

PAIR COALESCENCE TIMES OF ANCESTRAL LINEAGES OF TWO-DIMENSIONAL LOGISTIC BRANCHING RANDOM WALKS

MATTHIAS BIRKNER, ANDREJ DEPPERSCHMIDT, TIMO SCHLÜTER

We dedicate this paper to Alison M. Etheridge on the occasion of her 60th birthday.

ABSTRACT. Consider two ancestral lineages sampled from a system of two-dimensional branching random walks with logistic regulation in the stationary regime. We study the asymptotics of their coalescence time for large initial separation and find that it agrees with well known results for a suitably scaled two-dimensional stepping stone model and also with Malécot’s continuous-space approximation for the probability of identity by descent as a function of sampling distance. This can be viewed as a justification for the replacement of locally fluctuating population sizes by fixed effective sizes. Our main tool is a joint regeneration construction for the spatial embeddings of the two ancestral lineages.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and main result	1
1.1. The Wright-Malécot formula	1
1.2. Logistic branching random walks	2
1.3. Ancestral lineages of two samples from LBRW	3
1.4. Asymptotics for pair coalescence times and the probability of identity by descent	4
1.5. Remarks and discussion	5
1.6. Outlook	8
1.7. Outline	9
2. Summary of relevant results from [BDS24]	9
2.1. Ancestral lineages in LBRW	9
2.2. Coupling properties of η	9
2.3. A joint regeneration construction	10
3. Details for and proof of Theorem 1.3 and Corollary 1.4	12
3.1. Tails for meeting times	12
3.2. Completion of the proof of Theorem 1.3	19
3.3. Asymptotics for the Laplace transform of pair coalescence times: Proof of Corollary 1.4	20
Appendix A. Detailed proof of (3.9)	20
Appendix B. Detailed proof of the lower bound in (3.6)	21
Appendix C. Proof details for Lemma 3.6	21
Appendix D. Coalescing probabilities	25
Acknowledgements	27
References	27

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

1.1. **The Wright-Malécot formula.** Consider a population of a certain species which lives, reproduces and evolves in a two-dimensional space. We assume that the population is composed of individuals with possibly different (but neutral) genetic types, and that offspring disperse (only) locally around their parent’s location. Imagine that environmental conditions are – at least approximately – homogeneous in space and time, that the population has been around for quite long and has reached some sort of “equilibrium” with respect to its environment, and that the habitat is very large compared to the distance a typical individual can travel during

Date: 6th May 2024.

their lifetime. Then it seems a reasonable mathematical abstraction to assume that the state of the population can be described by some spatial random process which is (in distribution) shift-invariant in space and time and that one observes at any given time this process in its equilibrium state. For simplicity, we will assume in the following that individuals are haploid, and that mutations occur according to the so-called infinite alleles model, i.e. a mutation will always generate a novel type.

Imagine that we sample two individuals from this population at a given time, say one from the origin and another one at position x ($\in \mathbb{R}^2$, say). What is the probability $\phi(x)$ that the two sampled individuals have the same genetic type?

For such a situation, assuming that space is continuous and given by the two-dimensional plane \mathbb{R}^2 , Gustave Malécot [Mal48, Mal69] (and also Sewall Wright [Wri43, Wri46] who formulated a series representation of the same term) gave a remarkable approximation formula to answer this question, namely

$$(1.1) \quad \phi(x) \approx \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma^2\delta + K_0(\sqrt{2\mu}\kappa/\sigma)} K_0(\sqrt{2\mu}\|x\|/\sigma) \quad \text{for } \|x\| \geq \kappa.$$

Here, the parameters have the following interpretations: $\delta > 0$ is the local population density (i.e., in a region A one should find on average $\delta|A|$ many individuals), $\sigma > 0$ is the standard deviation of the spatial displacement between a typical individual and its parent, $\mu > 0$ is the mutation probability per generation and $\kappa > 0$ is a ‘‘local scale’’ parameter; the intuitive idea is that the approximation breaks down for distances smaller than κ . Finally, $K_0(\cdot)$ is the modified Bessel function of the second kind of order 0 (see Remark 1.5 below, where we recall relevant properties).

G. Malécot derived the formula (1.1) for $\phi(x)$ in the 1940ies by considering the recursion formula

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi(y) = (1 - \mu)^2 & \left(\frac{1 - \phi(0)}{\delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g_{\sigma^2}(y - z) g_{\sigma^2}(z) dz \right. \\ & \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} g_{\sigma^2}(z) g_{\sigma^2}(z') \phi(y + z - z') dz dz' \right) \end{aligned}$$

($g_{\sigma^2}(\cdot)$ is the twodimensional normal density with covariance σ^2 times the identity matrix), then taking the Fourier transform and (formally) inverting it. Briefly, the rationale behind (1.2) is a backwards in time argument. Imagine sampling two different individuals at spatial separation $y \neq 0$ and decompose the event that they have the same type according to their ancestry one generation ago. Neither must have experienced a mutation, which explains the factor $(1 - \mu)^2$ on the right-hand side. Next, imagine that the spatial displacement of these two individuals from their (respective) ancestors is described by a centred isotropic Gaussian displacement with variance σ^2 . The second integral on the right-hand side refers to the case that these ancestors lived at different positions (and are then necessarily distinct, with a new spatial separation) whereas the first integral comes from the case when the two ancestors lived at the same position (and are then with probability $1/\delta$ in fact the same individual).

This is arguably a remarkably early instance of the ‘modern’ retrospective viewpoint in mathematical population genetics which has become very prominent since the introduction of the Kingman coalescent and its many ramifications [Kin82] (and also [Hud83a, Hud83b, Taj83] in the biology literature). It is, however, not entirely rigorous. In fact, no stochastic population model exists in two-dimensional continuous space \mathbb{R}^2 which has both a non-trivial and homogeneous stationary distribution as well as a dynamics of embedded ancestral lineages literally compatible with (1.2). The situation is different on the discrete space \mathbb{Z}^2 , where one can meaningfully condition on constant local population sizes/densities, leading to the so-called stepping stone models (see also Remarks 1.9 and 1.8 below).

The Wright-Malécot formula (1.1) and its surrounding philosophy (as well as its difficulties) are nicely explained e.g. in [BDE02] and also in [Eth06, Eth19]. See also Remark 1.8 below, where we discuss some aspects relevant to the present study.

1.2. Logistic branching random walks. As mentioned above (and discussed in more detail in Remarks 1.8, 1.9 below), a popular way of modelling spatially distributed populations is to decompose the habitat, possibly somewhat artificially, into discrete ‘demes’, whose population

sizes or densities are exogeneously given or fixed, maybe varying in space and time as a deterministic function. Our aim in this paper is to derive an asymptotic analogue of (1.1) for a population model which has a non-trivial equilibrium in two-dimensional space with fluctuating local population sizes due to randomness in the reproduction and an endogeneous feed-back mechanism. We consider one prototypical, discrete model (both space, time and population numbers are discrete), for which our approach is technically easier than in the continuum case. We believe however that with more technical effort, continuous models could be studied in a similar fashion, see also Section 1.6 below.

Specifically, we consider the following version of logistic branching random walks (LBRW), which was studied in [BD07]. Let $p = (p_{xy})_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} = (p_{y-x})_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ be a symmetric aperiodic stochastic kernel on \mathbb{Z}^d with finite range $R_p \geq 1$, $\lambda = (\lambda_{xy})_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ a non-negative symmetric kernel on \mathbb{Z}^d with finite range R_λ and $m \in (1, 3)$. We assume that p is the transition kernel of an aperiodic and irreducible random walk on \mathbb{Z}^d . For a configuration $\xi \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we define

$$(1.3) \quad f(x; \xi) := \xi(x) \left(m - \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \lambda_{xz} \xi(z) \right)^+.$$

A configuration of the population η is a (random) element of $\mathbb{N}_0^{\mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}}$ where $\eta_n(x)$ is the number of particles at position $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ in generation $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The population evolves in the following way: given η_n , the state of the population at time n , each particle at x has $\text{Pois}((m - \sum_z \lambda_{z-x} \eta_n(z))^+)$ many offspring. We see from the parameter $(m - \sum_z \lambda_{z-x} \eta_n(z))^+$ that λ introduces local competition and each individual at z reduces the average reproductive success of the focal individuals at x by λ_{z-x} . Thus we also call λ the *competition kernel*. Lastly the offspring move a random walk step from their parent's position independently of each other according to the transition kernel p . Therefore, given η_n , we obtain by the superposition properties of independent Poisson random variables the following generation via

$$(1.4) \quad \eta_{n+1}(x) \sim \text{Pois} \left(\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_{yx} f(y; \eta_n) \right), \quad \text{independently for } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

In summary, (η_n) is a spatial population model with local density-dependent feedback, i.e. the offspring distribution is supercritical when there are few individuals in the vicinity and subcritical whenever there are too many. In general this system is not attractive, i.e., adding particles to the initial condition can stochastically decrease the population at later times. This is owed to the fact that the competition kernel is non-local as well as to the fact that by discreteness of time, all sites are updated simultaneously.

Theorem 1.1 ([BD07, Theorem 3 and Corollary 4]). *Assume $m \in (1, 3)$, $0 < \lambda_0 \ll 1$, $\lambda_z \ll \lambda_0$ for $z \neq 0$. Then (η_n) survives for all time globally and locally with positive probability for any non-trivial initial condition η_0 .*

Given survival, η_n converges in distribution to its unique non-trivial equilibrium $\bar{\nu}$.

The restriction on m stems from the fact that the proof in [BD07] requires that the logistic map $x \mapsto x(m - \lambda x)^+$ has a (unique) strictly positive stable fixed point (namely, $(m - 1)/\lambda$). For more discussion see [BD07].

1.3. Ancestral lineages of two samples from LBRW. Consider the stationary process $(\eta_n^{\text{stat}})_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ with $\mathcal{L}(\eta_n^{\text{stat}}) = \bar{\nu}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, enriched with “enough book-keeping” to follow ancestries of particles. Since we have discrete particles, it is in principle straightforward, though notationally cumbersome, to keep track of each particle's ancestry. We will not make this book-keeping explicit in the following but keep in mind that it is in principle there (see also Chapter 4 in [Dep08] or Section 4 in [BCD16]).

Let $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $x \neq 0$, sample one individual at random from η_0^{stat} at 0 and one from x . (We implicitly condition on $\eta_0^{\text{stat}}(0) > 0$ and $\eta_0^{\text{stat}}(x) > 0$ so that such sampling is possible. In the parameter regime we consider, η_0^{stat} will typically have a very large population density anyway, so the effect of this conditioning is extremely mild.) We denote

$$\begin{aligned} X &= (X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}, X_k = \text{position of ancestor } k \text{ generations in the past of particle sampled at } 0 \\ X' &= (X'_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}, X'_k = \text{position of ancestor } k \text{ generations in the past of particle sampled at } x \end{aligned}$$

and let τ_{coal} be the time (generations backwards in time) to the most recent common ancestor of the two sampled particles. Furthermore we define $\mathbb{P}_{x,x'}$ to be the measure with X started at x and X' at x' , i.e. we condition on $X_0 = x$ and $X'_0 = x'$.

The pair (X, X') can be interpreted as two delayed coalescing random walks in a dynamic random environment (which is generated by the time reversal of the population's space-time occupation field η), see Section 2.1 and Appendix D for details. Random walks in dynamic random environments (RWDRE) are a very active research topic, see e.g. the discussion and references in [BDS24, BČD16]. However, the possibility of coalescence, which is our focus here, is a scenario that is typically not considered in the context of RWDRE.

Note that the dynamics of (X, X') when averaging over η is not Markovian (intuitively, at a given time, past behaviour of (X, X') contains then information on the population densities the walks will experience in the future). When fixing η (i.e., in the context of random walks in random environments considering the “quenched law”), the dynamics is in Markovian (see Appendix D) but the transition probabilities are space-time inhomogeneous and depend in a relatively complicated way on $(\eta_n(x), n \in \mathbb{Z}_-, x \in \mathbb{Z}^2)$.

1.4. Asymptotics for pair coalescence times and the probability of identity by descent. With all other parameters fixed, (1.1) yields $\phi(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\|x\| \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, for fixed x (and δ, σ, κ fixed as well), (1.1) gives $\phi(x) \rightarrow 1$ as $\mu \rightarrow 0$. In applications, we might be interested in the population's genetics structure over large spatial scales and the mutation rate at the locus under study might be very small. Thus, it is not unnatural to assume that $\|x\|$ is very large and at the same time μ , though positive, is tiny.

In such a situation, interesting structure can arise from scaling. Assume that $x = Ny$ with $y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and $\mu = \mu_N = mN^{-2\gamma}$ with $m \in (0, \infty)$ and $\gamma \geq 1$ are scaled with $N \rightarrow \infty$ and we keep the other parameters δ, σ and κ fixed: we sample a pair with a large separation and the mutation rate is very small (proportional to a certain negative power of the separation). In this scenario (1.1) yields

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{K_0(\sqrt{2m}\|y\|N^{1-\gamma}/\sigma)}{2\pi\sigma^2\delta + K_0(\sqrt{2m}\kappa N^{-\gamma}/\sigma)} \sim \frac{-\log(\sqrt{2m}\|y\|N^{1-\gamma}/\sigma)}{-\log(\sqrt{2m}\kappa N^{-\gamma}/\sigma)} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma}$$

where we used the asymptotics of $K_0(\cdot)$ near 0 from (1.10).

Remark 1.2. To lessen the overall notation we will often write $\mathbb{P}_{Nx} = \mathbb{P}_{0,Nx}$ when we explicitly consider a particle starting at the origin and the other starting at Nx . Note that N is just a scaling parameter while $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ is some direction and we always assume Nx to be in \mathbb{Z}^2 , e.g. by rounding. This small “error” has no influence on the results and carrying it through all calculations would unnecessarily clutter the proofs. Later, in the proofs, the calculations often only depend on the distance of the particles and not their actual positions. In these cases we also write \mathbb{P}_R if the particles start at distance $R > 0$ to highlight this dependence.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $d = 2$, assume $m \in (1, 3)$, $0 < \lambda_0 \ll 1$, $\lambda_z \ll \lambda_0$ for $z \neq 0$. We have*

$$(1.6) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{coal}} > N^{2\gamma}) = \frac{1}{\gamma} \quad \text{for } \gamma \geq 1.$$

(\mathbb{P}_{Nx} refers to sampling at separation Nx , $x \neq 0$.)

Corollary 1.4 (An asymptotic analogue of Malécot's formula for LBRW). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.3, for $\mu_N = mN^{-2\gamma}$ with $\gamma \geq 1$, $m \in (0, \infty)$ we have*

$$(1.7) \quad \phi_N(Nx) = \mathbb{E}_{Nx}[(1 - \mu_N)^{2\tau_{\text{coal}}}] \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma}.$$

Our proof of Theorem 1.3 uses a joint regeneration construction for the spatial embedding (X, X') of the ancestral lineages of the two samples from Section 1.3. This construction was introduced in [BDS24] as a key technical tool to prove a quenched central limit theorem (literally, in a slightly different form since coalescence was not considered there). We recall relevant concepts and results from [BDS24] in Section 2.

1.5. Remarks and discussion.

Remark 1.5 (Modified Bessel function). For convenience, we recall here properties of Bessel functions which are relevant for this text, see also e.g. [DLM, Ch. 10]. For $\nu \in \mathbb{C}$, the modified Bessel equation of order ν is [DLM, 10.25.1]

$$(1.8) \quad z^2 \frac{d^2}{dz^2} w(z) + z \frac{d}{dz} w(z) - (z^2 + \nu^2) w(z) = 0.$$

There are two ‘standard’ solutions to (1.8), $I_\nu(\cdot)$ and $K_\nu(\cdot)$, the modified Bessel functions of the first and of the second kind, respectively, of order ν .

We focus here on the case $\nu = 0$ and we consider only real, non-negative arguments. $K_0(t)$ then solves

$$(1.9) \quad \frac{d^2}{dt^2} K_0(t) + \frac{1}{t} \frac{d}{dt} K_0(t) - K_0(t) = 0, \quad t > 0$$

and it is the unique solution to (1.9) with the following boundary behaviour, see e.g. [DLM, 10.25.3] and [DLM, 10.30.3],

$$(1.10) \quad K_0(t) \sim \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2t}} \exp(-t) \text{ for } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad K_0(0) \sim \log(1/t) \text{ for } t \rightarrow 0.$$

Remark 1.6 (Brownian motion viewpoint on Malécot’s formula). As observed e.g. in [BDE02, Appendix], the Wright-Malécot formula (1.1) can alternatively be viewed as an assumption on the behaviour of the spatial embedding of two sampled ancestral lineages, at least while their spatial separation is larger than κ . Namely, let us assume that two ancestral lineages, which were sampled with an initial separation x , cannot merge while separated by more than κ and until that time the difference of their spatial embeddings behaves like a $2d$ -Brownian motion $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with variance $2\sigma^2$. (Here, we replaced discrete generations by continuous time, and we implicitly assume that the mutation rate $\mu > 0$ is small so that the replacement $(1 - \mu)^{2\tau} \approx e^{-2\mu\tau}$ is justified.)

Put $\tau := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|B_t\| \leq \kappa\}$ and set

$$(1.11) \quad f_\mu(x) = \mathbb{E}_x[\exp(-2\mu\tau)\phi(\kappa)], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2$$

(where \mathbb{E}_x refers to the initial condition $B_0 = x$). It is well known that f_μ is the unique solution of

$$(1.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \sigma^2 \Delta f_\mu(x) - 2\mu f_\mu(x) &= 0, & \|x\| > \kappa, \\ f_\mu(x) &= \phi(\kappa), & \|x\| \leq \kappa. \end{aligned}$$

By radial symmetry, $f_\mu(x) = g_\mu(\|x\|)$, where g_μ solves (using the Laplace operator in polar coordinates)

$$(1.13) \quad g_\mu''(r) + \frac{1}{r} g_\mu'(r) - \frac{2\mu}{\sigma^2} g_\mu(r) = 0, \quad r \geq \kappa \quad \text{with} \quad g_\mu(\kappa) = \phi(\kappa), \quad g_\mu(\infty) = 0.$$

Note that (1.13) coincides with the modified Bessel ODE (1.9) up to a re-scaling (indeed, $\tilde{g}(t) := g_\mu(\sigma t / \sqrt{2\mu})$ solves (1.9) for $\sqrt{2\mu}\kappa/\sigma < t < \infty$), hence

$$g_\mu(r) = \frac{\phi(\kappa)}{K_0(\sqrt{2\mu}\kappa/\sigma)} K_0(\sqrt{2\mu}r/\sigma) \quad \text{for } r \geq \kappa.$$

The assumption on the behaviour of sampled ancestral lineages discussed above together with the strong Markov property of Brownian motion (and our assumption of mutations according to the infinite alleles model) implies then for $\|x\| \geq \kappa$

$$(1.14) \quad \phi(x) = f_\mu(x) = g_\mu(\|x\|) = \frac{\phi(\kappa)}{K_0(\sqrt{2\mu}\kappa/\sigma)} K_0(\sqrt{2\mu}\|x\|/\sigma),$$

which agrees with the right-hand side of (1.1).

But note that this argument shows the form of $\phi(x)$ involving the Bessel function, but in itself does not identify the prefactor. One can of course insert the value of $\phi(\kappa)$ from the right-hand side of (1.1) and then literally recover (1.1), which seems however a bit circular. This is an instance of the fact that we are treating here (as well as later in the proofs in Section 3) what

happens when the two lineages are close as something like a “black box” where we have no explicit control.

Remark 1.7 (Hitting times for two-dimensional random walk). Let $(S_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be an irreducible, centered 2-dimensional random walk with finite second moments and let $\tau_0 := \inf\{k : S_k = 0\}$ be the hitting time of the origin. For $x(n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $\|x(n)\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$(1.15) \quad \mathbb{P}(\tau_0 > n \mid S_0 = x(n)) \sim \frac{2 \log(\|x\|_2)}{\log n} \wedge 1 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This was first proved by Erdős and Taylor [ET60] for symmetric simple random walk on \mathbb{Z}^2 (see [ET60, (2.16)] and read $\rho = \|x(n)\|_2$, assuming $\|x(n)\|_2 \leq n^{1/3}$, cf. [ET60, (2.13)]) and later extended in [Saw77, Thm. 3]. These proofs are computational and do make use of the explicit structure of a random walk as a sum of i.i.d. steps, which allows fairly explicit computation of generating functions as well as renewal decompositions according to returns to the origin and local CLT estimates. We refer to [CG86, p. 354] for a nice heuristic explanation of the idea behind them.

Recalling (1.6) from Theorem 1.3 we see that our main result can be viewed as establishing the Erdős-Taylor asymptotics (1.15) for the difference $(S_k)_k := (X_k - X'_k)_k$ of the two ancestral lines. Intuitively, this holds because even though the law of $X - X'$ is complicated (it is in particular not a random walk, unlike the situation in the stepping stone model, see Remark 1.9 below), it is close to a random walk when the separation $X_k - X'_k$ is large (see the discussion in Section 2 and especially (2.6)). In this sense, our study belongs to the circle of results which are sometimes called “Lamperti problems” in honour of John Lamperti’s work in the 1960ies on locally perturbed random walks, see e.g. [MPW17] for background and references.

Our proof of Theorem 1.3 uses the simple (and robust) idea that for $\gamma > 1$ and $N \gg M \gg 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau_0 > N^{2\gamma} \mid \|S_0\|_2 = N) &\approx \mathbb{P}(\|S\|_2 \text{ hits } N^\gamma \text{ before dropping below } M \mid \|S_0\|_2 = N) \\ &\approx \frac{\log(N) - \log(M)}{\log(N^\gamma) - \log(M)} \approx \frac{1}{\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

because $\mathbb{Z}^2 \ni x \mapsto \log(\|x\|_2)$ is “almost harmonic” for $S = X - X'$ (it is of course literally harmonic for 2d Brownian motion). See also Remark 3.2 below.

Remark 1.8 (Known problems with Malécot’s formula). As mentioned above, the derivation of (1.1) in [Mal48, Mal69] is based on the recursion (1.2) via ‘backwards in time analysis’, however, there is no rigorous underlying forwards-in-time stochastic population model in the derivation. It is well known that in two dimensions the critical branching random walk dies out locally and builds large clumps in the regions in which it does survive. Similarly on compact spaces, such as a torus, the critical branching random walk dies out almost surely and forms arbitrarily dense clumps if conditioned to survive. J. Felsenstein called this phenomenon the ‘pain in the torus’ in [Fel75]. It is also well known that critical branching Brownian motion dies out in $d = 2$, see e.g. [Kal77], [BCG93]. Another problem is that there is no obvious way (nor in fact a consistent way) of extending the recursions backwards in time to larger sample sizes.

There are some remedies to overcome these issues that were considered in the literature.

- (a) A class of models known as stepping stone models is very popular. Here, the space is discretised and constant local population sizes are enforced. One can think in these models that in the forwards in time evolution of type configurations individuals in the new generation choose their parents at random from some neighbourhood in the previous generation and adopt their type (at this stage it is possible to introduce selection and mutation). Here the ancestral lineages perform random walks and accordingly the ancestries of samples of individuals perform coalescing random walks with a coalescence delay depending on the (constant) local population size.

Stepping stone models were introduced by Kimura and Weiss in [KW64] and different flavours of these models as well as different questions were studied in [WK65], [Mar70], [Mal75], [Saw76], [Shi81], [Shi88], [WH98, WH03] and many others. For an overview see for example Chapter 6 in [Eth11].

These models lead to elegant sampling formulas via duality with coalescing random walks (see also Remark 1.9 below) and it has been observed that the resulting probability

of identity as a function of sampling distance (see (1.16) below) agrees already for rather moderate separation x very well with $\phi(x)$ from (1.1) with suitably adjusted parameters, see e.g. [BDE02, Fig. 1]. On the other hand, the deterministic size restriction seems artificial and in particular not suitable for ‘ecological’ spatial stochastic models.

- (b) In order to overcome the restriction to constant local population size one can consider branching random walks or related processes with local regulation. Here the offspring distribution is supercritical in sparsely populated regions and subcritical when there are many neighbours. The models from this class are natural extensions of stepping stone models, of branching random walks as well as of the contact process.

There is a large body of literature in which such models are studied. For instance Bolker and Pacala [BP97, BP99], Law and Dieckmann [LD02], Murrell and Law [ML03] study such models based on simulations and non-rigorous moment closure approximations. Mathematically rigorous analyses were carried out by Etheridge [Eth04], Fournier and Méléard [FM04], Hutzenthaler and Wakolbinger [HW07], Blath, Etheridge and Meredith [BEM07], Birkner and Depperschmidt [BD07], Pardoux and Wakolbinger [PW11], Finkelshtein, Kondratiev and Kutoviy [FKK12], Le, Pardoux and Wakolbinger [LPW13], Greven, Sturm, Winter and Zähle [GSWZ15], Maillard and Penington [MP24], Etheridge, Kurtz, Letter, Ralph and Tsui [EKL⁺24] and others. Many aspects of models with local regulation have been studied, see e.g. [BG21] for a partial overview and further discussion. However, there is little hope for explicit sampling formulas.

- (c) In a series of papers starting with the work by A. M. Etheridge [Eth08] and [BEV10] together with N. H. Barton and A. Véber, the spatial- Λ -Fleming Viot process has been introduced and studied. Several properties of the process as well as extensions were considered in [VW15, EFS17, EK19, EVY20]. The process solves the problems described at the beginning of this remark and in principle elegant sampling formulas are available. In a suitable scaling limit, there is even an explicit analogue of the Wright-Malécot formula (1.1), see [For22, Theorem 2.4]. On the other hand, the derivation of the spatial- Λ -Fleming Viot process implicitly takes a large (local) population density limit and thus does not incorporate the possibility of local size fluctuations.

- (d) One can consider the Fleming-Viot process (see e.g. [Eth00]) or one of its ‘multiple merger’ generalisations, a Λ - or Ξ -Fleming-Viot process (see e.g. [DK99, BLG03, BBM⁺09]) with underlying Brownian motion on a compact, two-dimensional continuous space like a suitable bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^2 with periodic or reflecting boundary conditions. These processes have a fixed total mass, hence there is no problem with extinction nor with clumping, and observed (only) locally, the population size does fluctuate very much like a critical branching process (albeit not in a way that decorrelates with distance because of the total mass constraint). They also have (suitably interpreted) sampling consistency for arbitrary sample sizes, see [Koe24], and the ancestry of samples together with their spatial embeddings has an elegant description via so-called Brownian spatial coalescents; there is also an analogue of the Wright-Malécot formula in this context ([Koe24, Example 1.9]).

As observed in [Koe24, Section 1.7.3], for $d \geq 3$, the restriction to a compact (geographical) space can be overcome by considering an analogous programme based on the stationary version of superbrownian motion (which exists on \mathbb{R}^d for any $d \geq 3$, see e.g. [Eth00]).

As an aside, let us remark that regulating the branching rate based on the local population density while keeping the offspring law critical does not resolve the problem, as conjectured by Alison Etheridge in the early 2000s and later proved in [BS19].

Let us also note that in the context of classical interacting particle systems (e.g. summarised in [Lig99]), stepping stone models correspond to the voter model whereas the locally regulated models correspond to the contact process.

Remark 1.9 (Stepping stone models and relatives and identity by descent). Colonies of *fixed* local size N are arranged in a geographical space, say \mathbb{Z}^d . For each individual in colony x , with probability $p(x, y) = p(y - x)$ assign a random parent in previous generation from colony y . In these models the demographic structure is trivial, nevertheless these models are paradigm models for evolution of *type distribution* in space.

Ancestral lineages in such a model are coalescing random walks: Sample one individual from colony x and one from colony y . The spatial positions of the ancestral lines are random walks with (delayed) coalescence. While not yet merged, each takes an independent step according to the random walk transition kernel p , every time they are in the same colony, the two lines merge with probability $1/N$. Note that here, the recursive decomposition behind (1.2) becomes exact.

Assume that during the reproduction each offspring mutates with probability u (to a completely new type), let

$$\psi(x, y) := \text{probability in equilibrium that two individuals randomly drawn from colonies } x \text{ and } y \text{ have same type}$$

Assuming that p is symmetric we have

$$(1.16) \quad \psi(x, y) = \frac{1 - \psi(0, 0)}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - u)^{2k} p_{2k}(x, y) = \frac{G_u(x, y)}{N + G_u(0, 0)}$$

where p_k is the k -step transition kernel and

$$(1.17) \quad G_u(x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - u)^{2k} p_{2k}(x, y).$$

The first identity in (1.16) is computed e.g. in Theorem 5.4 in [Dur08] where one has to replace $2N$ by N in our case. The second identity in (1.16) follows by using the first, solving for $\psi(0, 0)$ and then substituting into the first identity.

For the behaviour of $\psi(x, y)$ for $\|x - y\| \rightarrow \infty$ we assume that p is irreducible and can be written for some $\nu \in (0, 1]$ as

$$(1.18) \quad p(x, y) = (1 - \nu)\delta_{x,y} + \nu q(x, y),$$

where q is a symmetric translation invariant stochastic kernel on \mathbb{Z}^2 with $q(0, 0) = 0$, finite third moments and covariance matrix given by σ^2 times the two dimensional unit matrix. By Theorem 5.7 in [Dur08], setting $\ell = (\nu\sigma^2/(2u))^{1/2}$, we have

$$(1.19) \quad \psi(x, y) \sim \frac{1}{2\pi N + \log \ell} \left(K_0(\|x - y\|/\ell) - K_0(\|x - y\|) \right),$$

where \sim denotes asymptotic equivalence as $u \rightarrow 0$, and K_0 is the modified Bessel function from (1.10).

For an incomplete list of literature on different flavours of the stepping stone models we refer to Remark 1.8(a). Let us note that [BDE02] observe a very good agreement with same quantity for the (discrete space) stepping stone model, cf. [BDE02, Fig. 1]. Also ‘‘explicit’’ results for the stepping stone model on the two-dimensional grid are obtained e.g. in [WH98, Sect. 4.5], where it is in fact also discussed that Malécots formula gives a good approximation of the result obtained there.

1.6. Outlook. As [Eth08, Section 7] observes, ‘‘it is widely believed that if one views populations over sufficiently large spatial and temporal scales, then there should be some averaging effect which would allow one to use classical population genetic models with constant population density but with effective parameters replacing the real population parameters’’. We share this belief and hope that our results help to corroborate it. Still, many questions concerning ancestral lineages in locally regulated models remain open:

- As they stand, Theorem 1.3 and Corollary 1.4 are ‘conceptual’ rather than practical. They describe a mathematical limit without controlling how large N needs to be and we have no explicit information about required conditions on the competition parameters. In addition, we identify the decay behaviour but our limit result does not capture a prefactor as in (1.1). Concerning the (very pertinent) question how to get numbers out of it, we would presently have to resort Monte Carlo estimates via computer simulations.

It would also be interesting to describe the asymptotic variance of an ancestral lineage from LBRW more explicitly. The regeneration construction from [BČD16, BDS24] in principle gives a possible answer (namely, the variance of inter-regeneration increments divided by the mean waiting time between regenerations) but there seems no easy way to actually compute these.

- On the other hand, the ‘abstract’ regeneration construction from [BČD16, BDS24] is in principle very flexible and allows to cover more general spatial population models with local regulation than just LBRW. We believe that any such model which has a ‘supercritical phase’ where it can be compared to the discrete time contact process could be accommodated in this framework. It would be also very interesting to see whether continuous-time models could be treated in this way but this will require new ideas, maybe as in [MP24], because in continuous time there is no a priori bound on the ‘propagation of information’.
- We focused here on the case $d = 2$ but the cases $d = 1$ and $d \geq 3$ could be treated as well. We believe by analogy with ordinary random walk that in $d = 1$, coalescence times will have square root tails and have a positive chance to be $+\infty$ in $d \geq 3$ (in fact, the latter follows from the arguments in [BDS24]). This in particular implies that for LBRW in $d \geq 3$ with neutral genetic types there exist multi-type equilibria.
- A natural question would be to consider larger sample sizes than just two. For a related simpler model, the discrete time contact process in $d = 1$, this was studied in [BGS19] and a Brownian web limit was established. It is conceivable that the same will hold for LBRW in $d = 1$. It is also conceivable that in $d = 2$, (neutral) multitype LBRW will exhibit diffusive clustering analogous to the classical voter model [CG86].
- Last but not least it would be highly interesting to consider types with selective differences in locally regulated models and their effect on ancestral lineages.

1.7. Outline. We recall important results and tools from [BDS24] (and from [BČD16]) in Section 2; the proof of Theorem 1.3 is given in Section 3, based on a series of intermediate results that build on the tools from Section 2, with some proof details and longer calculations relegated to Appendices A–D.

2. SUMMARY OF RELEVANT RESULTS FROM [BDS24]

In this section, we recall concepts, tools and results from [BDS24] (and from [BD07], [BČD16]) which will be needed in the proofs in Section 3.

2.1. Ancestral lineages in LBRW. As discussed in Section 1.3, we enrich the logistic branching random walks from (1.4) from Section 1.2 with genealogical information (cf Chapter 4 in [Dep08] or Section 4 in [BČD16]). Conditioned on the space-time configuration η , the spatial embedding X of an ancestral lineage from Section 1.3 is a time-inhomogeneous Markov chain with transition probabilities

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbb{P}(X_{k+1} = y \mid X_k = x, \eta) = \frac{p_{yx}f(y; \eta_{-k-1})}{\sum_z p_{zx}f(z; \eta_{-k-1})} =: p_\eta(k; x, y), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$$

(with some arbitrary convention if the denominator is 0). The joint transition dynamics of the pair (X, X') given η is the product of terms as in (2.1) when $X_k \neq X'_k$ and contains the possibility of coalescence when they jump to the same site. See Appendix D for details. Note that $p_\eta(k; x, y)$ is close to p_{yx} when η_{-k-1} has small relative fluctuations in a neighbourhood of x .

2.2. Coupling properties of η . First we start with η , the process describing the evolution of the population. Recall that $\eta_n(x)$ is the number of individuals at position $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ in generation n . For $m \in (1, 3)$, $0 < \lambda_0 \ll 1$ and $\lambda_z \ll \lambda_0$ for $z \neq 0$, by Theorem 1.1, η survives with positive probability and, conditioned on survival, converges in distribution to η^{stat} . The key idea behind this result is to construct (η_n) as in (1.4) as a function of a space-time ‘driving noise’ which takes the form of a space-time system of independent Poisson processes, see [BČD16, Section 4.1].

The corresponding deterministic model is a dynamical system $\zeta := (\zeta_n)_n$ (also called coupled map lattices) on $[0, \infty)^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ defined by

$$(2.2) \quad \zeta_{n+1}(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^2} p_{x-y} \zeta_n(y) \left(m - \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \lambda_{z-y} \zeta_n(z) \right)^+ = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^2} p_{x-y} f(y; \zeta_n),$$

where f here is the function introduced in (1.3). Think of $\zeta_n(x)$ as the expected number of individuals at site x in generation n . By [BD07], under the assumptions in Theorem 1.1, (ζ_n)

has a unique non-trivial fixed point, i.e. $\zeta_n(x)$ converges to $(m-1)/\sum_z \lambda_z$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. This is the crucial property which makes the coupling (2.3)–(2.4) below possible.

We interpret the ancestral lines as random walks in a dynamic random environment generated by the time reversal of η^{stat} . Our approach to handle this environment is to link the model with supercritical oriented percolation using a coarse-graining technique. That is, for $L_s, L_t \in \mathbb{N}$ we divide the $\mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}$ into space-time boxes whose ‘bottom parts’ are centred at points on the coarse-grained grid $L_s \mathbb{Z}^2 \times L_t \mathbb{Z}$ and define

$$\text{block}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{n}) := \{(y, k) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z} : \|y - L_s \tilde{x}\| \leq L_s, \tilde{n} L_t < k \leq (\tilde{n} + 1) L_t\}.$$

In [BČD16] it was shown that η satisfies a certain coupling property for the range of parameters we consider in Theorem 1.3. To be more precise, there exists a finite set of ‘good’ local configurations $G_\eta \subset \mathbb{Z}_+^{B_{2L_s}(0)}$ such that for any $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{n}) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}$ and any configurations $\eta_{\tilde{n}L_t}, \eta'_{\tilde{n}L_t} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ at time $\tilde{n}L_t$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta_{\tilde{n}L_t} \big|_{B_{2L_s}(L_s \tilde{x})}, \eta'_{\tilde{n}L_t} \big|_{B_{2L_s}(L_s \tilde{x})} \in G_\eta \\ (2.3) \quad & \Rightarrow \eta_{(\tilde{n}+1)L_t}(y) = \eta'_{(\tilde{n}+1)L_t}(y) \quad \text{for all } y \text{ with } \|y - L_s \tilde{x}\| \leq 3L_s \\ & \text{and } \eta_{(\tilde{n}+1)L_t} \big|_{B_{2L_s}(L_s(\tilde{x} + \tilde{e}))} \in G_\eta \text{ for all } \tilde{e} \text{ with } \|\tilde{e}\| \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

whenever the driving noise is ‘good’ and

$$(2.4) \quad \eta_{\tilde{n}L_t} \big|_{B_{2L_s}(L_s \tilde{x})} = \eta'_{\tilde{n}L_t} \big|_{B_{2L_s}(L_s \tilde{x})} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \eta_k(y) = \eta'_k(y) \quad \text{for all } (y, k) \in \text{block}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{n}),$$

where $\eta = (\eta_n)$ and $\eta' = (\eta'_n)$ are given by (1.4) with the same driving noise but possibly different initial conditions. In essence we are in a setting where ‘good’ local configurations propagate from one box-level to the next given the local driving noise is ‘good’. Therefore, if one can show that good local randomness has high probability (typically close to 1), one can couple this propagation of ‘good’ configurations to supercritical oriented percolation. Or phrased in a less mathematical way as in [BD07, p. 1780] “life plus good randomness leads to more life, so show that bad randomness has small probability”.

2.3. A joint regeneration construction. We observe the random walks only along these boxes (we typically think of $L_t > L_s \gg \max\{R_p, R_\lambda\}$). More specifically, let X be an ancestral lineage evolving in an environment generated by η^{stat} , then we define the corresponding coarse-grained random walk \tilde{X} by

$$\tilde{X}_n := \tilde{\pi}(X_{nL_t}),$$

where $\tilde{\pi}: \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ is the coarse-graining function

$$\tilde{\pi}(x) = \tilde{\pi}(x_1, x_2) = (\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2) := \left(\left\lceil \frac{x_1}{L_s} - \frac{1}{2} \right\rceil, \left\lceil \frac{x_2}{L_s} - \frac{1}{2} \right\rceil \right).$$

Thus, \tilde{X} observes X only along the space-time boxes. In [BDS24] we studied the behaviour of a pair of coarse-grained random walks (\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}') evolving in the same environment to prove a quenched CLT for X . The aim of this paper is to prove Theorem 1.3 in which we study the coalescing time of two ancestral lineages. It is obvious that the two lineages will have to enter the same space-time box before they are able to coalesce. Therefore we approach this by first studying when the coarse-grained versions (\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}') of these two ancestral lineages meet and estimate the error terms to then obtain the statement for (X, X') . In the following we recall useful results for the coarse-grained random walks we obtained in [BDS24] in the process of proving a quenched CLT for (X, X') . Note that, although we call \tilde{X} a coarse-grained random walk, it is in fact not exactly a random walk. But we invite the reader to think of it since this guides the proofs (treating the actual dynamics mostly leads to additional technical difficulties).

To study the behaviour of the two coarse-grained ancestral lineages we define a regeneration construction in [BDS24]; see Construction 4.5 therein. The purpose of these regeneration times is to split the random walk into increments that evaluate independent parts of the environment. We construct a double cone that encompasses the paths of both random walks and the part of environment η both walkers see during an increment. Furthermore, we allow regenerations only at times where we can ensure that the values of η that were evaluated up to the regeneration have no influence on the values of η in the future of the random walks. This construction isolates the




FIGURE 1. Double cone with a double cone shell (grey), a time slice of the middle tube (blue), and a path of a random walk crossing the double cone shell from outside to inside (red).

values of η inside the cone from the values outside, i.e. the values of the environment inside the cone are independent of the values outside. For a visual representation of the cone construction see Figure 1. Note that this isolation essentially stems from the fact that the construction is made in such a way that every path on the coarse-grained level has to hit a box where the local configuration is ‘good’ and the local driving noise is ‘good’ and thus the values of η inside this box are determined only by that local noise. The ancestral lineages and all information about the environment they gather are contained in the inner cone. Say we know the value of η somewhere outside the cone shell (in Figure 1 illustrated as the red dot); by the dynamics of the environment this information propagates along a path that has to cross the cone shell (grey in Figure 1). By construction we only regenerate when the cone shell isolates the inner cone (green) from the environment outside and thus the cone shell “shields” the environment in the inner cone from the information along the red path. For a more fleshed out and mathematical discussion of the construction we refer to [BDS24, Construction 4.5].

Let $(\tilde{R}_i)_i$, with $\tilde{R}_0 = 0$, be the regeneration times for the pair (\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}') , obtained via the construction described above. We recall a few of the important properties obtained for this sequence in [BDS24]. The first gives a control of the tail probabilities of the regeneration increments, that is

$$(2.5) \quad \sup_{x_0, x'_0} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1} > t \mid X_0 = x_0, X'_0 = x'_0) \leq Ct^{-\beta},$$

where β is a positive constant that we can tune arbitrarily large because we can enforce a very high density of ‘good’ boxes in η^{stat} . We enrich the probability space by another independent environment η' and consequently another ancestral line X'' evolving in η' with its own coarse-grained version \tilde{X}'' . A central technique we then employ is to compare the pair (\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}') with (\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}'') . Since \tilde{X} and \tilde{X}'' evolve in independent environments, they are in fact independent and we introduce regeneration times $(\tilde{R}_i^{\text{ind}})_i$ for (\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}'') constructed in an analogous way to the cone construction for $(\tilde{R}_i)_i$ but with the cone for \tilde{X}'' constructed in η' instead of η . It is easy to see that the tails for the increments of $(\tilde{R}_i)_i$ satisfy the same bound from (2.5). From the description of the cone construction we recall that each cone isolates the environment on the inside from the outside. An intuitive application of this is that, as long as the regeneration happens sufficiently fast such that the cones remain well separated and in particular do not overlap, the increment

for (\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}') should have almost the same distribution as the increment of (\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}'') . Indeed we obtain the following coupling result

$$(2.6) \quad \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, x' \in \mathbb{Z}^d, m \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left((X_{R_1^{\text{joint}}}, X'_{R_1^{\text{joint}}}, R_1^{\text{joint}}) = (x, x', m) \right) - \mathbb{P} \left((X_{R_1^{\text{ind}}}, X''_{R_1^{\text{ind}}}, R_1^{\text{ind}}) = (x, x', m) \right) \right| \leq C \|x_0 - x'_0\|^{-\beta},$$

with β being the some constant from (2.5). This coupling allows to transfer some asymptotic properties from the pair (\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}'') to (\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}') .

There are other properties we can derive from this coupling result. The first we want to highlight is what we call a separation lemma, which allows us control the time two random walkers need to move apart to some distance. We denote by

$$(2.7) \quad \hat{X}_k := \tilde{X}_{\tilde{R}_k}, \quad \hat{X}'_k := \tilde{X}'_{\tilde{R}_k}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0$$

the walks observed along their joint regeneration times.

For $r > 0$ we define $\hat{H}(r)$ as the first time the coarse-grained random walks along their regeneration sequence are at a distance of at least r

$$\hat{H}(r) := \inf \left\{ k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : \|\hat{X}_k - \hat{X}'_k\|_2 \geq r \right\}$$

and, for the other direction, let $\hat{h}(r)$ be the first time the two walkers come together to a distance of r , that is

$$\hat{h}(r) := \inf \left\{ k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : \|\hat{X}_k - \hat{X}'_k\|_2 \leq r \right\}.$$

Lemma 2.1 (Separation lemma). *Let $d \geq 2$. For all small enough $\delta > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $C, c > 0$ such that*

$$(2.8) \quad \sup_{x_0, x'_0} \mathbb{P}_{x_0, x'_0}^{\text{joint}} \left(\hat{H}(\tilde{n}^\delta) > \tilde{n}^{2\delta + \varepsilon} \right) \leq \exp(-C\tilde{n}^c).$$

An important technique for the proofs is a delicate interplay of the distance between \hat{X} and \hat{X}' and the control over the behaviour we can employ. Another vital component for the proofs below is Lemma 3.20 from [BDS24], there proved for a toy model but, using Remark 4.9 from [BDS24], we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2 (Hitting probabilities for spheres). *Put for $r_1 < r < r_2$*

$$(2.9) \quad f_d(r; r_1, r_2) = \begin{cases} \frac{r-r_1}{r_2-r_1}, & \text{when } d = 1, \\ \frac{\log r - \log r_1}{\log r_2 - \log r_1}, & \text{when } d = 2, \\ \frac{r_1^{2-d} - r^{2-d}}{r_1^{2-d} - r_2^{2-d}}, & \text{when } d \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there are (large) R and \tilde{R} such that for all $r_2 > r_1 > R$ with $r_2 - r_1 > \tilde{R}$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ satisfying $r_1 < r = \|x - y\|_2 < r_2$

$$(2.10) \quad (1 - \varepsilon) f_d(r; r_1, r_2) \leq \mathbb{P}_{x, y}^{\text{ind}} \left(\hat{H}(r_2) < \hat{h}(r_1) \right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) f_d(r; r_1, r_2).$$

3. DETAILS FOR AND PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3 AND COROLLARY 1.4

3.1. Tails for meeting times. Consider two particles which start at a distance of $\|x\|N$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall the notation introduced in Remark 1.2. We are interested in the asymptotic behaviour of the meeting time for the two particles, more specifically we want to show the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *For $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and $\gamma > 1$ the following limit holds*

$$(3.1) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{meet}} > N^{2\gamma}) = \frac{1}{\gamma}.$$

Remark 3.2. Our approach to proving the above proposition will show that there is essentially only one possibility for the event $\{\tau_{\text{meet}} > N^{2\gamma}\}$ to occur and that is, when the two random walkers separate to a distance of N^γ before meeting. From equation (3.6) we see that this takes $N^{2\gamma}$ many steps. Thus we morally also show that

$$\mathbb{P}_{Nx} \left(\max_{i \leq \tau_{\text{meet}}} \|X_i - X'_i\| \geq N^\gamma \right) \rightarrow 1/\gamma.$$

The first step toward proving Proposition 3.1 is to consider the behaviour of the coarse-grained pair $(\widehat{X}, \widehat{X}')$ introduced in Section 2.3 and wait for those to meet. This gives us a time at which we can ensure that X and X' are at a constant distance. For this reason we start by proving

$$(3.2) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{meet}} > N^{2\gamma}) = \frac{1}{\gamma}, \quad \gamma \geq 1,$$

where we understand \mathbb{P}_{Nx} as the distribution where one particle is started at the origin and the other at the site Nx .

To prove this we use two crucial claims we prove later on. The two particles each perform a random walk (on the coarse-graining level) which we denote by \widehat{X} and \widehat{X}' . Since we are interested in the meeting time, it is sufficient to consider the difference of these two and we set $\widehat{D} := \widehat{X} - \widehat{X}'$. Moreover we define the stopping times

$$(3.3) \quad \widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} := \inf\{k : \|\widehat{D}_k\| \leq M\}$$

for some constant $M \in \mathbb{R}$, and

$$(3.4) \quad \widehat{\tau}_R := \inf\{k : \|\widehat{D}_k\| \geq R\}$$

for some $R \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that in the following lemmas we study the behaviour of the coarse-grained pair $(\widehat{X}, \widehat{X}')$. While we still write \mathbb{P}_{Nx} we somewhat sweep under the rug that under \mathbb{P}_{Nx} the distance between \widehat{X} and \widehat{X}' is actually $N\|x\|/L_s$ and under \mathbb{P}_R it is R/L_s . However this linear scaling doesn't change the calculations done and we therefore omit this scaling to leave the proofs more accessible to read.

Lemma 3.3. *For $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and $\gamma > 1$ the following two limits hold*

$$(3.5) \quad \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma}) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\gamma}$$

and for $\varepsilon > 0$

$$(3.6) \quad \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon} \leq \widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma+\varepsilon}) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 1.$$

First we show how to apply the lemma to prove the following auxiliary result:

Lemma 3.4.

$$(3.7) \quad \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > N^{2\gamma}) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\gamma}, \quad \gamma > 1.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.4. We start with the lower bound. Note that we have the inclusion $\{\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma}\} \cap \{\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \geq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}\} \subset \{\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} \geq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}\}$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} \geq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) &\geq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma}, \widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \geq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) \\ &\geq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma}) - \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) \\ &\geq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma}) - \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

where the last line holds by (3.5) and (3.6). Setting $\tilde{\gamma} = \gamma - \varepsilon/2$ the last display can be written as

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} \geq N^{2\tilde{\gamma}}) \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{\gamma} + \varepsilon/2}.$$

Note that, since $\gamma > 1$, we can choose ε small enough such that $\tilde{\gamma} > 1$. Now, letting ε go to 0, we obtain

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > N^{2\tilde{\gamma}}) \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{\gamma}},$$

for every $\tilde{\gamma} > 1$.

Turning to the upper bound we note that

$$\{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > N^{2\gamma}\} = \{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > N^{2\gamma} \geq \tau_{N^{\gamma-\varepsilon}}\} \dot{\cup} \{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}, \hat{\tau}_{N^{\gamma-\varepsilon}} > N^{2\gamma}\}.$$

For the second set on the right hand side we see

$$\mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}, \hat{\tau}_{N^{\gamma-\varepsilon}} > N^{2\gamma}) \leq \mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\hat{\tau}_{N^{\gamma-\varepsilon}} > N^{2\gamma}) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

by (3.6). For the first set we see

$$\mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > N^{2\gamma} \geq \tau_{N^{\gamma-\varepsilon}}) \leq \mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \hat{\tau}_{N^{\gamma-\varepsilon}}) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\gamma - \varepsilon}$$

by (3.5). Combining the above we obtain

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > N^{2\gamma}) \leq \frac{1}{\gamma - \varepsilon}$$

and consequently

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > N^{2\gamma}) \leq \frac{1}{\gamma},$$

which concludes the proof of (3.7). \square

Now we prove the two equations from Lemma 3.3.

Proof of Lemma 3.3. We start with proving (3.5). Define the stopping time $\hat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} := \inf\{k : \|\hat{D}_k\| \leq m_N\}$, where $m_N = \sqrt{\log \log N}$ and the sets $A_N := \{\hat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} > \hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma}\}$ and $B_N := \{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma}\}$. By definition we have $A_N \subset B_N$ and thus by Lemma 2.2

$$(3.8) \quad \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma}) \geq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\hat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} > \hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma}) = \frac{1}{\gamma}.$$

To prove the upper bound it is sufficient to show that

$$(3.9) \quad \mathbb{P}_{N^x}(B_N \cap A_N^c) = \mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\hat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} < \hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) \rightarrow 0.$$

We provide in the following a somewhat rough sketch of the argument for (3.9), where we pretend that $\hat{D} = \hat{X} - \hat{X}'$ has “continuous” paths in the sense that we use $\hat{D}_{\hat{\tau}_R} = R$ and $\hat{D}_{\hat{\tau}_{\leq m_N}} = m_N$ in the computations. In the full proof, we control the error incurred by over-/undershoots at stopping times explicitly. It is however a little cumbersome and we relegate the details to Appendix A.

Note that, due to the Markov-property the left-hand side is roughly bounded by $\mathbb{P}_{m_N}(\hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}})$. We then use a similar idea to the separation lemma, that is Lemma 2.1, and introduce a „bridge state“ at $\tilde{m}_N = \log N$ between m_N and N^γ . Every time the random walks are at distance m_N they have a positive chance, still depending on N , to reach a constant distance M . Here we can construct corridors, similar to the separation lemma, that enforce a positive probability to reach the distance M within m_N steps. Therefore there exist a positive constant $\delta > 0$ such that the distance M can be reached from the distance m_N within m_N steps with probability at least δ^{m_N} . Whereas, for the other distances we obtain, using Lemma 2.2,

$$(3.10) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_N}(\hat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} > \hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma}) \sim \frac{\log \tilde{m}_N - \log m_N}{\log N^\gamma - \log m_N} \sim \frac{\log \log N}{\gamma \log N}.$$

We can write

$$\mathbb{P}_{m_N}(\hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) = \mathbb{P}_{m_N}(\hat{\tau}_{\tilde{m}_N} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) \left(\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_N}(\hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\leq m_N}) + \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_N}(\hat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} < \hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) \right).$$

and observe $\mathbb{P}_{m_N}(\hat{\tau}_{\tilde{m}_N} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) \leq 1 - \delta^{m_N}$. We split the attempts to hit the distance N^γ by how often the distance is \tilde{m}_N before eventually hitting N^γ . Using this we obtain a sum over

the number of failed attempts to reach a constant distance of M starting from m_N as an upper bound, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.11) \quad \mathbb{P}_{m_N}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) &\leq (1 - \delta^{m_N})\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_N}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \widehat{\tau}_{\leq m_N}) + (1 - \delta^{m_N})\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_N}(\widehat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} < \widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) \\
 &\leq (1 - \delta^{m_N})\frac{\log \log N}{\gamma \log N} + (1 - \delta^{m_N})\mathbb{P}_{m_N}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) \\
 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - \delta^{m_N})^k \frac{\log \log N}{\gamma \log N} \\
 &\leq \frac{\log \log N}{\delta^{m_N} \gamma \log N}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that by the choice of m_N we have

$$\frac{\log \log N}{\delta^{m_N} \gamma \log N} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Thus

$$(3.12) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma}) = \frac{1}{\gamma}.$$

See Appendix A for more details.

For (3.6) we first observe that, by the separation lemma,

$$\mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \geq N^{2\gamma+\varepsilon}) \leq \exp(-CN^c)$$

for some constants $C, c > 0$.

For the lower bound, we again give here a rough argument pretending that paths are ‘‘continuous’’ and refer to Appendix B for more details. Since $N < N^\gamma/2$ for N large enough, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) \leq \mathbb{P}_{N^\gamma/2}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}).$$

Furthermore let $\tau_{\text{exit}} := \inf\{k \geq 0: \|\widehat{D}_k\| \notin B_{N^\gamma/4}(N^\gamma/2)\}$, i.e. the exit time of the ball with radius $N^\gamma/4$ centred at $N^\gamma/2$. This yields

$$\mathbb{P}_{N^\gamma/2}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) \leq \mathbb{P}_{N^\gamma/2}(\tau_{\text{exit}} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}).$$

It remains to analyze the probability on the right hand side of the last display. To that end, note that $\|\widehat{D}_k\| \geq N^\gamma/4$ for all $k \leq \tau_{\text{exit}}$ if $\|\widehat{D}_0\| \in B_{N^\gamma/4}(N^\gamma/2)$ and we can couple the joint-pair, that is where both random walkers move in the same environment, with a pair of random walkers that evolve in independent copies of the environment, denoted by \widehat{X}^{ind} and $\widehat{X}'^{\text{ind}}$. Respectively we denote their difference process by \widehat{D}^{ind} and obtain, by using equation (2.6),

$$\mathbb{P}_{N^\gamma/2}(\tau_{\text{exit}} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) \leq CN^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}N^{-\beta\gamma} + \mathbb{P}_{N^\gamma/2}(\tau_{\text{exit}}^{\text{ind}} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}).$$

By tuning the parameters of the regeneration construction developed in [BDS24] correctly we can choose β arbitrarily large and, therefore, the first term on the right hand side vanishes in the limit. For the ind-pair we show in [BDS24] that a functional CLT holds and thus for any $K > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}_{N^\gamma/2}(\tau_{\text{exit}}^{\text{ind}} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) \leq \mathbb{P}_{N^\gamma/2}\left(\tau_{\text{exit}}^{\text{ind}} \leq \frac{N^{2\gamma}}{K}\right) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_0\left(\inf\{t: \|B_t\| > 1/4\} \leq \frac{1}{K}\right).$$

Thus, by taking K to infinity on both sides in the above display,

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{N^\gamma/2}(\tau_{\text{exit}}^{\text{ind}} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

and

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{N^x}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) = 0.$$

Finally we conclude that (3.6) holds. \square

Since we aim to study the meeting time of the two original random walks and not just their coarse-grained versions, we need to establish some control of the behaviour between the regeneration times. Our strategy is to observe along the coarse-grained versions along their simultaneous regeneration times and wait for those to hit the same box of some constant size, before we estimate the probability for the two original random walks to meet when started in the same box. Therefore we want to avoid a scenario where the original random walks are near each other and possibly meet before the coarse-grained versions along their regeneration times hit the same box.

Thus, to prove Proposition 3.1, we need some estimates that allow us to swap from the coarse-grained walkers to the original ones. A lot follows along the same ideas we used above.

Lemma 3.5. *For $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and $\gamma > 1$ the following limit holds*

$$(3.13) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx} \left(L_t \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} (\tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1}) > N^{2\gamma} \right) = \frac{1}{\gamma}.$$

Proof. We start with the lower bound.

$$\mathbb{P}_{Nx} \left(L_t \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} \tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1} \right) > N^{2\gamma} \right) \geq \mathbb{P}_{Nx} \left(\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} L_t > N^{2\gamma} \right) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\gamma},$$

by equation (3.7), where $(\tilde{R}_i)_i$ are the simultaneous regeneration times for the coarse-grained pair of random walkers (note that the pre-factor L_t , which is not present in (3.7), is irrelevant in the limit).

Proving the upper bound essentially relies on the tail bounds proved for the simultaneous regeneration times $(\tilde{R}_i)_i$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{Nx} \left(L_t \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} \tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1} > N^{2\gamma} \right) &= \mathbb{P}_{Nx} \left(L_t \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} \tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1} > N^{2\gamma}, \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} \leq \varepsilon N^{2\gamma} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}_{Nx} \left(L_t \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} \tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1} > N^{2\gamma}, \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \varepsilon N^{2\gamma} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{Nx} \left(L_t \sum_{i=1}^{\varepsilon N^{2\gamma}} \tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1} > N^{2\gamma} \right) + \mathbb{P}_{Nx} \left(\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \varepsilon N^{2\gamma} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using Markov's inequality the first term in the last line can be bounded from above by

$$(3.14) \quad \mathbb{P}_{Nx} \left(L_t \sum_{i=1}^{\varepsilon N^{2\gamma}} \tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1} > N^{2\gamma} \right) \leq \frac{L_t}{N^{2\gamma}} \sum_{i=1}^{\varepsilon N^{2\gamma}} \mathbb{E}_{Nx} [\tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1}] \leq CL_t \varepsilon$$

with some fixed constant $C < \infty$ by (2.5). Thus

$$(3.15) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx} \left(L_t \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} \tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1} > N^{2\gamma} \right) \leq CL_t \varepsilon + \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx} \left(\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \varepsilon N^{2\gamma} \right) \leq CL_t \varepsilon + \frac{1}{\gamma}$$

by Lemma 3.4 (again, the prefactor ε in the second term on the right-hand side, which is not present in (3.7), plays no role in the limit). Taking $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ in (3.15) yields the required upper bound. \square

Lemma 3.6. *There are constants $0 < C_1, C_2 < \infty$ such that*

$$(3.16) \quad \mathbb{E}_{Nx} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \wedge \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}^{-1}} \|\hat{D}_i\|_2^{-\beta} \right] \leq C_1 M^{2-\beta} - C_2 \|Nx\|_2^{2-\beta}$$

whenever M is large enough (recall from (3.3) that M also enters the definition of $\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}$).

Proof. We wish to find a function $f : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$(3.17) \quad \mathbb{E} [f(\hat{D}_{i+1}) - f(\hat{D}_i) \mid \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i] \leq -c \|\hat{D}_i\|_2^{-\beta} \quad \text{on the event } M < \|\hat{D}_i\|_2 < N^{2\gamma}$$

and $f(y) \geq 0$ when $\|y\| \leq M$ or $\|y\| \geq N^{2\gamma}$.

Given f satisfying (3.17), writing $\hat{\tau} := \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \wedge \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}$, we have for $M < \|y\| < N^{2\gamma}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.18) \quad 0 &\leq \mathbb{E}_y[f(\hat{D}_{\hat{\tau}})] = f(y) + \mathbb{E}_y\left[\sum_{i=0}^{\hat{\tau}-1} \left(f(\hat{D}_{i+1}) - f(\hat{D}_i)\right)\right] \\
 &= f(y) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_y\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{i < \hat{\tau}\}} \left(f(\hat{D}_{i+1}) - f(\hat{D}_i)\right)\right] \\
 &= f(y) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_y\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{i < \hat{\tau}\}} \mathbb{E}_y\left[f(\hat{D}_{i+1}) - f(\hat{D}_i) \mid \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i\right]\right] \leq f(y) - c \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_y\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{i < \hat{\tau}\}} \|\hat{D}_i\|_2^{-\beta}\right],
 \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$(3.19) \quad \mathbb{E}_y\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \wedge \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}-1} \|\hat{D}_i\|_2^{-\beta}\right] \leq \frac{1}{c} f(y).$$

Fairly straightforward, though somewhat lengthy computations show that the ansatz function

$$(3.20) \quad f(x) = 2^{\beta-2} M^{2-\beta} - \|x\|_2^{2-\beta} \mathbb{1}_{[M/2, \infty)}(\|x\|_2), \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$$

(which is inspired by the corresponding Green function of 2-dimensional Brownian motion in an annulus, see Remark C.2) does satisfy (3.17) with a suitable choice of $c > 0$. For details of the computation see Section C. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.1. We first establish a lower bound on the probability on the left-hand side of (3.1). Note that by construction, when $c_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small,

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned}
 &\{N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon} \leq \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma+\varepsilon}\} \cap \{\hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}\} \cap \{\tilde{R}_{i+1} - \tilde{R}_i < c_0 \|\hat{D}_i\| \text{ for all } 0 \leq i < \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma}\} \\
 &\subset \{\tau_{\text{meet}} > L_t \tilde{R}_{N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}}\}
 \end{aligned}$$

(note that at time $L_t \tilde{R}_i$, the two walks have a distance of at least $L_s(\|\hat{D}_i\| - 1)$ and until the next simultaneous regeneration, their distance can decrease by at most $L_t(\tilde{R}_{i+1} - \tilde{R}_i)2R_X$). Now

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.22) \quad &\mathbb{P}_{Nx}(N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon} \leq \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma+\varepsilon}, \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}, \text{ there exists } 0 \leq i < \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \text{ with } \tilde{R}_{i+1} - \tilde{R}_i \geq c_0 \|\hat{D}_i\|) \\
 &\leq \mathbb{E}_{Nx}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon} \leq \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma+\varepsilon}, \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}\}} \sum_{i=0}^{\hat{\tau}_{N\gamma}-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{R}_{i+1} - \tilde{R}_i \geq c_0 \|\hat{D}_i\|\}}\right] \\
 &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{N^{2\gamma+\varepsilon}} \mathbb{E}_{Nx}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{R}_{i+1} - \tilde{R}_i \geq c_0 \|\hat{D}_i\|\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{i < \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \wedge \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}\}}\right] \\
 &= \sum_{i=0}^{N^{2\gamma+\varepsilon}} \mathbb{E}_{Nx}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{i < \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \wedge \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}\}} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{R}_{i+1} - \tilde{R}_i \geq c_0 \|\hat{D}_i\|\}} \mid \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tilde{R}_i})\right] \\
 &\leq C \sum_{i=0}^{N^{2\gamma+\varepsilon}} \mathbb{E}_{Nx}[\mathbb{1}_{\{i < \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \wedge \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}\}} \|\hat{D}_i\|^{-\beta}] \leq C \mathbb{E}_{Nx}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \wedge \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}-1} \|\hat{D}_i\|^{-\beta}\right] \leq CM^{2-\beta}
 \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 3.6. We can thus estimate as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.23) \quad &\mathbb{P}_{Nx}(N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon} \leq \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma+\varepsilon}, \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}, \tilde{R}_{i+1} - \tilde{R}_i < c_0 \|\hat{D}_i\| \text{ for all } 0 \leq i < \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma}) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon} \leq \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma+\varepsilon}, \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) \\
 &\quad - \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon} \leq \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma+\varepsilon}, \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}, \text{ there exists } 0 \leq i < \hat{\tau}_{N\gamma} \text{ with } \tilde{R}_{i+1} - \tilde{R}_i \geq c_0 \|\hat{D}_i\|) \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{\gamma} - o(1) - CM^{2-\beta}
 \end{aligned}$$

for $N \rightarrow \infty$ by Lemma 3.3 and (3.22), thus

$$(3.24) \quad \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{meet}} > N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) \geq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{meet}} > L_t \tilde{R}_{N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}}) \geq \frac{1}{\gamma} - CM^{2-\beta}.$$

Replacing γ by $\gamma + \varepsilon/2$ in (3.24), then taking $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ and then $M \rightarrow \infty$ in the construction shows the lower bound in (3.1).

For the upper bound in (3.1), we argue as follows: Write

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.25) \quad & \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{meet}} > N^{2\gamma}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{meet}} > N^{2\gamma}, L_t \tilde{R}_{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} > N^{2\gamma}/2) + \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{meet}} > N^{2\gamma}, L_t \tilde{R}_{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} \leq N^{2\gamma}/2) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(L_t \tilde{R}_{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} > N^{2\gamma}/2) + \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{meet}} \geq L_t \tilde{R}_{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} + N^{2\gamma}/2).
\end{aligned}$$

where we already know for the second term in the last line

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(L_t \tilde{R}_{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} > N^{2\gamma}/2) = \frac{1}{\gamma}.$$

It remains to show that

$$(3.26) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{meet}} \geq L_t \tilde{R}_{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} + N^{2\gamma}/2) = 0.$$

In fact, the proof we provide for (3.26) shows that one could prove the stronger claim that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ one obtains $\mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{meet}} - L_t \tilde{R}_{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} \geq N^\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$. We stick to (3.26) since it is the exact limit we consider here.

At this point we want to give a small sketch of the idea to prove (3.26). In essence we want to use a similar iteration we used in the proof of Lemma 3.3 to get from a distance of N to constant distance that is independent of N . To that end define the sequence of stopping times $\hat{H}_i := \inf\{k > \hat{H}_{i-1} : \|\hat{D}_k\| \leq M\}$, starting with $\hat{H}_1 = \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}$, at which the coarse-grained random walks along their regeneration times hit a distance of M . At every \hat{H}_i there is a positive chance $\rho(ML_s)$ independent of N that the original random walkers meet within the next ML_s steps. And afterwards, if the attempt failed, we wait until the coarse-grained random walks separate to a distance of $\log N$. Thus the attempts are independent of each other and it is sufficient to find a suitable upper bound for the time each attempt takes to ensure there are enough.

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.27) \quad & \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{meet}} - L_t \tilde{R}_{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} > \frac{1}{2}N^{2\gamma}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_M(\tau_{\text{meet}} > \frac{1}{2}N^{2\gamma}, \tilde{R}_{\hat{H}_{\log^{1/2} N}} \leq N^\gamma) + \mathbb{P}_M(\tilde{R}_{\hat{H}_{\log^{1/2} N}} > N^\gamma).
\end{aligned}$$

To control the right hand side of the above display, we determine a sufficient upper bound on the second term. For the first term note that on the event $\{\tilde{R}_{\hat{H}_{\log^{1/2} N}} \leq N^\gamma\}$ the original random walkers will have at least $\log^{1/2} N$ independent attempts to meet before time $N^{2\gamma}/2$ each having a chance greater than $\rho(ML_s) > 0$ to succeed and thus the first term will go to 0 for $N \rightarrow \infty$. If an attempt to meet for original random walkers X and X' , starting from a distance of ML_s fails, we want to wait for the coarse-grained pair \hat{X} and \hat{X}' to separate to a distance of $\log N$. Again we observe the coarse-grained pair along their simultaneous regeneration times. By the separation lemma, see Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.28) \quad & \mathbb{P}_M\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\hat{\tau}_{\log N}} \tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1} > \log^4 N\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_M\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\log^3 N} \tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1} > \log^4 N\right) + \mathbb{P}_M(\hat{\tau}_{\log N} > \log^3 N) \\
&\leq \log^3(N) \cdot \log^{-\beta}(N) + \exp(-C \log^c N).
\end{aligned}$$

Additionally we need an upper bound for the amount of time it takes to get back to the constant distance M from which another attempt to meet can be made. For a small positive constant $\tilde{c} > 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.29) \quad & \mathbb{P}_{\log N}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} \tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1} > N^{2\tilde{c}}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\log N}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N^{\tilde{c}}} \tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}_{i-1} > N^{2\tilde{c}}\right) + \mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > N^{\tilde{c}}) \\
&\leq N^{\tilde{c}(1-2\beta)} + \mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > N^{\tilde{c}})
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to find a suitable upper bound for $\mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > N^{\tilde{c}})$. We do this in two parts, which we obtain on the right hand side of the display below

$$(3.30) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > N^{\tilde{c}}) = \mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > N^{\tilde{c}} > \widehat{\tau}_{N^{\tilde{c}/2-\varepsilon}}) + \mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}}, \widehat{\tau}_{N^{\tilde{c}/2-\varepsilon}} > N^{\tilde{c}}),$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is some small enough constant such that $\tilde{c}/2 - \varepsilon > 0$. Starting with the second term we get by the separation lemma, Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}}, \widehat{\tau}_{N^{\tilde{c}/2-\varepsilon}} > N^{\tilde{c}}) &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^{\tilde{c}/2-\varepsilon}} > N^{\tilde{c}}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^{\tilde{c}'}} > N^{2\tilde{c}'+2\varepsilon}) \\ &\leq \exp(-CN^{-2c(\tilde{c}'+\varepsilon)}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c}' = \tilde{c}/2 - \varepsilon$. For the first term in (3.30) we obtain

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > N^{\tilde{c}} > \widehat{\tau}_{N^{\tilde{c}/2-\varepsilon}}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \widehat{\tau}_{N^{\tilde{c}/2-\varepsilon}}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} \geq \widehat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} > \widehat{\tau}_{N^{\tilde{c}/2-\varepsilon}}) + \mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \widehat{\tau}_{N^{\tilde{c}/2-\varepsilon}} > \widehat{\tau}_{\leq m_N}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\log N}(\widehat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} > \widehat{\tau}_{N^{\tilde{c}/2-\varepsilon}}) + \mathbb{P}_{m_N}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}} > \widehat{\tau}_{N^{\tilde{c}/2-\varepsilon}}) \\ &\leq C \frac{\log \log N - \log m_N}{(\frac{\tilde{c}}{2} - \varepsilon) \log N - \log m_N} + C \frac{\log \log N}{\delta^{m_N} (\frac{\tilde{c}}{2} - \varepsilon) \log N}, \end{aligned}$$

where the estimates in the last line follow by calculations done in the proof of Lemma 3.3; see equations (3.10) and (3.11).

Turning back to (3.27) we now have the tools to give an upper bound for the right hand side of the inequality. Since $\widetilde{R}_{\widehat{H}_{\log^{1/2} N}}$ is the $\widehat{H}_{\log^{1/2} N}$ -th time of the above described iteration at which the random walkers can make an attempt at meeting within the next ML_s steps. Defining $\widehat{\tau}_{\log N}^i := \inf\{k > \widehat{H}_{i-1} : \|\widehat{D}_k\| \geq \log N\}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_M(\widetilde{R}_{\widehat{H}_i} - \widetilde{R}_{\widehat{H}_{i-1}} > \log^4 N + N^{2\tilde{c}}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_M\left(\sum_{j=\widehat{H}_{i-1}}^{\widehat{\tau}_{\log N}^i} \widetilde{R}_j - \widetilde{R}_{j-1} > \log^4 N\right) + \mathbb{P}_M\left(\sum_{j=\widehat{\tau}_{\log N}^i+1}^{\widehat{H}_i} \widetilde{R}_j - \widetilde{R}_{j-1} > N^{2\tilde{c}}\right) \\ &\leq C \log^{-1+\delta}(N), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the upper bounds obtained in (3.28), (3.29) and (3.31) and the fact that we can choose β arbitrarily large. Therefore, for the second term in (3.27) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_M(\widetilde{R}_{\widehat{H}_{\log^{1/2} N}} > N^\gamma) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_M(\exists i \leq \log^{1/2} N : \widetilde{R}_{\widehat{H}_i} - \widetilde{R}_{\widehat{H}_{i-1}} > \frac{N^\gamma}{\log^{1/2} N}) \\ &\leq \log^{1/2} N \cdot C \log^{-1} N. \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{meet}} - L_t \widetilde{R}_{\widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}}} > \frac{1}{2} N^{2\gamma}) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

and therefore, returning back to equation (3.25), we obtain the upper bound

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{meet}} > N^{2\gamma}) \leq \frac{1}{\gamma},$$

which concludes the proof. \square

3.2. Completion of the proof of Theorem 1.3. We briefly sketch how to complete the proof of Theorem 1.3 based on the results from Section 3.1: Since $\tau_{\text{meet}} \leq \tau_{\text{coal}}$, one half follows immediately from Proposition 3.1, namely $\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{coal}} > N^{2\gamma}) \geq \frac{1}{\gamma}$.

For the other direction, we argue as above (see the discussion following (3.26)) that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{coal}} - \tau_{\text{meet}} \geq N^\varepsilon) = 0$. (In fact, one could even show that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \mathbb{P}_y(\tau_{\text{coal}} - \tau_{\text{meet}} \leq T) = 1$.)

3.3. Asymptotics for the Laplace transform of pair coalescence times: Proof of Corollary 1.4.

Proof of (1.7), using (1.6). Fix $\gamma \geq 1$. We have for $\mu_N = mN^{-2\gamma}$

$$\mathbb{E}_{Nx}[(1 - \mu_N)^{2\tau_{\text{coal}}}] \sim \mathbb{E}_{Nx}[\exp(-2\mu_N\tau_{\text{coal}})].$$

For $0 < \varepsilon < 2\gamma$ we have for all sufficiently large N

$$\exp(-N^{-\varepsilon})\mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{coal}} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) \leq \mathbb{E}_{Nx}[\exp(-mN^{-2\gamma}\tau_{\text{coal}})] \leq \mathbb{P}_{Nx}(\tau_{\text{coal}} \leq N^{2\gamma+\varepsilon}) + \exp(-N^\varepsilon).$$

Thus, (1.6) yields

$$1 - \frac{1}{\gamma - \varepsilon/2} \leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{Nx}[\exp(-2\mu_N\tau_{\text{coal}})] \leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{Nx}[\exp(-2\mu_N\tau_{\text{coal}})] \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma + \varepsilon/2}.$$

Taking $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ gives (1.7). \square

APPENDIX A. DETAILED PROOF OF (3.9)

Recall $m_N = \sqrt{\log \log N}$ and $\tilde{m}_N = \log N$. Put

$$(A.1) \quad a_{N,M} := \sup \{ \mathbb{P}_y(\hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) : M < \|y\| \leq m_N \}$$

and

$$(A.2) \quad b_{N,M} := \sup \{ \mathbb{P}_z(\hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) : \log N < \|z\| \leq 2 \log N \}.$$

For $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $M < \|y\| \leq m_N$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_y(\hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) &= \mathbb{E}_y[\mathbb{P}_y(\hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\hat{\tau}_{\tilde{m}_N}})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_y \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\tau}_{\tilde{m}_N} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}\}} \mathbb{P}_{\hat{D}_{\hat{\tau}_{\tilde{m}_N}}}(\hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_y \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\tau}_{\tilde{m}_N} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}\}} (b_{N,M} + C(\log N)^3(\log N)^{-\beta}) \right] \\ (A.3) \quad &= \mathbb{P}_y(\hat{\tau}_{\tilde{m}_N} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) (b_{N,M} + C(\log N)^3(\log N)^{-\beta}) \end{aligned}$$

where we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_y(\|\hat{D}_{\hat{\tau}_{\tilde{m}_N}}\| > 2 \log N) &\leq \mathbb{P}_y(\hat{\tau}_{\tilde{m}_N} > (\log N)^3) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}_y(\|\hat{D}_k - \hat{D}_{k-1}\| \geq \log N \text{ for some } 1 \leq k \leq (\log N)^3) \\ &\leq e^{-C(\log N)^c} + C(\log N)^3(\log N)^{-\beta} \\ &\leq C(\log N)^3(\log N)^{-\beta} \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 2.2 and the tail bound for increments from (2.5) combined with finite range for the transition kernel p in the second inequality.

Obviously, $\mathbb{P}_y(\hat{\tau}_{\tilde{m}_N} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) = 1 - \mathbb{P}_y(\hat{\tau}_{\tilde{m}_N} > \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}})$. By constructing suitable ‘‘corridors’’ (as in the proof of Lemma 4.12 in [BDS24]) we can estimate

$$(A.4) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sup \{ \mathbb{P}_y(\hat{\tau}_{\tilde{m}_N} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) : M < \|y\| \leq m_N \} \\ &= 1 - \inf \{ \mathbb{P}_y(\hat{\tau}_{\tilde{m}_N} > \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) : M < \|y\| \leq m_N \} \leq 1 - \delta^{m_N} \end{aligned}$$

with some (small) $\delta > 0$. Thus, we obtain from (A.3) that

$$(A.5) \quad a_{N,M} \leq (1 - \delta^{m_N})(b_{N,M} + C(\log N)^3(\log N)^{-\beta})$$

To gain something from (A.5), we want to estimate $b_{N,M}$ in terms of $a_{N,M}$. Consider $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\log N < \|z\| \leq 2 \log N$, then

$$(A.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_z(\hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) &= \mathbb{P}_z(\hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} \leq \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) + \mathbb{P}_z(\hat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} < \hat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \hat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) \\ &\leq C \frac{\log \log N}{\log N} + a_{N,M} \end{aligned}$$

where we used the hitting lemma [BDS24, Lemma 3.20 and Remark 4.9], recalled in Lemma 2.2 (with $r = \|z\|$, $r_1 = m_N$, $r_2 = N^\gamma$) for the first term and observe that

$$\mathbb{P}_z(\widehat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} < \widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) = \mathbb{E}_z \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widehat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} < \widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \wedge \widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}}\}} \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{D}_{\widehat{\tau}_{\leq m_N}}}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) \right] \leq a_{N,M}.$$

Taking the supremum of z 's with $\log N < \|z\| \leq 2 \log N$ we obtain from (A.6) that

$$(A.7) \quad b_{N,M} \leq C \frac{\log \log N}{\log N} + a_{N,M}.$$

Inserting (A.7) into (A.5) yields

$$(A.8) \quad a_{N,M} \leq (1 - \delta^{m_N}) \left(a_{N,M} + C \frac{\log \log N}{\log N} \right),$$

iterating (A.8) gives

$$(A.9) \quad a_{N,M} \leq C \frac{\log \log N}{\log N} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - \delta^{m_N})^k \leq C \frac{\log \log N}{\log N} \frac{1}{\delta^{m_N}} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

To complete the proof of (3.9) we note that

$$\mathbb{P}_{N_x}(\widehat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} < \widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) = \mathbb{E}_{N_x} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widehat{\tau}_{\leq m_N} < \widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \wedge \widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}}\}} \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{D}_{\widehat{\tau}_{\leq m_N}}}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} < \widehat{\tau}_{\text{near}}) \right] \leq a_{N,M}.$$

□

APPENDIX B. DETAILED PROOF OF THE LOWER BOUND IN (3.6)

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{N_x}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{N_x} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma/2} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}\}} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\widehat{D}_{\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma/2}}\| \geq \frac{3}{4}N^\gamma\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{N^\gamma/2 \leq \|\widehat{D}_{\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma/2}}\| < \frac{3}{4}N^\gamma\}} \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{D}_{\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma/2}}}(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) \right) \right] \\ & \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon} \left(\frac{1}{4}N^\gamma \right)^{-\beta} + \sup \left\{ \mathbb{P}_y(\widehat{\tau}_{N^\gamma} \leq N^{2\gamma-\varepsilon}) : \frac{1}{2}N^\gamma \leq \|y\| \leq \frac{3}{4}N^\gamma \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and then argue as above.

APPENDIX C. PROOF DETAILS FOR LEMMA 3.6

Proof details for Lemma 3.6: The function f from (3.20) satisfies (3.17). Recall that we need to verify that the function

$$(3.20) \quad f(x) = 2^{\beta-2} M^{2-\beta} - \|x\|_2^{2-\beta} \mathbb{1}_{[M/2, \infty)}(\|x\|_2), \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$$

fulfills

$$(3.17) \quad \mathbb{E}[f(\widehat{D}_{i+1}) - f(\widehat{D}_i) \mid \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_i] \leq -c \|\widehat{D}_i\|_2^{-\beta} \quad \text{on the event } M < \|\widehat{D}_i\|_2 < N^{2\gamma}$$

for some $c > 0$.

In cartesian coordinates, we have

$$f(x_1, x_2) = 2^{\beta-2} M^{2-\beta} - (x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{1-\beta/2} \quad \text{for } x_1^2 + x_2^2 \geq M^2/4$$

and in this case

$$(C.1) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} f(x_1, x_2) = 2(\beta/2 - 1)x_1(x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{-\beta/2}$$

$$(C.2) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} f(x_1, x_2) = 2(\beta/2 - 1)x_2(x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{-\beta/2}$$

$$(C.3) \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1^2} f(x_1, x_2) = 2(\beta/2 - 1)(x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{-\beta/2} - 4(\beta/2 - 1)(\beta/2)x_1^2(x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{-\beta/2-1}$$

$$(C.4) \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_2^2} f(x_1, x_2) = 2(\beta/2 - 1)(x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{-\beta/2} - 4(\beta/2 - 1)(\beta/2)x_2^2(x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{-\beta/2-1}$$

$$(C.5) \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2} f(x_1, x_2) = -4(\beta/2 - 1)(\beta/2)x_1 x_2 (x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{-\beta/2-1} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_2 \partial x_1} f(x_1, x_2).$$

Now for $\|(x_1, x_2)\|_2 \geq M$ we have by Taylor expansion (we write $\Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y)$ to denote the transition probabilities of \widehat{D} under the ind-dynamics)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y) (f(y) - f(x)) \\
&= \sum_{y: \|y-x\|_2 < \|x\|_2/4} \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y) (f(y) - f(x)) + R_1(x) \\
&= \sum_{y: \|y-x\|_2 < \|x\|_2/4} \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y) \left(2(\beta/2 - 1)(y_1 - x_1) \|x\|_2^{-\beta} + 2(\beta/2 - 1)(y_2 - x_2) \|x\|_2^{-\beta} \right. \\
&\quad + (2(\beta/2 - 1) \|x\|_2^{-\beta} - 4(\beta/2 - 1)(\beta/2) x_1^2 \|x\|_2^{-\beta-2}) (y_1 - x_1)^2 \\
&\quad + (2(\beta/2 - 1) \|x\|_2^{-\beta} - 4(\beta/2 - 1)(\beta/2) x_2^2 \|x\|_2^{-\beta-2}) (y_2 - x_2)^2 \\
&\quad \left. - 8(\beta/2 - 1)(\beta/2) x_1 x_2 \|x\|_2^{-\beta-2} (y_1 - x_1)(y_2 - x_2) + R_2(x, y) \right) \\
&\text{(C.6)} \quad + R_1(x)
\end{aligned}$$

with $R_1(x) = \sum_{y: \|y-x\|_2 \geq \|x\|_2/4} \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y) (f(y) - f(x))$ and $R_2(x, y)$ being the remainder term when Taylor expanding $y \mapsto f(y)$ around x to second order. For example, using the Lagrange form of the remainder term, we have for some $\zeta = \zeta(x, y) \in \{x + t(y - x) : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
R_2(x, y) &= \frac{1}{6} \left(\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x_1^3} f(\zeta) (y_1 - x_1)^3 + 3 \frac{\partial^3}{\partial x_1^2 \partial x_2} f(\zeta) (y_1 - x_1)^2 (y_2 - x_2) \right. \\
&\text{(C.7)} \quad \left. + 3 \frac{\partial^3}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2^2} f(\zeta) (y_1 - x_1) (y_2 - x_2)^2 + \frac{\partial^3}{\partial x_2^3} f(\zeta) (y_2 - x_2)^3 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\text{(C.8)} \quad \sum_{y: \|y-x\|_2 < \|x\|_2/4} \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y) 2(\beta/2 - 1) \|x\|_2^{-\beta/2} ((y_1 - x_1) + (y_2 - x_2)) = 0$$

by symmetry and we can bound

$$\text{(C.9)} \quad |R_1(x)| \leq \|f\|_\infty \sum_{y: \|y-x\|_2 \geq \|x\|_2/4} \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y) \leq CM^{2-\beta} \|x\|_2^{-\beta}$$

by the tail bounds on inter-regeneration times and increments, cf. (2.5). We have

$$\text{(C.10)} \quad \left| \frac{\partial^3}{\partial x_1^3} f(\zeta) \right| + \left| \frac{\partial^3}{\partial x_1^2 \partial x_2} f(\zeta) \right| + \left| \frac{\partial^3}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2^2} f(\zeta) \right| + \left| \frac{\partial^3}{\partial x_2^3} f(\zeta) \right| \leq \frac{C}{\|\zeta\|_2^{\beta+1}} \quad \text{for } \|\zeta\|_2 \geq 1,$$

thus using (C.7), (C.10) and the fact that increments have (more than) three moments (cf. (2.5))

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{y: \|y-x\|_2 < \|x\|_2/4} \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y) |R_2(x, y)| \leq \sum_{y: \|y-x\|_2 < \|x\|_2/4} \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y) \frac{|y_1 - x_1|^3 + |y_2 - x_2|^3}{\|\zeta(x, y)\|_2^{\beta+1}} \\
&\text{(C.11)} \quad \leq \frac{C}{\|x\|_2^{\beta+1}} \sum_y \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y) (|y_1 - x_1|^3 + |y_2 - x_2|^3) \leq \frac{C}{\|x\|_2^{\beta+1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{y: \|y-x\|_2 < \|x\|_2/4} \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y) \left((2(\beta/2 - 1)\|x\|_2^{-\beta} - 4(\beta/2 - 1)(\beta/2)x_1^2\|x\|_2^{-\beta-2})(y_1 - x_1)^2 \right. \\
& \quad + (2(\beta/2 - 1)\|x\|_2^{-\beta} - 4(\beta/2 - 1)(\beta/2)x_2^2\|x\|_2^{-\beta-2})(y_2 - x_2)^2 \\
& \quad \left. - 8(\beta/2 - 1)(\beta/2)x_1x_2\|x\|_2^{-\beta-2}(y_1 - x_1)(y_2 - x_2) \right) \\
&= \frac{2\beta - 2}{\|x\|_2^{-\beta}} \sum_{y: \|y-x\|_2 < \|x\|_2/4} \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y) \left(\left(1 - \beta \frac{x_1^2}{\|x\|_2^2}\right)(y_1 - x_1)^2 + \left(1 - \beta \frac{x_2^2}{\|x\|_2^2}\right)(y_2 - x_2)^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. - 2\beta \frac{x_1x_2}{\|x\|_2^2}(y_1 - x_1)(y_2 - x_2) \right) \\
\text{(C.12)} \quad & \frac{2\beta - 2}{\|x\|_2^{-\beta}} \left((1, 0)\widehat{C}_{\|x\|_2}^{\text{ind}}(1, 0)^T + (0, 1)\widehat{C}_{\|x\|_2}^{\text{ind}}(0, 1)^T \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \beta(x_1/\|x\|_2, x_2/\|x\|_2)\widehat{C}_{\|x\|_2}^{\text{ind}}(x_1/\|x\|_2, x_2/\|x\|_2)^T \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\text{(C.13)} \quad \widehat{C}_{\|x\|_2}^{\text{ind}} = \sum_{z: \|z\|_2 < \|x\|_2/4} \Psi^{\text{ind}}(0, z) \begin{pmatrix} z_1^2 & z_1z_2 \\ z_1z_2 & z_2^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

is the covariance matrix of an increment under Ψ^{ind} (restricted to jump size $\|x\|_2/4$). Let $\widehat{\lambda}_1 \geq \widehat{\lambda}_2 > 0$ be the eigenvalues of $\widehat{C}_{\|x\|_2}^{\text{ind}}$ (by irreducibility, $\widehat{C}_{\|x\|_2}^{\text{ind}}$ must be invertible, at least when M is large enough because $\|x\|_2 \geq M$ by assumption). Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\substack{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2, \\ \|(x_1, x_2)\|_2 \geq M}} \left((1, 0)\widehat{C}_{\|x\|_2}^{\text{ind}}(1, 0)^T + (0, 1)\widehat{C}_{\|x\|_2}^{\text{ind}}(0, 1)^T \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \beta(x_1/\|x\|_2, x_2/\|x\|_2)\widehat{C}_{\|x\|_2}^{\text{ind}}(x_1/\|x\|_2, x_2/\|x\|_2)^T \right) \\
\text{(C.14)} \quad & \leq 2\widehat{\lambda}_1 - \beta\widehat{\lambda}_2 < 0
\end{aligned}$$

if $\beta > 2\widehat{\lambda}_1/\widehat{\lambda}_2$, which can be achieved by suitably tuning the parameters (see discussion in Remark C.1).

In total, we find

$$\text{(C.15)} \quad \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y)(f(y) - f(x)) \leq -c\|x\|_2^{-\beta} \quad \text{for } \|x\|_2 \geq M$$

with a constant $c > 0$.

Combined with the total variation bound on $\Psi^{\text{joint}} - \Psi^{\text{ind}}$ from (2.6) and the fact that the tail bound (2.5) holds for Ψ^{joint} as well as for Ψ^{ind} , this implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \Psi^{\text{joint}}(x, y)(f(y) - f(x)) \leq \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y)(f(y) - f(x)) \\
\text{(C.16)} \quad & + \|f\|_{\infty} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^2} |\Psi^{\text{joint}}(x, y) - \Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y)| \leq -c\|x\|_2^{-\beta},
\end{aligned}$$

i.e. (3.17) holds true. \square

Remark C.1 (Covariance of increments under Ψ^{ind} is not too anisotropic). Recall that ‘‘tuning the parameters’’ of the logistic branching random walk to conform with the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 means choosing the competition parameters λ_{xy} in (1.3), (1.4) small. Then the local population density tends to be large with small relative fluctuations. Thus, regeneration will tend to occur fast and $\Psi^{\text{ind}}(x, y)$ will be close to $p_{yx} = p_{x-y}$ where p is the displacement kernel from parent to offspring in (1.4). Since p is by assumption irreducible with finite range, $\widehat{\lambda}_1$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_2$ will be uniformly bounded away from 0 and from ∞ in the regime we consider, while we at the same time we can choose β large. Thus, the condition on $\widehat{\lambda}_1$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_2$ from (C.14) can be fulfilled.

Note also that if (p_{xy}) and (λ_{xy}) have additional symmetries, namely invariance under exchange of coordinates and plus mirror symmetry with respect to each coordinate individually, we have $\widehat{\lambda}_1 = \widehat{\lambda}_2$ and thus the condition in (C.14) is fulfilled for all $\beta > 2$.

Remark C.2 (The Green function of 2-dimensional Brownian motion in an annulus). For comparison, we recall here the answer corresponding to (3.17) for 2-dimensional Brownian motion. The radius process is in this case a 2-dimensional Bessel process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$, solving $dX_t = dB_t + (2X_t)^{-1}dt$, i.e. the generator is given by $Lf(x) = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x)f''(x) + \mu(x)f'(x)$ with $\sigma^2(x) \equiv 1$, $\mu(x) = 1/(2x)$.

We have

$$s(\eta) = \exp\left(-\int^\eta \frac{2\mu(\xi)}{\sigma^2(\xi)} d\xi\right) = \exp\left(-\int^\eta \frac{1}{\xi} d\xi\right) = \exp(-\log \eta) = \frac{1}{\eta},$$

hence the scale function is

$$S(x) = \int^x s(\eta) d\eta = \log x.$$

Let $0 < a < b$, consider the process which is stopped upon leaving (a, b) .

For $x \in [a, b]$ the Green function is

$$(C.17) \quad G_{a,b}(x, \xi) = \begin{cases} \frac{2(\log x - \log a)(\log b - \log \xi)}{\log b - \log a} \xi, & x \leq \xi \leq b, \\ \frac{2(\log b - \log x)(\log \xi - \log a)}{\log b - \log a} \xi, & a \leq \xi \leq x, \end{cases}$$

see, e.g., [KT81, Rem. 3.3 in Ch. 15.3]. Thus for $\beta > 2$ and $a < x < b$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^b G_{a,b}(x, \xi) \xi^{-\beta} d\xi \\ &= 2 \frac{\log b - \log x}{\log b - \log a} \int_a^x (\log \xi - \log a) \xi^{-(\beta-1)} d\xi + 2 \frac{\log x - \log a}{\log b - \log a} \int_x^b (\log b - \log \xi) \xi^{-(\beta-1)} d\xi \\ &= 2 \frac{\log b - \log x}{\log b - \log a} \left[-\frac{(\beta-2)^{-1} + \log \xi}{(\beta-2)\xi^{\beta-2}} + \frac{\log a}{(\beta-2)\xi^{\beta-2}} \right]_{\xi=a}^{\xi=x} \\ & \quad + 2 \frac{\log x - \log a}{\log b - \log a} \left[-\frac{\log b}{(\beta-2)\xi^{\beta-2}} + \frac{(\beta-2)^{-1} + \log \xi}{(\beta-2)\xi^{\beta-2}} \right]_{\xi=x}^{\xi=b} \\ &= \frac{2}{\beta-2} \frac{\log b - \log x}{\log b - \log a} \left(-\frac{(\beta-2)^{-1} + \log x}{x^{\beta-2}} + \frac{\log a}{x^{\beta-2}} + \frac{(\beta-2)^{-1} + \log a}{a^{\beta-2}} - \frac{\log a}{a^{\beta-2}} \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{2}{\beta-2} \frac{\log x - \log a}{\log b - \log a} \left(-\frac{\log b}{b^{\beta-2}} + \frac{(\beta-2)^{-1} + \log b}{b^{\beta-2}} + \frac{\log b}{x^{\beta-2}} - \frac{(\beta-2)^{-1} + \log x}{x^{\beta-2}} \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{\beta-2} \frac{\log b - \log x}{\log b - \log a} \left(\frac{\log a - \log x}{x^{\beta-2}} - \frac{(\beta-2)^{-1}}{x^{\beta-2}} + \frac{(\beta-2)^{-1}}{a^{\beta-2}} \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{2}{\beta-2} \frac{\log x - \log a}{\log b - \log a} \left(\frac{\log b - \log x}{x^{\beta-2}} + \frac{(\beta-2)^{-1}}{b^{\beta-2}} - \frac{(\beta-2)^{-1}}{x^{\beta-2}} \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{(\beta-2)^2} \frac{\log b - \log x}{\log b - \log a} (a^{2-\beta} - x^{2-\beta}) + \frac{2}{(\beta-2)^2} \frac{\log x - \log a}{\log b - \log a} (b^{2-\beta} - x^{2-\beta}) \\ &= \frac{2}{(\beta-2)^2 (\log b - \log a)} \left((\log b - \log x) (a^{2-\beta} - x^{2-\beta}) + (\log x - \log a) (b^{2-\beta} - x^{2-\beta}) \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{(\beta-2)^2 (\log b - \log a)} \left(a^{2-\beta} \log b - x^{2-\beta} \log b - a^{2-\beta} \log x + x^{2-\beta} \log x \right. \\ & \quad \left. + b^{2-\beta} \log x - x^{2-\beta} \log x - b^{2-\beta} \log a + x^{2-\beta} \log a \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{(\beta-2)^2 (\log b - \log a)} \left(-(\log b - \log a) x^{2-\beta} + (b^{2-\beta} - a^{2-\beta}) \log x + a^{2-\beta} \log b - b^{2-\beta} \log a \right) \\ (C.18) \quad & =: f_{a,b}(x) \end{aligned}$$

(note $\int \xi^{-c} \log \xi d\xi = -(c-1)^{-1} \xi^{1-c} ((c-1)^{-1} + \log \xi)$ for $c > 1$). It is straightforward to check that indeed $Lf_{a,b}(x) = -x^{-\beta}$ for $a < x < b$.

APPENDIX D. COALESCING PROBABILITIES

We want to quantify the probabilities for the ancestral lineages to coalesce in the next step. For that we consider different cases of starting positions and possible positions of the ancestor. For this setting we condition on the environmental process η , which gives us the number of individuals on each site. As we recall, given η we can define the dynamics of the ancestral lineages. To that we now want to add the probabilities for coalescence of two ancestral lineages.

To that end let $Y_{n,i}(x, y)$ be the number of children of the i -th individual from site x at time n that migrate to site y . By definition of the Y 's we obtain

$$(D.1) \quad \eta_{n+1}(y) = \sum_{x \in B_{R_X}(y)} \sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x)} Y_{n,i}(x, y).$$

Now let $y_1, y_2, x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $y_1 \neq y_2$. Say we knew the values of all Y 's, then the probability for an ancestral lineage at position y_1 and another at position y_2 at time $n+1$ to coalesce at time n at position x is given by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x)} \frac{Y_{n,i}(x, y_1)}{\eta_{n+1}(y_1)} \cdot \frac{Y_{n,i}(x, y_2)}{\eta_{n+1}(y_2)},$$

where, if the ancestral lineage is at some site, we choose the corresponding individual uniformly among all available. Since the information provided by the environment is only the values of η , we need to calculate the conditional expectation of the above expression, conditioned on η . More precisely, it is sufficient to condition on η_n and η_{n+1} .

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x)} \frac{Y_{n,i}(x, y_1)}{\eta_{n+1}(y_1)} \cdot \frac{Y_{n,i}(x, y_2)}{\eta_{n+1}(y_2)} \mid \eta_n, \eta_{n+1} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta_{n+1}(y_1)\eta_{n+1}(y_2)} \sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x)} \mathbb{E} [Y_{n,i}(x, y_1)Y_{n,i}(x, y_2) \mid \eta_n, \eta_{n+1}] \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta_{n+1}(y_1)\eta_{n+1}(y_2)} \sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x)} \mathbb{E} [Y_{n,i}(x, y_1) \mid \eta_n, \eta_{n+1}] \mathbb{E} [Y_{n,i}(x, y_2) \mid \eta_n, \eta_{n+1}], \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used that $Y_{n,i}(x, y_1)$ and $Y_{n,i}(x, y_2)$ are, conditioned on η_n , in fact independent Poisson random variables with parameters $f(x; \eta_n)p_{x,y_1}/\eta_n(x)$ and $f(x; \eta_n)p_{x,y_2}/\eta_n(x)$. Note that also $\eta_{n+1}(y) \sim \text{Poi}(\sum_z p_{z,y}f(z; \eta_n))$ and thus, by (D.1), conditioned on $\eta_{n+1}(y)$ the collection of $Y_{n,i}(x, y)$'s has a multinomial distribution with parameters $\eta_{n+1}(y)$ and

$$\frac{\frac{f(x; \eta_n)}{\eta_n(x)} p_{x,y}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z,y}}.$$

Therefore $Y_{n,i}(x, y_1)$ in the above conditioned expectation is binomial random variable and

$$(D.2) \quad \mathbb{E} [Y_{n,i}(x, y_1) \mid \eta_n, \eta_{n+1}] = \eta_{n+1}(y_1) \frac{\frac{f(x; \eta_n)}{\eta_n(x)} p_{x,y_1}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z,y_1}}.$$

It follows that the probability for coalescence on the site x at time n , starting from y_1 and y_2 at time $n+1$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\eta, \text{coal}}^{(2)}(n; (y_1, y_2), (x, x)) &= \frac{\eta_n(x)}{\eta_{n+1}(y_1)\eta_{n+1}(y_2)} \frac{\eta_{n+1}(y_1) \frac{f(x; \eta_n)}{\eta_n(x)} p_{x,y_1} \cdot \eta_{n+1}(y_2) \frac{f(x; \eta_n)}{\eta_n(x)} p_{x,y_2}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z,y_1} \cdot \sum_{z'} f(z'; \eta_n) p_{z',y_2}} \\ &= \frac{f(x; \eta_n) p_{x,y_1} \cdot f(x; \eta_n) p_{x,y_2}}{\eta_n(x) \sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z,y_1} \cdot \sum_{z'} f(z'; \eta_n) p_{z',y_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we study the probability that the two ancestral lineages meet on the same site but do not coalesce. Again we can consider what this probability would look like if we knew the values of

all Y 's. Here we get, again for $y_1 \neq y_2$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x)} \frac{Y_{n,i}(x, y_1)}{\eta_{n+1}(y_1)} \sum_{j \neq i}^{\eta_n(x)} \frac{Y_{n,j}(x, y_2)}{\eta_{n+1}(y_2)}.$$

By similar arguments as above we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x)} \frac{Y_{n,i}(x, y_1)}{\eta_{n+1}(y_1)} \sum_{j \neq i}^{\eta_n(x)} \frac{Y_{n,j}(x, y_2)}{\eta_{n+1}(y_2)} \mid \eta_n, \eta_{n+1} \right] \\ &= \eta_n(x)(\eta_n(x) - 1) \frac{\frac{f(x; \eta_n)}{\eta_n(x)} p_{x, y_1} \cdot \frac{f(x; \eta_n)}{\eta_n(x)} p_{x, y_2}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y_1} \cdot \sum_{z'} f(z'; \eta_n) p_{z', y_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

And thus

$$(D.3) \quad p_{\eta, \text{non-coal}}^{(2)}(n; (y_1, y_2), (x, x)) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta_n(x)}\right) \frac{f(x; \eta_n) p_{x, y_1} f(x; \eta_n) p_{x, y_2}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y_1} \cdot \sum_{z'} f(z'; \eta_n) p_{z', y_2}}.$$

Next we consider the two lineages starting from the same site and separating. Let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $x_1 \neq x_2$. By similar considerations as above we start with

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x_1)} \sum_{j=1}^{\eta_n(x_2)} \frac{Y_{n,i}(x_1, y) Y_{n,j}(x_2, y)}{\eta_{n+1}(y)(\eta_{n+1}(y) - 1)} \mid \eta_n, \eta_{n+1} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta_{n+1}(y)(\eta_{n+1}(y) - 1)} \sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x_1)} \sum_{j=1}^{\eta_n(x_2)} \eta_{n+1}(y)(\eta_{n+1}(y) - 1) \frac{\frac{f(x_1; \eta_n)}{\eta_n(x_1)} p_{x_1, y}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y}} \cdot \frac{\frac{f(x_2; \eta_n)}{\eta_n(x_2)} p_{x_2, y}}{\sum_{z'} f(z'; \eta_n) p_{z', y}} \\ &= \frac{f(x_1; \eta_n) p_{x_1, y} f(x_2; \eta_n) p_{x_2, y}}{(\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y})^2} \end{aligned}$$

and thus, if the lineages are yet to coalesce

$$(D.4) \quad p_{\eta}^{(2)}(n; (y, y), (x_1, x_2)) = \frac{f(x_1; \eta_n) p_{x_1, y} f(x_2; \eta_n) p_{x_2, y}}{(\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y})^2}.$$

For the case of different start and end positions we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\eta}^{(2)}(n; (y_1, y_2), (x_1, x_2)) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x_1)} \sum_{j=1}^{\eta_n(x_2)} \frac{Y_{n,i}(x_1, y_1)}{\eta_{n+1}(y_1)} \cdot \frac{Y_{n,j}(x_2, y_2)}{\eta_{n+1}(y_2)} \mid \eta_n, \eta_{n+1} \right] \\ &= \frac{f(x_1; \eta_n) p_{x_1, y_1} \cdot f(x_2; \eta_n) p_{x_2, y_2}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y_1} \cdot \sum_{z'} f(z'; \eta_n) p_{z', y_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

That leaves the calculations for starting on the same position and moving to the same position with and without coalescing.

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\eta, \text{coal}}^{(2)}(n; (y, y), (x, x)) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x)} \frac{Y_{n,i}(x, y)(Y_{n,i}(x, y) - 1)}{\eta_{n+1}(y)(\eta_{n+1}(y) - 1)} \mid \eta_n, \eta_{n+1} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta_{n+1}(y)(\eta_{n+1}(y) - 1)} \sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x)} \eta_{n+1}(y)(\eta_{n+1}(y) - 1) \left(\frac{\frac{f(x; \eta_n)}{\eta_n(x)} p_{x, y}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y}} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta_n(x)} \left(\frac{f(x; \eta_n) p_{x, y}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y}} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

This leaves us with the last case

$$\begin{aligned}
 p_{\eta, \text{non-coal}}^{(2)}(n; (y, y), (x, x)) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x)} \sum_{j \neq i}^{\eta_n(x)} \frac{Y_{n,i}(x, y) Y_{n,j}(x, y)}{\eta_{n+1}(y)(\eta_{n+1}(y) - 1)} \mid \eta_n, \eta_{n+1} \right] \\
 &= \frac{1}{\eta_{n+1}(y)(\eta_{n+1}(y) - 1)} \sum_{i=1}^{\eta_n(x)} \sum_{j \neq i}^{\eta_n(x)} \eta_{n+1}(y)(\eta_{n+1}(y) - 1) \left(\frac{\frac{f(x; \eta_n)}{\eta_n(x)} p_{x,y}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z,y}} \right)^2 \\
 &= \frac{\eta_n(x)(\eta_n(x) - 1)}{(\eta_n(x))^2} \left(\frac{\frac{f(x; \eta_n)}{\eta_n(x)} p_{x,y}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z,y}} \right)^2 \\
 &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta_n(x)} \right) \left(\frac{\frac{f(x; \eta_n)}{\eta_n(x)} p_{x,y}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z,y}} \right)^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

which concludes all cases. To summarize the calculations, let $x, y, x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be pairwise different. Then we have the following cases for a transition of two ancestral lineages:

$$(D.5) \quad p_{\eta, \text{coal}}^{(2)}(n; (y_1, y_2), (x, x)) = \frac{f(x; \eta_n) p_{x, y_1} \cdot f(x; \eta_n) p_{x, y_2}}{\eta_n(x) \sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y_1} \cdot \sum_{z'} f(z'; \eta_n) p_{z', y_2}}$$

$$(D.6) \quad p_{\eta, \text{non-coal}}^{(2)}(n; (y_1, y_2), (x, x)) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta_n(x)} \right) \frac{f(x; \eta_n) p_{x, y_1} f(x; \eta_n) p_{x, y_2}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y_1} \cdot \sum_{z'} f(z'; \eta_n) p_{z', y_2}}$$

$$(D.7) \quad p_{\eta}^{(2)}(n; (y, y), (x_1, x_2)) = \frac{f(x_1; \eta_n) p_{x_1, y} f(x_2; \eta_n) p_{x_2, y}}{(\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y})^2}$$

$$(D.8) \quad p_{\eta}^{(2)}(n; (y_1, y_2), (x_1, x_2)) = \frac{f(x_1; \eta_n) p_{x_1, y_1} \cdot f(x_2; \eta_n) p_{x_2, y_2}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y_1} \cdot \sum_{z'} f(z'; \eta_n) p_{z', y_2}}$$

$$(D.9) \quad p_{\eta, \text{coal}}^{(2)}(n; (y, y), (x, x)) = \frac{1}{\eta_n(x)} \left(\frac{f(x; \eta_n) p_{x, y}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y}} \right)^2$$

$$(D.10) \quad p_{\eta, \text{non-coal}}^{(2)}(n; (y, y), (x, x)) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta_n(x)} \right) \left(\frac{\frac{f(x; \eta_n)}{\eta_n(x)} p_{x, y}}{\sum_z f(z; \eta_n) p_{z, y}} \right)^2.$$

Note that we only need to consider the chance of coalescence if the two lineages meet on the same site, which is why we split those cases into a probability for coalescence and non-coalescence.

Acknowledgements. M.B. and A.D. would like to thank Alison Etheridge for many inspiring discussions over the years.

REFERENCES

- [BBM⁺09] Matthias Birkner, Jochen Blath, Martin Möhle, Matthias Steinrücken, and Johanna Tams, *A modified lookdown construction for the Xi-Fleming-Viot process with mutation and populations with recurrent bottlenecks*, ALEA, Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat. **6** (2009), 25–61 (English).
- [BČD16] Matthias Birkner, Jiří Černý, and Andrej Depperschmidt, *Random walks in dynamic random environments and ancestry under local population regulation*, Electron. J. Probab. **21** (2016), 1–43.
- [BCG93] Maury Bramson, J. Theodore Cox, and Andreas Greven, *Ergodicity of critical spatial branching processes in low dimensions*, Ann. Probab. **21** (1993), no. 4, 1946–1957 (English).
- [BD07] Matthias Birkner and Andrej Depperschmidt, *Survival and complete convergence for a spatial branching system with local regulation*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **17** (2007), no. 5–6, 1777–1807.

- [BDE02] Nick H. Barton, Frantz Depaulis, and Alison M. Etheridge, *Neutral evolution in spatially continuous populations*, Theoretical Population Biology **61** (2002), no. 1, 31–48.
- [BDS24] Matthias Birkner, Andrej Depperschmidt, and Timo Schlüter, *Quenched CLT for ancestral lineages of logistic branching random walks*, 2024, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.08567>.
- [BEM07] Jochen Blath, Alison M. Etheridge, and Mark Meredith, *Coeexistence in locally regulated competing populations and survival of branching annihilating random walk*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **17** (2007), no. 5-6, 1474–1507. MR 2358631 (2008j:60227)
- [BEV10] N. H. Barton, A. M. Etheridge, and A. Véber, *A new model for evolution in a spatial continuum*, Electron. J. Probab. **15** (2010), no. 7, 162–216. MR 2594876 (2010m:60249)
- [BG21] Matthias Birkner and Nina Gantert, *Ancestral lineages in spatial population models with local regulation*, Probabilistic structures in evolution, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., EMS Press, Berlin, [2021] ©2021, pp. 291–310. MR 4331865
- [BGS19] Matthias Birkner, Nina Gantert, and Sebastian Steiber, *Coalescing directed random walks on the backbone of a $1 + 1$ -dimensional oriented percolation cluster converge to the Brownian web*, ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat. **16** (2019), no. 2, 1029–1054. MR 4017185
- [BLG03] Jean Bertoin and Jean-François Le Gall, *Stochastic flows associated to coalescent processes*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **126** (2003), no. 2, 261–288 (English).
- [BP97] Benjamin M. Bolker and Stephen W. Pacala, *Using moment equations to understand stochastically driven spatial pattern formation in ecological systems*, Theoret. Population Biol **52** (1997), 179–197.
- [BP99] ———, *Spatial moment equations for plant competition: Understanding spatial strategies and the advantages of short dispersal*, American Naturalist **153** (1999), 575–602.
- [BS19] Matthias Birkner and Rongfeng Sun, *Low-dimensional lonely branching random walks die out*, Ann. Probab. **47** (2019), no. 2, 774–803 (English).
- [CG86] J. Theodore Cox and David Griffeath, *Diffusive clustering in the two-dimensional voter model*, Ann. Probab. **14** (1986), no. 2, 347–370. MR 832014 (87j:60146)
- [Dep08] Andrej Depperschmidt, *Survival, complete convergence and decay of correlations for a spatial branching system with local regulation*, Doctoral thesis, Technische Universität Berlin, Fakultät II - Mathematik und Naturwissenschaften, Berlin, 2008.
- [DK99] Peter Donnelly and Thomas G. Kurtz, *Particle representations for measure-valued population models*, Ann. Probab. **27** (1999), no. 1, 166–205 (English).
- [DLM] *NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions*, <https://dlmf.nist.gov/>, Release 1.1.12 of 2023-12-15, F. W. J. Olver, A. B. Olde Daalhuis, D. W. Lozier, B. I. Schneider, R. F. Boisvert, C. W. Clark, B. R. Miller, B. V. Saunders, H. S. Cohl, and M. A. McClain, eds.
- [Dur08] Richard Durrett, *Probability models for DNA sequence evolution*, second ed., Probability and its Applications (New York), Springer, New York, 2008. MR 2439767
- [EFS17] Alison Etheridge, Nic Freeman, and Daniel Straulino, *The Brownian net and selection in the spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot process*, Electron. J. Probab. **22** (2017), Paper No. 39, 36. MR 3646065
- [EK19] Alison M. Etheridge and Thomas G. Kurtz, *Genealogical constructions of population models*, Ann. Probab. **47** (2019), no. 4, 1827–1910. MR 3980910
- [EKL⁺24] Alison M. Etheridge, Thomas G. Kurtz, Ian Letter, Peter L. Ralph, and Terence Tsui Ho Lung, *Looking forwards and backwards: Dynamics and genealogies of locally regulated populations*, Electron. J. Probab. **29** (2024), Paper No. 1. MR 4705167
- [ET60] P. Erdős and S. J. Taylor, *Some problems concerning the structure of random walk paths*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **11** (1960), 137–162. (unbound insert). MR 0121870 (22 #12599)
- [Eth00] Alison M. Etheridge, *An introduction to superprocesses*, Univ. Lect. Ser., vol. 20, Providence, RI: AMS, American Mathematical Society, 2000 (English).

- [Eth04] ———, *Survival and extinction in a locally regulated population*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **14** (2004), no. 1, 188–214. MR 2023020 (2005b:60225)
- [Eth06] ———, *Evolution in fluctuating populations*, Mathematical statistical physics, Elsevier B. V., Amsterdam, 2006, pp. 489–545. MR 2581892
- [Eth08] ———, *Drift, draft and structure: some mathematical models of evolution*, Stochastic models in biological sciences. Proceedings of the workshop, Warsaw, Poland, May 29–June 2, 2006, Warsaw: Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Mathematics, 2008, pp. 121–144 (English).
- [Eth11] ———, *Some mathematical models from population genetics*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 2012, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011, Lectures from the 39th Probability Summer School held in Saint-Flour, 2009. MR 2759587 (2011j:92043)
- [Eth19] ———, *Spatial population models*, Malliavin calculus and normal approximations and Spatial population models. Lecture notes of two minicourses based on the presentations at the 23rd Brazilian school of probability, XXIII EBP, São Paulo, Brazil, July 22–27, 2019, Rio de Janeiro: Sociedade Brasileira de Matemática, 2019, pp. 75–186 (English).
- [EVY20] Alison M. Etheridge, Amandine Véber, and Feng Yu, *Rescaling limits of the spatial lambda-Fleming-Viot process with selection*, Electron. J. Probab. **25** (2020), Paper No. 120, 89. MR 4161130
- [Fel75] Joseph Felsenstein, *A pain in the torus: some difficulties with models of isolation by distance*, The American Naturalist **109** (1975), no. 967, 359–368.
- [FKK12] Dmitri Finkelshtein, Yuri Kondratiev, and Oleksandr Kutoviy, *Semigroup approach to birth-and-death stochastic dynamics in continuum*, J. Funct. Anal. **262** (2012), no. 3, 1274–1308 (English).
- [FM04] Nicolas Fournier and Sylvie Méléard, *A microscopic probabilistic description of a locally regulated population and macroscopic approximations*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **14** (2004), no. 4, 1880–1919. MR 2099656 (2005m:60231)
- [For22] Raphaël Forien, *Stochastic partial differential equations describing neutral genetic diversity under short range and long range dispersal*, Electron. J. Probab. **27** (2022), 41 (English), Id/No 106.
- [GSWZ15] Andreas Greven, Anja Sturm, Anita Winter, and Iljana Zähle, *Multi-type spatial branching models for local self-regulation I: Construction and an exponential duality*, 2015, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.04023>.
- [Hud83a] Richard R. Hudson, *Properties of a neutral allele model with intragenic recombination*, Theoretical Population Biology **23** (1983), no. 2, 183–201.
- [Hud83b] Richard R. Hudson, *Testing the constant-rate neutral allele model with protein sequence data*, Evolution **37** (1983), no. 1, 203–217.
- [HW07] Martin Hutzenthaler and Anton Wakolbinger, *Ergodic behaviour of locally regulated branching populations*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **17** (2007), no. 2, 474–501.
- [Kal77] Olav Kallenberg, *Stability of critical cluster fields*, Math. Nachr. **77** (1977), 7–43. MR 0443078 (56 #1451)
- [Kin82] John Frank Charles Kingman, *The coalescent*, Stochastic Processes Appl. **13** (1982), 235–248 (English).
- [Koe24] Peter Koepernik, *The Brownian spatial coalescent*, 2024, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.08557>.
- [KT81] Samuel Karlin and Howard M. Taylor, *A second course in stochastic processes*, Academic Press, 1981.
- [KW64] Motoo Kimura and George H Weiss, *The stepping stone model of population structure and the decrease of genetic correlation with distance*, Genetics **49** (1964), no. 4, 561–576.
- [LD02] Richard Law and Ulf Dieckmann, *Moment approximations of individual-based models*, The Geometry of Ecological Interactions (Ulf Dieckmann, Richard Law, and Johan A.J. Metz, eds.), Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002, pp. 252–270.
- [Lig99] Thomas M. Liggett, *Stochastic interacting systems: contact, voter and exclusion processes*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 324, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999. MR 1717346

- (2001g:60247)
- [LPW13] V. Le, E. Pardoux, and A. Wakolbinger, “*Trees under attack*”: a Ray-Knight representation of Feller’s branching diffusion with logistic growth, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **155** (2013), no. 3-4, 583–619. MR 3034788
- [Mal48] Gustave Malécot, *Les mathématiques de l’hérédité*, Masson Paris, 1948.
- [Mal69] ———, *The mathematics of heredity*, Revised, edited, and translated from the French by Demetrios M. Yermanos, W. H. Freeman and Co., San Francisco, Calif., 1969. MR 0258483 (41 #3130)
- [Mal75] ———, *Heterozygosity and relationship in regularly subdivided populations*, *Theor. Popul. Biol.* **8** (1975), no. 2, 212–241.
- [Mar70] Takeo Maruyama, *Effective number of alleles in a subdivided population*, *Theoret. Population Biology* **1** (1970), 273–306. MR 0363532
- [ML03] DJ Murrell and R Law, *Heteromyopia and the spatial coexistence of similar competitors*, *Ecology letters* **6** (2003), no. 1, 48–59.
- [MP24] Pascal Maillard and Sarah Penington, *Branching random walk with non-local competition*, 2024, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.14653>.
- [MPW17] Mikhail Menshikov, Serguei Popov, and Andrew Wade, *Non-homogeneous random walks*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 209, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017, Lyapunov function methods for near-critical stochastic systems. MR 3587911
- [PW11] Etienne Pardoux and Anton Wakolbinger, *From exploration paths to mass excursions—variations on a theme of Ray and Knight*, *Surveys in stochastic processes*, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2011, pp. 87–106. MR 2883855
- [Saw76] Stanley Sawyer, *Results for the stepping stone model for migration in population genetics*, *Ann. Probability* **4** (1976), no. 5, 699–728. MR 0682605 (58 #33157)
- [Saw77] ———, *Rates of consolidation in a selectively neutral migration model*, *Ann. Probab.* **5** (1977), 486–493 (English).
- [Shi81] Tokuzo Shiga, *Diffusion processes in population genetics*, *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **21** (1981), no. 1, 133–151. MR 606316 (82i:60129)
- [Shi88] ———, *Stepping stone models in population genetics and population dynamics*, *Stochastic processes in physics and engineering* (Bielefeld, 1986), *Math. Appl.*, vol. 42, Reidel, Dordrecht, 1988, pp. 345–355. MR 948717
- [Taj83] Fumio Tajima, *Evolutionary relationship of DNA sequences in finite populations*, *Genetics* **105** (1983), no. 2, 437–460.
- [VW15] Amandine Véber and Anton Wakolbinger, *The spatial Lambda-Fleming-Viot process: an event-based construction and a lockdown representation*, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **51** (2015), no. 2, 570–598. MR 3335017
- [WH98] Hilde M. Wilkinson-Herbots, *Genealogy and subpopulation differentiation under various models of population structure*, *Journal of Mathematical Biology* **37** (1998), no. 6, 535–585.
- [WH03] ———, *Coalescence times and F_{ST} values in subdivided populations with symmetric structure*, *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **35** (2003), no. 3, 665–690. MR 1990609 (2004f:92017)
- [WK65] George H. Weiss and Motoo Kimura, *A mathematical analysis of the stepping stone model of genetic correlation*, *J. Appl. Probability* **2** (1965), 129–149. MR 0177827 (31 #2089)
- [Wri43] Sewall Wright, *Isolation by distance*, *Genetics* **28** (1943), no. 2, 114.
- [Wri46] ———, *Isolation by distance under diverse systems of mating*, *Genetics* **31** (1946), no. 1, 39.