

$$\text{Also, } \left( \frac{S_{nt}}{\sigma\sqrt{n}} - \inf_{0 \leq s \leq t} \frac{S_{ns}}{\sigma\sqrt{n}}; 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left( B_t - \inf_{0 \leq s \leq t} B_s; 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right)$$

$$\text{and } \frac{S_n - I_n}{\sigma\sqrt{n}} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} B_1 - \inf_{0 \leq s \leq 1} B_s,$$

$$\text{where } I_n = \inf_{0 \leq i \leq n} S_i.$$

## 5) Functional invariance principle for the height function.

Recall the previous notation:

- $\mu$  is a critical offspring distribution on  $\mathbb{Z}_+$ , with finite positive variance  $\sigma^2$
- $(W_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is a random walk with  $\mathbb{P}(W_1 = i) = \mu(i+1)$
- $H_n = |\{0 \leq i \leq n-1; W_i = \min_{0 \leq j \leq n} W_j\}|$  is the height function
- $R_n = |\{1 \leq k \leq n; W_k = \max_{0 \leq j \leq k} W_j\}|$  is the number of weak records between times 1 and  $n$
- $M_n = \max_{0 \leq i \leq n} W_i$
- $I_n = \min_{0 \leq i \leq n} W_i$

We saw that  $(M_n, R_n) \stackrel{(d)}{=} (W_n - I_n, H_n)$ ,  
that  $\frac{H_n}{W_n - I_n} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \frac{Z}{\sigma^2}$

$$\text{and that } \left( \frac{W_{nt} - I_{nt}}{\sigma\sqrt{n}}; 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left( B_t - \inf_{0 \leq s \leq t} B_s; 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right).$$

As a consequence,  $\frac{H_n}{\sqrt{n}} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \frac{Z}{\sigma} (B_1 - \inf_{0 \leq s \leq 1} B_s)$

We show that actually more is true:

**Thm** Assume that in addition  $\exists \lambda > 0$  s.t.  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda k} \mu(k) < \infty$ .  
then  $\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} H_{nt}; 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \left( \frac{Z}{\sigma} (B_t - \inf_{0 \leq s \leq t} B_s); 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right)$

The idea is to show that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left| \frac{W_{nt} - I_{nt}}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{H_{nt}}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{a.s.} 0.$$



or, equivalently, that  $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left| \frac{M_{nt}}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{R_{nt}}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{a.s.} 0$  (\*)

This indeed implies the theorem, since if  $X_n \xrightarrow{(d)} X$  and  $Y_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  then  $X_n + Y_n \xrightarrow{(d)} X$ .

**Notation:** If  $(a_n)$  is a sequence of real numbers, we write  $a_n = o(\epsilon)$  if there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  s.t.  $|a_n| \leq \epsilon^n$  for every  $n$  large enough.

We shall show:

**Lemma 1** We have  $\sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| M_k - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} R_k \right| > n^{3/8} \right) = o(\epsilon)$ .

Lemma 1 implies (\*). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left| \frac{M_{nt}}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{R_{nt}}{\sqrt{n}} \right| > \frac{1}{n^{1/8}} \right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \exists 1 \leq k \leq n ; \left| M_k - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} R_k \right| > n^{3/8} \right) \\ \leq n \sup_{1 \leq k \leq n} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| M_k - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} R_k \right| > n^{3/8} \right) = o(\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\sum_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left| \frac{M_{nt}}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{R_{nt}}{\sqrt{n}} \right| > \frac{1}{n^{1/8}} \right) < \infty$ .

therefore, by Borel-Cantelli's lemma,

a.s.,  $\exists N$  (random) s.t.  $n \geq N \Rightarrow \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left| \frac{M_{nt}}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{R_{nt}}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \leq \frac{1}{n^{1/8}}$

This implies (\*).

To show Lemma 1, we will use:

**Lemma 2** Let  $(Y_i)_{i \geq 1}$  be a sequence of iid random variables such that  $\exists \lambda > 0$  s.t.  $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda Y_1}] < \infty$  and  $\mathbb{E}[Y_1] = 0$ . Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} |Y_1 + \dots + Y_k| > n^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} \right) = o(\epsilon)$ .

Proof of Lemma 2: The assumption implies  $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda Y_1}] = 1 + c\lambda^2 + o(\lambda^2)$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ , with  $c = \text{Var}(Y_1)/2$ . Hence  $\exists C > 0$  s.t.  $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda Y_1}] \leq e^{-C\lambda^2}$  for  $\lambda$  small enough.



Hence, for  $\lambda$  small enough, and  $1 \leq k \leq n$ ,

$$P(Y_1 + \dots + Y_k > n^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}) \leq e^{-\lambda n^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{\lambda(Y_1 + \dots + Y_k)} \right]$$

$$\leq e^{-\lambda n^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}} + cn\lambda^2.$$

Take  $\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ , and we get that for  $n$  large enough

$$P(Y_1 + \dots + Y_k > n^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}) \leq e^{-c\sqrt{n}}$$

the result follows (by also replacing  $Y_i$  by  $-Y_i$  to get  $|Y_1 + \dots + Y_k|$ ).  $\square$

We now show Lemma 1

Recall that  $T_0 = 0$  and  $T_i = \inf\{n > T_{i-1}; W_n \geq W_{T_{i-1}}\}$  are the weak record times of  $W$ , that

$$M_n = \sum_{k=1}^{R_n} (W_{T_k} - W_{T_{k-1}}),$$

that  $(W_{T_k} - W_{T_{k-1}}; k \geq 1)$  are iid with  $P(W_{T_1} = k) = p(k, \sigma^2)$ .

Now, for  $i \geq 1$ , set  $Y_i = W_{T_i} - W_{T_{i-1}} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}$ , so that

$(Y_i)_{i \geq 1}$  satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 1, and

$$M_k - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} R_k = \sum_{i=1}^{R_k} Y_i$$

Now fix  $\epsilon > 0$  small enough so that  $\frac{3}{8} > \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ , and set  $m_n = \lfloor n^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} \rfloor$ , and write

$$P\left(\sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} |M_k - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} R_k| > n^{\frac{3}{8}}\right) \leq P(R_n > m_n) + P\left(\sup_{0 \leq k \leq m_n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k Y_i \right| > n^{\frac{3}{8}}\right)$$

By Lemma 4.1, the second term is  $o(n)$ .

For the first term, write

$$P(R_n \geq m_n) = P(W_{T_{m_n}} \leq M_n)$$

$$\leq P\left(W_{T_{m_n}} \leq n^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}}\right) + P\left(M_n \geq n^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}}\right)$$



But  $\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq n^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}}) = \mathbb{P}(\sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} S_k \geq n^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}})$   
 $= o_e(n)$  by lemma 4.1

and

$$\mathbb{P}(W_{T_{m_n}} \leq n^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}}) = \mathbb{P}(W_{T_{m_n}} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} m_n \leq n^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} m_n)$$

But  $W_{T_{m_n}} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} m_n$  is the sum of  $m_n$  iid random variables satisfying the assumption of lemma 4.1, and  $n^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}} = o(m_n)$ .

Hence  $\mathbb{P}(W_{T_{m_n}} \leq n^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}}) = o_e(n)$ . □

NB It also possible to show that the Theorem holds more generally if only  $\sigma^2 < \infty$ .

## VII. Scaling limits of large conditioned GW trees and the Brownian excursion.

Here  $\mu$  is a critical offspring distribution on  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  s.t.  $\exists \lambda > 0$  s.t.  $\sum_{k \geq 1} e^{-\lambda k} \mu(k) < \infty$ .  
 Let  $\sigma^2$  be the variance of  $\mu$ .

Recall that  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$  is the law of a  $\text{GW}_\mu$ .

Assume that  $\sigma^2 > 0$  and that  $\mu$  is aperiodic (so that  $\mathbb{P}_\mu(|T| = n) > 0$  for large  $n$ ).

Let  $T_n$  be a  $\text{GW}_\mu$  tree conditioned on having  $n$  vertices. Our goal is to show the following result

Theorem Let  $(H_k(T_n); 0 \leq k \leq n-1)$  be the height function of  $T_n$ . Set  $H_n(T_n) = 0$ . There exists a random element of  $\mathbb{E}$  denoted by  $e$  such that

$$\left( \frac{H_{[nt]}(T_n)}{\sqrt{n}}; 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} e.$$

$e$  is called the Brownian excursion.

We will first construct  $e$

## 1) The Brownian Bridge

Proposition As  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ , the law of  $(B_s; 0 \leq s \leq 1)$  conditionally on  $\{|B_1| \leq \varepsilon\}$  converges weakly to a probability distribution on  $E$  denoted by  $\mathbb{P}^0$ . In addition,  $\mathbb{P}^0$  is the law of  $(B_s - sB_1; 0 \leq s \leq 1)$ .

Proof: set  $b_s = B_s - sB_1$  for  $0 \leq s \leq 1$ .

Step 1 For  $s \in (0, 1]$ ,  $\text{cov}(b_s, B_1) = \mathbb{E}[(B_s - sB_1) B_1]$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E}[B_s B_1] - s \\ &= \mathbb{E}[B_s(B_1 - B_s) + B_s^2] - s \\ &= \mathbb{E}[B_s] \mathbb{E}[B_1 - B_s] + 0 \quad \text{since } B_s \perp\!\!\!\perp B_1 - B_s \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $b \perp\!\!\!\perp B_1$  (exercise)