leq 1$. All in all this shows $\kappa_m \leq Cl \Delta^{RL} / \hat{w}(e_m)$. Finally, $\hat{w}(e_m) \geq w_{\min}$ for all m , in particular when the procedure stops at $m = \tau$, hence the bound on $\kappa_\tau = \kappa(x, l, w_{\min})$. \square

The following Lemma will bound the probability to exit $K(x, l, w_{\min})$ at an edge where the quasi-tree structure was violated.

Lemma 8.2. *If $m > \tau$, let $\text{cycle}(e_{m+1})$ be the event that the exploration of the $(L + 1)$ neighbourhood of the long-range edge $e_{m+1} \in E_m$ considered at the $(m + 1)$ -th step revealed a cycle. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Consider the following process. If $B_{\text{LR}}(x, L)$ is not quasi-tree-like, let $W_m := 1$ for all $m \geq 0$, otherwise set $W_0 := 0$ and for all $m \geq 0$ define*

$$W_{m+1} := W_m + (\hat{w}(e_{m+1}) \wedge \varepsilon/2) \mathbb{1}_{m < \tau} \mathbb{1}_{\text{cycle}(e_{m+1})}.$$

This is the total cumulative weight of edges that violated the quasi-tree structure at step $m + 1$ and that are below $\varepsilon/2$. Suppose $l = O(\log n)$, $R, L = O(\log \log n)$ and that $w_{\min} \geq e^{(\log \log n)^3} / n$. Then for all $s = s(n)$, with high probability, for all $x \in V$,

$$W_\tau \leq W_s + \varepsilon. \quad (46)$$

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $x \in V$ and $s = s(n)$. Suppose $B_{\text{LR}}(x, L)$ is quasi-tree-like, otherwise the result is trivial. Let $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \geq 0}$ be the standard filtration of the random graphs $(K_m)_m$. The choice of the edge e_{m+1} is \mathcal{F}_m -measurable. Averaging conditional on \mathcal{F}_m , the generation of the $L + 1$ long-range neighbourhood of the edge e_{m+1} requires the sampling of at most Δ^{RL} long-range edges.

For the first edge, there are exactly $n - \kappa_m$ possibilities. The quasi-tree structure is violated if an edge is sampled whose endpoint is at small-range distance at most R from a previous ball explored in the same phase or from K_m . In this case it is necessarily at small-range distance at most R from a long-range edge of K_m . Hence the conditional probability of $\text{cycle}(e_{m+1})$ is upper bounded by $\Delta^R(\Delta^{RL} + \kappa_m)/(n - \kappa_m - \Delta^{RL})$. Since $K_0 := B_{\text{LR}}(x, L)$ and the sets K_m are increasing, $\kappa_m \geq \Delta^{RL}$ thus we can bound the conditional probability

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{cycle}(e_{m+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_m] \leq \frac{2\Delta^{R(L+1)}\kappa_m}{n - 2\kappa_m}.$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E}[W_{m+1} - W_m \mid \mathcal{F}_m] = \mathbb{1}_{m < \tau} \hat{w}(e_m) \mathbb{P}[\text{cycle}(e_{m+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_m]$$

(44) implies for some constant $C > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[W_{m+1} - W_m \mid \mathcal{F}_m] &\leq \mathbb{1}_{m < \tau} \frac{Cl\Delta^{R(2L+1)}}{n - 2\kappa_\tau}, \\ \mathbb{E}[(W_{m+1} - W_m)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_m] &\leq \mathbb{1}_{m < \tau} \frac{Cl^2\Delta^{R(3L+1)}}{\kappa_m(n - 2\kappa_\tau)} \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, since every iteration of the procedure reveals at least one long-range edge, $\kappa_m \geq \Delta^{RL} + m$, in particular $\tau \leq \kappa_\tau$, hence summing over m yields

$$\begin{aligned} a &:= \sum_{m=s}^{\tau-1} \mathbb{E}[W_{m+1} - W_m \mid \mathcal{F}_m] \leq C' \kappa_\tau \frac{l\Delta^{R(2L+1)}}{n - 2\kappa_\tau}, \\ b &:= \sum_{m=s}^{\tau-1} \mathbb{E}[(W_{m+1} - W_m)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_m] \leq C' \log(\kappa_\tau) \frac{l^2\Delta^{R(3L+1)}}{n - 2\kappa_\tau} \end{aligned}$$

for some other constant $C' > 0$. Using (45), the assumptions made on the different parameters imply that $a = o(1)$ and $b = n^{-1+o(1)}$. Consider now the martingale M_k defined by

$$M_k := \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \left(W_k - W_s - \sum_{m=s}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[W_{m+1} - W_m \mid \mathcal{F}_m] \right).$$

Its increments are bounded by 1 and by construction $W_\tau - W_s = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} M_\tau + a$. Since $a = o(1)$, we infer that for large enough n

$$\mathbb{P}[W_\tau - W_s > 2\varepsilon] \leq \mathbb{P}[M_\tau > 2] \leq \mathbb{P}[\exists k > 0 : M_k > 2].$$

Thus we can apply Theorem 1.6 of [35] to bound

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists k > 0 : M_k > 2] \leq e^2 \left(\frac{4b/\varepsilon}{2 + 4b/\varepsilon} \right)^{2+4b/\varepsilon} \leq (2b\varepsilon^{-2})^2.$$

Since $b = n^{-1+o(1)}$, the right hand side is $o(1/n)$. \square

8.2 Nice paths: definition

We now define nice paths in order to prove Proposition 3.2. For the rest of this section set

$$R := C_R \log \log n, \quad C_L := C_L \log \log n, \quad M := C_M \log \log n$$

where $C_R, C_L, C_M > 0$ are constants chosen large enough so that the conclusion of Lemma 3.2 holds. By the second point of Lemma 3.1, there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that with high probability, from any starting point the chain has \mathcal{P} quasi-tree-like neighbourhood of radius $\lfloor \alpha \log n \rfloor$ after $\log n / 2h$ steps. Fix $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ for the rest of this section. In the sequel, we consider several constants C_0, \dots, C_5 , defined in terms of the constants $C_{LR}(\epsilon), C_h(\epsilon)$ of Proposition 3.1, which can in particular depend on ϵ . They are indexed in the reverse order in which they are fixed, so C_0 is chosen after C_1 , which is chosen after C_2 , etc. Let

$$t := \left\lfloor \frac{\log n}{h} + C_0 \sqrt{\log n} \right\rfloor, \quad s := \lfloor \alpha \log n \rfloor \wedge \left\lfloor \frac{\log n}{10h} \right\rfloor, \quad l_1 := \mathcal{d}(t - s) - C_4 \sqrt{t} \quad (47)$$

$$w_{\min} := e^{-h(t-s) - C_h \sqrt{t}} \quad w_{\max} := e^{-ht + C_1 \sqrt{t}}.$$

Given $x, y \in V, r \in \mathbb{N}/2, L \leq r \leq M$ and $l_3 \in [\mathcal{d}s - C_5 \sqrt{s}, \mathcal{d}s + C_5 \sqrt{s}]$, consider the following three-stage exploration of the environment:

1. Explore $K = K(x, l_1, w_{\min})$ as explained in the previous section. Let $E := E_\tau$ be the set of long-range edge remaining in the exploration queue at the end of the procedure, and consider the set E' of boundary vertices at long-range distance l_1 from x_0 , whose image under η is yet to determine.
2. Explore the backward neighbourhood $B = B(y, r + s, l_3) := B_{\mathcal{P}}(y, r + s) \cap B_{LR}(y, l_3)$.
3. Finally, reveal everything else.

It will be crucial in the sequel to control the numbers N_1, N_2 of long-range edges revealed during the two first stages. By definition $N_1 := \kappa(x, l_1, w_{\min})$. Observe that for any $\epsilon' < \alpha h \wedge \frac{1}{10}$, $h(t - s) < (1 - \epsilon') \log n + O(\sqrt{\log n})$. Thus by (45),

$$N_1 = O(l_1 \Delta^{RL} e^{h(t-s) + C_h \sqrt{t}}) = O(\log n \Delta^{C_R C_L (\log \log n)^2} n^{1-\epsilon'} e^{C \sqrt{\log n}})$$

for some constant C . The cardinality of B is bounded by that of $B_{\mathcal{P}}(y, r + s)$. Up to choosing $\alpha < (10 \log \Delta)^{-1}$, this is $O(\Delta^{r+s}) = O(n^{2/10})$ as $r \leq M = O(\log \log n)$. All in all, for any $\epsilon' < \alpha h \wedge \frac{1}{10}$,

$$N_1 = O(n^{1-\epsilon'}), \quad N_2 = O(n^{2/10}). \quad (48)$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_{r,l}$ be the σ -algebra generated by the long-range edges revealed during the two first stages. Unless the procedure stopped immediately K is quasi-tree-like, so a non-backtracking long-range path ξ from x to E' entirely contained in K must cross a unique edge of E . Let ξ_E denote this edge and define $w_E(\xi) := w_{x,R,L}(\xi_1 \cdots \xi_E)$. This is essentially the weight $w_x(\xi)$, but where the last steps of the path were truncated to keep a weight that is $\mathcal{F}_{r,l}$ -measurable.

In B , let F' be the set of boundary vertices which are at long-range distance exactly l from y , for which the shortest long-range path to y is unique and has a tree-like neighbourhood in $B_{\mathcal{P}}(y, r + s)$, that is $B \cap B_{LR}(z, L)$ contains no long-range cycle for all vertex z on this path. Consider now the set F of long-range edges in B that are at long-range distance $L - 1$ from F' . If ξ is a non-backtracking long-range path from F' to y , let ξ_F denote the unique edge of F crossed by ξ and ξ_{F+1} the subsequent edge. Set $w_F(\xi) := w_{\xi_F^+, R, L}(\xi_{F+1} \cdots \xi_{|\xi|-L+1})$, where ξ_F^+ is the endpoint of ξ_F closest from y . Here we truncate the path at both ends: the first steps to have a $\mathcal{F}_{r,l}$ -measurable weight but also the last steps, as the trajectories considered afterwards end at y .

Definition 8.1. Given $r \in \mathbb{N}/2$, $r \leq M$ and $l \in [ds - C_5\sqrt{\log n}, ds + C_5\sqrt{\log n}]$ let $\mathfrak{N}_{r,l}^t(x, y)$ be the set of length t paths \mathbf{p} between x and y such that

- (i) $\mathbf{p} \in \Gamma(R, L, M)$
- (ii) \mathbf{p} can be decomposed as the concatenation $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}_1\mathbf{p}_2\mathbf{p}_3$ of three paths such that: \mathbf{p}_1 is a path from x to E' entirely contained in $K(x, l_1, w_{\min})$, whose endpoint is the only vertex of E' it contains (which implies that it starts and ends with a long-range step),
- (iii) \mathbf{p}_2 is a path between E' and F' which starts with a small-range step but ends with a long-range step such that

$$C_3\sqrt{\log n} \leq |\mathbf{p}_2| \leq C_2\sqrt{\log n}.$$

for some $C_2, C_3 > 0$ and the endpoint of \mathbf{p}_2 is the only vertex of $B(y, r + s, l)$ it contains.

- (iv) \mathbf{p}_3 is a path of length $r + s$ from F' to y entirely contained in $B(y, r + s, l)$, which starts and ends with a small-range step and does not contain any regeneration edge in its first r steps,
- (v) $w_E(\xi(\mathbf{p}_1))w_F(\xi(\mathbf{p}_3)) \leq w_{\max}$.

In the sequel we consider

$$\mathcal{P}_{r,l}^t(x, y) := \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathfrak{N}_{r,l}^t(x, y)} \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{p}).$$

The complete set of nice paths is obtained by taking the union over parameters r, l , namely

$$\mathfrak{N}^t(x, y) := \bigcup_{\substack{r \leq M \\ r \in \mathbb{N}+1/2}} \bigcup_{l=ds-C_5\sqrt{s}}^{ds+C_5\sqrt{s}} \mathfrak{N}_{r,l}(x, y).$$

and the total probability of nice paths by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}}^t(x, y) := \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathfrak{N}^t(x, y)} \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{p})$.

Conditions (i) and (ii) allow to relate the probability of following a nice path with the weight constraint (v): thanks to the tree structure of $K(x, l_1)$, each vertex in E' has a unique ancestor edge in E . Given $e \in E$, let $E'(e)$ denote the set of vertices in E' with ancestor e and recall $\xi(e)$ is the unique non-backtracking long-range path from x to e . Similarly for $f \in F$, let $F'(f)$ be the set of vertices of F' from which the unique non-backtracking long-range path to y goes through f and $\xi(f)$ the unique non-backtracking long-range path from f^+ to y (which thus does not include f). Then for a fixed total long-range length l :

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p}: \xi(\mathbf{p}_1)_{E'}=e \\ \xi(\mathbf{p}_3)_{F'}=f \\ |\xi(\mathbf{p})|=l}} \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{p}) &\leq \sum_{\substack{\xi: \xi_{E'}=e \\ \xi_{F'}=f, \\ |\xi|=l}} \mathbf{P}_x[\xi(X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_l})_{\leq l-L+1} = \xi, (X_0 \cdots X_{\tau_l}) \in \Gamma(R, L, M)] \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{\xi: \xi_{E'}=e \\ \xi_{F'}=f, \\ |\xi|=l}} w_{x,R,L}(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 3.3. For each ξ in the sum,

$$\begin{aligned} w_{x,R,L}(\xi) &= w_{x,R,L}(\xi_1 \cdots \xi_E) w_{\xi_E^+, R, L}(\xi_{E+1} \cdots \xi_F) w_{\xi_F^+, R, L}(\xi_{F+1} \cdots \xi_{l-L+1}) \\ &= w_E(\xi_1 \cdots \xi_E) w_{\xi_E^+, R, L}(\xi_{E+1} \cdots \xi_F) w_F(\xi_{F+1} \cdots \xi_{l-L+1}) \end{aligned}$$

Observe now that for fixed e and f the first and third factors are fixed as well and determined by $\xi(\mathbf{p}_1), \xi(\mathbf{p}_3)$, so the sum is only over the steps $\xi_{E+1} \cdots \xi_{F-1}$. Since weights sum up to 1, we can also sum over l and bound

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p}: \xi(\mathbf{p}_1) = \xi_1 \\ \xi(\mathbf{p}_3) = \xi_3}} \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{p}) \leq w_{\max} \quad (49)$$

thanks to the weight constraint (v). In words: the total probability of nice paths with prescribed long-range edges in E and F is upper bounded by w_{\max} .

8.3 Nice paths are typical

We now prove the first point of Proposition 3.2. Let $s' = C \log \log n$ and $t = \log n/h + C_0(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\log n}$: we need to prove that the last t steps of a length $s' + t$ trajectory are nice with quenched probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$. There are several properties to check. Since there are finitely many of them, once a property is shown to hold with probability $1 - o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ or $1 - \varepsilon$ we can automatically assume it is satisfied when checking the remaining properties. Write $t' := s' + t$ to simplify notation.

We already proved in Lemma 3.2 that a failure of the requirement $(X_{s'} \cdots X_{t'}) \in \Gamma(R, L, M)$ occurs with probability $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. For fixed r, l the very definition of the backward neighbourhood $B(r, r + s, l)$ implies that it necessarily contains the last $r - s$ steps of the trajectory provided they have the prescribed long-range length l . Summing over r and l , the constraint that \mathbf{p}_2 only has its last endpoint in the backward neighbourhood while \mathbf{p}_3 is contained in it amounts to conditioning by the last regeneration time occurring before s . In particular this requires the existence of a regeneration time in the interval $[t' - s - M, t' - s]$ but this is exactly ensured by the fact that $(X_{s'} \cdots X_{t'}) \in \Gamma(R, L, M)$. Assume now this property hold and let $T_{F'}$ denote the last regeneration before time $t' - s$. The remaining obstructions to following a nice paths are:

1. the first steps of $(X_{s'} \cdots X_{t'})$ are not contained in $K = K(X_{s'}, l, w_{\min})$, which occurs if $B_{\text{LR}}(X_{s'}, L)$ is not quasi-tree-like. This occurs with probability $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ by Lemma 3.1.
2. from $X_{s'}$, the chain leaves K before it reaches long-range distance l_1 , which occurs if:
 - the loop-erased trace exits K through the L long-range neighbourhood of an edge e which satisfied $\hat{w}(e) < w_{\min}$: since cumulative weights along a path are non-increasing this implies $-\log w(\xi(X_{s'} \cdots X_{t'-s})) > -\log w_{\min} = h(t-s) + C_h\sqrt{t}$ which occurs with probability less than ε by Proposition 3.1.
 - the chain crosses an edge which violated the quasi-tree structure. Recall the process considered in Lemma 8.2. As mentioned above we can suppose $B_{\text{LR}}(X_{s'}, L)$ is quasi-tree-like. Then by Proposition 3.1, the total probability of paths with long-range length L and weights above $\varepsilon/2$ is $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Thus up to this $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ error the quantity W_{κ} considered in the lemma exactly counts the probability to exit K at an edge which violated the tree structure. Thanks to the choice of w_{\min} (47) the lemma establishes that with high probability, $W_{\kappa} \leq W_{\lfloor L/2 \rfloor} + \varepsilon$ for any value of $X_{s'}$. However $W_{\lfloor L/2 \rfloor} = 0$ as $B_{\text{LR}}(X_{s'}, L)$ is quasi-tree-like.
3. the path from $X_{t'-s-T_{F'}}$ to y is not unique or its long-range length is not in the interval $[\mathcal{d}s - C_5\sqrt{\log n}, \mathcal{d}s + C_5\sqrt{\log n}]$. If this path is not unique, this implies in particular that

the ball $B(X_{t'-s-M}, t' - s - M)$ is not quasi-tree-like. Since $M = O(s)$ Lemma 3.1 shows this occurs with probability $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. For the long-range distance requirement, Proposition 3.1 shows that $|\xi(X_{t'-s} \dots X_{t'}) - \mathcal{d}s| \leq C_{\text{LR}}\sqrt{s}$ with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$. Then note that the long-range distance traveled in the intervals $[T_{F'}, t']$ and $[t' - s, t']$ differ by at most M , hence $|\xi(X_{t'-s-T_{F'}} \dots X_{t'}) - \mathcal{d}s| \leq C_{\text{LR}}\sqrt{s} + M \leq C_5\sqrt{s}$ for a large enough constant C_5 , using that $M = o(s)$.

4. The intermediate path \mathbf{p}_2 does not have length $O(\sqrt{t})$. Observe that the long-range length is sub-additive. Since by definition a nice trajectory decomposes as the concatenation $(X_{s'} \dots X_{t'}) = \mathbf{p}_1\mathbf{p}_2\mathbf{p}_3$ the sub-additivity implies

$$|\xi(X_{s'} \dots X_{s'+t})| \leq |\xi(\mathbf{p}_1)| + |\xi(\mathbf{p}_2)| + |\xi(\mathbf{p}_3)|.$$

The path $\xi(\mathbf{p}_1)$ has length l_1 , whereas $\xi(\mathbf{p}_3)$ has variable length but from the bounds on l in Definition 8.1 and (47) we infer that their combined length is

$$|\xi(\mathbf{p}_1)| + |\xi(\mathbf{p}_3)| \leq \mathcal{d}t - (C_4 - C_5)\sqrt{t},$$

while the intermediate path obviously has length $|\xi(\mathbf{p}_2)| \leq |\mathbf{p}_2|$. Choose $C_4 \geq C_5 + 2C_{\text{LR}}$. Hence if $|\mathbf{p}_2| < C_3\sqrt{t}$ with $C_3 := C_{\text{LR}}$, then $|\xi(X_{s'} \dots X_{s'+t})| < \mathcal{d}t - C_{\text{LR}}\sqrt{t}$, which occurs with probability at most $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ by Proposition 3.1. To prove the upper bound on $|\mathbf{p}_2|$, observe $|\mathbf{p}_1| + s'$ coincides with the first hitting time τ_{l_1} of long-range distance l_1 after step s' . From Proposition 3.1 we can deduce the existence of $C_2 > 0$ such that $\tau_{l_1} - s' \geq t - s - C_2\sqrt{t}$ with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$. Since $|\mathbf{p}_3| \geq s$, we deduce that

$$|\mathbf{p}_2| = t - |\mathbf{p}_1| - |\mathbf{p}_3| \leq C_2\sqrt{t}.$$

5. $w_E(\xi(X_{s'} \dots X_{\tau_{l_1}}))w_F(\xi(X_{t'-s-T_{F'}} \dots X_{t'})) > w_{\max}$: let $\xi := \xi(X_{s'} \dots X_t)$. When deriving (49) we used that

$$w_{x,R,L}(\xi) = w_E(\xi_1 \dots \xi_E)w_{\xi_E^+,R,L}(\xi_{E+1} \dots \xi_F)w_F(\xi_{F+1} \dots \xi_l)$$

wher ξ_l is the last edge of ξ . Now by the non-backtracking property of nice paths $\xi(X_{s'} \dots X_{\tau_{l_1}})$ and $\xi(X_{t'-s-T_{F'}} \dots X_{t'})$ contain $\xi_1 \dots \xi_E$ and $\xi_{F+1} \dots \xi_l$ respectively so the goal is to show that $w_E(\xi_1 \dots \xi_E)w_F(\xi_{F+1} \dots \xi_l) > w_{\max}$ with probability at most ε . As we argued for the previous point, Proposition 3.1 implies $\tau_{l_1} - s' \geq t_1 := t - s - C_2\sqrt{t}$ with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$. Since cumulative weights are non-increasing along a path, we deduce that

$$w_E(\xi_1 \dots \xi_E) \leq w_{x,R,L}(\xi(X_{s'} \dots X_{t_1})) \leq e^{-t_1 h + C_h \sqrt{t_1}}$$

with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$. Similarly we know that $T_{F'} \leq t' - s$, hence

$$w_F(\xi_{F+1} \dots \xi_l) \geq w(\xi(X_{s'} \dots X_{t'-s})) \geq e^{-(t-s)h - C_h \sqrt{t-s}}$$

with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$. From these two bounds, we deduce

$$w_{\xi_E^+,R,L}(\xi_{E+1} \dots \xi_F) \geq e^{-C_h \sqrt{t-s} - C_h \sqrt{t_1} - C_h \sqrt{t}} \geq e^{-C'\sqrt{t}}$$

for some $C' = C'(\varepsilon) > 0$. Thus if $w_E(\xi_1 \dots \xi_E)w_F(\xi_{F+1} \dots \xi_l) > w_{\max}$ we obtain that

$$w_{x,R,L}(\xi) \geq w_{\max} e^{-C'\sqrt{t}}$$

which has probability at most ε if the constant C_1 in w_{\max} (47) is taken sufficiently large.

8.4 Concentration of nice paths

Recall $\mathcal{F}_{r,l}$ is the σ -algebra generated by the long-range edges revealed during the two first stages. For fixed r and l , we prove concentration of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}_{r,l}}^t(x, y)$ conditional on $\mathcal{F}_{r,l}$ using Theorem 1.2. The concentration will be strong enough for a union bound, which will yield Point (ii) of Proposition 3.2. Conditional on $\mathcal{F}_{r,l}$ all the randomness of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}_{r,l}}^t(x, y)$ comes from the intermediate path \mathfrak{p}_2 . It is contained in a random environment that arises from a uniform bijection σ' between the two subsets $V'_1 \subset V_1, V'_2 \subset V_2$ that remain to be matched after the two first stages. As was observed in the previous section, the two first stages revealed a number of long-range edges which is $O(n^{1-\varepsilon'})$, so σ' is a uniform bijection between sets of $n' = n - o(n)$ elements, which can be identified with a uniform permutation of n' elements.

The following lemma proves that conditions of concentration are fulfilled. We use Corollary 1.1 which is more practical to use than Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 8.3. *For all $r \leq M, l \geq 0$, conditional on $\mathcal{F}_{r,l}$ $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}_{r,l}}^t(x, y)$ can be realized as a multilinear function ϕ on $S_{n'}$ of degree at most*

$$d := C_2 \sqrt{\log n'}. \quad (50)$$

With the notations of Corollary 1.1,

$$\alpha_\phi = O(d^3(4\Delta)^d w_{\max} \log n), \quad A_\phi = O(d^2 \Delta^d n^{2/10} w_{\max})$$

$$\text{and } A_{\nabla\phi} = O(d^2(2\Delta)^d w_{\max}).$$

Proof. A pair of multi-indices (\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}) of size k identifies with a sequence of k potential long-range edges $(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_k, j_k)$. Note that all properties required of nice paths are either $\mathcal{F}_{r,l}$ -measurable or can be determined from the path (this would not be the case if we had chosen for instance to take the weight of $w(\xi(\mathfrak{p}_2))$ into account). Therefore it is possible to define the coefficient $a_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}}$ as the total probability of nice paths which meet exactly these long-range edges in addition to those that are contained in K or B (which do not count as random here). Nice paths do not have to cross the long-range edges but may only pass through one endpoint, due to the fact that the probability $p = p(x, \sigma(x))$ of crossing a long-range edge depends in general on σ .

The upper bound on the degree follows easily from this definition. By Point (iii) in Definition 8.1, the random part \mathfrak{p}_2 of nice paths has length bounded by $d = C_2 \sqrt{\log n'}$ which thus also upper bounds the number of long-range edges met by nice paths and consequently the degree.

To prove concentration recall the notation of Proposition 1.1. Consider a set S of long-range edges of size d or less. It is connected to at most d vertices of E' and F' , which in turn correspond to at most d edges in E and F . Therefore the set of nice paths that meet the edges of S exactly can cross at most d edges of E and d edges of F , hence by (49) we deduce that the maximal coefficient of ϕ is bounded by $d^2 w_{\max}$. By multilinearity, the maximal coefficient is non-increasing with respect to partial differentiation (see Lemma 9.6) so this proves

$$M(\partial_{ij}\phi, \sigma) \leq M(\phi, \sigma) \leq d^2 w_{\max}$$

for any potential long-range edge (i, j) . On the other hand, the number of monomials in ϕ can be upper bounded by the maximal number of paths between E' and F' of length d . Since F' has cardinality at most $n^{2/10}$ by (48)

$$N(\phi, \sigma) \leq |F'| \Delta^d = O(\Delta^d n^{2/10}).$$

Restricting to a potential long-range edge (i, j) , the latter can be part of at most $O((2\Delta)^d)$ paths of length d between E' and F' and thus as many monomials. Therefore

$$N(\partial_{ij}(\phi, \sigma)) \leq O((2\Delta)^d).$$

We deduce that $A_\phi = O(d^2 \Delta^d n^{2/10} w_{\max})$ and $A_{\nabla\phi} = O(d^2 (2\Delta)^d w_{\max})$. The log factor in Theorem 1.2 is thus $O(\log n)$ hence

$$\alpha_\phi = O(d^3 (4\Delta)^d w_{\max} \log n).$$

□

The following Lemma will be sufficient to deduce Proposition 3.2. The proof is postponed to the next section. Recall the measure $\mathbf{Q}_u^{(L)}$ was defined in (17). To ease notation we will drop the exponent (L) in the sequel. Recall also that $T_1^{(G,l)}, T_1^{(G,\infty)}$ denote regeneration times with horizon L in G^* and \mathcal{G} respectively, μ is the invariant measure of the regeneration chain in the quasi-tree and ν was considered in Proposition 5.6. Below we write $\mathbf{Q}_{\nu+c} = \sum_u (\nu(u) + c(u)) \mathbf{Q}_u$.

Lemma 8.4. *There exists a measure c on V such that $\sum_{v \in V} c(v) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}_{r,l}}^t(x, y) \mid \mathcal{F}_{r,l} \right] = \frac{(1 - o_{\mathbb{P}}(1))}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_\mu} \left[T_1^{(G,\infty)} \right]} \mathbf{Q}_{\nu+c} \left[X_{r+s} = y, |\xi(X_0 \cdots X_{r+s})| = l, r < T_1^{(G,L)} \leq M \right].$$

Proof of Proposition 3.2. The first point was proved in Section 8.3. Suppose first $x, y \in V$ and r, l are fixed. Let $\phi := \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}_{r,l}}^t(x, y)$ as in Lemma 8.3 and $z := \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \mathbb{E}[\phi] + \frac{\varepsilon}{2C_6 M n \sqrt{\log n}}$ for some $C_6 > 0$. Note that $w_{\max} \leq e^{-C\sqrt{\log n}}/n$ for some constant C which tends to $+\infty$ as the constant C_0 in the definition of t grows (47), while other factors of $\alpha_\phi, A_{\nabla\phi}$ are of all of order at most $e^{C'\sqrt{\log n}}$. Thus for any choice of $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$ Lemma 8.3 shows that $\alpha_\phi, A_{\nabla\phi}$ can both be bounded by $e^{-C\sqrt{\log n}}/n$, provided the constant C_0 is sufficiently large, while $d^2(d-1)A_\phi/n = o(n^{-3/5})$. In particular we can choose C so that $A_{\nabla\phi} \leq z$. Since $\mathbb{E}[\phi] \leq 2z/\varepsilon$ and $z \geq \varepsilon/(2C_6 M n \sqrt{\log n})$, applying Corollary 1.1 yields

$$\mathbb{P} [|\phi - \mathbb{E}[\phi]| \geq z] \leq 2 \exp \left(\frac{-C'\varepsilon^2}{\alpha_\phi M n \sqrt{\log n}} \right) \quad (51)$$

for some $C' = C'(\varepsilon) > 0$. Up to increasing again the value of C , we can ensure that $\alpha_\phi M n \sqrt{\log n} \leq (\log n)^{-2}$, hence

$$\mathbb{P} \left[|\phi - \mathbb{E}[\phi]| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \mathbb{E}[\phi] + \frac{\varepsilon}{2C_6 M n \sqrt{\log n}} \right] \leq \exp(-C'\varepsilon^2 (\log n)^2).$$

This is sufficient to take a union bound over $x, y \in V$ and $r \leq M, l \in [\mathcal{d}s - C_5 \sqrt{\log n}, \mathcal{d}s + C_5 \sqrt{\log n}]$. Thus summing over r, l we obtain that with high probability, for all $x, y \in V$,

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}}^t(x, y) - \sum_{r,l} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}_{r,l}}^t(x, y) \mid \mathcal{F}_{r,l} \right] \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sum_{r,l} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}_{r,l}}^t(x, y) \mid \mathcal{F}_{r,l} \right] + \frac{\varepsilon}{n}.$$

Lemma 8.4 gives an estimate of the conditional expectation which shows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}}^t(x, y) &\leq \frac{1 + \varepsilon/2}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_\mu} \left[T_1^{(G,\infty)} \right]} \sum_{r=0}^M \mathbf{Q}_{\nu+c} \left[X_{r+s} = y, r < T_1^{(G,L)} \leq M \right] + \frac{\varepsilon}{n} \\ &= (1 + \varepsilon/2) A \hat{\pi}(y) + \frac{(1 + \varepsilon/2)A}{\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_\nu} \left[T_1^{(G,L)} \right]} \sum_{r=0}^M \mathbf{Q}_c \left[X_{r+s} = y, r < T_1^{(G,L)} \leq M \right] + \frac{\varepsilon}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

with $A := \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_\nu} [T_1^{(G,L)}]}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_\mu} [T_1^{(G,\infty)}]}$. Summing over $y \in V$ and $r \in [0, M]$ in the second term yields $(1 + \varepsilon/2)A \sum_{v \in V} c(v) \leq 2A\varepsilon$ with high probability. On the other hand, from Lemma 8.4 we also have the lower bound

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{N}_1^t}(x, y) \geq (1 - \varepsilon/2)(1 - o_{\mathbb{P}}(1))A\hat{\pi}(y) - \varepsilon/n,$$

which by summing over $y \in V$ shows that $A \leq 1 + 10\varepsilon$ with high probability. Plugging this in the upper bound above yields the second statement of the proposition. \square

8.5 Expectation of nice paths

Proof of Lemma 8.4. Let $\tau_{E'}$ be the hitting time of E' . By definition, a nice path requires that $\tau_{E'} \leq t - s$ and the first part \mathfrak{p}_1 of the path is the trajectory until $\tau_{E'}$. The second part of a nice path is the trajectory until hitting F' . Therefore by strong Markov's property, one can bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{N}_{r,l}} \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{p}) &\leq \sum_{\substack{t_1+t_2=t-(r+s) \\ C_3\sqrt{\log n} \leq t_2 \leq C_2\sqrt{\log n}}} \sum_{u \in E'} \sum_{v \in F'} (\mathbf{P}_x [\tau_{E'} = t_1, X_{t_1} = u]) \\ &\times \mathbf{P} \left[\exists k \geq 0 : T_k^{(G,L)} = t_2, X_{t_2} = v, U_{t_2}(K) \leq m \mid X_{1/2} = u \right] \\ &\mathbf{P} [X_{r+s} = y, r < T_1 \leq M \mid X_{1/2} = v, \tau_{\eta(v)} > \tau_L]. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

In each term of this sum, the first and third factor are $\mathcal{F}_{r,l}$ -measurable, so only the second factor gets averaged when taking conditional expectation. We claim this expectation satisfies

$$\sum_{v \in F'} \left| \mathbb{P} \left[\exists k \geq 0 : T_k^{(G,L)} = t_2, X_{t_2} = v \mid X_{1/2} = u, \mathcal{F}_{r,l} \right] - \frac{\nu(v)}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_\mu} [T_1^{(G,\infty)}]} \right| + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Note that $\nu/\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_\mu} [T_1^{(G,\infty)}]$ is independent of u and t_1 , while the first factor in the sum considered above can be summed to at most 1. We can also recognize the measure \mathbf{Q}_v (17) in the third factor. Therefore provided the claim holds one obtains that for some $c = (c_v)_v$ satisfying $\sum_{v \in V} c(v) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{N}_{r,l}} \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{p}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{r,l} \right] &\leq \sum_{v \in F'} \left(\frac{\nu(v)}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_\mu} [T_1^{(G,\infty)}]} + c(v) \right) \mathbf{Q}_v [X_{r+s} = y, r < T_1 \leq M] \\ &\leq \sum_{v \in V} \frac{\nu(v) + c(v)}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_\mu} [T_1^{(G,\infty)}]} \mathbf{Q}_v [X_{r+s} = y, d_{\text{LR}}(v, y) = l, r < T_1 \leq M], \end{aligned}$$

where in the second we implicitly changed the definition of c , using that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_\mu} [T_1^{(G,\infty)}] = O(1)$. This proves an upper bound. To prove a matching lower bound, note that the inequality (53) is not sharp if the trajectory is not in $\Gamma(R, L, M)$, which occurs with probability $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ by Lemma 3.2, so the upper bound is also a lower bound up to a $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ error.

Let us prove the claim. Let $u \in E', v \in F'$. The idea is to couple the chains X and \mathcal{X} on a quasi-tree to relate their regeneration times, in order to use Proposition 5.6. However the conditioning by $\mathcal{F}_{r,l}$ already revealed some-long range edges, which requires in turn a similar conditioning in the quasi-tree. We argue that the only conditioning required is by $B_{\text{LR}}(O, L)$, the ball of radius L in a quasi-tree. Let u_0 be the ancestor of E at long-range distance L from

u . By definition of $K(x, l_1)$, the L long-range neighbourhood $B_{\text{LR}}(u_0, L)$ contains no long-range cycle and thus is a possible realization of $B_{\text{LR}}(O, L)$ around the root of a quasi-tree. Consider a quasi-tree \mathcal{G} which has this ball as the neighbourhood of its root and is completed with the standard procedure (so without taking consideration of the long-range edges revealed in $K \cup B$). Using the coupling of Section 2.5, the chain X started at u can thus be coupled with the chain \mathcal{X} on \mathcal{G} , started at the vertex of $B_{\text{LR}}(O, L)$ that identifies with u . This coupling fails after X enters B or if it re-enters K by another path than the one it used. Let τ_{coup} denote this new coupling time.

From (48), the probability of sampling an element of either K or B under the uniform measure on V is $O(1/n^{\varepsilon'})$ for some $\varepsilon' > 0$. Consequently, using the same comparison with a binomial we used in the proof of Lemma 2.1, the coupling fails by time $O(\sqrt{\log n})$ with probability $O(\log n/n^{2\varepsilon'}) = o(1)$. Note that considering regeneration times requires the knowledge of the L steps ahead but this is $O(\log \log n)$. Consequently it remains true that for $t_2 + L = O(\sqrt{\log n})$,

$$\sum_{v \in F'} \left| \mathbb{P} \left[\exists k \geq 0 : T_k^{(\mathcal{G}, L)} = t_2, X_{t_2} = v \mid X_{1/2} = u, \mathcal{F}_{r, l} \right] - \mathbb{P} \left[\exists k \geq 0 : T_k^{(\mathcal{G}, L)} = t_2, \iota(\mathcal{X}_{t_2}) = v \mid \mathcal{X}_{1/2} = x B_{\text{LR}}(O, L) \right] \right| \leq \mathbb{P}[\tau_{\text{coup}} > t \mid \mathcal{F}_{r, l}] = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1),$$

where $x \in B_{\text{LR}}(O, L)$ is a vertex at long-range distance L with type u . Obviously, $\{T_k^{(\mathcal{G}, \infty)}, k \geq 1\} \subset \{T_k^{(\mathcal{G}, L)}, k \geq 1\}$. This inclusion may be strict however, if the chain backtracks over a long-range distance L . Lemma 6.1 shows this occurs before time $O(\sqrt{\log n})$ with probability $o(1)$. Consequently, with high probability $T_k^{(\mathcal{G}, L)} = T_k^{(\mathcal{G}, \infty)}$ for all regeneration times that occur before t_2 , so we can exchange these random times in the equation above. Now since $t_2 = \Theta(\sqrt{\log n})$ and $m^2 = O((\log \log n)^{2\kappa+2}) = o(t_2)$, Proposition 5.6 proves that

$$\sum_{v \in V} \left| \mathbb{P} \left[\exists k \geq 0 : T_k^{(\mathcal{G}, \infty)} = t_2, \iota(\mathcal{X}_{t_2}) = v \mid \mathcal{X}_{1/2} = x, B_{\text{LR}}(O, L) \right] - \frac{\nu(v)}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_\mu} \left[T_1^{(\mathcal{G}, \infty)} \right]} \right| = o(1).$$

Using triangle inequality to combine the two previous bounds yields the claim. \square

9 Concentration for low-degree functions on the symmetric group: proof of Theorem 1.2

We start proving Proposition 1.1 in Section 9.1 then prove the main Theorem in Section 9.2.

9.1 Control of the smoothness parameters: proof of Proposition 1.1

Let ϕ be a multilinear polynomial in the indeterminates $(X_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$ of degree d . The operator D has the effect of replacing one indeterminate in each monomial by 1 and take the average. When doing so, some coefficients coming from different monomials of ϕ can be regrouped together. To avoid this, we can introduce new indeterminates instead of evaluating them at 1. This is formalized by the following construction: for all $m \geq 1$ write $X^{(m)} = (X_{ij}^{(m)})_{i,j=1}^n$. Let \tilde{D} be the linear operator on $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}, \dots]$ defined on monomials as

$$\tilde{D} : X_{i_1 j_1}^{(1)} \dots X_{i_k j_k}^{(1)} X_{i_{k+1} j_{k+1}}^{(m_{k+1})} X_{i_d j_d}^{(m_d)} \mapsto \frac{1}{kn} \sum_{l=1}^k X_{i_1 j_1}^{(1)} \dots X_{i_{l-1} j_{l-1}}^{(1)} X_{i_l j_l}^{(m_d+1)} X_{i_{l+1} j_{l+1}}^{(m_{l+1})} \dots X_{i_d j_d}^{(m_d)},$$

where $m_1 = \dots m_k = 1 < m_{k+1} \leq \dots \leq m_d$. Let $T : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[X_{ij}]$ be the operator that identifies $X^{(1)}$ with the X_{ij} and evaluates all other indeterminates $X^{(2)}, X^{(3)}, \dots$ at 1. Then by construction for all $l \geq 1$,

$$D^l \phi = T \tilde{D}^l \phi. \quad (54)$$

Extend the definitions of M, N to \mathcal{R} as follows: if $\psi \in \mathcal{R}$, let $M(\psi)$ be the maximal coefficient in absolute value of ψ and $N(\psi, \sigma)$ the number of non-zero monomials when evaluating $X_{ij}^{(1)} = \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(i)=j}$ and indeterminates $X^{(m)}$ at 1 for all $m \geq 2$. Note these are not $M(T\psi), N(T\psi, \sigma)$: the point is precisely to distinguish monomials that would otherwise be regrouped together when applying T . Write $N(\psi) := \max_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n} N(\psi, \sigma)$. If $\psi = \sum_{k=1}^d \psi_k \in \mathcal{R}$ decomposes as the sum of functions that are homogeneous in $X^{(1)}$ of degree k , then for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$

$$|T\psi(\sigma)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^d M(\psi_k) N(\psi_k, \sigma) \quad (55)$$

On the other hand we claim that if ψ is homogeneous of degree $d \geq 1$, then

$$M(\tilde{D}\psi) \leq \frac{1}{dn} M(\psi), \quad \text{and} \quad \forall \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n : N(\tilde{D}\psi, \sigma) \leq 2dn N(\psi, \sigma). \quad (56)$$

The first inequality is obvious from the definition of \tilde{D} . For the second inequality, observe that every monomial in $\tilde{D}\phi$ comes from a unique monomial of ϕ . The issue is that when evaluating $X^{(1)}$ at σ and other indeterminates $X^{(m)}$ at 1, a non-zero contribution in $\tilde{D}\phi(\sigma)$ may arise from a monomial that was zero in $\phi(\sigma)$. This occurs if this monomial contains exactly one indeterminate $X_{ij}^{(1)}$ with $\sigma(i) \neq j$, whereas all other indeterminates evaluate to 1. This leaves at most $2dn$ choices for each monomial, from which we deduce the claim.

Combining (54), (55) and (56), we obtain that for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and $l \leq d$

$$\begin{aligned} |D^l \phi(\sigma)| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^d M(\tilde{D}^l \phi_k) N(\tilde{D}^l \phi_k, \sigma) \\ &\leq 2^l \sum_{k=1}^d M(\phi_k) N(\phi_k, \sigma) \\ &\leq 2^l M(\phi) N(\phi) \end{aligned}$$

using that $M(\phi) = \max_{k \leq d} M(\phi_k)$ and $N(\phi, \sigma) = \sum_{k=1}^d N(\phi_k, \sigma)$.

The inequality for $U\phi$ is proved similarly. Clearly $M(U\phi) \leq (dn)^{-1} M(\phi)$ if ϕ is homogeneous of degree d . On the other hand, monomials of $U\phi$ are obtained by picking a monomial of ϕ , two indeterminates X_{ij}, X_{kl} in this monomial and replace them by X_{il}, X_{kj} . Consequently every monomial of ϕ gives rise to at most $d(d-1)$ monomials in $U\phi$. Thus we deduce that

$$M(U\phi) N(U\phi) \leq \frac{d-1}{n} M(\phi) N(\phi)$$

Then for a general function decomposing $\phi = \sum_{k=1}^d \phi_k$ as a sum of homogeneous functions implies

that for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$

$$\begin{aligned} |U\phi(\sigma)| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^d M(U\phi_k)N(U\phi_k, \sigma) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^d \frac{k-1}{n} M(\phi_k)N(\phi_k, \sigma) \\ &\leq \frac{d-1}{n} M(\phi)N(\phi, \sigma). \end{aligned}$$

9.2 Proof of the concentration inequality

9.2.1 Induction with the method of exchangeable pairs

The proof of Theorem 1.2 follows the original argument of Chatterjee for the $d = 1$ case, based on Stein's method of exchangeable pairs. Eventually, the argument consists in establishing an inequality involving the moment generating function of the random variable and its derivatives, so that it can be integrated to give a bound in the tail probability by Chernoff's inequality. In our case, we will obtain a differential inequality relating the moment generating functions of ϕ and that of the functions $D^k\phi$, which are of lower degree. A bound is thus proved for the function ϕ only by induction on the degree, which is made possible by the condition (8). To that end, we reindex the quantities β_ϕ, γ_ϕ in terms of d :

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_d &:= 6dC'_D \left(\log \left(\frac{4C_D n}{C'_D} \right)^+ + \frac{(2/n)(2 - e^{-2/n})}{1 - e^{-2/n}} \right) \\ \gamma_d &:= \frac{2\beta_d}{3} (2\mathbb{E}[\phi] + C_U) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Theorem 1.2 is thus the consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 9.1. *Let $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}_d, d \geq 1$ and $m(\theta) := \log \mathbb{E} [e^{\theta(\phi(\sigma) - \mathbb{E}[\phi])}]$. Suppose ϕ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.2. Then for all $\theta \in [0, 1/\beta_d]$*

$$m(\theta) \leq \frac{\gamma_d \theta^2}{2(1 - \beta_d \theta)}. \quad (58)$$

and for all $\theta \in (-1/\beta_d, 0]$,

$$m(\theta) \leq \frac{\gamma_d \theta^2}{2}. \quad (59)$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. For $\theta := t/(\gamma_d + \beta_d t)$, Chernoff's inequality and (58) give for all $t \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{P}[\phi(\sigma) - \mathbb{E}[\phi(\sigma)] \geq t] \leq e^{-\theta t + \log m(\theta)} \leq e^{\frac{-t^2}{2(\gamma_d + \beta_d t)}}.$$

Taking $\theta = -t/\gamma_d$ and (59) yields the lower tail. \square

For the case $d = 1$, a better inequality is established in the proofs of Proposition 1.1 and Theorem 1.5 in [21] using the method of exchangeable pairs. An exchangeable pair is a couple of random variables (X, X') invariant by permutation, so it has the same distribution as (X', X) . We prove Lemma 9.1 by induction, using the following rephrasing of Chatterjee's method of exchangeable pairs to prove concentration.

Proposition 9.1 ([23, Proof of Thm. 1.5]). *Let \mathcal{X} be a separable metric space, (X, X') be an exchangeable pair of \mathcal{X} -valued random variables. Let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[f] := \mathbb{E}[f(X)] = 0$. Suppose $F : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a square-integrable antisymmetric function which satisfies*

$$f(X) := \mathbb{E}[F(X, X') \mid X]$$

and $\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta f(x)} F(X, X')] < \infty$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[f(X)e^{\theta f(X)}] \right| \leq |\theta| \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta f(X)} \Delta(X)] \quad (60)$$

where

$$\Delta(X) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[|F(X, X')(f(X) - f(X'))| \mid X].$$

As explained in [21, 22], defining an exchangeable pair (X, X') on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ is equivalent to the consideration of a reversible Markov kernel P on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ defined by $Ph(x) = \mathbb{E}[h(X') \mid X = x]$ for all function h . Given a function f of zero mean, the antisymmetric function F can then be obtained as $F(X, X') = g(X) - g(X')$ where g satisfies the Poisson equation

$$g - Pg = f$$

which can generally be constructed as $g = \sum_{k \geq 0} P^k f$. If \mathcal{X} is a finite group and P is the kernel of an ergodic random walk on \mathcal{X} which puts constant mass on conjugacy classes, the previous infinite sum converges and [22][Theorem 1.2] provides a concentration result in terms of what is essentially the mixing time of the random walk. Lemma 9.1 is proved by refining this result, to handle the case of a non-uniform bound on the quantity $\Delta(\sigma)$ and get a Bernstein-like inequality. This is analog to proving concentration bounds for self-bounding functions or weakly self-bounding functions [17].

On the symmetric group, one obvious candidate of a Markov kernel is that of random transpositions. The corresponding exchangeable pair is $(\sigma, \sigma\tau)$ where $\tau = (IJ)$ is a random transposition with I, J uniform and independent in $[n]$ (τ can be the identity). The random transposition chain puts constant mass on the identity and on transpositions, which form conjugacy classes, and thus can be applied the previously mentioned argumentation, its mixing time having been completely determined from the work of Diaconis and Shahshahani [29]. Adapting arguments of [21][Chapt. 4], we arrive at the following lemma, proved in Section 9.2.2.

Lemma 9.2. *Let $f : \mathfrak{S}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ have zero mean. There exists a function $F : \mathfrak{S}_n \times \mathfrak{S}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[F(\sigma, \sigma\tau) \mid \sigma] = f(\sigma)$. Furthermore, if $C \geq 0$ is a constant such that $|f(\sigma) - f(\sigma\tau)| \leq C$ for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and transposition τ then*

$$|F(\sigma, \sigma\tau)| \leq \frac{Cn}{2} \left(\log \left(\frac{24 \|f\|_\infty n}{C} \right) + \frac{(2/n)(2 - e^{-2/n})}{1 - e^{-2/n}} \right). \quad (61)$$

If f has degree 1, $F(\sigma, \sigma') = (n/2)(f(\sigma) - f(\sigma'))$, so one has actually $|F(\sigma, \sigma\tau)| \leq Cn/2$.

From the previous lemma, upper bounding $\Delta(\sigma)$ essentially comes down to various quantities involving ϕ only. This will be done using a tensor representation of the function ϕ , namely we represent the function ϕ as $\phi(\sigma) = \text{tr}(AS^{\otimes d})$ for some $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R}_+)^{\otimes d}$, with S the permutation matrix representing σ . Restricting first to homogeneous functions, we can follow most of the arguments of Chatterjee in the one-dimensional case, which leads to the following lemmas, proved in Section 9.2.3.

Lemma 9.3. *Let $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}$. A.s.*

$$|\phi(\sigma) - \phi(\sigma\tau)| \leq \begin{cases} 2 \|\nabla\phi\|_\infty & \text{if } d = 1 \\ 6 \|\nabla\phi\|_\infty & \text{if } d \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

Lemma 9.4. *Let $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}_{=d}$. Then*

(i)

$$\frac{n}{2d} \mathbb{E}[\phi(\sigma) - \phi(\sigma\tau) \mid \sigma] = \left(1 - \frac{d-1}{2n}\right) \phi(\sigma) - D\phi(\sigma) - U\phi(\sigma).$$

(ii)

$$\frac{n}{2d} \mathbb{E}[|\phi(\sigma) - \phi(\sigma\tau)| \mid \sigma] \leq \left(1 - \frac{d-1}{2n}\right) \phi(\sigma) + D\phi(\sigma) + U\phi(\sigma).$$

(iii) $D\phi \in \mathfrak{F}_{=(d-1)}$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[D\phi] = \left(1 - \frac{d-1}{n}\right) \mathbb{E}[\phi].$$

Remark 9.1. The degree 1 case is made much simpler as in this case the function $\phi - \mathbb{E}[\phi]$ is actually an eigenfunction of the random transposition kernel. In general, decomposing the function into a basis of eigenfunctions or using representation theory can provide a neat expression of the function F in Lemma 9.2, but is not clear how to relate the projections onto eigenspaces to the hypotheses made on ϕ , in particular the non-negativity of the coefficients. This seems however to be the good strategy if one wants to get rid of the log factor, and could provide further improvements in the proof of Theorem 1.2, allowing perhaps to get rid of the consideration of the operators D and U . For instance, it is always possible to replace the function ϕ by another representative $\psi \in \mathfrak{F}$, which yields the same function on \mathfrak{S}_n but has the property that $D\psi = 0$. The issue is of course that we lose the non-negativity of the coefficients, which seems essential to get a self-bounding property like in the lemma. Note that writing $\phi(\sigma) = \text{tr}(AS^{\otimes d})$ can already be seen as the use of a specific representation of the symmetric group, the d -fold tensor product of the standard representation (by permutation matrices).

Proof of Lemma 9.1. The result is proved by induction on the degree. The case $d = 1$ is proved in [21] but can be recovered from the following arguments.

Let $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}_d$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.2. Let $\psi := \phi - \mathbb{E}[\phi]$ denote the centered version of ϕ and $m(\theta) := \log \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta\psi(\sigma)}]$.

Consider the function F obtained from Lemma 9.2 for the case $f = \psi$ and set $\Delta(\sigma) := 1/2 \mathbb{E}[|F(\sigma, \sigma\tau)| |f(\sigma) - f(\sigma\tau)| \mid \sigma]$. Lemma 9.3 gives an upper bound on the constant C appearing in (61), and the definition (57) of β_d is made to give the a.s. bound $|F(\sigma, \sigma\tau)| \leq \beta_d(n/2d)$. On the other hand, decompose $\phi = \sum_{l=0}^d \phi_l$ as a sum of homogeneous functions with non-negative coefficients. We can suppose that $\phi_0 = 0$. From Point (ii) in Lemma 9.4, one gets the bound in (conditional) expectation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n}{2d} \mathbb{E}[|\phi(\sigma) - \phi(\sigma\tau)| \mid \sigma] &\leq \sum_{l=1}^d \frac{n}{2l} \mathbb{E}[|\phi_l(\sigma) - \phi_l(\sigma\tau)| \mid \sigma] \\ &\leq \sum_{l=1}^d \phi_l(\sigma) + D\phi_l(\sigma) + U\phi_l(\sigma) \\ &= \phi(\sigma) + D\phi(\sigma) + U\phi(\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption (8), $U\phi(\sigma) \leq C_U$. From Point (iii) of Lemma 9.4 $\mathbb{E}[D\phi] \leq \mathbb{E}[\phi]$, hence letting $\psi_2 := D\phi - \mathbb{E}[D\phi]$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\sigma) &\leq \frac{\beta_d}{2} (\psi(\sigma) + \psi_2(\sigma) + 2\mathbb{E}[\phi] + C_U) \\ &\leq \frac{\beta_d}{2} (\psi(\sigma) + \psi_2(\sigma) + \tilde{\gamma}_d)\end{aligned}$$

where we write $\tilde{\gamma}_d := 2\mathbb{E}[\phi] + C_U$. Apply (60) to obtain

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\psi(\sigma) e^{\theta\psi(\sigma)} \right] \right| \leq \frac{\beta_d}{2} |\theta| \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\theta\psi(\sigma)} (\psi(\sigma) + \psi_2(\sigma) + \tilde{\gamma}_d) \right]. \quad (62)$$

Now by (iii), ψ_2 is the centered version of a degree $d-1$ function with non-negative coefficients. In the case $d=1$, $\psi_2=0$ so the previous inequality can easily be integrated to give (58) (see the proof of Thm. 1.5 in [21]). In the general case, we make use of the following duality formula for the entropy functional, to relate the moment generating functions of ψ and that of ψ_2 .

Proposition 9.2 ([18, Thm. 4.13]). *Let Y be a non-negative random variable. Define the entropy of Y as*

$$\text{Ent}(Y) := \mathbb{E}[Y \log Y] - \mathbb{E}[Y] \log \mathbb{E}[Y].$$

The entropy satisfies the variational relation

$$\text{Ent}(Y) = \sup_W \mathbb{E}[(W - \log \mathbb{E}[e^W])Y] \quad (63)$$

where the supremum is over all random variables with finite exponential moment.

Notice that

$$\frac{\text{Ent}(e^{\theta\psi(\sigma)})}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta\psi}]} = \theta m'(\theta) - m(\theta),$$

which is at the basis of the well known Herbst argument to prove concentration inequalities (see [18]). Letting $m_2(\theta) := \log \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta\psi_2(\sigma)}]$, (63) implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\theta| e^{\theta\psi(\sigma)} \psi_2(\sigma) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\theta\psi(\sigma)} \right] m_2(|\theta|) + \text{Ent}(e^{\theta\psi(\sigma)}).$$

Dividing by $\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta\psi(\sigma)}]$ in (62) thus yields

$$\begin{aligned}|m'(\theta)| &\leq \frac{\beta_d}{2} \left(|\theta| m'(\theta) + \tilde{\gamma}_d |\theta| + m_2(|\theta|) + \frac{\text{Ent}(e^{\theta\psi(\sigma)})}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta\psi(\sigma)}]} \right) \\ &= \frac{\beta_d}{2} \left((|\theta| + \theta) m'(\theta) - m(\theta) + \tilde{\gamma}_d |\theta| + m_2(|\theta|) \right).\end{aligned}$$

The term $m(\theta)$ can be neglected, observing that e^m is a convex function, which at $\theta=0$ takes value 1 and derivative $\mathbb{E}[\psi]=0$, implying $m'(\theta)$ has the sign of θ and $m(\theta) \geq 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence for $\theta \in [0, 1/\beta_d)$

$$m'(\theta) \leq \frac{(\beta_d \tilde{\gamma}_d / 2) \theta}{1 - \beta_d \theta} + \frac{(\beta_d / 2) m_2(\theta)}{1 - \beta_d \theta}.$$

Now assumption (8) was made so that $D\phi$ satisfies the same conditions as ϕ and can thus be applied the induction hypothesis:

$$m_2(\theta) \leq \frac{\gamma_{d-1} \theta^2}{2(1 - \beta_{d-1} \theta)}.$$

For all $\theta \in [0, 1/\beta_d)$, we can bound further

$$\frac{\beta_d \theta}{1 - \beta_{d-1} \theta} \leq \frac{\beta_d}{\beta_d - \beta_{d-1}} = 1.$$

As $m(0) = 0$ we deduce that for all $\theta \in [0, 1/\beta_d)$

$$\begin{aligned} m(\theta) &\leq \int_0^\theta \frac{(\beta_d \tilde{\gamma}_d/2 + \gamma_{d-1}/4)u}{1 - \beta_d u} du \\ &\leq \frac{(\beta_d \tilde{\gamma}_d/2 + \gamma_{d-1}/4)\theta^2}{2(1 - \beta_d \theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, (57) implies that $\beta_d \tilde{\gamma}_d/2 + \gamma_{d-1}/4 \leq \gamma_d$, which proves (58).

For the lower tail, consider $\theta \in (-1/\beta_d, 0]$. Using the same computations as above, bound

$$\begin{aligned} |m'(\theta)| &\leq \frac{\beta_d}{2} \left(\tilde{\gamma}_d |\theta| + m_2(|\theta|) \right) \\ &\leq (\beta_d \tilde{\gamma}_d/2 + \gamma_{d-1}/4) |\theta| \\ &\leq \gamma_d |\theta| \end{aligned}$$

which shows $m(\theta) \leq \gamma_d \theta^2/2$. □

9.2.2 Almost sure bound on F : proof of Lemma 9.2

Let μ be the probability measure on \mathfrak{S}_n which puts mass $1/n$ on the identity and $2/n^2$ on transpositions. The random transposition Markov chain is the random walk on \mathfrak{S}_n defined by iid increments of law μ . These are symmetric hence the uniform distribution unif is stationary. The Markov chain is ergodic and its mixing properties have been thoroughly investigated in [29]. In particular, it was proved that for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\|\mu^{*k} - \text{unif}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 6ne^{-2k/n}. \quad (64)$$

Let P denote the transition matrix of random transpositions and f be a function on \mathfrak{S}_n with zero mean under the uniform measure. Then the function F given by

$$F(\sigma, \sigma') := \sum_{k \geq 0} (P^k f(\sigma) - P^k f(\sigma'))$$

is well defined by the total variation convergence above and satisfies $\mathbb{E}[F(\sigma, \sigma') \mid \sigma] = f(\sigma)$. We refer to [21, 22] for details.

Lemma 9.2 is obtained by bounding F in two ways. On the one hand (64) implies

$$|P^k f(\sigma)| = |P^k f(\sigma) - \mathbb{E}[f]| \leq 12 \|f\|_\infty ne^{-2k/n}$$

and thus

$$|P^k f(\sigma) - P^k f(\sigma\tau)| \leq 24 \|f\|_\infty ne^{-2k/n}.$$

The second bound is based on the fact that μ puts constant mass on conjugacy classes. As observed by Chatterjee in [21, 22], this implies that

$$|P^k f(\sigma) - P^k f(\sigma\tau)| \leq \max_{\sigma', \tau'} |f(\sigma') - f(\sigma'\tau')| \leq C$$

for all $k \geq 0$, $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and transposition τ . Combine the two bounds as

$$\begin{aligned} |F(\sigma, \sigma\tau)| &\leq \sum_{k \geq 0} \min\left(C, 24 \|f\|_\infty n e^{-2k/n}\right) \\ &\leq C \sum_{k \geq 0} \min\left(1, 24 C^{-1} \|f\|_\infty n e^{-2k/n}\right) \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{n}{2} \log(24 C^{-1} \|f\|_\infty n) + 1 + \frac{1}{1 - e^{-2/n}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

9.2.3 Tensor representation

We now prove Lemmas 9.3 and 9.4.

Lemma 9.5. *Let $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}$ and $\tau = (IJ)$. For all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\sigma\tau) &= \phi(\sigma) + \partial_{I\sigma(J)}\phi(\sigma) + \partial_{J\sigma(I)}\phi(\sigma) - \partial_{I\sigma(I)}\phi(\sigma) - \partial_{J\sigma(J)}\phi(\sigma) \\ &\quad + 2\partial_{I\sigma(I)}\partial_{J\sigma(J)}\phi(\sigma) + 2\partial_{I\sigma(J)}\partial_{J\sigma(I)}\phi(\sigma). \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Proof. Let $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}$. Decomposing ϕ into homogeneous components, it suffices to consider the case of a homogeneous function. Suppose therefore that ϕ is homogeneous of degree $d \geq 1$. It can be realized as $\phi(\sigma) = \text{tr}(AS^{\otimes d})$ for some $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R}_+)^{\otimes d}$. We start with a simple computation relating derivatives of ϕ with the tensor A .

Let E_{ij} denote the matrix which has entry (i, j) equal to 1 and all other entries equal to 0. For all $M \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$, $i, j \in [n]$,

$$\partial_{ij}\phi(M) = \sum_{k=1}^d \text{tr}(A M^{\otimes(k-1)} \otimes E_{ij} \otimes M^{\otimes(d-k)}). \tag{66}$$

Indeed, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, expanding the tensor product yields

$$(M + tE_{ij})^{\otimes d} = M^{\otimes d} + t \sum_{k=1}^d M^{\otimes(k-1)} \otimes E_{ij} \otimes M^{\otimes(d-k)} + O(t^2)$$

Dividing by $t \neq 0$ and taking the limit $t \rightarrow 0$ gives the result.

For the sequel, we make use of the multilinearity of ϕ . Given multi-indices $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in [n]^d$, write $A_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}} = A_{i_1 \dots i_d, j_1 \dots j_d}$. The multilinearity implies we can suppose that $A_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}} = 0$ whenever \mathbf{i} or \mathbf{j} has two identical coordinates. Consequently the computation of $\text{tr}(AM)$ does not depend either on the entries $M_{\mathbf{j}}$ when \mathbf{i} or \mathbf{j} has some identical coordinates. More precisely, the kernel of the linear map $M \mapsto \text{tr}(AM)$ contains the subspace H of tensors whose only non-zero entries are such multi-indices. Therefore when computing $\text{tr}(AM)$, one can freely replace M with any of its representative modulo H , which allows in particular to get rid of potential dependency properties between entries of S . The permutation matrix of τ is $T = I + M_{IJ}$ with

$$M_{IJ} := E_{IJ} + E_{JI} - E_{II} - E_{JJ}.$$

Note that if we write products of permutation from right to left, so $\sigma\tau$ applies τ first and then σ , the permutation matrix of $\sigma\tau$ is TS , hence $\phi(\sigma\tau) = \text{tr}(AT^{\otimes d}S^{\otimes d})$. By expanding the tensor

product,

$$\begin{aligned} T^{\otimes d} &= I + \sum_{k=1}^d I^{\otimes(k-1)} \otimes M_{IJ} \otimes I^{\otimes(d-k)} \\ &+ \sum_{k_1 < k_2 \in [d]} I^{\otimes(k_1-1)} \otimes M_{IJ} \otimes I^{\otimes(k_2-k_1)} \otimes M_{IJ} \otimes I^{\otimes(d-k_2)} \pmod{H}. \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the expression of M_{IJ} in the second sum yields terms like $E_{IJ} \otimes E_{II}$ which are also in H and can be discarded. Now by (66),

$$\sum_{k=1}^d \text{tr}(A(I^{\otimes(k-1)} \otimes E_{IJ} \otimes I^{\otimes(d-k)})S^{\otimes d}) = \partial_{I\sigma(J)}\phi(\sigma)$$

and a similar observation can be made for order 2 derivatives. This proves Lemma 9.5. \square

Lemma 9.3 can be deduced easily, provided one can control second order derivatives. This requires no additional assumption, for taking partial derivatives can only give a smaller function, as proved by the following lemma.

Lemma 9.6. *Let $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}$. For all $k \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in [n]^k$,*

$$\|\partial_{\mathbf{ij}}^k \phi\|_{\infty} \leq \|\phi\|_{\infty}. \quad (67)$$

Proof. The general case follows from the $k = 1$ case by an easy induction. Let $i, j \in [n]$. Note that by multilinearity, the partial derivative $\partial_{ij}\phi$ cannot contain any indeterminate X_{ik} or X_{kj} , $k \in [n]$, so $\partial_{ij}\phi(\sigma) = \partial_{ij}\phi((\sigma(i)j)\sigma)$. Hence the maximum is always realized for a permutation σ such that $\sigma(i) = j$, but then for such permutations ϕ actually coincides with the partial derivative $\partial_{ij}\phi$. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n} |\partial_{ij}\phi(\sigma)| &= \max_{\sigma: \sigma(i)=j} |\partial_{ij}\phi(\sigma)| \\ &\leq \max_{\sigma: \sigma(i)=j} |\phi(\sigma)| \\ &\leq \|\phi\|_{\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of Lemma 9.3. If ϕ is assumed to have non-negative coefficients, (65) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(\sigma) - \phi(\sigma\tau)| &\leq |\partial_{I\sigma(J)}\phi(\sigma) + \partial_{J\sigma(I)}\phi(\sigma) - \partial_{I\sigma(I)}\phi(\sigma) - \partial_{J\sigma(J)}\phi(\sigma)| \\ &+ 2\partial_{I\sigma(I)}\partial_{J\sigma(J)}\phi(\sigma) + 2\partial_{I\sigma(J)}\partial_{J\sigma(I)}\phi(\sigma) \\ &\leq 2\|\nabla\phi\|_{\infty} + 4 \max_{i,j,k,l \in [n]} |\partial_{ij,kl}^2\phi(S)|, \end{aligned}$$

which establishes the result thanks to the previous lemma. \square

Proof of Lemma 9.4. Restricting to a homogeneous function $\phi \in \mathfrak{F}_{=d}$, (65) gives by averaging over I, J

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n}{2d} \mathbb{E}[\phi(\sigma) - \phi(\sigma\tau) \mid \sigma] &= \frac{1}{2dn} \sum_{i,j \in [n]} (\partial_{i\sigma(i)}\phi(\sigma) + \partial_{j\sigma(j)}\phi(\sigma) - \partial_{i\sigma(j)}\phi(\sigma) - \partial_{j\sigma(i)}\phi(\sigma) \\ &- 2\partial_{i\sigma(i)}\partial_{j\sigma(j)}\phi(\sigma) - 2\partial_{i\sigma(j)}\partial_{j\sigma(i)}\phi(\sigma)) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{d-1}{2n}\right) \phi(\sigma) - \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{i,j \in [n]} \partial_{i\sigma(j)}\phi(\sigma) - \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{i,j \in [n]} \partial_{i\sigma(j)}\partial_{j\sigma(i)}\phi(\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

which gives Point (i) of the Lemma. The second equality arises from the relation (7).

The bound in absolute value (ii) is obtained similarly, using first triangle inequality in (65). Finally Point (iii) is proved easily. \square

References

- [1] David Aldous. Random walks on finite groups and rapidly mixing markov chains. pages 243–297, 1983. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fbfb0068322>, doi:10.1007/bfb0068322. 7
- [2] David Aldous and Persi Diaconis. Shuffling cards and stopping times. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 93(5):333–348, 1986. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2323590>. 7
- [3] Luca Avena, Hakan Gludaş, Remco van der Hofstad, and Frank den Hollander. Random walks on dynamic configuration models: A trichotomy. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 129(9):3360–3375, sep 2019. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.spa.2018.09.010>, doi:10.1016/j.spa.2018.09.010. 8
- [4] Zsuzsanna Baran, Jonathan Hermon, Anđela Šarković, and Perla Sousi. Phase transition for random walks on graphs with added weighted random matching. 2023. [arXiv:2306.13077](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.13077). 7, 9
- [5] Anna Ben-Hamou. A threshold for cutoff in two-community random graphs. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 30(4):1824 – 1846, 2020. doi:10.1214/19-AAP1544. 7
- [6] Anna Ben-Hamou, Eyal Lubetzky, and Yuval Peres. Comparing mixing times on sparse random graphs. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 55(2):1116 – 1130, 2019. doi:10.1214/18-AIHP911. 7
- [7] Anna Ben-Hamou and Yuval Peres. Cutoff for permuted Markov chains. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 59(1):230 – 243, 2023. doi:10.1214/22-AIHP1248. 7, 8
- [8] Anna Ben-Hamou and Justin Salez. Cutoff for nonbacktracking random walks on sparse random graphs. *The Annals of Probability*, 45(3):1752–1770, 2017. 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 50
- [9] Itai Benjamini, Gady Kozma, and Nicholas Wormald. The mixing time of the giant component of a random graph. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 45(3):383–407, 2014. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/rsa.20539>, [arXiv:https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/rsa.20539](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/rsa.20539), doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/rsa.20539>. 4, 7
- [10] Nathanaël Berestycki, Eyal Lubetzky, Yuval Peres, and Allan Sly. Random walks on the random graph. *The Annals of Probability*, 46(1):456–490, 2018. doi:doi:10.1214/17-AOP1189. 4, 7, 25
- [11] E. Bolthausen. An estimate of the remainder in a combinatorial central limit theorem. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 66(3):379–386, 1984. doi:10.1007/BF00533704. 8

- [12] Erwin Bolthausen and Friedrich Götze. The rate of convergence for multivariate sampling statistics. *Ann. Stat.*, 21(4):1692–1710, 1993. doi:10.1214/aos/1176349393. 8
- [13] Charles Bordenave. A new proof of Friedman’s second eigenvalue theorem and its extension to random lifts. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 53(6):1393–1439, 2020. doi:10.24033/asens.2450. 8
- [14] Charles Bordenave, Pietro Caputo, and Justin Salez. Random walk on sparse random digraphs. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 170(3-4):933–960, 2018. doi:10.1007/s00440-017-0796-7. 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 45, 50
- [15] Charles Bordenave, Pietro Caputo, and Justin Salez. Cutoff at the “entropic time” for sparse Markov chains. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 173(1):261–292, February 2019. doi:10.1007/s00440-018-0834-0. 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 45
- [16] Charles Bordenave and Hubert Lacoin. Cutoff at the entropic time for random walks on covered expander graphs. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 21(5):1571–1616, 2022. doi:10.1017/S1474748020000663. 8, 34
- [17] Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pacal Massart. On concentration of self-bounding functions. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 14:no. 64, 1884–1899, 2009. doi:10.1214/EJP.v14-690. 63
- [18] Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. *Concentration inequalities*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013. A nonasymptotic theory of independence, With a foreword by Michel Ledoux. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199535255.001.0001. 65
- [19] Pietro Caputo and Matteo Quattropani. Mixing time of PageRank surfers on sparse random digraphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 59(3):376–406, apr 2021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002%2Frfa.21009>, doi:10.1002/rfa.21009. 8
- [20] Pietro Caputo and Matteo Quattropani. Mixing time trichotomy in regenerating dynamic digraphs. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 137:222–251, jul 2021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.spa.2021.03.003>, doi:10.1016/j.spa.2021.03.003. 8
- [21] Sourav Chatterjee. *Concentration inequalities with exchangeable pairs*. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2005. arXiv:math/0507526. 4, 8, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66
- [22] Sourav Chatterjee. Concentration of Haar measures, with an application to random matrices. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 245(2):379–389, 2007. doi:10.1016/j.jfa.2007.01.003. 8, 63, 66
- [23] Sourav Chatterjee. Stein’s method for concentration inequalities. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 138(1-2):305–321, 2007. doi:10.1007/s00440-006-0029-y. 4, 8, 63
- [24] Sourav Chatterjee. A short survey of Stein’s method, 2014. arXiv:1404.1392. 8
- [25] Sourav Chatterjee and Persi Diaconis. Speeding up Markov chains with deterministic jumps. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 181(1-3):377–400, 2021. doi:10.1007/s00440-021-01049-1. 7

- [26] Sourav Chatterjee, Persi Diaconis, and Elizabeth Meckes. Exchangeable pairs and Poisson approximation. *Probability Surveys*, 2(none):64 – 106, 2005. doi:[10.1214/154957805100000096](https://doi.org/10.1214/154957805100000096). 8
- [27] Guillaume Conchon-Kerjan. Cutoff for random lifts of weighted graphs. *The Annals of Probability*, 50(1):304 – 338, 2022. doi:[10.1214/21-AOP1534](https://doi.org/10.1214/21-AOP1534). 7
- [28] Persi Diaconis. The cutoff phenomenon in finite Markov chains. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 93(4):1659–1664, 1996. doi:[10.1073/pnas.93.4.1659](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.93.4.1659). 7
- [29] Persi Diaconis and Mehrdad Shahshahani. Generating a random permutation with random transpositions. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 57(2):159–179, 1981. doi:[10.1007/BF00535487](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00535487). 7, 63, 66
- [30] Bastien Dubail. Cutoff for mixtures of permuted markov chains: general case, 2024. arXiv:[2402.03415](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.03415). 3
- [31] Sean Eberhard and Péter P. Varjú. Mixing time of the Chung–Diaconis–Graham random process. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 179(1):317–344, February 2021. doi:[10.1007/s00440-020-01009-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-020-01009-1). 8
- [32] David Ellis, Ehud Friedgut, and Haran Pilpel. Intersecting families of permutations. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 24(3):649–682, 2011. doi:[10.1090/S0894-0347-2011-00690-5](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-2011-00690-5). 6
- [33] William Feller. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, Volume I*. 1967. 31
- [34] N. Fountoulakis and B.A. Reed. The evolution of the mixing rate of a simple random walk on the giant component of a random graph. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 33(1):68–86, 2008. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/rsa.20210>, arXiv:<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/rsa.20210>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/rsa.20210>. 4, 7
- [35] David A. Freedman. On tail probabilities for martingales. *The Annals of Probability*, 3:100–118, 1975. doi:[doi:10.1214/aop/1176996452](https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1176996452). 52
- [36] Joel Friedman. A proof of alon’s second eigenvalue conjecture and related problems. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, 195(910):0–0, 2008. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090%2Fmemo%2F0910>, doi:[10.1090/memo/0910](https://doi.org/10.1090/memo/0910). 8
- [37] Jonathan Hermon and Sam Olesker-Taylor. Cutoff for almost all random walks on abelian groups, 2021. arXiv:[2102.02809](https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.02809). 7
- [38] Jonathan Hermon and Sam Olesker-Taylor. Cutoff for random walks on upper triangular matrices, 2021. arXiv:[1911.02974](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.02974). 7
- [39] Jonathan Hermon, Allan Sly, and Perla Sousi. Universality of cutoff for graphs with an added random matching. *The Annals of Probability*, 50(1), Jan 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214%2F21-aop1532>, doi:[10.1214/21-aop1532](https://doi.org/10.1214/21-aop1532). 1, 3, 7, 9, 12, 13, 25, 37, 40, 42

- [40] Jonathan Hermon, Anđela Šarković, and Perla Sousi. Cutoff for random walk on random graphs with a community structure. 2022. [arXiv:2212.04469](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.04469). 7, 9
- [41] Wassily Hoeffding. A combinatorial central limit theorem. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22(4):558–566, 1951. [doi:doi:10.1214/aoms/1177729545](https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729545). 8
- [42] V. A. Kaimanovich and A. M. Vershik. Random walks on discrete groups: Boundary and entropy. *The Annals of Probability*, 11:457–490, 1983. [doi:doi:10.1214/aop/1176993497](https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1176993497). 42
- [43] David A. Levin and Yuval Peres. *Markov chains and mixing times*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017. Second edition of [MR2466937], With contributions by Elizabeth L. Wilmer, With a chapter on “Coupling from the past” by James G. Propp and David B. Wilson. [doi:10.1090/mbk/107](https://doi.org/10.1090/mbk/107). 34
- [44] Torgny Lindvall. *Lectures on the coupling method*. Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2002. 30
- [45] Torgny Lindvall and L. C. G. Rogers. On coupling of random walks and renewal processes. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 33:122–126, 1996. 30
- [46] Eyal Lubetzky and Yuval Peres. Cutoff on all Ramanujan graphs. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 26(4):1190–1216, July 2016. [doi:10.1007/s00039-016-0382-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00039-016-0382-7). 8
- [47] Eyal Lubetzky and Allan Sly. Cutoff phenomena for random walks on random regular graphs. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 153(3):475 – 510, 2010. [doi:10.1215/00127094-2010-029](https://doi.org/10.1215/00127094-2010-029). 7
- [48] Russell Lyons, Robin Pemantle, and Yuval Peres. Ergodic theory on Galton—Watson trees: speed of random walk and dimension of harmonic measure. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 15(3):593–619, 1995. [doi:10.1017/S0143385700008543](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385700008543). 42
- [49] Russell Lyons and Yuval Peres. *Probability on trees and networks*, volume 42 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2016. [doi:10.1017/9781316672815](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316672815). 2, 25, 26
- [50] Bernard Maurey. Construction de suites symétriques. *CR Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. AB*, 288(14):A679–A681, 1979. 4
- [51] Narutaka Ozawa. An entropic proof of cutoff on Ramanujan graphs. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 25:1 – 8, 2020. [doi:10.1214/20-ECP358](https://doi.org/10.1214/20-ECP358). 8
- [52] Daniel Paulin. Concentration inequalities for Markov chains by Marton couplings and spectral methods. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 20:no. 79, 32, 2015. [doi:10.1214/EJP.v20-4039](https://doi.org/10.1214/EJP.v20-4039). 34, 35
- [53] Justin Salez. Cutoff for non-negatively curved markov chains. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, May 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4171%2Fjems%2F1348>, [doi:10.4171/jems/1348](https://doi.org/10.4171/jems/1348). 7, 8
- [54] Laurent Saloff-Coste. Random walks on finite groups. In *Probability on Discrete Structures*, pages 263–346. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-3-662-09444-0_5, [doi:10.1007/978-3-662-09444-0_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-09444-0_5). 7

- [55] Charles Stein. A bound for the error in the normal approximation to the distribution of a sum of dependent random variables. *Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, 1972, 1972. URL: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.bsmsp/1200514239>. 8
- [56] Charles Stein. Approximate computation of expectations. *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, 7:i-164, 1986. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4355512>. 8
- [57] Michel Talagrand. Concentration of measure and isoperimetric inequalities in product spaces. *Publications mathématiques de l'IHÉS*, 81(1):73-205, Dec 1995. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/2Fbf02699376>, doi:10.1007/bf02699376. 4