

SOLVING MARGINALS OF THE LDP FOR THE DIRECTED LANDSCAPE

SAYAN DAS AND LI-CHENG TSAI

ABSTRACT. We prove the upper-tail Large Deviation Principle (LDP) for the parabolic Airy process and characterize the limit shape of the directed landscape under the upper-tail conditioning. The LDP result answers Conjecture 10.1 in [DDV24]. The starting point of our proof is the metric-level LDP for the directed landscape from [DDV24] that reduces our work to solving a variational problem. Our proof is PDE-based and uses geometric arguments, connecting the variational problem to the weak solutions of Burgers' equation. Further, our method may generalize to the setting of the upper-tail LDP for the KPZ fixed point under the multi-wedge initial data, and we prove a decomposition result in this direction.

1. INTRODUCTION

The directed landscape is a random directed metric that is believed to be the universal scaling limit of models in the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang (KPZ) universality class [KPZ86, Qua11, Cor12, QS15, Gan21]. It was constructed in [DOV22] from the Brownian last passage percolation, and is shown to be the scaling limit of a handful of integrable models [DV21, Wu23, ACH24]. Let $\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4 := \{(s, y; t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^4, s < t\}$. The directed landscape \mathcal{L} a random continuous function from \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4 to \mathbb{R} . For fixed $s < t$ and y , the law of $\mathcal{L}(s, y; t, \cdot)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(s, y; t, \cdot) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} (t - s)^{1/3} \text{Airy}_2(\cdot) - \frac{(\cdot - y)^2}{t - s}, \quad (1.1)$$

where Airy_2 denotes the Airy 2 process [PS02, CH14], and the right-hand side of (1.1) is often called the parabolic Airy process. The time-space marginal $\mathcal{L}(0, 0; \cdot, \cdot)$ is given by the KPZ fixed point with the narrow-wedge initial data [MQR21, NQR20].

In this paper, we prove the upper-tail Large Deviation Principle (LDP) for some of the marginals of the directed landscape. To set up the context, we recall the metric-level LDP for the directed landscape recently proven in [DDV24]. Let \mathcal{E} denote the set of all continuous functions $e : \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the (reverse) triangle inequality

$$e(s, y; u, z) + e(u, z; t, x) \leq e(s, y; t, x), \quad (s, y; u, z), (u, z; t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4. \quad (1.2)$$

Equip \mathcal{E} with the topology of uniform convergence on bounded sets. Given a topological space \mathcal{X} , we call $J : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ a **good rate function** if J is lower-semicontinuous and if $\{J \leq \alpha\}$ is pre-compact for every $\alpha < \infty$. Scale the directed landscape as $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(y, s; t, x) := \varepsilon \mathcal{L}(s, y\varepsilon^{-1/2}; t, x\varepsilon^{-1/2})$. Under such scaling, the law of large numbers of \mathcal{L}_ε is given by the **Dirichlet metric**

$$d(s, y; t, x) := -\frac{(x - y)^2}{t - s}. \quad (1.3)$$

It was shown in [DDV24] that $\{\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$ satisfies an LDP with speed $\varepsilon^{-3/2}$ and an explicit rate function I that is good.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60F10.

Key words and phrases. Burgers' equation, directed landscape, Kruzhkov entropy, Kardar–Parisi–Zhang universality class, large deviations.

The work [DDV24] offers several ways of expressing the rate function I . The one most relevant to us one uses the language of measures, which we now recall. Throughout this paper, a **path** means an H^1 function on a closed time interval, and we use $a(\eta)$ and $b(\eta)$ to denote the starting and ending time of the path η , namely $\eta \in H^1[a(\eta), b(\eta)]$. Let $\mathfrak{g}(\eta) := \{(t, \eta(t)) : t \in [a(\eta), b(\eta)]\}$ denote the graph of η . Paths being **internally disjoint** means their graphs are disjoint except at their endpoints. Consider the space of finite signed measures supported on countably many paths

$$\mathcal{N} := \left\{ \mu = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \rho_\gamma \delta_\gamma : \rho_\gamma \in L^{3/2}[a(\gamma), b(\gamma)], \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \|\rho_\gamma\|_{L^{3/2}[a(\gamma), b(\gamma)]} < \infty \right\}, \quad (1.4)$$

where Γ is a countable set of internally disjoint paths, and μ acts on $F \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by $\langle \mu, F \rangle := \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \int_{[a(\gamma), b(\gamma)]} dt \rho_\gamma(t) F(t, \gamma(t))$. We call ρ_γ the **density**. Let $\mathcal{N}_+ := \{\mu \in \mathcal{N} : \mu \geq 0\}$ denote the subspace of positive measures. Hereafter, write $\dot{\eta} = \frac{d}{dt}\eta$ for the time derivative and

$$\text{write } (s, y) \xrightarrow{\eta} (t, x) \text{ for “}\eta \text{ is a path that connects } (s, y) \text{ to } (t, x)\text{”}, \quad (1.5)$$

namely $a(\eta) = s$, $b(\eta) = t$, $\eta(s) = y$, and $\eta(t) = x$. Given a $\mu \in \mathcal{N}_+$, define the metric e_μ and the length $|\cdot|_{e_\mu}$ by

$$e_\mu(y, s; t, x) := \sup \{ |\eta|_{e_\mu} : (s, y) \xrightarrow{\eta} (t, x) \}, \quad |\eta|_{e_\mu} := \mu(\mathfrak{g}(\eta)) + |\eta|_d, \quad (1.6)$$

where $|\eta|_d := -\int_{[a(\eta), b(\eta)]} dt \dot{\eta}^2$. It was shown in [DDV24] that $\mu \mapsto e_\mu$ is a bijection from \mathcal{N}_+ to $\{e \in \mathcal{E} : I(e) < \infty\}$. Namely, metrics with finite rates are in bijective correspondence with measures in \mathcal{N}_+ . Further, for any such metric, the rate function can be written as follows:

$$\text{For } \mu = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \rho_\gamma \delta_\gamma, \quad I(e_\mu) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \int_{a(\gamma)}^{b(\gamma)} dt \frac{4}{3} \rho_\gamma^{3/2}. \quad (1.7)$$

To avoid ambiguity, we will refer to the right-hand side of (1.7) as the rate function. The right-hand side of (1.7) is called the Kruzhkov entropy in [DDV24], but we reserve the name Kruzhkov entropy for $q_{\text{BM}}(\alpha) := \alpha^2/4$ and the name Kruzhkov entropy production for Ent_\pm ; both defined in Section 2.2. As will be seen there (in particular in (2.20)), I and Ent_\pm are indeed closely related. However, there is a *subtle difference* between the two, which we will discuss in Section 2.3.

1.1. Result for wedge initial data. Our main result concerns the LDP for $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(0, 0; 1, \cdot)$. We view this as the time-one LDP for the KPZ fixed point under the narrow-wedge initial data, which is equivalent to the LDP for the parabolic Airy process. Let Λ be a union of finitely many bounded closed intervals and let $f : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Borel function such that $f(x) \geq -x^2$ on Λ . The LDP from [DDV24] together with the contraction principle gives

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \varepsilon^{3/2} \log \mathbf{P} [\|\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(0, 0; 1, \cdot) - f\|_{L^\infty(\Lambda)} < r] + I_{0,0;1,\Lambda}(f) \right| = 0, \quad (1.8)$$

$$I_{0,0;1,\Lambda}(f) := \inf \{ I(e_\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{N}_+, e_\mu(0, 0; 1, \cdot)|_\Lambda = f \}, \quad \inf \emptyset := \infty. \quad (1.9)$$

Our result gives an explicit description of $I_{0,0;1,\Lambda}(f)$ and characterizes the minimizer of (1.9). To set up the notation, for $c \in (0, \infty)$, consider the space $\mathcal{E}(c) := \{\phi \in C(\mathbb{R}) : \phi|_{[-c,c]} \in H^1[-c,c], \phi(x) \geq -x^2 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}, \phi(x) = -x^2 \text{ outside of } [-c,c]\}$, let $\mathcal{E} := \cup_{c \in (0, \infty)} \mathcal{E}(c)$, and

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) := \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx ((\partial_x \phi)^2 - 4x^2) : \phi \in \mathcal{E}, \phi|_\Lambda = f \right\}, \quad \inf \emptyset := \infty. \quad (1.10)$$

When $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) < \infty$, the infimum in (1.10) has a unique minimizer $f_* \in \mathcal{E}$, which is depicted in Figure 1 and described in Section 4.1. Generalizing the notation in (1.5), for $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, we write

$(s, y) \xrightarrow{\eta} B$ for “ η is a path that connects (s, y) to a point in B ”, and similarly for $A \xrightarrow{\eta} (t, x)$. Take the $f_*(x)$ as the terminal data at $t = 1$ and construct $h_*(t, x)$, for $(t, x) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, via the backward Hopf–Lax operator as

$$h_*(t, x) := \text{HL}_{1 \rightarrow t}^{\text{bk}}[f_*](x) := \inf \left\{ -|\chi|_d + f_*(\chi(1)) : (t, x) \xrightarrow{\chi} \{1\} \times \mathbb{R} \right\}. \quad (1.11)$$

Theorem 1.1.

(1) Let Λ , f , $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f)$, f_* , and h_* be as above.

$$\inf \left\{ I(\mathbf{e}_\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{N}_+, \mathbf{e}_\mu(0, 0; 1, \cdot)|_\Lambda = f \right\} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f), \quad (1.12)$$

and when this is finite, any minimizer satisfies $\mathbf{e}_\mu(0, 0; t, x) = h_*(t, x)$ on $(t, x) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$.

(2) When f is continuous, and piecewise linear or quadratic, the minimizer of (1.12) is unique and given by $\mu_* = \mathbf{M}[h_*]$, where $\mathbf{M}[\cdot]$ is defined later in (2.16).

Theorem 1.1 has a corollary about the limit shape of the directed landscape.

Corollary 1.2. Notation as in Theorem 1.1 and let $\mathcal{T}(r) := \{\|\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(0, 0; 1, \cdot) - f\|_{L^\infty(\Lambda)} < r\}$.

(1) If $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) < \infty$, then for any compact $A \subset (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$ and any $r' > 0$,

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-3/2} \log \mathbf{P} \left[\|\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(0, 0; \cdot, \cdot) - h_*\|_{L^\infty(A)} \geq r' \mid \mathcal{T}(r) \right] < 0. \quad (1.13)$$

(2) If f is continuous, and piecewise linear or quadratic, for any compact $B \subset \mathbb{R}_+^4$ and $r' > 0$,

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-3/2} \log \mathbf{P} \left[\|\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{e}_{\mu_*}\|_{L^\infty(B)} \geq r' \mid \mathcal{T}(r) \right] < 0. \quad (1.14)$$

In words, conditioned on $\mathcal{T}(r)$ with $r \rightarrow 0$, Part 1 asserts that $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(0, 0; \cdot, \cdot)$ concentrates around h_* , and Part 2 asserts that \mathcal{L}_ε concentrates around \mathbf{e}_{μ_*} . Both concentrations hold up to exponentially small probabilities and under their respective assumptions on f .

Our method is PDE-based and provides information on the limit shape of the directed landscape. The first half of Theorem 1.1(1) gives the upper-tail LDP for the parabolic Airy process. Thanks to the integrable structure behind it, the parabolic Airy process can be viewed as the top curve of the Airy line ensemble and enjoys the Brownian resampling property [CH14]. This resampling property offers a heuristic for the rate function (1.10) (see [DDV24, Section 10.1] for example), and one can try proving the LDP using the resampling property and existing methods, such as [GH22, Dau23]. Our proof, on the other hand, does not rely on this special property and provides information beyond the LDP. In particular, Corollary 1.2 gives the limit shape of the directed landscape when f is piecewise linear or quadratic.

We emphasize that the minimizing μ_* in Theorem 1.1(2) is generally *not piecewise linear*. When Λ consists of finitely many points and when f_* is concave, the minimizing μ_* is supported on the graph of finitely many linear paths γ with constant ρ_γ . This follows from [DDV24, Proposition 2.1]; see [Tsa23, LT23] for a similar result for the KPZ equation. Roughly speaking, for such special configurations, the infimum in (1.12) can be solved by hand, giving the piecewise linear μ_* just described. Beyond these special configurations, the infimum in (1.12) cannot be solved by hand (as far as we can tell), the support of μ_* generally consists of nonlinear paths γ , and the density ρ_γ is generally nonlinear. Example 1.4 gives one such instance.

Let us describe our strategy of proving Theorem 1.1. First, proving Theorem 1.1 amounts to solving the variational problem in (1.12). For a suitable μ , the function $\partial_x \mathbf{e}_\mu(0, 0, t, x)$ is a weak solution of (the inviscid) Burgers’ equation. This is pointed out in [DDV24, Section 1.1]; see also [Bak13]. In this paper, we only consider a class of piecewise smooth weak solutions of Burgers’




FIGURE 1. The set Λ is shown at the bottom. The gray curve is $-x^2$. The solid black curve is f . The dashed and solid black curves together make f_* .




FIGURE 2. Example 1.3. The dot is $(0, 0)$. The dashed paths are the characteristics of $\partial_x h_*$. The gray path is γ_α , which traces out the support of μ_* .

equation, which we call tractable solutions and define in Definition 2.1. This class of solutions, together with various approximation arguments, suffices for our proof. Given what said above, the variational problem in (1.12) can be written in terms tractable solutions. The key to solving this variational problem is an identity, stated in Proposition 2.6, that relates the Kruzhkov entropy productions to \mathcal{E}_{BM} . This identity gives a strong hint on what the minimizer of (1.12) should look like; see Section 2.4 for a brief discussion on this. A version of this identity appeared in [QT21, Proposition 2.6], but it was only considered for a special weak solution there. Here, we observe that the identity generalizes to all tractable solutions and use it to solve the variational problem. From a broader perspective, our proof is related to the Jensen–Varadhan picture of hydrodynamic large deviations [Jen00, Var04]. A major open problem under this picture is to approximate the Kruzhkov entropy production of general weak solutions of Burgers’ equation. This problem motivates or is related to several works in analysis, including [DLR03, DLOW03, DLOW04, GP13, LO18]. Our work, on the other hand, focuses on connecting the directed landscape to Burgers’ equation and does not touch on problems like this.

Hereafter, we will implicitly assume that $\mu \in \mathcal{N}_+$ is supported in $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$. Doing so does not lose any generality, because Theorem 1.1 concerns the deviations of $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(0, 0; 1, \cdot)$, and because $e_\mu(0, 0; 1, \cdot)$ remains unchanged even if we redefine $\mu \in \mathcal{N}_+$ to be zero outside of $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$. Accordingly, unless otherwise noted, *time variables such as s, t will be assumed to be within $[0, 1]$ for the rest of the paper.*

1.2. Examples. Here are a few examples to illustrate Theorem 1.1(2).

Example 1.3. Take $\Lambda = \{\alpha\}$ and $f(\alpha) = \beta - \alpha^2$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta > 0$. Since Λ consists of just one point, the assumption of Theorem 1.1(2) holds. One can solve explicitly

$$f_*(x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -2(\alpha - \sqrt{\beta})x + (\alpha - \sqrt{\beta})^2, \text{ when } x \in [\alpha - \sqrt{\beta}, \alpha] \\ -2(\alpha + \sqrt{\beta})x + (\alpha + \sqrt{\beta})^2, \text{ when } x \in [\alpha, \alpha + \sqrt{\beta}] \\ -x^2, \text{ when } |x - \alpha| > \sqrt{\beta} \end{array} \right\} =: A_{\alpha, \beta}(1, x), \quad (1.15)$$

$$h_*(t, x) = tA_{\alpha, \beta}\left(1, \frac{x}{t}\right) =: A_{\alpha, \beta}(t, x), \quad (1.16)$$

$$\mu_* = \beta \delta_{\gamma_\alpha}, \text{ where } \gamma_\alpha(t) := \alpha t. \quad (1.17)$$

Let us explain a way to visualize $\partial_x h_*$ and μ_* , which will be used in subsequent examples. As will be seen in Section 3.1, the derivative $\partial_x h_*$ is a (non-entropy) solution of Burgers’ equation, so it can be described by characteristics. A characteristic of $\partial_x h_*$ is a path χ such that

$$\dot{\chi}(t) = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_x h_*)(t, \chi(t)) = \text{constant}. \quad (1.18)$$




FIGURE 3. Example 1.4. The set $\Lambda = \{-\alpha, 0, \alpha\}$ is shown at the bottom. The gray curve is $-x^2$. The three dots above the gray curve represent f . The dashed curve is f_* .




FIGURE 4. Example 1.4. Possible configurations of the characteristics and μ_* . The dot is $(0,0)$. The dashed paths are the characteristics of $\partial_x h_*$. The gray paths trace out the support of μ_* , and the thickness of the paths indicates the size of the density of μ_* along those paths.

For Example 1.3, using (1.15)–(1.16), one sees that the characteristics are as depicted in Figure 2. The places where characteristics intersect are shocks, and by (1.18), the function $\partial_x h_*$ is not continuous at shocks. The precise definition of $\mu_* := M[h_*]$ will be given in (2.16) in Section 2.2. Roughly speaking, μ_* is constructed to be supported on shocks and to have density being $1/16$ of the square of the jump of $\partial_x h_*$:

$$\mu_* := M[h_*] := \sum_{\ell: \text{shocks}} \frac{1}{16} \left((\partial_x h_*)_{x=\ell(t)^-} - (\partial_x h_*)_{x=\ell(t)^+} \right)^2 \delta_\ell.$$

For Example 1.3, the shocks trace out the path $\ell = \gamma_\alpha$ and $(\partial_x h_*)_{x=\ell(t)^\pm} = -2(\alpha \pm \sqrt{\beta})$. Hence $\mu_* = \frac{1}{16}(4\sqrt{\beta})^2 \delta_{\gamma_\alpha} = \beta \delta_{\gamma_\alpha}$.

Example 1.4. Take $\Lambda = \{-\alpha, 0, \alpha\}$, $f(\pm\alpha) := \beta - \alpha^2$, and $f(0) := \beta'$, for some $\alpha, \beta, \beta' > 0$ such that $\beta' < \beta - \alpha^2$. In this case, f_* takes an M shape as depicted in Figure 3. The characteristics of $\partial_x h_*$ can be obtained by the “shear-and-cut” procedure described in Section 3.1 and the result gives either plot in Figure 4, depending on the values of α, β, β' . The measure μ_* is then read off from the shocks of $\partial_x h_*$, as explained previously and shown in Figure 4.

Example 1.5. Take $\Lambda = [-\alpha, \alpha]$ and $f(x) := -x^2 + \beta$ on Λ , for some $\alpha, \beta > 0$. In words, we seek to lift $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(0, 0; 1, \cdot)|_{[-\alpha, \alpha]}$ up by β . In this case, f_* is as depicted in Figure 5. The characteristics of $\partial_x h_*$ can be obtained by the “shear-and-cut” procedure described in Section 3.1 and the result gives either plot in Figure 6, depending on the values of α, β . The measure μ_* is then read off from the shocks of $\partial_x h_*$; see Figure 6.

1.3. Result for multi-wedge initial data. We next consider the multi-wedge initial data. Take any nonempty finite set $Z \subset \mathbb{R}$, a function $g : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and consider

$$\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^{Z,g}(t, x) := \max_{z \in Z} \{ \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(0, z; t, x) + g(z) \}. \quad (1.19)$$

This is the ε -scaled KPZ fixed point with initial data $g\mathbf{1}_Z - \infty\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus Z}$, which we call multi-wedge. We will only consider the finite-dimensional LDPs for $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^{Z,g}(1, \cdot)$. Fix any nonempty finite set $Y \subset \mathbb{R}$




FIGURE 5. Example 1.4. The set $\Lambda = [-\alpha, \alpha]$ is shown at the bottom. The gray curve is $-x^2$. The solid black curve is f . The dashed and solid black curves together make f_* .




FIGURE 6. Example 1.5. Possible configurations of the characteristics and μ_* . The dot is $(0,0)$. The dashed paths are the characteristics of $\partial_x h_*$. The gray paths trace out the support of μ_* , and the thickness of the paths indicates the size of the density of μ_* along those paths.

and $f : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(y) > \max_{z \in Z} \{-(y-z)^2 + g(z)\}$, for all $y \in Y$. The LDP from [DDV24] together with the contraction principle gives

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \varepsilon^{3/2} \log \mathbf{P} \left[\|\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^{Z,g}(1, \cdot) - f\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} < r \right] + I_{0,Z;1,Y}(g; f) \right| = 0, \quad (1.20)$$

$$I_{0,Z;1,Y}(g; f) := \inf \left\{ I(\mathbf{e}_\mu) : \max_{z \in Z} \{ \mathbf{e}_\mu(0, z; 1, y) + g(z) \} = f(y), \forall y \in Y \right\}. \quad (1.21)$$

Our result gives a decomposition of (1.21). Call $(Y_z)_{z \in Z}$ an **ordered partition of Y** if $\{Y_z\}_{z \in Z}$ is a partition of Y and $y < y'$ holds for all $(y, y') \in Y_z \times Y_{z'}$ with $z < z'$.

Proposition 1.6. *The infimum (1.21) is achieved by measures of the form: $\mu = \sum_{z \in Z} \mu_z$ such that, for some ordered partition $(Y_z)_{z \in Z}$ of Y ,*

- (1) the μ_z s have disjoint supports,
- (2) $\mathbf{e}_{\mu_z}(0, z; 1, y) + g(z) = f(y)$ for all $y \in Y_z$ and $z \in Z$, and
- (3) $\mathbf{e}_{\mu_z}(0, z; 1, y) + g(z) \leq f(y)$ for all $y \in Y$ and $z \in Z$.

One could try to prove a multi-wedge analog of (1.12) using Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 1.6. Indeed, Condition (2) along is equivalent to the setting of Theorem 1.1 with $\Lambda = Y_z$, $f \mapsto f - g(z)$, and with the spatial origin being shifted to z . Taking into account Conditions (1) and (3) requires further work. We do not pursue this and just state a conjecture.

Conjecture 1.7. Let $\mathcal{E}_z(c) := \{\phi \in C(\mathbb{R}) : \phi|_{[-c,c]} \in H^1[-c,c]; \phi(x) \geq -(x-z)^2 + g(z) \text{ on } \mathbb{R}; \phi(x) = -(x-z)^2 + g(z) \text{ outside of } [-c,c]\}$ and let $\mathcal{E}_z := \cup_{c \in (0, \infty)} \mathcal{E}_z(c)$. The infimum in (1.21) is equal to

$$\inf \left\{ \sum_{z \in Z} \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx \left((\partial_x \phi_z)^2 - 4(x-z)^2 \right) : (\phi_z)_{z \in Z} \in \prod_{z \in Z} \mathcal{E}_z; \left(\max_{z \in Z} \phi_z \right) \Big|_Y = f \right\}. \quad (1.22)$$

The analog of Conjecture 1.7 for TASEP is proven in [QT21, Section 2.3] with the aid of determinantal formulas.

1.4. Literature. For the directed landscape and KPZ fixed point, the one-point tail bounds follow from Tracy–Widom’s original work [TW94]; see also [RRV11] for a probabilistic derivation. The metric-level LDP in [DDV24] was established using only one-point tail bounds and basic properties of the directed landscape. At a finer level, the conditional limiting fluctuations and geodesics were studied in [Liu22b, LW24] using exact formulas from [Liu22a], and in [GH22, GHZ23] (also for the KPZ equation) using geometric arguments relying on the Brownian resampling property from [CH14, CH16].

For the totally asymmetric simple exclusion process, or equivalently the exponential last passage percolation, the one-point LDPs were obtained in [LS77, Sep98b, Sep98a, DZ99, Joh00], the process-level upper-tail LDP was studied in [Jen00, Var04] and proven in [QT21], and the process-level lower-tail LDP was studied in [OT19]. The lower-tail LDP for the first passage percolation was established in [BGS21] at the one-point level and recently in [Ver24] at the metric level. For the KPZ equation, one-point tails were studied in the physics works [LDMS16, LDMRS16, KLD17, SMP17, CGK⁺18, KLD18a, KLD18b, KLDP18] and in the mathematics works [DT21, Kim21, CG20b, CG20a, GL23, Lin21, CC22, Tsa22], and process-level large deviations were studied in the physics works [KK07, KK09, MKV16, MS17, MV18, KMS16, HMS19, KLD21, KLD22, KLD23] and the mathematics works [LT21, GLLT23, LT22, GH22, GHZ23, LT23, Tsa23]. For several other models in the KPZ universality class, the one-point LDPs have been established in [GS13, Jan15, EJ17, Jan19, DZ22, DLM23].

Outline. In Section 2, we describe the connection between the large deviations of the directed landscape and the weak solutions of Burgers’ equation. In Section 3, we prepare various tools and intermediate results necessary for the proof. Finally, in Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.1, Corollary 1.2, and Proposition 1.6.

Funding. The research of Tsai was partially supported by the NSF through DMS-2243112 and the Sloan Foundation Fellowship.

2. BURGERS’ EQUATION AND KRUSHKOV ENTROPY PRODUCTION

Here we explain the relation between the large deviations of the directed landscape, the weak solutions of Burgers’ equation, and the Kruzhkov entropy production.

2.1. Weak solutions of Burgers’ equation. Let us briefly recall some general properties of Burgers’ equation. We refer to [Eva22, Chapters 3 and 11] for an introduction to this topic. Consider (the invicid) Burgers’ equation and its Hamilton–Jacobi equation:

$$\partial_t u = \frac{1}{4} \partial_x (u^2), \quad \partial_t h = \frac{1}{4} (\partial_x h)^2, \quad (t, x) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.1)$$

which are related through $u = \partial_x h$. We view h as the height function. Call $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty((0, 1) \times \mathbb{R})$ a weak solution of Burgers’ equation if the first equation in (2.1) holds weakly on $(0, 1) \times \mathbb{R}$. No matter how smooth we require the initial data $u(0, \cdot)$ to be, the solutions generally develop discontinuity later in time, and there generally exist multiple weak solutions. Uniqueness is obtained only after imposing a so-call entropy condition. For a given initial data in a suitable class, there exists exactly one weak solution satisfying the entropy condition, called the entropy solution. While in the PDE literature, non-entropy solutions are often regarded as non-physical, in the study of the large deviations the directed landscape, non-entropy solutions are *highly relevant*. The relevance of non-entropy solutions in this context is observed as early as in [Jen00] and [Var04].




FIGURE 7. Tractable partition of a light cone. The dashed lines are $\mathfrak{T} \times \mathbb{R}$. The solid paths are $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}$.

In this paper, we will only work with what we call tractable solutions. As said, we will need to consider *non-entropy* solutions. To introduce tractable solutions, recall the Dirichlet metric d from (1.3) and consider

$$h_d(t, x) := d(0, 0; t, x) = -\frac{x^2}{t}, \quad u_d(t, x) := \partial_x h_d(t, x) = -\frac{2x}{t}, \quad (t, x) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.2)$$

These functions are smooth solutions of (2.1). They do become singular as $t \rightarrow 0$, but we will confine our attentions to a light cone

$$\mathcal{C}(c) := \{(t, x) : t \in [0, 1], |x| \leq ct\}, \quad (2.3)$$

for $c < \infty$, on which $|h_d|$ and $|u_d|$ stay bounded.

Definition 2.1. A tractable partition of $\mathcal{C}(c)$ consists of $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{D})$. The set $\mathfrak{T} = \{0 = t_0 < \dots < t_{|\mathfrak{T}|} = 1\}$ is a partition of $[0, 1]$. The set \mathfrak{B} consists of finitely many $C^1[t_{i-1}, t_i]$ paths, $i = 1, \dots, |\mathfrak{T}|$, and these paths do not intersect except at $t \in \mathfrak{T}$. We assume \mathfrak{B} contains the left and right boundaries of $\mathcal{C}(c) \cap ([t_{i-1}, t_i] \times \mathbb{R})$, $i = 1, \dots, |\mathfrak{T}|$. The light cone $\mathcal{C}(c)$ is partitioned by $\mathfrak{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ and the paths in \mathfrak{B} into finitely many open connected regions. Let \mathfrak{D} denote the set of these open connected regions. See Figure 7 for an illustration.

Call v with $v := \partial_x g$ a **tractable solution** with respect to a tractable partition $(\mathfrak{T}(v), \mathfrak{B}(v), \mathfrak{D}(v))$ of a light cone $\mathcal{C}(c)$ if $g \in C((0, 1] \times \mathbb{R})$ solves $\partial_t g = \frac{1}{4}(\partial_x g)^2$ a.e. on $(0, 1) \times \mathbb{R}$ and

- (1) $g = h_d$ outside of $\mathcal{C}(c)$ and $g \in C(\mathcal{C}(c))$ with the convention $g(0, 0) := 0$,
- (2) for each $D \in \mathfrak{D}(v)$, we have $g \in C^2(D)$ and $v \in L^\infty(D)$, and
- (3) for each $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(v)$, the limits $v_{\ell\pm}(t) := \lim_{x \rightarrow \ell(t)\pm} v(t, x)$ exist for $t \in (a(\ell), b(\ell))$ and are $C(a(\ell), b(\ell)) \cap L^\infty(a(\ell), b(\ell))$ functions.

Call any $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(v)$ a **boundary path** of v and any $D \in \mathfrak{D}(v)$ a **smooth region** of v .

Let us recall some basic properties of weak solutions of Burgers' equation, restricting the scope to a tractable solution $v = \partial_x g$. Recall that a **characteristic** of v is a linear path χ such that

$$\dot{\chi} = -\frac{1}{2}v|_\chi = \text{constant}. \quad (2.4)$$

Hereafter, $v|_\chi(t) := v(t, \chi(t))$. For any $D \in \mathfrak{D}(v)$, since v is a $C^1(D)$ solution, the region D is filled with non-intersecting characteristics. Next, recall that the places where v is discontinuous are called **shocks**, which can only occur on the boundary paths $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(v)$. For the discussions of shocks, we exclude the starting and ending times $t = a(\ell), b(\ell)$ when the limits $v_{\ell\pm}$ may not exist. An **entropy shock** and **non-entropy shock** are respectively where $v_{\ell-} < v_{\ell+}$ and $v_{\ell-} > v_{\ell+}$. We call v an entropy solution if it does not have non-entropy shocks. Next, we derive some useful

identities. Since $g \in C((0, 1] \times \mathbb{R})$ by assumption,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \ell(t)^-} g(t, x) = g(t, \ell(t)) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \ell(t)^+} g(t, x), \quad \text{for all } t \in (a(\ell), b(\ell)). \quad (2.5)$$

Take $t_1 < t_2 \in (a(\ell), b(\ell))$, use (2.5) to approximate $g(t_i, \ell(t_i))$ by $g(t_i, \ell(t_i) \pm \varepsilon)$, use the C^1 smoothness of the latter, and send $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. Doing so gives $g(t_2, \ell(t_2)) - g(t_1, \ell(t_1)) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt (\partial_t g + \dot{\ell} \partial_x g)|_{\ell \pm} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt (\frac{1}{4}v^2 + \dot{\ell}v)|_{\ell \pm}$. Hence $\frac{d}{dt}g(t, \ell(t))$ exists on $(a(\ell), b(\ell))$ and

$$g|_{\ell} := \frac{d}{dt}g(t, \ell(t)) = \frac{1}{4}v_{\ell+}^2 + v_{\ell+}\dot{\ell} = \frac{1}{4}v_{\ell-}^2 + v_{\ell-}\dot{\ell}. \quad (2.6)$$

From this, we further deduce

$$\dot{\ell} = -\frac{1}{4}(v_{\ell+} + v_{\ell-}), \quad \text{whenever } v_{\ell-} \neq v_{\ell+}, \quad (2.7)$$

$$(g|_{\ell} + \dot{\ell}^2) \mathbf{1}_{v_{\ell-} \neq v_{\ell+}} = \frac{1}{16}(v_{\ell-} - v_{\ell+})^2, \quad (2.8)$$

where (2.7) is the well-known Rankine–Hugoniot condition.

Next, to see the connection between Burgers' equation and the large deviations, consider

$$\mathbf{H}[\mu](t, x) := \mathbf{e}_{\mu}(0, 0; t, x), \quad (t, x) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.9)$$

Indeed, the variational problem (1.12) concerns $\mathbf{e}_{\mu}(0, 0; 1, x) = \mathbf{H}[\mu](1, x)$, and we are allowing t to vary in $(0, 1]$ to get a height function in (t, x) . Under this notation, h_d in (2.2) is $\mathbf{H}[0]$. For sufficiently “nice” μ , the function $\partial_x \mathbf{H}[\mu]$ is a tractable solution.

Definition 2.2. Call $\mu = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \rho_{\gamma} \delta_{\gamma} \in \mathcal{N}_+$ **piecewise linear and cone-supported** if Γ consists of finitely many linear (meaning $\dot{\gamma}$ is constant) internally disjoint paths, each ρ_{γ} is constant, and $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset \mathcal{C}(c)$ for some $c < \infty$.

Proposition 2.3. *For any piecewise linear and cone-supported μ , $\partial_x \mathbf{H}[\mu]$ is a tractable solution.*

A stronger version of Proposition 2.3, Proposition 2.3', will be proven in Section 3.3.

Remark 2.4. Proving Theorem 1.1 requires considering more general μ s than those in Definition 2.2. We achieve this by approximating the former by the latter. It is of independent interest to understand how general μ can be for $\partial_x \mathbf{H}[\mu]$ to still be a weak solution and to understand properties of $\partial_x \mathbf{H}[\mu]$.

Here are some notation for the next example. Given paths η and η' with $b(\eta) = a(\eta')$ and $\eta(b(\eta)) = \eta'(a(\eta'))$, we write $\eta \cup \eta' := \eta \mathbf{1}_{[a(\eta), b(\eta)]} + \eta' \mathbf{1}_{(a(\eta'), b(\eta'))}$ for the concatenated paths. Call a path η an \mathbf{e}_{μ} **geodesic** if $|\eta|_{\mathbf{e}_{\mu}} = \mathbf{e}_{\mu}(a, \eta(a); b, \eta(b))$, where $a = a(\eta)$ and $b = b(\eta)$.

Example 2.5. An elementary yet useful example is $\nu_{\alpha, \beta} := \beta \delta_{\gamma_{\alpha}}$, where $\gamma_{\alpha}(t) := \alpha t$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\beta \geq 0$. One can show that, for any $(t, x) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, the $\mathbf{e}_{\nu_{\alpha, \beta}}$ geodesic $(0, 0) \xrightarrow{\pi} (t, x)$ is of the form $\pi = \gamma_{\alpha}|_{[0, s]} \cup \chi$, for some $s \in [0, t]$, where χ is the linear path that connects $(s, \gamma_{\alpha}(s))$ and (t, x) . Recall $A_{\alpha, \beta}$ from (1.15)–(1.16). One can further solve the height function explicitly to get

$$\mathbf{H}[\nu_{\alpha, \beta}](t, x) = A_{\alpha, \beta}(t, x) := tA_{\alpha, \beta}(1, \frac{x}{t}). \quad (2.10)$$

From this, we see that $u := \partial_x \mathbf{H}[\nu_{\alpha, \beta}]$ has a non-entropy shock along $\mathbf{g}(\gamma_{\alpha})$.

2.2. Kruzhkov entropy. We now move to the highly relevant notion of the Kruzhkov entropy. Take $q_{\text{BM}}(\alpha) := \alpha^2/4$ and view it as the entropy. This is the relevant choice of entropy because $\phi \mapsto \int dx q_{\text{BM}}(\partial_x \phi)$ gives the large-deviation rate function of the Brownian motion with diffusivity 2, which is the invariant measure of the KPZ fixed point, modulo height shifts. Set $r_{\text{BM}}(\alpha) := \alpha^3/12$, which will be seen to be the entropy flux. Take any tractable solution v . Within each smooth region $D \in \mathfrak{D}(v)$, the function v is a C^1 solution of Burgers' equation. Using the chain rule together with $\partial_t v = \frac{1}{4} \partial_x (v^2)$ gives

$$\partial_t q_{\text{BM}}(v) - \partial_x r_{\text{BM}}(v) = 0, \quad \text{on } D, \quad (2.11)$$

or equivalently $\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} dx q_{\text{BM}}(v(t, x)) = r_{\text{BM}}(v(t, \beta)) - r_{\text{BM}}(v(t, \alpha))$, for all $\{t\} \times [\alpha, \beta] \subset D$. This means, within D , the quantity q_{BM} is conserved, and r_{BM} is the corresponding flux. On the other hand, along any boundary path $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(v)$,

$$(\partial_t q_{\text{BM}}(v) - \partial_x r_{\text{BM}}(v))|_{\ell} = (q_{\text{BM}}(v_{\ell+}) - q_{\text{BM}}(v_{\ell-})) \dot{\ell} \delta_{\ell} - (r_{\text{BM}}(v_{\ell+}) - r_{\text{BM}}(v_{\ell-})) \delta_{\ell}, \quad (2.12)$$

which is an element of \mathcal{N} in (1.4). The equality (2.12) is interpreted in the weak sense. Indeed, since $r_{\text{BM}}(v) = r_{\text{BM}}(v(t, x))$ can have a jump in x at $\ell(t)$, its x derivative is equal to $(r_{\text{BM}}(v_{\ell+}) - r_{\text{BM}}(v_{\ell-})) \delta_{\ell}$ in the weak sense; similarly for $\partial_t q_{\text{BM}}(v)$. Using (2.7), we simplify the right-hand side of (2.12) as

$$(\partial_t q_{\text{BM}}(v) - \partial_x r_{\text{BM}}(v))|_{\ell} = \frac{1}{48} (v_{\ell-} - v_{\ell+})^3 \delta_{\ell} \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (2.13)$$

This is nonzero wherever shocks occur, and is positive at non-entropy shocks and negative at entropy shocks. Accordingly, we consider the positive/negative entropy production

$$\text{Ent}_{\pm}(v) := \sum_{\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(v)} \frac{1}{48} \int_{a(\ell)}^{b(\ell)} dt |v_{\ell-} - v_{\ell+}|^3 \mathbf{1}_{v_{\ell\mp} > v_{\ell\pm}}. \quad (2.14)$$

Combining (2.12) over $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(v)$ and (2.11) over $D \in \mathfrak{D}(v)$ gives

$$\int_{[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}} dt dx (\partial_t q_{\text{BM}}(v) - \partial_x r_{\text{BM}}(v)) = \text{Ent}_{+}(v) - \text{Ent}_{-}(v). \quad (2.15)$$

The left-hand side is interpreted as $(\partial_t q_{\text{BM}}(v) - \partial_x r_{\text{BM}}(v)) \in \mathcal{N}$ acting on the constant function 1.

The entropy productions $\text{Ent}_{\pm}(v)$ are closely related to the rate function I . We now derive the identities (in (2.20)) that links the two. Recall that \mathcal{N}_{+} denotes the subspace of (1.4) consisting of positive measures. Let $v = \partial_x g$ be a tractable solution and consider

$$\mathbb{M}[g] := \sum_{\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(v)} (g|_{\ell} + \dot{\ell}^2) \mathbf{1}_{v_{\ell-} \neq v_{\ell+}} \delta_{\ell} = \sum_{\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(v)} \frac{1}{16} (v_{\ell-} - v_{\ell+})^2 \delta_{\ell} \in \mathcal{N}_{+}, \quad (2.16)$$

where we used (2.8) in the last equality. Decompose $\mathbb{M}[g]$ into its non-entropy and entropy parts

$$\mathbb{M}_{\text{non}}[g] := \sum_{\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(v)} \frac{1}{16} (v_{\ell-} - v_{\ell+})^2 \mathbf{1}_{v_{\ell-} > v_{\ell+}} \delta_{\ell}, \quad (2.17)$$

$$\mathbb{M}_{\text{ent}}[g] := \sum_{\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(v)} \frac{1}{16} (v_{\ell-} - v_{\ell+})^2 \mathbf{1}_{v_{\ell-} < v_{\ell+}} \delta_{\ell}. \quad (2.18)$$

Indeed, $I(e_{\mu})$ can also be viewed as a function of μ . We have been writing $I(e_{\mu})$ (instead of $I(\mu)$) to keep the notation consistent with that of [DDV24]. The notation however becomes clumsy when taking $\mathbb{M}[g]$, etc., as the measure. Hence, for these measures, we write

$$I(\mathbb{M}[g]) := I(e_{\mathbb{M}[g]}), \quad I(\mathbb{M}_{\text{non}}[g]) := I(e_{\mathbb{M}_{\text{non}}[g]}), \quad I(\mathbb{M}_{\text{ent}}[g]) := I(e_{\mathbb{M}_{\text{ent}}[g]}). \quad (2.19)$$

Comparing (1.7) and (2.14) shows that, for $v = \partial_x g$,

$$I(\mathbf{M}_{\text{non}}[g]) = \text{Ent}_+(v), \quad I(\mathbf{M}_{\text{ent}}[g]) = \text{Ent}_-(v). \quad (2.20)$$

The key to our proof is the following identity, (2.21), that relates entropy productions to \mathcal{E}_{BM} .

Proposition 2.6. *For any tractable solution $v = \partial_x g$,*

$$I(\mathbf{M}_{\text{non}}[g]) - I(\mathbf{M}_{\text{ent}}[g]) = \text{Ent}_+(v) - \text{Ent}_-(v) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx ((\partial_x g(1, x))^2 - 4x^2). \quad (2.21)$$

Proof. Take a $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that $g(t, x) = h_d(t, x)$ outside of $\mathcal{C}(c)$, which also gives $v(t, x) = u_d(t, x)$ outside of $\mathcal{C}(c)$. Consider $F(t) := \int_{-2c}^{2c} dx (q_{\text{BM}}(v(t, x)) - q_{\text{BM}}(u_d(t, x)))$ and note that $F(1) = (\text{RHS of (2.21)})$. Given that v is a tractable solution, it is not hard to check that F is piecewise C^1 on $[0, 1]$ and $F(0) = 0$. Hence

$$(\text{RHS of (2.21)}) = \int_0^1 dt \dot{F}(t) = \int_{[0,1] \times [-2c, 2c]} dt dx \partial_t q_{\text{BM}}(v) - \int_{[0,1] \times [-2c, 2c]} dt dx \partial_t q_{\text{BM}}(u_d). \quad (2.22)$$

In the second last expression, $\partial_t q_{\text{BM}}(g) \in \mathcal{N}$ and the integral is interpreted as an element of \mathcal{N} acting on the function $1_{[0,1] \times [-2c, 2c]}$. Since $u_d(t, x) = -2x/t$ is a C^1 solution of Burgers' equation, $\partial_t q_{\text{BM}}(u_d) = \partial_x r_{\text{BM}}(u_d)$. Replace the last integral in (2.22) with $\int_0^1 dt r_{\text{BM}}(u_d)|_{-2c}^{2c}$. Since $v = u_d$ outside of $\mathcal{C}(c)$, the integral is equal to $\int_0^1 dt r_{\text{BM}}(v)|_{-2c}^{2c} = \int_{-2c}^{2c} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx \partial_x (q_{\text{BM}}(v))$. Again, the last expression is interpreted as an element of \mathcal{N} acting on the function $1_{[0,1] \times [-2c, 2c]}$. We now have

$$(\text{RHS of (2.21)}) = \int_{[0,1] \times [-2c, 2c]} dt dx \partial_t q_{\text{BM}}(v) - \int_{[0,1] \times [-2c, 2c]} dt dx \partial_x r_{\text{BM}}(v). \quad (2.23)$$

Combine the two integrals, note that $\partial_t q_{\text{BM}}(v) - \partial_x r_{\text{BM}}(v) \in \mathcal{N}$ is supported on $\mathcal{C}(c) \subset [0, 1] \times [-2c, 2c]$, and use (2.15) and (2.20). Doing so gives the desired result. \square

2.3. Comparing I and Ent_{\pm} . It seems that the identities in (2.20) equate the rate function I to the entropy productions Ent_{\pm} , but there is a catch. Take any $\mu \in \mathcal{N}_+$ such that $v := \partial_x g := \partial_x \mathbf{H}[\mu]$ is a tractable solution. The identities in (2.20) involve $I(\mathbf{M}_{\text{ent}}[g])$ and $I(\mathbf{M}_{\text{non}}[g])$, not $I(\mathbf{e}_{\mu})$, and hence does not equate $I(\mathbf{e}_{\mu})$ to the entropy productions of $v = \partial_x \mathbf{e}_{\mu}(0, 0; \cdot, \cdot)$. Examples 2.9–2.8 below show that, in general, $I(\mathbf{e}_{\mu}) \neq I(\mathbf{M}_{\text{non}}[g])$ and $I(\mathbf{e}_{\mu}) \neq I(\mathbf{M}_{\text{ent}}[g])$. Indeed, comparing these quantities boils down to comparing μ and $\mathbf{M}_{\text{non}}[g]$, and μ and $\mathbf{M}_{\text{ent}}[g]$. We make a conjecture about how μ and $\mathbf{M}_{\text{non}}[g]$ compare.

Conjecture 2.7. Given any $\mu \in \mathcal{N}_+$ such that $v := \partial_x g := \partial_x \mathbf{H}[\mu]$ is a tractable solution, we have $\mu|_{\text{supp}(\mathbf{M}_{\text{non}}[g])} = \mathbf{M}_{\text{non}}[g]$. Namely μ and $\mathbf{M}_{\text{non}}[g]$ coincide on the non-entropy shocks of v . In particular, $I(\mathbf{e}_{\mu}) \geq I(\mathbf{M}_{\text{non}}[g]) = \text{Ent}_+(v)$.

Later in Proposition 2.3', we will show that when μ is piecewise linear and cone-supported, $I(\mathbf{e}_{\mu}) \geq I(\mathbf{M}_{\text{non}}[g])$. This, as it turns out, suffices for our proof of Theorem 1.1(1). Also related to Conjecture 2.7 is Theorem 1.1(2). There, we prove that $\mu = \mathbf{M}_{\text{non}}[g]$ when μ is a minimizer of (1.12), under the assumption that f is piecewise linear or quadratic.

Here are the examples that show that $I(\mathbf{e}_{\mu}) \neq I(\mathbf{M}_{\text{non}}[g])$ and that $I(\mathbf{e}_{\mu}) \neq I(\mathbf{M}_{\text{ent}}[g])$. The examples require Lemma 3.6. Recall $A_{\alpha, \beta}$ from (1.15)–(1.16) and recall that $\gamma_{\alpha}(t) := \alpha t$.

Example 2.8. Take $\mu = \beta_1 \delta_{\gamma_{\alpha_1}} + \beta_2 \delta_{\gamma_{\alpha_2}}$ for any $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$. For fixed $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2$, when β_1 gets large enough, we have $A_{\alpha_1, \beta_1}(1, \cdot) > A_{\alpha_2, \beta_2}(1, \cdot)$ on \mathbb{R} . Take any such β_1 . By Lemma 3.6, we have $H[\mu] = A_{\alpha_1, \beta_1}$, so $M_{\text{non}}[g] = \beta_1 \delta_{\gamma_{\alpha_1}}$ and $M_{\text{ent}}[g] = 0$. In particular,

$$I(e_\mu) = \frac{4}{3}(\beta_1^{3/2} + \beta_2^{3/2}) > \frac{4}{3}\beta_1^{3/2} = I(M_{\text{ent}}[g]) = \text{Ent}_+(v). \quad (2.24)$$

Example 2.9. Take $\mu = \beta \delta_{\gamma_\alpha} + \beta \delta_{-\gamma_\alpha}$ with $0 < \alpha < \sqrt{\beta}$. By Lemma 3.6,

$$H[\mu](t, x) = A_{\alpha, \beta}(t, x) \vee A_{-\alpha, \beta}(t, x) = t \left(A_{\alpha, \beta}(1, \frac{x}{t}) \vee A_{-\alpha, \beta}(1, \frac{x}{t}) \right). \quad (2.25)$$

From this expression and (1.15)–(1.16), one can check that $M_{\text{ent}}[g] = (\sqrt{\beta} - \alpha)^2 \delta_0$, where 0 denotes the constant path at $x = 0$. Hence $I(M_{\text{ent}}[g]) = \frac{4}{3}(\sqrt{\beta} - \alpha)^3$, which differs from $I(e_\mu) = \frac{8}{3}\beta^{3/2}$.

2.4. Idea of the proof. Let us explain the idea of the proof of Theorem 1.1. To focus on the idea, let us set aside finer technical details and consider the simpler case where Λ consists of finitely many points and μ is piecewise linear and cone-supported (Definition 2.2). Put $h = H[\mu]$ and assume $h(1, \cdot)|_\Lambda = f$, as required by (1.12). Proposition 2.3' in Section 3.3 shows that $\partial_x h$ is a tractable solution with $I(e_\mu) \geq I(M_{\text{non}}[h])$. Hence Proposition 2.6 yields

$$\begin{aligned} I(e_\mu) &\geq I(M_{\text{non}}[h]) \geq I(M_{\text{non}}[h]) - I(M_{\text{ent}}[h]) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx \left((\partial_x h(1, x))^2 - 4x^2 \right) \geq \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f), \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

where the last inequality follows because $h(1, \cdot)|_\Lambda = f$. Let us focus on the second and last inequalities in (2.26). The second inequality becomes sharp if and only if h does not have entropy shocks, and the last becomes sharp if and only if $h(1, \cdot) = f_*$, where f_* is the minimizer of (1.10); see Figure 1.

Hence, the question becomes whether we can construct a tractable solution $\partial_x h_*$ without entropy shocks such that $h_*(1, \cdot) = f_*$. To answer this question, recall that, for a given initial data ϕ in a suitable class, the Hopf–Lax operator

$$h(t, x) = \text{HL}_{0 \rightarrow t}[\phi](x) := \sup \{ |\chi|_d + \phi(\chi(0)) : \{0\} \times \mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{X} (t, x) \} \quad (2.27)$$

produces, through $\partial_x h$, the entropy solution of Burgers' equation with the initial data $\partial_x \phi$; see [Eva22, Chapter 3] for example. (Let us assume that the solution is tractable: In Section 3.1, we will specify a class of ϕ for this to hold.) Being an entropy solution, $\partial_x \phi$ does not have non-entropy shocks. Now, if we *time reverse* what just stated, the role of entropy shocks and non-entropy shocks exchange. Namely, the backward Hopf–Lax operator

$$\text{HL}_{1 \rightarrow t}^{\text{bk}}[\phi](x) := \inf \{ -|\chi|_d + \phi(\chi(1)) : (t, x) \xrightarrow{X} \{1\} \times \mathbb{R} \} \quad (2.28)$$

produces a weak solution of Burgers' equation, $\partial_x \text{HL}_{1 \rightarrow t}^{\text{bk}}[\phi](x)$, *without entropy shocks*. Given this property, the answer to the question is yes, by taking $h_*(t, x) = \text{HL}_{1 \rightarrow t}^{\text{bk}}[f_*](x)$.

The above discussion explains why we expect the results in Theorem 1.1. Our proof follows the same line of reasoning, but needs to incorporate various approximation procedures to handle more general Λ and μ than those considered above.

3. TOOLS

Here we prepare some tools, notation, and preliminary results to facilitate the proof.

3.1. Evolving piecewise linear or quadratic data by Hopf–Lax operators. Take a piecewise linear or quadratic $\phi \in C(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\phi = h_d(1, \cdot)$ outside of a bounded interval, view ϕ as the terminal data at time 1, evolve it by the backward Hopf–Lax operator as in (2.28), and let $h(t, x) := \text{HL}_{1 \rightarrow t}^{\text{bk}}[\phi](x)$ and $u := \partial_x h$. Under this setup, u can be described (fairly) explicitly by the “shear-and-cut” procedure (see [Whi11, Chapter 2] for example), which we now recall. Take the piecewise linear function $u(1, \cdot) = \partial_x \phi$ and consider its complete graph $\text{CG}(1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, which consists of the graph of $u(1, \cdot)$ and vertical line segments at the jumps, as depicted in Figure 8. To evolve $u(1, \cdot)$ to $u(t, \cdot)$ for $t < 1$, apply the shearing $(x, u) \mapsto (x + (1 - t)u, u)$ to $\text{CG}(1)$. The result gives a piecewise linear curve, which is denoted by $\text{CG}'(t)$ and depicted in Figure 8. The curve $\text{CG}'(t)$ is not a complete graph of a function when it has overhangs. At each overhang, make a vertical cut, in such way that the regions bounded by the cut and $\text{CG}'(t)$, to the left and right of the cut, have the same area; see Figure 9. These cuts convert $\text{CG}'(t)$ into $\text{CG}(t)$, and the latter is the complete graph of $u(t, \cdot)$. The shear-and-cut procedure satisfies the semigroup property. Namely, for any $1 > t_1 > t_2 > 0$, applying the procedure to go from 1 to t_1 and then from t_1 to t_2 is the same as applying the procedure to go from 1 to t_2 .

Let us examine properties of u under the shear-and-cut procedure. First, the shearing procedure evolves linear functions according to

$$\alpha_0 \xrightarrow{\text{shearing}} \alpha_0, \quad \frac{1}{\alpha_1}(x - \beta) \xrightarrow{\text{shearing}} \frac{1}{1-t+\alpha_1}(x - \beta). \quad (3.1)$$

Here $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \beta$ are constant and $\alpha_1 \neq 0$. Next, consider the vertical lines in $\text{CG}(1)$. As seen in Figure 9, any vertical line associated with an downward jump remains vertical, while any vertical line associated with an upward jump evolves into a line of a finite slope. In the latter case, the second relation in (3.1) applies for $\alpha_1 = 0$, by interpreting $\frac{1}{\infty}(x - \beta)$ as a vertical line. In particular, the (backward) time evolution removes all upward jumps in $u(1, \cdot)$. Since upward jumps correspond to entropy shocks, u does not have any entropy shocks. Based on these properties, it is not hard to check that at every $t \in (0, 1]$, $u(t, \cdot)$ is piecewise linear, that $u(t, x) = -2x/t$ outside of a light cone $\mathcal{C}(c)$, and that u is bounded on $\mathcal{C}(c)$. Next, take any $\ell(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ where $u(t, \cdot)$ or $\partial_x u(t, \cdot)$ is not continuous. We seek to describe how $\ell(t)$ evolves in t . By (3.1), $u(t, x)|_{x=\ell(t)^\pm}$ is either a constant α' or of the form $(x - \beta)/(-t + \alpha)$, where we absorb the 1 in the denominator in (3.1) into α . Using this and the fact that h solves $\partial_t h = \frac{1}{4}(\partial_x h)^2$ a.e., we see that $h(t, x)|_{x=\ell(t)^\pm}$ takes the form $\alpha'x + \alpha'^2 t/4 + \alpha''$ or $(x - \beta)^2/2(-t + \alpha) + \alpha'''$. This and the continuity of $h(t, \cdot)$ give, for constant α s and β s, one of the four equations

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \alpha_- \ell(t) + \frac{t}{4} \alpha_-'^2 + \alpha_-'' \\ \frac{1}{2(-t+\alpha_-)} (\ell(t) - \beta_-)^2 + \alpha_-''' \end{aligned} \right\} = \left\{ \begin{aligned} \alpha_+ \ell(t) + \frac{t}{4} \alpha_+'^2 + \alpha_+'' \\ \frac{1}{2(-t+\alpha_+)} (\ell(t) - \beta_+)^2 + \alpha_+''' \end{aligned} \right. \quad (3.2)$$

Solving these equations shows that $\ell(t)$ is of the form

$$\ell(t) = p_1(t) \pm \sqrt{p_2(t)}, \quad p_1, p_2 \text{ polynomials.} \quad (3.3)$$

This property will be used in the proof of Lemma 3.7, specifically the first paragraph in Step 3.

The discussion above motivates the definition of a subclass of solutions that we call piecewise linear. To facilitate the subsequent proof, it will be convenient to consider solutions not just on the entire $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, but also on the smaller region $[s, s'] \times \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 3.1. Call $v = \partial_x g$ a **piecewise linear solution** on $[s, s'] \times \mathbb{R}$ with respect to a tractable partition $(\mathfrak{T}(v), \mathfrak{B}(v), \mathfrak{D}(v))$ of a light cone $\mathcal{C}(c)$ if g solves $\partial_t g = \frac{1}{4}(\partial_x g)^2$ a.e. on $[s, s'] \times \mathbb{R}$, $s, s' \in \mathfrak{T}(v)$, and

- (1) $g = h_d$ on $([s, s'] \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus \mathcal{C}(c)$ and $g \in C(([s, s'] \times \mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}(c))$,




FIGURE 8. Shearing. The shearing maps (x, u) to $(x + (1 - t)u, u)$.




FIGURE 9. Cutting. In the insert, the two gray regions have the same area.

- (2) for each $D \in \mathfrak{D}(v)$ such that $D \subset (s, s') \times \mathbb{R}$, the solution v is either constant on D , or is bounded and takes the form $(x - \beta)/(-t + \alpha)$ on D , for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$; see Remark 3.2(3).
- (3) each $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(v)$ with $[a(\ell), b(\ell)] \subset [s, s']$ takes the form (3.3) and is continuous on $[a(\ell), b(\ell)]$, and $v_{\ell-} - v_{\ell+}$ is either always positive, always negative, or always zero on $(a(\ell), b(\ell))$.

A **tractable solution** on $[s, s'] \times \mathbb{R}$ with respect to $(\mathfrak{T}(v), \mathfrak{B}(v), \mathfrak{D}(v))$ is defined similarly.

Remark 3.2.

- (1) Indeed, a piecewise linear solution is a tractable solution. The phrase piecewise linear refers to the property that $v(t, x)$ is piecewise linear in x for fixed t .
- (2) Because v is only defined on $[s, s'] \times \mathbb{R}$, the portion of $(\mathfrak{T}(v), \mathfrak{B}(v), \mathfrak{D}(v))$ that partitions $([0, s] \cup [s', 1]) \times \mathbb{R}$ is irrelevant, and we could have defined the partition only on $[s, s'] \times \mathbb{R}$.
- (3) The function $(x - \beta)/(-t + \alpha)$ is singular at $t = \alpha$. In this case, v being bounded on D requires either $\overline{D} \cap (\{\alpha\} \times \mathbb{R}) = \emptyset$ or $D \subset \{(t, x) : |x - \beta| < c' |t - \alpha|\}$ for some $c' < \infty$.

The preceding discussion shows that $\partial_x(\text{HL}_{1 \rightarrow t}^{\text{bk}}[\phi](x))$ is a piecewise linear solution without entropy shocks. A similar argument works for the (forward) Hopf–Lax operator and gives a piecewise linear solution without non-entropy shocks. These properties are summarized in Lemma 3.3(1)–(2). We will also need the property stated in Lemma 3.3(3), which is readily verified from the shear-and-cut procedure above.

Lemma 3.3.

- (1) Suppose $\phi \in C(\mathbb{R})$ is piecewise linear or quadratic, and equal to $h_d(1, \cdot)$ outside of a bounded interval. Then $\partial_x(\text{HL}_{1 \rightarrow t}^{\text{bk}}[\phi](x))$ is a piecewise linear solution on $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$ without entropy shocks.
- (2) Take any $s \in (0, 1)$, and suppose $\phi \in C(\mathbb{R})$ is piecewise linear or quadratic, and equal to $h_d(s, \cdot)$ outside of a bounded interval. Then $\partial_x(\text{HL}_{s \rightarrow t}[\phi](x))$ is a piecewise linear solution on $[s, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$ without non-entropy shocks.
- (3) Same setting as in Part (2). Put $\text{HL}_{s \rightarrow t}[\phi](x) := \Phi(t, x)$, and take any linear path γ with $a(\gamma) = s$. Then $\Phi|_{\gamma}(t) = \Phi(t, \gamma(t))$ is continuous and piecewise rational.

3.2. Matching. Here and in the next section, we focus on results of a “matching” nature. Roughly speaking, these results either assert or utilize the statement that two types of functions are the same.

Lemma 3.4 gives a criterion for two such functions to coincide, and the rest of Sections 3.2–3.3 utilizes Lemma 3.4 to establish results.

To state Lemma 3.4, we need some notation. Given a $\mu \in \mathcal{N}_+$, we observe that the length of a path η under the metric e_μ (defined in (1.6)) can be written as

$$|\eta|_{e_\mu} := \mu(\mathfrak{g}\eta) + |\eta|_d = \int_{a(\eta)}^{b(\eta)} dt \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \rho_\gamma \mathbf{1}_{\gamma=\eta} + \int_{a(\eta)}^{b(\eta)} dt (-\eta^2). \quad (3.4)$$

For a set S of paths, write $\mathfrak{g}(S) := \cup_{\ell \in S} \mathfrak{g}(\ell)$. Take any tractable partitions $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{D})$ of a light cone $\mathcal{C}(c)$. Take any $\underline{s} < \bar{s} \in \mathfrak{T}$, let \mathfrak{B}' be a finite set of piecewise $C^1[\underline{s}, \bar{s}]$ paths; assume that the paths do not intersect except at $t = \underline{s}, \bar{s}$, that $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}') \subset \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B})$, and that \mathfrak{B}' contains the left and right boundaries of $\mathcal{C}(c) \cap ([\underline{s}, \bar{s}] \times \mathbb{R})$. Let \mathfrak{D}' denote the set of open connected regions in $\mathcal{C}(c) \cap ((\underline{s}, \bar{s}) \times \mathbb{R})$ partitioned by the paths in \mathfrak{B}' . For $E \in \mathfrak{D}'$ and $F \in C(\bar{E})$, define the domain Hopf–Lax operator

$$\text{HL}_{\partial E}[F](t, x) := \sup \{ |\chi|_d + F(a, \chi(a)) : \partial E \xrightarrow{\chi} (t, x) \}, \quad (t, x) \in E. \quad (3.5)$$

Take a $v = \partial_x g$ that is a tractable solution on $[\underline{s}, \bar{s}] \times \mathbb{R}$ with respect to $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{D})$ and satisfies

$$\text{HL}_{\partial E}[g] = g \text{ on } E, \quad \text{for all } E \in \mathfrak{D}'. \quad (3.6)$$

For any $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}'$, because $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}') \subset \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B})$ and because v is a tractable solution with respect to $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{D})$, by completing the square in (2.6), we have $g|_\ell + \ell^2 \geq 0$. Given this, define

$$\nu := \sum_{\ell \in \mathfrak{B}'} (g|_\ell + \ell^2) \delta_\ell \in \mathcal{N}_+, \quad (3.7)$$

$$\tilde{h}(t, x) := \sup \{ |\eta|_{e_\nu} + g(\underline{s}, \eta(\underline{s})) : \{\underline{s}\} \times \mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{\eta} (t, x) \}. \quad (3.8)$$

When $\underline{s} = 0$, since $g = h_d$ outside of $([0, \bar{s}] \times \mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}(c)$, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t, x) = -\infty \mathbf{1}_{x \neq 0}$. Given this, we set $g(0, \cdot) := -\infty \mathbf{1}_{x \neq 0}$ in (3.8), which amounts to requiring $\eta(0) = 0$.

Lemma 3.4. *Under the preceding setup, $g = \tilde{h}$ on $(\underline{s}, \bar{s}] \times \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Let us prove that $g \leq \tilde{h}$ on $\mathcal{C}(c) \cap ([\underline{s}, \bar{s}] \times \mathbb{R})$. Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$ and consider $(t, x) \in E$ for some $E \in \mathfrak{D}'$. Use (3.6) to get a path $\partial E \xrightarrow{\chi} (t, x)$ such that $|\chi|_d \geq g(t, x) - g(a, \chi(a)) - \varepsilon$, where $a := a(\chi)$. If $a = \underline{s}$, by (3.8), $g(t, x) \leq \tilde{h}(t, x) + \varepsilon$. Otherwise $\chi(a) = \ell(a)$ for some $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}'$, and we let $\eta := \ell|_{[\underline{s}, a]} \cup \chi$, where \cup means concatenating the paths, defined before Example 2.5. This way $|\eta|_{e_\nu} = g(a, \chi(a)) - g(\underline{s}, \eta(\underline{s})) + |\chi|_d \geq g(t, x) - g(\underline{s}, \eta(\underline{s})) - \varepsilon$. Hence $g(t, x) \leq \tilde{h}(t, x) + \varepsilon$. So far we have proven $g \leq \tilde{h} + \varepsilon$ on every $E \in \mathfrak{D}'$. Since v is a tractable solution, $g \in C(\mathcal{C}(c))$, and it is not hard to check that $\tilde{h} \in C(\mathcal{C}(c))$. Hence the inequality extends to $\mathcal{C}(c) \cap ([\underline{s}, \bar{s}] \times \mathbb{R})$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, the desired inequality follows.

Next, let us prove that $g \geq \tilde{h}$ on $\mathcal{C}(c) \cap ([\underline{s}, \bar{s}] \times \mathbb{R})$. Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$ and set $\tau := \inf \{ t \in [\underline{s}, \bar{s}] : g(t, x) \leq \tilde{h}(t, x) - \varepsilon, \text{ for some } |x| \leq ct \}$, with the convention that $\inf \emptyset := \infty$. Our goal is to prove $\tau \geq \bar{s}$. First, since $g, \tilde{h} \in C(\mathcal{C}(c))$ and since $g(\underline{s}, x) = \tilde{h}(\underline{s}, x)$ for $|x| \leq c\underline{s}$ by (3.7), we have $\tau > \underline{s}$. Given this, we next argue by contradiction. Assume $\tau \in (\underline{s}, \bar{s})$, so that

$$g(\tau, x) = \tilde{h}(\tau, x) - \varepsilon, \quad (3.9)$$

for some $|x| \leq c\tau$. Take any optimal η in (3.8) for $(t, x) \mapsto (\tau, x)$ and consider

$$\sigma := \sup \{ t \in [\underline{s}, \tau) : \eta(s) = \ell(s), \text{ for some } \ell \in \mathfrak{B}' \}. \quad (3.10)$$

Note that the set in (3.10) is nonempty. Otherwise $|\eta|_{e_\nu} = |\eta|_d$, and it follows that $\tilde{h}(\tau, x) \leq \text{HL}_{\partial E}[g](\tau, x) = g(\tau, x)$ for the $E \in \mathfrak{D}'$ that contains (τ, x) , which is prohibited by (3.9). We next argue for a contradiction in two separate cases.

Case 1, $\sigma < \tau$: In this case, $(\tau, x) \in E$ for some $E \in \mathfrak{D}'$. By (3.10), $(\sigma, \eta(\sigma)) \in \partial E$ and $\eta|_{(\sigma, \tau)} \subset E$. Write $\tilde{h}(\tau, x) = |\eta|_{[\underline{s}, \sigma]}|_d + \tilde{h}(\sigma, \eta(\sigma))$, and note that $\tilde{h}(\sigma, \eta(\sigma)) < g(\sigma, \eta(\sigma)) + \varepsilon$ because $\sigma < \tau$. Hence

$$\tilde{h}(\tau, x) < |\eta|_{[\underline{s}, \sigma]}|_d + g(\sigma, \eta(\sigma)) + \varepsilon \leq \text{HL}_{\partial E}[g](\tau, x) + \varepsilon = g(\tau, x) + \varepsilon, \quad (3.11)$$

where the last equality followed by (3.6). This contradicts (3.9).

Case 2, $\sigma = \tau$: In this case, there exists $\ell_0 \in \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\eta(s_j) = \ell_0(s_j)$ for a sequence $s_1 < s_2 < \dots \rightarrow \tau$. Take an $s := s_k \in [0, \tau)$ from the sequence, with a large enough k such that

$$\text{ConvexHull}(\mathfrak{g}(\eta|_{[s, \tau]})) \cap \mathfrak{g}(\ell) = \emptyset, \text{ for all } \ell \in \mathfrak{B}' \setminus \{\ell_0\}. \quad (3.12)$$

Write $\tilde{h}(\tau, x) = |\eta|_{[s, \tau]}|_{e_\nu} + \tilde{h}(s, \eta(s))$. To get a handle on $|\eta|_{[s, \tau]}|_{e_\nu}$, consider $O := \{t \in [s, \tau] : \eta(t) \neq \ell_0(t)\}$, which is open, and write it as a disjoint union $O = \cup_j (a_j, b_j)$. This way,

$$\tilde{h}(\tau, x) = |\eta|_{[s, \tau]}|_{e_\nu} + \tilde{h}(s, \eta(s)) = \int_{[s, \tau] \setminus O} dt g|_\eta + \sum_j |\eta|_{[a_j, b_j]}|_d + \tilde{h}(s, \eta(s)). \quad (3.13)$$

By (3.12) and the definition of (a_j, b_j) , we have $\mathfrak{g}(\eta|_{(a_j, b_j)}) \cap \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}') = \emptyset$. Hence $\mathfrak{g}(\eta|_{(a_j, b_j)}) \subset E$, for some $E \in \mathfrak{D}'$, and $(a_j, \ell_0(a_j)) \in \partial E$. These properties together with (3.6) imply

$$g(t, \eta(t)) = \text{HL}_{\partial E}[g](t, \eta(t)) \geq |\eta|_{[a_j, t]}|_d + g(a_j, \eta(a_j)), \quad \text{for all } t \in (a_j, b_j). \quad (3.14)$$

Taking the $t \rightarrow b_j$ limit gives $g(b_j, \eta(b_j)) \geq |\eta|_{[a_j, b_j]}|_d + g(a_j, \eta(a_j))$. Rewrite this as $|\eta|_{[a_j, b_j]}|_d \leq \int_{a_j}^{b_j} dt g|_\eta$, and insert it into (3.13). Doing so gives $\tilde{h}(\tau, x) \leq g(\tau, x) - g(s, \eta(s)) + \tilde{h}(s, \eta(s))$. The last term is $< g(s, \eta(s)) + \varepsilon$ because $s < \tau$. Combining the last two inequalities gives $\tilde{h}(\tau, x) < g(\tau, x) + \varepsilon$, which contradicts (3.9).

So far we have proven $g = \tilde{h}$ on $\mathcal{C}(c) \cap ([\underline{s}, \bar{s}] \times \mathbb{R})$, and we need to prove the same equality outside of the light cone, namely on $([\underline{s}, \bar{s}] \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus \mathcal{C}(c)$. Since g is equal to h_d outside of the light cone, it suffices to prove that the same holds for \tilde{h} . Take any $(t, x) \in ([\underline{s}, \bar{s}] \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus \mathcal{C}(c)$. Since ν is supported in $\mathcal{C}(c)$, any optimal path η in (3.8) starts from either $A_1 := \{(s, cs), (s, -cs) : s \in [\underline{s}, \bar{s}]\}$ or $A_2 := \{\underline{s}\} \times ((-\infty, \underline{s}] \cup [\underline{s}, \infty))$. We have $g = \tilde{h}$ on A_1 because $A_1 \subset \mathcal{C}(c)$, and $g = \tilde{h}$ on A_2 by the definition of \tilde{h} . Also, h is equal to h_d on $A_1 \cup A_2$. Using these properties in (3.8) gives that $\tilde{h}(t, x) = -x^2/t = h_d(t, x)$. \square

We next apply Lemma 3.4 to prove a reconstruction result.

Proposition 3.5. *For any tractable solution $v = \partial_x g$, we have $g = \text{H}[M[g]]$.*

Proof. We begin with a reduction. Consider the corresponding tractable partition $(\{t_0 < \dots < t_k\}, \mathfrak{B}(v), \mathfrak{D}(v))$ of a light cone $\mathcal{C}(c)$ for v . Let $\mathfrak{B}_i(v)$ denotes the set of those paths in $\mathfrak{B}(v)$ with starting time t_{i-1} and ending time t_i , and let $\mathfrak{D}_i(v)$ denotes the set of those regions in $\mathfrak{D}(v)$ that are subsets of $(t_{i-1}, t_i) \times \mathbb{R}$. We seek to apply Lemma 3.4 with $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{D}) = (\mathfrak{T}(v), \mathfrak{B}(v), \mathfrak{D}(v))$ and $(\underline{s}, \bar{s}, \mathfrak{B}', \mathfrak{D}') = (t_{i-1}, t_i, \mathfrak{B}_i, \mathfrak{D}_i)$ and inductively over $i = 1, \dots, |\mathfrak{T}(v)|$. Under this setup, the ν in (3.7) is equal to $M[g]|_{[t_{i-1}, t_i] \times \mathbb{R}}$. Hence, once Lemma 3.4 applies, the desired result follows.

It hence remains only to verify (3.6). Take any $D \in \mathfrak{D}_i(v)$, recall $\text{HL}_{\partial D}[g]$ from (3.5), and note that the paths there can be taken to be linear. We hence consider all linear paths χ s that satisfy $\partial D \xrightarrow{\chi} (t_0, x_0)$ with $\mathfrak{g}(\chi|_{(a(\chi), t_0)}) \subset D$. Differentiating $g(t, \chi(t))$ with the aid of $\partial_t g = \frac{1}{4}v^2$ gives

$$g|_{\chi} = \frac{1}{4}(v|_{\chi} + 2\dot{\chi})^2 - \dot{\chi}^2, \quad \dot{\chi} = \text{constant}. \quad (3.15)$$

Because v is a $C^1(D)$ solution of Burgers' equation, every point in D lies along a characteristic and the characteristics do not intersect within D . Among all the χ s considered above, one of them is a characteristic, denoted χ_0 . Combining (3.15) and (2.4) for $\chi = \chi_0$ gives $g(t_0, x_0) = |\chi_0|_d + g(a_0, \chi_0(a_0))$, where $a_0 := a(\chi_0)$. On the other hand, for any $\chi \neq \chi_0$, we must have $v|_{\chi}(t) \neq -2\dot{\chi}$ for all $t \in (a(\chi), t_0)$. Otherwise the characteristic that passes through $(t, \chi(t))$ is χ itself. This is prohibited because χ intersects with χ_0 at (t_0, x_0) . Hence, for any $\chi \neq \chi_0$, we have $g|_{\chi}(t) < -\dot{\chi}^2$ for all $t \in (a(\chi), t_0)$. Integrating this inequality gives $g(t_0, x_0) < |\chi|_d + g(a, \chi(a))$, where $a := a(\chi)$. To recap, we showed that $g(t_0, x_0) = |\chi_0|_d + g(a_0, \chi_0(a_0))$ and that, for all $\chi \neq \chi_0$, $g(t_0, x_0) < |\chi|_d + g(a, \chi(a))$. This proves that $\text{HL}_{\partial D}[g](t_0, x_0) = g(t_0, x_0)$. \square

Let us state a few monotone properties that will be used. They are readily checked from (1.6), (1.7), and (2.9). Hereafter, $\nu \leq \nu'$ means $\nu' - \nu \in \mathcal{N}_+$, and $\nu < \nu'$ means $0 \neq (\nu' - \nu) \in \mathcal{N}_+$.

$$\text{For } \nu \leq \nu' \in \mathcal{N}_+, \text{ we have } I(\mathbf{e}_{\nu}) \leq I(\mathbf{e}_{\nu'}). \quad (3.16)$$

$$\text{For } \nu \leq \nu' \in \mathcal{N}_+, \text{ we have } H[\nu] \leq H[\nu']. \quad (3.17)$$

$$\text{for } \nu < \nu' \in \mathcal{N}_+, \text{ we have } I(\mathbf{e}_{\nu}) < I(\mathbf{e}_{\nu'}). \quad (3.18)$$

3.3. Piecewise linear construction. We next turn to the setting of Proposition 2.3. Namely, we seek to establish properties of $H[\mu]$ and $\partial_x H[\mu]$ for a piecewise linear and cone supported μ . Let us begin by considering a more special μ . Recall the function $A_{\alpha, \beta}$ from (1.15)–(1.16).

Lemma 3.6. *Consider $\mu = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \rho_{\gamma} \delta_{\gamma}$ where Γ consists of finitely many paths (that intersect only at $t = 0$) of the form $\gamma(t) = \dot{\gamma} t$ with $\dot{\gamma} = \text{constant}$, and each $\rho_{\gamma} \geq 0$ is constant, and let $h := H[\mu]$ and $u := \partial_x h$. Then*

$$h = \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} A_{\dot{\gamma}, \rho_{\gamma}}, \quad (3.19)$$

u is a piecewise linear solution on $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, and

- (1) any $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(u)$ can have non-entropy shocks only if $\mathfrak{g}(\ell) \subset \mathfrak{g}(\gamma)$ for some $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $u_{\ell \pm} = -2(\dot{\gamma} \pm \sqrt{\rho_{\gamma}}) = \text{constant}$.

Proof. We will first construct a function g , verify that $v = \partial_x g$ is a piecewise linear solution and satisfies Property (1) for $u \mapsto v$, and then show that $g = H[\mu]$.

Step 1. Constructing g and verifying the desired properties. Simply define

$$g := \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} A_{\dot{\gamma}, \rho_{\gamma}}. \quad (3.20)$$

Recall from (1.15)–(1.16) that $A_{\alpha, \beta}(t, x) := tA_{\alpha, \beta}(1, x/t)$ and that $A_{\alpha, \beta}(1, \cdot)$ is continuous, piecewise linear or quadratic, and coincides with $h_d(1, \cdot)$ outside of a bounded interval. From these properties, it is straightforward to check that $v := \partial_x g$ is a piecewise linear solution on $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$ and satisfies Property (1) for $u \mapsto v$.

Step 2. Showing that $g \leq H[\mu]$. Recall $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$ from Example 2.5 and recall that $A_{\alpha, \beta} = H[\nu_{\alpha, \beta}]$. Our μ here is $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \nu_{\dot{\gamma}, \rho_{\gamma}}$. For each $\gamma \in \Gamma$, using (3.17) for $\nu = \nu_{\dot{\gamma}, \rho_{\gamma}}$ and $\nu' = \mu$ gives $A_{\dot{\gamma}, \rho_{\gamma}} \leq H[\mu]$. Taking the max over $\gamma \in \Gamma$ in this inequality gives $g \leq H[\mu]$.

Step 3. Showing that $g \geq H[\mu]$. The result of Step 1 asserts that v is a piecewise linear solution. Let $(\mathfrak{T}(v), \mathfrak{B}(v), \mathfrak{D}(v))$ be the corresponding tractable partition of a light cone $\mathcal{C}(c)$. To prove $g \geq H[\mu]$, we apply Lemma 3.4 with $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{D}) = (\mathfrak{T}(v), \mathfrak{B}(v), \mathfrak{D}(v))$ and $(\underline{s}, \bar{s}, \mathfrak{B}', \mathfrak{D}') = (0, 1, \Gamma \cup \{\ell_L, \ell_R\}, \mathfrak{D}')$, where ℓ_L and ℓ_R denotes the left and right boundaries of $\mathcal{C}(c)$, and \mathfrak{D}' consists of the open connected region thus partitioned. In Step 3-1 below, we will verify that our g in (3.20) satisfies (3.6). In Step 3-2 below, we will show that the corresponding ν , defined in (3.7), satisfies $\nu \geq \mu$. Under the current setup, it is readily checked that the \tilde{h} defined in (3.8) is equal to $H[\nu]$. Hence, once Steps 3-1 and 3-2 are completed, $g = \tilde{h} = H[\nu] \geq H[\mu]$.

Step 3-1. Verifying that g satisfies (3.6). Recall $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$ from Example 2.5 and recall that $A_{\alpha, \beta} = H[\nu_{\alpha, \beta}]$. From this, it is not hard to check that $\text{HL}_{\partial E}[A_{\alpha, \beta}] = A_{\alpha, \beta}$ on E , for any E of the form $\{(t, x) : \alpha't < x < \alpha t\}$ or $\{(t, x) : \alpha t < x < \alpha't\}$ where $\alpha' \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence $\text{HL}_{\partial E}[A_{\dot{\gamma}, \rho_\gamma}] = A_{\dot{\gamma}, \rho_\gamma}$ on E for every $E \in \mathfrak{D}'$. Also, as is readily checked from (3.5), the operator $\text{HL}_{\partial E}$ commutes with max, namely $\max \text{HL}_{\partial E}[\cdot] = \text{HL}_{\partial E}[\max \cdot]$. Combining the last two properties shows that g satisfies (3.6).

Step 3-2. Showing that $\nu \geq \mu$. This amounts to showing $g|_\gamma + \dot{\gamma}^2 \geq \rho_\gamma$, for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Recall that $\gamma(t) = \dot{\gamma} \cdot t$ and that $A_{\alpha, \beta}(t, \alpha t) = tA_{\alpha, \beta}(1, \alpha)$. Hence $(g|_\gamma)(t)$ and $(A_{\dot{\gamma}, \rho_\gamma}|_\gamma)(t)$ are linear in t and take value 0 at $t = 0$. This together with (3.20) implies $g|_\gamma \geq \frac{d}{dt}(A_{\dot{\gamma}, \rho_\gamma}|_\gamma)$. Explicit calculations give $\frac{d}{dt}(A_{\alpha, \beta}(t, \alpha t)) = A_{\alpha, \beta}(1, \alpha) = \beta - \alpha^2$. Hence $g|_\gamma \geq \rho_\gamma - \dot{\gamma}^2$. \square

We next consider piecewise linear and cone-supported μ .

Lemma 3.7. *For any piecewise linear and cone-supported $\mu = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \rho_\gamma \delta_\gamma$ (Definition 2.2), the function $u = \partial_x H[\mu]$, is a piecewise linear solution on $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, and*

- (1) *any $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(u)$ can have non-entropy shocks only if $\mathfrak{g}(\ell) \subset \mathfrak{g}(\gamma)$ for some $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $u_{\ell \pm} = -2(\dot{\gamma} \pm \sqrt{\rho_\gamma}) = \text{constant}$.*

Proof. To set up the proof, first, without loss of generality, assume that there exist $0 = \tau_0 < \dots < \tau_k = 1$ such that each $\gamma \in \Gamma$ satisfies $[a(\gamma), b(\gamma)] = [\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]$, for some i , and that the γ s do not intersect except at $t = \tau_0, \dots, \tau_k$. Since Γ is finite, this can always be achieved by cutting the paths shorter. Let $\Gamma_i := \{\gamma \in \Gamma : [a(\gamma), b(\gamma)] = [\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]\}$.

Let us use induction in i . For $i = 1$, Lemma 3.6 gives the desired result. Fix $i \geq 2$, assume the induction hypothesis that u is a piecewise linear solution on $[0, \tau_{i-1}] \times \mathbb{R}$, and set

$$\Phi(t, x) := \text{HL}_{\tau_{i-1} \rightarrow t}[h(\tau_{i-1}, \cdot)](x), \quad (t, x) \in [\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.21)$$

By Lemma 3.3(2) and the induction hypothesis, $\partial_x \Phi$ is a piecewise linear solution on $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$ without non-entropy shocks.

To implement the i th induction step, we follow the same strategy as the proof of Lemma 3.6. We will first construct a function $g \in C([\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R})$, verify that $v = \partial_x g$ is a piecewise linear solution on $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$ and satisfies Property (1) for $u \mapsto v$, and then show that $g = H[\mu]$.

Step 1. Constructing g and verifying the desired properties. We begin by motivating the construction of g , which may otherwise seem obscure. First, note that when $\Gamma_i = \emptyset$, taking $g = \Phi$ completes the i th induction step: Indeed, $\partial_x \Phi$ is a piecewise linear solution on $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$ without non-entropy shocks, and $\Phi = H[\mu]$ on $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$ when $\Gamma_i = \emptyset$. In general, $\Gamma_i \neq \emptyset$, and we construct g as $g := \Phi \vee \max\{\Psi_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma_i\}$, for a suitable $\Psi_\gamma(t, x)$ that ‘‘records the action generated by μ along the path γ ’’. Consider the restriction of μ onto $\mathfrak{g}(\gamma)$: $\mu|_{\mathfrak{g}(\gamma)} = \rho_\gamma \delta_\gamma$. A natural choice for Ψ_γ could be

$$\mathbf{e}_{\mu|_{\mathfrak{g}(\gamma)}}(\tau_{i-1}, \gamma(\tau_{i-1}); t, x) + \Phi|_\gamma(\tau_{i-1}). \quad (3.22)$$




FIGURE 10. The graphs of $\Phi|_\gamma$ and ψ_γ . The linear segments have velocity/slope $\rho_\gamma - \dot{\gamma}^2$.

Note that, at $(t, x) = (\tau_{i-1}, \gamma(\tau_{i-1}))$, the first term in (3.22) is equal to 0, so adding the constant $\Phi|_\gamma(\tau_{i-1})$ shifts it to the same value as Φ . The choice (3.22), however, does not work. Later in Step 3-2, we will need the property $g|_\gamma + \dot{\gamma}^2 \geq \rho_\gamma$. If we choose (3.22) for Ψ_γ , the resulting g will not satisfy the property. With this in mind, we will construct Ψ_γ as a variant of (3.22) geared toward satisfying the property.

We now complete the construction of g by constructing Ψ_γ . Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\gamma(t) := \sup \{ & (\Phi|_\gamma)(s) - (s - \tau_{i-1})(\rho_\gamma - \dot{\gamma}^2) : s \in [\tau_{i-1}, t] \} \\ & + (t - \tau_{i-1})(\rho_\gamma - \dot{\gamma}^2), \quad t \in [\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

In words, the function ψ_γ follows $\Phi|_\gamma$ as long as the condition $\Phi|_\gamma \geq \rho_\gamma - \dot{\gamma}^2$ holds, and when the condition fails, ψ_γ makes a “linear cut” with velocity $\rho_\gamma - \dot{\gamma}^2$. See Figure 10 for an illustration. By Lemma 3.3(3), $\Phi|_\gamma(t)$ is continuous and piecewise rational. This being the case, ψ_γ and $\Phi|_\gamma$ differ only on finitely many disjoint intervals $(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_M, b_M)$, or $(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_M, b_M]$ with $b_M = \tau_i$. The a s, b s, and M depend on γ , but to simplify notation we omit the dependence. The idea is to only “activate” $\mu|_{\mathfrak{g}(\gamma)}$ on these intervals. Let $\gamma_j := \gamma|_{[a_j, b_j]}$, consider the restriction of μ onto $\mathfrak{g}(\gamma_j)$, $\mu_{\gamma_j} := \rho_\gamma \delta_{\gamma_j}$, and let

$$\Psi_{\gamma_j}(t, x) := e_{\mu_{\gamma_j}}(a_j, \gamma(a_j); t, x) + \Phi|_\gamma(a_j). \quad (3.24)$$

Again, we add the constant $\Phi|_\gamma(a_j)$ to make Ψ_{γ_j} equal to Φ at $(t, x) = (a_j, \gamma(a_j))$. This defines Ψ_{γ_j} for $(t, x) \in (a_j, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$ and $(t, x) = (a_j, \gamma(a_j))$, and we set $\Psi_{\gamma_j}(t, x) := -\infty$ for other values of $(t, x) \in [\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$. Finally, let

$$\Psi_\gamma := \Psi_{\gamma_1} \vee \dots \vee \Psi_{\gamma_M}, \quad g := \Phi \vee \{ \Psi_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma_i \}, \quad (3.25)$$

with the convention that $\Psi_\gamma := -\infty$ when $M = 0$.

Before moving on, let us derive some explicit formulas for Ψ_{γ_j} . The function is described by $e_{\mu_{\gamma_j}}$ geodesics that start from $(a_j, \gamma(a_j))$. Since $\dot{\gamma}$ and ρ_γ are constant, these geodesics can be found explicitly, which we next describe. Let

$$\alpha_{\gamma_\pm} := \dot{\gamma} \pm \sqrt{\rho_\gamma}. \quad (3.26)$$

In Figure 11, the middle path is $\gamma|_{[a_j, b_j]}$, and the other four paths are linear with velocities α_{γ_-} and α_{γ_+} and starting points $(a_j, \gamma(a_j))$ and $(b_j, \gamma(b_j))$. These paths partition $(\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i) \times \mathbb{R}$ into the open regions S_{γ_j} , S'_{γ_j} , $R_{\gamma_j^-}$, and $R_{\gamma_j^+}$ depicted in Figure 11. Now consider the $e_{\mu_{\gamma_j}}$ geodesic that connects $(a_j, \gamma(a_j))$ to (t, x) . For $(t, x) \in S_{\gamma_j} \cap ((a_j, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R})$ the geodesic is linear. Further,

$$\Psi_{\gamma_j}(t, x) = \sup \{ |\chi|_d : (a_j, \gamma(a_j)) \xrightarrow{\chi} (t, x) \} + \Phi|_\gamma(a_j) \quad (3.27)$$




FIGURE 11




FIGURE 12

$$= -\frac{(x-\gamma(a_j))^2}{(t-a_j)_+} + \Phi|_{\gamma}(a_j), \quad (t, x) \in S_{\gamma j}, \quad (3.28)$$

where $(\cdot)_+ := \max\{\cdot, 0\}$. When $(t, x) \in S_{\gamma j} \cap ((a_j, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R})$, the expressions in (3.27)–(3.28) follow from linearity of the geodesic, and these expressions extend to all $(t, x) \in S_{\gamma j}$ under the conventions $\sup \emptyset = -\infty$, $0/0 := 0$, and $\alpha^2/0 := +\infty$ for $\alpha \neq 0$. Next, for $(t, x) \in S'_{\gamma j}$ the geodesic follows γ until time b_j and then becomes another linear path. When following γ , the geodesic sees a change of its length by $(b_j - a_j)(\rho_\gamma - \dot{\gamma}^2)$. Also, by the definitions of a_j , b_j , and ψ_γ , we have $(b_j - a_j)(\rho_\gamma - \dot{\gamma}^2) + \Phi|_{\gamma}(a_j) = \psi_\gamma(b_j)$; see Figure 10. Therefore,

$$\Psi_{\gamma j}(t, x) = \sup \{ |\chi|_d + \psi_\gamma(b_j) : (b_j, \gamma(b_j)) \xrightarrow{\chi} (t, x) \} \quad (3.29)$$

$$= -\frac{(x-\gamma(b_j))^2}{t-b_j} + \psi_\gamma(b_j), \quad (t, x) \in S'_{\gamma j}. \quad (3.30)$$

For $(t, x) \in R_{\gamma j\pm}$ the geodesic follows γ until time s , for some $s \in (a_j, b_j)$, and then becomes the linear path with velocity $\alpha_{\gamma\pm}$, giving

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\gamma j}(t, x) &= -2\alpha_{\gamma\pm}(x - (t - a_j)\dot{\gamma} - \gamma(a_j)) \\ &\quad + (t - a_j)(\rho_\gamma - \dot{\gamma}^2) + \Phi|_{\gamma}(a_j), \quad (t, x) \in R_{\gamma j\pm}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

We are now ready to verify that g satisfies the desired properties. Recall that Φ is a piecewise linear solution on $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$ without non-entropy shocks. Using this and the explicit formulas of $\Psi_{\gamma j}$, namely (3.28), (3.30), (3.31), it is not hard to check that $v = \partial_x g$ (with g defined in (3.25)) is a piecewise linear solution on $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$. Further, since Φ does not have non-entropy shocks, non-entropy shocks of v can only occur at those (t, x) such that $g = \Psi_{\gamma j}$ in a neighborhood of (t, x) , for some $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$ and some $j = 1, \dots, M$. As is readily checked from the explicit formulas of $\Psi_{\gamma j}$, discontinuity of $\partial_x \Psi_{\gamma j}$ happens only on $\mathbf{g}(\gamma|_{[a_j, b_j]})$, with $(\partial_x \Psi_{\gamma j})(t, \gamma(t)^\pm) = -2\alpha_{\gamma\pm} = -2(\dot{\gamma} \pm \sqrt{\rho_\gamma})$. Hence v satisfies Property (1) with $u \mapsto v$ on $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$.

Step 2. Showing that $g \leq H[\mu]$ on $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$. By the definition of Φ and $\Psi_{\gamma j}$ (see (3.21) and (3.24)), one readily checks that $\Phi \leq H[\mu]$ and $\Psi_{\gamma j} \leq H[\mu]$ on $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$. Since g is constructed as the maximum of Φ and the $\Psi_{\gamma j}$ s, the desired result follows.

Step 3. Showing that $g \geq H[\mu]$ on $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$. The result of Step 1 asserts that v is a piecewise linear solution on $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$. Let $(\mathfrak{T}(v), \mathfrak{B}(v), \mathfrak{D}(v))$ be the corresponding tractable partition of a light cone $\mathcal{C}(c)$. To prove $g \geq H[\mu]$, we apply Lemma 3.4 with $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{D}) = (\mathfrak{T}(v), \mathfrak{B}(v), \mathfrak{D}(v))$ and $(\underline{s}, \bar{s}, \mathfrak{B}', \mathfrak{D}') = (\{\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i\}, \Gamma \cup \{l_{iL}, l_{iR}\}, \mathfrak{D}')$, where l_{iL} and l_{iR} denote the left and right boundaries of $\mathcal{C}(c) \cap ([\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R})$, and \mathfrak{D}' consists of the open connected region thus partitioned.

Note that we can make $\mathfrak{g}(\Gamma_i) \subset \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}(v))$ by adding those $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$ into $\mathfrak{B}(v)$. Because the paths in $\mathfrak{B}(v)$ takes the form (3.3) and because the paths in Γ_i are linear, they intersect at most finitely many times. Hence, by cutting these paths shorter, we make sure that they form the boundary paths of a tractable partition.

In Step 3-1 below, we will verify that our g in (3.20) satisfies (3.6). In Step 3-2 below, we will show that the corresponding ν , defined in (3.7), satisfies $\nu \geq \mu|_{[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}}$. Under the current setup and given that $g(\tau_{i-1}, \cdot) = H[\mu](\tau_{i-1}, \cdot)$ by the induction hypothesis, it is readily checked that the \tilde{h} defined in (3.8) is equal to $H[\nu + \mu|_{[0, \tau_{i-1}] \times \mathbb{R}}]$. Hence, once Steps 3-1 and 3-2 are completed, $g = \tilde{h} = H[\nu + \mu|_{[0, \tau_{i-1}] \times \mathbb{R}}] \geq H[\mu]$ on $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}$.

Step 3-1. Verifying that g satisfies (3.6). From (3.21) and (3.24), it is not hard to checked that $\text{HL}_{\partial E}[\Phi] = \Phi$ and that $\text{HL}_{\partial E}[\Psi_{\gamma_j}] = \Psi_{\gamma_j}$ on every $E \in \mathfrak{D}'$. Since the operator $\text{HL}_{\partial E}$ commutes with \max , (3.6) holds.

Step 3-2. Showing that $\nu \geq \mu|_{[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}}$. Let us prepare some properties. First,

$$\Psi_{\zeta_j} \leq \Phi \quad \text{on } \overline{S_{\zeta_j} \cup S'_{\zeta_j}}, \quad \text{for all } \zeta \in \Gamma_i \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, M. \quad (3.32)$$

To see why, consider first $(t, x) \in S_{\zeta_j}$. Use (3.21) to write

$$\Phi|_{\zeta}(a_j) = \sup\{|\chi'|_d + h(\tau_{i-1}, \chi'(\tau_{i-1})) : \{\tau_{i-1}\} \times \mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{\chi'} (a_j, \zeta(a_j))\} \quad (3.33)$$

and insert it into (3.27) for $\gamma \mapsto \zeta$ to get

$$\Psi_{\zeta_j}(t, x) = \sup\{|\chi' \cup \chi|_d + h(\tau_{i-1}, \chi'(\tau_{i-1})) : \{\tau_{i-1}\} \times \mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{\chi'} (a_j, \zeta(a_j)) \xrightarrow{\chi} (t, x)\}. \quad (3.34)$$

We see that this is $\leq \text{HL}_{\tau_{i-1} \rightarrow t}[h(\tau_{i-1}, \cdot)](x) = \Phi(t, x)$. As for $(t, x) \in S'_{\zeta_j}$, by the definition of b_j , we have $\psi_{\zeta}(b_j) = \Phi_{\zeta}(b_j)$ (unless $b_j = \tau_i$, which implies $S'_{\zeta_j} = \emptyset$). Hence the same argument applies. So far we have proven (3.32) on $S_{\zeta_j} \cup S'_{\zeta_j}$. Indeed, Φ is continuous and Ψ_{ζ_j} is continuous except where it is $-\infty$. Hence (3.32) follows. Next, given (3.32), it is not hard check from the definitions of ψ_{γ} and Ψ_{γ} that

$$(\Psi_{\gamma}|_{\gamma}) \vee \Phi|_{\gamma} = \psi_{\gamma}, \quad \gamma \in \Gamma_i. \quad (3.35)$$

Also, from the definition of ψ_{γ} , it follows that the function is continuous, piecewise rational (so is differentiable everywhere except at finitely many points), and satisfies

$$\dot{\psi}_{\gamma} \geq \rho_{\gamma} - \dot{\gamma}^2 \text{ wherever } \dot{\psi}_{\gamma} \text{ exists}, \quad \gamma \in \Gamma_i. \quad (3.36)$$

We now prove $\nu \geq \mu|_{[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i] \times \mathbb{R}}$. This amounts to proving that $g|_{\gamma} \geq \rho_{\gamma} - \dot{\gamma}^2$, for all $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$ and for a.e. on $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]$. By the construction of g in Step 1, $g|_{\gamma}$ is continuous and piecewise rational, so is differentiable everywhere except at finitely many points. Fix any $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$ and any $t_0 \in (\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i)$ such that $g|_{\gamma}(t_0)$ and $\dot{\psi}_{\gamma}(t_0)$ exist. We show that $g|_{\gamma}(t_0) \geq \rho_{\gamma} - \dot{\gamma}^2$ in two cases separately.

Case 1. If $g|_{\gamma}(t_0) = (\Phi|_{\gamma} \vee \Psi_{\gamma}|_{\gamma})(t_0)$: Recall that g is the maximum of Φ and Ψ_{ζ} over $\zeta \in \Gamma_i$.

This property, the assumption of Case 1, and (3.35) together give

$$g|_{\gamma}(t_0) = \psi_{\gamma}(t_0), \quad \text{and} \quad g|_{\gamma}(t) \geq \psi_{\gamma}(t), \quad \text{for all } t \in (\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i). \quad (3.37)$$

Combining this with the assumption on t_0 gives $g|_{\gamma}(t_0) = \dot{\psi}_{\gamma}(t_0)$. This together with (3.36) gives the desired inequality.

Case 2. If $g|_{\gamma}(t_0) \neq (\Phi|_{\gamma} \vee \Psi_{\gamma}|_{\gamma})(t_0)$: Since g is the maximum of Φ and Ψ_{ζ} over $\zeta \in \Gamma_i$, in this case, there exist $\zeta \in \Gamma_i \setminus \{\gamma\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, such that

$$g|_{\gamma} = \Psi_{\zeta_j}|_{\gamma} > (\Psi_{\gamma}|_{\gamma} \vee \Phi|_{\gamma}) = \psi_{\gamma}, \quad \text{in a neighborhood of } t_0. \quad (3.38)$$

Consider $\underline{t}_0 := \sup\{t \in [\tau_{i-1}, t_0) : \Psi_{\zeta_j|_\gamma}(t) \leq \psi_\gamma(t)\}$. By (3.32) and (3.36), we have $(\underline{t}_0, \gamma(\underline{t}_0)), (t_0, \gamma(t_0)) \in \overline{R_{\zeta_{j+}}}$ or $(\underline{t}_0, \gamma(\underline{t}_0)), (t_0, \gamma(t_0)) \in \overline{R_{\zeta_{j-}}}$; see Figure 12 for an illustration. Given this property, using (3.31) for $\gamma \mapsto \zeta$ and the linearity of γ shows that $\Psi_{\zeta_j|_\gamma}(t)$ is *linear* on $[\underline{t}_0, t_0]$. Also, by the definition of \underline{t}_0 , we have $\Psi_{\zeta_j|_\gamma} > \psi_\gamma$ on $(\underline{t}_0, t_0]$ and $\Psi_{\zeta_j|_\gamma} = \psi_\gamma$ at \underline{t}_0 , so

$$\Psi_{\zeta_j|_\gamma}(t_0) - \Psi_{\zeta_j|_\gamma}(\underline{t}_0) > \psi_\gamma(t_0) - \psi_\gamma(\underline{t}_0) = \int_{\underline{t}_0}^{t_0} dt \dot{\psi}_\gamma. \quad (3.39)$$

Divide (3.39) by $t_0 - \underline{t}_0$; in the leftmost expression, use the property that $\Psi_{\zeta_j|_\gamma}(t)$ is linear on $[\underline{t}_0, t_0]$; in the rightmost expression, use (3.35). Doing so gives $\frac{d}{dt}(\Psi_{\zeta_j|_\gamma})(t_0) > \rho_\gamma - \dot{\gamma}^2$.

The left-hand side is equal to $g|_\gamma(t_0)$ by (3.38), so the desired inequality follows.

We have shown $g|_\gamma(t_0) \geq \rho_\gamma - \dot{\gamma}^2$ in both cases and hence have completed the proof. \square

We extract what we need from Lemma 3.7 for later and put it in Proposition 2.3'.

Proposition 2.3'. *Take any piecewise linear and cone-supported μ .*

- (1) *The function $u := \partial_x H[\mu]$ is a tractable solution, with $\mu \geq M_{\text{non}}[h]$ and $I(\mathbf{e}_\mu) \geq I(M_{\text{non}}[h])$.*
- (2) *For any $(t, x) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, there exists a path $(t, x) \xrightarrow{\pi} \{1\} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\pi|_{\mathbf{e}_{M_{\text{ent}}[h]}} + h(t, x) = h(1, \pi(1))$.*

Proof. (1) The first statement follows from Lemma 3.7 because a piecewise linear solution is a tractable solution. The second statement follow from Lemma 3.7(1) and (2.17). The last statement follows from the second statement and (3.16).

(2) Let $(\mathfrak{T}(u), \mathfrak{B}(u), \mathfrak{D}(u))$ be the tractable partition associated with u . To construct the path π , start at (t, x) ; follow a characteristic when being in $D \in \mathfrak{D}(u)$ and follow $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(u)$ when hitting such an ℓ . This procedure terminates in finite steps. We need to ensure that π does not take any of $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(u)$ with $u_{\ell-} > u_{\ell+}$. By Lemma 3.7(1), any $u_{\ell-} > u_{\ell+}$ happens only when $u_{\ell-}, u_{\ell+}, \ell$ are all constant. In this case, every $(t, \ell(t))$ with $t \in (a(\ell), b(\ell))$ is connected to a characteristic that is emanating from $\mathfrak{g}(\ell)$; see Figure 13 for an illustration. By taking a sequence $t_k \downarrow a(\ell)$, we see that the point $(a(\ell), \ell(a(\ell)))$ is connected to either a characteristic or an $\ell' \in \mathfrak{B}(u)$ with $u_{\ell'-} \leq u_{\ell'+}$; see Figure 13 for an illustration. This being the case, we can construct π such that $\pi = \pi_1 \cup \dots \cup \pi_M$, where each π_j is a segment of

- (1) a characteristic within a $D \in \mathfrak{D}(u)$, or
- (2) a path $\ell' \in \mathfrak{B}(u)$ with $u_{\ell'-} \leq u_{\ell'+}$.

Let $t = s_0 < s_1 < \dots < s_M = 1$ denote the starting and ending time of these π_j s.

- (1) Using $\partial_t h = \frac{1}{4}u^2$ and (2.4) gives $h(s_j, \pi(s_j)) - h(s_{j-1}, \pi(s_{j-1})) = |\pi_j|_d$, which is equal to $|\pi_j|_{\mathbf{e}_{M_{\text{ent}}[h]}}$ because $\mathfrak{g}(\pi_j|_{(s_{j-1}, s_j)}) \subset D$ for some $D \in \mathfrak{D}(u)$.
- (2) Using (2.8) and (2.18) gives $h(s_j, \pi(s_j)) - h(s_{j-1}, \pi(s_{j-1})) = |\pi_j|_{\mathbf{e}_{M_{\text{ent}}[h]}}$.

Adding these equalities over $j = 1, \dots, M$ gives the desired result. \square

3.4. Approximation. Here we prepare the tools for approximating paths and measures.

Lemma 3.8. *Take any sequence of measures $\{\mu_n\}_n \subset \mathcal{N}_+$ and any sequence of paths $\{\eta_n\}_n \subset H^1[a, b]$ such that $\inf_n |\eta_n|_{\mathbf{e}_{\mu_n}} > -\infty$ and that $\eta_n(a) = x$ is independent of n . There exist a subsequence $\{\eta_{n_j}\}_j$ and a path $\eta \in H^1[a, b]$ such that*

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\eta_{n_j} - \eta\|_{L^\infty[a, b]} = 0, \quad \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\eta_{n_j}|_{\mathbf{e}_{\mu_{n_j}}} \leq |\eta|_d + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(\mathbf{e}_{\mu_n}). \quad (3.40)$$




FIGURE 13. The dashed paths are characteristics.




FIGURE 14. The thin solid path is l . The thick solid path is π . The dashed paths are characteristics, with the thick one being χ .




FIGURE 15. The case where $\eta := \chi \cup \pi|_{[s_2, s_3]}$ is linear.

Proof. Since $H^1[a, b]$ is compactly embedded into $C[a, b]$, there exist a subsequence $\{\eta_{n_j}\}_j$ and an η such that the first limit in (3.40) holds. Next, use (3.4) for $\eta \mapsto \eta_{n_j}$ and consider the $j \rightarrow \infty$ limsups of the first and second integrals. The first limsup is at most $\limsup_n I(e_{\mu_n})$ by Hölder's inequality; the second limsup is at most $|\eta|_d$ because $\gamma \mapsto \int_{[a, b]} dt \dot{\gamma}^2$ is lower semicontinuous under the uniform topology. \square

Definition 3.9. Take any $\mu = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \rho_\gamma \delta_\gamma \in \mathcal{N}_+$ such that $I(e_\mu) < \infty$. Let us construct a piecewise linear approximation of (μ, Γ) as follows. First we need to perform a surgery on Γ . Examine any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, if $\mathbf{g}(\gamma)$ intersects with $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$ at any point other than $(0, 0)$, divide the path γ into $\gamma|_{[1/2, b(\gamma)]}$, $\gamma|_{[1/3, 1/2]}$, $\gamma|_{[1/4, 1/3]}$, \dots . Denote the post-surgery set still by Γ . This surgery does not change μ and ensures that for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$, there exists a $c_\gamma < \infty$ such that $\mathbf{g}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{C}(c_\gamma)$. Next, index the paths in Γ as $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots$ and put $[a(\gamma_i), b(\gamma_i)] = [a_i, b_i]$. For each γ_i , construct a sequence of piecewise linear paths $\gamma_{i1}, \gamma_{i2}, \dots \in H^1[a_i, b_i]$ with $\gamma_{in}(a_i) = \gamma_i(a_i)$ and $\gamma_{in}(b_i) = \gamma_i(b_i)$ for all n , and a sequence of piecewise constant $\rho_{i1}, \rho_{i2}, \dots \in L^1[a_j, b_j]$, such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{a_i}^{b_i} dt |\dot{\gamma}_{in} - \dot{\gamma}_i|^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{a_i}^{b_i} dt |\rho_{in} - \rho_{\gamma_i}|^{3/2} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (3.41)$$

Let $\mu_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_{in} \delta_{\gamma_{in}}$. This way, each μ_n is piecewise linear and cone-supported (Definition 2.2), and $I(e_{\mu_n}) \rightarrow I(e_\mu)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 3.10. For the μ and μ_n as in Definition 3.9 and for all $(s, y, s', y') \in \mathbb{R}_\dagger^4$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_{\mu_n}(s, y; s', y') \leq e_\mu(s, y; s', y'). \quad (3.42)$$

Proof. Take any $(s, y, s', y') \in \mathbb{R}_\dagger^4$ and any e_{μ_n} geodesic $(s, y) \xrightarrow{\pi_n} (s', y')$. Assume $\limsup_n |\pi_n|_{\mu_n} > -\infty$, otherwise the desired result follows immediately. Given the assumption, the proof of Lemma 3.8 shows that, after being passing to a subsequence, π_n converges pointwisely (uniformly in fact) to a path π and $\limsup_n \int_{[s, s']} dt (-\dot{\pi}_n^2) \leq \int_{[s, s']} dt (-\dot{\pi}^2)$. Using this and (3.4) for $\eta \mapsto \pi_n$ give

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_{\mu_n}(s, y; s', y') \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_s^{s'} dt \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_{\pi_n} \mathbf{1}_{\gamma_{in} = \pi_n} + \int_s^{s'} dt (-\dot{\pi}^2). \quad (3.43)$$

Next, by construction, for every fixed i and as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the path γ_{in} converges to γ_i pointwisely (uniformly in fact). This and the pointwise convergence of π_n to π together give $\limsup_n \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\gamma_{in}=\pi_n} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\gamma_i=\pi}$. Combining this with (3.41) shows that the second limsup in (3.43) is at most $\int_{[s,s']} dt \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \rho_i \mathbf{1}_{\gamma_i=\pi}$. Hence $\limsup_n e_{\mu_n}(s, y; s', y') \leq |\pi|_{e_{\mu}}$. Being the pointwise limit of π_n , the path π connects (s, y) to (s', y') , so $|\pi|_{e_{\mu}} \leq e_{\mu}(s, y; s', y')$ and the desired result follows. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1, COROLLARY 1.2, AND PROPOSITION 1.6

4.1. Basic properties related to \mathcal{E}_{BM} . To streamline the proof, let us prepare some notation and properties related to \mathcal{E}_{BM} . Recall that $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a finite union of closed intervals, $f : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Borel with $f \geq h_d(1, \cdot)$,

$$\mathcal{E}(c) := \{ \phi \in C(\mathbb{R}) : \phi|_{[-c,c]} \in H^1[-c, c], \phi \geq h_d(1, \cdot), \phi|_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-c,c]} = h_d(1, \cdot)|_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-c,c]} \}, \quad (4.1)$$

and $\mathcal{E} := \cup_{c \in (0, \infty)} \mathcal{E}(c)$. For $\phi \in \mathcal{E}$, set

$$Q_{\text{BM}}(\phi) := \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx ((\partial_x \phi)^2 - 4x^2). \quad (4.2)$$

This way, $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) = \inf\{Q_{\text{BM}}(\phi) : \phi \in \mathcal{E}, \phi|_{\Lambda} = f\}$. When $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) < \infty$, the infimum has a unique minimizer f_* , which can be obtained geometrically, as illustrated in Figure 1. Roughly speaking, f_* is obtained by interpolating f outside of Λ constrained to stay above the parabola $h_d(1, x) = -x^2$. We call this interpolation **parabola-constrained interpolation** and describe it next. Let $\text{Hypo}(\phi) := \{(x, \alpha) : \alpha \leq \phi(x)\}$ denotes the hypograph of ϕ ; decompose $\mathbb{R} \setminus \Lambda$ into disjoint open intervals; on any one of those intervals that is bounded, denoted (α', β') , consider the convex hull of $\text{Hypo}(h_d(1, \cdot)|_{[\alpha', \beta']}) \cup \{(\alpha', f(\alpha')), (\beta', f(\beta'))\}$ and make $f_*|_{(\alpha', \beta')}$ the function whose hypograph is this convex hull; on the leftmost interval, denoted $(-\infty, \alpha')$, let $f_*|_{(-\infty, \alpha')}$ be the function whose hypograph is the convex hull of $\text{Hypo}(h_d(1, \cdot)|_{(-\infty, \alpha']}) \cup \{(\alpha', f(\alpha'))\}$; do similarly on the rightmost interval.

Next we turn to the finite-dimensional analog of \mathcal{E}_{BM} . Take any $\vec{y} = (y_1 < \dots < y_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ with $\alpha_i \geq -y_i^2$ for all i , and consider

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM},k}(\vec{y}, \vec{\alpha}) := \inf\{Q_{\text{BM}}(\phi) : \phi \in \mathcal{E}, \phi(y_i) = \alpha_i, i = 1, \dots, k\}. \quad (4.3)$$

Just like before, the infimum has a unique minimizer, obtained by parabola-constrained interpolating $(y_1, \alpha_1), \dots, (y_k, \alpha_k)$. By analyzing how the minimizer varies in $(\vec{y}, \vec{\alpha})$, it is not hard to check that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM},k}(\vec{y}, \vec{\alpha}) \text{ is continuous on } \{(y_1 < \dots < y_k, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{2k} : \alpha_i \geq -y_i^2 \forall i\}. \quad (4.4)$$

To streamline the notation, for any finite $Y = \{y_1 < \dots < y_{|Y|}\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{E}$, write $\vec{Y} := (y_1, \dots, y_{|Y|})$ and $\phi(\vec{Y}) := (\phi(y_1), \dots, \phi(y_{|Y|}))$, and let f_{*Y} be the unique minimizer of (4.3) for $(\vec{y}, \vec{\alpha}) = (\vec{Y}, f_*(\vec{Y}))$. More explicitly,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM},|Y|}(\vec{Y}, f_*(\vec{Y})) := \inf\{Q_{\text{BM}}(\phi) : \phi \in \mathcal{E}, \phi = f_* \text{ on } Y\} = Q_{\text{BM}}(f_{*Y}). \quad (4.5)$$

Now take Y to be $\Lambda_m := \Lambda \cap \{i/m\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and consider

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM},|\Lambda_m|}(\vec{\Lambda}_m, f(\vec{\Lambda}_m)) := \inf\{Q_{\text{BM}}(\phi) : \phi \in \mathcal{E}, \phi(y) = f(y), \forall y \in \Lambda_m\} = Q_{\text{BM}}(f_{*\Lambda_m}). \quad (4.6)$$

The minimizer $f_{*\Lambda_m}$ is obtained by parabola-constrained interpolating $(y, f(y))_{y \in \Lambda_m}$. From this, it is not hard to check that, there exists a $c < \infty$ such that

$$\text{if } f \notin C(\Lambda), Q_{\text{BM}}(f_{*\Lambda_m}) \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } f \in C(\Lambda), f_{*\Lambda_m} \rightarrow f_* \text{ uniformly on } [-c, c] \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty, \\ \text{and } f_{*\Lambda_m} = f_* = h_d \text{ outside of } [-c, c] \text{ for all } m. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Also, consider

$$G_m(\lambda) := \inf \{ Q_{\text{BM}}(\phi) : \phi \in \mathcal{E}, \phi = f_* \text{ on } \Lambda_m, \|\phi - f_*\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \geq \lambda \}. \quad (4.9)$$

It is not hard to check that, if $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) < \infty$,

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} G_m(\varepsilon) \geq Q_{\text{BM}}(f_*) = \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f), \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (4.10)$$

4.2. Proof of Theorem 1.1(1), proving \leq in (1.12). Recall that $\Lambda_m := \Lambda \cap \{i/m\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and that $f_{*\Lambda_m}$ is the minimizer of the infimum in (4.6). Let $h_{*m}(t, x) := \text{HL}_{1 \rightarrow t}^{\text{bk}}[f_{*\Lambda_m}](x)$ and $\mu_{*m} := M[h_{*m}]$. Since $f_{*\Lambda_m}$ is obtained by parabola-constrained interpolating $(y, f(y))_{y \in \Lambda_m}$, the function is continuous, piecewise linear or quadratic, and equal to $h_d(1, \cdot)$ outside of a bounded interval. Given these properties, Lemma 3.3(1) asserts that h_{*m} is a tractable solution without entropy shocks, so $\mu_{*m} = M_{\text{non}}[h_{*m}]$ and $M_{\text{ent}}[h_{*m}] = 0$. Also, Proposition 3.5 gives that $H[\mu_{*m}] = h_{*m}$. Now apply Proposition 2.6 to get

$$I(\mathbf{e}_{\mu_{*m}}) - 0 = Q_{\text{BM}}(h_{*m}(1, \cdot)) = Q_{\text{BM}}(f_{*\Lambda_m}) = \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}, |\Lambda_m|}(\vec{\Lambda}_m, f(\vec{\Lambda}_m)) \leq \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f), \quad (4.11)$$

where the last inequality follows because $\Lambda_m \subset \Lambda$. If $f \notin C(\Lambda)$, using (4.7) gives the desired result. If $f \in C(\Lambda)$, using (4.8) gives $\mathbf{e}_{\mu_{*m}}(0, 0; 1, \cdot) \rightarrow f_*$ uniformly on \mathbb{R} . This together with the property that I is a good rate function gives

$$\inf \{ I(\mathbf{e}_\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{N}_+, \mathbf{e}_\mu(0, 0; 1, x) = f(x) \text{ for } x \in \Lambda \} \leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} I(\mathbf{e}_{\mu_{*m}}). \quad (4.12)$$

Combining (4.11)–(4.12) gives the desired result.

4.3. Proof of Theorem 1.1(1), proving \geq in (1.12). Having proven the inequality \leq in Section 4.2, hereafter we assume $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) < \infty$, which in particular implies $f \in C(\Lambda)$. Fix an arbitrary minimizer $\mu = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \rho_\gamma \delta_\gamma$ of (1.12) and put $h := H[\mu]$. Minimizers exist because I is a good rate function.

Let us first construct some approximations. This construction will be used here and in Sections 4.4. Fix an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. First, note that for any $c < \infty$, the mapping $\phi \mapsto Q_{\text{BM}}(\phi)$ is lower semicontinuous on $\mathcal{E}(c)$ under the uniform topology over $[-c, c]$; see (4.1) and (4.2). Combining this with (4.8) gives $\liminf_m Q_{\text{BM}}(f_{*\Lambda_m}) \geq Q_{\text{BM}}(f_*) = \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f)$. Given this and (4.10), fix a large enough m such that

$$Q_{\text{BM}}(f_{*\Lambda_m}) \geq \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) - \varepsilon, \quad G_m(\varepsilon) > \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f), \quad G_m \text{ defined in (4.9)}. \quad (4.13)$$

For this fixed m , take an arbitrary $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and add it to Λ_m to get $Y := \Lambda_m \cup \{x_0\}$; see Remark 4.1. For each $y \in Y$, take an \mathbf{e}_μ geodesic $(0, 0) \xrightarrow{\pi_y} (1, y)$, and expand the set Γ to include these π_y s: More precisely, take a $\Gamma' \supset \Gamma$ such that $\mathfrak{g}(\Gamma') \supset \mathfrak{g}(\pi_y)$, for all $y \in Y$. Set $\rho_\zeta := 0$ for all $\zeta \in \Gamma' \setminus \Gamma$ so that the resulting measure does not change, namely $\mu = \sum_{\zeta \in \Gamma'} \rho_\zeta \delta_\zeta$. Now construct the piecewise linear approximation μ_n of (μ, Γ') as in Definition 3.9. Set $h_n := H[\mu_n]$.

Remark 4.1. Adding x_0 is need only in Section 4.4 and is not in this section.

We now use the preceding approximations to prove the desired result. First, we argue that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(1, y) = h(1, y), \quad \text{for all } y \in Y := \Lambda_m \cup \{x_0\}. \quad (4.14)$$

To see why, recall that $\mathfrak{g}(\pi_y) \subset \mathfrak{g}(\Gamma')$ and that μ_n is constructed such that (3.41) hold for $\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots\} = \Gamma'$. Hence, there exists a path $(0, 0) \xrightarrow{\pi_{y,n}} (1, y)$ such that $\lim_n |\pi_{y,n}|_{e_{\mu_n}} = |\pi_y|_{e_\mu}$. The left-hand side is bounded above by $\liminf_n h_n(1, y)$, while the right-hand side is equal to $h(1, y)$. This prove the inequality \geq in (4.14). The other inequality follows by Lemma 3.10 for $(s, y; s', y') = (0, 0; 1, y)$. Next, using Proposition 2.3'(1) and Proposition 2.6 for $\mu \mapsto \mu_n$ gives $I(e_\mu) - I(M_{\text{ent}}[h_n]) \geq Q_{\text{BM}}(h_n(1, \cdot))$. Bound the last term from below by $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}, |Y|}(\vec{Y}, h_n(\vec{Y}))$, and take the $n \rightarrow \infty$ limit with the aid of (4.4) and (4.14). Doing so gives

$$I(e_\mu) - \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(M_{\text{ent}}[h_n]) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_{\text{BM}}(h_n(1, \cdot)) \geq \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}, |Y|}(\vec{Y}, h(\vec{Y})). \quad (4.15)$$

Recall that $h(1, \cdot)|_\Lambda = f$, so in particular $h(1, \cdot) = f$ on Λ_m . This together with $Y \supset \Lambda_m$ gives $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}, |Y|}(\vec{Y}, h(\vec{Y})) \geq \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}, |\Lambda_m|}(\vec{\Lambda}_m, f_*(\vec{\Lambda}_m)) = Q_{\text{BM}}(f_{*\Lambda_m})$. Combining this with (4.15) and the first inequality in (4.13) gives

$$I(e_\mu) - \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(M_{\text{ent}}[h_n]) \geq \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) - \varepsilon. \quad (4.16)$$

In particular, $I(e_\mu) \geq \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) - \varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, $I(e_\mu) \geq \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f)$ follows.

4.4. Proof of Theorem 1.1(1), proving $e_\mu(0, 0; t, x) = h_*(t, x)$. Continue with the notation in Section 4.3. Our goal here is to prove that $h(t, x) = h_*(t, x)$, for all $(t, x) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$. Let us first prove this for $t = 1$, namely

$$h_*(1, x) = f_*(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.17)$$

Since μ is a minimizer, the results of Sections 4.2–4.3 give $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) = I(e_\mu)$. Inserting this into (4.15) and forgoing the first limsup there give

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_{\text{BM}}(h_n(1, \cdot)) \geq \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}, |Y|}(\vec{Y}, h(\vec{Y})). \quad (4.18)$$

Further, since $h(1, y) = f(y)$ for all $y \in \Lambda_m$ and since $Y := \Lambda_m \cup \{x_0\}$, we have $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}, |Y|}(\vec{Y}, h(\vec{Y})) \geq G_m(|h(1, x_0) - f_*(x_0)|)$. Combining this with (4.18) gives $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) \geq G_m(|h(1, x_0) - f_*(x_0)|)$. At the same time, the second inequality in (4.13) gives $G_m(\varepsilon) > \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f)$. Since $G_m(\lambda)$ is nondecreasing in λ (readily seen from (4.9)), we must have $|h(1, x_0) - f_*(x_0)| < \varepsilon$, otherwise the last two inequalities can be combined and a contradiction would follow. Since $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ were arbitrary, (4.17) follows.

Let us prepare a bound that will be needed. Recall $h_n := H[\mu_n]$ from Section 4.3. We argue that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|h_n(1, \cdot) - f_*\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} < \varepsilon. \quad (4.19)$$

After passing to a subsequence, either $h_n(1, x_n) \rightarrow f_*(x_0) + \alpha$ for some $\alpha = \pm \limsup_n \|h_n(1, \cdot) - f_*\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$ and $x_1, x_2, \dots \rightarrow x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, or $h_n(1, x_n) \geq h_d(x_n) + \varepsilon/2$ for some $x_1, x_2, \dots \rightarrow \pm\infty$. If the first case happens with $|\alpha| = \infty$ or the second case happens, it is not hard to show that $Q_{\text{BM}}(h_n(1, \cdot)) \rightarrow \infty$. This is prohibited by (4.18). We hence consider the first case with $|\alpha| < \infty$. For the m fixed in Section 4.3, set $Y'_n := \Lambda_m \cup \{x_n\}$, write $Q_{\text{BM}}(h_n(1, \cdot)) \geq \mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}, |Y'_n|}(\vec{Y}'_n, h_n(1, \vec{Y}'_n))$ (see (4.3)), and take the $n \rightarrow \infty$ limit. When taking the limit, use (4.4), use (4.14) for $y \in \Lambda_m$, and use $h_n(1, x_n) \rightarrow f_*(x_0) + \alpha$. Doing so gives $\liminf_n Q_{\text{BM}}(h_n(1, \cdot)) \geq G_m(|\alpha|)$. Combining this with the first inequality in (4.18) gives $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) \geq G_m(|\alpha|)$. From here, the same argument as the last paragraph gives $|\alpha| < \varepsilon$, so (4.19) follows.

Let us prove $h \leq h_*$ on $(0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$. Take any $(t, x) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, and consider any path $(t, x) \xrightarrow{\eta} \{1\} \times \mathbb{R}$. The metric e_μ satisfies $e_\mu(0, 0; 1, \eta(1)) \geq e_\mu(0, 0; t, x) + |\eta|_{e_\mu}$ and $|\eta|_{e_\mu} \geq |\eta|_d$.

Recognize $e_\mu(0, 0; t, x)$ as $h(t, x)$ and recognize $e_\mu(0, 0; 1, \eta(1))$ as $h(1, \eta(1))$, which is equal to $f_*(\eta(1))$ by (4.17). We have $h(t, x) \leq -|\eta|_d + f_*(\eta(1))$. Taking the infimum over such η s gives

$$h(t, x) \leq \text{HL}_{1 \rightarrow t}^{\text{bk}}[f_*](x) =: h_*(t, x). \quad (4.20)$$

Let us prove $h \geq h_*$ on $(0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$. Recall μ_n from Section 4.3. Take any $(t, x) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, and use Proposition 2.3'(2) for $\mu \mapsto \mu_n$ to obtain a path $(t, x) \xrightarrow{\pi_n} \{1\} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\pi_n|_{\text{Ment}[h_n]} = h_n(1, \pi_n(1)) - h_n(t, x)$. Since μ is a minimizer, the results of Sections 4.2–4.3 gives $\mathcal{E}_{\text{BM}}(\Lambda, f) = I(e_\mu)$. Combining this with (4.16) gives $\limsup_n I(\text{Ment}(h_n)) \leq \varepsilon$. Given this property, apply Lemma 3.8 to $\{\pi_n\}_n$ and $\{\text{Ment}(h_n)\}_n$. The result gives a path $(t, x) \xrightarrow{\pi} \{1\} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\varepsilon + |\pi|_d \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (h_n(1, \pi_n(1)) - h_n(t, x)) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(1, \pi_n(1)) - \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(t, x). \quad (4.21)$$

By (4.19) and the fact that f_* is continuous, the liminf is at least $f_*(\pi(1)) - \varepsilon$. By Lemma 3.10 for $(s, y; s', y') = (0, 0; t, x)$, the last limsup is at most $h(t, x)$. After rearranging terms, we arrive at

$$h(t, x) \geq -|\pi|_d + f_*(1, \pi(1)) - 2\varepsilon \geq \text{HL}_{1 \rightarrow t}^{\text{bk}}[f_*](x) - 2\varepsilon =: h_*(t, x) - 2\varepsilon. \quad (4.22)$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, this completes the proof.

4.5. Proof of Theorem 1.1(2). We begin with a lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Take any $\mu \in \mathcal{N}_+$, set $H[\mu] = h$ and $u := \partial_x h$, assume u is a tractable solution with respect to the tractable partition $(\mathfrak{T}(u), \mathfrak{B}(u), \mathfrak{D}(u))$ of a light cone $\mathcal{C}(c)$, and consider the ε -thicken set of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}(u))$, namely*

$$B_\varepsilon(u) := \{(t, x) : |x - \ell(t)| \leq \varepsilon, t \in [a(\gamma), b(\gamma)] \text{ for some } \ell \in \mathfrak{B}(u)\}. \quad (4.23)$$

For every $\varepsilon > 0$, $h = H[\mu|_{B_\varepsilon(u)}]$.

Proof. First, we claim that, for every $(t, x) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, there exists a path $\mathfrak{B}(u) \cup \{(0, 0)\} \xrightarrow{\eta} (t, x)$ such that $|\eta|_d = h(t, x) - h(a, \pi(a))$, where $a = a(\eta)$, and the path η is obtained by concatenating the characteristics of u . If $(t, x) \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}(u))$, simply take η as the degenerate path with $[a(\eta), b(\eta)] = [t, t]$ and $\eta(t) = x$. Otherwise, let us construct η by going backward in time. Starting from $(t, x) \notin \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}(u))$, we going back in time by following a characteristic χ of u .

- If $(t, x) \in D$ for some $D \in \mathfrak{D}(u)$, or if $(t, x) \notin \mathcal{C}(c)$, such a characteristic χ indeed exists.
- Otherwise (t, x) lies along the upper boundary (picturing time as the vertical axis) of some $D \in \mathfrak{D}(u)$. Take a sequence of points $(t_k, x_k) \in D$ that approaches (t, x) . Since $u \in L^\infty(D)$, after being passed to a subsequence, $u(t_k, x_k)$ converges to a finite limit. Each (t_k, x_k) lies along a characteristic, which has velocity $-\frac{1}{2}u(t_k, x_k)$ by (2.4). Taking the limit of these characteristics gives a characteristic χ that is connected to (t, x) .

Follow χ backward in time until it reaches $(0, 0)$ or ∂D , and let $s \in [0, t)$ denote the time when this happens. Using $h = \frac{1}{4}v^2$ outside of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}(u))$ and using (2.4), we calculate $h(t, x) - h(s, \chi(s)) = |\chi|_{[s, t]}|_d$. Now, if $(s, \chi(s)) \notin \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}(u)) \cup \{(0, 0)\}$, repeat this process until reaching $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}(u)) \cup \{(0, 0)\}$ and concatenate the resulting characteristics. Doing so gives η .

We now turn to proving the statement of this lemma. Put $\nu := \mu|_{B_\varepsilon(u)}$. Since $\mu \geq \nu$, by (3.17) we have $h \geq H[\nu]$. Hence it suffices to prove $H[\nu] \geq h$. Taking any $(t_0, x_0) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, we prove this by constructing a path $(0, 0) \xrightarrow{\pi} (t_0, x_0)$ such that $|\pi|_{e_\nu} \geq h(t_0, x_0)$. First, use the preceding claim to find $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}(u)) \cup \{(0, 0)\} \xrightarrow{\eta_1} (t_0, x_0)$ such that $|\eta_1|_d = h(t_0, x_0) - h(a_1, \eta_1(a_1))$, where $a_1 := a(\eta_1)$. Next, take an e_μ geodesic $(0, 0) \xrightarrow{\pi_1} (a_1, \eta_1(a_1))$, let $t_1 := \sup\{t \in [0, a_1] : (t, \pi_1(t)) \notin B_\varepsilon(u)\}$, and put $x_1 := \pi_1(t_1)$. Since π_1 is an e_μ geodesic and since $h = H[\mu]$, we have $|\pi_1|_{[t_1, a_1]}|_{e_\mu} =$

$h(a_1, \eta_1(a_1)) - h(t_1, x_1)$. Further, since $\mathfrak{g}(\pi_1|_{[t_1, a_1]}) \subset B_\varepsilon(u)$, we have $|\pi_1|_{[t_1, a_1]}|_{e_\mu} = |\pi_1|_{[t_1, a_1]}|_{e_\nu}$. Now concatenate the paths $\pi_1|_{[t_1, a_1]}$ and $\eta_1|_{[a_1, t_0]}$. The proceeding properties give

$$\left| \pi_1|_{[t_1, a_1]} \cup \eta_1|_{[a_1, t_0]} \right|_{e_\nu} \geq \left| \pi_1|_{[t_1, a_1]} \right|_{e_\nu} + \left| \eta_1|_{[a_1, t_0]} \right|_d = h(t_0, x_0) - h(t_1, x_1). \quad (4.24)$$

Taking (t_1, x_1) as the new starting point and iterating this process give the desired π . \square

Let us prepare some notation. Set $u_* := \partial_x h_*$ and let μ be a minimizer as before. The assumption here (in Theorem 1.1(2)) is that f is continuous, and piecewise linear or quadratic on Λ , and our goal is to prove $\mu = M[h_*]$. The function $f_* \in C(\mathbb{R})$, obtained from parabola-constrained interpolating the graph of f , is piecewise linear or quadratic and equal to h_d outside of a bounded interval. By Lemma 3.3(1), u_* is a tractable solution without entropy shocks.

Next, we perform a few reductions. The result of Section 4.4 gives $h := H[\mu] = h_*$, so Lemma 4.2 implies that $H[\mu|_{B_\varepsilon(u_*)}] = h_*$. This property forces $\mu = \mu|_{B_\varepsilon(u_*)}$, otherwise $\mu > \mu|_{B_\varepsilon(u_*)}$, which implies $I(e_\mu) > I(e_\mu|_{B_\varepsilon(u_*)})$ by (3.18) and contradicts the condition that μ is a minimizer. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, it follows that μ is supported on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}(u_*))$. Next, take any $\ell \in \mathfrak{B}(v)$ and any open interval $O \subset (a(\ell), b(\ell))$ such that $u_{*\ell-} > u_{*\ell+}$ on O . It suffices to prove that

$$\text{for any } t \in O \text{ and any } e_\mu \text{ geodesic } (0, 0) \xrightarrow{\pi} (t, \ell(t)), \quad \pi|_{[0, t]} = \ell|_{[0, t]}. \quad (4.25)$$

Once (4.25) is proven, since $h_* = e_\mu(0, 0; \cdot, \cdot)$, it follows that $h_*(t, \ell(t)) = |\ell|_{[s, t]}|_{e_\mu} + h_*(s, \ell(s))$, for all $s < t \in O$. This implies $\mu|_{\mathfrak{g}(\ell|_O)} = M[h_*]|_{\mathfrak{g}(\ell|_O)}$, and this holds all O described above. Since μ is supported on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}(u_*))$ and since u_* has no entropy shocks, it follows that $\mu = M[h_*]$.

To prove (4.25), we argue by contradiction. Assume the opposite of (4.25): There exist $t_0 \in O$, an e_μ geodesic $(0, 0) \xrightarrow{\pi} (t_0, \ell(t_0))$, a region $D \in \mathfrak{D}(u_*)$, and an $s_3 \in O \cap (0, t_0]$ such that $\pi|_{(s_3-\lambda, s_3)} \subset D$, for some $\lambda > 0$, and that $\pi(s_3) = \ell(s_3)$; see Figure 14. Combining the property that $u_{*\ell-} > u_{*\ell+}$ on O with (2.7) for $v \mapsto u_*$ gives

$$-\frac{1}{2}u_{*\ell-} < \dot{\ell} < -\frac{1}{2}u_{*\ell+} \text{ on } O. \quad (4.26)$$

Since u_* is a $C^1(D)$ solution of Burgers' equation, every point in D lies along a characteristic of u_* . This property together with (4.26) implies that all points on $\mathfrak{g}(\pi|_{[0, s_3]}) \cap D$ that are sufficiently closed to $(s_3, \pi(s_3))$ are connected back to ℓ by characteristics; see Figure 14. Take one such point $(s_2, \pi(s_2))$ and the corresponding characteristic $(s_1, \pi(s_1)) \xrightarrow{\chi} (s_2, \pi(s_2))$. Assume s_2 is sufficient closed to s_3 such that $\mathfrak{g}(\chi|_{(s_1, s_2]}) \subset D$ and that $s_1 \in O$.

Given the preceding setup, we now argue for a contradiction. First, since π is an e_μ geodesic and since $h_* = e_\mu(0, 0; \cdot, \cdot)$,

$$h_*(s_3, \pi(s_3)) = h_*(s_2, \pi(s_2)) + \left| \pi|_{[s_2, s_3]} \right|_{e_\mu} = h_*(s_2, \pi(s_2)) + \left| \pi|_{[s_2, s_3]} \right|_d, \quad (4.27)$$

where the second equality follows because μ is supported on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{B}(u_*))$. Next, since χ is a characteristic, using $h_* = \frac{1}{4}u_*^2$ within D and (2.4), we have $h_*(s_2, \pi(s_2)) - h_*(s_1, \pi(s_1)) = |\chi|_{[s_1, s_2]}|_d$. Inserting this to (4.27) gives

$$h_*(s_3, \pi(s_3)) = h_*(s_1, \pi(s_1)) + \left| \chi|_{[s_1, s_2]} \cup \pi|_{[s_2, s_3]} \right|_d. \quad (4.28)$$

We finish the proof in two separate cases.

Case 1. The path $\eta := \chi \cup \pi|_{[s_2, s_3]}$ is linear: Consider $\eta(s_2) < \ell(s_2)$; the other case is similar. In this case η is a characteristic and intersects with π at $(s_3, \pi(s_3))$, so $u_{*\ell-}(s_3) = \dot{\eta}$. Further, $\eta|_{(s_2, s_3)}$ lies entirely to the left of $\ell|_{(s_2, s_3)}$ and $\eta(s_3) = \pi(s_3)$; see Figure 15. These properties together give $\dot{\eta} \leq \dot{\ell}(s_3)$. This, together with $u_{*\ell-}(s_3) = \dot{\eta}$, contradicts (4.26).

Case 2. The path $\eta := \chi \cup \pi|_{[s_2, s_3]}$ is not linear: In this case, (4.28) implies

$$h_*(s_3, \pi(s_3)) \not\leq \sup \left\{ h_*(s_1, \pi(s_1)) + |\zeta|_d : (s_1, \pi(s_1)) \xrightarrow{\zeta} (s_3, \pi(s_3)) \right\}. \quad (4.29)$$

On the right-hand side, write $h_*(s_1, \pi(s_1)) = e_\mu(0, 0; s_1, \pi(s_1))$ and bound $|\zeta|_d \leq |\zeta|_{e_\mu}$. We see that the right-hand side is bounded by $e_\mu(0, 0; s_3, \pi(s_3))$. This is equal to $h_*(s_3, \pi(s_3))$, leading to a contradiction.

4.6. Proof of Corollary 1.2. Let us prove Part (2). Fix $r' > 0$, recall $\mathcal{T}(r)$ from Corollary 1.2, and consider $F(r) := \inf \{ I(e) : \|e(0, 0, 1, \cdot) - f\|_{L^\infty(\Lambda)} < r, \|e - e_{\mu_*}\|_{L^\infty(B)} > r' \}$. The LDP from [DDV24] gives

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \varepsilon^{-3/2} \log \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{T}(r)] + I_{0,0;1,\Lambda}(f) \right| = 0, \quad (4.30)$$

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-3/2} \log \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{T}(r) \cap \{ \|\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon - e_{\mu_*}\|_{L^\infty(B)} > r' \}] \geq -\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} F(r). \quad (4.31)$$

By Theorem 1.1(2), the infimum (1.12) has as unique minimizer e_{μ_*} . Using this and the property that I is a good rate function, one deduces that $\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} F(r) > I_{0,0;1,\Lambda}(f)$. Combining this with (4.30)–(4.31) gives the desired result.

The proof of Part (1) is similar. The major difference is that, for Part (1), the uniqueness of μ is not given. Yet, by Theorem 1.1(1), $H[\mu] = h_*$ for every minimizer μ . This suffices for the proof, since Part (1) only concerns the marginal $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(0, 0; \cdot, \cdot)$.

4.7. Proof of Proposition 1.6. Fix any minimizer μ of (1.21). Since μ satisfies the condition in the infimum (1.21), for each $y \in Y$, there exists a $z_y \in Z$ and an e_μ geodesic $(0, z_y) \xrightarrow{\pi_y} (1, y)$ such that $|\pi_y|_{e_\mu} + g(z_y) = f(y)$. The choice of (z_y, π_y) may not be unique, and we argue that they can be chosen to satisfy the non-intersecting property: $\mathfrak{g}(\pi_y) \cap \mathfrak{g}(\pi_{y'}) = \emptyset$ whenever $z_y \neq z_{y'}$. To see how, put the pairs $(y, y') \in Y^2$, $y < y'$, under the lexicographic order of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. Consider the smallest pair (y, y') — under the lexicographic order — that violates the non-intersecting property, namely $\mathfrak{g}(\pi_y) \cap \mathfrak{g}(\pi_{y'}) \neq \emptyset$ and $z_y \neq z_{y'}$. Let $\underline{t} := \inf \{ t \in [0, 1] : \pi_y(t) = \pi_{y'}(t) \}$. We must have $|\pi_y|_{[0, \underline{t}]}|_{e_\mu} + g(z_y) = |\pi_{y'}|_{[0, \underline{t}]}|_{e_\mu} + g(z_{y'})$. Otherwise, say the inequality $>$ held, adding $|\pi_{y'}|_{[\underline{t}, 1]}|_{e_\mu}$ to both sides would give

$$\left| \pi_y|_{[0, \underline{t}]} \right|_{e_\mu} + \left| \pi_{y'}|_{[\underline{t}, 1]} \right|_{e_\mu} + g(z_y) > f(y'). \quad (4.32)$$

On the left-hand side, concatenating paths $\eta := \pi_y|_{[0, \underline{t}]} \cup \pi_{y'}|_{[\underline{t}, 1]}$ and writing the result as $|\eta|_{e_\mu} + g(z_y)$, we see that the left-hand side is bounded above by $\max_{z \in Z} \{ e_\mu(0, z; 1, y') + g(y') \}$. This contradicts the condition in the infimum in (1.21). Hence $|\pi_y|_{[0, \underline{t}]}|_{e_\mu} + g(z_y) = |\pi_{y'}|_{[0, \underline{t}]}|_{e_\mu} + g(z_{y'})$. Given this equality, we make a new choice $(z_{y'}, \pi_{y'}) \mapsto (z_y, \pi_y|_{[0, \underline{t}]} \cup \pi_{y'}|_{[\underline{t}, 1]})$ to satisfy the non-intersecting property. Repeat this procedure for all pairs $(y, y') \in Y^2$, $y < y'$, in the lexicographic order. Doing so produces $(z_y, \pi_y)_{y \in Y}$ that satisfies the non-intersecting property. Let $Y_z := \{y : z_y = z\}$, $Q_z := \cup_{y \in Y_z} \mathfrak{g}(\pi_y)$, and $\mu_z := \mu|_{Q_z}$. By construction, these μ_z s satisfy Conditions (1)–(2) in Proposition 1.6, and Condition (3) holds because $\mu_z \leq \mu$. Let $\nu := \sum_{z \in Z} \mu_z$, which is $\leq \mu$ by construction. Given the preceding properties, we must have $\mu = \nu$, otherwise ν satisfies the condition in (1.21) with $\nu < \mu$, which implies $I(e_\nu) < I(e_\mu)$ by (3.18) and contradicts the assumption that μ minimizes (1.21). This completes the proof.

REFERENCES

- [ACH24] Amol Aggarwal, Ivan Corwin, and Milind Hegde. Scaling limit of the colored ASEP and stochastic six-vertex models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.01341*, 2024.
- [Bak13] Yuri Bakhtin. The Burgers equation with Poisson random forcing. *Ann Probab*, 41(4):2961–2989, 2013.
- [BGS21] R. Basu, S. Ganguly, and A. Sly. Upper tail large deviations in first passage percolation. *Comm Pure Appl Math*, 74(8):1577–1640, 2021.
- [CC22] Mattia Cafasso and Tom Claeys. A Riemann–Hilbert approach to the lower tail of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation. *Comm Pure Appl Math*, 75(3):493–540, 2022.
- [CG20a] Ivan Corwin and Promit Ghosal. KPZ equation tails for general initial data. *Electron J Probab*, 25, 2020.
- [CG20b] Ivan Corwin and Promit Ghosal. Lower tail of the KPZ equation. *Duke Math J*, 169(7):1329–1395, 2020.
- [CGK⁺18] Ivan Corwin, Promit Ghosal, Alexandre Krajenbrink, Pierre Le Doussal, and Li-Cheng Tsai. Coulomb-gas electrostatics controls large fluctuations of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation. *Phys Rev Lett*, 121(6):060201, 2018.
- [CH14] Ivan Corwin and Alan Hammond. Brownian Gibbs property for Airy line ensembles. *Invent Math*, 195(2):441–508, 2014.
- [CH16] Ivan Corwin and Alan Hammond. KPZ line ensemble. *Probab Theory Related Fields*, 166:67–185, 2016.
- [Cor12] Ivan Corwin. The Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation and universality class. *Random Matrices: Theory Appl*, 1(01):1130001, 2012.
- [Dau23] Duncan Dauvergne. Wiener densities for the Airy line ensemble. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00097*, 2023.
- [DDV24] Sayan Das, Duncan Dauvergne, and Bálint Virág. Upper tail large deviations of the directed landscape. *arXiv:2405.14924*, 2024.
- [DLM23] Sayan Das, Yuchen Liao, and Matteo Mucciconi. Large deviations for the q -deformed polynuclear growth. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01179*, 2023.
- [DLOW03] Camillo De Lellis, Felix Otto, and Michael Westdickenberg. Structure of entropy solutions for multi-dimensional scalar conservation laws. *Arch Ration Mech Anal*, 170(2):137–184, 2003.
- [DLOW04] Camillo De Lellis, Felix Otto, and Michael Westdickenberg. Minimal entropy conditions for Burgers equation. *Quart Appl Math*, 62(4):687–700, 2004.
- [DLR03] Camillo De Lellis and Tristan Rivière. The rectifiability of entropy measures in one space dimension. *J Math Pures Appl (9)*, 82(10):1343–1367, 2003.
- [DOV22] Duncan Dauvergne, Janosch Ortmann, and Balint Virag. The directed landscape. *Acta Mathematica*, 229(2), 2022.
- [DT21] Sayan Das and Li-Cheng Tsai. Fractional moments of the stochastic heat equation. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 57(2):778–799, 2021.
- [DV21] D. Dauvergne and B. Virág. The scaling limit of the longest increasing subsequence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08210*, 2021.
- [DZ99] J.D. Deuschel and O. Zeitouni. On increasing subsequences of I.I.D. samples. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 8(3):247–263, 1999.
- [DZ22] Sayan Das and Weitao Zhu. Upper-tail large deviation principle for the ASEP. *Electron J Probab*, 27:1–34, 2022.
- [EJ17] Elnur Emrah and Chris Janjigian. Large deviations for some corner growth models with inhomogeneity. *Markov Processes Relat Fields*, 23:267–312, 2017.
- [Eva22] Lawrence C Evans. *Partial differential equations*, volume 19. American Mathematical Society, 2022.
- [Gan21] Shirshendu Ganguly. Random metric geometries on the plane and Kardar-Parisi-Zhang universality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.11287*, 2021.
- [GH22] Shirshendu Ganguly and Milind Hegde. Sharp upper tail estimates and limit shapes for the KPZ equation via the tangent method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.08922*, 2022.
- [GHZ23] Shirshendu Ganguly, Milind Hegde, and Lingfu Zhang. Brownian bridge limit of path measures in the upper tail of KPZ models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12009*, 2023.
- [GL23] Promit Ghosal and Yier Lin. Lyapunov exponents of the SHE under general initial data. In *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probabilites et statistiques*, volume 59, pages 476–502. Institut Henri Poincaré, 2023.
- [GLLT23] Pierre Yves Gaudreau Lamarre, Yier Lin, and Li-Cheng Tsai. KPZ equation with a small noise, deep upper tail and limit shape. *Probab Theory Related Fields*, pages 1–36, 2023.

- [GP13] François Golse and Benoît Perthame. Optimal regularizing effect for scalar conservation laws. *Rev Mat Iberoam*, 29(4):1477–1504, 2013.
- [GS13] Nicos Georgiou and Timo Seppäläinen. Large deviation rate functions for the partition function in a log-gamma distributed random potential. *Ann Probab*, 41(6):4248–4286, 2013.
- [HMS19] Alexander K Hartmann, Baruch Meerson, and Pavel Sasorov. Optimal paths of nonequilibrium stochastic fields: The Kardar-Parisi-Zhang interface as a test case. *Physical Review Research*, 1(3):032043, 2019.
- [Jan15] Chris Janjigian. Large deviations of the free energy in the O’Connell–Yor polymer. *J Stat Phys*, 160(4):1054–1080, 2015.
- [Jan19] Christopher Janjigian. Upper tail large deviations in Brownian directed percolation. *Electron Commun Probab*, 24, 2019.
- [Jen00] Lief Jensen. *The asymmetric exclusion process in one dimension*. PhD thesis, New York Univ., New York, 2000.
- [Joh00] K. Johansson. Shape fluctuations and random matrices. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 209(2):437–476, 2000. arXiv:math/9903134 [math.CO].
- [Kim21] Yujin H Kim. The lower tail of the half-space KPZ equation. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 142:365–406, 2021.
- [KK07] IV Kolokolov and SE Korshunov. Optimal fluctuation approach to a directed polymer in a random medium. *Phys Rev B*, 75(14):140201, 2007.
- [KK09] IV Kolokolov and SE Korshunov. Explicit solution of the optimal fluctuation problem for an elastic string in a random medium. *Phys Rev E*, 80(3):031107, 2009.
- [KLD17] Alexandre Krajenbrink and Pierre Le Doussal. Exact short-time height distribution in the one-dimensional Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation with Brownian initial condition. *Phys Rev E*, 96(2):020102, 2017.
- [KLD18a] Alexandre Krajenbrink and Pierre Le Doussal. Large fluctuations of the KPZ equation in a half-space. *SciPost Phys*, 5:032, 2018.
- [KLD18b] Alexandre Krajenbrink and Pierre Le Doussal. Simple derivation of the $(-\lambda H)^{5/2}$ tail for the 1D KPZ equation. *J Stat Mech Theory Exp*, 2018(6):063210, 2018.
- [KLD21] Alexandre Krajenbrink and Pierre Le Doussal. Inverse scattering of the Zakharov–Shabat system solves the weak noise theory of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation. *Phys Rev Lett*, 127(6):064101, 2021.
- [KLD22] Alexandre Krajenbrink and Pierre Le Doussal. Inverse scattering solution of the weak noise theory of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation with flat and Brownian initial conditions. *Phys Rev E*, 105:054142, 2022.
- [KLD23] Alexandre Krajenbrink and Pierre Le Doussal. Crossover from the macroscopic fluctuation theory to the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation controls the large deviations beyond Einstein’s diffusion. *Physical Review E*, 107(1):014137, 2023.
- [KLDP18] Alexandre Krajenbrink, Pierre Le Doussal, and Sylvain Prohac. Systematic time expansion for the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation, linear statistics of the GUE at the edge and trapped fermions. *Nucl Phys B*, 936:239–305, 2018.
- [KMS16] Alex Kamenev, Baruch Meerson, and Pavel V Sasorov. Short-time height distribution in the one-dimensional Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation: Starting from a parabola. *Phys Rev E*, 94(3):032108, 2016.
- [KPZ86] Mehran Kardar, Giorgio Parisi, and Yi-Cheng Zhang. Dynamic scaling of growing interfaces. *Phys Rev Lett*, 56(9):889, 1986.
- [LDMRS16] Pierre Le Doussal, Satya N Majumdar, Alberto Rosso, and Grégory Schehr. Exact short-time height distribution in the one-dimensional Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation and edge fermions at high temperature. *Phys Rev Lett*, 117(7):070403, 2016.
- [LDMS16] Pierre Le Doussal, Satya N Majumdar, and Grégory Schehr. Large deviations for the height in 1D Kardar-Parisi-Zhang growth at late times. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)*, 113(6):60004, 2016.
- [Lin21] Yier Lin. Lyapunov exponents of the half-line SHE. *J Stat Phys*, 183(3):1–34, 2021.
- [Liu22a] Zhipeng Liu. One-point distribution of the geodesic in directed last passage percolation. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 184(1):425–491, 2022.
- [Liu22b] Zhipeng Liu. When the geodesic becomes rigid in the directed landscape. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 27:1–13, 2022.
- [LO18] Xavier Lamy and Felix Otto. On the regularity of weak solutions to Burgers’ equation with finite entropy production. *Calc Var Partial Differential Equations*, 57(4):Paper No. 94, 19, 2018.

- [LS77] B.F. Logan and L.A. Shepp. A variational problem for random Young tableaux. *Advances in Mathematics*, 26(2):206–222, 1977.
- [LT21] Yier Lin and Li-Cheng Tsai. Short time large deviations of the KPZ equation. *Commun Math Phys*, 386(1):359–393, 2021.
- [LT22] Yier Lin and Li-Cheng Tsai. A lower-tail limit in the weak noise theory. *arXiv:2210.05629*, 2022.
- [LT23] Yier Lin and Li-Cheng Tsai. Spacetime limit shapes of the KPZ equation in the upper tails. *preprint*, 2023.
- [LW24] Zhipeng Liu and Yizao Wang. A conditional scaling limit of the KPZ fixed point with height tending to infinity at one location. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 29:1–27, 2024.
- [MKV16] Baruch Meerson, Eytan Katzav, and Arkady Vilenkin. Large deviations of surface height in the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation. *Phys Rev Lett*, 116(7):070601, 2016.
- [MQR21] Konstantin Matetski, Jeremy Quastel, and Daniel Remenik. The KPZ fixed point. *Acta Mathematica*, 227(1):115–203, 2021.
- [MS17] Baruch Meerson and Johannes Schmidt. Height distribution tails in the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation with brownian initial conditions. *J Stat Mech Theory Exp*, 2017(10):103207, 2017.
- [MV18] Baruch Meerson and Arkady Vilenkin. Large fluctuations of a Kardar-Parisi-Zhang interface on a half line. *Physical Review E*, 98(3):032145, 2018.
- [NQR20] Mihai Nica, Jeremy Quastel, and Daniel Remenik. One-sided reflected Brownian motions and the KPZ fixed point. In *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*, volume 8, page e63. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [OT19] Stefano Olla and Li-Cheng Tsai. Exceedingly large deviations of the totally asymmetric exclusion process. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 24(none):1 – 71, 2019.
- [PS02] Michael Prähofer and Herbert Spohn. Scale invariance of the PNG droplet and the Airy process. *Journal of statistical physics*, 108:1071–1106, 2002.
- [QS15] Jeremy Quastel and Herbert Spohn. The one-dimensional KPZ equation and its universality class. *J Stat Phys*, 160(4):965–984, 2015.
- [QT21] Jeremy Quastel and Li-Cheng Tsai. Hydrodynamic large deviations of TASEP. *arXiv:2104.04444*, 2021.
- [Qua11] Jeremy Quastel. Introduction to KPZ. *Current developments in mathematics*, 2011(1), 2011.
- [RRV11] J. Ramirez, B. Rider, and B. Virág. Beta ensembles, stochastic Airy spectrum, and a diffusion. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 24(4):919–944, 2011.
- [Sep98a] T. Seppäläinen. Large deviations for increasing sequences on the plane. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 112:221–244, 10 1998.
- [Sep98b] Timo Seppäläinen. Coupling the totally asymmetric simple exclusion process with a moving interface. *Markov Process. Related Fields*, 4(4):593–628, 1998.
- [SMP17] Pavel Sasorov, Baruch Meerson, and Sylvain Prolhac. Large deviations of surface height in the 1+1-dimensional Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation: exact long-time results for $\lambda h < 0$. *J Stat Mech Theory Exp*, 2017(6):063203, 2017.
- [Tsa22] Li-Cheng Tsai. Exact lower-tail large deviations of the KPZ equation. *Duke Math J*, 1(1):1–44, 2022.
- [Tsa23] Li-Cheng Tsai. High moments of the SHE in the clustering regimes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14375*, 2023.
- [TW94] Craig A Tracy and Harold Widom. Level-spacing distributions and the Airy kernel. *Commun Math Phys*, 159(1):151–174, 1994.
- [Var04] S.R.S. Varadhan. Large deviations for the asymmetric simple exclusion process. In *Stochastic analysis on large scale interacting systems*, volume 39 of *Adv Stud Pure Math*, pages 1–27, Tokyo, 2004. Math Soc Japan.
- [Ver24] Julien Verges. Large deviation principle at speed n^d for the random metric in first-passage percolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09589*, 2024.
- [Whi11] Gerald Beresford Whitham. *Linear and nonlinear waves*, volume 42. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [Wu23] Xuan Wu. The KPZ equation and the directed landscape. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00547*, 2023.

(Sayan Das) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

(Li-Cheng Tsai) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH