# RANDOM BIPARTITE GRAPHS WITH I.I.D. WEIGHTS AND APPLICATIONS TO INHOMOGENEOUS RANDOM INTERSECTION GRAPHS \*

Alastair HAIG  $^{\dagger}$  and Minmin WANG  $^{\ddagger}$ 

March 24, 2025

#### Abstract

We propose a random bipartite graph with weights assigned to both parts of the vertex sets. Edges are formed independently with probabilities that depend on these weights. This bipartite graph naturally gives rise to a random intersection graph which has nontrivial clustering properties and inhomogeneous vertex degrees. We focus on the situation where the weights are themselves i.i.d. random variables. In the so-called moderate clustering regime, we identify three types of scaling limit for the large connected components in the graphs at criticality, depending on the tail behaviours of the weight distributions of both parts.

AMS 2010 subject classifications: Primary 60C05. Secondary 05C80, 60F05, 60G52.

**Keywords**: random bipartite graph, random intersection graph, scaling limit of random graphs, Brownian motion, stable Lévy processes.

# Contents

1	Intro	oduction	2
	1.1	A model of random bipartite graphs with weights	3
	1.2	The case with i.i.d. weights	4
	1.3	Main results	4
2	Exp	loration of the bipartite graphs	7
	2.1	LIFO-queues and depth-first exploration of graphs	7
	2.2	Graph encoding processes	11
	2.3	A coupling with Poisson point processes in the i.i.d. case	12
	2.4	Limit theorems for the graph encoding processes	13
	2.5	Convergence of the surplus edges	15
	2.6	Construction of the limit graphs	17
	* 701 •		

\*This research is supported by EPSRC grant EP/W033585/1.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of Sussex, Falmer campus, Brighton, BN1 9QH, England, United Kingdom. Email: A.Haig@sussex.ac.uk

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of Sussex, Falmer campus, Brighton, BN1 9QH, England, United Kingdom. Email: Minmin.Wang@sussex.ac.uk

3	Proof	21
	3.1 Some results on the bipartite graph with fixed weights	21
	3.2 Proof of Proposition 2.6	22
	3.3 Proof for the convergence of surplus edges	34
	3.4 Proof of the main theorems	38
A	Convergence of the Laplace exponents A Girsanov-type theorem for Lévy processes	
B		
С	C A continuous-time version of Duquesne–Le Gall's Theorem	

# **1** Introduction

Ever since its conception by Erdős and Rényi in the 1960s, the study of random graphs has continued to yield fascinating discoveries and challenging questions for both combinatorists and probabilists. The current work contributes to a growing body of recent studies that focus on the large-scale structures of random graphs at the threshold of connectivity. Together, these studies point to a compelling picture of universality, wherein models of random graphs belonging to the same universality class are expected to exhibit similar large-scale behaviours within the so-called critical window. In particular, two notable advances in this direction have been:

- Identification of the Erdős–Rényi universality class. Aldous' seminal article [2] revealed a surprising connection between the sizes of large connected components in a critical G(n, p) and Brownian excursions. This work also pioneered the use of stochastic analysis in the study of critical random graphs. Addario-Berry, Broutin, and Goldschmidt [1] deepened this connection, demonstrating that after rescaling edge lengths by a factor of  $n^{-1/3}$ , one obtains a random metric space "encoded" by Brownian excursions for each of these large connected components. The limit graph introduced in [1], known as the Erdős–Rényi continuum graph, has since appeared in the scaling limits of many other models of random graphs; see [6–8, 11] to name a few.
- Discovery of the multiplicative coalescent universality class. Aldous' work [2] also highlighted the close relationships between random graphs and the multiplicative coalescent. Together with Aldous and Limic [3], these studies paved the way for discovering more general behaviours beyond those observed in the Erdős–Rényi graph. To date, the most comprehensive results in this direction concern the rank-1 model [9, 10, 14] (also called the Poisson random graph or multiplicative graph). The works [16] and [17] address the scaling limits of large components in these graphs under the general asymptotic regime identified in [3]. This leads to the introduction of a large family of limit graphs, where the role of Brownian excursions in the construction of the Erdős–Rényi continuum graph is replaced by excursions of a spectrally positive Lévy process. Specific members of this family have also been found in the scaling limits of critical configuration models ([7, 21]).

In [33], the Binomial bipartite graph model and the associated intersection graphs are investigated. Introduced in [30], the random intersection graph model provides a simple mechanism for tuning the density of triangles in the graphs, measured by the so-called clustering coefficient. The findings in [33] make the case for expanding the Erdős–Rényi continuum graph into a family of continuum graphs parameterised by a positive number  $\theta$ , which indicates the clustering level of the discrete graphs.

While the model of random bipartite graphs in [33] can be described as homogeneous, in this work, we introduce a model of inhomogeneous bipartite graphs by first assigning weights to both vertex sets.

#### **1.1** A model of random bipartite graphs with weights

Let  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Consider a bipartite graph with n black vertices and m white vertices. Suppose that each vertex is further equipped with a *weight*, i.e. a positive number that represents their propensities for forming edges. Denote the respective collections of weights for the black and white vertices as

$$\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in (0, \infty)^n$$
 and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m) \in (0, \infty)^m$ .

The edges in the bipartite graph are formed independently across pairs of vertices of different colours. Denote the black vertices as  $b_1, b_2, b_3, \ldots, b_n$  and the white vertices as  $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_m$ , and write  $p_{i,j}$  for the probability of having an edge between  $b_i$  and  $w_j$ . In our model, we assume that

$$p_{i,j} = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{x_i \cdot y_j}{z_{n,m}}\right), \quad 1 \le i \le n, 1 \le j \le m, \tag{1}$$

where  $z_{n,m} > 0$  is some normalising constant that will be specified later on. Denote by  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  the resulting graph.

**Inhomogeneous random intersection graphs.** The graph  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  induces, via the so-called *intersection graph* mechanism, a (non-bipartite) graph on n vertices. Specifically, let  $G(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  be the graph on the vertex set  $[n] := \{1, 2, 3, ..., n\}$ , where two vertices i, j share an edge between them if and only if  $b_i$  and  $b_j$  are at distance 2 from each other in  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ . One of the most interesting aspects of the random intersection graphs lies in their nontrivial *clustering* properties, which can be adjusted by tuning the ratio between m and n. More precisely, we quantify the clustering property of the graph by looking at the following conditional probability:

$$CL = \mathbb{P}(V_2 \text{ adjacent to } V_3 | V_1 \text{ adjacent to } V_3 \text{ and } V_2),$$

where  $(V_1, V_2, V_3)$  is a triplet of distinct vertices uniformly chosen. If both x and y are constant, then it is not difficult to check the following: (i)  $CL \rightarrow 0$  if  $m/n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ; (ii)  $CL \rightarrow 1$  if  $m/n \rightarrow 0$ and  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ; (iii)  $CL \rightarrow (1 + \sqrt{\theta})^{-1}$  if  $m = \lfloor \theta n \rfloor$  for some  $\theta \in (0, \infty)$  and  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Similar phenomena have been observed when x is not constant; we refer to [22] for further details. In this paper, we will restrict our attention to the *moderate clustering regime*; namely, we assume that

$$\exists \theta \in (0,\infty) : m = |\theta n|.$$
 (H-clustering)

**Connection with other models.** The expression of  $p_{i,j}$  in (1) is reminiscent of the rank-1 inhomogeneous random graph model as studied in [3, 10–12, 16, 17]. As in the rank-1 model, vertices with large weights are expected to emerge as "hubs", i.e. nodes with high degrees, in the graph. Compared to the rank-1 model, our model of random bipartite graphs have two sets of vertex weights, which can exhibit different tail behaviours. How the two sets of weights will interact with each other and influence the asymptotic behaviours of the graphs is one of the questions that have motivated this work.

The model of  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  and the associated intersection graph  $G(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  also encompass models of random graphs that have been introduced previously. In particular:

- The homogeneous case. This refers to the particular case where both x and y are constant. Say x<sub>i</sub> ≡ a ∈ (0,∞) and y<sub>j</sub> ≡ b ∈ (0,∞). In that case, each of the potential mn edges is present independently with the same probability p = 1 exp(-ab/z<sub>n,m</sub>). If z<sub>n,m</sub> = √mn, then this corresponds to the Binomial model studied in [33].
- The active/passive model. If only x (resp. y) is non constant, this is referred to as the active (i.e. passive) model in [13]. Degree distributions and clustering properties for the active model have been studied in [22]. See also [13] and the references therein.

Other models closely related to  $G(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  also include the ones studied in [4, 5, 15]. During the preparation of this article, we learn of the works [18–20] which introduce more general models than  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ . We point out that the approaches are genuinely different and while [18–20] focus on the weights of the components, we prove limit distributions for both the weights and the graph distances.

#### **1.2** The case with i.i.d. weights

In this work, we will focus on the case where both sets of weights  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  are i.i.d. random variables. The graph  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is then sampled by first conditioning on the weights. Let  $F^{(b)}$  and  $F^{(w)}$  be the cumulative distribution functions (c.d.f.) of two probability distributions supported on  $(0, \infty)$ . We further assume that both have finite second moments:

$$\sigma_2^{(\mathsf{b})} := \int_{(0,\infty)} x^2 dF^{(\mathsf{b})}(x) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_2^{(\mathsf{w})} := \int_{(0,\infty)} x^2 dF^{(\mathsf{w})}(x) < \infty, \tag{H-2nd}$$

which in particular implies the existence of a first moment in both cases. Let  $(X_i)_{i\geq 1}$  (resp.  $(Y_j)_{j\geq 1}$ ) be a sequence of i.i.d. variables with common law  $dF^{(b)}$  (resp.  $dF^{(w)}$ ). We then set  $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_m = (Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_m)$ . We shall use the short-hand notation

$$B_{n,m} = B(n,m;\mathbf{X}_n,\mathbf{Y}_m), \quad G_{n,m} = G(n,m;\mathbf{X}_n,\mathbf{Y}_m)$$

to denote the random bipartite graph with the vertex weight sequences  $X_n$  and  $Y_m$  and the associated intersection graph. Recall from (1) the normalising constant  $z_{n,m}$ . In the case with i.i.d. weights, we take

$$z_{n,m} = \sqrt{mn},$$

which amounts to placing  $\{G_{n,m} : n, m \ge 1\}$  in a "sparse regime". Standard branching process approximation techniques allow us to detect a phase transition in the size of the largest connected component; we refer to [15] for details. Here, we are interested in the *critical* case, i.e.

$$\sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})} \cdot \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{w})} = 1. \tag{H-critical}$$

### 1.3 Main results

We first gather the various assumptions that have been made on m, n and the weight distributions  $F^{(b)}, F^{(w)}$ . Recall from (H-clustering) that  $m = \lfloor \theta n \rfloor$ , which places  $G_{n,m}$  in a moderate clustering regime. Recall from (H-2nd) the assumption of finite second moments and from (H-critical) the criticality assumption. For  $r \in (0, \infty)$ , denote

$$\sigma_r^{(\mathbf{b})} = \int_{(0,\infty)} x^r dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x) \in [0,\infty] \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_r^{(\mathbf{w})} = \int_{(0,\infty)} x^r dF^{(\mathbf{w})}(x) \in [0,\infty].$$

We further assume the following tail behaviours from  $F^{(b)}$  and  $F^{(w)}$ : either

$$\sigma_3^{(\mathbf{b})} = \int_{(0,\infty)} x^3 dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x) < \infty, \tag{H-b-3rd}$$

or there exists some  $\alpha \in (1,2)$  and  $C^{(\mathbf{b})} \in (0,\infty)$  so that

$$1 - F^{(\mathbf{b})}(x) \sim C^{(\mathbf{b})} x^{-\alpha - 1}, \quad x \to \infty;$$
 (H-b-power)

analogously for  $F^{(w)}$ , either

$$\sigma_3^{(\mathbf{w})} = \int_{(0,\infty)} x^3 dF^{(\mathbf{w})}(x) < \infty, \tag{H-w-3rd}$$

or there exists some  $\alpha' \in (1,2)$  and  $C^{(w)} \in (0,\infty)$  so that

$$1 - F^{(\mathbf{w})}(x) \sim C^{(\mathbf{w})} x^{-\alpha'-1}, \quad x \to \infty.$$
 (H-w-power)

The symmetry in the model means that we can assume without loss of generality that the tail of  $F^{(w)}$  is *not heavier* than that of  $F^{(b)}$ . The combinations of the two tail behaviours lead to the following three distinctive scenarios:

- Double finite third moments: this is the case where both (H-b-3rd) and (H-w-3rd) hold.
- One dominant heavy tail: assume (H-b-power) holds for  $F^{(b)}$  with  $\alpha \in (1,2)$ ,  $C^{(b)} \in (0,\infty)$ , and for  $F^{(w)}$ , either (H-w-3rd) is true or (H-w-power) holds for some  $\alpha' \in (\alpha, 2)$  and  $C^{(w)} \in (0,\infty)$ .
- Matched heavy tails: in this case, (H-b-power) and (H-w-power) both hold with  $\alpha' = \alpha \in (1, 2)$ ,  $C^{(b)} \in (0, \infty)$  and  $C^{(w)} \in (0, \infty)$ .

For a connected component C of  $B_{n,m}$ , we denote by  $\mathbf{x}(C)$  the total weights of the black vertices in C, i.e.  $\mathbf{x}(C) = \sum_{i \in C} X_i$ . Let  $\{C_{n,(k)} : 1 \leq k \leq \kappa_{n,m}\}$  be the sequence of the connected components of  $B_{n,m}$  that contain at least one black vertex, ranked in decreasing order of their x-weights (breaking ties arbitrarily), i.e.  $\mathbf{x}(C_{n,(1)}) \geq \mathbf{x}(C_{n,(2)}) \geq \mathbf{x}(C_{n,(3)}) \geq \cdots$ . We turn each  $C_{n,(k)}$  into a metric space by furnishing it with the graph distance  $d_{\text{gr}}$  of  $B_{n,m}$  and a finite measure  $\mu_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}}$  which assigns an atom of size  $Y_j$  to each of the white vertex  $w_j$  contained in  $C_{n,(k)}$ . Our main results concern the scaling limit of the measured metric space  $(C_{n,(k)}, d_{\text{gr}}, \mu_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}})$ .

**Theorem 1.1** (Double finite third moments). Assume (H-clustering) and (H-critical). Under the assumptions (H-b-3rd) and (H-w-3rd), there exists a sequence of (random) measured metric spaces  $\mathcal{G}^{(1)}(\theta) = \{(\mathcal{C}_k^{(1)}, d_k^{(1)}, \mu_k^{(1)}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  so that we have the following convergence in distribution as  $n \to \infty$ :

$$\left\{ \left( C_{n,(k)}, \frac{1}{2}n^{-\frac{1}{3}} d_{\mathrm{gr}}, n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \mu_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}} \right) : 1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m} \right\} \implies \mathcal{G}^{(1)}(\theta)$$
(2)

with respect to the weak convergence of the product topology induced by the Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov topology.

**Theorem 1.2** (One dominant heavy tail). Assume (H-clustering) and (H-critical). Suppose that (H-b-power) holds for  $F^{(b)}$  with  $\alpha \in (1,2)$ ,  $C^{(b)} \in (0,\infty)$ , and that either (H-w-3rd) is true or (H-w-power) holds for some  $\alpha' \in (\alpha, 2)$  and  $C^{(w)} \in (0,\infty)$ . Then there exists a sequence of (random) measured metric spaces  $\mathcal{G}^{(2)}(\theta) = \{(\mathcal{C}_k^{(2)}, d_k^{(2)}, \mu_k^{(2)}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  so that we have the following convergence in distribution as  $n \to \infty$ :

$$\left\{ \left( C_{n,(k)}, \frac{1}{2}n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} d_{\mathrm{gr}}, n^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} \mu_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}} \right) : 1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m} \right\} \implies \mathcal{G}^{(2)}(\theta)$$
(3)

with respect to the weak convergence of the product topology induced by the Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov topology.

**Theorem 1.3** (Matched heavy tails). Assume (H-clustering) and (H-critical). Suppose that (H-b-power) and (H-w-power) both hold with  $\alpha' = \alpha \in (1,2)$ ,  $C^{(b)} \in (0,\infty)$  and  $C^{(w)} \in (0,\infty)$ . Then there exists a sequence of (random) measured metric spaces  $\mathcal{G}^{(3)}(\theta) = \{(\mathcal{C}_k^{(3)}, d_k^{(3)}, \mu_k^{(3)}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  so that we have the following convergence in distribution as  $n \to \infty$ :

$$\left\{ \left( C_{n,(k)}, \frac{1}{2} n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} d_{\mathrm{gr}}, n^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} \mu_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}} \right) : 1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m} \right\} \implies \mathcal{G}^{(3)}(\theta)$$
(4)

with respect to the weak convergence of the product topology induced by the Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov topology.

The mismatch between the way we rank the connected components in x-weights and the definition of  $\mu_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}}$ , which relies on y-weights, is due to the specific coding of the graphs we use. The following result, on the other hand, implies that we can switch to a ranking in y-weights and obtain the same limit graphs.

**Proposition 1.4** (Consistency of rankings). Let  $\{C'_{n,(k)} : 1 \le k \le \kappa'_{n,m}\}$  be the sequence of the connected components of  $B_{n,m}$  that contain at least one white vertex, ranked in decreasing order of their y-weights (breaking ties arbitrarily). Assume the conditions from one of the three Theorems 1.1-1.3. Then for any  $K \ge 1$ ,

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\Big( \forall \, 1 \le k \le K : C'_{n,(k)} = C_{n,(k)} \Big) = 1$$

 $\langle \mathbf{1} \rangle$ 

*Moreover, for each*  $k \ge 1$ *, the following convergence takes place in probability as*  $n \to \infty$ *:* 

$$\frac{\mathbf{x}(C_{n,(k)})}{\mathbf{y}(C_{n,(k)})} \longrightarrow \frac{\sigma_2^{(\mathsf{b})}}{\sqrt{\theta}}.$$
(5)

As in the cases of Erdős–Rényi model [1], the rank-1 models [16, 17], the configuration models [21] and a number of other notables random graph models, the limit graphs that appear in the previous theorems can be constructed from certain stochastic processes. We refer to Section 2.6.2 for the construction of  $\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(\theta), i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ .

Let us now explore the implications on the intersection graph  $G_{n,m}$ . Denote by  $\rho_n$  the mapping that sends the vertex  $b_i$  in the bipartite graph  $B_{n,m}$  to the vertex i in  $G_{n,m}$ , and denote by  $\hat{C}_{n,(k)}$  the image of  $C_{n,(k)}$  by  $\rho_n$ . Then  $\hat{C}_{n,(k)}$  is a connected component of  $G_{n,m}$ . Denote by  $d_{gr}^{RIG}$  the graph distance of  $G_{n,m}$ and let  $\mu_{n,k}^{RIG}$  be the push-forward of  $\mu_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}}$  by  $\rho_n$ . In [33], a simple argument (Proposition 2.4) shows that  $\rho_n$  is in fact an isometry between  $(B_{n,m}, d_{gr})$  and  $(G_{n,m}, 2 \cdot d_{gr}^{RIG})$ , and as a result one obtains a bound on the Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov distance between  $(\hat{C}_{n,(k)}, 2 \cdot d_{gr}^{RIG}, \mu_{n,k}^{RIG})$  and  $(C_{n,(k)}, d_{gr}, \mu_{n,k}^{\mathbf{x}})$ . For the current model, this bound combined with the previous theorems immediately yields the following results on the intersection graph  $G_{n,m}$ .

Corollary 1.5. Assume (H-clustering) and (H-critical).

(*i*) **Double finite third moments:** Under the assumptions (H-b-3rd) and (H-w-3rd), we have the following convergence in distribution as  $n \to \infty$ :

$$\left\{ \left( \hat{C}_{n,(k)}, n^{-\frac{1}{3}} d_{\mathrm{gr}}^{\mathrm{RIG}}, n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \mu_{n,k}^{\mathrm{RIG}} \right) : 1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m} \right\} \implies \mathcal{G}^{(1)}(\theta)$$

with respect to the weak convergence of the product topology induced by the Gromov–Hausdorff– Prokhorov topology.

(ii) One dominant heavy tail: Suppose that (H-b-power) holds for  $F^{(b)}$  with  $\alpha \in (1,2)$ ,  $C^{(b)} \in (0,\infty)$ , and that either (H-w-3rd) is true or (H-w-power) holds for some  $\alpha' \in (\alpha,2)$  and  $C^{(w)} \in (0,\infty)$ . We have the following convergence in distribution as  $n \to \infty$ :

$$\left\{ \left( \hat{C}_{n,(k)}, n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} d_{\mathrm{gr}}^{\mathrm{RIG}}, n^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} \mu_{n,k}^{\mathrm{RIG}} \right) : 1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m} \right\} \implies \mathcal{G}^{(2)}(\theta)$$

with respect to the weak convergence of the product topology induced by the Gromov–Hausdorff– Prokhorov topology.

(iii) Matched heavy tails: Suppose that (H-b-power) and (H-w-power) both hold with  $\alpha' = \alpha \in (1, 2)$ ,  $C^{(b)} \in (0, \infty)$  and  $C^{(w)} \in (0, \infty)$ . We have the following convergence in distribution as  $n \to \infty$ :

$$\left\{ \left( \hat{C}_{n,(k)}, n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} d_{\mathrm{gr}}^{\mathrm{RIG}}, n^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} \mu_{n,k}^{\mathrm{RIG}} \right) : 1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m} \right\} \implies \mathcal{G}^{(3)}(\theta)$$

with respect to the weak convergence of the product topology induced by the Gromov–Hausdorff– Prokhorov topology. **Organisation of the paper.** The proof of our main results is achieved by studying the scaling limit of certain stochastic processes that encode  $B_{n,m}$ . In Section 2, we introduce these graph encoding processes and identify their limit. We also explain how to obtain the limit graphs from these limit processes. Detailed proofs are found in Section 3.

# 2 Exploration of the bipartite graphs

Graph exploration has become a standard tool in the study of random graphs. In our current approach, we will rely on a Last-In-First-Out (LIFO) queue that will simultaneously generate the random bipartite graph  $B_{n,m}$  and a depth-first traversal of the graph. The idea of constructing graphs using LIFO-queues can be traced back to [16, 17], where a simpler version appears in the context of rank-1 models, and further back to [31] for the genealogies of branching processes.

# 2.1 LIFO-queues and depth-first exploration of graphs

We begin with the description of a generic LIFO-queue, and how it leads to a natural notion of genealogy. The focus of this subsection is an alternative construction of the random bipartite  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , which utilises two independent sequences of exponential variables. We then explain how the construction is connected with LIFO-queues.

A Last-In-First-Out queuing system. Let us consider a queuing system with a single server, where a total number of  $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  clients arrive during the whole process. Let  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $i \leq N$ . Suppose that Client *i* arrives at time  $t_i$  and requests  $\Delta_i \in [0, \infty)$  amount of service time. The client is served immediately, even if the server has been occupied by another client prior to its arrival. Once Client *i* has received in full the  $\Delta_i$  service time, noting that its own service can be interrupted by later arrivals, the server returns to the client whose service has been interrupted by the arrival of Client *i*.

**Genealogy of a LIFO-queue.** Given the previous queue with N clients, we say that Client i is a child of Client j if and only if the arrival of the former interrupts the service of the latter. In particular, if a client arrives when the server is unoccupied, then that client becomes an ancestor for a subset of the N clients that consists of those arriving while that client is still in the queue. It is not difficult to see that this notion of genealogy can be represented as a forest of *rooted ordered trees* on N vertices where each vertex stands for a client and siblings are ranked according to their arrivals. We point to Fig. 1 for an example. We note that the arrival order of the clients in the queue coincides with the depth-first traversal of this forest.

A LIFO-queue construction of  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ . Recall the random bipartite graph  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  with given weight sequences  $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{1 \le i \le n}$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_j)_{1 \le j \le m}$ . We now present an alternative construction of the graph where the connected components of the graph appear in a sequential way. Informally, the construction consists in sampling the neighbourhood of each vertex in turn. However, the particular schemes for sampling depend on the colour of the vertex. For black vertices, this is done in a breadth-first manner, i.e. the entire neighbourhood is sampled in one step; for white vertices, depth-first samplings are used instead: each time a member of the neighbourhood has been identified, we immediately move on to the neighbourhood of this member. Formally, let

$$\left\{E_i^{(\mathsf{b})}: 1 \leq i \leq n\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{E_j^{(\mathsf{w})}: 1 \leq j \leq m\right\}$$

be two independent collections of independent exponential variables of respective rates  $x_i/z_{n,m}$ ,  $1 \le i \le n$ , and  $y_j/z_{n,m}$ ,  $1 \le j \le m$ . During the construction, we operate a queue for the white vertices. At step



Figure 1: A LIFO queue and its genealogy.

 $k \ge 0$ , the status of the queue is recorded in an ordered sequence  $\mathcal{A}_k = \{(l_{k,i}, r_k(l_{k,i})) : 1 \le i \le h_k\}$ :  $l_{k,1}, l_{k,2}, l_{k,3}, \ldots$  are the labels of the first, second, third, and so on white vertices in the queue, and  $r_k(l_{k,i})$  is the remaining service time for  $l_{k,i}$  at that stage. Imagine also two dials–a black one and a white one–that will help us to record the progress of the construction. Initially, set the black dial  $\tau_0^{(b)} = 0$  and the white dial  $\tau_0^{(w)} = 0$ . Set the initial queue  $\mathcal{A}_0$  to be empty. At step  $k \ge 1$ , given  $\tau_{k-1}^{(b)}, \tau_{k-1}^{(w)}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{k-1}$  do as follows.

If  $\mathcal{A}_{k-1}$  is empty, this signifies the start of a new connected component. Let  $V_k = \operatorname{argmin}\{E_i^{(b)} : E_i^{(b)} > \tau_{k-1}^{(b)}\}$ , namely the first black vertex arriving after  $\tau_{k-1}^{(b)}$ . Set

$$\tau_k^{(\mathbf{b})} = E_{V_k}^{(\mathbf{b})}, \quad \text{and} \quad I(V_k) = (\tau_{k-1}^{(\mathbf{w})}, \tau_k^{(\mathbf{w})}] \quad \text{with} \quad \tau_k^{(\mathbf{w})} := \tau_{k-1}^{(\mathbf{w})} + x_{V_k}.$$

Declare  $V_k$  as the root of a new rooted tree whose first generation, consisting entirely of white vertices, is given by the following set

$$\mathcal{N}(V_k) := \{ w_j : j \in [m], E_j^{(\mathbf{w})} \in I(V_k) \}.$$

Update the queue as follows: in the reverse order of their arrivals, put each member of  $\mathcal{N}(V_k)$  to the top of  $\mathcal{A}_{k-1}$  along with a service request  $r_k(w_j) = y_j$  for each  $w_j \in \mathcal{N}(V_k)$ . Call the new queue  $\mathcal{A}_k$ .

If  $\mathcal{A}_{k-1}$  is not empty, let  $U_k$  be the first entry in  $\mathcal{A}_{k-1}$  along with its remaining service time  $r_{k-1}(U_k)$ . This signifies that  $U_k$  is the customer being served from  $\tau_{k-1}^{(b)}$  until the moment

$$\tau_k^{(\mathbf{b})} := \left(\tau_{k-1}^{(\mathbf{b})} + r_{k-1}(U_k)\right) \wedge \min\left\{E_i^{(\mathbf{b})} : E_i^{(\mathbf{b})} > \tau_{k-1}^{(\mathbf{b})}\right\}$$

In words,  $U_k$  will receive its service in full unless interrupted by a new arrival. If  $\tau_k^{(b)} - \tau_{k-1}^{(b)} < r_{k-1}(U_k)$ , then a new black vertex arrives and breaks the service of  $U_k$ . Let  $V_k = \operatorname{argmin}\{E_i^{(b)} : E_i^{(b)} > \tau_{k-1}^{(b)}\}$  be this black vertex and declare  $V_k$  as a child of  $U_k$ . Set

$$I(V_k) = (\tau_{k-1}^{(w)}, \tau_k^{(w)}] \quad \text{with} \quad \tau_k^{(w)} := \tau_{k-1}^{(w)} + x_{V_k}.$$

The offspring of  $V_k$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{N}(V_k) = \left\{ w_j : j \in [m], E_j^{(\mathbf{w})} \in I(V_k) \right\}.$$

Update the queue as follows: first, set the remaining service time for  $U_k$  to be  $r_k(U_k) = r_{k-1}(U_k) - (E_{V_k}^{(b)} - \tau_{k-1}^{(b)})$ ; secondly, in the reverse order of their arrivals, add each member of  $\mathcal{N}(V_k)$  to the top of



**Figure 2:** A LIFO-queue construction of  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ . The first steps of the construction can be explained as follows: since  $E_2^{(b)}$  is the smallest among all the  $E_i^{(b)}$ 's, we have  $V_1 = 2$  and start the first tree rooted at  $b_2$ . An inspection of the line below finds the two neighbours of  $b_2$ :  $w_4$  and  $w_5$ ; thus  $A_1 = \{(w_4, y_4), (w_5, y_5)\}$ . At step 2, we start with  $U_2 = w_4$ . The service of  $w_4$  gets interrupted by the arrival of  $b_4$  at  $E_4^{(b)}$ , which becomes the first child of  $w_4$ . We then immediately pivots to identifying the neighbours of  $b_4$  and finding  $w_1$  as a result. At the end of step 2, the queue status is given by  $A_2 = \{(w_1, y_1), (w_4, y_4 - (E_4^{(b)} - E_2^{(b)})), (w_5, y_5)\}$ . Note that the arrivals of  $b_1$  and  $b_5$  add no new white nodes to the queue, so their "interruption" of the currently serviced client is finished instantly.

 $\mathcal{A}_{k-1}$  along with a service request  $r_k(w_j) = y_j$  for each  $w_j \in \mathcal{N}(V_k)$ . Any other previous member of  $\mathcal{A}_{k-1}$  has their remaining service time unchanged. Call the new queue  $\mathcal{A}_k$ . If, instead,  $\tau_k^{(b)} - \tau_{k-1}^{(b)} = r_{k-1}(U_k)$ , then the server completes the service of  $U_k$  at  $\tau_k^{(b)}$ . In that case, remove  $U_k$  from  $\mathcal{A}_{k-1}$  to yield  $\mathcal{A}_k$  and set  $\tau_k^{(w)} = \tau_{k-1}^{(w)}$ . Stop when  $\mathcal{A}_{k-1}$  is empty and  $\tau_{k-1}^{(b)} > \max_{i \in [n]} E_i^{(b)}$ .

In Fig. 2, we illustrate the previous construction with a simple example. Let us point out the following features of the previous construction:

- The construction stops in no more than m+n steps. Indeed, at each step we complete the sampling of the neighbourhood for at least one vertex. If A<sub>k-1</sub> is empty, then we identify N(V<sub>k</sub>). If A<sub>k-1</sub> is non empty and the service of U<sub>k</sub> is interrupted by the arrival of V<sub>k</sub>, we again identify N(V<sub>k</sub>). If A<sub>k-1</sub> if A<sub>k-1</sub> is non empty but U<sub>k</sub> receives its service in full, then we complete the construction of the neighbourhood of U<sub>k</sub> at step k. We also note that in that case, V<sub>k</sub> is undefined. The stopping mechanism also ensures that all the n black vertices will be explored by the end.
- The construction outputs a bipartite forest where each tree component is rooted at a black vertex. Indeed, the construction ensures that at each step all the neighbours of  $V_k$  and  $U_k$  are vertices that have not appeared so far in the construction. We further rank vertices of the same generation according to their arrival orders. The vertex set of this forest contains the *n* black vertices and a subset of the *m* white vertices. Add any remaining white vertices as isolated vertices to the forest and call the resulting graph  $\mathcal{F}$ . We shall see that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a spanning forest of  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ .



Figure 3: Black forest inside the bipartite forest.

To make the connection between  $\mathcal{F}$  and the previous queuing system, denote by  $\mathcal{F}^{(b)}$  the following forest induced by  $\mathcal{F}$  on the set of black vertices: a black vertex b is the parent of the black vertex b' if and only if b is the grandparent of b' in  $\mathcal{F}$ ; see Fig. 3. Let us also note that each black vertex  $b_i$  appears as a unique  $V_k$  during the previous construction. As a result, we have assigned an interval  $I(i) := I(V_k)$ used to sample its offspring. Meanwhile, consider a queuing system of n clients with respective arrival times  $(E_i^{(b)})_{i \in [n]}$  and the service time for the client arriving at  $E_i^{(b)}$  being

$$\Delta_i^{\mathrm{bi}} := \sum_{j \in [m]} y_j \mathbf{1}_{\{E_j^{(\mathbf{w})} \in I(i)\}}, \quad 1 \le i \le n.$$

$$(6)$$

Call this the *bipartite LIFO-queue* and let  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$  be the forest of rooted ordered trees induced by it.

# **Lemma 2.1.** We have $\hat{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F}^{(b)}$ .

*Proof.* Given the queue  $(\mathcal{A}_k)_{k\geq 0}$  for the white vertices, we now define a corresponding queue for the black vertices by merging the white vertices that are offspring of a common black vertex. Indeed, we note that each time new entries are added to  $(\mathcal{A}_k)_{k\geq 1}$ , they are added as a collection  $\mathcal{N}(V_k)$ , where  $V_k$  is some black vertex. Aggregate all the service requests from  $\mathcal{N}(V_k)$  into a single request from the client  $V_k$ . Operate the queue in an obvious way: if a client from  $\mathcal{N}(V_k)$  is being served at time t in the previous queue, then say  $V_k$  is served at time t in the current queue. It is then straightforward to check that the queue for the black vertices coincides with the bipartite LIFO-queue. The conclusion follows.

**Surplus edges.** In general, the random graph  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is not a forest. To complete the construction, we need to include some additional edges without affecting the connected component structure of  $\mathcal{F}$ . These additional edges will be referred to as *surplus edges*. Denote by K the total steps that the construction takes. For  $1 \le k \le K$ , if  $V_k$  is defined in that step, then set

$$\mathcal{S}_k = \left\{ (V_k, w_j) : w_j \in \mathcal{A}_{k-1} \right\};$$

otherwise, set  $S_k = \emptyset$ . In words,  $S_k$  identifies all the candidates for a potential surplus edge at step k. If  $w_j \in \mathcal{A}_{k-1}$ , let us denote  $y_j(k)$  the remaining amount of service that  $w_j$  has yet to receive when  $V_k$  arrives. Given  $(S_k)_{1 \le k \le K}$ , let  $\{I_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [m]\}$  be a collection of independent Bernoulli variables that satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}\left[I_{i,j} \mid (\mathcal{S}_k)_{1 \le k \le K}\right] = \mathbf{1}_{\{\exists k \le K: (b_i, w_j) \in \mathcal{S}_k\}} (1 - \exp(-y_j(k)x_i/z_{n,m}).$$
(7)

Then

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,m} := \left\{ (b_i, w_j) : I_{i,j} = 1, i \in [n], j \in [m] \right\}$$
(8)

denotes the set of endpoints of sampled surplus edges. Let B' be the graph obtained after adding all the edges from  $\mathcal{E}_{n,m}$  to  $\mathcal{F}$  and forgetting the roots and vertex ordering in  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** B' is distributed as  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ .

A proof of Lemma 2.2 is given in Section 3.1. Thanks to it, we will tacitly **assume from now on** that  $B(n,m;\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$  has been constructed using the exponential variables  $(E_i^{(b)})_{i\in[n]}, (E_j^{(w)})_{j\in[m]}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{n,m}$ .

# 2.2 Graph encoding processes

Recall from Section 2.1 the generic LIFO-queue with arrivals at  $(t_i)_{1 \le i \le N}$  and service requests  $(\Delta_i)_{1 \le i \le N}$ . The *server load* of at time t refers to the total amount of unfulfilled service time from the clients in the queue at that moment. To track that quantity, let us introduce:

$$Z_t^Q = -t + \sum_{1 \le i \le N} \Delta_i \mathbf{1}_{\{t_i \le t\}}, \quad t \ge 0.$$

$$\tag{9}$$

We note that the negative drift represents the discharge rate of the server, while  $Z_t^Q$  jumps upwards of size  $\Delta_i$  at each  $t_i$ ,  $1 \le i \le N$ . From this, it is not difficult to convince oneself that the server load at time t is given precisely by

$$Z_t^Q - \inf_{u \le t} Z_u^Q.$$

Recall again from Section 2.1 that we have associated a forest of rooted ordered trees to the queue. Let us observe that in the aforementioned forest the ancestors of a client are those waiting in the queue while the client is being served. Hence, the height of a client in the forest corresponds to the queue length for the duration of its service.<sup>1</sup> To find that quantity, we follow Le Gall and Le Jan [31] to introduce the so-called *height process*: for each  $t \ge 0$ , let

$$H_t^Q = \# \left\{ s \le t : Z_{s-}^Q < \inf_{u \in [s,t]} Z_u^Q \right\} = \# \left\{ t_i \le t : 1 \le i \le N, Z_{t_i-}^Q < \inf_{u \in [t_i,t]} Z_u^Q \right\}.$$
(10)

We claim that  $H_{t_i}^Q$  is the height of the client arriving at time  $t_i$ ,  $1 \le i \le N$ . Indeed, due to the Last-In-First-Out rule, the client arriving at time  $t_j$  departs from the queue at the first moment after  $t_j$  when the server load falls back to the level just prior to its arrival, that is the moment

$$\inf \left\{ t > t_j : Z_t^Q \le Z_{t_j}^Q \right\} = \inf \left\{ t > t_j : Z_t^Q - \inf_{u \le t} Z_u^Q \le Z_{t_j}^Q - \inf_{u < t_j} Z_u^Q \right\}.$$

It follows that  $H_t^Q$  counts the number of clients in the queue at time t. In fact, the previous arguments can be used to establish a stronger identity: denote by  $d_{gr}^Q$  the graph distance of the forest and let  $v_t$  be the client being served at time t (set  $v_t = \dagger$  if the queue is empty at time t); then for any  $0 \le s \le t$ , we have

$$d_{\rm gr}^Q(v_s, v_t) = H_s^Q + H_t^Q - 2\min_{s \le u \le t} H_u^Q,$$
(11)

if  $\inf_{u \le s} Z_u^Q = \inf_{u \le t} Z_u^Q$ , indicating the two clients are in the same tree component, and  $d_{gr}^Q(v_s, v_t) = \infty$  otherwise. Underlying the identity (11) is the fact that  $H^Q$  can be viewed as a time-changed version of the so-called contour process of the forest; we refer to [16], Section 3.2 for further detail.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>We define the height of a root vertex as 1. The queue length counts the customer currently being served.

To introduce the relevant processes for the bipartite graph  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , let us recall the bipartite LIFO-queue with arrivals at  $(E_i^{(b)})_{i \in [n]}$  and service requests  $(\Delta_i^{bi})_{i \in [n]}$  from (6). We define

$$Z_{t}^{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} = -t + \sum_{i \in [n]} \Delta_{i}^{\mathrm{bi}} \mathbf{1}_{\{E_{i}^{(\mathrm{b})} \le t\}} \quad \text{and} \quad H_{t}^{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} = \# \left\{ s \le t : Z_{s-}^{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} \le \inf_{u \in [s,t]} Z_{u}^{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} \right\}, \quad t \ge 0.$$
(12)

Then  $H_t^{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$  is the length of the bipartite LIFO-queue at time t. We recall the forest  $\mathcal{F}$  produced by the LIFO-queue construction of  $B(n,m;\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ , which turns out to be a spanning forest of the graph. Recalling from Lemma 2.1 the connection between  $\mathcal{F}$ , the black sub-forest  $\mathcal{F}^{(b)}$  and the forest  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$  associated to the bipartite queue, we have

$$2H_{E_i^{(\mathbf{b})}}^{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} - 1 = \text{height of the black vertex } b_i \text{ in } \mathcal{F}, \quad 1 \le i \le n.$$
(13)

The process  $Z^{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$  can be expressed as a more explicit function of  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, (E_i^{(\mathbf{b})})_{i \in [n]}, (E_j^{(\mathbf{w})})_{j \in [m]}$ . Indeed, let us define

$$\Lambda^{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \sum_{i \in [n]} x_i \mathbf{1}_{\{E_i^{(b)} \le t\}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda^{\mathbf{y}}(t) = \sum_{j \in [m]} y_j \mathbf{1}_{\{E_j^{(w)} \le t\}}.$$
 (14)

Lemma 2.3. We have

$$Z_t^{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} = -t + \Lambda^{\mathbf{y}} \circ \Lambda^{\mathbf{x}}(t), \quad t \ge 0.$$
(15)

We give the proof of Lemma 2.3 in Section 3.1. Let  $(g_{n,i}, d_{n,i}), 1 \le i \le \kappa'_{n,m}$  be the maximal open intervals of the following set

$$\left\{t > 0: Z_t^{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} > \inf_{s \le t} Z_s^{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}\right\},\$$

ranked in increasing order of their left endpoints. Meanwhile, let  $T_{n,i}$  be the *i*-th tree that appears in the LIFO-queue construction of  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{x}(T_{n,\ell})$  (resp.  $\mathbf{y}(T_{n,i})$ ) the total  $\mathbf{x}$ -weights of the black vertices in  $T_{n,i}$  (resp. the total  $\mathbf{y}$ -weights of the white vertices in  $T_{n,i}$ ). Let  $\kappa_{n,m}$  stand for the number of connected components in  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  that contains at least one black vertex.

**Lemma 2.4.** We have  $\kappa_{n,m} = \kappa'_{n,m}$ . For  $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \kappa_{n,m}$ , we have

$$d_{n,i} - g_{n,i} = \mathbf{y}(T_{n,i}) \quad and \quad \Lambda^{\mathbf{x}}(d_{n,i}) - \Lambda^{\mathbf{x}}(g_{n,i}) = \mathbf{x}(T_{n,i}).$$
(16)

A proof of Lemma 2.4 can be found in Section 3.1. For the moment, let us simply note that the previous lemma suggest that we can recover the connected components of the graph by tracking the excursion intervals of  $(Z_t^{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}})_{t\geq 0}$  above its running infimum.

### 2.3 A coupling with Poisson point processes in the i.i.d. case

From now on, we are only concerned with the i.i.d. case. Recall that we take  $z_{n,m} = \sqrt{mn}$  in this case. Inspired by the work [28], we introduce a pair of Poisson point processes which will generate both the vertex weights and the exponential variables used in the previous construction. Recall  $F^{(b)}$  and  $F^{(w)}$ , the c.d.f. for the respective weight distributions for black and white vertices. Let  $\Pi^{(b)} = \{(E_i^{(b)}, X_i) : 1 \le i \le N_n^{(b)}\}$  be a Poisson point measure on  $\mathbb{R}^2_+$  with intensity measure

$$\pi^{(\mathbf{b})}(dt, dx) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} x e^{-xt/\sqrt{mn}} dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x) dt.$$

Note in particular that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} \pi^{(b)}(dt, dx) = n$ . Similarly, let  $\Pi^{(w)} = \{(E_j^{(w)}, Y_j) : 1 \le j \le N_m^{(w)}\}$  be a Poisson point measure on  $\mathbb{R}^2_+$  with intensity measure

$$\pi^{(\mathbf{w})}(ds, dy) = \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} y e^{-ys/\sqrt{mn}} dF^{(\mathbf{w})}(y) ds,$$

and independent of  $\Pi^{(b)}$ . We observe the following distributional properties of  $\Pi^{(b)}$  and  $\Pi^{(w)}$ , whose proof is standard and therefore omitted.

**Lemma 2.5.** The total number of atoms  $N_n^{(b)}$  of  $\Pi^{(b)}$  is a Poisson variable of mean n; similarly,  $N_m^{(w)}$  is a Poisson variable of mean m. Given  $N_n^{(b)}$ , the pairs  $(E_i^{(b)}, X_i), 1 \le i \le N_n^{(b)}$  are i.i.d. with the joint distribution  $\pi^{(b)}(dt, dx)/n$ . In particular, given  $N_n^{(b)} = n$ , the marginal distribution of  $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$  is that of an i.i.d. sequence with common distribution  $dF^{(b)}$ , and conditional on  $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ ,  $E_i^{(b)}, 1 \le i \le n$  are independent and each with  $Exp(X_i/\sqrt{mn})$  distribution. Similarly, given  $N_m^{(w)} = m$ , the marginal distribution of  $(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_m)$  is that of an i.i.d. sequence with common distribution  $dF^{(w)}$ , and conditional on  $(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_m)$ ,  $E_j^{(w)}, 1 \le j \le m$  are independent and each with  $Exp(Y_i/\sqrt{mn})$  distribution.

Let us consider the bipartite graph with random weight sequences  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n := \{x_i : 1 \le i \le N_n^{(b)}\}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_m = \{y_j : 1 \le j \le N_m^{(b)}\}$ . In particular, on the event  $\{N_n^{(b)} = n, N_m^{(w)} = m\}$ , the previous lemma ensures that we obtain a version of  $B_{n,m} = B(n,m;\mathbf{X}_n,\mathbf{Y}_m)$ . On the complement of that event, we obtain a graph with a different size in the vertex set; nevertheless, it still makes sense to talk about the graph  $B(n,m;\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n,\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_m)$ . For this reason, let

 $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$  be the joint distribution of  $\Pi^{(b)}$  and  $\Pi^{(w)}$ .

The construction in Section 2.1 and Lemma 2.5 combined allow us to view  $B(n, m; \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_m)$  as a function of  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_m, (E_i^{(b)})_{1 \le i \le N_n^{(b)}}, (E_j^{(w)})_{1 \le j \le N_m^{(w)}}$  and some extra randomness used to sample the surplus edges that can be assumed to be independent of the previous random variables. By enlarging the probability space to accommodate the extra randomness, we will **assume from now on** that  $B(n, m; \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_m)$  is thus defined under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ . Furthermore, the graph encoding processes introduced in Section 2.2 also have a version under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ : let

$$\Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(t) = \sum_{1 \le i \le N_n^{(\mathbf{b})}} X_i \mathbf{1}_{\{E_i^{(\mathbf{b})} \le t\}}, \quad \Lambda^{(\mathbf{w},m)}(t) = \sum_{1 \le i \le N_m^{(\mathbf{w})}} Y_j \mathbf{1}_{\{E_j^{(\mathbf{w})} \le t\}}, \tag{17}$$

$$Z_t^{n,m} = -t + \Lambda^{(\mathbf{w},m)} \circ \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(t), \quad H_t^{n,m} = \# \Big\{ s \le t : Z_{s-}^{n,m} \le \inf_{u \in [s,t]} Z_u^{n,m} \Big\}.$$
(18)

# 2.4 Limit theorems for the graph encoding processes

Recall that we have assumed  $m = \lfloor \theta n \rfloor$ ; see (H-clustering). Recall the c.d.f.  $F^{(b)}$ ,  $F^{(w)}$  for the weight distributions and the notation  $\sigma_r^{(b)}$ ,  $\sigma_r^{(w)}$  for their respective *r*-th moments. The critical regime that we are interested in requires  $\sigma_2^{(b)} \cdot \sigma_2^{(w)} = 1$ ; see (H-critical). We have distinguished three scenarios regarding the tail behaviours of  $F^{(b)}$  and  $F^{(w)}$ : double finite third moments, one dominant heavy tail and matched heavy tails. We describe here the scaling limit of  $(Z^{n,m}, H^{n,m})$ , introduced in (18), in each of these scenarios. For  $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , we denote by  $\mathbb{D}(I, \mathbb{R}^d)$  the space of càdlàg functions from I to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  equipped with the Skorokhod topology.

Scaling limit of  $Z^{n,m}$ . For  $i \in \{1,2,3\}$ , let  $\mathcal{L}^{(i)} = (\mathcal{L}^{(i)}_t)_{t\geq 0}$  be a spectrally positive stable Lévy process whose law is characterised by the Laplace transform:

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda \mathcal{L}_t^{(i)}}] = \exp\left(t\Psi_i(\lambda)\right), \quad \lambda \ge 0, \ t \ge 0,$$
(19)

where

$$\Psi_{1}(\lambda) = C(2) C_{1}\lambda^{2}, \quad C_{1} = \sigma_{3}^{(w)}\sigma_{2}^{(b)} + \sqrt{\theta}(\sigma_{2}^{(w)})^{2}\sigma_{3}^{(b)},$$
  

$$\Psi_{2}(\lambda) = C(\alpha)C_{2}\lambda^{\alpha}, \quad C_{2} = C^{(b)}\theta^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}}(\sigma_{2}^{(w)})^{\alpha},$$
  

$$\Psi_{3}(\lambda) = C(\alpha)C_{3}\lambda^{\alpha}, \quad C_{3} = C^{(w)}\sigma_{2}^{(b)} + C^{(b)}\theta^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}}(\sigma_{2}^{(w)})^{\alpha},$$

and  $C(\alpha) = (\alpha + 1)\Gamma(2 - \alpha)/(\alpha(\alpha - 1))$  for  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$  and C(2) = 1/2. We shall refer to  $\Psi_i$  as the *Laplace exponent* of  $\mathcal{L}^{(i)}$ . Now let  $\mathcal{Z}^{(i)} = (\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a stochastic process with càdlàg sample paths whose distribution satisfies the following absolute continuity relationship: for each  $t \geq 0$  and every measurable function  $F : \mathbb{D}([0, t], \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}_+$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[F\left(\left(\mathcal{Z}_{s}^{(i)}\right)_{s\leq t}\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[F\left(\left(\mathcal{L}_{s}^{(i)}\right)_{s\leq t}\right)\cdot\mathcal{E}_{t}^{(i)}\right]$$
(20)

with

$$\mathcal{E}_{t}^{(i)} = \exp\Big\{-\int_{0}^{t} \frac{\sigma_{2}^{(\mathbf{b})}s}{\theta} d\mathcal{L}_{s}^{(i)} - \int_{0}^{t} \Psi_{i}\Big(\frac{\sigma_{2}^{(\mathbf{b})}s}{\theta}\Big) ds\Big\}.$$
(21)

Underlying the identity (20) is the property that  $(\mathcal{E}_t^{(i)})_{t\geq 0}$  is a unit-mean positive martingale; we refer to Appendix B for further details. We will shortly see that  $\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}$ , i = 1, 2, 3, all appear in the scaling limit of  $Z^{n,m}$  under the various assumptions of  $F^{(b)}$  and  $F^{(w)}$ .

Let us present some alternative definitions of  $\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}$ . For i = 1, we note that  $\mathcal{L}^{(1)}$  is a Brownian motion. In that case, the identity in (20) is a special case of Girsanov's Theorem for Brownian motions and we have in fact

$$\mathcal{Z}^{(1)} \stackrel{(d)}{=} \Big\{ \mathcal{L}_t^{(1)} - \Big(\frac{\sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})}}{\theta}\Big)^{-1} \cdot \Psi_1\Big(\frac{\sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})}t}{\theta}\Big) : t \ge 0 \Big\}.$$
(22)

In words,  $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$  is a Brownian motion with a parabolic drift. For both i = 2 and i = 3,  $\mathcal{L}^{(i)}$  is an  $\alpha$ -stable process. Let  $(\mathcal{M}_t)_{t\geq 0}$  be a martingale process with càdlàg sample paths which has independent increments and whose marginal laws are characterised as follows: for all  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda\mathcal{M}_t}\right] = \exp\left\{\left(\alpha+1\right)\int_0^t \int_0^\infty (e^{-\lambda x} - 1 + \lambda x)e^{-\sigma_2^{(b)}xs/\theta}x^{-\alpha-1}dx\,ds\right\}.$$
(23)

Then a Girsanov-type theorem for Lévy processes (see Appendix B) says that

$$\mathcal{Z}^{(i)} \stackrel{(d)}{=} \left\{ C_i \cdot \mathcal{M}_t - \left(\frac{\sigma_2^{(b)}}{\theta}\right)^{-1} \cdot \Psi_i \left(\frac{\sigma_2^{(b)}t}{\theta}\right) : t \ge 0 \right\}, \quad i = 2, 3.$$
(24)

**Height processes in the limit.** For the spectrally positive Lévy process  $\mathcal{L}^{(i)}$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , the notion of height process has been introduced by Le Gall and Le Jan [31], who show that there exists a stochastic process  $(\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_t^{(i)})_{t\geq 0}$  of continuous sample paths so that the following limit exists in probability for all  $t \geq 0$ :

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{t}^{(i)} := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{0}^{t} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{L}_{s}^{(i)} \le \inf_{u \in [s,t]} \mathcal{L}_{u}^{(i)} + \epsilon\}} ds.$$
(25)

The identity (20) allows us to assert the existence of an analogous height process for  $\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}$ . Namely, for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , there exists some process  $(\mathcal{H}_t^{(i)})_{t\geq 0}$  of continuous sample paths satisfying

$$\mathcal{H}_{t}^{(i)} := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{0}^{t} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{Z}_{s}^{(i)} \le \inf_{u \in [s,t]} \mathcal{Z}_{u}^{(i)} + \epsilon\}} ds,$$
(26)

where the limit above exists in probability for all  $t \ge 0$ . Furthermore, for  $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$ , which is a Brownian motion with a parabolic drift, its height process takes a simple form, as almost surely we have

$$\mathcal{H}_{t}^{(1)} = \frac{2}{C_{1}} \Big( \mathcal{Z}_{t}^{(1)} - \inf_{s \le t} \mathcal{Z}_{s}^{(1)} \Big), \quad t \ge 0.$$
(27)

We refer to [23] for further background on the height processes of Lévy processes and particularly Eq. (1.7) there for the simplification in the Brownian case.

**Proposition 2.6** (Convergence of the graph encoding processes). Assume (H-clustering) and (H-critical). For  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , let  $(\mathcal{Z}_t^{(i)})_{t\geq 0}$  be the stochastic process defined in (20) and  $(\mathcal{H}_t^{(i)})_{t\geq 0}$  be as in (26).

(1) **Double finite third moments:** Under both (H-b-3rd) and (H-w-3rd), the following weak convergence takes place under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_m^{(w)} = m, N_n^{(b)} = n)$ :

$$\left\{n^{-\frac{1}{3}}Z_{n^{2/3}t}^{n,m}, n^{-\frac{1}{3}}H_{n^{2/3}t}^{n,m}: t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{\mathcal{Z}_{t}^{(1)}, \mathcal{H}_{t}^{(1)}: t \ge 0\right\} \text{ in } \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_{+}, \mathbb{R}^{2}).$$
(28)

(2) One dominant heavy tail: Assume that (H-b-power) holds with  $\alpha \in (1,2)$  and  $C^{(b)} \in (0,\infty)$ . Assume that either (H-w-3rd) is true or (H-w-power) holds with  $\alpha' \in (\alpha, 2)$  and  $C^{(w)} \in (0,\infty)$ . Then the following weak convergence takes place under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_m^{(w)} = m, N_n^{(b)} = n)$ :

$$\left\{n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}Z_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m}, n^{-\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha+1}}H_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m}: t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{\mathcal{Z}_t^{(2)}, \mathcal{H}_t^{(2)}: t \ge 0\right\} \text{ in } \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2).$$
(29)

(3) Matched heavy tails: Assume that both (H-b-power) and (H-w-power) hold with  $\alpha = \alpha' \in (1,2)$ and  $C^{(b)} \in (0,\infty), C^{(w)} \in (0,\infty)$ . Then the following weak convergence takes place under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_m^{(w)} = m, N_n^{(b)} = n)$ :

$$\left\{n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}Z_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m}, n^{-\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha+1}}H_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m} : t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{\mathcal{Z}_t^{(3)}, \mathcal{H}_t^{(3)} : t \ge 0\right\} \text{ in } \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2).$$
(30)

The proof of Proposition 2.6, given in Section 3.2, is the main focus of the proof section 3.

### 2.5 Convergence of the surplus edges

Roughly speaking, Proposition 2.6 from the previous section implies the convergence of the spanning forest  $\mathcal{F}$  to the spanning forest of the continuum graphs. Recall that the finite graph can be obtained from its spanning forest by inserting a collection of surplus edges. We show here that the collection of surplus edges also has a trackable limit distribution. Together with the previous convergence of graph encoding processes, this will provide the principal arguments of our main results.

Before presenting our result on the convergence of the surplus edges, we first introduce some modifications on how we sample these edges in  $B_{n,m}$ . The first modification is deterministic and consists in altering locally the graph distance. The second modification highlights the hidden Poissonian features of the surplus edges.

Local modifications in the graph distance. Recall  $\mathcal{E}_{n,m}$ , the set of surplus edges of  $B_{n,m}$  under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ , and recall that all its elements are of the form  $e = (b_i, w_j)$  for which there exists some unique  $1 \le k \le K$  so that  $b_i = V_k$  and  $w_j \in \mathcal{A}_{k-1}$ . In words, surplus edges are only formed between the black vertex explored at step k and a white vertex from the queue at that time,  $1 \le k \le K$ . Let  $e = (b_i, w_j) \in \mathcal{E}_{n,m}$  and let k(e) be such that  $V_{k(e)} = b_i$ . Since the queue  $\mathcal{A}_{k-1}$  is filled by the white neighbours of  $(V_\ell)_{\ell < k}$  that have not been fully explored, we can find a unique k'(e) < k so that  $w_j \in \mathcal{N}(V_{k'(e)})$ . Now let  $(V_{k(e)}, V_{k'(e)})$  be the edge obtained from e by replacing the white vertex with its parent in  $\mathcal{F}$  and define the collection

$$\mathcal{E}'_{n,m} = \left\{ \left( V_{k(e)}, V_{k'(e)} \right) : e \in \mathcal{E}_{n,m} \right\}.$$
(31)

Let B'' be the graph obtained after adding all the edges from  $\mathcal{E}'_{n,m}$  to  $\mathcal{F}$  and forgetting the roots and vertex ordering in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Although B'' is no longer a bipartite graph, it provides a convenient approximation on  $B_{n,m}$  as shown in the following lemma. Recall the ranked sequence  $\{C_{n,(k)} : 1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m}\}$  of the connected components of  $B_{n,m}$  that contain at least one black vertex. Let Id be the identity map from the vertex set of  $B_{n,m}$  to that of B''. Recall that  $d_{gr}$  stands for the graph distance of  $B_{n,m}$ ; let d'' be the graph distance of B''.

**Lemma 2.7.** For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq \kappa_{n,m}$ ,  $\mathrm{Id}(C_{n,(k)})$  is a connected component of B''; moreover, denoting

$$dis_k(Id) = \sup\{|d_{gr}(x, y) - d''(x, y)| : x, y \in C_{n,(k)}\},\$$

we have

$$\operatorname{dis}_k(\operatorname{Id}) \le s_{n,k},$$

where  $s_{n,k}$  is the number of surplus edges with both endpoints in  $C_{n,(k)}$ .

**Poissonisation of surplus edges.** We present here an alternative way of sampling surplus edges via a Poisson point process. To that end, we will need an auxiliary function  $\Sigma^{n,m}$  introduced below. Roughly speaking, the function transfers y-weights to x-weights. Recall from (6) the bipartite LIFO-queue with service requests  $(\Delta_k^{\text{bi}})$ . Recall that if  $\Delta_k^{\text{bi}} = 0$ , then Client k will immediately leave the queue the moment it arrives. Given the bipartite LIFO-queue, for  $t \ge 0$ , we set

$$\mathfrak{D}_t = \{1 \le k \le N_n^{(\mathbf{b})} : \text{Client } k \text{ has departed by time } t \text{ if } \Delta_k^{\mathrm{bi}} > 0 \text{ and } E_k^{(\mathbf{b})} \le t \text{ if } \Delta_k^{\mathrm{bi}} = 0\}$$

and

 $\mathfrak{W}_t = \{1 \le k \le N_n^{(b)} : \Delta_k^{bi} > 0 \text{ and Client } k \text{ is in the queue at time } t\}.$ (32)

If  $k \in \mathfrak{W}_t$ , denote by  $\Delta_k(t)$  the service time that Client k has received by t. Let  $\Sigma^{n,m} : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$  be as follows:

$$\Sigma^{n,m}(t) = \sum_{k} X_k \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in \mathfrak{D}_t\}} + \sum_{k} \frac{\Delta_k(t)}{\Delta_k^{\mathrm{bi}}} \cdot X_k \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in \mathfrak{W}_t\}}.$$
(33)

For  $1 \le k \le N_n^{(b)}$ , denote by  $J_k$  the set of time when Client k is served, with the convention that  $J_k = \{E_k^{(b)}\}$  if  $\Delta_k^{bi} = 0$ . Note that  $J_k, 1 \le k \le N_n^{(b)}$  are disjoint sets. For  $A \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ , let its image set by  $\Sigma^{n,m}$  be defined as follows:

$$\Sigma^{n,m}(A) = \{ y : \exists t \in A \text{ s.t. } \Sigma^{n,m}(t-) \le y \le \Sigma^{n,m}(t) \}$$

We also write |A| for the Lebesgues measure of a Borel set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ . The following result summarises some useful properties of  $\Sigma^{n,m}$ .

**Lemma 2.8.** The function  $t \mapsto \Sigma^{n,m}(t)$  is increasing and strictly increasing on the set of time when the queue is nonempty. Moreover, we have  $|\Sigma^{n,m}(J_k)| = X_k$  for each  $1 \le k \le N_n^{(b)}$ .

Let  $Q_{n,m} = \{(s_i, y_i) : 1 \le i \le q_{n,m}\}$  be a Poisson point measure with rate  $1/\sqrt{mn}$  on

$$D_{n,m} := \{(s,y) : \exists t \ge 0 \text{ s.t. } \Sigma^{n,m}(t-) \le s \le \Sigma^{n,m}(t), 0 \le y \le Z_t^{n,m} - \inf_{u \le t} Z_u^{n,m} \}.$$

Suppose  $(s_i, y_i) \in Q_{n,m}$ . By definition, we can find some  $t_i \ge 0$  satisfying  $\Sigma^{n,m}(t_i-) \le s_i \le \Sigma^{n,m}(t_i)$ . Since the queue is not empty at time t if and only if  $Z_t^{n,m} > \inf_{u \le t} Z_u^{n,m}$ , with probability 1, the queue is not empty at time  $t_i$ . As a result,  $\Sigma^{n,m}$  is strictly increasing on a neighbourhood of  $t_i$  and such  $t_i$  is therefore unique a.s. Let  $b_{\ell_i}$  be the client being served at time  $t_i$ . We set  $t'_i = \sup\{u \le t_i : Z_u^{n,m} - \inf_{v \le u} Z_v^{n,m} \le y_i\}$ , and let  $b_{\ell'_i}$  be the client being served at time  $t'_i$ . Define

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,m}'' = \left\{ (b_{\ell_i}, b_{\ell'_i}) : 1 \le i \le q_{n,m} \right\}.$$
(34)

**Lemma 2.9.**  $\mathcal{E}''_{n,m}$  has the same distribution as  $\mathcal{E}'_{n,m}$ .

Proof of Lemmas 2.7-2.9 is given in Section 3.3. Thanks to these results, we can focus on the Poisson point measure  $Q^{n,m}$  instead of the original surplus edges. We now present the main result concerning its scaling limit, whose proof is again found in Section 3.3. To that end, let us introduce that for a, b > 0,

$$\mathscr{S}[a,b](Q^{n,m}) = \{(s_i/b, y_i/a) : 1 \le i \le q_{n,m}\}$$

Recall  $\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}$  from (20). Given  $\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}$ , let  $\mathcal{Q}^{(i)}$  be a Poisson point measure with rate  $1/\sqrt{\theta}$  on

$$\mathcal{D}^{(i)} := \left\{ (s, y) : s \ge 0, 0 \le y \le \mathcal{Z}_{\sqrt{\theta}\sigma_2^{(\mathsf{w})}s}^{(i)} - \inf_{u \le \sqrt{\theta}\sigma_2^{(\mathsf{w})}s} \mathcal{Z}_u^{(i)} \right\}.$$
(35)

Proposition 2.10 (Convergence of the surplus edges). Assume (H-clustering) and (H-critical).

- (1) **Double finite third moments:** Under both (H-b-3rd) and (H-w-3rd), the rescaled point measure  $\mathscr{S}[n^{\frac{1}{3}}, n^{\frac{2}{3}}](Q^{n,m})$  under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_n^{(b)} = n, N^{(w)} = m)$  converges in distribution to  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}$  on any compact set of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , jointly with the convergence in (28).
- (2) One dominant heavy tail: Assume that (H-b-power) holds with  $\alpha \in (1,2)$  and  $C^{(b)} \in (0,\infty)$ . Assume that either (H-w-3rd) is true or (H-w-power) holds with  $\alpha' \in (\alpha, 2)$  and  $C^{(w)} \in (0,\infty)$ . Then  $\mathscr{S}[n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}, n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}](Q^{n,m})$  under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_n^{(b)} = n, N^{(w)} = m)$  converges in distribution to  $Q^{(2)}$ on any compact set of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , jointly with the convergence in (29).
- (3) Matched heavy tails: Assume that both (H-b-power) and (H-w-power) hold with  $\alpha = \alpha' \in (1,2)$ and  $C^{(b)} \in (0,\infty), C^{(w)} \in (0,\infty)$ . Then  $\mathscr{S}[n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}, n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}](Q^{n,m})$  under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_n^{(b)} = n, N^{(w)} = m)$  converges in distribution to  $Q^{(3)}$  on any compact set of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , jointly with the convergence in (30).

# 2.6 Construction of the limit graphs

So far, we have seen in Proposition 2.6 that  $(\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}, \mathcal{H}^{(i)})$  appears in the scaling limit for the discrete graph encoding processes  $(\mathbb{Z}^{n,m}, \mathbb{H}^{n,m})$ , as well as in Proposition 2.10 that  $\mathcal{Q}^{(i)}$  describes the limit distribution of surplus edges,  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . We explain here how the limit graphs  $\mathcal{G}^{(i)}$  in Theorems 1.1-1.3 are obtained from the triple  $(\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}, \mathcal{H}^{(i)}, \mathcal{Q}^{(i)})$ . The basic idea is that  $\mathcal{H}^{(i)}$  will be used to construct a forest of continuum random trees, where "shortcuts" will then be identified using  $(\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}, \mathcal{Q}^{(i)})$ .

#### 2.6.1 Graphs encoded by real-valued functions

We follow the approach in [17] to present the construction of a measured metric space from a real-valued function and a finite collection of points. The construction is slightly more general than the one seen for instance in [1] as it allows the function to have jumps, which is particularly appealing for us as our discrete height processes  $H^{n,m}$  are not continuous. We assume that our reader is familiar with the notions of real trees [24], measured metric spaces [26], and Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov topology [32]. In particular, we adopt the following definition of Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov distance: for two measured metric spaces  $\mathcal{G}_1 = (G_1, d_1, \mu_1)$  and  $\mathcal{G}_2 = (G_2, d_2, \mu_2)$ , their Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov distance is given by

$$d_{GHP}(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) := \inf \left\{ d_E^{Haus} \left( \phi_1(G_1), \phi_2(G_2) \right) + d_{Pr} \left( \mu_1 \circ \phi_1^{-1}, \mu_2 \circ \phi_2^{-1} \right) \right\},\$$

where the infimum is over all Polish spaces  $(E, d_E)$  and isometric embeddings  $\phi_i$  from  $G_i \to E$ ;  $d_E^{\text{Haus}}$  stands for the Hausdorff distance of E, and  $d_{\text{Pr}}$  is the Prokhorov distance for the finite Borel measures on E, with  $\mu_i \circ \phi_i^{-1}$  standing for the push-forward of  $\mu_i$  by  $\phi_i$ , i = 1, 2. We further point out that the space of (equivalence classes) of compact measured metric spaces is a Polish space in the topology induced by  $d_{\text{GHP}}$  ([32]).

Let  $\zeta_h \in (0, \infty)$  and  $h : [0, \zeta_h] \to \mathbb{R}_+$  be a right-continuous function with left-hand limits (i.e. càdlàg). We shall further assume that

- either *h* is continuous;
- or  $h([0, \zeta_h])$  is a finite set.

For  $(s,t) \in [0, \zeta_h]^2$ , let us define

$$d_h(s,t) = h(s) + h(t) - 2b_h(s,t), \text{ where } b_h(s,t) = \min\{h(u) : \min(s,t) \le u \le \max(s,t)\}.$$

Say  $s \sim_h t$  if and only if  $d_h(s,t) = 0$ . Then  $d_h$  induces a distance on the quotient space  $T_h := [0, \zeta_h] / \sim_h$ , which we still denote as  $d_h$ . The metric space  $(T_h, d_h)$  is compact and tree-like as it satisfies the so-called four-point inequality: for all  $s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4 \in [0, \zeta_h]$ , it holds that

$$d_h(s_1, s_2) + d_h(s_3, s_4) \le \max\{d_h(s_1, s_3) + d_h(s_2, s_4), d_h(s_1, s_4) + d_h(s_2, s_3)\}$$

On the other hand,  $(T_h, d_h)$  is not necessarily connected. Let  $p_h$  stand for the canonical projection from  $[0, \zeta_h]$  to  $T_h$  and denote by  $\mu_h$  the push-forward of the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, \zeta_h]$  by  $p_h$ . Let us define the measured metric space

$$\mathcal{T}_h := (T_h, d_h, \mu_h). \tag{36}$$

Informally speaking, the measured metric space that we are aiming for will be obtained from  $\mathcal{T}_h$  by inserting a finite number of "shortcuts". Despite  $(T_h, d_h)$  not being connected in general, for  $x, y \in T_h$ , we refer to a *path from* x to y in  $T_h$  a finite sequence  $(e_1, e_2, e_3, \ldots, e_p)$  where  $p \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,  $e_i = (x_i, y_i) \in T_h^2$ ,  $1 \le i \le p$ , and  $x_1 = x, y_p = y$ . Now let  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\Pi = \{(u_i, v_i) : 1 \le i \le q\}$  with  $(u_i, v_i) \in T_h^2$  for  $1 \le i \le q$ . Fix some  $\epsilon > 0$ . For a path  $\gamma = (e_1, e_2, e_3, \ldots, e_p)$  with  $e_i = (x_i, y_i), 1 \le i \le p$ , its  $(\Pi, \epsilon)$ -modified length is defined as

$$\ell_{\Pi,\epsilon}(\gamma) = \sum_{1 \le i \le p} \ell(e_i),$$

where  $\ell(e_i) = \min\{\epsilon, d_h(x_i, y_i)\}$  if either  $(x_i, y_i)$  or  $(y_i, x_i) \in \Pi$ , and  $\ell(e_i) = d_h(x_i, y_i)$  otherwise. The following defines a pseudo-distance on  $T_h$  if  $\epsilon = 0$  and a distance if  $\epsilon > 0$ : for all  $x, y \in T_h$ , let

$$d_{h,\Pi,\epsilon}(x,y) = \inf \{ \ell_{\Pi,\epsilon}(\gamma) : \gamma \text{ is a path from } x \text{ to } y \text{ in } T_h \}.$$

In the case where  $\epsilon = 0$ , we then turn it into a true distance by quotienting the points at  $d_{h,\Pi,\epsilon}$ -distance 0 from each other, similarly to the way that  $\mathcal{T}_h$  is defined. In both cases, call the resulting metric space  $(G_{h,\Pi,\epsilon}, d_{h,\Pi,\epsilon})$  and denote by  $p_{h,\Pi,\epsilon}$  the canonical projection from  $(T_h, d_h)$  to  $(G_{h,\Pi,\epsilon}, d_{h,\Pi,\epsilon})$ . Write  $\mu_{h,\Pi,\epsilon}$  for the push-forward of  $\mu_h$  by  $p_{h,\Pi,\epsilon}$ . The end product of our construction is the following measured metric space

$$\mathcal{G}(h,\Pi,\epsilon) = (G_{h,\Pi,\epsilon}, d_{h,\Pi,\epsilon}, \mu_{h,\Pi,\epsilon}).$$
(37)

In the sequel, it is sometimes more convenient to define the endpoints of shortcuts from their pre-images in  $[0, \zeta_h]$ . Accordingly, let  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varpi = \{(s_i, t_i) : 1 \le i \le q\}$  with  $s_i, t_i \in [0, \zeta_h]$  for  $1 \le i \le q$ . We then define  $\Pi(\varpi) = \{(p_h(s_i), p_h(t_i)) : 1 \le i \le q\}$  and set

$$\mathscr{G}(h, \varpi, \epsilon) = \mathcal{G}(h, \Pi(\varpi), \epsilon).$$
 (38)

The encoding of the bipartite graph. Recall from (18) the pair  $(Z^{n,m}, H^{n,m})$ . In particular,  $H^{n,m}$  only takes finite values on any compact set of  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , and therefore satisfies the previous conditions of h. From Lemma 2.4, we note that there is a correspondence between the excursion intervals of  $Z^{n,m}$  above its running infimum and the connected components of  $B_{n,m}$  that contain at least one black vertex. Let us rank these excursion intervals according to their lengths and let  $(g_{n,(k)}, d_{n,(k)})$  be the k-th longest such

interval,  $1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m}$ . We note this is also the k-th longest excursion interval of  $H^{n,m}$  above 0. Let  $H^{n,k}$  denote the portion of  $H^{n,m}$  running on this interval:

$$\mathbf{H}_{t}^{n,k} = H_{t+g_{n,(k)}}^{n,m}, \quad 0 \le t \le \zeta_{n,(k)} := d_{n,(k)} - g_{n,(k)}.$$

Recall that  $C_{n,(k)}$  stands for the k-th largest connected component of  $B_{n,m}$  in x-weights. Let  $T_{n,(k)}$  be the connected component of  $\mathcal{F}$  that has the same vertex set as  $C_{n,(k)}$ . In other words,  $T_{n,(k)}$  is a spanning tree of  $C_{n,(k)}$ . Recall the measure  $\mu_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}}$ , which assigns an atom of size  $Y_j$  to each of the white vertex  $w_j$  contained in  $C_{n,(k)}$ . Recall from (6) the quantity  $\Delta_i^{\text{bi}}$  and let  $\hat{\mu}_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}}$  be the measure which assigns an atom of size  $\Delta_i^{\text{bi}}$  to each black vertex  $b_i$  in  $C_{n,(k)}$ . Put differently,  $\hat{\mu}_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}}$  can be obtained from  $\mu_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}}$  by transferring the total **y**-weights of their offspring to each black vertex. Let  $d_{\text{gr}}^{\mathcal{F}}$  denote the graph distance in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Denote by  $T_{n,(k)}^{(b)}$  the subset that contains all the black vertices of  $T_{n,(k)}$ . Comparing (13) and (11) with the previous definition of  $d_h$ , we find that

$$\left(T_{n,(k)}^{(b)}, d_{\mathrm{gr}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mu}_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}}\right)$$
 is isometric to  $\mathcal{T}_{2\mathrm{H}^{n,k}}, \quad 1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m}.$  (39)

Meanwhile, since in  $T_{n,(k)}$  each white vertex is at distance 1 from a black vertex, we have for all a > 0,

$$d_{\text{GHP}}\left(\left(T_{n,(k)}^{(b)}, a \cdot d_{\text{gr}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mu}_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}}\right), \left(T_{n,(k)}, a \cdot d_{\text{gr}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \mu_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}}\right)\right) \le 2a.$$

$$(40)$$

Finally, recall from (31) the set  $\mathcal{E}'_{n,m}$  of modified surplus edges with both endpoints in the black vertex set. Let  $\mathcal{E}'(k)$  be the subset of  $\mathcal{E}'_{n,m}$  formed by those edges with both endpoints in  $T^{(b)}_{n,(k)}$ , and let  $\Pi(k)$ be the image of  $\mathcal{E}'(k)$  by the isometry from  $T^{(b)}_{n,(k)}$  to  $\mathcal{T}_{2\mathrm{H}^{n,k}}$  whose existence is ensured in (39). We note that  $\mathcal{G}(2\mathrm{H}^{n,k},\Pi(k),1)$  is the measured metric space obtained from  $\mathcal{T}_{2\mathrm{H}^{n,k}}$  by inserting each member of  $\Pi(k)$  as an edge of length 1. Taking into account (39), (40) and Lemma 2.7, we conclude that for any a > 0,

$$d_{\text{GHP}}\left(\mathcal{G}(2a\mathrm{H}^{n,k},\Pi(k),a),\left(C_{n,(k)},a\cdot d_{\text{gr}},\mu_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}}\right)\right) \le 2a(s_{n,k}+1),\tag{41}$$

with  $s_{n,k}$  standing for the cardinality of  $\Pi(k)$ ,  $1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m}$ .

**Comparison of two function-encoded graphs.** As our main strategy for proving convergence of graphs relies upon their coding functions, we will utilise the following result from [16]. Let  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ , suppose that  $h_j : [0, \zeta_j] \to \mathbb{R}_+$  is a càdlàg function that is either continuous or  $h_j([0, \zeta_j])$  is a finite set, and  $\varpi_j = \{(s_{j,i}, t_{j,i}) : 1 \le i \le q\}$  is a collection of points with  $0 \le s_{j,i} \le t_{j,i} < \zeta_j$  for each  $i \le q$ . Suppose further that there is some  $\delta > 0$  verifying

$$\max_{1 \le i \le q} |s_{1,i} - s_{2,i}| \le \delta, \quad \max_{1 \le i \le q} |t_{1,i} - t_{2,i}| \le \delta.$$

Let  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$ . Then we have ([16], Lemma 2.7)

$$d_{\text{GHP}}\left(\mathscr{G}(h_1, \varpi_1, \epsilon_1), \mathscr{G}(h_2, \varpi_2, \epsilon_2)\right) \\ \leq 6(q+1)\left(\|\hat{h}_1 - \hat{h}_2\|_{\infty} + \omega_{\delta}(\hat{h}_1)\right) + 3q \max\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2\} + |\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|,$$
(42)

where  $\hat{h}_j$  is the extension of  $h_j$  to  $\mathbb{R}_+$  by setting  $\hat{h}_j(x) = 0$  for all  $x \ge \zeta_j$ , and  $\omega_{\delta}(\hat{h}_1) = \sup\{|\hat{h}_1(s) - \hat{h}_1(t)| : |s - t| \le \delta\}$  is the  $\delta$ -modulus of continuity of  $\hat{h}_1$ .

### 2.6.2 The three limit graphs

The double finite third moment regime. Recall from (20) the limit process  $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$  in the double finite third moments regime and note that (22) says that  $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$  is a Brownian motion with a parabolic drift. Results from Aldous [2] (see in particular Section 5 there) show that the excursions of  $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$  above its running infimum process can be ranked in decreasing order of their lengths. For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $(g_k, d_k)$  be the k-th longest excursion of  $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$  above its running infimum. Recall from (26) as well as (27) the height process  $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$  for  $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$ . We note that  $(g_k, d_k)$  is also the k-th longest excursion of  $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$  above 0. Denote by  $\mathcal{H}^{1,k}$  the portion of  $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$  running on this interval:

$$\mathcal{H}_t^{1,k} = \mathcal{H}_{g_k+t}^{(1)}, \quad 0 \le t \le \zeta_k := d_k - g_k.$$

Recall from (35) the Poisson point measure  $Q^{(1)} = \{(s_i, y_i) : i \ge 1\}$ . If  $(s_i, y_i) \in Q^{(1)}$  and  $s_i \in (g_k, d_k)$ , we set

$$t_i = \sup \left\{ u \le s_i : \mathcal{Z}_u^{(1)} - \inf_{v \le u} \mathcal{Z}_v^{(1)} \le y_i \right\}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$  attains a running infimum at  $g_k$ , we have  $t_i \in (g_k, s_i)$ . Note that the previous definition of  $t_i$  mimics the construction of  $\mathcal{E}''_{n,m}$  in (34). Let us now define

$$\varpi_k = \{(s_i - g_k, t_i) : (s_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}, s_i \in (g_k, d_k)\}, \quad k \ge 1.$$

Recall from (38) the measured metric space  $\mathscr{G}(h, \varpi_h, \epsilon)$ . The limit graph  $\mathcal{G}^{(1)} = \{(\mathcal{C}_k^{(1)}, d_k^{(1)}, \mu_k^{(1)}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  in Theorem 1.1 is given by

$$\left(\mathcal{C}_{k}^{(1)}, d_{k}^{(1)}, \mu_{k}^{(1)}\right) = \mathscr{G}\left(\mathcal{H}^{1,k}, \varpi_{k}, 0\right), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$
(43)

The one dominant heavy tail regime. In this case, the limit process  $\mathcal{Z}^{(2)}$  is a semi-martingale with independent increments which further satisfies the absolute continuity relationship (20) with an  $\alpha$ -stable process. We point out that  $\mathcal{Z}^{(2)}$  has already been used to describe the scaling limit of critical configuration models with i.i.d. degrees; see [28] and [21]. In particular, in the notation of Theorem 8.1 in [28], we have

$$\left\{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}\mathcal{Z}_t^{(2)}: t \ge 0\right\} \stackrel{(d)}{=} \{X_t^{\nu} + A_t^{\nu}: t \ge 0\}$$

with  $\gamma = \alpha + 2$ ,  $\mu = \theta / \sigma_2^{(w)}$  and  $c = C_2 \cdot \mu$  in the notation there. As a result, Theorem 8.3 of [28] applies, and we can therefore rank the excursion intervals of  $\mathcal{Z}^{(2)}$  above its running infimum in decreasing order of their lengths. As in the previous case, let  $(g_k, d_k)$  be the k-th longest excursion of  $\mathcal{Z}^{(2)}$  above its running infimum,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . The height process  $\mathcal{H}^{(2)}$  is introduced in (26). The definition there implies that  $(g_k, d_k)$  is also the k-th longest excursion of  $\mathcal{H}^{(2)}$  above 0. The rest of the construction is done in exactly the same way as in the double finite third moments regime, except that we replace  $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$  with  $\mathcal{Z}^{(2)}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$ with  $\mathcal{H}^{(2)}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}$  with  $\mathcal{Q}^{(2)}$ .

The matched heavy tail regime. The semi-martingale representation (24) implies that

$$\left\{\mathbf{C}_2^{-1}\mathcal{Z}_t^{(2)}: t \ge 0\right\} \stackrel{(d)}{=} \left\{\mathbf{C}_3^{-1}\mathcal{Z}_t^{(3)}: t \ge 0\right\}.$$

Therefore, the construction in the previous regime can be easily adapted to the current one; we omit the detail.

# **3** Proof

#### 3.1 Some results on the bipartite graph with fixed weights

Recall from Introduction the bipartite graph  $B(n, m; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  with the fixed weight sequences  $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{1 \le i \le n}$ and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_j)_{1 \le j \le m}$ . We give here the proofs of Lemmas 2.2-2.4 that concern this model. Clearly, the same properties also hold for  $B_{n,m}$ , the model with i.i.d. weights.

Sketch proof for Lemma 2.2. The main idea is similar to the one used in [17] for rank-1 models. A formal argument in that case can be found in Section 3 of [17]. We sketch here an informal argument, primarily based upon the memoryless properties of the exponential distribution. Let  $I_{i,j}$  denotes the indicator for the event that the black vertex  $b_i$  is adjacent to the white vertex  $w_i$  in the graph B'. By definition, it suffices to show that  $I_{i,j}$ ,  $i \in [n]$ ,  $j \in [m]$  are independent Bernoulli variables with respective means  $p_{i,j}$  as defined in (1). Say that at step k,  $V_k = b_i$  has been assigned. Among the m white vertices, we distinguish two subsets:  $\mathcal{W}$ , which consists of those j satisfying  $E_j^{(w)} > \tau_{k-1}^{(w)}$ , and the complement of  $\mathcal{W}$ . Conditional on  $w_i \in \mathcal{W}$ , the probability that  $w_i \in \mathcal{N}(V_k)$  is then precisely  $p_{i,j}$ . And if the event occurs, then  $w_i$  will be adjacent to  $b_i$  in B'. On the other hand, if  $w_i \notin \mathcal{W}$ , then either  $w_i = U_{k'}$  for some  $k' \leq k$  or  $w \in \mathcal{A}_{k-1}$ . In the first case, the presence of an edge between  $\{w_i, V_k = b_i\}$  has been sampled at step k' in the algorithm (affirmative if k' = k and negative if k' < k). In the second case, recall that  $y_i(k)$  denotes the remaining amount of service that  $w_i$  has yet to receive when  $V_k$  arrives. Then during the  $\Delta := y_j - y_j(k)$  amount of service that  $w_j$  has received up to that point,  $V_k$  does not appear, which is an event of probability  $\exp(-x_i \cdot \Delta/z_{n,m})$ . The conditional distribution of  $I_{i,j}$  given the event is then precisely the one given in (7). 

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Let us write  $\hat{Z}_t = -t + \Lambda^{\mathbf{y}} \circ \Lambda^{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ . Since both have the same linear drift, it suffices to show that  $Z^{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$  and  $\hat{Z}$  share the same jumps. To that end, we first note that as  $\Lambda^{\mathbf{x}}$  only increases through jumps, the jumping times of  $\hat{Z}_t$  are necessarily jumping times of  $\Lambda^{\mathbf{x}}$ , which are  $E_i^{(b)}$ ,  $1 \le i \le n$ . It remains to show that for each  $i \in [n]$ ,

$$\hat{\Delta}_i := \hat{Z}_{E_i^{(\mathsf{b})}} - \hat{Z}_{E_i^{(\mathsf{b})}-} = \Delta_i^{\mathrm{bi}}.$$

By definition, we have

$$\hat{\Delta}_i = \sum_{j \in [m]} y_j \mathbf{1}_{\{\Lambda^{\mathbf{x}}(E_i^{(\mathbf{b})} -) < E_j^{(\mathbf{w})} \le \Lambda^{\mathbf{x}}(E_i^{(\mathbf{b})})\}}.$$

Recall from the LIFO-queue construction that the black vertex  $b_i$  appears as certain  $V_k$  during the construction. In other words, there is a unique k = k(i) such that  $V_k = b_i$ . Recall also the way that the white dial is updated: we have  $\tau_j^{(w)} - \tau_{j-1}^{(w)} = x_{V_j}$  if  $V_j$  is defined and  $\tau_j^{(w)} - \tau_{j-1}^{(w)} = 0$  if no  $V_j$  is appointed at step j. It follows that

$$au_k^{(\mathbf{w})} = \sum_{j \leq k} x_{V_j} \mathbf{1}_{\{V_j \text{ is defined}\}}.$$

Since the order in which  $V_j, j \ge 1$  appear coincides with the ranking of  $(E_i^{(b)})_{i \in [n]}$ , we deduce that

$$\Lambda^{\mathbf{x}}(E_i^{(\mathsf{b})}-) = \tau_{k-1}^{(\mathsf{w})} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda^{\mathbf{x}}(E_i^{(\mathsf{b})}) = \tau_k^{(\mathsf{w})}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\hat{\Delta}_{i} = \sum_{j \in [m]} y_{j} \mathbf{1}_{\{E_{j}^{(\mathsf{w})} \in (\tau_{k-1}^{(\mathsf{w})}, \tau_{k}^{(\mathsf{w})}]\}} = \sum_{j \in [m]} y_{j} \mathbf{1}_{\{E_{j}^{(\mathsf{w})} \in I(V_{k})\}} = \sum_{j \in [m]} y_{j} \mathbf{1}_{\{E_{j}^{(\mathsf{w})} \in I(i)\}} = \Delta_{i}^{\mathrm{bi}},$$

according to the definition (6). This completes the proof.

Proof of Lemma 2.4. The first identity in (16) follows from general results on LIFO-queues. Indeed, recall  $Z_t^Q$  from (9), which tracks the server load. In particular, the server is idle at time t if and only if  $Z_t^Q = \inf_{s \le t} Z_s^Q$ . Moreover, after the first customer of the queue arrives, the server will only become idle after having served out all the clients in the first tree. It follows that if  $(g_1^Q, d_1^Q)$  is the first excursion interval of  $Z^Q$  above its running infimum, then  $d_1^Q - g_1^Q$  is equal to the total service requests from the customers in the first tree. Iterating this argument for the subsequent excursion intervals, we obtain a bijection between the excursion lengths of  $Z^Q$  and the total service requests from each tree. Applying this to  $Z^{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$  and noting from (6) that the service requests correspond to the **y**-weights of the white vertices in  $T_{n,i}$ , we deduce the first identity in (16), as well as  $\kappa_{n,m} = \kappa'_{n,m}$ . For the second, observe that  $\Lambda^{\mathbf{x}}$  and  $Z^{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$  share the same jumping times. Since the jumps of  $Z^{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$  that appear in  $[g_{n,i}, d_{n,i})$  are precisely the black vertices of  $T_{n,i}$ , the conclusion follows.

### 3.2 **Proof of Proposition 2.6**

We prove in this subsection Proposition 2.6, which asserts the convergence of the graph encoding processes  $(Z^{n,m}, H^{n,m})$  under the three different scenarios. Our approach here is inspired by the work of Conchon-Kerjan and Goldschmidt [21], although in our case  $Z^{n,m}$  is itself a composition of explorationtype processes. On the other hand, the exploration processes we introduce here have more regular distributional properties, which will significantly simplify the calculations for their convergence. Let us first lay out the main steps of the proof.

### 3.2.1 An overview of the proof

Recall from Section 2.3 the coupling of LIFO-queue construction of the graph with a pair of Poisson point measures. In particular, we have

$$B_{n,m} \stackrel{(d)}{=} B(n,m; \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_n) \text{ under } \mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot \mid N_n^{(\mathbf{b})} = n, N_m^{(\mathbf{w})} = m).$$

The following lemma says that in fact we can remove the conditioning on  $N_n^{(b)}$  and  $N_m^{(w)}$ . Roughly speaking, this is because we are primarily concerned with large connected components, which appear early in the exploration and only rely upon the first o(n) atoms in the Poisson point measures. Recall  $\Lambda^{(b,n)}$  from (17) and  $(Z^{n,m}, H^{n,m})$  from .

**Lemma 3.1.** Assume (H-clustering). Let  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of positive real numbers that satisfies  $b_n \to \infty$  and  $b_n = o(n)$  as  $n \to \infty$ . Let  $t_0 \in (0, \infty)$ . Assume that the sequence  $b_n^{-1} \Lambda_{b_n t_0}^{(\mathbf{b},n)}$ ,  $n \ge 1$  is tight. Denote by  $\mu_n$  the law of  $(Z_{b_n t}^{n,m}, H_{b_n t}^{n,m})_{t \le t_0}$  under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$  and by  $\hat{\mu}_n$  the law of the same pair under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_n^{(\mathbf{b})} = n, N_m^{(\mathbf{w})} = m)$ . Then

$$d_{\mathrm{TV}}(\hat{\mu}_n, \mu_n) := \sup_{A} \left| \hat{\mu}_n(A) - \mu_n(A) \right| \to 0, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty,$$

where the supremum is over all the Borel sets A of the Skorokhod space  $\mathbb{D}([0, t_0], \mathbb{R}^2)$ .

Lemma 3.1 is shown in Section 3.2.2. Thanks to it, we only need to prove the claimed convergences in Proposition 2.6 under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ . We divide the remaining proof into the following steps.

Step 1: Radon–Nikodym derivatives for the graph exploration processes. We note that under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ ,  $Z^{n,m}$  has independent but inhomogeneous increments. We establish here an analogue of (20) for  $Z^{n,m}$ . To that end, let us first introduce two mutually independent compound Poisson processes  $(L_t^{(b)})_{t\geq 0}$  and

 $(L_t^{(w)})_{t\geq 0}$  under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$  with respective Lévy measures  $\sqrt{n/m} x dF^{(b)}(x)$  and  $\sqrt{m/n} y dF^{(b)}(y)$ . In other words, we have for all  $t \geq 0, \lambda \geq 0$ :

$$\mathbf{E}_{n,m}[e^{-\lambda L_t^{(\mathbf{b})}}] = \exp(t\,\varphi^{(\mathbf{b})}(\lambda)), \quad \mathbf{E}_{n,m}[e^{-\lambda L_t^{(\mathbf{w})}}] = \exp(t\,\varphi^{(\mathbf{w})}(\lambda)), \tag{44}$$

where the Laplace exponents  $\varphi^{(b)}$  and  $\varphi^{(w)}$  are given by

$$\varphi^{(\mathbf{b})}(\lambda) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} \int_{(0,\infty)} (e^{-\lambda x} - 1) x dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x), \quad \varphi^{(\mathbf{w})}(\lambda) = \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \int_{(0,\infty)} (e^{-\lambda x} - 1) x dF^{(\mathbf{w})}(x).$$
(45)

We then set

$$L_t^{n,m} := -t + L^{(\mathbf{w})} \circ L^{(\mathbf{b})}(t) := -t + L_{L_t^{(\mathbf{b})}}^{(\mathbf{w})}, \quad t \ge 0.$$
(46)

We point out that  $(L_t^{n,m})_{t\geq 0}$  is itself a Lévy process, by standard results on the subordination of Lévy processes. The proof of the following result can be found in Section 3.2.3.

**Lemma 3.2.** Let  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . The following identity holds for all  $t \ge 0$  and all measurable function  $F : \mathbb{D}([0,t],\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}_+$ , we have

$$\mathbf{E}_{n,m}\Big[F\Big(\big(Z_s^{n,m}\big)_{s\le t}\Big)\Big] = \mathbf{E}_{n,m}\Big[F\Big(\big(L_s^{n,m}\big)_{s\le t}\Big)\cdot E_t^{n,m}\Big],\tag{47}$$

where

$$E_t^{n,m} = \exp\Big\{-\int_0^{L_t^{(b)}} \frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}} \, dL_s^{(w)} - \int_0^{L_t^{(b)}} \varphi^{(w)}\Big(\frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}}\Big) ds - \int_0^t \frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}} \, dL_s^{(b)} - \int_0^t \varphi^{(b)}\Big(\frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}}\Big) ds\Big\}.$$
(48)

Step 2: Convergence of the Lévy processes and their height processes. In Section 2.2, we have introduced the height process  $H_t^{n,m}$  as the following functional of  $Z^{n,m}$ :

$$H_t^{n,m} = \# \Big\{ s \le t : Z_{s-}^{n,m} \le \inf_{s \le u \le t} Z_u^{n,m} \Big\}.$$

We now introduce its counterpart for  $L^{n,m}$  using the same functional:

$$\widehat{H}_{t}^{n,m} = \# \Big\{ s \le t : L_{s-}^{n,m} \le \inf_{s \le u \le t} L_{u}^{n,m} \Big\}, \quad t \ge 0.$$

**Lemma 3.3.** Assume (H-clustering) and (H-critical). For  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , let  $(\mathcal{L}_t^{(i)})_{t\geq 0}$  be the Lévy process specified in (19) and  $(\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_t^{(i)})_{t\geq 0}$  be as in (25).

(1) **Double finite third moments:** Under both (H-b-3rd) and (H-w-3rd), the following weak convergence takes place under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ :

$$\left\{n^{-\frac{1}{3}}L_{n^{2/3}t}^{n,m}, n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\widehat{H}_{n^{2/3}t}^{n,m} : t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{\mathcal{L}_{t}^{(1)}, \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{t}^{(1)} : t \ge 0\right\} \text{ in } \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_{+}, \mathbb{R}^{2}).$$
(49)

(2) One dominant heavy tail regime: Assume that (H-b-power) holds with  $\alpha \in (1,2)$  and  $C^{(b)} \in (0,\infty)$ . Assume that either (H-w-3rd) is true or (H-w-power) holds with  $\alpha' \in (\alpha,2)$  and  $C^{(w)} \in (0,\infty)$ . Then the following weak convergence takes place under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ :

$$\left\{n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}L_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m}, n^{-\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha+1}}\widehat{H}_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m} : t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{\mathcal{L}_t^{(2)}, \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_t^{(2)} : t \ge 0\right\} \text{ in } \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2).$$
(50)

(3) Matched heavy tails regime: Assume that both (H-b-power) and (H-w-power) hold with  $\alpha = \alpha' \in (1,2)$  and  $C^{(b)} \in (0,\infty), C^{(w)} \in (0,\infty)$ . The following weak convergence holds under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ :

$$\left\{n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}L_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m}, n^{-\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha+1}}\widehat{H}_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m} : t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{\mathcal{L}_t^{(3)}, \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_t^{(3)} : t \ge 0\right\} \text{ in } \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2).$$
(51)

Our proof of Lemma 3.3, given in Section 3.2.4, relies heavily on Duquesne–Le Gall's Theorem that asserts the convergence for the contour functions of critical Bienaymé trees. However, for our purpose here, we require a modified version–stated in Appendix C–of the original theorem.

Step 3: Convergence of the Radon–Nikodym derivatives. The final ingredient for the proof of Proposition 2.6 concerns the convergence of  $E_t^{n,m}$  in (48). Recall  $\mathcal{E}_t^{(i)}$  from (21).

**Lemma 3.4.** For each  $t \ge 0$ , the following statements hold true under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ :

(1) Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.3 (1),  $E_{n^{2/3}t}^{n,m}$  is uniformly integrable and converges in distribution to  $\mathcal{E}_{t}^{(1)}$ , jointly with the convergence in (49). Furthermore, for all  $t_0 \geq 0$ , we have the following convergence in probability:

$$\sup_{t \le t_0} \left| n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(n^{\frac{2}{3}}t) - \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})}t \right| \to 0.$$
(52)

(2) Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.3 (2),  $E_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m}$  is uniformly integrable and converges in distribution to  $\mathcal{E}_t^{(2)}$ , jointly with the convergence in (50). Furthermore, for all  $t_0 \ge 0$ , we have the following convergence in probability:

$$\sup_{t \le t_0} \left| n^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}t) - \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})}t \right| \to 0.$$
(53)

(3) Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.3 (3),  $E_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m}$  is uniformly integrable and converges in distribution to  $\mathcal{E}_{t}^{(3)}$ , jointly with the convergence in (51). Furthermore, for all  $t_0 \ge 0$ , we have the following convergence in probability:

$$\sup_{t \le t_0} \left| n^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}t) - \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})}t \right| \to 0.$$
(54)

We provide the proof of Lemma 3.4 in Section 3.2.5. To conclude this overview, we explain how the previous results will yield Proposition 2.6.

*Proof of Proposition 2.6 subject to Lemmas 3.1-3.4.* We use  $a_n, b_n$  to denote the appropriate spacial and temporal scaling for  $Z^{n,m}$  in each of the three scenarios, namely  $a_n = n^{1/3}, b_n = n^{2/3}$  under the double finite third moments assumptions and  $a_n = n^{1/\alpha+1}, b_n = n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}$  in the other two scenarios. Let  $t_0 \ge 0$  and  $F : \mathbb{D}([0, t_0], \mathbb{R}^2) \to \mathbb{R}$  be continuous and bounded. Lemma 3.2 applies to yield that

$$\mathbf{E}_{n,m}\left[F\left(\left(\frac{1}{a_n}Z_{b_nt}^{n,m}\right)_{t\leq t_0}, \left(\frac{a_n}{b_n}H_{b_nt}^{n,m}\right)_{t\leq t_0}\right)\right] = \mathbf{E}_{n,m}\left[F\left(\left(\frac{1}{a_n}L_{b_nt}^{n,m}\right)_{t\leq t_0}, \left(\frac{a_n}{b_n}\widehat{H}_{b_nt}^{n,m}\right)_{t\leq t_0}\right) \cdot E_{b_nt}^{n,m}\right].$$

Let  $K \in (0, \infty)$ . Thanks to Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4, we find that for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and under the relevant assumptions,

$$\lim_{K \to \infty} \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbf{E}_{n,m} \Big[ F\Big( \Big( \frac{1}{a_n} L_{b_n t}^{n,m} \Big)_{t \le t_0}, \Big( \frac{a_n}{b_n} \widehat{H}_{b_n t}^{n,m} \Big)_{t \le t_0} \Big) \cdot E_{b_n t}^{n,m} \wedge K \Big] \\ = \mathbb{E} \Big[ F\Big( \Big( \mathcal{L}_t^{(i)} \Big)_{t \le t_0}, \Big( \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_t^{(i)} \Big)_{t \le t_0} \Big) \cdot \mathcal{E}_t^{(i)} \Big] = \mathbb{E} \Big[ F\Big( \Big( \mathcal{Z}_t^{(i)} \Big)_{t \le t_0}, \Big( \mathcal{H}_t^{(i)} \Big)_{t \le t_0} \Big) \Big],$$

where in the last identity we have used (20) and the observation that  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{t}^{(i)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{t}^{(i)}$  are the same functional of  $\mathcal{L}^{(i)}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}$  respectively. Combined with the previous arguments, this proves the convergences (28)-(30) under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ . Lemma 3.1 then allows us to conclude that the same convergences also hold under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_{n}^{(b)} = n, N_{m}^{(w)} = m)$ , noting that the tightness assumption in the lemma is ensured by (52), (53), (54) respectively.

#### 3.2.2 Proof of Lemma 3.1

We start with an observation on Poisson distributions.

**Lemma 3.5.** Suppose that  $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are two sequences of positive real numbers that satisfy  $r_n \to \infty$  and  $r_n = o(s_n)$  as  $n \to \infty$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $N_1^n$  and  $N_2^n$  be two independent Poisson random variables of respective means  $r_n$  and  $s_n$  under  $\mathbb{P}$ . Then

$$\sum_{k\geq 0} \left| \mathbb{P}(N_1^n = k) - \mathbb{P}(N_1^n = k \mid N_1^n + N_2^n = \lfloor r_n + s_n \rfloor) \right| \to 0, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

*Proof.* For  $K \in (0, \infty)$ , let us denote the set

$$\Delta_{n,K} = \left\{ k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : |k - r_n| \le K \sqrt{r_n} \right\}.$$

Thanks to the Central Limit Theorem, we have

$$\lim_{K \to \infty} \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(N_1^n \in \Delta_{n,K}) = 1.$$

In view of this, we note that the conclusion will follow once we show that for each K > 0,

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \sum_{k \in \Delta_{n,K}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left( N_1^n = k \right) - \mathbb{P} \left( N_1^n = k \left| N_1^n + N_2^n = \lfloor r_n + s_n \rfloor \right) \right| = 0.$$
(55)

Let us denote  $t_n = r_n + s_n$  and  $N_3^n = N_1^n + N_2^n$ , which follows a Poisson distribution of mean  $t_n$ . To the end of proving (55), let us first argue that

$$\sup_{k \in \Delta_{n,K}} \left| \frac{\mathbb{P}(N_2^n = \lfloor t_n \rfloor - k)}{\mathbb{P}(N_3^n = \lfloor t_n \rfloor)} - 1 \right| \to 0, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$
(56)

To see why this is true, let us recall Stirling's formula ([25], II.9.15 on p.54), which says

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \quad n! = \sqrt{2\pi n} \exp\left(n \log \frac{n}{e} + \epsilon_n\right), \quad \text{with } 0 \le \epsilon_n \le \frac{1}{12n}.$$
 (57)

Let  $z = \lfloor t_n \rfloor - k - s_n = r_n - k + \lfloor t_n \rfloor - t_n$ . Then  $k \in \Delta_{n,K}$  implies that  $z \in \hat{\Delta}_{n,K} := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |x| \le K\sqrt{r_n} + 1\}$ . We deduce from (57) that

$$\mathbb{P}(N_2^n = \lfloor t_n \rfloor - k) = \mathbb{P}(N_2^n = s_n + z) = e^{-s_n} \frac{s_n^{s_n + z}}{(s_n + z)!}$$
$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(s_n + z)}} \exp\left\{-s_n + (s_n + z)\log s_n - (s_n + z)\log \frac{s_n + z}{e} - \epsilon_n(z)\right\}$$
$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(s_n + z)}} \exp\left\{z - (s_n + z)\log\left(1 + \frac{z}{s_n}\right) - \epsilon_n(z)\right\},$$

where  $0 \le \epsilon_n(z) \le (12(s_n+z))^{-1}$ ; in particular,  $\sup_{z \in \hat{\Delta}_{n,K}} |\epsilon_n(z)| \to 0$ . Let us write  $\log(1+x) = x - \frac{1}{2}x^2 + r(x)x^3$ , where the function r is uniformly bounded on [-1/2, 1/2]. We find that

$$\exp\left\{z - (s_n + z)\log\left(1 + \frac{z}{s_n}\right)\right\} = \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\frac{z^2}{s_n} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{z^3}{s_n^2} - r\left(\frac{z}{s_n}\right)\left(\frac{z^3}{s_n^2} + \frac{z^4}{s_n^3}\right)\right\}.$$

With the assumption that  $r_n = o(s_n), n \to \infty$ , we deduce that

$$\sup_{z\in\hat{\Delta}_{n,K}} \left| \exp\left\{ z - (s_n + z) \log\left(1 + \frac{z}{s_n}\right) - \epsilon_n(z) \right\} - 1 \right| \to 0, \quad n \to \infty$$

Since  $\sqrt{2\pi(s_n+z)} \sim \sqrt{2\pi s_n}$  uniformly for  $z \in \hat{\Delta}_{n,K}$ , it follows that

$$\sup_{k \in \Delta_{n,K}} \left| \mathbb{P}(N_2^n = \lfloor t_n \rfloor - k) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi s_n}} \right| \to 0, \quad n \to \infty.$$
(58)

A similar but simpler argument shows that

$$\mathbb{P}(N_3^n = \lfloor t_n \rfloor) \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t_n}}, \quad n \to \infty$$

Together with (58) and the fact that  $t_n = r_n + s_n \sim s_n$  as  $n \to \infty$ , we deduce the convergence in (56). Back to (55), we note that the independence between  $N_1^n$  and  $N_2^n$  implies that

$$\sum_{k \in \Delta_{n,K}} \left| \mathbb{P}(N_1^n = k) - \mathbb{P}(N_1^n = k \mid N_3^n = \lfloor t_n \rfloor) \right| = \sum_{k \in \Delta_{n,K}} \mathbb{P}(N_1^n = k) \cdot \left| 1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(N_2^n = \lfloor t_n \rfloor - k)}{\mathbb{P}(N_3^n = \lfloor t_n \rfloor)} \right|.$$

In view of (56), the above converges to 0 by the dominated convergence theorem. By the previous arguments, the proof is complete.  $\Box$ 

Recall  $\Lambda^{(b,n)}$  and  $\Lambda^{(w,m)}$  from (17). Recall that  $d_{TV}$  stands for the total variation distance between probability measures. As an application of Lemma 3.5, let us show the following

**Lemma 3.6.** Assume (H-clustering). Let  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of positive real numbers that satisfies  $b_n \to \infty$  and  $b_n = o(n)$  as  $n \to \infty$ . Let  $t_0 \in (0, \infty)$ . Denote by  $\nu_n^{(b)}$  the law of the collection

$$\mathcal{N}_{t_0} := \left\{ (E_i^{(\mathbf{b})}, X_i) : 1 \le i \le N_n^{(\mathbf{b})}, E_i^{(\mathbf{b})} \le b_n t_0 \right\}$$

under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$  and by  $\hat{\nu}_n^{(b)}$  the law of  $\mathcal{N}_{t_0}$  under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_n^{(b)} = n, N_m^{(w)} = m)$ . Similarly, let  $\nu_m^{(w)}$  be the law of the collection  $\{(E_j^{(w)}, Y_j) : 1 \leq j \leq N_m^{(w)}, E_j^{(w)} \leq b_n t_0\}$  under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$  and  $\hat{\nu}_m^{(w)}$  be its law under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_n^{(b)} = n, N_m^{(w)} = m)$ . Then

$$d_{\rm TV}(\nu_n^{(\mathsf{b})}, \hat{\nu}_n^{(\mathsf{b})}) \to 0 \quad and \quad d_{\rm TV}(\nu_m^{(\mathsf{w})}, \hat{\nu}_m^{(\mathsf{w})}) \to 0, \quad as \ n \to \infty.$$
(59)

Proof. We focus on the first convergence, as the other one can be similarly argued. Let us denote

$$N_1^n = \# \mathcal{N}_{t_0}$$
 and  $N_2^n = N_n^{(b)} - N_1^n$ .

We note that conditional on  $N_1^n = k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{t_0}$  is distributed as k i.i.d. pairs of the joint distribution  $\pi^{(\mathbf{b})}(dt, dx)/n$ . The proof boils down to showing that

$$d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(\mathbb{P}(N_1^n \in \cdot), \ \mathbb{P}(N_1^n \in \cdot \mid N_n^{(\mathsf{b})} = n)\right) \to 0, \quad n \to \infty.$$
(60)

We note that  $N_1^n, N_2^n$  are two independent Poisson variables with respective means:

$$r_n := \mathbb{E}[N_1^n] = n \int_{(0,\infty)} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{xb_n t_0}{\sqrt{mn}}}\right) dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x) \le \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} b_n t_0 \sigma_1^{(\mathbf{b})}, \quad s_n := \mathbb{E}[N_2^n] = n - r_n,$$

where we have used the elementary inequality  $1 - e^{-x} \le x$  for  $x \ge 0$ . Our assumption on  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  implies that  $r_n \to \infty$  and  $r_n = o(s_n)$ , as  $n \to \infty$ . Lemma 3.5 applies to yield (60). The conclusion follows.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We note that  $(\Lambda^{(b,n)}(t))_{t \leq b_n t_0}$  is determined by the collection  $\mathcal{N}_{t_0}$  and is independent of  $N_m^{(w)}$ . Thanks to Lemma 3.6, we can find two processes  $(\Lambda^{(b)}(t))_{t \leq b_n t_0}$  and  $(\hat{\Lambda}^{(b)}(t))_{t \leq b_n t_0}$  defined on the canonical probability space so that  $(\Lambda^{(b)}(t))_{t \leq b_n t_0}$  has the same distribution as  $(\Lambda^{(b,n)}(t))_{t \leq b_n t_0}$  under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ ,  $(\hat{\Lambda}^{(b)}(t))_{t \leq b_n t_0}$  has the same distribution as  $(\Lambda^{(b,n)}(t))_{t \leq b_n t_0}$  under  $\mathbf{P}(\cdot | N_n^{(b)} = n, N_m^{(w)} = m)$ , and

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\exists t \le b_n t_0 : \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b})}(t) \neq \hat{\Lambda}^{(\mathbf{b})}(t)\Big) \to 0.$$

By the tightness assumption, for each  $\epsilon > 0$ , we can find some  $K = K(\epsilon, t_0) \in (0, \infty)$  satisfying

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(\Lambda^{(\mathbf{b})}(b_n t_0) \le K b_n) \ge 1 - \epsilon.$$

Another application of Lemma 3.6 allows us to find two processes  $(\Lambda^{(w)}(t))_{t \leq Kb_n}$  and  $(\hat{\Lambda}^{(w)}(t))_{t \leq Kb_n}$ with respective distributions  $\nu_m^{(w)}$  and  $\hat{\nu}_m^{(w)}$  satisfying that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\exists t \le Kb_n : \Lambda^{(\mathbf{w})}(t) \neq \hat{\Lambda}^{(\mathbf{w})}(t)\Big) \to 0.$$

It follows that

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(\Lambda^{(\mathsf{b})}(b_n t_0) \le K b_n \text{ and } \Lambda^{(\mathsf{w})} \circ \Lambda^{(\mathsf{b})}(t) = \hat{\Lambda}^{(\mathsf{w})} \circ \hat{\Lambda}^{(\mathsf{b})}(t) \text{ for all } t \le b_n t_0\Big) \ge 1 - \epsilon$$

This shows that the total variation distance between the law of  $(\Lambda^{(\mathbf{w},m)} \circ \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(t))_{t \leq b_n t_0}$  under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$  and the same process under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_n^{(\mathbf{b})} =, N_m^{(\mathbf{w})} = m)$  tends to 0. Since  $Z_t^{n,m} = -t + \Lambda^{(\mathbf{w},m)} \circ \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(t)$  and  $H_t^{n,m}$  is a measurable function of  $(Z_s^{n,m})_{s \leq t}$ , the conclusion follows.

### 3.2.3 Proof of Lemma 3.2

Our proof of Lemma 3.2 relies upon a Girsanov-type theorem for spectrally positive Lévy processes, recalled in Appendix B.

*Proof of Lemma 3.2.* Recall from (44) the compound Poisson processes  $L^{(b)}$  and  $L^{(w)}$  and from (45) their Laplace exponents  $\varphi^{(b)}$  and  $\varphi^{(w)}$ . Recall  $\Lambda^{(b,n)}(t)$  and  $\Lambda^{(w,m)}(t)$  from (17), which are respective functions of the Poisson point measures  $\Pi^{(b)}$  and  $\Pi^{(w)}$ . The exponential formula for Poisson point measures yields that

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{E}_{n,m}[e^{-\lambda\Lambda^{(\mathbf{w},m)}(t)}] &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\exp\Big(-\sum_{1\leq j\leq N_m^{(\mathbf{w})}}\lambda Y_j \mathbf{1}_{\{E_j^{(\mathbf{w})}\leq t\}}\Big)\Big] = \exp\Big\{-\int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} \left(1-e^{-\lambda y}\mathbf{1}_{\{s\leq t\}}\right)\pi^{(\mathbf{w})}(dy,ds)\Big\}\\ &= \exp\Big\{-\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}\int_0^t \int_{(0,\infty)} \left(1-e^{-\lambda y}\right)y e^{-ys/\sqrt{mn}}dF^{(\mathbf{w})}(y)\Big\}\\ &= \exp\Big\{\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}\int_0^t \int_{(0,\infty)} \Big\{(e^{-y(\lambda+s/\sqrt{mn})}-1)-(e^{-ys/\sqrt{mn}}-1)\Big\}y dF^{(\mathbf{w})}(y)\Big\}\\ &= \exp\Big\{\int_0^t \Big\{\varphi^{(\mathbf{w})}\Big(\lambda+\frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}}\Big)-\varphi^{(\mathbf{w})}\Big(\frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}}\Big)\Big\}ds\Big\}.\end{split}$$

We note that  $\Lambda^{(\mathbf{w},m)}$  has independent increments. Comparing the previous calculation with (104), we deduce the following absolute continuity relationship between  $\Lambda^{(\mathbf{w},m)}$  and  $L^{(\mathbf{w})}$ : for all  $t \ge 0$  and measurable function  $F : \mathbb{D}([0,t],\mathbb{R}_+)$ , we have

$$\mathbf{E}_{n,m}\Big[F\Big(\big(\Lambda^{(\mathbf{w},m)}(s)\big)_{s\leq t}\Big)\Big] = \mathbf{E}_{n,m}\Big[F\Big(\big(L_s^{(\mathbf{w})}\big)_{s\leq t}\Big) \cdot E_t^{(\mathbf{w})}\Big],\tag{61}$$

where

$$E_t^{(\mathbf{w})} = \exp\Big\{-\int_0^t \frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}} \, dL_s^{(\mathbf{w})} - \int_0^t \varphi^{(\mathbf{w})}\Big(\frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}}\Big) ds\Big\}.$$

A similar identity holds for  $\Lambda^{(b,n)}$  and  $L^{(b)}$ :

$$\mathbf{E}_{n,m}\left[F\left(\left(\Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(s)\right)_{s\leq t}\right)\right] = \mathbf{E}_{n,m}\left[F\left(\left(L_s^{(\mathbf{b})}\right)_{s\leq t}\right) \cdot E_t^{(\mathbf{b})}\right],\tag{62}$$

with

$$E_t^{(\mathbf{b})} = \exp\Big\{-\int_0^t \frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}} \, dL_s^{(\mathbf{b})} - \int_0^t \varphi^{(\mathbf{b})}\Big(\frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}}\Big) ds\Big\}.$$

Since  $\Lambda^{(b,n)}(t) < \infty$  almost surely and its distribution is independent of  $\Lambda^{(w,m)}$  and  $L^{(w)}$ , we apply (61) and (62) to find that

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{E}_{n,m}[e^{-\lambda\Lambda^{(\mathbf{v},m)}\circ\Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(t)}] &= \int_{(0,\infty)} \mathbf{P}_{n,m}\big(\Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(t) \in ds\big) \mathbf{E}_{n,m}\big[e^{-\lambda\Lambda^{(\mathbf{v},m)}(s)}\big] \\ &= \int_{(0,\infty)} \mathbf{P}_{n,m}\big(\Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(t) \in ds\big) \mathbf{E}_{n,m}\big[e^{-\lambda L_s^{(\mathbf{v})}} \cdot E_s^{(\mathbf{v})}\big] \\ &= \int_{(0,\infty)} \mathbf{E}_{n,m}\big[\mathbf{1}_{\{L_t^{(\mathbf{b})} \in ds\}} E_t^{(\mathbf{b})}\big] \cdot \mathbf{E}_{n,m}\big[e^{-\lambda L_s^{(\mathbf{v})}} \cdot E_s^{(\mathbf{v})}\big] \\ &= \mathbf{E}_{n,m}\Big[e^{-\lambda L^{(\mathbf{v})} \circ L^{(\mathbf{b})}(t)} \cdot E_{L_t^{(\mathbf{b})}}^{(\mathbf{v})} \cdot E_t^{(\mathbf{b})}\Big] = \mathbf{E}_{n,m}\Big[e^{-\lambda L^{(\mathbf{v})} \circ L^{(\mathbf{b})}(t)} \cdot E_t^{n,m}\Big]. \end{split}$$

Since  $Z_t^{n,m} = -t + \Lambda^{(\mathbf{w},m)} \circ \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(t)$  and  $L_t^{n,m} = -t + L^{(\mathbf{w})} \circ L^{(\mathbf{b})}(t)$ , we deduce that

$$\mathbf{E}_{n,m}[e^{-\lambda Z_t^{n,m}}] = \mathbf{E}_{n,m}[e^{-\lambda L_t^{n,m}} \cdot E_t^{n,m}], \quad \lambda \ge 0$$

The above shows an absolute continuity relationship between  $Z_t^{n,m}$  and  $L_t^{n,m}$ . As both  $(Z_t^{n,m})_{t\geq 0}$  and  $(L_t^{n,m})_{t\geq 0}$  have independent increments, the distributions of both processes are determined by their marginal laws. The conclusion follows.

### 3.2.4 Proof of Lemma 3.3

We first recall from Whitt [34] the following result on the convergence of the composed functions.

**Lemma 3.7** (Theorem 3.1 in [34]). For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\lambda_n \in \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+)$ . Suppose further that  $t \mapsto \lambda_n(t)$  is non decreasing. Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+)$ ; moreover, suppose that  $\lambda$  is strictly increasing. Suppose further that  $\mathbf{x}_n \to \mathbf{x}$  in  $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\lambda_n \to \lambda$  in  $\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$ . Then  $\mathbf{x}_n \circ \lambda_n \to \mathbf{x} \circ \lambda$  in  $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$ .

### Part I: Proof of Lemma 3.3 under the double finite third moments assumptions

Step 1: Convergence of  $L^{n,m}$ . It is well-known that the functional convergence of spectrally positive Lévy processes is equivalent to the convergence of their Laplace exponents; see for instance Lemma A.3 combined with Theorem B.8 in [16]. Recall from (44) that  $L^{(b)}$  is a compound Poisson process with the Laplace exponent  $\varphi^{(b)}$  under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ . Let us introduce

$$\hat{L}_{t}^{(b)} := L_{t}^{(b)} - \mathbf{E}_{n,m}[L_{t}^{(b)}] = L_{t}^{(b)} - \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} \sigma_{2}^{(b)} t, \quad t \ge 0,$$
(63)

so that for all  $\lambda \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbf{E}_{n,m}[e^{-\lambda \hat{L}_1^{(\mathbf{b})}}] = e^{\hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{b})}(\lambda)} \text{ with } \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{b})}(\lambda) = \varphi^{(\mathbf{b})}(\lambda) + \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}}\sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})}\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}}\int_{(0,\infty)} (e^{-\lambda x} - 1 + \lambda x)xdF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x).$$

Similarly, let us set

$$\hat{L}_{t}^{(w)} := L_{t}^{(w)} - \mathbf{E}_{n,m}[L_{t}^{(w)}] = L_{t}^{(w)} - \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \,\sigma_{2}^{(w)}t, \quad t \ge 0,$$
(64)

and

$$\hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{w})}(\lambda) = \log \mathbf{E}_{n,m}[e^{-\lambda \hat{L}_1^{(\mathbf{w})}}] = \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \int_{(0,\infty)} (e^{-\lambda x} - 1 + \lambda x) x dF^{(\mathbf{w})}(x).$$
(65)

Under the assumptions (H-b-3rd), (H-w-3rd) and (H-clustering), Lemma A.1 asserts that

$$n^{\frac{2}{3}}\hat{\varphi}^{(\mathsf{b})}(n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\lambda) \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{2}\theta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sigma_3^{(\mathsf{b})}\lambda^2, \quad n^{\frac{2}{3}}\hat{\varphi}^{(\mathsf{w})}(n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\lambda) \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{2}\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma_3^{(\mathsf{w})}\lambda^2.$$
(66)

Combined with the independence between  $(\hat{L}_t^{(b)})_{t\geq 0}$  and  $(\hat{L}_t^{(w)})_{t\geq 0}$ , this implies:

$$\left\{n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\hat{L}_{n^{2/3}t}^{(\mathbf{b})}, n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\hat{L}_{n^{2/3}t}^{(\mathbf{w})} : t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{\mathcal{L}_{t}^{(\mathbf{b})}, \mathcal{L}_{t}^{(\mathbf{w})} : t \ge 0\right\} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_{+}, \mathbb{R}^{2}), \tag{67}$$

where  $(\mathcal{L}^{(b)}, \mathcal{L}^{(w)})$  is a pair of independent Brownian motion with respective Laplace exponents  $\Psi^{(b)}, \Psi^{(w)}$  given by

$$\Psi^{(\mathbf{b})}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\theta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sigma_{3}^{(\mathbf{b})}\lambda^{2}, \quad \Psi^{(\mathbf{w})}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma_{3}^{(\mathbf{w})}\lambda^{2}, \quad \lambda \ge 0.$$
(68)

We observe that the previous convergence of  $\hat{L}_t^{(b)}$  also implies that for any  $t_0 \ge 0$ ,

$$\sup_{t \le t_0} n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \hat{L}_{n^{2/3}t}^{(b)} \to 0 \text{ in probability, so that } \sup_{t \le t_0} \left| n^{-\frac{2}{3}} L_{n^{2/3}t}^{(b)} - \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_2^{(b)} t \right| \to 0 \text{ in probability.}$$
(69)

Recall from (46) the definition of  $L_t^{n,m}$ . Using the criticality assumption (H-critical), we can write

$$\begin{split} L_t^{n,m} &= -t + L^{(\texttt{w})} \circ L^{(\texttt{b})}(t) = -t + \hat{L}^{(\texttt{w})} \circ L^{(\texttt{b})}(t) + \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \sigma_2^{(\texttt{w})} L_t^{(\texttt{b})} \\ &= \hat{L}^{(\texttt{w})} \circ L^{(\texttt{b})}(t) + \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \sigma_2^{(\texttt{w})} \hat{L}_t^{(\texttt{b})} - \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} \sigma_2^{(\texttt{w})} \sigma_2^{(\texttt{b})}\right) t \\ &= \hat{L}^{(\texttt{w})} \circ L^{(\texttt{b})}(t) + \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \sigma_2^{(\texttt{w})} \hat{L}_t^{(\texttt{b})}. \end{split}$$

It follows that

$$n^{-\frac{1}{3}}L_{n^{2/3}t}^{n,m} = n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\hat{L}^{(\mathsf{w})}\left(n^{\frac{2}{3}} \cdot n^{-\frac{2}{3}}L^{(\mathsf{b})}(n^{\frac{2}{3}}t)\right) + \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}\sigma_{2}^{(\mathsf{w})}n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\hat{L}_{n^{2/3}t}^{(\mathsf{b})}$$

Using the joint convergence in (67) and the convergence in probability from (69), we apply Lemma 3.7 to find that

$$\left\{n^{-\frac{1}{3}}L_{n^{2/3}t}^{n,m}: t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_{2}^{(\mathbf{b})}t/\sqrt{\theta}}^{(\mathbf{w})} + \sqrt{\theta}\sigma_{2}^{(\mathbf{w})}\mathcal{L}_{t}^{(\mathbf{b})}: t \ge 0\right\},\tag{70}$$

jointly with the convergence in (67). Using the scaling property of Brownian motions, we find that the right-hand side in (70) is a Brownian motion with the quadratic variation  $\sigma_3^{(w)} \sigma_2^{(b)} + \sqrt{\theta} (\sigma_2^{(w)})^2 \sigma_3^{(b)}$ , which has the same distribution as  $(\mathcal{L}_t^{(1)})_{t\geq 0}$  in (19). This confirms the desired convergence from  $L^{n,m}$ .

Step 2: Convergence of  $H^{n,m}$ . We intend to apply Theorem C.1 with  $a_n = n^{1/3}$  and  $b_n = n^{2/3}$  to  $X^{(n)} = L^{n,m}$  and  $X = \mathcal{L}^{(1)}$ . To check the assumptions of the theorem, we recall that  $(L_t^{n,m} + t)_{t\geq 0}$  is a compound Poisson process. Denoting  $\pi_n$  for the Lévy measure of this compound Poisson process and writing  $\varphi$  for the Laplace exponent of  $L^{n,m}$ , we have

$$\varphi(\lambda) - \lambda = \int_{(0,\infty)} (e^{-\lambda x} - 1)\pi_n(dx), \tag{71}$$

Meanwhile, the subordination of Lévy processes implies that

$$\varphi(\lambda) - \lambda = \varphi^{(\mathbf{b})} \Big( -\varphi^{(\mathbf{w})}(\lambda) \Big), \quad \lambda \ge 0,$$
(72)

where  $\varphi^{(w)}$  and  $\varphi^{(b)}$  are the respective Laplace exponents of  $L^{(w)}$  and  $L^{(b)}$ . Taking  $\lambda$  to infinity in (71), we deduce from the monotone convergence theorem that  $q_n := \pi_n(\mathbb{R}_+) = -\lim_{\lambda \to \infty} (\varphi(\lambda) - \lambda)$ . In view of (72) and the definition (45) of  $\varphi^{(w)}$ , we have

$$q_n = -\lim_{\lambda \to \infty} \varphi^{(\mathbf{b})} \Big( -\varphi^{(\mathbf{w})}(\lambda) \Big) = -\varphi^{(\mathbf{b})} \Big( \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \sigma_1^{(\mathbf{w})} \Big).$$

It follows that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} q_n = \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{(0,\infty)} \left( 1 - e^{-\sqrt{\theta}\sigma_1^{(\mathbf{w})}x} \right) x dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x) =: q_0 \in (0,\infty).$$
(73)

On the other hand, the weak convergence of  $n^{-1/3}L_{n^{2/3}}^{n,m}$  towards  $\mathcal{L}_1^{(1)}$  is implied by (70). It remains to check (106). We shall prove that the condition (109) is satisfied in this case. Recall  $g_n$  from (105) and  $\Psi_n$  from (108). Comparing them with  $\varphi$  in (71), we find that

$$g_n(s) - 1 = \frac{1}{q_n} \int_{(0,\infty)} (e^{-(1-s)q_n x} - 1)\pi_n(dx) = \frac{1}{q_n} \Big(\varphi\big((1-s)q_n\big) - (1-s)q_n\Big),$$

so that

$$\begin{split} \Psi_n(u) &= n^{\frac{2}{3}} q_n^{-1} \varphi(u n^{-\frac{1}{3}} q_n) = n^{\frac{2}{3}} q_n^{-1} \Big( \varphi^{(\mathbf{b})} \big( -\varphi^{(\mathbf{w})} (u n^{-\frac{1}{3}} q_n) \big) + u n^{-\frac{1}{3}} q_n \Big) \\ &= n^{\frac{2}{3}} q_n^{-1} \Big( \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{b})} \big( -\varphi^{(\mathbf{w})} (u n^{-\frac{1}{3}} q_n) \big) + \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})} \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{w})} (u n^{-\frac{1}{3}} q_n) \Big). \end{split}$$

where we have used (72) in the second identity and the criticality assumption (H-critical) in the third. Using the inequality  $e^{-x} - 1 + x \ge \frac{1}{2}x^2e^{-x}$  for all  $x \ge 0$  and the convergence of  $q_n \to q_0$  as seen in (73), we find that for all  $u \in [0, n^{1/3}]$  and n sufficiently large,

$$\begin{split} \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{w})}(un^{-\frac{1}{3}}q_n) &\geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}(q_nun^{-\frac{1}{3}})^2 \int_{(0,\infty)} e^{-un^{-1/3}q_nx} x^3 dF^{(\mathbf{w})}(x) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}(q_nun^{-\frac{1}{3}})^2 \int_{(0,\infty)} e^{-q_nx} x^3 dF^{(\mathbf{w})}(x) \geq \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\theta} q_n^2 \eta u^2 n^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \end{split}$$

with  $\eta := \int_{(0,\infty)} x^3 e^{-q_0 x} dF^{(w)}(x) \in (0,\infty)$ . Combined with the fact that  $\hat{\varphi}^{(b)}$  only takes non negative values, this yields that for sufficiently large n and all  $u \in [0, n^{1/3}]$ :

$$\Psi_n(u) \ge n^{\frac{2}{3}} q_n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})} \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{w})}(un^{-\frac{1}{3}} q_n) \ge \frac{1}{4} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})} q_n \eta \, u^2,$$

from which (109) follows. In consequence, Theorem C.1 applies to yield the convergence in (49).

**Part II: Proof of Lemma 3.3 under the one dominant heavy tail assumptions.** The proof here follows the same steps as in the previous one. We only point out the main differences and omit the details. For the convergence of  $L^{n,m}$ , introduce  $\hat{L}^{(b)}$  and  $\hat{L}^{(w)}$  as in (63) and (64), with their respective Laplace exponents  $\hat{\varphi}^{(b)}$  and  $\hat{\varphi}^{(w)}$ . Under (H-b-power) and (H-clustering), Lemma A.2 implies that

$$\left\{n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\hat{L}_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{(\mathbf{b})}:t\geq 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{\mathcal{L}_{t}^{(\mathbf{b})}:t\geq 0\right\} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_{+},\mathbb{R}),\tag{74}$$

where in this case  $\mathcal{L}^{(b)}$  is a spectrally positive  $\alpha$ -stable process satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda \mathcal{L}_1^{(\mathbf{b})}}] = e^{\Psi^{(\mathbf{b})}(\lambda)}, \quad \text{with } \Psi^{(\mathbf{b})}(\lambda) = \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} C^{(\mathbf{b})} C(\alpha) \lambda^{\alpha}, \quad \lambda \ge 0.$$
(75)

In above, the constant  $C(\alpha) = (\alpha + 1)\Gamma(2 - \alpha)/\alpha(\alpha - 1)$ . On the other hand, assuming in the first instance that (H-w-3rd) holds. Then Lemma A.1 implies that  $\hat{\varphi}^{(w)}(n^{-1/\alpha+1}\lambda) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-2/\alpha+1}), n \to \infty$ . In consequence, for all  $\lambda \ge 0$ ,

$$n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}\hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{w})}(n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\lambda) \to 0, \quad \text{so that} \quad n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\sup_{t \le t_0}|\hat{L}_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{(\mathbf{w})}| \to 0 \quad \text{in probability for all } t_0 \ge 0.$$
(76)

If, instead, (H-w-power) holds for some  $\alpha' \in (\alpha, 2)$ , replacing Lemma A.1 with Lemma A.2 yields the same conclusion. Meanwhile, the same arguments leading to (69) yield in the current case:

$$\sup_{t \le t_0} \left| n^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} L_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{(\mathbf{b})} - \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})} t \right| \to 0 \quad \text{in probability for all } t_0 \ge 0.$$
(77)

Arguing as in the previous part, we deduce from the critical assumption (H-critical) that

$$n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}L_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m} = n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\hat{L}^{(\mathbf{w})}\Big(n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}\cdot n^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}L^{(\mathbf{b})}(n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}t)\Big) + \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}\sigma_{2}^{(\mathbf{w})}n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\hat{L}_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{(\mathbf{b})}(n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}t)$$

Lemma 3.7 combined with (76), (77) and (74) implies that

$$\left\{n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}L_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m}: t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{\sqrt{\theta}\sigma_2^{(\mathsf{w})}\mathcal{L}_t^{(\mathsf{b})}: t \ge 0\right\},\tag{78}$$

jointly with the convergence in (74). We readily check that the limit process above is distributed as  $\mathcal{L}^{(2)}$ in (19). For the convergence of the height process  $H^{n,m}$ , we rely on Theorem C.1 with  $a_n = n^{1/\alpha+1}$ and  $b_n = n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}$ . The beginning of the proof is identical to the previous part. In particular, (73) still holds, with  $q_n$  standing for the total mass of the Lévy measure of  $L^{n,m}$ . To check the condition (109) in the current case, let us show that we can find some  $C \in (0, \infty)$  so that for all  $u \in [0, n^{1/\alpha+1}]$  and sufficiently large n,

$$\Psi_n(u) = n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} q_n^{-1} \left( \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathsf{b})} \left( -\varphi^{(\mathsf{w})} (un^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} q_n) \right) + \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} \sigma_2^{(\mathsf{b})} \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathsf{w})} (un^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} q_n) \right) \ge C u^{\alpha}.$$

Indeed, from the inequality  $1 - e^{-x} \ge xe^{-x}$  for  $x \ge 0$ , we obtain that for all  $u \in [0, n^{1/\alpha+1}]$  and sufficiently large n,

$$-\varphi^{(\mathbf{w})}(un^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}q_n) = \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \int_{(0,\infty)} (1 - e^{-un^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}q_n x}) x dF^{(\mathbf{w})}(x) \ge \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\theta}q_0 \eta' un^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}},$$

with  $\eta' := \int_{(0,\infty)} x^2 e^{-q_0 x} dF^{(w)}(x) \in (0,\infty)$ . Lemma A.3 allows us to find some positive constant c so that for all  $u \in [0, n^{1/\alpha+1}]$  and sufficiently large n,

$$\hat{\varphi}^{(\mathsf{b})}\left(-\varphi^{(\mathsf{w})}(un^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}q_n)\right) \ge \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathsf{b})}\left(\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\theta}q_0\eta un^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\right) \ge cu^{\alpha}n^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}},$$

from which it follows that

$$\Psi_n(u) \ge n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} q_n^{-1} \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{b})} \left( -\varphi^{(\mathbf{w})} (un^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} q_n) \right) \ge c q_n^{-1} u^{\alpha}$$

Hence, condition (109) holds in this case. The joint convergence in (50) then follows as a result of Theorem C.1.

**Part III: Proof of Lemma 3.3 under the matched heavy tails assumptions.** This is very similar to the previous two cases. The main difference lies in the counterpart of (67): under the current assumptions, we have instead

$$\left\{n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\hat{L}_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{(\mathbf{b})}, n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\hat{L}_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{(\mathbf{w})} : t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{\mathcal{L}_{t}^{(\mathbf{b})}, \mathcal{L}_{t}^{(\mathbf{w})} : t \ge 0\right\} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_{+}, \mathbb{R}^{2}), \tag{79}$$

where  $(\mathcal{L}^{(b)}, \mathcal{L}^{(w)})$  is a pair of independent  $\alpha$ -stable processes with respective Laplace exponents  $\Psi^{(b)}, \Psi^{(w)}$  given by

$$\Psi^{(\mathbf{b})}(\lambda) = \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} C^{(\mathbf{b})} C(\alpha) \lambda^{\alpha}, \quad \Psi^{(\mathbf{w})}(\lambda) = \theta^{\frac{1}{2}} C^{(\mathbf{w})} C(\alpha) \lambda^{\alpha}, \quad \lambda \ge 0.$$
(80)

As a result, we have

$$\left\{n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}L_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m}:t\geq 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_{2}^{(\mathbf{b})}t/\sqrt{\theta}}^{(\mathbf{w})}+\sqrt{\theta}\sigma_{2}^{(\mathbf{w})}\mathcal{L}_{t}^{(\mathbf{b})}:t\geq 0\right\},\tag{81}$$

jointly with the convergence in (79). We then observe that the limit process in (81) has the same distribution as  $\mathcal{L}^{(3)}$  introduced in (19). The condition (109) can be checked in the same way as in Part II.

Before ending this subsection, let us point out that we have in fact shown that under the respective sets of assumptions in Lemma 3.3,

$$\left\{\frac{1}{a_n}\hat{L}_{b_nt}^{(\mathsf{b})}, \frac{1}{a_n}\hat{L}_{b_nt}^{(\mathsf{w})}, \frac{1}{a_n}L_{b_nt}^{n,m} : t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{\mathcal{L}_t^{(\mathsf{b})}, \mathcal{L}_t^{(\mathsf{w})}, \mathcal{L}_{\sigma_2^{(\mathsf{b})}t/\sqrt{\theta}}^{(\mathsf{w})} + \sqrt{\theta}\sigma_2^{(\mathsf{w})}\mathcal{L}_t^{(\mathsf{b})} : t \ge 0\right\}$$
(82)

in  $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{R}^2)\times\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{R}),$  as well as

$$\sup_{t \le t_0} \left| \frac{1}{b_n} L_{b_n t}^{(\mathbf{b})} - \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})} t \right| \to 0 \quad \text{in probability for all } t_0 \ge 0.$$
(83)

where

- under the double finite third moments assumptions,  $a_n = n^{1/3}$ ,  $b_n = n^{2/3}$  and  $(\mathcal{L}^{(b)}, \mathcal{L}^{(w)})$  is a pair of independent Brownian motions introduced in (68);
- under the one dominant heavy tail assumptions,  $a_n = n^{1/\alpha+1}, b_n = n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}, \mathcal{L}^{(w)}$  is the null process while  $\mathcal{L}^{(b)}$  is an  $\alpha$ -stable process that satisfies (75);
- under the matched heavy tails assumptions,  $a_n = n^{1/\alpha+1}$ ,  $b_n = n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}$ , and  $(\mathcal{L}^{(b)}, \mathcal{L}^{(w)})$  is a pair of independent  $\alpha$ -stable processes satisfying (80);

Under the relevant assumptions, the convergence in (82) corresponds to respectively (67) and (70) from Part I, (74), (76), (78) from Part II, and (79), (81) from Part III. The convergence in (83) is shown as (69) in Part I, as (77) in Part II, and can be shown in the same way under the matched heavy tails assumptions.

#### 3.2.5 Proof of Lemma 3.4

We will need the following lemma, whose proof is elementary and thus omitted.

**Lemma 3.8.** Let t > 0,  $\mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbb{D}([0, t], \mathbb{R})$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{D}([0, t], \mathbb{R})$ . Assume that  $\mathbf{x}_n \to \mathbf{x}$  in  $\mathbb{D}([0, t], \mathbb{R})$  as  $n \to \infty$ . Then for any positive sequence  $a_n \to t$ , we have

$$\int_0^{a_n} \mathbf{x}_n(s) ds \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} \int_0^t \mathbf{x}(s) ds = \int_0^t \mathbf{x}(s-) ds.$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.4.* We adopt the notation from (82). We note that the convergences of  $(\hat{L}^{(b)}, \hat{L}^{(w)})$  therein imply the following convergences of their Laplace exponents: for all  $\lambda \ge 0$ ,

$$b_n \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{b})}(\lambda/a_n) \to \Psi^{(\mathbf{b})}(\lambda), \quad b_n \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{w})}(\lambda/a_n) \to \Psi^{(\mathbf{w})}(\lambda),$$
(84)

where under the doubly finite third moments assumptions,  $\Psi^{(b)}, \Psi^{(w)}$  are given in (68); under the one dominant heavy tail assumptions,  $\Psi^{(b)}$  is defined in (75) and  $\Psi^{(w)} \equiv 0$ ; under the matched heavy tails assumptions,  $\Psi^{(b)}, \Psi^{(w)}$  are introduced in (80). In all three cases, we have  $a_n = n^{1/\alpha+1}$  and  $b_n = n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}$  with the understanding that  $\alpha = 2$  for the doubly finite third moments assumptions. Let us denote

$$\rho = \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})} / \sqrt{\theta}, \quad \text{so that} \quad \rho^{-1} = \sqrt{\theta} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{w})},$$

thanks to the criticality assumption (H-critical). Recall that  $\mathcal{L}^{(i)}$  are the respective limit of  $L^{n,m}$  under the relevant sets of assumptions and  $\Psi_i$  is its Laplace exponent, for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . In view of (82), we can assume from now on that

$$\mathcal{L}_{t}^{(i)} = \mathcal{L}_{\rho t}^{(\mathsf{w})} + \rho^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{t}^{(\mathsf{b})} \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_{i}(\lambda) = \rho \Psi^{(\mathsf{w})}(\lambda) + \Psi^{(\mathsf{b})}(\lambda/\rho).$$
(85)

Thanks to Skorokhod's Representation Theorem, we are able to assume that the convergences in (82) and (83) both take place **almost surely**. We split  $E_t^{n,m}$  as follows:

$$-\log E_t^{n,m} = D_t^{(\mathsf{w})} + D_t^{(\mathsf{b})}$$

where

$$D_t^{(\mathbf{w})} = \int_0^{L_t^{(\mathbf{b})}} \frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}} dL_s^{(\mathbf{w})} + \int_0^{L_t^{(\mathbf{b})}} \varphi^{(\mathbf{w})} \Big(\frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}}\Big) ds, \quad D_t^{(\mathbf{b})} = \int_0^t \frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}} dL_s^{(\mathbf{b})} + \int_0^t \varphi^{(\mathbf{b})} \Big(\frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}}\Big) ds.$$

Recall from (63) and (64) the compensated processes  $\hat{L}^{(w)}, \hat{L}^{(b)}$ , with respective Laplace exponents  $\hat{\varphi}^{(w)}, \hat{\varphi}^{(b)}$ . We have

$$\begin{split} D_t^{(\mathbf{w})} &= \int_0^{L_t^{(\mathbf{b})}} \frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}} d\Big( \hat{L}_s^{(\mathbf{w})} + \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \, \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{w})} s \Big) + \int_0^{L_t^{(\mathbf{b})}} \Big\{ \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{w})} \Big( \frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}} \Big) - \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \, \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{w})} \frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}} \Big\} ds \\ &= \int_0^{L_t^{(\mathbf{b})}} \frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}} \, d\hat{L}_s^{(\mathbf{w})} + \int_0^{L_t^{(\mathbf{b})}} \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{w})} \Big( \frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}} \Big) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{mn}} \int_0^{L_t^{(\mathbf{b})}} \Big( \hat{L}^{(\mathbf{w})} \circ L^{(\mathbf{b})}(t) - \hat{L}_s^{(\mathbf{w})} \Big) ds + \int_0^{L_t^{(\mathbf{b})}} \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{w})} \Big( \frac{s}{\sqrt{mn}} \Big) ds, \end{split}$$

where we have applied an integration by parts in the last line. A change of variables  $s = b_n u$  then yields

$$D_{b_n t}^{(\mathbf{w})} = \frac{b_n}{\sqrt{mn}} \int_0^{L_{b_n t}^{(\mathbf{b})}/b_n} \left( \hat{L}^{(\mathbf{w})} \circ L^{(\mathbf{b})}(b_n t) - \hat{L}_{b_n u}^{(\mathbf{w})} \right) du + \int_0^{L_{b_n t}^{(\mathbf{b})}/b_n} b_n \hat{\varphi}^{(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{b_n u}{\sqrt{mn}} \right) du.$$

We note that  $a_n b_n = n$ . In view of Lemmas 3.8 and 3.7, the convergences in (82), (83) along with (84) imply that

$$D_{b_n t}^{(\mathbf{w})} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}} \int_0^{\rho t} \left( \mathcal{L}_{\rho t}^{(\mathbf{w})} - \mathcal{L}_u^{(\mathbf{w})} \right) du + \int_0^{\rho t} \Psi^{(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{u}{\sqrt{\theta}} \right) du$$

We then apply a change of variables, followed by an integration by parts to find that the previous limit is equal to

$$D_{b_n t}^{(\mathsf{w})} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}} \int_0^t \rho s \, d\mathcal{L}_{\rho s}^{(\mathsf{w})} + \int_0^t \rho \Psi^{(\mathsf{w})} \Big(\frac{\rho s}{\sqrt{\theta}}\Big) ds.$$

By a similar argument, we can show that

$$D_{b_n t}^{(\mathbf{b})} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}} \int_0^t s \, d\mathcal{L}_s^{(\mathbf{b})} + \int_0^t \Psi^{(\mathbf{b})} \left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{\theta}}\right) ds.$$
(86)

Combining the two and noting (85), we conclude that

$$-\log E_{b_n t}^{n,m} = D_{b_n t}^{(\mathbf{w})} + D_{b_n t}^{(\mathbf{b})} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \int_0^t \frac{\rho s}{\sqrt{\theta}} \, d\mathcal{L}_s^{(i)} + \int_0^t \Psi_i \Big(\frac{\rho s}{\sqrt{\theta}}\Big) ds = -\log \mathcal{E}_t^{(i)},$$

jointly with the convergence in (82). As  $E_t^{n,m}$  takes non negative values and  $\mathbf{E}_{n,m}[E_t^{n,m}] = 1 = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_t^{(1)}]$ , which is implied by (47) and (20), the previous convergence in distribution also implies that  $E_t^{n,m}$ ,  $n \ge 1$  is uniformly integrable; see for instance Lemma 3.11 in [29].

For the convergence of  $\Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}$ , recall  $E_t^{(\mathbf{b})}$  from (62) and note that  $E_t^{(\mathbf{b})} = \exp(-D_t^{(\mathbf{b})})$ . The convergence in (86), combined with the fact that  $E_t^{(\mathbf{b})}$  is a positive random variable with unit mean, implies that  $E_{b_n,t}^{(\mathbf{b})}$ ,  $n \ge 1$  is uniformly integrable. We then deduce from (62) and (83) that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\mathbf{P}_{n,m}\Big(\sup_{s\leq t}\Big|\frac{1}{b_n}\Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(b_ns)-\rho s\Big|\geq \epsilon\Big)=\mathbf{E}_{n,m}\Big[\mathbf{1}_{\{\sup_{s\leq t}|L_{b_ns}^{(\mathbf{b})}/b_n-\rho s|\geq \epsilon\}}\cdot E_{b_nt}^{(\mathbf{b})}\Big]\xrightarrow{n\to\infty}0,$$

which completes the proof.

#### **3.3** Proof for the convergence of surplus edges

#### 3.3.1 Preliminaries

We give here the proof of Lemmas 2.7-2.9.

Proof of Lemma 2.7. The first statement is clear since for  $e \in \mathcal{E}'_{n,m}$ , its counterpart  $e' = (V_{k(e)}, V_{k'(e)})$ is in the same connected component as e. For the upper bound of dis<sub>k</sub>, recall from the notion of path and  $(\Pi, \epsilon)$ -modified length. Suppose that  $\mathcal{E}_k = \{e_i = (b_i, w_i) : 1 \le i \le s_{n,k}\}$  is the subset of  $\mathcal{E}_{n,m}$ containing those edges with ends in  $C_{n,(k)}$ . Write  $\mathcal{E}'_k = \{e'_i = (V_{k(e_i)}, V_{k'(e_i)}) : 1 \le i \le s_{n,k}\}$  its counterpart in  $\mathcal{E}'_{n,m}$ . Let  $x, y \in C_{n,(k)}$  and let  $(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_p)$  be the shortest path in B'' between x and y, where  $f_i = (x_i, y_i), 1 \le i \le p$ . Denote  $\overleftarrow{f_i} = (y_i, x_i)$ . Since  $\mathcal{E}'_k$  contains at most  $s_{n,k}$  elements, there are at most  $s_{n,k}$  elements among  $(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_p)$  for which either  $f_i$  or  $\overleftarrow{f_i}$  belong to  $\mathcal{E}'_k$ . For those  $f_i$ , their lengths in d'' are 1, while their lengths in  $d_{gr}$  is 2. For the remaining  $f_i$ , their lengths in d'' coincide with their lengths in  $\mathcal{F}$ , and therefore in  $d_{gr}$  as well. It follows that

$$d''(x,y) = \sum_{1 \le i \le p} d''(x_i, y_i) \ge \sum_{1 \le i \le p} d_{\mathrm{gr}}(x_i, y_i) - s_{n,k} \ge d_{\mathrm{gr}}(x, y) - s_{n,k},$$

for any  $x, y \in C_{n,(k)}$ . A similar argument for  $d_{gr}$  leads to the bound in the other direction. The conclusion then follows.

Proof of Lemma 2.8. The first statement is clear from the definition of  $\Sigma^{n,m}$ . For the second, we first consider the case where  $\Delta_k^{\text{bi}} > 0$ . In that case,  $J_k$  has Lebesgue measure  $\Delta_k^{\text{bi}}$ , since in the bipartite queue client k requests  $\Delta_k^{\text{bi}}$  service time. We then observe that Client k is being served, the slope of  $\Sigma^{n,m}$  is precisely  $X_k/\Delta_k^{\text{bi}}$ . Now if  $\Delta_k^{\text{bi}} = 0$ , then  $\Sigma^{n,m}$  has a jump of size  $X_k$  at  $E_k^{(b)}$ . Since  $\Sigma^{n,m}(J_k) = [\Sigma^{n,m}(E_k^{(b)}), \Sigma^{n,m}(E_k^{(b)})]$  by our definition of the image set, the conclusion follows.  $\Box$ 

Proof of Lemma 2.9. Recall that all surplus edges are of the form  $(V_k, w)$  for some  $w \in \mathcal{A}_{k-1}$ . Recall that  $J_k$  stands for the set of time when  $V_k$  receives its service and that  $Y_j(k)$  is the remaining service time of  $w_j$  when  $V_k$  arrives, provided  $w_j \in \mathcal{A}_{k-1}$ . From the properties of general LIFO queues, we have  $Z_t^{n,m} - \inf_{u \leq t} Z_u^{n,m}$  equal to the total service request from the clients in the queue. Suppose that at time t, the queue consists of  $w_{j_1}, w_{j_2}, \ldots, w_{j_M}$  with  $M \geq 1$ ; then we can partition the interval from 0 to  $Z_t^{n,m} - \inf_{u \leq t} Z_u^{n,m}$  into M disjoint subintervals  $I_t(w_{j_1}), I_t(w_{j_2}), \ldots, I_t(w_{j_M})$  with respective lengths  $Y_{j_i}(k), 1 \leq i \leq M$ . For each pair  $(V_k, w_j)$  for  $w_j \in \mathcal{A}_{k-1}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , let us set

$$D(V_k, w_j) = \left\{ (s, y) : \exists t \in J_k \text{ s.t. } \Sigma^{n, m}(t-) \le s \le \Sigma^{n, m}(t), y \in I_t(w_j) \right\}.$$

On the one hand, by our construction,  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}((V_k, w_j \in \mathcal{E}_{n,m}) = 1 - \exp(-X_i Y_j(k)/\sqrt{mn})$  if  $V_k$  corresponds to the black vertex *i*. On the other hand, standard properties of Poisson point measure combined with Lemma 2.8 imply that the probability of  $Q^{n,m}$  containing at least one atom in  $D(V_k, w_j)$  is the same as the previous probability. To conclude, it suffices to note the following: first, the disjoint union of  $D(V_k, w_j)$  over  $w_j \in \mathcal{A}_{k-1}, 1 \leq k \leq K$  yields  $D_{n,m}$ ; second, each atom in  $D(V_k, w_j)$  will produce an edge  $e' \in \mathcal{E}''_{n,m}$  between  $V_k$  and the parent of  $w_j$ .

### 3.3.2 Proof of Proposition 2.10

We start with an observation: the convergences of  $(\Lambda^{(b,n)}(t))_{t\geq 0}$  under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$  in Lemma 3.6 combined with Lemma 3.4 immediately yield the same convergences under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_n^{(b)} = n, N_m^{(w)} = m)$ , stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.9. Assume (H-clustering) and (H-critical).

(1) Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.6 (1), for all  $t_0 \ge 0$ , we have

$$\sup_{t \le t_0} \left| n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(n^{\frac{2}{3}}t) - \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})}t \right| \to 0 \text{ in probability under } \mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot \mid N_n^{(\mathbf{b})} = n, N_m^{(\mathbf{w})} = m).$$
(87)

(2) Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.6 (2) or (3), for all  $t_0 \ge 0$ , we have

$$\sup_{t \le t_0} \left| n^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}t) - \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})}t \right| \to 0 \text{ in probability under } \mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot \mid N_n^{(\mathbf{b})} = n, N_m^{(\mathbf{w})} = m).$$
(88)

Recall  $\Sigma^{n,m}$  from (33). As a first step in proving Proposition 2.10, let us show the following result.

Lemma 3.10. Assume (H-clustering) and (H-critical).

(1) Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.6 (1), for all  $t_0 \ge 0$ , we have

$$\sup_{t \le t_0} \left| n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \Sigma_{n^{2/3}t}^{n,m} - \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})} t \right| \to 0 \quad \text{in probability under } \mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot \mid N_n^{(\mathbf{b})} = n, N_m^{(\mathbf{w})} = m).$$
(89)

(2) Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.6 (2) or (3), for all  $t_0 \ge 0$ , we have

$$\sup_{t \le t_0} \left| n^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} \Sigma_{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t}^{n,m} - \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})} t \right| \to 0 \quad \text{in probability under } \mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot \mid N_n^{(\mathbf{b})} = n, N_m^{(\mathbf{w})} = m).$$
(90)

*Proof.* To ease the notation, let us denote by  $\hat{\mathbf{P}} = \mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_n^{(\mathbf{b})} = n, N_m^{(\mathbf{w})} = m)$ . **Proof of (89).** Recall from (32) the set  $\mathfrak{W}_t$  of clients waiting in the bipartite queue at time  $t \ge 0$ . Let

$$\hat{\Sigma}_t := \sum_{1 \le i \le N_n^{(\mathbf{b})}} X_i \mathbf{1}_{\{i \in \mathfrak{W}_t\}},$$

Since the customers that have either departed before t or are currently waiting in the queue must have arrived by t, we deduce that for all  $t \ge 0$ ,

$$\Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(t) \ge \Sigma_t^{n,m} \ge \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(t) - \hat{\Sigma}_t.$$
(91)

We claim that under the assumptions of Proposition 2.6(1),

$$n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \sup_{t \le n^{2/3} t_0} \hat{\Sigma}_t \to 0 \quad \text{in probability under } \hat{\mathbf{P}},\tag{92}$$

which will then imply (89), thanks to (91) and the convergence in (87). To show (92), let us recall that  $H_t^{n,m}$  corresponds to the queue length at time t. Take  $\epsilon > 0$  and L > 0. We have

$$\hat{\mathbf{P}}\Big(\sup_{t \le n^{2/3} t_0} \hat{\Sigma}_t \ge \epsilon n^{\frac{2}{3}}\Big) \le \hat{\mathbf{P}}\Big(\sup_{t \le n^{2/3} t_0} H_t^{n,m} \ge Ln^{\frac{1}{3}}\Big) + \hat{\mathbf{P}}\Big(X^*(n^{2/3} t_0) \ge L^{-1} \epsilon n^{\frac{1}{3}}\Big), \tag{93}$$

where  $X^*(n^{2/3}t_0) = \max_{1 \le i \le N_n^{(b)}} X_i \mathbf{1}_{\{E_i^{(b)} \le n^{2/3}t_0\}}$ . To control this quantity, let us introduce for  $\delta > 0$ :

$$J(\delta) = \# \{ 1 \le i \le N_n^{(b)} : E_i^{(b)} \le n^{\frac{2}{3}} t_0, X_i \ge \delta n^{\frac{1}{3}} \}.$$

Then  $X^*(n^{2/3}t_0) \ge \delta n^{1/3}$  if and only if  $J(\delta) \ge 1$ . Meanwhile,  $J(\delta)$  under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$  is a Poisson random variable with mean

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_n &= \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} \int_0^{n^{2/3} t_0} \int_{[\delta n^{1/3},\infty)} x e^{-xs/\sqrt{mn}} dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x) ds \le \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} \int_0^\infty \int_{[\delta n^{1/3},\infty)} x e^{-xs/\sqrt{mn}} dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x) ds \\ &= n \int_{[\delta n^{1/3},\infty)} dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x) \le \delta^{-3} \int_{[\delta n^{1/3},\infty)} x^3 dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x), \end{aligned}$$

which tends to 0 as  $n \to \infty$ , since  $dF^{(b)}$  has finite third moment. This shows that  $J(\delta) \to 0$  in probability under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ , which in turn implies that  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}(X^*(n^{2/3}t_0) \ge \delta n^{\frac{1}{3}}) \to 0$ , for each fixed  $\delta > 0$ . Since  $X^*(n^{2/3}t_0)$  is a measurable function of the collection  $\mathcal{N}_{t_0}$ , Lemma 3.6 yields that

$$\hat{\mathbf{P}}\left(X^*(n^{2/3}t_0) \ge \delta n^{\frac{1}{3}}\right) \to 0, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Plugging this into (93), we find that

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \hat{\mathbf{P}} \Big( \sup_{t \le n^{2/3} t_0} \hat{\Sigma}_t \ge \epsilon n^{\frac{2}{3}} \Big) \le \limsup_{n \to \infty} \hat{\mathbf{P}} \Big( \sup_{t \le n^{2/3} t_0} H_t^{n,m} \ge Ln^{\frac{1}{3}} \Big).$$

According to Proposition 2.6 (1),  $(n^{-1/3}H_{n^{2/3}t}^{n,m})_{t\geq 0}, n \geq 1$  is tight. Then (92) follows by taking  $L \to \infty$ . **Proof of** (90). We introduce  $\hat{\Sigma}_t$  as in the previous case. Note that (91) still holds. In view of the convergence in (88), it remains to show that

$$n^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} \sup_{t \le n^{\alpha/\alpha+1} t_0} \hat{\Sigma}_t \to 0 \quad \text{in probability under } \hat{\mathbf{P}}.$$
(94)

We denote by  $X_{\sigma(i)}$  the *i*-th largest among  $\{X_i : 1 \leq i \leq N_n^{(b)}, E_i^{(b)} \leq n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t_0\}$  (breaking ties arbitrarily). Clearly, for each  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\hat{\Sigma}_t \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} X_{\sigma(i)} + \sum_{N < i \leq N_n^{(b)}} X_{\sigma(i)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma(i) \text{ is in the queue at time } t\}}$$

It follows that

$$\hat{\mathbf{P}}\Big(\sup_{t\leq n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t_0}\hat{\Sigma}_t\geq\epsilon n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}\Big)\leq P_1+P_2+P_3,$$

where

$$\begin{split} P_1 &= \hat{\mathbf{P}}\Big(\sum_{1 \le i \le N} X_{\sigma(i)} \ge \epsilon n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}\Big), \ P_2 &= \hat{\mathbf{P}}\Big(\sup_{t \le n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t_0} H_t^{n,m} \ge Ln^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha+1}}\Big), \\ P_3 &= \hat{\mathbf{P}}\Big(X_N^*(n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}t_0) \ge L^{-1}\epsilon n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\Big) \quad \text{with} \quad X_N^*(n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}t_0) = \max_{N < i \le N_n^{(b)}} X_{\sigma(i)} \mathbf{1}_{\{E_{\sigma(i)}^{(b)} \le n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}t_0\}} \end{split}$$

This time let us set for each a > 0,

$$J(a) = \#\{1 \le i \le N_n^{(\mathbf{b})} : E_i^{(\mathbf{b})} \le n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} t_0, X_i \ge a\},\$$

which, under  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$ , has a Poisson distribution of mean

$$\alpha_n(a) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} \int_0^{n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}t_0} \int_{[a,\infty)} x e^{-xs/\sqrt{mn}} dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x) ds.$$

In the first instance, we take  $a = \delta n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}$  with some fixed  $\delta > 0$ . Note that

$$\alpha_n(\delta n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}) \le \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} t_0 \int_{[\delta n^{\alpha/\alpha+1},\infty)} x dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x) \le \delta^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} \int_{[\delta n^{\alpha/\alpha+1},\infty)} x^2 dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x).$$

Since  $m = \lfloor \theta n \rfloor$  and  $dF^{(b)}$  has finite second moment, we deduce from the above that  $\alpha_n(\delta n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}) \to 0$  as  $n \to \infty$ , which implies that for each  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\mathbf{P}_{n,m}\left(X_{\sigma(1)} \ge \delta n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}\right) \to 0, \quad n \to \infty.$$

Once again, we can substitute in above  $\mathbf{P}_{n,m}$  with  $\hat{\mathbf{P}}$  thanks to Lemma 3.6. It then follows  $P_1 \to 0$ , as  $n \to \infty$ . Next, let us take  $a = \delta n^{1/\alpha+1}$ , which yields

$$\alpha_n(\delta n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}) \le n \int_{[\delta n^{1/\alpha+1},\infty)} dF^{(\mathbf{b})}(x) = n\left(1 - F(\delta n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}})\right) \le 2C^{(\mathbf{b})}\delta^{-1-\alpha}$$

for sufficiently large n, where we have used that under (H-b-power), we have  $1 - F^{(b)}(x) \le 2C^{(b)}x^{-1-\alpha}$  for sufficiently large x. We note that

$$\mathbf{P}_{n,m}\left(X_{N}^{*}(n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}t_{0}) \geq \delta n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}\right) = \mathbf{P}_{n,m}\left(J(\delta n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}) > N\right) \leq N^{-1}\mathbf{E}_{n,m}\left[J(\delta n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}})\right] = N^{-1}\alpha_{n}(\delta n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}).$$

Thanks to the previous bound, we deduce that

$$\limsup_{N \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbf{P}_{n,m} \left( X_N^*(n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} t_0) \ge \delta n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} \right) = 0.$$

The arguments in the proof of Lemma 3.1 then allow us to conclude that  $\limsup_{N\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} P_3 = 0$ . Finally, the respective convergences in (29) and (30) imply that  $\lim_{L\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} P_2 = 0$ . This completes the proof of (94) and then (90) as well.

*Proof of Proposition 2.10.* Let  $a_n = n^{1/\alpha+1}$ ,  $b_n = n^{\alpha/\alpha+1}$  with the understanding that  $\alpha = 2$  under the doubly finite third moments assumptions. By Skorokhod's Representation theorem, we can assume that the convergences of  $(Z^{n,m}, H^{n,m})$  in Proposition 2.6 and  $\Sigma^{n,m}$  in Lemma 3.10 take place almost

surely under the relevant assumptions. Denote by  $\Sigma^{-1}(s) = \inf\{t : \Sigma^{n,m}(t) > s\}$ . Then Elementary arguments imply that for any  $s_0 \ge 0$ ,

$$\sup_{s \le b_n s_0} \left| b_n^{-1} \Sigma^{-1}(b_n s) - \sqrt{\theta} \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{w})} s \right| \to 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$
(95)

In above, we have used the fact that  $\sigma_2^{(b)} \cdot \sigma_2^{(w)} = 1$ . Since Poisson point measures converge if and only if their intensity measures converge accordingly, it suffices to show that for any continuous function  $f : \mathbb{R}^2_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ , we have for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{mn}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} f(b_n^{-1}s, a_n^{-1}y) \mathbf{1}_{D_{n,m}}(s, y) ds dy \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{a.s.} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} f(s, y) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}(s, y) ds dy.$$
(96)

where we recall  $D_{n,m}$  and  $\mathcal{D}^{(i)}$  are the respective supports of  $Q^{n,m}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}^{(i)}$ . With a change of variables and noting  $a_n b_n = n$ , we can rewrite the left-hand side of (96) as follows:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{mn}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} f(b_n^{-1}s, a_n^{-1}y) \mathbf{1}_{D_{n,m}}(s, y) ds dy = \frac{n}{\sqrt{mn}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} f(s', y') \mathbf{1}_{D_{n,m}}(b_n s', a_n y') ds' dy'$$
$$= \frac{n}{\sqrt{mn}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} f(s', y') \mathbf{1}_{\{a_n y' \le Z^{n,m} \circ \Sigma^{-1}(b_n s') - \inf_{u \le b_n s'} Z^{n,m} \circ \Sigma^{-1}(u)\}} ds' dy',$$

where in the last line we have implicitly used the fact that for those  $(s, y) \in D_{n,m}$ , if  $s = \Lambda^{n,m}(t)$ , then  $\Lambda^{n,m}$  is invertible at t. The assumption that  $m = \lfloor \theta n \rfloor$ , the aforementioned convergence of  $(Z^{n,m}, H^{n,m})$ , (95) and Lemma 3.7 then imply the desired convergence in (96).

#### **3.4 Proof of the main theorems**

Having shown Proposition 2.6 for the convergence of graph encoding processes and Proposition 2.10 for the convergence of surplus edges, we explain here how we obtain our main results Theorems 1.1-1.3 and Proposition 1.4. Note from Lemma 2.4 that the excursion lengths in  $Z^{n,m}$  correspond to the y-weights of the connected components, while the order in which they appear is with respect to the x-weights. We therefore need a slight adaption of Aldous' size-biased point process technique in our arguments.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We will use the shorthand notation  $\hat{\mathbf{P}} = \mathbf{P}_{n,m}(\cdot | N_n^{(b)} = n, N_m^{(w)} = m)$ . By Skorokhod's Representation Theorem, we can assume that the convergence (28) of  $(Z^{n,m}, H^{n,m})$  in Proposition 2.6, the convergence of  $\mathscr{S}[n^{\frac{1}{3}}, n^{\frac{2}{3}}](Q^{n,m})$  in Proposition 2.10, and the convergence (87) of  $\Lambda^{(b,n)}$  all take place **almost surely**. Let us recall that  $C_{n,(k)}$  is the k-th largest connected components of  $B_{n,m}$  ranked in x-weights and is explored during  $[g_{n,(k)}, d_{n,(k)})$ . In particular, we have  $\mathbf{x}(C_{n,(k)}) = \Lambda^{(b,n)}(d_{n,(k)}) - \Lambda^{(b,n)}(g_{n,(k)}-)$  by Lemma 2.4. Let us consider

$$\Xi_{n,m} = \Big\{ \Big( n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)} \big( g_{n,(k)} - \big), n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)} \big( d_{n,(k)} \big) - n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)} \big( g_{n,(k)} - \big) \Big) : 1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m} \Big\}.$$

According to our LIFO construction, connected components are explored with a size-biased random order; here "size" refers to the x-weight of a connected component. Furthermore,  $\Lambda^{(b,n)}(t-)$  counts the x-weights of all the black vertices that have arrived prior to time t. Therefore,  $\Xi_{n,m}$  is a size-biased point process in the sense of Aldous [2].

Recall from Section 2.6.2 that we can rank the excursions of  $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$  above its running infimum in decreasing order of their lengths and  $(g_k, d_k)$  is the k-th longest such excursion interval,  $1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m}$ . Denote  $\rho = \sigma_2^{(b)}/\sqrt{\theta}$  and let

$$\Xi = \left\{ \left( \rho g_k, \rho(d_k - g_k) \right) : k \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Properties of Brownian motion then imply that almost surely  $\Xi$  has finite elements on any compact of  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \infty)$ . We claim the following convergence hold in probability: for all  $K \ge 1$  and  $t_k, \epsilon_k > 0$ ,  $1 \le k \le K$ ,

$$\left\{\#\left(\Xi_{n,m}\cap[0,t_k]\times[\epsilon_k,\infty)\right):1\le k\le K\right\} \longrightarrow \left\{\#\left(\Xi\cap[0,t_k]\times[\epsilon_k,\infty)\right):1\le k\le K\right\}.$$
(97)

Indeed, fix  $T, \epsilon > 0$  and let  $(g_j^T, d_j^T)$ ,  $1 \le j \le J$  be those among  $(g_k, d_k)$ ,  $k \ge 1$  that satisfy  $g_k \le \rho^{-1}T$ and  $d_k - g_k > \rho^{-1}\epsilon$ . We assume  $g_1^T < g_2^T < g_3^T < \cdots$ . Similarly, let  $(g_{n,j}^T, d_{n,j}^T)$ ,  $1 \le j \le J_n$  be those among  $(g_{n,(k)}, d_{n,(k)})$ ,  $1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m}$  that satisfy  $\Lambda^{(b,n)}(g_{n,(k)}) \le Tn^{2/3}$  and  $\Lambda^{(b,n)}(d_{n,(k)}) - \Lambda^{(b,n)}(g_{n,(k)}) > \epsilon n^{2/3}$ , ranked in increasing order of their left endpoints. Thanks to the uniform convergence (87) of  $\Lambda^{(b,n)}$ , for  $\delta > 0$  and n taken sufficiently large, the previous collection is identical to the sub-collection among  $(g_{n,(k)}, d_{n,(k)})$ ,  $1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m}$  that satisfy  $g_{n,(k)} \le (1 + \delta)\rho^{-1}Tn^{2/3}$  and  $d_{n,(k)} - g_{n,(k)} > (1 - \delta)\rho^{-1}\epsilon n^{2/3}$ . Since almost surely  $d_k - g_k, k \ge 1$  take distinct values, we can choose the previous  $\delta$  so that with probability exceeding  $1 - \epsilon$ ,  $(g_j^T, d_j^T)$ ,  $1 \le j \le J$  are also those among  $(g_k, d_k), k \ge 1$  that satisfy  $g_k \le (1 + \delta)\rho^{-1}T$  and  $d_k - g_k > (1 - \delta)\rho^{-1}\epsilon$ . Now the convergence (28) combined with standard arguments (see for instance Lemma 7 in [2]) implies that almost surely

$$J_n \to J \text{ and for } 1 \le j \le J : n^{-\frac{2}{3}} g_{n,j}^T \to g_j^T, n^{-\frac{2}{3}} d_{n,j}^T \to d_j^T.$$
 (98)

With another application of the convergence (87), it follows that almost surely

$$n^{-\frac{2}{3}}\Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(g_{n,j}^{T}-) \to \rho g_{n,j}^{T}, \quad n^{-\frac{2}{3}}\Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(d_{n,j}^{T}) \to \rho d_{n,j}^{T}, \quad 1 \le j \le J.$$

The convergence in (97) then follows by varying T and  $\epsilon$ . Aldous' theory of size-biased point processes (Proposition 15 in [2]) allows us to deduce that

$$\left\{ n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)} \big( d_{n,(k)} \big) - n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)} \big( g_{n,(k)} - \big) : 1 \le k \le \kappa_{n,m} \right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{ \rho(d_k - g_k) : k \ge 1 \right\}$$
(99)

with respect to the  $\ell^2$ -topology. In particular, this implies that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $K \ge 1$ , we can find some  $T < \infty$  such that

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \hat{\mathbf{P}}\Big(\max_{k \le K} g_{n,(k)} \le T n^{2/3}\Big) \ge 1 - \epsilon.$$
(100)

Recall that  $H^{n,k}$  is the portion of  $H^{n,m}$  running on  $[g_{n,(k)}, d_{n,(k)}]$  and  $\mathcal{H}^{n,k}$  is defined in a similar way, which also has continuous sample paths. The almost sure convergence of  $H^{n,m}$  in (28), combined with (100) and (98), then implies that for each  $k \ge 1$ ,

$$\left\{n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\mathbf{H}_{n^{2/3}t}^{n,k}: 0 \le t \le n^{-\frac{2}{3}}\zeta_{n,(k)}\right\} \Longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^{n,k} \text{ in } \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{R})$$

in probability. Replacing the convergence of  $H^{n,m}$  with that of  $Q^{n,m}$ , we deduce in a similar fashion that

$$\mathscr{S}[n^{\frac{1}{3}}, n^{\frac{2}{3}}](Q^{n,m} \cap \left([g_{n,(k)}, d_{n,(k)}] \times \mathbb{R}\right)] \Longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}^{(1)} \cap \left([g_k, d_k] \times \mathbb{R}\right)$$

in probability. Note that on the one hand, Lemma 2.9 and (41) tell us that  $(C_{n,(k)}, d_{\text{gr}}, \mu_{n,k}^{\mathbf{y}})$  can be obtained from  $\mathbf{H}^{n,k}$  and the restriction of  $Q^{n,m}$  to  $[g_{n,(k)}, d_{n,(k)}] \times \mathbb{R}$ . On the other hand, recall from (43) the construction of the limit graph  $(\mathcal{C}_{k}^{(1)}, d_{k}^{(1)}, \mu_{k}^{(1)})$ . The previous convergences along with (42) allow us to conclude.

*Proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.* This is very similar to the previous proof; we therefore omit the detail.  $\Box$ 

Proof of Proposition 1.4. We will assume the conditions from Theorem 1.1; the other two cases can be similarly argued. In that case, the convergence in (5) follows from the facts that  $d_{n,(k)} - g_{n,(k)} =$  $\mathbf{y}(C_{n,(k)}), \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(d_{n,(k)}) - \Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}(g_{n,(k)}-) = \mathbf{x}(C_{n,(k)})$ , the lower bound in (100), and the uniform convergence of  $\Lambda^{(\mathbf{b},n)}$  in Lemma 3.9. For the consistency in rankings, let  $B'_{n,m}$  be the graph obtained from  $B_{n,m}$  by swapping the vertex colours with black vertices changed to white and vice versa. It is then straightforward to check that  $B'_{n,m}$  is a random bipartite graph on m black vertices and n white vertices, where weights on the black vertices (resp. white vertices) are sampled from  $F^{(\mathbf{w})}$  (resp. from  $F^{(\mathbf{b})}$ ). All our previous arguments still apply, after changing roles of  $(n, F^{(\mathbf{b})})$  and  $(m, F^{(\mathbf{w})})$ . In particular, in analogue to (99), the sequence  $\{n^{-2/3}\mathbf{y}(C'_{n,(k)}) : k \ge 1\}$  is tight in  $\ell^2$ . This implies that with high probabilities,  $C'_{n,(k)}$  will be explored before some  $Tn^{2/3}$  and therefore appear as some  $C_{n,(k')}$  for some  $k' \ge 1$ . However, since  $\mathbf{x}(C_{n,(k')})/\mathbf{y}(C_{n,(k')}) \to \rho$  and  $n^{-2/3}\mathbf{x}(C_{n,(k')}) \to \rho(d_{k'} - g_{k'})$  with  $\rho = \sigma_2^{(\mathbf{b})}/\sqrt{\theta}$ , we find that  $n^{-2/3}\mathbf{y}(C_{n,(k')}) = n^{-2/3}\mathbf{y}(C'_{n,(k)}) \to d_{k'} - g_{k'}$ . As  $d_k - g_k, k \ge 1$  are distinct, it has to be the case that k' = k for sufficiently large n.

# A Convergence of the Laplace exponents

Let F be the cumulative distribution function of a probability measure supported on  $(0, \infty)$ . Define

$$\varphi(\lambda) = \int_{(0,\infty)} (e^{-\lambda x} - 1 + \lambda x) x \, dF(x), \quad \lambda \ge 0.$$

**Lemma A.1.** Assume that  $\sigma_3(F) := \int_{(0,\infty)} x^3 dF(x) < \infty$ . Then for each  $\lambda \ge 0$ ,

$$n^{\frac{2}{3}}\varphi(n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\lambda) \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{2}\sigma_3(F)\lambda^2$$

*Proof.* Let us denote  $\phi(x) = e^{-x} - 1 + x$ . We note that  $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 + r(x)x^3$ , where r is a continuous and therefore bounded function on  $[0, x_0]$  for any fixed  $x_0 \ge 0$ . We can write

$$n^{\frac{2}{3}}\varphi(n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\lambda) = n^{\frac{2}{3}}\int_{(0,\infty)} \phi(n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\lambda x)x \, dF(x)$$
  
=  $\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 \int_{(0,n^{\frac{1}{3}}]} x^3 dF(x) + n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\lambda^3 \int_{(0,n^{\frac{1}{3}}]} r(n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\lambda x)x^4 dF(x) + n^{\frac{2}{3}} \int_{(n^{\frac{1}{3}},\infty)} \phi(n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\lambda x)x dF(x)$   
=:  $I_1 + I_2 + I_3$ .

Since  $\sigma_3(F) < \infty$ , we have  $\int_{[M,\infty)} x^3 dF(x) = o(1)$  as  $M \to \infty$ . As a result, we deduce that for each  $\lambda \ge 0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma_3(F)\lambda^2 - I_1 = \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 \int_{(n^{\frac{1}{3}},\infty)} x^3 dF(x) \to 0, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$
(101)

Using  $0 \le \phi(x) \le \frac{1}{2}x^2$  for all  $x \ge 0$ , we find that

$$0 \le I_3 \le \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 \int_{(n^{\frac{1}{3}},\infty)} x^3 dF(x) \to 0, \quad n \to \infty.$$
 (102)

For  $I_2$ , we first note that  $C_r := \sup_{x \in [0, n^{1/3}]} |r(n^{-\frac{1}{3}}\lambda x)| < \infty$  for each fixed  $\lambda$ . Take some  $\epsilon > 0$  and let us write

$$\begin{split} \int_{(0,n^{\frac{1}{3}}]} x^4 dF(x) &= \int_{(0,\epsilon n^{\frac{1}{3}}]} x^4 dF(x) + \int_{(\epsilon n^{\frac{1}{3}},n^{\frac{1}{3}}]} x^4 dF(x) \leq \epsilon n^{\frac{1}{3}} \sigma_3(F) + n^{\frac{1}{3}} \int_{(\epsilon n^{\frac{1}{3}},\infty)} x^3 dF(x) \\ &= \epsilon n^{\frac{1}{3}} \sigma_3(F) + o(n^{\frac{1}{3}}), \quad n \to \infty. \end{split}$$

Since  $\epsilon$  can be taken arbitrarily small, this shows that  $\int_{(0,n^{1/3}]} x^4 dF(x) = o(n^{\frac{1}{3}})$ . Combined with the bound for r(x), this implies that

$$|I_2| \le \lambda^3 C_r \cdot n^{-\frac{1}{3}} \int_{(0,n^{\frac{1}{3}}]} x^4 dF(x) \to 0, \quad n \to \infty.$$

Together with (101) and (102), this concludes the proof.

**Lemma A.2.** Assume that  $1 - F(x) \sim C_F x^{-1-\gamma}$  as  $x \to \infty$  for some  $C_F \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\gamma \in (1, 2)$ . Then for each  $\lambda \ge 0$ ,

$$n^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1}}\varphi(n^{-\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}\lambda) \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} C_F \frac{(\gamma+1)\Gamma(2-\gamma)}{\gamma(\gamma-1)}\lambda^{\gamma}$$

*Proof.* Let us denote  $\psi(x) = x(e^{-x} - 1 + x)$ . Then we have

$$\varphi(\lambda) = \lambda^{-1} \int_{(0,\infty)} \psi(\lambda x) dF(x) = \int_{(0,\infty)} \int_0^x \psi'(\lambda u) du dF(x) = \int_0^\infty \psi'(\lambda u) (1 - F(u)) du,$$

where we have used Fubini's Theorem in the last identity. A change of variable then yields

$$n^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1}}\varphi(n^{-\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}\lambda) = n\int_0^\infty \psi'(\lambda y) \Big(1 - F\left(n^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}y\right)\Big) dy.$$

Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . The assumption of F implies that for all  $y \ge \epsilon$ , we have

$$1 - F(n^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}y) = C_F n^{-1} y^{-\gamma-1} (1 + o(1)), \quad n \to \infty$$

where the o(1)-term is uniform for all  $y \ge \epsilon$ . It follows that

$$n\int_{\epsilon}^{\infty}\psi'(\lambda y)\Big(1-F\big(n^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}y\big)\Big)dy \xrightarrow{n\to\infty} C_F\int_{\epsilon}^{\infty}\psi'(\lambda y)y^{-\gamma-1}dy.$$
(103)

An integration by parts yields that

$$C_F \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \psi'(\lambda y) y^{-\gamma - 1} dy = C_F(\gamma + 1) \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} (e^{-\lambda y} - 1 + \lambda y) y^{-\gamma - 1} dy - C_F \lambda^{-1} \epsilon^{-\gamma - 1} \psi(\lambda \epsilon)$$
$$\xrightarrow{\epsilon \to 0+} C_F(\gamma + 1) \int_{0}^{\infty} (e^{-\lambda y} - 1 + \lambda y) y^{-\gamma - 1} dy = C_F \frac{(\gamma + 1)\Gamma(2 - \gamma)}{\gamma(\gamma - 1)} \lambda^{\gamma},$$

where we have used the fact that  $\psi(x) \sim \frac{1}{2}x^3$  as  $x \to 0+$ . Noting that  $\psi'(x) = (e^{-x} - 1 + x) + x(1 - e^{-x}) \ge 0$  for all  $x \ge 0$ , we can apply the monotone convergence theorem and take  $\epsilon \to 0$  in (103). This allows us to conclude.

**Lemma A.3.** Assume that  $1 - F(x) \sim C_F x^{-1-\gamma}$  as  $x \to \infty$  for some  $C_F \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\gamma \in (1, 2)$ . Then for each  $\lambda_0 \ge 0$ , we can find some  $C = C(\lambda_0) \in (0, \infty)$  so that

$$\forall \lambda \in [0, \lambda_0] : \quad \varphi(\lambda) \ge C \lambda^{\gamma}$$

Proof. As in the beginning of the previous proof, we apply Fubini's Theorem to obtain that

$$\varphi(\lambda) = \int_0^\infty \psi'(\lambda u)(1 - F(u))du,$$

where  $\psi(x) = x(e^{-x} - 1 + x)$ . We note that  $\psi'(x) = e^{-x} - 1 + x + x(1 - e^{-x}) \ge x(1 - e^{-x}) \ge 0$ for all  $x \ge 0$ . Meanwhile, the assumption on F implies that we can find some  $C' \in (0, \infty)$  so that  $1 - F(x) \ge C' x^{-1-\gamma}$  for all  $x \ge 1$ . It follows that

$$\begin{split} \varphi(\lambda) &\geq \int_{1}^{\infty} \psi'(\lambda u)(1 - F(u)) du \geq C' \lambda \int_{1}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-\lambda u}) u^{-\gamma} du = C' \lambda^{\gamma} \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-y}) y^{-\gamma} dy \\ &\geq C' \lambda^{\gamma} \int_{\lambda_{0}}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-y}) y^{-\gamma} dy. \end{split}$$

This implies the desired inequality, since the last integral is finite.

# **B** A Girsanov-type theorem for Lévy processes

We follow Appendix A of Conchon-Kerjan and Goldschmidt [21]. Let  $(L_t)_{t\geq 0}$  be a spectrally positive Lévy process with Laplace exponent  $\Psi$ , namely,

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda L_t}] = \exp\left(t\Psi(\lambda)\right), \quad \lambda \ge 0, t \ge 0,$$

For each q > 0, define

$$\mathcal{E}_t = \exp\Big(-\int_0^t qs \, dL_s - \int_0^t \Psi(qs) ds\Big), \quad t \ge 0.$$

Then  $(\mathcal{E}_t)_{t\geq 0}$  is a unit-mean positive martingale with respect to the natural filtration  $(\mathscr{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$  of  $(L_t)_{t\geq 0}$ . This allows us to introduce a new probability measure **Q** on the canonical space by setting

$$\frac{d\mathbf{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}\Big|_{\mathscr{F}_t} = \mathcal{E}_t, \quad t \ge 0$$

Then we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q}}[e^{-\lambda L_t}] = \exp\Big(\int_0^t \big(\Psi(\lambda + qs) - \Psi(qs)\big)ds\Big).$$
(104)

Let us note that under  $\mathbf{Q}$ ,  $(L_t)_{t\geq 0}$  still has independent increments, although the distributions of increments are no longer stationary. As a result of this independence, the law of  $(L_t)_{t\geq 0}$  can still be determined from its marginal laws. Put another way, (104) characterises the law of  $(L_t)_{t\geq 0}$  under  $\mathbf{Q}$ . We can also identify the Doob–Meyer decomposition of  $(L_t)_{t\geq 0}$  under  $\mathbf{Q}$ . To that end, let us assume that  $\Psi$  takes the following form:

$$\Psi(\lambda) = \alpha_0 \lambda + \frac{1}{2}\beta \lambda^2 + \int_{(0,\infty)} (e^{-\lambda x} - 1 + \lambda x)\pi(dx),$$

where  $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\pi$  is a  $\sigma$ -finite measure on  $(0, \infty)$  satisfying  $\int_{(0,\infty)} (x \wedge x^2) \pi(dx) < \infty$ . In particular, this covers the case  $\Psi(\lambda) = \lambda^{\alpha}$  for  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ , as it corresponds to taking  $\alpha_0 = \beta = 0$ and  $\pi(dx) = \alpha(\alpha - 1)/\Gamma(2 - \alpha)x^{-\alpha - 1}dx$ . Let  $(\mathcal{M}_t)_{t\geq 0}$  be a martingale with independent increments whose marginal laws are characterised by

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda\mathcal{M}_t}] = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\beta\lambda^2 t + \int_0^t \int_{(0,\infty)} (e^{-\lambda x} - 1 + \lambda x)e^{-qxs}\pi(dx)ds\right), \quad \lambda \ge 0, t \ge 0.$$

Then the Laplace transform of  $\mathcal{M}_t - \Psi(qt)/q$  coincides with the right-hand side of (104). In other words,

 $\{L_t: t \ge 0\}$  under  $\mathbf{Q}$  is distributed as  $\{\mathcal{M}_t - \frac{1}{q}\Psi(qt): t \ge 0\}.$ 

# C A continuous-time version of Duquesne–Le Gall's Theorem

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\pi_n$  be a finite measure supported on  $(0, \infty)$  and denote by  $q_n = \pi_n(\mathbb{R}_+)$  its total mass. Suppose that  $\{X_t^{(n)} + t : t \ge 0\}$  is a compound Poisson process with Lévy measure  $\pi_n$ . We define its associated height process as follows:

$$\mathbf{H}_{t}^{(n)} = \# \Big\{ 0 \le s \le t : X_{s-} < \inf_{u \in [s,t]} X_{u} \Big\}, \quad t \ge 0.$$

Let  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$  be as follows:

$$\Psi(\lambda) = \alpha_0 \lambda + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 + \int_{(0,\infty)} (e^{-\lambda x} - 1 + \lambda x)\pi(dx),$$

where  $\alpha_0 \ge 0, \beta \ge 0$  and  $\pi$  is a  $\sigma$ -finite measure on  $(0, \infty)$  satisfying  $\int_{(0,\infty)} (x \wedge x^2) \pi(dx) < \infty$ . Assume further that

$$\int^{\infty} \frac{d\lambda}{\Psi(\lambda)} < \infty$$

Let  $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$  be a spectrally positive Lévy process with Laplace exponent  $\Psi$  and let  $(H_t)_{t\geq 0}$  be its height process, defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{H}_t = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0+} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{X_s \le \inf_{u \in [s,t]} X_u + \epsilon\}} ds,$$

where the limit exists in probability; see [23].

Let  $W_n$  be a random variable with distribution  $\mathbb{P}(W_n \in dx) = \pi_n(dx)/q_n$  and denote by  $g_n$  the generating function for the Poisson $(q_n W_n)$  distribution, namely,

$$g_n(s) = \frac{1}{q_n} \int_{(0,\infty)} \sum_{k \ge 0} s^k \mathbb{P} \big( \text{Poisson}(x) = k \big) \pi_n(dx) = \frac{1}{q_n} \int_{(0,\infty)} e^{(s-1)q_n x} \pi_n(dx), \quad s \in [0,1].$$
(105)

For  $m \ge 1$ , write  $g_n^{\circ m} = g_n \circ g_n \circ \cdots \circ g_n$  for the *m*-th iterated composition of  $g_n$ .

**Theorem C.1.** Let  $a_n, b_n$  be two sequences of positive numbers satisfying  $a_n \to \infty$ ,  $b_n/a_n \to \infty$  and  $b_n/a_n^2 \to \beta_0 \in [0, \infty)$ . Assume that as  $n \to \infty$ ,  $q_n \to q \in (0, \infty)$  and

$$\frac{1}{a_n} X_{b_n}^{(n)} \Longrightarrow X_1.$$

Assume further that there exists some  $\delta > 0$  so that

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} a_n \left( 1 - g_n^{\circ \lfloor \delta b_n / a_n \rfloor}(0) \right) < \infty.$$
(106)

Then we have the joint convergence:

$$\left\{\frac{1}{a_n}X_{b_nt}^{(n)}, \frac{a_n}{b_n}\mathbf{H}_{b_nt}^{(n)}: t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{X_t, \mathbf{H}_t: t \ge 0\right\} \quad in \ \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2).$$
(107)

Denote

$$\Psi_n(u) = b_n \left( g_n \left( 1 - \frac{u}{a_n} \right) - 1 + \frac{u}{a_n} \right), \quad 0 \le u \le a_n.$$
(108)

If we have

$$\lim_{y \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \int_{y}^{a_n} \frac{du}{\Psi_n(u)} = 0,$$
(109)

then (106) holds for some  $\delta > 0$ .

*Proof.* We follow closely the arguments in [16]. In the current set-up, we allow the Lévy measure  $\pi_n$  of  $X^{(n)}$  to be a general finite measure on  $(0, \infty)$ , while in [16] it takes a specific form:  $\pi_n(dx) = (\sum_i w_i)^{-1} \sum_{i \ge 1} w_i \delta_{w_i}(dx)$ , where  $(w_i)_{i \ge 1}$  is a finite sequence of positive numbers. The specific form of  $\pi_n$  actually plays little role in the proof in [16]. On the other hand, the fact that we allow  $\pi_n(\mathbb{R}_+)$  to be different from 1 requires some slight modifications in the proof. Overall, the arguments laid out here are mostly straightforward adaptations from [16]. We only outline the main steps and highlight the differences.

Step 1: Coding processes for a Bienaymé forest. Denote by  $\tau_1 < \tau_2 < \tau_3 < \cdots$  the successive jump times of  $X^{(n)}$ . We also write  $\Delta_i = \Delta X_{\tau_i}^{(n)}$ . Consider the LIFO-queue with (an infinite number of) customers arriving at  $(\tau_i)_{i\geq 1}$  and requesting  $\Delta_i$  service time, so that  $X_t^{(n)} - \inf_{u \leq t} X_u^{(n)}$  corresponds to the load of the server at time t. Let  $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{T}_i)_{i\geq 1}$  be the forest associated to the queue, where  $\mathcal{T}_i$  is the *i*-th tree component ranked in the arrival times of the customers. Thanks to the Markovian nature of  $X^{(n)}$ , each  $\mathcal{T}_i$  is an independent copy of a Bienaymé tree with a Poisson $(q_n W_n)$  offspring distribution. Let  $(V_k^{(n)})_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$  and  $(\operatorname{Hght}_k^{(n)})_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$  be the respective Lukasiewicz path and height process of this forest, which is obtained by running a depth-first traversal of the forest and setting the increment  $\Delta V_k^{(n)} + 1$  (resp.  $\operatorname{Hght}_k^{(n)}$ ) to be the number of offspring (resp. height) of the k-th vertex in this traversal. We refer to Section 3.1 in [16] for a precise definition. Let also  $(C_t^{(n)})_{t\geq 0}$  be the contour process of the forest, obtained by tracking the height of an imaginary particle travelling at unit speed in a depth-first fashion in the forest. We again point to Section 3.1 in [16] for a definition of this classic notion. For  $t \geq 0$ , denote

$$N(t) = \sum_{i \ge 1} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_i \le t\}}, \quad M(t) = \sum_{s \le t} \mathbf{1}_{\{\Delta H_s^{(n)} \neq 0\}}$$

Note that N(t) counts the number of jumps of  $X^{(n)}$  up to time t, while M(t) counts the same quantity for  $H^{(n)}$ . We have the following analogue of Lemma 3.1 in [16].

**Lemma C.2.** For each  $t \ge 0$ , conditional on  $X_t^{(n)} - \inf_{u \le t} X_u^{(n)}$ ,  $V_{N(t)}^{(n)} - \inf_{k \le N(t)} V_k^{(n)}$  has a Poisson distribution of mean  $q_n(X_t^{(n)} - \inf_{u \le t} X_u^{(n)})$ ; conditional on  $-\inf_{u \le t} X_u^{(n)}$ ,  $-\inf_{k \le N(t)} V_k^{(n)}$  has a Poisson distribution of mean  $-q_n \inf_{u \le t} X_u^{(n)}$ . In consequence, for all a, x > 0, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\Big|V_{N(t)}^{(n)} - q_n X_t^{(n)}\Big| > 2a\Big) \le 1 \wedge \frac{4q_n x}{a^2} + \mathbb{P}\Big(-\inf_{u \le t} X_u^{(n)} \ge x\Big) + \mathbb{E}\Big[1 \wedge \frac{q_n}{a^2} \big(X_t^{(n)} - \inf_{u \le t} X_u^{(n)}\big)\Big].$$
(110)

The proof of the lemma proceeds exactly as in the proof of Lemma 3.1 in [16]. Informally, to see why the first statement is true, we note that  $V_{N(t)}^{(n)} - \inf_{k \le N(t)} V_k^{(n)}$  counts the number of those customers that will arrive after t and appear as the offspring of some client currently in the queue. Meanwhile, the same arguments leading to Eq. (95) and (96) in [16] yield in the current case that  $C_{M(t)}^{(n)} = H_t^{(n)}$  for all  $t \ge 0$  and for each  $t, a \in (0, \infty)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{s\leq t} \left| M(s) - 2q_n s \right| > 2a) \leq 1 \wedge \frac{16q_n t}{a^2} + \mathbb{P}\Big(1 + \sup_{s\leq t} \operatorname{Hght}_{N(s)}^{(n)} > a\Big).$$
(111)

Step 2: Convergence of  $V^{(n)}$ . Let us show that under the conditions of the theorem, we have

$$\left\{\frac{1}{a_n}V^{(n)}_{\lfloor b_nt \rfloor}: t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{qX_{t/q}: t \ge 0\right\}.$$
(112)

We follow the arguments in Section 7.1 of [16]. In the first instance, let us introduce a random walk  $(S_k^{(n)})_{k\geq 0}$ , where  $S_0^{(n)} = 0$  and for  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\Delta S_k^{(n)} = q_n \Delta_k - 1 + \mathcal{N}_k,$$

where  $(\mathcal{N}_k)_{k\geq 1}$  are i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$  variables, independent of  $(\Delta_k)_{k\geq 1}$ . Combining the convergence of  $X_{b_n}^{(n)}/a_n$  to  $X_1$  with  $q_n \to q$ , we have

$$\frac{q_n}{q_n}X^{(n)}_{b_n/q_n} \implies qX_{1/q}.$$

This is equivalent to the convergence of their Laplace exponents, which is further equivalent to the following (Theorem 2.9, Chapter VII, [27]):

$$\frac{b_n}{a_n} \left( 1 - \int_{(0,\infty)} x \pi_n(dx) \right) \to \alpha \tag{113}$$

$$\frac{b_n}{q_n} \int_{(0,\infty)} \left( 1 \wedge \frac{q_n x^2}{a_n^2} \right) \pi_n(dx) \to \beta q + \frac{1}{q} \int_{(0,\infty)} (1 \wedge q^2 x^2) \pi(dx)$$
(114)

$$\forall h \in \mathcal{C}_0: \quad \frac{b_n}{q_n} \int_{(0,\infty)} h\Big(\frac{q_n x}{a_n}\Big) \pi_n(dx) \to \frac{1}{q} \int_{(0,\infty)} h(qx) \pi(dx), \tag{115}$$

where  $C_0$  denotes the set of all bounded continuous functions from  $\mathbb{R}_+$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  vanishing on a neighbourhood of 0. We note that

$$\mathbb{E}[S_1^{(n)}] = \int_{(0,\infty)} x\pi_n(dx) - 1, \quad \text{so that} \quad \frac{b_n}{a_n} \mathbb{E}[S_1^{(n)}] \to -\alpha.$$
(116)

As  $a_n \to \infty$  and the probability that  $\mathcal{N}_k \ge a_n$  is exponentially small, we also have

$$\operatorname{Var}\left(S_{1}^{(n)} \wedge a_{n}\right) = \frac{1}{q_{n}} \int_{(0,\infty)} (q_{n}x \wedge a_{n})^{2} \pi_{n}(dx) - \left(\frac{1}{q_{n}} \int_{(0,\infty)} (q_{n}x \wedge a_{n}) \pi_{n}(dx)\right)^{2} + 1 + o(1), \quad n \to \infty.$$

Since  $b_n/a_n \to \infty$ , (113) implies  $\int x\pi_n(dx) = 1 + o(1)$ , as  $n \to \infty$ . Therefore, the second term above is -1 + o(1) as  $n \to \infty$ . We then deduce from (114) and the assumption  $b_n/a_n^2 \to \beta_0$  that

$$\frac{b_n}{a_n^2} \operatorname{Var}(S_1^{(n)} \wedge a_n) \to \beta q + \frac{1}{q} \int_{(0,\infty)} 1 \wedge (qx)^2 \pi(dx), \tag{117}$$

as well as

$$b_n \mathbb{E}\Big[h\Big(\frac{S_1^{(n)}}{a_n}\Big)\Big] = \frac{b_n}{q_n} \int_{(0,\infty)} h\Big(\frac{q_n x}{a_n}\Big) \pi_n(dx) + o(1) \to \frac{1}{q} \int_{(0,\infty)} h(qx) \pi(dx),$$

for all  $h \in C_0$ . Together with (116) and (117), this ensures  $\frac{1}{a_n}S_{\lfloor b_n \rfloor}^{(n)} \implies qX_{1/q}$  (Theorem 2.35, Ch. VII, [27]). Writing  $L(\lambda) = \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(-\lambda S_1^{(n)})]$ , we obtain (Lemma A.3 in [16]) that for each  $\lambda \ge 0$ ,

$$b_n L(\lambda/a_n) \to \Psi(q\lambda)/q.$$
 (118)

Meanwhile, since  $S_1^{(n)} = q_n \Delta_1 - 1 + \mathcal{N}_1$ , we can write

$$L(\lambda) = \lambda + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 + \log \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda q_n \Delta_1}].$$

Now let  $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(-\lambda V_1^{(n)})]$ . Noting that  $V_1^{(n)} + 1$  is a Poisson random variable of mean  $q_n \Delta_1$ , we find that

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \lambda + \log \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-q_n \Delta_1(1-e^{-\lambda})\right)\right] = \lambda + L(1-e^{-\lambda}) - (1-e^{-\lambda}) - \frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-\lambda})^2.$$

It then follows from (118) that  $b_n \mathcal{L}(\lambda/a_n) \to \Psi(q\lambda)/q$  for each  $\lambda \ge 0$ . The convergence in (112) now follows (Corollary 3.6, Ch. VII, [27]).

Step 3: Joint convergence of  $X^{(n)}$  and  $H^{(n)}$ . Thanks to Theorem 2.5.2 and Corollary 2.5.1 in [23], the convergence in (112) together with the condition (106) yields the following:

$$\left\{\frac{1}{a_n}V_{\lfloor b_nt \rfloor}^{(n)}, \frac{a_n}{b_n} \operatorname{Hght}_{\lfloor b_nt \rfloor}^{(n)}, \frac{a_n}{b_n}C_{b_nt}^{(n)} : t \ge 0\right\} \Longrightarrow \left\{qX_{t/q}, \tilde{\operatorname{H}}_t, \tilde{\operatorname{H}}_{t/2} : t \ge 0\right\} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^3),$$
(119)

where  $(\tilde{H}_t)_{t\geq 0}$  is the height process for  $(qX_{t/q})_{t\geq 0}$  and satisfies

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_t = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{qX_{s/q} \le \inf_{u \in [s,t]} qX_{u/q} + \epsilon\}} ds = \mathbf{H}_{t/q} \quad \text{ almost surely.}$$

We note that  $N(t), t \ge 0$  is a Poisson process of rate  $q_n$ . It is then not difficult to show that for all  $t \ge 0$ ,

$$\sup_{s \le t} \left| \frac{1}{b_n} N(b_n t) - qt \right| \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 0 \quad \text{in probability.}$$

Combining this with (110) and the convergence of  $X^{(n)}$ , we deduce that jointly with the convergence in (119), we also have  $(X_t^{(n)})_{t\geq 0}$  converging in distribution to  $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ . Similarly, with (111) and the identity  $C_{M(t)}^{(n)} = H_t^{(n)}$ , we can further incorporate  $H^{(n)}$  into the convergence to conclude that

$$\left\{\frac{1}{a_n}V_{\lfloor b_nt \rfloor}^{(n)}, \frac{a_n}{b_n} \mathrm{Hght}_{\lfloor b_nt \rfloor}^{(n)}, \frac{a_n}{b_n}C_{b_nt}^{(n)}, \frac{a_n}{b_n}X_{b_nt}^{(n)}, \frac{a_n}{b_n}\mathrm{H}_{b_nt}^{(n)} : t \ge 0\right\} \Rightarrow \left\{qX_{t/q}, \tilde{\mathrm{H}}_t, \tilde{\mathrm{H}}_{t/2}, X_t, \tilde{\mathrm{H}}_{qt} : t \ge 0\right\}$$

in  $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^3) \times \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2)$ . As  $(\tilde{H}_{qt})_{t \ge 0} = (H_t)_{t \ge 0}$  almost surely, the joint convergence in (107) follows. Finally, to see why (109) is a sufficient condition for (106), one can follow the same arguments given in the proof of Proposition 7.3 in [16].

# References

- L. Addario-Berry, N. Broutin, and C. Goldschmidt. The continuum limit of critical random graphs. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 152(3-4):367–406, 2012.
- [2] David Aldous. Brownian excursions, critical random graphs and the multiplicative coalescent. Ann. Probab., 25(2):812–854, 1997.
- [3] David Aldous and Vlada Limic. The entrance boundary of the multiplicative coalescent. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 3:No. 3, 59 pp. (electronic), 1998.
- [4] Frank G. Ball, David J. Sirl, and Pieter Trapman. Epidemics on random intersection graphs. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 24(3):1081 1128, 2014.
- [5] Andrew D. Barbour and Gesine Reinert. The shortest distance in random multi-type intersection graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 39(2):179–209, 2011.
- [6] Shankar Bhamidi, Nicolas Broutin, Sanchayan Sen, and Xuan Wang. Scaling limits of random graph models at criticality: Universality and the basin of attraction of the erdős-rényi random graph. arXiv:1411.3417, 2014.
- [7] Shankar Bhamidi, Souvik Dhara, Remco van der Hofstad, and Sanchayan Sen. Universality for critical heavy-tailed network models: Metric structure of maximal components. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 47:1–57, 2020.
- [8] Shankar Bhamidi and Sanchayan Sen. Geometry of the vacant set left by random walk on random graphs, Wright's constants, and critical random graphs with prescribed degrees. *Random Struct Alg.*, 56:676–721, 2020.
- [9] Shankar Bhamidi, Sanchayan Sen, and Xuan Wang. Continuum limit of critical inhomogeneous random graphs. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 169(1-2):565–641, 2017.
- [10] Shankar Bhamidi, Remco van der Hofstad, and Sanchayan Sen. The multiplicative coalescent, inhomogeneous continuum random trees, and new universality classes for critical random graphs. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 170(1-2):387–474, 2018.
- [11] Shankar Bhamidi, Remco van der Hofstad, and Johan S. H. van Leeuwaarden. Scaling limits for critical inhomogeneous random graphs with finite third moments. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 15:no. 54, 1682–1703, 2010.

- [12] Shankar Bhamidi, Remco van der Hofstad, and Johan S. H. van Leeuwaarden. Novel scaling limits for critical inhomogeneous random graphs. *Ann. Probab.*, 40(6):2299–2361, 2012.
- [13] Mindaugas Bloznelis, Erhard Godehardt, Jerzy Jaworski, Valentas Kurauskas, and Katarzyna Rybarczyk. Recent progress in complex network analysis: Models of random intersection graphs. In Berthold Lausen, Sabine Krolak-Schwerdt, and Matthias Böhmer, editors, *Data Science, Learning by Latent Structures, and Knowledge Discovery*, pages 69–78. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015.
- [14] Béla Bollobás, Svante Janson, and Oliver Riordan. The phase transition in inhomogeneous random graphs. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 31(1):3–122, 2007.
- [15] Béla Bollobás, Svante Janson, and Oliver Riordan. Sparse random graphs with clustering. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 38(3):269–323, 2011.
- [16] Nicolas Broutin, Thomas Duquesne, and Minmin Wang. Limits of multiplicative inhomogeneous random graphs and Lévy trees: Limit theorems. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 181:865–973, 2021.
- [17] Nicolas Broutin, Thomas Duquesne, and Minmin Wang. Limits of multiplicative inhomogeneous random graphs and Lévy trees: The continuum graphs. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 32(4):2448–2503, 2022.
- [18] David Jr Clancy. Component sizes of rank-2 multiplicative random graphs. arXiv:2410.09224, 2024+.
- [19] David Jr Clancy. Near-critical bipartite configuration models and their associated intersection graphs. arXiv:2410.11975, 2024+.
- [20] David Jr Clancy, Vitalii Konarovskyi, and Vlada Limic. Degree corrected stochastic block model: excursion representation. arXiv:2409.18894, 2024+.
- [21] Guillaume Conchon-Kerjan and Christina Goldschmidt. The stable graph: the metric space scaling limit of a critical random graph with i.i.d. power law degrees. *Ann. Probab.*, 51(1):1–69, 2023.
- [22] Maria Deijfen and Willemien Kets. Random intersection graphs with tunable degree distribution and clustering. *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences*, 23(4):661–674, 2009.
- [23] Thomas Duquesne and Jean-François Le Gall. Random trees, Lévy processes and spatial branching processes. *Astérisque*, (281):vi+147, 2002.
- [24] Steven N. Evans. *Probability and real trees*, volume 1920 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- [25] William Feller. An introduction to probability theory and its applications. Vol. I. Third edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney, 1968.
- [26] Misha Gromov. *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*, volume 152 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1999.
- [27] Jean Jacod and Albert N. Shiryaev. Limit theorems for stochastic processes, volume 288 of Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2003.
- [28] Adrien Joseph. The component sizes of a critical random graph with given degree sequence. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 24(6):2560–2594, Dec 2014.
- [29] Olav Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2002.
- [30] MichałKaroński, Edward Scheinerman, and Karen Singer-Cohen. On random intersection graphs: The subgraph problem. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 8:131–159, 1999.
- [31] Jean-Francois Le Gall and Yves Le Jan. Branching processes in Lévy processes: the exploration process. *Ann. Probab.*, 26(1):213–252, 1998.
- [32] Grégory Miermont. Tessellations of random maps of arbitrary genus. Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4), 42(5):725–781, 2009.
- [33] Minmin Wang. Large random intersection graphs inside the critical window and triangle counts. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 30:1–63, 2025.
- [34] Whitt Ward. Some useful functions for functional limit theorems. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 5(1):67–85, 1980.