

SCALING LIMIT OF THE ALDOUS-BRODER CHAIN ON REGULAR GRAPHS: THE TRANSIENT REGIME

OSVALDO ANGTUNCIO HERNÁNDEZ, GABRIEL BERZUNZA OJEDA, AND ANITA WINTER

ABSTRACT. The continuum random tree is the scaling limit of the uniform spanning tree on the complete graph with N vertices. The Aldous-Broder chain on a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a discrete-time stochastic process with values in the space of rooted trees whose vertex set is a subset of V which is stationary under the uniform distribution on the space of rooted trees spanning G . In Evans, Pitman and Winter (2006) [EPW06] the so-called root growth with re-grafting process (RGRG) was constructed. Further it was shown that the suitable rescaled Aldous-Broder chain converges to the RGRG weakly with respect to the Gromov-Hausdorff topology. It was shown in Peres and Revelle (2005) [PR04] that (upto a dimension depending constant factor) the continuum random tree is, with respect to the Gromov-weak topology, the scaling limit of the uniform spanning tree on \mathbb{Z}_N^d , $d \geq 5$. This result was recently strengthened in Archer, Nachmias and Shalev (2024) [ANS24] to convergence with respect to the Gromov-Hausdorff-weak topology, and therefore also with respect to the Gromov-Hausdorff topology. In the present paper we show that also the suitable rescaled Aldous-Broder chain converges to the RGRG weakly with respect to the Gromov-Hausdorff topology when initially started in the trivial rooted tree. We give conditions on the increasing graph sequence under which the result extends to regular graphs and give probabilistic expressions scales at which time has to be sped up and edge lengths have to be scaled down.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Estimates on RWs and locally erased RWs on regular graphs	10
2.1. Decomposition into nearly independent random walk path segments	11
2.2. Estimates on intersections probabilities of random walks	15
2.3. Locally non-erased time indices on regular graphs	22
2.4. Asymptotic estimates	30
3. The RGRG driven by a Poisson point process	36
3.1. Behavior of the RGRG map between re-grafting events	40
4. The Aldous-Broder chain and the skeleton chain	43
4.1. The sets of ghost indices	44
4.2. The skeleton chain	56
4.3. Distance between the Aldous-Broder chain and the skeleton chain	64
4.4. Behavior of the skeleton chain between long loops	66
5. Decomposable paths	76
6. Bounding the GH-distance between the Aldous-Broder chain and the c -RGRG map	81
7. Coupling the cut-times and cut-points	85
8. Proof of Main Result	88
Acknowledgements	90
References	90

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study the scaling limit of an algorithm generating trees that span simple, connected graphs. We say that a graph is simple when it does not contain multiple edges between a pair of vertices nor a self-edge from one vertex to itself. A spanning tree of a finite

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60J80, 60F17, 05C81.

Key words and phrases. Uniform Spanning Tree, Aldous-Broder Chain, Root-Growth with Re-Grafting, Continuum Random Tree, Random Walks on Graphs, Loop Erased Random Walk.

simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ is a subtree, $T = (V, E')$, with $E' \subseteq E$. The uniform spanning tree of G (denoted by $\text{UST}(G)$) is the random tree which is uniformly distributed on the set of all trees spanning G . It is closely related to several other topics in probability theory, including loop-erased random walks ([Wil96]), potential theory [BLPS01], conformally invariant scaling limits ([Sch00, LSW04]), domino tiling [BP93, Ken00], the Abelian sandpile model [Dha90, Jar18], and Sznitman's interlacement process [Tei09, Szn10, Hut18].

A simplest way to generate the $\text{UST}(G)$ is the following: run the random walk, $W = (W(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, on G , where $\mathbb{N}_0 := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, until the first time the walk has visited all the vertices. Obviously, the random subgraph $\mathcal{T} := (V, E')$ with edge set given as

$$(1) \quad E' := \{ \{W(\sigma_v - 1), v\}; v \in V \setminus \{W(0)\} \},$$

where $\sigma_v := \min \{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 : W(k) = v\}$, is a spanning tree of G . Less obvious though, Aldous ([Ald90, Proposition 1]) and Broder ([Bro89, Corollary 4]) showed independently that \mathcal{T} is the $\text{UST}(G)$, or equivalently, $(V, E', W(0))$ is the uniform rooted spanning tree provided that $W(0)$ is distributed according to the stationary distribution of W (compare also with [AT89]). A related algorithm generating the $\text{UST}(G)$ faster than the cover time is the *Wilson algorithm* ([Wil96]) which allows us to sample the $\text{UST}(G)$ by joining together loop-erased random walk paths on G . Given a path segment $\gamma([0, n]) := (\gamma(0), \dots, \gamma(n)) \in V^{[0, n+1]}$, the loop erased path segment $\text{LE}(\gamma([0, n]))$ is the loop free path segment obtained by erasing all loops in chronological order. Recently, some modifications of the Aldous-Broder algorithm have been studied as well ([Hut18, HLT21]).

Exploiting the reversibility of the driving random walk the idea behind the two above algorithms can be turned into *coupling from the past*. For that we consider yet another version of the Aldous-Broder algorithm ([Sym84, AT89, Ald90]). Consider now the random walk $(W(n))_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \cap (-\infty, 0]}$ on the finite simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ run from time $-\infty$ to zero, and let for $v \in V$ and for an interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ bounded by above,

$$(2) \quad L_v(I) := \max \{k \in I : W(k) = v\}$$

be the time of the last visit of v during I . Then it is obvious that the subgraph $G'' = (V, E'')$ with

$$(3) \quad E'' := \{ \{v, W(L_v(0) + 1)\}; v \in V \setminus \{W(0)\} \},$$

is a tree spanning G . Moreover, it is shown in [AT89] that the stationary distribution of the Aldous-Broder chain is for each rooted tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, \tilde{E}, \tilde{\rho})$ spanning $G = (V, E)$ given as

$$(4) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}) = C^{-1} \prod_{x \in V \setminus \{\rho\}} (\deg_G(x))^{-1}$$

with a normalizing constant C . Here we denote by $\deg_G(x)$ the degree in G of the vertex x . In particular, if G is a regular graph, i.e., if all vertices have the same degree in G , then the $\text{UST}(G)$ is stationary for the Aldous-Broder chain.




FIGURE 1. Illustrates an AB-move in the Aldous-Broder algorithm on a lattice graph in discrete time. The red cross indicates the current root. One can see that the new root was already contained in the tree, and thus it gets connected with the old root. At the same time, we erase the edge connecting the new root with the vertex visited one step after the last visit of the new root. Note that here we jump from a spanning tree of intrinsic height 13 to one of intrinsic height 9.

We can use the idea behind this algorithm, and provide a stationary Markov chain, $Y^G = (Y^G(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, with values in the space of rooted trees which we start that time 0 in the trivial tree and which has the $\text{UST}(G)$ as its invariant distribution. For that, we define the Aldous-Broder map (AB-map) that sends the random walk path $W = (W(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ to a rooted tree $(T(n), E(n), \rho(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ given for every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ as follows:

- $T(k) := \{W(0), \dots, W(k)\}$,
- $E(k) := \{\{v, W(L_v(k) + 1)\}; v \in T(k) \setminus \{W(k)\}\}$, and
- $\rho(k) := W(k)$

with $L_v(k) = L_v([0, k])$ as defined in (2). This yields a discrete-time stochastic process,

$$(5) \quad Y^G = (Y^G(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0},$$

taking values in the space of rooted trees of G whose invariant distribution is the UST rooted according to the stationary distribution of the random walk on G .

This so-called *Aldous-Broder chain* starts in the trivial tree $Y^G(0) = (\{W(0)\}, W(0))$ (and trivially rooted at $Y^G(0) := W(0)$), and has the following one step transition (compare with Figure 1): given the current state (T, E, ρ) at say time n , then in the next step with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ we remain in (T, E, ρ) , while with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ we do the following:

(AB-chain) We pick a vertex v adjacent to ρ in G at random according to the simple random walk transition probability $P(\rho, v) = \frac{1}{\deg_G(\rho)}$, where ρ is the current root, and then do the following:

- **Root Growth.** If $v \notin T$, we add v to the set of vertices and we insert a new edge between v and ρ .
- **AB-move.** If $v \in T$, we insert a new edge between v and ρ but erase the edge that connects v with $W(L_v(n) + 1)$.
- **New root.** In any case we let v be the new root.

The main goal of the present paper is to present a scaling limit of the Aldous-Broder chain Y^G for a class of increasing regular graphs including d -dimensional tori of side length N as $N \rightarrow \infty$, $d \geq 5$. For that purpose we encode our trees as rooted metric trees. For that we refer to a pointed metric space (T, d, ρ) as a rooted metric tree if $\rho \in T$ and (T, d) satisfies the following two conditions ([ALW17, Definition 1.1]):

(4pc) (T, d) is 0-hyperbolic, or equivalently, satisfies the 4 point condition, i.e.,

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} & d(x_1, x_2) + d(x_3, x_4) \\ & \leq \max \{ d(x_1, x_3) + d(x_2, x_4), d(x_1, x_4) + d(x_2, x_3) \}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in T$.

(bp) (T, d) contains all branch points, i.e., for all $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in T$ there is $c = c(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in T$ such that for $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$,

$$(7) \quad d(x_i, c) + d(c, x_j) = d(x_i, x_j).$$

We will refer to a metric tree (T, d) as an \mathbb{R} -tree if it is in addition path-connected.

To measure the distance between any two rooted metric trees, (T, d, ρ) and (T', d', ρ') , we introduce the notion of correspondences and their distortion (compare e.g. with [Gro99] or [BBI01a, Theorem 7.3.25]). We call a subset $\mathfrak{R} \subseteq T \times T'$ a *correspondence* if $(\rho, \rho') \in \mathfrak{R}$, and if for all $x \in T$ there is $x' \in T'$ with $(x, x') \in \mathfrak{R}$ and for all $y' \in T'$ there is $y \in T$ with $(y, y') \in \mathfrak{R}$, and denote its *distortion* by

$$(8) \quad \text{dis}(\mathfrak{R}) := \sup \{ |d(x, y) - d'(x', y')|; (x, x'), (y, y') \in \mathfrak{R} \}.$$

Obviously, two metric spaces are isometric if and only if there exists a correspondence between them of distortion zero. We consider two rooted metric trees (T, d, ρ) and (T', d', ρ') to be *equivalent* if there exists an isometry $\varphi : T \rightarrow T'$ with $\varphi(\rho) = \rho'$, and denote by $\mathbb{T}_{\text{metric}}$ the space of equivalence classes of pointed compact metric trees. Define the Gromov-Hausdorff distance (GH-distance) between two equivalence classes $[(T, d, \rho)]$ and $[(T', d', \rho')]$ as

$$(9) \quad d_{\text{GH}}([(T, d, \rho)], [(T', d', \rho')]) := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\mathfrak{R}} \text{dis}(\mathfrak{R}),$$

where the infimum is taken over all correspondences \mathfrak{R} between any representatives from the two equivalence classes. We say that a sequence $([(T_N, d_N, \rho_N)])_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $([(T, d, \rho)])$ in the topology of *Gromov-Hausdorff-convergence* (*GH-convergence*) if

$$(10) \quad d_{\text{GH}}([(T_N, d_N, \rho_N)], [(T'_N, d'_N, \rho'_N)]) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

Note that $\mathbb{T}_{\text{metric}}$ equipped with the topology of Gromov-Hausdorff convergence is a Polish space ([EPW06, Theorem 2]).

As for a scaling limit, it was shown in [EPW06, Proposition 7.1] that the family of Aldous-Broder Markov chains $\{Y^{\mathbb{K}_m}; m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ on the complete graph \mathbb{K}_m with m vertices can be suitably rescaled as follows: suppose that each tree $Y^{\mathbb{K}_m}(0)$ is a non-random spanning tree of \mathbb{K}_m and such that $m^{-1/2}Y^{\mathbb{K}_m}(0)$ converges in the pointed Gromov-Hausdorff topology to some rooted compact metric tree, $X(0)$, as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Then there exists a piecewise deterministic Markov process, $X = (X(t))_{t \geq 0}$, such that

$$(11) \quad \mathcal{L}_{Y^{\mathbb{K}_m}(0)} \left(\left(m^{-1/2} Y^{\mathbb{K}_m}(\lfloor m^{1/2} t \rfloor) \right)_{t \geq 0} \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathcal{L}_{X(0)} \left((X(t))_{t \geq 0} \right),$$

where convergence means weak convergence in Skorokhod topology of random càdlàg paths with values in $\mathbb{T}_{\text{metric}}$ equipped with the topology of pointed GH-convergence. The so-called *Root Growth with Re-grafting dynamics* (*RGRG*), $X = (X(t))_{t \geq 0}$, appearing in the limit is the piecewise deterministic Markovian jump process with the following dynamics: given the current state (T, d, ρ) ,

- **Re-grafting.** For each $v \in T$, a cut point occurs at unit rate $\lambda^{(T,d)}(dv)$ with λ being the length measure on (T, d) (see [EPW06, Section 2.4]). As a result $T \setminus \{v\}$ is decomposed into two subtree components. One of them containing the root ρ . We reconnect by identifying v with ρ , i.e., redefining all mutual distances accordingly.
- **Root growth.** In between two jumps the root grows away from the tree at unit speed.

RGRG is a deterministic pure jump process if started in a tree of finite length. A rigorous Poisson process construction of the RGRG for general initial trees is given in [EPW06]. The RGRG is invariant under the random real tree known as the Brownian continuum random tree (CRT). The CRT appears as the scaling limit of suitably rescaled Bienaymé branching trees with finite variance offspring distribution given a fixed number of m vertices, as $m \rightarrow \infty$ ([Ald91, Ald93]). If we choose for the offspring distribution a critical Poisson distribution and condition on its size to be m , then the resulting tree equals in distribution the uniform tree with m vertices, or equivalently, the $\text{UST}(\mathbb{K}_m)$. This implies that

$$(12) \quad \mathcal{L} \left(m^{-1/2} \text{UST}(\mathbb{K}_m) \right) \xrightarrow[m \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathcal{L}(\text{CRT}),$$

where here \Rightarrow denotes weak convergence of probability distributions on $\mathbb{T}_{\text{metric}}$ equipped with the topology of the GH-convergence.

Apparently, as conjectured by Pitman, the CRT is also the scaling limit of the UST for a class of graphs that are relatively fast mixing. This class includes the d -dimensional discrete torus

$$(13) \quad \mathbb{Z}_N^d = \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}^d \Big|_{\text{mod } N}.$$

And indeed, it was shown in [PR04, Theorem 1.1], that for $d \geq 5$ there exists a constant $\beta(d)$ such that

$$(14) \quad \mathcal{L}\left(N^{-\frac{d}{2}} \text{UST}(\mathbb{Z}_N^d)\right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathcal{L}\left(\beta(d) \cdot \text{CRT}\right),$$

where convergence is with respect to a related topology of Gromov-weak convergence. The constant $\beta(d)$ is of the form $\beta(d) = \frac{\gamma(d)}{\sqrt{\alpha(d)}}$ with

$$(15) \quad \gamma(d) = \mathbb{P}(\text{LE}(\hat{W}^1([0, \infty))) \cap \hat{W}^2([1, \infty)) = \emptyset)$$

and

$$(16) \quad \alpha(d) = \mathbb{P}(Q_{1,2} \cap Q_{1,3} \cap Q_{2,3})$$

where for $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $Q_{i,j}$ denotes the event $\{\text{LE}(\hat{W}^i([0, \infty))) \cap \hat{W}^j([1, \infty)) = \emptyset\}$, and with W^1, W^2 and W^3 independent lazy random walks on \mathbb{Z}^d starting at the origin (see [PR04, Lemma 8.1]). The result was extended in [Sch09, Theorem 1.1] to $d = 4$ up to some logarithmic term correction the scaling factor. Recently, the CRT up to a scaling factor was also shown to be the scaling limit of the UST on sequences of dense graphs that converge in graphon sense and thus also for the UST of the Erdős-Renyi graph in the dense regime ([AS24]).

This convergence was recently stated in [ANS24, Theorem 1.1] to even hold, for $d \geq 5$, with respect to a stronger notion of convergence, namely in the GH-weak sense, and thereby also in the topology of GH-convergence (compare [ALW16]). This suggests that it might be possible to also rescale the Aldous-Broder chain on the high-dimensional in GH-topology such that the scaling limit is invariant under the CRT.

If we observe how the distance of the initial root to the current root is changing over time, then (11) implies that on the complete graph for all initial positions $k \in \mathbb{K}_m$,

$$(17) \quad \mathcal{L}_k\left(\left(m^{-\frac{1}{2}} d^{\mathbb{K}_m}(\rho^{\mathbb{K}_m}(\lfloor m^{\frac{1}{2}} t \rfloor), \rho^{\mathbb{K}_m}(0))\right)_{t \geq 0}\right) \xrightarrow[m \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathcal{L}_0\left(\left(R(t)\right)_{t \geq 0}\right),$$

where here \Rightarrow is weak convergence with respect to the Skorokhod topology for $[0, \infty)$ -valued càdlàg paths, and where $R = (R(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is the *Rayleigh process*, i.e., the piecewise deterministic $[0, \infty)$ -valued Markovian jump process with generator

$$(18) \quad \Omega f(x) = f'(x) + \int_0^1 (f(ux) - f(x)) du, \quad f \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, \infty)).$$

Its invariant distribution is the *Rayleigh distribution* which has density $xe^{-\frac{x}{2}}$, $x \in [0, \infty)$.

In [Sch08, Theorem 1.1, Remark 1.2] the dynamics of the length of a loop erased path of a random walk on \mathbb{Z}_N^d was studied. It was shown that this process has in $d \geq 4$ also the Rayleigh process as its limit. In $d \geq 5$, the result reads as follows: if W_N is the simple random walk on \mathbb{Z}_N^d starting in 0, then

$$(19) \quad \mathcal{L} \left(\left(N^{-\frac{d}{2}} \# \text{LE}(W_N([0, N^{\frac{d}{2}}t])) \right)_{t \geq 0} \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathcal{L}_0 \left(\beta(d) (R(\sqrt{\alpha(d)t}))_{t \geq 0} \right),$$

where here \Rightarrow is once more weak convergence with respect to the Skorokhod topology for $[0, \infty)$ -valued càdlàg paths.

Our main result generalizes this to the whole Aldous Broder chain as follows:

Theorem 1 (Convergence of the Aldous-Broder chain on \mathbb{Z}_N^d , $d \geq 5$). *Let $\{Y^{\mathbb{Z}_N^d}; N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a family of Aldous-Broder chains with values in rooted metric trees embedded in \mathbb{Z}_N^d , $d \geq 5$ which start in the rooted tree $Y^{\mathbb{Z}_N^d}(0) = (\{0\}, 0)$. Then with the constants $\beta(d)$ and $\alpha(d)$ from (14) and (16), respectively,*

$$(20) \quad \mathcal{L}_{(\{0\}, 0)} \left(\left(N^{-\frac{d}{2}} Y^{\mathbb{Z}_N^d}(\lfloor N^{\frac{d}{2}}t \rfloor) \right)_{t \geq 0} \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathcal{L}_{(\{\rho\}, \rho)} \left(\left(\beta(d) \cdot X(\sqrt{\alpha(d)t}) \right)_{t \geq 0} \right),$$

where \Rightarrow stands for weak convergence in Skorokhod space on \mathbb{T}_{metric} in the topology of GH-convergence.

As we see in Theorem 1, the spatial dependencies inherent in the trees spanning \mathbb{Z}_N^d , $d \geq 5$, are not relevant on the space and time scale $N^{\frac{d}{2}}$. Notice that $d \geq 5$ is considered as *transient regime* in the sense that if W_N^1 and W_N^2 are two independent lazy random walk on the torus \mathbb{Z}_N^d , $d \geq 5$, then the mean number of intersections, $H^{\mathbb{Z}_N^d}$ until the mixing time (see (21) below), is uniformly bounded as $N \rightarrow \infty$. In this transient regime the lazy random walk on \mathbb{Z}_N^d allows until a time of the order $N^{\frac{d}{2}}$ for a *separation between short versus long loops* (compare with Assumption 4.1). That is, lazy random walk paths frequently self-intersect by closing loops much shorter than the mixing time, while rarely they are closing a loop longer than the mixing time, and if so its length is of macroscopic order $N^{\frac{d}{2}}$.

On \mathbb{Z}_N^d , the rate at which the latter happens equals $N^{-\frac{d}{2}}$. Thus, running the Aldous-Broder chain on the time scale $N^{\frac{d}{2}}$ results in a finite number of macroscopically long loops. Due to the transience of the random walk on the whole lattice \mathbb{Z}^d , $d \geq 5$, loops of length $N^{\frac{d}{2}}$ would not be observable on \mathbb{Z}^d on our time scale $N^{\frac{d}{2}}$. This explains why the constants $\beta(d)$ and $\alpha(d)$ can be expressed as intersection probabilities of the random walk on \mathbb{Z}^d . This is similar to what is known as the *finite system scheme* which compares the behavior of large finite particle systems or interacting diffusions on the torus with the infinite system on the whole lattice ([CG94, CGS95, CDG04, GLW05]).

To sketch the main ideas of the proof, notice first that due to the local geometry of the torus, the Aldous-Broder chain is very hard to handle on a microscopic scale. We therefore introduce for each $s \geq 1$ with the s -skeleton chain (or skeleton chain) a simpler chain which is still very close to the Aldous-Broder chain in GH-distance. In the s -skeleton chain, at many of the time indices at which the lazy random walk closes a loop of length at most s , we are going to erase this loop completely rather than doing only the required AB-move, i.e., just erasing the edge from the current position of the random walk to the vertex it went to after the last visit of this position. However, in doing so we need to be careful, as a loop of length at most s might be twisted with a loop longer than s in such a way that erasing the smaller loop would disconnect the tree grown so far into two disconnected components (see Figure 3). We want to avoid the latter. For that purpose we introduce the notion of s -ghost indices (see Definition 4.1), and define the rooted s -skeleton tree at a given time $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as the subgraph obtained from the rooted Aldous-Broder tree at time n restricted to the non- s -ghost indices at time n . We then assume that the Aldous-Broder chain is driven by a good path $\gamma: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow V$ that is a path with the following two properties: for given $s', s, r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$,

- **separating loop lengths.** there are no loops of length larger than s' and shorter than r ,
- **dense set of $2s'$ -local cut points.** for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $n \geq 2s'$ there is a so-called $2s'$ -local cut point $\ell \in [n, n + s]$ satisfying $\mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell - 2s', \ell]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, \ell + 2s']) = \emptyset$,

where once more we write $\mathbf{R}^\gamma(A) := \{\gamma(n), n \in A\} \subseteq V$ for the range of the path γ over the time index set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$. Under these conditions, loops of length at most s get erased in the s -skeleton chain if they are not twisted with a loop of macroscopic length. The conditions also ensure that we can rule out such a twist if these loops of lengths at most s are not closing too shortly after a time index at which a macroscopically long loop was closed. We can further show that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the s -skeleton chain at time n is connected and thus a rooted tree that is in GH-distance at most r from the Aldous-Broder tree at time n (Proposition 4.18). Finally, the dynamics of the s -skeleton is easy to describe: it consists of *root growth*, *AB-moves* mostly only when a macroscopically long loop is closed, and *erasure of loops* no longer than s .

Consider next a sequence of simple, connected regular graphs $\{G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in the *transient regime*, i.e., such that $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} H^{G_N} < \infty$, where

$$(21) \quad H^{G_N} := \sup_{\rho_N \in V_N} \sum_{i,j=1}^{\tau_{\text{mix}}^{G_N}} \mathbb{P}_{(\rho_N, \rho_N)}(W_N^1(i) = W_N^2(j)),$$

for two independent lazy random walks W_N^1 and W_N^2 on G_N (see (31) for our definition of $\tau_{\text{mix}}^{G_N}$). Put

$$(22) \quad (c^{G_N}(r_N))^2 := \mathbb{P}_{\pi_{G_N} \otimes \pi_{G_N}}(\text{LE}(W_N^1[1, r_N - s_N]) \text{ intersects with } W_N^2([1, r_N - s_N])),$$

and let

$$(23) \quad \Gamma^{G_N}(r_N) := \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{G_N}}[\#\text{LE}(W_N(A_1^N))].$$

Assume that we can find a sequence $(r_N) \subset \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$(24) \quad (\ln(\#V_N))^2 t_{\text{mix}}^{G_N} \ll r_N \ll \frac{\Gamma^{G_N}(r_N)}{c^{G_N}(r_N)} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\#V_N})$$

(compare Corollary 2.18). In order to establish a scaling limit for the skeleton chain on G_N , we further choose $(s_N) \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(25) \quad (\ln(\#V_N))^2 t_{\text{mix}}^{G_N} \ll s_N \ll (\log(c^{G_N}(r_N)))^6 r_N,$$

and rely on the fact that for any time intervals A_1^N, A_2^N, \dots of equal size, $r_N - s_N$, and separated by at least s_N , the segments $W_N(A_i^N)$ are up to time of order $\frac{r_N}{c^{G_N}(r_N)}$ nearly independent and identically distributed like the path segment $W_N([0, r_N])$ of the lazy random walk started in the stationary distribution. Moreover, with high probability lazy random walk paths are good paths up to time of order $\frac{r_N}{c^{G_N}(r_N)}$. We are then using these segments to mimic points in the complete graph. To do so, we refer to a segment $\gamma(I')$ as the s -local loop erased path segment $\gamma(I)$, for a path $\gamma: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow V$, a finite interval $I \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ and $I' \subseteq I$, if $\gamma(I')$ is obtained from $\gamma(I)$ by erasing all loops of size at most s in chronological order. We then say that the j^{th} segment performs

- **Root growth**, if the range $R^{W_N}(A_j^N)$ does not intersect with the range of any of the s_N -local loop erased path segments $W_N(A_i^N)$, $1 \leq i < j$. In this case we glue the s_N -local loop erased path segment $W_n(A_j^N)$ to the tree grown so far.
- an **AB-move**, if the range $R^{W_N}(A_j^N)$ intersects with, say the s_N -local loop erased path segment $W_N(A_i^N)$ for some $1 \leq i < j$. In this case we perform an AB-move on the segments, i.e., we take away the s_N -local loop erased path segment which had latest been glued to the s_N -local loop erased path $W_N(A_i^N)$ before.

With the choice of our scaling parameters we can couple the Poisson process driving the limiting RGRG and the lazy random walk driving the skeleton chain in such a way that with high probability up to time of order $\frac{r_N}{c^{G_N}(r_N)}$ such that we find a Poisson point in the square

$B_{i,j}^{c^{G_N}(r_N)}$ where for $c > 0$

$$(26) \quad B_{i,j}^c := \{(x, y) : (j-1)c \leq x < jc, (i-1)c \leq y < ic\}$$

for some $1 \leq i < j$, if and only if the j^{th} -segment performs an AB-move involving the s_N -loop erased i^{th} -segment. On such an event we obtain good bounds on the GH-distance between the s_N -skeleton chain and the RGRG. As in between two AB-moves branch lengths grow like those of a loop erased random walk and these lengths concentrate around the mean, after rescaling edge length in the Aldous-Broder chain by $\frac{c^{G_N}(r_N)}{\Gamma^{G_N}(r_N)}$, we converge to the RGRG in the Skorokhod topology.

We shall therefore generalize Theorem 1 as follows:

Theorem 2 (Scaling the Aldous-Broder chain on regular graphs: transient regime). *Assume that $(G_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of finite simple, connected, regular graphs in the transient regime, i.e., $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} H^{G_N} < \infty$, and such that we can choose (s_N) and (r_N) such that (24) and (25) holds. Let $\{Y^{G_N}; N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a family of Aldous-Broder chains with values in rooted metric trees embedded in G_N which start in the rooted trivial tree, i.e., $Y^{G_N}(0) = (\{\rho_N\}, \rho_N)$. Then,*

$$(27) \quad \mathcal{L}_{(\{\rho_N\}, \rho_N)} \left(\left(\frac{c_N}{\mathbb{E}_{\pi^{G_N}}[\#\text{LE}^{W_N}([0, r_N])]} Y^{G_N} \left(\left\lfloor \frac{t}{c_N} \right\rfloor r_N \right) \right)_{t \geq 0} \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathcal{L}_{(\{\rho\}, \rho)} \left((X(t))_{t \geq 0} \right),$$

where $\xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]$ here means weak convergence in the Skorokhod space of càdlàg paths with values in $\mathbb{T}_{\text{metric}}$ equipped with the pointed GH-convergence.

Outline. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we introduce the random walk driving the Aldous-Broder chain as well as a locally loop erased version. We then get bounds on the intersection probabilities of a random walk segment with an earlier and locally loop erased segment (Lemma 2.14). We also show a concentration inequality of a locally loop erased segment around its mean (Lemma 2.17). In Section 3 we recall the Poisson point process construction of the RGRG from [EPW06]. In Section 4 we construct with the *skeleton chain* an auxiliary discrete-time chain with values in rooted tree graphs that is close in Skorokhod distance with respect to the pointed GH-distance when rooted tree graphs, and for which it is much easier to prove the convergence to the RGRG dynamics after our rescaling. In Section 5 we show that with high probability the random walk paths on the macroscopic time scale can be decomposed into nearly independent and identically distributed segments separated by gaps with lengths of a slightly larger order than the mixing time. In Section 6 we bound the GH-distance between the skeleton chain and the RGRG. In Section 7 we present the coupling between the Poisson process driving the RGRG and the lazy random walk driving the skeleton chain. In Section 8 we collect all our results and prove Theorem 2. Finally, we discuss that high-dimensional tori in $d \geq 5$ satisfy all of our assumptions.

2. ESTIMATES ON RWS AND LOCALLY ERASED RWS ON REGULAR GRAPHS

In this section we provide estimates on the lazy random walk that will be useful for the proof of our main result. We start in Subsection 2.1 with estimates that allow to compare a family of path segments of the lazy random walk with path segments of an i.i.d. family of lazy random walks. In Subsection 2.2 we give bounds on the mean number of certain self-intersection events involving the lazy random walk. Finally, in Subsection 2.3, we introduce loop-erased and locally loop-erased random walks and state a uniform concentration inequality for the length of (locally) loop-erased path segments (Lemma 2.17).

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite simple, connected graph with a finite vertex set $V = V(G)$ and edge set $E = E(G)$. Write $x \sim y$ if the vertices $x, y \in V$ are connected by an edge, i.e., if $\{x, y\} \in E$. As usual the *degree* of a vertex $x \in V$ is given as $\deg(x) := \sum_{y \in V} \mathbf{1}_E(\{x, y\})$. We then say that $G = (V, E)$ is a finite simple, connected, *regular graph* if the map $x \in V \mapsto \deg(x)$

is constant. To avoid trivialities, we always assume $\#V \geq 2$ (and thus $\#E \geq 1$), where for any finite set A , we denote by $\#A$ its *cardinality*.

We consider the time-homogeneous discrete-time Markov chain $W := (W_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ such that

$$(28) \quad \mathbb{P}_x(W(1) = y) = \mathbb{P}(W(1) = y | W(0) = x) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } x = y, \\ \frac{1}{2\deg(x)}, & x \sim y \in V. \end{cases}$$

We refer to W as the *lazy random walk* on G .

Obviously, W is irreducible and reversible. Also, the degree distribution

$$(29) \quad \pi^G(x) := \frac{\deg(x)}{2\#E}, \quad x \in V,$$

is the stationary distribution. Specifically, if $G = (V, E)$ is a regular graph, then π^G is the uniform distribution on V , i.e., $\pi^G(x) \equiv (\#V)^{-1}$ for $x \in V$. Moreover, W is aperiodic. Thus, $W(n)$ converges, in distribution, to π^G , as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

For all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we denote by

$$(30) \quad t_{\text{mix}, \ell_\infty}^G(W; \varepsilon) := \min \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \max_{x, y \in V} \left| \frac{\mathbb{P}_x(W(n) = y)}{\pi^G(y)} - 1 \right| \leq \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Put

$$(31) \quad t_{\text{mix}}^G = t_{\text{mix}}^G(W) := t_{\text{mix}, \ell_\infty}^G(W; \frac{1}{4}).$$

That is, for any $n \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G$ and $x, y \in V$,

$$(32) \quad \frac{3}{4}\pi^G(y) \leq \mathbb{P}_x(W(n) = y) \leq \frac{5}{4}\pi^G(y).$$

2.1. Decomposition into nearly independent random walk path segments. In this subsection we decompose the path of a lazy random walk into nearly independent segments.

We refer to $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ as a path on G iff $\{\gamma(n), \gamma(n+1)\} \in E$ or $\gamma(n+1) = \gamma(n)$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. For any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $m \leq n$, abbreviate

$$(33) \quad [m, n] := \{j \in \mathbb{N}_0 : m \leq j \leq n\}.$$

We use the convention $[m, n] = \emptyset$ if $m > n$.

If $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$, we write

$$(34) \quad \gamma(I) := (\gamma(n) : n \in I) \in V^{\#I},$$

for the map which sends each time index $n \in I$ to a vertex $\gamma(n) \in V$. If I is a finite interval, i.e., $I = [m, n]$ for some $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $m \leq n$, then $\gamma(I)$ yields a *path segment*. By convention we define $\gamma(\emptyset) := \emptyset$.

For two lazy random walks (W_1, W_2) , we denote by $\mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}$ their joint law when each starts independently from the stationary distribution, and $\mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}$ starting each on the same vertex $\rho \in V$. Similarly, for several lazy random walks, the notation $\mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \dots \otimes \pi^G}$ will be used.

The first result extends [Sch09, Lemma 2.5]. It says that probabilities of path segments $W(A_1), \dots, W(A_k)$ of a lazy random walk, each happening after a long period of time, can be bounded by path segments of *independent* random walks $W_1(A_1), \dots, W_k(A_k)$ that start in the stationary distribution. After this lemma, we give a more precise estimate to *approximate* such quantities.

Lemma 2.1 (Nearly independent after mixing). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite simple, connected graph, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and W, W_1, \dots, W_k independent lazy random walks on G . Consider $s \in \mathbb{N}$ with $s \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$, and finite intervals A_1, \dots, A_k with $\min(A_1) \geq s$, $\min(A_{i+1}) - \max(A_i) \geq s$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$. Then for all $F : V^{\sum_{i=1}^k \#A_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\rho \in V$,*

$$(35) \quad \mathbb{E}_\rho \left[F(W(A_1), \dots, W(A_k)) \right] \leq 2^k \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G \otimes \dots \otimes \pi^G} \left[F(W_1(A_1), \dots, W_k(A_k)) \right],$$

and

$$(36) \quad \mathbb{E}_\rho \left[F(W(A_1), \dots, W(A_k)) \right] \geq 2^{-k} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G \otimes \dots \otimes \pi^G} \left[F(W_1(A_1), \dots, W_k(A_k)) \right].$$

Remark 2.2. In the setting of Lemma 2.1, note that since each W_1, \dots, W_k starts in the stationary distribution, we have

$$(37) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G \otimes \dots \otimes \pi^G} \left[F(W_1(A_1), \dots, W_k(A_k)) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G \otimes \dots \otimes \pi^G} \left[F(W_1([1, \#A_1]), \dots, W_k([1, \#A_k])) \right].$$

The latter implies that the expectation, only depends on the length of the intervals A_1, \dots, A_k .

Proof. We will show that for all $\gamma_i \in V^{\#A_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, and all $\rho \in V$,

$$(38) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho \left(W(A_1) = \gamma_1, \dots, W(A_k) = \gamma_k \right) \leq 2^k \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G} \left(W(A_i) = \gamma_i \right).$$

For that we shall proceed by induction on k . Let $k = 1$ and define $A - b := \{a - b : a \in A\}$, for any finite non-empty interval A and $b \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since $\min A_1 - 1 \geq s - 1 \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G$, then for all $\gamma \in V^{\#A_1}$ and all $\rho \in V$, by (32),

$$(39) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\rho \left(W(A_1) = \gamma \right) &= \sum_{v \in V} \mathbb{P}_\rho \left(W(\min A_1 - 1) = v \right) \mathbb{P}_v \left(W(A_1 - \min A_1 + 1) = \gamma \right) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{v \in V} \pi^G(v) \mathbb{P}_v \left(W([1, \#A_1]) = \gamma \right) \\ &= 2 \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G} \left(W(A_1) = \gamma \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by stationarity.

Assume next that (38) holds for all $k \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$ for some $m \geq 2$. Then, writing $\gamma_i := (\gamma_i(1), \dots, \gamma_i(\#A_i)) \in V^{\#A_i}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, then for any $\rho \in V$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_\rho \left(W(A_1) = \gamma_1, \dots, W(A_m) = \gamma_m \right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_\rho \left(W(A_1) = \gamma_1, \dots, W(A_{m-1}) = \gamma_{m-1} \right) \mathbb{P}_{\gamma_{m-1}(\#A_{m-1})} \left(W(A_m - \max A_{m-1}) = \gamma_m \right) \\
(40) \quad &\leq 2^{m-1} \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G} \left(W(A_i) = \gamma_i \right) 2 \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G} \left(W(A_m - \max A_{m-1}) = \gamma_m \right) \\
&= 2^m \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G} \left(W(A_i) = \gamma_i \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have applied the induction hypothesis and (39) in the third line together with the assumption $\min A_m - \max A_{m-1} \geq s$.

The proof of (36) is similar by using the lower bound in (32). \square

Recall from (30) the uniform mixing time $t_{\text{mix}, \ell_\infty}^G(W; \varepsilon)$ of a lazy random walk on G . For all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we denote by

$$\begin{aligned}
(41) \quad t_{\text{mix}, \ell_1}^G(W; \varepsilon) &:= \min \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \max_{x \in V} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{y \in V} |\mathbb{P}_x(W(n) = y) - \pi^G(y)| \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
&= \min \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \max_{x \in V, A \subseteq V} |\mathbb{P}_x(W(n) \in A) - \pi^G(A)| \leq \varepsilon \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that if $G = (V, E)$ is a finite simple, connected, regular graph such that $\#V \geq 2$, then for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$(42) \quad t_{\text{mix}, \ell_1}^G(W; \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \leq t_{\text{mix}, \ell_\infty}^G(W; \varepsilon) \leq t_{\text{mix}, \ell_1}^G(W; \frac{\varepsilon}{\#V})$$

We are thus in a position to apply [LP17, (4.32)] together (32), to conclude that for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \geq qt_{\text{mix}}^G$,

$$(43) \quad \max_{x \in V} \sum_{y \in V} |\mathbb{P}_x(W(n) = y) - \pi^G(y)| \leq 2 \cdot 4^{-q}.$$

Lemma 2.3 (Distance to independence). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite simple, connected, regular graph, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and W, W_1, \dots, W_k independent lazy random walks on G . If $s, q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $s \geq qt_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$, then for all finite non-empty intervals $A_1, \dots, A_k \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $\min(A_1) \geq s$, $\min(A_{i+1}) - \max(A_i) \geq s$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$, all functions $F : V^{\sum_{i=1}^k \#A_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and all $\rho \in V$,*

$$(44) \quad \left| \mathbb{E}_\rho [F(W(A_1), \dots, W(A_k))] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G \otimes \dots \otimes \pi^G} [F(W_1(A_1), \dots, W_k(A_k))] \right| \leq 2k4^{-q} \|F\|_\infty.$$

Proof. Note that by the triangle inequality it is enough to show that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\rho \in V$, we have

$$(45) \quad \sum_{\gamma_1 \in V^{\#A_1}, \dots, \gamma_k \in V^{\#A_k}} \left| \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(A_1) = \gamma_1, \dots, W(A_k) = \gamma_k) - \prod_{j=1}^k \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W(A_j) = \gamma_j) \right| \leq 2k4^{-q}.$$

Indeed, for $k = 1$, we see that

$$(46) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_\rho[F(W(A_1))] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G}[F(W_1(A_1))] \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{\gamma_1 \in V^{\#A_1}} F(\gamma_1) \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(A_1) = \gamma_1) - \sum_{\gamma_1 \in V^{\#A_1}} F(\gamma_1) \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W(A_1) = \gamma_1) \right| \\ &\leq \|F\|_\infty \sum_{\gamma_1 \in V^{\#A_1}} \left| \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(A_1) = \gamma_1) - \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W(A_1) = \gamma_1) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

and a similar argument for general k shows that (45) is sufficient.

We shall proceed by induction over $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $k = 1$, and consider $A_1 \subset \mathbb{N}$ a non-empty interval with $\min(A_1) \geq s$. To prove (45), we sum over all $\gamma := (\gamma(1), \dots, \gamma(\#A_1)) \in V^{\#A_1}$ and apply the Markov property at time $\min A_1$. Recall the notation, $A_1 - b := \{a - b : a \in A_1\}$, for $b \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and set $\tilde{\gamma} = (\gamma(2), \dots, \gamma(\#A_1)) \in V^{\#A_1 - 1}$. Thus, for all $\rho \in V$ we have that

$$(47) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{\gamma \in V^{\#A_1}} \left| \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(A_1) = \gamma) - \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W(A_1) = \gamma) \right| \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in V^{\#A_1}} \left| \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(\min A_1) = \gamma(1)) \mathbb{P}_{\gamma(1)}(W(A_1 - \min A_1) = \gamma) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{1}{\#V} \mathbb{P}_{\gamma(1)}(W(A_1 - \min A_1) = \gamma) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{\gamma(1) \in V} \left| \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(\min A_1) = \gamma(1)) - \frac{1}{\#V} \right| \sum_{\tilde{\gamma} \in V^{\#A_1 - 1}} \mathbb{P}_{\gamma(1)}(W(A_1 \setminus \{\min A_1\} - \min A_1) = \tilde{\gamma}) \\ &= \sum_{\gamma(1) \in V} \left| \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(\min A_1) = \gamma(1)) - \frac{1}{\#V} \right| \\ &\leq 2 \cdot 4^{-q}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used in the second line that used that π^G is the stationary distribution, and (43) in the last line. This implies (45) for $k = 1$.

Assume next that the statement (45) holds for all $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We shall show that it also holds with $k = m + 1$. Fix $\rho \in V$. Then conditioning on the history up to time $\max A_m$, noting that $\min A_{m+1} - \max A_m \geq s$ (which implies no overlap between the sets),

adding a zero and using the triangle inequality, we have

(48)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\gamma_1 \in V^{\#A_1}, \dots, \gamma_{m+1} \in V^{\#A_{m+1}}} \left| \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(A_1) = \gamma_1, \dots, W(A_{m+1}) = \gamma_{m+1}) - \prod_{j=1}^{m+1} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W(A_j) = \gamma_j) \right| \\
& \leq \sum_{\gamma_1 \in V^{\#A_1}, \dots, \gamma_{m+1} \in V^{\#A_{m+1}}} \left\{ \left| \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(A_1) = \gamma_1, \dots, W(A_m) = \gamma_m) - \prod_{j=1}^m \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W(A_j) = \gamma_j) \right| \right. \\
& \quad \left. \mathbb{P}_{W(\max A_m)}(W(A_{m+1} - \max A_m) = \gamma_{m+1}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left| \mathbb{P}_{W(\max A_m)}(W(A_{m+1} - \max A_m) = \gamma_{m+1}) - \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W(A_{m+1}) = \gamma_{m+1}) \right| \prod_{j=1}^m \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W(A_j) = \gamma_j) \right\} \\
& \leq 2(m+1)4^{-q}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used in the last line the induction hypothesis with $k = m$ and $k = 1$. As the right hand side in the second last line does not depend on ρ the claim (45), and thus (44) follows. \square

2.2. Estimates on intersections probabilities of random walks. In this subsection, we bound probabilities on self-intersection of random walks. For a path $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ and $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$, we write

$$(49) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma(A) := \{\gamma(n) : n \in A\} \subseteq V.$$

for the *range* of $\gamma(A)$, i.e., the set of distinct vertices visited by γ during times in A . By convention we define $\mathbf{R}^\gamma(\emptyset) = \emptyset$.

Proposition 2.4 (Range self-intersection probabilities). *Let W be the lazy random walk on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$. If $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $s \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$, and if $A_1, A_2, A_3 \subset \mathbb{N}$ are finite intervals with $\min(A_1) \geq s$ and $\min(A_{i+1}) - \max(A_i) \geq s$, $i = 1, 2$, then for all $\rho \in V$,*

$$(50) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathbf{R}^W(A_1) \cap \mathbf{R}^W(A_2) \neq \emptyset) \leq \frac{4\#A_1\#A_2}{\#V},$$

and

$$(51) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathbf{R}^W(A_1) \cap \mathbf{R}^W(A_2) \neq \emptyset, \mathbf{R}^W(A_1) \cap \mathbf{R}^W(A_3) \neq \emptyset) \leq \frac{8(\#A_1)^2\#A_2\#A_3}{(\#V)^2}.$$

Proof. Let W_1, W_2, W_3 be i.i.d. lazy random walks on G and independent of W . Recall that since we assume that G is a regular graph, for all $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$(52) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W_i(n) = x) = \pi^G(x) = \frac{1}{\#V}, \quad x \in V.$$

We start with the proof of (50). It follows from (35) in Lemma 2.1 that

$$(53) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathbf{R}^W(A_1) \cap \mathbf{R}^W(A_2) \neq \emptyset) &\leq 4\mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(\mathbf{R}^{W_1}(A_1) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}(A_2) \neq \emptyset) \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{n \in A_1, m \in A_2} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(W_1(n) = W_2(m)). \end{aligned}$$

By independence and (52), we have that for all $m \in A_1, n \in A_2$,

$$(54) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(W_1(n) = W_2(m)) = \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W_1(n) = x) \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W_1(m) = x) = \frac{1}{\#V}.$$

Thus (50) follows from (53).

Next we prove (51). It follows from (35) in Lemma 2.1 that

$$(55) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathbf{R}^W(A_1) \cap \mathbf{R}^W(A_2) \neq \emptyset, \mathbf{R}^W(A_1) \cap \mathbf{R}^W(A_3) \neq \emptyset) \\ &\leq 8\mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(\mathbf{R}^{W_1}(A_1) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}(A_2) \neq \emptyset, \mathbf{R}^{W_1}(A_1) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_3}(A_3) \neq \emptyset) \\ &\leq 8 \sum_{n, u \in A_1, m \in A_2, v \in A_3} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(W_1(n) = W_2(m), W_1(u) = W_3(v)). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by independence and (52),

$$(56) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(W_1(n) = W_2(m), W_1(u) = W_3(v)) \\ &= \sum_{x_1, x_2 \in V} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W_2(m) = x_1) \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W_3(v) = x_2) \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W_1(n) = x_1, W_1(u) = x_2) = \frac{1}{(\#V)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (51) follows from (55). \square

We can prove an analogous formula to (50) for which in Proposition 2.4 the assumption $\min(A_1) \geq s$ is dropped.

Corollary 2.5 (Range self-intersection probabilities starting at zero). *Let W be the lazy random walk on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$. If $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $s \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$, and if $A_1, A_2 \subset \mathbb{N}$ are finite intervals with $\min(A_1) = 0$ and $\min(A_2) - \max(A_1) \geq s$, then for all $\rho \in V$ we have*

$$(57) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathbf{R}^W(A_1) \cap \mathbf{R}^W(A_2) \neq \emptyset) \leq \frac{2\#A_1\#A_2}{\#V}.$$

Proof. The proof follows the same lines as the proof of (50) in Proposition 2.4. Indeed, let W_1 and W_2 be two independent lazy random walks on G . Then, by a proof analogous to that of (35) in Lemma 2.1, we have that

$$(58) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathbf{R}^W(A_1) \cap \mathbf{R}^W(A_2) \neq \emptyset) \leq 2\mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \pi^G)}(\mathbf{R}^{W_1}(A_1) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}(A_2) \neq \emptyset).$$

Note that (58) and an argument analogous to the proof of (50) in Proposition 2.4 (using also (52)) imply that

$$(59) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\rho(R^W(A_1) \cap R^W(A_2)) \neq \emptyset \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{n \in A_1} \sum_{m \in A_2} \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_\rho(W_1(n) = x) \mathbb{P}_{\pi_G}(W_2(m) = x) = \frac{2\#A_1\#A_2}{\#V}. \end{aligned}$$

□

For a given path $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$, and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m < n$ and $\gamma(n) = \gamma(m)$, we refer to $\gamma([m, n])$ as a loop of length $n - m$. The next lemma estimates the probability that up to a given time there are no loops of an intermediate length.

Lemma 2.6 (Separation of s' -short and r -long loops). *Fix $s', r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq s' + 1$ and $s' \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$, and let W be the lazy random walk on $G = (V, E)$. Then, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\rho \in V$,*

$$(60) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho\left(W(n) \notin R^W([n + s', n + r]), \forall n \in [0, N]\right) \geq 1 - \frac{2(r - s' + 1)(N + 1)}{\#V}.$$

Proof. For all $\rho \in V, n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \geq s'$, by the Markov property and Lemma 2.1,

$$(61) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(n) = W(n + k)) &= \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_x(W(k) = x) \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(n) = x) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_G}(W(k) = x) \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(n) = x) \\ &= \frac{2}{\#V} \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(n) = x) \\ &= \frac{2}{\#V}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by the union bound,

$$(62) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\rho\left(\bigcup_{n \in [0, N]} \{W(n) \in R^W([n + s', n + r])\}\right) &\leq \sum_{n=0}^N \sum_{k=s'}^r \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(n) = W(n + k)) \\ &\leq \frac{2(r - s' + 1)(N + 1)}{\#V}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the claim. □

We next define *local cut points* that will later be useful in the approximation of the AB chain by the so-called skeleton chain. Note that our definition is slightly different from that in [PR04, p. 13] or [Sch09, p. 337]. These points will be crucial to approximate the Aldous-Broder chain with a simpler chain (see Proposition 4.18).

Definition 2.7 (s' -local cut point). Fix $s' \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$. We say that $\ell \geq s'$ is an s' -local cut point of the path γ if

$$(63) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma\left([\ell - s', \ell]\right) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma\left([\ell + 1, \ell + s']\right) = \emptyset.$$

Note that in accordance with the terminology of [PR04] and [Sch09], we used the name s' -local cut points. Nevertheless, a more appropriate name is s' -separation points, since from their Definition 2.7, they separate a part of the path into two segments that do not intersect.

For all $s' \in \mathbb{N}$ and a finite interval $A \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ of length at least $2s' + 1$, set

$$(64) \quad \mathbf{CP}^{\gamma, s'}(A) := \{\ell \in [\min A + s', \max A - s'] : \ell \text{ is an } s'\text{-local cut point}\} \subseteq A.$$

Next we define the probability that segments of length $s' \in \mathbb{N}$ of two lazy random walks, W_1 and W_2 , on $G = (V, E)$ that start both in the same uniformly distributed vertex and are conditionally independent do not intersect. That is,

$$(65) \quad \bar{q}^G(s') := \frac{1}{\#V} \sum_{\rho \in V} \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}\left(\mathbf{R}^{W_1}([0, s']) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}([1, s']) \neq \emptyset\right).$$

The next result bounds the probability that up to a given time N all times on $[0, N]$ are *at most at distance s* from a $2s'$ -local cut point. It corresponds to [PR04, Corollary 4.1]; see also [Sch09, Proposition 2.13].

Lemma 2.8 (Existence of local cut points). *Let W be the lazy random walk on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$. Fix $s, s', N, q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N \geq s$, $s \geq 6s'$ and $2s' \geq qt_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$. Then for all $\rho \in V$,*

$$(66) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathbf{CP}^{W, 2s'}([m, m + s]) \neq \emptyset, \forall m \in [0, N - s]) \geq 1 - (N - s + 1) \left((\bar{q}^G(2s'))^{\lfloor \frac{s}{6s'} \rfloor} + \frac{s}{3 \cdot 4qs'} \right).$$

We prepare the proof of Lemma 2.8 by showing the following identity.

Lemma 2.9 (Non-intersection probabilities identity). *Let W be lazy random walk on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$. Then for all $\ell \geq s' \geq 1$,*

$$(67) \quad \bar{q}^G(s') = \mathbf{R}^W([\ell - s, \ell]) \cap \mathbf{R}^W([\ell + 1, \ell + s]) \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. Set $\gamma := (\gamma(0), \dots, \gamma(s)) \in V^{s'+1}$. By the Markov property, conditioning on $W([\ell - s', \ell])$,

$$(68) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\pi_G}(\mathbf{R}^W([\ell - s', \ell]) \cap \mathbf{R}^W([\ell + 1, \ell + s']) \neq \emptyset) \\ &= \frac{1}{\#V} \sum_{\rho \in V} \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathbf{R}^W([\ell - s', \ell]) \cap \mathbf{R}^W([\ell + 1, \ell + s']) \neq \emptyset) \\ &= \frac{1}{\#V} \sum_{\rho \in V} \sum_{\gamma \in V^{s'+1}} \mathbb{P}_\rho(W([\ell - s', \ell]) = \gamma) \mathbb{P}_{\gamma(s')}(\mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, s']) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}([1, s']) \neq \emptyset), \end{aligned}$$

where W_2 is a lazy random walk on G . By time reversibility (see e.g., [LP17, (1.30)]), for all $\gamma \in V^{s'+1}$,

$$(69) \quad \pi^G(\rho) \mathbb{P}_\rho(W([\ell - s', \ell]) = \gamma) = \pi^G(\gamma(s')) \mathbb{P}_{\gamma(s')}(W([0, s']) = \gamma_{\text{rev}}, W(\ell) = \rho),$$

where $\gamma_{\text{rev}} := (\gamma(s), \dots, \gamma(0))$. Since $\pi^G(v) = (\#V)^{-1}$, for $v \in V$, we have that

$$(70) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(\mathbf{R}^W([\ell - s', \ell]) \cap \mathbf{R}^W([\ell + 1, \ell + s']) \neq \emptyset) \\ &= \frac{1}{\#V} \sum_{\gamma_{\text{rev}} \in V^{s'+1}} \sum_{\rho \in V} \mathbb{P}_{\gamma(s)}(W([0, s']) = \gamma_{\text{rev}}, W(\ell) = \rho) \mathbb{P}_{\gamma(s')}(R^\gamma([0, s']) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}([1, s']) \neq \emptyset) \\ &= \frac{1}{\#V} \sum_{\gamma \in V^{s'+1}} \mathbb{P}_{\gamma(s')}(W([0, s']) = \gamma_{\text{rev}}) \mathbb{P}_{\gamma(s')}(R^{\gamma_{\text{rev}}}([0, s']) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}([1, s']) \neq \emptyset) \\ &= \frac{1}{\#V} \sum_{\gamma(s') \in V} \mathbb{P}_{(\gamma(s'), \gamma(s'))}(\mathbf{R}^{W_1}([0, s']) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}([1, s']) \neq \emptyset), \end{aligned}$$

where W_1 and W_2 are two conditionally independent lazy random walks on G starting uniformly in the same vertex. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.8. Let $s, s', N, q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N \geq s$ and $s \geq 6s'$ and $2s' \geq qt_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$. Then by the union bound

$$(71) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\text{CP}^{W, 2s'}([m, m+s]) \neq \emptyset, \forall m \in [0, N-s]) \geq 1 - \sum_{m=0}^{N-s} \mathbb{P}_\rho(\text{CP}^{W, 2s'}([m, m+s]) = \emptyset).$$

Moreover, by Definition 2.7, we have that, for all $m \in [0, N-s]$,

$$(72) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\rho(\text{CP}^{W, 2s'}([m, m+s]) = \emptyset) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathbf{R}^W([\ell - 2s', \ell]) \cap \mathbf{R}^W([\ell + 1, \ell + 2s']) \neq \emptyset, \forall \ell \in [m + 2s', m + s - 2s']) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathbf{R}^W([\ell_k - 2s', \ell_k]) \cap \mathbf{R}^W([\ell_k + 1, \ell_k + 2s']) \neq \emptyset, \forall k \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor s/6s' \rfloor\}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\ell_k := m + (6k - 2)s'$, for $k \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{s}{6s'} \rfloor\}$. Next, we use (72), apply (44) in Lemma 2.3 with $A_k := [\ell_k - 2s', \ell_k + 2s']$, for $k \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{s}{6s'} \rfloor\}$, and Lemma 2.9 to obtain that

$$(73) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\rho(\text{CP}^{W, 2s'}([m, m+s]) = \emptyset) \\ &\leq \prod_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor \frac{s}{6s'} \rfloor} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(\mathbf{R}^W([\ell_k - 2s', \ell_k]) \cap \mathbf{R}^W([\ell_k + 1, \ell_k + 2s']) \neq \emptyset) + 2 \lfloor \frac{s}{6s'} \rfloor 4^{-q} \\ &\leq \left(\bar{q}^G(2s')\right)^{\lfloor \frac{s}{6s'} \rfloor} + \frac{s}{3 \cdot 4^q s'}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we used that $\min A_1 = m + 2s' \geq qt_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$ and for $k \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{s}{6s'} \rfloor - 1\}$, $\min A_{k+1} - \max A_k = 2s' \geq qt_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$ and that $[m, m + s]$ has length at least $6s' + 1$ by hypothesis.

Therefore, the combination of (71), (72) and (73) imply our claim. \square

We will close this subsection with an upper bound on $\bar{q}^G(s)$. For that we introduce the following quantity. Let W be the lazy random walk on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$. For $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\rho \in V$, define

$$(74) \quad H_\rho^W(m, n) := \sum_{i=0}^m \sum_{j=0}^n \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(i+j) = \rho) \quad \text{and} \quad H_\rho^W(m) := \sum_{i=0}^m \sum_{j=0}^m \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(i+j) = \rho).$$

We also define

$$(75) \quad H^G(m, n) := \sum_{\rho \in V} \pi^G(\rho) H_\rho^W(m, n) \quad \text{and} \quad H^G(m) := \sum_{\rho \in V} \pi^G(\rho) H_\rho^W(m).$$

Note that for any $\rho \in V$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have $H_\rho^W(m, n) \geq H_\rho^W(0, 0) = 1 > 0$, and thus, $H^G(m, n) > 0$. The next result provides upper bounds for the functions H_ρ^W and H^G which will be useful later in this work.

Lemma 2.10. *Let W be the lazy random walk on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$. Fix $\rho \in V$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m \geq n \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$. Then*

$$(76) \quad H_\rho^W(m, n) \leq H_\rho^W(m) \leq \sup_{\rho \in V} H_\rho^W(t_{\text{mix}}^G) + \frac{5m^2}{2\#V}$$

and in particular,

$$(77) \quad H^G(m, n) \leq H^G(m) \leq \sup_{\rho \in V} H_\rho^W(t_{\text{mix}}^G) + \frac{5m^2}{2\#V}.$$

Proof. Fix $\rho \in V$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m \geq n \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$. Note that $H_\rho^W(m, n) \leq H_\rho^W(m)$ by (74), and clearly (77) follows from (76). Thus, it is enough to upper bound $H_\rho^W(m)$. By symmetry, (32) and (52), we have that

$$(78) \quad \begin{aligned} H_\rho^W(m) &\leq H_\rho^W(t_{\text{mix}}^G) + 2 \sum_{i=t_{\text{mix}}^G+1}^m \sum_{j=0}^m \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(i+j) = \rho) \\ &\leq H_\rho^W(t_{\text{mix}}^G) + \frac{5m^2}{2\#V}. \end{aligned}$$

(Note that $i+j \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$, for $t_{\text{mix}}^G + 1 \leq i \leq m$ and $0 \leq j \leq m$.) \square

Lemma 2.11. *Let W be the lazy random walk on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$. Then, for any $s \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$,*

$$(79) \quad \bar{q}^G(s) \leq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{10s^2}{\#V}\right) \frac{1}{\sup_{\rho \in V} H_{\rho}^W(s)} \leq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{10s^2}{\#V}\right) \frac{1}{\sup_{\rho \in V} H_{\rho}^W(s) + \frac{5}{2} \frac{s^2}{\#V}}.$$

Proof. We call a pair $(i, j) \in [0, s] \times [0, s]$ an s -last-intersection pair if

$$(80) \quad W_1(i) = W_2(j) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{R}^{W_1}([i, 2s]) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}([j+1, 2s]) = \emptyset,$$

and denote by LIP^s the set of s -last intersection pairs on $[0, s] \times [0, s]$. Define also the set

$$(81) \quad \mathcal{O}_s^c := \{W_1(k) = W_2(\ell) \text{ for some } (k, \ell) \in [0, 2s] \times [0, 2s] \text{ with } \max(k, \ell) > s\}.$$

By the union bound, symmetry and (32), for all $\rho \in V$,

$$(82) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}(\mathcal{O}_s^c) &\leq 2 \sum_{\ell=s+1}^{2s} \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}(W_1(k) = W_2(\ell)) \\ &= 2 \sum_{\ell=s+1}^{2s} \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_{\rho}(W_1(k) = x) \mathbb{P}_{\rho}(W_2(\ell) = x) \\ &\leq \frac{5}{2} \sum_{\ell=s+1}^{2s} \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_{\rho}(W_1(k) = x) \pi^G(x) \\ &= \frac{10s^2}{\#V}. \end{aligned}$$

We now claim that

$$(83) \quad \{W_1(0) = W_2(0)\} \cap \{\#\text{LIP}^s \geq 1\} \setminus \mathcal{O}_s^c = \{W_1(0) = W_2(0)\} \setminus \mathcal{O}_s^c.$$

To see this, first choose the largest values $i \in [0, s]$ and $j \in [0, s]$ such that $W_1(i) = W_2(j)$ and $\mathbf{R}^{W_1}([i, s]) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}([j+1, s]) = \emptyset$ (which exist in the event $\{W_1(0) = W_2(0)\} \setminus \mathcal{O}_s^c$). Then by (81),

$$(84) \quad \mathbf{R}^{W_1}([i, 2s]) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}([j+1, 2s]) \cap \left(\{W_1(0) = W_2(0)\} \setminus \mathcal{O}_s^c\right) = \emptyset,$$

which implies (i, j) is an s -last intersection pair. Therefore, on the event $\{W_1(0) = W_2(0)\} \setminus \mathcal{O}_s^c$ we have $\#\text{LIP}^s \geq 1$ and (83) follows. Thus

$$(85) \quad \mathbb{E}_{(\rho, \rho)}(\#\text{LIP}^s) \geq \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}(\#\text{LIP}^s \geq 1) \geq \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}(\mathcal{O}_s) \geq 1 - \frac{10s^2}{\#V}.$$

Note that, by the Markov property, for any $(i, j) \in [0, s] \times [0, s]$ and $\rho \in V$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}((i, j) \in \text{LIP}^s) \\
(86) \quad &= \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}(W_1(i) = W_2(j) = x) \mathbb{P}_{(x, x)}(\mathbf{R}^{W_1}([0, 2s - i]) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}([1, 2s - j]) = \emptyset) \\
&\leq \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}(W_1(i) = W_2(j) = x) \mathbb{P}_{(x, x)}(\mathbf{R}^{W_1}([0, s]) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}([1, s]) = \emptyset),
\end{aligned}$$

since $s \leq 2s - i$ and $s \leq 2s - j$. Therefore by (85),

$$\begin{aligned}
(87) \quad & 1 - \frac{10s^2}{\#V} \leq \frac{1}{\#V} \sum_{\rho \in V} \mathbb{E}_{(\rho, \rho)}(\#\text{LIP}^s) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\#V} \sum_{\rho \in V} \sum_{i=0}^s \sum_{j=0}^s \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}((i, j) \in \text{LIP}^s) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\#V} \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_{(x, x)}(\mathbf{R}^{W_1}([0, s]) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}([1, s]) = \emptyset) \sum_{\rho \in V} \sum_{i=0}^s \sum_{j=0}^s \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}(W_1(i) = W_2(j) = x) \\
&\leq \bar{q}^G(s) \sup_{x \in V} \sum_{\rho \in V} \sum_{i=0}^s \sum_{j=0}^s \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}(W_1(i) = W_2(j) = x).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $\mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}(W_1(i) = W_2(j) = x) = \mathbb{P}_\rho(W_1(i) = x) \mathbb{P}_\rho(W_2(j) = x)$ by independence. Applying Lemma 2.10 together with (69), we obtain for any $x \in V$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(88) \quad & \sum_{\rho \in V} \sum_{i=0}^s \sum_{j=0}^s \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}(W_1(i) = W_2(j) = x) = \sum_{\rho \in V} \sum_{i=0}^s \sum_{j=0}^s \mathbb{P}_x(W_1(i) = \rho) \mathbb{P}_\rho(W_2(j) = x) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^s \sum_{j=0}^s \mathbb{P}_x(W_1(i+j) = x) \\
&\leq \sup_{\rho \in V} H_\rho^W(s) + \frac{5}{2} \frac{s^2}{\#V}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the combination of (87) and (88) implies the claim. \square

2.3. Locally non-erased time indices on regular graphs. In this subsection we give estimates on intersection probabilities of a random walk path with an earlier loop erased or locally loop erased path segment. We will also state a concentration inequality for the length of (locally) loop erased path segments. As commonly known, given a path segment $\gamma([0, n])$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the (s -locally) loop erased path is obtained by erasing all loop (of length at most s) in chronological order (compare with Figure 2). Given a path $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$, and a finite non-empty interval $A \subset \mathbb{N}_0$, we define a function




FIGURE 2. A path segment $\gamma = (\gamma(0), \gamma(1), \dots, \gamma(n))$, $n = 1, \dots, 8, 9, \dots, 14$ together with its loop erasure. Here $\text{NE}^\gamma(1) = [0, 1]$, $\text{NE}^\gamma(8) = [0, 8]$, $\text{NE}^\gamma(9) = \{0, 9\}$ and $\text{NE}^\gamma(14) = \{0\} \cup [9, 14]$.

$\text{NE}^{\gamma, A} : A \rightarrow A$ as follows. Set $\text{NE}^{\gamma, A}(\min A) = \{\min A\}$, and for $n \in [\min A + 1, \max A]$, define recursively

$$(89) \quad \text{NE}^{\gamma, A}(n) := \{m \in \text{NE}^{\gamma, A}(n-1) : \gamma(n) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma, A}(n-1) \cap [\min A, m])\} \cup \{n\} \subseteq A.$$

The name $\text{NE}^{\gamma, A}$ stands for *non-erased* time indices by the loop-erased path on A , that is, $\text{LE}(\gamma(A \cap [\min A, n])) = \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma, A}(n))$ for $n \in A$. Thus $\text{NE}^{\gamma, A}(n)$ represents all the time indices that were not erased by the loop-erased path of γ on A up to time $n-1$, and that are not inside a loop created by the last step $\gamma(n)$ (if any). On the other hand, the erased times indices can be defined recursively by letting $\text{E}^{\gamma, A}(\min A) = \emptyset$, and for $n \in [\min A + 1, \max A]$,

$$(90) \quad \text{E}^{\gamma, A}(n) := \text{E}^{\gamma, A}(n-1) \cup \{m \in \text{NE}^{\gamma, A}(n-1) : \gamma(n) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma, A}(n-1) \cap [\min A, m])\},$$

i.e., $\text{E}^{\gamma, A}(n) = A \setminus \text{NE}^{\gamma, A}(n)$.

For a finite interval $A \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ of length $\#A \geq 2s + 1$, with $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and a path $\gamma : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$, put

$$(91) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A) \\ & := \left\{ m \in [\min A + s, \max A - s] : \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(m)) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([m+1, m+s]) = \emptyset \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We refer to indices in $\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)$ as (A,s) -locally non-erased, which are called *locally retained* in [PR04, Definition 3]. We also define the so-called (A,s) -locally non-erased path as

$$(92) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)),$$

compare with [PR04, Definition 4].

Remark 2.12. Note that $\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)$ only depends on the values of the path segment $\gamma(A)$.

As a preparation we state the following:

Lemma 2.13 (Intersection of independent walks). *Let W_1 and W_2 be two independent lazy random walks on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$. Then, for any $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\rho \in V$,*

$$(93) \quad \mathbb{P}_{(\rho,\rho)}(W_1(n) = W_2(m)) = \mathbb{P}_\rho(W_1(n+m) = \rho).$$

Proof. On the one hand, by independence, we get that

$$(94) \quad \mathbb{P}_{(\rho,\rho)}(W_1(n) = W_2(m)) = \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_\rho(W_1(n) = x) \mathbb{P}_\rho(W_2(m) = x).$$

On the other hand, recall that $\pi^G(x) \equiv (\#V)^{-1}$, for $x \in V$, is the stationary distribution. Then, by time reversibility (see e.g., [LP17, (1.30)]), $\mathbb{P}_\rho(W_2(m) = x) = \mathbb{P}_x(W_2(m) = \rho)$. Thus,

$$(95) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{(\rho,\rho)}(W_1(n) = W_2(m)) &= \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_\rho(W_1(n) = x) \mathbb{P}_x(W_2(m) = \rho) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_\rho(W_1(n+m) = \rho). \end{aligned}$$

□

Recall the definition of (A,s) -locally non-erased time indices in (91). The next result bounds the probability that a segment of the lazy random walk intersects with a locally non-erased path segment of an independent lazy random walk.

Lemma 2.14 (Intersection probability bounds). *Let W_1, W_2 be independent lazy random walks on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$. Then, for any finite intervals $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\#A \wedge \#B \geq 2s + 1$ we have*

$$(96) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(\mathbf{R}^{W_1}(B) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}(\text{NE}^{W_2,s}(A)) \neq \emptyset) \leq \frac{\#B}{\#V} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G}[\#\mathbf{R}^{W_2}(\text{NE}^{W_2,s}(A))].$$

Furthermore,

$$(97) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(\mathbf{R}^{W_1}(B) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}(\text{NE}^{W_2,s}(A)) \neq \emptyset) \\ &\geq \frac{\#B}{4\#A\#VH^G(\max\{\#A-1, \#B-1\})} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi^G}[\#\mathbf{R}^{W_2}(\text{NE}^{W_2,s}(A))] \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Define

$$(98) \quad J = J(W_1, W_2) := \sum_{n \in A} \mathbf{1}_{R^{W_2}(\text{NE}^{W_2, s}(A))}(W_1(n)),$$

and note that

$$(99) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(\mathbf{R}^{W_1}(A) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}(\text{NE}^{W_2, s}(A)) \neq \emptyset) = \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(J \geq 1).$$

The *upper bound* (96) follows from independence, the fact that π^G is the stationary distribution (see (52)) and the union bound. To be precise,

$$(100) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(J \geq 1) &\leq \sum_{n \in B} \sum_{\gamma \in V^{\#A}} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W_1(n) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A))) \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W_2(A) = \gamma) \\ &= \sum_{n \in B} \sum_{\gamma \in V^{\#A}} \frac{\#\mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A))}{\#V} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W_2(A) = \gamma) \\ &= \frac{\#B}{\#V} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G} \left[\#\mathbf{R}^{W_2}(\text{NE}^{W_2, s}(A)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We now prove the *lower bound* (97) we use the second moment method, i.e.

$$(101) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(J \geq 1) \geq \frac{(\mathbb{E}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}[J])^2}{\mathbb{E}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}[J^2]}.$$

Note that by (52),

$$(102) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}[J] &= \sum_{n \in B} \sum_{\gamma \in V^{\#A}} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(W_1(n) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A))) \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G}(W_2(A) = \gamma) \\ &= \frac{\#B}{\#V} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G} \left[\#\mathbf{R}^{W_2}(\text{NE}^{W_2, s}(A)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, by symmetry, we deduce that

$$(103) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}[J^2] &\leq 2 \sum_{n \in B} \sum_{m \in B, m \leq n} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(W_1(n) \in \mathbf{R}^{W_2}(A), W_1(m) \in \mathbf{R}^{W_2}(A)) \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{n \in B} \sum_{m \in B, m \leq n} \sum_{v \in A} \sum_{u \in A, u \leq v} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(W_1(n) = W_2(v), W_1(m) = W_2(u)). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, note that, for $m \leq n$ and $u \leq v$,

$$(104) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(W_1(n) = W_2(v), W_1(m) = W_2(u)) \\ &= \sum_{\rho \in V} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(W_1(n) = W_2(v) | W_1(m) = \rho, W_2(u) = \rho) \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \pi^G}(W_1(m) = \rho, W_2(u) = \rho) \\ &= \frac{1}{(\#V)^2} \sum_{\rho \in V} \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}(W_1(n-m) = W_2(v-u)) \\ &= \frac{1}{(\#V)^2} \sum_{\rho \in V} \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(n-m+v-u) = \rho), \end{aligned}$$

where W is the lazy random walk on G . Hence, (75) and (103) and (104) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\pi_G \otimes \pi_G}[J^2] &\leq \frac{4}{(\#V)^2} \sum_{n \in B} \sum_{m \in B, m \leq n} \sum_{v \in A} \sum_{u \in A, u \leq v} \sum_{\rho \in V} \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(n-m+v-u) = \rho) \\
(105) \quad &= \frac{4\#A\#B}{(\#V)^2} \sum_{\rho \in V} \sum_{i=0}^{\#B-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\#A-1} \mathbb{P}_\rho(W(i+j) = \rho) \\
&= \frac{4\#A\#B}{\#V} H^G(\#A-1, \#B-1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the combination of (76), (101), (102) and (105) show (97). \square

Recall the definition of the function H_ρ^W in (74). The following result bounds the expected number of (A, s) -locally non-erased indices by a fraction of the number of indices in the set.

Lemma 2.15 (Bounding the expected number of (A, s) -locally non-erased indices). *Let W be the lazy random walk on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$. Fix $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$. Let $A \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ be any finite interval such that $\#A \geq 2s + 1$. Then,*

$$(106) \quad \left(1 - \frac{10s^2}{\#V}\right) \frac{\#A - 2s}{\sup_{\rho \in V} H_\rho^W(s)} \leq \mathbb{E}_{\pi_G}[\#\text{NE}^{W,s}(A)] \leq \#A.$$

Proof. The upper bound is obvious. We therefore only need to prove the lower bound. By (91),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\pi_G}[\#\text{NE}^{W,s}(A)] &= \sum_{\ell \in [\min A + s, \max A - s]} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_G}(\mathbf{R}^W(\text{NE}^{W, [\ell-s, \ell]}(m)) \cap \mathbf{R}^W([\ell+1, \ell+s]) = \emptyset) \\
(107) \quad &\geq \sum_{\ell \in [\min A + s, \max A - s]} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_G}(\mathbf{R}^W([\ell-s, \ell]) \cap \mathbf{R}^W([\ell+1, \ell+s]) = \emptyset).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by (107) and Lemma 2.9, we deduce that, for W_1 and W_2 independent lazy random walks on G ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\pi_G}[\#\text{NE}^{W,s}(A)] &\geq \frac{\#A - 2s}{\#V} \sum_{\rho \in V} \mathbb{P}_{(\rho, \rho)}(\mathbf{R}^{W_1}([0, s]) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_2}([1, s]) = \emptyset) \\
(108) \quad &= (\#A - 2s) \bar{q}^G(s).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the claim follows from Lemma (2.11). \square

We continue by transferring the bounds of Lemma 2.15 on the expected number of (A, s) -locally non-erased indices to the expected number of elements in a (A, s) -locally non-erased chain. The following result corresponds to [PR04, Corollary 4.2].

Lemma 2.16 (Bounding the expected number of points in an (A, s) -locally non-erased chain). *Let W be the lazy random walk on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$. Fix $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$. Let $A \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ be any finite interval such that $\#A \geq 2s + 1$. Then,*

$$(109) \quad \left(1 - \frac{10s^2}{\#V}\right) \frac{\#A - 2s}{\sup_{\rho \in V} H_{\rho}^W(s)} - \frac{2(\#A - 2s)^2}{\#V} \leq \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G} [\#\mathbf{R}^W(\text{NE}^{W,s}(A))] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G} [\#\text{NE}^{W,s}(A)] \leq \#A.$$

Proof. The upper bound is obvious. We therefore only need to prove the lower bound. Let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$. Note that

$$(110) \quad \#\mathbf{R}^{\gamma}(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)) = \sum_{k \in \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A) \cap \{\min A + s, k - 1\})\}}.$$

To see this, note that the sum on the right-hand side counts the time indices $k \in \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)$ such that there is not $j \in \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)$ with $j < k$ and $\gamma(j) = \gamma(k)$ (that is, all different values in $\mathbf{R}^{\gamma}(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A))$). Thus,

$$(111) \quad \#\mathbf{R}^{\gamma}(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)) = \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A) - \sum_{k \in \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\gamma(k) \in \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A) \cap \{\min A + s, k - 1\})\}}.$$

On the other hand, note that

$$(112) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\gamma(k) \in \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A) \cap \{\min A + s, k - 1\})\}} \\ &= \sum_{k \in [\min A + s, \max A - s]} \mathbf{1}_{\{\gamma(k) \in \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A) \cap \{\min A + s, k - 1\}), k \in \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)\}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in [\min A + s, \max A - s]} \sum_{j \in [\min A + s, k - 1]} \mathbf{1}_{\{\gamma(k) = \gamma(j), k \in \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A), j \in \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since for any $j \geq s$, $\gamma(j) \in \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}(\text{NE}^{\gamma, [j-s, j]}(j))$ by (89), it follows that if $\gamma(k) = \gamma(j)$ for $k \in [\min A + s, \max A - s]$ and $j \in [k - s, k - 1]$, then

$$(113) \quad \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}(\text{NE}^{\gamma, [j-s, j]}(j)) \cap \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}([j + 1, j + s]) \neq \emptyset.$$

This implies that such an index j satisfies $j \notin \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)$, by (91). The latter together with (112) implies

$$(114) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\gamma(k) \in \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A) \cap \{\min A + s, k - 1\})\}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in [\min A + s, \max A - s]} \sum_{j \in [\min A + s, k - s - 1]} \mathbf{1}_{\{\gamma(k) = \gamma(j), k \in \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A), j \in \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)\}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in [\min A + s, \max A - s]} \sum_{j \in [\min A + s, k - s - 1]} \mathbf{1}_{\{\gamma(k) = \gamma(j)\}}. \end{aligned}$$

By combining (111) and (114), we obtain that

$$(115) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\pi_G} [\#\mathbf{R}^W(\mathbf{NE}^{W,s}(A))] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E}_{\pi_G} [\#\mathbf{NE}^{W,s}(A)] - \sum_{k \in [\min A + s, \max A - s]} \sum_{j \in [\min A + s, k - s - 1]} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_G}(W(k) = W(j)) \end{aligned}$$

Note that, by the Markov property and (52),

$$(116) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_G}(W(k) = W(j)) &= \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_x(W(k-j) = x) \mathbb{P}_{\pi_G}(W(j) = x) \\ &= \frac{1}{\#V} \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_x(W(k-j) = x) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\#V} \sum_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_G}(W(k-j) = x) \\ &= \frac{2}{\#V}, \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain the third inequality we have applied (35) in Lemma 2.1 since $k - j \geq s + 1 \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G + 2$.

Finally, the upper bound follows from (115), (116) and Lemma 2.15. \square

We finish this subsection with a concentration inequality for the length of a locally non-erased chain, on a finite interval. It corresponds to [PR04, (25) in Lemma 5.3].

Lemma 2.17 (Concentration of the length of a locally non-erased chain). *Let W be the lazy random walk on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$. Let $s, q, q' \in \mathbb{N}$ and A be a finite interval $A \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\#A \geq 2s + 1$,*

$$(117) \quad \min A \geq s, \quad 3s + 1 \leq q \leq \#A + s \quad \text{and} \quad s \geq q' t_{\text{mix}}^G + 1, \quad \text{with} \quad q' \geq \frac{\ln(2\#V)}{\ln 4}.$$

Then, for $y > 2(3s + 1 + q^2/(\#A + s))$ and $\rho \in V$, we have

$$(118) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\rho} \left(\left| \#\mathbf{R}^W(\mathbf{NE}^{W,s}(A)) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_G} [\#\mathbf{R}^W(\mathbf{NE}^{W,s}(A))] \right| \geq (\#A + s) \frac{y}{q} \right) \\ & \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{\#A + s}{2q} \left(\frac{y}{q} \right)^2 \right) + \frac{\#A + s}{q\#V}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. This lemma will be proved by breaking down A into smaller segments that are separated by a distance of at least s from each other. Then we approximate the original lazy random walk on each of the smaller segments, with i.i.d. copies of lazy random walks starting from the stationary distribution. This will allow us to apply Hoeffding's inequality and conclude the result.

For $q, s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\#A \geq 2s + 1$ and $3s + 1 \leq q \leq \#A + s$, we define

$$(119) \quad A_j^{(q,s)} := [\min A + (j-1)q, \min A + jq - s - 1] \subseteq A,$$

for $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, where $k = \lfloor (\#A + s)/q \rfloor$. Since $q \geq 3s + 1$, the sets $A_1^{(q,s)}, \dots, A_k^{(q,s)}$ are disjoint. Consequently, by (91), $\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_1^{(q,s)}), \dots, \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_k^{(q,s)})$ are also disjoint. Note also that $\min(A_1^{(q,s)}) = \min(A) \geq s$ and $\min(A_{j+1}^{(q,s)}) - \max(A_j^{(q,s)}) = s + 1$, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$. We therefore have

$$(120) \quad \sum_{j=1}^k \#R^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_j^{(q,s)})) \leq \#R^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A))$$

and

$$(121) \quad \begin{aligned} \#R^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A)) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^k \#R^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_j^{(q,s)})) + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (3s + 1) + \#A + s - kq \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^k \#R^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_j^{(q,s)})) + \frac{\#A + s}{q} (3s + 1) + q. \end{aligned}$$

To obtain the first inequality in (121) note that the number of points between two consecutive intervals $[\min A_j^{(q,s)} + s, \max A_j^{(q,s)} - s]$ and $[\min A_{j+1}^{(q,s)} + s, \max A_{j+1}^{(q,s)} - s]$, for $j \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$, is bounded above by $3s + 1$, while the difference between $\max A - s$ and $\max A_k^{(q,s)} - s$ is bounded by $\#A + s - kq$. Then, the triangle inequality, (120) and (121) imply that, for $y > 2(3s + 1 + q^2/(\#A + s))$,

$$(122) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\rho \left(\left| \#R^W(\text{NE}^{W,s}(A)) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G} [\#R^W(\text{NE}^{W,s}(A))] \right| \geq \frac{(\#A + s)y}{q} \right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}_\rho \left(\left| \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\#R^W(\text{NE}^{W,s}(A_j^{(q,s)})) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G} [\#R^W(\text{NE}^{W,s}(A_j^{(q,s)}))] \right) \right| \geq \frac{(\#A + s)y}{2q} \right), \end{aligned}$$

Let W_1, \dots, W_k be i.i.d. lazy random walks on G with initial distribution given by π^G . Then, (122), (117) and (44) in Lemma 2.3 (using the latter with q') imply that, for $y > 2(3s + 1 + q^2/(\#A + s))$,

$$(123) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\rho \left(\left| \#R^W(\text{NE}^{W,s}(A)) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G} [\#R^W(\text{NE}^{W,s}(A))] \right| \geq \frac{(\#A + s)y}{q} \right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \dots \otimes \pi^G} \left(\left| \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\#R^{W_j}(\text{NE}^{W_j,s}(A_j^{(q,s)})) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G} [\#R^{W_j}(\text{NE}^{W_j,s}(A_j^{(q,s)}))] \right) \right| \geq \frac{(\#A + s)y}{2q} \right) \\ + \frac{\#A + s}{q\#V}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for any path γ on G , we have $\#R^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_j^{(q,s)})) \leq q$. Since, under $\mathbb{P}_{\pi^G \otimes \dots \otimes \pi^G}$, $\#R^{W_1}(\text{NE}^{W_1,s}(A_1^{(q,s)})), \dots, \#R^{W_k}(\text{NE}^{W_k,s}(A_k^{(q,s)}))$ are i.i.d. random variables, (123) and Hoeffding's inequality [Gut13, Theorem 1.3 in Chapter 3] imply that, for $y > 2(3s + 1 + q^2/(\#A + s))$,

$$(124) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\rho \left(\left| \#R^W(\text{NE}^{W,s}(A)) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi^G}[\#R^W(\text{NE}^{W,s}(A))] \right| \geq \frac{(\#A + s)y}{q} \right) \\ \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{\#A + s}{2q} \left(\frac{y}{q} \right)^2 \right) + \frac{\#A + s}{q\#V}. \end{aligned}$$

□

2.4. Asymptotic estimates. In this subsection, we establish asymptotic estimates for the probabilities and quantities introduced in the preceding sections, which will be used in the proof of our main result.

Let $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ be a sequence of finite simple, connected, regular graphs, with $G_N = (V_N, E_N)$, such that $\#V_N \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. For every $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $W_N = (W_N(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a lazy random walk on G_N . Suppose further that there are sequences $(s'_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(s_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(r_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} such that

$$(125) \quad 1 \ll \left(\frac{\ln(2\#V_N)}{\ln 4} \right)^2 t_{\text{mix}}^{G_N} \ll \frac{\ln(2\#V_N)}{\ln 4} s'_N \ll s_N \ll r_N \ll (\#V_N)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

and

$$(126) \quad \left(\ln \left(\frac{(\#V_N)^{1/2}}{r_N} \right) \right)^6 s_N \ll r_N.$$

Next, we introduce Assumption **Transient random walk**, which bounds $H_\rho^{W_N}$ in (74) up to the mixing time $t_{\text{mix}}^{G_N}$. (Compare this with Condition (2) in [PR04].)

Transient random walk: There exists $\theta > 0$ such that

$$(127) \quad \sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{\rho \in V_N} H_\rho^{W_N}(t_{\text{mix}}^{G_N}) = \sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{\rho \in V_N} \sum_{i=0}^{t_{\text{mix}}^{G_N}} \sum_{j=0}^{t_{\text{mix}}^{G_N}} \mathbb{P}_\rho(W_N(i+j) = \rho) \leq \theta.$$

From (74), it follows that necessarily $\theta \geq 1$ since $H_\rho^{W_N}(m) \geq 1$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

The next result is an immediate consequence of our bound on the intersection between a random walk and an independent locally non-erased chain (Lemma 2.14), together with our bound on the expected number of elements in a locally non-erased chain (Lemma 2.16).

Corollary 2.18 (Uniform bounds on (A, s) -locally non erased indices). *Let $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ be a sequence of finite simple, connected, regular graphs such that are $(s'_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(s_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(r_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} that satisfy (125). Suppose also that $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ satisfies the Assumption *Transient random walk*. Let $(A_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(B_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of finite intervals of \mathbb{N}_0 (i.e., $A_N, B_N \subset \mathbb{N}_0$, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$) such that $B_N \subset A_N$, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$,*

$$(128) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#A_N}{r_N} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#B_N}{r_N} = 1$$

Then

$$(129) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi^{G_N}} [\#\mathbf{R}^{W_N}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_N))] = \Theta(r_N), \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

and

$$(130) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\pi^{G_N} \otimes \pi^{G_N}} (\mathbf{R}^{W_N^1}(B_N) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_N^2}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N^2, s_N}(A_N)) \neq \emptyset) = \Theta\left(\frac{r_N^2}{\#V_N}\right), \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $W_N^1 = (W_N^1(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $W_N^2 = (W_N^2(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ are two independent lazy random walks on G_N .

Proof. By (125) and (128), we can assume throughout the proof that N is sufficiently large such that $s_N \geq t_{\text{mix}}^{G_N} + 1$ and $\#A_N \geq 2s_N + 1$.

First, we prove (129). It follows from the upper bound in (109) of Lemma 2.16 that

$$(131) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi^{G_N}} [\#\mathbf{R}^{W_N}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_N))] \leq \#A_N.$$

On the other hand, by (76) (with $m = s_N$) and the lower bound in (109) of Lemma 2.16,

$$(132) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\pi^{G_N}} [\#\mathbf{R}^{W_N}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_N))] \\ & \geq \left(1 - \frac{10s_N^2}{\#V_N}\right) \frac{\#A_N - 2s_N}{\sup_{\rho \in V_N} H_\rho^{W_N}(t_{\text{mix}}^{G_N}) + \frac{5}{2} \frac{s_N^2}{\#V_N}} - \frac{2(\#A_N - 2s_N)^2}{\#V_N}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by (125), (128) and Assumption *Transient random walk*, we have that

$$(133) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi^{G_N}} [\#\mathbf{R}^{W_N}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_N))] \geq \frac{\#A_N}{\theta} + o(\#A_N), \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, (131) and (133) imply (129).

Now, we prove (130). It follows immediately from the upper bounds in (96) and (109) in Lemma 2.14 and Lemma 2.16, respectively, that

$$(134) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\pi^{G_N} \otimes \pi^{G_N}} (\mathbf{R}^{W_N^1}(B_N) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_N^2}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N^2, s_N}(A_N))) \leq \frac{\#B_N \#A_N}{\#V_N}.$$

On the other hand, by the lower bound in (97) of Lemma 2.14, and (77) (with $m = \#A_N - 1 = \max\{\#A_N - 1, \#B_N - 1\}$) and we have

$$(135) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\pi^{G_N} \otimes \pi^{G_N}} (\mathbf{R}^{W_N^1}(B_N) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_N^2}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N^2, s_N}(A_N))) \\ & \geq \frac{\#B_N}{4\#A_N\#V_N} \left(\sup_{\rho \in V_N} H_\rho^{W_N}(t_{\text{mix}}^{G_N}) + \frac{5(\#A_N - 1)^2}{2\#V_N} \right)^{-1} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi^{G_N}} [\#\mathbf{R}^{W_N}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_N))] \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by (125), (128), (132) (or (133)), and Assumption **Transient random walk** we have that

$$(136) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\pi^{G_N} \otimes \pi^{G_N}} (\mathbf{R}^{W_N^1}(B_N) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_N^2}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N^2, s_N}(A_N))) \geq \frac{(\#A_N)^2}{4\theta^3\#V_N} + o\left(\frac{(\#A_N)^2}{\#V_N}\right),$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, (134) and (136) imply (130). \square

Recall the definition of \bar{q}^{G_N} in (65) and $H_\rho^{W_N}$ in (74). In the next corollary we bound \bar{q}^{G_N} . It also proves that Assumption **Transient random walk** and (125), give a bound on the number of times that a random walk on G_N , comes back to its starting position between the first $i + j$ steps, for $i, j \leq 2s'_N$. The latter can be thought as a condition for the random walk on the graph to be transient.

Corollary 2.19. *Let $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ be a sequence of finite simple, connected, regular graphs, and consider $(s'_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(s_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(r_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} that satisfy (125). Suppose also that $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ satisfies the Assumption **Transient random walk**. Then,*

$$(137) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \bar{q}^{G_N}(2s'_N) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\theta}.$$

where $\theta \geq 1$ is the constant defined in the Assumption **Transient random walk**.

Moreover,

$$(138) \quad (\#V_N)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\bar{q}^{G_N}(2s'_N))^{\lfloor \frac{s_N}{6s'_N} \rfloor} = o(1), \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. By (125), we can assume throughout the proof that N is sufficiently large such that $2s'_N \geq t_{\text{mix}}^{G_N} + 1$. It follows from the definition of \bar{q}^{G_N} in (65), Lemma 2.11 (with $s = 2s'_N$) and the Assumption **Transient random walk** that

$$(139) \quad \bar{q}^{G_N}(2s'_N) \leq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{10(2s'_N)^2}{\#V_N} \right) \frac{1}{\theta + \frac{5(2s'_N)^2}{\#V_N}}.$$

Then (137) follows from (139) and (125).

Next, we prove (138). Note that

$$(140) \quad (\#V_N)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\bar{q}^{G_N}(2s'_N))^{\lfloor \frac{s_N}{6s'_N} \rfloor} = \exp \left(\frac{s_N}{6s'_N} \left(\frac{3s'_N}{s_N} \ln(\#V_N) + \frac{6s'_N}{s_N} \left\lfloor \frac{s_N}{6s'_N} \right\rfloor \ln(\bar{q}^{G_N}(2s'_N)) \right) \right).$$

Since by (125), $(s'_N/s_N) \ln(\#V_N) = o(1)$ and $s'_N/s_N = o(1)$, then (138) follows from (140) and (137). \square

Fix $r, s \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1$. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, define the following sub-intervals of \mathbb{N}_0 ,

$$(141) \quad A_i^{(r,s)} := [(i-1)r + s, ir - 1], \quad \text{and} \quad B_i^{(r,s)} := [(i-1)r + 2s, ir - s - 1].$$

The following result gives us the asymptotic order of γ_N and c_N . Its proof is simply an application of (129) and (130) in Corollary 2.18, and (125).

Corollary 2.20 (Uniform bounds on $(A_i^{(r_N, s_N)}, s_N)$ -locally non erased indices). *Let $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ be a sequence of finite simple, connected, regular graphs such that are $(s'_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(s_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(r_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} that satisfy (125). Suppose also that $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ satisfies the Assumption *Transient random walk*. Further, let W_N, W_N^1 and W_N^2 be independent lazy random walks on G_N . Define the sequences $(\gamma_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{R}_+ and $(c_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ by letting*

$$(142) \quad \gamma_N := \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{G_N}} [\#\mathbf{R}^{W_N}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_1^{(r_N, s_N)}))],$$

and

$$(143) \quad (c_N)^2 := -\ln \mathbb{P}_{\pi_{G_N} \otimes \pi_{G_N}} (\mathbf{R}^{W_N^1}(A_1^{(r_N, s_N)}) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_N^2}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N^2, s_N}(A_1^{(r_N, s_N)})) = \emptyset),$$

for $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(144) \quad \gamma_N = \Theta(r_N) \quad \text{and} \quad c_N^2 = \Theta\left(\frac{r_N^2}{\#V_N}\right).$$

We now prove that the length of the range of all $(A_i^{(r_N, s_N)}, s_N)$ -locally non-erased indices is asymptotically close to γ_N , as $N \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly for all i within a specified interval.

Corollary 2.21 (Asymptotic concentration of the length of a locally non-erased chain). *Let $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ be a sequence of finite simple, connected, regular graphs such that $G_N = (V_N, E_N)$, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose also that $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ satisfies the Assumption *Transient random walk*. Assume that we can find sequences $(r_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(s_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that (125) and (126) hold. Let $(\gamma_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(c_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequences defined in (142) and (143), respectively. Further, let $W_N = (W_N(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a lazy random walk on G_N such that $W_N(0) = \rho_N \in V_N$. Fix $0 < T < \infty$. Then, for N large enough, we have that*

$$(145) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\rho_N} \left(\sup_{0 \leq i \leq \lfloor T/c_N \rfloor} \left| \#\mathbf{R}^{W_N}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_i^{(r_N, s_N)})) - \gamma_N \right| \leq r_N \left(\frac{s_N}{r_N}\right)^{1/6} \right) = 1 - o(1).$$

Proof. Our approach involves applying the result from Lemma 2.17. However, prior to its application, we must carefully select the appropriate sequences to ensure that the conditions outlined in Lemma 2.17 are satisfied. First note that Corollary 2.20 allows us to select a sufficiently large value for N such that $T/c_N \geq 2$.

Let $q_N := \lfloor (r_N s_N)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rfloor$, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that $\#A_i^{(r_N, s_N)} = r_N - s_N$ and $\min A_i^{(r_N, s_N)} = s_N$, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. By (125), we can (and will) choose N large enough (independently of $i \in \mathbb{N}$) such that $\#A_i^{(r_N, s_N)} \geq 2s_N + 1$ and the interval $A_i^{(r_N, s_N)}$ satisfies the conditions in (117) of Lemma 2.17 with $q' = \frac{\ln(2\#V_N)}{\ln 4}$. Define

$$(146) \quad y_N := s_N^{2/3} r_N^{1/3}.$$

By (125) we can (and will) choose N even larger and also (independently of $i \in \mathbb{N}$) so that

$$(147) \quad y_N > 2(3s_N + 1 + q_N^2 / (\#A_i^{(r_N, s_N)} + s_N)) = 2(3s_N + 1 + (\lfloor (r_N s_N)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rfloor)^2 / r_N).$$

On the one hand, observe that

$$(148) \quad \frac{(\#A_i^{(r_N, s_N)} + s_N)y_N}{q_N} \geq \frac{r_N s_N^{2/3} r_N^{1/3}}{(r_N s_N)^{\frac{1}{2}}} = r_N \left(\frac{s_N}{r_N} \right)^{1/6},$$

and

$$(149) \quad \frac{(\#A_i^{(r_N, s_N)} + s_N)}{2q_N} \left(\frac{y_N}{q_N} \right)^2 \geq \frac{r_N}{2(r_N s_N)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{s_N^{4/3} r_N^{2/3}}{r_N s_N} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r_N}{s_N} \right)^{1/6},$$

On the other hand, by (125),

$$(150) \quad \frac{(\#A_i^{(r_N, s_N)} + s_N)}{q_N \#V_N} \sim \frac{r_N^{1/2}}{s_N^{1/2} \#V_N}, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, by (150), we can (and will) select a larger N (independently of $i \in \mathbb{N}$) such that

$$(151) \quad \frac{(\#A_i^{(r_N, s_N)} + s_N)}{q_N \#V_N} \leq \frac{2r_N^{1/2}}{s_N^{1/2} \#V_N}.$$

Recall the definition of the sequence $(\gamma_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ given in (142). By combining (148), (149), (151) and applying (118) in Lemma 2.17, we obtain that, for N large enough (independently of $i \in \mathbb{N}$),

$$(152) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\rho_N} \left(\left| \#R^{W_N}(\text{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_i^{(r_N, s_N)})) - \gamma_N \right| \leq r_N \left(\frac{s_N}{r_N} \right)^{1/6} \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}_{\rho_N} \left(\left| \#R^{W_N}(\text{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_i^{(r_N, s_N)})) - \gamma_N \right| \leq (\#A_i^{(r_N, s_N)} + s_N) \frac{y_N}{q_N} \right) \\ & \leq 2e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r_N}{s_N} \right)^{1/6}} + \frac{2r_N^{1/2}}{s_N^{1/2} \#V_N}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by using the union bound and (152),

$$(153) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\rho_N} \left(\sup_{0 \leq i \leq \lfloor T/c_N \rfloor} \left| \# \mathbf{R}^{W_N}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_i^{(r_N, s_N)})) - \gamma_N \right| \leq r_N \left(\frac{s_N}{r_N} \right)^{1/6} \right) \\ \geq 1 - \frac{2T}{c_N} \left(e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r_N}{s_N} \right)^{1/6}} + \frac{r_N^{1/2}}{s_N^{1/2} \#V_N} \right).$$

Next, (144) in Corollary 2.20 implies that for sufficiently large N there is a constant $C > 0$,

$$(154) \quad \frac{2T}{c_N} \left(e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r_N}{s_N} \right)^{1/6}} + \frac{r_N^{1/2}}{s_N^{1/2} \#V_N} \right) \leq \frac{CT(\#V_N)^{1/2}}{r_N} \left(e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r_N}{s_N} \right)^{1/6}} + \frac{r_N^{1/2}}{s_N^{1/2} \#V_N} \right) \\ \leq CT \left(e^{\ln((\#V_N)^{1/2}/r_N) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r_N}{s_N} \right)^{1/6}} + \frac{1}{(s_N r_N \#V_N)^{1/2}} \right).$$

Therefore, our claim (145) follows by combining (153) and (154) together with (125) and (126). \square

In the following corollary, we establish a bound on the number of intersections between the range of a segment and the range of locally non-erased indices from a preceding segment. To that end, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$(155) \quad \mathcal{N}^{\gamma, (r, s)}(n) := \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{R}^\gamma(\mathbf{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A_i^{(r, s)})) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_j^{(r, s)}) \neq \emptyset\}},$$

with $\mathcal{N}^{\gamma, (r, s)}(0) = \mathcal{N}^{\gamma, (r, s)}(1) = 0$.

Corollary 2.22. *Let $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ be a sequence of finite simple, connected, regular graphs such that $G_N = (V_N, E_N)$, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose also that $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ satisfies the Assumption *Transient random walk*. Assume that we can find sequences $(r_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(s_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that (125) holds. Let $(c_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence defined in (143). Further, let $W_N = (W_N(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a lazy random walk on G_N such that $W_N(0) = \rho_N \in V_N$. Then, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $0 < T < \infty$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$(156) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\rho_N} \left(\mathcal{N}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}(\lfloor T/c_N \rfloor) \leq c_N^{-\alpha} \right) = 1 - o(1).$$

Proof. Corollary 2.20 allows us to select a sufficiently large value for N such that $T/c_N \geq 2$. By applying (125), (35) in Lemma 2.1, and possibly increasing N further as needed, we obtain that

$$(157) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\rho_N} \left(\mathbf{R}^{W_N}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_i^{(r_N, s_N)})) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_N}(B_j^{(r_N, s_N)}) \neq \emptyset \right) \\ \leq 4 \mathbb{P}_{\pi^{G_N} \otimes \pi^{G_N}} \left(\mathbf{R}^{W_N^2}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N^2, s_N}(A_1^{(r_N, s_N)})) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_N^1}(B_1^{(r_N, s_N)}) \neq \emptyset \right),$$

for $1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor T/c_N \rfloor$, and W_N^1, W_N^2 two independent lazy random walks on G_N . Thus, by using Markov's inequality and the union bound, we have

$$(158) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\rho_N} \left(\mathcal{N}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}(\lfloor T/c_N \rfloor) \geq c_N^{-\alpha} \right) \\ & \leq 4 \frac{T^2}{c_N^{2-\alpha}} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^{G_N} \otimes \pi^{G_N}} \left(\mathbf{R}^{W_N^2}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N^2, s_N}(A_1^{(r_N, s_N)})) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_N^1}(B_1^{(r_N, s_N)}) \neq \emptyset \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by combining (144) with (130) from Corollary 2.18, we conclude that for sufficiently large N there is a constant $C > 0$ (which may vary from line to line) such that

$$(159) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\rho_N} \left(\mathcal{N}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}(\lfloor T/c_N \rfloor) \geq c_N^{-\alpha} \right) \\ & \leq CT^2 \frac{(\#V_N)^{1-\alpha/2}}{r_N^{2-\alpha}} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^{G_N} \otimes \pi^{G_N}} \left(\mathbf{R}^{W_N^2}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N^2, s_N}(A_1^{(r_N, s_N)})) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_N^1}(B_1^{(r_N, s_N)}) \neq \emptyset \right) \\ & \leq CT^2 \frac{(\#V_N)^{1-\alpha/2}}{r_N^{2-\alpha}} \frac{r_N^2}{\#V_N} \\ & \leq CT^2 \frac{r_N^\alpha}{(\#V_N)^{\alpha/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, our claim follows from (125). □

3. THE RGRG DRIVEN BY A POISSON POINT PROCESS

In this section, we recall the construction of the RGRG from [EPW06] and obtain estimates for the probability of the process to be *decomposable* up to a given time. When the process is decomposable, we will be able to establish a coupling between indices of intersection of paths, coming from the Aldous-Broder chain and from the RGRG (see Section 7).

Definition 3.1 (Nice point cloud). We refer to a set

$$(160) \quad \pi \subset \Delta_+^2 := \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : t \in \mathbb{R}_+, x \in (0, t]\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^2$$

as a nice point cloud if it has the following properties:

- (a) For all $t > 0$, $\#\pi \cap (\{t\} \times [0, t]) \leq 1$ and $\#\pi \cap (\mathbb{R}_+ \times \{t\}) \leq 1$.
- (b) For all $t > 0$, the set $\pi \cap \{(t', x) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : x \leq t' \leq t\}$ is finite.

For a nice point cloud $\pi \in \Delta_+^2$, put $\tau_0(\pi) = 0$ and define recursively for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(161) \quad \tau_i(\pi) := \inf \{x > \tau_{i-1}(\pi) : \exists y \in [0, x] \text{ with } (x, y) \in \pi\}.$$

For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $p_i(\pi)$ be the unique point such that $(\tau_i(\pi), p_i(\pi)) \in \pi$.

We shall introduce the *root growth with re-grafting map* (RGRG map), denote by $\text{RGRG}^\pi := (\text{RGRG}^\pi(t))_{t \geq 0}$, that takes a nice point cloud and maps it to a path with values in the space of rooted \mathbb{R} -trees. For $t \geq 0$, let

$$(162) \quad T_t := [0, t] \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_t := t,$$

and define $\text{RGRG}^\pi(t) := ([0, t], d_t^\pi, \rho_t)$ inductively as follows. Assume we have already defined the process for all $t' \in [0, \tau_i(\pi)]$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We then define the metric d_t^π for all $t \in (\tau_i(\pi), \tau_{i+1}(\pi)]$. We will distinguish the two cases between t being a root growth or a re-graft time.

Root growth. Assume that $t \in (\tau_i(\pi), \tau_{i+1}(\pi))$ and define d_t^π by

$$(163) \quad d_t^\pi(x, y) := \begin{cases} d_{\tau_i(\pi)}^\pi(x, y), & \text{if } x, y \in [0, \tau_i(\pi)], \\ |y - x|, & \text{if } x, y \in (\tau_i(\pi), t], \\ |x - \tau_i(\pi)| + d_{\tau_i(\pi)}^\pi(\tau_i(\pi), y), & \text{if } x \in (\tau_i(\pi), t], y \in [0, \tau_i(\pi)] \\ |y - \tau_i(\pi)| + d_{\tau_i(\pi)}^\pi(\tau_i(\pi), x), & \text{if } y \in (\tau_i(\pi), t], x \in [0, \tau_i(\pi)]. \end{cases}$$

Re-Grafting. Assume that $t = \tau_{i+1}(\pi)$. Given a rooted metric tree (T, d, ρ) and a point $x \in T$, we denote by

$$(164) \quad S_x^T := S_x^{(T, d, \rho)} = \{y \in T : x \in \llbracket \rho, y \rrbracket\}$$

the rooted subtree of (T, d, ρ) above x and rooted at x (here we denote by $\llbracket \rho, y \rrbracket$ all the points between ρ and y in T). Define the metric d_t^π by

$$(165) \quad d_t^\pi(x, y) := \begin{cases} d_{t-}^\pi(x, y), & \text{if } x, y \in S_{p_{i+1}(\pi)}^{T_{t-}}, \\ d_{t-}^\pi(x, y), & \text{if } x, y \in [0, t) \setminus S_{p_{i+1}(\pi)}^{T_{t-}}, \\ d_{t-}^\pi(x, \rho_{t-}) + d_{t-}^\pi(p_{i+1}(\pi), y), & \text{if } x \in [0, t) \setminus S_{p_{i+1}(\pi)}^{T_{t-}}, y \in S_{p_{i+1}(\pi)}^{T_{t-}}, \\ d_{t-}^\pi(y, \rho_{t-}) + d_{t-}^\pi(p_{i+1}(\pi), x), & \text{if } y \in [0, t) \setminus S_{p_{i+1}(\pi)}^{T_{t-}}, x \in S_{p_{i+1}(\pi)}^{T_{t-}}. \end{cases}$$

In words, at time $t = \tau_{i+1}(\pi)$, $\text{RGRG}^\pi(t)$ is obtained from $\text{RGRG}^\pi(t-)$ by pruning off the subtree $S_{p_{i+1}(\pi)}^{T_{t-}}$ and re-attaching it to the root.

Note that the process $\text{RGRG}^\pi(t)$ is càdlàg with respect to convergence in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology.

Remark 3.2 (Poisson point processes are nice). The conditions on π for being a nice point cloud will hold almost surely if π is a realization of a Poisson point processes on Δ_+^2 with the Lebesgue measure λ as the intensity measure. It is this random mechanism that will produce a stochastic process having the root growth with re-grafting dynamics. \square

Definition 3.3 (Root growth with re-grafting (RGRG) process). We define the *root growth with re-grafting (RGRG)* process $X = (X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ by letting for each $t \geq 0$,

$$(166) \quad X(t) := \text{RGRG}^\Pi(t),$$

where Π is the Poisson process on Δ_+^2 with the Lebesgue measure as intensity measure.

For each $c \in (0, \infty)$ and $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq i < j$, consider the square

$$(167) \quad B_{(i,j)}^c := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : (j-1)c \leq x < jc, (i-1)c \leq y < ic\}.$$

For that we need that the point cloud is c -decomposable up to time T in the following sense.

Definition 3.4 (c -decomposable point cloud). Fix $c > 0$ and $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\lfloor \frac{T}{c} \rfloor \geq 3$. We will refer to a nice point cloud $\pi \subset \Delta_+^2$ as a c -decomposable point cloud up to time T if the following holds:

(i) Up to time T each square contains at most one point, i.e.,

$$(168) \quad \mathcal{N}_1^{\pi,c}(T) := \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor \frac{T}{c} \rfloor} \mathbf{1}_{\{\#\pi \cap B_{(i,j)}^c \geq 2\}} = 0.$$

(ii) There are no upper triangles up to time T that contain a point, i.e.,

$$(169) \quad \mathcal{N}_2^{\pi,c}(T) := \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{T}{c} \rfloor} \mathbf{1}_{\{\#\pi \cap E_j^c \geq 1\}} = 0,$$

where upper triangles are subsets of Δ_+^2 of the form

$$(170) \quad E_j^c := \{(x, y) \in \Delta_+^2 : jc \leq x < (j+1)c, jc \leq y \leq x\}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

(iii) Up to time T there are no two squares in the same row that contain a point, i.e.,

$$(171) \quad \mathcal{M}_1^{\pi,c}(T) := \sum_{1 \leq i < k < j \leq \lfloor \frac{T}{c} \rfloor} \mathbf{1}_{\{\#\pi \cap B_{(i,j)}^c \geq 1, \#\pi \cap B_{(k,j)}^c \geq 1\}} = 0.$$

(iv) Up to time T there are no two squares in the same column that contain a point, i.e.,

$$(172) \quad \mathcal{M}_2^{\pi,c}(T) := \sum_{1 \leq i < j < k \leq \lfloor \frac{T}{c} \rfloor} \mathbf{1}_{\{\#\pi \cap B_{(i,j)}^c \geq 1, \#\pi \cap B_{(i,k)}^c \geq 1\}} = 0.$$

In the following we also write for all $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$(173) \quad \mathcal{E}^c(T) := \{\pi \subset \Delta_+^2 : \pi \text{ is } c\text{-decomposable up to time } T\},$$

and let for a nice point cloud $\pi \subset \Delta_+^2$,

$$(174) \quad \sigma^{\pi,c} := \max \{T \in \mathbb{R}_+ : \pi \in \mathcal{E}^c(T)\}.$$

Lemma 3.5 (Decomposability up to time N). *Let Π be a Poisson point process on Δ_+^2 with the Lebesgue measure λ as the intensity measure. Then for all $c \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\lfloor \frac{T}{c} \rfloor \geq 3$,*

$$(175) \quad \mathbb{P}(\sigma^{\Pi, c} > T) \geq 1 - \frac{3}{4}c^2T^2 - \frac{1}{2}cT - \frac{1}{3}cT^3.$$

In particular, $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(\sigma^{\Pi, c} > T) = 1$ for all $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Proof. Note that by the union bound and Markov's inequality,

$$(176) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Pi \in \mathcal{E}^c(T)) &\geq 1 - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor \frac{T}{c} \rfloor} \mathbb{P}(\#\Pi \cap B_{(i,j)}^c \geq 2) - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{T}{c} \rfloor} \mathbb{P}(\#\Pi \cap E_j^c \geq 1) \\ &- \sum_{1 \leq i < k < j \leq \lfloor \frac{T}{c} \rfloor} \mathbb{P}(\#\Pi \cap B_{(i,j)}^c \geq 1, \#\Pi \cap B_{(k,j)}^c \geq 1) \\ &- \sum_{1 \leq i < j < k \leq \lfloor \frac{T}{c} \rfloor} \mathbb{P}(\#\Pi \cap B_{(i,j)}^c \geq 1, \#\Pi \cap B_{(i,k)}^c \geq 1). \end{aligned}$$

Next, by using that for all $x > 0$, $1 - e^{-x} \leq x$ and $1 - e^{-x} - xe^{-x} \leq \frac{x^2}{2}$, we obtain that

$$(177) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Pi \in \mathcal{E}^c(T)) &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}c^{-2}T^2(1 - e^{-c^2} - c^2e^{-c^2}) \\ &- c^{-1}T(1 - e^{-\frac{c^2}{2}}) - (\frac{1}{3}c^{-3}T^3 + \frac{1}{2}c^{-2}T^2)(1 - e^{-c^2})^2 \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{3}{4}c^2T^2 - \frac{1}{2}cT - \frac{1}{3}cT^3. \end{aligned}$$

□

For $c > 0$ we introduce the c -RGRG, denoted by $X^{(c)} = (X^{(c)}(t))_{t \geq 0}$, by letting

$$(178) \quad X^{(c)}(t) := \text{RGRG}^\pi(t \wedge \sigma^{\pi, c}), \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

where π is a nice point cloud on Δ_+^2 . When instead of a nice point cloud, a Poisson point process on Δ_+^2 with the Lebesgue measure λ as intensity measure is used, we denote the c -RGRG as $X^{\Pi, (c)}$.

Corollary 3.6 (Convergence to the RGRG). *Let Π be a Poisson point process on Δ_+^2 with the Lebesgue measure λ as its intensity measure. Then, for all $0 \leq T < \infty$, we have that,*

$$(179) \quad \lim_{c \downarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} d_{\text{GH}}(X^{\Pi, (c)}(t), X(t)) = 0, \quad \text{in probability.}$$

In particular,

$$(180) \quad (X^{\Pi, (c)}(t))_{t \geq 0} \xrightarrow[c \downarrow 0]{\Rightarrow} (X(t))_{t \geq 0},$$

where \Rightarrow stands for weak convergence of random variables with values in the Skorohod space $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{T})$.

Proof. Note that (179) is a mere consequence of (178), Lemma 3.5, and the union bound. Clearly, (179) implies (180). \square

3.1. Behavior of the RGRG map between re-grafting events. In this subsection, we show that between re-grafting events, the RGRG map undergoes exclusively root growing transitions, as outlined in (163).

Fix $c > 0$ and let $\pi \subset \Delta_+^2$ be a nice point cloud; see Definition 3.1. Recall the definition of the sets $B_{(i,j)}^c$'s in (167). For $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq i < j$, we define

$$(181) \quad Z_{(i,j)}^{\pi,c} := \mathbf{1}_{\{\pi \cap B_{(i,j)}^c \neq \emptyset\}}.$$

If $Z_{(i,j)}^{\pi,c} = 1$, then we call j a cut-time and i a cut-point. The following lemma proves that if a c -decomposable nice point cloud contains no points within the interval $[0, kc]$, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then the RGRG map exhibits path-like behavior, characterized solely by root-growth transitions.

Lemma 3.7. *Fix $c > 0$ and $0 \leq T < \infty$ such that $T/c \geq 2$. Let $\pi \subset \Delta_+^2$ be a nice point cloud. Fix any $0 \leq k \leq \lfloor T/c \rfloor$, suppose that*

$$(182) \quad Z_{(i,j)}^{\pi,c} = 0, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i < j \leq k.$$

(If $k < 2$, then (182) is satisfied by vacuity.) If $\sigma^{\pi,c} > T$, then $\text{RGRG}^\pi(kc)$ is the metric space equivalent to the interval $[0, kc]$ endowed with the Euclidean distance.

Proof. If $k = 0$, then our claim is trivial since in this case $\text{RGRG}^\pi(0)$ is a point. For $k = 1$, given that $\sigma^{\pi,c} > T$, the nice point cloud is c -decomposable. Consequently, it fulfils property (ii) of Definition 3.4 and (a) in Definition 3.1, namely that π contains no points within the set

$$(183) \quad \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : x \in [0, c], y \in (0, x]\}$$

(that is, $\tau_1(\pi) > c$). Therefore, RGRG^π undergoes only root-growth transitions within the interval $[0, c]$, resulting in $\text{RGRG}^\pi(c)$ being a metric space equivalent to the interval $[0, c]$ endowed with the Euclidean distance.

For $2 \leq k \leq \lfloor T/c \rfloor$, the nice point cloud π is c -decomposable, given that $\sigma^{\pi,c} > T$. Consequently, properties (ii) of Definition 3.4, (a) of Definition 3.1, and (182) collectively imply that π contains no points within the set

$$(184) \quad \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : x \in [0, kc], y \in (0, x]\}$$

(i.e., $\tau_1(\pi) > c$). As a result, RGRG^π undergoes exclusively root-growth transitions within the interval $[0, kc]$, leading to $\text{RGRG}^\pi(kc)$ being a metric space equivalent to the interval $[0, kc]$ endowed with the Euclidean distance. \square

The next step involves generalizing the preceding lemma. Intuitively, we show that the RGRG map, during any time interval devoid of points from the nice point cloud, undergoes exclusively root-growing transitions. To formally state this result, we require the following definitions.

Fix $c > 0$ and $0 < T < \infty$ such that $T/c \geq 2$. For $2 \leq k \leq \lfloor T/c \rfloor$, suppose that there exists an integer $1 \leq n \leq \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ and indices $1 \leq i_m < j_m \leq k$, for $1 \leq m \leq n$, such that $i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n$ are all distinct,

$$(185) \quad Z_{(i_m, j_m)}^{\pi, c} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{(i, j)}^{\pi, c} = 0,$$

for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ with either i or j not in $\{i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n\}$.

In particular, the latter implies the existence of at least one point of π within the set

$$(186) \quad B_{(i_m, j_m)}^c = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : (j_m - 1)c \leq x < j_m c, (i_m - 1)c \leq y < i_m c\},$$

for $1 \leq m \leq n$. Moreover, by property (a) of Definition 3.1, π has not point within the sets

$$(187) \quad \{(j_m - 1)c\} \times [0, i_m c] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{R}_+ \times \{(i_m - 1)c\},$$

for $1 \leq m \leq n$.

Now, we remove the intervals $\cup_{m=1}^n ((i_m - 1)c, i_m c) \cup ((j_m - 1)c, j_m c)$ from $[0, kc]$. More precisely, let i'_1, \dots, i'_{2n} be the sequence $i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n$ ordered in increasing order, that is, $i'_1 < \dots < i'_{2n}$. Set $i'_0 = 0$ and $i'_{2n+1} = k + 1$. For $m = 0, \dots, 2n$, define the following sub-intervals,

$$(188) \quad I_m^c = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } [i'_m c, (i'_{m+1} - 1)c] = \emptyset, \\ [i'_m c, (i'_{m+1} - 1)c] & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $m = 0, \dots, 2n$, let $\text{Branch}^c(I_m^c)$ be the metric subspace of $\text{RGRG}^\pi(kc)$ restricted to the interval I_m^c (that is, we equip $\text{Branch}^c(I_m^c)$ with the metric induced by the restriction of d_{kc}^π to I_m^c). Note that due to the way the intervals I_m^c are defined, then $\text{Branch}^c(I_m^c)$ is a compact metric space when equipped with the euclidean distance. Finally, we consider the metric space $\cup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^c(I_m^c)$ formed by the union of the metric spaces $\text{Branch}^c(I_m^c)$. This union is naturally endowed with the metric induced by the restriction of d_{kc}^π to this set.

Lemma 3.8. *Fix $c > 0$ and $0 < T < \infty$ such that $T/c \geq 2$. Let $\pi \subset \Delta_+^2$ be a nice point cloud. Fix any $2 \leq k \leq \lfloor T/c \rfloor$ and suppose that there exists an integer $1 \leq n \leq \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ and indices $1 \leq i_m < j_m \leq k$, for $1 \leq m \leq n$, such that $i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n$ are all distinct, satisfy*

$$(189) \quad Z_{(i_m, j_m)}^{\pi, c} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{(i, j)}^{\pi, c} = 0,$$

for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ with either i or j not in $\{i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n\}$.

Suppose that $\sigma^{\pi, c} > T$. Then,

(i) For $m = 0, \dots, 2n$, $\text{Branch}^c(I_m^c)$ is the metric space equivalent to the interval I_m^c endowed with the Euclidean distance, with length $(i'_{m+1} - i'_m - 1)c \vee 0$.

(ii)

$$(190) \quad d_{\text{H}}\left(\text{RGRG}^\pi(kc), \bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^c(I_m^c)\right) \leq 2c.$$

(iii) Consider $m = 0, \dots, 2n$ such that $I_m^c \neq \emptyset$. Let $y_1, y_2 \in I_m^c$ such that $y_1 < y_2$. Then,

$$(191) \quad c(u_2 - u_1 - 1) \vee 0 \leq d_{\text{RGRG}^\pi(kc)}(y_1, y_2) \leq c(u_2 - u_1 - 1) \vee 0 + 2c,$$

where $u_1, u_2 \in \{i'_m + 1, \dots, i'_{m+1}\}$ are such that $u_1 \leq u_2$, $y_1 \in [(u_1 - 1)c, u_1c)$ and $y_2 \in [(u_2 - 1)c, u_2c)$.

(iv) Consider different $m_1, m_2 \in \{0, \dots, 2n\}$ such that $I_{m_1}^c \neq \emptyset$ and $I_{m_2}^c \neq \emptyset$. Let $y_1 \in I_{m_1}^c$ and $y_2 \in I_{m_2}^c$ such that $y_1 < y_2$. For $i = 1, 2$, let \tilde{y}_i be the boundary point in $I_{m_i}^c$ that is in the path in $\text{RGRG}^\pi(kc)$ from y_1 to y_2 . Let

$$(192) \quad M_{y_1, y_2}^c := \{m \in \{0, \dots, 2n\} : \text{Branch}^c(I_m^c) \text{ is contained in the path from } y_1 \text{ to } y_2\}.$$

Then,

$$(193) \quad d_{\text{RGRG}^\pi(kc)}(y_1, y_2) \geq c(u_2 + u_4 - u_1 - u_3 - 2) \vee 0 + \sum_{m \in M_{y_1, y_2}^c} c(i'_{m+1} - i'_m - 1) \vee 0$$

and

$$(194) \quad d_{\text{RGRG}^\pi(kc)}(y_1, y_2) \leq c(u_2 + u_4 - u_1 - u_3 - 2) \vee 0 + \sum_{m \in M_{y_1, y_2}^c} c(i'_{m+1} - i'_m - 1) \vee 0 + 4c + 2cn,$$

where $u_1, u_2 \in \{i'_{m_1} + 1, \dots, i'_{m_1+1}\}$ and $u_3, u_4 \in \{i'_{m_2} + 1, \dots, i'_{m_2+1}\}$ are such that $u_1 \leq u_2$, $u_3 \leq u_4$, $y_1 \wedge \tilde{y}_1 \in [(u_1 - 1)c, u_1c)$, $y_1 \vee \tilde{y}_1 \in [(u_2 - 1)c, u_2c)$, $y_2 \wedge \tilde{y}_2 \in [(u_3 - 1)c, u_3c)$ and $y_2 \vee \tilde{y}_2 \in [(u_4 - 1)c, u_4c)$.

Proof. First we prove (i). If $I_m^c = \emptyset$, then our claim follows immediately. Then, we suppose that $I_m^c \neq \emptyset$. Recall that the nice point cloud π is c -decomposable since $\sigma^{\pi, c} > T$. Thus, by properties (ii) of Definition 3.4, (a) of Definition 3.1, and (189), π contains no points within the set

$$(195) \quad \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : x \in I_m^c, y \in (0, x]\}.$$

Then, RGRG^π undergoes exclusively root-growth transitions within the interval I_m^c , leading to $\text{RGRG}^\pi(\max I_m^c)$ restricted to I_m^c being a metric space equivalent to the interval I_m^c endowed with the Euclidean distance.

To conclude that $\text{Branch}^c(I_m^c)$ is the metric space equivalent to the interval I_m^c endowed with the Euclidean distance, it enough to justify that π contains no points within the set

$$(196) \quad \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : x \in (\max I_m^c, kc], y \in I_m^c\}.$$

But this is a consequence of properties **(ii)** towards **(iv)** of Definition 3.4, **(a)** of Definition 3.1, and (189).

Next, we prove **(ii)**. This follows directly from an equivalent definition of the Hausdorff distance between metric subspaces \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} of a metric space (\mathcal{Z}, d) (see e.g., [BBI01b, Exercise 7.3.2])

$$(197) \quad d_H(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) := \max \left\{ \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d(x, \mathcal{Y}), \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} d(\mathcal{X}, y) \right\}.$$

Now we prove Parts **(iii)** and **(iv)** of the lemma. First, we remark that if, say $y_2 = \max I_m^c$, then necessarily $y_2 = (i'_{m+1} - 1)c$, which justifies that u_2 can take the value i'_{m+1} . Now, the proof of **(iii)** and **(iv)** follows by decomposing the path connecting y_1 with y_2 within $\text{RGRG}^\pi(kc)$. Indeed, note that $\sum_{m \in M_{y_1, y_2}^c} c(i'_{m+1} - i'_m - 1) \vee 0$ is the size of each $\text{Branch}^c(I_m^c)$ contained in the path from y_1 to y_2 , by **(i)**. The term $c(u_2 - u_1 - 1) \vee 0 + 2c$ accounts for the distance between y_1 and \tilde{y}_1 in I_m^c , by **(iii)**. Finally, the term $2cn$ bounds the removed intervals $\cup_{m=1}^n ((i_m - 1)c, i_m c) \cup ((j_m - 1)c, j_m c)$. \square

4. THE ALDOUS–BRODER CHAIN AND THE SKELETON CHAIN

Recall from the introduction the map AB^γ such that $\text{AB}^\gamma(0) := (\gamma(0), \emptyset, \gamma(0))$ (that is, a single-vertex tree) and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is the rooted tree graph given by

$$(198) \quad \text{AB}^\gamma(n) := \left(\mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n]), \{ \{x, \gamma(L_x(n-1) + 1)\}; x \in \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n-1]) \setminus \{\gamma(n)\} \}, \gamma(n) \right),$$

where for a path $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ on a finite simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n])$,

$$(199) \quad L_x(n) = L_x([0, n]) := \max \{k \in [0, n] : \gamma(k) = x\}.$$

The goal of this section is to construct with the *skeleton chain* another discrete-time chain with values in rooted tree graphs that is close in Skorokhod distance with respect to the pointed Gromov-Hausdorff-distance when rooted tree graphs are encoded as pointed metric spaces. For that purpose we shall use that for typical paths we can separate short from long loops, where a loop is short if it scales down to a point under our scaling. Thus for time indices

within short loops it should not matter whether we erase one edge as required in the Aldous-Broder move or erase the whole loop. We therefore think of those time indices as ghost indices. In Subsection 4.1 we define the sets of *ghost indices* up to a certain time, and prove in Lemma 4.3 that under certain typical events, the ghost indices are indeed those that would be locally erased on that interval. In Subsection 4.2 we then introduce the *skeleton chain* as the chain which for a given time is the rooted subgraphs obtained from the rooted trees of the Aldous-Broder chain at that time spanned by the non-ghost time indices up to that time. For this skeleton chain is then easy to prove the convergence to the limit dynamics of root growth and re-grafting after our rescaling. In Subsection 4.3 we then bound the Gromov-Hausdorff distance between the skeleton chain and the Aldous-Broder chain uniformly in time (Proposition 4.18).

4.1. The sets of ghost indices. Fix $s \in \mathbb{N}$ with $s \geq 2$, and let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$.

Definition 4.1 (Ghost index chain). Set $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(0) := \emptyset$. Suppose that we have constructed $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)$, for some $n \geq 1$. Define

$$(200) \quad \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n) := \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1) \cup \{m \in [0, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1) : m \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{G}_n)\},$$

where we say that m satisfies (\mathbf{G}_n) if

(\mathbf{G}_n) It holds that

$$(201) \quad \gamma(n) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n-s+1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)),$$

and that for $m_1 := \max\{h \in [n-s+1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1) : \gamma(h) = \gamma(n)\}$, we have that

$$(202) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)), \quad \text{for all } k \in [m_1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1).$$

If $m \in [0, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)$ is a ghost index in $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$, then we will say that it satisfies (201) and (202) in (\mathbf{G}_n) .

From the definition of ghost index chain, note that it will be important to differentiate between loops of the path γ with length smaller than s . Recall from the discussion above Lemma 2.6, the definition of short and long loops. We will frequently consider paths that satisfy the following property for some fixed $s', r, N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s' < r$:

No loops of intermediate length: If $\gamma(m_1) = \gamma(m_2)$, for some $m_1, m_2 \in [0, N]$, then $|m_2 - m_1| \notin [s', r]$.

In subsequent sections, we will show that if the path is a lazy random walk on G , then with high probability it has no loops of intermediate length over an adequate interval (see Definition 5.1 and Proposition 5.3).




FIGURE 3. We illustrate why we impose (202) to later ensure that the subgraph restricted to the non-ghost indices is connected. A loop shorter than s is closing at time index $n+1$. There exists $k \in [m_1, n] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ and $k_0 \in [0, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ with $\gamma(k_0) = \gamma(k)$. If $k - k_0 > s$, a loop longer than s is closed at time index k . If we would erase the recently formed loop $[m_1, \dots, n]$, the graph would disconnect. We therefore need a condition that prevents that indices in $\{m_1, \dots, n\}$ are declared to be in $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n+1)$.

Remark 4.2 (laziness indices immediately become ghost indices). Let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$. If $\gamma(n) = \gamma(n+1)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then $n \in \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n+1)$, or equivalently, $n \in \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m)$ for all $m \geq n+1$.

Recall from (91) the set $\text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A)$ of (A, s) -locally non-erased indices. Recall also from (92) that $\text{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A))$ denotes the (A, s) -locally non-erased path. The next result will play a crucial role later in the proof of the main result of this work. We will use it in Corollary 4.10, to compare segments of the subgraphs spanned by the non-ghost time indices of the Aldous-Broder chain and the locally non-erased paths, whenever the path on such segments satisfy certain *only ghost indices* conditions.

Lemma 4.3. Fix $r, s, s' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s+1 \geq 18s'+1$. Let $A \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ be a finite interval such that $\min A \geq s$ and $\#A \geq 3s+1$. Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N \geq \max A$. Let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ that satisfies Assumption *No loops of intermediate length*, and the following properties:

Local cut points: For all $m \in [0, N-s]$, the interval $[m, m+s]$ contains a $2s'$ -local cut point.

Only ghost indices (1): For all $m \in [\min A + s, \max A - s]$ and $2s'$ -local cut-point $\ell \in [m-s, m]$, if $n_1 \in [\ell+1, m]$ and $\tilde{m} \in [\ell, n_1-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1-1)$ are such that $\gamma(n_1) \in \text{R}^\gamma([n_1-s+1, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1-1))$, then

$$(203) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \text{R}^\gamma([0, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1-1)), \quad \text{for all } k \in [m_1, n_1-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1-1),$$

where $m_1 = \max\{h \in [n_1-s+1, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1-1) : \gamma(h) = \gamma(n_1)\}$.

Only ghost indices (2): For all $m \in [\min A + s, \max A - s]$, if $n_2 \in [m + 1, m + s - 1]$ and $m \in [\min A + s, \max A - s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2 - 1)$ are such that $\gamma(n_2) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n_2 - s + 1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2 - 1))$, then

$$(204) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, k - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2 - 1)), \quad \text{for all } k \in [m_1, n_2 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2 - 1),$$

where $m_1 = \max\{h \in [n_2 - s + 1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2 - 1) : \gamma(h) = \gamma(n_2)\}$.

Then,

$$(205) \quad \text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A) = [\min A + s, \max A - s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n), \quad \text{for all } n \in [\max A, N].$$

Remark 4.4. In Assumption **Only ghost indices (1)**, whenever $\ell = m$, then (203) holds by vacuity.

Remark 4.5. The assumptions of only ghost indices in Lemma 4.3 will simplify to prove when a non-ghost index transitions to a ghost index as the path γ evolves. Given these assumptions, if a small loop has been just created at time n and m is a non-ghost index at time $n - 1$ satisfying (201), then it will be a ghost index at time n . The latter can be deduced from the following reformulation.

Only ghost indices (1): Fix $m \in [\min A + s, \max A - s]$ and a $2s'$ -local cut-point $\ell \in [m - s, m]$. Assume $n_1 \in [\ell + 1, m]$ and that $\tilde{m} \in [\ell, n_1 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1 - 1)$ satisfy (201) in (\mathbf{G}_{n_1}) . If furthermore (203) holds, then \tilde{m} also satisfies (202) in (\mathbf{G}_{n_1}) . In particular, by Definition 4.1, we have that $\tilde{m} \in \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1)$.

Only ghost indices (2): Fix $m \in [\min A + s, \max A - s]$. Assume $n_2 \in [m + 1, m + s - 1]$ and $m \in [\min A + s, \max A - s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2 - 1)$ satisfy (201) in (\mathbf{G}_{n_2}) . If furthermore (204) holds, then m also satisfies (202) in (\mathbf{G}_{n_2}) . In particular, by Definition 4.1, we have that $m \in \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2)$.

Before we prove Lemma 4.3, we need the following two technical results. The first result implies that whenever every index in the interval $[m + 1, n]$, for some $n > m \geq s$, does not satisfy (201), then the ghost indices $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\cdot)$ in that interval do not change.

Lemma 4.6. Fix $r, s, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1$ and $n > m \geq s$. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$. Suppose that, for all $k \in [m + 1, n]$, $\gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([k - s + 1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k - 1))$. Then,

$$(206) \quad [m - s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m) = [m - s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k), \quad \text{for all } k \in [m + 1, n].$$

Proof. Since $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m) \subseteq \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k)$, we have that $[m - s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k) \subseteq [m - s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m)$. Then, it only remains to prove that

$$(207) \quad [m - s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m) \subseteq [m - s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k).$$

The above is proved by showing that every $\tilde{m} \in [m-s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m)$ does not satisfy (201) in (\mathbf{G}_k) . Then, we proceed by induction.

First, we consider the case $k = m + 1$. Note that $[m-s+2, m-s] = [m-s+2, m-s+1] = \emptyset$ and thus, by Definition 4.1, $[m-s, m-s+1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m) \subseteq [m-s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m+1)$. On the other hand, we have by our assumption that $\gamma(m+1) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([m-s+2, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m))$, for all $\tilde{m} \in [m-s+2, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m)$. Thus, by Definition 4.1, $[m-s+2, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m) \subseteq [m-s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m+1)$. By combining the two inclusions established earlier, our claim (207) for $k = m + 1$ is proven.

Suppose that $n > m + 1$ and that

$$(208) \quad [m-s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m) = [m-s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k-1),$$

for some $k \in [m+2, n]$. If $k-s+1 > m$, we have that $[k-s+1, \tilde{m}] = \emptyset$, for all $\tilde{m} \in [m-s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m)$. Thus, by Definition 4.1, $[m-s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m) \subseteq [m-s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k)$, i.e., (207) holds.

Now, suppose that $k-s+1 \leq m$. Note that $[k-s+1, \tilde{m}] = \emptyset$, for all $\tilde{m} \in [m-s, k-s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m)$. Thus, by Definition 4.1, $[m-s, k-s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m) \subseteq [m-s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k)$. On the other hand, we have by our assumption and the induction hypothesis (i.e., (208)) that

$$(209) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([k-s+1, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k-1)),$$

for all $\tilde{m} \in [k-s+1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m) = [k-s+1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k-1)$. Thus, $[k-s+1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m) \subseteq [m-s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k)$. By combining the two inclusions obtained, we conclude (207). \square

Lemma 4.7. Fix $r, s, s', m, N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s+1 \geq 18s'+1$ and $N \geq m \geq 2s$. Let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$. Let $\ell \in [m-s, m]$ be a $2s'$ -local cut point of γ . Suppose also that γ satisfies Assumption *No loops of intermediate length*, and for the given m and ℓ :

Only ghost indices: If $n_1 \in [\ell+1, m]$ and $\tilde{m} \in [\ell, n_1-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1-1)$ are such that $\gamma(n_1) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n_1-s+1, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1-1))$, then

$$(210) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1-1)), \quad \text{for all } k \in [m_1, n_1-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1-1),$$

where $m_1 = \max\{h \in [n_1-s+1, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1-1) : \gamma(h) = \gamma(n_1)\}$.

Then we have,

$$(211) \quad [\ell, n] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n) = [\ell, n] \cap \mathbf{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n), \quad \text{for all } n \in [\ell, m].$$

Remark 4.8. Note that the only difference between Assumption *Only ghost indices (1)* and Assumption *Only ghost indices* is that in the former we take any $m \in [\min A + s, \max A - s]$ whereas in the latter we take a fixed $m \geq 2s$.

Proof. Note that $\{\ell\} = [\ell, \ell] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\ell) = [\ell, \ell] \cap \mathbf{NE}^{\gamma, [\ell-s, \ell]}(\ell)$ (i.e., our claim for $m = \ell$ holds). Then, we assume that $m-s \leq \ell < m$ and proceed by induction. The case $n = \ell$ should be clear. Then, suppose that

$$(212) \quad [\ell, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1) = [\ell, n-1] \cap \mathbf{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n-1),$$

for some $n \in [\ell + 1, m]$. Note that $n \in [\ell, n] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ and $n \in [\ell, n] \cap \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n)$. Thus, it is enough to prove that $[\ell, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n) = [\ell, n-1] \cap \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n)$.

First, we show that $[\ell, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n) \subseteq [\ell, n-1] \cap \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n)$. Suppose that $[\ell, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n) \neq \emptyset$ and consider $\tilde{m} \in [\ell, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$. In particular, $\tilde{m} \in [\ell, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)$. To reach a contradiction, assume that \tilde{m} satisfies (201) in (\mathbf{G}_n) for such n , that is $\gamma(n) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell, n-1, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1))$. Recall Remark 4.8 and the reformulation of Assumption **Only ghost indices (1)**. By Assumption **Only ghost indices** (using it with $n_1 = n$), we have that \tilde{m} satisfies (202) in (\mathbf{G}_n) and thus, by Definition 4.1 we have $\tilde{m} \in \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$. The latter is a contradiction. Hence, by Definition 4.1, we must have that

$$(213) \quad \gamma(n) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell, n-1, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)).$$

Note that $n-s \leq \ell \leq \tilde{m} \leq n-1$. Then, since $\ell \in [m-s, m]$ is a $2s'$ -local cut point (see Definition 2.7), the Assumption **No loops of intermediate length** implies that

$$(214) \quad \gamma(n) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell \vee (n-s'+1), \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)).$$

On the other hand, since by the induction hypothesis (212),

$$(215) \quad \begin{aligned} [\ell \vee (n-s'+1), \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1) &= [\ell \vee (n-s'+1), \tilde{m}] \cap ([\ell, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)) \\ &= [\ell \vee (n-s'+1), \tilde{m}] \cap (\text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n-1) \cap [\ell, n-1]), \end{aligned}$$

we conclude that

$$(216) \quad \gamma(n) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell \vee (n-s'+1), \tilde{m}] \cap \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n-1)).$$

We also conclude from (215) that $\tilde{m} \in \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n-1)$. Moreover, again by Assumption **No loops of intermediate length** and since ℓ is a $2s'$ -local cut point, we have that

$$(217) \quad \gamma(n) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([m-s, \ell \vee (n-s'+1)]).$$

Therefore, it follows from (216) and (217) that $\tilde{m} \in [\ell, n-1] \cap \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n)$ (recall (89)).

Next, we show that $[\ell, n-1] \cap \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n) \subseteq [\ell, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$. The idea is to show that every $\tilde{m} \in [\ell, n-1] \cap \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n)$ does not satisfy (201) in (\mathbf{G}_n) . Suppose that $[\ell, n-1] \cap \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n) \neq \emptyset$ and consider $\tilde{m} \in [\ell, n-1] \cap \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n)$. In particular, by (89) and the induction hypothesis (i.e., (212)), note that

$$(218) \quad \tilde{m} \in [\ell, n-1] \cap \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n-1) = [\ell, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1).$$

On the other hand, by (89),

$$(219) \quad \gamma(n) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(n-1) \cap [m-s, \tilde{m}]).$$

Since $\ell \in [m-s, m]$ is a $2s'$ -local cut point (see Definition 2.7), Assumption **No loops of intermediate length** implies (217), and thus (216) holds. Moreover, by using the induction hypothesis again and (215), we deduce that (214) also holds. Finally, by using again Assumption **No loops of intermediate length** and that $n-s \leq \ell \leq \tilde{m} \leq n-1$, we obtain (213). That is, by (218) and Definition 4.1, $\tilde{m} \in [\ell, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$. \square

We have now all the ingredients to prove Lemma 4.3.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Throughout the proof, we fix $n \in [\max A, N]$.

First, we show that $\text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A) \subseteq [\min A + s, \max A - s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$. We proceed by contradiction. Suppose that $\text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A) \neq \emptyset$ and that there exists $m \in \text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A)$ such that $m \notin [\min A + s, \max A - s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$. Then, $m \in [\min A + s, \max A - s] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$, i.e., by Definition 4.1, there exists $\tilde{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m < \tilde{n} \leq n$, $m \in [\min A + s, \max A - s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1)$, $m \in [\min A + s, \max A - s] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n})$ and m satisfies $(\mathbf{G}_{\tilde{n}})$. Thus, by (201) (with $n = \tilde{n}$),

$$(220) \quad \gamma(\tilde{n}) \in \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}([\tilde{n}-s+1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1)).$$

Note that such a time index \tilde{n} must satisfy $m < \tilde{n} \leq m+s$ for the above to be true. Moreover, by the Assumption **No loops of intermediate length**,

$$(221) \quad \gamma(\tilde{n}) \in \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}([\tilde{n}-s'+1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1)).$$

On the one hand, by Assumption **Local cut points**, we know that the interval $[m-s, m]$ contains a $2s'$ -local cut point, say ℓ . Then, by the Definition 2.7 (of $2s'$ -local cut point), and (221), we have that

$$(222) \quad \gamma(\tilde{n}) \in \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}([\ell \vee (\tilde{n}-s'+1), m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1)).$$

On the other hand, since $\ell \in [m-s, m]$ is a $2s'$ -local cut point, the Assumption **No loops of intermediate length**, the inclusion $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m) \subseteq \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1)$, the Assumption **Only ghost indices (1)** (which implies Assumption **Only ghost indices** of Lemma 4.7), and Lemma 4.7 imply that

$$(223) \quad [\ell \vee (\tilde{n}-s'+1), m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1)$$

$$(224) \quad = \left(([\ell, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m)) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1) \right) \cap ([\ell \vee (\tilde{n}-s'+1), m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1))$$

$$(225) \quad = \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(m) \cap ([\ell \vee (\tilde{n}-s'+1), m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1)).$$

By (222) and (223),

$$(226) \quad \gamma(\tilde{n}) \in \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}(\text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(m) \cap ([\ell \vee (\tilde{n}-s'+1), m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1))),$$

which implies that $\gamma(\tilde{n}) \in \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}(\text{NE}^{\gamma, [m-s, m]}(m))$ and thus, $m \notin \text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A)$ (recall (91)). This is a contradiction and thus, $\text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A) \subseteq [\min A + s, \max A - s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$.

Next, we show that $[\min A + s, \max A - s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n) \subseteq \text{NE}^{s, \gamma}(A)$. Suppose that $[\min A + s, \max A - s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n) \neq \emptyset$ and that $m \in [\min A + s, \max A - s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$. In particular, $m \in [\min A + s, \max A - s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n})$, for all $\tilde{n} \in [m + 1, m + s - 1]$ (recall that $n \geq \max A$). To reach a contradiction, assume that such an m satisfies (201) in $(\mathbf{G}_{\tilde{n}})$ for some $\tilde{n} \in [m + 1, m + s - 1]$, that is $\gamma(\tilde{n}) \in \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}([\tilde{n} - s + 1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n} - 1))$. But then, by the Assumption **Only ghost indices (2)** (with $n_2 = \tilde{n}$), we have that m also satisfies (202) in $(\mathbf{G}_{\tilde{n}})$. By Definition 4.1, this contradicts that $m \notin \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n})$. Thus,

$$(227) \quad \gamma(\tilde{n}) \notin \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}([\tilde{n} - s + 1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n} - 1)), \quad \text{for all } \tilde{n} \in [m + 1, m + s - 1].$$

In particular, by (227), Lemma 4.6, and since $[m - s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}) \subseteq [m - s, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n} - 1)$ we conclude that

$$(228) \quad \gamma(\tilde{n}) \notin \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}([\tilde{n} - s + 1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m)), \quad \text{for all } \tilde{n} \in [m + 1, m + s - 1].$$

On the one hand, by the Assumption **Local cut points**, we know that the interval $[m - s, m]$ contains a $2s'$ -local cut point, say ℓ . Then, by Assumption **Local cut points**, Definition 2.7 (of $2s'$ -local cut point), and (228), we have that

$$(229) \quad \gamma(\tilde{n}) \notin \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}([\ell \vee (\tilde{n} - s + 1), m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m)), \quad \text{for all } \tilde{n} \in [m + 1, m + s - 1].$$

On the other hand, Assumption **No loops of intermediate length**, Assumption **Only ghost indices (1)** and Lemma 4.7 (with $n = m$) imply that

$$(230) \quad [\ell \vee (\tilde{n} - s + 1), m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(m) = [\ell \vee (\tilde{n} - s + 1), m] \cap \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m - s, m]}(m),$$

for all $\tilde{n} \in [m + 1, m + s - 1]$. Hence, by (229) and (230),

$$(231) \quad \gamma(\tilde{n}) \notin \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}([\ell \vee (\tilde{n} - s + 1), m] \cap \text{NE}^{\gamma, [m - s, m]}(m)), \quad \text{for all } \tilde{n} \in [m + 1, m + s - 1].$$

Finally, Assumption **No loops of intermediate length** and (231) imply that

$$(232) \quad \gamma(\tilde{n}) \notin \mathbf{R}^{\gamma}(\text{NE}^{\gamma, [m - s, m]}(m)), \quad \text{for all } \tilde{n} \in [m + 1, m + s].$$

In the above expression, to include $m + s$ recall that $\text{NE}^{\gamma, [m - s, m]}(m) \subseteq [m - s, m]$. Therefore from (232) we conclude that $m \in \text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A)$ (recall (91)), and $[\min A + s, \max A - s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n) \subseteq \text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A)$. \square

The next result of this subsection states that $2s'$ -local cut points are not ghost indices.

Lemma 4.9. *Fix $r, s, s' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$. Let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ that satisfies Assumption **No loops of intermediate length**. Let $\ell \in [2s', N - 2s']$ be a $2s'$ -local cut point of the path γ . Then, $\ell \in [0, n] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$, for $n \in [\ell, N]$.*

Proof. Clearly $\ell \in [0, \ell] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\ell)$, by Definition 4.1. On the other hand, since $\ell \in [2s', N - 2s']$ is a $2s'$ -local cut point (recall Definition 2.7), Assumption **No loops of intermediate length** implies that $\gamma(n) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n - s' + 1, \ell])$, for all $n \in [\ell + 1, N]$. Then, it is straightforward from Assumption **No loops of intermediate length** and Definition 4.1 that $\ell \in [0, n] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$, for $n \in [\ell, N]$. \square

To conclude this subsection, we prove a key result showing that if the path γ satisfies certain non-intersection properties, then Lemma 4.3's conditions **Only ghost indices (1)** and **Only ghost indices (2)** hold.

Recall from (141), the definition of the sub-intervals $A_i^{(r, s)}$ and $B_i^{(r, s)}$. We also consider the sequence of times $(\tau_i^{\gamma, (r, s)})_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ defined recursively as follows. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ as in Assumptions **No loops of intermediate length** and **Local cut points**. Set $\tau_0^{\gamma, (r, s)} = 0$ and for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

(233)

$$\tau_i^{\gamma, (r, s)} := \inf\{k \in \{\tau_{i-1}^{\gamma, (r, s)} + 1, \dots, \lfloor N/r \rfloor + 1\} : \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\mathbf{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A_j^{(r, s)})) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_k^{(r, s)}) \neq \emptyset \text{ some } j < k\};$$

with the convention $\inf \emptyset = \lfloor N/r \rfloor + 1$. Recall that $\gamma : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ is a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$. Consider the following properties:

(P.1) If there exists $i, j \in [0, \lfloor N/r \rfloor]$ such that $\mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r, s)}) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_j^{(r, s)}) \neq \emptyset$, then

(234)

$$\mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_{k_1}^{(r, s)}) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_{k_2}^{(r, s)}) = \emptyset,$$

for all $k_1, k_2 \in [0, \lfloor N/r \rfloor]$ with $k_1 \in \{i, j\}$ and $k_2 \notin \{i, j\}$.

(P.2) For every $i \in [2, \lfloor N/r \rfloor]$, we have that

(235)

$$\mathbf{R}^\gamma([(j-1)r, jr-1] \setminus B_j^{(r, s)}) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\min B_i^{(r, s)}, \max B_i^{(r, s)} + s]) = \emptyset,$$

for all $j \in [0, \lfloor N/r \rfloor]$ such that $j < i$.

(P.3) For every $i \in [2, \lfloor N/r \rfloor]$, we have that

(236)

$$\mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, \max B_{i-1}^{(r, s)}]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([(i-1)r, ir-1] \setminus B_i^{(r, s)}) = \emptyset.$$

Corollary 4.10. Fix $r, s, s' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ that satisfies Assumptions **No loops of intermediate length**, **Local cut points** and properties **(P.1)-(P.3)**. Then, if $N \geq r$, for $\tilde{k} \in [1, \lfloor N/r \rfloor]$ and $i \in [\tau_{\tilde{k}-1}^{\gamma, (r, s)} + 1, \tau_{\tilde{k}}^{\gamma, (r, s)} - 1]$,

(237)

$$\mathbf{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A_i^{(r, s)}) = B_i^{(r, s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n), \quad \text{for all } n \in [ir - 1, N].$$

Before we prove Corollary 4.10, we need the following auxiliary result.

Lemma 4.11. *Fix $r, s, s' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ that satisfies the Assumption *Local cut points*. Fix $m \in [s, N]$ and $\ell \in [m - s, m]$ a $2s'$ -local cut-point. Suppose that*

$$(238) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, \ell] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k-1)) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k-1)) = \emptyset,$$

for all $k \in [\ell+1, m-1]$. Then, for all $n \in [\ell+1, m]$ such that $\gamma(n) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1))$, we have that

$$(239) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)), \quad \text{for all } k \in [m_1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1),$$

where $m_1 := \max\{h \in [n-s+1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1) : \gamma(h) = \gamma(n)\}$.

Proof. If $m \in \{\ell, \dots, \ell+3\}$ our claim holds by vacuity. Then, suppose that $m > \ell+3$ and proceed by induction on n . For $n = \ell+1, \ell+2$ our claim also holds by vacuity. Suppose that $n = \ell+3$ is such that $\gamma(n) = \gamma(h)$ for some $h \in [\ell+1, \ell+2] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\ell+2)$. Indeed, we must have $h = \ell+1$. Since $[\ell+1, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1) = \emptyset$, for $k \in [\ell+1, \ell+2] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\ell+2)$, we conclude that (239) is satisfied.

Next, suppose that for some $n \in [\ell+1, m]$, we have shown that for all $\tilde{n} \in [\ell+1, n-1]$ such that $\gamma(\tilde{n}) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, \tilde{n}-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1))$, we have that

$$(240) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1)), \quad \text{for all } k \in [\tilde{m}_1, \tilde{n}-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1),$$

where $\tilde{m}_1 := \max\{h \in [\tilde{n}-s+1, \tilde{n}-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{n}-1) : \gamma(h) = \gamma(\tilde{n})\}$. Then, we prove that if $\gamma(n) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1))$, we have that

$$(241) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)), \quad \text{for all } k \in [m_1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1),$$

where $m_1 := \max\{h \in [n-s+1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1) : \gamma(h) = \gamma(n)\}$.

We proceed by contradiction. Suppose that

$$(242) \quad \gamma(k) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)),$$

for some $k \in [m_1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)$. Hence, there exists $\tilde{k} \in [m_1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)$ and $\tilde{h} \in [\ell+1, \tilde{k}-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)$ such that $\gamma(\tilde{k}) = \gamma(\tilde{h})$. In particular, since $\tilde{k} - s + 1 \leq n - s \leq m - s \leq \ell$, $\tilde{h} \in [\ell+1, \tilde{k}-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{k}-1)$ and it satisfies (201) in $(\mathbf{G}_{\tilde{k}})$. Define $m_2 = \max\{h \in [\tilde{k}-s+1, \tilde{k}-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{k}-1) : \gamma(h) = \gamma(\tilde{k})\}$. However, by the induction hypothesis (240) (with $\tilde{n} = \tilde{k}$ and $\tilde{m}_1 = \tilde{m}_2$), we have that

$$(243) \quad \gamma(\tilde{k}_1) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, \tilde{k}_1-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{k}-1)),$$

for all $\tilde{k}_1 \in [\tilde{m}_2, \tilde{k} - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{k} - 1)$. Moreover, our assumption (238) (with $k = \tilde{k}$) implies that

$$(244) \quad \gamma(\tilde{k}_1) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, \ell] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{k} - 1)), \quad \text{for all } \tilde{k}_1 \in [\tilde{m}_2, \tilde{k} - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{k} - 1).$$

Thus, (243) and (244) show that \tilde{h} does not satisfies (202) in $(\mathbf{G}_{\tilde{k}})$ and we conclude that $\tilde{h} \in \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(\tilde{k})$. This contradicts the fact that $\tilde{h} \in [\ell + 1, \tilde{k} - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n - 1)$ (recall $\tilde{k} \leq n - 1$) and finishes our proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 4.10. First, we consider the case $r \leq N \leq 2r - 1$. Then $\lfloor N/r \rfloor = 1$ and $\tau_1^{\gamma, (r, s)} = 2$ (that is, $\tilde{k} = 1$ and $i = 1$). We verify that $A_1^{(r, s)}$ satisfies **Only ghost indices (1)** and **Only ghost indices (2)**.

We start by proving that the **Only ghost indices (1)** property holds. Let $m \in B_1^{(r, s)}$ and $\ell \in [m - s, m]$ a $2s'$ -local cut-point. For $n_1 \in [\ell + 1, m]$ and $\tilde{m} \in [\ell, n_1 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1 - 1)$ such that $\gamma(n_1) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n_1 - s + 1, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1 - 1))$, define $m_1 = \max\{h \in [n_1 - s + 1, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1 - 1) : \gamma(h) = \gamma(n_1)\}$. By the Assumptions **No loops of intermediate length** and Definition 2.7 of $2s'$ -local cut-point, we must have that

$$(245) \quad m_1 \in [\ell + 1, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1 - 1).$$

On the other hand, since $\ell \in [m - s, m]$ is a $2s'$ -local cut-point (see Definition 2.7), $m \in B_1^{(r, s)}$, the Assumption **No loops of intermediate length** implies that

$$(246) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, \ell] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k - 1)) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, k - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k - 1)) = \emptyset,$$

for all $k \in [\ell + 1, m - 1]$. Therefore, by (245) and (246), Lemma 4.11 implies that

$$(247) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, k - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1 - 1)), \quad \text{for all } k \in [m_1, n_1 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1 - 1).$$

This proves that $A_1^{(r, s)}$ satisfies the **Only ghost indices (1)** property.

Next, we show that the **Only ghost indices (2)** property holds. Let $m \in B_1^{(r, s)}$. For $n_2 \in [m + 1, m + s - 1]$ and $m \in B_1^{(r, s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2 - 1)$ such that $\gamma(n_2) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n_2 - s + 1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2 - 1))$, define $m_1 = \max\{h \in [n_2 - s + 1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2 - 1) : \gamma(h) = \gamma(n_2)\}$. On the one hand, by the Assumption **Local cut points**, there exists $\ell \in [n_2 - s, n_2]$ a $2s'$ -local cut-point. Then, by the Assumptions **No loops of intermediate length** and Definition 2.7 of $2s'$ -local cut-point, we must have that $\gamma(n_2) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, n_2 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2 - 1))$ and so,

$$(248) \quad m_1 \in [\ell + 1, n_2 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2 - 1).$$

On the other hand, since $\ell \in [n_2 - s, n_2]$ is a $2s'$ -local cut-point (see Definition 2.7), $m \in B_1^{(r, s)}$, and the Assumption **No loops of intermediate length** imply that

$$(249) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, \ell] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k - 1)) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, k - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k - 1)) = \emptyset,$$

for all $k \in [\ell + 1, n_2 - 1]$. Therefore, by (248) and (249), Lemma 4.11 implies that

$$(250) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, k - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2 - 1)), \quad \text{for all } k \in [m_1, n_2 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_2 - 1).$$

This proves that $A_1^{(r, s)}$ satisfies the **Only ghost indices (2)** property.

Then, we have proved that, for $\tilde{k} = 1$, $i = 1$, Lemma 4.3 implies that

$$(251) \quad \mathbf{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A_1^{(r, s)}) = B_1^{(r, s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n), \quad \text{for all } n \in [r - 1, N].$$

We henceforth suppose that $N \geq 2r$ and thus, $\lfloor N/r \rfloor \geq 2$. Consider the case $\tilde{k} = 1$ and proceed by induction on $i \in [\tau_0^{\gamma, (r, s)} + 1, \tau_1^{\gamma, (r, s)} - 1] = [1, \tau_1^{\gamma, (r, s)} - 1]$. For $i = 1$, a similar argument to the one used previously, based on Lemma 4.3, shows that

$$(252) \quad \mathbf{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A_1^{(r, s)}) = B_1^{(r, s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n), \quad \text{for all } n \in [r - 1, N].$$

Suppose that, for all $j \in [0, i - 1]$,

$$(253) \quad \mathbf{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A_j^{(r, s)}) = B_j^{(r, s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n), \quad \text{for all } n \in [jr - 1, N].$$

We will prove that

$$(254) \quad \mathbf{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A_i^{(r, s)}) = B_i^{(r, s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n), \quad \text{for all } n \in [ir - 1, N].$$

To do so, it is enough to prove that the interval $A_i^{(r, s)}$ satisfies the properties **Only ghost indices (1)** and **Only ghost indices (2)** in Lemma 4.3.

First, we verify **Only ghost indices (1)**. Fix $m \in B_i^{(r, s)}$ and a $2s'$ -local cut-point $\ell \in [m - s, m]$. For $n_1 \in [\ell + 1, m]$ and $\tilde{m} \in [\ell, n_1 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1 - 1)$ such that $\gamma(n_1) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n_1 - s + 1, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1 - 1))$, define $m_1 = \max\{h \in [n_1 - s + 1, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1 - 1) : \gamma(h) = \gamma(n_1)\}$. By the Assumptions **No loops of intermediate length** and Definition 2.7 of $2s'$ -local cut-point, we must have that

$$(255) \quad m_1 \in [\ell + 1, \tilde{m}] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_1 - 1).$$

By the definition of $\tau_1^{\gamma, (r, s)}$ in (233), the induction hypothesis (253) and **(P.1)**,

$$(256) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\mathbf{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A_j^{(r, s)})) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r, s)}) = \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_j^{(r, s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(k - 1)) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r, s)}) = \emptyset,$$

for all $j \in [1, i - 1]$ and $k \in [\ell + 1, m - 1]$. We remark that the previous holds for $k \geq \ell + 1$ since $\ell + 1 \geq (i - 1)r - 1$. Note that if $i = 1$, then (256) holds by vacuity. Moreover, from (256), **(P.2)** and **(P.3)** we obtain

$$(257) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([(j - 1)r, jr - 1] \setminus B_j^{(r, s)}) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r, s)}) = \emptyset, \quad \text{for all } j \in [1, i - 1],$$

and

$$(258) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, (i-1)r - s - 1]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([(i-1)r, (i-1)r + 2s - 1]) = \emptyset.$$

On the other hand, since $\ell \in [m - s, m]$ is a $2s'$ -local cut-point (see Definition 2.7), $m \in B_i^{(r,s)}$, the Assumption **No loops of intermediate length**, (256), (257) and (258) imply that

$$(259) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, \ell] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(k-1)) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(k-1)) = \emptyset,$$

for all $k \in [\ell + 1, m - 1]$. Therefore, by (255) and (259), Lemma 4.11 implies that

$$(260) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_1 - 1)), \quad \text{for all } k \in [m_1, n_1 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_1 - 1).$$

This proves that $A_i^{(r,s)}$ satisfies the **Only ghost indices (1)** property.

Next, we verify the **Only ghost indices (2)** property. Let $m \in B_i^{(r,s)}$. For $n_2 \in [m + 1, m + s - 1]$ and $m \in B_i^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_2 - 1)$ such that $\gamma(n_2) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n_2 - s + 1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_2 - 1))$, define $m_1 = \max\{h \in [n_2 - s + 1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_2 - 1) : \gamma(h) = \gamma(n_2)\}$. On the other hand, by the Assumption **Local cut points**, there exists $\ell \in [n_2 - s, n_2]$ a $2s'$ -local cut-point. Then, by the Assumptions **No loops of intermediate length** and Definition 2.7 of $2s'$ -local cut-point, we must have that $\gamma(n_2) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, n_2 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_2 - 1))$ and so,

$$(261) \quad m_1 \in [\ell + 1, n_2 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_2 - 1).$$

By the definition of $\tau_1^{\gamma,(r,s)}$ in (233), the induction hypothesis (253) and **(P.1)**,

$$(262) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\mathbf{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_j^{(r,s)})) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r,s)}) = \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_j^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(k-1)) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r,s)}) = \emptyset,$$

for all $j \in [1, i-1]$ and $k \in [\ell + 1, n_2 - 1]$. If $i = 1$, then (256) holds by vacuity. Moreover, by the Assumption **No loops of intermediate length**, **(P.2)** and **(P.3)**,

$$(263) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, (i-1)r + 2s - 1]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([ir - s, ir - 1]) = \emptyset.$$

On the other hand, since $\ell \in [n_2 - s, n_2]$ is a $2s'$ -local cut-point (see Definition 2.7), $m \in B_i^{(r,s)}$, the Assumption **No loops of intermediate length**, (257), (258) and (263) imply that

$$(264) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, \ell] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(k-1)) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(k-1)) = \emptyset,$$

for all $k \in [\ell + 1, n_2 - 1]$. Therefore, by (261) and (264), Lemma 4.11 implies that

$$(265) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_2 - 1)), \quad \text{for all } k \in [m_1, n_2 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_2 - 1).$$

This proves that $A_i^{(r,s)}$ satisfies the **Only ghost indices (2)** property.

Then, we have proved that, for $k = 1$ and $i \in [\tau_0^{\gamma, (r,s)} + 1, \tau_1^{\gamma, (r,s)} - 1]$, Lemma 4.3 implies that

$$(266) \quad \text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) = B_i^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n), \quad \text{for all } n \in [ir - 1, N].$$

Finally, to prove the general case (237) for all $\tilde{k} \in [1, \lfloor N/r \rfloor]$, one proceeds by induction on \tilde{k} . Recall that we have assumed $\tilde{k} \geq 2r$. Then, as in the case of $\tilde{k} = 1$ and $i \in [\tau_0^{\gamma, (r,s)} + 1, \tau_1^{\gamma, (r,s)} - 1]$, a similar argument will prove our claim. \square

4.2. The skeleton chain. In this subsection we introduce the skeleton chain which is obtained from the Aldous-Broder chain by restricting the latter to the non-ghost indices.

Definition 4.12 (The skeleton chain). Fix $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and a path $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ on a simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ be the subgraph of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ restricted to the vertex set $\mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$ rooted at $\gamma(n)$. We refer to

$$(267) \quad \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s} := (\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$$

as the skeleton chain.

Note that $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(0)$ is the trivial tree with only one vertex. Note also that $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ is not necessarily connected but that its connected components are trees. The first result states that $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ is connected.

Lemma 4.13 (Connectedness). Fix $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$. Then, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ is connected. In particular, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ is a subtree of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ rooted at $\gamma(n)$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Recall from Definition 4.1 that $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, (r,s)}(0) = \emptyset$, and that therefore $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(0)$ is the trivial tree rooted at $\gamma(0)$. Now, we suppose that, for some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(\ell - 1)$ is a connected tree rooted at $\gamma(\ell - 1)$, for all $\ell \in [1, n_0]$. We shall show that $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n_0)$ is a connected tree rooted at $\gamma(n_0)$. We consider the following three cases:

- *Case 1.* $\gamma(n_0) \notin \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n_0 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_0 - 1))$.
- *Case 2.* $\gamma(n_0) \in \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n_0 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_0 - 1))$ but $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_0 - 1) = \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_0)$.
- *Case 3.* $\gamma(n_0) \in \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n_0 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_0 - 1))$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_0) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_0 - 1) \neq \emptyset$.

Case 1 (Root growth). Assume that $\gamma(n_0) \notin \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n_0 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_0 - 1))$. Then $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_0) = \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n_0 - 1)$ by Definition 4.1. As $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n_0 - 1)$ is a connected subtree of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n_0 - 1)$ rooted at $\gamma(n_0 - 1)$ by the induction hypothesis, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n_0)$ is obtained from $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n_0 - 1)$ by adding

the vertex $\gamma(n_0)$ and the edge $\{\gamma(n_0 - 1), \gamma(n_0)\}$ and letting $\gamma(n_0)$ be the new root. In particular, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n_0)$ is a connected tree rooted at $\gamma(n_0)$ which yields the induction claim.

Case 2 (Aldous-Broder move). Assume that $\gamma(n_0) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, n_0 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1))$ but $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0) = \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)$. The latter implies that $\gamma(n_0) \neq \gamma(n_0 - 1)$ by Remark 4.2. As $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)$ is a connected subtree of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n_0 - 1)$ rooted at $\gamma(n_0 - 1)$ by the induction hypothesis and as $\gamma(n_0 - 1) \neq \gamma(n_0)$, $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n_0)}(n_0 - 1) + 1), \gamma(n_0)\}$ must be an edge in $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)$ and $\gamma(L_{\gamma(n_0)}(n_0 - 1) + 1) \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)$. Therefore $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n_0)$ is obtained by removing the edge $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n_0)}(n_0 - 1) + 1), \gamma(n_0)\}$ and adding the new edge $\{\gamma(n_0 - 1), \gamma(n_0)\}$. In particular, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n_0)$ is a connected tree rooted at $\gamma(n_0)$ which yields the induction claim.

Case 3 (ghost loop erasure). Assume that $\gamma(n_0) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, n_0 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1))$ and that $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1) \neq \emptyset$. We first claim that $n_0 - 1 \in \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)$. Indeed $n_0 - 1 \notin \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)$ by Definition 4.1. Moreover, by the assumption in Case 3 (in particular, since $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1) \neq \emptyset$), we have that $n_0 - 1$ satisfies (\mathbf{G}_{n_0}) in Definition 4.1, that is, $\gamma(n_0) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n_0 - s + 1, n_0 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1))$ and with

$$(268) \quad m^*(n_0 - 1) := \max\{h \in [n_0 - s + 1, n_0 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1) : \gamma(h) = \gamma(n_0)\},$$

we also have that

$$(269) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, k - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)), \text{ for all } k \in [m^*(n_0 - 1), n_0 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1).$$

We claim that

$$(270) \quad \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1) = [m^*(n_0 - 1), n_0 - 1],$$

and thus that $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n_0)$ is obtained from $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)$ by erasing the loop of length $n_0 - 1 - m^*(n_0 - 1)$ (that is, the vertices $\mathbf{R}^\gamma([m^*(n_0 - 1), n_0 - 1])$) and letting the new root be $\gamma(n_0)$. Provided we have shown (270), it remains to show that the graph obtained from this ghost loop erasure is still connected.

To show (270), consider first $m \in [m^*(n_0 - 1), n_0 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)$. Note that m clearly satisfy the condition (\mathbf{G}_{n_0}) , i.e., $\gamma(n_0) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n_0 - s + 1, m] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1))$ (because $\gamma(n_0) = \gamma(m^*(n_0 - 1))$), and thus $\gamma(n_0) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n_0 - s + 1, m^*(\gamma(n_0 - 1))] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1))$ as well as $\gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, k - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1))$ for all $k \in [m^*(n_0 - 1), n_0 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)$ (due to (269)). Thus $[m^*(n_0 - 1), n_0 - 1] \subseteq \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)$. Consider next $m \in [n_0 - s + 1, m^*(n_0 - 1) - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)$. In this case m does not satisfy the condition (\mathbf{G}_{n_0}) (because if $\gamma(n_0) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n_0 - s + 1, m^*(n_0 - 1) - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1))$, then $\gamma(m^*(n_0 - 1)) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, k - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1))$ which violates (202) with $k = m^*(n_0 - 1)$), and thus $m \notin \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1) = \emptyset$. As $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1) \subseteq [n_0 - s + 1, n_0 - 1]$ by Definition 4.1, (270) is confirmed.

We close the proof by verifying that deleting the vertices $\mathbf{R}^\gamma([m^*(n_0 - 1), n_0 - 1])$ from $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n_0)$ yields a connected graph. Assume to the contrary that there are $k_1, k_2 \in [0, m^*(n_0 - 1)$

1)] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1) such that the unique path in $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)$ connecting $\gamma(k_1)$ with $\gamma(k_2)$ goes through a vertex in $\mathbb{R}^\gamma([m^*(n_0 - 1), n_0 - 1])$. In this case there would be an $\ell_1 \in [0, m^*(n_0 - 1)] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)$ such that $\gamma(\ell_1) \neq \gamma(n_0)$ and $\ell_2 \in [m^*(n_0 - 1) + 1, n_0 - 1]$ such that $\gamma(\ell_2) = \gamma(\ell_1)$. However, by (270), $\ell_2 \in [m^*(n_0 - 1) + 1, n_0 - 1]$ implies that ℓ_2 must satisfy (\mathbf{G}_{n_0}) which means in particular that $\gamma(\ell_2) \notin \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, \ell_2 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n_0 - 1)) \supseteq \{\gamma(\ell_1)\}$, which contradicts that $\gamma(\ell_1) = \gamma(\ell_2)$. \square

From the proof of Lemma 4.13 we can easily derive the dynamics of the skeleton chain (see Figure 4 for an illustration). Recall the definition of the times $L_x(n)$ in (199) for $x \in \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n])$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Remark 4.14 (Dynamics of the skeleton chain). Fix $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$. The *skeleton chain* $(\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ has the following dynamics. $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(0)$ is the trivial tree. Then, given $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n - 1)$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we construct $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ by distinguishing three cases:

- **Root growth.** If $\gamma(n)$ is not a vertex in $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n - 1)$ then $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ is obtained from $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n - 1)$ by adding the vertex $\gamma(n)$ and the edge $\{\gamma(n - 1), \gamma(n)\}$ letting the root be $\gamma(n)$.
- **Aldous-Broder move.** If $\gamma(n)$ is a vertex in $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n - 1)$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n - 1) = \emptyset$ then a cycle is created and $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ is constructed from $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n - 1)$ by applying the Aldous-Broder algorithm. That is, the edge $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n)}(n - 1) + 1), \gamma(n)\}$ is replaced by the edge $\{\gamma(n - 1), \gamma(n)\}$.
- **Ghost loop erasure.** If $\gamma(n)$ is a vertex in $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n - 1)$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n - 1) \neq \emptyset$ then the ghost indices $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n - 1)$ created at time n form a loop of length at most s , and this loop is erased in the skeleton.

In the context of Remark 4.14, consider the specific instance where the skeleton chain undergoes a **Ghost indices erasure** move. That is, $\gamma(n) \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n - 1)$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n - 1) \neq \emptyset$. In this case, $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ performs an Aldous-Broder move, that is, $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ is constructed from $\text{AB}^\gamma(n - 1)$ by replacing the edge $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n)}(n - 1) + 1), \gamma(n)\}$ by the edge $\{\gamma(n - 1), \gamma(n)\}$. ($\gamma(n)$ is the new root of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$.)

By removing the edge $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n)}(n - 1) + 1), \gamma(n)\}$ from $\text{AB}^\gamma(n - 1)$ (before adding the new edge) we disconnect $\text{AB}^\gamma(n - 1)$ into two connected components (or two subtrees). Namely, the subtree above $\gamma(n)$ rooted at $\gamma(n)$, denoted by $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$, and the subtree that contains the root $\gamma(n - 1)$ of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n - 1)$, denoted by $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$. Then, by adding the edge $\{\gamma(n - 1), \gamma(n)\}$, one only attach to $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ the vertex $\gamma(n)$. Denote this new subtree by $\tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$. Thus, $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ is obtained by gluing together $\tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$ and $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$ at the vertex $\gamma(n)$. Indeed, by the Aldous-Broder algorithm, $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ is the subtree of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ above $\gamma(n - 1)$, rooted at $\gamma(n - 1)$.




FIGURE 4. Illustrates the dynamics of the skeleton chain. In the left-hand side, the skeleton up to a certain time is shown. In the first row, the last steps of the random walk are depicted in red. From left to right, there is root-growing, the Aldous-Broder algorithm is applied, or a small cycle is erased. In the bottom row the resulting skeleton is shown for each of the corresponding possibilities.

To conclude this section we show that, under certain assumptions, the number of vertices of the subtree $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ can be bounded. To this end, we establish some key properties of its vertex composition. Recall from (64) the set of s' -local cut points, $\text{CP}^{\gamma, s'}(A)$, in an finite interval A . In the following result, for $v \in V$ we use $\gamma^{-1}(v)$ to denote the inverse mapping $\{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \gamma(n) = v\}$.

Lemma 4.15 (Key properties of ghost loop erasure). *Fix $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$. If $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is such that $\gamma(n) \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1) \neq \emptyset$, then the following holds:*

- (i) *If v is a vertex of $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ then $\gamma^{-1}(v) \subseteq \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$.*
- (ii) *Let $n \geq 2$, $m \in [1, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$, $\ell \in [0, m-1]$, and $k \in [0, \ell]$. If $h_1 \in [k, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ and $h_2 \in [\ell+1, m] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ with $\gamma(h_2) \notin \mathcal{R}^\gamma([k, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$ such that $\{\gamma(h_1), \gamma(h_2)\}$ is an edge in $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$, then $\gamma(h_1) \in \mathcal{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$.*
- (iii) *Let $n \geq 2$ and $l_1, l_2 \in [0, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ with $l_1 < l_2$ and such that $\gamma(l_1), \gamma(l_2)$ are vertices in $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$. If we can choose $\ell \in [l_1, l_2-1]$ such that $\mathcal{R}^\gamma([l_1, \ell]) \cap \mathcal{R}^\gamma([l_2+1, n]) = \emptyset$, then there exists $l_2^* \in [\ell+1, l_2]$ and a path connecting $\gamma(l_1)$ and $\gamma(l_2^*)$ in $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ with edges $\{\{\gamma(i_j), \gamma(i_{j+1})\}\}_{0 \leq j \leq \tilde{k}-1}$ such that $i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_{\tilde{k}} = l_2^*$, $\gamma(i_0) = \gamma(l_1)$, $i_0 \in [l_1, \ell]$ and $\tilde{k} \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. (i) follows immediately since $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ is connected by Lemma 4.13.

To prove (ii), assume that $h_1 \in [k, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ and $h_2 \in [\ell + 1, m] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ with $\gamma(h_2) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([k, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$ such that $\{\gamma(h_1), \gamma(h_2)\}$ is an edge in $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$. Then $\gamma(h_1)$ and $\gamma(h_2)$ are different from $\gamma(n)$ because $\gamma(n) \in S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$ and $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}} \cap C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}} = \emptyset$. Clearly, $\gamma(h_1) = \gamma(L_{\gamma(h_1)}(n))$. If $L_{\gamma(h_1)}(n) > h_2$, then our claim follows immediately because $L_{\gamma(h_1)}(n) \in \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ by part (i) and $h_2 \geq \ell + 1$ by assumption.

Now, assume that $h_1 \leq L_{\gamma(h_1)}(n) < h_2$. Then, $\gamma(h_2) = \gamma(L_{\gamma(h_1)}(n) + 1)$ by (198). Thus $L_{\gamma(h_1)}(n), L_{\gamma(h_1)}(n) + 1 \in \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ by part (i). Since $\gamma(L_{\gamma(h_1)}(n) + 1) = \gamma(h_2) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([k, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$, it follows that $L_{\gamma(h_1)}(n) + 1 \in ([0, k-1] \cup [\ell + 1, n]) \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$. Further, since $L_{\gamma(h_1)}(n) + 1 \geq h_1 + 1 \geq k + 1$, it follows that $L_{\gamma(h_1)}(n) \in [\ell + 1, n - 1]$, and thus $\gamma(h_1) = \gamma(L_{\gamma(h_1)}(n)) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, n])$. This together with $L_{\gamma(h_1)}(n) \in \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ gives the claim.

To prove (iii), recall from the Aldous-Broder algorithm (see (198)) that there exists a path connecting $\gamma(l_1)$ and $\gamma(l_2)$ in $\text{AB}^\gamma(l_2)$ with edges $\{\{\gamma(i_j), \gamma(i_{j+1})\}\}_{0 \leq j \leq \tilde{k}-1}$ such that $i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_{\tilde{k}} = l_2$, $\gamma(i_0) = \gamma(l_1)$ and $\tilde{k} \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $\ell \in [l_1, l_2 - 1]$ is such that $\mathbf{R}^\gamma([l_1, \ell]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([l_2 + 1, n]) = \emptyset$. Since $\gamma(i_0) = \gamma(l_1)$, we have $i_0 \in [l_1, \ell]$. Furthermore, we can and will choose $i_0 = L_{\gamma(l_1)}(l_2)$. Put $k(\ell) := \max\{j \in \{1, \dots, \tilde{k}\} : i_j \leq \ell\}$ and $l_2^* := i_{k(\ell)+1}$. Then, in particular,

$$(271) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\{i_0, \dots, i_{k(\ell)}\}) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([l_2 + 1, n]) = \emptyset,$$

and $\gamma(i_0), \dots, \gamma(i_{k(\ell)}), \gamma(l_2^*)$ are vertices in the path connecting $\gamma(l_1)$ with $\gamma(l_2)$ in $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$. It follows from (198) that the collection of edges $\{\{\gamma(i_j), \gamma(i_{j+1})\}\}_{0 \leq j \leq \tilde{k}-1}$ form a path in $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ connecting $\gamma(l_1)$ with $\gamma(l_2^*)$ such that it is contained in the path connecting $\gamma(l_1)$ with $\gamma(l_2)$ in $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$. Since $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ is a connected subtree of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$, the path with edges $\{\{\gamma(i_j), \gamma(i_{j+1})\}\}_{0 \leq j \leq \tilde{k}-1}$ is also a path in $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$. \square

Remark 4.16. In the setting of Lemma 4.15. Note that (i) shows that the vertices in $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ are only images of ghost indexes under the path γ .

Recall the definition of the interval $B_i^{(r,s)}$, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, as given in (141). Recall that $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ is a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$. Consider the following additional properties that complement properties (P.1)-(P.3):

(P.4) We have that

$$(272) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, r \lfloor N/r \rfloor - 1]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([r \lfloor N/r \rfloor + 2s, N]) = \emptyset$$

and

$$(273) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, r \lfloor N/r \rfloor - s - 1]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([r \lfloor N/r \rfloor, r \lfloor N/r \rfloor + 2s - 1]) = \emptyset.$$

Lemma 4.17. Fix $r, s, s' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$. Let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ that satisfies Assumptions *No loops of intermediate*

length, Local cut points and the properties (P.1)-(P.4). Then, for all $n \in [0, N]$, such that $\gamma(n) \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1) \neq \emptyset$,

$$(274) \quad \#C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}} \leq r.$$

Proof. We assume $n \geq r+1$, otherwise (274) holds trivially. By Lemma 4.15 (i), the vertices of $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ belong to $\mathbb{R}^\gamma(\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$, where $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ satisfies (270) (with $n = n_0$), and $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ does not contain vertices of $\mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$.

Recall that $n \geq r+1$ and $n-1 \in \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ by (270). Recall also that $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ is the subtree of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ above $\gamma(n-1)$, rooted at $\gamma(n-1)$. By the Definition of $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ and Lemma 4.15 (i), the subtree $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ is a subgraph of the subgraph of $\text{AB}(n)$ restricted to $\mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$. For simplicity, we will also use $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ to denote the vertex set of $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$.

Next we use the properties established in Lemma 4.15 to control the size of $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$, or more precisely, its vertex set. Let $\ell \in [n-s-2, n-2]$ be a $2s'$ -local cutpoint (by Assumption **Local cut points**, this $2s'$ -local cutpoint exists). Note that $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}} \cap \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)) \neq \emptyset$.

Case (i). Suppose that $\mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)) \cap \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)) = \emptyset$.

We claim that in this case $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ is a subgraph of the subgraph of $\text{AB}(n)$ restricted to $\mathbb{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$. (That is, $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$).

To prove the above claim, we proceed by contradiction. Suppose that there exists $l_1 \in [0, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ such that $\gamma(l_1) \in C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ and $\gamma(l_1) \notin \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$. Since $\gamma(n-1) \in C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}} \cap \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$, then Lemma 4.15 (iii) implies that there are $h_1 \in [0, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ and $h_2 \in [\ell+1, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ such that $\{\gamma(h_1), \gamma(h_2)\}$ is an edge in $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$. But this is a contradiction to Lemma 4.15 (ii) with $k = 0$. Indeed, since $\mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)) \cap \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)) = \emptyset$ then $\gamma(h_1) \notin \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$ and $\gamma(h_2) \notin \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n))$, which are conditions required in Lemma 4.15 (ii).

This finishes the proof of the claim in **Case (i)**.

Next, we will consider the case

$$(275) \quad \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)) \cap \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)) \neq \emptyset.$$

However, our assumptions allow us to simplify this case further. Recall that $\ell \in [n-s-2, n-2]$ is a $2s'$ -local cutpoint. Then, by Definition 2.7 and the Assumption **No loops of intermediate length**,

$$(276) \quad \mathbb{R}^\gamma([n-r-1, \ell]) \cap \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1]) = \emptyset.$$

The above implies that we only need to consider the case

$$(277) \quad \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n-r-2] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)) \cap \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\ell+1, n-1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n)) \neq \emptyset.$$

Recall the definition of the interval $B_i^{(r,s)}$ in (141). Since the interval $[\ell + 1, n - 1]$ is of length at most $s + 1$, if (277) holds, then by (P.1)-(P.4), there must exist a unique pair $j_1, j_2 \in [0, \lfloor N/r \rfloor]$ such that $j_1 < j_2$ and

$$(278) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_{j_1}^{(r,s)}) \cap [0, n - r - 2] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_{j_2}^{(r,s)}) \cap [\ell + 1, n - 1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n) \neq \emptyset,$$

$$(279) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma((B_{j_1}^{(r,s)})^c \cap [0, \min B_{j_2}^{(r,s)} - 2s - 1]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_{j_2}^{(r,s)}) \cap [\ell + 1, n - 1] = \emptyset,$$

$$(280) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, \max B_{j_2-1}^{(r,s)}]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\min B_{j_2}^{(r,s)} - 2s, \min B_{j_2}^{(r,s)} - 1] \cap [\ell + 1, n - 1]) = \emptyset,$$

and

$$(281) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, \min B_{j_2}^{(r,s)} - 1]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\max B_{j_2}^{(r,s)} + 1, \max B_{j_2}^{(r,s)} + s] \cap [\ell + 1, n - 1]) = \emptyset.$$

Note that in (279) we denote by $(B_{j_1}^{(r,s)})^c$ the complement of $B_{j_1}^{(r,s)}$. Thus, we only need to consider the following case. By the Assumption **Local cut points**, there exists a $2s'$ -local cut point $\tilde{\ell} \in [\min B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} - s - 1, \min B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} - 1]$. Define $\tilde{B}_{j_1}^{(r,s)} := [\tilde{\ell} + 1, \max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)}]$.

Case (ii). Suppose that there exists a unique pair $j_1, j_2 \in [0, \lfloor N/r \rfloor]$ such that $j_1 < j_2$ and (278)-(281) hold.

We claim that $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ is a subgraph of the subgraph of $\text{AB}(n)$ restricted to $\mathbf{R}^\gamma((\tilde{B}_{j_1}^{(r,s)} \cup [\ell + 1, n - 1]) \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$. (That is, $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^\gamma((\tilde{B}_{j_1}^{(r,s)} \cup [\ell + 1, n - 1]) \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$).

Before proving our claim in **Case (ii)**, we make some useful observations. Since (278) holds and the interval $[\ell + 1, n - 1]$ is of length at most $s + 1$, we necessarily have

$$(282) \quad [\ell + 1, n] \subseteq [(j_2 - 1)r, j_2 r - 1] = [\min B_{j_2}^{(r,s)} - 2s, \max B_{j_2}^{(r,s)} + s].$$

In particular, we have that $n - r - 2 \leq (j_2 - 1)r - 3$. Then, by (276) and (279)-(281),

$$(283) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, \tilde{\ell}] \cup [\min B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} + 1, \ell]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, n - 1]) = \emptyset.$$

This implies that the segment $\mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, n - 1])$ intersects only with $\mathbf{R}^\gamma(\tilde{B}_{j_1}^{(r,s)})$. On the other hand, since $\tilde{\ell} \in [\min B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} - s - 1, \min B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} - 1]$ is a $2s'$ -local cut point (see Definition 2.7), the Assumption **No loops of intermediate length** and (P.1)-(P.2) imply that

$$(284) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, \tilde{\ell}]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\tilde{B}_{j_1}^{(r,s)}) = \emptyset.$$

We now turn to the proof of the claim stated after **Case (ii)**. Namely, that $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ is a subgraph of the subgraph of $\text{AB}(n)$ restricted to $\text{R}^\gamma((\widetilde{B}_{j_1}^{(r,s)} \cup [\ell + 1, n - 1]) \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$. We proceed by contradiction. Suppose that there exists $m \in ([0, \ell] \setminus \widetilde{B}_{j_1}^{(r,s)}) \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ such that $\gamma(m) \in C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ and $\gamma(m) \notin \text{R}^\gamma((\widetilde{B}_{j_1}^{(r,s)} \cup [\ell + 1, n - 1]) \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$.

There are two sub-cases:

1. Assume $m \in [\max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} + 1, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$. Since $\gamma(n-1) \in C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}} \cap \text{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, n - 1])$, then Lemma 4.15 (iii) implies that there are $h_1 \in [\max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} + 1, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ and $h_2 \in [\ell + 1, n - 1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ such that $\{\gamma(h_1), \gamma(h_2)\}$ is an edge in $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$. But this is a contradiction to Lemma 4.15 (ii) (with $k = \max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} + 1$) since by (283),

$$(285) \quad \text{R}^\gamma([\max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} + 1, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)) \cap \text{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, n - 1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)) = \emptyset.$$

2. Assume $m \in [0, \widetilde{\ell}] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ and $\gamma(m) \notin \text{R}^\gamma([\max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} + 1, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$. Again, since $\gamma(n-1) \in C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}} \cap \text{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, n - 1])$, Lemma 4.15 (iii) implies that there are $h_1 \in [m, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ and $h_2 \in [\ell + 1, n - 1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ such that $\{\gamma(h_1), \gamma(h_2)\}$ is an edge in $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$. (Note that $\gamma(h_1)$ must be an ancestor of $\gamma(m)$ in the tree $\text{AB}(n)$.) Then, there are three sub-cases:

- 2.1. If $h_1 \in [\max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} + 1, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$, then a similar argument as in sub-case 1. yields a contradiction to Lemma 4.15 (ii).

- 2.2. If $h_1 \in [\widetilde{\ell} + 1, \max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)}] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ and $\gamma(h_1) \notin \text{R}^\gamma([\max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} + 1, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$, then since $\gamma(h_1) \in C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}} \cap \text{R}^\gamma([\widetilde{\ell} + 1, \max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)}] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$ and $\gamma(h_1)$ is an ancestor of $\gamma(m)$, by Lemma 4.15 (iii) there are $l_3 \in [h_1, \widetilde{\ell}] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ and $l_4 \in [\widetilde{\ell} + 1, h_1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ such that $\{\gamma(l_3), \gamma(l_4)\}$ is an edge in $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$.

First, if $\gamma(l_3) \in \text{R}^\gamma([\max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} + 1, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$, then there exists $l_5 \in [\max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} + 1, \ell]$ such that $\gamma(l_3) = \gamma(l_5)$ and $\gamma(l_5) \notin \text{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, n - 1] \cup [\widetilde{\ell} + 1, \max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)}] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$ by (283) and (284). Then a similar argument as in sub-case 1. yields a contradiction to Lemma 4.15 (ii). On the other hand, if $\gamma(l_3) \notin \text{R}^\gamma([\max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} + 1, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$, then we get a contradiction to Lemma 4.15 (ii) since by (283) and (284), we have

$$(286) \quad \text{R}^\gamma([0, \widetilde{\ell}] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)) \cap \text{R}^\gamma([\widetilde{\ell} + 1, \max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)}] \cup [\ell + 1, n - 1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)) = \emptyset.$$

- 2.3. If $h_1 \in [0, \widetilde{\ell}] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ and $\gamma(h_1) \notin \text{R}^\gamma([\widetilde{\ell} + 1, \ell] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$, then we have two further cases to consider (by (278)). Namely, $\gamma(h_2) \in \text{R}^\gamma([\widetilde{\ell} + 1, \max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)}] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$ and $\gamma(h_2) \notin \text{R}^\gamma([\widetilde{\ell} + 1, \max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)}] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$.

First, suppose that there exists $\tilde{l}_2 \in [\tilde{\ell} + 1, \max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)}] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ such that $\gamma(\tilde{l}_2) = \gamma(h_2)$ (i.e., $\gamma(h_2) \in \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\tilde{\ell} + 1, \max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)}] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$). Then a similar argument as in the previous sub-case **2.2**. yields a contradiction to Lemma 4.15 (ii). On the other hand, if $\gamma(h_2) \notin \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\tilde{\ell} + 1, \max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)}] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$ (i.e., $\gamma(l_2) \in \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, n - 1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$), we get a contradiction to Lemma 4.15 (ii) since by (283),

$$(287) \quad \mathbb{R}^\gamma([\ell + 1, n - 1] \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)) \cap \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, \tilde{\ell}] \cup [\max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} + 1, \ell]) \cap \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n) = \emptyset.$$

This finishes the proof of **Case (ii)**.

Finally, recall that $n \geq r + 1$, $n - 1 \in \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ by (270) (with $n = n_0$), and that $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ is the subtree of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ above $\gamma(n - 1)$, rooted at $\gamma(n - 1)$. Recall also that the interval $[\ell + 1, n - 1]$ is of length at most $s + 1$. Since $\tilde{\ell} \in [\min B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} - s - 1, \min B_{j_1}^{(r,s)} - 1]$ is a $2s'$ -local cut point, (274) follows from the claims in **Case (i)** and **Case (ii)** by noticing that the interval $[\tilde{\ell} + 1, \max B_{j_1}^{(r,s)}]$ is of length at most $r - 2s$. \square

4.3. Distance between the Aldous-Broder chain and the skeleton chain. We have proven in Lemma 4.13 that if the path $\gamma : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ satisfies the Assumption **No loops of intermediate length**, then $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ is a rooted subtree of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$. We then view $\text{Skel}_\gamma^{(r,s)}(n)$ and $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ as pointed metric measure spaces, where as usual a finite rooted graph-theoretical tree (T, d, ρ) is identified with the pointed metric space $(T, d_{\text{graph}}, \rho)$ with d_{graph} being the graph distance. Recall the pointed Gromov-Hausdorff distance between two compact pointed metric spaces defined in (9).

Proposition 4.18 (Bounding the GH-distance of the Aldous-Broder chain to the skeleton chain). *Fix $r, s, s' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ that satisfies Assumptions **No loops of intermediate length**, **Local cut points** and the properties **(P.1)**-**(P.4)**. Then, for all $n \in [0, N]$,*

$$(288) \quad d_{\text{GH}}(\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n), \text{AB}^\gamma(n)) \leq r.$$

Proof. Recall by Lemma 4.13 that $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ is a rooted subtree of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$, for all $n \in [0, N]$. We claim that for all $x \in \text{AB}^\gamma(n)$, there exists $y \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ such that

$$(289) \quad d_{\text{graph}}^{(n)}(x, y) \leq r,$$

for all $n \in [0, N]$, where $d_{\text{graph}}^{(n)}$ denotes the graph distance relative to the tree $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$. Clearly, (289) implies (288). Therefore, we proceed to prove (289) by induction.

If $n \in [0, r - 1]$, then, by Lemma 4.13, for all $x \in \text{AB}^\gamma(n)$, there exists $y \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ such that $d_{\text{graph}}^{(n)}(x, y) \leq r$. This shows (289) for $n \in [0, r - 1]$. Then, we assume that for all $x \in \text{AB}^\gamma(n - 1)$, there exists $y \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n - 1)$ such that

$$(290) \quad d_{\text{graph}}^{(n-1)}(x, y) \leq r,$$

for $n \in [1, N]$. By using the dynamics of the Skeleton chain described in Remark 4.14 and the induction hypothesis (290), we will prove (289) by considering the following cases:

Case 1 (Root-growth type I). Suppose that $\gamma(n) \notin \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)$ (i.e. $\gamma(n) \notin \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1))$) and $\gamma(n) \notin \text{AB}^\gamma(n-1)$. In this case, both trees $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ and $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ are obtained by adding the same vertex $\gamma(n)$ and the edge $\{\gamma(n-1), \gamma(n)\}$ (the new root in both trees is $\gamma(n)$). Therefore, it should be clear that by the induction hypothesis (290), (289) is satisfied.

Case 2 (Root-growth type II). Suppose that $\gamma(n) \notin \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)$ and $\gamma(n) \in \text{AB}^\gamma(n-1)$. On the one hand, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ is obtained by adding the vertex $\gamma(n)$ and the edge $\{\gamma(n-1), \gamma(n)\}$. On the other hand, $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ is obtained by doing an Aldous-Broder move, that is, $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ is constructed from $\text{AB}^\gamma(n-1)$ by replacing the edge $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n)}(n-1)+1), \gamma(n)\}$ by the edge $\{\gamma(n-1), \gamma(n)\}$. (Again, $\gamma(n)$ is the new root in both trees.)

Note that the removed edge $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n)}(n-1)+1), \gamma(n)\}$ does not belong to $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)$ since in this case the Skeleton chain is doing a root-growth movement (recall Remark 4.14). Moreover, by removing the edge $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n)}(n-1)+1), \gamma(n)\}$ from $\text{AB}^\gamma(n-1)$ (before adding the new edge) we disconnect $\text{AB}^\gamma(n-1)$ into two connected components (or two subtrees). One is the subtree above $\gamma(n)$ rooted at $\gamma(n)$, denoted by $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$. The other component contains the root $\gamma(n-1)$ of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n-1)$ and is denoted by $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$. Then, by adding the edge $\{\gamma(n-1), \gamma(n)\}$, one only attach to $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ the vertex $\gamma(n)$. Denote this new subtree by $\tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$. (That is, $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ is obtained by gluing together $\tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$ and $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$ at the vertex $\gamma(n)$.)

Clearly, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ is a subtree of $\tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$. Then, by the induction hypothesis (290), we have that for all $x \in \tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$, there exists $y \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ such that $d_{\text{graph}}^{(n)}(x, y) \leq r$. On the other hand, from the induction hypothesis (290), we know that for all $x \in S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$ there exists $y \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)$ such that $d_{\text{graph}}^{(n-1)}(x, y) \leq r$. However, note that necessary $\gamma(n)$ is in the path connecting x and y in $\text{AB}^\gamma(n-1)$. Then, $d_{\text{graph}}^{(n)}(x, \gamma(n)) = d_{\text{graph}}^{(n-1)}(x, \gamma(n)) \leq r$. But $\gamma(n) \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ (indeed, $\gamma(n)$ is the root of $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n)$). Thus, the above shows that (289) also holds in this case.

Case 3 (Aldous-Broder move). Suppose that $\gamma(n) \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n-1)$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(n-1) = \emptyset$. In this case, both trees $\text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(n)$ and $\text{AB}^\gamma(n)$ are obtained by replacing the edge $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n)}(n-1)+1), \gamma(n)\}$ by the edge $\{\gamma(n-1), \gamma(n)\}$. (Again, $\gamma(n)$ is the new root in both trees.)

Note that by removing the edge $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n)}(n-1)+1), \gamma(n)\}$ from $\text{AB}^\gamma(n-1)$ (before adding the new edge) we disconnect $\text{AB}^\gamma(n-1)$ into two connected components (or two subtrees). Namely, $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$ and $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ defined as in the previous **Case 2 (Root-growth type II)**. Let $\tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$ denote the subtree defined as in **Case 2 (Root-growth type II)**.

Similarly, by removing the edge $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n)}(n-1)+1), \gamma(n)\}$ from $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)$ (before adding the new edge) we disconnect $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)$ into two connected components (or two subtrees). One is the subtree above $\gamma(n)$ rooted at $\gamma(n)$, denoted by $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{Skel}}$. The other component contains the root $\gamma(n-1)$ of $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)$ and is denoted by $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{Skel}}$. Then, by adding the edge $\{\gamma(n-1), \gamma(n)\}$, one only attach to $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{Skel}}$ the vertex $\gamma(n)$. Denote this new subtree by $\tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{Skel}}$. (That is, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ is obtained by gluing together $\tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{Skel}}$ and $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{Skel}}$ at the vertex $\gamma(n)$.)

Clearly, $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{Skel}}$ is a subtree of $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$ and $\tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{Skel}}$ is a subtree of $\tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$. Since $\gamma(n) \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ (indeed, $\gamma(n)$ is the root of $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$), it follows from the induction hypothesis (290), that necessary for all $x \in S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$ and $x' \in \tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$, there are $y \in S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{Skel}}$ and $y' \in \tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{Skel}}$ such that $d_{\text{graph}}^{(n)}(x, y) \leq r$ and $d_{\text{graph}}^{(n)}(x', y') \leq r$. Thus, (289) also holds in this case.

Case 4 (Ghost indices erasure). Suppose that $\gamma(n) \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1) \neq \emptyset$. In this case, all the ghost indices created $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)$ form a small loop at time n (that is, a loop of length less or equal to $s' - 1$ by the Assumption **No loops of intermediate length**). This loop is erased in the skeleton.

On the other hand, $\text{AB}^{\gamma}(n)$ is obtained by doing an Aldous-Broder move, that is, $\text{AB}^{\gamma}(n)$ is constructed from $\text{AB}^{\gamma}(n-1)$ by replacing the edge $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n)}(n-1)+1), \gamma(n)\}$ by the edge $\{\gamma(n-1), \gamma(n)\}$. ($\gamma(n)$ is the new root of $\text{AB}^{\gamma}(n)$.) As in **Case 2 (Root-growth type II)** and **Case 3 (Aldous-Broder move)**, by removing the edge $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n)}(n-1)+1), \gamma(n)\}$ from $\text{AB}^{\gamma}(n-1)$ (before adding the new edge) we disconnect $\text{AB}^{\gamma}(n-1)$ into two connected components (or two subtrees). Namely, $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$ and $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{AB}}$ defined as in **Case 2 (Root-growth type II)**. Let $\tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$ denote the subtree defined as in **Case 2 (Root-growth type II)**.

Similarly, by removing the edge $\{\gamma(L_{\gamma(n)}(n-1)+1), \gamma(n)\}$ from $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)$ we disconnect $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)$ into two connected components (or two subtrees). Namely, $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{Ske}}$ and $C_{\gamma(n-1)}^{\text{Ske}}$ defined as in **Case 3 (Aldous-Broder move)**. Then, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ is exactly the connected component $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{Skel}}$.

Clearly, $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{Skel}}$ is a subtree of $S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$. Then, by the induction hypothesis (290), we have that for all $x \in S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$, there exists $y \in S_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{Skel}}$ such that $d_{\text{graph}}^{(n)}(x, y) \leq r$. On the other hand, by Lemma 4.17, $\#C_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}} \leq r$. Then, since $\gamma(n) \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ (indeed, $\gamma(n)$ is the root of $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$), it follows that necessary for all $x \in \tilde{C}_{\gamma(n)}^{\text{AB}}$, $d_{\text{graph}}^{(n)}(x, \gamma(n)) \leq r$. Thus, the above shows that (289) also holds in this case.

This concludes our proof. □

4.4. Behavior of the skeleton chain between long loops. This subsection establishes analogous results to those in Subsection 3.1. Informally, we prove that between long loops of the

path γ (those with a length of $r + 1$ or greater), the Skeleton chain exhibits purely path-like behavior, equivalently, it only exhibits root-growth or ghost indices erasure (recall the dynamics of Remark 4.14).

Fix $s, s', r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$. Recall that $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ and the definition of the intervals $A_i^{(r,s)}$'s and $B_i^{(r,s)}$'s in (141), for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq i < j$, we define

$$(291) \quad Z_{(i,j)}^{\gamma, (r,s)} := \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbb{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)})) \cap \mathbb{R}^\gamma(B_j^{(r,s)}) \neq \emptyset\}}.$$

Just as in (181), if $Z_{(i,j)}^{\gamma, (r,s)} = 1$, then we call j a cut-time and i a cut-point. First, we show that if the path γ does not form a long loop (with a length of $r + 1$ or greater) within the interval $[0, kr]$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$ is a connected path.

Lemma 4.19. *Assume $r, s, s' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$. Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N/r \geq 2$. Let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ that satisfies Assumptions *No loops of intermediate length*, *Local cut points* and Properties (P.1)-(P.4) on $[0, N]$. Fix any $0 \leq k \leq \lfloor N/r \rfloor$ and suppose that*

$$(292) \quad Z_{(i,j)}^{\gamma, (r,s)} = 0, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i < j \leq k.$$

(If $k < 2$, then (292) is satisfied by vacuity.) Then, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$ is a connected path, and

$$(293) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) \leq \#\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) + 3ks + 1.$$

Proof. First, we prove that $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$ is connected, for $0 \leq k \leq \lfloor N/r \rfloor$. In fact, by Lemma 4.13, we know that $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ is connected, for all $n \in [0, \lfloor N/r \rfloor r]$. Subsequently, we focus on demonstrating that $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$ is a path.

We fix $k \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor N/r \rfloor\}$ and proceed by induction to prove that $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ is a path for every $n \in \{0, \dots, kr\}$. For $n = 0, 1$, note that $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ is clearly a path. Then, we assume that $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(m)$ is a path for every $m \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ and prove that $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ is a path.

We will prove that at time n , the Skeleton chain undergoes either a root-growth or a ghost indices erasure movement (refer to Remark 4.14). Consequently, by the inductive hypothesis, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ maintains its path structure. We consider two cases:

Case 1. Suppose that $\gamma(n) \notin \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1))$. In this case, the Skeleton undergoes a root-growth movement at time n (refer to Remark 4.14). Consequently, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(n)$ unequivocally remains a path.

Case 2. Suppose that

$$(294) \quad \gamma(n) \in \mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)).$$

We start by showing that

$$(295) \quad \gamma(n) \in \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n-s+1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1))$$

and

$$(296) \quad \gamma(n) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, n-s] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)).$$

If $n \in [0, s-1]$, then (295) and (296) are satisfied. Suppose that $n \in [s, kr]$. By the assumption of **No loops of intermediate length**, we know that

$$(297) \quad \gamma(n) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0 \vee (n-r), n-s]).$$

If $n \in [s, r-1]$, then (297) implies that (295) and (296) are satisfied. So, we assume that $n \in [r, kr]$. Recall the definitions of the intervals $B_i^{(r,s)}$'s in (141). Since $n \in [r, kr]$, there exists $j \in \{2, \dots, k+1\}$ such that $n \in [(j-1)r, jr-1]$. On the one hand, if $n \in [(j-1)r, jr-1] \setminus B_j^{(r,s)}$, then (P.3) implies that

$$(298) \quad \gamma(n) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, n-r-1]).$$

On the other hand, if $n \in B_j^{(r,s)}$, it necessarily follows that $j \leq k$ since $n \in [r, kr]$. Thus, (292) and Corollary 4.10 (note that, $k < \tau_1^{\gamma, (r,s)}$) imply that

$$(299) \quad \gamma(n) \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^{j-1} \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\mathbf{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)})) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{j-1} \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)).$$

Hence (299) and (P.2) imply that

$$(300) \quad \gamma(n) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, n-r-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)).$$

Therefore, if $n \in [r, kr]$, then (295) and (296) follows from (297), (298) and (300).

Next, we prove that there exists $m_1 \in [n-s+1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)$ such that $\gamma(m_1) = \gamma(n)$ (that is, m_1 satisfies (201) in (\mathbf{G}_n)) and

$$(301) \quad \gamma(k) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, k-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)), \quad \text{for all } k \in [m_1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)$$

(that is, m_1 satisfies (202) in (\mathbf{G}_n)). But by the induction hypothesis, we know that $\text{Skel}(n-1)$ is a path. Recall from Definition 4.12 that $\text{Skel}(n-1)$ is the subgraph of $\text{AB}^\gamma(n-1)$ restricted to the vertex set $\mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1))$. In particular, we have that any $m_1 \in [n-s+1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)$ such that $\gamma(m_1) = \gamma(n)$ satisfies (301). (Note that, by (295), there is at least one $m_1 \in [n-s+1, n-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)$ such that $\gamma(m_1) = \gamma(n)$.)

Consequently, by (295), (296) and (301), it is established that at time n , the scenario aligns with **Case 3** within the proof of Lemma 4.13. This implies that at time n , the Skeleton

undergoes a Ghost indices erasure movement (refer to Remark 4.14). As a result, $\text{Skel}(n)$ maintains its path structure.

This concludes the proof of the first part of Lemma 4.19.

Finally, we prove that (293). Clearly, for $k = 0, 1$, the inequality (293) holds. Suppose that $k \in \{2, \dots, \lfloor N/r \rfloor\}$. Recall from Definition 4.12 that $\text{Skel}(kr)$ is the subgraph of $\text{AB}^\gamma(kr)$ restricted to the vertex set $\mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, kr] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr))$. On the other hand, note that, $\mathbb{R}^\gamma([0, kr] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr))$ is equal to

$$(302) \quad \{\gamma(kr)\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathbb{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathbb{R}^\gamma(\left([(i-1)r, ir - 1 \right] \setminus B_i^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)),$$

which by (292) and Corollary 4.10 (note that, $k < \tau_1^{\gamma,(r,s)}$) is equal to

$$(303) \quad \{\gamma(kr)\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathbb{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)})) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathbb{R}^\gamma(\left([(i-1)r, ir - 1 \right] \setminus B_i^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)).$$

Note also that (292) and Corollary 4.10 imply that the sets

$$(304) \quad \mathbb{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)})) = \mathbb{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)),$$

for $i = 1, \dots, k$, are disjoint. Therefore, the lower bound in (293) is a direct consequence of (303). The upper bound in (293) also follows from (303) in conjunction with the observation that

$$(305) \quad \# \left(\{\gamma(kr)\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathbb{R}^\gamma(\left([(i-1)r, ir - 1 \right] \setminus B_i^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)) \right) \leq 3ks + 1.$$

This concludes the proof of (293). \square

The next objective is to generalize the preceding lemma. We aim to prove, under specific assumptions regarding the path γ , that the Skeleton chain, when restricted to an interval encompassing segments not involved in any intersection, exhibits a path structure. To formalize this, we require the following definitions.

Consider $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N/r \geq 2$. Fix $2 \leq k \leq \lfloor N/r \rfloor$ and suppose that there exists an integer $1 \leq n \leq \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ and indices $1 \leq i_m < j_m \leq k$, for $1 \leq m \leq n$, such that $i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n$ are all distinct,

$$(306) \quad Z_{(i_m, j_m)}^{\gamma,(r,s)} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{(i, j)}^{\gamma,(r,s)} = 0,$$

for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ with either i or j not in $\{i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n\}$.

Next, suppose that the path $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ satisfies the Assumption **Local cut points** on $[0, N]$. Let i'_1, \dots, i'_{2n} be the sequence $i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n$ ordered in increasing order, that is, $i'_1 < \dots < i'_{2n}$. Set $i'_0 = 0$ and $i'_{2n+1} = k + 1$. For $m = 0, \dots, 2n$, define $I_m^{(r,s)} \subset [0, N]$, as

$$(307) \quad I_m^{(r,s)} = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } [\min B_{i'_{m+1}}, \max B_{i'_{m+1}-1}] = \emptyset, \\ [\ell_m^1 + 1, \ell_m^2] & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where ℓ_m^1 is the largest $2s'$ -local cutpoint in $[\min B_{i'_{m+1}} - s, \min B_{i'_{m+1}}]$, and ℓ_m^2 is the smallest $2s'$ -local cutpoint in $[\max B_{i'_{m+1}-1} + 1, \max B_{i'_{m+1}-1} + s + 1]$, whenever $[\min B_{i'_{m+1}}, \max B_{i'_{m+1}-1}] \neq \emptyset$. (By Assumption **Local cut points**, those $2s'$ -local cutpoints exist.)

For $m = 0, \dots, 2n$, let $\text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)})$ be the subgraph of $\text{AB}^\gamma(kr)$ restricted to the vertex set $\text{R}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr))$. Note that $\text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)})$ is a subgraph (not necessary connected) of $\text{Skel}_\gamma^{(r,s)}(kr)$. Moreover, if $[\min B_{i'_{m+1}}, \max B_{i'_{m+1}-1}] = \emptyset$, then, by Lemma 4.9, $\gamma(\ell_m^2) \in \text{R}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr))$.

Finally, in the following result, we also consider the metric space $\bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)})$ formed by the union of the metric spaces $\text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)})$. This union is naturally endowed with the metric induced by the restriction of the metric of $\text{Skel}_\gamma^{(r,s)}(kr)$ to this set.

Lemma 4.20. *Assume $r, s, s' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$. Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N/r \geq 2$. Let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ that satisfies Assumptions **No loops of intermediate length**, **Local cut points** and **Properties (P.1)-(P.4)** on $[0, N]$. Fix any $2 \leq k \leq \lfloor N/r \rfloor$ and suppose that there exists an integer $1 \leq n \leq \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ and indices $1 \leq i_m < j_m \leq k$, for $1 \leq m \leq n$, such that $i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n$ are all distinct, and*

$$(308) \quad Z_{(i_m, j_m)}^{(r,s)}(\gamma) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{(i, j)}^{(r,s)}(\gamma) = 0,$$

for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ with either i or j not in $\{i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n\}$. Then,

(i) For $m = 0, \dots, 2n$, $\text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)})$ is a connected path. In particular, for each $n \in I_m^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$, there is no different $n' \in I_m^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$ such that $\gamma(n) = \gamma(n')$.

(ii) It holds that

$$(309) \quad d_{\text{H}} \left(\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr), \bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)}) \right) \leq 2r + 6s.$$

(iii) For $m = 0, \dots, 2n$ such that $I_m^{(r,s)} \neq \emptyset$, we have that

$$(310) \quad \sum_{h=i'_m+1}^{i'_{m+1}-1} \# \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) \leq \# \text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)}) \leq \sum_{h=i'_m+1}^{i'_{m+1}-1} \# \text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) + 3s(i'_{m+1} - i'_m - 1) \vee 0 + 2s.$$

(iv) Consider $m = 0, \dots, 2n$ such that $I_m^{(r,s)} \neq \emptyset$. Let $n_1, n_2 \in I_m^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$ be such that $n_1 < n_2$. Then,

$$(311) \quad \sum_{h=u_1+1}^{u_2-1} \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) \leq d_{\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr)}(\gamma(n_1), \gamma(n_2)) \leq \sum_{h=u_1+1}^{u_2-1} \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) + 3s(u_2 - u_1 - 1) \vee 0 + 2r,$$

where $u_1, u_2 \in \{i'_m + 1, \dots, i'_{m+1}\}$ are such that $u_1 \leq u_2$, $n_1 \in [(u_1 - 1)r, u_1 r - 1]$ and $n_2 \in [(u_2 - 1)r, u_2 r - 1]$.

(v) Consider different $m_1, m_2 \in \{0, \dots, 2n\}$ such that $I_{m_1}^{(r,s)} \neq \emptyset$ and $I_{m_2}^{(r,s)} \neq \emptyset$. Let $n_1 \in I_{m_1}^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$ and $n_2 \in I_{m_2}^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$ such that $n_1 < n_2$. For $i = 1, 2$, let \tilde{n}_i be the boundary point in $I_{m_i}^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$ that is in the path in $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$ from $\gamma(n_1)$ to $\gamma(n_2)$. Let

$$(312) \quad M_{n_1, n_2}^{(r,s)} := \{m \in \{0, \dots, 2n\} : \text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)}) \text{ is contained in the path from } \gamma(n_1) \text{ to } \gamma(n_2)\},$$

Then,

$$(313) \quad \begin{aligned} & d_{\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr)}(\gamma(n_1), \gamma(n_2)) \\ & \geq \sum_{h=u_1+1}^{u_2-1} \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) + \sum_{h=u_3+1}^{u_4-1} \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) + \sum_{m \in M_{n_1, n_2}^{(r,s)}} \#\text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(314) \quad \begin{aligned} & d_{\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr)}(\gamma(n_1), \gamma(n_2)) \\ & \leq \sum_{h=u_1+1}^{u_2-1} \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) + \sum_{h=u_3+1}^{u_4-1} \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) + \sum_{m \in M_{n_1, n_2}^{(r,s)}} \#\text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)}) \\ & \quad + 3s(u_2 - u_1 + u_4 - u_3 - 2) \vee 0 + 4r + 2rn, \end{aligned}$$

where $u_1, u_2 \in \{i'_{m_1} + 1, \dots, i'_{m_1+1}\}$ and $u_3, u_4 \in \{i'_{m_2} + 1, \dots, i'_{m_2+1}\}$ are such that $u_1 \leq u_2$, $u_3 \leq u_4$, $n_1 \wedge \tilde{n}_1 \in [(u_1 - 1)r, u_1 r - 1]$, $n_1 \vee \tilde{n}_1 \in [(u_2 - 1)r, u_2 r - 1]$, $n_2 \wedge \tilde{n}_2 \in [(u_3 - 1)r, u_3 r - 1]$ and $n_2 \vee \tilde{n}_2 \in [(u_4 - 1)r, u_4 r - 1]$.

Proof. Fix $k \in \{2, \dots, \lfloor N/r \rfloor\}$ and $m \in \{0, \dots, 2n\}$. Assume that $I_m^{(r,s)} \neq \emptyset$. Note that $\ell_m^2 = \max I_m^{(r,s)}$ and $\ell_m^1 + 1 = \min I_m^{(r,s)}$. First, we prove that

$$(315) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma((I_m^{(r,s)} \cap [0, n]) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, \ell_m^1 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)) = \emptyset.$$

for all $n \in I_m^{(r,s)}$. This is equivalent to prove that for each $n \in I_m^{(r,s)}$,

$$(316) \quad \gamma(h) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, \ell_m^1 - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)), \quad \text{for } h \in (I_m^{(r,s)} \cap [0, n]) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n),$$

Fix $n \in I_m^{(r,s)}$ and consider $h \in I_m^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$. Note that $h \geq \ell_m^1 \geq s$. Since ℓ_m^1 is a $2s'$ -local cutpoint (recall Definition 2.7), the assumption of **No loops of intermediate length** implies that

$$(317) \quad \gamma(h) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0 \vee (h-r), \ell_m^1 \vee (h-s')]).$$

If $h \in [s, r-1]$, then (317) implies (316). So, we assume that $h \in [r, \ell_m^2]$ and $\ell_m^2 \geq r$. Since $h \in [r, \ell_m^2]$, there exists $j \in \{i'_m + 1, \dots, i'_{m+1} - 1\}$ such that $h \in [(j-1)r, jr - 1]$. On the one hand, if $h \in [(j-1)r, jr - 1] \setminus B_j^{(r,s)}$, then (P.3) implies that

$$(318) \quad \gamma(h) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, h-r-1]).$$

On the other hand, assume $h \in B_j^{(r,s)}$. Thus (308) implies that

$$(319) \quad \gamma(h) \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^{j-1} \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)})).$$

Recall the definition of $\tau_i^{\gamma,(r,s)}$ given in (233). By (308), there exists $\tilde{k} \in [1, \lfloor N/r \rfloor]$ such that $\{i'_m + 1, \dots, i'_{m+1} - 1\} \subseteq [\tau_{\tilde{k}-1}^{\gamma,(r,s)} + 1, \tau_{\tilde{k}}^{\gamma,(r,s)} - 1]$. Therefore, by Corollary 4.10

$$(320) \quad \bigcup_{u=1}^{m-1} \bigcup_{i=i'_u+1}^{i'_{u+1}-1} \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)})) = \bigcup_{u=1}^{m-1} \bigcup_{i=i'_u+1}^{i'_{u+1}-1} \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1))$$

and

$$(321) \quad \bigcup_{i=i'_m+1}^{j-1} \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)})) = \bigcup_{i=i'_m+1}^{j-1} \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)).$$

Moreover, note that

$$(322) \quad \bigcup_{u=1}^m \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_{i'_u}^{(r,s)})) \subseteq \bigcup_{u=1}^m \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_{i'_u}^{(r,s)})$$

and thus, by (308), (319), (322) and (P.1),

$$(323) \quad \gamma(h) \notin \bigcup_{u=1}^m \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_{i'_u}^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)).$$

Hence (319), (320), (321), (323) and (P.2) imply that

$$(324) \quad \gamma(h) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, h-r-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)).$$

Therefore, if $h \in [r, \ell_m^2]$, then (316) follows from (317), (318) and (324).

This concludes that proof of (316) and thus of (315).

Next, we prove that

$$(325) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell_m^2 + 1, n] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)) = \emptyset,$$

for all $n \in [\ell_m^2 + 1, kr]$. This is equivalent to prove that for each $n \in [\ell_m^2 + 1, kr]$,

$$(326) \quad \gamma(h) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)), \quad \text{for } h \in [\ell_m^2 + 1, n] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n).$$

Fix $n \in [\ell_m^2 + 1, kr]$ and consider $h \in [\ell_m^2 + 1, n] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n)$. Note that $h \geq \ell_m^2 + 1 \geq r - s$. Since ℓ_m^2 is a $2s'$ -local cutpoint (recall Definition 2.7), the assumption of **No loops of intermediate length** implies that

$$(327) \quad \gamma(h) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0 \vee (h-r), \ell_m^2 \vee (h-s')]).$$

If $h \in [r-s, r-1]$, then (327) implies (326). So, we assume that $h \in [\ell_m^2 + 1, n] \cap [r, n]$ such that $[\ell_m^2 + 1, n] \cap [r, n] \neq \emptyset$. Then, there exists $j \in \{i'_m + 1, \dots, k\}$ such that $h \in [(j-1)r, jr-1]$. On the one hand, if $h \in [(j-1)r, jr-1] \setminus B_j^{(r,s)}$, then (P.3) implies that

$$(328) \quad \gamma(h) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, h-r-1]).$$

On the other hand, assume $h \in B_j^{(r,s)}$. Thus, (308) and Corollary 4.10 imply that

$$(329) \quad \gamma(h) \notin \bigcup_{i=i'_m+1}^{i'_{m+1}-1} \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)})) = \bigcup_{i=i'_m+1}^{i'_{m+1}-1} \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)).$$

Thus, by (329) and (P.1),

$$(330) \quad \gamma(h) \notin \mathbf{R}^\gamma([0 \vee \ell_m^1, h-r-1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n-1)).$$

Therefore, if $h \in [\ell_m^2 + 1, n] \cap [r, n]$, then (326) follows from (327), (328) and (330).

This concludes that proof of (326) and thus of (325).

Having established the preceding results, we are now prepared to prove Lemma 4.20. We start with the proof of (i). We prove that $\text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)})$ is a connected path. The proof follows an argument similar to that of Lemma 4.19, and hence we only outline the key ideas. Assume

that $I_m^{(r,s)} \neq \emptyset$, otherwise our claim is trivial. For $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $B_m^\gamma(n)$ be the subgraph of $AB^\gamma(n)$ restricted to the vertex set $R^\gamma((I_m^{(r,s)} \cap [0, n]) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n))$. Observe that $B_m^\gamma(n) = \text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)})$, for $n = kr$. The goal is to prove that

$$(331) \quad B_m^\gamma(n) \text{ is a connected path for every } n \in \{0, \dots, kr\}.$$

Recall that $\ell_m^2 = \max I_m^{(r,s)}$ and $\ell_m^1 + 1 = \min I_m^{(r,s)}$. Then, $B_m^\gamma(n) = \emptyset$, for all $n = 0, \dots, \ell_m^1$, and our claim follows, that is, $B_m^\gamma(n)$ is a connected path. Next, an induction argument, analogous to the proof of the first claim in Lemma 4.20 but employing (315), establishes that $B_m^\gamma(n)$ is a connected path for every $n \in \{\ell_m^1 + 1, \dots, \ell_m^2\}$. (The above is equivalent to prove that the Skeleton chain $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(\cdot)$ exhibits purely path-like behaviour in the interval $[\ell_m^1 + 1, \ell_m^2]$.) Finally, to prove that $B_m^\gamma(n)$ remains a connected path for $n \in \{\ell_m^2 + 1, \dots, kr\}$, it suffices to employ (325). Notably, the latter also implies

$$(332) \quad I_m^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(\ell_m^2) = I_m^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(n),$$

for all $n \in \{\ell_m^2 + 1, \dots, kr\}$, as evident from Definition 4.1.

The ‘‘in particular’’ part of (i) follows from Definition 4.1. This concludes the proof of (i).

Now, we prove (ii). By (197), it is enough to bound

$$(333) \quad \sup \left\{ d_H \left(x, \bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)}) \right) : x \in \text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr) \setminus \bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)}) \right\}.$$

The latter is bounded by the maximum size among the connected components of $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr) \setminus \bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)})$. Those are formed by segments involving the creation of a long-loop (of length larger than $r + 1$) in the trajectory of the path γ . By (307) and the definition of ℓ_m^1 and ℓ_m^2 , note that each of those connected components is contained in

$$(334) \quad \begin{aligned} & [\max B_{i_{m-1}}^{(r,s)} + 1, \min B_{i_m}^{(r,s)} - 1] \cup (B_{i_m}^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)) \cup [\max B_{i_m}^{(r,s)} + 1, \min B_{i_{m+1}}^{(r,s)} - 1] \\ & \bigcup [\max B_{j_{m-1}}^{(r,s)} + 1, \min B_{j_m}^{(r,s)} - 1] \cup (B_{j_m}^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)) \cup [\max B_{j_m}^{(r,s)} + 1, \min B_{j_{m+1}}^{(r,s)} - 1], \end{aligned}$$

for some $m \in [1, n]$, where i_m and j_m are defined before (306). Since the size of the set in (334) is at most $2r + 6s$, then (ii) follows.

We continue with the proof of (iii). First note that n_2 could be equal to ℓ_m^2 , and this could be equal (by Definition (307)) to $\max B_{i'_{m+1}-1} + s + 1 \in [(i'_{m+1} - 1)r, i'_{m+1}r - 1]$, which justifies $u_2 = i'_{m+1}$. The proof of (310) follows a similar argument to that of (293) in Lemma 4.20. Recall that $\text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)})$ is defined as the subgraph of $AB^\gamma(kr)$ restricted to the vertex set $R^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr))$. Define

$$(335) \quad D_i^{(r,s)} := R^\gamma([(i-1)r, ir-1] \setminus B_i^{(r,s)}) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr),$$

for $i = i'_m + 1, \dots, i'_{m+1} - 1$,

$$(336) \quad C_{1,m}^{(r,s)} = \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\ell_m^1 + 1, \min B_{i'_{m+1}} - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr))$$

and

$$(337) \quad C_{2,m}^{(r,s)} = \mathbf{R}^\gamma([\max B_{i'_{m+1}-1} + 1, \ell_m^2] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)).$$

Note that $\mathbf{R}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr))$ is equal to

$$(338) \quad C_{1,m}^{(r,s)} \cup \bigcup_{i=i'_m+1}^{i'_{m+1}-1} \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)) \cup D_i^{(r,s)} \cup C_{2,m}^{(r,s)}.$$

Now, using (308) and Corollary 4.10, the set in (338) is equal to

$$(339) \quad C_{1,m}^{(r,s)} \cup \bigcup_{i=i'_m+1}^{i'_{m+1}-1} \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)})) \cup D_i^{(r,s)} \cup C_{2,m}^{(r,s)}.$$

Note also that (308) and Corollary 4.10 imply that the sets

$$(340) \quad \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)})) = \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_i^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)),$$

for $i = i'_m + 1, \dots, i'_{m+1} - 1$, are disjoint. Therefore, the lower bound in (310) is a direct consequence of (339). The upper bound in (310) also follows from (339) in conjunction with the observation that

$$(341) \quad \# \left(C_{1,m}^{(r,s)} \cup \bigcup_{i=i'_m+1}^{i'_{m+1}-1} D_i^{(r,s)} \cup C_{2,m}^{(r,s)} \right) \leq 3s(i'_{m+1} - i'_m - 1) + 2s.$$

This concludes the proof of (iii).

Now we prove (iv). The proof is similar to that of part (iii). Clearly, for $n_1, n_2 \in I_m^{(r,s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$ such that $n_1 < n_2$, there are $u_1, u_2 \in \{i'_m + 1, \dots, i'_{m+1}\}$ such that $u_1 \leq u_2$, $n_1 \in [(u_1 - 1)r, u_1 r - 1]$ and $n_2 \in [(u_2 - 1)r, u_2 r - 1]$. Define

$$(342) \quad C(n_1) = \mathbf{R}^\gamma([n_1, u_1 r - 1] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr))$$

and

$$(343) \quad C(n_2) = \mathbf{R}^\gamma([(u_2 - 1)r, n_2] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)).$$

Note that $\mathbf{R}^\gamma([n_1, n_2] \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(kr))$ is equal to

$$(344) \quad C(n_1) \cup \bigcup_{i=u_1+1}^{u_2-1} \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_i \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(kr)) \cup D_i^{(r, s)} \cup C(n_2),$$

which by (308) and Corollary 4.10, is equal to

$$(345) \quad C(n_1) \cup \bigcup_{i=u_1+1}^{u_2-1} \mathbf{R}^\gamma(\mathbf{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A_i^{(r, s)})) \cup D_i^{(r, s)} \cup C(n_2).$$

Then, (311) follows from (345).

Finally, we prove (v). The proof follows a similar argument to that in part (iv). Indeed, we decompose the path connecting $\gamma(n_1)$ with $\gamma(n_2)$ within $\text{Skel}_\gamma^{(r, s)}(kr)$. Then, we utilize the fact that the branches $\text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r, s)})$ are disjoint. The term $\sum_{m \in M_{n_1, n_2}^{(r, s)}} \#\text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r, s)})$ is the size of each branch contained in the path from n_1 to n_2 in $\text{Skel}_\gamma^{(r, s)}(kr)$. Also, the term $\sum_{h=u_1+1}^{u_2-1} \#\mathbf{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A_i^{(r, s)}) + 3s(u_2 - u_1 - 1) \vee 0 + 2r$ accounts for the distance between $\gamma(n_1)$ and $\gamma(\tilde{n}_1)$ in $\text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r, s)})$, by (iv). Finally, the term $2rn$ bounds the removed intervals $\bigcup_{m=1}^n \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_{i_m}^{(r, s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(kr)) \cup \mathbf{R}^\gamma(B_{j_m}^{(r, s)} \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma, s}(kr))$. \square

5. DECOMPOSABLE PATHS

In this section, we prove that the lazy random walk on a finite, simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$ satisfies all assumptions and properties introduced in the preceding section with high probability up to a given fixed time. Namely, Assumptions **No loops of intermediate length**, **Local cut points** and properties **(P.1)-(P.4)** with high probability up to a given fixed time. This will enable us to directly apply the results established in Corollary 4.10 and Proposition 4.18.

We start by introducing the notion of *decomposable paths* in the deterministic setting.

Definition 5.1 ((r, s, s') -good paths up to \mathbb{N}). Let $r, s, s' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$. We say that a path $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ on a finite, simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$ is an (r, s, s') -good path on $[0, N]$ if it satisfies Assumptions **No loops of intermediate length** and **Local cut points** on $[0, N]$.

In the following, we write

$$(346) \quad \mathcal{G}^{G; (r, s, s')} (N) := \{ \gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V : \gamma \text{ is a } (r, s, s')\text{-good path on } [0, N] \}.$$

Recall the definition of $B_i^{(r, s)}$ in (141).

Definition 5.2 ((r, s, s') -decomposable paths). Let $r, s, s' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$, $s' \geq t_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. We define a path $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ on a finite, simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$ as (r, s, s') -decomposable on $[0, N]$ if $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^{G, (r, s, s')}(N)$ and satisfies **(P.1)**-**(P.4)**.

In the following, we write

$$(347) \quad \mathcal{D}^{G, (r, s, s')}(N) := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^{G, (r, s, s')}(N) : \gamma \text{ is } (r, s, s')\text{-decomposable on } [0, N]\}.$$

Next, for (r, s, s') -decomposable γ , let

$$(348) \quad \sigma^{\gamma, (r, s, s')} := \max \{m \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \gamma \in \mathcal{D}^{G, (r, s, s')}(m)\}.$$

The next result gives an estimate of the probability that the lazy random walk on a simple, connected, regular graph is (r, s, s') -decomposable until a given fixed time.

Proposition 5.3 (Decomposability up to time N). *Let W be the lazy random walk on a finite simple, connected, regular graph $G = (V, E)$. Let $r, s, s', q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$, $2s' \geq qt_{\text{mix}}^G + 1$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for all $\rho \in V$, we have*

$$(349) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\sigma^{W, (r, s, s')} > N) \geq 1 - N(\bar{q}^G(2s'))^{\lfloor \frac{s}{6s'} \rfloor} - \frac{2(3r + 2s)N}{\#V} - \frac{16rN^3}{(\#V)^2} - \frac{8Ns(3N + 2s)}{r\#V} - \frac{sN}{3 \cdot 4qs'},$$

where \bar{q}^G is defined in (65).

Proof. By Definition 5.1, Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.8 together with the union bound, for all $\rho \in V$,

$$(350) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\rho(W \in \mathcal{D}^{G, (r, s, s')}(N)) &\geq 1 - \frac{2(r - s' + 1)(N + 1)}{\#V} - (N - s + 1) \left((\bar{q}^G(2s'))^{\lfloor \frac{s}{6s'} \rfloor} + \frac{s}{3 \cdot 4qs'} \right) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{4rN}{\#V} - N(\bar{q}^G(2s'))^{\lfloor \frac{s}{6s'} \rfloor} - \frac{sN}{3 \cdot 4qs'}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we define random variables that integrate the properties **(P.1)**-**(P.4)**. Let

$$(351) \quad \mathcal{N}_1^{\gamma, (r, s)}(N) := \sum_{1 \leq j_1, j_2, j_3 \leq \lfloor \frac{N}{r} \rfloor} \mathbf{1}_{\{\#\{j_1, j_2, j_3\}=3\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{R^\gamma(B_{j_1}^{(r, s)}) \cap R^\gamma(B_{j_2}^{(r, s)}) \neq \emptyset, R^\gamma(B_{j_3}^{(r, s)}) \cap R^\gamma(B_{j_2}^{(r, s)}) \neq \emptyset\}}$$

$$(352) \quad \mathcal{N}_2^{\gamma, (r, s)}(N) := \sum_{\substack{2 \leq i \leq \lfloor \frac{N}{r} \rfloor \\ 1 \leq j < i}} \mathbf{1}_{\{R^\gamma([(j-1)r, jr-1] \setminus B_j^{(r, s)}) \cap R^\gamma([\min B_i^{(r, s)}, \max B_i^{(r, s)} + s]) \neq \emptyset\}},$$

$$(353) \quad \mathcal{N}_3^{\gamma, (r,s)}(N) := \sum_{2 \leq i \leq \lfloor \frac{N}{r} \rfloor} \mathbf{1}_{\{R^\gamma([0, \max B_{i-1}^{(r,s)}]) \cap R^\gamma([(i-1)r, ir-1] \setminus B_i^{(r,s)}) \neq \emptyset\}},$$

and

$$(354) \quad \mathcal{N}_4^{\gamma, (r,s)}(N) := \mathbf{1}_{\{R^\gamma([0, r\lfloor N/r \rfloor - 1]) \cap R^\gamma([r\lfloor N/r \rfloor + 2s, N]) \neq \emptyset\}} \\ + \mathbf{1}_{\{R^\gamma([0, r\lfloor N/r \rfloor - s - 1]) \cap R^\gamma([r\lfloor N/r \rfloor, r\lfloor N/r \rfloor + 2s - 1]) \neq \emptyset\}}.$$

Note that the variables $\mathcal{N}_k^{\gamma, (r,s)}(N)$'s equalling zero corresponds to the fulfilment of the corresponding properties **(P.1)**-**(P.4)**. That is, $\mathcal{N}_1^{\gamma, (r,s)}(N) = 0$ if and only if **(P.1)** is satisfied, and similarly for the other variables. Now, for any fixed $\rho \in V$, we bound $\mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathcal{N}_k^{W, (r,s)}(T) \geq 1)$, for $k = 1, \dots, 4$.

First, we prove that

$$(355) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathcal{N}_1^{W, (r,s)}(N) \geq 1) \leq \frac{16rN^3}{(\#V)^2}.$$

Observe that (355) holds trivially when $N < 3r$, as $\mathcal{N}_1^{W, (r,s)}(N) = 0$ in this case. Then, suppose that $N \geq 3r$. By (51) in Proposition 2.4, for any $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ all different, we have that

$$(356) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(R^W(B_j^{(r,s)}) \cap R^W(B_k^{(r,s)}) \neq \emptyset, R^W(B_i^{(r,s)}) \cap R^W(B_k^{(r,s)}) \neq \emptyset) \leq \frac{8(r-3s)^4}{(\#V)^2}.$$

Therefore, (355) follows by observing that (356) and Markov's inequality imply that

$$(357) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathcal{N}_1^{W, (r,s)}(N) \geq 1) \leq 2 \left\lfloor \frac{N}{r} \right\rfloor^3 \frac{8(r-3s)^4}{(\#V)^2}.$$

Next, we prove that

$$(358) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathcal{N}_2^{W, (r,s)}(N) \geq 1) \leq \frac{12sN^2}{r\#V}.$$

Observe that (358) holds trivially when $N < 2r$, as $\mathcal{N}_2^{W, (r,s)}(N) = 0$ in this case. Then, suppose that $N \geq 2r$. For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, note that

(359)

$$R^W([(j-1)r, jr-1] \setminus B_j^{(r,s)}) = R^W([(j-1)r, (j-1)r+2s-1]) \cup R^W([jr-s, jr-1]).$$

Then, by (359), (50) in Proposition 2.4 and the union bound, we have that, for any $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ different,

$$(360) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(R^W([(j-1)r, jr-1] \setminus B_j^{(r,s)}) \cap R^W([\min B_i^{(r,s)}, \max B_i^{(r,s)} + s]) \neq \emptyset) \leq \frac{12s(r-2s)}{\#V}.$$

Hence, (358) follows by observing that (360) and Markov's inequality imply that

$$(361) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathcal{N}_2^{W,(r,s)}(N) \geq 1) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{N}{r} \right\rfloor^2 \frac{12s(r-2s)}{\#V}.$$

Now, we prove that

$$(362) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathcal{N}_3^{W,(r,s)}(N) \geq 1) \leq \frac{12sN^2}{r\#V} + \frac{16s^2N}{r\#V}.$$

Observe that (362) holds trivially when $N < 2r$, as $\mathcal{N}_3^{W,(r,s)}(N) = 0$ in this case. Then, suppose that $N \geq 2r$. It follows from (359) (with $j = i$) and the union bound that, for $i \geq 2$,

$$(363) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\rho(R^W([0, \max B_{i-1}^{(r,s)}]) \cap R^W([(i-1)r, ir-1] \setminus B_i^{(r,s)}) \neq \emptyset) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_\rho(R^W([0, \max B_{i-1}^{(r,s)}]) \cap R^W([(i-1)r, (i-1)r+2s-1]) \neq \emptyset) \\ &+ \mathbb{P}_\rho(R^W([0, \max B_{i-1}^{(r,s)}]) \cap R^W([ir-s, ir-1]) \neq \emptyset). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, once again, the union bound implies that

$$(364) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\rho(R^W([0, \max B_{i-1}^{(r,s)}]) \cap R^W([(i-1)r, (i-1)r+2s-1]) \neq \emptyset) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_\rho(R^W([0, s]) \cap R^W([(i-1)r, (i-1)r+2s-1]) \neq \emptyset) \\ &+ \mathbb{P}_\rho(R^W([s+1, \max B_{i-1}^{(r,s)}]) \cap R^W([(i-1)r, (i-1)r+2s-1]) \neq \emptyset). \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, by (50) in Proposition 2.4,

$$(365) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(R^W([s+1, \max B_{i-1}^{(r,s)}]) \cap R^W([(i-1)r, (i-1)r+2s-1]) \neq \emptyset) \leq \frac{8s((i-1)r-1)}{\#V}.$$

On the other hand, by Corollary 2.5 we have

$$(366) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(R^W([0, s]) \cap R^W([(i-1)r, (i-1)r+2s-1]) \neq \emptyset) \leq \frac{4s(s+1)}{\#V}.$$

Then, by (364), (365) and (366),

$$(367) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\rho(R^W([0, \max B_{i-1}^{(r,s)}]) \cap R^W([(i-1)r, (i-1)r+2s-1]) \neq \emptyset) \\ & \leq \frac{8s(i-1)r}{\#V} + \frac{8s^2}{\#V}. \end{aligned}$$

Following a computation analogous to (367), we have that

$$(368) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(R^W([0, \max B_{i-1}^{(r,s)}]) \cap R^W([ir-s, ir-1]) \neq \emptyset) \leq \frac{4s(i-1)r}{\#V} + \frac{8s^2}{\#V}.$$

Hence, (362) follows by observing that (363), (367), (368) and Markov's inequality imply that

$$(369) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathcal{N}_3^{W,(r,s)}(N) \geq 1) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{N}{r} \right\rfloor^2 \frac{12sr}{\#V} + \left\lfloor \frac{N}{r} \right\rfloor \frac{16s^2}{\#V}.$$

Finally, we prove that

$$(370) \quad \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathcal{N}_4^{W,(r,s)}(N) \geq 1) \leq \frac{2rN}{\#V} + \frac{4sN}{\#V}.$$

Observe that (370) holds trivially when $N < r$, as $\mathcal{N}_4^{W,(r,s)}(N) = 0$ in this case. Then, suppose that $N \geq r$. By applying Corollary 2.5 and following a derivation analogous to that of (362), we observe that

$$(371) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathcal{N}_4^{W,(r,s)}(N) \geq 1) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, r\lfloor N/r \rfloor - 1]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([r\lfloor N/r \rfloor + 2s, N]) \neq \emptyset) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P}_\rho(\mathbf{R}^\gamma([0, r\lfloor N/r \rfloor - s - 1]) \cap \mathbf{R}^\gamma([r\lfloor N/r \rfloor, r\lfloor N/r \rfloor + 2s - 1]) \neq \emptyset) \\ & \leq \frac{2r\lfloor N/r \rfloor(N - r\lfloor N/r \rfloor - 2s + 1)}{\#V} + \frac{4s(r\lfloor N/r \rfloor - s)}{\#V}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, (371) implies (370).

Therefore, (349) follows from Definition 5.2 and the union bound by combing (350), (355), (358), (362), (370). This finishes our proof. \square

We conclude this section by proving a consequence of Proposition 5.3. We show that, under suitable conditions, with high probability, a sequence of lazy random walks $(W_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ on a sequence of finite, simple, connected, regular graphs $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ converges to a decomposable path as the size of the sequence of graphs grows boundlessly.

Corollary 5.4. *Let $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ be a sequence of finite simple, connected, regular graphs such that are $(s'_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(s_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(r_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} that satisfy (125). Suppose also that $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ satisfies the Assumption *Transient random walk* and let $(c_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence defined in (143). For every $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $\rho_N \in G_N$ and let $W_N = (W_N(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be the lazy random walk on G_N . Then, for any constant $T \in (0, \infty)$, we have that*

$$(372) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\rho_N}(\sigma^{W_N, (r_N, s_N, s'_N)} > Tr_N/c_N) = 1 - o(1).$$

Proof. Note that by (144) in Corollary 2.19, we have $r_N/c_N = \Theta((\#V_N)^{1/2})$. Also, by (125), one can assume that N is sufficiently large such that $2s'_N \geq \left(\frac{\ln(2\#V_N)}{\ln 4}\right)t_{\text{mix}}^{G_N} + 1$. Thus, the result is a consequence of (349) in Proposition 5.3, (138) in Corollary 2.19, Corollary 2.20 and (125). \square

6. BOUNDING THE GH-DISTANCE BETWEEN THE ALDOUS-BRODER CHAIN AND THE c -RGRG MAP

In this subsection, we compare the Gromov-Hausdorff distance between the Aldous-Broder chain and the c -RGRG map. Fix $0 \leq T < \infty$, $c > 0$ and $r, s, s' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$. Let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ and let $\pi \subset \Delta_+^2$ be a nice point cloud.

For each $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq i < j$, recall the definition of the variables $Z_{(i,j)}^{\pi,c}$ and $Z_{(i,j)}^{\gamma,(r,s)}$ given in (181) and (291), respectively. Recall also, the definition of the times $\sigma^{\pi,c}$ and $\sigma^{\gamma,(r,s,s')}$ given in (174) and (348), respectively.

Note that for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, from (155) we can rewrite $\mathcal{N}^{\gamma,(r,s)}$ as

$$(373) \quad \mathcal{N}^{\gamma,(r,s)}(k) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} Z_{(i,j)}^{\gamma,(r,s)}.$$

This variable counts the number of indices in $[1, k]$, involving a long loop between a segment and a locally non-erased segment. In the context of Lemma 4.20, whenever (308) is satisfied we have $\mathcal{N}^{\gamma,(r,s)}(k) = 2n$.

Lemma 6.1 (Comparing the Aldous-Broder chain and the c -RGRG). *Let $\pi \subset \Delta_+^2$ be a nice point cloud and let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$. Fix $r, s, s' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$. Fix $c > 0$ and $0 \leq T < \infty$ such that $T/c \geq 2$ and $(\sigma^{\gamma,(r,s,s')}/r) \wedge (\sigma^{\pi,c}/c) > T/c$. Suppose that*

$$(374) \quad Z_{(i,j)}^{\gamma,(r,s)} = Z_{(i,j)}^{\pi,c} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor T/c \rfloor.$$

Then, for any $a > 0$,

$$(375) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} d_{\text{GH}} \left(a \cdot \text{AB}^{\gamma}(\lfloor t/c \rfloor r), \text{RGRG}^{\pi}(\lfloor t/c \rfloor c) \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor T/c \rfloor} \left| a \cdot \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) - c \right| + \frac{3asT}{c} + 2a(r+s) + 2c \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2}(ar+c)\mathcal{N}^{\gamma,(r,s)}(\lfloor T/c \rfloor) + ar. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 6.2. If (374) is satisfied, then $\mathcal{N}^{\gamma,(r,s)}(k) = \mathcal{N}^{\pi,c}(k)$, for all $k = 0, \dots, \lfloor T/c \rfloor$, where $\mathcal{N}^{\pi,c}(k) := \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} Z_{(i,j)}^{\pi,c}$. In particular, we can substitute $\mathcal{N}^{\gamma,(r,s)}(k)$ by $\mathcal{N}^{\pi,c}(k)$ in (375).

In preparation for the proof of Lemma 6.1, we need the next result.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\pi \subset \Delta_+^2$ be a nice point cloud and let $\gamma: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow V$ be a path on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$. Fix $r, s, s' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3s + 1 \geq 18s' + 1$. Fix $c > 0$ and $0 \leq T < \infty$ such that $T/c \geq 2$ and $(\sigma^{\gamma,(r,s,s')}/r) \wedge (\sigma^{\pi,c}/c) > T/c$. Suppose that*

$$(376) \quad Z_{(i,j)}^{\gamma,(r,s)} = Z_{(i,j)}^{\pi,c}, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor T/c \rfloor.$$

(i) Fix any $0 \leq k \leq \lfloor T/c \rfloor$ and suppose that

$$(377) \quad Z_{(i,j)}^{\gamma,(r,s)} = 0, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i < j \leq k.$$

(If $k < 2$, then (292) is satisfied by vacuity.) Then, for any $a > 0$,

$$(378) \quad d_{\text{GH}}(a \cdot \text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr), \text{RGRG}^{\pi}(kc)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left| a \cdot \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) - c \right| + 3ask + a.$$

(ii) Fix any $2 \leq k \leq \lfloor T/c \rfloor$ and suppose also that there exists an integer $1 \leq n \leq \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ and indices $1 \leq i_m < j_m \leq k$, for $1 \leq m \leq n$, such that $i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n$ are all distinct,

$$(379) \quad Z_{(i_m, j_m)}^{\gamma,(r,s)} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{(i,j)}^{\gamma,(r,s)} = 0,$$

for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ with either i or j not in $\{i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n\}$. Then, for any $a > 0$,

$$(380) \quad \begin{aligned} & d_{\text{GH}}(a \cdot \text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr), \text{RGRG}^{\pi}(kc)) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left| a \cdot \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) - c \right| + 3ask + 2a(r+s) + 2c + n(ar+c). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof relies on the results from Lemmas 3.7, 3.8, 4.19 and 4.20. Observe that the conditions of those Lemmas are satisfied. Indeed, since $(\sigma^{\gamma,(r,s,s')}/r) \wedge (\sigma^{\pi,c}/c) > T/c$, it follows that $\sigma^{\gamma,(r,s,s')} > \lfloor T/c \rfloor r$ and $\sigma^{\pi,c} > T$. Thus, γ is (r, s, s') -decomposable on the interval $[0, \lfloor T/c \rfloor r]$ (recall Definition 5.2), and π is a c -decomposable point cloud up to time T (recall Definition 3.4).

First, we prove (i). Recall that an isomorphism between metric spaces must be distance preserving. Then, (i) follows immediately from Lemmas 3.7 and 4.19. Indeed, it is enough to observe that, in this case, $\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$ and $\text{RGRG}^{\pi}(kc)$ can be isometrically embedded to the interval $[0, a \cdot (\#\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr) - 1)]$ and $[0, kc]$, respectively.

Next, we prove (ii). It follows from the triangle inequality, Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 4.20 that

$$(381) \quad \begin{aligned} & d_{\text{GH}}(a \cdot \text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr), \text{RGRG}^{\pi}(kc)) \\ & \leq d_{\text{GH}} \left(a \cdot \bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^{\gamma}(I_m^{(r,s)}), \bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^c(I_m^c) \right) + 2(c + ar + 3as). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$(382) \quad d_{\text{GH}} \left(a \cdot \bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^{\gamma}(I_m^{(r,s)}), \bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^c(I_m^c) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\mathfrak{R}} \text{dis}(\mathfrak{R}),$$

where the infimum is taken over all correspondences \mathfrak{R} between $\bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)})$ and $\bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^c(I_m^c)$ and $\text{dis}(\mathfrak{R})$, is the distortion of \mathfrak{R} , defined in (8).

By Lemmas 3.8 and 4.20, we know that for $m = 0, \dots, 2n$, the set $\text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)})$ is a connected path and $\text{Branch}^c(I_m^c)$ is a compact interval. We can then construct a correspondence $\mathfrak{R} \subseteq \bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)}) \times \bigcup_{m=0}^{2n} \text{Branch}^c(I_m^c)$ as follows:

$(x, y) \in \mathfrak{R}$ if and only if there exists $m \in [0, 2n]$ and $h \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that for a unique $n_x \in (I_m^{(r,s)} \cap [(h-1)r, hr-1]) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$, we have $x = \gamma(n_x) \in \text{Branch}^\gamma(I_m^{(r,s)})$ and $y \in I_m^c \cap [(h-1)c, hc]$. The uniqueness of n_x follows from Lemma 4.20.

Let $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in \mathfrak{R}$. Then, there exist $m_1, m_2 \in [0, 2n]$ and $h_1, h_2 \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that

- $n_1 \in (I_{m_1}^{(r,s)} \cap [(h_1-1)r, h_1r-1]) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$ and $n_2 \in (I_{m_2}^{(r,s)} \cap [(h_2-1)r, h_2r-1]) \setminus \mathcal{G}^{\gamma,s}(kr)$,
- $x_1 = \gamma(n_1) \in \text{Branch}^\gamma(I_{m_1}^{(r,s)})$ and $x_2 = \gamma(n_2) \in \text{Branch}^\gamma(I_{m_2}^{(r,s)})$,
- $y_1 \in I_{m_1}^c \cap [(h_1-1)c, h_1c]$ and $y_2 \in I_{m_2}^c \cap [(h_2-1)c, h_2c]$.

Furthermore, we assume that the correspondence \mathfrak{R} is constructed such that $n_1 < n_2$ if and only if $x_1 < x_2$. We consider two cases:

Case 1. Suppose that $m_1 = m_2$. Then, we have $h_1 = h_2$. Without of generality we assume that $n_1 < n_2$. Then, by Lemma 4.20 (iv) and Lemma 3.8 (iii), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & |a \cdot d_{\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr)}(x_1, x_2) - d_{\text{RGRG}^\pi(kc)}(y_1, y_2)| \\
 & \leq \sum_{h=u_1+1}^{u_2-1} \left| a \cdot \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) - c \right| + 3as(u_2 - u_1 - 1) \vee 0 + 2ar + 2c \\
 (383) \quad & \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left| a \cdot \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) - c \right| + 3ask + 2ar + 2c,
 \end{aligned}$$

where u_1 and u_2 are defined as in Lemma 4.20 (iv) and Lemma 3.8 (iii).

Case 2. Suppose that $m_1 \neq m_2$. Without loss of generality we assume that $n_1 < n_2$. A similar computation to that in **Case 1**, using Lemma 4.20 (iii)-(v) and Lemma 3.8 (iv) yields to

$$\begin{aligned}
 & |a \cdot d_{\text{Skel}^{\gamma,s}(kr)}(x_1, x_2) - d_{\text{RGRG}^\pi(kc)}(y_1, y_2)| \\
 (384) \quad & \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left| a \cdot \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) - c \right| + 6ask + 4ar + 2arn + 2as + 4c + 2cn.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, by **Case 1**, **Case 2** and (8), we have that

$$(385) \quad \text{dis}(\mathfrak{R}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left| a \cdot \#\text{NE}^{\gamma,s}(A_i^{(r,s)}) - c \right| + 6ask + 4a(r+s) + 4c + 2n(ar+c).$$

Finally, (380) follows from (382) and (385), completing the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.1. Observe that

$$(386) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} d_{\text{GH}} \left(a \cdot \text{AB}^\gamma(\lfloor t/c \rfloor r), \text{RGRG}^\pi(\lfloor t/c \rfloor c) \right) \\ &= \sup_{k \in [0, \lfloor T/c \rfloor]} d_{\text{GH}} \left(a \cdot \text{AB}^\gamma(kr), \text{RGRG}^\pi(kc) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(\sigma^{\gamma, (r, s, s')}/r) \wedge (\sigma^{\pi, c}/c) > T/c$, it follows that $\sigma^{\gamma, (r, s, s')} > \lfloor T/c \rfloor r$ and $\sigma^{\pi, c} > T$. Thus, γ is (r, s, s') -decomposable on the interval $[0, \lfloor T/c \rfloor r]$ (recall Definition 5.2), and π is a c -decomposable point clouds up to time T (recall Definition 3.4). It follows from (386), the triangle inequality and Proposition 4.18, that

$$(387) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} d_{\text{GH}} \left(a \cdot \text{AB}^\gamma(\lfloor t/c \rfloor r), \text{RGRG}^\pi(\lfloor t/c \rfloor c) \right) \\ & \leq \sup_{k \in [0, \lfloor T/c \rfloor]} d_{\text{GH}} \left(a \cdot \text{AB}^\gamma(kr), a \cdot \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(kr) \right) \\ & \quad + \sup_{k \in [0, \lfloor T/c \rfloor]} d_{\text{GH}} \left(a \cdot \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(kr), \text{RGRG}^\pi(kc) \right) \\ & \leq \sup_{k \in [0, \lfloor T/c \rfloor]} d_{\text{GH}} \left(a \cdot \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(kr), \text{RGRG}^\pi(kc) \right) + ar. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we use Lemma 6.3 to bound,

$$(388) \quad d_{\text{GH}} \left(a \cdot \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(kr), \text{RGRG}^\pi(kc) \right),$$

for $k \in [0, \lfloor T/c \rfloor]$.

Since γ is (r, s, s') -decomposable, it satisfies (P.1), and thus,

$$(389) \quad Z_{(i, j)}^{\gamma, (r, s)} Z_{(i', j)}^{\gamma, (r, s)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{(i, j)}^{\gamma, (r, s)} Z_{(i, j')}^{\gamma, (r, s)} = 0,$$

for all $i, j, i', j' \in [1, k]$ such that $i \neq i'$ and $j \neq j'$. Then, by (389), we only need to consider two cases:

Case 1. $\mathcal{N}^{\gamma, (r, s)}(\lfloor T/c \rfloor) = 0$. In this case, we are in the setting of Lemma 6.3 (i), and thus, (378) holds.

Case 2. $\mathcal{N}^{\gamma, (r, s)}(\lfloor T/c \rfloor) = 2n$ for some $n \in [1, \lfloor k/2 \rfloor]$. In this case, we are in the setting of Lemma 6.3 (ii), and thus, (380) holds.

Then, by Case 1 and Case 2, we have

$$d_{\text{GH}} \left(a \cdot \text{Skel}^{\gamma, s}(kr), \text{RGRG}^\pi(kc) \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left| a \cdot \#\text{NE}^{\gamma, s}(A_i^{(r, s)}) - c \right| + 3ask + 2a(r + s)$$

$$(390) \quad + 2c + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{N}^{\gamma, (r, s)}(\lfloor T/c \rfloor)(ar + c).$$

Finally, (375) follows from (387) and (390). This concludes our proof. \square

7. COUPLING THE CUT-TIMES AND CUT-POINTS

Recall the definition of $Z_{(i,j)}^{\pi, c}$ given in (181), and $Z_{(i,j)}^{\gamma, (r, s)}$ given in (291). We will use the definition of the times $\sigma^{\pi, c}$ and $\sigma^{\gamma, (r, s, s')}$ given in (174) and (348), respectively.

Recall the coupling assumption (374) from Lemma 6.1, which couples the cut-points and cut-times of both the Aldous-Broder chain and the c-RGRG. In this section, we prove that this condition holds with high probability when the underlying path is a lazy random walk and the nice point cloud is generated by a Poisson point process.

Proposition 7.1 (Coupling of the cut-times and cut-points). *Let $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ be a sequence of finite simple, connected, regular graphs such that are sequence $(s_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(r_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} that satisfy (125). Suppose also that $(G_N; N \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ satisfies the Assumption *Transient random walk*. For every $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $\rho_N \in G_N$ and let $W_N = (W_N(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a lazy random walk on G_N . Let Π be a Poisson point process on Δ_+^2 with the Lebesgue measure λ as the intensity measure. Let $(c_N; N \in \mathbb{N})$ be the sequence defined in (143). Fix any $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and N large enough such that $T/c_N \geq 2$. Then, the random variables*

$$(391) \quad (Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)})_{1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor T/c_N \rfloor} \quad \text{and} \quad (Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N})_{1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor T/c_N \rfloor}$$

can be coupled in such a way that

$$(392) \quad \mathbb{P}_{(\rho_N, 0)}(Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)} = Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}, \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor T/c_N \rfloor) = 1 - o(1), \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{(\rho_N, 0)}$ is the joint law of W_N starting at ρ_N and $X^{(c)}$ starting at 0.

The proof will make use of the following estimate which is similar to [Sch09, Lemma 4.5].

Lemma 7.2 (Coupling on the hypercube). *For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Z = (Z_i; i \in [j])$ and $Z' = (Z'_i; i \in [j])$ be two sequences of $\{0, 1\}$ -valued random variables. Then, there exists a coupling of Z and Z' such that*

$$(393) \quad \mathbb{P}(Z = Z') \geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^j \sum_{k \neq i} (\mathbb{E}[Z_k Z_i] + \mathbb{E}[Z'_k Z'_i]) - \sum_{i=1}^j |\mathbb{E}[Z_i] - \mathbb{E}[Z'_i]|.$$

We will also use the following result, that gives us a formula to compute the *total variation distance* between two measures μ and ν on a common space Ω , that is

$$(394) \quad d_{\text{TV}}(\mu, \nu) = \max_{A \subseteq X} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)|.$$

Recall that a *coupling* between μ and ν is a pair of random variables (X, Y) on a common probability space such that the marginal distribution of X is μ and of Y is ν .

Proposition 7.3 (Proposition 4.7 in [LP17]). *Let μ and ν be two probability distributions on a common space Ω . Then*

$$(395) \quad d_{\text{TV}}(\mu, \nu) = \inf\{\mathbb{P}(X \neq Y) : (X, Y) \text{ is a coupling of } \mu \text{ and } \nu\}.$$

Furthermore, there exists a coupling, called *optimal coupling*, which attains the infimum.

Proof of Proposition 7.1. The argument is similar to that of [Sch09, Proposition 4.7]. We apply Lemma 7.2 for fixed $j \in \mathbb{N}$, to couple $Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}$ and $Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}$ for all $1 \leq i < j$, and then we proceed by induction on j .

Since the result holds by vacuity for $j = 1$, assume it holds for every $2 \leq j < k$ for some fixed $k \geq 3$. Recall the definition of c_N in (143) and note that, for $1 \leq i < j$,

$$(396) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}] &= \mathbb{P}(\Pi \cap \mathcal{B}_{i,j}^{c_N} \neq \emptyset) = 1 - e^{-c_N^2} \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{\pi^{G_N} \otimes \pi^{G_N}}(\mathbf{R}^{W_N^2}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_1^{(r_N, s_N)}) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_N^1}(\mathcal{B}_1^{(r_N, s_N)})) \neq \emptyset). \end{aligned}$$

Note also that

$$(397) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\rho_N}[Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}] = \mathbb{P}_{\rho_N}(\mathbf{R}^{W_N}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_j^{(r_N, s_N)}) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_N}(\mathcal{B}_i^{(r_N, s_N)})) \neq \emptyset).$$

Then, by (125), Lemma 2.3 (with $k = 2$ and $q = \frac{\ln(2\#V_N)}{\ln 4}$), and possibly increasing N further as needed, we obtain that

$$(398) \quad \left| \mathbb{P}_{\rho_N}(\mathbf{R}^{W_N}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_j^{(r_N, s_N)}) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_N}(\mathcal{B}_i^{(r_N, s_N)})) \neq \emptyset) - \mathbb{P}_{\pi^{G_N} \otimes \pi^{G_N}}(\mathbf{R}^{W_N^2}(\mathbf{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_1^{(r_N, s_N)}) \cap \mathbf{R}^{W_N^1}(\mathcal{B}_1^{(r_N, s_N)})) \neq \emptyset) \right| \leq \frac{4}{2\#V_N},$$

for $1 \leq i < j$.

The latter implies that

$$(399) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\rho_N}[Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}] - \mathbb{E}[Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}] \right| \leq \frac{4j}{2\#V_N}.$$

For $1 \leq i < k < j$, note that, by independence,

$$(400) \quad \mathbb{E}[Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N} Z_{(k,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}] = \mathbb{P}(\Pi \cap \mathcal{B}_{i,j}^{c_N} \neq \emptyset, \Pi \cap \mathcal{B}_{k,j}^{c_N} \neq \emptyset) = (1 - e^{-c_N^2})^2,$$

and then,

$$(401) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbb{E}[Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N} Z_{(k,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}] \leq j^2 (1 - e^{-c_N^2})^2.$$

On the other hand, for $1 \leq i < k < j$, (51) in Proposition (2.4) imply that

$$(402) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\rho_N} [Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)} Z_{(k,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}] \leq \frac{8r_N^4}{(\#V_N)^2}.$$

It follows that

$$(403) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_N} [Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)} Z_{(k,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}] \leq \frac{8j^2 r_N^4}{(\#V_N)^2}.$$

For $j \geq 2$ fixed, let $\mu_j^{W_N}$ and μ_j^Π denote the probability distributions of

$$(404) \quad (Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}; i \in [1, j-1]) \quad \text{and} \quad (Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}; i \in [1, j-1]),$$

respectively. We now apply Lemma 7.2 and Proposition 7.3, together with (399), (401) and (403). Thus, for every fixed $j \geq 2$, we can couple

$$(405) \quad \begin{aligned} d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_j^{W_N}, \mu_j^\Pi) &\leq \mathbb{P}((Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}; i \in [1, j-1]) \neq (Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}; i \in [1, j-1])) \\ &\leq \frac{4j}{2\#V_N} + \frac{8j^2 r_N^4}{(\#V_N)^2} + j^2(1 - e^{-c_N^2})^2, \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for $k \geq 2$, let $\mu_{\leq k}^{W_N}$ and $\mu_{\leq k}^\Pi$ denote the probability distributions of

$$(406) \quad (Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}; 1 \leq i < j \leq k) \quad \text{and} \quad (Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}; 1 \leq i < j \leq k),$$

respectively. Then, Proposition 7.3 and the triangle inequality implies for every $k \geq 2$ that

$$(407) \quad d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_{\leq k}^{W_N}, \mu_{\leq k}^\Pi) \leq d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_{\leq k-1}^{W_N}, \mu_{\leq k-1}^\Pi) + d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_k^{W_N}, \mu_k^\Pi).$$

Therefore, by Proposition 7.3, we can couple for every $k \geq 2$

$$(408) \quad d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_{\leq k}^{W_N}, \mu_{\leq k}^\Pi) \leq \mathbb{P}((Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}; 1 \leq i < j \leq k) \neq (Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}; 1 \leq i < j \leq k)).$$

Finally, (405), (407), (408) and an induction argument show that for every $k \geq 2$

$$(409) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}((Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}; 1 \leq i < j \leq k) \neq (Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}; 1 \leq i < j \leq k)) \\ &\leq \frac{2k^2}{\#V_N} + \frac{8k^3 r_N^4}{(\#V_N)^2} + k^3(1 - e^{-c_N^2})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Recall the definition of c_N in (143) and the inequality $1 - e^{-x} \leq x$, for $x \geq 0$. Then, by (144) in Corollary 2.20, there exists a constant $C_T > 0$ (depending on T) such that for N large enough,

$$(410) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\left(Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}; 1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor T/c_N \rfloor\right) \neq \left(Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}; 1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor T/c_N \rfloor\right)\right) \\ & \leq \frac{2T^2}{c_N^2 \#V_N} + \frac{8T^3 r_N^4}{c_N^3 (\#V_N)^2} + \frac{T^3 c_N^4}{c_N^3} \\ & \leq C_T \left(\frac{1}{r_N^2} + \frac{r_N}{(\#V_N)^{1/2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we obtain (392) from (410) and (125). \square

8. PROOF OF MAIN RESULT

Recall from (5) the Aldous–Broder chain Y^G on a finite, simple, connected graph $G = (V, E)$, and from Definition 3.3 the RGRG X as well as from (178) the c -RGRG $X^{\Pi, (c)}$ for some $c > 0$. In this section we prove Theorem 2.

The proof of such a theorem relies on bounding the Gromov-Hausdorff distance between the rescaled Aldous–Broder chain and the c_N -RGRG and showing that they are close with high probability.

Proposition 8.1 (Bounding the GH distance between AB chain and c -RGRG). *Assume that $(G_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of finite simple, connected, regular graphs in the transient regime, i.e., $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} H^{G_N} < \infty$, and such that we can choose (s_N) and (r_N) such that (24) and (25) holds. Let $\{Y^{G_N}; N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a family of Aldous-Broder chains with values in rooted metric trees embedded in G_N which start in the rooted trivial tree, i.e., $Y^{G_N}(0) = (\{\rho_N\}, \rho_N)$. Then, for any fixed $0 \leq T < \infty$, any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant C_T (depending on T) such that*

$$(411) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} d_{\text{GH}}\left(\frac{c_N}{\gamma_N} \text{AB}^{W_N}(\lfloor t/c_N \rfloor r_N), X^{\Pi, (c_N)}(\lfloor t/c_N \rfloor c_N)\right) \leq C_T h_N\right) = 1 - o(1),$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$(412) \quad h_N = \left(\frac{s_N}{r_N}\right)^{1/6} + \frac{s_N}{r_N} + \frac{r_N}{(\#V_N)^{1/2}} + \left(\frac{r_N}{(\#V_N)^{1/2}}\right)^{1-\alpha}.$$

Proof. First note that by Corollary 2.20 and (125), we can select a sufficiently large value for N such that $T/c_N \geq 2$.

By Proposition 7.1, the random variables

$$(413) \quad \left(Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}\right)_{1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor T/c_N \rfloor} \quad \text{and} \quad \left(Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}\right)_{1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor T/c_N \rfloor}$$

can be coupled so that

$$(414) \quad \mathbb{P}_{(\rho_N, 0)} \left(Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)} = Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}, \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor T/c_N \rfloor \right) = 1 - o(1), \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Define the events,

$$(415) \quad \begin{aligned} A_{N,T}^{(1)} &:= \left\{ Z_{(i,j)}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)} = Z_{(i,j)}^{\Pi, c_N}, \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq \lfloor T/c_N \rfloor \right\}, \\ A_{N,T}^{(2)} &:= \left\{ \sigma^{\Pi, c_N} > T, \sigma^{W_N, (r_N, s_N, s'_N)} > Tr_N/c_N \right\}, \\ A_{N,T}^{(3)} &:= \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq i \leq \lfloor T/c_N \rfloor} \left| \#R^{W_N}(\text{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_i^{(r_N, s_N)})) - \gamma_N \right| \leq r_N \left(\frac{s_N}{r_N} \right)^{1/6} \right\}, \\ A_{N,T}^{(4)} &:= \left\{ \mathcal{N}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}(\lfloor T/c_N \rfloor) \leq c_N^{-\alpha} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

for some fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

It follows from (414), Lemma 3.5, Corollary 2.20, Corollary 5.4, Corollary 2.21, Corollary 2.22 and (125) that

$$(416) \quad \mathbb{P}(A_{N,T}^{(1)} \cap A_{N,T}^{(2)} \cap A_{N,T}^{(3)} \cap A_{N,T}^{(4)}) = 1 - o(1), \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Finally, observe that under the event $A_{N,T}^{(1)} \cap A_{N,T}^{(2)} \cap A_{N,T}^{(3)} \cap A_{N,T}^{(4)}$, (375) in Lemma 6.1 yields to

$$(417) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} d_{\text{GH}} \left(\frac{c_N}{\gamma_N} \text{AB}^{W_N}(\lfloor t/c_N \rfloor r_N), X^{\Pi, (c_N)}(\lfloor t/c_N \rfloor c_N) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{c_N}{\gamma_N} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor T/c_N \rfloor} \left| R^{W_N}(\text{NE}^{W_N, s_N}(A_i^{(r_N, s_N)})) - \gamma_N \right| + 3 \frac{c_N}{\gamma_N} \frac{3s_N T}{c_N} + 2 \frac{c_N}{\gamma_N} (r_N + s_N) \\ & \quad + 2c_N + \left(\frac{c_N}{\gamma_N} r_N + c_N \right) \mathcal{N}^{W_N, (r_N, s_N)}(\lfloor T/c_N \rfloor) + \frac{c_N}{\gamma_N} r_N, \end{aligned}$$

with probability $1 - o(1)$. Therefore, our claim follows from Corollary 2.20 and the bounds in the event $A_{N,T}^{(1)} \cap A_{N,T}^{(2)} \cap A_{N,T}^{(3)} \cap A_{N,T}^{(4)}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. We will use the fact that convergence in the Skorohod space $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{T})$, is equivalent to convergence in $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \mathbb{T})$, for any $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ which is a continuity point of X (see Theorem 16.2 in [Bil99]). Consider any fixed $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$, which by standard results is a.s. a continuity point of X . Note that the function $g_N(t) = c_N \lfloor t/c_N \rfloor$, for $t \geq 0$, converges uniformly over compact intervals to the identity function. Then it follows from (180) in Corollary 3.6 and for example, [Whi80, Theorem 3.1] that

$$(418) \quad (X^{\Pi, (c_N)}(c_N \lfloor t/c_N \rfloor))_{t \geq 0} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} (X(t))_{t \geq 0},$$

weakly as random variables with values in the Skorohod space $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{T})$. On the other hand, it follows from our assumption (125) that h_N defined in (412), satisfies $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} h_N = 0$. Hence, (418), Proposition 8.1, the triangle inequality and the union bound imply that

$$(419) \quad \left(\frac{c_N}{\gamma_N} \mathbf{AB}^{W_N}(\lfloor t/c_N \rfloor r_N) \right)_{t \in [0, T]} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} (X(t))_{t \in [0, T]},$$

weakly as random variables with values in the Skorohod space $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \mathbb{T})$. Here we used Theorem 3.1 in Billingsley [Bil99] saying that if the distance between two sequences goes to zero in probability and one converges in law, then the other also converges to the same limit. \square

Remark 8.2 (Application to \mathbb{Z}_N^d , $d \geq 5$). Assume that $G_N := \mathbb{Z}_N^d$, $d \geq 5$. Then it is known that for some $C \in (0, \infty)$, $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} H^{\mathbb{Z}_N^d} < \infty$ if $d \geq 5$. To see this, one can show that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\rho \in V_N$,

$$(420) \quad \left| \mathbb{P}_\rho(W_N = \rho) - \pi^{\mathbb{Z}_N^d}(\rho) \right| \leq C \frac{1}{N^{d/2}}$$

(compare, for example, [Cox89, Equation (2.10)]). Notice further that $\int_1^{N^{d/2}} x^{-d/2} dx \leq C N^{d-d^2/4} < \infty$ whenever $d \geq 5$.

Moreover, we can conclude from [LP17, Theorem 5.6] that $\tau_{\text{mix}}^{\mathbb{Z}_N^d} = \mathcal{O}(N^2) \ll N^{d/2} = \#V_N^{1/2}$. So we can clearly find sequences (s_N) and (r_N) that satisfy (24) and (25).

Recall $c_N := c^{\mathbb{Z}_N^d}(r_N)$ and $\gamma_N := \Gamma^{\mathbb{Z}_N^d}(r_N)$ from (22) respectively (23). Recall further $\alpha(d)$ and $\gamma(d)$ from (15) respectively (16). It is shown in [PR04, Lemma 8.1] that $\frac{\gamma_N}{r_N} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} \gamma(d)$ and $\frac{N^d c_N}{(r_N)^2} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} \alpha(d)$ and (16), respectively. This yields the claim of Theorem 1. \square

Acknowledgements. OAH and AW were supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (through Project-ID444091549 within SPP-2265).

REFERENCES

- [Ald90] David Aldous, *The random walk construction of uniform spanning trees and uniform labeled trees*, SIAM Journal of discrete Mathematics (1990), 450–465.
- [Ald91] ———, *The continuum random tree I*, Ann. Probab. **19** (1991), 1–28.
- [Ald93] ———, *The continuum random tree III*, Ann. Probab. **21** (1993), 248–289.
- [ALW16] Siva Athreya, Wolfgang Löhr, and Anita Winter, *The gap between Gromov-vague and Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **126** (2016), no. 9, 2527–2553. MR 3522292
- [ALW17] Siva Athreya, Wolfgang Löhr, and Anita Winter, *Invariance principle for variable speed random walks on trees*, Annals Probab. **45** (2017), no. 2, 625–667, arXiv:1404.6290. MR 3630284
- [ANS24] Eleanor Archer, Asaf Nachmias, and Matan Shalev, *The GHP scaling limit of uniform spanning trees in high dimensions*, Comm. Math. Phys. **405** (2024), no. 3, Paper No. 73, 41. MR 4712854

- [AS24] Eleanor Archer and Matan Shalev, *The GHP scaling limit of uniform spanning trees of dense graphs*, *Random Structures and Algorithms* **25** (2024), no. 1, 149–190.
- [AT89] Venkat Anantharam and Pantelis Tsoucas, *A proof of the Markov chain tree theorem*, *Stat. Probab. Letters* **8** (1989), 189–192.
- [BBI01a] Dmitri Burago, Yuri Burago, and Sergei Ivanov, *A course in metric geometry*, vol. 33, American Mathematical Soc., 2001.
- [BBI01b] ———, *A course in metric geometry*, *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, vol. 33, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001. MR 1835418
- [Bil99] Patrick Billingsley, *Convergence of probability measures*, second ed., *Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1999, A Wiley-Interscience Publication. MR 1700749
- [BLPS01] Itai Benjamini, Russell Lyons, Yuval Peres, and Oded Schramm, *Uniform spanning forests*, *Ann. Probab.* **29** (2001), 1–65.
- [BP93] R. Burton and Robin Pemantle, *Local characteristics, entropy and limit theorems for spanning trees and domino tilings via transfer-impedances*, *Ann. Probab.* **21** (1993), 1329–1371. MR 1235419
- [Bro89] Andrei Z. Broder, *Generating random spanning trees*, 30th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (1989), 442–447.
- [CDG04] J. T. Cox, D. A. Dawson, and A. Greven, *Mutually catalytic super branching random walks: large finite systems and renormalization analysis*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **171** (2004), no. 809, viii+97. MR 2074427
- [CG94] J. T. Cox and A. Greven, *The finite systems scheme: An abstract theorem and a new example*, *Proceedings of CRM Conference on Measure valued processes. Stochastic partial differential equation and interacting Systems*, CRM and Lecture Notes series of the American Mathematical Society, vol. 5, 1994, pp. 55–68.
- [CGS95] Ted Cox, Andreas Greven, and T. Shiga, *Finite and infinite systems of interacting diffusions*, *Probab. Theory Rel. Fields* **103** (1995), 165–197.
- [Cox89] J. T. Cox, *Coalescing random walks and voter model consensus times on the torus in \mathbf{Z}^d* , *Ann. Probab.* **17** (1989), no. 4, 1333–1366. MR 1048930
- [Dha90] D. Dhar, *Self-organized critical state of sandpile automaton models*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** (1990), 1613–1616. MR 1044086
- [EPW06] Steven N. Evans, Jim Pitman, and Anita Winter, *Rayleigh processes, real trees, and root growth with re-grafting*, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **134** (2006), no. 1, 81–126. MR 2221786
- [GLW05] Andreas Greven, Vlada Limic, and Anita Winter, *Representation theorems for interacting Moran models, interacting Fisher-Wright diffusions and applications*, *Electronic Journal Probability* **10(39)** (2005), 1286–1358.
- [Gro99] Misha Gromov, *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*, *Progress in Mathematics*, vol. 152, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1999, Based on the 1981 French original [MR0682063 (85e:53051)], With appendices by M. Katz, P. Pansu and S. Semmes, Translated from the French by Sean Michael Bates. MR 1699320
- [Gut13] Allan Gut, *Probability: a graduate course*, second ed., *Springer Texts in Statistics*, Springer, New York, 2013. MR 2977961
- [HLT21] Yiping Hua, Russell Lyons, and Pengfei Tang, *A reverse Aldous–Broder algorithm*, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **57** (2021), no. 2, 890–900.

- [Hut18] Tom Hutchcroft, *Interlacements and the wired spanning forest*, *Annals of Probability* **46** (2018), no. 2, 1170–2000.
- [Jar18] Antal A. Jarai, *Sandpile models*, *Probab. Surveys* **15** (2018), 243–306.
- [Ken00] Rick Kenyon, *The asymptotic determinant of the discrete laplacian*, *Acta Math.* **185** (2000), 239–286. MR 1819995
- [LP17] David A. Levin and Yuval Peres, *Markov chains and mixing times*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017, Second edition of [MR2466937], With contributions by Elizabeth L. Wilmer, With a chapter on “Coupling from the past” by James G. Propp and David B. Wilson. MR 3726904
- [LSW04] Gregory F. Lawler, Oded Schramm, and Wendelin Werner, *Conformal invariance of planar loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees*, *Ann. Probab.* **32** (2004), no. 1B, 939–995.
- [PR04] Yuval Peres and David Revelle, *Scaling limits of the uniform spanning tree and loop-erased random walk on finite graphs*, arXiv Mathematics e-prints (2004), math/0410430.
- [Sch00] Oded Schramm, *Scaling limits of loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees*, *Israel J. Math.* **118** (2000), 221–288. MR 1776084
- [Sch08] Jason Schweinsberg, *Loop-erased random walk on finite graphs and the Rayleigh process*, *J. Theoret. Probab.* **21** (2008), no. 2, 378–396. MR 2391250
- [Sch09] ———, *The loop-erased random walk and the uniform spanning tree on the four-dimensional discrete torus*, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **144** (2009), no. 3-4, 319–370. MR 2496437
- [Sym84] D.E. Symer, *Expanded ergodic Markov chains and cycling systems*, 1984, Senior thesis, Dartmouth College.
- [Szn10] Alain-Sol Sznitman, *Vacant set of random interlacements and percolation*, *Annals of Mathematics* **171** (2010), no. 3, 2039–2087.
- [Tei09] A. Teixeira, *Interlacement percolation on transient weighted graphs*, *Electron. J. Probab.* **14** (2009), 1604–1628. MR 2525105
- [Whi80] Ward Whitt, *Some useful functions for functional limit theorems*, *Math. Oper. Res.* **5** (1980), no. 1, 67–85. MR 561155
- [Wil96] David B. Wilson, *Generating spanning trees more quickly than the cover time*, *Proceedings of the 28 International Congress of Mathematicians Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, 1996.

OSVALDO ANGTUNCIO HERNÁNDEZ, CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN EN MATEMÁTICAS, DEPARTAMENTO DE PROBABILIDAD Y ESTADÍSTICA, GUANAJUATO, MÉXICO

Email address: osvaldo.angtuncio@cimat.mx

GABRIEL BERZUNZA OJEDA, UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNITED KINGDOM.

Email address: gabriel.berzunza-ojeda@liverpool.ac.uk

ANITA WINTER, UNIVERSITÄT DUISBURG-ESSEN, FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄTSSTR. 2, D-45141 ESSEN, GERMANY

Email address: anita.winter@uni-due.de