Asymptotics of Bernoulli Gibbsian Line Ensembles

Xiang Fang, Lukas Fesser, Christian Serio, Carson Teitler, and Angela Wang
Graduate Student Assistant: Weitao Zhu
Advisor: Evgeni Dimitrov

Columbia University REU

July 29, 2020

Let $\{X_i\}$ be a sequence of independent identically distributed random variables with mean μ and variance σ^2. Let $S_n = X_1 + \cdots + X_n$.

- **Law of Large Numbers:** $\dfrac{S_n}{n} \longrightarrow \mu$ as $n \to \infty$ almost surely.
- **Central Limit Theorem:** $\dfrac{S_n - n\mu}{\sigma\sqrt{n}} \implies \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ as $n \to \infty$.
- **Donsker's Theorem:** For $t \in [0,1]$, let $W^{(n)}(t) = \dfrac{S_{nt} - nt\mu}{\sigma\sqrt{n}}$ if $nt \in \mathbb{N}$, and linearly interpolate. Then $W^{(n)} \in C([0,1])$ and $W^{(n)} \implies W$ as $n \to \infty$, a standard Brownian motion on $[0,1]$.



Figure: An example of a random walk and a Brownian motion.

Multiple random walks

- If $S_{n+1} - S_n \in \{0, 1\}$, then $\{S_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a *Bernoulli random walk*
- An *avoiding Bernoulli line ensemble* $\mathfrak{L} = (L_1, \ldots, L_k)$ consists of k avoiding Bernoulli random walks on an interval $[T_0, T_1]$, such that $L_1(s) \geq L_2(s) \geq \cdots \geq L_k(s)$ for $s \in [T_0, T_1]$



- Question: What does the limit look like as $k \to \infty$?

Airy Line Ensemble

As $k \to \infty$, k avoiding random walks are conjectured to converge to the *Airy line ensemble* $\mathcal{A}$, and the top curve to the *Airy process* $\mathcal{A}_1$



Avoiding Brownian bridges



Dyson Brownian motion

- Increasing the number of paths pushes us outside of the Gaussian universality class and into the *Kardar-Parisi-Zhang (KPZ) universality class*
- Open problem: Show that "generic" random walks with "generic" initial conditions converge to the Airy line ensemble
- We consider this problem for Bernoulli random walks; the proof is only known if all walks start from 0

Two sufficient conditions for convergence in distribution:

- *Finite dimensional* convergence – difficult, requires exact algebraic formulas
- *Tightness* (existence of weak subsequential limits) – easier, more qualitative/analytic

We focused on tightness, which we prove by controlling the maximum, the minimum, and the modulus of continuity



Figure: The Modulus of Continuity

Our Result

Theorem (DFFSTWZ)

Let $\{\mathfrak{L}^N = (L_1^N, \dots, L_k^N)\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ *be a sequence of* k *avoiding Bernoulli random walks. Fix* $p \in (0,1)$ *and* $\lambda > 0$*, and suppose that for all* $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ *we have*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\big(L_1^N(nN^{2/3}) - pnN^{2/3} + \lambda n^2 N^{1/3} \le N^{1/3}x\big) = F_{TW}(x).$$

Then $\{\mathfrak{L}^N\}$ *is a tight sequence.*

- F_{TW} is the *Tracy-Widom distribution* – the one-point marginal for the Airy process
- [Dauvergne-Nica-Virág '19] showed that finite dimensional convergence of all curves implies tightness
- Our result shows that it suffices for the top curve to converge in the f.d. sense



History of the line ensembles

Arguments in this paper are inspired by

1. *Brownian Gibbs property for Airy line ensembles* [Corwin-Hammond '14] and *KPZ line ensemble* [Corwin-Hammond '15], which address similar issues for continuous line ensembles
2. *Transversal fluctuations of the ASEP, stochastic six vertex model, and Hall-Littlewood line ensembles* [Corwin-Dimitrov '17], which considers similar questions in a discrete setting

Proving tightness

Recall that to show tightness, we want to control:

1. **Minimum** of bottom curve L_k^N
2. **Maximum** of top curve L_1^N
3. **Modulus of continuity** of each curve L_i^N

We will focus on bounding the minimum:

Lemma (DFFSTWZ)

Fix $r, \epsilon > 0$. Then there exist constants $M > 0$ and $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $N \geq N_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{x \in [-r,r]} \left(L_k^N(xN^{2/3}) - pxN^{2/3}\right) < -MN^{1/3} \right) < \epsilon.$$

Monotone coupling

Lowering entry and exit data $\vec{x}, \vec{y}$ for the curves $\implies$ curves shift down on whole interval [Corwin-Hammond '14]



- $\color{red}{\mathfrak{L}^{high}}$ and $\color{blue}{\mathfrak{L}^{low}}$ are "coupled":

$$\mathbb{P}(\color{red}{L_k^{high}}(s) < -R) \leq \mathbb{P}(\color{blue}{L_k^{low}}(s) < -R)$$

Strong coupling

A Bernoulli random walk $\ell^{(N)}$ on $[0, N]$ can be coupled with an "exponentially close" Brownian bridge $B^{(N)}$ [Dimitrov-Wu '19]



$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{s \in [0,N]} \left| \ell^{(N)}(s) - B^{(N)}(s) \right| \geq M(\log N)^2 + x \right) < Ke^{-Ax}$$

Controlling the minimum: pinning the bottom curve

Lemma (DFFSTWZ)

For any $r, \epsilon > 0$, there exists $R > r$ and a constant $M > 0$ so that for large N,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{x \in [r,R]} \left(L_k^N(xN^{2/3}) - pxN^{2/3} \right) < -MN^{1/3} \right) < \epsilon.$$

The same is true of the maximum on $[-R, -r]$.



Couple L_k^N with a Brownian bridge: if "pinned" at two points in $[r, R]$ and $[-R, -r]$, it cannot be low on scale $N^{1/3}$ on $[-r, r]$

Proving the pinning lemma

- Recall our assumption:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(L_1^N(nN^{2/3}) - pnN^{2/3} + \lambda n^2 N^{1/3} \le xN^{1/3}\right) \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{} F_{TW}(x)$$

- The top curve looks like a parabola with an affine shift on large scales



- Two curves: if L_2^N is low on $[r, R]$, L_1^N looks like a free Brownian bridge

$$\lambda\left(\frac{R^2+r^2}{2}\right) - \lambda\left(\frac{R+r}{2}\right)^2 = \lambda\,\frac{R^2+r^2-2rR}{4} = O(R^2)$$

- For large R, the top curve would be far from the parabola at the midpoint!