HAL
open science

Entropy-controlled Last-Passage Percolation

Quentin Berger, Torri Niccolo

To cite this version:

Quentin Berger, Torri Niccolo. Entropy-controlled Last-Passage Percolation. The Annals of Applied Probability, 2019, 29 (3), pp.1878-1903. hal-01811267

HAL Id: hal-01811267

https://hal.science/hal-01811267v1

Submitted on 13 Nov 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ENTROPY-CONTROLLED LAST-PASSAGE PERCOLATION

QUENTIN BERGER AND NICCOLÒ TORRI

ABSTRACT. In the present article we consider a natural generalization of Hammersley's Last Passage Percolation (LPP) called *Entropy-controlled Last Passage Percolation* (E-LPP), where points can be collected by paths with a global (entropy) constraint which takes in account the whole structure of the path, instead of a local (1-Lipschitz) constraint as in Hammersley's LPP. The E-LPP turns out to be a key ingredient in the context of the directed polymer model when the environment is heavy-tailed, which we consider in [5]. We prove several estimates on the E-LPP in continuous and in discrete settings, which are of interest on their own. We give applications in the context of polymers in heavy-tail environment which are essentials tools in [5]: we show that the limiting variational problem conjectured in [10, Conjecture 1.7] is finite, and we prove that the discrete variational problem converges to the continuous one, generalizing techniques used in [2, 11].

Keywords: Directed polymer, Heavy-tail distributions, Weak-coupling limit, Last Passage Percolation, Super-diffusivity.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 60F05, 82D60; Secondary 60K37, 60G70.

1. INTRODUCTION: HAMMERSLEY' LPP AND BEYOND

Let us recall the original Hammersley's Last Passage Percolation (LPP) problem of the maximal number of points that can be collected by up/right paths, also known as Ulam's problem [16] of the maximal increasing sequence.

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and $(Z_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant m}$ be m points independently drawn uniformly on the square $[0,1]^2$. We denote the coordinates of these points $Z_i := (x_i, y_i)$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$. A sequence $(z_{i_\ell})_{1\leqslant \ell\leqslant k}$ is said to be *increasing* if $x_{i_\ell} > x_{i_{\ell-1}}$ and $y_{i_\ell} > y_{i_{\ell-1}}$ for any $1 \leqslant \ell \leqslant k$ (by convention $i_0 = 0$ and $z_0 = (0,0)$). The question is to find the length of the longest increasing sequence among the m points, which is equivalent to finding the length of the longest increasing subsequence of a random (uniform) permutation of length m: we let

$$\mathcal{L}_m = \max\big\{k : \exists\,(i_1,\dots,i_k)\ s.t.\ (Z_{i_\ell})_{1\leqslant\ell\leqslant k} \text{ is increasing}\big\}. \tag{1.1}$$

Hammersley [12] first proved that $m^{-1/2}\mathcal{L}_m$ converges a.s. and in L^1 to some constant, that was believed to be 2. Then the constant has been proven to be indeed 2, see [13, 17], and estimates related to $\mathcal{L}_m$ were improved by a series of papers, culminating with a seminal paper by Baik, Deift and Johansson [3], showing that $m^{-1/6}(\mathcal{L}_m - 2\sqrt{m})$ converges in distribution to the Tracy-Widom distribution.

The main goal of the present article is to define the *Entropy-controlled Last Passage Percolation* (E-LPP), a natural extension of Hammersley's LPP (1.1). We introduce the concept of *global* (entropy) path constraint, which depends on the structure of the whole path, and is related to the moderate deviation rate function of the simple symmetric random walk.

The authors acknowledge the support of PEPS grant from CNRS. N. Torri was supported by a public grant overseen by the French National Research Agency (ANR) as part of the "Investissements d'Avenir" program (ANR-11-LABX-0020-01 and ANR-10-LABX-0098).

The E-LPP turns out to be crucial in the analysis of the directed polymer model in a heavy-tailed environment in $(1+1)$-dimension. We refer to [7, 8, 9] for the definition of the directed polymer model and a general overview on the main questions. Let us stress that among these, a fundamental question is to capture the transversal fluctuations exponent ξ of the polymer. This problem as attracted much attention in recent years, in particular because the model is in the KPZ universality class: in particular, it is conjectured that at any fixed inverse temperature β, the transversal fluctuation exponent is $\xi = 2/3$. Alberts, Khanin and Quastel [1] recently introduced the concept of *intermediate disorder regime* in which β scales with n, the size of the system. In the setting of a heavy-tailed environment, this was considered first by Auffinger-Louidor [2], who showed that rescaling suitably β, the model has transversal fluctuations of order one, that is $\xi = 1$. Dey and Zygouras [10] then proved that with a different (stronger) rescaling of β, the model has Brownian fluctuations, that is $\xi = 1/2$. Moreover Dey and Zygouras proposed a phase-diagram picture that connects the exponent of the transversal fluctuation of the polymer ξ with the tail exponent α of the heavy-tailed distribution of the environment and the decay rate of β. In [5] we start to complete this picture by giving a complete description in the case of $\alpha \in (0, 2)$: one of the main results is a proof of Conjecture 1.7 of [10], describing explicitly the limit, cf. Theorem 2.4. One crucial tool needed in [5] is the E-LPP defined below (in the discrete and continuous case), which allows to go beyond the Lipschitz setting of [2, 11], and treat intermediate transversal fluctuations $1/2 < \xi < 1$.

Let us highlight that in the related paper [4] we investigate further generalizations of Hammersley's LPP problem which can bring about new tool and perspectives on this research topic.

1.1. **Organization of the article.** We state all our results in Section 2: in Section 2.1 we give the precise definition of E-LPP and we state our results for the E-LPP in continuous and in discrete settings; in Section 2.2 we consider the problem of E-LPP with heavy-tail weights that appears in [5], and we show that the continuous limit in Theorem 2.4 of [5] is well defined, completing the proof of [10, Conjecture 1.7]; in Section 2.3 we state the convergence of the discrete energy-entropy variational problem to its continuous counterpart. This result is crucial to prove the convergence in Theorems 2.2–2.7 of [5]. The proofs of the all results are presented in Sections 3 to 5.

2. Main Results

Operating a rotation by 45° clockwise, we may map Hammersley's LPP problem (cf. Section 1) to that of the maximal number of points that can be collected by 1-Lipschitz paths $s : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$. We now introduce a new (natural) model where the Lipschitz constraint is replaced by a path entropy constraint.

2.1. **Entropy-controlled LPP.** For $t > 0$, and a finite set $\Delta = \big\{(t_i, x_i); 1 \leqslant i \leqslant j\big\} \subset [0, t] \times \mathbb{R}$ with $|\Delta| = j \in \mathbb{N}$ and with $0 \leqslant t_1 \leqslant t_2 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant t_j \leqslant t$, we can define the entropy of Δ as

$$\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{j} \frac{(x_i - x_{i-1})^2}{t_i - t_{i-1}}\,, \tag{2.1}$$

where we used the convention that $(t_0, x_0) = (0, 0)$. If there exists some $1 \leqslant i \leqslant j$ such that $t_i = t_{i-1}$ then we set $\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta) = +\infty$. This corresponds to the definition (2.7) of the entropy of a continuous path $s : [0, t] \to \mathbb{R}$, applied to the linear interpolation of the points of Δ: to any set Δ we can therefore canonically associated a (continuous) path with the same

entropy. The set Δ is seen as a set of points a path has to go through. For $S = (S_i)_{i\geqslant 0}$ a simple symmetric random walk on $\mathbb{Z}$, and if $\Delta \subset \mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{Z}$, we have that $\mathbf{P}(\Delta \subset S) \leqslant e^{-\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)}$ ($\Delta \subset S$ means that $S_{t_i} = x_i$ for all $i \leqslant |\Delta|$)—we used that for the simple random walk $\mathbf{P}(S_i = x) \leqslant e^{-x^2/2i}$ by a standard Chernoff bound argument.

Then, for any fixed $B > 0$, we will consider the maximal number of points that can be collected by paths with entropy smaller than B, among a random set Υ_m of m points, whose law is denoted $\mathbb{P}$. We now consider two types of problems, depending on how this set Υ_m is constructed:

(i) *continuous* setting: for $t, x > 0$, we consider a domain $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{t,x} := [0,t]\times[-x,x]$, and $\mathbf{\Upsilon}_m = \mathbf{\Upsilon}_m(t,x) = \{Y_1,\dots,Y_m\}$ where $(Y_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant m}$ is a collection of independent r.v. chosen uniformly in $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{t,x}$;

(ii) *discrete* setting: for $n, h \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider a domain $\Lambda_{n,h} := [\![0,n]\!]\times[\![-h,h]\!]$, and $\Upsilon_m = \Upsilon_m(n,h) = \{Y_1,\dots,Y_m\}$ is a set of m distinct points taken randomly in $\Lambda_{n,h}$.

We are then able to define the Entropy-controlled LPP by

$$\mathcal{L}_m^{(B)}(t,x) = \max_{\substack{\Delta\subset\mathbf{\Upsilon}_m(t,x)\\ \mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant B}} \big|\Delta\big|\,, \qquad L_m^{(B)}(n,h) = \max_{\substack{\Delta\subset\Upsilon_m(n,h)\\ \mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant B}} \big|\Delta\big|\,, \tag{2.2}$$

the maximal number of points than can be included in a set Δ that has entropy smaller than B. In other words, it is the maximal number of points in $\mathbf{\Upsilon}_m$ or Υ_m that can be collected by a path of entropy smaller than B. note that we use the different font to be able to differentiate the setting: $\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{\Upsilon}$ for the continuous case and L, Λ, Υ for the discrete one.

We show the following result—the lower bound is not needed for our applications, but can be found in [4].

Theorem 2.1. *There are constants $C_0, c_0, c_0' > 0$ such that: for any $t, x, B > 0$, $n, h \geqslant 1$*

(i) continuous setting: *for all $m \geqslant 1$ and all $k \leqslant m$*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathcal{L}_m^{(B)}(t,x) \geqslant k\Big) \leqslant \Big(\frac{C_0(Bt/x^2)^{1/2}m}{k^2}\Big)^k. \tag{2.3}$$

(ii) discrete setting: *for all $1 \leqslant m \leqslant nh$ and all $k \leqslant m$*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(L_m^{(B)}(n,h) \geqslant k\Big) \leqslant \Big(\frac{C_0(Bn/h^2)^{1/2}m}{k^2}\Big)^k. \tag{2.4}$$

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is not difficult but a bit technical, and we give it in Section 3. This result shows in particular that $\mathcal{L}_m^{(B)}(t,x)$ is of order $\big((Bt/x^2)^{1/4}\sqrt{m}\big)\wedge m$, resp. $L_m^{(B)}(n,h)$ is of order $\big((Bn/h^2)^{1/4}\sqrt{m}\big)\wedge m$, as stressed by the following corollary. We stress that keeping track of the dependence in B is essential for the applications we have in mind.

Corollary 2.2. *For any $b > 0$, there is a constant $c_b > 0$ such that, for any $m \geqslant 1$, and any positive B, and any t, x, resp. n, h,*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\frac{\mathcal{L}_m^{(B)}(t,x)}{\big((Bt/x^2)^{1/4}\sqrt{m}\big)\wedge m}\Big)^b\Big] \leqslant c_b\,;\ \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\frac{L_m^{(B)}(n,h)}{\big((Bn/h^2)^{1/4}\sqrt{m}\big)\wedge m}\Big)^b\Big] \leqslant c_b\,.$$

Remark 2.3. On may view Theorem 2.1 as a generalization of [11, Proposition 3.3]. More precisely, we recover [11, Proposition 3.3] by considering $\Lambda_{n,n} = [\![n,n]\!]^2$ and replacing the entropy condition $\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta) \leqslant B$ by a *Lipschitz* condition, that is considering only the sets Δ whose points can be interpolated using a Lipschitz path. Let us denote $L_m^{(\mathrm{Lip})}(n)$ the LPP obtained. Now observe that if Δ satisfies the Lipschitz condition we have that $\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta) \leqslant n/2$

(recall the definition (2.1)): as a consequence it holds that $L_m^{(n/2)}(n,n) \geqslant L_m^{(\mathrm{Lip})}(n)$. We also stress that our definition of E-LPP opens the way to many extensions: in particular as soon as one is able to properly define the entropy of a path (*i.e.* of a set Δ), one could extend the results to the case of paths with unbounded jumps or even non-directed paths: this is the object of [4], where a general notion of path-constrained LPP is developed and studied.

Let us stress here that one might want to reverse the point of view, and estimate the minimal entropy needed for a path to visit at least k points. This turns out to be essential in Section 4 of [5]. One realizes that

$$\inf_{\substack{\Delta\subset\Upsilon_m\\|\Delta|\geqslant k}} \mathrm{Ent}(\Delta) \leqslant B \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad \sup_{\substack{\Delta\subset\Upsilon_m\\\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant B}} |\Delta| \geqslant k\,.$$

Hence, an easy consequence of Theorem 2.1 is that for any $k \leqslant n$ (we state it only in the discrete setting)

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\inf_{\Delta\subset\Upsilon_m,|\Delta|\geqslant k} \mathrm{Ent}(\Delta) \leqslant B\Big) \leqslant \Big(\frac{C_0(Bn/h^2)^{1/2}m}{k^2}\Big)^k. \tag{2.5}$$

It therefore says that, with high probability, a path that collects k points in $\Upsilon_m \subset \Lambda_{n,h}$ has an entropy larger than a constant times $k^4/m^2 \times h^2/n$.

2.2. **Application I: continuous E-LPP with heavy-tail weights.** In [5] we prove the convergence of the directed polymer model in heavy-tail environment (suitably rescaled) to a continuous energy-entropy variational problem $\mathcal{T}_\beta$, defined below in (2.9) (or in Section 2.2 of [5]). A first application of our E-LPP is to show that this variational problem is well-defined when the tail decay exponent α is in $(1/2,2)$: this is Theorem 2.4, which proves the first part of [10, Conjecture 1.7]. The second part of this conjecture, *i.e.* that $\mathcal{T}_\beta$ is indeed the scaling limit of the directed polymer in heavy-tail environment, is proved in [5, Theorem 2.4].

Let us recall some notations from Section 2.2 in [5]. The set of allowed paths (scaling limits of random walk trajectories) is

$$\mathscr{D} := \big\{s : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}\ ;\ s \text{ continuous and a.e. differentiable}\big\}\,, \tag{2.6}$$

and the (continuum) *entropy* of a path $s \in \mathscr{D}$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{Ent}(s) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \big(s'(t)\big)^2 dt\,. \tag{2.7}$$

This last definition derives from the rate function of the moderate deviation of the simple random walk (see [15] or [5, Eq. (2.14)]).

We let $\mathcal{P} := \{(w_i,t_i,x_i)\}_{i\geqslant 1}$ be a Poisson Point Process on $[0,\infty)\times[0,1]\times\mathbb{R}$ of intensity $\mu(\mathrm{d}w\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}x) = \frac{\alpha}{2}w^{-\alpha-1}1_{\{w>0\}}\mathrm{d}w\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}x$, where $\alpha \in (0,2)$. For a quenched realization of $\mathcal{P}$, the *energy* of a continuous path $s \in \mathscr{D}$ is then defined by

$$\pi(s) = \pi_{\mathcal{P}}(s) := \sum_{(w,t,x)\in\mathcal{P}} w\, 1_{\{(t,x)\in s\}}, \tag{2.8}$$

where $(t,x) \in s$ means that (t,x) is visited by the path s, that is $s_t = x$.

Using (2.7) and (2.8) we define the *energy–entropy competition variational problem*: for any $\beta \geqslant 0$ we let

$$\mathcal{T}_\beta := \sup_{s\in\mathscr{D},\mathrm{Ent}(s)<+\infty} \Big\{\beta\pi(s) - \mathrm{Ent}(s)\Big\}. \tag{2.9}$$

The next result shows that it is well defined, and gives some of its properties.

Theorem 2.4. *For $\alpha \in (1/2, 2)$ we have the scaling relation*

$$\mathcal{T}_\beta \overset{(d)}{=} \beta^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}} \mathcal{T}_1, \tag{2.10}$$

and $\mathcal{T}_\beta \in (0, +\infty)$ for all $\beta > 0$ a.s. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}\big[(\mathcal{T}_\beta)^\upsilon\big] < \infty$ for any $\upsilon < \alpha - 1/2$. We also have that a.s. the map $\beta \mapsto \mathcal{T}_\beta$ is continuous, and that the supremum in (2.9) *is attained by some unique continuous path s^*_β with $\mathrm{Ent}(s^*_\beta) < \infty$.*

On the other hand, for $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$ we have $\mathcal{T}_\beta = +\infty$ for all $\beta > 0$ a.s.

Remark 2.5. As we discuss in Section 2.5 of [5], the fact that the maximizer of $\mathcal{T}_\beta$ is unique could be used to show the concentration of the paths around s^*_β under the polymer measure $\mathbf{P}^\omega_{n,\beta_n}$, in analogy with the result obtained by Auffinger and Louidor in Theorem 2.1 of [2].

2.3. **Application II: discrete E-LPP with heavy-tail weigths.** In this section we discuss the convergence of a discrete energy-entropy variational problem $T^{\beta_{n,h}}_{n,h}$ defined below (2.15), to its continuous counterpart $\mathcal{T}_\beta$ (2.9). This is a crucial result that we need in [5] to prove Theorems 2.4–2.7.

We introduce the discrete field $\{\omega_{i,x}; (i,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}\}$, which are i.i.d. non-negative random variables of law $\mathbb{P}$: there is some slowly varying function $L(\cdot)$ and some $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\omega > x\big) = L(x)x^{-\alpha}\,. \tag{2.11}$$

This random field is the discrete counterpart of the Poisson Point Process $\mathcal{P}$ introduced in Section 2.2. We refer to Section 5.1 for further details.

Let us consider $F(x) = \mathbb{P}(\omega \leqslant x)$ be the disorder distribution, cf. (2.11), and define the function $m(x)$ by

$$m(x) := F^{-1}\big(1 - \tfrac{1}{x}\big), \qquad \text{so } \mathbb{P}\big(\omega > m(x)\big) = 1/x. \tag{2.12}$$

The second identity characterizes $m(x)$ up to asymptotic equivalence: we have that $m(\cdot)$ is a regularly varying function with exponent $1/\alpha$.

For any given box $\Lambda_{n,h} = [\![1, n]\!] \times [\![-h, h]\!]$ we can rewrite the discrete field in this region $(\omega_{i,x})_{(i,x)\in\Lambda_{n,h}}$ using the *ordered statistic*: we let $M^{(n,h)}_r$ be the r-th largest value of $(\omega_{i,x})_{(i,x)\in\Lambda_{n,h}}$ and $Y^{(n,h)}_r \in \Lambda_{n,h}$ its position—note that $(Y^{(n,h)}_r)^{|\Lambda_{n,h}|}_{r=1}$ is simply a random permutation of the points of $\Lambda_{n,h}$. In such a way

$$(\omega_{i,j})_{(i,j)\in\Lambda_n} = (M^{(n,h)}_r, Y^{(n,h)}_r)^{|\Lambda_{n,h}|}_{r=1}\,. \tag{2.13}$$

In the following we refer to $(M^{(n,h)}_r)^{|\Lambda_{n,h}|}_{r=1}$ as the *weight* sequence. We now define the energy collected by a set $\Delta \subset \Lambda_{n,h}$ and its contribution by the first ℓ weights (with $1 \leqslant \ell \leqslant |\Lambda_{n,h}|$) as follows

$$\Omega_{n,h}(\Delta) := \sum_{r=1}^{|\Lambda_{n,h}|} M^{(n,h)}_r 1_{\{Y^{(n,h)}_r \in \Delta\}}\,; \;\; \Omega^{(\ell)}_{n,h}(\Delta) := \sum_{r=1}^{\ell} M^{(n,h)}_r 1_{\{Y^{(n,h)}_r \in \Delta\}}\,. \tag{2.14}$$

We also set $\Omega^{(>\ell)}_{n,h}(\Delta) := \Omega_{n,h}(\Delta) - \Omega^{(\ell)}_{n,h}(\Delta)$.

In such a way we can define the (discrete) variational problem

$$T^{\beta_{n,h}}_{n,h} := \max_{\Delta\subset\Lambda_{n,h}} \big\{\beta_{n,h}\Omega_{n,h}(\Delta) - \mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\big\}\,, \tag{2.15}$$

with $\beta_{n,h}$ some function of n, h (soon to be specified), and $\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)$ as defined in (2.1). We also define analogues of (2.15) with a restriction to the ℓ largest weights, or beyond the ℓ-th weight

$$\begin{aligned} T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)} &:= \max_{\Delta\subset\Lambda_{n,h}} \left\{\beta_{n,h}\Omega_{n,h}^{(\ell)}(\Delta) - \mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\right\}, \\ T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(>\ell)} &:= \max_{\Delta\subset\Lambda_{n,h}} \left\{\beta_{n,h}\Omega_{n,h}^{(>\ell)}(\Delta) - \mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

The following proposition is crucial for the proof of Theorem 2.7 below, and is also a central tool in [5, Section 4].

Proposition 2.6. *The following hold true:*

- *For any $a < \alpha$, there is a constant $c_a > 0$ such that for any $1 \leqslant \ell \leqslant nh$, for any $b > 1$*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)} \geqslant b \times \big(\beta_{n,h}m(nh)\big)^{4/3}\Big(\frac{n}{h^2}\Big)^{1/3}\Big) \leqslant c_a\, b^{-3a/4}\,. \tag{2.17}$$

- *We also have that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that for any $b > 1$*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(>\ell)} \geqslant b \times \big(\beta_{n,h}m(nh/\ell)\big)^{4/3}\Big(\frac{\ell^2 n}{h^2}\Big)^{1/3}\Big) \leqslant cb^{-\alpha\ell/4} + e^{-cb^{1/4}}\,. \tag{2.18}$$

The proof is is postponed to Section 5.3. Observe that we need here to keep track of the dependence on n, h: to that end, estimates obtained in Section 1 will be crucial. Note already that if $\frac{n}{h^2}\beta_{n,h}m(nh) \to \beta \in (0,\infty)$, as $n, h \to \infty$, it gives that $T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)}$ is of order $\beta^4 h^2/n$.

In the next result we prove the convergence in distribution for (2.15), which generalizes the convergence of related variational problems considered in [2, 11].

Theorem 2.7. *Suppose that $\frac{n}{h^2}\beta_{n,h}m(nh) \to \nu \in [0,\infty)$ as $n, h \to \infty$. For every $\alpha \in (1/2, 2)$ and for any $q > 0$ we have the following convergence in distribution*

$$\frac{n}{h^2}\, T_{n,qh}^{\beta_{n,h}} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{(d)} \mathcal{T}_{\nu,q} := \sup_{s\in\mathscr{M}_q} \left\{\nu\pi(s) - \mathrm{Ent}(s)\right\}, \tag{2.19}$$

with $\mathscr{M}_q := \{s \in \mathscr{D}, \mathrm{Ent}(s) < \infty, \max_{t\in[0,1]} |s(t)| \leqslant q\}$. We also have

$$\frac{n}{h^2}\, T_{n,qh}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{(d)} \mathcal{T}_{\nu,q}^{(\ell)} := \sup_{s\in\mathscr{M}_q} \left\{\nu\pi^{(\ell)}(s) - \mathrm{Ent}(s)\right\}, \tag{2.20}$$

where $\pi^{(\ell)} := \sum_{r=1}^{\ell} M_r 1_{\{Y_r\in s\}}$ with $\{(M_r, Y_r)\}_{r\geqslant 1}$ the ordered statistics of $\mathcal{P}$ restricted to $[0,1]\times[-q,q]$, see Section 5.1. Finally, we have

$$\mathcal{T}_{\nu,q}^{(\ell)} \xrightarrow[\ell\to\infty]{a.s.} \mathcal{T}_{\nu,q}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{T}_{\nu,q} \xrightarrow[q\to\infty]{a.s.} \mathcal{T}_{\nu}. \tag{2.21}$$

3. Proof of Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.2

3.1. **Proof of Theorem 2.1.** We start with the proof in the continuous setting. The discrete setting follows the same lines and details will be skipped.

Continuous setting. Let us consider $\mathcal{E}_k^{(t,B)}$ the set of k-uples in $[0,t]\times\mathbb{R}$ (*i.e.* up to time t) that have entropy smaller than B:

$$\mathcal{E}_k^{(t,B)} = \left\{ \big((t_\ell,x_\ell)\big)_{1\leqslant\ell\leqslant k} \subset [0,t]\times\mathbb{R}\,;\ \begin{array}{c} 0<t_1<\cdots<t_k<t\ ; \\ \mathrm{Ent}\big((t_\ell,x_\ell)_{1\leqslant\ell\leqslant k}\big)\leqslant B \end{array} \right\}.$$

We can compute exactly the volume of $\mathcal{E}_k^{(t,B)}$.

Lemma 3.1. *We have, for any $t>0$ and $B>0$*

$$\mathrm{Vol}\big(\mathcal{E}_k^{(t,B)}\big) = C_k\times B^{k/2}t^{3k/2}, \quad \textit{with } C_k = \frac{\pi^k/\sqrt{2}}{\Gamma\big(k/2+1\big)\Gamma\big(3k/2+1\big)}\,.$$

In particular, it gives that there exists some constant C such that

$$\mathrm{Vol}\big(\mathcal{E}_k^{(t,B)}\big) \leqslant \Big(\frac{CB^{1/2}t^{3/2}}{k^2}\Big)^k.$$

Proof. The key to the computation is the induction formula below, based on the decomposition over the left-most point in $\mathcal{E}_k^{(t,B)}$ at position (u,y) (by symmetry we can assume $y\geqslant 0$): it leaves $k-1$ points with remaining time $t-u$ and entropy smaller than $B-\frac{y^2}{2u}$,

$$\mathrm{Vol}\big(\mathcal{E}_k^{(t,B)}\big) = 2\int_{u=0}^t\int_{y=0}^{\sqrt{2Bu}} \mathrm{Vol}\big(\mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{(t-u,B-y^2/2u)}\big)dydu. \tag{3.1}$$

The induction is only calculations. For $k=1$ we have

$$\mathrm{Vol}\big(\mathcal{E}_1^{(t,B)}\big) = 2\int_{u=0}^t\int_{y=0}^{\sqrt{2Bu}} dudy = 2\sqrt{2B}\int_0^t u^{1/2}du = \frac{4\sqrt{2}}{3}B^{1/2}t^{3/2}\,,$$

so that we indeed have that $C_1=\pi(\sqrt{2}\Gamma(3/2)\Gamma(5/2))^{-1}$.

For $k\geqslant 2$, by induction, we have

$$\mathrm{Vol}(\mathcal{E}_k^{(t,B)}) = 2C_{k-1}\int_{u=0}^t\int_{y=0}^{\sqrt{2Bu}} (t-u)^{3(k-1)/2}\big(B-\tfrac{y^2}{2u}\big)^{(k-1)/2}dydu.$$

Then, by a change of variable $w=y^2/(2Bu)$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{y=0}^{\sqrt{2Bu}} \big(B-\tfrac{y^2}{2u}\big)^{(k-1)/2}dy &= B^{(k-1)/2}\int_0^1 (1-w)^{(k-1)/2}\sqrt{\frac{Bu}{2}}w^{-1/2}dw \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}B^{k/2}\,u^{1/2}\,\frac{\Gamma\big((k-1)/2+1\big)\Gamma(1/2)}{\Gamma(k/2+1)}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{u=0}^t u^{1/2}(t-u)^{3(k-1)/2}dx &= t^{3(k-1)/2+1/2+1}\int_0^1 v^{1/2}(1-v)^{3(k-1)/2}dv \\ &= t^{3k/2}\frac{\Gamma(3/2)\Gamma(3(k-1)/2+1)}{\Gamma(3k/2+1)}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the constant C_k verifies

$$C_k = 2C_{k-1}\times\sqrt{\pi}\frac{\Gamma\big((k-1)/2+1\big)}{\Gamma(k/2+1)}\times\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}\frac{\Gamma(3(k-1)/2+1)}{\Gamma(3k/2+1)}\,,$$

which completes the induction, in view of the formula for C_{k-1}.

For the inequality in the second part of the lemma, we simply use Stirling's formula to get that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\Gamma\big(k/2+1\big) \geqslant \big(ck\big)^{k/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma\big(3k/2+1\big) \geqslant \big(ck\big)^{3k/2}.$$

□

Let us denote $\mathcal{N}_k$ the number of sets $\Delta \subset \Upsilon_m(t,x)$ with $|\Delta| = k$, that have entropy at most B. We write

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\mathcal{L}_m^{(B)}(t,x) \geqslant k\big) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_k \geqslant 1) \leqslant \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{N}_k].$$

Since all the points are exchangeable, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{N}_k] = \binom{m}{k}\mathbb{P}\Big(\exists\, \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k \ s.t.\ (Z_{\sigma(1)},\dots,Z_{\sigma(k)}) \in \mathcal{E}_k^{(t,B)}\Big),$$

where $Z_1 = (t_1,x_1),\dots,Z_k = (t_k,x_k)$ are independent uniform r.v. on the domain $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{t,x}$ (with volume $2tx$). We then have that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\exists\, \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k \ s.t.\ (Z_{\sigma(1)},\dots,Z_{\sigma(k)}) \in \mathcal{E}_k^{(t,B)}\Big) = k!\,\frac{\mathrm{Vol}(\mathcal{E}_k^{(t,B)})}{(2tx)^k}.$$

We therefore obtain, using that $\binom{m}{k} \leqslant m^k/k!$, together with Lemma 3.1

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\mathcal{L}_m^{(B)}(t,x) \geqslant k\big) \leqslant \Big(\frac{CB^{1/2}t^{1/2}m}{2xk^2}\Big)^k \tag{3.2}$$

This gives the upper bound of Theorem 2.1-(i). □

Discrete setting: upper bound. The proof follows the same idea as above: we skip most of the details. Define $E_k^{(n,B)}$ the set of k-uples in $[\![1,n]\!] \times \mathbb{Z}$ that have entropy smaller than B:

$$E_k^{(n,B)} := \left\{ \big((t_\ell,x_\ell)\big)_{1\leqslant \ell\leqslant k} \subset [\![1,n]\!]\times\mathbb{Z}\,;\ \begin{array}{l} 0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k \leqslant n\,; \\ \mathrm{Ent}\big((t_\ell,x_\ell)_{1\leqslant\ell\leqslant k}\big) \leqslant B \end{array} \right\}.$$

We can estimate the cardinality of $E_k^{(n,B)}$—however not in an exact manner as in the continuous case.

Lemma 3.2. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds true that*

$$\mathrm{Vol}\big(E_k^{(n,B)}\big) \leqslant 2^k\, C_k \times B^{k/2} n^{3k/2}, \quad \textit{with } C_k = \frac{\pi^k/\sqrt{2}}{\Gamma\big(k/2+1\big)\Gamma\big(3k/2+1\big)}.$$

Proof. The analogous of (3.1) is here

$$\mathrm{Vol}\big(E_k^{(n,B)}\big) = 2\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{y=0}^{\sqrt{2Bi}} \mathrm{Vol}\big(E_{k-1}^{(n-i,B-x^2/2i)}\big). \tag{3.3}$$

The induction is again straightforward calculations: we can use the computations made in the continuous setting, together with the comparison between finite sums and Riemann integrals, *i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=0}^{n} g(i) \leqslant \int_0^{n+1} g(z)\mathrm{d}z \qquad \text{if } g \text{ is increasing,} \\ &\sum_{i=0}^{n} g(i) \leqslant g(0) + \int_0^{n} g(z)\mathrm{d}z \qquad \text{if } g \text{ is decreasing}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Details are left to the reader. □

Again, we have $\mathbb{P}\big(L_m^{(B)}(n,h) \geqslant k\big) \leqslant \mathbb{E}[N_k]$, where N_k is the number of sets $\Delta \subset \Upsilon_m \subset \Lambda_{n,h}$ with $|\Delta| = k$, that have entropy at most B. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[N_k] = \binom{m}{k}\mathbb{P}\Big(\exists\, \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k \ s.t.\ (Z_{\sigma(1)}^{(n,h)}, \dots, Z_{\sigma(k)}^{(n,h)}) \in \mathcal{E}_k^{(n,B)}\Big),$$

where $(Z_1^{(n,h)}, \cdots, Z_k^{(n,h)})$ are a uniform random choice of k distinct points from $\Lambda_{n,h}$ (which contains $n(2h+1)$ points)—the main difference with the continuous setting comes from the fact that the Z_i's are not independent. We therefore have that, using Lemma 3.2,

$$\mathbb{E}[n_k] = \binom{m}{k}\frac{\mathrm{Vol}(E_k^{(n,B)})}{\binom{2nh+n}{k}} \leqslant \frac{m^k}{(2nh)^k}\Big(\frac{CB^{1/2}}{k^2}\Big)^k.$$

We also used that $\binom{m}{k} \leqslant m^k/k!$ and that $\binom{2nh+n}{k} \geqslant (2nh+n-k)^k/k!$ with $k \leqslant n$. This concludes the proof of the upper bound in Theorem 2.1-(ii). □

3.2. **Proof of Corollary 2.2.** We prove it in the continuous setting, the discrete one being similar. From Theorem 2.1, we deduce that for any $u \geqslant (eC_0)^{1/2}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathcal{L}_m^{(B)}(t,x) \geqslant u\,(Bt/x^2)^{1/4}\sqrt{m}\Big) \leqslant \exp\Big(-u(Bt/x^2)^{1/4}\sqrt{m}\Big). \tag{3.5}$$

Applying this inequality with $u = (eC_0)^{1/2}$, and using also the *a priori* bound $\mathcal{L}_m^{(B)}(n,h) \leqslant m$, we get that for any $b > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\frac{\mathcal{L}_m^{(B)}(t,x)}{\big((Bt/x^2)^{1/4}m^{1/2}\big)\wedge m}\Big)^b\Big] \\
&\qquad \leqslant (eC_0)^{b/2} + \int_{(eC_0)^{b/2}}^{+\infty}\mathbb{P}\Big(\frac{\mathcal{L}_m^{(B)}(t,x)}{\big((Bt/x^2)^{1/4}m^{1/2}\big)\wedge m} > u^{1/b}\Big)du \\
&\qquad \leqslant (eC_0)^{b/2} + cst.
\end{aligned}$$

4. Proof of Theorem 2.4

Let us recall that $\mathcal{P} := \big\{(w_i,t_i,x_i)\colon i \geqslant 1\big\}$ is a Poisson Point Process on $[0,\infty)\times[0,1]\times\mathbb{R}$ of intensity $\mu(\mathrm{d}w\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}x) = \frac{\alpha}{2}w^{-\alpha-1}1_{\{w>0\}}\mathrm{d}w\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}x$, as introduced in Section 2.2.

4.1. **Ideas of the proof.** First we prove that $\mathcal{T}_\beta = +\infty$ when $\alpha \leqslant 1/2$. Then, we prove the scaling relation (2.10), and finally we show the finiteness of the υ-th moment ($\upsilon < \alpha - 1/2$). We stress that the core of the proof is based on an application of the continuous E-LPP: roughly, the idea of the proof is to decompose the variational problem (2.9) according to the value of the entropy:

$$\mathcal{T}_\beta = \sup_{B\geqslant 0}\Big\{\beta \sup_{s\in\mathscr{D},\mathrm{Ent}(s)=B}\pi(s) - B\Big\}. \tag{4.1}$$

Then, a simple scaling argument gives that

$$\sup_{s:\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant B}\pi(s) \overset{(d)}{=} B^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}}\sup_{s:\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant 1}\pi(s).$$

The E-LPP appears essential to show that the last supremum is finite, see in particular Lemma 4.1 below. Then, at a heuristic level, we get that $\mathcal{T}_\beta$ is finite because in (4.1) we

have $B^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}} \ll B$ as $B \to \infty$ (remember that $\alpha > 1/2$). In the last part of the proof we prove the continuity of $\beta \mapsto \mathcal{T}_\beta$ and of the existence and uniqueness of the maximizer in (2.9).

4.2. **Case $\alpha \leqslant 1/2$.** Let us prove here that $\mathcal{T}_\beta = +\infty$ when $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$. For any k in $\mathbb{Z}$, we define the event

$$\mathcal{G}_k := \left\{\mathcal{P} \cap [\beta^{-1}2^{2k+1}, +\infty) \times [\tfrac{1}{2}, 1] \times [2^{k-1}, 2^k] \neq \varnothing\right\},$$

On the event $\mathcal{G}_k$, we denote (w_k, t_k, x_k) a point of $\mathcal{P}$ such that $w_k \geqslant \beta^{-1}2^{2k+1}$ and $(t_k, x_k) \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \times [2^{k-1}, 2^k]$: considering the path going straight to (t_k, x_k) we get that

$$\mathcal{T}_\beta \geqslant \beta w_k - \frac{x_k^2}{2t_k} \geqslant 2^{2k}, \qquad \text{on the event } \mathcal{G}_k\,.$$

Then, it is just a matter of estimating $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_k)$. We stress that considering $\mathcal{M}_k$ the maximal weight in $[\frac{1}{2}, 1] \times [2^{k-1}, 2^k]$, we find that $\mathcal{M}_k$ is of order $(2^k)^{1/\alpha}$ (as a maximum of a field of independent heavy-tail random variables, or using the scaling relations below), so that we get that: if $\alpha < 1/2$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_k) \to 1$ as $k \to +\infty$; if $\alpha = 1/2$, there is a constant $c > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_k) \geqslant c$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$; if $\alpha > 1/2$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_k) \to 1$ as $k \to -\infty$. note that the events $\mathcal{G}_k$ are independent, so an application of Borel-Cantelli lemma gives that for $\alpha \leqslant 1/2$, a.s. $\mathcal{G}_k$ occurs for infinitely many $k \in \mathbb{N}$: since $\mathcal{T}_\beta \geqslant 2^{2k}$ on $\mathcal{G}_k$, it implies that $\mathcal{T}_\beta = +\infty$ a.s. for $\alpha \leqslant 1/2$.

On the other hand, it also proves that when $\alpha > 1/2$, a.s. there exists some $k_0 \leqslant -1$ such that $\mathcal{G}_{k_0}$ occurs and thus $\mathcal{T}_\beta \geqslant 2^{2k_0} > 0$.

4.3. **Scaling relations.** For any $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $a > 0$ we consider two functions $\varphi(w, t, x) := (w, t, ax)$ and $\psi(w, t, x) := (a^{-1/\alpha}w, t, x)$ which scale space by a (hence the entropy by a^2) and weights by $a^{-1/\alpha}$ respectively. The random sets $\varphi(\mathcal{P})$ and $\psi(\mathcal{P})$ are still two Poisson Point Processes with the same law, that is $\varphi(\mathcal{P}) \overset{(d)}{=} \psi(\mathcal{P})$. This implies that (recall the definition (2.8))

$$\pi(as) \overset{(d)}{=} a^{1/\alpha}\pi(s).$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_{s\in\mathscr{D},\mathrm{Ent}(s)<\infty} \left\{\beta\pi(s) - a^2\mathrm{Ent}(s)\right\} \overset{(d)}{=} \sup_{s\in\mathscr{D},\mathrm{Ent}(s)<\infty} \left\{\beta a^{-1/\alpha}\pi(s) - \mathrm{Ent}(s)\right\}. \tag{4.2}$$

Consequently, for any $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $a^2\mathcal{T}_{\beta/a^2} \overset{(d)}{=} \mathcal{T}_{\beta a^{-1/\alpha}}$. In particular, for any $\beta > 0$ it holds true that for $\alpha > 1/2$

$$\mathcal{T}_\beta \overset{(d)}{=} \beta^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}}\mathcal{T}_1\,. \tag{4.3}$$

4.4. **Finite moments of $\mathcal{T}_\beta$.** We show that for $\alpha \in (1/2, 2)$ $\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{T}_\beta)^\upsilon] < \infty$ for any $\upsilon < \alpha - 1/2$, which readily implies that $\mathcal{T}_\beta < \infty$ a.s. For any interval $[c, d)$ with $0 \leqslant c < d$ we let

$$\mathcal{T}_\beta\big([c, d)\big) := \sup_{s\in\mathscr{D},\mathrm{Ent}(s)\in[c,d)} \left\{\beta\pi(s) - \mathrm{Ent}(s)\right\}, \tag{4.4}$$

and we observe that $\mathcal{T}_\beta = \mathcal{T}_\beta\big([0,1)\big) \vee \sup_{k\geqslant 0} \mathcal{T}_\beta\big([2^k, 2^{k+1})\big)$. Moreover, as in (4.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_\beta\big([2^k, 2^{k+1})\big) &\overset{(\mathrm{d})}{=} \sup_{s:\,\mathrm{Ent}(s)\in[1,2)} \big\{ 2^{\frac{k}{2\alpha}}\beta\pi(s) - 2^k\,\mathrm{Ent}(s)\big\} \\ &\leqslant 2^{\frac{k}{2\alpha}}\beta \sup_{s:\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant 2} \pi(s) - 2^k\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

We show the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *For any $a<\alpha$, we have that there is a constant $c_a>0$ such that for any $t>1$ we get*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{s\in\mathscr{D},\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant 2} \pi(s) > t\Big) \leqslant c_a t^{-a}\,.$$

From this lemma and (4.5), we get that for any $t\geqslant -1$ and any k large enough so that $\beta^{-1}2^{-\frac{k}{2\alpha}}2^{-k}>2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathcal{T}_\beta\big([2^k,2^{k+1})\big)>t\Big) &\leqslant \mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{s\in\mathscr{D},\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant 2}\pi(s) > \beta^{-1}2^{-\frac{k}{2\alpha}}(t+2^k)\Big) \\ &\leqslant c_a\beta^a 2^k 2^{\frac{a}{2\alpha}}\big(t+2^k\big)^{-a}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Then, for any $t\geqslant 1$ and $a<\alpha$, we get by a union bound that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\big(\mathcal{T}_\beta>t\big) &\leqslant \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathcal{T}_\beta\big([2^k,2^{k+1})\big)>t\Big) \\ &\leqslant c_a' 2^a\beta^a t^{-a}\sum_{k=0}^{\log_2 t} 2^{k\frac{a}{2\alpha}} + c_a' 2^a\beta^a \sum_{k>\log_2 t} 2^{-ak\left(1-\frac{1}{2\alpha}\right)} \\ &\leqslant c_a''\beta^a t^{-a} t^{\frac{a}{2\alpha}} + c_a'' t^{-a\left(1-\frac{1}{2\alpha}\right)} \leqslant 2c_a''\beta^a t^{-a\left(1-\frac{1}{2\alpha}\right)}\,, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $t+2^k\geqslant t/2$ if $k\leqslant\log_2 t$, and $t+2^k\geqslant 2^k/2$ if $k>\log_2 t$. For the second sum we also used that $1-\frac{1}{2\alpha}>0$ when $\alpha>1/2$. In particular, this shows that for any $\delta>0$, there is some constant $c_{\delta,\beta}>0$ such that for any $t\geqslant 1$

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\mathcal{T}_\beta>t\big)\leqslant c_{\delta,\beta}t^{-(\alpha-\frac{1}{2})+\delta}\,, \tag{4.7}$$

which proves that $\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{T}_\beta)^\upsilon]<\infty$ for any $\upsilon<\alpha-1/2$.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Let us recall that $\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant 2$ implies that $\max|s|\leqslant 2$. Therefore we can restrict our Poisson Point Process to $\mathbb{R}_+\times[0,1]\times[-2,2]$. In this case (cf. Section 5.1 below) we rewrite a realization of the Poisson Point Process by using its ordered statistic. We introduce $(Y_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an i.i.d. sequence of uniform random variables on $[0,1]\times[-2,2]$ and $(M_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a random sequence independent of $(Y_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined by $M_i = 4^{1/\alpha}(\mathcal{E}_1+\cdots+\mathcal{E}_i)^{-1/\alpha}$ with $(\mathcal{E}_j)_{j\geqslant 1}$ an i.i.d. sequence of $\mathrm{Exp}(1)$ random variables. In such a way $\mathcal{P}\overset{(\mathrm{d})}{=}(M_i,Y_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\pi(s)=\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}M_i 1_{\{Y_i\in s\}}$.

The proof is then a consequence of Theorem 2.1 (with $B=1$), which allows to use the same ideas as in [11, Proposition 3.3] – we develop the argument used in [11] in a more robust way, which makes it easier to adapt to the discrete setting. Using the notations introduced in Section 1, for any $i\geqslant 0$, we denote $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_i=\{Y_1,\dots,Y_i\}$ ($\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_0=\varnothing$), and let $\Delta_i=\Delta_i(s)=s\cap\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_i$ be the set of the i largest weights collected by s. The E-LPP can be written here as $\mathcal{L}_i^{(2)}:=\max_{s:\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant 2}|\Delta_i(s)|$ – we drop here the dependence on t,x.

Using that M_i is a non-increasing sequence, we write

$$\pi(s) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=2^j}^{2^{j+1}-1} M_i 1_{\{Y_i \in s\}} \leqslant \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} M_{2^j} \mathcal{L}^{(2)}_{2^{j+1}} \,. \tag{4.8}$$

Then, we fix some $\delta > 0$ such that $1/\alpha - 1/2 > 2\delta$, and we let $C = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{j(1/2-1/\alpha+2\delta)}$: we obtain via a union bound that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant 2} \pi(s) > t\Big) &\leqslant \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(M_{2^j} \mathcal{L}^{(2)}_{2^{j+1}} > \frac{1}{C}\, t\, 2^{j(1/2-1/\alpha+2\delta)}\Big) \\ &\leqslant \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Big[\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathcal{L}^{(2)}_{2^{j+1}} > C' \log t\, (2^{j+1})^{1/2+\delta)}\Big) + \mathbb{P}\Big(M_{2^j} > C'' \frac{t}{\log t} (2^j)^{-1/\alpha+\delta}\Big)\Big] . \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Here C' is a constant that we choose large in a moment, and C'' is a constant depending on C, C' - we also work with $t \geqslant 2$ for simplicity.

For the first probability in the sum, we obtain from Theorem 2.1-(i) that provided $C'(\log t)2^{j\delta} \geqslant 2C_0^{1/2}$

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathcal{L}^{(2)}_{2^{j+1}} > C' \log t\, (2^{j+1})^{1/2+\delta)}\Big) \leqslant \Big(\frac{1}{2}\Big)^{C'(\log t)2^{j\delta}} \leqslant t^{-\log 2\, C' 2^{j\delta}} \,.$$

Hence, for t sufficiently large we get that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(\mathcal{L}^{(2)}_{2^{j+1}} > C' \log t\, (2^{j+1})^{1/2+\delta)}\Big) \leqslant c t^{-C' \log 2} \leqslant c t^{-a} \tag{4.10}$$

provided that we fixed C' large.

For the second probability in the sum, recall that $M_i \overset{(\mathrm{d})}{=} 4^{1/\alpha} \mathrm{Gamma}(i)^{-1/\alpha}$, so that for any $a < \alpha$, $\mathbb{E}[(i^{1/\alpha} M_i)^a]$ is bounded by a constant independent of i. Therefore, Markov's inequality gives that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(M_{2^j} > C'' \frac{t}{\log t} (2^j)^{-1/\alpha+\delta}\Big) \leqslant c (\log t)^a t^{-a} (2^j)^{-a\delta} \,,$$

so that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(M_{2^j} > C'' \frac{t}{\log t} (2^j)^{-1/\alpha+\delta}\Big) \leqslant c (\log t)^a t^{-a} \,. \tag{4.11}$$

Plugging (4.10) and (4.11) into (4.9), we obtain that for any $a' < a < \alpha$ there are constants $c > 0$ such that for any $t \geqslant 2$

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant 2} \pi(s) > t\Big) \leqslant 2c (\log t)^a t^{-a} \leqslant c' t^{-a'} \,,$$

which concludes the proof. □

4.5. **Continuity of $\beta \mapsto \mathcal{T}_\beta$.** An obvious and crucial fact that we use along the way is that for any realization of $\mathcal{P}$, $\beta \mapsto \mathcal{T}_\beta$ is non-decreasing.

Left-continuity. Let us first show that $\beta \mapsto \mathcal{T}_\beta$ is left-continuous, since it is less technical. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. For any β, there exists a path $s_\beta^{(\varepsilon)}$ with $\pi(s_\beta^{(\varepsilon)}) < \infty$ such that $\mathcal{T}_\beta \leqslant \beta\pi(s_\beta^{(\varepsilon)}) - \mathrm{Ent}(s_\beta^{(\varepsilon)}) + \varepsilon$. Using this path $s_\beta^{(\varepsilon)}$, we then simply write that for any $\delta > 0$

$$\mathcal{T}_\beta \geqslant \mathcal{T}_{\beta-\delta} \geqslant (\beta-\delta)\pi(s_\beta^{(\varepsilon)}) - \mathrm{Ent}(s_\beta^{(\varepsilon)})\,.$$

Letting $\delta \downarrow 0$, we get that the right hand side converges to $\beta\pi(s_\beta^{(\varepsilon)}) - \mathrm{Ent}(s_\beta^{(\varepsilon)}) \geqslant \mathcal{T}_\beta - \varepsilon$. Since ε is arbitrary, one concludes that $\lim_{\delta\uparrow 0}\mathcal{T}_{\beta-\delta} = \mathcal{T}_\beta$, that is $\beta \mapsto \mathcal{T}_\beta$ is left-continuous.

Right-continuity. It remains to prove that a.s. $\beta \mapsto \mathcal{T}_\beta$ is right-continuous. We prove a preliminary result.

Lemma 4.2. *For any $K > 0$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. there exists $B_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 \leqslant \beta \leqslant K$*

$$\mathcal{T}_\beta = \mathcal{T}_\beta\big([0,B_0]\big)\,, \tag{4.12}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_\beta\big([0,B_0]\big)$ is defined in (4.4).

Proof. Let us recall that $\mathcal{T}_\beta = \mathcal{T}_\beta\big([0,1)\big) \vee \sup_{k\geqslant 0}\mathcal{T}_\beta\big([2^k,2^{k+1})\big)$. Using (4.6) with $t=-1$, for any $a<\alpha$ we have that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathcal{T}_\beta\big([2^k,2^{k+1})\big) > -1\Big) \leqslant c_a\beta^a 2^{k\frac{a}{2\alpha}}\big(2^k-1\big)^{-a} \leqslant c_{a,K}\,2^{k(\frac{1}{2\alpha}-1)}.$$

Since $\frac{1}{2\alpha}-1<0$, by Borel-Cantelli lemma we obtain that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. there exists $k_0>0$ such that $\mathcal{T}_\beta\big([2^k,2^{k+1})\big) \leqslant -1$ for all $k \geqslant k_0$. This concludes the proof. □

Then, since we now consider paths with entropy bounded by B_0, we can restrict the Poisson Point Process $\mathcal{P}$ to $\mathbb{R}_+\times[0,1]\times[-\sqrt{2B_0},\sqrt{2B_0}]$. In this case we write a realization of the Poisson Point Process by using its ordered statistic. More precisely we introduce $M_i := (8B_0)^{1/2\alpha}(\mathcal{E}_1+\cdots+\mathcal{E}_i)^{-1/\alpha}$, where $(\mathcal{E}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an i.i.d. sequence of exponential of mean 1 and $(Y_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a i.i.d. sequence of uniform random variables on $[0,1]\times[-\sqrt{2B_0},\sqrt{2B_0}]$, independent of $(\mathcal{E}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$. Then, $\mathcal{P} \overset{(d)}{=} (M_i,Y_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\pi(s) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty M_i 1_{\{Y_i\in s\}}$.

For any $\ell\in\mathbb{N}$, we let $\pi^{(\ell)} := \sum_{i=1}^\ell M_i 1_{Y_i\in s}$ be the "truncated" energy of a path: we can write for any $\beta<K$, and any $\delta>0$ such that $\beta+\delta\leqslant K$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_{\beta+\delta} = \mathcal{T}_{\beta+\delta}\big([0,B_0]\big) \leqslant \sup_{s\in\mathscr{D},\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant B_0}&\big\{(\beta+\delta)\pi^{(\ell)}(s) - \mathrm{Ent}(s)\big\}\\ &+(\beta+\delta)\sup_{s\in\mathscr{D},\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant B_0}\big|\pi(s)-\pi^{(\ell)}(s)\big|\,.\end{aligned}$$

Then, we show that

$$\max_{s\in\mathscr{D},\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant B_0}\big|\pi(s)-\pi^{(\ell)}(s)\big| \xrightarrow[\ell\to\infty]{a.s.} 0\,. \tag{4.13}$$

Hence, for any fixed ε, we can a.s. choose some ℓ_ε such that for any $\beta<K$ and any $\delta>0$ with $\beta+\delta\leqslant K$

$$\mathcal{T}_\beta \leqslant \mathcal{T}_{\beta+\delta} \leqslant \sup_{s\in\mathscr{D},\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant B_0}\big\{(\beta+\delta)\pi^{(\ell)}(s)-\mathrm{Ent}(s)\big\} + K\varepsilon\,.$$

Then, letting $\delta\downarrow 0$, and since the supremum can now be reduced to a finite set (we consider only ℓ points), we get that for any $\beta<K$

$$\mathcal{T}_\beta \leqslant \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\mathcal{T}_{\beta+\delta} \leqslant \sup_{s\in\mathscr{D},\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant B_0}\big\{\beta\pi^{(\ell)}(s)-\mathrm{Ent}(s)\big\} + \varepsilon \leqslant \mathcal{T}_\beta + \varepsilon\,.$$

Since ε is arbitrary, this shows that $\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\mathcal{T}_{\beta+\delta}=\mathcal{T}_\beta$ a.s., that is $\beta\mapsto\mathcal{T}_\beta$ is right-continuous.

It remains to prove (4.13). For any $i\in\mathbb{N}$ we consider $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_i=\{Y_1,\dots,Y_i\}$ and for any given path s we define $\Delta_i=\Delta_i(s)=s\cap\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_i$ the set of the i largest weights collected by s. Then, let $\mathcal{L}_i^{(B_0)}=\sup_{s\in\mathscr{D}_{B_0}}|\Delta_i(s)|$, as introduced in (2.2). Realizing that $1_{\{Y_i\in s\}}=|\Delta_i(s)|-|\Delta_{i-1}(s)|$, and integrating by parts (as done in [11]), we obtain for any $s\in\mathscr{D}_{B_0}$

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(s)-\pi^{(\ell)}(s)&=\sum_{i>\ell}M_i1_{\{Y_i\in s\}}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=\ell+1}^{n}M_i\big(|\Delta_i|-|\Delta_{i-1}|\big)\\&=\lim_{n\to\infty}\Big(\sum_{i=\ell+1}^{n-1}|\Delta_i|(M_i-M_{i+1})+M_n|\Delta_n|-M_\ell|\Delta_\ell|\Big)\\&\leqslant\sum_{i=\ell+1}^{\infty}\mathcal{L}_i^{(B_0)}(M_i-M_{i+1})+\limsup_{n\to\infty}M_n\mathcal{L}_n^{(B_0)}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.14}$$

At this stage, the law of large numbers gives that $\lim_{n\to\infty}n^{1/\alpha}M_n=(8B_0)^{1/2\alpha}$ a.s., and Corollary 2.2 gives that $\limsup_{n\to\infty}n^{-1/2}\mathcal{L}_n^{(B_0)}<+\infty$ a.s. Since $\alpha<2$, we therefore conclude that $\limsup_{n\to\infty}M_n\mathcal{L}_n^{(B_0)}=0$ a.s.

We let $U_\ell:=\sum_{i>\ell}\mathcal{L}_i^{(B_0)}(M_i-M_{i-1})$. We are going to show that there exists some ℓ_0 such that $\sum_{i>\ell_0}\mathcal{L}_i^{(B)}(M_i-M_{i-1})<\infty$ a.s., and thus $\lim_{\ell\to\infty}U_\ell=0$ a.s. We show that $\mathbb{E}[U_{\ell_0}^2]$ is finite for ℓ_0 large enough. For any $\varepsilon>0$, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have that

$$U_{\ell_0}\leqslant\Big(\sum_{i>\ell_0}\big(i^{-\frac12-\varepsilon}\big)^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\sum_{i>\ell_0}\big(i^{-\frac12+\varepsilon}\mathcal{L}_i^{(B_0)}(M_i-M_{i+1})\big)^2\Big)^{1/2}.$$

Then, we get that for ℓ_0 large enough

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[U_{\ell_0}^2]&\leqslant C\sum_{i>\ell_0}i^{1+2\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}\big[(\mathcal{L}_i^{(B)})^2\big]\mathbb{E}\big[(M_i-M_{i-1})^2\big]\\&\leqslant C'_{B_0}\sum_{i>\ell_0}i^{1+2\varepsilon}\times i\times i^{-2-2/\alpha}<+\infty\,.\end{aligned}$$

Here, we used Corollary 2.2 and a straightforward calculation that gives $\mathbb{E}\big[(M_i-M_{i-1})^2\big]\leqslant ci^{-2-2/\alpha}$ for i large enough (see for instance Equation (7.2) in [11]). Provided ε is small enough so that $2\varepsilon-2/\alpha<-1$ we obtain that $\mathbb{E}[U_{\ell_0}^2]<\infty$. □

4.6. **Existence and uniqueness of the maximizer.** As a consequence of Lemma 4.2, to show that the supremum is attained and is unique in (2.9), it is enough to prove the following result.

Lemma 4.3. *For a.e. realization of $\mathcal{P}$ and for any $B>0$ we have that*

$$s_\beta^*(B)=\operatorname*{arg\,max}_{s\in\mathscr{D}_B}\big\{\beta\pi(s)-\mathrm{Ent}(s)\big\}$$

exists, and it is unique. Here, we defined $\mathscr{D}_B:=\{s\in\mathscr{D}\colon\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant B\}$.

Proof. Our first step is to show that $\mathscr{D}_B$ is compact for the uniform norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Let us observe that for any $s:[0,1]\to\mathbb{R}$, the condition $\mathrm{Ent}(s)\leqslant B$ implies that

$$|s(x)-s(y)|\leqslant\int_y^x|s'(t)|dt\leqslant(2B)^{1/2}|x-y|^{1/2},\qquad\forall\,x,y\in[0,1],$$

so that s belongs to the Hölder Space $C^{1/2}([0,1])$. Hence, $\mathscr{D}_B$ is included in $C^{1/2}([0,1])$ which is compact for the uniform norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ by the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem. We therefore only need to show that $\mathscr{D}_B$ is closed for the uniform norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$.

For this purpose we consider a convergent sequence s_n and we denote by $\mathbf{s}$ its limit. Since $\mathrm{Ent}(s_n) = \frac{1}{2}\|s_n'\|_{L^2}^2$ for all n, we have that $(s_n')_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ belongs to the (closed) ball of radius $(2B)^{1/2}$ of $L^2([0,1])$. By Banach–Alaoglu theorem, the sequence $(s_n')_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ contains a weakly convergent subsequence. This means that there exist n_k and $s^\star$ such that

$$\int_0^1 \varphi(x)s_{n_k}'(x)\mathrm{d}x \xrightarrow[k\to\infty]{} \int_0^1 \varphi(s)s^\star(x)dx, \qquad \forall\varphi\in L^2([0,1]).$$

By uniqueness of the limit (and taking $\varphi(x) = 1_{\{[0,y]\}}(x)$), this relation implies that $\mathbf{s}(y) = \int_0^y s^\star(x)dx$, that is $\mathbf{s}' = s^\star$ almost everywhere. Since the L^2 norm is weakly lower semi-continuous by the Hahn-Banach theorem – that is $\|s^\star\|_{L^2} \leqslant \liminf_{k\to\infty}\|s_{n_k}'\|_{L^2}$ – we obtain that $\mathbf{s}\in\mathscr{D}_B$, so $\mathscr{D}_B$ is closed. As a by-product of this argument we also have that the entropy function $s\mapsto \mathrm{Ent}(s)$ is lower semi-continuous on $(\mathscr{D}_B, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$.

Existence of the maximizer. Since $\mathscr{D}_B$ is compact, the existence of the maximizer comes from the fact that the function

$$t_\beta(s) := \beta\pi(s) - \mathrm{Ent}(s) \tag{4.15}$$

is upper semi-continuous, thanks to the extreme value theorem tells. Since we have already shown that $s\mapsto\mathrm{Ent}(s)$ is lower semi-continuous, we only need to prove the following.

Lemma 4.4. *For a.e. realization of $\mathcal{P}$ and for any $B>0$ the function $s\mapsto\pi(s)$ is upper semi-continuous on $(\mathscr{D}_B, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$.*

Proof. We recall that if $s\in\mathscr{D}_B$ then $\max_{t\in[0,1]}|s(t)| \leqslant \sqrt{2B}$. Therefore, using the same notations as above, we can write a realization of the Poisson Point Process $\mathcal{P}$ by using its ordered statistic: $\mathcal{P} = (M_i, Y_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, $\pi(s) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty M_i 1_{\{Y_i\in s\}}$, and recall that for any $\ell\in\mathbb{N}$ we let $\pi^{(\ell)} := \sum_{i=1}^\ell M_i 1_{\{Y_i\in s\}}$. Thanks to (4.13), we only need to prove that for any fixed $\ell\in\mathbb{N}$ the function $s\mapsto\pi^{(\ell)}(s)$ is upper semi-continuous: then $\pi(s)$, as the uniform limit of $\pi^{(\ell)}$, is still upper semi-continuous.

For any $s\in\mathscr{D}_B$ we let $\iota_s := \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_\ell\backslash\{s\cap\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_\ell\}$ be the set of all points of $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_\ell = \{Y_1,\dots,Y_\ell\}$ that are not in s. Since there are finitely many points, we realize that there exists $\eta = \eta(s,\ell) > 0$ such that $d_H(\iota_s, \mathrm{graph}(s)) > \eta$, with d_H is the Hausdorff distance.

Given $s\in\mathscr{D}_B$, we consider a sequence $(s_n)_n$, $s_n\in\mathscr{D}_B$ that converges to s, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\|s_n - s\|_\infty = 0$. We observe that whenever $\|s_n - s\|_\infty \leqslant \eta/2$, we have that $d_H(\iota_s, \mathrm{graph}(s_n)) > \eta/2$. This means that for n large enough

$$\{s_n\cap\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_\ell\}\subset\{s\cap\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_\ell\},$$

which implies that $\pi^{(\ell)}(s) \geqslant \limsup_{n\to\infty}\pi^{(\ell)}(s_n)$. □

Uniquenes of the maximizer. The strategy is very similar to the one used in [2, Lemma 4.1] or [11, Lemma 4.2]. For any $s\in\mathscr{D}_B$, we let $I(s) := \{s\cap\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_\infty\}$, where we $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_\infty = \{Y_i,\, i\in\mathbb{N}\}$.

Let us assume that we have two maximizers $s_1\neq s_2$. Since $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_\infty$ is dense in $[0,1]\times[-\sqrt{2B},\sqrt{2B}]$ we have that $I(s_1)\neq I(s_2)$. In particular, there exists i_0 such that $Y_{i_0}\in I(s_1)$ and $Y_{i_0}\notin I(s_2)$, and since s_1 and s_2 are two maximizers of (4.15) it means

$$\max_{s:\, Y_{i_0}\in I(s)} t_\beta(s) = \max_{s:\, Y_{i_0}\notin I(s)} t_\beta(s).$$

This implies that

$$\beta M_{i_0} = \max_{s\colon Y_{i_0}\notin I(s)} t_\beta(s) - \max_{s\colon Y_{i_0}\in I(s)} \left\{\beta \sum_{j,j\neq i_0} M_j 1_{\{Y_j\in s\}} - \mathrm{Ent}(s)\right\}. \tag{4.16}$$

Conditioning on $(Y_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(M_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N},j\neq i_0}$ we have that the l.h.s. has a continuous distribution – the distribution of $M_{i_0}^{-\alpha}$ conditional on $(Y_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(M_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N},j\neq i_0}$ is uniform on the interval $[M_{i_0-1}^{-\alpha}, M_{i_0+1}^{-\alpha}]$ –, while the r.h.s. is a constant – it is independent of M_{i_0}. Therefore the event (4.16) has zero probability, and by sigma sub-additivity we get that $\mathbb{P}\big(I(s_1)\neq I(s_2)\big)=0$, which contradicts the existence of two distinct maximizers. □

5. Proof of Proposition 2.6 and Theorem 2.7

Let us state right away a lemma that will prove to be useful in the rest of the paper.

Lemma 5.1. *For any $\eta>0$, there exists a constant c such that, for any $t>1$ and any $\ell\leqslant nh$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(M_\ell^{(n,h)} > tm(\tfrac{nh}{\ell})\Big) \leqslant (ct)^{-(1-\eta)\alpha\ell}.$$

Proof. We simply write that by a union bound

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(M_r^{(n,h)} > tm(\tfrac{nh}{r})\Big) \leqslant \binom{nh}{r}\mathbb{P}\Big(\omega_1 > tm(\tfrac{nh}{r})\Big)^r \leqslant \Big(c\frac{nh}{r}\mathbb{P}\big(\omega_1 > tm(\tfrac{nh}{r})\big)\Big)^r.$$

Then, since $\mathbb{P}(\omega_1>x)$ is regularly varying with exponent $-\alpha$, Potter's bound (cf. [6]) gives that there is a constant c_η such that for any $t\geqslant 1$

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\omega_1 > tm(\tfrac{nh}{r})\big) \leqslant c_\eta t^{-(1-\eta)\alpha}\mathbb{P}\big(\omega_1 > m(\tfrac{nh}{r})\big) = c_\eta t^{-(1-\eta)\alpha}\,\frac{nh}{r},$$

where we used the definition of $m(\cdot)$ in the last identity. This concludes the proof. □

5.1. **Continuum limit of the ordered statistic.** For any $q>0$ let $\Lambda_{n,qh}=[\![1,n]\!]\times[\![-qh,qh]\!]$ and let $(M_r^{(n,qh)}, Y_r^{(n,qh)})_{r=1}^{|\Lambda_{n,qh}|}$ be the ordered statistic in that box, cf. (2.13). If we rescale $\Lambda_{n,qh}$ by $n\times h$, and we let $(\widetilde{Y}_r^{(n,qh)})_{r=1}^{|\Lambda_{n,h}|}$ be the rescaled permutation, *i.e.* a random permutation of the points of the set $([0,1]\times[-q,q])\cap(\frac{\mathbb{N}}{n}\times\frac{\mathbb{Z}}{h})$. Then for any fixed $\ell\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\big(\widetilde{Y}_1^{(n,qh)},\dots,\widetilde{Y}_\ell^{(n,qh)}\big) \xrightarrow{(\mathrm{d})} \big(Y_1,\dots,Y_\ell\big), \quad \text{as} \quad n,h\to\infty, \tag{5.1}$$

where $(Y_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an i.i.d. sequence of uniform random variables on $[0,1]\times[-q,q]$. For the continuum limit for the weight sequence $(M_r^{(n,qh)})_{r=1}^{|\Lambda_{n,qh}|}$, we use some basic facts of the classical extreme value theory (see e.g., [14]), that is for all $\ell\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\Big(\widetilde{M}_i^{(n,qh)} := \frac{M_i^{(n,qh)}}{m(nh)},\ i=1,\dots,\ell\Big) \xrightarrow{(\mathrm{d})} \big(M_i,\ i=1,\dots,\ell\big), \tag{5.2}$$

where $(M_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the *continuum weight sequence*. The sequence $(M_i)_{i\geqslant 1}$ can be defined as $M_i := (2q)^{1/\alpha}(\mathcal{E}_1+\cdots+\mathcal{E}_i)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$, where $(\mathcal{E}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an i.i.d. sequence of exponential random variables of mean 1, independent of the Y_i's.

In such a way $(M_i,Y_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the ordered statistic associated with a realization of a Poisson Point Process on $[0,\infty)\times[0,1]\times[-q,q]$ of intensity $\mu(\mathrm{d}w,\mathrm{d}t,\mathrm{d}x)=\frac{\alpha}{2}w^{-\alpha-1}1_{\{w>0\}}\mathrm{d}w\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}x$.

5.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.7.** For any $q > 0$, we consider the Poisson Point Process restricted to $[0,1] \times [-q,q]$, and we label its elements according to its ordered statistic $(M_i, Y_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$. For any $\Delta \subset [0,1] \times [-q,q]$ we define $\pi^{(\ell)}(\Delta) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} M_i 1_{\{Y_i \in \Delta\}}$ and $\pi^{(>\ell)}(\Delta) := \pi(\Delta) - \pi^{(\ell)}(\Delta)$. In analogy with the discrete setting (cf. (2.16)), we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{\nu,q}^{(>\ell)} &= \sup_{s\in\mathscr{M}_q} \left\{\nu\pi^{(>\ell)}(s) - \mathrm{Ent}(s)\right\}, \\ \mathcal{T}_{\nu,q}^{(\ell)} &= \sup_{s\in\mathscr{M}_q} \left\{\nu\pi^{(\ell)}(s) - \mathrm{Ent}(s)\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

We first show the convergence (2.20) of the large-weights variational problem, before we prove (2.19).

Convergence of the large weights. Note that the maximum of $T_{n,qh}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\nu,q}^{(\ell)}$ are achieved on $\Upsilon_\ell = \Upsilon_\ell(q)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_\ell = \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_\ell(q)$ respectively, that is

$$\begin{aligned} T_{n,qh}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)} &= \max_{\Delta\subset\Upsilon_\ell} \left\{\beta_{n,h}\Omega_{n,h}^{(\ell)}(\Delta) - \mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\right\}, \\ \mathcal{T}_{\nu,q}^{(\ell)} &= \sup_{\Delta\subset\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_\ell} \left\{\nu\pi^{(\ell)}(\Delta) - \mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

where $\Upsilon_\ell(q)$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_\ell(q)$) is the set of the locations of the ℓ largest weights inside $\Lambda_{n,qh}$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{1,q}$). Since we have only a finite number of points, the convergence (2.20) is a consequence of (5.1) and (5.2) and the Skorokhod representation theorem.

Restriction to the large weights. To show the convergence (2.19), it is therefore enough to control the contribution of the large weights. Let $\delta > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2} > \delta$. Using Potter's bound (cf. [6]) we have that

$$\left(\beta_{n,h} m(nh/\ell)\right)^{\frac{4}{3}} \left(\frac{\ell^2 n}{h^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leqslant c\frac{h^2}{n}\ell^{-\frac{4}{3}(\frac{1}{\alpha}-\frac{1}{2}-\delta)}.$$

Plugging it into (2.18) and taking $b = b_{\ell,\varepsilon} := \varepsilon\, \ell^{\frac{4}{3}(\frac{1}{\alpha}-\frac{1}{2}+\delta)}$, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\frac{n}{h^2} T_{n,qh}^{\beta_{n,h},(>\ell)} \geqslant \varepsilon\Big) \leqslant c' b_{\ell,\varepsilon}^{-\alpha\ell/4} + e^{-c' b_{\ell,\varepsilon}^{1/4}} \overset{\ell\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0, \tag{5.5}$$

uniformly on n, h. Combined with (2.20) and the first part of (2.21), this gives the convergence (2.19).

Proof of (2.21).

This is a simple consequence of the monotonicity of $\ell \mapsto \mathcal{T}_{\nu,q}^{(\ell)}$ and of $q \mapsto \mathcal{T}_{\nu,q}$ (together with the fact that $\mathcal{T}_\nu$ is well defined).

5.3. **Proof of Proposition 2.6.** Let us first focus on $T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)}$. As in (4.4) in the continuous setting, we introduce, for any interval $[c,d)$,

$$T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)}\big([c,d)\big) := \max_{\Delta\subset\Lambda_{n,h},\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\in[c,d)} \left\{\beta_{n,h}\Omega_{n,h}^{(\ell)}(\Delta) - \mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\right\}. \tag{5.6}$$

Then, we realize that for any $d > 0$

$$T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)} = T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)}\big([0,d)\big) \vee \sup_{k\geqslant 1} T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)}\big([2^{k-1}d, 2^k d)\big).$$

Using that

$$T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)}\big([2^{k-1}d, 2^k d)\big) \leqslant \beta_{n,h} \sup_{\Delta\,:\,\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant 2^k d} \Omega_{n,h}^{(\ell)}(\Delta) - 2^{k-1}d, \quad \text{for } k \geqslant 1,$$

$$T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)}\big([0, d)\big) \leqslant \beta_{n,h} \sup_{\Delta\,:\,\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant d} \Omega_{n,h}^{(\ell)}(\Delta),$$

with the choice $d = b\,\widehat{\beta}$ and $\widehat{\beta} := (\beta_{n,h} m(nh))^{4/3}(n/h^2)^{1/3}$, a union bound gives that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(\ell)} \geqslant b\widehat{\beta}\Big) &\leqslant \sum_{k\geqslant 0} \mathbb{P}\Big(\beta_{n,h} \sup_{\Delta\,:\,\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant 2^k b\widehat{\beta}} \Omega_{n,h}^{(\ell)}(\Delta) \geqslant 2^{k-1} b\widehat{\beta}\Big) \\ &\leqslant \sum_{k\geqslant 0} \mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{\Delta\,:\,\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant 2^k b\widehat{\beta}} \Omega_{n,h}^{(\ell)}(\Delta) \geqslant 2^{k-1} b\, m(nh)\big(\widehat{\beta}n/h^2\big)^{1/4}\Big), \qquad (5.7)\end{aligned}$$

where we use that $\widehat{\beta}$ satisfies the equation $\widehat{\beta} = \beta_{n,h} m(nh)(\widehat{\beta}n/h^2)^{1/4}$.

We then need the following lemma, analogous to Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 5.2. *For any $a < \alpha$, there exists a constant c such that for any $B \geqslant 1$, $n, h \geqslant 1$, and any $t > 1$*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{\Delta\,:\,\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant B} \Omega_{n,h}^{(\ell)}(\Delta) \geqslant t \times m(nh)\big(Bn/h^2\big)^{1/4}\Big) \leqslant ct^{-a}$$

Applying this lemma in (5.7) (with $B = 2^k b\widehat{\beta}$, $t = 2^{3k/4-1}b^{3/4}$), we get that for any $k \geqslant 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{\Delta\,:\,\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant 2^k b\widehat{\beta}} \Omega_{n,h}^{(\ell)}(\Delta) \geqslant 2^{k-1} b m(nh)(\widehat{\beta}n/h^2)^{1/4}\Big) \leqslant c(2^k b)^{-3a/4},$$

so that summing over k in (5.7), we get Proposition 2.6.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. We mimic here the proof of Lemma 4.1, but we need to keep the dependence on the parameters n, h, B. For $i \geqslant 0$, we denote $\Upsilon_i := \{Y_1^{(n,h)}, \dots, Y_i^{(n,h)}\}$ with the $Y_j^{(n,h)}$ introduced in Section 2.3 ($\Upsilon_0 = \varnothing$), and for any Δ we let $\Delta_i := \Delta \cap \Upsilon_i$ be the restriction of Δ to the i largest weights. As in (4.8), we can write

$$\frac{1}{m(nh)(Bn/h^2)^{1/4}} \times \sup_{\Delta:\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant B} \Omega_{n,h}^{(\ell)}(\Delta) \leqslant \sum_{j=0}^{\log_2 \ell} \widetilde{M}_{2^j} \widetilde{L}_{2^{j+1}}, \qquad (5.8)$$

where $\widetilde{M}_i = M_i^{(n,h)}/m(nh)$ and $\widetilde{L}_i = L_i^{(B)}(n,h)/(Bn/h^2)^{1/4}$ are the renormalized weights and E-LPP (we drop the dependence on n, h, B for notational convenience).

As in the proof of Lemma 4.1, we fix some $\delta > 0$ such that $1/\alpha - 1/2 > 2\delta$, and as for (4.9), the probability in Lemma 5.2 is bounded by

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\log_2 \ell} \Big[\mathbb{P}\Big(\widetilde{L}_{2^{j+1}} > C' \log t\, (2^{j+1})^{1/2+\delta}\Big) + \mathbb{P}\Big(\widetilde{M}_{2^j} > C'' \frac{t}{\log t}(2^j)^{-1/\alpha+\delta}\Big)\Big]. \qquad (5.9)$$

For the first probability in the sum, we obtain from Theorem 2.1-(ii) that provided that $C'(\log t)2^{j\delta} \geqslant 2C_0^{1/2}$

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\widetilde{L}_{2^{j+1}} > C' \log t\, (2^{j+1})^{1/2+\delta)}\Big) \leqslant \Big(\frac{1}{2}\Big)^{C'(\log t)2^{j\delta}} \leqslant t^{-(\log 2)C'2^{j\delta}}. \qquad (5.10)$$

Then, the first sum in (5.9) is bounded by t^{-a} provided that C' had been fixed large enough.

For the second probability in (5.9), we use Lemma 5.1 above to get that for any $a < \alpha$

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\widetilde{M}_{2^j} > C'' \frac{t}{\log t}(2^j)^{-1/\alpha+\delta}\Big) \leqslant \mathbb{P}\Big(M_{2^j}^{(n,h)} > C''' \frac{t}{\log t}(2^j)^{\delta/2} m(nh2^{-j})\Big)$$
$$\leqslant c(\log t)^a t^{-a}(2^j)^{-a\delta}\,. \tag{5.11}$$

For the first inequality, we used Potter's bound to get that $m(nh2^{-j}) \leqslant cm(nh)(2^j)^{-1/\alpha+\delta/2}$. We conclude that the second sum in (5.9) is bounded by a constant times $(\log t)^a t^{-a}$.

All together, and possibly decreasing the value a a (by an arbitrarily small anount), this yields Lemma 5.2. □

Let us now turn to the case of $T_{n,h}^{\beta_{n,h},(>\ell)}$. We first need an analogue of Lemma 5.2.

Lemma 5.3. *There exists a constant c such that for any $B \geqslant 1$, $n, h \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leqslant \ell \leqslant nh$, for any $t > 1$*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{\Delta\,:\,\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant B} \Omega_{n,h}^{(>\ell)}(\Delta) \geqslant t \times m(nh/\ell)\,\ell^{1/2}\big(Bn/h^2\big)^{1/4}\Big) \leqslant ct^{-\alpha\ell/3} + e^{-c\sqrt{t}}\,.$$

Proof. Analogously to (5.8), we get that

$$\frac{1}{m(nh/\ell)\ell^{1/2}(Bn/h^2)^{1/4}} \times \sup_{\Delta:\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant B} \Omega_{n,h}^{(>\ell)}(\Delta)$$
$$\leqslant \sum_{j=0}^{\log_2(nh/\ell)} \frac{M_{2^j\ell}^{(n,h)}}{m(nh/\ell)} \frac{L_{2^{j+1}\ell}^{(n,h)}}{\ell^{1/2}(Bn/h^2)^{1/4}}\,, \tag{5.12}$$

Then, we get similarly to (5.10)-(5.11) that for any $\delta > 0$: (a) thanks to Theorem 2.1-(ii) we have

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\frac{L_{2^{j+1}\ell}^{(n,h)}}{\ell^{1/2}(Bn/h^2)^{1/4}} \geqslant C'\sqrt{t}(2^{j+1})^{1/2+\delta}\Big) \leqslant \Big(\frac{1}{2}\Big)^{C'\sqrt{t}2^{j\delta}} \leqslant e^{-c\sqrt{t}\,2^{\delta j}}\,; \tag{5.13}$$

(b) thanks to Lemma 5.1 we have

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\frac{M_{2^j\ell}^{(n,h)}}{m(nh/\ell)} \geqslant C''\sqrt{t}(2^j)^{-1/\alpha+\delta}\Big) \leqslant ct^{-\alpha\ell/3}(2^j)^{-\alpha\delta\ell/2}\,. \tag{5.14}$$

Lemma 5.3 follows from a bound analogous to (5.9). □

Then, setting $\widehat{\beta}_\ell = (\beta_{nh}m(nh/\ell))^{4/3}(\ell^2 n/h^2))^{\frac{1}{3}}$ so that we have $\widehat{\beta}_\ell = \beta_{n,h}m(nh/\ell)\ell^{1/2}(\widehat{\beta}_\ell n/h^2)^{1/4}$, we obtain similarly to (5.7) that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(T_{n,h}{}^{\beta_{n,h},(>\ell)} \geqslant b \times \widehat{\beta}_\ell\Big)$$
$$\leqslant \sum_{k\geqslant 0} \mathbb{P}\Big(\beta_{n,h} \sup_{\Delta\,:\,\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant 2^k b\widehat{\beta}_\ell} \Omega_{n,h}^{(>\ell)}(\Delta) \geqslant 2^{k-1}b\widehat{\beta}_\ell\Big)$$
$$\leqslant \sum_{k\geqslant 0} \mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{\Delta\,:\,\mathrm{Ent}(\Delta)\leqslant 2^k b\widehat{\beta}_\ell} \Omega_{n,h}^{(>\ell)}(\Delta) \geqslant 2^{k-1}b\; m(nh/\ell)(\ell^2\widehat{\beta}_\ell n/h^2)^{1/4}\Big)$$
$$\leqslant \sum_{k\geqslant 0} \Big(c(2^k b)^{-\alpha\ell/4} + e^{-c2^{3k/8}b^{3/8}}\Big) \leqslant c'b^{-\alpha\ell/4} + e^{-c'b^{1/4}}\,.$$

This concludes the proof of Proposition 2.6.

Acknowledgements

We are most grateful to N. Zygouras for many enlightening discussions.

References

[1] T. Alberts, K. Khanin, and J. Quastel. The intermediate disorder regime for directed polymers in dimension 1 + 1. *Ann. Probab.*, 42:1212–1256, 2014.
[2] A. Auffinger and O. Louidor. Directed polymers in random environment with heavy tails. *Comm. on Pure and Applied Math.*, 64:183–204, 2011.
[3] J. Baik, P. Deift, and K. Johansson. On the ditribution of the longest increasing subsequence of random permutations. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 12:1119–1178, 1999.
[4] Q. Berger and N. Torri. Beyond hammersley's last-passage percolation: a discussion on possible new local and global constraints. *arXiv:1802.04046*, 2018.
[5] Q. Berger and N. Torri. Directed polymers in heavy-tail random environment. *arXiv:1802.03355*, 2018.
[6] N. H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie, and J. L. Teugels. *Regular Variation*, volume 27 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its applications*. Cambridge University Press, 1987.
[7] F. Comets. *Directed Polymers in Random Environments*, volume 2175 of *Ecole d'Eté de probabilités de Saint-Flour*. Springer International Publishing, 2016.
[8] F. Comets, T. Shiga, and N. Yoshida. Probabilistic analysis of directed polymers in a random environment: a review. *Stochastic analysis on large scale interacting systems*, 39, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo:115–142, 2004.
[9] F. den Hollander. *Random polymers*, volume 1974 of *Ecole d'Eté de probabilités de Saint-Flour*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
[10] P. S. Dey and N. Zygouras. High temperature limits for $(1+1)$-dimensional directed polymer with heavy-tailed disorder. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(6):4006–4048, 2016.
[11] B. Hambly and J. B. Martin. Heavy tails in last-passage percolation. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 137:227–275, 2007.
[12] J. M. Hammersley. A few seedlings of research. In University of California Press, editor, *Proc. Sixth Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. and Probab.*, volume 1, pages 345–394, 1972.
[13] B. F. Logan and L. A. Shepp. A variational problem for random young tableaux. *Advances in Math.*, 26:206–222, 1977.
[14] R. Resnick. *Extreme values, regular variation and point process*. Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. New York, Springer, 1987.
[15] C. Stone. On local and ratio limit theorems. *Proc. Fifth Berkeley Symp. on Math. Statist. and Prob. (Univ. of Calif. Press, 1967)*, 2:217–224, 1967.
[16] S. M. Ulam. Monte Carlo calculations in problems of mathematical physics. In *Modern mathematics for the engineer: Second series*, pages 261–281. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1961.
[17] A. M. Vershik and S. V. Kerov. Asymptotics of the plancherel measure of the symmetric group and the limiting form of young tables. *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, 18:527–531, 1977.

Sorbonne Université, LPSM, Campus Pierre et Marie Curie, case 188, 4 place Jussieu, 75252 Paris Cedex 5, France
E-mail address: quentin.berger@sorbonne-universite.fr

Sorbonne Université, LPSM, Campus Pierre et Marie Curie, case 188, 4 place Jussieu, 75252 Paris Cedex 5, France
E-mail address: niccolo.torri@sorbonne-universite.fr