

Scaling and local limits of Baxter permutations and bipolar orientations through coalescent-walk processes

Jacopo Borga^{*1} and Mickaël Maazoun^{†2}

¹Institut für Mathematik, Universität Zürich, Switzerland

²Université de Lyon, ENS de Lyon, Unité de mathématiques pures et appliquées UMR 5669 CNRS, France

Abstract

Baxter permutations, plane bipolar orientations, and a specific family of walks in the non-negative quadrant, called *tandem walks*, are well-known to be related to each other through several bijections. We introduce a further new family of discrete objects, called *coalescent-walk processes* and we relate it to the three families mentioned above.

We prove joint Benjamini–Schramm convergence (both in the annealed and quenched sense) for uniform objects in the four families. Furthermore, we explicitly construct a new random measure of the unit square, called the *Baxter permuton* and we show that it is the scaling limit (in the permuton sense) of uniform Baxter permutations. On top of that, we relate the limiting objects of the four families to each other, both in the local and scaling limit case.

The scaling limit result is based on the convergence of the trajectories of the coalescent-walk process to the *coalescing flow* – in the terminology of Le Jan and Raimond (2004) – of a perturbed version of the Tanaka stochastic differential equation. Our scaling result entails joint convergence of the tandem walks of a plane bipolar orientation and its dual, extending the main result of Gwynne, Holden, Sun (2016), and answering more precisely Conjecture 4.4 of Kenyon, Miller, Sheffield, Wilson (2019).




Figure 1: The diagrams of two uniform Baxter permutations of size 3253 and 4520. The underlying generating algorithm is discussed in Appendix C.

Key words and phrases. Local and scaling limits, permutations, planar maps, walks in cones.
 2010 *Mathematics subject classification.* 60C05, 60G50, 05A05, 05C10, 34K50.

^{*}jacopo.borga@math.uzh.ch

[†]mickael.maazoun@ens-lyon.fr

Contents

1	Introduction and main results	3
1.1	Baxter permutations and permuton convergence	3
1.2	Plane bipolar orientations, tandem walks, and bijections with Baxter permutations	4
1.3	Coalescent-walk processes	7
1.4	Local limit results	8
1.5	Scaling limit results	10
1.6	Scaling limits of bipolar orientations and relations with other works	11
1.7	Generality of our techniques and open problems	12
1.8	Outline of the paper	14
2	Bipolar orientations, walks in cones, Baxter permutations and coalescent-walk processes	14
2.1	Planar maps and rooted trees	15
2.2	The Kenyon-Miller-Sheffield-Wilson bijection	15
2.3	Baxter permutations and bipolar orientations	17
2.4	Discrete coalescent-walk processes	18
2.4.1	The coalescent-walk process corresponding to a two-dimensional walk	19
2.4.2	The permutation associated with a coalescent-walk process	20
2.4.3	The coalescent forest of a coalescent-walk process	21
2.5	From walks to Baxter permutations via coalescent-walk processes	22
2.6	Anti-involutions for discrete coalescent-walk processes and the trees of bipolar orientations	25
2.6.1	The reversed coalescent-walk process	26
2.6.2	Two anti-involution mappings	26
3	Local limit results	27
3.1	Mappings of the commutative diagram in the infinite-volume	28
3.2	Random infinite objects	29
3.3	Local topologies	31
3.4	Proofs of the local limit results	32
4	Scaling limits of coalescent-walk processes	35
4.1	The continuous coalescent-walk process	35
4.2	The unconditioned scaling limit result	37
4.3	The conditioned scaling limit result	38
5	Scaling limits of Baxter permutations and bipolar orientations	42
5.1	The permuton limit of Baxter permutations	42
5.2	Joint convergence of the four trees of bipolar orientations	45
A	Walks in the two-dimensional non-negative quadrant	51
A.1	Statements of the technical results	51
A.2	Proof of the technical results	52

B	Generalizations	54
B.1	A coalescent-walk process for separable permutations	54
B.2	Liouville quantum gravity and mating-of-trees	56
C	Simulations of large Baxter permutations	57

1 Introduction and main results

In the last 30 years, several bijections between Baxter permutations, plane bipolar orientations and certain walks in the plane have been discovered. These relations between discrete objects of different nature are a *beautiful piece of combinatorics*¹, that we aim at investigating from a more probabilistic point of view.

These bijective results come from the enumerative works of Gire [Gir93] and later Bousquet-Mélou [BM03], where they explored the connection between Baxter permutations and generating trees with two-dimensional labels. Bousquet-Mélou noticed that Baxter permutations were equinumerous to plane bipolar orientations. A remarkable bijection (denoted OP in the present paper) between plane bipolar orientations with n edges and Baxter permutations of size n was then given by Bonichon, Bousquet-Mélou and Fusy [BBMF11].

Later Felsner, Fusy, Noy and Orden [FFNO11] gave a unified presentation of some other (partially already-known) bijections between Baxter permutations, 2-orientations of planar quadrangulations, certain pairs of binary trees, and triples of non-intersecting lattice paths.

Kenyon, Miller, Sheffield and Wilson [KMSW19] introduced a bijection (denoted OW in the present paper) between plane bipolar orientations and a family of two-dimensional walks in the non-negative quadrant. The latter has been used in [BMFR19] to enumerate plane bipolar orientations together with the number of faces of degree r for every $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

In this paper we explore local and scaling limits of some of these objects and we study the relations between their limits. Indeed, since these objects are related by several bijections at the discrete level, we expect that most of the relations among them also hold in the “limiting discrete and continuous worlds”.

In the next three sections we introduce the precise definitions of the objects involved in our work and we describe some of the bijections mentioned above.

1.1 Baxter permutations and permuton convergence

Baxter permutations were introduced by Glen Baxter in 1964 [Bax64] to study fixed points of commuting functions. A permutation σ is Baxter if it is not possible to find $i < j < k$ such that $\sigma(j+1) < \sigma(i) < \sigma(k) < \sigma(j)$ or $\sigma(j) < \sigma(k) < \sigma(i) < \sigma(j+1)$. Baxter permutations are well-studied from a combinatorial point of view by the *permutation patterns* community (see for instance [Boy67, CGHK78, Mal79, BGRR18]). They are a particular example of family of permutations avoiding *vincular patterns* (see [BP12] for more details). We denote by \mathcal{P} the set of Baxter permutations².

The study of random permutations, especially uniform permutations in *permutation classes*, which are families of permutations avoiding classical patterns, is an emerging topic at the interface of combinatorics and discrete probability theory. There are two main approaches to

¹Quoting the abstract of [FFNO11].

²We also denote by \mathcal{P}_n the set of Baxter permutations of size n . This convention will be used for all combinatorial classes studied in the paper.

it: the first is the study of statistics on permutations, and the second, more recent, looks for limits of permutations themselves. For instance, one can study the shape of the rescaled diagram of a random permutation (i.e. the sets of points of the Cartesian plane at coordinates $(i, \sigma(i))$) using the formalism of *permutons*, developed by [HKM⁺13]. This approach is a rapidly developing field in discrete probability theory, see for instance [ML10, MP14, MP16, HRS17, BBF⁺19b, BBF⁺18, BBF⁺19a, BBFS20, BDS19, BS19, HRS19, KKRW20, Maa19].

A permuton μ is a Borel probability measure on the unit square $[0, 1]^2$ with uniform marginals, that is $\mu([0, 1] \times [a, b]) = \mu([a, b] \times [0, 1]) = b - a$, for all $0 \leq a \leq b \leq 1$. Any permutation σ of size $n \geq 1$ may be interpreted as the permuton μ_σ given by the sum of Lebesgue area measures

$$\mu_\sigma(A) = n \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Leb}([(i-1)/n, i/n] \times [(\sigma(i)-1)/n, \sigma(i)/n] \cap A),$$

for all Borel measurable set A of $[0, 1]^2$.

Let \mathcal{M} be the set of permutons equipped with the topology of weak convergence of measures: a sequence of (deterministic) permutons $(\mu_n)_n$ converges to μ if $\int_{[0,1]^2} f d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_{[0,1]^2} f d\mu$, for every (bounded and) continuous function $f : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. With this topology, \mathcal{M} is a compact metric space (we refer the reader to [BBF⁺19b, Section 2] for a complete introduction to permutons).

A sequence of random permutations σ_n converges in distribution in the permuton sense, if the associated sequence of permutons μ_{σ_n} converges. Permuton convergence is a statement about the first-order geometry of the diagram of σ_n . Nevertheless, permuton convergence is equivalent to joint convergence in distribution of all *pattern density* statistics (see [BBF⁺19b, Theorem 2.5]).

Permuton convergence was investigated for some remarkable subclasses of Baxter permutations. Separable permutations, i.e. permutations avoiding the two classical patterns 2413 and 3142, converge to the *Brownian permuton* [BBF⁺18]. This result provided the first example of a sequence of uniform permutations in a class converging to a non-deterministic permuton. Dokos and Pak [DP14] explored the expected limit shape of the so-called *doubly alternating Baxter permutations*. In their article they claimed that “*it would be interesting to compute the limit shape of random Baxter permutations*”. The present paper answers this open question (see Fig. 1 for some simulations of the diagram of uniform Baxter permutations of large size).

1.2 Plane bipolar orientations, tandem walks, and bijections with Baxter permutations

Plane bipolar orientations, or *bipolar orientations* for short, are planar maps (i.e. connected graphs properly embedded in the plane up to continuous deformation) equipped with an acyclic orientation of the edges with exactly one source (i.e. a vertex with only outgoing edges) and one sink (i.e. a vertex with only incoming edges), both on the outer face. We denote by \mathcal{O} the set of bipolar orientations. The size of a bipolar orientation m is its number of edges and it is denoted by $|m|$.

Every bipolar orientation can be plotted in the plane with every edge oriented from bottom to top (this is a consequence for instance of [BBMF11, Proposition 1]; see the left-hand side of Fig. 2 for an example). We think of the outer face as split in two: the *left outer face*, and

the *right outer face*. The orientation of the edges around each vertex/face is constrained: we sum up these local constraints, settling some vocabulary, on the right-hand-side of Fig. 2. We call indegree/outdegree of a vertex the number of incoming/outgoing edges around this vertex. We call left degree (resp. right degree) of an inner face the number of left (resp. right) edges around that face.




Figure 2: On the left-hand side, in black, a bipolar orientation m of size 10 drawn with every edge oriented from bottom to top. In red, its dual map m^* , drawn with every edge oriented from right to left. On the right-hand side, the behavior of the orientation around each vertex/face/edge. Note for instance that in the cyclic ordering around each vertex different from the source and the sink there are top/outgoing edges, a right face, bottom/incoming edges, and a left face.

The dual map m^* of a bipolar orientation m (the *primal*) is obtained by putting a vertex in each face of m , and an edge between two faces separated by an edge in m , oriented from the right face to the left face. The primal right outer face becomes the dual source, and the primal left outer face becomes the dual sink. Then m^* is also a bipolar orientation (see the left-hand side of Fig. 2). The map m^{**} is just m with the orientation reversed, and $m^{****} = m$.

We now define a notion at the heart of the two bijections OW and OP mentioned above. Let m be a bipolar orientation. Disconnecting every incoming edge but the rightmost one at every vertex turns the map m into a plane tree $T(m)$ rooted at the source, which we call the *down-right tree* of the map (see the left-hand side of Fig. 3 for an example). The tree $T(m)$ contains every edge of m , and the clockwise contour exploration of $T(m)$ identifies an ordering of the edges of m . We denote by $e_1, \dots, e_{|m|}$ the edges of m in this order (see again Fig. 3). The tree $T(m^{**})$ can be obtained similarly from m by disconnecting every outgoing edge but the leftmost, and is rooted at the sink. The following remarkable facts hold: *The contour exploration of $T(m^{**})$ visits edges of m in the order $e_{|m|}, \dots, e_1$. Moreover, one can draw $T(m)$ and $T(m^{**})$ in the plane, one next to the other, in such a way that the interface between the two trees traces a path, called interface path³, from the source to the sink visiting edges $e_1, \dots, e_{|m|}$ in this order (see the middle picture of Fig. 3 for an example).*

The following bijection between bipolar orientations and two-dimensional walks in the non-negative quadrant was discovered by Kenyon, Miller, Sheffield and Wilson [KMSW19].

³Note that the interface path coincides with the clockwise contour exploration of $T(m)$, an example is given in the first two pictures of Fig. 3.

Definition 1.1. Let $n \geq 1$, $m \in \mathcal{O}_n$. We define $\text{OW}(m) = (X_t, Y_t)_{1 \leq t \leq n} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^2)^n$ as follows: for $1 \leq t \leq n$, X_t is the height in the tree $T(m)$ of the bottom vertex of e_t (i.e. its distance to the source s in $T(m)$), and Y_t is the height in the tree $T(m^{**})$ of the top vertex of e_t (i.e. its distance to the sink s' in $T(m^{**})$).

An example is given in the right-hand side of Fig. 3.




Figure 3: On the left-side the tree $T(m)$ built by disconnecting the bipolar orientation m from Fig. 2 with the edges ordered according to the exploration process (in light green). In the middle, the two trees $T(m)$ and $T(m^{**})$ with the *interface path* tracking the interface between the two trees (in dark green). On the right-hand side, the tandem walk $\text{OW}(m)$ (defined in Definition 1.1).

Theorem 1.2 (Theorem 1 of [KMSW19]). *The mapping OW is a size-preserving bijection between \mathcal{O} and the set \mathcal{W} of walks in the non-negative quadrant $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^2$ starting on the y-axis, ending on the x-axis, and with increments in*

$$A = \{(+1, -1)\} \cup \{(-i, j), i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}. \quad (1)$$

We call \mathcal{W} the set of *tandem walks*, as done in [BMFR19]. For more explanations on the bijection OW and the set \mathcal{W} we refer to Section 2.2.

We now introduce a second bijection, fundamental for our results, between bipolar orientations and Baxter permutations, discovered by Bonichon, Bousquet-Mélou and Fusy [BBMF11].

Definition 1.3. Let $n \geq 1$, $m \in \mathcal{O}_n$. Recall that every edge of the map m corresponds to its dual edge in the dual map m^* . Let $\text{OP}(m)$ be the only permutation π such that for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, the i -th edge to be visited in the exploration of $T(m)$ corresponds to the $\pi(i)$ -th edge to be visited in the exploration of $T(m^*)$.

An example is given in Fig. 4.

Theorem 1.4 (Theorem 2 of [BBMF11]). *The mapping OP is a size-preserving bijection between the set \mathcal{O} of bipolar orientations and the set \mathcal{P} of Baxter permutations.*

The definition given in Definition 1.3 is a simple reformulation of the bijection presented in [BBMF11], for more details see Section 2.3.




Figure 4: A schema explaining the map OP . On the left-hand side, the bipolar orientation m and its dual m^* , from Fig. 2. We plot in black the labeling of the edges of m obtained in Fig. 3 and in red the labeling of the edges of m^* obtained by the same procedure. On the right-hand side, the permutation $\text{OP}(m)$ (together with its diagram) obtained by pairing the labels of the corresponding primal and dual edges between m and m^* .

1.3 Coalescent-walk processes

So far we have considered three families of objects: Baxter permutations (\mathcal{P}), tandem walks (\mathcal{W}), and bipolar orientations (\mathcal{O}). We saw that they are linked by the maps OW and OP .

To investigate local and scaling limits of Baxter permutations, it is natural to first prove local and scaling limits results for tandem walks (these results are standard, and some already available in the literature) and then try to transfer these convergences to permutations through the map $\text{OP} \circ \text{OW}^{-1}$. However, the definition of this composite map makes it not very tractable, and our first combinatorial result is a rewriting of it.

Consider a tandem walk $W = (X, Y) \in \mathcal{W}_n$ and the corresponding Baxter permutation $\sigma = \text{OP} \circ \text{OW}^{-1}(W)$. We introduce the *coalescent-walk process* driven by W . It is a family of discrete walks $Z = \{Z^{(i)}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$, where $Z^{(i)} = Z_t^{(i)}$ has time indexes $t \in \{i, \dots, n\}$ and it is informally defined as follows: $Z^{(i)}$ starts at 0 at time i , takes the same steps as Y when it is nonnegative, takes the same steps as $-X$ when it is negative unless such a step would force $Z^{(i)}$ to become nonnegative. If the latter case happens at time j , then $Z^{(i)}$ is forced to coalesce with $Z^{(j)}$ at time $j + 1$. For a precise definition we refer the reader to Section 2.4. An illustration is given on the left-hand side of Fig. 5. We denote $\text{WC}(W) = Z$, and \mathcal{C}_n the set of coalescent-walk processes obtained in this way from tandem walks in \mathcal{W}_n .

In a coalescent-walk process, trajectories do not cross, hence the name. As a result, one can order them from bottom to top, defining a permutation of the integers. We denote by \mathfrak{S}_n the set of permutations of size n . If $Z \in \mathcal{C}_n$, we denote $\text{CP}(Z)$ the only permutation $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ such that for $i, j \in [n]$, $\sigma(i) < \sigma(j)$ if and only if the trajectory $Z^{(i)}$ is weakly-under $Z^{(j)}$. The reader can check that in the case of Fig. 5 we have $\text{CP}(Z) = 86579124103$, which corresponds to $\text{OP} \circ \text{OW}^{-1}(W)$ (see Fig. 2) witnessing an instance of our main combinatorial result:




Figure 5: The coalescent-walk process $Z = \text{WC}(W)$ associated to the walk $W = (X, Y) = \text{OW}(m)$. The walk Y is plotted in red and $-X$ is plotted in blue. On the right-hand side, the map m together with the tree $T(m^*)$ drawn in red.

Theorem 1.5. *The following diagram commutes*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{W} & \xrightarrow{\text{WC}} & \mathcal{C} \\
 \text{OW} \uparrow & & \downarrow \text{CP} \\
 \mathcal{O} & \xrightarrow{\text{OP}} & \mathcal{P}
 \end{array} \quad (2)$$

Note that the mappings involved in the diagram are denoted using two letters that refer to the domain and co-domain. The proof of this result is given in Section 2.5. The key-step is the following fact, proved in Proposition 2.17. *Given a bipolar orientation m , then the “branching structure” of the trajectories of the coalescent-walk process $\text{WC} \circ \text{OW}(m)$ is equal to the tree $T(m^*)$.* The reader is invited to verify it in Fig. 5.

1.4 Local limit results

We can now consider local limits, more precisely Benjamini–Schramm limits, of the four families in Eq. (2). Informally, Benjamini–Schramm convergence for discrete objects looks at the convergence of the neighborhoods of any fixed size of a uniformly distinguished point, called the root of the object. In order to properly define the Benjamini–Schramm convergence for the four families, we need to present the spaces of infinite objects and the respective local topologies. This is done in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, but we give a quick summary here.

- \mathfrak{W}_\bullet is the space of two-dimensional walks indexed by a finite or infinite interval of \mathbb{Z} containing zero, with value $(0, 0)$ at time 0, local convergence being finite-dimensional convergence.
- $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\bullet$ is the space of coalescent-walk processes indexed by a finite or infinite interval of \mathbb{Z} containing zero, local convergence being finite-dimensional convergence.
- The space $\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\bullet$ of infinite permutations and the local topology were defined in [Bor20b]. In this context, an infinite permutation is a total ordering on a finite or infinite interval of \mathbb{Z} containing zero.
- The space $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_\bullet$ of infinite rooted maps is equipped with the local topology derived from the local convergence of graphs of Benjamini and Schramm. See for instance [Cur18] for an introduction.

In the first three items, the index 0 is to be understood as the root of the infinite objects, and comparison between a rooted finite object and an infinite one is done after applying the appropriate shift.

We define below the candidate local limiting objects. Let ν denote the probability distribution on \mathbb{Z}^2 given by:

$$\nu = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{(+1,-1)} + \sum_{i,j \geq 0} 2^{-i-j-3}\delta_{(-i,j)}, \quad \text{where } \delta \text{ denotes the Dirac measure,} \quad (3)$$

and let⁴ $\overline{\mathbf{W}} = (\overline{\mathbf{X}}, \overline{\mathbf{Y}}) = (\overline{\mathbf{W}}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a two-sided random two-dimensional walk with step distribution ν , having value $(0,0)$ at time 0. Remark that $\overline{\mathbf{W}}$ is not confined to the non-negative quadrant.

A formal definition of the other limiting objects requires an extension of the mappings in Eq. (2) to infinite-volume objects⁵ which is done in Section 2.4, Section 3.1 and Section 3.2. Nevertheless, let $\overline{\mathbf{Z}} = \text{WC}(\overline{\mathbf{W}})$ be the corresponding infinite coalescent-walk process, $\overline{\sigma} = \text{CP}(\overline{\mathbf{Z}})$ the corresponding infinite permutation on \mathbb{Z} , and $\overline{\mathbf{m}} = \text{OW}^{-1}(\overline{\mathbf{W}})$ the corresponding infinite map. For every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let \mathbf{W}_n , \mathbf{Z}_n , σ_n , and \mathbf{m}_n denote uniform objects of size n in \mathcal{W}_n , \mathcal{C}_n , \mathcal{P}_n , and \mathcal{O}_n respectively, related by the bijections of Eq. (2).

Theorem 1.6 (Quenched Benjamini–Schramm convergence). *Consider the sigma-algebra $\mathfrak{B}_n := \sigma(\mathbf{W}_n) = \sigma(\mathbf{Z}_n) = \sigma(\sigma_n) = \sigma(\mathbf{m}_n)$. Let \mathbf{i}_n be an independently chosen uniform index of $[n]$. We have the following convergence in probability in the space of probability measures over $\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_\bullet \times \widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_\bullet \times \widetilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\bullet \times \widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}_\bullet$,*

$$\mathcal{L}\left(\left((\mathbf{W}_n, \mathbf{i}_n), (\mathbf{Z}_n, \mathbf{i}_n), (\sigma_n, \mathbf{i}_n), (\mathbf{m}_n, \mathbf{i}_n)\right) \middle| \mathfrak{B}_n\right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{P} \mathcal{L}(\overline{\mathbf{W}}, \overline{\mathbf{Z}}, \overline{\sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{m}}). \quad (4)$$

We note that the mapping OW^{-1} naturally endows the map \mathbf{m}_n with an edge labeling and the root \mathbf{i}_n of \mathbf{m}_n is chosen according to this labeling. An immediate corollary, which follows by averaging, is the simpler *annealed* statement.

Corollary 1.7 (Annealed Benjamini–Schramm convergence). *We have the following convergence in distribution in the space $\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_\bullet \times \widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_\bullet \times \widetilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\bullet \times \widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}_\bullet$,*

$$((\mathbf{W}_n, \mathbf{i}_n), (\mathbf{Z}_n, \mathbf{i}_n), (\sigma_n, \mathbf{i}_n), (\mathbf{m}_n, \mathbf{i}_n)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} (\overline{\mathbf{W}}, \overline{\mathbf{Z}}, \overline{\sigma}, \overline{\mathbf{m}}). \quad (5)$$

Using the theory developed in [Bor20b], quenched convergence of permutations is equivalent to a statement on *consecutive patterns densities*. For $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ and $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, denote $\widetilde{c\text{-occ}}(\pi, \sigma)$ the proportion of the $n - k + 1$ sets of k consecutive indices of $[n]$ that induce the pattern π in σ . Denote $\widetilde{c\text{-occ}}(\pi, \overline{\sigma})$ the probability that the restriction of the total order $\overline{\sigma}$ to an interval of size $|\pi|$ induces the pattern π (the choice of the interval is not relevant since $\overline{\sigma}$ is *shift-invariant*, for more details see [Bor20b, Section 2.6]). By [Bor20b, Corollary 2.38], quenched convergence of Baxter permutations implies the following.

Corollary 1.8. *We have the following convergence in probability w.r.t. the product topology on $[0, 1]^{\mathfrak{S}}$.*

$$(\widetilde{c\text{-occ}}(\pi, \sigma_n))_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}} \xrightarrow{P} (\widetilde{c\text{-occ}}(\pi, \overline{\sigma}))_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}}. \quad (6)$$

⁴Here and throughout the paper we denote random quantities using **bold** characters.

⁵The terminology *finite/infinite-volume* refers to the fact that the objects are defined in a compact/non-compact set. For instance a Brownian motion with time space \mathbb{R} is a infinite-volume object and a Brownian excursion with time space $[0, 1]$ is a finite-volume object.

We collect a few comments on these results.

1. Eqs. (4) and (6) witness a concentration phenomenon. Indeed, in both instances, the left-hand side is random, and the right-hand side is deterministic.
2. The fact that the four convergences are joint follows from the fact that the extensions of the mappings in Eq. (2) to infinite-volume objects are a.e. continuous.
3. The annealed Benjamini-Schramm convergence for bipolar orientations to the so-called *Uniform Infinite Bipolar Map* was already proven in [GHS17, Prop. 3.10] (see Section 1.6 for the relationship between our work and existing works in the theory of planar maps).

1.5 Scaling limit results

We now turn to our main probabilistic result. For $n \geq 1$, let σ_n be a uniform Baxter permutation of size n and $\mathbf{m}_n = \text{OP}^{-1}(\sigma_n)$ the corresponding uniform bipolar orientation with n edges. Let $\mathbf{W}_n = \text{OW}(\mathbf{m}_n)$ and $\mathbf{W}_n^* = \text{OW}(\mathbf{m}_n^*)$ be the two tandem walks associated to \mathbf{m}_n and to its dual \mathbf{m}_n^* . Let \mathcal{W}_n and \mathcal{W}_n^* be the two continuous functions from $[0, 1]$ to $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$ that linearly interpolate between the points $\mathcal{W}_n^\theta(\frac{k}{n}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \mathbf{W}_n^\theta(k)$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$ and $\theta \in \{\emptyset, *\}$.

Let $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{X}(t), \mathcal{Y}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ be a *standard two-dimensional Brownian motion of correlation $-1/2$* , that is a continuous two-dimensional Gaussian process such that the components \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are standard one-dimensional Brownian motions, and $\text{Cov}(\mathcal{X}(t), \mathcal{Y}(s)) = -1/2 \cdot (t \wedge s)$. Let \mathcal{W}_e be a *two-dimensional Brownian excursion of correlation $-1/2$ in the non-negative quadrant*, that is the process $(\mathcal{W}(t))_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ conditioned on $\mathcal{W}(1) = (0, 0)$ and on staying in the non-negative quadrant $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$. A rigorous definition is given in Appendix A.

Consider the map $s : \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ defined by $s(f, g) = (g(1 - \cdot), f(1 - \cdot))$. Consider also the map $R : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ that rotates a permuton by an angle $-\pi/2$, that is $R(\mu)(A) = \mu\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot A\right)$ for every Borel set A .

Theorem 1.9. *There exist two measurable maps $r : \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2)$ and $\phi : \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that we have the convergence in distribution*

$$(\mathcal{W}_n, \mathcal{W}_n^*, \mu_{\sigma_n}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{W}_e, \mathcal{W}_e^*, \mu_B), \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{W}_e^* = r(\mathcal{W}_e)$, and $\mu_B = \phi(\mathcal{W}_e)$. In particular, we have $r(\mathcal{W}_e) \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{W}_e$. Moreover, we have the following equalities that hold at $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{W}_e}$ -almost every point of $\mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2)$,

$$r^2 = s, \quad r^4 = \text{Id}, \quad \phi \circ r = R \circ \phi.$$

We give a few remarks on this result:

1. The convergence of the first or second marginal was obtained in [KMSW19] as an immediate application of the results of [DW20] on walks in cones.
2. Our strategy of proof consists in describing the relation between \mathcal{W}_n , \mathcal{W}_n^* and σ_n in a way that lends itself to take limits. This is explained in the next section of this introduction, providing the reader with some insights in how the coupling of the right-hand-side of Eq. (7) is constructed. Precise statements, including explicit constructions of the maps r and ϕ , are given in Section 5 (see in particular Theorems 5.6 and 5.7).

3. The limiting permuton μ_B , called the *Baxter permuton*, is a new fractal random measure on the unit square (see Definition 5.4 for a precise definition).
4. Recall that each coordinate of \mathbf{W}_n or \mathbf{W}_n^* records the height function of a tree which can be drawn on \mathbf{m}_n or its dual. So this statement can be interpreted as joint convergence of four trees to a coupling of four Brownian CRTs. We discuss the relation with Conjecture 4.4 of [KMSW19], the main result of [GHS16], and other related works, in Section 1.6.

The proof of Theorem 1.9 is based on a result on scaling limits of the coalescent-walk processes $\mathbf{Z}_n = \text{WC}(\mathbf{W}_n)$, which appears to be of independent interest. We give here some brief explanations and we refer the reader to Section 4 for more precise results.

The definition of the coalescent-walk processes $Z = \text{WC}(W)$ associated to a two-dimensional walk W is a sort of “discretized” version of the following family of stochastic differential equation driven by *the same* two-dimensional process $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ and defined for $u \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{cases} d\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}(t) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}(t) > 0\}} d\mathbf{Y}(t) - \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}(t) \leq 0\}} d\mathbf{X}(t), & t \geq u, \\ \mathbf{Z}^{(u)}(t) = 0, & t \leq u. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

This equation, that goes under the name of *perturbed Tanaka’s SDE*, has already been studied in the literature [Pro13, cHK18] in the case where \mathbf{W} is a two-dimensional Brownian motion of correlation ρ with $\rho \in (-1, 1)$, and more generally when the correlation coefficient varies with time. In particular, pathwise uniqueness and strong existence of a solution are known. Since the scaling limit of \mathbf{W}_n (that is conditioned to start on the x -axis and end on the y -axis) is a correlated two-dimensional Brownian excursion \mathbf{W}_e , one can expect that the scaling limit for the coalescent-walk process $\mathbf{Z}_n = \text{WC}(\mathbf{W}_n)$ is a sort of flow of solutions $\{\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}(t)\}_{u \in [0,1]}$ of the SDEs in Eq. (8) driven by \mathbf{W}_e (instead of \mathbf{W}). This intuition is made precise in Theorem 4.10 and it is the key-step for proving Theorem 1.9.

The study of flows of solutions driven by the same *noise* is the subject of the theory of coalescing flows of Le Jan and Raimond, specifically that of *flows of mappings*. See [LJR04] and the references therein. We point out that since in our proof of Theorem 1.9 we consider solutions of Eq. (8) for only a countable number of distinct u at a time for a specific equation which admits strong solutions, we do not need to make use of this theory. In particular, Theorem 4.10 gives convergence of a countable number of trajectories in the product topology. Stronger convergence results, such as the ones obtained for the *Brownian web* (see [SSS17] for a comprehensive survey) would be desirable.

We now turn on discussing the implications of Theorem 1.9 on the scaling limit of bipolar orientations and their trees.

1.6 Scaling limits of bipolar orientations and relations with other works

Scaling limits of random planar maps have been thoroughly studied with motivations from string theory and conformal field theory. Convergence results for many models of random planar maps were obtained, both as random metric spaces (with the celebrated theorems of Le Gall and Miermont [LG13, Mie13] showing convergence to the *Brownian map*) and, very recently, as random Riemann surfaces (to $\sqrt{8/3}$ -Liouville quantum gravity [HS19]).

The number of bipolar orientations of a given planar map is computed by coefficient extraction in the Tutte polynomial. This makes bipolar orientations one of the various combinatorially tractable models of *planar maps with additional structure*, like spanning-tree

decorated maps, loop-decorated maps, and so on. Uniform objects in such combinatorial classes are not uniform planar maps anymore. Their scaling limit is expected to differ, and be connected to γ -Liouville quantum gravity (γ -LQG for short) for some $\gamma \neq \sqrt{8/3}$. While convergence results as random surfaces remain open, weaker topologies such as *Peanosphere convergence* have been investigated with success. We refer to [GHS19] for a comprehensive survey.

The specific case of bipolar orientations was first studied by Kenyon, Miller, Sheffield and Wilson [KMSW19], using their bijection OW interpreted as a *mating-of-trees* encoding of bipolar orientations. Using the remarkable works of Denisov and Wachtel [DW15] and Duraj and Wachtel [DW20] on scaling limits of random walks conditioned to stay in a cone, they showed that the random tandem walk associated to a random bipolar orientation converges to a two-dimensional Brownian excursion of correlation $-1/2$ in the non-negative quadrant (this corresponds to the convergence of the first marginal in Eq. (7)). This is called *Peanosphere convergence* of the maps decorated by their interface path to a $\sqrt{4/3}$ -LQG sphere together with a SLE_{12} curve.

A stronger result was given by Gwynne, Holden and Sun [GHS16], in the specific case of the *uniform infinite-volume bipolar triangulation (UIBT)*. They show a joint scaling limit result for the coding two-dimensional walks of this map and of its dual (this is an analogue of the convergence of the first two marginals in Eq. (7), despite the walks considered in [GHS16] are simpler since they restrict their analysis to triangulations). The limit is an intricate coupling of two plane Brownian motions defined by LQG theory.

Our Theorem 1.9 gives a parallel result in the case of the uniform finite-volume bipolar map. This gives a more accurate answer (than the one in [GHS16]) to Conjecture 4.4 of [KMSW19]. Note that, compared to [GHS16], our result deals with *finite-volume bipolar orientations* instead of *infinite-volume bipolar triangulations*. We conclude this section discussing the relations between our work and the one of Gwynne, Holden and Sun [GHS16].

Our notion of coalescent-walk processes is an extension in a more general setting of the random walk \mathcal{X} defined in [GHS16, Section 2.1]. The fact that it encodes the spanning tree of the dual map (Proposition 2.17), is a version of [GHS16, Lemma 2.1], albeit we present it differently. Our main technical ingredient is the convergence of the coalescent-walk process driven by a random planar walk (Theorem 4.5). It corresponds to [GHS16, Theorem 4.1]. The way the limiting object (the right-hand side of Eq. (22)) is defined is however completely different, and the proofs differ as a consequence. In our case, it comes from the perturbed Tanaka's SDE given in Eq. (8). In their case, it is built using imaginary geometry, and characterized by its excursion decomposition. These are nonetheless two descriptions of the same object, providing an SDE formulation of an intricate imaginary geometry coupling. We discuss this further in Appendix B.2 and wish to explore consequences in further works.

We also mention the work of Li, Sun, and Watson [LSW17]: working in the setting of Schnyder woods, which can be understood as a biased model of bipolar orientations, they show a similar result to Theorem 1.9. In particular, they also treat finite-volume objects coded by excursions. Their technique is similar to that of [GHS16].

1.7 Generality of our techniques and open problems

We discuss here some problems that we would like to address in future projects and some possible further applications of the techniques that we developed in the current paper.

- The Baxter permuton μ_B is a new fractal random measure of the unit square. We think

it might be worth it to investigate its properties. The first two natural questions that we would like to answer are the following:

- What is the density of the intensity measure $\mathbb{E}[\mu_B]$?
- What is the Hausdorff dimension of the support of μ_B ?

We point out that similar questions were solved for the separable Brownian permuton (i.e. the permuton limit for separable permutations) in a recent work of the second author [Maa19].

- As already mentioned, it would be desirable to improve the convergence to continuous coalescent-walk processes in a stronger topology. As in the case of the Brownian web, this would allow to study coalescent point, non-uniqueness points, and the interaction between the coalescent process and its backwards version, features that are not captured in our results.

- We believe that our techniques are robust and they can be applied to others families of permutations. We first remark that the case of separable permutations (see Appendix B.1) can be treated with coalescent-walk processes too.

Moreover, we would like to explore several new families of permutations where a bijection with two-dimensional walks is available. A technique is presented in a recent work of the first author [Bor20a] to sample uniform permutations in families enumerated through generating trees as conditioned random colored walks. In [Bor20a], the analysis for determining a central limit theorem for proportions of consecutive patterns is restricted to one-dimensional walks, i.e. to families having a generating tree with one-dimensional labels. Nevertheless, the sampling procedure applies also to generating trees with multi-dimensional labels, providing the desired bijection. Examples of families of permutations with two-dimensional labels can be found for instance in [BM03, Eli07, BGRR18, BBGR19].

- Another interesting aspect that we think deserves more attention is the following. We saw that Baxter permutations and bipolar orientations “correspond to” a two-dimensional Brownian excursion of correlation $-1/2$. In Appendix B.1, we will see that separable permutations and rooted series-parallel non-separable maps⁶ (i.e. rooted non-separable maps that do not contain the complete graph K_4 as a minor) “correspond to” a two-dimensional Brownian excursion of correlation 1, that is “equivalent” to a standard one-dimensional Brownian excursion. A natural question is:

- Are there other families of permutations that “correspond to” a two-dimensional Brownian excursion of correlation ρ for some different values of ρ ?

As discussed in Appendix B.2, the study of a similar problem in Schnyder woods by [LSW17] involves two-dimensional Brownian excursions of correlation $-\sqrt{2}/2$. However, the corresponding model of permutations is not natural (it is a weighted model of Baxter permutations). We expect this to hold in the generalizations of Schnyder woods described in [BF12].

In [BBMF11, Proposition 5] it was shown that Baxter permutations avoiding the pattern 2413 are in bijection, through OP, with rooted non-separable planar maps. We believe that these families are good candidates for a first answer to the question above.

⁶It was shown in [BBMF11, Proposition 6] that separable permutations and rooted series-parallel non-separable maps are in bijection.

1.8 Outline of the paper

Section 2. After setting some definitions and recalling some properties of the bijection OW, we properly define coalescent-walk processes and prove Theorem 1.5. This section contains all discrete arguments used in the rest of the paper.

Section 3. This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.6. We first define the local topologies and the infinite-volume objects. Then the argument follows readily from local convergence of uniform tandem walks \mathbf{W}_n to the random walk $\overline{\mathbf{W}}$, and local continuity of the maps $\text{OW}^{-1}, \text{WC}, \text{CP}$. In particular, the local limit of Baxter permutations is defined from the infinite-volume coalescent-walk process $\overline{\mathbf{Z}} = \text{WC}(\overline{\mathbf{W}})$, which enjoys the nice property that its trajectories are random walks (Proposition 3.3). This turns out to be useful also in the following sections.

Section 4. To proceed with the proof of Theorem 1.9, we need to show that the trajectories of the coalescent-walk process $\mathbf{Z}_n = \text{WC}(\mathbf{W}_n)$ converge in distribution, jointly with \mathbf{W}_n . We prove this for coalescent-walk processes driven by unconditioned random walks (Theorem 4.5). The proof relies on the pathwise uniqueness property of the SDE (8). We then transfer this result to walks in the non-negative quadrant, culminating in Theorem 4.10, which is the basis for the next section.

Section 5. We finally state and prove Theorems 5.6 and 5.7, which are more precise versions of Theorem 1.9.

Appendix A. This section contains absolute continuity results and local limits theorem used in the study of conditioned walks in the non-negative quadrant, extracted from [DW15, DW20, BMFR19] or stated in a different form when needed.

Appendix B. This section contains comments on possible generalizations.

Appendix C. In this final section we explain how the simulations for Baxter permutations presented in the first page of this paper are obtained.

Acknowledgments Thanks to Mathilde Bouvel, Valentin Féray and Grégory Miermont for their dedicated supervision and enlightening discussions. Thanks to Nicolas Bonichon, Emmanuel Jacob, Jason Miller, Kilian Raschel, Olivier Raimond and Vitali Wachtel for enriching discussions and pointers.

2 Bipolar orientations, walks in cones, Baxter permutations and coalescent-walk processes

This section contains the combinatorial material relevant to our arguments. We first settle in Section 2.1 some definitions and terminology related to planar maps and rooted trees. Then in Section 2.2 we describe the reverse OW bijection and in Section 2.3 we show that the definition of OP given in Definition 1.3 is equivalent to the one presented in [BBMF11]. Finally, Section 2.4 is the combinatorial heart of the paper: we properly introduce coalescent-walk processes and the maps CP and WC, proving Theorem 1.5.

2.1 Planar maps and rooted trees

A *planar map* is a finite connected graph embedded in the plane with no edge-crossings, considered up to orientation-preserving homeomorphisms of the plane. A map has vertices, edges, and faces, the latter being the connected components of the plane remaining after deleting the edges. The outer face is unbounded, the inner faces are bounded⁷.

Alternatively, a planar map is a finite collection of finite polygons (the inner faces), glued along some pairs of edges, so that the resulting surface has the topology of the disc, i.e. is simply connected and has one boundary. We call finite map an arbitrary gluing of a finite collection of finite polygons. A submap m' of a planar map m is a subset of the inner faces of m , where gluing of faces in m' inherits from the gluing in m . The submap m' is in general a finite map, and it is a planar map if and only if it is simply connected.

For our purposes, we view rooted plane trees with the root at the bottom. A rooted plane tree may be seen as a set of edges equipped with a parent-child relationship, where each edge has at most one parent. The children of each edge are ordered as well as the parentless edges, that are the edges on top of the root. Other edges sit on top of their respective parent in the prescribed ordering.

The *down-right tree* $T(m)$ of a bipolar orientation m was defined informally in the introduction. In this context, we have the following more rigorous definition:

- The edges of $T(m)$ are the edges of m .
- Let $e \in m$ and v its bottom vertex. The parent of e in $T(m)$ is the right-most incoming edge of v , if it exists.
- The ordering of edges on top of e in $T(m)$ inherits from their ordering on top of their common bottom vertex in m .

We conclude this section recalling that the *exploration* of a tree T is the visit of its vertices (or its edges) starting from the root and following the contour of the tree in the clockwise order. Moreover, the *height process* of a tree T is the sequence of integers obtained by recording for each visited vertex (following the exploration of T) its distance to the root.

2.2 The Kenyon-Miller-Sheffield-Wilson bijection

We recall the definition of the mapping $\text{OW} : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ given in the introduction since it is fundamental for what follows.

Definition 2.1. Let $n \geq 1$, $m \in \mathcal{O}_n$. We define $\text{OW}(m) = (X_t, Y_t)_{1 \leq t \leq n} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^2)^n$ as follows: for $1 \leq t \leq n$, X_t is the height in the tree $T(m)$ of the bottom vertex of e_t (i.e. its distance to the source s in $T(m)$), and Y_t is the height in the tree $T(m^{**})$ of the top vertex of e_t (i.e. its distance to the sink s' in $T(m^{**})$).

Recall that \mathcal{W} is the set of tandem walks, i.e. two-dimensional walks in the non-negative quadrant, starting at $(0, h)$ and ending at $(k, 0)$ for some $h \geq 0, k \geq 0$, with increments in $A = \{(+1, -1)\} \cup \{(-i, j), i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$. An equivalent way of understanding OW is as follows.

Remark 2.2. Let $m \in \mathcal{O}$ and $\text{OW}(m) = ((X_t, Y_t))_{1 \leq t \leq n}$. The walk $(0, X_1 + 1, \dots, X_{|m|} + 1)$ is the height process of the tree $T(m)$. The walk $(0, Y_{|m|} + 1, Y_{|m|-1} + 1, \dots, Y_1 + 1)$ is the height process of the tree $T(m^{**})$.

⁷The outer face plays a special role in the maps we consider. In the usual terminology of the literature, they are *planar maps with one boundary*.

We now explain some properties of the map OW . Let $m \in \mathcal{O}$ and $\text{OW}(m) = ((X_t, Y_t))_{1 \leq t \leq n}$. Suppose that the left outer face of m has $h + 1$ edges and the right outer face of m has $k + 1$ edges, for some $h, k \geq 0$. Then the walk $(X_t, Y_t)_{t \in [|m|]}$ starts at $(0, h)$, ends at $(k, 0)$, and stays by definition in the non-negative quadrant $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^2$.

We give an interpretation to the increments of the walk, i.e. the values of $(X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}) - (X_t, Y_t)$. We say that two edges of a tree are consecutive if one is the parent of the other. The interface path of the map m , defined in Section 1.2, has two different behaviors:

- either it is following two edges e_t and e_{t+1} that are consecutive, both in $T(m)$ and $T(m^{**})$, in which case the increment is $(+1, -1)$;
- or it is first following e_t , then it is traversing a face of m , and finally is following e_{t+1} , in which case the increment is $(-i, +j)$ with $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and the traversed face has left degree $i + 1$ and right degree $j + 1$.

Example 2.3. Consider the map m in Fig. 3. The corresponding walk $\text{OW}(m)$ plotted on the right-hand side of Fig. 3 is:

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 &= (0, 2), W_2 = (0, 3), W_3 = (0, 3), W_4 = (1, 2), W_5 = (2, 1), \\ W_6 &= (0, 3), W_7 = (1, 2), W_8 = (2, 1), W_9 = (3, 0), W_{10} = (2, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Note, for instance, that $W_6 - W_5 = (-2, 2)$, indeed between edge 5 and edge 6 the interface path is traversing a face with 3 edges on the left boundary and 3 edges on the right boundary. On the other hand $W_9 - W_8 = W_8 - W_7 = W_7 - W_6 = (+1, -1)$. Indeed, in these cases, the interface path is following consecutive edges.

We finish this section by describing the inverse bijection OW^{-1} . We actually construct a map Θ on a larger space of walks, whose restriction to \mathcal{W} is the inverse of OW .

Let I be an interval (finite or infinite) of \mathbb{Z} . Let $\mathfrak{W}(I)$ be the set of two-dimensional walks with time space I (considered up to an additive constant). More precisely $\mathfrak{W}(I)$ is the quotient $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^I / \sim$ where $w \sim w'$ if and only if there exists $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $w(i) = w'(i) + x$ for all $i \in I$. We usually take an explicit representant of elements of $\mathfrak{W}(I)$, chosen according to context. For instance, if $0 \in I$, we often take the representant that verifies $w(0) = (0, 0)$, called "pinned at zero". Let $\mathfrak{W}_A(I) \subset \mathfrak{W}(I)$ be the restriction to two-dimensional walks with increments in A . For every $n \geq 1$, \mathcal{W}_n is naturally embedded in $\mathfrak{W}_A([n])$, with an explicit representant.

Let $I = [j, k]$ be a finite integer interval. We shall define Θ on every walk in $\mathfrak{W}_A(I)$ by induction over the size of I , and denote by $\mathfrak{m}(I)$ the image of $\mathfrak{W}_A(I)$ by Θ . An element $m \in \mathfrak{m}(I)$ is a bipolar orientation, together with a subinterval of the interface path, started on the left boundary, and ended on the right boundary, labeled in sequence by j, \dots, k . The edges labeled j, \dots, k are called *explored edges*, and the edge labeled k is called *active*. The other edges, called *unexplored*, are either below j on the left boundary, or above k on the right boundary. Bipolar orientations of size $n \geq 1$ are the elements of $\mathfrak{m}([n])$ with no unexplored edges. The elements of $\mathfrak{m}(I)$ are called *marked bipolar orientations* by [BMFR19].

The only element W of $\mathfrak{W}_A(\{j\})$ is mapped to a single edge with label j . If $W \in \mathfrak{W}_A([j, k])$ with $k > j$, then denote by $m' = \Theta(W|_{[j, k-1]})$ and

1. if $W_k - W_{k-1} = (1, -1)$, then $\Theta(W)$ is obtained from m' , by giving label $k + 1$ to the edge immediately above the edge of label k . If no such edge exists, a new edge is added on top of the sink with label $k + 1$.
2. If $W_k - W_{k-1} = (-i, j)$, then $\Theta(W)$ is obtained from m' by adding a face of left-degree $i + 1$ and right-degree $j + 1$. Its left boundary is glued to the right boundary of m' ,

starting with identifying the top-left edge of the new face with e_k , and continuing with edges below. The bottom-right edge of the new face is given label $k + 1$, hence is now active. All other edges that were not present in m' are unexplored.

An example of this construction (inductively building $\Theta(W)$ with $W \in \mathcal{W}$) is given in Fig. 6. For an example of application of the map Θ to a walk that is not a tandem walk see Fig. 7.




Figure 6: The sequence of bipolar orientations $m_k = \Theta(W|_{[1,k]})$ determined by the walk W considered in Example 2.3. Note that m_{10} is exactly the map m in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. For each map m_k , we indicate on top of it (in green) the value W_k . Between two maps m_k and m_{k+1} , we report (in purple) the corresponding increment $W_{k+1} - W_k$. For every map m_k , we draw the explored edges with full lines, the unexplored edges with dotted lines, and we additionally highlight the active edge e_k in bold.

Proposition 2.4 (Theorem 1 of [KMSW19]). *For every finite interval I , the map $\Theta : \mathfrak{W}_A(I) \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}(I)$ is a bijection. Moreover, for every $n \geq 1$, $\Theta(W_n) = \mathcal{O}_n$ and $\text{OW}^{-1} : \mathcal{W}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_n$ coincides with Θ . Finally, if $W \in \mathfrak{W}_A(I)$ and $[j, k] \subset I$, then the map $\Theta(W|_{[j,k]})$ is the submap obtained from $\Theta(W)$ by keeping*

1. edges with label j, \dots, k (explored edges);
2. faces that have explored edges on both their left and right boundary (explored faces);
3. other edges incident to explored faces (unexplored edges).

2.3 Baxter permutations and bipolar orientations

We first explain here why our map OP given in Definition 1.3 is the same as the bijection Ψ of Bonichon, Bousquet-Mélou and Fusy [BBMF11, Section 3.2].

The definition of Ψ can be rephrased in our setting as follows. Let $m \in \mathcal{O}_n$ be a bipolar orientation. We denote by m^{-1} the symmetric image of m along the vertical axis. Consider




Figure 7: The sequence of bipolar orientations $m_k = \Theta(W|_{[j, j+k-1]})$ determined by the walk $W_j = (0, 0)$, $W_{j+1} = (-2, 0)$, $W_{j+2} = (-1, -1)$, $W_{j+3} = (-4, 1)$, that is an element of the set $\mathfrak{W}_A([j, j+3])$. This walk is not a tandem walk. We used the same notation used in Fig. 6.

the tree $T(m^{-1})$, and set $\Psi(m)$ to be the only permutation $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ such that for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, the i -th edge to be visited in the exploration of $T(m)$ corresponds to the $\pi(i)$ -th edge to be visited in the exploration of $T(m^{-1})$. It was observed in [BBMF11, Remark 11] that the exploration of $T(m^{-1})$ visits edges of m in the same⁸ order as the exploration of $T(m^*)$, justifying that $\text{OP}(m) = \Psi(m)$.

We have the following additional properties of the map OP .

Theorem 2.5 ([BBMF11], Theorems 2 and 3, and Propositions 1 and 4). *One can draw m on the diagram of $\text{OP}(m)$ in such a way that every edge of m passes through the corresponding point of $\text{OP}(m)$. Moreover, we have the following symmetry properties:*

1. denoting by σ^* the permutation obtained by rotating the diagram of $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ clockwise by angle $\pi/2$, we have $\text{OP}(m^*) = \text{OP}(m)^*$;
2. we have $\text{OP}(m^{-1}) = \text{OP}(m)^{-1}$.

2.4 Discrete coalescent-walk processes

This subsection is devoted to defining coalescent-walk processes and our specific model of coalescent-walk processes obtained from tandem walks by the map WC . We then define the permutation and forest naturally associated to a coalescent-walk process.

Definition 2.6. Let I be a (finite or infinite) interval of \mathbb{Z} . We call *coalescent-walk process* over I a family $\{(Z_s^{(t)})_{s \geq t, s \in I}\}_{t \in I}$ of one-dimensional walks such that:

- for every $t \in I$, $Z_t^{(t)} = 0$;
- for $t' \geq t \in I$, if $Z_k^{(t)} \geq Z_k^{(t')}$ (resp. $Z_k^{(t)} \leq Z_k^{(t')}$) then $Z_{k'}^{(t)} \geq Z_{k'}^{(t')}$ (resp. $Z_{k'}^{(t)} \leq Z_{k'}^{(t')}$) for every $k' \geq k$.

⁸Actually a stronger result holds: $T(m^{-1})$ and $T(m^{**})$ are related by a classic bijection of the set of finite trees, which is the counterpart of the *Kreweras complement* for noncrossing partitions: the Lukasiewicz walk of $T(m^{**})$ is the reversal of the height function of $T(m^{-1})$. In particular they have the same scaling limit. This is similar to [GHS16, Lemma 2.4].

Note that, as a consequence, if there is a time k such that $Z_k^{(t)} = Z_k^{(t')}$, then $Z_{k'}^{(t)} = Z_{k'}^{(t')}$ for every $k' \geq k$. In this case, we say that $Z^{(t)}$ and $Z^{(t')}$ are *coalescing* and we call *coalescent point* of $Z^{(t)}$ and $Z^{(t')}$ the point $(\ell, Z_\ell^{(t)})$ such that $\ell = \min\{k \geq \max\{t, t'\} \mid Z_k^{(t)} = Z_k^{(t')}\}$.

We denote by $\mathfrak{C}(I)$ the set of coalescent-walk processes over some interval I .

2.4.1 The coalescent-walk process corresponding to a two-dimensional walk

We now introduce formally the coalescent-walk processes driven by some specific two-dimensional walks that include tandem walks. Let I be a (finite or infinite) interval of \mathbb{Z} . Recall that $\mathfrak{W}_A(I)$ denotes the set of walks (considered up to an additive constant) indexed by I , and that take their increments in A , defined in Eq. (1) page 6.

Definition 2.7. Let $W \in \mathfrak{W}_A(I)$ and denote by $W_t = (X_t, Y_t)$ for $t \in I$. The *coalescent-walk process associated to W* is the family of walks $\text{WC}(W) = \{Z^{(t)}\}_{t \in I}$, defined for $t \in I$ by $Z_t^{(t)} = 0$, and for all $\ell \geq t$ such that $\ell + 1 \in I$,

- if $W_{\ell+1} - W_\ell = (1, -1)$ then $Z_{\ell+1}^{(t)} - Z_\ell^{(t)} = -1$;
- if $W_{\ell+1} - W_\ell = (-i, j)$, for some $i, j \geq 0$, then

$$Z_{\ell+1}^{(t)} - Z_\ell^{(t)} = \begin{cases} j, & \text{if } Z_\ell^{(t)} \geq 0, \\ i, & \text{if } Z_\ell^{(t)} < 0 \text{ and } Z_\ell^{(t)} < -i, \\ j - Z_\ell^{(t)}, & \text{if } Z_\ell^{(t)} < 0 \text{ and } Z_\ell^{(t)} \geq -i. \end{cases}$$

Note that this definition is invariant by addition of a constant to W . We check easily that $\text{WC}(W)$ is a coalescent process meaning that WC is a mapping $\mathfrak{W}_A(I) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(I)$. We also set $\mathcal{C}_n = \text{WC}(\mathcal{W}_n)$ and $\mathcal{C} = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \mathcal{C}_n$. For two examples, we refer the reader to the left-hand side of Fig. 5 and to Fig. 8. We finally suggest to the reader to compare the formal Definition 2.7 with the more intuitive definition given in Section 1.3.




Figure 8: Construction of the coalescent-walk process associated to the orange walk $W = (W_t)_{1 \leq t \leq 10}$ on the left-hand side. In the middle diagram the two walks Y (in red) and $-X$ (in blue) are plotted. Finally, on the right-hand side the two walks are shifted (one towards the top and one to the bottom) and the ten walks of the coalescent-walk process are plotted in green.

Observation 2.8. The y -coordinates of the coalescent points of a coalescent-walk process obtained in this fashion are non-negative.

2.4.2 The permutation associated with a coalescent-walk process

Given a coalescent-walk process on $Z = \{Z^{(t)}\}_{t \in I} \in \mathfrak{C}(I)$ defined on a (finite or infinite) interval I , we can define a binary relation \leq_Z on I as follows:

$$\begin{cases} i \leq_Z i, \\ i \leq_Z j, & \text{if } i < j \text{ and } Z_j^{(i)} < 0, \\ j \leq_Z i, & \text{if } i < j \text{ and } Z_j^{(i)} \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Proposition 2.9. \leq_Z is a total order on I .

Proof. Since every pair in I is comparable by definition, we just have to check that \leq_Z is an order. By construction it is antisymmetric and reflexive. For transitivity, take $i < j < k$. If $Z_k^{(i)}$ and $Z_k^{(j)}$ are both negative, then $i \leq_Z k$ and $j \leq_Z k$ and whatever the relative ordering between i and j , transitivity holds on $\{i, j, k\}$. If they are both non-negative, the same reasoning holds. If one of them is non-negative, and one of them is negative, say $Z_k^{(i)} < 0 \leq Z_k^{(j)}$ (the other case is similar), then $i \leq_Z k$ and $k \leq_Z j$. Now by definition of coalescent-walk process, it must be that $Z_j^{(i)} < Z_j^{(j)} = 0$, so that $i \leq_Z j$ and transitivity holds on $\{i, j, k\}$. \square

This definition allows to associate a permutation to a coalescent-walk process on the interval $[n]$.

Definition 2.10. Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Let $Z = \{Z^{(t)}\}_{t \in [n]} \in \mathfrak{C}([n])$ be a coalescent-walk process over $[n]$. Denote $\text{CP}(Z)$ the unique permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ such that for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$,

$$\sigma(i) \leq \sigma(j) \iff i \leq_Z j.$$

We will furnish an example that clarifies the definition above in Example 2.16 below.

We have that pattern extraction in the permutation $\text{CP}(Z)$ depends only on a finite number of trajectories (see Proposition 2.11 below), a key step towards proving permuton convergence for uniform Baxter permutations.

If x_1, \dots, x_n is a sequence of distinct numbers, let $\text{std}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be the unique permutation π in \mathfrak{S}_n that is in the same relative order as x_1, \dots, x_n , i.e., $\pi(i) < \pi(j)$ if and only if $x_i < x_j$. Given a permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and a subset of indices $I \subseteq [n]$, let $\text{pat}_I(\sigma)$ be the permutation induced by $(\sigma(i))_{i \in I}$, namely, $\text{pat}_I(\sigma) := \text{std}((\sigma(i))_{i \in I})$. For example, if $\sigma = 87532461$ and $I = \{2, 4, 7\}$ then $\text{pat}_{\{2, 4, 7\}}(87532461) = \text{std}(736) = 312$.

Proposition 2.11. Let σ be a permutation obtained from a coalescent-walk process $Z = \{Z^{(t)}\}_{1 \leq t \leq N}$ via the map CP . Let $I = \{i_1 < \dots < i_k\} \subseteq [n]$. Then $\text{pat}_I(\sigma) = \pi$ if and only if the following condition holds: for all $1 \leq \ell < s \leq k$,

$$Z_{i_s}^{(i_\ell)} \geq 0 \iff \pi(s) < \pi(\ell).$$

This proposition is immediate once one notes that

$$Z_{i_s}^{(i_\ell)} \geq 0 \iff i_s \leq_Z i_\ell \iff \sigma(i_s) \leq \sigma(i_\ell) \iff \pi(s) < \pi(\ell).$$

2.4.3 The coalescent forest of a coalescent-walk process

Note that given a coalescent-walk process on $[n]$, the plane drawing of the family of the trajectories $\{Z^{(t)}\}_{t \in I}$ identifies a natural tree structure, more precisely, a \mathbb{Z} -planted plane forest, as per the following definition.

Definition 2.12. A \mathbb{Z} -planted plane tree is a rooted plane tree such that the root has an additional parent-less edge that is equipped with a number in \mathbb{Z} called its (root-)index.

A \mathbb{Z} -planted plane forest is an ordered sequence of \mathbb{Z} -planted plane trees (T_1, \dots, T_ℓ) such that the (root-)indexes are weakly increasing along the sequence of trees. A \mathbb{Z} -planted plane forest admits an exploration process, which is the concatenation of the exploration processes of all the trees, following the order of the sequence.

An example of a \mathbb{Z} -planted plane forest is given on the right-hand side of Fig. 9 (each tree is drawn with the root on the right; trees are ordered from bottom to top; the root-indexes are indicated on the right of each tree).

We give here a formal definition of the \mathbb{Z} -planted plane forest corresponding to a coalescent-walk process. For a more informal description, we suggest to look at Fig. 9 and at the description given in Example 2.16.

Definition 2.13. Let Z be a coalescent-walk process over a finite interval I . Its forest, denoted $\text{LFor}(Z)$ for “labeled forest”, is a \mathbb{Z} -planted plane forest with additional edge labels in I , defined as follows:

- the edge-set is I , vertices are identified with their parent edge, and the edge $i \in I$ is understood as bearing the label i .
- For any pair of edges (i, j) with $i < j$, i is a child of j if $(j, 0)$ is the coalescent point of $Z^{(i)}$ and $Z^{(j)}$.
- Children of a given parent are ordered by \leq_Z .
- The different trees of the forests are ordered such that their root-edges are in increasing \leq_Z -order.
- The index of the tree whose root-edge has label i is the value $Z_{\max I}^{(i)}$.




Figure 9: The forest $\text{LFor}(Z)$ corresponding to the coalescent-walk process that was obtained in Fig. 8. How this forest is constructed is explained in Example 2.16. On the right-hand side we also draw the associated total order \leq_Z and the associated permutation $\text{CP}(Z)$.

We then have the following result, which is immediate from the properties of a coalescent-walk process.

Proposition 2.14. $\text{LFor}(Z)$ is a \mathbb{Z} -planted plane forest, equipped with a labeling of its edges by the values of I . Moreover the total order \leq_Z on I coincides with the total order given by the exploration process of the forest $\text{LFor}(Z)$.

Remark 2.15. In the case where $I = [n]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, the permutation $\pi = \text{CP}(Z)$ is readily obtained from $\text{LFor}(Z)$: for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\pi(i)$ is the position in the exploration of $\text{LFor}(Z)$ of the edge with label i .

Example 2.16. Fig. 9 shows the forest of trees $\text{LFor}(Z)$ corresponding to the coalescent-walk process $Z = \{Z^{(t)}\}_{t \in [10]}$ plotted on the left-hand side (where the forest is plotted from bottom to top). It can be obtained by marking with ten vertices the points $\{(t, Z_t^{(t)} = 0)\}_{t \in [10]}$. The edge structure of the trees in $\text{LFor}(Z)$ is given by the green lines starting at each dot, and interrupted at the next dot. The lines that go to the end uninterrupted (for example this is the case of the line starting at $(Z_t^{(4)})_{t \geq 4}$), correspond to the root-edges of the different trees. The plane structure of $\text{LFor}(Z)$ is inherited from the drawing of Z in the plane.

We observe the order \leq_Z by considering the exploration process of the forest: $6 \leq_Z 9 \leq_Z 10 \leq_Z 7 \leq_Z 8 \leq_Z 5 \leq_Z 4 \leq_Z 1 \leq_Z 2 \leq_Z 3$. As a result, $\text{CP}(Z) = 89107614523$.

Equivalently, we can pull back (on the points $(t, Z_t^{(t)} = 0)$ of the coalescent-walk process) the position of edges in the exploration process (these positions are written in purple), and then $\text{CP}(Z)$ is obtained by reading these numbers from left to right.

2.5 From walks to Baxter permutations via coalescent-walk processes

We are now in position to prove the main result of this section, that is Theorem 1.5.

We are going to show that $\text{OP} = \text{CP} \circ \text{WC} \circ \text{OW}$. The key ingredient is to show that the dual tree $T(m^*)$ of a bipolar orientation can be recovered from its encoding two-dimensional walk by building the associated coalescent-walk process Z and looking at the coalescent forest $\text{LFor}(Z)$. More precisely, let $W = (W_t)_{t \in [n]} = \text{OW}(m)$ be the walk encoding a given bipolar orientation m , and $Z = \text{WC}(W)$ be the corresponding coalescent-walk process. Then the following result holds.

Proposition 2.17. *The following are equal.*

- The dual tree $T(m^*)$ with edges labeled according to the order given by the exploration of $T(m)$.
- The tree obtained by attaching all the edge-labeled trees of $\text{LFor}(Z)$ to a common root.

Theorem 1.5 then follows immediately, by construction of $\text{OP}(m)$ from $T(m^*)$ and $T(m)$ (Theorem 1.4) and of $\text{CP}(Z)$ from $\text{LFor}(Z)$ (Remark 2.15). Proposition 2.17 is illustrated in an example in Fig. 10.

An interesting corollary of Proposition 2.17, useful for later purposes (see for instance Section 2.6), is the following. Given a coalescent-walk process Z , we introduce the discrete local time process $L_Z = (L_Z^{(i)}(j))$, $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, defined by

$$L_Z^{(i)}(j) = \# \left\{ k \in [i, j] \mid Z_k^{(i)} = 0 \right\}. \quad (10)$$

Corollary 2.18. *Let (m, W, Z, σ) be objects of size n in $\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{P}$ connected by the commuting diagram in Eq. (2). Then the height process (X_1^*, \dots, X_n^*) of $T(m^*)$ is equal to*




Figure 10: In the left-hand side the map m from Fig. 4 with the dual tree $T(m^*)$ in red with edges labeled according to the order given by the exploration of $T(m)$. In the right-hand side the associated coalescent-walk process $Z = \text{WC} \circ \text{OW}(m)$. Note that the red tree (with its labeling) and the green tree (with its labeling) are equal.

$\left(L_Z^{(\sigma^{-1}(i))}(n) \right)_{i \in [n]}$. In other words,

$$X_{\sigma(i)}^* = L_Z^{(i)}(n) - 1, \quad i \in [n].$$

We make the following observation useful for later purposes.

Observation 2.19. Consider the tree $T(m^*)$ with edges labeled according to its exploration process. Let P_i be the ancestry line in $T(m^*)$ of the edge $\sigma(i)$, i.e. the sequence of edges in the unique path in $T(m^*)$ from the edge $\sigma(i)$ to the root of $T(m^*)$. Then, for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, $L_Z^{(i)}(j)$ is equal to the number of edges in P_i with a $T(m)$ -label weakly smaller than j .

The rest of this section is devoted to proving Proposition 2.17. We will proceed by induction over the size of m . Because a restriction of a walk in \mathcal{W} is not necessarily in \mathcal{W} , we will work on the larger space \mathfrak{W}_A , and the corresponding maps $\mathbf{m}(I)$.

We start with a few definitions. Let I be a finite interval, and take $m \in \mathbf{m}(I)$, recalling the definition of $\mathbf{m}(I)$ from Section 2.2. In particular, m is a bipolar orientation with explored edges labeled by I , and possibly unexplored edges at the top of its right boundary and at the bottom of its left boundary. For $i \in I$, denote by e_i the explored edge bearing label i in m . Denote e_i^* its dual edge in the map m^* .

Definition 2.20. The \mathbb{Z} -planted, edge-labeled, plane forest $\text{DualF}(m)$ is the restriction of $T(m^*)$ to edges $(e_i^*)_{i \in I}$. More precisely,

1. The edge-set of $\text{DualF}(m)$ is $(e_i^*)_{i \in I}$.
2. An edge e_i^* is on top of e_j^* if it is the case in $T(m^*)$.
3. Parent-less edges are planted in \mathbb{Z} according to the following rule:
 - (a) if e_i^* is dual to an explored edge on the right boundary of m , then it is indexed by its non-positive height relative to the active edge;
 - (b) otherwise, e_i is at the left of an inner face f of m , so that the parent of e_i^* in $T(m^*)$ must be dual to an unexplored edge which is at the top-right edge of f . We index e^* by the (positive) height of this edge relative to the active edge.




Figure 11: The forests $\text{DualF}(m_1), \dots, \text{DualF}(m_{10})$ drawn on top of the maps m_1, \dots, m_{10} of Fig. 6, with the increments of the walk W in purple. We notice that for $m_{10} = m \in \mathcal{O}$, $\text{DualF}(m)$ is just $T(m^*)$ disconnected at its root.

This construction is illustrated in Fig. 11. We remark that if $m \in \mathcal{O}$ (this is for instance the case of the last picture in Fig. 11), then $\text{DualF}(m)$ is simply obtained by disconnecting $T(m^*)$ at its root, labeling all edges according to their position in the exploration of $T(m)$, and indexing root-edges by their (non-positive) height on the right boundary of m . Thus, the next result implies Proposition 2.17.

Proposition 2.21. *Let I be a finite interval and $W \in \mathfrak{W}_A(I)$. Set $Z = \text{WC}(W)$ and $m = \Theta(W)$. Then*

$$\text{DualF}(m) = \text{LFor}(Z).$$

Proof. We will proceed by induction over the size of I . If $I = \{k\}$, both $\text{DualF}(m)$ and $\text{LFor}(Z)$ consist of a single edge planted at 0 with label k . For the induction step, assume $I = [j, k+1]$ with $j \leq k$, and let $m' = \Theta(W|_{[j,k]})$. We will compare how $F = \text{DualF}(m)$ is obtained from $F' = \text{DualF}(m')$ and how $\text{LFor}(Z)$ is obtained from $\text{LFor}(Z|_{[j,k]})$, distinguishing two cases according to the increment $W_{k+1} - W_k$.

First case: $W_{k+1} - W_k = (+1, -1)$. In this case, m is obtained from m' by moving the active edge up by one. So that F has an additional edge (dual to e_{k+1}) compared to F' . This edge is parent-less, has index 0, and is now the parent of all (previously parent-less) edges that used to have index 1. All other parent-less edges remain parent-less and their indices decrease by 1.

Second case: $W_{k+1} - W_k = (-i, j)$, for $i \geq 0, j \geq 0$. In this case, m is obtained from m' by gluing a face f of left-degree $i+1$ and right-degree $j+1$ to the right boundary of m' . The

previous active edge e_k is at the top-left of f , and the new active edge e_{k+1} at the bottom-right of f . Parent-less edges of positive index in F' are still parent-less edges in F , and their index increases by j . Parent-less edges of index smaller than $-i$ are still parent-less edges, and their index increases by i . Parent-less edges of F' with index $0, -1, \dots, -i$ are children in $T(m^*)$ of the edge dual to the top-right edge \bar{e} of f . We now have two sub-cases.

1. If $h = 0$, then $\bar{e} = e_{k+1}$ is the new active edge, so parent-less edges of F' with index $0, \dots, -i$ are now children of the new parent-less edge e_{k+1} at height 0.
2. If $h > 0$, then \bar{e} is not an explored edge, so parent-less edges of F' with index $0, \dots, -i$ are still parent-less edges, but their index is now the height of \bar{e} which is h . Finally, e_{k+1} is a new parent-less edge of index 0 with no children.

Comparing this with the evolution between $\text{LFor}(Z|_{[j,k]})$ and $\text{LFor}(Z)$ (see Fig. 12 and Definition 2.20) yields the proposition. \square




Figure 12: The evolution between the forests $F = F_k$ and $F' = F_{k+1}$ in parallel with the increments of the coalescent-walk process Z between times k and $k+1$. On the left-hand side the first case of the proof of Proposition 2.21 and on the right-hand side the second one (subcase 2).

We collect for future use the following consequence.

Corollary 2.22. *Let I be a finite interval and $W \in \mathfrak{W}_A(I)$. Set $Z = \text{WC}(W)$ and $m = \Theta(W)$. Fix $i \in I$ and call e the corresponding edge in m . Let v the top vertex of e .*

If $j > i$ is the smallest index greater than i such that $Z_j^{(i)} = 0$ and $Z_{j+1}^{(i)} < 0$ (provided that such a j exists), and $s > j+1$ is the smallest index greater than $j+1$ such that $Z_s^{(i)} \geq 0$ (provided that such an s exists) then the number of outgoing edges of v in m is bounded by $s - j - 1$.

Proof. It is enough to note that the only edges of m that can be outgoing edges of v are the ones corresponding to the indices $j+1, j+2, \dots, s-1$. \square

2.6 Anti-involutions for discrete coalescent-walk processes and the trees of bipolar orientations

We now want to investigate the relations between the four trees $T(m)$, $T(m^*)$, $T(m^{**})$, $T(m^{***})$ of a bipolar orientation m (and its dual maps) and some corresponding coalescent-walk processes. The results presented in this section will be also useful for Section 5.

2.6.1 The reversed coalescent-walk process

Let m be a bipolar orientation, $W = \text{OW}(m)$ be the corresponding tandem walk, and $Z = \text{WC} \circ \text{OW}(m) = \text{WC}(W)$ be the corresponding coalescent-walk process. We set

- $LT(m^*)$ to be the tree $T(m^*)$ with edges labeled according to the order given by the exploration of $T(m)$.
- $\text{LTr}(Z)$ to be the tree obtained by attaching all the edge-labeled trees of $\text{LFor}(Z)$ to a common root.

We saw in Proposition 2.17 that $LT(m^*) = \text{LTr}(Z)$. We now want to recover from the walk W (and a new associated coalescent-walk process) the tree $LT(m^{**})$, i.e. the tree $T(m^{**})$ with edges labeled according to the order given by the exploration of $T(m^{**})$. For that, we have to consider the following.

Definition 2.23. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Given a one dimensional walk $X = (X_t)_{t \in [n]}$ we denote by \tilde{X} the time reversed walk $(X_{n+1-t})_{t \in [n]}$. Given a two-dimensional walk $W = (X, Y) = (X_t, Y_t)_{t \in [n]}$, we denote by \tilde{W} the time reversed and coordinates swapped walk (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{X}) .

Proposition 2.24. Let m be a bipolar orientation and $W = \text{OW}(m)$ be the corresponding walk. Consider the walk \tilde{W} and the corresponding coalescent-walk process $\tilde{Z} := \text{WC}(\tilde{W})$. Then

$$\text{OW}(m^{**}) = \tilde{W} \quad \text{and} \quad LT(m^{***}) = \text{LTr}(\tilde{Z}).$$

An example of the coalescent-walk process $\tilde{Z} = \text{WC}(\tilde{W})$ is given on the left-bottom-hand side of Fig. 13 in the case of the bipolar orientation m considered in Fig. 2, that is the map that we always used for our examples.

Proof of Proposition 2.24. Note that using Proposition 2.17 with the map m^{**} (instead of m) and the walk $W^{**} = \text{OW}(m^{**})$ (instead of $W = \text{OW}(m)$) we obtain that $LT(m^{***}) = \text{LTr}(Z^{**})$, where $Z^{**} = \text{WC}(W^{**})$. In order to conclude, it is enough to note that $W^{**} = \tilde{W}$ and so $\text{LTr}(Z^{**}) = \text{LTr}(\tilde{Z})$. \square

2.6.2 Two anti-involution mappings

We now know that given a bipolar orientation m and the corresponding walk $W = \text{OW}(m)$, we can read the trees $LT(m^*)$ and $LT(m^{**})$ in the coalescent-walk processes $Z = \text{WC}(W)$ and $\tilde{Z} = \text{WC}(\tilde{W})$ respectively. Obviously, considering the bipolar map m^* and the corresponding walk $W^* = \text{OW}(m^*)$, we can read the trees $LT(m^{**})$ and $LT(m^{****}) = LT(m)$ in the coalescent-walk processes $Z^* = \text{WC}(W^*)$ and $\tilde{Z}^* = \text{WC}(\tilde{W}^*)$ respectively.

Actually, we can determine the random walk $W^* = \text{OW}(m^*)$ directly from the coalescent-walk processes Z and \tilde{Z} , as explained in Proposition 2.25 below. We recall that the discrete local time process $L_Z = \left(L_Z^{(i)}(j) \right)$, $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, was defined by $L_Z^{(i)}(j) = \# \left\{ k \in [i, j] \mid Z_k^{(i)} = 0 \right\}$. We also recall (see Theorem 2.5) that σ^* denotes the permutation obtained by rotating the diagram of a permutation σ clockwise by angle $\pi/2$.

Proposition 2.25. Let m be a bipolar orientation of size n . Set $W^* = (X^*, Y^*) = \text{OW}(m^*)$, $\sigma = \text{OP}(m)$, $W = \text{OW}(m)$, $Z = \text{WC}(W)$ and $\tilde{Z} = \text{WC}(\tilde{W})$. Then

$$(X_i^*)_{i \in [n]} = \left(L_Z^{(\sigma^{-1}(i))}(n) - 1 \right)_{i \in [n]} \quad \text{and} \quad (Y_i^*)_{i \in [n]} = \left(L_{\tilde{Z}}^{(\sigma^*(i))}(n) - 1 \right)_{i \in [n]}.$$

Proof. The fact that $(X_i^*)_{i \in [n]} = \left(L_Z^{(\sigma^{-1}(i))}(n) - 1 \right)_{i \in [n]}$ follows from Corollary 2.18. Let $Z^{**} = \text{WC} \circ \text{OW}(m^{**})$. Using Corollary 2.18 with the map m^{**} (instead of m) and Remark 2.2 we obtain that $(Y_{n+1-i}^*)_{i \in [n]} = \left(L_{Z^{**}}^{OP(m^{**})^{-1}(i)}(n) - 1 \right)_{i \in [n]}$, and so, since we know from Proposition 2.24 that $Z^{**} = \tilde{Z}$, we conclude that $(Y_i^*)_{i \in [n]} = \left(L_{\tilde{Z}}^{OP(m^{**})^{-1}(n+1-i)}(n) - 1 \right)_{i \in [n]}$. It remains to show that $OP(m^{**})^{-1}(n+1-i) = \sigma^*(i)$. From Theorem 2.5 we have that

$$OP(m^{**})^{-1}(n+1-i) = (OP(m)^{**})^{-1}(n+1-i) = OP(m)^*(i) = \sigma^*(i),$$

where in the second equality we used that, for any permutation π of size n , $\pi(n+1-i) = (\pi^{-1})^{***}(i)$. This ends the proof. \square

From the above proposition it is meaningful to consider the following two mappings. We set WPC to be the map from the set of walks \mathcal{W} to the set of pairs of discrete coalescent-walk processes $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$, defined by

$$\text{WPC}(W) = (\text{WC}(W), \text{WC}(\tilde{W})) \quad \text{for all } W \in \mathcal{W}.$$

We also set PCW to be the map from the set of pairs of coalescent-walk processes in $\text{WPC}(\mathcal{W}) \subseteq \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$ to the set of walks \mathcal{W} , defined by

$$\text{PCW}(Z, \tilde{Z}) = \left(L_Z^{(\sigma^{-1}(i))}(|Z|) - 1, L_{\tilde{Z}}^{(\sigma^*(i))}(|Z|) - 1 \right)_{i \in [|Z|]}, \quad \text{for all } (Z, \tilde{Z}) \in \text{WPC}(\mathcal{W}),$$

where, if $(Z, \tilde{Z}) = \text{WPC}(W)$, then $\sigma = \text{OP} \circ \text{OW}^{-1}(W) = \text{CP} \circ \text{WC}(W)$, i.e. σ is the Baxter permutation associated to W .

From our constructions and Propositions 2.24 and 2.25 we have the following.

Theorem 2.26. *Fix $W^0 \in \mathcal{W}$. Consider the following sequence*

$$W^0 \xrightarrow{\text{WPC}} (Z_1, \tilde{Z}_1) \xrightarrow{\text{PCW}} W^1 \xrightarrow{\text{WPC}} (Z_2, \tilde{Z}_2) \xrightarrow{\text{PCW}} W^2 \xrightarrow{\text{WPC}} \dots \xrightarrow{\text{WPC}} (Z_4, \tilde{Z}_4) \xrightarrow{\text{PCW}} W^4.$$

Then setting $m = \text{OW}^{-1}(W^0)$, i.e. the bipolar map associated to W^0 , we have that

$$W^i = \text{OW} \left(m^{*i} \right), \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4,$$

$$\left(\text{LTr}(Z_i), \text{LTr}(\tilde{Z}_i) \right) = \left(\text{LT} \left(m^{*i} \right), \text{LT} \left(m^{*i+2} \right) \right), \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3, 4.$$

*Therefore (since $m = m^{****}$) $W^0 = W^4$ and so $(\text{PCW} \circ \text{WPC})^4 = \text{Id} = (\text{WPC} \circ \text{PCW})^4$.*

The coalescent-walk processes Z_1, \tilde{Z}_1, Z_2 and \tilde{Z}_2 , and the corresponding edge-labeled trees $\text{LT}(m^*)$, $\text{LT}(m^{***})$, $\text{LT}(m^{**})$ and $\text{LT}(m)$, in the specific case of our running example, are plotted in Fig. 13.

3 Local limit results

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.6, a joint (annealed and quenched) local convergence for the four families of objects put in correspondence by the mappings in the commutative diagram in Eq. (2).




Figure 13: On the left-hand side the coalescent-walk processes Z_1 and \tilde{Z}_1 and the corresponding edge-labeled trees $LT(m^*)$ and $LT(m^{***})$. On the right-hand side the coalescent-walk processes Z_2 and \tilde{Z}_2 , and the corresponding edge-labeled trees $LT(m^{**})$ and $LT(m)$. We oriented the coalescent-walk processes in such a way that the comparison between trees is convenient.

3.1 Mappings of the commutative diagram in the infinite-volume

Let I be a (finite or infinite) interval of \mathbb{Z} . Recall that $\mathfrak{W}_A(I)$ is the subset of two-dimensional walks with time space I and with increments in A (that was defined in Eq. (1) page 6). Recall also that $\mathfrak{C}(I)$ is the set of coalescent-walk processes on I , and that the map $WC : \mathfrak{W}_A(I) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(I)$ sends walks to coalescent-walk processes, both in the finite and infinite-volume case.

In this section we extend the maps CP and Θ defined earlier to infinite-volume objects. Recall that the map Θ was defined on a set of unconditioned walks in such a way that the restriction to \mathcal{W} is the inverse of OW (see Section 2.2).

We start with the map CP . We denote by $\mathfrak{S}(I)$ the set of total orders on I , which we call permutations over I . This terminology makes sense because for $n \geq 1$, the set \mathfrak{S}_n of permutations of size n is readily identified with $\mathfrak{S}([n])$, by the map $\sigma \mapsto \preceq_\sigma$, where

$$i \preceq_\sigma j \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \sigma(i) \leq \sigma(j) .$$

Then we can extend $CP : \mathfrak{C}(I) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(I)$ to the case when I is infinite, by setting $CP(Z)$ to be the total order \leq_Z on I defined in Section 2.4.2. This is consistent, through the stated identification, with our previous definition of CP when $I = [n]$.

Finally, we also extend Θ to the infinite-volume case. We need first to clarify what is our definition of infinite planar maps. From now on, a planar map is a gluing along edges of a finite number of finite polygons.

Definition 3.1. An *infinite oriented quasi-map* is an infinite collection of finite polygons with oriented edges, glued along some of their edges in such a way that the orientation is preserved. In the case the graph corresponding to an infinite oriented quasi-map is locally finite (i.e. every vertex has finite degree) then we say that it is an *infinite oriented map*.

We call *boundary* of an infinite oriented map, the collection of edges of the finite polygons that are not glued with any other edge. An infinite oriented map m is

1. *simply connected* if for every finite submap $f \subset m$ there exists a finite submap $f' \subset m$ which is a planar map (i.e. is simply connected) with $f \subset f' \subset m$;
2. *boundaryless* if the boundary of m is empty.

When these two conditions are verified, we say that m is an *infinite map of the plane*⁹.

Let I be an infinite interval and $w \in \mathfrak{W}(I)$. We recall that we can view a finite bipolar orientation as a finite collection of finite inner faces, together with an adjacency relation on the oriented edges of these faces. This allows us to construct $\Theta(w)$ as a projective limit, as follows.

From Proposition 2.4, if J and J' are finite intervals and $J' \subset J \subset I$ then $\Theta(w|_{J'})$ is a submap of $\Theta(w|_J)$ defined in a unique way. This means that the face set of $\Theta(w|_{J'})$ is included in that of $\Theta(w|_J)$, and that two faces of $\Theta(w|_{J'})$ are adjacent if and only if they are adjacent through the same edge in $\Theta(w|_J)$.

Then, taking J_n a growing sequence of finite intervals such that $I = \cup_n J_n$, we set $\Theta(w) := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \Theta(w|_{J_n})$ to be an infinite collection of finite polygons, together with a gluing relation between the edges of these faces, i.e. $\Theta(w)$ is an infinite oriented quasi-map.

3.2 Random infinite objects

We define here what will turn out to be our local limiting objects. Recall that ν denotes the following probability distribution on A (defined in Eq. (1) page 6):

$$\nu = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{(+1, -1)} + \sum_{i, j \geq 0} 2^{-i-j-3} \delta_{(-i, j)}, \quad \text{where } \delta \text{ denotes the Dirac measure,} \quad (11)$$

and recall that $\overline{W} = (\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) = (\overline{W}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a bidirectional random two-dimensional walk with step distribution ν , having value $(0, 0)$ at time zero. The interest of introducing the probability measure ν resides in the following way of obtaining uniform elements of \mathcal{W}_n as conditioned random walks. For all $n \geq 1$, let $\mathfrak{W}_{A, \text{exc}}^n \subset \mathfrak{W}_A([0, n-1])$ be the set of two-dimensional walks in the non-negative quadrant $(W_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n-1}$ of length n , starting and ending at $(0, 0)$, with increments in A . Remark that for $n \geq 1$, the mapping $\mathfrak{W}_{A, \text{exc}}^{n+2} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_n$ removing the first and the last step, i.e. $W \mapsto (W_t)_{1 \leq t \leq n}$, is a bijection. An easy calculation then gives the following (obtained also in [KMSW19, Remark 2]).

Proposition 3.2. *Conditioning on $\{(\overline{W}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n+1} \in \mathfrak{W}_{A, \text{exc}}^{n+2}\}$, the law of $(\overline{W}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n+1}$ is the uniform distribution on $\mathfrak{W}_{A, \text{exc}}^{n+2}$, and the law of $(\overline{W}_t)_{1 \leq t \leq n}$ is the uniform distribution on \mathcal{W}_n .*

Let $\overline{Z} = \text{WC}(\overline{W})$ be the corresponding coalescent-walk process, $\overline{\sigma} = \text{CP}(\overline{Z})$ be the corresponding permutation on \mathbb{Z} , and $\overline{m} = \Theta(\overline{W})$ be the corresponding infinite quasi-map. Let us show some properties of these objects.

Proposition 3.3. *For every $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\overline{Z}^{(t)}$ has the distribution of a random walk with the same step distribution as \overline{Y} (which is the same as that of $-\overline{X}$).*

⁹We point out that when the map is locally finite, it is well-defined as a topological manifold, and the combinatorial notions of simple connectivity and boundarylessness defined above are equivalent to the topological ones. By the classifications of two-dimensional surfaces, m is an infinite map of the plane if and only if it is homeomorphic to the plane.

Remark 3.4. Recall that the increments of a walk of a coalescent-walk process are not always equal to one of the increments of the corresponding walk (recall the last case considered in Definition 2.7). The statement of Proposition 3.3 is a sort of “miracle” of the geometric distribution.

Proof of Proposition 3.3. Let us fix $k \geq t$. By construction, $(\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_s^{(t)})_{t \leq s \leq k}$ is a measurable functional of $(\bar{\mathbf{W}}_s)_{t \leq s \leq k}$. As a result, $\bar{\mathbf{W}}_{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{W}}_k = (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_k)$ is independent of $(\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_s^{(t)})_{t \leq s \leq k}$. We can rewrite $\bar{\mathbf{W}}_{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{W}}_k = \mathbf{B} \times (1, -1) + (1 - \mathbf{B}) \times (-\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ where \mathbf{B} is a Bernoulli random variable of parameter $1/2$, \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} are geometric of parameter $1/2$, i.e. $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U} = \ell) = 2^{-\ell-1}$, for all $\ell \geq 0$, altogether independent, and independent of $(\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_s^{(t)})_{t \leq s \leq k}$.

Now from the definition of $\bar{\mathbf{Z}}$ (Definition 2.7), we get

$$\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{k+1}^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^{(t)} = -\mathbf{B} + (1 - \mathbf{B}) \left[\mathbb{1}_{\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^{(t)} \geq 0} \mathbf{V} + \mathbb{1}_{\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^{(t)} < 0} \left(\mathbf{U} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{U} < -\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^{(t)}} + (\mathbf{V} - \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^{(t)}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{U} \geq -\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^{(t)}} \right) \right],$$

So the law of $\left(\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{k+1}^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^{(t)} \mid (\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_s^{(t)})_{t \leq s \leq k} \right)$ is equal to

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(-\mathbf{B} + (1 - \mathbf{B})\mathbf{V}) & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^{(t)} \geq 0 \\ \mathcal{L} \left(-\mathbf{B} + (1 - \mathbf{B}) \cdot (\mathbf{U} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{U} < q} + (\mathbf{V} + q) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{U} \geq q}) \right) \Big|_{q = -\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^{(t)}} & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^{(t)} < 0. \end{cases}$$

By the memoryless property of the geometric distribution, $\mathbf{U} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{U} < q} + (\mathbf{V} + q) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{U} \geq q}$ is distributed like \mathbf{V} regardless of q . As a result, since $\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{k+1}^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^{(t)}$ is independent of $(\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_s^{(t)})_{s \leq k}$, we have that

$$\mathcal{L} \left(\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{k+1}^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^{(t)} \mid (\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_s^{(t)})_{s \leq k} \right) = \mathcal{L}(-\mathbf{B} + (1 - \mathbf{B})\mathbf{V}) = \mathcal{L}(\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_k) = \mathcal{L}(-\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{k+1} + \bar{\mathbf{X}}_k).$$

This implies the proposition. \square

Let us now consider $\bar{\mathbf{m}} = \Theta(\bar{\mathbf{W}})$. Recall that it is an infinite quasi-map, i.e. a countable union of finite polygons, glued along edges.

Proposition 3.5. *Almost surely, $\bar{\mathbf{m}}$ is an infinite map of the plane. In particular it is locally finite.*

Proof. We show that every vertex of $\bar{\mathbf{m}}$ has finite degree, i.e. that $\bar{\mathbf{m}}$ is locally finite. Let $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ be the index of some edge $e \in \bar{\mathbf{m}}$ and denote by v its top vertex. Let $j \geq i$ be the smallest index such that $\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_j^{(i)} = 0$, $\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{j+1}^{(i)} < 0$, and $s \geq j + 1$ be the smallest index such that $\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_s^{(i)} \geq 0$. The indexes j and s exist almost surely thanks to Proposition 3.3. These conditions, together with Corollary 2.22, imply that the number of outgoing edges of v is bounded by $s - j - 1$. Repeating the same argument with the map $\bar{\mathbf{m}}^{**} \stackrel{d}{=} \bar{\mathbf{m}}$ (recall that $\bar{\mathbf{m}}^{**}$ denotes $\bar{\mathbf{m}}$ with the orientation of the edges reversed) we can prove the same result for the number of ingoing edges of v , proving that v has a.s. finite degree. Since this argument can be done for all vertices of $\bar{\mathbf{m}}$ we can conclude that $\bar{\mathbf{m}}$ is locally finite almost surely.

Let us show that every edge of $\bar{\mathbf{m}}$ is adjacent to two faces, i.e. that $\bar{\mathbf{m}}$ is boundaryless. Let $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ be the index of some edge $e \in \bar{\mathbf{m}}$, and $j \geq i$ be the smallest index after i where $\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_j^{(i)} = 0$, which exists almost surely thanks to Proposition 3.3. Considering the finite map $\Theta(\bar{\mathbf{W}}|_{[i, j]})$, we see using Proposition 2.21 that e almost surely has a face at its right and so

this happens also in $\overline{\mathbf{m}}$. By countable intersection, this is true almost surely for every edge of $\overline{\mathbf{m}}$. The same property is also true at the left because $(\overline{\mathbf{m}})^{**}$ has the same distribution as $\overline{\mathbf{m}}$. So $\overline{\mathbf{m}}$ is boundaryless.

The infinite map $\overline{\mathbf{m}}$ being simply connected is immediate: by definition of $\overline{\mathbf{m}}$, every finite submap $f \subset \overline{\mathbf{m}}$ is included in one of the finite planar maps $\mathbf{f}_n = \Theta(\overline{\mathbf{W}}|_{J_n})$. \square

3.3 Local topologies

We define a (finite or infinite) *rooted walk* (resp. *rooted coalescent-walk process*, *rooted permutation*) as a walk (resp. coalescent-walk process, permutation) over a (finite or infinite) interval of \mathbb{Z} containing 0. More formally, we define the sets (with the corresponding notions of size)

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_{\bullet} &= \bigsqcup_{I \ni 0} \mathfrak{W}(I), & \text{where } |W| = |I| \text{ if } W \in \mathfrak{W}(I), \\ \widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_{\bullet} &= \bigsqcup_{I \ni 0} \mathfrak{C}(I), & \text{where } |Z| = |I| \text{ if } Z \in \mathfrak{C}(I), \\ \widetilde{\mathfrak{S}}_{\bullet} &= \bigsqcup_{I \ni 0} \mathfrak{S}(I), & \text{where } |\sigma| = |I| \text{ if } \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(I).\end{aligned}$$

Of course, 0 has to be understood as the root of any object in one of those classes. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$, \mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}^n is the subset of objects in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_{\bullet}$ of size n , i.e. $\mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}^n = \bigcup_{I \ni 0, |I|=n} \mathfrak{W}(I)$, and \mathfrak{W}_{\bullet} denotes the set of finite-size objects. We also define analogs for $\widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_{\bullet}, \widetilde{\mathfrak{S}}_{\bullet}$.

We justify the terminology. A rooted object of size n can be also understood as an unrooted object of size n together with an index in $[n]$ which identifies the root through the following identifications¹⁰:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{W}^n \times [n] &\longrightarrow \mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}^n, & (W, i) &\longmapsto (W_{i+t})_{t \in [-i+1, n-i]} \in \mathfrak{W}([-i+1, n-i]), \\ \mathfrak{C}^n \times [n] &\longrightarrow \mathfrak{C}_{\bullet}^n, & ((Z_t^{(s)})_{s,t \in [n]}, i) &\longmapsto (Z_{i+t}^{(i+s)})_{s,t \in [-i+1, n-i]} \in \mathfrak{C}([-i+1, n-i]), \\ \mathfrak{S}^n \times [n] &\longrightarrow \mathfrak{S}_{\bullet}^n, & (\sigma, i) &\longmapsto \prec_{\sigma, i} \in \mathfrak{S}([-i+1, n-i]), \quad \text{where } \ell \prec_{\sigma, i} j \iff \sigma_{\ell+i} \leq \sigma_{j+i}.\end{aligned}$$

We may now define *restriction functions*: for $h \geq 1$, I an interval of \mathbb{Z} containing 0, and $\square \in \mathfrak{W}(I), \mathfrak{C}(I)$ or $\mathfrak{S}(I)$, we define

$$r_h(\square) = \square|_{I \cap [-h, h]}.$$

So, for all $h \geq 1$, r_h is a well-defined function $\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_{\bullet} \rightarrow \mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}$, $\widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_{\bullet} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_{\bullet}$, and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{S}}_{\bullet} \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}_{\bullet}$. Finally local distances on either $\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_{\bullet}, \widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_{\bullet}$ or $\widetilde{\mathfrak{S}}_{\bullet}$ are defined by a common formula:

$$d(\square_1, \square_2) = 2^{-\sup \{h \geq 1 : r_h(\square_1) = r_h(\square_2)\}}, \quad (12)$$

with the classical conventions that $\sup \emptyset = 0$, $\sup \mathbb{Z}_{>0} = +\infty$ and $2^{-\infty} = 0$.

The metric space $(\widetilde{\mathfrak{S}}_{\bullet}, d)$ is a compact space (see [Bor20b, Theorem 2.16]) and so complete and separable, i.e. it is a Polish space. On the other hand, $(\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_{\bullet}, d)$ and $(\widetilde{\mathfrak{C}}_{\bullet}, d)$ are Polish, but not compact (see for instance [Cur18, Section 1.2.1]).

¹⁰Note that the natural identification for walks would be $(W, i) \mapsto (W_{i+t} - W_i)_{t \in [-i+1, n-i]}$, but since we are considering walks up to an additive constant then the identification $(W, i) \mapsto (W_{i+t})_{t \in [-i+1, n-i]}$ is equivalent.

For the case of planar maps, the theory is slightly different. For a finite interval I , we denote by $\mathbf{m}(I)$ the set of planar oriented maps with edges labeled by the integers in the interval I . We point out that we do not put any restriction on the possible choices for the labeling. We also define the set of finite rooted maps $\mathbf{m}_\bullet = \bigsqcup_{I \ni 0, |I| < \infty} \mathbf{m}(I)$, where the edge labeled by 0 is called root.

A finite rooted map is obtained by rooting (i.e. distinguishing an edge) a finite unrooted map, by the identification $\mathbf{m}([n]) \times [n] \rightarrow \mathbf{m}_\bullet^n$ which sends (m, i) to the map obtained from m by shifting all labels by $-i$. The distance is defined similarly as in Eq. (12). Let $B_h(m)$ be the ball of radius h in m , that is the submap of m consisting of the faces of m that contain a vertex at distance less than h of the tail of the root-edge. We set $d(m, m') = 2^{-\sup \{h \geq 1 : B_h(m) = B_h(m')\}}$, with the same conventions as before. We do not describe the set of possible limits, but simply take $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_\bullet$ to be the completion of the metric space (\mathbf{m}_\bullet, d) . In particular, it is easily seen that $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_\bullet$ contains all the infinite rooted planar maps.

Proposition 3.6. *The maps $\text{WC} : \widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_\bullet \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{C}}_\bullet$ and $\text{CP} : \tilde{\mathfrak{C}}_\bullet \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\bullet$ are 1-Lipschitz.*

Proof. This is immediate since by definition, $r_h(\text{WC}(W)) = \text{WC}(r_h(W))$ and $r_h(\text{CP}(Z)) = \text{CP}(r_h(Z))$. \square

Proposition 3.7. *The map $\Theta : \widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_\bullet \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_\bullet$ is almost surely continuous at \overline{W} .*

Proof. Assume we have a realization \overline{W} of \overline{W} such that $\overline{m} = \Theta(\overline{W})$ is a rooted infinite oriented planar map, in particular is locally finite (this holds for almost all realizations thanks to Proposition 3.5). Let $h > 0$. The ball $B_h(\overline{m})$ is a finite subset of \overline{m} . Since $\overline{m} = \bigcup_n \Theta(\overline{W}|_{[-n, n]})$, there must be n such that $\Theta(\overline{W}|_{[-n, n]}) \supset B_h(\overline{m})$. As a result, for all $W' \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}_\bullet$ such that $d(W', \overline{W}) < 2^{-n}$, then $B_h(\Theta(W')) = B_h(\Theta(\overline{W}))$. This shows a.s. continuity. \square

3.4 Proofs of the local limit results

We turn to the proof of Theorem 1.6. We will prove local convergence for walks and then transfer to the other objects by continuity of the maps $\text{WC}, \text{CP}, \Theta$. Let us recall that thanks to Proposition 3.2, \mathbf{W}_n is distributed like $\overline{W}|_{[n]}$ under a suitable conditioning. This will allow us to prove the following technical lemmas.

Lemma 3.8. *Fix $h \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $W \in \mathfrak{W}([-h, h]) \subset \mathfrak{W}_\bullet^{2h+1}$. Fix $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Then, uniformly for all i such that $\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor + h < i < \lfloor (1 - \varepsilon)n \rfloor - h$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(r_h(\mathbf{W}_n, i) = W) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(r_h(\overline{W}) = W).$$

Lemma 3.9. *Fix $h \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $W \in \mathfrak{W}([-h, h]) \subset \mathfrak{W}_\bullet^{2h+1}$. Fix $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Then, uniformly for all i, j such that $\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor + h < i, j < \lfloor (1 - \varepsilon)n \rfloor - h$ and $|i - j| > 2h$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(r_h(\mathbf{W}_n, i) = r_h(\mathbf{W}_n, j) = W) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(r_h(\overline{W}) = W)^2. \quad (13)$$

We just prove the second lemma, the proof of the first one is similar and simpler. Before doing that, we do the following observation, useful for the proof of Lemma 3.9. In what follows we use the convention that the infimum of a two-dimensional walk is equal to the infima of the two one-dimensional components.

Observation 3.10. Let $x = (x_i)_{i \in [0, n]} = (\sum_{j=1}^i y_j)_{i \in [n]}$ be a one-dimensional deterministic walk of size n , i.e. $y_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all j . Let $h \ll n$ and consider a second deterministic one-dimensional walk $x' = (x'_i)_{i \in [0, h]} = (\sum_{j=1}^i y'_j)_{i \in [0, h]}$. Fix also k, ℓ such that $0 \leq k < \ell \leq n$ and consider the walk $x'' = (x''_i)_{i \in [0, n+2h]}$ obtained by inserting two copies of the walk x' in the walk x at time k and ℓ . That is, for all $i \in [0, n+2h]$,

$$x''_i = \sum_{j=1}^k y_j \cdot \mathbb{1}_{j \leq i} + \sum_{j=1}^h y'_j \cdot \mathbb{1}_{j+k \leq i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{\ell} y_j \cdot \mathbb{1}_{j+k+h \leq i} + \sum_{j=1}^h y'_j \cdot \mathbb{1}_{j+\ell+h \leq i} + \sum_{j=\ell+1}^n y_j \cdot \mathbb{1}_{j+\ell+2h \leq i}.$$

Then

$$\inf_{i \in [0, n+2h]} \{x''_i\} = \inf_{i \in [0, n]} \{x_i\} + \Delta,$$

where $\Delta = \Delta(x, k, \ell, x') \in \mathbb{R}^2$ fulfills $\|\Delta\| \leq 2 \sup_{i \in [0, h]} \|x'_i\|$ (as a norm take the sum of the modulus of the components).

Proof of Lemma 3.9. Set $E := \{r_h(\overline{\mathbf{W}}|_{[n]}, i) = r_h(\overline{\mathbf{W}}|_{[n]}, j) = W\}$. By Proposition 3.2, the left-hand-side of Eq. (13) can be rewritten as $\mathbb{P}\left(E \mid (\overline{\mathbf{W}}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n+1} \in \mathfrak{W}_{A, \text{exc}}^{n+2}\right)$. Using Lemma A.2, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E \mid (\overline{\mathbf{W}}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n+1} \in \mathfrak{W}_{A, \text{exc}}^{n+2}\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{E}} \cdot \alpha_{n+2, \lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor}^{0,0} \left(\inf_{0 \leq k \leq n+2-2\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor} \overline{\mathbf{W}}_k, \overline{\mathbf{W}}_{n+2-2\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor}\right)\right], \quad (14)$$

where $\alpha_{n+2, \lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor}^{0,0}(a, b)$ is a function explicitly described in Eq. (51) and

$$\tilde{E} := \{r_h(\overline{\mathbf{W}}|_{[n]}, i - \lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor) = r_h(\overline{\mathbf{W}}|_{[n]}, j - \lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor) = W\}.$$

From Observation 3.10, conditioning on \tilde{E} , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\inf_{0 \leq k \leq n+2-2\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor} \overline{\mathbf{W}}_k, \overline{\mathbf{W}}_{n+2-2\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor}\right) \\ &= \left(\inf_{0 \leq k \leq n+2-2\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor - 2(2h+1)} \overline{\mathbf{S}}_k + \Delta, \overline{\mathbf{S}}_{n+2-2\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor - 2(2h+1)} + 2\delta\right), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\overline{\mathbf{S}} = (\overline{\mathbf{S}}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is the walk obtained from $(\overline{\mathbf{W}}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ removing the $2h+1$ steps around $i - \lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor$ and $j - \lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor$, $\delta = W_h - W_{-h}$ and Δ is a deterministic function of $(\overline{\mathbf{S}}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$, i, j and W , bounded by twice the total variation of W . Using the relation in Eq. (15) we can rewrite the right-hand side of Eq. (14) as

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{E}) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\alpha_{n+2, \lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor}^{0,0} \left(\inf_{0 \leq k \leq n-2\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor - 2(2h+1)} \overline{\mathbf{S}}_k + \Delta, \overline{\mathbf{S}}_{n-2\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor - 2(2h+1)} + 2\delta\right)\right],$$

where we used the independence between \tilde{E} and the right-hand side of Eq. (15). Note that $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{E}) = \mathbb{P}(r_h(\overline{\mathbf{W}}) = W)^2$ since $|i - j| > 2h$ by assumption. We now show that the second factor of the equation above converges to 1 uniformly for all i, j . Set for simplicity of notation

$$f(\overline{\mathbf{S}}) = \left(\inf_{0 \leq k \leq n-2\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor - 2(2h+1)} \overline{\mathbf{S}}_k + \Delta, \overline{\mathbf{S}}_{n-2\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor - 2(2h+1)} + 2\delta\right).$$

By Lemma A.3 we have

$$\sup_{i,j} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\alpha_{n+2, \lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor}^{0,0} (f(\bar{\mathbf{S}})) \right] - \mathbb{E} [\alpha_\varepsilon (g(\bar{\mathbf{S}}))] \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\alpha_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ is given in Eq. (52) and

$$g(\bar{\mathbf{S}}) = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\inf_{0 \leq k \leq n-2\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor - 2(2h+1)} \bar{\mathbf{S}}_k \right) + \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{n-2\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor - 2(2h+1)} + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{n}} \right).$$

Therefore, in order to conclude, it is enough to show that $\mathbb{E} [\alpha_\varepsilon (g(\bar{\mathbf{S}}))] \rightarrow 1$.

We have that $\mathbb{E} [\alpha_\varepsilon (g(\bar{\mathbf{S}}))] \rightarrow \mathbb{E} [\alpha_\varepsilon (g(\mathbf{W}))]$, where $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ is a standard two-dimensional Brownian motion of correlation $-1/2$. This follows from the fact that Δ is bounded, that α_ε is a continuous and bounded function (see Lemma A.3), and that

$$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \right)_{t \in [0,1]} \xrightarrow{d} (\mathbf{W}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}.$$

The latter claim is a consequence of Donsker's theorem and the basic computation $\text{Var}(\nu) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$. In addition, we have that $\mathbb{E} [\alpha_\varepsilon (g(\mathbf{W}))] = 1$ by Proposition A.4 (used with $h = 1$), and so we can conclude the proof. \square

We can now prove the main result of this section, i.e. the quenched local limit result.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. We start by proving that

$$\mathcal{L}((\mathbf{W}_n, \mathbf{i}_n) | \mathbf{W}_n) \xrightarrow{P} \mathcal{L}(\bar{\mathbf{W}}). \quad (16)$$

For that it is enough (see for instance [Bor20b, Corollary 2.38] for an argument in the case of permutations) to show that, for any $h \geq 1$ and fixed finite rooted walk $W \in \mathfrak{W}([-h, h]) \subset \mathfrak{W}_\bullet$,

$$\mathbb{P}(r_h(\mathbf{W}_n, \mathbf{i}_n) = W | \mathbf{W}_n) \xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{P}(r_h(\bar{\mathbf{W}}) = W). \quad (17)$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{P}(r_h(\mathbf{W}_n, \mathbf{i}_n) = W | \mathbf{W}_n) = \frac{\#\{j \in [n] : r_h(\mathbf{W}_n, j) = W\}}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} \mathbb{1}_{\{r_h(\mathbf{W}_n, j) = W\}}.$$

We use the second moment method to prove that this sum converges in probability to $\mathbb{P}(r_h(\bar{\mathbf{W}}) = W)$. We first compute the first moment:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} \mathbb{1}_{\{r_h(\mathbf{W}_n, j) = W\}} \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} \mathbb{P}(r_h(\mathbf{W}_n, j) = W) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(r_h((\bar{\mathbf{W}})) = W),$$

where for the limit we used Lemma 3.8. We now compute the second moment:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} \mathbb{1}_{\{r_h((\bar{\mathbf{W}}_t)_{t \in [n]}, j) = W\}} \right)^2 \right] \\ = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i, j \in [n], |i-j| > 2h} \mathbb{P}(r_h(\mathbf{W}_n, i) = r_h(\mathbf{W}_n, j) = W) + O(1/n). \end{aligned}$$

This converges to $\mathbb{P}(r_h(\overline{W}) = W)^2$ by Lemma 3.9. The computations of the first and second moment, together with Chebyshev's inequality lead to the proof of Eq. (17) and so to the quenched convergence of walks.

Now to extend the result to other objects, we will use continuity of the maps WC, CP, Θ (see Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 3.7). Using a combination of the results stated in [Kal17, Theorem 4.11, Lemma 4.12]¹¹ we have that Eq. (16) implies the following convergence

$$\mathcal{L}\left(\left((W_n, i_n), (WC(W_n), i_n), (CP(W_n), i_n), (\Theta(W_n), i_n)\right) \middle| \mathfrak{B}_n\right) \xrightarrow{P} \mathcal{L}(\overline{W}, \overline{Z}, \overline{\sigma}, \overline{m}), \quad (18)$$

and so Eq. (4) holds. \square

4 Scaling limits of coalescent-walk processes

In this section we deal with scaling limits of coalescent-walk processes both in the finite and infinite-volume case. The results in this section culminate in Theorem 4.10, upon which the proof of the two main theorems in Section 5 rely, namely Theorem 5.6 and Theorem 5.7. Nevertheless, we believe that our intermediate results, Theorem 4.5 and Proposition 4.8, are of independent interest.

All the spaces of continuous functions considered below are implicitly endowed with the topology of uniform convergence on every compact.

4.1 The continuous coalescent-walk process

We start by defining our continuous limiting object: it is formed by the solutions of the following family of stochastic differential equations (SDEs) indexed by $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and driven by a two-dimensional process $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$:

$$\begin{cases} d\mathcal{Z}^{(u)}(t) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{Z}^{(u)}(t) > 0\}} d\mathcal{Y}(t) - \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{Z}^{(u)}(t) \leq 0\}} d\mathcal{X}(t), & t \geq u, \\ \mathcal{Z}^{(u)}(t) = 0, & t \leq u. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Existence and uniqueness of a solution of the SDE above (for $u \in \mathbb{R}$ fixed) were already studied in the literature in the case where the driving process \mathcal{W} is a Brownian motion, in particular with the following result.

We recall that a *standard two-dimensional Brownian motion of correlation ρ* is a continuous two-dimensional Gaussian process such that the components \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are standard one-dimensional Brownian motions, and $\text{Cov}(\mathcal{X}(t), \mathcal{Y}(s)) = -1/2 \cdot (t \wedge s)$.

Theorem 4.1 (Theorem 2 of [Pro13], Proposition 2.2 of [cHK18]). *Fix $\rho \in (-1, 1)$. Let $T \in (0, \infty]$ and let $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ be a standard two-dimensional Brownian motion of correlation ρ and time-interval $[0, T]$. We have pathwise uniqueness and existence of a strong solution for the SDE:*

$$\begin{cases} d\mathcal{Z}(t) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{Z}(t) > 0\}} d\mathcal{Y}(t) - \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{Z}(t) \leq 0\}} d\mathcal{X}(t), & 0 \leq t < T, \\ \mathcal{Z}(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

¹¹The specific result that we need is a generalization of the *mapping theorem* for random measures: Let $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ be a sequence of random measures on a space E that converges in distribution to a random measure μ on E . Let F be a function from E to a second space H such that the set D_F of discontinuity points of F has measure $\mu(D_F) = 0$ a.s.. Then the sequence of pushforward random measures $(\mu_n \circ F^{-1})_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ converges in distribution to the pushforward random measure $\mu \circ F^{-1}$.

Namely, letting $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions, and assuming that \mathbf{W} is an $(\mathcal{F}_t)_t$ -Brownian motion,

1. if $\mathbf{Z}, \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ are two $(\mathcal{F}_t)_t$ -adapted continuous processes that verify Eq. (20) almost surely, then $\mathbf{Z} = \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ almost surely.
2. There exists an $(\mathcal{F}_t)_t$ -adapted continuous processes \mathbf{Z} which verifies Eq. (20) almost surely.

In particular, there exists for every $t \in (0, \infty]$ a measurable map $F_t : \mathcal{C}([0, t)) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}([0, t))$, called the solution map, such that

3. setting $\mathbf{Z} = F_t(\mathbf{W}|_{[0, t)})$, then \mathbf{Z} verifies Eq. (20) almost surely on the interval $[0, t)$.
4. For every $0 \leq s \leq t \leq \infty$, then $F_t(\mathbf{W}|_{[0, t)})|_{[0, s)} = F_s(\mathbf{W}|_{[0, s)})$ almost surely.

Assume from now on that $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ is a standard two-dimensional Brownian motion of correlation $-1/2$ and time-interval \mathbb{R} . Let $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be the canonical filtration of \mathbf{W} . For every $u \in \mathbb{R}$ we define

$$\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}(t) = \begin{cases} (F_\infty((\mathbf{W}(u+s) - \mathbf{W}(u))_{0 \leq s < \infty}))(t-u), & t \geq u, \\ 0, & t < u. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}$ is $(\mathcal{F}_t)_t$ -adapted. Because Eq. (19) is invariant by addition of a constant to \mathbf{W} , and because $(\mathbf{W}(u+s) - \mathbf{W}(u))$ is a Brownian motion with time-interval \mathbb{R}_+ , we see that for every fixed $u \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}$ verifies Eq. (19) almost surely.

Our construction makes the map $(\omega, u) \mapsto \mathbf{Z}^{(u)}$ jointly measurable. Hence by Tonelli's theorem, for almost every ω , $\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}$ is a solution for almost every u .

Remark 4.2. Given ω (even restricted to a set of probability one), we cannot say that $\{\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}\}_{u \in \mathbb{R}}$ forms a whole field of solutions to Eq. (19) driven by \mathbf{W} . Indeed, we cannot guarantee that the SDE holds for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$ simultaneously. In fact, we expect thanks to intuition coming from Liouville Quantum Gravity, that there exist exceptional times $u \in \mathbb{R}$ where uniqueness fails, with two or three distinct solutions. This phenomenon is also observed in another coalescing flows of an SDE [BK04], and in the Brownian web [SSS17].

Remark 4.3. By Lévy's characterization theorem [RY13, Theorem 3.6], for every fixed $u \in \mathbb{R}$, the process $\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}$ is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion on $[u, \infty)$ with $\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}(u) = 0$. Note however that the coupling of $\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}$ for different values of $u \in \mathbb{R}$ is highly nontrivial.

Definition 4.4. We call *continuous coalescent-walk process* (driven by \mathbf{W}) the collection of stochastic processes $\{\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}\}_{u \in \mathbb{R}}$.

Since for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{Z}_{t \geq u}^{(u)}$ is a Brownian motion, one can define almost surely its local time process at zero $\mathcal{L}^{(u)}$ (see [RY13, Chapter VI]) namely for $t \geq u$, $\mathcal{L}^{(u)}(t)$ is the limit in probability of

$$\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \text{Leb} \left(\left\{ s \in [u, t] : |\mathbf{Z}_s^{(u)}| < \varepsilon \right\} \right).$$

By convention we set $\mathcal{L}^{(u)}(t) = 0$ for $t < u$, and $\mathcal{L}^{(u)}$ is a continuous process on \mathbb{R} .

In the next section we show that the *continuous coalescent-walk process* is the scaling limit of the discrete infinite-volume coalescent-walk processes defined in Section 2.4.1.

4.2 The unconditioned scaling limit result

Let $\overline{\mathbf{W}} = (\overline{\mathbf{X}}, \overline{\mathbf{Y}}) = (\overline{\mathbf{X}}_k, \overline{\mathbf{Y}}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be the random two-dimensional walk (with step distribution ν) defined below Eq. (3) page 9, and let $\overline{\mathbf{Z}} = \text{WC}(\overline{\mathbf{W}})$ be the corresponding discrete coalescent-walk process. Let also $(\overline{\mathbf{L}}^{(i)}(j))_{-\infty < i \leq j < \infty} = L_{\overline{\mathbf{Z}}}$ be the local time process of $\overline{\mathbf{Z}}$ as defined in Eq. (10) page 22. By convention, from now on we extend trajectories of $\overline{\mathbf{Z}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{L}}$ to the whole of \mathbb{Z} by setting $\overline{\mathbf{Z}}^{(j)}(i) = \overline{\mathbf{L}}^{(j)}(i) = 0$ for $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $i < j$. We define rescaled versions: for all $n \geq 1, u \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_n^{(u)} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_n^{(u)} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the continuous functions defined by linearly interpolating the following points:

$$\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n \left(\frac{k}{n} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \overline{\mathbf{W}}_k, \quad \overline{\mathbf{Z}}_n^{(u)} \left(\frac{k}{n} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \overline{\mathbf{Z}}_k^{(\lceil nu \rceil)}, \quad \overline{\mathcal{L}}_n^{(u)} \left(\frac{k}{n} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(\lceil nu \rceil)}(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (21)$$

Our first scaling limit result for infinite-volume coalescent-walk processes is the following result that deals with a single trajectory.

Theorem 4.5. *Fix $u \in \mathbb{R}$. We have the following joint convergence in $(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}))^4$:*

$$\left(\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n, \overline{\mathbf{Z}}_n^{(u)}, \overline{\mathcal{L}}_n^{(u)} \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} \left(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}^{(u)}, \mathcal{L}^{(u)} \right). \quad (22)$$

The end of this subsection is devoted to the proof of this result.

Convergence of $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n$ and of $(\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_n^{(u)}, \overline{\mathcal{L}}_n^{(u)})$. The first step in the proof is to establish component-wise convergence in Eq. (22). By Donsker's theorem, upon computing $\text{Var}(\nu) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$, we get that the rescaled random walk $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n = (\overline{\mathbf{X}}_n, \overline{\mathbf{Y}}_n)$ converges to $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ in distribution. Using Proposition 3.3, we know that a single trajectory of the discrete coalescent-walk process has the distribution of a random walk, and applying again an invariance principle such as [Bor82, Theorem 1.1], we get that $(\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_n^{(u)}(u+t), \overline{\mathcal{L}}_n^{(u)}(u+t))_{t \geq 0}$ converges to a one-dimensional Brownian motion and its local time, which is indeed distributed like $(\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}, \mathcal{L}^{(u)})$ thanks to Remark 4.3.

Proof of joint convergence. The second step in the proof is to establish joint convergence. By Prokhorov's theorem, both $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n$ and of $(\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_n^{(u)}, \overline{\mathcal{L}}_n^{(u)})$ are tight sequences of random variables. Since the product of two compact sets is compact, then the left-hand side of Eq. (22) forms a tight sequence. Therefore, again by Prokhorov's theorem, it is enough to identify the distribution of all joint subsequential limits in order to show the convergence in Eq. (22). Assume that along a subsequence, we have

$$\left(\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n, \overline{\mathbf{Z}}_n^{(u)}, \overline{\mathcal{L}}_n^{(u)} \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} \left(\mathbf{W}, \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}} \right), \quad (23)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ is a Brownian motion started at time u , and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ is its local time process at zero. The joint distribution of the right-hand-side is unknown for now, but we will show that $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = \mathbf{Z}^{(u)}$ almost surely, which will complete the proof. Using Skorokhod's theorem, we may define all involved variables on the same probability space and assume that the convergence in Eq. (23) is in fact almost sure.

Let $(\mathcal{G}_t)_t$ be the smallest complete filtration to which \mathbf{W} and $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ are adapted, i.e. \mathcal{G}_t is the completion of $\sigma(\mathbf{W}(s), \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(s), s \leq t)$ by the negligible events of \mathbb{P} . We shall show that \mathbf{W} is a $(\mathcal{G}_t)_t$ -Brownian motion, that is for $t \in \mathbb{R}, s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$,

$$(\mathbf{W}(t+s) - \mathbf{W}(t)) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{G}_t.$$

For fixed n , by definition of random walk, $(\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n(t+s) - \overline{\mathbf{W}}_n(t)) \perp\!\!\!\perp \sigma(\overline{\mathbf{W}}_k, k \leq \lfloor nt \rfloor)$. Therefore,

$$(\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n(t+s) - \overline{\mathbf{W}}_n(t)) \perp\!\!\!\perp \left(\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n(r), \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n^{(u)}(r) \right)_{r \leq n^{-1} \lfloor nt \rfloor}. \quad (24)$$

By convergence, we obtain that $(\mathbf{W}(t+s) - \mathbf{W}(t))$ is independent of $(\mathbf{W}(r), \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r))_{r \leq t}$, completing the claim that \mathbf{W} is an $(\mathcal{G}_t)_t$ -Brownian motion.

Now fix a rational $\varepsilon > 0$ and an open interval with rational endpoints (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) on which $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(t) > \varepsilon$ - note that the interval (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) depends on $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(t)$. By almost sure convergence, there is N_0 such that for $n \geq N_0$, $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n^{(u)} > \varepsilon/2$ on (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) . On the interval $(\mathbf{a} + 1/n, \mathbf{b})$, the process $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n^{(u)} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_n$ is constant by construction of the coalescent-walk process (see Section 2.4.1). Hence the limit $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} - \mathbf{y}$ is constant too on (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) almost surely. We have shown that almost surely $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} - \mathbf{y}$ is locally constant on $\{t > u : \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(t) > \varepsilon\}$. This translates into the following almost sure equality:

$$\int_u^t \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r) > \varepsilon\}} d\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r) = \int_u^t \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r) > \varepsilon\}} d\mathbf{y}(r), \quad t \geq u.$$

The stochastic integrals are well-defined: on the left-hand side by considering the canonical filtration of $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$, on the right-hand-side by considering $(\mathcal{G}_t)_t$. The same can be done for negative values, leading to

$$\int_u^t \mathbb{1}_{\{|\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r)| > \varepsilon\}} d\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r) = \int_u^t \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r) > \varepsilon\}} d\mathbf{y}(r) - \int_u^t \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r) < -\varepsilon\}} d\mathbf{x}(r).$$

By stochastic dominated convergence theorem, one can take the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, [RY13, Thm. IV.2.12], and obtain

$$\int_u^t \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r) \neq 0\}} d\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r) = \int_u^t \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r) > 0\}} d\mathbf{y}(r) - \int_u^t \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r) < 0\}} d\mathbf{x}(r).$$

Thanks to the fact that $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ is a Brownian motion, $\int_u^t \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r)=0\}} d\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(r) = 0$, so that the left-hand side of the equation above equals $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(t)$. As a result $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ verifies Eq. (20) almost surely and we can apply pathwise uniqueness (Theorem 4.1, item 1) to complete the proof that $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = \mathbf{Z}^{(u)}$ almost surely. \square

4.3 The conditioned scaling limit result

In the previous section we saw a scaling limit result for infinite-volume coalescent-walk processes. We now deal with the finite-volume case, the one that we need for our results.

For all $n \geq 1$, let \mathbf{W}_n be a uniform element of the space of tandem walks \mathcal{W}_n and $\mathbf{Z}_n = \text{WC}(\mathbf{W}_n)$ be the corresponding uniform coalescent-walk process. Let also $\mathbf{L}_n = (\mathbf{L}_n^{(i)}(j))_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} = \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{Z}_n}$ be the local time process of \mathbf{Z}_n as defined in Eq. (10) page 22.

For all $n \geq 1, u \in (0, 1)$, let $\mathbf{W}_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $\mathbf{Z}_n^{(u)} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{L}_n^{(u)} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the continuous functions defined by linearly interpolating the following points defined for all $k \in [n]$,

$$\mathbf{W}_n \left(\frac{k}{n} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \mathbf{W}_n(k), \quad \mathbf{Z}_n^{(u)} \left(\frac{k}{n} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \mathbf{Z}_n^{(\lceil nu \rceil)}(k), \quad \mathcal{L}_n^{(u)} \left(\frac{k}{n} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \mathcal{L}_n^{(\lceil nu \rceil)}(k). \quad (25)$$

Our goal is to obtain a scaling limit result for these processes in the fashion of Theorem 4.5.

Let \mathbf{W}_e denote a two-dimensional Brownian excursion of correlation $-1/2$ in the non-negative quadrant and denote by $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}, \mathbb{P}_{\text{exc}})$ the completed canonical probability space of \mathbf{W}_e . From now on we work in this space. The law of the process \mathbf{W}_e is characterized (for instance) by Proposition A.4 below. Using Proposition 3.2 and Proposition A.1, we have that \mathbf{W}_e is the scaling limit of \mathbf{W}_n . Then, the scaling limit of \mathbf{Z}_n should be the continuous coalescent-walk process driven by \mathbf{W}_e , i.e. the collection (indexed by $u \in [0, 1]$) of solutions of Eq. (19) driven by \mathbf{W}_e .

Let us remark that since Brownian excursions are semimartingales [RY13, Exercise 3.11], it makes sense to consider stochastic integrals against such processes, so the SDE in Eq. (19) driven by \mathbf{W}_e is well-defined. We can also transport existence and uniqueness of strong solutions from Theorem 4.1 using absolute continuity arguments as follows.

Denote by $\mathcal{F}_t^{(u)}$ the sigma-algebra generated by $\mathbf{W}_e(s) - \mathbf{W}_e(u)$ for $u \leq s \leq t$ and completed by negligible events of \mathbb{P}_{exc} .

Theorem 4.6. *For every $u \in (0, 1)$, there exists a continuous $\mathcal{F}_t^{(u)}$ -adapted stochastic process $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}$ on $[u, 1)$, such that*

1. *the map $(\omega, u) \mapsto \mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}$ is jointly measurable.*
2. *For every $0 < u < r < 1$, $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}$ verifies Eq. (19) with driving motion \mathbf{W}_e , restricted to the interval $[u, r]$, almost surely.*
3. *If $0 < u < r < 1$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ is an $\mathcal{F}_t^{(u)}$ -adapted stochastic process that verifies Eq. (19) with driving motion \mathbf{W}_e on interval $[u, r]$, then $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = \mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}$ on $[u, r]$ almost surely.*

Proof. Recall that the solution maps F_t defined in Theorem 4.1. For $0 < u < r < 1$, we define the process $\mathbf{R}_{u,r} \in \mathcal{C}([u, r])$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{R}_{u,r}(t) := F_{r-u}((\mathbf{W}_e(u+s) - \mathbf{W}_e(u))_{0 \leq s \leq r-u})(t-u), \quad t \leq u \leq r.$$

By definition, $\mathbf{R}_{u,r}$ is measurable with regards to $\mathcal{F}_r^{(u)}$. By Proposition A.4, the distribution of $((\mathbf{W}_e(u+s) - \mathbf{W}_e(u))_{0 \leq s \leq r-u})$ is absolutely continuous with regards to that of a Brownian motion with time-interval $[0, r-u]$. Hence thanks to items 3 and 4 of Theorem 4.1,

1. $\mathbf{R}_{u,r}$ almost surely verifies Eq. (19) driven by \mathbf{W}_e on interval $[u, r]$;
2. for $0 < u < r < r' < 1$, we have $\mathbf{R}_{u,r} = (\mathbf{R}_{u,r'})|_{[u,r]}$ almost surely.

Moreover, $(u, r, \omega) \mapsto \mathbf{R}_{u,r}$ is clearly measurable by construction.

Finally this holds simultaneously for all rational r, r' such that $0 < u < r < r' < 1$, so that there almost surely exists $\mathbf{Z}^{(u)} \in \mathcal{C}([u, 1))$ whose restriction coincides with $\mathbf{R}_{u,r}$ for every rational r . Hence it almost surely verifies Eq. (19) driven by \mathbf{W}_e . For fixed $r_0 \in (u, 1)$, $\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}|_{[u, r_0]} = \mathbf{R}_{u, r_0}$, which is $\mathcal{F}_{r_0}^{(u)}$ -measurable. Hence $\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}$ is $\mathcal{F}^{(u)}$ -adapted. This proves existence of a strong solution.

We now move to the uniqueness claim. Consider two $\mathcal{F}^{(u)}$ -adapted solutions $\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}, \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^{(u)}$ of the SDE in Eq. (19) driven by \mathbf{W}_e . By assumption $r < 1$. There must be $H, \tilde{H} : \mathcal{C}([u, r]) \rightarrow$

$\mathcal{C}([u, r])$ so that almost surely,

$$\mathbf{Z}^{(u)} = H(\mathbf{W}_e(s) - \mathbf{W}_e(u), u \leq s \leq r) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^{(u)} = \tilde{H}(\mathbf{W}_e(s) - \mathbf{W}_e(u), u \leq s \leq r).$$

By absolute continuity (Proposition A.4), given a two-dimensional Brownian motion \mathbf{B} , the processes $H(\mathbf{B})$ and $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{B})$ are solutions of the SDE in Eq. (19) driven by \mathbf{B} . By pathwise uniqueness (Theorem 4.1, item 2), $H(\mathbf{B}) = \tilde{H}(\mathbf{B})$ almost surely so that by absolute continuity, $\mathbf{Z}^{(u)} = \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^{(u)}$ almost surely. \square

Now for $u \in (0, 1)$ denote by $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}$ the strong solution of Eq. (19) driven by \mathbf{W}_e provided by the previous theorem. Note that the process $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}$ is defined and continuous on the interval $[u, 1]$. Since $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}(u) = 0$, we extend continuously $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}$ on $[0, 1]$ by setting $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}(t) = 0$ for $0 \leq t \leq u$. It will turn out below that $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}$ can also be extended continuously at time 1.

A remark similar to Remark 4.2 holds for the family $\{\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}\}_{u \in (0, 1)}$, that is, we can only guarantee that for almost every ω , $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}$ is a solution of Eq. (19) for almost every $u \in (0, 1)$. Denote by $(\mathcal{L}_e^{(u)})_{u \leq t < 1}$ the local time process at zero of the semimartingale $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}$ on $[u, 1]$. By convention, set $L_e^{(u)}(t) = 0$ for $0 \leq t < u$.

Definition 4.7. We call *continuous coalescent-walk process* (driven by \mathbf{W}_e) the collection of stochastic processes $\{\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}\}_{u \in (0, 1)}$.

We can now prove a scaling limit result for finite-volume coalescent-walk processes. We first deal with the case of a single trajectory $\mathbf{Z}_n^{(u)}$. Then we consider a more general case in Theorem 4.10.

Proposition 4.8. Fix $u \in (0, 1)$. The stochastic process $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}$ can be extended to a continuous function on $[0, 1]$ by setting $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}(1) = 0$, and we have the following joint convergence in the product space of continuous functions $\mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2) \times \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$:

$$\left(\mathbf{W}_n, \mathbf{Z}_n^{(u)}, \mathcal{L}_n^{(u)} \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} \left(\mathbf{W}_e, \mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}, \mathcal{L}_e^{(u)} \right). \quad (26)$$

Remark 4.9. Note that the convergence of local times does not go up to time one. This will be corrected later in Lemma 5.10 for a uniformly random starting point, using a combinatorial argument.

Proof. The convergence in distribution $\mathbf{W}_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} \mathbf{W}_e$ is Proposition A.1. Now let $0 < \varepsilon < u \wedge (1 - u)$. By construction, $\left((\mathbf{W}_n - \mathbf{W}_n(u))|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]}, \mathbf{Z}_n^{(u)}|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]}, \mathcal{L}_n^{(u)}|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]} \right)$ is a measurable functional of $(\mathbf{W}_n(k) - \mathbf{W}_n(\lfloor \varepsilon n \rfloor))_{\lfloor \varepsilon n \rfloor \leq k \leq \lfloor (1-\varepsilon)n \rfloor}$. Using Theorem 4.5 together with Lemmas A.2 and A.3 and Proposition A.4, we get that (the arguments are similar to the ones used in the proof of Proposition A.1)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left((\mathbf{W}_n - \mathbf{W}_n(u))|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]}, \mathbf{Z}_n^{(u)}|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]}, \mathcal{L}_n^{(u)}|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]} \right) \\ & \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} \left((\mathbf{W}_e - \mathbf{W}_e(u))|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]}, \mathbf{Z}_e^{(u)}|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]}, \mathcal{L}_e^{(u)}|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Theorem 4.5, we use Prokhorov's theorem twice, and obtain that the sequence

$$\left(\mathbf{W}_n, \left((\mathbf{W}_n - \mathbf{W}_n(u))|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]}, \mathbf{Z}_n^{(u)}|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]}, \mathcal{L}_n^{(u)}|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]} \right)_{\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, u \wedge 1 - u)} \right) \quad (27)$$

is tight. The only possible limit in distribution is

$$\left(\mathcal{W}_e, \left((\mathcal{W}_e - \mathcal{W}_e(u))|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]}, \mathcal{Z}_e^{(u)}|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]}, \mathcal{L}_e^{(u)}|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]} \right)_{\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, u \wedge 1-u)} \right) \quad (28)$$

because the processes $\mathcal{Z}_n^{(u)}|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]}$ and $\mathcal{L}_n^{(u)}|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]}$ are measurable functionals of $(\mathcal{W}_n(k) - \mathcal{W}_n(\lfloor \varepsilon n \rfloor))_{\lfloor \varepsilon n \rfloor \leq k \leq \lfloor (1-\varepsilon)n \rfloor}$ and the restriction map that sends \mathcal{W}_n to $(\mathcal{W}_n - \mathcal{W}_n(u))|_{[u, 1-\varepsilon]}$ is continuous (and so this relation must carry over to the limit). Hence there is convergence in distribution of the sequence in Eq. (27) to the limit in Eq. (28). We may now use Skorokhod's coupling theorem to obtain a large probability space where almost surely, we have uniform convergence on $[0, 1]$ of \mathcal{W}_n to \mathcal{W}_e , uniform convergence on $[u, 1-\varepsilon]$ of $\mathcal{Z}_n^{(u)}$ to $\mathcal{Z}_e^{(u)}$ and $\mathcal{L}_n^{(u)}$ to $\mathcal{L}_e^{(u)}$ for every rational $\varepsilon > 0$.

We can now use the deterministic bound $-\mathcal{X}_n \leq \mathcal{Z}_n^{(k)} \leq \mathcal{Y}_n$ (easily proven by induction) which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{k, \ell \geq n} \|\mathcal{Z}_k^{(u)} - \mathcal{Z}_\ell^{(u)}\|_{[0, 1]} &\leq 2 \sup_{k \geq n} \|\mathcal{Z}_k^{(u)} - \mathcal{Z}_e^{(u)}\|_{[0, 1-\varepsilon]} + 2 \sup_{k \geq n} \|\mathcal{Z}_k^{(u)}\|_{[1-\varepsilon, 1]} \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{k \geq n} \|\mathcal{Z}_k^{(u)} - \mathcal{Z}_e^{(u)}\|_{[0, 1-\varepsilon]} + 2 \|\mathcal{W}_e\|_{[1-\varepsilon, 1]} + 2 \sup_{k \geq n} \|\mathcal{W}_k - \mathcal{W}_e\|_{[1-\varepsilon, 1]}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking n to infinity yields $\limsup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{k, \ell \geq n} \|\mathcal{Z}_k^{(u)} - \mathcal{Z}_\ell^{(u)}\|_{[0, 1]} \leq \|\mathcal{W}_e\|_{[1-\varepsilon, 1]}$. Since ε is arbitrary, $(\mathcal{Z}_n^{(u)})_n$ is actually a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ and converges uniformly to a continuous function, which necessarily takes value zero at time 1 and coincides with $\mathcal{Z}^{(u)}$ on $[0, 1)$. \square

We finish by stating a version of the previous result, for several uniform starting points. This is the foundation upon which the next section is built.

Theorem 4.10. *Let $(u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. uniform random variables on $[0, 1]$, independent of all other variables. We have the following joint convergence in the product space of continuous functions $\mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2) \times (\mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}))^{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$:*

$$\left(\mathcal{W}_n, \left(\mathcal{Z}_n^{(u_i)}, \mathcal{L}_n^{(u_i)} \right)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} \left(\mathcal{W}_e, \left(\mathcal{Z}_e^{(u_i)}, \mathcal{L}_e^{(u_i)} \right)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \right).$$

Proof. Fix $u_1, \dots, u_k \in (0, 1)$. Joint tightness and the fact that $\mathcal{Z}_e^{(u)}$ and $\mathcal{L}_e^{(u)}$ are measurable functions of \mathcal{W}_e , imply that convergence in distribution in Eq. (26) holds jointly for $u \in \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$. This means that for every bounded continuous $\varphi : \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2) \times (\mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}))^{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(\mathcal{W}_n, \left(\mathcal{Z}_n^{(u_i)}, \mathcal{L}_n^{(u_i)} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq k} \right) \right] \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(\mathcal{W}_e, \left(\mathcal{Z}_e^{(u_i)}, \mathcal{L}_e^{(u_i)} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq k} \right) \right].$$

With dominated convergence one can integrate this over $u_1, \dots, u_k \in [0, 1]$, which by Fubini-Tonelli's theorem gives

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(\mathcal{W}_n, \left(\mathcal{Z}_n^{(u_i)}, \mathcal{L}_n^{(u_i)} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq k} \right) \right] \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(\mathcal{W}_e, \left(\mathcal{Z}_e^{(u_i)}, \mathcal{L}_e^{(u_i)} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq k} \right) \right].$$

As k is arbitrary, this is the claim of convergence in distribution in the product topology. \square

5 Scaling limits of Baxter permutations and bipolar orientations

This section is split in two parts: in the first one, we construct a permuton from the continuous coalescent-walk process $\mathfrak{Z}_e = \{\mathfrak{Z}_e^{(u)}\}_{u \in [0,1]}$ introduced in Definition 4.7, and we show that it is the limit of uniform Baxter permutations (see Theorem 5.6). We also show that this convergence holds jointly with the one for the coalescent-walk process (proved in Theorem 4.10). Building on these results, in the second part, we prove a joint (scaling limit) convergence result for all the objects considered in this paper, i.e. tandem walks, Baxter permutations, bipolar orientations and coalescent-walk processes (see Theorem 5.7). In both cases, a key ingredient is the convergence of the discrete coalescent-walk process to its continuous counterpart (see Theorem 4.10).

5.1 The permuton limit of Baxter permutations

We recall some basics on permuton limits that we need for this section. For a complete introduction we refer the reader to [BBF⁺19b, Section 2] and references therein.

Firstly, the space of permutons \mathcal{M} , equipped with the topology of weak convergence of measures, is compact and metrizable by the metric d_\square defined as follows: for every pair of permutons (μ, μ') ,

$$d_\square(\mu, \mu') := \sup_{R \in \mathcal{R}} |\mu(R) - \mu'(R)|,$$

where \mathcal{R} denotes the set of rectangles contained in $[0, 1]^2$.

We need now to define the permutation induced by k points in the square $[0, 1]^2$. Take a sequence of k points $(X, Y) = ((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k))$ in $[0, 1]^2$ in general position, i.e. with distinct x and y coordinates. We denote by $((x_{(1)}, y_{(1)}), \dots, (x_{(k)}, y_{(k)}))$ the x -reordering of (X, Y) , i.e. the unique reordering of the sequence $((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k))$ such that $x_{(1)} < \dots < x_{(k)}$. Then the values $(y_{(1)}, \dots, y_{(k)})$ are in the same relative order as the values of a unique permutation of size k , that we call the *permutation induced by* (X, Y) .

Let μ be a random permuton and $((\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Y}_i))_{i \geq 1}$ be an i.i.d. sequence with distribution μ conditionally¹² on μ . On this space, we denote by $\text{Perm}_k(\mu)$ the permutation induced by $((\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Y}_i))_{1 \leq i \leq k}$. The following concentration result shows that μ is close to $\text{Perm}_k(\mu)$ in probability when k is large.

Lemma 5.1 (Approximation of a random permuton by a random permutation [BBF⁺19b, Lemma 2.3]). *There exists k_0 such that if $k > k_0$, for any random permuton ν ,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left[d_\square(\mu_{\text{Perm}_k(\nu)}, \nu) \geq 16k^{-1/4} \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} e^{-\sqrt{k}}.$$

This lemma may be used to prove a nice characterization of permuton convergence in distribution: μ_n converges to μ in distribution if and only if $\text{Perm}_k(\mu_n)$ converges to $\text{Perm}_k(\mu)$ in distribution for every $k \geq 1$ [BBF⁺19b, Thm. 2.5]. We will not use this result here but rather directly refer to the lemma above.

We now introduce the candidate limiting permuton for Baxter permutations. Its definition is rather straightforward by analogy with the discrete case (see Section 2.4.2). We consider

¹²For a contraction of a probability space where this is possible see [BBF⁺19b, Section 2.1].

the continuous coalescent-walk process $\mathbf{Z}_e = \{\mathbf{Z}_e^{(t)}\}_{t \in [0,1]}$. Actually $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(t)}$ was not defined for $t \in \{0,1\}$ (see Definition 4.7). As what happens on a negligible subset of $[0,1]$ is irrelevant to the arguments to come, this poses no problems.

We first define a random binary relation $\leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e}$ on $[0,1]^2$ as follows (this is an analogue of the definition given in Eq. (9) page 20 in the discrete case):

$$\begin{cases} t \leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e} t & \text{for every } t \in [0,1], \\ t \leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e} s & \text{for every } 0 \leq t < s \leq 1 \text{ such that } \mathbf{Z}_e^{(t)}(s) < 0, \\ s \leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e} t, & \text{for every } 0 \leq t < s \leq 1 \text{ such that } \mathbf{Z}_e^{(t)}(s) \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

Note that the map $(\omega, t, s) \mapsto \mathbb{1}_{t \leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e} s}$ is measurable.

Proposition 5.2. *The relation $\leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e}$ is antisymmetric and reflexive. Moreover, there exists a random set $\mathbf{A} \subset [0,1]^2$ of a.s. zero Lebesgue measure, i.e. $\mathbb{P}(\text{Leb}(\mathbf{A}) = 0) = 1$, such that the restriction of $\leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e}$ to $[0,1]^2 \setminus \mathbf{A}$ is transitive almost surely.*

Proof. Antisymmetry and reflexivity are immediate by definition. Therefore we just have to prove transitivity.

Let us start by showing that, almost surely, two distinct trajectories of the coalescent-walk process $\mathbf{Z}_e = \{\mathbf{Z}_e^{(t)}\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ do not cross. That is, if $0 \leq r \leq s \leq t < 1$, and $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(r)}(s) \leq \mathbf{Z}_e^{(s)}(s)$, then $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(r)}(t) \leq \mathbf{Z}_e^{(s)}(t)$ almost surely. By contradiction, if $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(r)}(t) > \mathbf{Z}_e^{(s)}(t)$, then upon exchanging the trajectories when they first meet, one provides another solution of the SDE (19) page 35 started at time r , in negation of the uniqueness claim (Theorem 4.6, item 3).

By Fubini–Tonelli’s theorem, there exists a random set \mathbf{A} with $\mathbb{P}(\text{Leb}(\mathbf{A}) = 0) = 1$, such that this noncrossing property holds on $[0,1]^2 \setminus \mathbf{A}$ almost surely. From this result, the proof that $\leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e}$ is transitive on $[0,1]^2 \setminus \mathbf{A}$ is the same as in the discrete case (see Proposition 2.9). \square

We now define a random function that encodes the total order $\leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(t) &:= \text{Leb}(\{x \in [0,1] \mid x \leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e} t\}) \\ &= \text{Leb}\left(\{x \in [0,t) \mid \mathbf{Z}_e^{(x)}(t) < 0\} \cup \{x \in [t,1] \mid \mathbf{Z}_e^{(t)}(x) \geq 0\}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where here $\text{Leb}(\cdot)$ denotes the one-dimensional Lebesgue measure. Note that since the map $(\omega, t, s) \mapsto \mathbb{1}_{t \leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e} s}$ is measurable, the map $(\omega, t) \mapsto \varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(t)$ is measurable too.

Observation 5.3. Note that the function defined in Eq. (30) is inspired by the following: if σ is the Baxter permutation associated to a coalescent-walk process $Z = \{Z^{(t)}\}_{t \in [n]} \in \mathcal{C}$, then $\sigma(i) = \#\{j \in [n] \mid j \leq_Z i\}$.

Definition 5.4. The *Baxter permuton* is the push-forward of the Lebesgue measure on $[0,1]$ via the map $(\text{Id}, \varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e})$, that is

$$\mu_B(\cdot) := (\text{Id}, \varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e})_* \text{Leb}(\cdot) = \text{Leb}(\{t \in [0,1] \mid (t, \varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(t)) \in \cdot\}). \quad (31)$$

The Baxter permuton μ_B is a random measure on the unit square $[0,1]^2$ and the terminology is justified by the following lemma, that also states some results useful for the consecutive theorem. The second item of the lemma is proved using the same ideas as for [Maa19, Proposition 3.1].

Lemma 5.5. *The following claims hold:*

1. *For $0 < t < s < 1$, $\mathbf{Z}^{(t)}(s) \neq 0$ almost surely.*
2. *The random measure μ_B is a.s. a permuton.*
3. *Almost surely, for almost every $t < s \in [0, 1]$, either $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(t)}(s) > 0$ and $\varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(s) < \varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(t)$, or $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(t)}(s) < 0$ and $\varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(s) > \varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(t)$.*

Proof. We start by proving the first claim. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $0 < t < s < 1 - \varepsilon < 1$. As we have seen in the proof of Theorem 4.6, $(\mathbf{Z}^{(t)}(t+r))_{0 \leq r \leq 1-t-\varepsilon}$ is absolutely continuous with regards to a Brownian motion of lifetime $1-t-\varepsilon$. As a result, $\mathbf{Z}^{(t)}(s) \neq 0$ almost surely, proving claim 1.

For the second claim, by definition, the measure μ_B is a probability measure on the unit square and its first marginal is almost surely uniform. As such, to prove claim 2 we simply have to check that

$$(\varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e})_* \text{Leb} = \text{Leb} \text{ a.s.} \quad (32)$$

Let $(U_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be i.i.d. uniform random variables on $[0, 1]$. Set for $k \geq 2$,

$$U_{1,k} := \frac{1}{k-1} \# \left\{ i \in [2, k] \mid U_i \leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e} U_1 \right\}.$$

The random variables $\left(\mathbb{1}_{\{U_i \leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e} U_1\}} \right)_{i \geq 2}$ are i.i.d., conditionally on (\mathbf{W}_e, U_1) . Thus by the law of large numbers $U_{1,k}$ converges almost surely as k tends to infinity to

$$\mathbb{P}[U_2 \leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e} U_1 \mid \mathbf{W}_e, U_1] = \text{Leb}(\{x \in [0, 1] \mid x \leq_{\mathbf{Z}_e} U_1\}) = \varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(U_1).$$

On the other hand, by the exchangeability of the U_i , and using claim 1, the random variable $U_{1,k}$ is uniform in $\left\{ \frac{0}{k-1}, \dots, \frac{k-1}{k-1} \right\}$, conditionally on \mathbf{W}_e . Therefore $\varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(U_1)$ is uniform on $[0, 1]$ conditionally on \mathbf{W}_e . This proves Eq. (32) and claim 2.

For the third claim, consider a pair of independent uniform random variables U and V independent of \mathbf{W}_e . It is immediate from Proposition 5.2 that if $U \leq V$ and $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(U)}(V) > 0$ then $\varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(U) \leq \varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(V)$ a.s., and if $U \leq V$ and $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(U)}(V) < 0$ then $\varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(U) \geq \varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(V)$ a.s. The equality case $\mathbf{Z}_e^{(U)}(V) = 0$ is almost surely excluded by claim 1, and the equality case $\varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(U) = \varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(V)$ is almost surely excluded by the fact that $\varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(U)$ and $\varphi_{\mathbf{Z}_e}(V)$ are two independent uniform random variables thanks to Eq. (32). This proves claim 3. \square

We can now prove that Baxter permutations converge in distribution to the Baxter permuton. Since it will be useful in the next section, we also show that this convergence is joint with the convergence of the corresponding walk and the corresponding coalescent-walk processes.

We reuse the notation of Section 4.3. In particular, \mathbf{W}_n is a uniform element of the space of tandem walks \mathcal{W}_n , $\mathbf{Z}_n = \text{WC}(\mathbf{W}_n)$ is the associated uniform coalescent-walk process, and $\sigma_n = \text{CP}(\mathbf{Z}_n)$ is the associated uniform Baxter permutation.

Theorem 5.6. *Jointly with the convergence of Theorem 4.10, we have that $\mu_{\sigma_n} \xrightarrow{d} \mu_B$.*

Proof. Assume there is a subsequence along which μ_{σ_n} converges in distribution to some random permuton $\tilde{\mu}$ jointly with the convergences of Theorem 4.10. We shall show that $\tilde{\mu}$ has the same distribution as μ_B . By virtue of Prokhorov's theorem and compactness of the metric space \mathcal{M} , this is enough to prove the joint convergence claim. To simplify things,

we assume that the subsequential convergence is almost sure using Skorokhod's theorem. In particular, almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\mu_{\sigma_n} \rightarrow \mu_B$ in the space of permutons, and for every $i \geq 1$, $\mathcal{Z}_n^{(u_i)} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_e^{(u_i)}$ uniformly on $[0, 1]$, where $(u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d. uniform random variables on $[0, 1]$.

Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We denote by ρ_n^k the pattern induced by σ_n on the indices $\lceil nu_1 \rceil, \dots, \lceil nu_k \rceil$ (ρ_n^k is undefined if two indices are equal). From the uniform convergence above, and recalling that $\mathcal{Z}_n^{(u)}\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \mathcal{Z}_n^{(\lceil nu \rceil)}(k)$, we have for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ that

$$\text{sgn} \left(\mathcal{Z}_n^{(\lceil nu_i \rceil \wedge \lceil nu_j \rceil)}(\lceil nu_i \rceil \vee \lceil nu_j \rceil) \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{sgn}(\mathcal{Z}_e^{(u_i \wedge u_j)}(u_j \vee u_i)) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Note that the function sgn is not continuous, but by the first claim of Lemma 5.5, the random variable $\mathcal{Z}_e^{(u_i \wedge u_j)}(u_j \vee u_i)$ is almost surely nonzero hence a continuity point of sgn . By Proposition 2.11 and the third claim of Lemma 5.5, this means that $\rho_n^k \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho^k$, where ρ^k denotes the permutation $\text{Perm}_k(\mu_B)$ induced by $(u_i, \varphi_{\mathcal{Z}_e}(u_i))_{i \in [k]}$. Using Lemma 5.1, we have for k large enough that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[d_{\square}(\mu_{\rho_n^k}, \mu_{\sigma_n}) > 16k^{-1/4} \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} e^{-\sqrt{k}} + O(n^{-1}), \quad (33)$$

where the error term $O(n^{-1})$ comes from the fact that ρ_n^k might be undefined. Since $\rho_n^k \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho^k$ and $\mu_{\sigma_n} \rightarrow \tilde{\mu}$, then taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[d_{\square}(\mu_{\rho^k}, \tilde{\mu}) > 16k^{-1/4} \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} e^{-\sqrt{k}},$$

and so $\mu_{\rho^k} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mu}$. Another application of Lemma 5.1 gives that $\mu_{\rho^k} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_B$. The last two limits yield $\tilde{\mu} = \mu_B$ almost surely. This concludes the proof. \square

5.2 Joint convergence of the four trees of bipolar orientations

Fix $n \geq 1$. Let \mathbf{m}_n be a uniform bipolar orientation of size n , and consider its iterates $\mathbf{m}_n^*, \mathbf{m}_n^{**}, \mathbf{m}_n^{***}$ by the dual operation. Denote $\star = \{\emptyset, *, **, ***\}$ the group of dual operations, that is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$. For $\theta \in \star$, let $\mathbf{W}_n^\theta = (\mathbf{X}_n^\theta, \mathbf{Y}_n^\theta)$, \mathbf{Z}_n^θ and σ_n^θ be the uniform objects corresponding to \mathbf{m}_n^θ via the commutative diagram in Eq. (2) page 8. We also denote by \mathbf{L}_n^θ the local time process of \mathbf{Z}_n^θ (see Eq. (10) page 22 for a definition). We define rescaled versions as usual: for $u \in [0, 1]$, let $\mathcal{W}_n^\theta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $\mathcal{Z}_n^{\theta, (u)} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{L}_n^{\theta, (u)} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the continuous functions obtained by linearly interpolating the following families of points defined for all $k \in [n]$:

$$\mathcal{W}_n^\theta \left(\frac{k}{n} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \mathbf{W}_n^\theta(k), \quad \mathcal{Z}_n^{\theta, (u)} \left(\frac{k}{n} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \mathcal{Z}_n^{\theta, (\lceil nu \rceil)}(k), \quad \mathcal{L}_n^{\theta, (u)} \left(\frac{k}{n} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \mathbf{L}_n^{\theta, (\lceil nu \rceil)}(k).$$

Finally, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let $((u_{n,i}, u_{n,i}^*))_{i \geq 1}$ be an i.i.d. sequence of distribution $\mu_{\sigma_n^\theta}$ conditionally on \mathbf{m}_n . Let also $u_{n,i}^{**} = 1 - u_{n,i}$ and $u_{n,i}^{***} = 1 - u_{n,i}^*$ for $n, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. The first and second marginal of a permuton are uniform irregardless of the permuton, which implies that for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\theta \in \star$, $(u_{n,i}^\theta)_{i \geq 1}$ is an i.i.d. sequence of uniform random variables on $[0, 1]$ independent of \mathbf{m}_n^θ .

We can now state one of the main theorems of this paper which is in some sense (made precise later) a joint scaling limit convergence result for all these objects.

As always, we start by defining the limiting objects. For each $\theta \in \star$, let $\mathcal{W}_e^\theta = (\mathcal{X}_e^\theta, \mathcal{Y}_e^\theta)$ be distributed like \mathcal{W}_e , and let \mathcal{Z}_e^θ be the associated continuous coalescent-walk process and \mathcal{L}_e^θ be its local-time process. We take, as in the discrete case, an auxiliary i.i.d. sequence of uniform random variables on $[0, 1]$, independent of \mathcal{W}_e^θ and denoted by $(\mathbf{u}_i^\theta)_{i \geq 1}$.

Note that we did not specify the coupling of the various continuum objects for different values of $\theta \in \star$. Nevertheless, in the statement of Theorem 5.7 below this coupling is made precise. We consider the time-reversal and coordinates-swapping mapping $s : \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ defined by $s(f, g) = (g(1 - \cdot), f(1 - \cdot))$.

Theorem 5.7. *Let \mathbf{u} denote a uniform random variable in $[0, 1]$ independent of \mathcal{W}_e . Then*

1. *almost surely, $\mathcal{L}_e^{(\mathbf{u})} \in \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ has a limit at 1, and we still denote by $\mathcal{L}_e^{(\mathbf{u})} \in \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ its extension.*
2. *There exists a measurable map $r : \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that almost surely, denoting $(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}) = r(\mathcal{W}_e)$,*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{X}}(\varphi_{\mathcal{Z}_e}(\mathbf{u})) = \mathcal{L}_e^{\theta, (\mathbf{u})}(1) \quad \text{and} \quad r(s(\mathcal{W}_e)) = s(r(\mathcal{W}_e)). \quad (34)$$

These properties uniquely determine the map r $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{W}_e}$ -almost everywhere. Moreover,

$$r(\mathcal{W}_e) \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{W}_e, \quad r^2 = s \quad \text{and} \quad r^4 = \text{Id}, \quad \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{W}_e} - a.e. \quad (35)$$

3. *If we couple \mathcal{W}_e^θ and $(\mathbf{u}_i^\theta)_{i \geq 1}$ together for varying θ by taking $\mathcal{W}_e^{\theta*} = r(\mathcal{W}_e^\theta)$ and $\mathbf{u}_i^{\theta*} = \varphi_{\mathcal{Z}_e}(\mathbf{u}_i^\theta)$ for $i \geq 1$, $\theta \in \{\emptyset, *, **\}$, then we have joint convergence in distribution*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\mathcal{W}_n^\theta, \left(\mathbf{u}_{n,i}^\theta, \mathcal{Z}_n^{\theta, (\mathbf{u}_{n,i}^\theta)}, \mathcal{L}_n^{\theta, (\mathbf{u}_{n,i}^\theta)} \right)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}, \mu_{\sigma_n^\theta} \right)_{\theta \in \star} \\ & \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} \left(\mathcal{W}_e^\theta, \left(\mathbf{u}_i^\theta, \mathcal{Z}_e^{\theta, (\mathbf{u}_i^\theta)}, \mathcal{L}_e^{\theta, (\mathbf{u}_i^\theta)} \right)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}, \mu_{\mathcal{Z}_e^\theta} \right)_{\theta \in \star} \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

in the space

$$\left(\mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2) \times ([0, 1] \times C([0, 1], \mathbb{R}) \times C([0, 1], \mathbb{R}))^{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \times \mathcal{M} \right)^4.$$

4. *In this coupling, we almost surely have, for $\theta \in \star$,*

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{Z}_e^{\theta*}} \circ \varphi_{\mathcal{Z}_e^\theta} = 1 - \text{Id}, \quad \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{W}_e} - a.e. \quad (37)$$

Remark 5.8. We highlight that the results presented in the theorem above (in particular in Eqs. (34) and (35)) are a continuous analog of the results obtained in Section 2.6 for discrete objects (see in particular Theorem 2.26). The specific connections between the results for continuous and discrete objects are made clear in the proof of Theorem 5.7 below.

Proof of Theorem 5.7. We start by showing that the left-hand side of Eq. (36) is tight. Theorem 4.10 and Theorem 5.6 give us tightness of all involved random variables, with the caveat that $(\mathcal{L}_n^{\theta, (\mathbf{u}_i^\theta)})_n$ is a priori only tight in the space $\mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$. Tightness in $\mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ results

from Lemma 5.10, whose statement and proof is postponed to the end of this section, proving in passing item 1.

We now consider a subsequence of

$$\left(\mathcal{W}_n^\theta, \left(\mathbf{u}_i^\theta, \mathbf{z}_n^{\theta, (\mathbf{u}_{n,i}^\theta)}, \mathcal{L}_n^{\theta, (\mathbf{u}_{n,1}^\theta)} \right)_{i \geq 1}, \mu_{\sigma_n^\theta} \right)_{\theta \in \star}$$

converging in distribution. For fixed $\theta \in \star$, we know the distribution of the limit thanks to Theorem 4.10 and Theorem 5.6 (the limit of $\mathcal{L}_n^{\theta, (\mathbf{u}_i^\theta)}$, being a random continuous function on $[0, 1]$, is determined by its restriction to $[0, 1)$). Henceforth, it is legitimate to denote by

$$\left(\mathcal{W}_e^\theta, \left(\mathbf{u}_i^\theta, \mathbf{z}_e^{\theta, (\mathbf{u}_i^\theta)}, \mathcal{L}_e^{\theta, (\mathbf{u}_i^\theta)} \right)_{i \geq 1}, \mu_{\mathbf{z}_e^\theta} \right)_{\theta \in \star} \quad (38)$$

the limit, keeping in mind that the coupling for varying θ is undetermined at the moment. We shall determine it to complete the proof of items 2 and 3. We start by proving the following identities:

$$\mathcal{W}_e^{**} = s(\mathcal{W}_e), \quad \mathcal{W}_e^{***} = s(\mathcal{W}_e^*), \quad (39)$$

$$\mathbf{u}_i^{\theta*} = \varphi_{\mathbf{z}_e^\theta}(\mathbf{u}_i^\theta), \quad i \geq 1, \theta \in \star, \quad (40)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_e^{\theta*}(\mathbf{u}_i^{\theta*}) = \mathcal{L}_e^{\theta, (\mathbf{u}_i^\theta)}(1), \quad i \geq 1, \theta \in \star. \quad (41)$$

The claim in Eq. (39) is the easiest. Thanks to Proposition 2.24, we have that $\mathcal{W}_n^{**} = s(\mathcal{W}_n)$ and $\mathcal{W}_n^{***} = s(\mathcal{W}_n^*)$, for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Since s is continuous on $\mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$, the same result holds in the limit, proving Eq. (39).

To prove Eq. (40), we use the following lemma, whose proof is skipped. It follows rather directly from the definition of weak convergence of measures.

Lemma 5.9. *Suppose that for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$, μ_n is a random measure on a Polish space and $(\mathbf{X}_i^n)_{i \geq 1}$ an i.i.d. sequence of elements with distribution μ_n conditionally on μ_n . Assume that $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu_\infty$ in distribution for the weak topology. Then we have the joint convergence in distribution*

$$(\mu_n, \mathbf{X}_1^n, \mathbf{X}_2^n, \dots) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} (\mu_\infty, \mathbf{X}_1^\infty, \mathbf{X}_2^\infty, \dots).$$

In view of the construction of $(\mu_{\sigma_n^\theta}, (\mathbf{u}_{n,i}^\theta, \mathbf{u}_{n,i}^{\theta*})_{i \geq 1})$, it implies that the joint distribution of $(\mu_{\mathbf{z}_e^\theta}, (\mathbf{u}_i^\theta, \mathbf{u}_i^{\theta*})_{i \geq 1})$ is that of $\mu_{\mathbf{z}_e^\theta}$ together with an i.i.d. sequence of elements with distribution $\mu_{\mathbf{z}_e^\theta}$ conditionally on $\mu_{\mathbf{z}_e^\theta}$. In particular, we must have $\mathbf{u}_i^{\theta*} = \varphi_{\mathbf{z}_e^\theta}(\mathbf{u}_i^\theta)$ almost surely. This proves Eq. (40).

Finally, we have the discrete identity $\mathcal{X}_n^{\theta*}(n^{-1} \lceil n \mathbf{u}_i^{\theta*} \rceil) = \mathcal{L}_n^{\theta, (\mathbf{u}_i^\theta)}(1) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}$ for every $n \geq 1$ thanks to Corollary 2.18. By convergence in distribution, we obtain Eq. (41).

The continuous stochastic process $\mathcal{X}_e^{\theta*}$ is almost surely determined by its values on the dense sequence $(\mathbf{u}_i^{\theta*})_{i \geq i_0}$. By Eq. (41) and 0-1 law, we have that $\mathcal{X}_e^{\theta*} \in \sigma(\mathcal{W}_e^\theta)$. This together with Eq. (39) implies that $\sigma(\mathcal{Y}_e^{\theta*}) = \sigma(\mathcal{X}_e^{\theta***}) \subset \sigma(\mathcal{W}_e^{\theta**}) = \sigma(\mathcal{W}_e^\theta)$. As a result $\mathcal{W}_e^{\theta*} \in \sigma(\mathcal{W}_e^\theta)$ and there exists a measurable map $r : \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$r(\mathcal{W}_e^\theta) = \mathcal{W}_e^{\theta*}. \quad (42)$$

Then the claims in Eqs. (34) and (35) are an immediate consequence of Eqs. (39) and (41). The fact that Eq. (34) uniquely determines $r \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_e}$ -almost everywhere also results from the fact that a continuous function is uniquely determined by its values on a set of full Lebesgue measure. This completes the proof of item 2. Finally, Eqs. (40) and (42) show that the coupling in Eq. (38) is the one announced in the statement of item 3, and in particular is independent of the subsequence. Together with tightness, this proves item 3.

For item 4, we observe that $\mathbf{u}_{n,1}^\theta = 1 - \mathbf{u}_{n,1}^{\theta**} + 1/n$, so that by passing to the limit, $\mathbf{u}_1^{\theta**} = 1 - \mathbf{u}_1^\theta$. Then item 4 follows from Eq. (40). \square

We now move to the tightness lemma that was left aside. The proof relies heavily¹³ on the relation between the coalescent-walk process and the dual map presented in Corollary 2.18.

Lemma 5.10. *Let \mathbf{u} be a uniform random variable on $[0, 1]$, independent of \mathbf{W}_n . The sequence $(\mathcal{L}_n^{(\mathbf{u})}(1))_n$ is tight, and for every $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$, there exists $x \in (0, 1)$ and $n_0 \geq 1$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_n^{(\mathbf{u})}(1) - \mathcal{L}_n^{(\mathbf{u})}(1-x) \geq \delta\right) \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0. \quad (43)$$

Therefore $(\mathcal{L}_n^{(\mathbf{u})})_n$ is tight in the space $\mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$.

Proof of Lemma 5.10. Let us denote by $U_n = \lceil n\mathbf{u} \rceil$, and $V_n = \sigma_n(U_n)$, where we recall that $\sigma_n = \text{CP} \circ \text{WC}(\mathbf{W}_n)$. Both U_n and V_n are separately independent of \mathbf{W}_n . Using Corollary 2.18, we have $\mathcal{L}_n^{(\mathbf{u})}(1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}(\mathbf{X}_n^*(V_n) + 1)$, from which tightness for $(\mathcal{L}_n^{(\mathbf{u})}(1))_n$ follows. We turn to the analysis of

$$\mathcal{L}_n^{(\mathbf{u})}(1) - \mathcal{L}_n^{(\mathbf{u})}(1-x) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}\left(\mathbf{L}_n^{(U_n)}(n) - \mathbf{L}_n^{(U_n)}(\lfloor (1-x)n \rfloor)\right). \quad (44)$$

We now consider the tree $T(\mathbf{m}_n^*)$ with edges labeled by its exploration process. From Observation 2.19, the quantity $\left(\mathbf{L}_n^{(U_n)}(n) - \mathbf{L}_n^{(U_n)}(\lfloor (1-x)n \rfloor)\right)$ counts the number of edges on the ancestry line of the edge V_n in $T(\mathbf{m}_n^*)$ with a $T(\mathbf{m}_n)$ -label strictly greater than $\lfloor (1-x)n \rfloor$. The idea of the proof is to show the existence of an edge on this ancestry line of height less than $\delta\sqrt{2n}$ and of $T(\mathbf{m}_n)$ -label less than $\lfloor (1-x)n \rfloor$ with high probability. As $T(\mathbf{m}_n)$ -labels decrease going up an ancestry line of $T(\mathbf{m}_n^*)$, this will be enough (see Eq. (46) below).

Let us make this more precise. Let Δ_n a random quantity to be determined later (see Eq. (49) below), but that will turn out to be smaller than $\delta\sqrt{2n}$ with probability bounded below. Set

$$B_n = \sup\{k \leq V_n : \mathbf{X}_n^*(k) = \Delta_n\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_n = \inf\{k > V_n : \mathbf{X}_n^*(k) \leq \Delta_n\}. \quad (45)$$

On the event $\mathcal{E}_n = \{\mathbf{X}_n^*(V_n) \geq \Delta_n\} = \{\tau_n \neq \infty\} = \{B_n \neq -\infty\}$, the edge B_n is an ancestor of the edge V_n in $T(\mathbf{m}_n^*)$, of height $\mathbf{X}_n^*(B_n) = \Delta_n$. We denote by $A_n = \sigma_n^{-1}(B_n)$ the $T(\mathbf{m}_n)$ -label of this edge (see Fig. 14 for a schema of the notation).

By Observation 2.19, $\mathbf{X}_n^*(B_n) = \Delta_n = \left(\mathbf{L}_n^{(U_n)}(n) - \mathbf{L}_n^{(U_n)}(A_n)\right)$. Since $\mathbf{L}_n^{(U_n)}(\cdot)$ is increasing and nonnegative, it is clear that $\mathbf{L}_n^{(U_n)}(n) - \mathbf{L}_n^{(U_n)}(\lfloor (1-x)n \rfloor)$ is bounded by Δ_n unless the event \mathcal{E}_n is realised and $A_n \geq \lceil n(1-x) \rceil$. Translating into probabilities,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_n^{(\mathbf{u})}(1) - \mathcal{L}_n^{(\mathbf{u})}(1-x) \geq \delta\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n, A_n \geq \lceil n(1-x) \rceil\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\Delta_n \geq \delta\sqrt{2n}\right). \quad (46)$$

¹³We point out that we failed at finding a proof of Lemma 5.10 that does not use the relation given by Corollary 2.18.




Figure 14: The ancestry line of V_n in $T(\mathbf{m}_n^*)$ is (partially) plotted in red together with the different quantities involved in the proof. Recall that the $T(\mathbf{m}_n)$ -labels along this ancestry line increase from left to right.

We focus on the first term in the right-hand side of the equation above. The quantity A_n is the index of the walk \mathbf{W}_n corresponding to an edge of \mathbf{m}_n whose definition is clearer from the walk \mathbf{W}_n^* . Hence it would be more tractable to rewrite the condition $A_n \geq \lceil n(1-x) \rceil$ in terms of the walk \mathbf{W}_n^* . To that end, we introduce $\eta > 0$ and assume that $\max_{\lceil n(1-x) \rceil, n} Y_n \leq \eta\sqrt{2n}$. If $A_n \geq \lceil n(1-x) \rceil$ then necessarily $Y_n(A_n) \leq \eta\sqrt{2n}$. This trick is very useful to our purposes, as $Y_n(A_n) = L_n^{*(B_n)}(n) - 1$ (this follows once again by Corollary 2.18 together with Theorem 2.26). Finally, we have the following inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n, A_n \geq \lceil n(1-x) \rceil\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n, L_n^{*(B_n)}(n) \leq \eta\sqrt{2n} + 1\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{\lceil n(1-x) \rceil, n} Y_n \geq \eta\sqrt{2n}\right). \quad (47)$$

The first term in the right-hand side is, as desired, solely about the walk \mathbf{W}_n^* and its corresponding coalescent process, and we now focus on controlling it. By definition of B_n and τ_n (see Eq. (45)), the walk \mathbf{X}_n^* takes a positive excursion between times B_n and τ_n so that by construction of the coalescent-walk process, the walk $\mathbf{Z}_n^{(B_n)}$ takes a negative excursion between these times and weakly crosses zero upwards between times $\tau_n - 1$ and τ_n . Hence, denoting $G_n := \mathbf{Z}_n^{(B_n)}(\tau_n)$ and $R_n(k) := \mathbf{Z}_n^{(B_n)}(\tau_n + k) - G_n$, $k \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_n &= Y_n(\tau_n) - Y_n(\tau_n - 1), \\ L_n^{*(B_n)}(\tau_n + k) &= 1 + \#\{i \in [0, k], R_n(i) = -G_n\}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, $L_n^{*(B_n)}(n) = \#\{i \in [0, n - \tau_n], R_n(i) = -G_n\} + 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n, L_n^{*(B_n)}(n) \leq \eta\sqrt{2n} + 1\right) \leq \\ &\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n, \inf_{j \in [0, n^{1/4}]} \#\{i \in [0, n - \tau_n], R_n(i) = -j\} \leq \eta\sqrt{2n}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{0 \leq k \leq n} |Y_n(k) - Y_n(k-1)| \geq n^{1/4}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_n, \inf_{j \in [0, n^{1/4}]} \#\{i \in [0, n - \tau_n], R_n(i) = -j\} \leq \eta\sqrt{2n}\right) + o(1). \quad (48) \end{aligned}$$

The second term in the second line was easily treated by removing the excursion conditioning using Eq. (56) of Lemma A.5 and then using a union bound, yielding $\mathbb{P}(\max_{0 \leq k \leq n} |Y_n(k) - Y_n(k-1)| \geq n^{1/4}) \leq Cn^4 n^{-n^{1/4}}$.

We turn to the first term in the right-hand side of Eq. (48). We use the idea that \mathbf{R}_n is close in distribution to a random walk, which implies that its local time near zero in a time interval of order n is indeed of order \sqrt{n} , and so the first term can be made small by taking η small. Actually, thanks to Proposition 3.3, \mathbf{R}_n would exactly be a random walk if there were no excursion conditioning on \mathbf{W}_n^* and if Δ_n were defined so that τ_n is a stopping time of \mathbf{W}_n^* . We shall use an absolute continuity argument to compare our current situation to this ideal one. Let $0 < 2u < y$ and set

$$\Delta_n := \mathbf{X}_n^*(\lfloor yn \rfloor). \quad (49)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n, \inf_{j \in [0, n^{1/4}]} \#\{i \in [0, n - \tau_n], \mathbf{R}_n(i) = -j\} \leq \eta\sqrt{2n}) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{V}_n \geq yn, \tau_n \leq (1 - 2u)n, \inf_{j \in [0, n^{1/4}]} \#\{i \in [0, un], \mathbf{R}_n(i) = -j\} \leq \eta\sqrt{2n}\right) \\ + y + \mathbb{P}(\tau_n \geq (1 - 2u)n). \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Our choice of definition for Δ_n makes the event in the first term in the right-hand side of the equation above measurable with respect to $\sigma((\mathbf{W}_{n, \lfloor nu \rfloor + k}^* - \mathbf{W}_{n, \lfloor nu \rfloor}^*)_{0 \leq k \leq n - 2\lfloor nu \rfloor}, \mathbf{V}_n)$. By Lemma A.2 and Proposition 3.2, its probability is bounded independently of n by a constant C_u times the same probability under the unconditioned law (for which \mathbf{W}_n^* is a random walk of step distribution ν). Under the unconditioned law, τ_n is a stopping time. Applying the strong Markov property and using Proposition 3.3, we have that \mathbf{R}_n is a random walk of step distribution ν . So using an invariance principle for random walk local times [Bor82, theorem 1.1], the quantity $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \inf_{j \in [0, n^{1/4}]} \#\{i \in [0, un], \mathbf{R}_n(i) = -j\}$ converges in distribution to the local time at zero of a standard Brownian motion \mathcal{B} during the interval $[0, u]$, which is distributed like $|\mathcal{B}_u|$. Hence the first term in the right-hand side of Eq. (50) is bounded by $C_u(\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{B}_u| > \eta) + o_{u, \eta}(1))$.

Combining this with the estimates of Eqs. (44), (46) to (48) and (50), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_n^{(u)}(1) - \mathcal{L}_n^{(u)}(1 - x) \geq \delta\right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\Delta_n \geq \delta\sqrt{2n}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{\lfloor n(1-x) \rfloor, n} \mathbf{Y}_n \geq \eta\sqrt{2n}\right) + o(1) \\ + y + \mathbb{P}\left(\tau_n \geq (1 - 2u)n\right) + C_u \mathbb{P}\left(|\mathcal{B}_u| > \eta\right) + o_{u, \eta}(1). \end{aligned}$$

The probability of each term is readily bounded as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_n^{(u)}(1) - \mathcal{L}_n^{(u)}(1 - x) \geq \delta\right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{[0, y]} \mathcal{X}_n^* \geq \delta\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{[1-x, 1]} \mathbf{Y}_n \geq \eta\right) + o(1) \\ + y + \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{X}_n^*(1 - 2u) \geq \max_{[0, y]} \mathcal{X}_n^*\right) + C_u \mathbb{P}\left(|\mathcal{B}_u| > \eta\right) + o_{u, \eta}(1). \end{aligned}$$

As both \mathbf{Y}_n and \mathcal{X}_n^* converge to Brownian excursions, we can make this estimate arbitrarily small for large n upon choosing y small enough, then u small enough, then η small enough, then x small enough. This proves the lemma. \square

A Walks in the two-dimensional non-negative quadrant

A.1 Statements of the technical results

Let $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{W}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ be a two-dimensional random walk with step distribution ν (defined in Eq. (3) page 9), started at a point $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. We denote this measure by \mathbb{P}_x . Let $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ be a standard two-dimensional Brownian motion of correlation $-1/2$. After the simple computation $\text{Var}(\nu) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$, the classical Donsker's theorem implies that the process $\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \mathbf{W}_{[nt]}\right)_{t \in [0,1]}$ converges in distribution to the process $(\mathbf{W}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$. In this section we are interested in the behaviour of \mathbf{W} under the conditioning of starting and ending close to the origin, and staying in the non-negative quadrant $Q = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^2$. This has been treated in much wider generality in [DW15] and [DW20], and specialized in [BMFR19] to families of walks with steps in A (defined in Eq. (1) page 6). The following convergence in distribution can be found in [KMSW19], as an immediate consequence of [DW20, Thm 4].

Proposition A.1. *Let $x, y \in Q$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}_x \left(\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \mathbf{W}_{nt} \right)_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \in \cdot \mid \mathbf{W}_{[0,n]} \subset Q, \mathbf{W}_n = y \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W}_e \in \cdot),$$

where \mathbf{W}_e is some process that we call the two-dimensional Brownian excursion of correlation $-1/2$ in the non-negative quadrant.

We will now go through the initial steps of a slightly different proof of this result, one that highlights an absolute continuity phenomenon between a conditioned walk away of its starting and ending points and an unconditioned one. The two lemmas that we prove here (absolute continuity of the walk and local limit estimate of the density factor) are needed in this paper to show convergence of a coalescent-walk process driven by a conditioned random walk.

In what follows, we still use the convention that the infimum of a two-dimensional walk is equal to the infima of the two one-dimensional components. We also use the *hat* to denote reversal of coordinates, so that $\widehat{(i, j)} = (j, i)$.

Lemma A.2. *Let $h : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded measurable function. Let $x, y \in Q$ and $1 \leq m < n/2$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x[h((\mathbf{W}_i - \mathbf{W}_m)_{m \leq i \leq n-m}) \mid \mathbf{W}_{[0,n]} \subset Q, \mathbf{W}_n = y] \\ = \mathbb{E}_0 \left[h(\mathbf{W}_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n-2m} \cdot \alpha_{n,m}^{x,y} \left(\inf_{0 \leq i \leq n-2m} \mathbf{W}_i, \mathbf{W}_{n-2m} \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\alpha_{n,m}^{x,y}(a, b) = \sum_{z \in Q: z+a \in Q} \frac{\mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{W}_m = z, \mathbf{W}_{[0,m]} \subset Q) \mathbb{P}_{\hat{y}}(\mathbf{W}_m = \hat{z} + \hat{b}, \mathbf{W}_{[0,m]} \subset Q)}{\mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{W}_n = y, \mathbf{W}_{[0,n]} \subset Q)}. \quad (51)$$

Lemma A.3. *Fix $x, y \in Q$. For all $1/2 > \varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{a \geq 0, b \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \alpha_{n, [n\varepsilon]}^{x,y}(a, b) - \alpha_\varepsilon \left(\frac{a}{\sqrt{2n}}, \frac{b}{\sqrt{2n}} \right) \right| = 0,$$

where α_ε is a bounded continuous function over $(\mathbb{R}_+)^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ defined by

$$\alpha_\varepsilon(a, b) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{8\varepsilon^5} \int_{x: x+a \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} g(x)g(x+b)dx \quad (52)$$

and

$$g(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3\pi}} x_1 x_2 (x_1 + x_2) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_1 x_2)\right). \quad (53)$$

A byproduct of this approach is a different characterization of the law of \mathcal{W}_e , which is immediate from Proposition A.1 and Lemmas A.2 and A.3.

Proposition A.4. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ and integrable $h : \mathcal{C}([0, 1 - 2\varepsilon], \mathbb{R}^2)$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[h((\mathcal{W}_e(\varepsilon + t) - \mathcal{W}_e(\varepsilon))_{0 \leq t \leq 1-2\varepsilon}) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[h(\mathcal{W}_{|[0, 1-2\varepsilon]}) \alpha_\varepsilon \left(\inf_{[0, 1-2\varepsilon]} \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}(1-2\varepsilon) \right) \right].$$

A.2 Proof of the technical results

Proof of Lemma A.2. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{W}_{[0,n]} \subset Q, \mathbf{W}_n = y\} &= \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{W}_m + \inf_{m \leq i \leq n-m} (\mathbf{W}_i - \mathbf{W}_m) \geq (0, 0)\} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\inf_{0 \leq i \leq m} \mathbf{W}_i \geq (0, 0)\} \\ &\cdot \mathbb{1}\{\inf_{0 \leq i \leq m} (\mathbf{W}_{n-i} - \mathbf{W}_n + y) \geq (0, 0)\} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{W}_{n-m} - \mathbf{W}_n + y) = \mathbf{W}_m + (\mathbf{W}_{n-m} - \mathbf{W}_m)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We introduce a decomposition over the values of \mathbf{W}_m , yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{W}_{[0,n]} \subset Q, \mathbf{W}_n = y\} &= \sum_{z: z + \inf_{m \leq i \leq n-m} (\mathbf{W}_i - \mathbf{W}_m) \geq (0, 0)} \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{W}_m = z\} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\inf_{0 \leq i \leq m} \mathbf{W}_i \geq (0, 0)\} \\ &\cdot \mathbb{1}\{\inf_{0 \leq i \leq m} (\mathbf{W}_{n-i} - \mathbf{W}_n + y) \geq (0, 0)\} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{W}_{n-m} - \mathbf{W}_n + y) = z + (\mathbf{W}_{n-m} - \mathbf{W}_m)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the independence of increments of the random walk, along with the fact that $\mathbf{W}_{n-i} - \mathbf{W}_n$ is a random walk of step distribution $(x, y) \mapsto \nu(-x, -y) = \nu(y, x)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{W}_{[0,n]} \subset Q, \mathbf{W}_n = y \mid (\mathbf{W}_i - \mathbf{W}_m)_{m \leq i \leq n-m}) \\ &= \sum_{z \in Q: z + \inf_{0 \leq i \leq n-2m} (\mathbf{W}_i) \in Q} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{W}_m = z, \mathbf{W}_{[0,m]} \subset Q) \mathbb{P}_{\hat{y}}(\mathbf{W}_m = \hat{z} + \widehat{\mathbf{W}_{n-2m}}, \mathbf{W}_{[0,m]} \subset Q). \end{aligned}$$

From that we can conclude using Eq. (51) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_x[h((\mathbf{W}_i - \mathbf{W}_m)_{m \leq i \leq n-m}) \mid \mathbf{W}_{[0,n]} \subset Q, \mathbf{W}_n = y] = \\ &\mathbb{E}_x \left[h((\mathbf{W}_i - \mathbf{W}_m)_{m \leq i \leq n-m}) \frac{\mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{W}_{[0,n]} \subset Q, \mathbf{W}_n = y \mid (\mathbf{W}_i - \mathbf{W}_m)_{m \leq i \leq n-m})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W}_{[0,n]} \subset Q, \mathbf{W}_n = y)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_0 \left[h(\mathbf{W}_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n-2m} \cdot \alpha_{n,m}^{x,y} \left(\inf_{0 \leq i \leq n-2m} \mathbf{W}_i, \mathbf{W}_{n-2m} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Finally we prove the estimate given in Lemma A.3 for the density factor $\alpha_{n,m}^{x,y}(a,b)$. It relies on local limit results one can find in [BMFR19, Prop. 28, Prop. 29, Prop. 32]. These are specializations of the results of [DW15]. We collect those estimates in the following lemma.

Lemma A.5. *Fix $x \in Q$. There exists a positive function V on Q such that as $n \rightarrow \infty$ the following asymptotics hold*

$$\mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{W}_{[0,n]} \subset Q) \sim \frac{1}{4\sqrt{\pi}} V(x) n^{-3/2} \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (54)$$

$$\delta_1(x, n) := \sup_{y \in Q} \left| n^{5/2} \cdot \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{W}_n = y, \mathbf{W}_{[0,n]} \subset Q) - \frac{V(x)}{8\sqrt{\pi}} g\left(\frac{y}{\sqrt{2n}}\right) \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad (55)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{W}_n = y, \mathbf{W}_{[0,n]} \subset Q) \sim \frac{1}{8\sqrt{3}\pi} \cdot \frac{V(x)V(\hat{y})}{n^4}, \quad (56)$$

where g was defined in Eq. (53) above.

From Lemma A.5, the proof of Lemma A.3 is similar to the proof of Eq. (56) from Eqs. (54) and (55) in [BMFR19, Prop. 29] or [DW15, Theorem 5].

Proof of Lemma A.3. In what follows, $m = \lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Let us consider $\alpha_{n,m}^{x,y}(a,b)$ defined in Eq. (51). By Eq. (56), the denominator (which is independent of a, b) is of order n^{-4} . This is the scale to which we need to estimate the numerator.

We first deal with the infiniteness of the sum by cutting it off at $t\sqrt{n}$, for some $t > 0$, and bound the remainder. Using Eq. (55) for one factor (note that g is bounded) and Eq. (54) for the other, there is a constant C depending only on x, y such that

$$\begin{aligned} R_n &:= \sum_{|z| > t\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{W}_m = z, \mathbf{W}_{[0,m]} \subset Q) \mathbb{P}_{\hat{y}}(\mathbf{W}_m = \hat{z} + \hat{b}, \mathbf{W}_{[0,m]} \subset Q) \\ &\leq C n^{-3/2} n^{-5/2} \sum_{|z| > t\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{W}_m = z \mid \mathbf{W}_{[0,m]} \subset Q) \\ &= C n^{-4} \mathbb{P}_x(|\mathbf{W}_{\lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor}| > t\sqrt{n} \mid \mathbf{W}_{[0, \lfloor n\varepsilon \rfloor]} \subset Q). \end{aligned}$$

So that thanks to the central limit theorem for \mathbf{W} under the meander conditioning [BMFR19, Prop. 31], we can find a function $\delta_2(x, y, \varepsilon, n, t)$ independent of a, b such that

$$n^4 R_n \leq \delta_2(x, y, \varepsilon, n, t) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_2(x, y, \varepsilon, n, t) = 0. \quad (57)$$

Now set

$$B_n := \sum_{z: z+a \in Q, |z| \leq t\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{W}_m = z, \mathbf{W}_{[0,m]} \subset Q) \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\hat{y}}(\mathbf{W}_m = \hat{z} + \hat{b}, \mathbf{W}_{[0,m]} \subset Q).$$

Using Eq. (55) and symmetry of g , we have for fixed x and y that

$$\begin{aligned} B_n &= m^{-5} \cdot \frac{V(x)V(\hat{y})}{(8\sqrt{\pi})^2} \sum_{z: z+a \in Q, |z| \leq t\sqrt{n}} g\left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon n}}\right) g\left(\frac{z+b}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon n}}\right) \\ &\quad + O(1)(t\sqrt{n})^2 m^{-5} (\delta_1(x, m) + \delta_1(\hat{y}, m)). \end{aligned}$$

Collecting this estimate of the numerator with the estimate in Eq. (56) of the denominator, both uniform in (a, b) , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_{n, [\varepsilon n]}^{x,y}(a, b) &= O(1)n^4 R_n + o(1) + \frac{\sqrt{3} + o(1)}{8\varepsilon^5} \times \frac{1}{(\sqrt{n})^2} \sum_{z \geq a, |z| \leq t\sqrt{n}} g\left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon n}}\right) g\left(\frac{z+b}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon n}}\right) \\ &= O(1)n^4 R_n + o(1) + \frac{\sqrt{3} + o(1)}{8\varepsilon^5} \int_{w \geq \frac{a}{\sqrt{n}}, |w| \leq t} g\left(\frac{w}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon n}}\right) g\left(\frac{w+b}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon n}}\right) dw + o(1),\end{aligned}$$

where the last $o(1)$ corresponds to the uniform modulus of continuity of g at the scale $n^{-1/2}$ resulting from Riemann summation. All error terms are uniform in (a, b) . Finally,

$$\left| \alpha_{n, [n\varepsilon]}(a, b) - \alpha_\varepsilon\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}a, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}b\right) \right| = O(1)n^4 R_n + o(1) + O(1) \int_{|w| > t} g(w).$$

By integrability of g and Eq. (57), this last term can be made negligible by taking $n \rightarrow \infty$ and then $t \rightarrow \infty$. \square

B Generalizations

B.1 A coalescent-walk process for separable permutations

We return here to the class of separable permutations, a well-known subclass of the Baxter permutations, defined by avoidance of the two classical patterns 2413 and 3142. As we already mentioned in the introduction, the map OP puts separable permutation in bijection with *rooted series-parallel non-separable maps* [BBMF11, Prop. 6]. The scaling limit of this class of permutations, called the *Brownian separable permuton*, was introduced in [BBF⁺18].

In this section, we point out an encoding of separable permutations by a discrete coalescent-walk process, different from the one given by $\text{WC} \circ \text{OW} \circ \text{OP}^{-1}$, but more suitable for our purposes. We will also present what we believe to be the scaling limit of this coalescent-walk process, and relate it to the construction of the Brownian separable permuton given in [Maa19].

We first recall another definition of separable permutations more suited to our goals. A *signed tree* t is a rooted plane tree whose internal vertices are decorated with signs in $\{\oplus, \ominus\}$ (see the first picture of Fig. 15 for an example). We label its leaves with the integers from 1 to k according to the exploration process of t . The signs can be interpreted as coding a different ordering of the rooted tree t : we call \tilde{t} the tree obtained from t by reversing the order of the children of each vertex with a minus sign (see the second picture of Fig. 15). The order of the leaves is changed by this procedure, and we set $\sigma(i)$ to be the position in \tilde{t} (w.r.t. its exploration process) of the leaf i . We call $\text{perm}(t)$ this permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ (see the third picture of Fig. 15). Separable permutations are exactly the ones obtained from a signed tree through this procedure.

We now introduce the discrete coalescent-walk process associated to a separable permutation. Let t be a signed tree with k leaves and e edges, and let $C = (C_0, \dots, C_{2e})$ be its contour function. For every $i \in [1, 2e - 1]$ which is a local minimum of C , we denote s_i the sign of the internal vertex of t which is visited by C at time i . For every i which is a local maximum of C (a visit-time of a leaf of t), we construct the walk $Z^{(i)}$ starting at time i at 0,




Figure 15: An example of a coalescent-walk process driven by the signed excursion of a signed tree.

i.e. $Z_t^{(i)} = 0$. The walk is defined inductively by the following: for all $i \leq j \leq 2e - 1$,

$$Z_{j+1}^{(i)} - Z_j^{(i)} := \begin{cases} (C_{j+1} - C_j), & \text{if } Z_j^{(i)} > 0, \\ -(C_{j+1} - C_j), & \text{if } Z_j^{(i)} < 0, \\ -1, & \text{if } Z_j^{(i)} = 0 \text{ and } s_j = \oplus, \\ 1, & \text{if } Z_j^{(i)} = 0 \text{ and } s_j = \ominus, \\ 0, & \text{if } Z_j^{(i)} = 0 \text{ and } j \text{ is not a local minimum of } C. \end{cases}$$

We set $Z_t = \{Z^{(i)}, i \text{ local maximum of } C\}$, that is the coalescent-walk process associated to the separable permutation $\text{perm}(t)$ (see the fourth picture of Fig. 15 for an example). We observe that Z_t is a coalescent-walk process on $[0, 2e]$ in the sense of Definition 2.6, except that the trajectories do not start at every point of the interval, which is irrelevant to the rest of the discussion.

We leave to the reader the following observation (similar to Proposition 2.17) that justifies the construction of Z_t . We denote with $\text{LTr}(Z_t)$ the labeled tree induced by the trajectories of the coalescent-walk process Z_t (see the fifth picture of Fig. 15 for an example).

Observation B.1. The tree $\text{LTr}(Z_t)$ is the same as the tree \tilde{t} (forgetting the signs). Consequently, using Proposition 2.14, we have that $\text{CP}(Z_t) = \text{perm}(t)$.

Hence we see that separable permutations may be constructed using a coalescent-walk process driven by the discrete contour function (and its reflection) of a signed tree.

An *alternating signed tree* is a signed tree with the additional property that signs alternate along ancestry lines. A uniform separable permutation of size n corresponds to a uniform alternating signed tree with n leaves [BBF⁺18, Proposition 2.13]. Upon rescaling, the contour

function of the uniform alternating signed tree converges to a Brownian excursion [BBF⁺18, Proposition 2.23]. A small leap of faith leads us to believe that the scaling limit of the discrete coalescent-walk process should be the continuous coalescent-walk process given by the following family of SDEs defined for all $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{cases} d\mathbf{Z}^{(t)}(s) = \text{sgn}(\mathbf{Z}^{(t)}(s)) \mathbf{e}(s), & 0 < t \leq s \leq 1, \\ \mathbf{Z}^{(t)}(t) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (58)$$

where \mathbf{e} is a Brownian excursion on $[0, 1]$. This is the coalescing flow of the well-known *Tanaka SDE*, driven by an excursion instead of a Brownian motion. The defining feature of this equation is the absence of pathwise uniqueness: solutions are not measurable functions of the driving process \mathbf{e} , but incorporate also additional randomness, taking in this instance (see [LJR04, §4.4.3]) the form of independent uniform signs $\mathbf{s}(u) \in \{\oplus, \ominus\}$ for every $u \in (0, 1)$ that is a local minimum¹⁴ of \mathbf{e} . The solutions are then constructed explicitly as follows. For $0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1$, set $\mathbf{m}(t, s) := \inf_{[t, s]} \mathbf{e}$, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}(t, s) = \inf\{u \geq t : \mathbf{e}(u) = \mathbf{m}(t, s)\}$. Then

$$\mathbf{Z}^{(t)}(s) := (\mathbf{e}(s) - \mathbf{m}(t, s))\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\mu}(t, s)).$$

This construction is reminiscent of the discrete setting. Moreover we leave to the reader the following:

Observation B.2. Let $\mu_{\mathbf{Z}}$ be the permuton built (as in Section 5) from the continuous coalescent-walk process \mathbf{Z} defined by Eq. (58). Then $\mu_{\mathbf{Z}}$ coincides with the permuton constructed from (\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{s}) in [Maa19]. In particular, it has the distribution of the Brownian separable permuton.

This shows that the Brownian separable permuton falls in the framework of continuous coalescent-walk processes. We believe an approach similar to the one of this paper would be doable to rigorously prove the convergence from discrete to continuous coalescent-walk processes.

As separable permutations form a subset of the Baxter permutations, another route would be to specialize the bijections given for Baxter permutations in Theorem 1.5. Let $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ be a uniform separable permutation of size n , $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \text{OW} \circ \text{OP}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and $\mathbf{Z} = \text{WC}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$. Simulations lead us to believe that when the size of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is large, both \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} concentrate around the contour function of the alternating signed tree coding $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. We also believe that the discrete coalescent-walk process \mathbf{Z} should converge, in the limit, to the continuous coalescent-walk process \mathbf{Z} defined by the Tanaka's SDEs in Eq. (58).

B.2 Liouville quantum gravity and mating-of-trees

As mentioned in the introduction, uniform infinite bipolar triangulations were studied in [GHS16]. The authors showed convergence of the corresponding coalescent-walk process (in our terminology). Their limit \mathbf{Z} is in general defined in terms of two parameters κ' and θ , which in the specific case of bipolar triangulations take the values $\kappa' = 12$ and $\theta = \pi/2$. More precisely, \mathbf{Z} is defined from the interaction of the $\text{SLE}_{16/\kappa'}$ flow lines of angle θ to the space-filling $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ curve $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ of angle zero generated (in the sense of imaginary geometry) by the same field \mathbf{h} on a $\sqrt{16/\kappa'}$ -LQG quantum plane $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ with $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ independent of \mathbf{h} . They gave, for general κ' and θ , a description of the law of $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})$, where (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) is a standard two-dimensional

¹⁴ For the technicalities involved in indexing an i.i.d. sequence by this random countable set, see [Maa19].

Brownian motion of correlation ρ with $\rho = \cos(4\pi/\kappa')$, given by the *mating-of-tree* encoding of (μ, η) [GHS16, Proposition 3.2]. This characterization is written in terms of the excursions of \mathbf{Z} away from zero. In particular, there exists a constant $p = p(\kappa', \theta)$ so that \mathbf{Z} is a skew Brownian motion of parameter p (see [Lej06]), and $p(\kappa', \pi/2) = 1/2$. We believe, in the case $\kappa' = 12$ and $\theta = \pi/2$, that their description is equivalent to saying that \mathbf{Z} solves our SDE (8) driven by (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) .

For general κ' and θ , we conjecture that the SDE to be considered is the following:

$$d\mathbf{Z}^{(t)}(s) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}(t) > 0\}} d\mathbf{Y}(t) - \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{Z}^{(u)}(t) \leq 0\}} d\mathbf{X}(t) + (2p - 1)d\mathcal{L}^{(t)}(s), \quad s \geq t, \quad (59)$$

where $p = p(\kappa', \theta)$, (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) is a standard two-dimensional Brownian motion of correlation ρ with $\rho = \cos(4\pi/\kappa')$, and $\mathcal{L}^{(t)}(s)$ is the local time at zero of $\mathbf{Z}^{(t)}$ accumulated during the time interval $[t, s]$.

In support of this conjecture, we point out that a local time term appears in the analysis of the case $\kappa' = 16$ and $\theta = \pi/3$ in [LSW17], and that Lévy's characterization theorem tells us that $\mathbf{Z}^{(t)} + (2p - 1)\mathcal{L}^{(t)}$ is a Brownian motion, so that $\mathbf{Z}^{(t)}$ is indeed a skew Brownian motion of parameter p .

In the case $p = 1/2$, we recover the perturbed Tanaka SDE (20) of [Pro13, cHK18], which has pathwise unique solutions for $\rho < 1$. The edge case $\rho = 1$ (i.e. $\kappa' = \infty$, the underlying geometry being 0-LQG, that is Euclidean geometry) corresponds to the Tanaka SDE (58) which is not pathwise unique. When $\rho = 1$ but $p \neq 1/2$ we obtain the SDE

$$d\mathbf{Z}^{(t)}(s) = \text{sgn}(\mathbf{Z}^{(t)}(s))d\mathbf{X}(s) + (2p - 1)d\mathcal{L}^{(t)}(s), \quad s \geq t, \quad (60)$$

which we believe to give rise, if \mathbf{X} is replaced by a Brownian excursion, to the *biased Brownian permuton of parameter $1 - p$* , in the terminology of [BBF⁺19b, Maa19]. The opposite edge case $\rho = -1$ (i.e. $\kappa' = 4$, the underlying geometry being the critical 2-LQG) is the Harrison and Shepp's equation defining skew Brownian motion, whose solutions are pathwise unique [Lej06], and whose coalescing flow was studied by Burdzy and his coauthors (see [BK04] and the references therein).

Although the cases $p \neq 1/2$ and $\rho \neq -1$ are not present in the literature, we expect pathwise uniqueness of Eq. (59) to hold for every $p \in [0, 1]$ and $\rho \in [-1, 1]$.

C Simulations of large Baxter permutations

The simulations for Baxter permutations presented in the first page of this paper have been obtained in the following way:

1. first, we have sampled a uniform random walk of size $n + 2$ in the non-negative quadrant starting at $(0, 0)$ and ending at $(0, 0)$ with increments distribution given by Eq. (11). This has been done using a "rejection algorithm": it is enough to sample a walk W starting at $(0, 0)$ with increments distribution given by Eq. (11), up to the first time it leaves the non-negative quadrant. Then one has to check if the last step inside the non-negative quadrant is at the origin $(0, 0)$. When this is the case (otherwise we resample a new walk), the part of the walk W inside the non-negative quadrant, denoted \widetilde{W} , is a uniform walk of size $|\widetilde{W}|$ in the non-negative quadrant starting at $(0, 0)$ and ending at $(0, 0)$ with increments distribution given by Eq. (11).
2. Removing the first and the last step of \widetilde{W} , thanks to Proposition 3.2, we obtained a uniform random walk in \mathcal{W}_n .

3. Finally, applying the mapping $CP \circ WC$ to the walk given by the previous step, we obtained a uniform Baxter permutation of size n (thanks to Theorem 1.5).
 Note that our algorithm gives a random Baxter permutation which, conditioned on its size to be equal to n , is uniformly distributed among all Baxter permutations of size n .

References

- [Bax64] G. Baxter. On fixed points of the composite of commuting functions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 15:851–855, 1964.
- [BBF⁺18] F. Bassino, M. Bouvel, V. Féray, L. Gerin, and A. Pierrot. The Brownian limit of separable permutations. *The Annals of Probability*, 46(4):2134–2189, 2018.
- [BBF⁺19a] F. Bassino, M. Bouvel, V. Féray, L. Gerin, M. Maazoun, and A. Pierrot. Scaling limits of permutation classes with a finite specification: a dichotomy. *arXiv preprint :1903.07522*, 2019.
- [BBF⁺19b] F. Bassino, M. Bouvel, V. Féray, L. Gerin, M. Maazoun, and A. Pierrot. Universal limits of substitution-closed permutation classes. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, to appear, 2019.
- [BBFS20] J. Borga, M. Bouvel, V. Féray, and B. Stuffer. A decorated tree approach to random permutations in substitution-closed classes. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 25:52 pp., 2020.
- [BBGR19] N. R. Beaton, M. Bouvel, V. Guerrini, and S. Rinaldi. Enumerating five families of pattern-avoiding inversion sequences; and introducing the powered Catalan numbers. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 777:69–92, 2019.
- [BBMF11] N. Bonichon, M. Bousquet-Mélou, and É. Fusy. Baxter permutations and plane bipolar orientations. *Sém. Lothar. Combin.*, 61A:Art. B61Ah, 29, 2009/11.
- [BDS19] J. Borga, E. Duchi, and E. Slivken. Almost square permutations are typically square. *arXiv preprint: 1910.04813*, 2019.
- [BF12] O. Bernardi and É. Fusy. Schnyder decompositions for regular plane graphs and application to drawing. *Algorithmica*, 62(3-4):1159–1197, 2012.
- [BGRR18] M. Bouvel, V. Guerrini, A. Rechnitzer, and S. Rinaldi. Semi-Baxter and strong-Baxter: two relatives of the Baxter sequence. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 32(4):2795–2819, 2018.
- [BK04] K. Burdzy and H. Kaspi. Lenses in skew Brownian flow. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(4):3085–3115, 2004.
- [BM03] M. Bousquet-Mélou. Four classes of pattern-avoiding permutations under one roof: generating trees with two labels. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 9(2):Research paper 19, 31, 2002/03. Permutation patterns (Otago, 2003).
- [BMFR19] M. Bousquet-Mélou, É. Fusy, and K. Raschel. Plane bipolar orientations and quadrant walks. *arXiv preprint: 1905.04256*, 2019.

- [Bor82] A. N. Borodin. On the asymptotic behavior of local times of recurrent random walks with finite variance. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 26(4):758–772, 1982.
- [Bor20a] J. Borga. Asymptotic normality of consecutive patterns in permutations encoded by generating trees with one-dimensional labels. *arXiv preprint: 2003.08426*, 2020.
- [Bor20b] J. Borga. Local convergence for permutations and local limits for uniform ρ -avoiding permutations with $|\rho| = 3$. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 176(1):449–531, 2020.
- [Boy67] W. M. Boyce. Generation of a class of permutations associated with commuting functions. *Math. Algorithms 2 (1967)*, 19–26; addendum, *ibid.*, 3:25–26, 1967.
- [BP12] A. M. Baxter and L. K. Pudwell. Enumeration schemes for vincular patterns. *Discrete Math.*, 312(10):1699–1712, 2012.
- [BS19] J. Borga and E. Slivken. Square permutations are typically rectangular. *arXiv preprint: 1904.03080*, to appear in *Annals of Applied Probability*, 2019.
- [CGHK78] F. R. K. Chung, R. L. Graham, V. E. Hoggatt, Jr., and M. Kleiman. The number of Baxter permutations. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 24(3):382–394, 1978.
- [cHK18] M. Çağlar, H. Hajri, and A. H. Karakuş. Correlated coalescing Brownian flows on \mathbb{R} and the circle. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 15(2):1447–1464, 2018.
- [Cur18] N. Curien. Random graphs: the local convergence point of view. *Unpublished lecture notes. Available at <https://www.math.u-psud.fr/~curien/enseignement.html>*, 2018.
- [DP14] T. Dokos and I. Pak. The expected shape of random doubly alternating Baxter permutations. *Online J. Anal. Comb.*, 9:12, 2014.
- [DW15] D. Denisov and V. Wachtel. Random walks in cones. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(3):992–1044, 2015.
- [DW20] J. Duraj and V. Wachtel. Invariance principles for random walks in cones. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 130(7):3920–3942, 2020.
- [Eli07] S. Elizalde. Generating trees for permutations avoiding generalized patterns. *Ann. Comb.*, 11(3-4):435–458, 2007.
- [FFNO11] S. Felsner, É. Fusy, M. Noy, and D. Orden. Bijections for Baxter families and related objects. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 118(3):993–1020, 2011.
- [GHS16] E. Gwynne, N. Holden, and X. Sun. Joint scaling limit of a bipolar-oriented triangulation and its dual in the peanosphere sense. *arXiv preprint: 1603.01194*, 2016.
- [GHS17] E. Gwynne, N. Holden, and X. Sun. A mating-of-trees approach for graph distances in random planar maps. *arXiv preprint: 1711.00723*, 2017.

- [GHS19] E. Gwynne, N. Holden, and X. Sun. Mating of trees for random planar maps and Liouville quantum gravity: a survey. *arXiv preprint: 1910.04713*, 2019.
- [Gir93] S. Gire. *Arbres, permutations à motifs exclus et cartes planaires: quelques problèmes algorithmiques et combinatoires*. PhD thesis, Bordeaux 1, 1993.
- [HKM⁺13] C. Hoppen, Y. Kohayakawa, C. G. Moreira, B. Ráth, and R. M. Sampaio. Limits of permutation sequences. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 103(1):93–113, 2013.
- [HRS17] C. Hoffman, D. Rizzolo, and E. Slivken. Pattern-avoiding permutations and Brownian excursion part I: shapes and fluctuations. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 50(3):394–419, 2017.
- [HRS19] C. Hoffman, D. Rizzolo, and E. Slivken. Scaling limits of permutations avoiding long decreasing sequences. *arXiv preprint: 1911.04982*, 2019.
- [HS19] N. Holden and X. Sun. Convergence of uniform triangulations under the cardy embedding. *arXiv preprint: 1905.13207*, 2019.
- [Kal17] O. Kallenberg. *Random measures, theory and applications*, volume 77. Springer, 2017.
- [KKRW20] R. Kenyon, D. Král', C. Radin, and P. Winkler. Permutations with fixed pattern densities. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 56(1):220–250, 2020.
- [KMSW19] R. Kenyon, J. Miller, S. Sheffield, and D. B. Wilson. Bipolar orientations on planar maps and SLE_{12} . *Ann. Probab.*, 47(3):1240–1269, 2019.
- [Lej06] A. Lejay. On the constructions of the skew Brownian motion. *Probab. Surv.*, 3:413–466, 2006.
- [LG13] J.-F. Le Gall. Uniqueness and universality of the Brownian map. *The Annals of Probability*, 41(4):2880–2960, 2013.
- [LJR04] Y. Le Jan and O. Raimond. Flows, coalescence and noise. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(2):1247–1315, 2004.
- [LSW17] Y. Li, X. Sun, and S. S. Watson. Schnyder woods, $SLE(16)$, and Liouville quantum gravity. *arXiv preprint: 1705.03573*, 2017.
- [Maa19] M. Maazoun. On the Brownian separable permuton. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, page 1–26, 2019.
- [Mal79] C. L. Mallows. Baxter permutations rise again. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 27(3):394–396, 1979.
- [Mie13] G. Miermont. The Brownian map is the scaling limit of uniform random plane quadrangulations. *Acta mathematica*, 210(2):319–401, 2013.
- [ML10] N. Madras and H. Liu. Random pattern-avoiding permutations. *Algorithmic Probability and Combinatorics, AMS, Providence, RI*, pages 173–194, 2010.

- [MP14] S. Miner and I. Pak. The shape of random pattern-avoiding permutations. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 55:86–130, 2014.
- [MP16] N. Madras and L. Pehlivan. Large deviations for permutations avoiding monotone patterns. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 23(4):Paper 4.36, 20, 2016.
- [Pro13] V. Prokaj. The solution of the perturbed Tanaka-equation is pathwise unique. *Ann. Probab.*, 41(3B):2376–2400, 2013.
- [RY13] D. Revuz and M. Yor. *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, volume 293. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [SSS17] E. Schertzer, R. Sun, and J. M. Swart. The Brownian web, the Brownian net, and their universality. In *Advances in disordered systems, random processes and some applications*, pages 270–368. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2017.