

Upper tail large deviations of the directed landscape

Sayan Das

Duncan Dauvergne

Bálint Virág

Abstract

Starting from one-point tail bounds, we establish an upper tail large deviation principle for the directed landscape at the metric level. Metrics of finite rate are in one-to-one correspondence with measures supported on a set of countably many paths, and the rate function is given by a certain *Krushkov entropy* of these measures. As an application of our main result, we prove a large deviation principle for the directed geodesic.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Applications	7
3	Preliminaries	17
4	Topology	29
5	The rate function	37
6	Finite-rate metrics, measures and Krushkov entropy	39
7	The large deviation upper bound	46
8	The large deviation lower bound	51
9	Large deviations of the directed geodesic	53
10	The rate function as an integrated Dirichlet energy	55

1 Introduction

The directed landscape describes random planar geometry: it is expected to be the scaling limit of planar first passage percolation, and has been proven to be the scaling limit of a rich class of models in the KPZ (Kardar-Parisi-Zhang) universality class, including integrable models of last passage percolation (Dauvergne, Ortmann and Virag (2022), Dauvergne and Virág (2021)), coloured tasep (Aggarwal, Corwin and Hegde (2024)), and the continuum directed random polymer and the KPZ equation (Wu (2023)).

The directed landscape is best thought of as a random directed metric on the space-time plane. More precisely, define \mathcal{E} be the set of all continuous functions e from $\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4 = \{(x, s; y, t) \in \mathbb{R}^4, s < t\}$ to \mathbb{R} satisfying the (reverse) triangle inequality

$$e(p; q) + e(q; r) \leq e(p; r)$$

for $(p; q), (q; r) \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$. The directed landscape is a random element $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{E}$. Because of the triangle inequality, we can think of an element $e \in \mathcal{E}$ as a **(directed) metric**, and view e as assigning distances between pairs of points $(x, s), (y, t)$ in the space-time plane. The condition that e only assigns a distance when $s < t$ makes the second-coordinate time-like, and because of this restriction, there is no contradiction in allowing our directed metrics to be real-valued. The fact that the triangle inequality is reversed for the directed landscape is simply a convention.

For a fixed point pair $u = (x, s; y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$ the law of $\mathcal{L}(u)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(u) \stackrel{d}{=} (t - s)^{1/3} \text{TW} + d(u), \quad d(u) = -\frac{(y - x)^2}{t - s}, \quad (1.1)$$

where TW is a GUE Tracy-Widom random variable. We call d the **Dirichlet metric** (with negative sign). In particular, it can be shown that after scaling

$$\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x, s; y, t) := \varepsilon \mathcal{L}(x\varepsilon^{-1/2}, s; y\varepsilon^{-1/2}, t) \quad (1.2)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we have $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \rightarrow d$ uniformly on bounded subsets (see Corollary 10.7 in Dauvergne et al. (2022) for a quantitative version). But how likely is it that \mathcal{L}_ε is close to a different metric?

Our main theorem answers this question. For this theorem and throughout the paper, we equip \mathcal{E} with the topology of uniform convergence on bounded sets. This is stronger than uniform convergence on compact sets, since it requires uniform convergence near the boundary $s = t$ in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4 .

Theorem 1.1. *There exists a lower semicontinuous function $I : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that for every Borel measurable $A \subset \mathcal{E}$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we have*

$$\exp((o(1) - \inf_{A^\circ} I)\varepsilon^{-3/2}) \leq P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in A) \leq \exp((o(1) - \inf_{\bar{A}} I)\varepsilon^{-3/2}).$$

Moreover, $I^{-1}[0, a]$ is compact for every $a < \infty$, $I^{-1}(0) = d$, and I is strictly increasing on $I^{-1}[0, \infty)$.

In other words, the family $\{\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon\}$ satisfies a large deviation principle with speed $\varepsilon^{-3/2}$ and good rate function I .

Large deviations at speed $\varepsilon^{-3/2}$ are typically called upper-tail large deviations in the KPZ literature. There is no notion of “upper tail” involved in the statement of the theorem. Lower tail events simply have infinite rate at this speed. There is no contradiction to having different large deviation principles at different speeds, and we expect to see another principle at speed ε^{-3} corresponding to the lower tail. Indeed, in the closely related setting of first passage percolation, a lower tail large deviation principle at the metric level was recently established by Verges (2024). What is special for this particular speed is that I is a good rate function: the sub-level sets are compact. At higher speeds sub-level sets must contain our entire $I^{-1}[0, \infty)$.

Monotonicity of the rate function is a feature of large deviations at the metric level. It is not expected to hold for important contractions, such as the upper-tail large deviations for the Airy process. Another feature of the metric-level large deviations is a simple characterization of the rate function, which we describe next.

1.1 The rate function

For $e \in \mathcal{E}$ and a continuous function $\gamma : [s, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, henceforth referred to as a path, define the **length** $|\gamma|_e$ of γ with respect to e by

$$|\gamma|_e = \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \inf_{s=r_0 < r_1 < \dots < r_k} \sum_{i=1}^k e(\gamma(r_{i-1}), r_{i-1}; \gamma(r_i), r_i). \quad (1.3)$$

The triangle inequality guarantees that $|\gamma|_e \leq e(\gamma(s), s; \gamma(t), t)$, and we call a path γ an **e -geodesic** if this is an equality.

For the Dirichlet metric, the length is a negative Dirichlet energy: when γ is absolutely continuous, we have $|\gamma|_d = -\int_s^t \gamma'^2$, and otherwise $|\gamma|_d = -\infty$. Let H^1 be the set of all paths γ with $|\gamma|_d > -\infty$. The metrics in Theorem 1.1 with finite rate can be described planting good regions in \mathbb{R}^2 on top of the Dirichlet metric.

Given a singular measure μ on \mathbb{R}^2 , define a directed metric e_μ as follows. For a path $\gamma : [s, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathfrak{g}\gamma = \{(\gamma(r), r) : r \in [s, t]\}$ denote the **graph** of γ , and define

$$e_\mu(x, s; y, t) = \sup_{\gamma} \mu(\mathfrak{g}\gamma) + |\gamma|_d, \quad (1.4)$$

where the supremum is over all $\gamma \in H^1$ with domain $[s, t]$ satisfying $\gamma(s) = x, \gamma(t) = y$. In words, paths are rewarded by covering sets of large μ -measure with their graphs, but are penalized by the Dirichlet metric for excessive undulation.

Such metrics were studied by [Bakhtin \(2013\)](#) in the case when μ is a Poisson point process. For us, μ will be deterministic and without atoms. We note in passing that under some technical conditions, as a function of y, t the metric $e_\mu(x, s; y, t)$ satisfies a Hamilton-Jacobi equation (an Eikonal equation) with “forcing term” given by μ . The y -derivative then satisfies a forced inviscid Burgers’ equation.

More precisely, our measures μ will be supported on a countable union of graphs $\mathfrak{g}\gamma, \gamma \in \Gamma \subset H^1$ and have the property that for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$, the time-marginal of the restricted measure $\mu|_{\mathfrak{g}\gamma}$ has a Lebesgue density. Finally, all our measures will have finite **Kruzhkov entropy** $\mathcal{K}(\mu)$. For this, define the **temporal density** $\rho_\mu(x, t)$ of μ , by setting $\rho_\mu(x, t) = 0$ for $(x, t) \notin \text{supp}(\mu)$, and whenever $(x, t) \in \mathfrak{g}\gamma$ for some $\gamma \in \Gamma$, letting $\rho_\mu(x, t)$ be the Lebesgue density of the t -marginal of $\mu|_{\mathfrak{g}\gamma}$. As long as ρ_μ exists, it is well-defined μ -a.e. Then

$$\mathcal{K}(\mu) = \int \sqrt{\rho_\mu} d\mu.$$

The name is motivated by Kruzhkov’s analysis of Burgers’ equation and its generalizations, [Kruzhkov \(1970\)](#). The definition is related to the concept of Rényi entropy, where a power of the density is integrated against the measure. We call a measure satisfying the above conditions a **planted network measure**. Then for all $e \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$I(e) = \begin{cases} \frac{4}{3}\mathcal{K}(\mu) & \text{if } e = e_\mu \text{ for some planted network measure } \mu \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We will also show that in any finite rate metric, the length of a path $\gamma \in H^1$ is given by $\mu(\mathfrak{g}\gamma) + |\gamma|_d$. This representation quickly implies the last two claims of Theorem 1.1.

Applications, an alternate characterization, and the proof

In Section 2, a continuation of this introduction, we give several applications of Theorem 1.1 to describe large deviations for marginals of the directed landscape. Among other results, we describe the joint large deviations of $\mathcal{L}(u_1), \dots, \mathcal{L}(u_k)$ for any finite collection of points u_1, \dots, u_k .

We also present a full large deviation principle for the directed geodesic Π . This is the a.s. unique \mathcal{L} -geodesic between the points $(0, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$. By the symmetries of the directed landscape, any \mathcal{L} -geodesic between deterministic points is equal in law to an

affine function of Π . The large deviations of the directed geodesic are described by a good rate function $J : C([0, 1]) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$. It turns out that $J(f)$ solves a variational problem, and its value is between $4/3$ times the cubes of the $L^{3/2}$ and L^3 norms of f , and that both of these norms are attained for different choices of f . We use our large deviation principle to show that as $a \rightarrow \infty$ we have $P(\sup_{[0,1]} |\Pi| \geq a) = e^{-\frac{32}{3}a^3 + o(a^3)}$, to partially solve a conjecture of [Liu \(2022a\)](#), and to present a new conjecture.

A natural question that arises from our description of the rate function is how to systematically determine μ from the measure e . This can be done by differentiation. For $e \in \mathcal{E}$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$, define

$$\rho_e(p) = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{e(p; p + (\theta t, t)) - d(p; p + (\theta t, t))}{t}. \quad (1.5)$$

The limit above can be thought of as quantifying how much excess density the metric e has at p when compared with the Dirichlet metric. When $e = e_\mu$ for a planted network measure μ , then ρ_e is the temporal density of μ . Another upshot of this differentiation approach to understanding finite rate metrics is a formula for the rate function in terms of an integrated Dirichlet energy. This interpretation is closely related to the predicted large deviations of the Airy process, which should be the same as those of a Brownian motion conditioned to remain above a parabola. See Section 10 for details.

Our proof relies only on single-point bounds for the Tracy-Widom random variables, and builds the geometric picture on top of this by relying on deterministic topological arguments and the metric structure of the directed landscape. Indeed, most of the proof is devoted to understanding the deterministic structure of finite-rate metrics in \mathcal{E} . Because we use so little about the structure of the directed landscape, we believe that the methods should extend quite generally to other first and last passage percolation models, even non-integrable ones under some mild conditions.

A partial review of previous work

We give a partial literature review here, focusing on work in the KPZ universality class related to the study of large deviations. See [Quastel \(2011\)](#); [Corwin \(2012\)](#); [Zygouras \(2018\)](#); [Ganguly \(2021\)](#) and references therein for a broader review of the KPZ universality class.

Large deviations in the KPZ universality class have been studied by many authors. The upper tail bound for the Tracy-Widom law can be deduced from results in the original paper of [Tracy and Widom \(1994\)](#). A probabilistic derivation using the stochastic Airy operator was given by [Ramirez, Rider and Virág \(2011\)](#).

One-point large deviations in exactly solvable last passage percolation models have been explored by Logan and Shepp (1977), Seppäläinen (1998a,b), Deuschel and Zeitouni (1999), Johansson (2000) using a range of methods. At the process level, large deviations for tasep (equivalently exponential last passage percolation) in the upper-tail regime were studied by Jensen (2000) and Varadhan (2004), but the full proof in this regime had to wait until the recent paper of Quastel and Tsai (2021). A version of Kruzhkov entropy appears in that paper. To express the rate function there, one has to solve a Burgers' equation. In our case, the formulas simplify because we consider the higher, metric level of large deviations. Also, at this level, we only need to rely on single-point tail bounds as opposed to the KPZ fixed point-like determinantal formulas used in Quastel and Tsai (2021).

Process level large deviations at different speed (those corresponding to lower tail) have been studied by Olla and Tsai (2019) for tasep. The recent exciting preprint of Verges (2024) proves a lower tail large deviation principle in first passage percolation on \mathbb{Z}^d at the metric level. A one-point lower tail large deviation principle for this model with $d = 2$ was previously shown by Basu, Ganguly and Sly (2021).

A study of what happens to the directed landscape and its geodesics at finer fluctuation scales under large deviation events was initiated in Liu (2022b), Liu and Wang (2024). These papers obtained one-point and multi-point Gaussian convergence for the geodesic and the KPZ fixed point, respectively, using exact formulas from Liu (2022a). Relying on probabilistic and geometric arguments, a Brownian bridge limit for the geodesic under an upper-tail large deviation event was proven in Ganguly, Hegde and Zhang (2023) using precise bounds from Ganguly and Hegde (2022).

Recently, there has been significant interest within both the mathematics and physics communities in understanding large deviations of the KPZ equation (Kardar, Parisi and Zhang (1986)). The works of Le Doussal, Majumdar and Schehr (2016), Kamenev, Meerson and Sasorov (2016), Sasorov, Meerson and Prolhac (2017), Corwin, Ghosal, Krajenbrink, Le Doussal and Tsai (2018), Krajenbrink, Le Doussal and Prolhac (2018), Le Doussal (2019), Krajenbrink and Le Doussal (2019), Corwin and Ghosal (2020a,b), Das and Tsai (2021), Tsai (2022), Cafasso and Claeys (2022), Ghosal and Lin (2023) obtain results on one-point tails of KPZ equation. Process level limits and large deviations for the KPZ equation were studied by Lin and Tsai (2023) and Gaudreau Lamarre, Lin and Tsai (2023). For some other integrable models in the KPZ universality class, one-point large deviation principles have been established by Georgiou and Seppäläinen (2013), Janjigian (2015), Emrah and Janjigian (2017), Janjigian (2019), Das and Zhu (2022), Das, Liao and Mucciconi (2023).

Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe various applications of our main theorem. In Section 3, we collect preliminary properties and estimates for the directed landscape and Airy sheet, and establish simple extensions of the one-point bounds of Theorem 3.4. Woven through Section 3 is a heuristic derivation of the large deviation principle, which is naturally suggested by the preliminaries. In Section 4, we introduce a subspace of \mathcal{E} , where the rate function is finite, and prove properties of it. The rate function and various approximations for metrics are defined and analyzed in Sections 5 and 6. In Sections 7 and 8, we prove the upper and lower bounds for the large deviations. Finally, in Section 10, we express the rate function as an integrated Dirichlet energy.

2 Applications

In this section, we study the minimizing metric and its rate function for various optimization problems. We first prove a proposition which describing a generic structure of the minimizer for a particular class of optimization problems.

A finite or countable collection of paths is **internally disjoint** if for all distinct γ, γ' in the collection with domains $[a, b], [c, d]$ and $r \in (a, b) \cap (c, d)$ we have $\gamma(r) \neq \gamma'(r)$. We will use the intuitive notion of rightmost geodesics, see the discussion before Lemma 4.5 for the precise definition, but otherwise the proposition and its proof only appeal to Theorem 1.1 and the structure of the rate function introduced in Section 1.1.

Proposition 2.1 (Multi-point upper tail decay for the directed landscape).

For $i = 1, \dots, k$, let $(p_i; q_i) \in \mathbb{R}_+^4$ and $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(p_i; q_i) \geq \alpha_i, i = 1, \dots, k) = \exp(-\beta\varepsilon^{-3/2} + o(\varepsilon^{-3/2})), \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.1)$$

Here $\beta < \infty$ solves the variational problem

$$\beta := \inf_{e \in \mathcal{M}} I(e), \quad \mathcal{M} = \{e \in \mathcal{E} : e(u_i) \geq \alpha_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, k\}.$$

This infimum is achieved by at least one $e \in \mathcal{M}$, and any such e equals e_μ for some measure μ with the following structure.

- (a) The support of μ is contained in a set of the form $\bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathfrak{g}\pi_i$ where each π_i is the rightmost e_μ -geodesic from p_i to q_i .

- (b) There is a finite collection of line segments $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathfrak{g}\pi_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \mathfrak{g}\gamma_i$, and ρ_μ is μ -a.e. constant on each of the line segments $\mathfrak{g}\gamma_i$.
- (c) If $\gamma_i(t) = \gamma_j(t)$ for $i \neq j$, then either $(\gamma_i(t), t) \in \bigcup_{\ell=1}^k \{p_\ell, q_\ell\}$, or at least three segments meet at the point $(\gamma_i(t), t)$. That is, there exists an index ℓ distinct from i and j so that $\gamma_i(t) = \gamma_j(t) = \gamma_\ell(t)$.

Proof. To see that $\beta < \infty$, observe that we can find a finite rate metric in \mathcal{M} by considering a measure μ supported on straight line segments between p_i to q_i and setting ρ_μ to be a high enough constant on the graphs of these segments.

Now suppose $e_n \in \mathcal{M}$ is a sequence of metrics with $I(e_n) \rightarrow \beta$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\beta < \infty$ and sub-level sets of I are compact, e_n has a subsequential limit e^* , which lies in \mathcal{M} since this set is closed. Moreover, $I(e^*) \leq \beta$ by lower semicontinuity of I . Hence $e^* = e_\mu$ for some μ and $I(e_\mu) = \beta$.

Next, let π_i be the rightmost geodesic from p_i to q_i under e^* (these exist by Lemma 4.7). The metric μ must be supported inside $\bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathfrak{g}\pi_i$, since the metric induced by $\mu|_{\bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathfrak{g}\pi_i}$ is still in \mathcal{M} , and has strictly smaller Kruzhkov entropy if μ has mass outside this set. This gives (a).

Let us consider ν defined via $\rho_\nu := \rho_\mu + c$ with $c > 0$. Note that $e_\nu \in \mathcal{M}^\circ$ and $I(e_\nu) - I(e_\mu)$ can be made arbitrarily small by choosing c small enough as μ is supported on finitely many paths. Thus $\beta = \inf_{\mathcal{M}^\circ} I$, and consequently (2.1) is now a direct application of the Theorem 1.1.

Now, any two distinct paths π_i, π_j must overlap on a closed interval, a simple fact about rightmost geodesics. Therefore there is a collection of internally disjoint paths $\gamma_i, i = 1, \dots, m$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathfrak{g}\pi_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \mathfrak{g}\gamma_i$. If we choose m minimally, then (c) must hold for this collection. Indeed, if there were a pair γ_i, γ_j with $\gamma_i(t) = \gamma_j(t)$, then internal disjointness guarantees that t is an endpoint of the domains $[a_i, b_i], [a_j, b_j]$ of γ_i, γ_j . If $t = a_i = b_j$ or $t = a_j = b_i$, then we can concatenate γ_i, γ_j to give an internally disjoint collection of $m - 1$ paths whose graphs cover the same region $\bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathfrak{g}\pi_i$. If $t = a_i = a_j$ or $t = b_i = b_j$, then either $(\gamma_i(t), t)$ is an endpoint of one of the paths π_i , or else there is a third path γ_ℓ with $\gamma_i(t) = \gamma_j(t) = \gamma_\ell(t)$.

Finally, we claim that each γ_i must be a straight line, and that ρ_μ must be constant along $\mathfrak{g}\gamma_i$. It is enough to check this for $\gamma_1 : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Define $\mu^* = \mu|_{\bigcup_{i=2}^m \mathfrak{g}\gamma_i}$, and for $\varepsilon \geq 0$ let ν_ε be the measure supported on the line segment γ_1^* from $(\gamma_1(a), a)$ to $(\gamma_1(b), b)$ and with ρ_ν constant along γ_1^* , and equal to $(\alpha^{3/2} - \varepsilon)^{2/3}$, where α is the average of $\rho_\mu(\gamma_1(t), t), t \in [a, b]$. Let μ_ε^* be the measure with $\rho_{\mu_\varepsilon^*} = \rho_{\mu^*} \vee \rho_{\nu_\varepsilon}$. By a short computation,

$$\mathcal{K}(\mu) - \mathcal{K}(\mu_\varepsilon^*) \geq \mathcal{K}(\mu|_{\mathfrak{g}\gamma_1}) - \mathcal{K}(\nu_\varepsilon)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_a^b \rho_\mu(\gamma_1(t), t)^{3/2} dt - \frac{1}{(b-a)^{1/2}} \int_a^b \rho_\mu(\gamma_1(t), t) dt + (b-a)\varepsilon \\
&\geq (b-a)\varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where the final bound uses Jensen's inequality. Moreover, the e_μ -length of any concatenation of paths $\gamma_{i_1}, \dots, \gamma_{i_\ell}$ is bounded above by the $e_{\mu_\varepsilon^*}$ -length of any concatenation of paths $\gamma_{i_1}^*, \dots, \gamma_{i_\ell}^*$ where $\gamma_i^* = \gamma_i$ for $i \geq 2$, as long as $|\gamma_1^*|_{e_{\mu_\varepsilon^*}} \geq |\gamma_1|_{e_\mu}$. Using the characterization of length in terms of the measure μ discussed at the end of Section 1.1, this inequality is equivalent to $\mu_\varepsilon^*(\gamma_1^*) + |\gamma_1^*|_d \geq \mu(\gamma_1) + |\gamma_1|_d$, which is implied by the claim that

$$(b-a)(\alpha^{3/2} - \varepsilon)^{2/3} - (b-a)\alpha + |\gamma_1^*|_d \geq |\gamma_1|_d.$$

This inequality implies that if γ_1 is not a straight line, then $e_{\mu_\varepsilon^*} \in \mathcal{M}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, which is a contradiction since $\mathcal{K}(\mu_\varepsilon^*) < \mathcal{K}(\mu_\varepsilon)$ for $\varepsilon > 0$. If γ_1 is a straight line, then we still have that $\mathcal{K}(\mu_0^*) \in \mathcal{M}$ and so the inequalities in the previous display must all be equalities, forcing ρ_μ to be constant along γ_1 . \square

We use Proposition 2.1 to resolve two optimization problems.

Example 2.2 (Back to a single point). For $\alpha \geq 0$, consider the one point variational problem:

$$\inf \{ I(e) : e(0, 0; 0, 1) \geq \alpha \} = \frac{4}{3}\alpha^{3/2}.$$

By Proposition 2.1, a measure μ for the optimizing metric is supported on the straight line from $(0, 0)$ to $(0, 1)$ with $\rho_\mu = \alpha_1$, a constant, along this line. The bound $e_\mu(0, 0; 0, 1) \geq \alpha$ implies $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha$. Thus $I(e_\mu) = \frac{4}{3}\alpha_1^{3/2}$, which is minimized when $\alpha_1 = \alpha$.

Example 2.3 (V or Y?). Let us consider the two-point variational problem:

$$\inf \{ I(e) : e(0, 0; -1, 1) \geq \alpha, e(0, 0; 1, 1) \geq \alpha \}.$$

By Proposition 2.1, the optimizing measure μ with temporal density ρ is supported on three line segments that meet at some point (r, t) :

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma : [0, t] &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & \gamma(s) &= rs/t, & \rho|_{\mathfrak{g}\gamma} - (\gamma')^2 &\equiv p, \\
\gamma_1 : [t, 1] &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & \gamma_1(s) &= r - (s-t)\frac{r+1}{1-t}, & \rho|_{\mathfrak{g}\gamma_1} - (\gamma_1')^2 &\equiv q_1, \\
\gamma_2 : [t, 1] &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & \gamma_2(s) &= r - (s-t)\frac{r-1}{1-t}, & \rho|_{\mathfrak{g}\gamma_2} - (\gamma_2')^2 &\equiv q_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $e_\mu(0, 0; -1, 1) = pt + q_1(1-t) \geq \alpha$ which implies $q_1 \geq (\alpha - pt)/(1-t)$. Similarly, $q_2 \geq (\alpha - pt)/(1-t)$. We have

$$I(e_\mu) = \frac{4}{3} \int_0^t (p + \gamma'(s)^2)^{3/2} ds + \frac{4}{3} \int_t^1 (q_1 + \gamma_1'(s)^2)^{3/2} ds + \frac{4}{3} \int_t^1 (q_2 + \gamma_2'(s)^2)^{3/2} ds$$




Figure 1: Optimizers in Example 2.3 for $\alpha \in [-1, 0]$ (left) and $\alpha > 0$ (right).

$$\geq \frac{4}{3} \left[\frac{(tp + \frac{r^2}{t})^{3/2}}{\sqrt{t}} + \frac{(\alpha - pt + \frac{(r+1)^2}{1-t})^{3/2}}{\sqrt{1-t}} + \frac{(\alpha - pt + \frac{(r-1)^2}{1-t})^{3/2}}{\sqrt{1-t}} \right].$$

with equality if and only if $e_\mu(0, 0; -1, 1) = e_\mu(0, 0; 1, 1) = \alpha$. Therefore the optimizer e_μ must have $q_1 = q_2 = (\alpha - pt)/(1 - t)$. To find the optimizer from this point forward, we shall minimize the right-hand side above over p, r, t . As a function of r , the above expression is minimized when $r = 0$. Thus,

$$I(p, t) := I(e_\mu) = \frac{4}{3} \left[tp^{3/2} + 2 \frac{(\alpha - pt + (1-t)^{-1})^{3/2}}{\sqrt{1-t}} \right].$$

As a function of p , one can check that the above expression is minimized when

$$p = p^*(t) := \frac{4(\alpha + (1-t)^{-1})}{1 + 3t}.$$

Finally, $I(p^*(t), t)$ is minimized at t^* where

$$t^* = \begin{cases} 0, & \alpha \in [-1, 0], \\ (\sqrt{1 + 1/\alpha} - \sqrt{1/\alpha})^2, & \alpha > 0. \end{cases}$$

We have

$$I(p^*(t^*), t^*) = \begin{cases} \frac{8}{3}(1 + \alpha)^{3/2}, & \alpha \in [-1, 0], \\ \frac{4}{3} + 2\alpha + \frac{4}{3}(1 + \alpha)^{3/2}, & \alpha > 0. \end{cases}$$

The optimizing metric thus takes a 'V' structure for $\alpha \in [-1, 0]$ and a 'Y' structure for $\alpha > 0$, see Figure 1.

The remaining examples study variational problems with different forms than Proposition 2.1.

Given a finite or countable collection of internally disjoint paths $\{\gamma_i : [a_{\gamma_i}, b_{\gamma_i}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{i \in I} \subset H^1$ with corresponding *weight functions* $\{w_i : [a_{\gamma_i}, b_{\gamma_i}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{i \in I}$ satisfying $w'_i \geq$

$-(\gamma'_i)^2$, we define a measure μ on \mathbb{R}^2 by setting its temporal density to be $\rho_\mu = w'_i + \gamma'^2_i$ on each $\mathfrak{g}\gamma_i$ and zero everywhere else. We shall call the corresponding metric e_μ (defined via (1.4)) to be the metric obtained by planting paths $\{\gamma_i\}_{i \in I}$ with corresponding weight functions $\{w_i\}_{i \in I}$. For such a metric e_μ we have

$$I(e_\mu) = \frac{4}{3} \sum_{i \in I} \int_{a\gamma_i}^{b\gamma_i} (w'_i(t) + (\gamma'_i(t))^2)^{3/2} dt. \quad (2.2)$$

Example 2.4 (Weight function large deviations). Consider the optimization problem:

$$\inf \{I(e) : e(0, 0; 0, t) = w(t), \text{ for } t \in [0, 1]\},$$

where $w : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an absolutely continuous function with $w(0) = 0$, $w' \geq 0$, and $\int_0^1 |w'(t)|^{3/2} dt < \infty$. Then the above infimum is achieved by the metric e_{μ_*} , where $\rho_{\mu_*}(0, t) = w'(t)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$, and $\rho_{\mu_*} = 0$ elsewhere. From the fact that $|\gamma|_{e_{\mu_*}} = \mu_*(\mathfrak{g}\gamma) + |\gamma|_d$, it is easy to check that $e_{\mu_*}(0, 0; 0, t) = w(t)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$.

On the other hand, let e be any finite rate metric satisfying $e(0, 0; 0, t) = w(t)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. For each $n \geq 1$ and $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^n\}$, let $\pi_{k,n}$ be the rightmost geodesic from $(0, 0)$ to $(0, k2^{-n})$ under e . Again these exist by Lemma 4.7. Let e_n be the metric obtained from μ restricted to $\bigcup_{k=1}^{2^n} \mathfrak{g}\pi_{k,n}$. Then $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is an increasing sequence of metrics bounded above by e . In particular, the sequence e_n is precompact and monotone, so $e_n \uparrow e^*$ for some metric e^* . We have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(e_n) = I(e^*) \leq I(e)$$

and $e^*(0, 0; 0, t) = w(t)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. Let d_n be the metric obtained by planting straight lines from $(0, (k-1)2^{-n})$ to $(0, k2^{-n})$ with weight w_k satisfying $w'_k := 2^n[w(k2^{-n}) - w((k-1)2^{-n})]$. Then $d_n(0, 0; 0, k2^{-n}) = w(k2^{-n})$ for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^n\}$. Using a similar argument as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, one can check that $I(d_n) \leq I(e_n)$. We have

$$I(d_n) = \frac{4}{3} 2^{n/2} \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} [w(k2^{-n}) - w((k-1)2^{-n})]^{3/2},$$

and so $I(d_n) \rightarrow I(e_{\mu_*})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and hence $I(e_{\mu_*}) \leq I(e)$.

2.1 Large deviations of the directed geodesic

In this section, we present a large deviation principle for geodesics in the directed landscape. Let $u = (x, s; y, t) \in \mathbb{R}^4_{\uparrow}$, let $u_\varepsilon = (x/\varepsilon, s; y/\varepsilon, t)$ and let $\gamma_{u_\varepsilon} : [s, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the (a.s. unique) \mathcal{L} -geodesic with endpoints u_ε as an element of the space of continuous functions $C([s, t])$ from $[s, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with respect to uniform convergence.

Theorem 2.5. For every Borel measurable set $A \subset C([s, t])$ we have

$$\exp((o(1) - \inf_{A^c} J_u)\varepsilon^{-3}) \leq P(\gamma_{u_\varepsilon} \in A) \leq \exp((o(1) - \inf_A J_u)\varepsilon^{-3}).$$

Here $J_u : C([s, t]) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a good rate function satisfying $J_u(f) = \infty$ when $f \notin H^1$ and

$$J_u(f) := \inf \{I(e) : e \in \mathcal{D}_u(f)\} \quad (2.3)$$

for $f \in H^1$, where $\mathcal{D}_u(f) \subset \mathcal{E}$ is the set of metrics where f is a geodesic with endpoints u .

We will use the abbreviations $J = J_{(0,0;0,1)}$, $\mathcal{D}(f) = \mathcal{D}_{(0,0;0,1)}(f)$. Theorem 2.5 is essentially an application of the contraction principle from large deviation theory, but we need to be a bit careful since there is not a natural continuous map taking metrics to a geodesic from $(0, 0) \rightarrow (0, 1)$. We postpone the proof to Section 9. Here we first establish a few natural properties of the rate function J , and then use these to understand $J(f)$ for some specific examples.

Lemma 2.6. 1. The infimum in (2.3) is always achieved by a metric $e \in \mathcal{E}$ whenever it is finite. Moreover, any metric achieving this infimum is given by planting the single path f with some weight function w .

2. $J_{(x,s;y,t)}(f) = J(Af)$ where $Af : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$Af(r) = (t - s)^{-1/3}(f(s + (t - s)r) - [x + r(y - x)]).$$

In other words, Af is the function given by transforming the plane under the landscape symmetry mapping $(x, s) \rightarrow (0, 0)$, $(y, t) \rightarrow (0, 1)$.

3. If $f(0) = f(1) = 0$, $f \in H^1$ then $J(f)$ is the value of the optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & \frac{4}{3} \int_0^1 (w'(s) + f'(s))^2 ds, \\ \text{subject to} \quad & w(t) - w(s) \geq -\frac{(f(t) - f(s))^2}{t - s}, \quad 0 \leq s < t \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

4. Assume $f(0) = f(1) = 0$, $f \in H^1$. Think of f' as a random variable defined on $[0, 1]$ with Lebesgue measure. Then $J(f)$ is the value of the optimization problem

$$\text{minimize } \frac{4}{3} E\rho^{3/2} \quad \text{subject to } E[\rho | [s, t]] \geq \text{Var}[f' | [s, t]] \quad 0 \leq s < t \leq 1.$$

over all random variables $\rho : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. The expectation and variance are conditioned on the event $[s, t]$.

5. For $a \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $J(af) = |a|^3 J(f)$.

6. Consider a finite or countable disjoint collection of subintervals $\{[a_i, b_i], i \in F\}$ of $[0, 1]$. For any path f from $(0, 0)$ to $(0, 1)$ we have $J(f) \geq \sum_{i \in F} J_{p_i; q_i}(f|_{[a_i, b_i]})$ where $p_i = (a_i, f(a_i)), q_i = (b_i, f(b_i))$.

Proof. For part 1, let $e_n \in \mathcal{D}(f)$ be a sequence of metrics with $I(e_n) \downarrow J(f) < \infty$. Then since the sub-level sets of I are compact, all the metrics e_n are contained in a common compact set and so there exists a subsequential limit e . Since I is lower semicontinuous, $I(e) \leq J(f)$. From the definition of path length, it is easy to see that f must also be a geodesic in e and so $e \in \mathcal{D}(f)$ and hence $I(e)$ achieves the infimum (2.3). Since e is a finite rate metric, $e = e_\mu$ for some planted network measure μ . Consider $\nu = \mu|_{\mathfrak{g}f}$, and observe that $e_\nu \in \mathcal{D}(f)$. Therefore $I(e_\nu) = I(e)$ and so $e_\nu = e$ since I is strictly monotone. Part 2 follows from the symmetries of \mathcal{L} (see Lemma 3.3).

Next, by part 1 and the formula from (2.2) it is enough to minimize

$$\frac{4}{3} \int_0^1 (w'(t) + f'(t)^2)^{3/2} dt$$

over all absolutely continuous weight functions with $w' \geq -f'^2$ that make f a geodesic in e . Claim 3 spells out this condition. Note that $w' \geq -f'^2$ is implied by the constraint there. Part 4 is just a reformulation of 3 with $\rho = w' + f'^2$, and part 5 follows from part 4, since if ρ solves the optimization problem in 4 for f , then for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $a^2 \rho$ solves the optimization problem for af .

The inequality in 6 follows by 3. Indeed, the right hand side of the inequality can be written as the optimization problem

$$\text{minimize } \sum_{i \in F} \frac{4}{3} \int_{a_i}^{b_i} (w'(s) + f'(s)^2)^{3/2} ds, \quad \text{subject to } w(t) - w(s) \geq -\frac{(f(t) - f(s))^2}{t - s},$$

where the constraint is only imposed for pairs s, t with $a_i \leq s < t \leq b_i$ for some $i \in F$. \square

Lemma 2.7 ($L^{3/2}$ and L^3 -norm bounds). *We have*

$$\frac{4}{3} \left(\int_0^1 |f'(t)|^2 dt \right)^{3/2} \leq J(f) \leq \frac{4}{3} \int_0^1 |f'|^3 dt. \quad (2.4)$$

In particular $J(f) = \frac{4}{3} \int_0^1 |f'|^3 dt$ whenever $|f'|$ is constant almost everywhere.

If we can find a finite or countable disjoint collection of sets $[a_i, b_i], i \in F$, whose union $\bigcup_{i \in F} [a_i, b_i]$, is a subset of $[0, 1]$ of Lebesgue measure 1, such that $f(a_i) = f(b_i) = 0$ for all i , and such that $|f'|$ is constant Lebesgue-a.e. on each of the intervals $[a_i, b_i]$, then the upper bound in (2.4) is an equality.

If the function f' , viewed as a random variable defined on $[0, 1]$ with Lebesgue measure satisfies the conditional variance bound

$$E|f'|^2 = \text{Var}(f') \geq \text{Var}[f' \mid [s, t]], \quad 0 \leq s < t \leq 1,$$

then the lower bound in (2.4) is an equality.

Proof. Taking $w = 0$ in Lemma 2.6.3 clearly satisfies the constraint and gives the present upper bound.

The lower bound follows from Jensen's inequality and the bound $w(1) \geq d(0, 0; 0, 1) = 0$:

$$\int_0^1 (w'(t) + f'(t)^2)^{3/2} dt \geq \left(\int_0^1 w'(t) + f'(t)^2 dt \right)^{3/2} \geq \left(\int_0^1 f'(t)^2 dt \right)^{3/2}. \quad (2.5)$$

In the case when $|f'|$ is constant, these two bounds agree, and we have identified $J(f)$. For the second claim, we have

$$J(f) \geq \sum_{i \in F} J_{(0, a_i), (0, b_i)}(f|_{[a_i, b_i]}) = \sum_{i \in F} \frac{4}{3} \int_{a_i}^{b_i} |f'(t)|^3 dt = \frac{4}{3} \int_0^1 |f'|^3 dt,$$

where the first bound uses Lemma 2.6.6, and the first equality uses Lemma 2.6.2 and the constant $|f'|$ case of the present lemma. For the final claim, if the conditional variance bound holds, then turning to Lemma 2.6.4, we can set $\rho \equiv \text{Var}(f') = E|f'|^2$ to solve the optimization problem. The quantity $\frac{4}{3}E\rho^{3/2}$ equals the lower bound in (2.4). \square

The next lemma computes the rate function for a piecewise linear f with two pieces. The result is somewhat surprising.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $f_a(0) = f_a(1) = 0$, $f_a(a) = 1$, and let f_a be linear on $[0, a]$ and $[a, 1]$. Then $J(f_a) = J(f_{1-a})$, and for $a \in [0, 1/2]$ we have $J(f_a) = \frac{3-4a^2}{6(1-a)^3 a^2}$. In particular, $J(f_a)$ is not thrice differentiable at $a = 1/2$.*

Proof. Let $a \leq 1/2$ and set $b = (1/a + 1/(1-a))^2$, the squared difference of slopes of the two pieces of f . Applying the optimality condition of Lemma 2.6.4 to intervals of the form $[0, t]$, $t \in [2a, 1]$, we get

$$\rho \geq 0, \quad \int_0^t (\rho - \lambda)(s) ds \geq 0, \quad \lambda(t) = b(\frac{1}{4} \wedge (a^2/t^2)). \quad (2.6)$$

A simple computation shows that $\rho = \lambda$ satisfies all the constraints of the optimization problem of Lemma 2.6.4. Next we will solve the problem of minimizing $\frac{4}{3} \int_0^1 \rho^{3/2}$ subject to the less restrictive conditions (2.6).

To show that a minimizer exists, let ρ_n be a sequence satisfying (2.6) so that $\int_0^1 \rho_n^{3/2}$ converges to the infimum q . Since ρ_n has bounded $L^{3/2}$ -norm, and hence bounded L^1 -norm, it has an L^1 -weakly convergent subsequence $\rho_n \rightarrow \rho$ with $\int_0^1 \rho^{3/2} \leq q$ by Fatou's lemma. Weak convergence implies that (2.6) holds for ρ .

We claim that $\rho \neq \lambda$ cannot be a minimizer. Consider ρ satisfying (2.6) and let $f_\rho(t) = \int_0^t (\rho - \lambda)(s) ds$. Suppose that $f_\rho(s) = \delta > 0$ for some $s \in (0, 1]$. Let

$$s_0 = \inf\{r \leq s : f_\rho(r) \geq \delta/2\}, \quad s_1 = \sup\{r \geq s : f_\rho(r) \geq \delta/2\}.$$

Then there is a set $A \subset [s_0, s]$ of positive Lebesgue measure on which $\rho \geq \lambda + \delta/4$. If $s_1 = 1$, then $\rho^* = \rho - (\delta/4)\mathbf{1}_A$ still satisfies the conditions (2.6) since

$$f_{\rho^*}(u) \geq f_\rho(u) - \frac{\delta}{4}\mathbf{1}(u \geq s_0) \geq 0,$$

and moreover $\int_0^1 (\rho^*)^{3/2} < \int_0^1 \rho^{3/2}$. Hence ρ cannot be a minimizer. If $s_1 < 1$, then we can find another set $B \subset [s, s_1]$ of positive Lebesgue measure on which $\rho \leq \lambda - \delta/4$. By possibly reducing the size of either A or B , we may assume that they have the same positive Lebesgue measure $|A| = |B|$. Let $\eta = \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbf{1}_A$. Then for all $r \in [0, \delta/4]$, $\rho + r\eta$ satisfies (2.6) since $|f_\rho(u) - f_{\rho+r\eta}(u)| \leq r\mathbf{1}(u \in [s_0, s_1])$. On the other hand,

$$\partial_r \int_0^1 (\rho + r\eta)^{3/2} \Big|_{r=0} = \frac{3}{2} \int \eta \rho^{1/2} \leq \frac{3}{2}|A| (-(\lambda(s) + \delta)^{1/2} + (\lambda(s) - \delta)^{1/2}) < 0,$$

so for some small $r > 0$, $\rho + r\eta$ is a better candidate than ρ . Thus $\rho = \lambda$ is the unique minimizer of the less restrictive problem (2.6), and λ satisfies all conditions of the stricter Lemma 2.6.4. We compute the $L^{3/2}$ -norm of λ to get the claim. \square

Corollary 2.9. *Let π be the \mathcal{L} -geodesic from $(0, 0)$ to $(0, 1)$. Then as $a \rightarrow \infty$*

$$P(\pi(1/2) \geq a) = e^{-\frac{32}{3}a^3 + o(a^3)}, \quad P(\sup_{[0,1]} |\pi| \geq a) = e^{-\frac{32}{3}a^3 + o(a^3)}.$$

Proof. Any function f with $f(0) = f(1) = 0$ and $\sup_{[0,1]} |f| \geq a$ must have

$$\int_0^1 |f'|^2 \geq \left(\int_0^1 |f'| \right)^2 = 4a^2$$

by Jensen's inequality. The upper bounds on the above probabilities then follow from the left bound in (2.4). The matching lower bound follows from the construction in Lemma 2.8. \square

Remark 2.10 (Liu's conjecture). The first claim partially proves Conjecture 1.5 by Liu (2022a) for the special case $t = 1/2$. In forthcoming work, R. Basu and co-authors (Basu

(2024)), show that the rest of the conjecture is not correct. They also give an independent proof of the $t = 1/2$ case starting from (and extending to) exponential last passage percolation. Conjecture 1.5 of Liu (2022a) gives the correct value for having a zero-length path that takes the value a at time t . When $t \neq 1/2$, the zero-length path with the conjectured rate will not be a geodesic: some shortcuts will have positive length.

Heuristics using large deviations for the Airy process suggest that geodesic under the large deviation event $\pi(t) > a$ for $t \neq 1/2$ will not follow a piecewise linear path. In particular, it will not be f_t from Lemma 2.8! Instead, it will have two linear pieces and a parabola. Solving the optimization problem (or even describing the heuristic behind it) is beyond the scope of this paper, but we can state the resulting formula as a new conjecture.

Conjecture 2.11. For $t \in (0, 1/2]$, as $a \rightarrow \infty$ we have $P(\pi(t) \geq a) = e^{-\iota(t)a^3 + o(a^3)}$ where

$$\iota(t) = \frac{-(2t)^{5/2}(9b+4) + 6t^2(25b+13) - 2(2t)^{3/2}(26b+19) - 48\sqrt{2t} + 24}{3(3-\sqrt{8t})^3(1-t)^2t^2},$$

with

$$b = \frac{\sqrt{72t^2 + 6(2t)^{3/2} - 143t - 12\sqrt{2t} + 72}}{(9-8t)\sqrt{t}}.$$

In particular, as $t \rightarrow 0$ we have $\iota(t) = \frac{8}{27}/t^2 + o(1/t^2)$.

The last part should recover the rate function for the semi-infinite geodesic, see Rahman and Virág (2021) for the definition.

Lemma 2.7 allows us to construct classes of functions f where either the upper or lower bound in (2.4) is satisfied. We finish this section by giving a few specific examples of such functions.

Lemma 2.12. Fix $\beta \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\alpha > 0$, and consider the continuous function f which is linear on each of the intervals $[0, \beta]$, $[\beta, 1-\beta]$, $[1-\beta, 1]$ and satisfies $f(0) = f(1) = 0$, $f(\beta) = f(1-\beta) = \alpha$. Then if $\beta \geq 1/8$, $J(f)$ is given by the lower bound in (2.4).

Proof. By Lemma 2.6.5, it suffices to prove this when $\alpha = 1$. Observe that $|f'(t)| = 1/\beta$ on $[0, \beta] \cup [1-\beta, 1]$, whereas $f' = 0$ on $[\beta, 1-\beta]$. Therefore we can compute that $\text{Var}(f') = 2/\beta$. On the other hand, for $[s, t]$ with either $s > \beta$ or $t < 1-\beta$, f' is a Bernoulli- p random variable multiplied by $\pm 1/\beta$ for some $p \in [0, 1]$. Then

$$\text{Var}[f' \mid [s, t]] \leq \frac{1}{4\beta^2},$$

with equality if and only if $p = 1/2$. The condition $\beta \geq 1/8$ implies that this is less than or equal to $2/\beta$. Finally, if $s \leq \beta < 1-\beta \leq t$, then

$$\text{Var}[f' \mid [s, t]] \leq E[|f'|^2 \mid [s, t]] \leq E|f'|^2 = 2/\beta.$$

The lemma follows from the last claim of Lemma 2.7. \square

It is not difficult to construct other explicit examples where the lower bound is attained. One simple example is $f(x) = x(1 - x)$. The next lemma gives an example where the upper bound is attained.

Lemma 2.13. *There exist functions f with $f(0) = f(1) = 1$, rate $J(f) = \infty$ and $\int_0^1 f'(t)^2 dt < \infty$.*

Proof. The following function f is defined through the condition $f(0) = 0$ and its derivative. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$f'(s) = \begin{cases} j^{1/3}, & s \in \left[\frac{1}{j+1}, \frac{1+1/(2j)}{j+1} \right) \\ -j^{1/3}, & s \in \left[\frac{1+1/(2j)}{j+1}, \frac{1}{j} \right). \end{cases}$$

Then $\int_0^1 |f'|^2 < \infty$. However, $|f'|$ is constant almost everywhere between consecutive zeros of f , and so by Lemma 2.7 we have $J(f) = \frac{4}{3} \int_0^1 |f'|^3 = \infty$. \square

Lemma 2.13 constructs an example of a function which will have finite length in any directed metric with finite rate, but will not be a geodesic in any of these metrics!

3 Preliminaries

In this section we list the preliminaries needed to prove the large deviation principle for \mathcal{L} . These preliminaries also naturally suggest what the large deviation rate function should be, and so woven through this section will be a heuristic argument for our large deviation principle. We start by defining directed metrics.

Definition 3.1. A **directed metric of positive sign** on a set X is a function $e : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that $e(x, x) = 0$ for all $x \in X$ and e satisfies the triangle inequality $e(x, z) \leq e(x, y) + e(y, z)$. We say that $e : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ is a **directed metric of negative sign** if $-e$ is a directed metric of positive sign.

Section 5 of [Dauvergne and Virág \(2021\)](#) builds up a general theory of directed metrics. They are a natural generalization of metrics, when the symmetry condition $e(x, y) = e(y, x)$ is removed. In our context, any function $e : \mathbb{R}_+^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the set \mathcal{E} can be extended to a directed metric (of negative sign) on all of \mathbb{R}^2 by setting $e(p; p) = 0$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $e(p; q) = -\infty$ when $p \neq q$ and $(p; q) \notin \mathbb{R}_+^4$. Because of this, we can always think of \mathcal{E} as the set of continuous directed metrics on the space-time plane, and we refer to elements of \mathcal{E}

simply as metrics. The path length formula (1.3) for $e \in \mathcal{E}$ is a special case of the usual formula for the length of a path in a (directed) metric.

The directed landscape is a random directed metric. It is built from the Airy sheet \mathcal{S} , which is a random continuous function $\mathcal{S} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined precisely, for example, in [Dauvergne and Virág \(2021\)](#), Definition 1.22. In this paper we take the law of the Airy sheet as a black box as we require only a few properties of the object. We call

$$\mathcal{S}_\sigma(x, y) := \sigma \mathcal{S}(x/\sigma^2, y/\sigma^2)$$

an **Airy sheet of scale σ** .

Definition 3.2. The directed landscape $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the unique random continuous function satisfying

- I. (Airy sheet marginals) For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s > 0$ we have

$$\mathcal{L}(x, t; y, t + s^3) \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{S}_s(x, y)$$

jointly in all x, y . That is, the increment over time interval $[t, t + s^3)$ is an Airy sheet of scale s .

- II. (Independent increments) For any disjoint time intervals $\{[t_i, s_i] : i \in \{1, \dots, k\}\}$, the random functions $\{\mathcal{L}(\cdot, t_i; \cdot, s_i) : i \in \{1, \dots, k\}\}$ are independent.

- III. (Metric composition law) Almost surely, for any $r < s < t$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that

$$\mathcal{L}(x, r; y, t) = \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}} [\mathcal{L}(x, r; z, s) + \mathcal{L}(z, s; y, t)]. \quad (3.1)$$

The triangle inequality for \mathcal{L} is equivalent to the weaker claim that LHS \geq RHS in the metric composition law (3.1). The fact that the metric composition law is an equality implies that \mathcal{L} defines a geodesic space: almost surely, for any point pair $(p; q) \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}(p; q) = \max_{\gamma: p \rightarrow q} |\gamma|_{\mathcal{L}}.$$

For fixed $(p; q)$, this maximum is almost surely uniquely attained (i.e. there is a unique geodesic). Existence and uniqueness of \mathcal{L} -geodesics are shown in [Dauvergne et al. \(2022\)](#), Theorem 12.1 and Lemma 13.2.

Like many scaling limits, the directed landscape satisfies many distributional symmetries, which we use throughout.

Lemma 3.3 (Lemma 10.2, [Dauvergne et al. \(2022\)](#)). *We have the following equalities in distribution as random continuous functions from $\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Here $r, c \in \mathbb{R}$, and $q > 0$.*

1. (Time stationarity)

$$\mathcal{L}(x, t; y, t + s) \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{L}(x, t + r; y, t + s + r).$$

2. (Spatial stationarity)

$$\mathcal{L}(x, t; y, t + s) \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{L}(x + c, t; y + c, t + s).$$

3. (Shear stationarity)

$$\mathcal{L}(x, t; y, t + s) \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{L}(x + ct, t; y + ct + sc, t + s) + s^{-1}[(x - y)^2 - (x - y - sc)^2].$$

4. (KPZ rescaling)

$$\mathcal{L}(x, t; y, t + s) \stackrel{d}{=} q\mathcal{L}(q^{-2}x, q^{-3}t; q^{-2}y, q^{-3}(t + s)).$$

By Lemma 3.3, we can observe that for any fixed $u = (x, s; y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^4$, the law of the random variable $\mathcal{L}(u)$ is simply a shifted and rescaled version of the law of $\mathcal{L}(0, 0; 0, 1)$:

$$\mathcal{L}(u) \stackrel{d}{=} (t - s)^{1/3} \mathcal{L}(0, 0; 0, 1) - \frac{(x - y)^2}{t - s}. \quad (3.2)$$

Equation (3.2) provides a good way of thinking about \mathcal{L} : it consists of the ‘Dirichlet part’

$$d(x, s; y, t) = -\frac{(x - y)^2}{t - s},$$

and a noise part, which consists of a Tracy-Widom random variable. One way of thinking about the rescaling \mathcal{L}_ε is that it provides one way of scaling down the strength of the noise part to have size ε . Indeed, at the level of one-point distributions, by Lemma 3.3 we have

$$\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u) \stackrel{d}{=} \varepsilon(t - s)^{1/3} \mathcal{L}(0, 0; 0, 1) + d(x, s; y, t) \quad (3.3)$$

In order to understand the large deviation behaviour of the whole directed landscape, we should first try to understand the large deviation behaviour at the level of single points. By (3.2), it suffices to understand the tails of the Tracy-Widom random variable $\mathcal{L}(0, 0; 0, 1)$.

Theorem 3.4 (see Theorem 1.3 in [Ramirez et al. \(2011\)](#)). *Let $X = \mathcal{L}(0, 0; 0, 1)$. Then we have the following asymptotics as $m \rightarrow \infty$:*

$$P(X > m) = e^{-[\frac{4}{3} + o(1)]m^{3/2}}, \quad P(X < -m) = e^{-[\frac{1}{12} + o(1)]m^3}.$$

From Theorem 3.4 we can observe that it is much easier to make the directed landscape large at a single point than to make it small. Heuristically, this is fairly easy to see if we think of \mathcal{L} as a path metric: to make $\mathcal{L}(0, 0; 0, 1)$ large we need to plant a *single good path*, whereas to make $\mathcal{L}(0, 0; 0, 1)$ small we need to make *all paths bad*. This phenomena extends all the way through to our large deviation principle for \mathcal{L} . Indeed, at the $\varepsilon^{3/2}$ -scale our rate function will assign infinite rate to any metric e with $e(u) < d(u)$ for some $u \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$, and will assign finite rates only to metrics than can be achieved by planting countably many paths.

Let us try to describe this more precisely, in a way that derives the rate function I . Let e be any directed metric on \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4 with $e \geq d$. We will explore the possibility that \mathcal{L}_ε can be close to e by looking at the behaviour of \mathcal{L}_ε restricted to a single path $\gamma : [s, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For $r < r' \in [s, t]$ let $u_{r,r'} = (\gamma(r), r; \gamma(r'), r')$, and consider the event where for fixed $\delta > 0$, we have

$$|\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u_{r,r'}) - e(u_{r,r'})| < \delta \quad (3.4)$$

for all $s \leq r < r' \leq t$. In other words, this is the event where \mathcal{L}_ε is close to e along γ . Now, by Theorem 3.4 and (3.3), the probability of (3.4) for fixed r, r' is given by

$$\exp\left(-\frac{4}{3}\varepsilon^{3/2}\Theta(e, u_{r,r'}) + O(\delta\varepsilon^{3/2}(r' - r)^{-1/2})\right),$$

where for $u = (x, s; y, t)$,

$$\Theta(e, u) := \frac{[e(u) - d(u)]_+^{3/2}}{(t - s)^{1/2}} = \left[\frac{e(u)}{t - s} + \frac{(x - y)^2}{(t - s)^2}\right]_+^{3/2} (t - s). \quad (3.5)$$

Moreover, by the temporal independence in \mathcal{L} (Property II of Definition 3.2), the events in (3.4) are independent for disjoint intervals $[r, r']$, and so the probability that (3.4) holds for all consecutive pairs r, r' on a partition $r_0 < r_1 < \dots < r_k$ of $[s, t]$ is given by

$$\exp\left(-\frac{4}{3}\varepsilon^{3/2}\sum_{i=1}^k \Theta(e, u_{r_{i-1}, r_i}) + O(k\delta\varepsilon^{3/2}\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} (r_i - r_{i-1})^{-1/2})\right),$$

which for a fine enough partition, δ sufficiently small, and γ, e sufficiently nice is well approximated by $e^{-\varepsilon^{3/2}I(\gamma, e)}$, where

$$I(\gamma, e) = \frac{4}{3} \int_s^t (w'(r) + [\gamma'(r)]^2)^{3/2}, \quad w(r) = \|\gamma|_{[s, r]}\|_e.$$

This computation only gives a lower bound on the chance that \mathcal{L}_ε is close to e since we have only compared the metrics along the single path γ . This gives a lower bound on $I(e)$.

The general form of the rate function in Theorem 1.1 comes from comparing the metrics on arbitrary collections of disjoint paths:

$$I(e) = \sup_{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k} \sum_{i=1}^k I(\gamma_i, e),$$

where the supremum is over all finite collections of disjoint paths $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k$. The fact that the rate function is additive over disjoint paths loosely follows from the fact that the landscape \mathcal{L} is derived as a limit of last passage models built on independent noise, so the behaviour of \mathcal{L} along two disjoint paths should be independent. To prove this, we will need an asymptotic independence proposition for the Airy sheet.

3.1 Quantitative approximate independence in the Airy sheet

Proposition 3.5. Fix $\Delta > 0$. Fix any $a_1 < b_1 < a_2 < b_2 < \dots < a_k < b_k$ and $c_1 < d_1 < c_2 < d_2 < \dots < c_k < d_k$, and suppose that

$$c_{i+1} - d_i > 2\Delta, \quad a_{i+1} - b_i > 2\Delta \quad (3.6)$$

for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$. For each $i = 1, \dots, k$, let A_i be a Borel subset of $C([a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i])$. Then

$$\left| P \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k \{S|_{[a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i]} \in A_i\} \right) - \prod_{i=1}^k P(S|_{[a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i]} \in A_i) \right| \leq 2kP(\|\Pi\|_\infty \geq \Delta) \leq 4ke^{-c'\Delta^3}, \quad (3.7)$$

where Π is the a.s. unique \mathcal{L} -geodesic in \mathcal{L} from $(0, 0)$ to $(0, 1)$, and $c' > 0$ is an absolute constant.

We refer to Figure 2 for a visualization of the above lemma.




Figure 2: By Condition (3.6) the open quadrilaterals Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 are disjoint.

Proof of Proposition 3.5. The second bound in (3.7) follows from Proposition 12.3 in [Dauvergne et al. \(2022\)](#), so it suffices to show the first bound. The main strategy behind the proof of Proposition 3.5 is to construct a coupling of $k+1$ landscapes $(\mathcal{L}_0, \mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_k)$ such that $(\mathcal{L}_i)_{i=1}^k$

are all independent and with a high explicit probability $\mathcal{L}_0(x, 0; y, 1) = \mathcal{L}_i(x, 0; y, 1)$ for all $x \in [a_i, b_i]$ and $y \in [c_i, d_i]$. This is a more quantitative variant of the proof of Proposition 2.6 in [Dauvergne \(2024\)](#).

To do this, we first construct a coupling of copies of exponential last passage percolation. Let $(\xi_v^{(i)})_{v \in \mathbb{Z}^2, i=1, \dots, k}$ be collections of independent rate-one exponential random variables. For $i = 1, \dots, m$ let $a'_i = a_i - \Delta, b'_i = b_i + \Delta, c'_i = c_i - \Delta, d'_i = d_i + \Delta$, and let Q_i be the open parallelogram with vertices

$$(a'_i, 0), \quad (b'_i, 0), \quad (c'_i, 1), \quad (d'_i, 1),$$

see Figure 2. Due to the condition (3.6), the parallelograms Q_i are disjoint (see Figure 2). For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $A_n : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ by letting $A_n(x, s) = (\lfloor xn^{2/3} + sn \rfloor, \lfloor sn \rfloor)$, and let

$$\xi_v^{(0)}(n) := \begin{cases} \xi_v^{(i)} & \text{if } v \in A_n(Q_i) \text{ for some } i = 1, 2, \dots, k \\ \xi_v^{(1)} & \text{if } v \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^k A_n(Q_i). \end{cases}$$

Loosely speaking, $\xi_v^{(0)}(n)$ is formed by ‘stitching’ together different collections of exponential weights. The linear scaling operator A_n is chosen to set up convergence to the directed landscape.

We now consider $k + 1$ copies of exponential last passage percolation using $k + 1$ collection of weights: $(\xi_v^{(0)}(n))_{v \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ and $(\xi_v^{(i)})_{v \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ where $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. For any points $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $v_{1,i} \leq v_{2,i}$ for $i = 1, 2$, let $T_n^{(i)}(v_1, v_2)$ denote the last passage value from v_1 to v_2 computed using the i -th collection of exponential weights for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$. That is,

$$T_n^{(i)}(v_1, v_2) = \max_{\pi: v_1 \rightarrow v_2} \sum_{j=0}^{\|v_1 - v_2\|_1} \xi_{\pi_j}^{(i)}(n) \quad (3.8)$$

where $\xi_{\pi_j}^{(i)}(n) = \xi_{\pi_j}^{(i)}$ for $n \geq 1$, and the maximum is over all paths $\pi = (\pi_0, \dots, \pi_{\|v_1 - v_2\|_1})$ with $\pi_0 = v_1, \pi_{\|v_1 - v_2\|_1} = v_2$ and $\pi_i - \pi_{i-1} \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \|v_1 - v_2\|_1$. Almost surely, for all v_1, v_2 there is a unique geodesic $\pi^{(i)}(v_1, v_2)$ achieving the maximum in (3.8). Set

$$L_n^{(i)}(x, s; y, t) := 4n^{-1/3} [T_n^{(i)}(A_n(x, s); A_n(y, t)) - 4n(t - s) - 2n^{2/3}(y - x)].$$

By Theorem 1.7 in [Dauvergne and Virág \(2021\)](#), for each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$, $L_n^{(i)} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{L}$, uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{R}_+^4 . Since the prelimits are all defined on the same probability space, along a subsequence $(n_r)_{r=1}^\infty$ we have

$$(L_{n_r}^{(0)}, L_{n_r}^{(1)}, \dots, L_{n_r}^{(k)}) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathcal{L}_0, \mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_k).$$

where each \mathcal{L}_i is a directed landscape and the last k copies, $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2, \dots, \mathcal{L}_k$ are independent. Letting $\mathcal{S}_i = \mathcal{L}_i(\cdot, 0; \cdot, 1)$, the left-hand side of (3.7) is then equal to

$$\left| P \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k \{ \mathcal{S}_0|_{[a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i]} \in A_i \} \right) - P \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k \{ \mathcal{S}_i|_{[a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i]} \in A_i \} \right) \right|,$$

which by a union bound is bounded above by $\sum_{i=1}^k P(\mathcal{S}_0|_{[a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i]} \neq \mathcal{S}_i|_{[a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i]})$. Therefore letting $\mathcal{S}_n^{(i)}$ denote the prelimiting version of \mathcal{S}_i , to finish the proof, it suffices to show that for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\mathcal{S}_n^{(0)}|_{[a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i]} \neq \mathcal{S}_n^{(i)}|_{[a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i]}) \leq 2P(\|\Pi\|_\infty \geq \Delta). \quad (3.9)$$

We will have $\mathcal{S}_n^{(i)}|_{[a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i]} \neq \mathcal{S}_n^{(0)}|_{[a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i]}$ if and only if one of geodesics $\pi^{(i)}(A_n(x, 0); A_n(y, 1))$ or $\pi^{(0)}(A_n(x, 0); A_n(y, 1))$ for $(x, y) \in [a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i]$ exits the set $A_n(Q_i)$. By planarity, these geodesics satisfy the following ordering property: all of the geodesics $\pi^{(i)}(A_n(x, 0); A_n(y, 1))$ for $(x, y) \in [a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i]$ are contained in the subset of the strip $\mathbb{R} \times [0, n]$ bounded on the left and right by $\pi^{(i)}(A_n(a_i, 0); A_n(b_i, 1))$ and $\pi^{(i)}(A_n(c_i, 0); A_n(d_i, 1))$ respectively, and similarly for the geodesics $\pi^{(0)}$. Therefore (3.9) is implied by claim that for $j = 0, i$ we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\pi^{(j)}((a_i, 0)_n; (b_i, 1)_n) \cup \pi^{(j)}((c_i, 0)_n; (d_i, 1)_n) \not\subset A_n(Q_i)) \leq P(\|\Pi\|_\infty \geq \Delta). \quad (3.10)$$

Using Theorem 1.7/1.8 in [Dauvergne and Virág \(2021\)](#) for $j = 0, i$, the rescaled sets

$$A_n^{-1}[\pi^{(j)}((a_i, 0)_n; (b_i, 1)_n)] \cup A_n^{-1}[\pi^{(j)}((c_i, 0)_n; (d_i, 1)_n)]$$

converge in law as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the Hausdorff topology on compact sets to the set

$$\mathfrak{g}\Pi_1 \cup \mathfrak{g}\Pi_2 := \{(\Pi_1(r), r) : r \in [0, 1]\} \cup \{(\Pi_2(r), r) : r \in [0, 1]\},$$

where Π_1 is the a.s. unique geodesic from $(a_i, 0)$ to $(c_i, 1)$ in \mathcal{L} , and Π_2 is the a.s. unique geodesic from $(b_i, 0)$ to $(d_i, 1)$. Therefore the limsup in (3.9) is bounded above by $P(\mathfrak{g}\Pi_1 \cup \mathfrak{g}\Pi_2 \not\subset Q_i)$. Noting that $\Pi_1 \leq \Pi_2$, and letting $L_1(t) = b'_i t + a'_i(1-t)$ and $L_2(t) = c'_i t + d'_i(1-t)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathfrak{g}\Pi_1 \cup \mathfrak{g}\Pi_2 \not\subset Q) &\leq P(\Pi_1(r) \leq L_1(r) \text{ for some } r \in [0, 1]) \\ &\quad + P(L_2(r) \leq \Pi_2(r) \text{ for some } r \in [0, 1]) \leq 2P(\|\Pi\|_\infty \geq \Delta), \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality uses the shear and translation invariance of \mathcal{L} (Lemma 3.3), to translate to statements about geodesics from $(0, 0)$ to $(0, 1)$. This yields (3.10), completing the proof. \square

Remark 3.6. The second bound in (3.7) where we have appealed to Proposition 12.3 in [Dauvergne et al. \(2022\)](#) uses more than one-point bounds. However, we note in passing that the argument for showing $A'_\varepsilon \subset A_\varepsilon$ in Proposition 7.1 yields a proof of the geodesic tail bound needed here. This proof relies only on Propositions 3.11, 3.12, which we build from the one-point bounds in Theorem 3.4. Note that a fortiori, Corollary 2.9 determines the optimal rate in the stretched exponential tail bound for $\|\Pi\|_\infty$.

Proposition 3.7 (Airy sheet tails). *There is a universal constant $c_0 > 0$ so that the following holds. Let $s < t$, $\Delta > 0$ and $U = \{(x_i, s; y_i, t) : i = 1, \dots, k\}$ with $x_i + \Delta \leq x_{i+1}$ and $y_i + \Delta \leq y_{i+1}$ for all i . Let $r : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $r \geq d$. Let $\theta = \sum_{u \in U} \Theta(r, u)$. Then as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we have*

$$P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon|_U \geq r) = \exp((o(1) - \frac{4}{3}\theta)\varepsilon^{-3/2}), \quad \text{if } \theta < c_0 \frac{\Delta^3}{(t-s)^2}.$$

Proof. Let $\Delta_0 = \Delta / ((t-s)^{2/3} \varepsilon^{1/2})$. By Proposition 3.5 and scaling,

$$\left| P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon|_U \geq r) - \prod_{u \in U} P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u) \geq r(u)) \right| \leq 4k \exp(-c\Delta_0^3) = \exp\left(\left(o(1) - c \frac{\Delta^3}{(t-s)^2}\right)\varepsilon^{-3/2}\right).$$

The claim follows if we bound the product using the Tracy-Widom upper tail bound in Theorem 3.4 and scaling. \square

3.2 Neighborhood bounds

The goal of this section is to use to go from pointwise bounds to uniform bounds over compact or bounded subsets. The methods here are standard: the lower bound follows by a quick chaining argument, while the upper bound follows from the lower bound and the triangle inequality. Let $u_0 = (0, 0; 0, 1)$.

Proposition 3.8. *With a universal $c_0 > 0$, for every $\eta \in (0, 1/12)$ there is $c_\eta > 0$ so that*

$$P\left(\inf_{u: \|u-u_0\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon} \mathcal{L}(u) < -a\right) \leq c_\eta \exp(-a^3(\eta - c_0\varepsilon^{1/3})), \quad \text{for all } a > 0, \varepsilon \in (0, 1/5].$$

Proof. This is a standard chaining argument. We specify a nice countable set $U \subset \mathbb{R}_+^4$ so that a dense set of point pairs in the domain of the inf above can be connected by some concatenation of d -geodesics for $u \in U$. Then we use the union bound and the one-point bound to show that elements of U are unlikely to have a small \mathcal{L} -value.

To define the point pairs, let $\mathbb{D} = \{i/2^k \in [0, 1) : i, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ denote the dyadic rationals in $[0, 1)$. For $x \in \mathbb{D}$ let $0.x_1x_2\dots$ denote its binary expansion with $x_i = 0$ eventually. Define $s(x)$ so that $x_{s(x)}$ is the last nonzero bit in the expansion. Define the map

$$\alpha : \mathbb{D}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2, \quad \alpha(x, y) = (0.x_1\dots x_\sigma, 0.y_1\dots y_\sigma), \quad \sigma = \max(s(x), s(y)) - 1.$$

Iterating α will eventually take any point in \mathbb{D} to $(0, 0)$. This is how we will build our chains up to simple similarity transformations φ_i .

Next, we define two similarity transformations $\varphi_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $i = 0, 1$ by the following properties. Let $R_\theta : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ denote the counterclockwise rotation by θ , and set

$$\varphi_0(x) = \sqrt{2}\varepsilon R_{-3\pi/4}x + (0, \varepsilon), \quad \varphi_1(x) = \sqrt{2}\varepsilon R_{\pi/4}x + (0, 1 - \varepsilon).$$

In other words, φ_i takes $[0, 1]^2$ to the closed L^1 -ball of radius ε about $(0, i)$, $\varphi_0(0, 0) = (0, \varepsilon)$, and $\varphi_1(0, 0) = (0, 1 - \varepsilon)$. Let $u_1 = (0, \varepsilon; 0, 1 - \varepsilon)$, and set

$$U = \left\{ (\varphi_0(p); \varphi_0(\alpha(p))), p \in \mathbb{D}^2 \right\} \cup \{u_1\} \cup \left\{ (\varphi_1(\alpha(p)); \varphi_1(p)), p \in \mathbb{D}^2 \right\},$$

and let $U_k = \{(x, s; y, t) \in U : t - s = \varepsilon 2^{-k/2}\}$. By construction, we have the following:

$$\{u_1\} \cup \bigcup_{k \geq 0} U_k = U \subset \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4, \quad |U_k| \leq 2^{2k+1}, \quad \frac{|x - y|}{t - s} \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for all } (x, s; y, t) \in U.$$

Let $A_i = \varphi_i(\mathbb{D}^2)$. For every $p \in A_0$, iterating $\varphi_0 \circ \alpha \circ \varphi_0^{-1}$ we get a sequence $p = p_0, p_1, \dots, p_\ell = (0, \varepsilon)$ so that $(p_i; p_{i+1}) \in U$. Similarly, for every $q \in A_1$, there is a sequence $(0, 1 - \varepsilon) = q_0, \dots, q_\ell = q$ so that $(q_i; q_{i+1}) \in U$. Concatenating the two sequences to connect p to q , and using the triangle inequality we get

$$\inf_{A_0 \times A_1} \mathcal{L} \geq \mathcal{L}(u_1) + 2b + 2S, \quad S = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \min_{U_k} (\mathcal{L} - d), \quad b = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \min_{U_k} d = \frac{-\varepsilon}{1 - 2^{-1/2}} > -4\varepsilon.$$

where d is the Dirichlet metric (1.1). By the union bound and scaling properties of the directed landscape (Lemma 3.3) for any sequence $\beta_k \geq 0$ with total sum β we have

$$P(S \leq -a\beta\varepsilon^{1/3}) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{2k+2} P(\mathcal{L}(u_0) \leq -a\beta_k 2^{k/6}).$$

Without loss of generality, let $a \geq 2$ and let $\beta_k = 2^{2-k/12}$. Then

$$P(S \leq -a\beta\varepsilon^{1/3}) \leq c'_\eta e^{-\eta a^3} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{2k+2} \exp(-7\eta\beta_k^3 2^{k/2}) = c''_\eta e^{-\eta a^3}$$

by the lower tail bound of Theorem 3.4. By the same bound again,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\inf_{A_0 \times A_1} \mathcal{L} \leq -a\right) &\leq P(\mathcal{L}(u_1) \leq -a(1 - 2\beta\varepsilon^{1/3}) + 8\varepsilon) + P(S \leq -a\beta\varepsilon^{1/3}) \\ &\leq c'_\eta e^{-\eta a^3(1-2\beta\varepsilon^{1/3}-8\varepsilon)^3} + c''_\eta e^{-\eta a^3} \end{aligned}$$

Since the closure of $A_0 \times A_1$ contains all u with $\|u - u_0\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon/2$, the claim follows. \square

We will now use the lower bound and the triangle inequality to get an upper tail bound. Let $u_0 = (0, 0; 0, 1)$.

Proposition 3.9. *With a universal $c_0 > 0$, for every $\eta \in (0, 4/3)$ there is $c_\eta > 0$ so that*

$$P\left(\sup_{u: \|u-u_0\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon} \mathcal{L}(u) > a\right) \leq c_\eta \exp(-a^{3/2}(\eta - c_0\varepsilon^{1/3})), \quad \text{for all } a > 0, \varepsilon \in (0, 1/5].$$

Proof. Let S denote the sup above, let $b > 0$ large to be chosen later, and $p_1 = (0, -b^3\varepsilon)$, $q_1 = (0, 1 + b^3\varepsilon)$. By the triangle inequality, we have

$$S \leq \mathcal{L}(p_1; q_1) - S_0 - S_1, \quad S_0 = \inf_{p: \|p\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon} \mathcal{L}(p_1; p), \quad S_1 = \inf_{q: \|q-(0,1)\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon} \mathcal{L}(q; q_1).$$

By the symmetries of the directed landscape (Lemma 3.3), after scaling time by $b^{-3}\varepsilon^{-1}$ and shifting, we have

$$S_1 \stackrel{d}{=} S_0 \stackrel{d}{=} b\varepsilon^{1/3} \inf_{|x| \leq \varepsilon^{1/3}/b^2, |s-1| \leq 1/b^3} \mathcal{L}(0, 0; x, s).$$

For b large enough, by the lower tail bound, Proposition 3.8, we have $P(S_0 < -r) \leq c \exp(-r^3/(30b^3\varepsilon))$ all $r > 0, \varepsilon \in (0, 1/5]$. With $r = 40^{1/3}ba^{1/2}\varepsilon^{1/3}$, a union bound gives

$$P(S \geq a) \leq P(\mathcal{L}(p_1; q_1) > a(1 - 2b^340^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/3}a^{-1/2})) + 2ce^{-(4/3)a^{3/2}}$$

With large enough b , for $a \geq 1$ the claim now follows from the one-point upper tail bound of Theorem 3.4. The $a \leq 1$ case will hold automatically if we properly adjust c_η . \square

3.3 Efficient covers

The neighborhood bounds in the previous section will lead to tightness bounds for \mathcal{L}_ε over bounded sets, as long as such sets can be covered efficiently with translates of a neighborhood under the symmetry group of the landscape. The last claim (3.14) of the next lemma does show exactly this. The lemma uses the compact sets

$$\tilde{B}_n = \{u = (x, s; y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4 : t - s \geq 1/n, \|u\|_\infty \leq n\}, \quad \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \tilde{B}_n = \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4, \quad (3.11)$$

and the boxes $\Lambda_{a,b} = ([-a, a] \times [-b, b])^2$.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\alpha_{i,j,k,\ell}$ denote the map $(x, s) \mapsto (2^{-2\ell}(x + i + ks), 2^{-3\ell}(s + j))$, and for $(p; q) \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ set $\alpha_n(p; q) = (\alpha_n(p); \alpha_n(q))$ for the diagonal map on \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4 . Then there exist absolute constants $r_0, c_0 > 0$ so that*

$$\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^4} \alpha_n(\tilde{B}_{r_0}) = \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4, \quad (3.12)$$

and for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a, b > 0$ we have

$$\#\{n \in \mathbb{Z}^3 : \alpha_{n,\ell}(\tilde{B}_{r_0}) \cap \Lambda_{a,b} \neq \emptyset\} \leq c_0(a^2 2^{4\ell} + 1)b2^{3\ell}. \quad (3.13)$$

Moreover, the left-hand side above is 0 if $c_0 b \leq 2^{-3\ell}$.

Similarly, for any open neighborhood U of $(0, 0; 0, 1)$ there exists $c_U > 0$, $m_U \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S \subset (\frac{1}{m_U}\mathbb{Z})^4$ so that for any $a, b > 0$ we have $\Lambda_{a,b} \subset \bigcup_{n \in S} \alpha_n(U)$ and for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$\#\{(i, j, k, \lambda) \in S : \lfloor \lambda \rfloor = \ell\} \leq c_U(a^2 2^{4\ell} + 1)b2^{3\ell} \quad (3.14)$$

and the left-hand side equals 0 if $c_U b \leq 2^{-3\ell}$.

It is possible, but cumbersome, to prove the lemma by hand. Instead we use a bit of group theory for a quick proof.

Proof. The maps $\{\alpha_{i,j,k,1} : (i, j, k) \in \mathbb{R}^3\}$ form the real Heisenberg group $H_{\mathbb{R}}$, as can be seen via the matrix representation

$$\begin{bmatrix} x \\ s \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} 1 & k & i \\ 0 & 1 & j \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ s \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x + i + ks \\ s + j \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The discrete Heisenberg group $H_{\mathbb{Z}} = \{\alpha_{i,j,k,1} : (i, j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}^3\}$ forms a co-compact lattice in $H_{\mathbb{R}}$, so there is a compact subset $K \subset H_{\mathbb{R}}$ with $\bigcup_{\alpha \in H_{\mathbb{Z}}} \alpha(K) = H_{\mathbb{R}}$. Let $S = \{(0, 0; 0, r) : r \in [1, 4]\}$. Since the diagonal action of $H_{\mathbb{R}}$ is transitive on each set $O_r = \{(x, s; y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\uparrow}^4 : t - s = r\}$, we have

$$\mathbb{R}_{\uparrow}^4 = \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}, h \in H_{\mathbb{R}}} \alpha_{0,0,0,\ell} \circ h(S) = \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}, \alpha \in H_{\mathbb{Z}}} \bigcup_{h \in K} \alpha_{0,0,0,\ell} \circ \alpha \circ h(S) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^4} \alpha_n(C), \quad (3.15)$$

with $C = \{h(p) : (h, p) \in K \times S\}$. The map $(h, p) \mapsto h(p)$ is continuous, so C is compact. Since every compact set is contained in some \tilde{B}_r , (3.12) follows.

For a nonempty intersection in (3.13), i, j, k must satisfy

$$2^{-2\ell}|x + i + sk| \leq a, \quad 2^{-3\ell}|s + j| \leq b, \quad 2^{-2\ell}|x + sk - y - tk| \leq 2a, \quad 2^{-3\ell}(t - s) \leq 2b$$

for some $(x, s; y, t) \in \tilde{B}_{r_0}$. Since $t - s$ is bounded below, the third inequality limits the number of choices for k to at most $c(a2^{2\ell} + 1)$. Given k , the first inequality allows at most $c(a2^{2\ell} + 1)$ choices for i . The second inequality gives at most $cb2^{3\ell} + 1$ choices for j . Since $t - s > 1/r_0$, by the last inequality there are no solutions if $2^{3\ell}b < c$, and (3.13) and the subsequent ‘Moreover’ follows.

For the ‘Similarly’ claim, by (3.15) and rescaling, for large enough $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a compact $C' \subset U$ such that $\mathbb{R}_{\uparrow}^4 = \bigcup_{n \in (m_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^4} \alpha_n(C')$. Therefore there exists a finite set $F \subset (m_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^4$ so that $\tilde{B}_{r_0} \subset \bigcup_{n \in F} \alpha_n(U)$. The remaining claims follow similarly to (3.13). \square

3.4 Exponential tightness bounds for \mathcal{L}_ε

In this section, we deduce two exponential tightness bounds for \mathcal{L}_ε . These bounds do not rely on the fine topological structure explored in the coming sections.

Proposition 3.11. *For every bounded $B \subset \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$, $a, \delta > 0$ we have*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{3/2} \log P\left(|\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u) - d(u)| \geq a(t-s)^{1/3} + \delta \text{ for some } u = (x, s; y, t) \in B\right) \leq -\frac{4}{3}a^{3/2}.$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the claim for $B = [-n, n]^4 \cap \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$. For any open or closed D , let

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\varepsilon,1}(D) &= \left\{ \varepsilon |\mathcal{L}(u) - d(u)| \geq a(t-s)^{1/3} \text{ for some } u = (x, s; y, t) \in D \right\}. \\ A_{\varepsilon,2}(D) &= \left\{ \varepsilon |\mathcal{L}(u) - d(u)| \geq \delta \text{ for some } u = (x, s; y, t) \in D \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\eta < 4/3$. By Propositions 3.8 and 3.9 there exists $c > 0$ and an open neighborhood U of $(0, 0; 0, 1)$ so that for $i = 1, 2$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $P(A_{\varepsilon,1}(U)) < ce^{-\eta(a/\varepsilon)^{3/2}}$ and $P(A_{\varepsilon,2}(U)) < ce^{-(\delta/\varepsilon)^{3/2}}$.

Let $B^\varepsilon = ([-n/\varepsilon^{1/2}, n/\varepsilon^{1/2}] \times [-n, n])^2 \cap \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$. Lemma 3.10 provides a set $S \subset (\frac{1}{m_U}\mathbb{Z})^4$ so that $B^\varepsilon \subset \bigcup_{n \in S} \alpha_n(U)$. Let A be the event in the proposition. Then

$$P(A) \leq P\left(\bigcap_{i=1,2} A_{\varepsilon,i}(B^\varepsilon)\right) \leq \sum_{n \in S} \min_{i=1,2} P(A_{\varepsilon,i}(\alpha_n(U))) = \sum_{n \in S} \min(P(A_{\varepsilon,1}(U)), P(A_{\varepsilon/2^{n_4},2}(U)))$$

where n_4 denotes the last coordinate of n , and c' is a constant depending on a, δ . Here the final inequality uses the symmetries of the directed landscape (Lemma 3.3). Thus, by the cardinality bounds (3.14), for any $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$P(A) \leq \frac{c2^{7\ell_0}}{\varepsilon} e^{-\eta(a/\varepsilon)^{3/2}} + \frac{c}{\varepsilon} \sum_{\ell=\ell_0}^{\infty} 2^{7\ell} e^{-(\delta 2^\ell/\varepsilon)^{3/2}} \leq \frac{c'2^{\ell_0}}{\varepsilon} (e^{-\eta(a/\varepsilon)^{3/2}} + e^{-(\delta 2^{\ell_0}/\varepsilon)^{3/2}}),$$

where c, c' depends on a, n, η, δ but not on ε or ℓ_0 . Set ℓ_0 large, then let $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ and finally let $\eta \uparrow \frac{4}{3}$ to get the result. \square

We will only need a very weak version of the following proposition in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 3.12. *For every compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$, let $r = \min\{t-s : (x, s; y, t) \in K\}$, and let $a > 0$. We have*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^3 \log P\left(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u) \leq d(u) - a \text{ for some } u \in K\right) \leq -\frac{a^3}{12r}.$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the claim for \tilde{B}_n defined in (3.11). For any open or closed D , let

$$A_\varepsilon(D) = \left\{ \varepsilon \mathcal{L}(u) \leq d(u) - a \text{ for some } u \in D \right\}.$$

Let $\eta < 1/12$. By Proposition 3.8, for every $\delta > 0$ there exists $c > 0$ and an open neighborhood U of $(0, 0; 0, 1)$ of diameter at most δ so that for and all $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $P(A_\varepsilon(U)) < ce^{-\eta(a/\varepsilon)^3}$.

Let $B^\varepsilon = \{(x, s; y, t) : (\varepsilon^{1/2}x, s; \varepsilon^{1/2}y, t) \in \tilde{B}_n\}$. By Lemma 3.10 we can find $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and sets $S'_\varepsilon \subset (\frac{1}{m_0}\mathbb{Z})^4$ so that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $B^\varepsilon \subset \bigcup_{n \in S'_\varepsilon} \alpha_n(U)$. Let S_ε denote the set of $n \in S'_\varepsilon$ for which $\alpha_n(U) \cap B^\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$. By the compactness of \tilde{B}_n , the set $N_{4,U} = \{n_4 : n \in S_\varepsilon, \varepsilon > 0\}$ is finite (here n_4 denotes the last coordinate). Let A_ε be the event in the proposition. Then

$$P(A_\varepsilon) = P(A_\varepsilon(B^\varepsilon)) \leq \sum_{n \in S} P(A_\varepsilon(\alpha_n(U))) = \sum_{n \in S} P(A_{\varepsilon/2^{n_4}}(U)) \leq c \sum_{n \in S} e^{-\eta(a2^{n_4}/\varepsilon)^3},$$

where the final equality is by the symmetries of the directed landscape (Lemma 3.3). By the cardinality bounds (3.14), $\#S_\varepsilon \leq c/\varepsilon$, and so letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we get

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^3 \log P(A_\varepsilon) \leq -\eta \min_{k \in N_{4,U}} (a2^k)^3.$$

As $\delta \rightarrow 0$, the minimum above converges to a^3/r . Letting $\eta \uparrow \frac{1}{12}$ yields the result. \square

4 Topology

In this section, we introduce the space of functions on which we define the rate function and prove some basic properties of the metrics in this space. First, recall from the introduction that \mathcal{E} is the space of continuous functions $e : \mathbb{R}_\dagger^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the topology of uniform convergence on bounded sets, satisfying the reverse triangle inequality $e(p; q) + e(q; r) \leq e(p; r)$ for all triples $(p; q), (q; r), (p; r) \in \mathbb{R}_\dagger^4$. The space \mathcal{E} is completely metrizable with the following metric \mathbf{d} . Let $B_n = [-n, n]^4 \cap \mathbb{R}_\dagger^4$, and for $e, e' \in \mathcal{E}$, let

$$\mathbf{d}(e, e') = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \frac{\mathbf{d}_n(e, e')}{1 + \mathbf{d}_n(e, e')}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{d}_n(e, e') = \|e|_{B_n} - e'|_{B_n}\|_\infty. \quad (4.1)$$

A general directed metric $e \in \mathcal{E}$ does not have enough structure for us to define the rate function. To work around this, we will define our rate function on a well-behaved subset $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{E}$ and simply set it to be ∞ elsewhere. We call $e \in \mathcal{E}$ **Dirichlet-dominant** if $e \geq d$

everywhere. For such e and a point $u = (x, s; y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$, recall the definition of Θ from (3.5), and define

$$\Theta(e) = \sup_{u_1, \dots, u_k} \sum_{i=1}^k \Theta(e, u_i),$$

where the supremum is over all finite sets of points $u_i = (x_i, s_i; y_i, t_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ such that the intervals (s_i, t_i) are disjoint. The quantity $\Theta(e)$ can be thought of as a measure of how close e is to the Dirichlet metric, and is closely related to the rate function.

Definition 4.1. For $m > 0$, let $\mathcal{D}_m \subset \mathcal{E}$ be the set of functions e satisfying the following three conditions:

- (i) e is Dirichlet-dominant: $e \geq d$.
- (ii) e is Dirichlet-close: $\Theta(e) \leq m$.
- (iii) e satisfies the metric composition law: for any points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s < r < t$ we have

$$e(x, s; y, t) = \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}} e(x, s; z, r) + e(z, r; y, t). \quad (4.2)$$

We set $\mathcal{D} := \bigcup_{m>0} \mathcal{D}_m$.

Property (iii) can be thought of as ensuring that e defines a geodesic space, and later on we will show that this is indeed the case.

The rate function is only finite on a subset of \mathcal{D} . In the remainder of this section we collect some basic structural properties of \mathcal{D} . These properties can loosely be summarized as saying that each \mathcal{D}_m is a compact, and that all metrics $e \in \mathcal{D}$ define geodesic spaces with quantitatively controlled path lengths.

The first three facts we record are immediate from considering the above definitions of $\Theta(e)$, \mathcal{D}_m . We leave the proofs to the reader.

Lemma 4.2. (i) *The function $e \mapsto \Theta(e)$ is lower semi-continuous on the space of continuous functions $e : \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $e \geq d$.*

(ii) *If $e \in \mathcal{D}_m$, then for all $u = (x, s; y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$, since $\Theta(e) \leq m$ we have*

$$e(u) - d(u) \leq m^{2/3}(t - s)^{1/3}.$$

(iii) *For all $m > 0$, the set \mathcal{D}_m is invariant under the four landscape symmetries from Lemma 3.3.*

For some purposes, it will be more convenient to work with metrics that satisfy the condition in Lemma 4.2(ii) rather than the bound on $\Theta(e)$ in Definition 4.1(ii). For this reason, we let \mathcal{D}_m^* be the set of all $e \in \mathcal{E}$ satisfying Definition 4.1(i)(iii) and Lemma 4.2(ii). Note that Lemma 4.2(iii) also holds for \mathcal{D}_m^* . We next prove that \mathcal{D}_m is compact, which will be necessary for eventually establishing our rate function is good. We start with an equicontinuity lemma. We state this lemma in more generality than we need it here as it will later be used to prove exponential tightness for the upper bound in Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $n, m, \varepsilon > 0$, and suppose that $e \in \mathcal{E}$ satisfies the estimates*

$$d(u) - \varepsilon \leq e(u) \leq d(u) + m^{2/3}(t - s)^{1/3} + \varepsilon \quad (4.3)$$

for all $u = (x, s; y, t) \in B_n$. Suppose also that for some $1 \leq \ell$ and $n \geq m \vee \ell$, for any points $x, y \in [-\ell, \ell]$ and $s < r_1 < r_2 < t \in [-\ell, \ell]$ we have

$$e(x, s; y, t) = \max_{z_1, z_2 \in [-n, n]} e(x, s; z_1, r_1) + e(z_1, r_1; z_2, r_2) + e(z_2, r_2; y, t). \quad (4.4)$$

Consider $u_1 = (p_1; q_1) = (x_1, s_1; y_1, t_1)$, $u_2 = (p_2; q_2) = (x_2, s_2; y_2, t_2) \in B_\ell$ with $\|u_1 - u_2\|_\infty < [(t_1 - s_1)^3 \wedge (t_2 - s_2)^3]/64$. Then

$$|e(u_1) - e(u_2)| \leq 4\varepsilon + 12n^2\|u_1 - u_2\|_\infty^{1/9}.$$

Proof. Set $\alpha = \|u_1 - u_2\|_\infty$. Choose $s_3 \in [s_1 + \alpha^{1/3}, s_1 + 2\alpha^{1/3}) \cap [s_2 + \alpha^{1/3}, s_2 + 2\alpha^{1/3})$ and $t_3 \in (t_1 - 2\alpha^{1/3}, t_1 - \alpha^{1/3}] \cap (t_2 - 2\alpha^{1/3}, t_2 - \alpha^{1/3}]$. Our restriction on α guarantees that $s_3 < t_3$. By (4.4) we have that

$$e(u_i) = \max_{z_1, z_2 \in [-n, n]} e(p_i; z_1, s_3) + e(z_1, s_3; z_2, t_3) + e(z_2, t_3; q_i).$$

Therefore by (4.3) we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |e(u_1) - e(u_2)| &\leq 4\varepsilon + 2^{4/3}m^{2/3}\alpha^{1/9} \\ &\quad + \sup_{z, z' \in [-n, n]} |d(p_1; z, s_3) - d(p_2; z, s_3)| + |d(z', t_3; q_1) - d(z', t_3; q_2)|. \end{aligned}$$

By a straightforward computation, the above supremum is bounded by $8n^2\alpha^{1/3}$. \square

We are now ready to prove our main compactness tool.

Proposition 4.4. *Each of the sets $\mathcal{D}_m, \mathcal{D}_m^*$ is compact in \mathcal{E} .*

Proof. First let \mathcal{E}_* denote the space \mathcal{E} but with the topology of uniform convergence on compact, rather than bounded, sets. We first check that \mathcal{D}_m^* is precompact in \mathcal{E}_* . For this, by the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem it is enough to check boundedness and equicontinuity on every compact set $\tilde{B}_\ell, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Boundedness follows from Dirichlet dominance and Lemma 4.2(ii). Equicontinuity follows from Lemma 4.3, since (4.3) holds with $\varepsilon = 0$ on \mathbb{R}_+^d , and in the metric composition law in Definition 4.1(iii), by (4.3), on B_ℓ we have

$$\begin{aligned} e(x, s; y, t) &= \max_{z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}} e(x, s; z_1, r_1) + e(z_1, r_1; z_2, r_2) + e(z_2, r_2; y, t) \\ &= \max_{z_1, z_2 \in [-n, n]} e(x, s; z_1, r_1) + e(z_1, r_1; z_2, r_2) + e(z_2, r_2; y, t), \end{aligned}$$

for $n = (m + 1)(\ell + 1)$.

Next we upgrade this to compactness in \mathcal{E}_* . That is, for a sequence $e_n \in \mathcal{D}_m^*$ we need to check that any subsequential limit e is in \mathcal{D}_m^* as well. The conditions in Definition 4.1(i) and Lemma 4.2(ii) are closed conditions in the \mathcal{E}_* -topology, so e must satisfy these conditions.

To check that Definition 4.1(iii) holds for e , observe that Lemma 4.2(ii) and Definition 4.1(iii) imply the following bound on \mathcal{D}_m^* . For any points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s < r < t$ there exists $\alpha = \alpha(x, y, s, r, t)$ such that for all $e' \in \mathcal{D}_m^*$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} e'(x, s; y, t) &= \max_{z \in [-\alpha, \alpha]} e'(x, s; z, r) + e'(z, r; y, t). \\ e'(x, s; y, t) &\geq 1 + \sup_{z \notin [-\alpha, \alpha]} e'(x, s; z, r) + e'(z, r; y, t). \end{aligned}$$

These two conditions are also closed conditions in the \mathcal{E}_* -topology, so both must be satisfied by e . Moreover, these conditions imply Definition 4.1(iii) as desired.

To complete the proof of the proposition, it suffices to show that any \mathcal{E}_* -convergent sequence e_i in \mathcal{D}_m^* is also \mathcal{E} -convergent to the same limit e . For this, consider the compact sets \tilde{B}_n defined in (3.11), and observe that for any $n' \geq n$ in \mathbb{N} , Definition 4.1(i) and Lemma 4.2(ii) imply that

$$\|e_i|_{B_n} - e|_{B_n}\|_\infty \leq \|e_i|_{\tilde{B}_{n'}} - e|_{\tilde{B}_{n'}}\|_\infty + m^{2/3}(n')^{-1/3}$$

The right-hand side above converges to $m^{2/3}(n')^{-1/3}$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ since $e_i \rightarrow e$ in \mathcal{E}_* . Taking $n' \rightarrow \infty$ then gives that $e_i \rightarrow e$ in \mathcal{E} .

For \mathcal{D}_m , let e_n be a sequence in \mathcal{D}_m with a limit point $e \in \mathcal{D}_m^*$. Then e satisfies Definition 4.1(ii) by the lower semicontinuity of Θ , Lemma 4.2(i). Thus $e \in \mathcal{D}_m$. \square

Now, let $e \in \mathcal{E}$, and let $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any continuous path. Let $\bar{\gamma}(r) := (\gamma(r), r)$. Recall from the introduction that the e -length of γ can be defined as follows. For a partition

$\mathcal{P} = \{a = r_0 < \dots < r_k = b\}$ of $[a, b]$, let

$$|\gamma|_{e, \mathcal{P}} = \sum_{i=1}^k e(\bar{\gamma}(r_{i-1}); \bar{\gamma}(r_i)), \quad |\gamma|_e = \inf_{\mathcal{P} \text{ a partition of } [a, b]} |\gamma|_{e, \mathcal{P}},$$

A path from p to q is a geodesic if $|\gamma|_e = e(p; q)$, and a metric e defines a **geodesic space** if for every $(p, q) \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$ there is a geodesic from p to q . The next lemma establishes that all metrics in \mathcal{D} are geodesic spaces. A geodesic γ from p to q is called a **rightmost geodesic** if every geodesic γ' from p to q satisfies $\gamma' \leq \gamma$. First, we construct a candidate for the rightmost geodesic.

Lemma 4.5. *For every $e \in \mathcal{D}$, $u = (p, q) = (x, s; y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$, and $r \in [s, t]$ the function*

$$z \mapsto e(p; z, r) + e(z, r; q). \quad (4.5)$$

has a rightmost maximizer $z_u(r)$. Moreover, $z_u(\cdot)$ is continuous.

In (4.5) for $r \in \{s, t\}$, we have extended e outside of \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4 as discussed after Definition 3.1.

Proof. A maximizer necessarily exists by Definition 4.1(iii), and the continuity of e and Lemma 4.2(ii) guarantee that a rightmost maximizer exists.

Next, we claim that $r \mapsto z_u(r)$ is continuous. Indeed, the shape conditions in Definition 4.1(i) and Lemma 4.2(ii) guarantee that z_u is continuous at s, t . The continuity of e implies that z_u is upper semicontinuous everywhere. Moreover, the metric composition law (Definition 4.1(iii)) implies that for any $r' < r \in (s, t)$, the value $z_{(\bar{z}_u(r'); q)}(r)$ maximizes the function (4.5), and so $z_{(\bar{z}_u(r'); q)}(r) \leq z_u(r)$. Therefore

$$z_u(r') = \liminf_{r \downarrow r'} z_{(\bar{z}_u(r'); q)}(r) \leq \liminf_{r \downarrow r'} z_u(r),$$

where the equality uses that $z_{(\bar{z}_u(r'); q)}$ is continuous at r' , which we have just established. Combining this with the upper semicontinuity of z_u yields that z_u is right-continuous at r' . A symmetric argument gives left-continuity. \square

Next, we show the quadrangle inequality on \mathcal{D} .

Lemma 4.6. *For $e \in \mathcal{D}$, and points $(p, q) = (x, s; y, t)$, $(p', q') = (x', s'; y', t)$ with $x < x'$, and $y < y'$ we have*

$$e(p; q') + e(p'; q) \leq e(p; q) + e(p'; q').$$

Proof. In the setting of Lemma 4.5, since $x < x', y < y'$ and $z_{(p,q')} - z_{(p',q)}$ is continuous, by the intermediate value theorem there exists $r \in (s, t)$ with $z_{(p,q')}(r) = z_{(p',q)}(r)$. Let $o = (z_{(p',q)}(r), r)$. By the triangle inequality,

$$e(p; q') + e(p'; q) = e(p; o) + e(o; q') + e(p'; o) + e(o; q) \leq e(p; q) + e(p'; q'). \quad \square$$

Lemma 4.7. *The function z_u defined in Lemma 4.5 is a rightmost geodesic from p to q .*

Proof. We follow the argument from [Dauvergne et al. \(2022\)](#), Lemma 13.2. Any e -geodesic γ from p to q satisfies $\gamma \leq z_u$ by definition so it is enough to show that z_u is itself a geodesic. For this, is enough to show that for every pair of points $r_1 < r_2 \in [s, t]$ we have

$$e(p; q) = e(p; \bar{z}_u(r_1)) + e(\bar{z}_u(r_1); \bar{z}_u(r_2)) + e(\bar{z}_u(r_2); q). \quad (4.6)$$

Letting $a = z_{(\bar{z}_u(r_1), q)}(r_2)$ and $b = z_{(p, \bar{z}_u(r_2))}(r_1)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} e(p; q) &= e(p; \bar{z}_u(r_1)) + e(\bar{z}_u(r_1); a, r_2) + e(a, r_2; q), \\ e(p; q) &= e(p; b, r_1) + e(b, r_1; \bar{z}_u(r_2)) + e(\bar{z}_u(r_2); q). \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Lemma 4.5, $a \leq z_u(r_2)$ and $b \leq z_u(r_1)$. Therefore adding the above two equalities and applying the quadrangle inequality in Lemma 4.6 gives that

$$\begin{aligned} 2e(p; q) &\leq [e(p; \bar{z}_u(r_1)) + e(\bar{z}_u(r_1); \bar{z}_u(r_2)) + e(\bar{z}_u(r_2); q)] \\ &\quad + [e(p; b, r_1) + e(b, r_1; a, r_2) + e(a, r_2; q)]. \end{aligned}$$

The triangle inequality for e implies that both of the bracketed expressions on the right-hand side above are less than or equal to $e(p, q)$. This forces (4.6). \square

The remaining lemmas in this section aim to understand the structure of finite length paths in metrics $e \in \mathcal{D}$. We start with the special case when $e = d$, where path length is given the negative of the Dirichlet energy.

Lemma 4.8. *(Lemma 5.1.6, [Dembo and Zeitouni \(2009\)](#)) Let $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. If γ is absolutely continuous, then*

$$|\gamma|_d = - \int_a^b |\gamma'(t)|^2 dt, \quad (4.7)$$

and if γ is not absolutely continuous then $|\gamma|_d = -\infty$.

Going forward, we write H^1 for the space of finite Dirichlet energy paths (i.e. paths for which $|\gamma|_d \neq -\infty$). Lemma 4.8 implies that for all $p = (x, s), q = (y, t)$ the unique d -geodesic from p to q is the linear function. For general metrics in \mathcal{D} , geodesics cannot wander too far from the Dirichlet geodesics.

Lemma 4.9. Let $(p; q) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and let π_d be the (linear) d -geodesic from p to q . Let $e \in \mathcal{D}_m$. Let π be a path between points $p = (x, s), q = (y, t)$, with $|\pi|_e \geq |\pi|_d$. Then for any $r \in [s, t]$

$$|\pi(r) - \pi_d(r)| \leq 2^{1/3}(t-s)^{1/6} \sqrt{m[r \wedge (t-r)]}.$$

Proof. By symmetries of \mathcal{D}_m (Lemma 4.2(iii)), it suffices to prove the bound when $x = s = y = 0$. In this case, $e(0, 0; 0, t) \geq 0$, whereas by Lemma 4.2(ii)

$$\begin{aligned} e(0, 0; z, r) + e(z, r; 0, t) &\leq -\frac{z^2}{r} - \frac{z^2}{t-r} + mr^{1/3} + m(t-r)^{1/3} \\ &\leq -\frac{z^2}{r \wedge (t-r)} + 2^{2/3}mt^{1/3}. \end{aligned}$$

For z to lie along π , the right-hand side above must be greater than or equal to 0, implying that $|z| \leq 2^{1/3} \sqrt{m[r \wedge (t-r)]} t^{1/6}$. \square

Lemma 4.8 also implies that a path has finite d -length if and only if it has finite Dirichlet energy. This also holds for general $e \in \mathcal{D}$ by the following lemma.

Lemma 4.10. Let $e \in \mathcal{D}_m$, and let $\gamma : [s, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any path. Then

$$|\gamma|_d \leq |\gamma|_e \leq |\gamma|_d + m^{2/3}(t-s)^{1/3}.$$

To prove Lemma 4.10, we start with a useful lemma based on Jensen's inequality.

Lemma 4.11. Suppose that $e, e_* \in \mathcal{D}$ with $e_* \geq e$, and consider a collection of points $U = \{u_i = (x_i, s_i; y_i, t_i) : i = 1, \dots, k\} \subset \mathbb{R}_\dagger^4$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \Theta(e_*, u_i) - \Theta(e, u_i) \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (e_*(u_i) - e(u_i)) \right)^{3/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (t_i - s_i) \right)^{-1/2}$$

Proof. We can write

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \Theta(e_*, u_i) - \Theta(e, u_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k f(\varepsilon_i, b_i, t_i - s_i) - f(0, b_i, t_i - s_i), \quad (4.8)$$

where

$$\varepsilon_i = e_*(u_i) - e(u_i), \quad b_i = e(u_i) + \frac{(x_i - y_i)^2}{t_i - s_i}, \quad f(\varepsilon, b, \Delta) = \left[\frac{b + \varepsilon}{\Delta} \right]^{3/2} \Delta.$$

Since $e_* \geq e$, we have $\varepsilon_i \geq 0$ for all i . Moreover, Dirichlet dominance of e ensures that $b_i \geq 0$ for all i . For fixed $\varepsilon, \Delta \geq 0$, the difference $f(\varepsilon, b, \Delta) - f(0, b, \Delta)$ is monotone increasing in b , so (4.8) is bounded below by

$$\sum_{i=1}^k f(\varepsilon_i, 0, t_i - s_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k (\varepsilon_i / [t_i - s_i])^{3/2} [t_i - s_i] \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon_i \right)^{3/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (t_i - s_i) \right)^{-1/2}.$$

The final inequality is Jensen's inequality. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.10. The bound $|\gamma|_d \leq |\gamma|_e$ follows since $d \leq e$. For the second bound, it suffices to show that

$$|\gamma|_{e,\mathcal{P}} - |\gamma|_{d,\mathcal{P}} \leq m^{2/3}(t-s)^{1/3}.$$

for any partition \mathcal{P} . Using Lemma 4.11 with $e_* = e, e = d$ and the definition of Θ we have

$$(|\gamma|_{e,\mathcal{P}} - |\gamma|_{d,\mathcal{P}})^{3/2} \leq \Theta(e)(t-s)^{1/2},$$

which gives the desired bound since $\Theta(e) \leq m$. \square

Next, for a path $\gamma : [s, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a metric e define the **weight function** $w_{\gamma,e} : [s, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $w_{\gamma,e}(r) = |\gamma|_{[s,r]}|_e$. Lemma 4.8 implies that for any path $\gamma \in H^1$, that the weight function $w_{\gamma,d}$ is absolutely continuous with derivative $w'_{\gamma,d} = -|\gamma'|^2$. This absolute continuity also holds for general metrics $e \in \mathcal{D}$.

Lemma 4.12. *Let $\gamma \in H^1, e \in \mathcal{D}$. Then $w_{\gamma,e}$ is absolutely continuous and $w'_{\gamma,e} \geq -|\gamma'|^2$ Lebesgue-a.e.*

We define the **excess density** of e along γ as the function $\rho_{\gamma,e} : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\rho_{\gamma,e}(r) = w'_{\gamma,e}(r) + \gamma'(r)^2 \geq 0. \quad (4.9)$$

Proof. Write $x_- = -\min(x, 0)$ and $x_+ = \max(x, 0)$. We have $[w_{\gamma,e}(t) - w_{\gamma,e}(s)]_- \leq |w_{\gamma,d}(t) - w_{\gamma,d}(s)|$ for any $s < t$ since $e \geq d$ and Dirichlet weight functions are non-increasing. Since the weight function $w_{\gamma,d}$ is absolutely continuous, for $w_{\gamma,e}$ to be absolutely continuous it is therefore enough to show that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for a disjoint collection of intervals $(s_i, t_i), i = 1, \dots, \ell$ we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (t_i - s_i) < \delta \quad \implies \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (w_{\gamma,e}(t_i) - w_{\gamma,e}(s_i))_+ < \varepsilon. \quad (4.10)$$

Using Lemma 4.11, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(e) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \Theta(e, (\bar{\gamma}(s_i); \bar{\gamma}(t_i))) \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e(\bar{\gamma}(s_i); \bar{\gamma}(t_i)) - d((\bar{\gamma}(s_i); \bar{\gamma}(t_i))) \right)^{3/2} \delta^{-1/2} \\ &\geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (w_{\gamma,e}(t_i) - w_{\gamma,e}(s_i))_+ \right)^{3/2} \delta^{-1/2} \end{aligned}$$

yielding (4.10) as long as $\delta < \varepsilon^3 \Theta(e)^{-2}$. As $e \geq d, w'_{\gamma,e} \geq -|\gamma'|^2$ Lebesgue-a.e. \square

We finish this section by recording a property of path length under approximation.

Lemma 4.13. *If $\gamma_n \rightarrow \gamma$ pointwise, and $e_n \rightarrow e$ in \mathcal{D} , then $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\gamma_n|_{e_n} \leq |\gamma|_e$.*

The proof of Lemma 4.13 is immediate from the definition and we leave the details to the reader.

5 The rate function

In this section, we give a path definition of the rate function I , and use this to prove that it is a good rate function. For $e \in \mathcal{D}$ and a path $\gamma \in H^1$, recall the excess density $\rho_{\gamma,e} = w'_{\gamma,e} + |\gamma'|^2$ defined in (4.9) and define

$$I(\gamma, e) = \frac{4}{3} \int_{a_\gamma}^{b_\gamma} \rho_{\gamma,e}(t)^{3/2} dt. \quad (5.1)$$

Here and throughout the paper we let $[a_\gamma, b_\gamma]$ be the domain of a path γ .

We say that a finite or countable collection of Dirichlet paths Γ is a **network** if it is **internally disjoint**, i.e. for all $\gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma$ with domains $[a, b], [a', b']$ and $r \in (a, b) \cap (a', b')$ we have $\gamma(r) \neq \gamma'(r)$. We call the network **disjoint** if this also holds on $[a, b] \cap [a', b']$.

Definition 5.1 (Rate function). Define the rate function $I : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by setting $I(e) = \infty$ for $e \notin \mathcal{D}$ and for $e \in \mathcal{D}$, letting

$$I(e) := \sup_{\Gamma} I(\Gamma, e), \quad \text{where} \quad I(\Gamma, e) := \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} I(\gamma, e).$$

Here the supremum is over all networks Γ .

In Definition 5.1, we can equivalently take the supremum over all finite networks. Also, by slightly truncating paths we can take the supremum over all finite disjoint networks. Next, we record a few basic properties of the rate function.

Proposition 5.2. *The function $I : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ satisfies the following properties:*

- (i) $I(d) = 0$.
- (ii) For any $\alpha < \infty$, the sub-level set $I^{-1}[0, \alpha]$ is contained in $\mathcal{D}_{3\alpha/4}$.
- (iii) I is lower semi-continuous: if $e_n \rightarrow e$ in \mathcal{E} , then $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(e_n) \geq I(e)$.
- (iv) For all $\alpha < \infty$, $I^{-1}[0, \alpha]$ is compact in \mathcal{E} .

Properties (iii, iv) above together imply that I defines a good rate function.

To prepare for the proof of the proposition, we need a lemma relating the integral expression of the rate $I(\gamma, e)$ to a partition-based expression of the rate. This partition-based expression will be used to facilitate proofs throughout the paper.

For $e \in \mathcal{D}$, a path $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\gamma \in H^1$, and a partition $\mathcal{P} = \{r_0 < r_1 < \dots < r_k\}$ of $[a, b]$ and with the notation $x_+ = \max(x, 0)$, define

$$I(\gamma, e, \mathcal{P}) := \frac{4}{3} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{w_{\gamma,e}(r_i) - w_{\gamma,e}(r_{i-1})}{r_i - r_{i-1}} + \frac{(\gamma(r_i) - \gamma(r_{i-1}))^2}{(r_i - r_{i-1})^2} \right)_+^{3/2} (r_i - r_{i-1}). \quad (5.2)$$

Lemma 5.3. *Let $e \in \mathcal{D}$, $\gamma \in H^1$, $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and let \mathcal{P} be a partition of $[a, b]$. Then $I(\gamma, e, \mathcal{P}) \leq I(\gamma, e)$. Moreover, for any sequence of partitions $\mathcal{P}_n = \{r_{n,0} = a < \dots < r_{n,\ell(n)} = b\}$ such that the mesh size $m(\mathcal{P}_n) := \min\{r_{n,i} - r_{n,i-1} : i = 1, \dots, \ell(n)\}$ approaches 0 with n , we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(\gamma, e, \mathcal{P}_n) = I(\gamma, e).$$

Proof. For a function $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a partition $\mathcal{P} = \{r_0 < \dots < r_k\}$ of $[a, b]$, write $[f]_{\mathcal{P}}$ for the function which for $s \in [r_i, r_{i+1})$ is given by the average of f on that interval:

$$[f]_{\mathcal{P}}(s) = \frac{1}{r_{i+1} - r_i} \int_{r_i}^{r_{i+1}} f(s) ds.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} I(\gamma, e, \mathcal{P}) &= \frac{4}{3} \int_a^b ([w'_{\gamma,e}]_{\mathcal{P}} + ([\gamma']_{\mathcal{P}})^2)_+^{3/2} \leq \frac{4}{3} \int_a^b ([w'_{\gamma,e}]_{\mathcal{P}} + ([\gamma']_{\mathcal{P}})^2)_+^{3/2} \\ &= \frac{4}{3} \int_a^b ([w'_{\gamma,e} + (\gamma')^2]_{\mathcal{P}})^{3/2} \leq \frac{4}{3} \int_a^b (w'_{\gamma,e} + (\gamma')^2)^{3/2} = I(\gamma, e). \end{aligned}$$

Here the two inequalities both use Jensen's inequality, and the equality on the middle line uses that $[f + g]_{\mathcal{P}} = [f]_{\mathcal{P}} + [g]_{\mathcal{P}}$ and that $w'_{\gamma,e} + (\gamma')^2 \geq 0$. This yields the first part of the lemma.

For the 'Moreover', observe that $[w'_{\gamma,e}]_{\mathcal{P}_n} + ([\gamma']_{\mathcal{P}_n})^2 \rightarrow w'_{\gamma,e} + (\gamma')^2$ Lebesgue a.e. by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem. Therefore by Fatou's lemma,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(\gamma, e, \mathcal{P}_n) \geq \frac{4}{3} \int_a^b (w'_{\gamma,e} + (\gamma')^2)_+^{3/2} = I(\gamma, e),$$

which combined with the first part of the lemma yields the result. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.2. Property (i) holds because $I(\gamma, d) = 0$ for any $\gamma \in H^1$. For part (ii), consider any $e \in \mathcal{D}$. For any path γ with endpoints $u = (x, s; y, t)$ we have

$$\frac{3}{4} I(\gamma, e) = \int \rho_{\gamma,e}(r)^{3/2} dr \geq \frac{(\int_s^t \rho_{\gamma,e})^{3/2}}{\sqrt{t-s}} = \frac{(|\gamma|_e - |\gamma|_d)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{t-s}} \geq \frac{(|\gamma|_e - d(u))^{3/2}}{\sqrt{t-s}}$$

Now let U be any set of points defined on time intervals with disjoint interiors, and for $u \in U$ let γ_u be an e -geodesic between the endpoints of u . Then

$$I(e) \geq \sum_{u \in U} I(\gamma_u, e) \geq \frac{4}{3} \sum_{u=(x,s;y,t) \in U} \frac{(|\gamma_u|_e - d(u))^{3/2}}{\sqrt{t-s}} = \frac{4}{3} \sum_{u \in U} \Theta(e, u).$$

So $\Theta(e) \leq 3I(e)/4$, which yields (ii).

For part (iii), let $e_{n(i)}$ be a subsequence where $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} I(e_{n(i)}) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(e_n)$. If this limit is infinite, then the claim is trivially true, so we may assume this limit is finite, in which case by part (ii) there exists $m > 0$ such that $e_{n(i)} \in \mathcal{D}_m$ for all large enough i . By compactness of \mathcal{D}_m , Proposition 4.4, $e \in \mathcal{D}_m$ as well, and so its rate function is given by maximizing over networks.

Therefore for $\alpha < I(e)$, by Lemma 5.3 we can find a disjoint network $\gamma_j : [a_j, b_j] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $j = 1 \dots, k$ and partitions $\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_k$ of the domains of $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^k I(\gamma_j, e, \mathcal{P}_j) \geq \alpha$. Moreover, we can make the mesh sizes of \mathcal{P}_j arbitrarily small.

For every n , let γ_j^n be the path from $\bar{\gamma}_j(a_j)$ to $\bar{\gamma}_j(b_j)$ which equals γ_j on the points of \mathcal{P}_j and is given by the rightmost e_n -geodesic in between points of the partition \mathcal{P}_j . As long as the mesh sizes of \mathcal{P}_j are sufficiently small, since $e_{n(i)} \in \mathcal{D}_m$ for large enough i , by Lemma 4.9 the paths $\gamma_1^{n(i)}, \dots, \gamma_k^{n(i)}$ are disjoint for large enough i . Therefore

$$I(e_{n(i)}) \geq \sum_{j=1}^k I(\gamma_j^{n(i)}, e_{n(i)}, \mathcal{P}_j) \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^k I(\gamma_j, e, \mathcal{P}_j),$$

and so $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(e_n) \geq I(e)$.

For part (iv), $\mathcal{D}_{3\alpha/4}$ is compact by Proposition 4.4 and $I^{-1}[0, \alpha]$ is closed by part (iii) and a subset of $\mathcal{D}_{3\alpha/4}$ by part (ii), so $I^{-1}[0, \alpha]$ is compact. \square

6 Finite-rate metrics, measures and Kruzhkov entropy

In this section we give a full description of the structure of finite-rate metrics. As we will see, metrics are in one-to-one correspondence with measures μ on \mathbb{R}^2 whose support is contained in a set of the form $\mathfrak{g}\Gamma := \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \mathfrak{g}\gamma$ for some network Γ and have finite **Kruzhkov entropy**. We call such measures **planted network measures**.

We first define the **temporal density** $\rho_\mu(x, t)$ of μ . For $\gamma \in \Gamma$, $(x, t) \in \mathfrak{g}\gamma$ define $\rho_\mu(x, t)$ as the Lebesgue density of the t -marginal of $\mu|_{\mathfrak{g}\gamma}$. Set $\rho_\mu = 0$ on $(\mathfrak{g}\Gamma)^c$. The temporal density ρ_μ is well-defined μ -almost everywhere, i.e. it is independent of the network Γ . Define the **Kruzhkov entropy** by

$$\mathcal{K}(\mu) = \int \sqrt{\rho_\mu} d\mu.$$

The name is motivated by Kruzhkov's analysis of Burgers' equation and its generalizations, but as far as we know, this is the first time it is used to define an entropy of a measure.

Definition 6.1 (Measure to metric). Given a planted network measure μ , define the metric

$$e_\mu(p; q) = \sup_{\pi} \mu(\mathbf{g}\pi) + |\pi|_d$$

where the sup is over all H^1 paths π from p to q . We call such a metric a planted network metric.

A priori, it is not clear that e_μ even lies in \mathcal{E} , let alone that e_μ produces a finite rate metric. We prove this on route to our main structure theorem. Next, for a finite rate metric e , we say a network Γ is e -complete if $I(e) = I(\Gamma, e)$.

Definition 6.2 (Metric to measure). For a finite-rate metric e and a network Γ define

$$\mu_{\Gamma, e} = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} (\rho_{\gamma, e} dt) \circ \gamma^{-1},$$

where the notation refers to the pushforward measure, and $\rho_{\gamma, e}$ is the excess density defined in (4.9). Set $\mu_e = \mu_{\Gamma, e}$ for any e -complete network Γ .

At this point, it is not clear that μ_e is well-defined. This is shown in Proposition 6.7. However, $\mu_{\Gamma, e}$ is well defined for all Γ . Its temporal density is given by

$$\rho_{\Gamma, e}(x) = \begin{cases} \rho_{\gamma, e}(t) & \text{if } (\gamma(t), t) = x \text{ for some } \gamma \in \Gamma \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

The change-of-variables formula applied to (5.1) implies

$$I(\Gamma, e) = \frac{4}{3} \int \sqrt{\rho_{\Gamma, e}} d\mu_{\Gamma, e} = \frac{4}{3} \mathcal{K}(\mu_{\Gamma, e}). \quad (6.1)$$

This motivates the main structure theorem.

Theorem 6.3. *Definitions 6.1 and 6.2 give a one-to-one correspondence between finite rate metrics and planted network measures. The maps $\mu \rightarrow e_\mu$ and $e \rightarrow \mu_e$ are inverses of each other. Moreover $I(e_\mu) = \frac{4}{3} \mathcal{K}(\mu)$.*

An immediate corollary of Theorem 6.3 is the following.

Corollary 6.4. *I is strictly monotone: for distinct $e, e' \in \mathcal{D}$ with $e \leq e'$, we have $I(e) < I(e')$.*

To prove Theorem 6.3 we need the following lemma. It will be useful for eliminating conflicts when defining $\mu_{\Gamma, e}$ for two different Γ .

Lemma 6.5. *Let $e \in \mathcal{D}$, and let $\gamma, \pi \in H^1$ be paths with e -weight functions w_γ, w_π whose domains overlap on an interval $[a, b]$. Let $K_0 = \{r \in [a, b] : \gamma(r) = \pi(r)\}$. Then $w'_\gamma(r) = w'_\pi(r)$ and $\rho_{\pi,e} = \rho_{\gamma,e}$ for Lebesgue-a.e. $r \in K_0$.*

Proof. Let K be a closed subset of K_0 . Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let \mathcal{P} be a partition of $[a, b]$ so that

$$|\gamma|_{[a,b]} > |\gamma|_{[a,b]|\mathcal{P}} - \varepsilon,$$

where we drop e from the notation $|\gamma|_e$ and $|\gamma|_{e,\mathcal{P}}$ for convenience. The open set $(a, b) \setminus K$ is a finite or countable union of disjoint open intervals U_1, U_2, \dots . Let k be so that the finite set $\mathcal{P} \cap ((a, b) \setminus K)$ is contained in $\bigcup_{i=1}^k U_i$, and that $K' = [a, b] \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^k U_i$ satisfies

$$\varepsilon + \int_K w'_\gamma > \int_{K'} w'_\gamma, \quad \int_K w'_\pi < \varepsilon + \int_{K'} w'_\pi. \quad (6.2)$$

The latter can be achieved by the dominated convergence theorem. K' is a finite union of disjoint closed intervals V_0, \dots, V_k . Let \mathcal{P}' be the union of \mathcal{P} and the endpoints of U_1, \dots, U_k . By construction, $\mathcal{P}' \setminus \mathcal{P} \subset K$, and also $\mathcal{P} \cap K' \subset K$, hence $\mathcal{P}' \cap K' \subset K$, which implies $|\gamma|_{V_i|\mathcal{P}'} = |\pi|_{V_i|\mathcal{P}'}$ for all i . We bound

$$\int_{K'} w'_\gamma = |\gamma|_{[a,b]} - \sum_{i=1}^k |\gamma|_{\overline{U}_i} > |\gamma|_{[a,b]|\mathcal{P}'} - \varepsilon - \sum_{i=1}^k |\gamma|_{\overline{U}_i|\mathcal{P}'}$$

where \overline{U}_i is the closure of U_i . We have

$$|\gamma|_{[a,b]|\mathcal{P}'} - \sum_{i=1}^k |\gamma|_{\overline{U}_i|\mathcal{P}'} = \sum_{i=0}^k |\gamma|_{V_i|\mathcal{P}'} = \sum_{i=0}^k |\pi|_{V_i|\mathcal{P}'} \geq \sum_{i=0}^k |\pi|_{V_i} = \int_{K'} w'_\pi.$$

With (6.2), this gives $\int_K w'_\gamma > \int_K w'_\pi - 3\varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, and the roles of γ and π are symmetric, $\int_K w'_\gamma = \int_K w'_\pi$. Since this holds for all closed $K \subset K_0$, we have that $w'_\gamma(r) = w'_\pi(r)$ for Lebesgue-a.e. $r \in K_0$. The claim for $\rho_{\gamma,e}, \rho_{\pi,e}$ follows by applying this equality to both e and d . \square

To show that e -complete networks exist, we will use the following extension lemma.

Lemma 6.6. *Let $\varepsilon > 0, e \in \mathcal{D}$, and Γ, Π be finite networks. There exists a finite network $\Gamma^+ \supset \Gamma$ so that for every Borel $A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$*

$$\varepsilon + \int_A \sqrt{\rho_{\Gamma^+,e}} d\mu_{\Gamma^+,e} > \int_A \sqrt{\rho_{\Pi,e}} d\mu_{\Pi,e}.$$

In particular, $\frac{4}{3}\varepsilon + I(\Gamma^+, e) > I(\Pi, e)$.

Proof. For $\gamma \in \Gamma, \pi \in \Pi$, let $K_{\gamma, \pi}$ be the set of times t where $\gamma(t) = \pi(t)$. The set $K_\pi = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} K_{\gamma, \pi}$ is closed, so $(a_\pi, b_\pi) \setminus K_\pi$ is a countable union of open intervals. Let D_π denote the set of paths given by π restricted to the closure of one of these intervals. Let D_π^ε be a finite subset of D_π so that $I(D_\pi^\varepsilon, e) > I(D_\pi, e) - \varepsilon/n$, where $n = |\Pi|$. Let

$$\Gamma^+ = \Gamma \cup \bigcup_{\pi \in \Pi} D_\pi^\varepsilon.$$

We have

$$\int_A \sqrt{\rho_{\Gamma^+, e}} d\mu_{\Gamma^+, e} = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \int_{\bar{\gamma}^{-1}(A)} \rho_{\gamma, e}^{3/2}(t) dt + \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_{\eta \in D_\pi^\varepsilon} \int_{\bar{\eta}^{-1}(A)} \rho_{\eta, e}^{3/2}(t) dt. \quad (6.3)$$

The first sum in (6.3) is bounded below by

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma, \pi \in \Pi} \int_{\bar{\gamma}^{-1}(A) \cap K_{\gamma, \pi}} \rho_{\gamma, e}^{3/2}(t) dt = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma, \pi \in \Pi} \int_{\bar{\pi}^{-1}(A) \cap K_{\gamma, \pi}} \rho_{\pi, e}^{3/2}(t) dt,$$

where the equality uses Lemma 6.5. To bound the second sum in (6.3) term we write

$$\varepsilon/n + \sum_{\eta \in D_\pi^\varepsilon} \int_{\bar{\eta}^{-1}(A)} \rho_{\eta, e}^{3/2}(t) dt \geq \sum_{\eta \in D_\pi^\varepsilon} \int_{\bar{\eta}^{-1}(A)} \rho_{\eta, e}^{3/2}(t) dt = \int_{\bar{\pi}^{-1}(A) \cap K_\pi^\varepsilon} \rho_{\pi, e}^{3/2}(t) dt.$$

Summing the above bounds we get

$$\varepsilon + \int_A \sqrt{\rho_{\Gamma^+, e}} d\mu_{\Gamma^+, e} \geq \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \left(\int_{\bar{\pi}^{-1}(A) \cap K_\pi} \rho_{\pi, e}^{3/2}(t) dt + \int_{\bar{\pi}^{-1}(A) \cap K_\pi^\varepsilon} \rho_{\pi, e}^{3/2}(t) dt \right) = \int_A \sqrt{\rho_{\Pi, e}} d\mu_{\Pi, e}. \quad \square$$

The next proposition implies that μ_e is well-defined for finite rate metrics. It also sheds light to how lengths are measured in e .

Proposition 6.7. *Let $I(e) < \infty$. Then*

1. *Any finite network is contained in an e -complete network.*
2. *For any two e -complete networks Γ, Π , we have $\mu_{\Gamma, e} = \mu_{\Pi, e} =: \mu_e$. Also, $\rho_{\Gamma, e} = \rho_{\Pi, e} =: \rho_e$ almost everywhere with respect to μ_e .*
3. *$|\gamma|_e = \mu_e(\mathfrak{g}\gamma) + |\gamma|_d$ for $\gamma \in H^1$.*

Proof. Let Π_n be a sequence of finite networks so that $I(\Pi_n, e) \rightarrow I(e)$. Let Γ_1 be the given finite network, and for $n \geq 2$ construct Γ_n consecutively as follows. Use Lemma 6.6 to get $\Gamma_n \supset \Gamma_{n-1}$, a finite network with $I(\Gamma_n, e) \geq I(\Pi_n, e) - 1/n$. Then $\Gamma = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \Gamma_n$ is an e -complete network, showing 1.

For 2, let $\Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma$ be a finite network with $I(\Gamma_0, e) > I(e) - \frac{4}{3}\varepsilon$, and define Π_0 similarly. Use the notation $\nu_\Gamma = \sqrt{\rho_{\Gamma,e}}\mu_{\Gamma,e}$. Let $\Gamma_1 \supset \Gamma_0$ be a finite network satisfying $\varepsilon + \nu_{\Gamma_1}(A) \geq \nu_{\Pi_0}(A)$ for all Borel A as in Lemma 6.6. Then for any Borel A we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_\Gamma(A) &\leq \nu_{\Gamma_0}(A) + \varepsilon \leq \nu_{\Gamma_1}(A) + \varepsilon = \nu_{\Gamma_1}(\mathbb{R}^2) - \nu_{\Gamma_1}(A^c) + \varepsilon \\ &\leq \frac{3}{4}I(e) - \nu_{\Pi_0}(A^c) + 2\varepsilon \leq \frac{3}{4}I(e) - \nu_\Pi(A^c) + 3\varepsilon = \nu_\Pi(A) + 3\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since A, ε were arbitrary and the roles of ν_Γ, ν_Π are symmetric, we get $\nu_\Gamma = \nu_\Pi =: \nu$.

Use the notation $\mathfrak{g}\Gamma = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \mathfrak{g}\gamma$. By the definition, $\nu((\mathfrak{g}\Gamma)^c) = \nu((\mathfrak{g}\Pi)^c) = 0$. Moreover, on $\mathfrak{g}\Gamma \cap \mathfrak{g}\Pi$, $\rho_{\Gamma,e} = \rho_{\Pi,e}$ by Lemma 6.5, and so $\rho_{\Gamma,e} = \rho_{\Pi,e}$ ν -almost everywhere. Since by definition $\mu_\Gamma(\{x : \rho_\Gamma(x) = 0\}) = 0$, and the same holds for Π , we see that $\mu_{\Gamma,e} = \mu_{\Pi,e} := \mu_e$, and $\rho_{\Gamma,e} = \rho_{\Pi,e}$ μ_e -almost everywhere, proving 2.

For part 3, there is an e -complete network Γ containing γ , and then $\mu_{\Gamma,e}(\mathfrak{g}\gamma) = |\gamma|_e - |\gamma|_d$ by the definition of $\mu_{\Gamma,e}$. \square

Next, we analyze the map $\mu \rightarrow e_\mu$. We first check that $e_\mu \in \mathcal{D}$ for any measure μ with finite entropy.

Lemma 6.8. *Let μ be a measure supported on $\mathfrak{g}\Gamma$ for some network Γ and assume that $\mathcal{K}(\mu)$ is finite. Then for any path γ , we have*

$$\frac{\mu(\mathfrak{g}\gamma)^{3/2}}{(b_\gamma - a_\gamma)^{1/2}} \leq \int_{\mathfrak{g}\gamma} \sqrt{\rho_\mu} d\mu = \mathcal{K}(\mu|_{\mathfrak{g}\gamma}) \leq \mathcal{K}(\mu). \quad (6.4)$$

Moreover, defining $e = e_\mu$ by $e(p; q) = \sup_\gamma \mu(\mathfrak{g}\gamma) + |\gamma|_d$ over all paths $\gamma \in H^1$ from p to q , we have that $e \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mu)}$.

Proof. The bound (6.4) is immediate from Jensen's inequality. We will use it to prove that $e \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mu)}$.

A priori, it is not clear that e is continuous. However, e is Dirichlet-dominant by construction (Definition 4.1(i)) and by (6.4), we have that $\Theta(e) \leq \mathcal{K}(\mu)$ giving Definition 4.1(ii). From there continuity of e follows exactly as in the proof of the equicontinuity for \mathcal{D}_m^* in Lemma 4.3/Proposition 4.4. Finally, from the path definition, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $s < r < t$,

$$e(x, s; y, t) = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} e(x, s; z, r) + e(z, r; y, t).$$

This supremum is unchanged if we replace \mathbb{R} by a large finite interval since $\Theta(e) < \infty$. Continuity of e then implies the metric composition law, Definition 4.1(iii). \square

In general, when we try to define a metric through lengths of paths, it may not in the end give the desired lengths. The next proposition shows that e_μ is well-behaved in this sense.

Proposition 6.9. For any measure μ supported on $\mathfrak{g}\Gamma$ for some network Γ with $\mathcal{K}(\mu) < \infty$, setting $e = e_\mu$, we have $|\gamma|_e = \mu(\mathfrak{g}\gamma) + |\gamma|_d$ for every Dirichlet path γ .

Proof. For a fixed partition \mathcal{P} on $[a_\gamma, b_\gamma]$, let $S(\gamma, \mathcal{P})$ denote the set of paths $\pi \in H^1$ from $\bar{\gamma}(a_\gamma)$ to $\bar{\gamma}(b_\gamma)$ which equal γ on \mathcal{P} . The definition of path length and the definition of the distance e can be combined to give

$$|\gamma|_e = \inf_{\mathcal{P}} |\gamma|_{e, \mathcal{P}} = \inf_{\mathcal{P}} \sup_{\pi \in S(\gamma, \mathcal{P})} \mu(\mathfrak{g}\pi) + |\pi|_d, \quad (6.5)$$

which shows $|\gamma|_e \geq \mu(\mathfrak{g}\gamma) + |\gamma|_d$. Now let $\mu' = \mu|_{(\mathfrak{g}\gamma)^c}$, and let O be any open set containing $\mathfrak{g}\gamma$. Then for any partition \mathcal{P} ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\pi \in S(\gamma, \mathcal{P})} \mu(\mathfrak{g}\pi) + |\pi|_d \\ & \leq \mu(\mathfrak{g}\gamma) + \sup_{\pi \in S(\gamma, \mathcal{P}), \mathfrak{g}\pi \subset O} (\mu'(\mathfrak{g}\pi) + |\pi|_d) \vee \sup_{\pi \in S(\gamma, \mathcal{P}), \mathfrak{g}\pi \not\subset O} (\mu'(\mathfrak{g}\pi) + |\pi|_d) \\ & \leq \mu(\mathfrak{g}\gamma) + \sup_{\pi \in S(\gamma, \mathcal{P}), \mathfrak{g}\pi \subset O} (c_\gamma \mathcal{K}(\mu'|_O)^{2/3} + |\pi|_d) \vee \sup_{\pi \in S(\gamma, \mathcal{P}), \mathfrak{g}\pi \not\subset O} (c_\gamma \mathcal{K}(\mu'|_O)^{2/3} + |\pi|_d), \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

where the second inequality uses (6.4) applied to μ' , where $c_\gamma := (b_\gamma - a_\gamma)^{1/3}$. As the mesh size of \mathcal{P} tends to 0, we claim that the second supremum term in (6.6) tends to $-\infty$. Indeed, the triangle inequality for the L^2 -norm implies that for any $\pi \in H^1$ from $\bar{\gamma}(a_\gamma)$ to $\bar{\gamma}(b_\gamma)$ we have

$$\sqrt{-|\pi|_d} \geq \sqrt{-|\pi - \gamma|_d} - \sqrt{-|\gamma|_d},$$

and for $\pi \in S(\gamma, \mathcal{P})$, $\mathfrak{g}\pi \not\subset O$, the first term on the right-hand side above blows up to ∞ as the mesh of \mathcal{P} tends to 0 whereas the second term is finite. On the other hand,

$$\inf_{\mathcal{P}} \sup_{\pi \in S(\gamma, \mathcal{P}), \mathfrak{g}\pi \subset O} (c_\gamma \mathcal{K}(\mu'|_O)^{2/3} + |\pi|_d) = c_\gamma \mathcal{K}(\mu'|_O)^{2/3} + |\gamma|_d.$$

As we let the open set O decrease down to $\mathfrak{g}\gamma$, $\mathcal{K}(\mu'|_O) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\mu'|_{\mathfrak{g}\gamma}) = 0$ by the dominated convergence theorem. This gives that $|\gamma|_e \leq \mu(\mathfrak{g}\gamma) + |\gamma|_d$. \square

We now have all the ingredients to prove our structure theorem.

Proof of Theorem 6.3. Start with a finite rate metric e , construct μ_e , and let Γ be an e -complete network. This exists by Proposition 6.7.3. Then $\mathcal{K}(\mu_e) = \mathcal{K}(\mu_{\Gamma, e}) = \frac{3}{4}I(\Gamma, e) = \frac{3}{4}I(e)$ by (6.1). Now, for all $\gamma \in H^1$,

$$|\gamma|_e = \mu_e(\mathfrak{g}\gamma) + |\gamma|_d = |\gamma|_{e_{\mu_e}}, \quad (6.7)$$

where the first equality uses Proposition 6.7.3 and the second uses Proposition 6.9. Finally, $e \in \mathcal{D}$ since e has finite rate, and $e_{\mu_e} \in \mathcal{D}$ by Lemma 6.8, and so both e, e_{μ_e} are geodesic

spaces by Lemma 4.7 with all geodesics in H^1 by Lemma 4.10. Therefore (6.7) implies $e = e_{\mu_e}$.

Now start with μ supported on $\mathfrak{g}\Gamma$ with $\mathcal{K}(\mu) < \infty$. Then

$$|\gamma|_{e_\mu} = \mu(\mathfrak{g}\gamma) + |\gamma|_d \quad (6.8)$$

for all $\gamma \in H^1$ by Proposition 6.9. Applying (6.8) to the paths $\gamma|_{[a_\gamma, r]}$ for all $r \in [a_\gamma, b_\gamma]$ we see that $\rho_{\gamma, e_\mu} = \rho_\mu$ for any path γ and hence $\mu_{\Pi, e_\mu} = \mu|_{\mathfrak{g}\Pi}$ for any network Π . Therefore

$$I(e) = \sup_{\Pi} I(e, \Pi) = \sup_{\Pi} \int_{\mathfrak{g}\Pi} \sqrt{\rho_\mu} d_{\mu|_{\mathfrak{g}\Pi}} = \frac{4}{3} \mathcal{K}(\mu_{\Gamma, e_\mu}) = \frac{4}{3} \mathcal{K}(\mu)$$

by (6.1), and so e_μ is a finite rate metric with $\mu = \mu_{e_\mu}$. \square

We finish this section with a few estimates that will be useful in proving the large deviation principle, Theorem 1.1. The first lemma will be useful in the large deviation upper bound on cones. It will be used to show that a metric is large enough if distances are large on a certain finite set.

Lemma 6.10. *Assume $e = e_\mu$ is a finite rate metric and μ is supported on $\mathfrak{g}\Gamma$ for a network Γ . By possibly replacing each of the paths $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with $\gamma|_{[a_\gamma, (a_\gamma + b_\gamma)/2]}$ and $\gamma|_{[(a_\gamma + b_\gamma)/2, b_\gamma]}$ we may assume that for any point pair $(p; q) = (x, s; y, t)$ there is at most one path $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with $\gamma(s) = x, \gamma(t) = y$.*

We can then unambiguously define $e^0(x, s; y, t) = |\gamma|_{[s, t]}|_e$ if $\gamma(s) = x, \gamma(t) = y$ for some $\gamma \in \Gamma$, and $e^0(x, s; y, t) = -\infty$ otherwise. Let

$$e'(u) = \sup_{\mathcal{P}} \sup_{\pi} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (e^0 \vee d)(\pi(t_i), \pi(t_{i+1}))$$

Then $e' = e$. Moreover, the inner sup is non-decreasing as the partition is refined.

Proof. The refinement claim can be proven by induction as we add an extra time in the partition. The inequality to check is

$$\sup_x (e^0 \vee d)(p; x, s) + (e^0 \vee d)(x, s; q) \geq (e^0 \vee d)(p; q).$$

When $d(p; q) \geq e^0(p; q)$ then we can take (x, s) to be the point on the line segment pq and d in both terms on the left. Otherwise, let $\gamma \in \Gamma$ so that $p, q \in \mathfrak{g}\gamma$ and take $x = \gamma(s)$ and e^0 in both terms on the left.

It follows from the definition that $d \leq e' \leq e$. This implies that $e' \in \mathcal{D}$ and is of finite rate. By the definition of length, for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $[s, t] \subset [a_\gamma, b_\gamma]$ we have $|\gamma|_{[s, t]}|_{e'} = |\gamma|_{[s, t]}|_e$. Therefore $\mu_{e'} \geq \mu_e$, and so $e' = e$. \square

Proposition 6.11. *Suppose μ_n, μ are planted network measures such that $\mu_n(A) \uparrow \mu(A)$ for every Borel set A . Then $e_{\mu_n} \rightarrow e_\mu$ in \mathcal{E} .*

Proof. Since $I(e_{\mu_n}) \leq I(e_\mu) < \infty$ and sub-level sets of I are compact, e_{μ_n} has a subsequential limit e . For any path γ we have $|\gamma|_{e_{\mu_n}} = \mu_n(\mathbf{g}\gamma) + |\gamma|_d \rightarrow \mu(\mathbf{g}\gamma) + |\gamma|_d = |\gamma|_{e_\mu}$. Thus by Lemma 4.13, $|\gamma|_e \geq |\gamma|_{e_\mu}$. This shows $e \geq e_\mu$. On the other hand $e_{\mu_n} \leq e$ for all n since $\mu_n \leq \mu$, so $e \leq e_\mu$. \square

Approximating a finite-rate planted network measure by its restrictions to finitely many slightly truncated paths we get the following.

Corollary 6.12. *Any finite-rate metric can be approximated from below by finite disjoint planted network metrics.*

7 The large deviation upper bound

In this section, we prove the ingredients needed for the large deviation upper bound. The large deviation upper bound will follow from a version of exponential tightness (Proposition 7.3) and an upper bound on small balls (Proposition 7.4). Both of these bounds use only the limited inputs of Theorem 3.4, Proposition 3.5 and the topological framework of the previous sections. We start with exponential tightness.

7.1 Exponential tightness

Here it will be convenient to expand the space \mathcal{E} to the space $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ comprising all continuous functions from $\mathbb{R}_+^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the same metric \mathbf{d} introduced in Section 4.

Proposition 7.1. *For every $m > 0$, there exists a compact set $K_m \subset \overline{\mathcal{E}}$ such that for all $\delta > 0$,*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{3/2} \log P(\mathbf{d}(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon, K_m) \geq \delta) \leq -\frac{4}{3}m. \quad (7.1)$$

Proof. Throughout we assume $m \geq 1, \delta \leq 1$. By definition (4.1) of \mathbf{d} , letting $\ell = 2 + \lceil \log_2(\delta^{-1}) \rceil$, for $f \in \overline{\mathcal{E}}$ we have

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon, f) \geq \delta \quad \implies \quad \mathbf{d}_\ell(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon, f) > \delta/2.$$

Therefore it is enough to construct a compact set K'_m in the continuous function space $C(B_\ell)$ of continuous functions from $B_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the uniform norm, such that (7.1) holds with $\mathbf{d}_\ell, K'_m, \delta/2$ in place of \mathbf{d}, K_m, δ . For this, define the events

A_ε : For all $u \in B_{2\ell m}$, we have $d(u) - \delta/10 \leq \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u) \leq d(u) + m^{2/3}(t-s)^{1/3} + \delta/10$. Here and throughout the proof, we let s, t be the time coordinates of u when the notation is unambiguous.

A'_ε : For all \mathcal{L}_ε -geodesics π with endpoints in B_ℓ , we have $\mathfrak{g}\pi \in B_{2\ell m}$.

We have $P(A_\varepsilon) \geq 1 - \exp(-\frac{4}{3}\varepsilon^{3/2}(m + o(1)))$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ by Propositions 3.11 and 3.12. Moreover, $A_\varepsilon \subset A'_\varepsilon$. Indeed, suppose there is a geodesic π between points $p = (x, s), q = (y, t) \in [-\ell, \ell]^2$ that exits $B_{2\ell m}$. Then there exists $r \in (s, t)$ and $z = \pm 2m\ell$ such that $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(p; q) = \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(p; z, r) + \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(z, r; q)$, and so by the condition on A_ε we have

$$d(p; q) - d(p; z, r) - d(z, r; q) \leq 2m^{2/3}\ell^{1/3} + 3\delta/10.$$

A quick computation shows this is not possible. Therefore to complete the proof, we just need to construct a compact set K'_m so that on $A_\varepsilon = A_\varepsilon \cap A'_\varepsilon$ we have $\|\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon|_{B_\ell} - f\|_\infty \leq \delta/2$ for some $f \in K'_m$.

The event A'_ε implies that for any $(p; q) \in B_\ell$, we have the metric composition law

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(p; q) &= \max_{z \in [-2m\ell, 2m\ell]} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(p; z, r) + \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(z, r; q) \\ &= \max_{z_1, z_2 \in [-2m\ell, 2m\ell]} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(p; z_1, r_1) + \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(z_1, r_1; z_2, r_2) + \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(z_2, r_2; q). \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

Therefore on A_ε , by Lemma 4.3 we have the estimate

$$|\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u_1) - \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u_2)| \leq 2\delta/5 + 48m^2\ell^2\|u_1 - u_2\|_\infty^{1/9} \quad (7.3)$$

for all $u_1, u_2 \in B_\ell$ with $\|u_1 - u_2\|_\infty < \delta^9/(64 \cdot 10^9 m^6)$ and $(t_1 - s_1) \vee (t_2 - s_2) \geq \delta^3/(1000m^2)$. We use this to construct an approximation to \mathcal{L}_ε with an explicit modulus of continuity. Fix $\beta = m^{-18}\ell^{-18}48^{-9}(\delta/10)^9$, $\gamma = \delta^3/(2000m^2)$, define $B'_\ell = \{u \in B_\ell : t - s \geq 2\gamma\}$ and let $M = \tilde{B}_\ell \cap (\beta\mathbb{Z})^4$. Now for $u \in B'_\ell$, let $F_\varepsilon : B'_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ interpolate $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon|_M$ by setting

$$F_\varepsilon(u) = \sum_{v \in M: \|v-u\|_\infty < \beta} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(v) \frac{[\beta - \|v-u\|_\infty]}{\sum_{v \in M: \|v-u\|_\infty < \beta} [\beta - \|v-u\|_\infty]}. \quad (7.4)$$

We extend F_ε to all of B_ℓ as follows. For $u = (x, s; y, t)$ with $t - s < 2\gamma$, define

$$F_\varepsilon(u) = d(u) + [F_\varepsilon(x, s; y, s + 2\gamma) - d(x, s; y, s + 2\gamma)](t - s - \gamma)^+.$$

By construction, $F_\varepsilon = d$ off of the compact subset $\widehat{B}_\ell = \{u \in B_\ell : t - s \geq \gamma\}$. Moreover, by the definition of A_ε , F_ε satisfies a uniform bound on \widehat{B}_ℓ depending only on δ, m, ℓ . Finally, on \widehat{B}_ℓ , F_ε satisfies an explicit modulus of continuity depending only on δ, m, ℓ . This uses

(7.3), along with the estimate in A_ε comparing \mathcal{L}_ε and d , which handles F_ε on $\widehat{B}_\ell \setminus B'_\ell$. Therefore by the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem on $C(\widehat{B}_\ell)$, there exists a compact set $K'_m \subset C(B_\ell)$ such that on A_ε , we have $F_\varepsilon \in K'_m$. Moreover, by (7.3), (7.4) we have that

$$|F_\varepsilon(u) - \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u)| \leq 2\delta/5 + \delta/10 = \delta/2$$

when $t - s \geq 2\gamma$. When $t - s \leq 2\gamma$, we can obtain the same estimate via the bounds in the definition of A_ε . Therefore $\|\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon|_{B_\ell} - F_\varepsilon\|_\infty \leq \delta/2$, as desired. \square

Next, we upgrade Proposition 7.1 to move from the abstract compact set K_m to the explicit compact set \mathcal{D}_m . We will use the notation Θ introduced in Section 4, and in the proof we write $B(e, \varepsilon)$ for the open d -ball of radius ε about a function $e \in \overline{\mathcal{E}}$, and $B(K, \varepsilon) = \bigcup\{B(e, \varepsilon) : e \in K\}$. We will use the following folklore lemma, whose proof we leave to the reader.

Lemma 7.2. *Let C be a closed set and K be a compact set in a metric space (M, d) with $C \cap K = \emptyset$. Then $d(C, K) := \inf_{C \times K} d > 0$.*

Proposition 7.3. *For every $\delta, m > 0$ we have*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{3/2} \log P(\mathbf{d}(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{D}_m) > \delta) \leq -\frac{4}{3}m. \quad (7.5)$$

Proof. Let $m, \delta > 0$ and consider the sets

$$\mathcal{C}_{m, \delta} = K_m \setminus B(\mathcal{D}_m, \delta).$$

Every $e \in \mathcal{C}_{m, \delta}$ satisfies one of the following four conditions:

1. There are points $(p; q), (q; r) \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$ with $e(p; q) + e(q; r) > e(p; r)$.
2. There exists $u \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$ with $e(u) < d(u)$.
3. There exists $(p, q) = (x, s; y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$ and $r \in (s, t)$ with

$$e(p; q) > \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} e(p; z, r) + e(z, r; q).$$

4. There exists finite set of points $U_e \subset \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^4$ defined on disjoint time intervals such that

$$\sum_{u \in U_e} \Theta(e, u) > m.$$

We show that in all of these cases we can find $\gamma_e > 0$ such that

$$P(\mathbf{d}(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon, e) < \gamma_e) \leq \exp(-\frac{4}{3}\varepsilon^{3/2}(m + o(1))), \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (7.6)$$

If e satisfies property 1, then since \mathcal{L}_ε satisfies the reverse triangle inequality, for small enough γ we have $P(\mathbf{d}(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon, e) < \gamma) = 0$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. If e satisfies property 2, then by

Theorem 3.4, for small enough γ we have $P(\mathbf{d}(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon, e) < \gamma) \leq 2 \exp(-\gamma\varepsilon^3)$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Next, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 7.1, there exists $m, \ell \geq 0$ such that with probability at least $1 - \exp(-\frac{4}{3}\varepsilon^{3/2}(m + o(1)))$, (7.2) holds. This implies that if e satisfies property 3, then (7.6) holds for small enough γ_e . Finally, if e satisfies property 4, then since $\Theta(\cdot, u)$ is continuous on $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ for all u , for small enough γ , if $\mathbf{d}(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon, e) < \gamma$ then

$$\sum_{u \in U_e} \Theta(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon, u) \geq m.$$

By Theorem 3.4 and the temporal independence of \mathcal{L}_ε , the probability of this event is at most $\exp(-\frac{4}{3}\varepsilon^{3/2}(m + o(1)))$.

Now, since K_m is compact, its closed subset $\mathcal{C}_{m,\delta}$ is also compact. Therefore the open cover $\{O_e := B(e, \gamma_e) : e \in \mathcal{C}_{m,\delta}\}$ contains a finite subcover $\{O_{e_1}, \dots, O_{e_n}\}$. By Lemma 7.2, we have $r := (\mathbf{d}((O_{e_1} \cup \dots \cup O_{e_n})^c, \mathcal{C}_{m,\delta}) \wedge \delta)/2 > 0$. Therefore if $\mathbf{d}(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{D}_m) > \delta$ then $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \notin B(K_m, r)$ or $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in O_{e_i}$ for some $i = 1, \dots, n$. The first event is covered by Proposition 7.1, and the second is covered by (7.6). \square

Next, we prove the large deviation upper bound on small balls in \mathcal{D}_m .

7.2 A bound on small balls

Proposition 7.4. *For any $e \in \mathcal{D}$, we have*

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^{3/2} \log P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in B(e, \delta)) \leq -I(e). \quad (7.7)$$

For the proof, we need a definition. For a network Γ , define the **separation** of Γ as

$$\Delta(\Gamma) = \inf\{|\gamma(r) - \gamma'(r)| : \gamma \neq \gamma' \in \Gamma, r \in [a_\gamma, b_\gamma] \cap [a_{\gamma'}, b_{\gamma'}]\}, \quad (7.8)$$

the minimal gap between paths in Γ . For a finite disjoint network, we have $\Delta(\Gamma) > 0$.

Proof. Let Γ be a finite disjoint network, and let $S = \{a_\gamma, b_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ be the set of all endpoints of paths in Γ . Define the partition $\mathcal{P}_{n,\gamma} = (S \cup n^{-1}\mathbb{Z}) \cap [a_\gamma, b_\gamma]$.

Write $\bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \mathcal{P}_{n,\gamma} = \{t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k\}$. For all $i = 1, \dots, k$, let U_i be the (possibly empty) set of all points of the form $(\bar{\gamma}(t_{i-1}); \bar{\gamma}(t_i))$ where $\gamma \in \Gamma$, and let $U = \bigcup_{i=1}^k U_i$. Then

$$P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in B(e, \delta)) \leq P\left(\bigcap_{u \in U} \{\mathcal{L}(u) \geq e(u) - \delta\}\right) = \prod_{i=1}^k P\left(\bigcap_{u \in U_i} \{\mathcal{L}(u) \geq e(u) - \delta\}\right). \quad (7.9)$$

The last equality follows since \mathcal{L} has independent time increments. Proposition 3.7 together with (7.9) gives that if $|\Gamma| = 1$ or if

$$\theta(\Gamma, n) := \sum_{u \in U} \Theta(e, u) < c_0 \Delta(\Gamma)^3 n^2, \quad (7.10)$$

we have

$$P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in B(e, \delta)) \leq \exp \left((o(1) - \frac{4}{3} \sum_{u \in U_i} \Theta(e - \delta, u)) \varepsilon^{-3/2} \right).$$

In this case, letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and using that $\Theta(\cdot, u)$ is continuous shows that

$$\eta := \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^{3/2} \log P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in B(e, \delta)) \leq -\frac{4}{3} \sum_{u \in U} \Theta(e, u) \leq -\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} I(\gamma, e, \mathcal{P}_{n, \gamma})$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition (5.2). By Lemma 5.3, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we see that $\frac{4}{3}\theta(\Gamma, n) \rightarrow I(\Gamma, e)$ so when $|\Gamma| = 1$ or (7.10) holds, the above calculation is valid for large enough n . Therefore the left-hand side of (7.7) is bounded above by

$$-\max \left(\sup\{I(\Gamma, e) : |\Gamma| = 1\}, \sup\{I(\Gamma, e) : I(\Gamma, \varepsilon) < \infty, \Gamma \text{ finite, disjoint}\} \right).$$

At this point, either the first term in the maximum is ∞ , in which case $I(e) = \infty$ and we have the result, or else in the second term we can eliminate the constraint that $I(\Gamma, e) < \infty$, and this term equals $I(e)$ by the discussion following Definition 5.1. \square

Next, we assemble the parts to complete the proof of the large deviation upper bound.

7.3 Proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1.1

Fix any closed set $C \subset \mathcal{E}$ and let $\delta, m > 0$. By Proposition 7.4, for every $e \in C \cap \mathcal{D}_m$ we can find an open ball B centered at e such that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^{3/2} \log P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in B) \leq -I(e) + \delta. \quad (7.11)$$

By Proposition 4.4, $\mathcal{D}_m \cap C$ is compact, so it is covered by a finite collection \mathcal{O} of such balls. Let r be the distance of the compact set $C \cap \mathcal{D}_m$ and the closed set $(\bigcup \mathcal{O})^c$. By Lemma 7.2, $r > 0$. Then

$$C \subset \left(\bigcup \mathcal{O} \right) \cup \{e \in \mathcal{E} : \mathbf{d}(e, \mathcal{D}_m) > r/2\}.$$

Therefore applying (7.11) together with Proposition 7.1 gives that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^{3/2} \log P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in C) \leq -\min \left(\inf_{e \in C} I(e) + \delta, \frac{4m}{3} \right).$$

Taking $m \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\delta \rightarrow 0$ completes the proof.

8 The large deviation lower bound

8.1 A bound on cones

Given $e \in \mathcal{E}$, define the cone with apex e by

$$\text{Cone}_e := \{e' \in \mathcal{E} : e' \geq e\}. \quad (8.1)$$

In this section, we prove a large deviation lower bound on neighborhoods of cones. This will be combined with strict monotonicity of I and a topological argument to give the full large deviation lower bound.

Theorem 8.1. *Let e be a finite disjoint planted network metric so that μ_e is supported on the graph $\mathfrak{g}\Gamma$ of a finite disjoint network Γ . For all $\delta > 0$ we have*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^{3/2} \log P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in B(\text{Cone}_e, \delta)) \geq -I(e). \quad (8.2)$$

Proof. We may assume that $I(e) < \frac{4}{3}m < \infty$, or else there is nothing to prove. Our first goal is to reduce the problem to having to control only finitely many values of \mathcal{L}_ε . Towards this end, write

$$\text{Cone}_e = \bigcap_{r \in (0, \infty), u \in \mathbb{R}_\dagger^4} G(u, e - r), \quad G(u, e) = \{e' \in \mathcal{E} : e'(u) \geq e(u)\}.$$

so that

$$\mathcal{D}_m \cap B(\text{Cone}_e, \delta/2)^c \subset \text{Cone}_e^c = \bigcup_{r \in (0, \infty), u \in \mathbb{R}_\dagger^4} G(u, e - r)^c,$$

an open cover. Since \mathcal{D}_m is compact (Proposition 4.4) so is $\mathcal{D}_m \cap B(\text{Cone}_e, \delta/2)^c$, and therefore we can find a finite subcover $\{G(u, e - r_u)^c : u \in Q\}$. Let $r = (\delta \wedge \min_{u \in Q} r_u)/2$. Then $\{G(u, e - 2r)^c : u \in Q\}$ is also a subcover, giving

$$B(\text{Cone}_e, \delta/2) \supset \mathcal{D}_m \cap \bigcap_{u \in Q} G(u, e - 2r). \quad (8.3)$$

The set \mathcal{D}_m is too small for our bounds. To fix this, we claim that

$$B(\text{Cone}_e, \delta) \supset B(\mathcal{D}_m, r) \cap \bigcap_{u \in Q} G(u, e - r). \quad (8.4)$$

Indeed, let e_1 be in the set on the right. Then there exists $e_2 \in \mathcal{D}_m$ with $\mathbf{d}(e_1, e_2) < r$ so that $e_2 \in \bigcap_{u \in Q} G(u, e - 2r)$. By (8.3) then $e_2 \in B(\text{Cone}_e, \delta/2)$. Then $e_1 \in B(\text{Cone}_e, \delta)$ since $\delta \geq r + \delta/2$, giving (8.4).

Let $S = \bigcup_{(x,s;y,t) \in Q} \{s, t\}$, the set containing all time coordinates in Q . By Lemma 6.10, for $\tau > 0$ we can find a partition $\mathcal{P} = \{t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k\}$ containing S so that the following holds. First, $t_{i+1} - t_i \leq \tau$ for all i . Second, for every $u = (x, t_i; y, t_j) \in Q$ there exists points $(x, t_i) = z_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_j = (y, t_j)$ with increasing and consecutive time coordinates t_i, t_{i+1}, \dots, t_j so that

$$\sum_{v \in V_u} e^0 \vee d(v) > e(u) - r, \quad \text{where } V_u = \{(z_{\ell-1}, z_\ell) : \ell = i+1, \dots, j\}. \quad (8.5)$$

Here the function e^0 is defined in Lemma 6.10. Let $U = \bigcup_{u \in Q} V_u$. By (8.5) and the triangle inequality for \mathcal{L}_ε ,

$$P\left(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in \bigcap_{u \in Q} G(u, e - r)\right) \geq P\left(\bigcap_{u \in U} \{\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u) \geq e^0 \vee d(u)\}\right). \quad (8.6)$$

Write $U = \bigcup_{i=1}^k U_i$ with $U_i = \{(x, t_{i-1}; y, t_i) \in U\}$. By the independent increment property of the directed landscape and the upper tail bound of Proposition 3.7, the right hand side of (8.6) equals

$$\prod_{i=1}^k P\left(\bigcap_{u \in U_i} \{\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(u) \geq e^0 \vee d(u)\}\right) = \exp\left(-\sum_{u \in U} \frac{4}{3}\varepsilon^{-3/2}(\Theta(e^0 \vee d, u) + o(1))\right) \quad (8.7)$$

as long as the minimal gap $\Delta(\Gamma)$ defined in (7.8) satisfies

$$\sum_{u \in U} \Theta(e^0 \vee d, u) < c_0 \Delta(\Gamma)^3 / \tau^2. \quad (8.8)$$

Finally, by Jensen's inequality,

$$\sum_{u \in U} \Theta(e^0 \vee d, u) = \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in \Gamma, (x,s;y,t) \in U: \\ \gamma(s)=x, \gamma(t)=y}} \frac{(\int_s^t \rho_{\gamma,e}(r) dr)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{t-s}} \leq \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \int \rho_{\gamma,e}(r)^{3/2} dr = \frac{3}{4}I(e), \quad (8.9)$$

so in particular (8.8) holds for τ small enough. By Proposition 7.1

$$P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in B(\mathcal{D}_m, r)^c) \leq e^{-(\frac{4}{3}m + o(1))\varepsilon^{-3/2}}.$$

This together with (8.4) and (8.6)-(8.9) imply the claim. \square

Next, we conclude the proof of the large deviation lower bound.

8.2 Proof of the lower bound in Theorem 1.1

Let $O = A^\circ$, an open set. If O does not contain finite rate metrics, there is nothing to prove. So let $e_0 \in O$ with $I(e_0) < \infty$. Then $e_0 \in \mathcal{D}$, and by Corollary 6.12, we can find a finite disjoint planted network metric $e \leq e_0$ so that $e \in O$. It suffices to show that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^{3/2} \log P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in O) \geq -I(e). \quad (8.10)$$

Recall the set Cone_e from Theorem 8.1. We bound $P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in O)$ below by

$$P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in O \cap B(\text{Cone}_e, \delta)) = P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in B(\text{Cone}_e, \delta)) - P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in B(\text{Cone}_e, \delta) \cap O^c),$$

and so in view of Theorem 8.1, to prove (8.10) it is enough to show that for some $\delta > 0$,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^{3/2} \log P(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in B(\text{Cone}_e, \delta) \cap O^c) < -I(e). \quad (8.11)$$

The closure of $B(\text{Cone}_e, \delta) \cap O^c$ is contained in $B(\text{Cone}_e, 2\delta) \cap O^c$. By the large deviation upper bound, it suffices to show that

$$s = \sup_{\delta > 0} \inf_{e' \in B(\text{Cone}_e, 2\delta) \cap O^c} I(e') > I(e).$$

If $s = \infty$, there is nothing to prove. Otherwise we can find $e_n \in B(\text{Cone}_e, 1/n) \cap O^c$ with $I(e_n) \rightarrow s$. By Proposition 5.2, I is lower semi-continuous with compact sub-level sets, so e_n has a subsequential limit $e^* \in \text{Cone}_e \cap O^c$ and $s = \lim I(e_n) \geq I(e^*)$. Thus $e^* \geq e$ and $e^* \neq e$. Strict monotonicity of I , Corollary 6.4, gives $I(e^*) > I(e)$, as required.

9 Large deviations of the directed geodesic

In this section, we use the results of Section 2 to prove Theorem 2.5. By symmetries of \mathcal{L} , it suffices to prove the theorem when $(p; q) = (0, 0; 0, 1)$.

Proof of Theorem 2.5.

J is lower semicontinuous. Consider $f_n \rightarrow f$ uniformly, and suppose that $J(f_n)$ converges to a finite limit, or else there is nothing to prove. By Lemma 2.6, we can find e_n achieving the infimum (2.3) for each f_n , and since I is a good rate function, there is a subsequential limit e of the e_n , and $I(e) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(e_n)$. Let $u = (0, 0; 0, 1)$, then $|f_n|_{e_n} = e_n(u) \rightarrow e(u)$. By Lemma 4.13, $|f|_e \geq \liminf |f_n|_{e_n} = \lim e_n(u) = e(u)$, so f is a geodesic in e . Thus $J(f) \leq I(e)$, as required.

Sub-level sets are compact. By Lemma 2.7, for $\alpha > 0$, we have that $J^{-1}[0, \alpha]$ is contained in the set

$$\left\{ f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f(0) = f(1) = 0, \int_0^1 |f'(t)|^{3/2} dt \leq \sqrt{3\alpha/4} \right\},$$

which is compact in the uniform norm. Since J is lower semicontinuous, $J^{-1}[0, \alpha]$ is also closed. Therefore sub-level sets are compact, and J is a good rate function.

The large deviation upper bound. Let $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{E}$ denote the set of geodesic spaces, see the definition prior to Lemma 4.5. Since $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{G}$ by Lemma 4.7, $I = \infty$ outside \mathcal{G} . Since also $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{G}$ almost surely, it follows that \mathcal{L}_ε satisfies the large deviation principle, Theorem 1.1, on \mathcal{G} replacing \mathcal{E} .

Let A be a Borel subset of $C([0, 1])$, and let $S_A \subset \mathcal{G}$ be the set of metrics that have a geodesic from $(0, 0)$ to $(0, 1)$ which lies in A . Then

$$P(\varepsilon\gamma \in A) = P(\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon^2} \in A). \quad (9.1)$$

Moreover, if A is closed then S_A is also closed by Lemma 4.13, and so by the large deviation upper bound for \mathcal{L}_ε we have

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-3} \log P(\varepsilon\gamma \in A) \leq -\inf_{S_A} I = -\inf_A J.$$

The large deviation lower bound. Suppose that A is open in $C([0, 1])$, and assume that $J(f) < \infty$ for some $f \in A$. By (9.1) and the large deviation lower bound for \mathcal{L}_ε on \mathcal{G} we have

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-3} \log P(\varepsilon\gamma \in A) = -\inf_{S_A^\circ} I,$$

where here the interior is defined with respect to \mathcal{G} . Thus it is enough to show that for any $f \in A$ with $J(f) < \alpha < \infty$, we can find $e \in S_A^\circ$ with $I(e) < \alpha$.

Let μ be a planted network measure supported on $\mathfrak{g}f$ so that $e_\mu \in \mathcal{D}(f)$ and $I(e_\mu) = J(f)$, and let λ be the measure supported on $\mathfrak{g}f$ with time marginal given by Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$. Let $\kappa > 0$ and $e = e_{\mu+\kappa\lambda}$. By the triangle inequality for $L^{3/2}$ -norms, $I(e)^{2/3} \leq I(e_\mu)^{2/3} + \kappa$, and we can set κ small enough so that $I(e) < \alpha$.

Since f is an e_μ -geodesic for u , f must be the unique e -geodesic for u . This implies

$$\max_{a \in \{\delta, -\delta\}} \sup_{r \in [0, 1]} \left(e(p; f(r) + a, r) + e(f(r) + a, r; q) \right) < e(u). \quad (9.2)$$

Let $\delta > 0$ so that $\{g : \|f - g\|_\infty < \delta\} \subset A$ and so $S_{\{g : \|f - g\|_\infty < \delta\}} \subset S_A$.

If $e_n \in \mathcal{G}$ and $e_n \rightarrow e$ uniformly on bounded sets, then for all large n (9.2) holds for e_n as well. Any e_n -geodesic g is continuous and by (9.2) cannot intersect $f + \delta$ or $f - \delta$, hence $\|f - g\|_\infty < \delta$ and $e_n \in S_A^\circ$. Since for any $e_n \rightarrow e$ we have $e_n \in S_A$ for large enough n , we have $e \in S_A^\circ$, as required. \square

10 The rate function as an integrated Dirichlet energy

The goal of this section is to give an alternate characterization of the rate function that is based on differentiating the metric directly. To motivate this form of the rate function, we first focus on understanding the one-dimensional spatial marginals $x \mapsto \mathcal{L}(x, s; y, t)$ and $y \mapsto \mathcal{L}(x, s; y, t)$. All of these marginals are rescaled versions of the **parabolic Airy process** $\mathfrak{A}_1(x) = \mathcal{L}(0, 0; x, 1)$.

10.1 Conjectured large deviations for the Airy process

The parabolic Airy process is the top line in a random sequence of functions $(\mathfrak{A}_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, i \in \mathbb{N})$ known as the parabolic Airy line ensemble. The parabolic Airy line ensemble can be loosely thought of as a system of infinitely many Brownian motions (of diffusion coefficient 2) conditioned on the non-intersection event $\mathfrak{A}_1 > \mathfrak{A}_2 > \dots$ and with the boundary condition $\mathfrak{A}_i(x) \sim -x^2$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. This idea can be made precise through the Brownian Gibbs resampling property [Corwin and Hammond \(2014\)](#). When restricted to the top line, this property says that given the function \mathfrak{A}_2 and the values of \mathfrak{A}_1 outside of an interval $[a, b]$, the function $\mathfrak{A}_1|_{[a, b]}$ is simply a Brownian bridge between the points $(a, \mathfrak{A}_1(a))$ and $(b, \mathfrak{A}_1(b))$ conditioned on the event $\mathfrak{A}_1 > \mathfrak{A}_2$.

The shifted process $\mathfrak{A}_2(x) + x^2$ is stationary, and it is difficult to push \mathfrak{A}_2 far below the parabola $-x^2$, so the Brownian Gibbs resampling property suggests that a good proxy for \mathfrak{A}_1 is simply a Brownian motion \mathfrak{B} (of diffusion coefficient 2) conditioned on the event $\mathfrak{B}(x) > -x^2$ for all x and given the boundary condition $\mathfrak{B}(x) \sim -x^2$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ ¹. We can hope to understand the large deviations for \mathfrak{A}_1 by first developing a large deviation principle for \mathfrak{B} . This follows from Schilder's large deviation principle for Brownian motion.

Let $\mathfrak{B}_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon \mathfrak{B}(\varepsilon^{-1/2}x)$, so that \mathfrak{B}_ε converges in law to the parabola $g(x) = -x^2$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. For any absolutely continuous function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $f(x) \geq g(x)$ for all x and

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} f(x) - x^2 = 0,$$

define

$$Q(f) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (f'(x)^2 - g'(x)^2) dx = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (f'(x)^2 - 4x^2) dx, \quad (10.1)$$

and set $\mathcal{I}(f) = \infty$ for any other function f . Then for $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we should have a large deviation principle which makes precise the statement that

$$P(\mathfrak{B}_\varepsilon \approx f) = \exp(-\varepsilon^2[Q(f) + o(1)]). \quad (10.2)$$

¹To construct \mathfrak{B} precisely, take the limit in law as $a \rightarrow \infty$ of a Brownian bridge $W_a : [-a, a] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $W_a(a) = W_a(-a) = -a^2 + 1$ and conditioned on the event $W_a(x) > -x^2$ for all x .

The large deviation principle (10.2) should also hold for the parabolic Airy process. While this result is not straightforward due to the more delicate nature of \mathfrak{A}_1 , it seems within reach of current methods, e.g. see [Ganguly and Hegde \(2022\)](#), [Dauvergne \(2023\)](#) for recent work on related problems. Such a large deviation principle for the parabolic Airy process can be rephrased in terms of our rate function I . We state this as an open problem.

Conjecture 10.1. For any function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\min\{I(e) : e \in \mathcal{D}, e(0, 0; \cdot, 1) = f\} = Q(f). \quad (10.3)$$

It would also be quite interesting to find a proof of Conjecture 10.1 using only our definition of I . While we attempted this, we were only able to verify (10.3) for a few straightforward choices of the function f , see Examples 2.2 and 2.3.

10.2 The rate function in terms of gradients of directed metrics

The above discussion suggests that we may be able to *build* up the rate function I through a kind of integrated Dirichlet energy. This is the goal of the present section. Along the way, we will prove the differentiation formula (1.5) for the planted network measure in terms of the metric. First, for a metric $e \in \mathcal{D}$, define its **gradient field** $D_e : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(q, \theta) \mapsto D_q e(\theta)$ by letting

$$D_q e(\theta) = \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{e(q; q + (t\theta, t))}{t}.$$

As we will see, the gradient field D_e typically behaves much more nicely than the metric e itself. In particular, the part of the rate function of e coming from the infinitesimal part of e around p can be expressed through (10.1). More precisely, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 10.2. *Let $e \in \mathcal{D}$ be a finite rate metric and let $\mu = \mu_e$. Then there is a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}$ whose complement has Lebesgue measure 0 such that for all $q \in \mathbb{R} \times S$, the limit $D_q e(\theta)$ exists for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and*

$$Q(D_q e) = \frac{4}{3} \rho_\mu(q)^{3/2}, \quad \rho_\mu(q) = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} D_q e(\theta) - D_q d(\theta).$$

Theorem 10.2 gives the following corollary.

Corollary 10.3. *For any $e \in \mathcal{D}$ of finite rate, we can write*

$$I(e) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{R}} Q(D_{(x,s)} e) \right) ds.$$

The inner sum in Corollary 10.3 is over uncountably many elements, but by Theorem 10.2, for Lebesgue a.e. $s \in \mathbb{R}$ there are only countably many non-zero terms. One way to think of Corollary 10.3 is by viewing the gradient field $D_q e$ as the ‘Riemannian metric tensor’ for the directed metric e . With this language, Corollary 10.3 states that we can build the rate function for the metric by integrating the rate function for the metric tensor over the whole space.

Proof of Theorem 10.2. Let Γ be a network such that $\mathfrak{g}\Gamma$ contains the support of μ , and for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ define the excess density $\rho_\gamma = \rho_{\gamma,e}$ as in (4.9), which recall is related to ρ_μ by Definition 6.2. Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}$ to be the set of points where

- $a_\gamma, b_\gamma \notin S$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$.
- s is a Lebesgue point for $\gamma', |\gamma'|^2, \rho_\gamma, \rho_\gamma^{3/2}$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with $s \in (a_\gamma, b_\gamma)$, and also a Lebesgue point for

$$g(z) := \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \rho_\gamma^{3/2} \mathbf{1}(z \in [a_\gamma, b_\gamma]).$$

Then S^c has Lebesgue measure 0, by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, using the integrability of $|\gamma'|^2, \rho_\gamma^{3/2}$ and g (whose integral over \mathbb{R} is bounded above by $\mathcal{K}(\mu)$).

Now fix $q = (x, s) \in S \times \mathbb{R}, \theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and let π_r denote the rightmost geodesic from q to $q_r := q + (\theta r, r)$. First suppose $q \notin \mathfrak{g}\Gamma$ and hence $\rho_\mu(q) = 0$. By Lemma 4.9 there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $|\pi_r(h) - x| \leq cr^{2/3}$ for all $0 < h < r \leq 1$. Therefore by Proposition 6.7 we can write

$$\frac{1}{r} (|\pi_r|_e - |\pi_r|_d) \leq \frac{1}{r} \int_s^{s+r} \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \rho_\gamma(z) \mathbf{1}(z \in [a_\gamma, b_\gamma]), |\gamma(z) - x| \leq cr^{2/3} dz \quad (10.4)$$

By Jensen’s inequality, the right-hand side of (10.4) is bounded above by

$$\left(\frac{1}{r} \int_s^{s+r} \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \rho_\gamma^{3/2}(z) \mathbf{1}(z \in [a_\gamma, b_\gamma], |\gamma(z) - x| \leq cr^{2/3}) dz \right)^{2/3},$$

whose limit as $r \rightarrow 0$ is 0 since s is a Lebesgue point for g and $\gamma', \rho_\gamma^{3/2}$ for all γ . Therefore $e(q; q_r) \leq d(q; q_r) + o(r)$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. The opposite inequality also holds by Dirichlet dominance of e , yielding the theorem in this case.

Now suppose $q \in \mathfrak{g}\Gamma$. By our assumptions on S , there is a unique $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $q \in \mathfrak{g}\gamma$. Decompose $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$, where $\mu_1 = \mu|_{\mathfrak{g}\gamma}, \mu_2 = \mu|_{(\mathfrak{g}\gamma)^c}$. We have that

$$e_{\mu_1}(q; q_r) \leq e(q; q_r) \leq e_{\mu_1}(q; q_r) + e_{\mu_2}(q; q_r) - d(q; q_r),$$

and from the previous case $e_{\mu_2}(q; q_r) - d(q; q_r) = o(r)$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. Therefore it suffices to prove this case for μ_1 . Letting $w' = \rho_\gamma - |\gamma'|^2$, our goal will be to show that

$$D_q e(\theta) = \begin{cases} -\theta^2, & |\theta - \gamma'_1(s)| \geq \sqrt{\rho_\gamma(s)}, \\ w'(s) - 2\sqrt{\rho_\gamma(s)}|\theta - \gamma'(s)| + 2\gamma'(s)(\theta - w'(s)), & |\theta - \gamma'(s)| \leq \sqrt{\rho_\gamma(s)}. \end{cases} \quad (10.5)$$

This function is the concave majorant of the parabola $-\theta^2$ and a single spike of height $w'(s)$ at location $\gamma'(s)$. From here a quick calculation proves the two claims in the theorem. To prove (10.5), observe that

$$e_{\mu_1}(q; q_r) = \sup_{\pi: q \rightarrow q_r} \mu_1(\pi \cap \gamma) + |\pi|_d = o(r) + \sup_{\pi: q \rightarrow q_r} \rho_\gamma(s) \lambda\{t : \pi(t) = \gamma(t)\} + |\pi|_d, \quad (10.6)$$

where here λ denotes Lebesgue measure, and in the equality we have used that s is a Lebesgue point of ρ_γ . Now, since s is a Lebesgue point of γ' , $|\gamma'|^2$ we have $\gamma(s+h) = \gamma(s) + h\gamma'(s) + o(h)$ and $|\gamma|_{[s, s+h]}|_d + o(r) = h|\gamma'(s)|^2 + o(h)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. Therefore in (10.6), up to a $o(r)$ -term it suffices to optimize over paths π that equal γ on an initial interval $[s, s+hr]$ and are straight lines afterwards. Hence (10.6) equals

$$o(r) + \sup_{h \in [0,1]} \rho_\gamma(s)hr + hr|\gamma'(s)|^2 + \frac{r(\gamma'(s)h - \theta)^2}{1-h},$$

from which the formula (10.5) easily follows after taking $r \rightarrow 0$. □

References

- Aggarwal, A., Corwin, I. and Hegde, M. (2024). Scaling limit of the colored ASEP and stochastic six-vertex models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.01341*.
- Bakhtin, Y. (2013). The Burgers equation with Poisson random forcing, *The Annals of Probability* **41**(4): 2961 – 2989.
- Basu, R. (2024). Personal communication.
- Basu, R., Ganguly, S. and Sly, A. (2021). Upper tail large deviations in first passage percolation, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **74**(8): 1577–1640.
- Cafasso, M. and Claeys, T. (2022). A Riemann-Hilbert Approach to the lower tail of the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang Equation, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **75**(3): 493–540.
- Corwin, I. (2012). The Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation and universality class, *Random matrices: Theory and applications* **1**(01): 1130001.
- Corwin, I. and Ghosal, P. (2020a). KPZ equation tails for general initial data, *Electronic Journal of Probability* **25**(none): 1 – 38.

- Corwin, I. and Ghosal, P. (2020b). Lower tail of the KPZ equation, *Duke Mathematical Journal* **169**(7): 1329 – 1395.
- Corwin, I., Ghosal, P., Krajenbrink, A., Le Doussal, P. and Tsai, L.-C. (2018). Coulomb-gas electrostatics controls large fluctuations of the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation, *Physical review letters* **121**(6): 060201.
- Corwin, I. and Hammond, A. (2014). Brownian Gibbs property for Airy line ensembles, *Invent Math* **195**(2): 441–508.
- Das, S., Liao, Y. and Mucciconi, M. (2023). Large deviations for the q -deformed polynuclear growth, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01179* .
- Das, S. and Tsai, L.-C. (2021). Fractional moments of the stochastic heat equation, *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, Vol. 57, Institut Henri Poincaré, pp. 778–799.
- Das, S. and Zhu, W. (2022). Upper-tail large deviation principle for the ASEP, *Electronic Journal of Probability* **27**: 1–34.
- Dauvergne, D. (2023). Wiener densities for the Airy line ensemble, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00097* .
- Dauvergne, D. (2024). Non-uniqueness times for the maximizer of the KPZ fixed point, *Advances in Mathematics* **442**: 109550.
- Dauvergne, D., Ortmann, J. and Virag, B. (2022). The directed landscape, *Acta Mathematica* **229**(2).
- Dauvergne, D. and Virág, B. (2021). The scaling limit of the longest increasing subsequence, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08210* .
- Dembo, A. and Zeitouni, O. (2009). *Large deviations techniques and applications*, Springer.
- Deuschel, J. and Zeitouni, O. (1999). On increasing subsequences of I.I.D. samples, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **8**(3): 247–263.
- Emrah, E. and Janjigian, C. (2017). Large deviations for some corner growth models with inhomogeneity, *Markov Process. Related Fields* **23**(1): 267–312.
- Ganguly, S. (2021). Random metric geometries on the plane and Kardar-Parisi-Zhang universality, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.11287* .

- Ganguly, S. and Hegde, M. (2022). Sharp upper tail estimates and limit shapes for the KPZ equation via the tangent method, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.08922* .
- Ganguly, S., Hegde, M. and Zhang, L. (2023). Brownian bridge limit of path measures in the upper tail of KPZ models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12009* .
- Gaudreau Lamarre, P. Y., Lin, Y. and Tsai, L.-C. (2023). KPZ equation with a small noise, deep upper tail and limit shape, *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **185**(3-4): 885–920.
- Georgiou, N. and Seppäläinen, T. (2013). Large deviation rate functions for the partition function in a log-gamma distributed random potential, *The Annals of Probability* **41**(6): 4248–4286.
- Ghosal, P. and Lin, Y. (2023). Lyapunov exponents of the SHE under general initial data, *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probabilités et statistiques*, Vol. 59, Institut Henri Poincaré, pp. 476–502.
- Janjigian, C. (2015). Large deviations of the free energy in the O’Connell–Yor polymer, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **160**(4): 1054–1080.
- Janjigian, C. (2019). Upper tail large deviations in Brownian directed percolation, *Electronic Communications in Probability* **24**(none): 1 – 10.
- Jensen, L. (2000). *The asymmetric exclusion process in one dimension*, PhD thesis, Ph. D. dissertation, New York Univ., New York.
- Johansson, K. (2000). Shape fluctuations and random matrices, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **209**(2): 437–476. arXiv:math/9903134 [math.CO].
- Kamenev, A., Meerson, B. and Sasorov, P. V. (2016). Short-time height distribution in the one-dimensional Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation: Starting from a parabola, *Physical Review E* **94**(3): 032108.
- Kardar, M., Parisi, G. and Zhang, Y. (1986). Dynamic scaling of growing interfaces, *Physical Review Letters* **56**(9): 889.
- Krajenbrink, A. and Le Doussal, P. (2019). Linear statistics and pushed Coulomb gas at the edge of β -random matrices: Four paths to large deviations, *Europhysics Letters* **125**(2): 20009.

- Krajenbrink, A., Le Doussal, P. and Prolhac, S. (2018). Systematic time expansion for the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation, linear statistics of the GUE at the edge and trapped fermions, *Nuclear Physics B* **936**: 239–305.
- Kruzhkov, S. N. (1970). First order quasilinear equations in several independent variables, *Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik* **10**(2): 217.
- Le Doussal, P. (2019). Large deviations for the KPZ equation from the KP equation, *arXiv preprint* . arXiv:1910.03671v2 [cond-mat.dis-nn].
- Le Doussal, P., Majumdar, S. N. and Schehr, G. (2016). Large deviations for the height in 1D Kardar-Parisi-Zhang growth at late times, *Europhysics Letters* **113**(6): 60004.
- Lin, Y. and Tsai, L.-C. (2023). Spacetime limit shapes of the KPZ equation in the upper tails, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14380* .
- Liu, Z. (2022a). One-point distribution of the geodesic in directed last passage percolation, *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **184**(1): 425–491.
- Liu, Z. (2022b). When the geodesic becomes rigid in the directed landscape, *Electronic Communications in Probability* **27**: 1–13.
- Liu, Z. and Wang, Y. (2024). A conditional scaling limit of the KPZ fixed point with height tending to infinity at one location, *Electronic Journal of Probability* **29**: 1–27.
- Logan, B. and Shepp, L. (1977). A variational problem for random Young tableaux, *Advances in Mathematics* **26**(2): 206–222.
- Olla, S. and Tsai, L.-C. (2019). Exceedingly large deviations of the totally asymmetric exclusion process, *Electronic Journal of Probability* **24**(none): 1 – 71.
- Quastel, J. (2011). Introduction to KPZ, *Current developments in mathematics* **2011**(1).
- Quastel, J. and Tsai, L.-C. (2021). Hydrodynamic large deviations of TASEP, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.04444* .
- Rahman, M. and Virág, B. (2021). Infinite geodesics, competition interfaces and the second class particle in the scaling limit, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.06849* .
- Ramirez, J., Rider, B. and Virág, B. (2011). Beta ensembles, stochastic Airy spectrum, and a diffusion, *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **24**(4): 919–944.

- Sasorov, P., Meerson, B. and Prolhac, S. (2017). Large deviations of surface height in the 1+ 1-dimensional Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation: exact long-time results for $\lambda h < 0$, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2017**(6): 063203.
- Seppäläinen, T. (1998a). Coupling the totally asymmetric simple exclusion process with a moving interface, *Markov Process. Related Fields* **4**(4): 593–628.
- Seppäläinen, T. (1998b). Large deviations for increasing sequences on the plane, *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **112**: 221–244.
- Tracy, C. A. and Widom, H. (1994). Level-spacing distributions and the Airy kernel, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **159**: 151–174.
- Tsai, L.-C. (2022). Exact lower-tail large deviations of the KPZ equation, *Duke Mathematical Journal* **171**(9): 1879 – 1922.
- Varadhan, S. R. (2004). Large deviations for the asymmetric simple exclusion process, *Stochastic analysis on large scale interacting systems*, Vol. 39, Mathematical Society of Japan, pp. 1–28.
- Verges, J. (2024). Large deviation principle at speed n^d for the random metric in first-passage percolation, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09589* .
- Wu, X. (2023). The KPZ equation and the directed landscape, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00547* .
- Zygouras, N. (2018). Some algebraic structures in KPZ universality, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.07204* .
- Sayan Das. Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago, 5734 S. University Avenue, Room 108 Chicago, IL, 60637. sayan.das@columbia.edu
- Duncan Dauvergne. Departments of Mathematics, University of Toronto, 40 St. George St., Toronto, Ontario, M5S2E4. duncan.dauvergne@utoronto.ca
- Bálint Virág. Departments of Mathematics, University of Toronto, 40 St. George St., Toronto, Ontario, M5S2E4. balint@math.toronto.edu