

# Confluence of geodesic paths and separating loops in large planar quadrangulations

J. Bouttier and E. Guitter

Institut de Physique Théorique  
CEA, IPhT, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France  
CNRS, URA 2306  
jeremie.bouttier@cea.fr  
emmanuel.guitter@cea.fr


## Abstract

We consider planar quadrangulations with three marked vertices and discuss the geometry of triangles made of three geodesic paths joining them. We also study the geometry of minimal separating loops, i.e. paths of minimal length among all closed paths passing by one of the three vertices and separating the two others in the quadrangulation. We concentrate on the universal scaling limit of large quadrangulations, also known as the Brownian map, where pairs of geodesic paths or minimal separating loops have common parts of non-zero macroscopic length. This is the phenomenon of confluence, which distinguishes the geometry of random quadrangulations from that of smooth surfaces. We characterize the universal probability distribution for the lengths of these common parts.

## 1. Introduction

Understanding the geometry of large random quadrangulations is a fundamental issue relating combinatorics, probability theory and statistical physics. Indeed random quadrangulations, or more generally random maps, provide natural discrete models for random surfaces, for instance in the context of two-dimensional quantum gravity [1-3], and may mathematically be viewed as metric spaces endowed with the graph distance. In the same way that discrete random walks converge to the Brownian motion in a suitable scaling limit, it is expected that random planar quadrangulations converge to the so-called Brownian map [4,5] in the scaling limit where the size of the quadrangulation becomes large jointly with the fourth power of the scale at which distances are measured. This Brownian map is moreover expected to be the universal scaling limit for many models of planar maps such as random planar triangulations or more generally maps with arbitrary bounded face degrees or even maps coupled to non-critical statistical models. It can be constructed as a random metric space and has been shown to be homeomorphic to the two-dimensional sphere [6,7].

A number of local properties of the Brownian map can be derived from a detailed analysis of discrete maps. In this spirit, the simplest observable in the Brownian map is the distance between two points. The statistics of this distance is characterized by the so-called two-point function and was obtained in Ref. [8] via scaling arguments for large triangulations, and in Ref. [9] via an exact computation of the discrete two-point function for planar quadrangulations. A related quantity is the radius, whose law was studied in Refs. [10,11]. The question of estimating the number of geodesics (i.e. paths of shortest length) between two points was addressed later [12] and it was found that for typical points, all geodesics coalesce into a unique macroscopic geodesic path in the scaling limit [13,14].



**Fig. 1:** A schematic picture of the phenomenon of confluence for the geometry of triangles (a) and separating loops (b) in the scaling limit of large maps. In (a), the three geodesics (represented as thick blue lines) linking the three points  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$  and  $v_3$  have common parts of macroscopic length. The triangle is therefore characterized by six lengths (as indicated by double arrows) and by the area of the two domains delimited by its open part. In (b), a minimal separating loop passing by  $v_3$  and separating  $v_1$  from  $v_2$  also has a common part of macroscopic length and is therefore characterized by two lengths (as indicated by double arrows) and by the area of the two domains delimited by its open part.

Properties involving three points on the map give a much richer geometric information. For instance, we may consider the “triangle” made by the three geodesics between these points. In a previous paper [15], the authors have computed the joint probability distribution for the pairwise distances between three uniformly chosen random vertices in a random quadrangulation. In the scaling limit, this yields the so-called three-point function of the Brownian map, which can be interpreted as the joint law for the three side lengths of the triangle. The three-point function was considered previously in Ref. [16] where an expression involving two distances only was obtained and used as a basis for an Operator Product Expansion analysis in the limit where two of the points approach


each other. The full dependence on the three distances was found in Ref. [15] as a corollary of the exact discrete expression for quadrangulations. On the other hand, it was recognized by Le Gall that geodesics exhibit a phenomenon of *confluence* [14]. In our setting, this means that any two sides of the triangle merge before reaching their common endpoint, and hence have a common part of non-zero macroscopic length. This is quite unlike smooth surfaces where two sides of a triangle only meet at their endpoint. Thus a full characterization of the geometry of triangles involves six lengths, which are those of the three segments proper to each side and of the three segments common to two sides (see Fig. 1-(a)), as well two areas for the two domains in the map delimited by the triangle.

Beyond triangles, another interesting geometric construction involving three points is what we call a minimal separating loop, defined as follows: given three distinguished points, say  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$  and  $v_3$ , we define a separating loop as a closed path passing through  $v_3$  and *separating*  $v_1$  from  $v_2$ , in the sense that any path from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$  necessarily intersects it. A minimal separating loop is such a separating loop with minimal length. We expect the minimal separating loop to be unique at a macroscopic level, and to have a finite macroscopic length (note that, if we relax the condition that the loop passes through  $v_3$  or that it separates  $v_1$  from  $v_2$ , then clearly we can find loops of arbitrarily small length). Moreover, its two halves are geodesic paths and we again expect a phenomenon of confluence, namely the two halves share a macroscopic common segment (see Fig. 1-(b)). The characterization of the geometry of minimal separating loops involves therefore the lengths of its common and “open” parts, as well as the areas of the two domains delimited by the loop.

In this paper, we derive the probability distributions for the above parameters characterizing triangles and loops when the three points are chosen uniformly at random. This is done by explicit computations of the discrete counterparts of these distributions in the framework of planar quadrangulations, using the methodology developed in Ref. [15] and based on the Schaeffer [17] and Miermont [13] bijections between quadrangulations and well-labeled maps.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we give a precise definition of minimal separating loops in triply-pointed planar quadrangulations and compute the generating function for such quadrangulations with a *prescribed value for the loop length*. To this end, we provide in Section 2.1 two alternative bijections based on the Schaeffer and Miermont constructions relating the desired class of triply-pointed quadrangulations with suitable classes of well-labeled trees or maps. In Section 2.2, we calculate their generating functions by expressing them in terms of basic building blocks already computed in Ref. [15]. Section 2.3 is devoted to the analysis of the scaling limit, with a particular emphasis on the universal probability law for the length of the minimal separating loop, as well as its correlation with the distances between the marked vertices. In Section 3, we turn to the phenomenon of confluence, which we analyze by a refinement of the above enumeration. In Section 3.1, we give the probability law for the length of the part common to two geodesics leading to the same vertex. We then investigate the phenomenon of confluence for minimal separating loops in Section 3.2 where we

derive the probability distribution for the parameters characterizing the geometry of these loops. Section 4 is devoted to the geometry of triangles. There we revisit the bijection of Ref. [15] and solve a refined enumeration problem in order to keep track of the six lengths characterizing the triangle. We deduce their joint law in the scaling limit, and provide explicit expressions for a number of marginal laws. We discuss our results and conclude in Section 5.



**Fig. 2:** A quadrangulation with three marked vertices  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$  and  $v_3$ , represented as a traffic network, i.e. a ribbon graph with roundabouts. In (a), we show (red thick lines) a particular separating loop of length 6. In (b), the indicated separating loop is minimal, i.e. has a minimal length (here 4) among the loops passing through  $v_3$  and separating  $v_1$  from  $v_2$ .

## 2. Minimal separating loops

Consider a quadrangulation of the sphere, i.e. a planar map whose faces all have degree four, equipped with three marked distinct vertices  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$  and  $v_3$ . As customary for orientable maps, we may represent the map as a ribbon graph by splitting each edge of the quadrangulation into two oriented half-edges (with opposite orientations) so that half-edges are oriented clockwise around each face (see Fig. 2). It is also convenient to place a small counterclockwise oriented roundabout around each vertex so that the map looks like a traffic network. We can then consider (oriented) paths on this traffic network, and in particular loops made of a closed non-intersecting circuit starting from and returning back to the marked vertex  $v_3$ . Any such loop separates the sphere into two simply connected domains. Note that any vertex along the loop naturally belongs to exactly one of these domains by following the roundabout convention. The circuit is called a *separating loop* if the marked vertices  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  do not lie in the same domain (see Fig. 2 for an illustration). The length of a circuit is the number of half-edges it passes through. A *minimal separating loop* is a separating loop of minimal length.

Clearly the length  $l_{123}$  of a minimal separating loop is strictly positive and, from the bipartite nature of planar quadrangulations, it is even. Also, if we call  $d_{13}$  (respectively  $d_{23}$ ) the graph distance from  $v_1$  (respectively  $v_2$ ) to  $v_3$ , following a geodesic path back and forth from  $v_3$  to the closest vertex  $v_1$  or  $v_2$  forms a separating loop of length  $2 \min(d_{13}, d_{23})$ , therefore:


$$l_{123} \leq 2 \min(d_{13}, d_{23}) . \quad (2.1)$$

The purpose of the next sections is to enumerate triply-pointed quadrangulations whose three marked vertices have prescribed values of  $d_{13}$ ,  $d_{23}$  and  $l_{123}$ .

An alternative definition of separating loops, mentioned in the introduction, consists in taking arbitrary (possibly self-intersecting) closed paths passing through  $v_3$  and such that any path from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$  necessarily intersects them. This gives rise to a broader set of minimal separating loops but does not affect the minimal length since any such minimal separating loop can be transformed into a non self-intersecting circuit of the same length by “undoing” the crossings.

### 2.1. Combinatorics

#### *Approach via the Schaeffer bijection*




**Fig. 3:** The quadrangulation of Fig. 2 with a marked origin (corresponding to  $v_3$  in Fig. 2) and its coding (a) by a well-labeled tree (blue thick lines). The quadrangulation is recovered from the well-labeled tree by connecting each corner to its successor (dashed red arrows in (b)).

It is well-known [18] that any planar quadrangulation with  $n$  faces and a marked origin vertex is in one-to-one correspondence with a *well-labeled tree* with  $n$  edges and with minimal label 1. Here we define a well-labeled tree as a plane tree with vertices carrying integer labels  $\ell$  satisfying

$$|\ell(v) - \ell(v')| \leq 1 \text{ if } v \text{ and } v' \text{ are adjacent in the tree} . \quad (2.2)$$


As shown by Schaeffer [17], this tree can be drawn directly on the quadrangulation by applying local rules which associate with each face of the quadrangulation an edge of the tree (see Fig. 3). The tree spans all vertices of the quadrangulation except the origin, and the label of each vertex is nothing but its graph distance to the origin in the quadrangulation. Conversely, to recover the quadrangulation from the well-labeled tree, we draw non-crossing arches connecting every *corner* of the tree to its *successor*. Recall that a corner is the sector between two consecutive edges around a vertex, and the successor of a corner with label  $\ell > 1$  is the first corner with label  $\ell - 1$  encountered after it clockwise along the contour of the tree, while all corners with label 1 have the same successor which is an extra vertex added in the external face (see Fig. 3-(b)). The arches form the edges of the quadrangulation and the added vertex is the origin. Note that the *chain of successors* of a given corner (i.e. its successor, the successor of its successor, and so on until the origin) provides a geodesic path from the associated vertex to the origin.



**Fig. 4:** A well-labeled tree with two marked vertices  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ . The edges of the branch from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$  are represented as magenta thick lines and the other edges as light-blue thin solid lines. The vertex  $v_3$  is the origin added in the external face. We consider a vertex of minimal label (here 2) on the branch from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$  and represent the chains of successors (dashed red arrows) starting from two of its corners, one on each side of the branch. These form a minimal loop separating  $v_1$  from  $v_2$  and passing through  $v_3$ .

In the case of a triply-pointed quadrangulation, we can take  $v_3$  as the origin vertex and we end up with a well-labeled tree with two marked vertices  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  carrying labels  $\ell(v_1) = d_{13}$  and  $\ell(v_2) = d_{23}$ . Let us now explain how the quantity  $l_{123}$  can be read off the tree. Within the tree, there is a unique branch connecting  $v_1$  to  $v_2$  (see Fig. 4). Any loop separating  $v_1$  from  $v_2$  in the quadrangulation must intersect this branch at some vertex  $v$ . Decomposing the loop into a first part from  $v_3$  to  $v$  and a second part from  $v$  back to  $v_3$ , both parts have length larger than the distance  $\ell(v)$  from  $v$  to  $v_3$ ,

and we find that the length of the loop is larger than  $2\ell(v)$ , and hence larger than  $2u$ , where  $u$  is the minimal label encountered along the branch from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$ . This holds in particular for minimal separating loops, and we therefore have  $l_{123} \geq 2u$ . Conversely, a separating loop of length  $2u$  is obtained by considering a vertex with minimal label  $u$  on the branch, picking two corners on opposite sides of the branch and considering the chain of successors of these two corners which are both paths to  $v_3$  of length  $u$  (see Fig. 4). This implies  $l_{123} \leq 2u$  and therefore  $l_{123} = 2u$ . More generally, any minimal separating loop crosses the branch at a vertex with minimal label  $u$ , and hence it is made of two geodesic paths of the same length  $u$  joining the origin to that vertex which they reach from both sides of the branch.




**Fig. 5:** The well-labeled tree coding a triply-pointed quadrangulation with prescribed values of  $d_{13}$ ,  $d_{23}$  and  $l_{123}$ . It has two marked vertices  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  with respective labels  $s = d_{13} - l_{123}/2$  and  $t = d_{23} - l_{123}/2$ . The minimal label on the branch between  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  is 0 and the global minimal label is  $1 - u = 1 - l_{123}/2$ .

For consistency with the alternative approach described below, we decide to shift all labels on the well-labeled tree by  $-u$  so that the minimal label on the branch from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$  becomes 0. The minimal label in the whole tree is now  $1 - u$ , while  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  receive respective non-negative labels  $s \equiv d_{13} - u$  and  $t \equiv d_{23} - u$  (see Fig. 5 for an illustration). To conclude, triply-pointed quadrangulations with prescribed values of  $d_{13}$ ,  $d_{23}$  and  $l_{123}$  are in one-to-one correspondence with well-labeled trees having two marked vertices labeled  $s = d_{13} - l_{123}/2$  and  $t = d_{23} - l_{123}/2$ , such that the minimal label on the branch joining these two vertices is 0 and the global minimal label in the tree is  $1 - u = 1 - l_{123}/2$ .

#### *Approach via the Miermont bijection*

An alternative approach is based on a bijection by Miermont [13] generalizing the Schaeffer bijection to multiply-pointed planar quadrangulations. More precisely, the Miermont bijection acts on a quadrangulation equipped with, say  $p$  marked vertices  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_p$ , called *sources* and  $p$  integers  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_p$  called *delays*, satisfying the con-



**Fig. 6:** The quadrangulation of Fig. 2 with three marked vertices  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$ ,  $v_3$ , and its coding (a) by a well-labeled map (blue thick lines) using the Miermont bijection with particular delays  $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = -1$  and  $\tau_3 = -2$ . The quadrangulation is recovered from the well-labeled map by connecting each corner to its successor (dashed red arrows in (b)).

ditions:

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_i - \tau_j| &< d_{ij}, \quad 1 \leq i \neq j \leq p, \\ \tau_i - \tau_j + d_{ij} &\text{ is even, } \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq p, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where  $d_{ij}$  is the graph distance between  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ . It results into a planar map with  $p$  faces that is well-labeled, i.e. its vertices carry integer labels  $\ell$  satisfying

$$|\ell(v) - \ell(v')| \leq 1 \quad \text{if } v \text{ and } v' \text{ are adjacent in the map.} \quad (2.4)$$

Again, this map can be drawn directly on the quadrangulation by applying local rules which associate with each face of the quadrangulation an edge of the map (see Fig. 6). The map spans all vertices of the quadrangulation except the  $p$  sources and the label of a vertex  $v$  is given by

$$\ell(v) = \min_{j=1, \dots, p} d(v, v_j) + \tau_j \quad (2.5)$$

where  $d(v, v_j)$  is the graph distance from  $v$  to the source  $v_j$  in the quadrangulation. Each face of the well-labeled map encloses exactly one source of the quadrangulation and we call the faces  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_p$  accordingly. We furthermore have the property that, for any vertex  $v$  incident to  $f_i$ , the minimum in (2.5) is attained for  $j = i$ , i.e.  $d(v, v_i) = \ell(v) - \tau_i$ . In particular, the minimal label among vertices incident to  $f_i$  is  $\tau_i + 1$ , corresponding to nearest neighbors of  $v_i$ .

Conversely, to recover the quadrangulation from the well-labeled map, we add inside each face  $f_i$  an extra vertex with label  $\tau_i$  where

$$\tau_i = \min_{v \text{ incident to } f_i} \ell(v) - 1, \quad (2.6)$$



and each corner with label  $\ell$  inside  $f_i$  is connected by an arch to its successor, which is the first corner with label  $\ell - 1$  encountered counterclockwise inside the face (corresponding for the external face to the clockwise orientation around the map). The arches form the edges of the quadrangulation and the added vertices are the sources (see Fig. 6-(b)).

Let us now see how to use the Miermont bijection to address the specific question of three marked vertices with prescribed values of  $d_{13}$ ,  $d_{23}$  and  $l_{123}$ . As in Ref. [15], the idea is to supplement the Miermont bijection (here with  $p = 3$  sources) by a particular choice of delays related to  $d_{13}$ ,  $d_{23}$  and  $l_{123}$ . This particular choice will restrict the topology of the resulting well-labeled maps with 3 faces, and induce extra conditions on labels. More precisely, from the inequality (2.1), we may use the following parametrization:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{13} &= s + u , \\ d_{23} &= t + u , \\ l_{123} &= 2u , \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

with  $s, t, u$  non-negative integers, and moreover  $u \neq 0$ . Our particular choice of delays is:


$$\begin{aligned} \tau_1 &= -s = l_{123}/2 - d_{13} , \\ \tau_2 &= -t = l_{123}/2 - d_{23} , \\ \tau_3 &= -u = -l_{123}/2 . \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Note that this particular choice fulfils the general condition (2.3) except when we have the equality  $l_{123} = 2 \min(d_{13}, d_{23})$ , i.e. when  $s$  or  $t$  vanishes. This particular case must be treated separately, as will be explained below.

Assuming  $s$  and  $t$  strictly positive, a close look at the properties resulting from the choice of delays (2.8) in the Miermont bijection shows that the resulting well-labeled map is necessarily of the type displayed in Fig. 7. In particular, we find that any minimal separating loop must remain inside the face  $f_3$ , and hence *the faces  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  cannot be adjacent*, i.e. cannot be incident to a common edge. The map can be viewed as made of a skeleton map (thick lines and big dots in Fig. 7) to which trees are attached. The skeleton is necessarily made of two *cycles*  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ , which form respectively the frontier between  $f_1$  and  $f_3$ , and between  $f_2$  and  $f_3$ , together with a *bridge*  $b$  connecting  $c_1$  to  $c_2$ , and whose edges are only incident to  $f_3$ . Moreover, the labels must satisfy the following constraints (see Fig. 7):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\substack{v \text{ incident} \\ \text{to } f_1}} \ell(v) &= 1 - s , & \min_{\substack{v \text{ incident} \\ \text{to } f_2}} \ell(v) &= 1 - t , & \min_{\substack{v \text{ incident} \\ \text{to } f_3}} \ell(v) &= 1 - u , \\ \min_{v \text{ on } c_1} \ell(v) &= 0 , & \min_{v \text{ on } c_2} \ell(v) &= 0 , & \min_{v \text{ on } b} \ell(v) &= 0 . \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

The first three constraints are general consequences of the Miermont bijection and rephrase the general condition (2.6), while the last three constraints result from our




**Fig. 7:** The well-labeled map with three faces coding a triply-pointed quadrangulation with prescribed values of  $d_{13}$ ,  $d_{23}$  and  $l_{123}$ , in the case  $l_{123} < \min(d_{13}, d_{23})$ . The faces  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are not adjacent, and their frontiers with the face  $f_3$  form two cycles  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ , connected by a bridge  $b$ , whose edges are adjacent to  $f_3$  only. The minimal label for vertices incident to  $f_1$  (respectively  $f_2$  and  $f_3$ ) is  $1-s = 1-d_{13}+l_{123}/2$  (respectively  $1-t = 1-d_{23}+l_{123}/2$  and  $1-u = 1-l_{123}/2$ ). The minimal label on the cycle  $c_1$  is 0, as is that on the cycle  $c_2$  and that on the bridge  $b$ .

particular choice of delays, and can be obtained by arguments similar to those presented in Ref. [15]. More precisely, the constraint on  $c_1$  (respectively  $c_2$ ) ensures that the distance between  $v_1$  and  $v_3$  (respectively  $v_2$  and  $v_3$ ) is  $s+u$  (respectively  $t+u$ ), while the constraint on  $b$  ensures that the length of a minimal separating loop is  $2u$ . Note that the bridge  $b$  can be reduced to a single vertex, necessarily with label 0.

When  $s = 0$  and  $t > 0$ , we apply the Miermont bijection with  $p = 2$  sources only, namely  $v_2$  and  $v_3$ , and delays  $\tau_2 = -t$ ,  $\tau_3 = -u$ . We obtain a well-labeled map with two faces of the type illustrated in Fig. 8-(a). In particular,  $v_1$  is necessarily incident to  $f_3$  and has label 0, and is connected to the frontier between  $f_2$  and  $f_3$  by a bridge having non-negative labels only. This can be seen as a degenerate version of the generic case displayed in Fig. 7, where the face  $f_1$  is shrunk into a single vertex. We have a symmetric picture when  $s > 0$  and  $t = 0$ . Finally, if  $s = t = 0$ , we apply the Miermont bijection with  $p = 1$  source only (equivalent to the Schaeffer bijection), namely  $v_3$ , and delay  $\tau_3 = -u$ . We then obtain a well-labeled tree on which the vertices  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  have label 0 and the branch connecting them has non-negative labels. Again this is a degenerate case of the generic situation in which both  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  degenerate to single vertices.

To conclude, triply-pointed quadrangulations with prescribed values of  $d_{12}$ ,  $d_{13}$  and  $l_{123}$  are in one-to-one correspondence with well-labeled maps of the generic type displayed in Fig. 7, or of its degenerate versions displayed in Fig. 8.




**Fig. 8:** (a) The well-labeled map with two faces and a marked vertex coding a triply-pointed quadrangulation with prescribed values of  $d_{13}$ ,  $d_{23}$  and  $l_{123}$ , in the case  $l_{123} = d_{13} < d_{23}$ . The marked vertex  $v_1$  is incident to the face  $f_3$  and is connected to the frontier  $c_2$  between  $f_2$  and  $f_3$  by a bridge  $b$  (whose edges are adjacent to  $f_3$  only). The label of  $v_1$  is 0 and the minimal label for vertices incident to  $f_2$  (respectively  $f_3$ ) is  $1 - t = 1 - d_{23} + l_{123}/2$  (respectively  $1 - u = 1 - l_{123}/2$ ). The minimal label on the cycle  $c_2$  is 0, as is that on the bridge  $b$ . (b) The well-labeled tree with two marked vertices coding a triply-pointed quadrangulation with prescribed values of  $d_{13}$ ,  $d_{23}$  and  $l_{123}$ , in the case  $l_{123} = d_{13} = d_{23}$ . The marked vertices  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are connected by a branch  $b$  and have label 0. The global minimal label is  $1 - u = 1 - l_{123}/2$ , while the minimal label on the branch  $b$  is 0.

## 2.2. Generating functions

### Known generating functions

We can now readily relate the generating functions of the various well-labeled maps above to those introduced in Ref. [15]. As usual, we attach a weight  $g$  to each edge of a well-labeled map, which amounts to a weight  $g$  per face of the quadrangulation. The



**Fig. 9:** A schematic picture of the known generating functions  $R_\ell$ ,  $X_{s,t}$ ,  $\tilde{X}_{\ell;s,t}$  and  $Y_{s,t,u}$  (see the text).

first generating function is that of well-labeled trees planted at a corner with label  $\ell > 0$  and whose labels are all larger than or equal to 1 (see Fig. 9). It reads [9]:

$$R_\ell = R \frac{[\ell]_x [\ell + 3]_x}{[\ell + 1]_x [\ell + 2]_x} \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$[\ell]_x \equiv \frac{1 - x^\ell}{1 - x} \quad (2.11)$$

and where

$$R = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 12g}}{6g}, \quad (2.12)$$

$$x = \frac{1 - 24g - \sqrt{1 - 12g} + \sqrt{6}\sqrt{72g^2 + 6g + \sqrt{1 - 12g}} - 1}{2(6g + \sqrt{1 - 12g} - 1)}.$$

Note that  $R_\ell = 1 + \mathcal{O}(g)$  for all  $\ell \geq 1$ , with a conventional weight 1 for the tree reduced to a single vertex. The generating function of well-labeled trees planted at a corner with label  $\ell \geq 0$  and whose labels are all larger than or equal to  $1 - s$ , for some  $s > 0$ , is then simply given by  $R_{\ell+s}$ , as obtained by a simple shift of all labels by  $s$ .

The second generating function is that of well-labeled trees with two distinct marked vertices having label 0, connected by a branch with non-negative labels only, and such that the trees attached to one side of the branch have labels larger than or equal to  $1 - s$  and those attached to the other side have labels larger than or equal to  $1 - t$ , with  $s > 0$  and  $t > 0$  (see Fig. 9). By convention, the trees attached to the marked vertices are assumed to be on opposite sides, so that the result is symmetric in  $s$  and  $t$ . This generating function reads [15]:

$$\begin{aligned} X_{s,t} &= \sum_{m \geq 0} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{M}=(\ell_0, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_m=0) \\ \text{s.t. } \ell_i \geq 0, \ |\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i| \leq 1, \ i=0, \dots, m-1}} \prod_{k=0}^{m-1} g R_{\ell_k+s} R_{\ell_k+t} \\ &= \frac{[3]_x [s+1]_x [t+1]_x [s+t+3]_x}{[1]_x [s+3]_x [t+3]_x [s+t+1]_x}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Note that  $X_{s,t} = 1 + \mathcal{O}(g)$ , with a conventional weight 1 for the tree reduced to a single vertex, which is added for convenience to the family of trees enumerated by  $X_{s,t}$ .

We may instead consider well-labeled trees with two marked vertices, one with label  $\ell > 0$ , the other with label 0, with *strictly positive* labels on the branch inbetween and such that the trees attached to one side have labels larger than or equal to  $1 - s$  and those attached to the other side have labels larger than or equal to  $1 - t$ , with  $s > 0$  and  $t > 0$  (see Fig. 9). The tree attached to extremity with label  $\ell$  is assumed to have labels larger than or equal to  $1 - s$  and that attached to the extremity with label 0 is assumed to have labels larger than or equal to  $1 - t$ . The resulting generating function reads [15]:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_{\ell;s,t} &= \sum_{m \geq \ell} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{M}=(\ell=\ell_0, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_m=0) \\ \text{s.t. } \ell_i > 0, \ |\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i| \leq 1, \ i=0, \dots, m-1}} g R_{\ell+s} R_t \prod_{k=1}^{m-1} g R_{\ell_k+s} R_{\ell_k+t} \\ &= \frac{x^\ell [s+1]_x [s+2]_x [t]_x [t+3]_x [2\ell+s+t+3]_x}{[s+t+3]_x [\ell+s+1]_x [\ell+s+2]_x [\ell+t]_x [\ell+t+3]_x}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

This last formula extends to  $\ell = 0$  where it yields  $X_{0;s,t} = 1$ , corresponding again to a conventional weight 1 for the tree reduced to a single vertex.

The final generating function counts well-labeled trees with three marked vertices, say  $w_1, w_2, w_3$ , and with the following constraints (see Fig. 9). On the tree, the marked vertices are connected by three branches joining at a central vertex. We impose that the branches leading respectively to  $w_1, w_2$  and  $w_3$  appear clockwise around this central vertex. We also impose that all labels on these branches be strictly positive, except for  $w_1, w_2$  and  $w_3$ , which have label 0. We further impose that trees attached to the

branch from  $w_1$  to  $w_2$  on the side opposite to  $w_3$  have labels larger than or equal to  $1 - s$ . Similarly, we impose that trees attached to the branch from  $w_2$  to  $w_3$  (respectively from  $w_3$  to  $w_1$ ) on the side opposite to  $w_1$  (respectively  $w_2$ ) have labels larger than or equal to  $1 - t$  (respectively  $1 - u$ ). By convention, the labels on the tree attached to  $w_1$  (respectively  $w_2$  and  $w_3$ ) are assumed to be larger than or equal to  $1 - s$  (respectively  $1 - t$  and  $1 - u$ ). The corresponding generating function reads [15]:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{s,t,u} &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \tilde{X}_{\ell;s,t} \tilde{X}_{\ell;t,u} \tilde{X}_{\ell;u,s} \\ &= \frac{[s+3]_x [t+3]_x [u+3]_x [s+t+u+3]_x}{[3]_x [s+t+3]_x [t+u+3]_x [u+s+3]_x} . \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

Again, we have  $Y_{s,t,u} = 1 + \mathcal{O}(g)$ , with a conventional weight 1 for the tree reduced to a single vertex, which is added for convenience to the family of trees enumerated by  $Y_{s,t,u}$ .

#### *Application to minimal separating loops via the Schaeffer bijection*

In this approach, we have to enumerate trees of the type displayed in Fig. 5. It is convenient to first relax the condition on the global minimum, demanding only that it be larger than or equal to  $1 - u$ . We can then decompose the tree by cutting it at the first and last occurrence of the label 0 on the branch from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$ , resulting in three trees counted respectively by  $\tilde{X}_{s;u,u}$ ,  $X_{u,u}$  and  $\tilde{X}_{t;u,u}$  (see Fig. 10 for an illustration). The corresponding generating function therefore reads:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u) &= \tilde{X}_{s;u,u} X_{u,u} \tilde{X}_{t;u,u} \\ &= x^{s+t} \frac{[3]_x [u]_x^2 [u+1]_x^4 [u+2]_x^2 [2s+2u+3]_x [2t+2u+3]_x}{[1]_x [2u+1]_x [2u+3]_x \prod_{k=0}^3 [s+u+k]_x [t+u+k]_x} . \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

To restore the condition that the global minimal label be exactly  $1 - u$ , we simply have to consider  $\Delta_u H_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u)$  where  $\Delta_u$  is the finite difference operator:


$$\Delta_u f(u) \equiv f(u) - f(u-1) . \quad (2.17)$$

To conclude, the generating function for triply-pointed quadrangulations with prescribed values of  $d_{13}$ ,  $d_{23}$  and  $l_{123}$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\text{loop}}(d_{13}, d_{23}; l_{123}) &= \Delta_u H_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u) \\ \text{with } s &= d_{13} - l_{123}/2 , \quad t = d_{23} - l_{123}/2 , \quad u = l_{123}/2 . \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

#### *Application to minimal separating loops via the Miermont bijection*

In this approach, we simply have to enumerate maps of the type displayed in Figs. 7 and 8. Again, we relax the conditions on the minimal label within each face, namely




**Fig. 10:** The cutting of a well-labeled tree of the type of Fig. 5 (with a relaxed constraint on the global minimal label) at the first and last label 0 encountered along the branch from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$ . This results into three pieces, enumerated by  $\tilde{X}_{s;u,u}$ ,  $X_{u,u}$  and  $\tilde{X}_{t;u,u}$  respectively.

we demand only that it be larger than or equal to  $1 - s$ ,  $1 - t$  or  $1 - u$  respectively. In the generic case of Fig. 7, we can now decompose the map by cutting it at the first and last occurrence of the label 0 on the cycle  $c_1$ , starting from the endpoint of the bridge  $b$ , at the first and last occurrence of the label 0 on the cycle  $c_2$ , starting from the other endpoint of the bridge  $b$ , and finally at the first and last occurrence of the label 0 on the bridge  $b$  itself (see Fig. 11 for an illustration). This results in general into five trees counted respectively by  $X_{s,u}$ ,  $Y_{s,u,u}$ ,  $X_{u,u}$ ,  $Y_{t,u,u}$  and  $X_{t,u}$ . The corresponding generating function therefore reads

$$\begin{aligned}
 F_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u) &= X_{s,u} Y_{s,u,u} X_{u,u} Y_{t,u,u} X_{t,u} \\
 &= \frac{[3]_x [s+1]_x [t+1]_x [u+1]_x^4 [s+2u+3]_x [t+2u+3]_x}{[1]_x^3 [s+u+1]_x [s+u+3]_x [t+u+1]_x [t+u+3]_x [2u+1]_x [2u+3]_x}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.19}$$

Note that this formula incorporates the cases where some of the cutting points above coincide as we added in  $X_{s,t}$  and  $Y_{s,t,u}$  the weight 1 of the tree reduced to a single



**Fig. 11:** The cutting of a well-labeled map of the type of Fig. 7 (with relaxed constraints on labels inside each face) at the first and last label 0 encountered along the cycles  $c_1$ ,  $c_2$  and the branch  $b$  (see the text). This results into five pieces, enumerated by  $X_{s,u}$ ,  $Y_{s,u,u}$ ,  $X_{u,u}$ ,  $Y_{t,u,u}$  and  $X_{t,u}$  respectively.

vertex. It also naturally incorporates the degenerate cases of Fig. 8: for instance, the situation of Fig. 8-(a) is properly taken into account by having the two leftmost trees in the decomposition of Fig. 11 reduced to single vertices, while the situation of Fig. 8-(b) is properly taken into account by having the two leftmost and the two rightmost trees in the decomposition of Fig. 11 reduced to single vertices. Again, we can restore the constraint that the minimal label within each face be equal to  $1 - s$ ,  $1 - t$  or  $1 - u$  respectively by considering  $\Delta_s \Delta_t \Delta_u F_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u)$ . We deduce the alternative formula:

$$G_{\text{loop}}(d_{13}, d_{23}; l_{123}) = \Delta_s \Delta_t \Delta_u F_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u) \quad (2.20)$$

with  $s = d_{13} - l_{123}/2$ ,  $t = d_{23} - l_{123}/2$ ,  $u = l_{123}/2$ .



Note that the two expressions (2.18) and (2.20) are consistent as we have the identity:

$$\Delta_s \frac{[s+1]_x [s+2u+3]_x}{[s+u+1]_x [s+u+3]_x} = x^s \frac{[1]_x [u]_x [u+2]_x [2s+2u+3]_x}{\prod_{k=0}^3 [s+u+k]_x} \quad (2.21)$$

which can be checked directly from the definition (2.11).

A simpler generating function is that of triply-pointed quadrangulations with a prescribed value of  $l_{123}$  only. The corresponding generating function  $G_{\text{loop}}(l_{123})$  is obtained by summing  $G_{\text{loop}}(d_{13}, d_{23}; l_{123})$  over all the allowed values of  $d_{13}$  and  $d_{23}$  for a fixed  $l_{123}$ . This amounts to a summation over all non-negative values of  $s$  and  $t$ , which is easily performed upon using the expression (2.20) by noting that, with the above expression (2.19), the quantities  $F_{\text{loop}}(-1, t, u)$  and  $F_{\text{loop}}(s, -1, u)$  vanish identically, so that:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\text{loop}}(l_{123}) &= \Delta_u F_{\text{loop}}(\infty, \infty, u) \\ &= \Delta_u \frac{[3]_x [u+1]_x^4}{[1]_x^3 [2u+1]_x [2u+3]_x} \text{ with } u = l_{123}/2 . \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

### 2.3. Continuum limit

The scaling limit is obtained by letting  $g$  approach its critical value  $1/12$  and considering large values of  $d_{13}$ ,  $d_{23}$  and  $l_{123}$  with the following scaling:

$$\begin{aligned} g &= \frac{1}{12} (1 - \Lambda \epsilon) \\ d_{13} &= D_{13} \epsilon^{-1/4} , \quad d_{23} = D_{23} \epsilon^{-1/4} , \quad l_{123} = L_{123} \epsilon^{-1/4} , \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

and  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . The quantity  $\Lambda$  may be interpreted as a ‘‘cosmological constant’’. In this limit, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\text{loop}}(l_{123}) &\sim \epsilon^{-1/4} 2 \mathcal{G}_{\text{loop}}(L_{123}; \alpha) \\ \text{where } \mathcal{G}_{\text{loop}}(L_{123}; \alpha) &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_U \left. \frac{3}{\alpha^2} \frac{\sinh^4(\alpha U)}{\sinh^2(2\alpha U)} \right|_{U=L_{123}/2} = \frac{3}{4\alpha} \frac{\sinh(\alpha L_{123}/2)}{\cosh^3(\alpha L_{123}/2)} . \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

Here and throughout the paper, we use the notation:

$$\alpha = \sqrt{3/2} \Lambda^{1/4} . \quad (2.25)$$

Note the factor  $1/2$  in the definition of  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{loop}}$ , which is introduced to compensate the fact that, at the discrete level,  $l_{123}$  can take only even integer values. More generally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\text{loop}}(d_{12}, d_{13}, l_{123}) &\sim \epsilon^{1/4} 2 \mathcal{G}_{\text{loop}}(D_{12}, D_{13}, L_{123}; \alpha) , \\ F_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u) &\sim \epsilon^{-1/2} \mathcal{F}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U; \alpha) , \\ H_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u) &\sim \mathcal{H}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U; \alpha) , \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U; \alpha) &= \frac{3}{\alpha^2} \frac{\sinh(\alpha S) \sinh(\alpha T) \sinh^4(\alpha U) \sinh(\alpha(S+2U)) \sinh(\alpha(T+2U))}{(\sinh(\alpha(S+U)) \sinh(\alpha(T+U)) \sinh(2\alpha U))^2}, \\ \mathcal{H}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U; \alpha) &= 3 \frac{\sinh^8(\alpha U) \sinh(2\alpha(S+U)) \sinh(2\alpha(T+U))}{\sinh^2(2\alpha U) \sinh^4(\alpha(S+U)) \sinh^4(\alpha(T+U))},\end{aligned}\tag{2.27}$$


and where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_{\text{loop}}(D_{12}, D_{23}, L_{123}; \alpha) &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_S \partial_T \partial_U \mathcal{F}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U; \alpha) = \frac{1}{2} \partial_U \mathcal{H}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U; \alpha) \\ \text{with } S &= D_{13} - L_{123}/2, \quad T = D_{23} - L_{123}/2, \quad U = L_{123}/2.\end{aligned}\tag{2.28}$$

Again the two expressions above for  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{loop}}(D_{12}, D_{23}, L_{123}; \alpha)$  are consistent as we have the identity

$$\partial_S \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{\sinh(\alpha S) \sinh(\alpha(S+2U))}{\sinh^2(\alpha(S+U))} \right) = \frac{\sinh^2(\alpha U) \sinh(2\alpha(S+U))}{\sinh^4(\alpha(S+U))},\tag{2.29}$$

which is the continuous counterpart of (2.21).



**Fig. 12:** Plot of the probability density  $\rho_{\text{loop}}(L_{123})$ .

The above continuous formulae can be used to capture the statistical properties of triply-pointed quadrangulations with *fixed size*, i.e. with a fixed number  $n$  of faces, in the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Indeed, fixing  $n$  amounts to extracting the  $g^n$  term of the various discrete generating functions at hand. This can be done by a contour integral in  $g$  which, at large  $n$ , translates via a saddle point estimate into an integral over a real variable  $\xi$ . More precisely, considering for instance the generating function  $G_{\text{loop}}(l_{123})$ , we write

$$G_{\text{loop}}(l_{123})|_{g^n} = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint \frac{dg}{g^{n+1}} G_{\text{loop}}(l_{123})\tag{2.30}$$

and we perform the change of variables

$$g = \frac{1}{12} \left( 1 + \frac{\xi^2}{n} \right) , \quad l_{123} = L_{123} n^{1/4} . \quad (2.31)$$

At large  $n$ , the contour integral becomes at dominant order an integral over real values of  $\xi$  and we can use the continuous formulae above with  $\epsilon = 1/n$  and  $\lambda = -\xi^2$ . After a proper normalization by the number of triply-pointed quadrangulations with fixed size  $n$ , we obtain the probability density  $\rho_{\text{loop}}(L_{123})$  for the rescaled length  $L_{123}$ :

$$\rho_{\text{loop}}(L_{123}) = \frac{2}{i\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \, \xi e^{-\xi^2} \mathcal{G}_{\text{loop}}(L_{123}; \sqrt{-3i\xi/2}) . \quad (2.32)$$

The quantity  $\rho_{\text{loop}}(L_{123}) dL_{123}$  is the infinitesimal probability that the (rescaled) minimal length for loops having origin  $v_3$  and separating  $v_1$  from  $v_2$  lies in the range  $[L_{123}, L_{123} + dL_{123}]$  in the ensemble of triply-pointed quadrangulations with fixed size  $n$ , in the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This probability density is plotted in Fig. 12 and has the following limiting behaviors:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{loop}}(L_{123}) &\sim \frac{3}{16} L_{123}^3 \quad \text{when } L_{123} \rightarrow 0 , \\ \rho_{\text{loop}}(L_{123}) &\sim \frac{1}{6^{1/6}} L_{123}^{2/3} e^{-(\frac{3}{4})^{5/3} L_{123}^{4/3}} \quad \text{when } L_{123} \rightarrow \infty . \end{aligned} \quad (2.33)$$

The associated average value of  $L_{123}$  reads

$$\langle L_{123} \rangle = \frac{4}{3} \langle D \rangle = 2.36198 \dots \quad \text{with} \quad \langle D \rangle = 2\sqrt{\frac{3}{\pi}} \Gamma\left(\frac{5}{4}\right) = 1.77148 \dots \quad (2.34)$$

Here and throughout the paper, we decide to express average distances in units of the average distance  $\langle D \rangle$  between two uniformly chosen vertices in a large quadrangulation, whose value given above was computed in Refs. [19–21].


Similarly, the joint probability density for  $D_{13} = d_{13}/n^{1/4}$ ,  $D_{23} = d_{23}/n^{1/4}$  and  $L_{123}$  reads:

$$\rho_{\text{loop}}(D_{12}, D_{13}, L_{123}) = \frac{2}{i\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \, \xi e^{-\xi^2} \mathcal{G}_{\text{loop}}(D_{12}, D_{13}, L_{123}; \sqrt{-3i\xi/2}) , \quad (2.35)$$

while the conditional probability density for  $D_{13}$  and  $D_{23}$ , given the value of  $L_{123}$ , simply reads:


$$\rho_{\text{loop}}(D_{12}, D_{13} | L_{123}) = \frac{\rho_{\text{loop}}(D_{13}, D_{23}, L_{123})}{\rho_{\text{loop}}(L_{123})} . \quad (2.36)$$

This conditional probability density is represented in Fig. 13 for decreasing values of  $L_{123}$  (namely  $L_{123} = 2.0$ ,  $L_{123} = 1.6$  and  $L_{123} = 1.0$ ), and in Fig. 14 for increasing values of  $L_{123}$  (namely  $L_{123} = 2.0$ ,  $L_{123} = 3.0$  and  $L_{123} = 4.0$ ). For large enough  $L_{123}$ ,




**Fig. 13:** Plots of the conditional probability density  $\rho_{\text{loop}}(D_{13}, D_{23}|L_{123})$  for  $L_{123} = 2.0$ ,  $L_{123} = 1.6$  and  $L_{123} = 1.0$ , from top to bottom. For each plot on the left, we display its associated contour plot on the right.

this joint probability density is maximal for equal values of  $D_{13}$  and  $D_{23}$ , i.e. when the two vertices  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are equally distant from  $v_3$ . On the contrary, for small enough  $L_{123}$ , we observe a symmetry breaking phenomenon with a probability density being



**Fig. 14:** Plots of the conditional probability density  $\rho_{\text{loop}}(D_{13}, D_{23} | L_{123})$  for  $L_{123} = 2.0$ ,  $L_{123} = 3.0$  and  $L_{123} = 4.0$ , from top to bottom.

maximal when one of the two vertices  $v_1$  or  $v_2$  lies closer from  $v_3$  than the other.



**Fig. 15:** (a) Plot of the conditional probability density  $\rho_{\text{loop}}(D_{13}, D_{23}|L_{123})$  for a small value of  $L_{123}$ , here  $L_{123} = 0.02$ . This density is concentrated in two regions corresponding to either  $D_{13}$  or  $D_{23}$  being of order  $L_{123}$ . A zoom on the first region is obtained by considering the same plot (b) with a rescaled abscissa  $\omega = 2D_{13}/L_{123}$ , or the corresponding contour plot (c). As apparent by taking longitudinal and transverse cut views along the thick lines in (c), the probability density factorizes in this region into the product of the density  $\psi(\omega)$  (red curve in (d)) and the two-point function  $\rho(D_{23})$  (green curve in (e)).

This phenomenon increases for smaller  $L_{123}$  and, when  $L_{123} \rightarrow 0$ , we find that

$$\rho_{\text{loop}}(D_{13}, D_{23}|L_{123}) \sim \rho(D_{13}) \times \frac{2}{L_{123}} \psi\left(\frac{2D_{23}}{L_{123}}\right) + \rho(D_{23}) \times \frac{2}{L_{123}} \psi\left(\frac{2D_{13}}{L_{123}}\right) \quad (2.37)$$

with a scaling function

$$\psi(\omega) = \frac{3}{4} \frac{2\omega - 1}{\omega^4} \quad (2.38)$$


normalized to 1/2 when  $\omega$  varies from 1 to  $\infty$ , and where  $\rho(D)$  is the so called *canonical two-point function*, which is the probability density for the distance  $D$  between two vertices picked uniformly at random in a large quadrangulation. This canonical two-

point function is given by a formula similar to (2.32):

$$\rho(D) = \frac{2}{i\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \xi e^{-\xi^2} \mathcal{G}(D; \sqrt{-3i\xi/2})$$

$$\text{with } \mathcal{G}(D; \alpha) = 4\alpha^3 \frac{\cosh(\alpha D)}{\sinh^3(\alpha D)} . \quad (2.39)$$

The particular form (2.37) expresses that, when  $L_{123}$  becomes small, one of two vertices  $v_1$  or  $v_2$ , say  $v_1$  necessarily lies in the vicinity of  $v_3$ , with a distance  $D_{13}$  of the order of  $L_{123}$  and governed by the density (2.38) for  $\omega = 2D_{13}/L_{123}$ , while the other vertex lies at an arbitrary distance from the two others, with a probability density given simply by the two-point function of quadrangulations, as expected. This behavior is depicted in Fig. 15, for  $L_{123} = 0.02$ . This result corroborates the known property of quadrangulations of large size  $n$ : small loops of length negligible with respect to  $n^{1/4}$  in the quadrangulation necessarily separate it into a macroscopic domain containing most of the area of the quadrangulation, and a small part of negligible size with respect to  $n$ .



**Fig. 16:** (a) Plot of the conditional probability density  $\rho_{\text{loop}}(D_{13}, D_{23} | L_{123})$  for a large value of  $L_{123}$ , here  $L_{123} = 20.0$ . The same plot (b) and its contour (c) in the rescaled variables  $\mu = (D_{13} - L_{123}/2)(9L_{123}/2)^{1/3}$  and  $\nu = (D_{23} - L_{123}/2)(9L_{123}/2)^{1/3}$ . In these variables, the conditional probability density tends to a limiting distribution  $\Phi(\mu, \nu)$ , as shown in (d).

In the other limit, i.e. when  $L_{123}$  becomes large, we find the limiting behavior:

$$\rho_{\text{loop}}(D_{13}, D_{23}|L_{123}) \sim \left(\frac{9L_{123}}{2}\right)^{2/3} \Phi(\mu, \nu) \quad (2.40)$$

with  $\mu = \left(D_{13} - \frac{L_{123}}{2}\right) \left(\frac{9L_{123}}{2}\right)^{1/3}$ ,  $\nu = \left(D_{23} - \frac{L_{123}}{2}\right) \left(\frac{9L_{123}}{2}\right)^{1/3}$ ,


with a scaling function

$$\Phi(\mu, \nu) = e^{-(\mu+\nu)} (2 - e^{-\mu} - e^{-\nu}) \quad (2.41)$$

properly normalized to 1 when  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  vary from 0 to  $\infty$ . At large  $L_{123}$ , both distances  $D_{13}$  and  $D_{23}$  are therefore necessarily of order  $L_{123}/2$ , with differences  $D_{13} - L_{123}/2$  and  $D_{23} - L_{123}/2$  of order  $L_{123}^{-1/3}$ , governed by the joint probability density (2.41). This behavior is depicted in Fig. 16 for  $L_{123} = 20.0$ .

### 3. Confluence

#### 3.1. Confluence of geodesics




**Fig. 17:** A schematic picture of the phenomenon of confluence of geodesics. For generic points  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$  and  $v_3$  and in the scaling limit of large quadrangulations, the geodesic from  $v_1$  to  $v_3$  and that from  $v_2$  to  $v_3$  (represented as thick blue lines) are unique and have a common part of macroscopic length  $\delta$ .



In this section, we explain how we can use the quantities computed in section 2, or slight generalizations of them, to study the phenomenon of *confluence of geodesics* in the scaling limit of large quadrangulations. It was shown by Le Gall [14] and Miermont [13] that two typical points in a large random quadrangulation are joined by a unique “macroscopic” geodesic path. By this, it is meant that, although there is a large (extensive in the length) number of geodesic paths between two points at a discrete level, all these geodesics remain within a distance negligible with respect to  $n^{1/4}$ , which is the scale at which points can be distinguished in the scaling limit. Moreover, given three typical vertices  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$  and  $v_3$ , the unique macroscopic geodesic from  $v_1$  to  $v_3$  and the unique macroscopic geodesic from  $v_2$  to  $v_3$  merge before reaching  $v_3$ , i.e. have a macroscopic common part (see Fig. 17). This is the phenomenon of confluence of geodesics [14] which raises interesting problems, such as that of the distribution of the length  $\delta$  of this common part.

*Approach via the Schaeffer bijection*



**Fig. 18:** In the well-labeled tree of Fig. 5, we distinguish (a) the minimal label  $1 - u'$  on trees attached to one side of the branch from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$  and the minimal label  $1 - u''$  on trees attached to the other side of the branch, with  $u = \max(u', u'')$ . The quantity  $|u' - u''|$  measures the length of the common part of the leftmost geodesics from  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  to the added vertex  $v_3$ . As apparent in (b), here in the case  $u' > u''$ , these leftmost geodesics are made of two distinct chains of successors of respective lengths  $s - u''$  (green long-dashed arrows) and  $t - u''$  (red short-dashed arrows), followed by a common chain of successors of length  $u' - u''$  (magenta solid arrows).

At a discrete level, this length can be estimated by a particular choice of geodesics defined as follows: we start again with a triply-pointed quadrangulation with marked vertices  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$  and  $v_3$  and consider the associated well-labeled tree obtained from the Schaeffer bijection, taking  $v_3$  has the origin. This tree has two marked vertices  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , and upon shifting the labels so that the minimal label on the branch between  $v_1$

and  $v_2$  is 0, it is of the type displayed in Fig. 5 for some  $s$ ,  $t$  and  $u$ . We can now consider the *leftmost* geodesic from  $v_1$  to  $v_3$  formed by the chain of successors from the corner incident to  $v_1$  and lying immediately on the right of the branch oriented from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$ . Similarly, we consider the leftmost geodesic from  $v_2$  to  $v_3$  obtained as the chain of successors from the corner incident to  $v_2$  and lying immediately on the left of the branch (oriented again from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$ ). These two geodesics will merge at a point which we characterize as follows (see Fig. 18 for an illustration): let us call  $1 - u'$  (respectively  $1 - u''$ ) the minimal label on trees attached to the left (respectively right) side of the branch oriented from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$  (with the convention that the tree attached to  $v_1$  lies on the left side of the branch, and that attached to  $v_2$  on the right side), with  $u = \max(u', u'')$ . Then the two chosen geodesics have a common part of length  $|u' - u''|$ . Indeed, assuming without loss of generality that  $u = u' \geq u''$ , all the  $s + u$  successors of the corner chosen at  $v_1$  lie on the left of the branch until  $v_3$  (with label  $-u$ ) is reached. On the other hand, among the  $t + u$  successors of the corner chosen at  $v_2$ , the first  $t + u'' - 1$  successors are found on the right of the branch but the  $(t + u'')$ -th successor, having label  $-u''$ , is on the left of the branch and coincides with the  $(s + u'')$ -th successor of the corner chosen at  $v_1$ . From that point, all remaining successors form a common part of length  $u' - u''$  (see Fig.18). To conclude, there is a correspondence between, on the one hand, well-labeled trees with fixed values of  $s$ ,  $t$ ,  $u'$  and  $u''$  as defined above and, on the other hand, triply-pointed quadrangulations with prescribed values  $d_{13} = s + \max(u', u'')$ ,  $d_{23} = t + \max(u', u'')$ ,  $l_{123} = 2 \max(u', u'')$  and such that the leftmost geodesics from  $v_1$  to  $v_3$  and from  $v_2$  to  $v_3$  have a common part of length  $|u' - u''|$ . Note that the sign of  $u' - u''$  simply accounts for the relative position of the geodesics: when  $u' > u''$  (respectively  $u'' > u'$ ), the geodesic from  $v_1$  to  $v_3$  merges on the right (respectively on the left) of the geodesic from  $v_2$  to  $v_3$ .


We now wish to enumerate the above trees. By an immediate generalization of Eq. (2.16), such trees have generating function:

$$\Delta_{u'} \Delta_{u''} H_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u', u'') \text{ where } H_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u', u'') = \tilde{X}_{s;u',u''} X_{u',u''} \tilde{X}_{t;u'',u'} . \quad (3.1)$$

In the scaling limit, this generating function becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{U'} \partial_{U''} \mathcal{H}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U', U''; \alpha) \text{ where} \\ & \mathcal{H}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U', U''; \alpha) = \\ & 3 \frac{\sinh^4(\alpha U') \sinh^4(\alpha U'') \sinh(\alpha(2S + U' + U'')) \sinh(\alpha(2T + U' + U''))}{(\sinh(\alpha(U' + U'')) \sinh(\alpha(S + U')) \sinh(\alpha(S + U'')) \sinh(\alpha(T + U')) \sinh(\alpha(T + U'')))^2} \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

and we expect that any other choice for the geodesics at the discrete level would lead to the same continuous expression. This formula holds in the grand canonical formalism and can be transformed via an integral of the type (2.32) into the canonical normalized joint probability density for  $D_{13}$ ,  $D_{23}$ ,  $L_{123}$  and the (rescaled) length  $\delta \equiv |U' - U''|$  for the common part of the geodesics.



**Fig. 19:** In the well-labeled map of Fig. 7, we mark the last occurrence of a label 0 on each (counterclockwise oriented) cycle  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  and call  $1 - u'$  the minimal label on trees attached to the part of the frontier of the external face made of: (i) the left side of the branch  $b$  (oriented from  $c_1$  to  $c_2$ ), (ii) the external side of the cycle  $c_1$  before reaching the marked label 0, and (iii) the external side of the cycle  $c_2$  after passing the marked label 0. We also call  $1 - u''$  the minimal label on trees attached to the complementary part of the frontier, with  $u = \max(u', u'')$ . The quantity  $|u' - u''|$  measures the length of the common part of two particular geodesics leading from  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  to  $v_3$ , as apparent in (b), here in the case  $u' > u''$ .

#### *Approach via the Miermont bijection*

As in section 2, a useful alternative expression for the above function may be obtained by use of the Miermont bijection for triply-pointed quadrangulations, leading, for the special choice (2.8) of delays, to well-labeled maps of the type displayed in Fig. 7 (or of its degenerate versions) for some  $s$ ,  $t$ , and  $u$ . A particular geodesic path from  $v_1$  to  $v_3$  is obtained by picking say, the last label 0 on the (counterclockwise oriented) cycle

$c_1$ , looking at the two corners at that vertex lying immediately on the right of the cycle when we follow the cycle in both directions, and considering the chains of successors of these two corners. The concatenation of these chains forms the desired geodesic path. A similar geodesic path can be considered from  $v_2$  to  $v_3$ , passing via the last label 0 on the (counterclockwise oriented) cycle  $c_2$ . Let us now call  $1 - u'$  the minimal label on trees attached to the left side of the branch  $b$  (oriented from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$ ), to the external side of the cycle  $c_1$  before the last occurrence of a label 0 on this cycle, and to the external side of the cycle  $c_2$  after the last occurrence of a label 0 on this cycle (see Fig. 19 for an illustration). We also call  $1 - u''$  the minimal label on trees attached to the complementary part of the frontier of the face  $f_3$ , with  $u = \max(u', u'')$ . Then by arguments similar to the discussion above, the two particular geodesics have a common part of length  $|u' - u''|$ . We now have a correspondence between, on the one hand, well-labeled maps with fixed values of  $s, t, u'$  and  $u''$  as defined above and, on the other hand, triply-pointed quadrangulations with prescribed values  $d_{13} = s + \max(u', u'')$ ,  $d_{23} = t + \max(u', u'')$ ,  $l_{123} = 2 \max(u', u'')$  and such that the two particular geodesics considered above from  $v_1$  to  $v_3$  and from  $v_2$  to  $v_3$  have a common part of length  $|u' - u''|$ . By an immediate generalization of Eq. (2.19), such maps are enumerated by:

$$\Delta_s \Delta_t \Delta_{u'} \Delta_{u''} F_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u', u'') \text{ where} \quad (3.3)$$

$$F_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u', u'') = X_{s,u'} Y_{s,u'',u'} X_{u',u''} Y_{t,u',u''} X_{t,u''}$$

Note that this generating function is different from that given by (3.1) as our particular choice of geodesics differs in the Schaeffer and in the Miermont bijection approach. In the scaling limit however, we expect to recover the same expression (3.2) due to the unicity of geodesics at a macroscopic level. Indeed, the expression (3.3) translates into:

$$\partial_S \partial_T \partial_{U'} \partial_{U''} \mathcal{F}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U', U''; \alpha) \text{ where} \quad (3.4)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U', U''; \alpha) = \frac{3}{\alpha^2} \frac{\sinh(\alpha S) \sinh(\alpha T) \sinh^2(\alpha U') \sinh^2(\alpha U'') \sinh(\alpha(S+U'+U'')) \sinh(\alpha(T+U'+U''))}{\sinh(\alpha(S+U')) \sinh(\alpha(S+U'')) \sinh(\alpha(T+U')) \sinh(\alpha(T+U'')) \sinh^2(\alpha(U'+U''))}$$

which precisely matches the continuous expression (3.2), namely:

$$\partial_S \partial_T \partial_{U'} \partial_{U''} \mathcal{F}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U', U''; \alpha) = \partial_{U'} \partial_{U''} \mathcal{H}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U', U''; \alpha) \quad (3.5)$$


as a consequence of the identity

$$\partial_S \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{\sinh(\alpha S) \sinh(\alpha(S+U'+U''))}{\sinh(\alpha(S+U')) \sinh(\alpha(S+U''))} \right) = \frac{\sinh(\alpha U') \sinh(\alpha U'') \sinh(\alpha(2S+U'+U''))}{\sinh^2(\alpha(S+U')) \sinh^2(\alpha(S+U''))} \quad (3.6)$$

*Marginal law for  $\delta$*

It is now a simple exercise to obtain, in this scaling limit, the marginal law for  $\delta$ . We simply have to integrate over all positive values of  $S$ ,  $T$ ,  $U'$  and  $U''$  with the constraint that  $|U' - U''| = \delta$ . This is done more easily in the grand canonical formalism first and by use of the expression (3.4), namely:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^\infty dS \int_0^\infty dT \int_0^\infty dU' \int_0^\infty dU'' \delta(|U' - U''| - \delta) \partial_S \partial_T \partial_{U'} \partial_{U''} \mathcal{F}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U', U''; \alpha) \\
&= \int_0^\infty dU' \int_0^\infty dU'' \delta(|U' - U''| - \delta) \partial_{U'} \partial_{U''} \mathcal{F}_{\text{loop}}(\infty, \infty, U', U''; \alpha) \\
&= \int_0^\infty dU' \int_0^\infty dU'' \delta(|U' - U''| - \delta) \partial_{U'} \partial_{U''} \left( \frac{3}{\alpha^2} \frac{\sinh^2(\alpha U') \sinh^2(\alpha U'')}{\sinh^2(\alpha(U' + U''))} \right) \\
&= \int_0^\infty dU' \int_0^\infty dU'' \delta(|U' - U''| - \delta) 18 \frac{\sinh^2(\alpha U') \sinh^2(\alpha U'')}{\sinh^4(\alpha(U' + U''))} \\
&= 36 \int_\delta^\infty dU \frac{\sinh^2(\alpha U) \sinh^2(\alpha(U - \delta))}{\sinh^4(\alpha(2U - \delta))} \\
&= \frac{3}{2\alpha} e^{-2\alpha\delta}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$



**Fig. 20:** Plot of the probability density  $\sigma(\delta)$  for the length  $\delta$  of the common part of the two geodesics from  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  to  $v_3$  in the scaling limit of large triply-pointed quadrangulations.

As before, we can transform this result into the probability density for the (rescaled) variable  $\delta$  in the canonical ensemble of triply-pointed quadrangulations of large fixed

size. This probability density reads:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma(\delta) &= \frac{2}{i\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \, \xi e^{-\xi^2} \left( \frac{3}{2\alpha} e^{-2\alpha\delta} \right) \Big|_{\alpha=\sqrt{-3i\xi/2}} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{3}{\pi}} \left\{ \Gamma\left(\frac{3}{4}\right) {}_0F_2\left(\left\{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}\right\}, -\frac{9\delta^4}{64}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 3\delta^2 \Gamma\left(\frac{5}{4}\right) {}_0F_2\left(\left\{\frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{2}\right\}, -\frac{9\delta^4}{64}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sqrt{3\pi}\delta^3 {}_0F_2\left(\left\{\frac{5}{4}, \frac{7}{4}\right\}, -\frac{9\delta^4}{64}\right) \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where


$${}_0F_2(\{b_1, b_2\}, z) \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{k!} \frac{1}{(b_1)_k (b_2)_k} \quad \text{with} \quad (b)_k \equiv \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} (b+i) . \tag{3.9}$$

This probability density is plotted in Fig. 20. We have in particular

$$\langle \delta \rangle = \frac{1}{3} \langle D \rangle = 0.590494 \dots \tag{3.10}$$


i.e. the common part represents on average one third of the length of a geodesic.

### 3.2. Confluence of minimal separating loops



**Fig. 21:** A schematic picture of the phenomenon of confluence of minimal separating loops. For generic points  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$  and  $v_3$  and in the scaling limit of large quadrangulations, the minimal loop originating from  $v_3$  and separating  $v_1$  from  $v_2$  (represented as a thick blue line) is unique and is made of a common part of macroscopic length  $\delta_{\text{loop}}$  and an open part of macroscopic length  $L'_{123}$ .

The minimal separating loops themselves also exhibit a phenomenon of confluence. Indeed, a minimal separating loop is made of two geodesics of same length emanating from a particular vertex  $v$  (with minimal label on the branch from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$ ) and reaching  $v_3$ . In the scaling limit, we expect that the macroscopic minimal separating loop is unique and moreover, its two constituent geodesics have a common part of macroscopic length  $\delta_{\text{loop}}$  (see Fig. 21 for an illustration). Note that, although  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$  and  $v_3$  are generic points,  $v$  is a non-typical point as it can be connected to  $v_3$  by two distinct macroscopic geodesics which are not confluent at  $v$ . We shall call the complementary part the *open part* of the loop, with length  $L'_{123} = L_{123} - 2\delta_{\text{loop}}$ .



**Fig. 22:** In the well-labeled tree of Fig. 5, we mark the first label 0 on the branch from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$  and call  $1 - u'$  the minimal label on trees attached to the part of the branch lying from  $v_1$  to the marked label 0. We also call  $1 - u''$  the minimal label on trees attached to the complementary part of the branch, with  $u = \max(u', u'')$ . The quantity  $|u' - u''|$  measures the length of the common part of a particular minimal loop originating from  $v_3$  and separating  $v_1$  from  $v_2$ , as apparent in (b), here in the case  $u' > u''$ . The length of the open part of the minimal separating loop is  $2 \min(u', u'') = 2u''$ .

The statistics for  $\delta_{\text{loop}}$  and  $L'_{123}$  can be computed along the same lines as in section

3.1. In the Schaeffer approach, on the branch from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$  in the well-labeled tree, we now consider the vertex  $v$  with minimal label closest to  $v_1$ . Calling  $1 - u'$  the minimal label for trees attached to the part of the branch from  $v_1$  to  $v$ , and  $1 - u''$  the minimal label for trees attached to the complementary part, the quantity  $|u' - u''|$  measures the length of the desired common part for a particular minimal loop formed by two chains of successors starting from  $v$  (see Fig. 22 for an illustration). As for the length of the open part of the loop, it is simply measured by  $2 \min(u', u'')$ . The generating function for the objects above is immediately given by

$$\Delta_{u'} \Delta_{u''} \bar{H}_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u', u'') \text{ where } \bar{H}_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u', u'') = \tilde{X}_{s;u',u'} X_{u'',u''} \tilde{X}_{t;u'',u''} . \quad (3.11)$$

In the scaling limit, this generating function becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{U'} \partial_{U''} \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U', U''; \alpha) \text{ where} \\ & \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U', U''; \alpha) = 3 \frac{\sinh^4(\alpha U') \sinh^4(\alpha U'') \sinh(\alpha(2(S+U'))) \sinh(\alpha(2(T+U''))}{\sinh(2\alpha U') \sinh(2\alpha U'') \sinh^4(\alpha(S+U')) \sinh^4(\alpha(T+U''))} \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

which yields the joint law for  $L'_{123} = 2 \min(U', U'')$ ,  $D_{13} = S + \max(U', U'')$ ,  $D_{23} = T + \max(U', U'')$  and  $\delta_{\text{loop}} = |U' - U''|$ . Note that the sign of  $U' - U''$  indicates which domain delimited by the open part contains the common part of the loop. As apparent in Fig. 22, this common part lies in the domain containing  $v_1$  when  $U' > U''$ .

An alternative expression is found through the Miermont approach where we consider well-labeled maps of the type displayed in Fig. 23 using a particular minimal separating loop passing through the vertex with minimal label on the branch  $b$  closest to the cycle  $c_1$ . We find a generating function

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_s \Delta_t \Delta_{u'} \Delta_{u''} \bar{F}_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u', u'') \text{ where} \\ & \bar{F}_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u', u'') = X_{s,u'} Y_{s,u',u''} X_{u'',u''} Y_{t,u'',u''} X_{t,u''} \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

whose scaling limit


$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_S \partial_T \partial_{U'} \partial_{U''} \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U', U''; \alpha) \text{ where} \\ & \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U', U''; \alpha) = \\ & \frac{3}{\alpha^2} \frac{\sinh(\alpha S) \sinh(\alpha T) \sinh^2(\alpha U') \sinh^2(\alpha U'') \sinh(\alpha(S+2U')) \sinh(\alpha(T+2U''))}{\sinh^2(\alpha(S+U')) \sinh^2(\alpha(T+U'')) \sinh(2\alpha U') \sinh(2\alpha U'')} \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

matches the expression (3.12) above. This matching is again a direct consequence of the identity (2.29).

We can integrate over  $S$  and  $T$  and obtain the marginal law for  $U'$  and  $U''$


$$\frac{3}{\alpha^2} \partial_{U'} \partial_{U''} \frac{\sinh^2(\alpha U') \sinh^2(\alpha U'')}{\sinh(2\alpha U') \sinh(2\alpha U'')} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{1}{\cosh^2(\alpha U') \cosh^2(\alpha U'')} . \quad (3.15)$$





**Fig. 23:** In the well-labeled map of Fig. 7, we mark the first occurrence of a label 0 on the branch  $b$  oriented from the cycle  $c_1$  to the cycle  $c_2$  and call  $1 - u'$  the minimal label on trees attached to the part of the frontier of the external face made of: (i) the part of the branch  $b$  lying between  $c_1$  and the marked label 0 and (ii) the external side of the cycle  $c_1$ . We call  $1 - u''$  the minimal label on trees attached to the complementary part of the frontier, with  $u = \max(u', u'')$ . The quantity  $|u' - u''|$  measures the length of the common part of a particular minimal loop originating for  $v_3$  and separating  $v_1$  from  $v_2$ , as apparent in (b), here in the case  $u' > u''$  (corresponding to having the common part in the domain containing  $v_1$ ). The length of the open part is  $2 \min(u', u'')$ .

This can be translated into the marginal joint law for  $\delta_{\text{loop}}$  and  $L'_{123}$ . For triply-pointed




**Fig. 24:** Plot of the joint probability density  $\tau_{\text{loop}}(\delta_{\text{loop}}, L'_{123})$  for the length  $\delta_{\text{loop}}$  of the common part and the length  $L'_{123}$  of the open part of the minimal loop originating from  $v_3$  and separating  $v_1$  from  $v_2$  in the scaling limit of large triply-pointed quadrangulations.

quadrangulations of fixed large size  $n$ , we find the joint probability density:

$$\tau_{\text{loop}}(\delta_{\text{loop}}, L'_{123}) = \frac{2}{i\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \, \xi e^{-\xi^2} \frac{3/4}{\cosh^2\left(\alpha\left(\frac{L'_{123}}{2} + \delta_{\text{loop}}\right)\right) \cosh^2\left(\alpha\frac{L'_{123}}{2}\right)} \Big|_{\alpha=\sqrt{-3i\xi/2}}. \quad (3.16)$$

This probability density is plotted in Fig. 24.



**Fig. 25:** Plot of the marginal probability density  $\tau_{\text{loop}}(\delta_{\text{loop}})$  for the length of the common part of the minimal loop originating from  $v_3$  and separating  $v_1$  from  $v_2$  in the scaling limit of large triply-pointed quadrangulations.


Upon integrating  $\tau_{\text{loop}}(\delta_{\text{loop}}, L'_{123})$  over  $L'_{123}$ , we get the marginal density distribution for the length  $\delta_{\text{loop}}$  only, namely:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\text{loop}}(\delta_{\text{loop}}) = & \frac{2}{i\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \, \xi e^{-\xi^2} \frac{3}{2\alpha} \frac{1}{\sinh^3(\alpha\delta_{\text{loop}}) \cosh(\alpha\delta_{\text{loop}})} \\ & \times \left\{ 2 \cosh^2(\alpha\delta_{\text{loop}}) (\alpha\delta_{\text{loop}} - \log(\cosh(\alpha\delta_{\text{loop}}))) \right. \\ & \left. - \sinh(\alpha\delta_{\text{loop}}) (\cosh(\alpha\delta_{\text{loop}}) + e^{-\alpha\delta_{\text{loop}}}) \right\} \Big|_{\alpha=\sqrt{-3i\xi/2}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

This probability density is plotted in Fig. 25. We have in particular

$$\langle \delta_{\text{loop}} \rangle = \frac{2}{3} (2 - \log 4) \langle D \rangle = 0.724779 \dots \quad (3.18)$$

in terms of the average length  $\langle D \rangle$  of a geodesic path.



**Fig. 26:** Plot of the marginal probability density  $\bar{\tau}_{\text{loop}}(L'_{123})$  for the length of the open part of the minimal loop originating from  $v_3$  and separating  $v_1$  from  $v_2$  in the scaling limit of large triply-pointed quadrangulations.

On the other hand, upon integrating  $\tau_{\text{loop}}(\delta_{\text{loop}}, L'_{123})$  over  $\delta_{\text{loop}}$ , we get the marginal density distribution for the length  $L'_{123}$  only, namely:

$$\bar{\tau}_{\text{loop}}(L'_{123}) = \frac{2}{i\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \, \xi e^{-\xi^2} \frac{3}{4\alpha} \frac{1}{\cosh^3\left(\alpha \frac{L'_{123}}{2}\right)} e^{-\alpha \frac{L'_{123}}{2}} \Big|_{\alpha=\sqrt{-3i\xi/2}}. \quad (3.19)$$

This probability density is plotted in Fig. 26. We have in particular

$$\langle L'_{123} \rangle = \frac{4}{3} (\log 4 - 1) \langle D \rangle = 0.912418 \dots \quad (3.20)$$

Note that  $2\langle \delta_{\text{loop}} \rangle + \langle L'_{123} \rangle = \frac{4}{3} \langle D \rangle$ , in agreement with Eq. (2.34).

### 3.3. Area enclosed by a minimal separating loop

Within the above framework, we may easily address the question of the partitioning of the area of triply-pointed quadrangulations over the two domains separated by a minimal separating loop. For a given separating loop, we may indeed decide to attach a weight per face of the quadrangulation depending on which domain it lies in. In the equivalent Miermont picture and for the particular minimal separating loop considered in Fig. 23, this amounts to assigning a weight, say  $g_1$  (respectively  $g_2$ ) to edges lying in the domain containing  $v_1$  (respectively  $v_2$ ), which results in the generating function:

$$\Delta_s \Delta_t \Delta_{u'} \Delta_{u''} \bar{F}_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u', u''; g_1, g_2) \text{ where}$$

$$\bar{F}_{\text{loop}}(s, t, u', u''; g_1, g_2) = X_{s,u'}(g_1) Y_{s,u',u'}(g_1) X_{u'',u''}(g_2) Y_{t,u'',u''}(g_2) X_{t,u''}(g_2) . \quad (3.21)$$

Here  $X_{s,t}(g_m)$  and  $Y_{s,t,u}(g_m)$  denote the generating functions  $X_{s,t}$  and  $Y_{s,t,u}$ , as given by (2.13) and (2.15), with  $g$  replaced by  $g_m$  in (2.12), for  $m = 1, 2$ . In the continuum limit, we set

$$g_1 = \frac{1}{12}(1 - \Lambda_1 \epsilon) \quad , \quad g_2 = \frac{1}{12}(1 - \Lambda_2 \epsilon) \quad (3.22)$$

which amounts to having a different cosmological constant in both domains. The generating function above translates into the scaling function

$$\partial_S \partial_T \partial_{U'} \partial_{U''} \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U', U''; \alpha_1, \alpha_2) \text{ where}$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{loop}}(S, T, U', U''; \alpha_1, \alpha_2) = 3^3 \mathcal{Y}(S, U', U'; \alpha_1) \mathcal{Y}(T, U'', U''; \alpha_2) \quad (3.23)$$

$$\mathcal{Y}(S, T, U; \alpha) \equiv \frac{1}{3\alpha} \frac{\sinh(\alpha S) \sinh(\alpha T) \sinh(\alpha U) \sinh(\alpha(S + T + U))}{\sinh(\alpha(S + T)) \sinh(\alpha(T + U)) \sinh(\alpha(U + S))}$$

and  $\alpha_m = \sqrt{3/2} \Lambda_m^{1/4}$ . Here,  $\mathcal{Y}$  is the scaling limit of  $Y$ , while each  $X$  tends to 3 in the scaling limit, irrespectively of its arguments.

Upon integrating over all possible values of  $S, T, U'$  and  $U''$ , we get a function

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{loop}}(\infty, \infty, \infty, \infty; \alpha_1, \alpha_2) = \frac{3}{4\alpha_1 \alpha_2} . \quad (3.24)$$

Returning to the canonical formalism where we fix the sizes of the two domains separated by the minimal loop to be respectively  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  (with  $n_1 + n_2 = n$ ,  $n_1 \gg 1$ ,  $n_2 \gg 1$ ), we set  $\epsilon = 1/n$  and  $\Lambda_m = -\xi_m^2$ , so that the expression (3.24) tends to  $n^{1/2} i/(2\sqrt{\xi_1 \xi_2})$ . Setting  $n_1 = \eta n$  and  $n_2 = (1 - \eta)n$ , we obtain the probability density for  $\eta$  as

$$\varrho(\eta) = \frac{2}{i\pi^{3/2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi_1 \xi_1 e^{-\eta \xi_1^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi_2 \xi_2 e^{-(1-\eta)\xi_2^2} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\xi_1 \xi_2}}$$

$$= \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})} \frac{1}{\eta^{3/4} (1 - \eta)^{3/4}} . \quad (3.25)$$

The partitioning  $\eta$  of the mass is therefore governed by a simple Beta distribution with parameters  $\{1/4, 1/4\}$ . In particular the two domains are most likely of very asymmetric sizes, with a probability density maximal for  $\eta = 0$  or  $1$ .

More precisely, we can naturally distinguish the two domains as exactly one of them contains the common part of the minimal separating loop. As mentioned above, this information is encoded in the sign of  $U' - U''$ . We may integrate (3.23) over  $S$ ,  $T$ ,  $U'$  and  $U''$  in the domain  $U' > U''$ , corresponding to the case where the common part lies in the domain containing  $v_1$ . This leads to

$$\int_0^\infty dU' \frac{3}{4\alpha_1\alpha_2} [\partial_{U'} \tanh(\alpha_1 U')] \tanh(\alpha_2 U') , \quad (3.26)$$

which, together with the symmetric contribution from the domain  $U'' > U'$  (obtained by exchanging  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$ ), adds up to (3.24). We can in principle deduce from (3.26) the (now asymmetric) law for  $\eta$  conditionally on the position of the common part. We have not found a compact simple form for this law but its first few moments can be computed. We find an average value


$$\langle \eta \rangle_{U' > U''} = \langle 1 - \eta \rangle_{U'' > U'} = \frac{1}{3}(1 + \log 4) \sim 79.543\% \quad (3.27)$$

for the proportion of the total area lying in the same domain as the common part of the minimal separating loop.

#### 4. The three-point function revisited

The three-point function of planar quadrangulations enumerates quadrangulations of the sphere with three marked vertices  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$  and  $v_3$  *at prescribed pairwise distances*  $d_{12}$ ,  $d_{23}$  and  $d_{31}$ . It was computed in Ref. [15] and, in the scaling limit of quadrangulations of fixed large size  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , translates into a universal joint probability  $\rho(D_{12}, D_{23}, D_{31})$  for the three rescaled lengths  $D_{12} = d_{12}/n^{1/4}$ ,  $D_{23} = d_{23}/n^{1/4}$  and  $D_{31} = d_{31}/n^{1/4}$  of the three geodesics forming the triangle  $(v_1, v_2, v_3)$ . As mentioned in the introduction, a full description of the geometry of this triangle must incorporate the phenomenon of confluence. We call the lengths of the common parts respectively  $\delta_1$  (for the two geodesics leading to  $v_1$ ),  $\delta_2$  (for the two geodesics leading to  $v_2$ ) and  $\delta_3$  (for the two geodesics leading to  $v_3$ ). The remaining proper parts of the geodesics form an open triangle with sides of respective lengths  $D'_{12} = D_{12} - \delta_1 - \delta_2$ ,  $D'_{23} = D_{23} - \delta_2 - \delta_3$  and  $D'_{31} = D_{31} - \delta_3 - \delta_1$  (see Fig. 27 for an illustration). A natural question is that of determining the corresponding joint probability density  $\rho(D'_{12}, D'_{23}, D'_{31}, \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3)$ .

As explained in Ref. [15], triply-pointed quadrangulations with prescribed values of the pairwise distances  $d_{12}$ ,  $d_{23}$  and  $d_{31}$  are in one-to-one correspondence with particular well-labeled maps with three faces. This is again a consequence of the Miermont bijection with three sources  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$  and  $v_3$ , and with a particular choice of delays, now



**Fig. 27:** A schematic picture of the phenomenon of confluence of geodesics for the three geodesics linking three generic points  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$  and  $v_3$  in the scaling limit of large quadrangulations. These geodesics (represented as thick blue lines) have common parts of macroscopic lengths  $\delta_1$ ,  $\delta_2$  and  $\delta_3$ . The remaining open part of the triangle has sides of macroscopic lengths  $D'_{12}$ ,  $D'_{23}$  and  $D'_{31}$ , and separates the quadrangulation into two domains. The three common parts may lie in the same domain (as represented here) or in different domains, giving rise to eight possibilities for the relative position of the three geodesics (see Fig. 33 below).


given by

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_1 = -s &\equiv \frac{d_{23} - d_{31} - d_{12}}{2} , \\ \tau_2 = -t &\equiv \frac{d_{31} - d_{12} - d_{23}}{2} , \\ \tau_3 = -u &\equiv \frac{d_{12} - d_{23} - d_{31}}{2} ,\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

where we use the parametrization of the pairwise distances

$$\begin{aligned}d_{12} &= s + t , \\ d_{23} &= t + u , \\ d_{31} &= u + s .\end{aligned}\tag{4.2}$$

As shown in Ref. [15], the maps obtained for this choice of delays are now of the type displayed in Fig. 28, or degenerate versions of this generic form when one of the frontiers between faces or one of the faces reduces to a single vertex. By a simple decomposition of the map in five pieces obtained by cutting the map at the first and last occurrence of




**Fig. 28:** Structure of the well-labeled maps with three faces coding triply-pointed quadrangulations with prescribed values of the pairwise distances between the marked vertices:  $d_{12} = s + t$ ,  $d_{23} = t + u$  and  $d_{31} = u + s$ . These maps are easily enumerated by cutting them at the first and last label 0 on each frontier (big green dots).

a label 0 on each frontier, we immediately get the generating function for these maps:

$$\Delta_s \Delta_t \Delta_u F(s, t, u) \text{ where} \quad (4.3)$$

$$F(s, t, u) = X_{s,t} X_{t,u} X_{u,s} (Y_{s,t,u})^2 .$$

If we now consider, say the first label 0 on each of the three pairwise frontiers between faces, the global frontier of each face can then be divided into two parts lying inbetween the two marked labels 0 on this frontier. We may then distinguish the minimal label on trees attached to the first part of the frontier from that on trees attached to the second part of the frontier (see Fig. 29-(a) for an illustration). For instance, the minimal label  $1 - s$  in the first face corresponds to a minimal label  $1 - s'$  on one part and  $1 - s''$  on the other part with  $s = \max(s', s'')$ . We have similar minima  $1 - t'$ ,  $1 - t''$  and  $1 - u'$ ,  $1 - u''$  in the other faces. The quantities  $|s' - s''|$ ,  $|t' - t''|$  and  $|u' - u''|$  measure the lengths of the pairwise common parts of three particular geodesics made of chains of successors of corners at the marked labels 0 (see Fig. 29-(b)). Similarly, the quantities  $\min(s', s'') + \min(t', t'')$ ,  $\min(t', t'') + \min(u', u'')$  and  $\min(u', u'') + \min(s', s'')$  are the lengths of the proper parts of the same three geodesics. With the above refinements,



**Fig. 29:** In the map of Fig. 28, we mark the first label 0 on each frontier. We then call  $1 - s'$ ,  $1 - s''$ ,  $1 - t'$ ,  $1 - t''$ ,  $1 - u'$  and  $1 - u''$  respectively the minimal label on trees attached to the six frontier sides delimited by these marked points as shown, with  $s = \max(s', s'')$ ,  $t = \max(t', t'')$  and  $u = \max(u', u'')$ . The quantities  $|s' - s''|$ ,  $|t' - t''|$  and  $|u' - u''|$  measure the lengths of the common parts (represented by solid magenta arrows) of three particular geodesics obtained from the concatenation of chains of successors of the marked labels 0. The situation represented here corresponds to  $s'' > s'$ ,  $t'' > t'$  and  $u'' > u'$ .

the generating functions now reads

$$\Delta_{s'} \Delta_{s''} \Delta_{t'} \Delta_{t''} \Delta_{u'} \Delta_{u''} F(s', s'', t', t'', u', u'') \text{ where} \quad (4.4)$$

$$F(s', s'', t', t'', u', u'') = X_{s'', t''} X_{t'', u''} X_{u'', s''} Y_{s', t', u'} Y_{s'', t'', u''} .$$

and its continuous counterpart reads


$$\partial_{S'} \partial_{S''} \partial_{T'} \partial_{T''} \partial_{U'} \partial_{U''} \mathcal{F}(S', S'', T', T'', U', U''; \alpha) \text{ where} \quad (4.5)$$

$$\mathcal{F}(S', S'', T', T'', U', U''; \alpha) = 3^3 \mathcal{Y}(S', T', U'; \alpha) \mathcal{Y}(S'', T'', U''; \alpha)$$

$$\mathcal{Y}(S, T, U; \alpha) = \frac{1}{3\alpha} \frac{\sinh(\alpha S) \sinh(\alpha T) \sinh(\alpha U) \sinh(\alpha(S + T + U))}{\sinh(\alpha(S + T)) \sinh(\alpha(T + U)) \sinh(\alpha(U + S))}$$

which yields directly the joint law  $\rho(D'_{12}, D'_{23}, D'_{31}, \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3)$  for  $D'_{12} = \min(S', S'') + \min(T', T'')$ ,  $D'_{23} = \min(T', T'') + \min(U', U'')$ ,  $D'_{31} = \min(U', U'') + \min(S', S'')$ ,  $\delta_1 = |S' - S''|$ ,  $\delta_2 = |T' - T''|$  and  $\delta_3 = |U' - U''|$ . Note that the sign of  $S' - S''$  (respectively  $T' - T''$ ,  $U' - U''$ ) indicates in which of the domains delimited by the open part of the





**Fig. 30:** Plots of the conditional probability density  $\theta(\delta_1, \delta_2 | D_{12})$  for the lengths of the two common parts of a geodesic of fixed length  $D_{12}$ , here for (a)  $D_{12} = 1.0$ , (b)  $2.0$  and (c)  $5.0$ .

triangle the common part leading to  $v_1$  (respectively  $v_2, v_3$ ) lies. Let us now discuss in more details a number of marginal laws inherited from  $\rho(D'_{12}, D'_{23}, D'_{31}, \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3)$ .

A first marginal law is that for the lengths  $\delta_1$ ,  $D'_{12}$  and  $\delta_2$  of the three parts of the geodesic between  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ . It is obtained by first integrating (4.5) over  $U'$  and  $U''$ , which yields  $\partial_{S'} \partial_{S''} \partial_{T'} \partial_{T''} \mathcal{F}(S', S'', T', T'', \infty, \infty)$ , then integrating over  $S'$ ,  $S''$ ,  $T'$  and  $T''$  with fixed values  $\min(S', S'') = \sigma$ ,  $\max(S', S'') = \sigma + \delta_1$ ,  $\min(S', S'') = \tau$ ,  $\max(S', S'') = \tau + \delta_2$ , and finally integrating over  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  with the condition  $\sigma + \tau = D'_{12}$ .

We obtain the grand canonical function

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{3}{2}\alpha \left\{ \frac{1}{\sinh^3(\alpha D'_{12}) \sinh^3(\alpha(D'_{12} + \delta_1 + \delta_2))} + \frac{1}{\sinh^3(\alpha(D'_{12} + \delta_1)) \sinh^3(\alpha(D'_{12} + \delta_2))} \right\} \\ \times \left\{ 2\alpha D'_{12} \left( 2 \cosh(\alpha\delta_1) \cosh(\alpha\delta_2) + \cosh(\alpha(2D'_{12} + \delta_1 + \delta_2)) \right) \right. \\ \left. + 2 \sinh(\alpha(\delta_1 + \delta_2)) - 2 \sinh(\alpha(2D'_{12} + \delta_1 + \delta_2)) - \cosh(\alpha(\delta_1 - \delta_2)) \sinh(2\alpha D'_{12}) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

from which we can get the canonical joint probability density  $\theta(\delta_1, \delta_2, D'_{12})$  as before. It is interesting to consider this probability density conditionally on the value of the total length  $D_{12}$  of the geodesic between  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , namely:


$$\theta(\delta_1, \delta_2 | D_{12}) = \frac{\theta(\delta_1, \delta_2, D_{12} - \delta_1 - \delta_2)}{\rho(D_{12})} \quad (4.7)$$

where  $\rho(D)$  is the canonical two-point function (2.39). This conditional probability density is plotted in Fig. 30 for  $D_{12} = 1.0, 2.0$  and  $5.0$ .


At large  $D_{12}$ , it takes the simple form

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(\delta_1, \delta_2 | D_{12}) &\sim \frac{1}{D_{12}} \times (9D_{12})^{1/3} \chi((9D_{12})^{1/3}(D_{12} - \delta_1 - \delta_2)) \\ \text{where } \chi(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{1}{\sinh^3(\lambda/2)} + \frac{8}{e^{3\lambda/2}} \right) (\lambda \cosh(\lambda/2) - 2 \sinh(\lambda/2)) \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

In this limit, the geodesic consists mainly of two common parts linked by a small open part whose length is of order  $D_{12}^{-1/3}$ , with a distribution given by the scaling function  $\chi(\lambda)$ . The position of this open part is moreover uniform along the geodesic. This property is illustrated in Fig. 31.



**Fig. 32:** Plot of the probability density  $\theta(D'_{12})$  for the length  $D'_{12}$  of the proper part of the geodesic between  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  in the scaling limit of large triply-pointed quadrangulations.



**Fig. 31:** The conditional probability density  $\theta(\delta_1, \delta_2 | D_{12})$  for a large value of  $D_{12}$  (here  $D_{12} = 10.0$ ) becomes uniform in the “transverse” direction (corresponding to fixing the value of  $\delta_1 + \delta_2$ ) and characterized by the scaling function  $\chi(\lambda)$  in the “longitudinal” direction (corresponding to varying the value of  $\delta_1 + \delta_2$ ), with a scaling variable  $\lambda = (9D_{12})^{1/3}D'_{12} = (9D_{12})^{1/3}(D_{12} - \delta_1 - \delta_2)$ .


Upon integrating (4.6) over  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$ , we can get the marginal law for  $D'_{12}$  only. In the grand canonical formalism, it reads:

$$\frac{3}{16\alpha \sinh^4(\alpha D'_{12})} \left\{ 2\alpha D'_{12} \left( 8 + 13e^{-2\alpha D'_{12}} - 4e^{-4\alpha D'_{12}} + e^{-6\alpha D'_{12}} \right) - \left( 1 - e^{-2\alpha D'_{12}} \right) \left( 20 - 3e^{-2\alpha D'_{12}} + e^{-4\alpha D'_{12}} \right) \right\} \quad (4.9)$$

from which we obtain the canonical probability density  $\theta(D'_{12})$ . This probability density is plotted in Fig. 32. We have in particular

$$\langle D'_{12} \rangle = \frac{1}{3} \langle D \rangle = 0.590494 \dots \quad (4.10)$$

i.e. the length of the open part represents on average one third of the length of a geodesic, in agreement with (3.10). Upon integrating (4.6) over  $D'_{12}$  and  $\delta_2$  and turning to the canonical formalism, we can recover the marginal law  $\sigma(\delta_1)$  of Section 3.1. Similarly, upon integrating (4.6) over  $D'_{12}$ ,  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  with a fixed value of  $D_{12} = D'_{12} + \delta_1 + \delta_2$ , and upon turning to the canonical formalism, we recover the two-point function  $\rho(D_{12})$ , as it should.



**Fig. 33:** A schematic picture of the eight possible arrangements for the three common parts of the geodesics with respect to their open part. In the cases (a) and (h), the three common parts lie on the same side of the open part. In the remaining cases, two of the common parts lie on the same side and the third one on the other side. Note that, due to the orientation of the sphere, (a) and (h) (respectively (b) and (e), (c) and (f), (d) and (g)) can be distinguished through the cyclic order of the three sources.

To conclude this section, let us finally discuss the global arrangement of the three geodesics on the sphere. As illustrated in Fig. 33, there are eight possibilities: in two cases ((a) and (h) in Fig. 33), the three common parts lie in the same domain, while in the remaining six cases ((b) to (g) in Fig. 33), two of the common parts lie in the same domain and the third one in the other domain.

We may wonder what the probability is of observing a given arrangement in the canonical ensemble. Any of the above arrangements corresponds simply to a choice of sign for  $S' - S''$ ,  $T' - T''$  and  $U' - U''$ . To obtain, say arrangement (a), we may integrate (4.5) with the conditions  $S' = \max(S', S'') = S$ ,  $T' = \max(T', T'') = T$ ,  $U' = \max(U', U'') = U$ , leading to the grand canonical function

$$3^3 (\partial_S \partial_T \partial_U \mathcal{Y}(S, T, U; \alpha)) \mathcal{Y}(S, T, U; \alpha) . \quad (4.11)$$

To obtain arrangement (b), the third condition must be replaced by  $U'' = \max(U', U'') = U$ , leading to a grand canonical function

$$3^3 (\partial_S \partial_T \mathcal{Y}(S, T, U; \alpha)) (\partial_U \mathcal{Y}(S, T, U; \alpha)) . \quad (4.12)$$

All the remaining arrangements follow by symmetry and their contributions add up to the grand canonical three-point function

$$3^3 \partial_S \partial_T \partial_U (\mathcal{Y}(S, T, U; \alpha))^2, \quad (4.13)$$

which is the continuous limit of Eq. (4.3). To obtain the probability of having a given arrangement, we simply have to integrate its individual contribution over  $S$ ,  $T$ ,  $U$ , and divide by the integral of (4.13). Note that this ratio, obtained in the grand canonical ensemble yields directly the correct canonical probability since all grand canonical individual contributions integrate to a numerical constant times the same function  $1/\alpha^2$ . A simple calculation shows that each of the arrangements (a) and (h) occurs with a probability  $1/4$ , while each of the arrangements (b)-(g) occurs with a probability  $1/12$ .

As for the partitioning of the area over the two domains, we find that, if we disregard the particular arrangement at hand, the probability density for the proportion  $\eta$  of the total area lying in one of the two domains is again given by the symmetric Beta distribution (3.25) with parameters  $\{1/4, 1/4\}$ . On the other hand, if we consider a particular arrangement, the partitioning of the area is no longer symmetric over the two domains. In the case of arrangement (a) or (h), we find that, on average,  $\sim 94.259\%$  of the total area lies in the domain containing the three common parts, while, in the case of the arrangement (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (g), an average of  $\sim 67.224\%$  of the total area lies in the domain containing the two common parts.

## 5. Conclusion and discussion

In this paper, we derived a number of probability distributions for the lengths and areas of triangles made of the three geodesics connecting three uniformly drawn random points, as well as of minimal separating loops. These laws are expected to be universal features of the Brownian map and provide quantitative results characterizing the phenomenon of confluence. This phenomenon is remarkable as it places the Brownian map half way between smooth surfaces and trees. In smooth surfaces, geodesics cannot merge and the three sides of a triangle only meet at their endpoints so that there are no common parts. In contrast, in trees, the three sides of a triangle meet at a central common vertex so that there is no open part. As for a minimal separating loop on a tree, it corresponds generically to a back-and-forth travel to the above central common vertex and hence has no open part. On a smooth surface, depending on the shape of the surface, a minimal separating loop is either a back-and-forth travel along a geodesic, with no open part, or a simple curve with no common part. Having both open and common parts of non-zero length is a peculiarity of the Brownian map.

It is tempting to relate the above results to the so-called “baby universe structure” of two-dimensional quantum gravity well-known in the physics literature [3,22]. In this picture, a baby universe is a region of the surface separated by a small neck, and a typical surface consists of many such baby universes attached to a mother universe and arranged in a tree-like fashion. The influence of baby universes on the behavior of

the three-point function was already discussed in Ref. [16]. Qualitatively, the confluence phenomenon could simply result from the fact that a typical point lies in a baby universe and all geodesics leading to it are forced to pass through the same chain of small necks. The length of the common part of geodesics could then be interpreted as a measure of the spatial extent of baby universes. More precise statements would require a rigorous definition of baby universes at a discrete level. A first possibility consists in looking only at so-called “minimum neck baby universes” (*minbus*) [22]. It was shown however that a typical minbu remains finite [23], and hence its extent vanishes in the continuum limit. One should then look at more general baby universes with larger necks but one then faces the problem that there is no canonical decomposition of a general map in such baby universes.

Our approach consisted in obtaining discrete results for random quadrangulations and taking their scaling limit. So far we lack a general formalism which would allow us to compute the same results directly in the continuum. Despite recent progress [24,25], the so-called Liouville field theory does not yet seem to be able to address such questions. Moreover, our results are restricted to the so-called universality class of pure gravity. It would be desirable to extend them to other universality classes of random surfaces coupled to critical matter models [2] (characterized by their central charge  $c$ , the pure gravity having  $c = 0$ ) such as the celebrated Ising model ( $c = 1/2$ ) [26]. Discrete approaches based on bijections with blossom trees [27-29] or labeled trees [30,31] exist for these problems but those have not been used, so far, to extract geometrical information. Some of these models (with a central charge  $c > 1$ ) are expected to behave like branched polymers, and hence should have the geometry of trees described above.

## References

- [1] V. Kazakov, *Bilocal regularization of models of random surfaces*, Phys. Lett. **B150** (1985) 282-284; F. David, *Planar diagrams, two-dimensional lattice gravity and surface models*, Nucl. Phys. **B257** (1985) 45-58; J. Ambjørn, B. Durhuus and J. Fröhlich, *Diseases of triangulated random surface models and possible cures*, Nucl. Phys. **B257** (1985) 433-449; V. Kazakov, I. Kostov and A. Migdal *Critical properties of randomly triangulated planar random surfaces*, Phys. Lett. **B157** (1985) 295-300.
- [2] for a review, see: P. Di Francesco, P. Ginsparg and J. Zinn-Justin, *2D Gravity and Random Matrices*, Physics Reports **254** (1995) 1-131.
- [3] J. Ambjørn, B. Durhuus and T. Jonsson, *Quantum Geometry: A statistical field theory approach*, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [4] J. F. Marckert and A. Mokkadem, *Limit of normalized quadrangulations: the Brownian map*, Annals of Probability **34(6)** (2006) 2144-2202, arXiv:math.PR/0403398.
- [5] J. F. Le Gall, *The topological structure of scaling limits of large planar maps*, invent. math. **169** (2007) 621-670, arXiv:math.PR/0607567.
- [6] J. F. Le Gall and F. Paulin, *Scaling limits of bipartite planar maps are homeomorphic to the 2-sphere*, arXiv:math.PR/0612315.
- [7] G. Miermont, *On the sphericity of scaling limits of random planar quadrangulations*, Elect. Comm. Probab. **13** (2008) 248-257, arXiv:0712.3687 [math.PR].
- [8] J. Ambjørn and Y. Watabiki, *Scaling in quantum gravity*, Nucl.Phys. **B445** (1995) 129-144.
- [9] J. Bouttier, P. Di Francesco and E. Guitter, *Geodesic distance in planar graphs*, Nucl. Phys. **B663**[FS] (2003) 535-567, arXiv:cond-mat/0303272.
- [10] P. Chassaing and G. Schaeffer, *Random Planar Lattices and Integrated SuperBrownian Excursion*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **128(2)** (2004) 161-212, arXiv:math.CO/0205226.
- [11] G. Miermont and M. Weill, *Radius and profile of random planar maps with faces of arbitrary degrees*, Electron. J. Probab. **13** (2008) 79-106, arXiv:0706.3334 [math.PR].
- [12] J. Bouttier and E. Guitter, *Statistics of geodesics in large quadrangulations*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **41** (2008) 145001 (30pp), arXiv:0712.2160 [math-ph].
- [13] G. Miermont, *Tessellations of random maps of arbitrary genus*, arXiv:0712.3688 [math.PR]
- [14] J.-F. Le Gall, *Geodesics in large planar maps and in the Brownian map*, arXiv:0804.3012 [math.PR].
- [15] J. Bouttier and E. Guitter, *The three-point function of planar quadrangulations*, J. Stat. Mech. (2008) P07020, arXiv:0805.2355 [math-ph].

- [16] H. Aoki, H. Kawai, J. Nishimura and A. Tsuchiya, *Operator product expansion in two-dimensional quantum gravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B474** (1996) 512-528, arXiv:hep-th/9511117.
- [17] M. Marcus and G. Schaeffer, *Une bijection simple pour les cartes orientables* (2001), available at <http://www.lix.polytechnique.fr/Labo/Gilles.Schaeffer/Biblio/>; see also G. Schaeffer, *Conjugaison d'arbres et cartes combinatoires aléatoires*, PhD Thesis, Université Bordeaux I (1998) and G. Chapuy, M. Marcus and G. Schaeffer, *A bijection for rooted maps on orientable surfaces*, arXiv:0712.3649 [math.CO].
- [18] R. Cori and B. Vauquelin, *Planar maps are well labeled trees*, Canad. J. Math. **33(5)** (1981) 1023-1042.
- [19] J.-F. Delmas, *Computation of moments for the length of the one dimensional ISE support*, Elect. Journ. of Probab. **8(17)** (2003) 1-15.
- [20] M. Bousquet-Mélou, *Limit laws for embedded trees. Applications to the integrated superBrownian excursion*, Random Structures and Algorithms **29(4)** (2006) 475-523, arXiv:math.CO/0501266.
- [21] J. Bouttier, *Physique statistique des surfaces aléatoires et combinatoire bijective des cartes planaires*, PhD Thesis (2005).
- [22] S. Jain and S. Mathur, *World-sheet geometry and baby universes in 2D quantum gravity*, Phys. Lett. **B 286** (1992) 239-246, arXiv:hep-th:9204017.
- [23] C. Banderier, P. Flajolet, G. Schaeffer and M. Soria, *Random Maps, Coalescing Saddles, Singularity Analysis, and Airy Phenomena*, Random Structures and Algorithms **19** (2001) 194-246.
- [24] B. Duplantier and S. Sheffield, *Liouville Quantum Gravity and KPZ*, arXiv:0808.1560 [math.PR].
- [25] F. David and M. Bauer, *Another derivation of the geometrical KPZ relations*, arXiv:0810.2858 [math-ph].
- [26] D. Boulatov and V. Kazakov, *The Ising model on a random planar lattice: the structure of the phase transition and the exact critical exponents*, Phys. Lett. **B186** (1987) 379-384.
- [27] M. Bousquet-Mélou and G. Schaeffer, *The degree distribution in bipartite planar maps: application to the Ising model*, arXiv:math.CO/0211070.
- [28] J. Bouttier, P. Di Francesco and E. Guitter. *Combinatorics of Hard Particles on Planar Graphs*, Nucl.Phys. **B655** (2003) 313-341, arXiv:cond-mat/0211168.
- [29] J. Bouttier, P. Di Francesco and E. Guitter. *Combinatorics of bicubic maps with hard particles*, J.Phys. A: Math.Gen. **38** (2005) 4529-4560, arXiv:math.CO/0501344.
- [30] J. Bouttier, P. Di Francesco and E. Guitter. *Planar maps as labeled mobiles*, Elec. Jour. of Combinatorics **11** (2004) R69, arXiv:math.CO/0405099.
- [31] J. Bouttier, P. Di Francesco and E. Guitter. *Blocked edges on Eulerian maps and mobiles: Application to spanning trees, hard particles and the Ising model*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40** (2007) 7411-7440, arXiv:math.CO/0702097.