GEOMETRY OF THE MINIMAL SPANNING TREE OF A RANDOM 3-REGULAR GRAPH

LOUIGI ADDARIO-BERRY\textsuperscript{1} AND SANCHAYAN SEN\textsuperscript{2}

Abstract. The global structure of the minimal spanning tree (MST) is expected to be universal for a large class of underlying random discrete structures. But very little is known about the intrinsic geometry of MSTs of most standard models, and so far the scaling limit of the MST viewed as a metric measure space has only been identified in the case of the complete graph [5].

In this work, we show that the MST constructed by assigning i.i.d. continuous edge-weights to either the random (simple) 3-regular graph or the 3-regular configuration model on \( n \) vertices, endowed with the tree distance scaled by \( n^{-1/3} \) and the uniform probability measure on the vertices, converges in distribution with respect to Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov topology to a random compact metric measure space. Further, this limiting space has the same law as the scaling limit of the MST of the complete graph identified in [5] up to a scaling factor of \( 6^{1/3} \). Our proof relies on a novel argument that uses a coupling between the 3-regular configuration model and the Erdős-Rényi random graph. The techniques of this paper can be used to establish the scaling limit of the MST in the setting of various different random graph models provided one additional technical condition is verified.

1. Introduction

Consider a finite, connected, and weighted graph \( (V, E, w) \), where \( (V, E) \) is the underlying graph and \( w : E \to [0, \infty) \) is the weight function. A spanning tree of \( (V, E) \) is a tree that is a subgraph of \( (V, E) \) with vertex set \( V \). A minimal spanning tree (MST) \( T \) of \( (V, E, w) \) satisfies

\[
\sum_{e \in T} w(e) = \min \left\{ \sum_{e \in T'} w(e) : T' \text{ is a spanning tree of } (V, E) \right\}.
\]

(1.1)

The two natural choices for the underlying weighted graph are (i) a deterministic graph (e.g., the complete graph on \( n \) vertices or the hypercube) or a random graph (e.g., Erdős-Rényi random graph, random regular graph, or inhomogeneous random graphs) with i.i.d. continuous edge-weights assigned to them, and (ii) the complete graph on a finite set of random points in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) (e.g., \( n \) i.i.d. points or a Poisson point process in the unit cube) where the edge-weights are some function of the Euclidean length of the edges. The MST in the latter case is sometimes called the Euclidean MST.
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The MST is one of the most studied functionals in combinatorial optimization and geometric probability and has inspired a large body of work. For an account of law of large numbers and related asymptotics in the Euclidean setting, see e.g., [12, 13, 17, 19, 82]. Central limit theorems (CLT) for the total weight of Euclidean MSTs were first proved by Kesten and Lee [60] and by Alexander [15] in 1996. This was a long-standing open question at the time of its solution. Later certain other CLTs related to MSTs were proved in [62, 63]. A question raised in [60] about the convergence rate in the CLT for the total weight of the Euclidean MST was answered in [34].

Studies related to MSTs in several other directions were undertaken in [18, 27, 77, 78, 80]. An account of certain structural and connectivity properties of minimal spanning forests can be found in [14, 16, 68, 76] and the references therein. For an account of the scaling limit of minimal spanning trees in subsets of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) with respect to the topology introduced by Aizenman, Burchard, Newman, and Wilson, see, e.g., [7, 46].

The MST of \( K_n \) - the complete graph on \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \) has been studied extensively as well. A celebrated theorem of Frieze [44] shows that under some assumptions on the weight distributions, the total weight of the MST of \( K_n \) converges in expectation to \( \zeta(3) \).

This was extended to other models in [21, 43, 45, 79]. A more general distributional convergence result was proved in [10]. The central limit theorem for the total weight of the MST of \( K_n \) constructed using i.i.d. Uniform[0, 1] edge-weights was proved in [53].

The global geometric properties of the MST, e.g., the diameter and the typical distance, have also been of considerable interest. But until very recently, the literature on such results was very thin. Frieze and McDiarmid asked a question [42, Research Problem 23] about the ‘likely shape of a minimum spanning tree’ and the order of the diameter of the MST. In the statistical physics literature, paths in the the MST correspond to optimal paths in the so-called strong disorder regime for complex networks. The first correct prediction about the behavior of distances in the MST was made in [29] (see also [30]), where it was predicted that in the strong disorder regime, the length of optimal paths in complex networks should scale like \( n^{1/3} \) if the degree distribution of the network has finite third moment.

An upper bound of the order \( n^{1/3} \) on the diameter of the MST of \( K_n \) was proved in [6]: Let \( M_{\infty, \text{er}} \) be the MST of \( K_n \) constructed using i.i.d. continuous edge-weights, and denote by \( \text{diam}(M_{\infty, \text{er}}) \) the maximum tree distance between two vertices of \( M_{\infty, \text{er}} \). Then \( \text{diam}(M_{\infty, \text{er}}) = O_P(n^{1/3}) \). Nachmias and Peres [74] showed that the diameter of the largest component of the critical Erdős-Rényi random graph is \( \Theta_P(n^{1/3}) \). There is a natural coupling between MSTs and percolation (see Observation 2 in Section 4.1), which together with the above result gives a matching lower bound:

\[
\text{diam}(M_{\infty, \text{er}}) = \Omega_P(n^{1/3}).
\]

Then a stronger result was proved in [5], where the scaling limit of \( M_{\infty, \text{er}} \) viewed as a metric measure space was obtained. We state this result in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1 (Scaling limit of the MST of the complete graph [5]).** View \( M_{\infty, \text{er}} \) as a random metric measure space by endowing it with the tree distance and the uniform probability measure on its vertices. Then there exists a random compact metric measure space \( \mathcal{M} \) such
that
\[ n^{-1/3} M_{\infty}^\text{n-er} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{M} \]

w.r.t. Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov topology. Further, almost surely, the space \( \mathcal{M} \) is a binary real tree and its Minkowski dimension exists and equals 3.

Theorem 1.1 appears to be one of the first scaling limits to be identified for any problem from combinatorial optimization, and so far, the above theorem gives the only result where the metric space scaling limit of the MST has been identified. Several questions about the geometry of \( \mathcal{M} \) remain open. For instance, what is the distribution of the typical distance in \( \mathcal{M} \)? More generally, is there a stick-breaking construction of \( \mathcal{M} \)? Is the support of the mass measure \( \mu \) on \( \mathcal{M} \) the whole of \( \mathcal{M} \)? Since \( \mathcal{M} \) is a compact, by [38, Corollary 1.2], the metric space \( \mathcal{M} \) (without the measure) is encoded by a (random) continuous function (see Section 3.4). What can we say about the distribution of this function?

The limiting space \( \mathcal{M} \) is expected to be a universal object in the following sense: For a wide array of random discrete structures that exhibit mean-field behavior, the MST constructed using i.i.d. continuous edge-weights should have a rescaled version of \( \mathcal{M} \) as its scaling limit. Examples of such models include the high-dimensional discrete torus, the hypercube, random regular graphs or more generally random graphs with given degree sequence (under finite third moment assumption on the degrees), various models of inhomogeneous random graphs (under appropriate assumptions), bounded-size rules, and the quantum random graph model. See Section 6 for a more detailed discussion.

In this work, we take a first step in this broader program of establishing universality of the MST by showing that the above claim is true for the random simple 3-regular graph and the 3-regular configuration model. The core of the largest component of the Erdős-Rényi random graph, in the critical window and also in the barely-supercritical regime up to a certain threshold, can be described by a 3-regular configuration model on a random number of vertices and having random edge-lengths (see [56]). This makes the 3-regular case special. We use an indirect approach by exploiting the above coupling between the 3-regular configuration model and the Erdős-Rényi random graph. However, with an additional technical estimate, our arguments can be extended to establish the scaling limit of the MST for many of the random graph models mentioned above. We refer the reader to Section 6 for details.

1.1. Organization of the paper. In Section 1.2, we describe the random graph models considered in this paper. Section 2 contains precise statements of our main results. We have deferred major definitions to Section 3, where we also give the necessary background on results on scaling limits of critical random graph models. In Section 4 we list several properties of MSTs, describe the connection between MSTs and percolation and the so-called cycle-breaking algorithm. We also state a result (Theorem 4.8) central to our argument. The proofs of our main results are given in Section 5. We close in Section 6 by discussing the relevance of this work and related open problems.

1.2. Random graph models. First we define the classical Erdős-Rényi random graph model. Recall that \( K_n \) denotes the complete graph on \([n]\).
Definition 1.2 (The Erdős-Rényi process). The Erdős-Rényi process \( \text{ER}(n, \lambda), \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \) is a stochastic process taking values in the space of subgraphs of \( K_n \) defined as follows: Assign a random variable \( U_{ij} \) to each edge \((i, j)\) of \( K_n \), where \( U_{ij}, 1 \leq i < j \leq n \), are i.i.d. Uniform \([0, 1]\) random variables. Set \( \text{ER}(n, \lambda) \) to be the subgraph of \( K_n \) whose vertex set is \([n]\) and edge set is \( \{ (i, j) : U_{ij} \leq n^{-1} + \lambda n^{-4/3} \} \).

For convenience, we will assume that the random vector \((U_{ij}, 1 \leq i < j \leq n)\) is given by the identity map on the canonical probability space \([0, 1]^{\binom{n}{2}}\) endowed with the \((\binom{n}{2})\)-fold product of the uniform measure on \([0, 1]\).

Now fix a collection of \( n \) vertices labeled by \([n] := \{ 1, 2, \ldots, n \}\) and an associated degree sequence \( d^{(n)} = (d_v, v \in [n]) \) where \( \ell_n := \sum_{v \in [n]} d_v \) is assumed even. There are two natural constructions resulting in a random graph on \([n]\) with the prescribed degree sequence.

Definition 1.3 (Uniformly distributed simple graphs). Suppose \( d = (d_v, v \in [n]) \) is a given degree sequence. Consider the set of all simple graphs with vertex set \([n]\) where vertex \( v \) has degree \( d_v \), and write \( \lambda \) for the random graph having uniform distribution over this set.

When \( d_v = 3 \) for all \( v \in [n] \), we will denote the corresponding random graph by \( \lambda n,3 \). In this case, we assume that \( n \) is even.

Recall that a multigraph is a graph where we allow multiple edges and self-loops.

Definition 1.4 (Configuration model \([20,28,73]\)). Let \( G_{n,d} \) be the random multigraph with degree sequence \( d \) constructed sequentially as follows: Equip each vertex \( v \in [n] \) with \( d_v \) half-edges or stubs. Pick two half-edges uniformly from the set of half-edges that have not yet been paired, and pair them to form a full edge. Repeat till all half-edges have been paired.

When \( d_v = 3 \) for all \( v \in [n] \), we will denote the corresponding random multigraph by \( G_{n,3} \). In this case, we assume that \( n \) is even.

Note that \( G_{n,d} \) is not uniformly distributed over the set of multigraphs with degree sequence \( d \). We record the the distribution of \( G_{n,d} \) here for later use. Let \( G \) be a multigraph on vertex set \([n]\) in which there are \( x_{ij} \) many edges between \( i \) and \( j \), \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n \), and vertex \( i \) has \( x_{ii} \) many loops, so that \( d_i = x_{ii} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij} \) is the total degree of \( i \) (note that a loop contributes two to the degree). Let \( \ell_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i \). Then

\[
\mathbb{P} \left( G_{n,d} = G \right) = \frac{1}{(\ell_n - 1)!} \times \frac{\prod_{i \in [n]} d_i!}{\prod_{i \in [n]} 2^{x_{ii}} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} x_{ij}!}. \tag{1.3}
\]

The proof of (1.3) can be found in [51, Proposition 7.7].

2. Main results

In this section we will describe our main results. We first fix some conventions that we will follow throughout this paper.

Convention. (i) For any metric measure space \( X = (X, d, \mu) \) and \( \alpha > 0 \), \( \alpha X \) will denote the metric measure space \((X, \alpha d, \mu)\), i.e, the space where the metric has been multiplied by \( \alpha \) and the measure \( \mu \) has remained unchanged. Precise definitions of metric space
convergence including the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov (GHP) topology are deferred to Section 3.

(ii) When a graph with edge-lengths is viewed as a metric space, the distance between vertices will always be computed using the edge-lengths. When not specified, all edge-lengths are taken to be one, and the corresponding metric becomes the graph distance. When a finite connected graph is viewed as a metric measure space, the measure, unless specified otherwise, will be the uniform probability measure on the vertices.

(iii) For any finite (not necessarily connected) graph $G$, unless the edge-weights are specified, the “MST of $G$” will mean the (random) minimal spanning tree of the largest component of $G$ obtained by assigning i.i.d. continuous weights to the edges of $G$. It is a standard fact (see Observation 1 in Section 4.1) that the law of the MST constructed using exchangeable edge-weights that are almost surely pairwise distinct does not depend on the distribution of the underlying weights. So the above definition of MST of $G$ makes sense.

Recall the definitions of $G_{n,3}$ and $G_{n,3}$ from Section 1.2. Our first main result concerns the scaling limit of the MST of $G_{n,3}$.

**Theorem 2.1** (Scaling limit of the MST of the 3-regular configuration model). For $n$ even, let $M_n$ denote the MST of $G_{n,3}$. Think of $M_n$ as a metric measure space by using the tree distance and the uniform probability measure on the vertices. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be as in Theorem 1.1. Then

$$n^{-1/3} \cdot M_n \overset{d}{\to} 6^{1/3} \cdot \mathcal{M} \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty$$

with respect to Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov topology.

Our next main result concerns the scaling limit of the MST of $\overline{G}_{n,3}$.

**Theorem 2.2** (Scaling limit of the MST of the simple 3-regular graph). For $n$ even, let $\overline{M}_n$ denote the MST of $\overline{G}_{n,3}$. Then the result in Theorem 2.1 continues to hold with $\overline{M}_n$ in place of $M_n$, i.e.,

$$n^{-1/3} \cdot \overline{M}_n \overset{d}{\to} 6^{1/3} \cdot \mathcal{M} \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty$$

with respect to Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov topology.

**Remark 1.** Let

$$B_n := \{ G_{n,3} \text{ is connected} \} .$$

By the results of [40,64],

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} P(B_n) = 1 = \lim_{n \to \infty} P( \overline{G}_{n,3} \text{ is connected}).$$

Thus the conclusions of the two theorems above also hold for $G_{n,3}$ and $\overline{G}_{n,3}$ conditioned to be connected. Further, the results of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 remain true if the MST were constructed using exchangeable edge-weights that are almost surely pairwise distinct.

A crucial ingredient in the proof is the following result:

**Theorem 2.3.** Almost surely the mass measure $\mu$ on $\mathcal{M}$ is non-atomic, i.e.,

$$P(\mu(x) = 0 \text{ for every } x \in \mathcal{M}) = 1.$$
3. Definitions and various scaling limits

3.1. Notation. For any set $A$, we write $|A|$ or $\#A$ for its cardinality and $\mathbb{1}\{A\}$ for the associated indicator function. For any graph $H$, we write $V(H)$ and $E(H)$ for the set of vertices and the set of edges of $H$ respectively. We write $|H|$ for the number of vertices in $H$, i.e., $|H| = |V(H)|$. For any finite connected graph $H = (V, E)$, we write $\text{sp}(H)$ for the number of surplus edges in $H$, i.e., $\text{sp}(H) := |E| - |V| + 1$.

For any finite multigraph $H = (V, E)$ and $e_1, \ldots, e_k \in E$, let $H \setminus \{e_1, \ldots, e_k\} := (V, E \setminus \{e_1, \ldots, e_k\})$. While removing a single edge $e$ we will simply write $H \setminus e$ instead of $H \setminus \{e\}$.

Further, denote by $\text{Conne}(H)$ the set of all edges $e \in E$ such that $H \setminus e$ is connected. For any finite multigraph $H = (V, E)$ and edges $f_1, \ldots, f_k$ in the complete graph on $V$, let $H \cup \{f_1, \ldots, f_k\} := (V, E \cup \{f_1, \ldots, f_k\})$. For two multigraphs $H_i = (V_i, E_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, we write $H_1 \cup H_2$ for the multigraph $(V_1 \cup V_2, E_1 \cup E_2)$. If $H_2$ is a connected component of $H_1$, then we write $H_1 \setminus H_2$ for the multigraph $(V_1 \setminus V_2, E_1 \setminus E_2)$.

For any $u > 0$, $\Gamma_u$ will denote a Gamma$(u, 1)$ random variable. We will write $\Gamma^{(\alpha)}_u$, $\alpha \in \Lambda$, to denote i.i.d. Gamma$(u, 1)$ random variables indexed by the set $\Lambda$.

For any metric space $(X, d)$ and $U \subseteq X$, we define $\text{diam}(U; X) := \sup \{d(x_1, x_2) : x_1, x_2 \in U\}$. We simply write $\text{diam}(U)$ when there is no scope of confusion. For any $\delta > 0$ and $x \in X$, we let $B(x, \delta) = \{y \in X : d(x, y) \leq \delta\}$. For any metric measure space $(X, d, \mu)$, we define $\mu(B(x, \delta)) : x \in X$.

For any tree $t$ on $[m]$ rooted at $\rho$, we write $\text{ht}(u, t) := d(\rho, u)$ for $u \in t$, and $\text{ht}(t) = \max_{u \in [m]} \text{ht}(u, t)$.

If $u \neq \rho$, we write $\overleftarrow{u}$ for the the parent of $u$ in $t$. If $\overleftarrow{u} \neq \rho$, then $\overleftarrow{u}^{(2)}$ will denote the parent of $\overleftarrow{u}$. Similarly define $\overleftarrow{u}^{(k)}$ for $k \leq \text{ht}(u, t)$.

For any set $A$ and function $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we let $\|f\|_{\infty} := \sup_{x \in A}|f(x)|$. We use the standard Landau notation of $o(\cdot)$, $O(\cdot)$ and the corresponding order in probability notation $o_P(\cdot)$ and $O_P(\cdot)$. We use $\overset{p}{\longrightarrow}$, $\overset{d}{\longrightarrow}$, and $\overset{a.e.}{\longrightarrow}$ to denote convergence in probability, convergence in distribution, and almost-sure convergence respectively.

Throughout this paper, $C, C', c, c'$ will denote positive universal constants, and their values may change from line to line. Special constants will be indexed as $c_1, c_2$ etc. We freely omit ceilings and floors when there is little risk of confusion in doing so.

3.2. Topologies on the space of metric spaces. We mainly follow [1, 5, 33, 72]. All metric spaces under consideration will be compact. For any compact $(X, d)$ and $A, B \subseteq X$, we define the Hausdorff distance between $A$ and $B$ to be

$$d_H(A, B) := \inf \{\varepsilon > 0 : A \subseteq B_\varepsilon \text{ and } B \subseteq A_\varepsilon\},$$

where $A_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{x \in A} \{y : d(y, x) \leq \varepsilon\}$.

Next we recall the Gromov-Hausdorff distance $d_{\text{GH}}$ between metric spaces. Fix two metric spaces $X_1 = (X_1, d_1)$ and $X_2 = (X_2, d_2)$. For a subset $C \subseteq X_1 \times X_2$, the distortion of $C$
is defined as
\[ \text{dis}(C) := \sup \{ |d_1(x_1, y_1) - d_2(x_2, y_2)| : (x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2) \in C \}. \]

A correspondence \( C \) between \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) is a measurable subset of \( X_1 \times X_2 \) such that for every \( x_1 \in X_1 \), there exists at least one \( x_2 \in X_2 \) such that \((x_1, x_2) \in C \) and vice-versa. The Gromov-Hausdorff (GH) distance between the two metric spaces \( (X_1, d_1) \) and \( (X_2, d_2) \) is defined as
\[ d_{GH}(X_1, X_2) = \frac{1}{2} \inf \{ \text{dis}(C) : C \text{ is a correspondence between } X_1 \text{ and } X_2 \}. \]

Let \( \mathcal{G}_{\text{GH}} \) denote the set of isometry equivalence classes of compact metric spaces endowed with the quotient metric induced by \( d_{GH} \), which we will continue to denote by \( d_{GH} \).

We next define the marked topology; see [72, Sections 6.4 and 6.5] for a more detailed treatment. A marked metric space is a triple \( (X, d, C) \), where \( (X, d) \) is a compact metric space and \( C \) is a compact subset of \( X \). The isometry classes \([ (X, d, C) ] \) of marked spaces are defined in the obvious way, and the set of such isometry classes is denoted by \( \mathcal{G}_{\text{GH}}^* \).

We put the following metric on \( \mathcal{G}_{\text{GH}}^* \): For \( [X_i] = \{ (X_i, d_i, C_i) \} \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{GH}}^*, i = 1, 2, \) define
\[ d_{GH}^*([X_1], [X_2]) := \inf_{\phi_1, \phi_2} \left\{ d_H(\phi_1(X_1), \phi_2(X_2)) + d_H(\phi_1(C_1), \phi_2(C_2)) \right\}, \]
where infimum is taken over all isometric embeddings \( \phi_i : X_i \rightarrow Z, \ i = 1, 2, \) into some metric space \( Z \). The following result is the content of [72, Proposition 9].

**Lemma 3.1.** (a) The space \( (\mathcal{G}_{\text{GH}}^*, d_{GH}^*) \) is Polish.
(b) A collection \( \{ ([X_\alpha, d_\alpha, C_\alpha]) : \alpha \in \Lambda \} \) is relatively compact in \( (\mathcal{G}_{\text{GH}}^*, d_{GH}^*) \) iff \{ \((X_\alpha, d_\alpha)\) : \( \alpha \in \Lambda \) \} is relatively compact in \( (\mathcal{G}_{\text{GH}}, d_{GH}) \) or equivalently iff the collection of metric spaces \{ \((X_\alpha, d_\alpha) : \alpha \in \Lambda \) \} is uniformly totally bounded.

To ease notation, from now on, we will simply write \( X_1 \) to denote both the space \( (X_1, d_1, C_1) \) and its equivalence class \([X_1] \).

A compact metric measure space \( (X, d, \mu) \) is a compact metric space \( (X, d) \) with an associated finite measure \( \mu \) on the Borel sigma algebra of \( X \). We will use the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov (GHP) distance to compare compact metric measure spaces.

Given two compact metric measure spaces \( (X_1, d_1, \mu_1) \) and \( (X_2, d_2, \mu_2) \) and a measure \( \pi \) on the product space \( X_1 \times X_2 \), the discrepancy of \( \pi \) with respect to \( \mu_1 \) and \( \mu_2 \) is defined as
\[ D(\pi; \mu_1, \mu_2) := ||\mu_1 - \pi_1|| + ||\mu_2 - \pi_2|| \]
where \( \pi_1, \pi_2 \) are the marginals of \( \pi \) and \( ||\cdot|| \) denotes the total variation of signed measures. Then define the metric \( d_{\text{GHP}} \) between \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) is defined as
\[ d_{\text{GHP}}(X_1, X_2) := \inf \left\{ \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \text{dis}(C), D(\pi; \mu_1, \mu_2), \pi(C^c) \right\} \right\}, \]
where the infimum is taken over all correspondences \( C \) and measures \( \pi \) on \( X_1 \times X_2 \).
The function $d_{GHP}$ is a pseudometric and defines an equivalence relation: $X \sim Y \iff d_{GHP}(X, Y) = 0$. Let $\mathcal{S}_{GHP}$ be the set of all equivalence classes of compact metric measure spaces. As before, we continue to denote the quotient metric by $d_{GHP}$. Then by [1], $(\mathcal{S}_{GHP}, d_{GHP})$ is a complete separable metric space. As before, to ease notation, we will continue to use $(X, d, \mu)$ to denote both the metric space and the corresponding equivalence class.

Sometimes we will be interested in not just one but an infinite sequence of compact metric measure spaces. Then the relevant space will be $\mathcal{S}_{GHP}^\infty$ equipped with the product topology inherited from $d_{GHP}$.

3.3. **Scaling limits of component sizes at criticality.** The starting point for establishing the metric space scaling limit is understanding the behavior of the component sizes. Aldous [11] studied the maximal components of the Erdős-Rényi random graph in the critical regime and proved the following remarkable result.

**Theorem 3.2** ([11], Corollary 2). Write $\mathcal{C}^n_{i, \text{st}}(\lambda)$ for the $i$-th largest connected component of $\text{ER}(n, \lambda)$. Then there exists a random sequence $\zeta(\lambda) = \left( (\xi_i(\lambda), N_i(\lambda)), i \geq 1 \right)$ such that as $n \to \infty$,

$$\left( \left( n^{-2/3} |\mathcal{C}^n_{i, \text{st}}(\lambda)|, \text{sp}(\mathcal{C}^n_{i, \text{st}}(\lambda)), i \geq 1 \right) \right) \overset{d}{\longrightarrow} \zeta(\lambda)$$

with respect to product topology.

This convergence in fact holds w.r.t. a stronger topology. We refer the reader to [11] for an explicit description of the limiting sequence $\zeta(\lambda)$. We record here a result about the asymptotic growth of the random variables $\xi_1(\lambda)$ and $N_1(\lambda)$.

**Lemma 3.3.** We have, as $\lambda \to \infty$,

$$\frac{\xi_1(\lambda)}{\lambda} \overset{p}{\longrightarrow} 2, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{N_1(\lambda)}{\lambda^3} \overset{p}{\longrightarrow} \frac{2}{3}.$$

The proof of this result can be found in [5, Lemma 5.6]. (See also [4] for the analogue of this result for the multiplicative coalescent in the regime where the scaling limit is a pure-jump process.)

Theorem 3.2 has since been generalized to a number of other random graph models. In the context of graphs with given degree sequence, Nachmias and Peres [75] studied critical percolation on random regular graphs; Riordan [81] analyzed the configuration model with bounded degrees; Joseph [59] considered i.i.d. degrees. A stronger result was obtained in [37]. We will state a weaker version of this result next.

For a measure $\nu$ on $\mathbb{R}$, and $p > 0$, write $\sigma_p(\nu) = \int_{[0]} |x|^p \nu(\text{d}x)$; if $\nu$ has support $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ then $\sigma_p(\nu) = \sum_{i \geq 0} i^p \nu(i)$. Recall that $\nu_n \rightharpoonup \nu$ w.r.t. the Wasserstein distance $W_p$ if $\nu_n \to \nu$ weakly and $\sigma_q(\nu_n) \to \sigma_q(\nu) < \infty$ for all $0 \leq q \leq p$; see [83, Definition 6.8].

**Assumption 3.4.** Suppose $d = (d_n^{(v)})$, $v \in [n]$ is a degree sequence for each $n \geq 1$, and write $\nu_n := n^{-1} \sum_{v \in [n]} \delta_{d_v}$ for the empirical degree distribution. Assume the following hold as $n \to \infty$:

(i) There exists a measure $\nu$ on $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\nu^n \rightharpoonup \nu$ w.r.t. $W_3$ distance.
(ii) The degree sequence is in the critical scaling window, i.e., there exists \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \) such that

\[
\frac{\sigma_1(v)}{(\sigma_3(v) - 4\sigma_1(v))^{2/3}} \cdot \left( \frac{\sigma_2(v^n)}{\sigma_1(v)} - 2 \right) \cdot n^{1/3} \to \lambda.
\]  

(3.1)

Note that this assumption implies that \( \sigma_2(v) = 2\sigma_1(v) \).

**Theorem 3.5** ([37]). Consider a sequence of degree sequences \( d = d^{(n)} \), \( n \geq 1 \), satisfying Assumption 3.4 with limiting empirical distribution \( v \). Let \( C^n_i \) be the \( i \)-th largest connected component of \( G_{n,d} \) (or \( G_{n,\overline{d}} \)). Then as \( n \to \infty \),

\[
\left( \frac{(\sigma_3(v) - 4\sigma_1(v))^{1/3}}{\sigma_1(v) \cdot n^{2/3}} \cdot |C^n_i|, sp(C^n_i), i \geq 1 \right) \to _d \lambda(\lambda)
\]

with respect to product topology.

This result, in a stronger form, can be found in [37, Theorem 2 and Remark 5]. In [37], the description of the limiting sequence is slightly different. But it is easy to restate the result in the above form using Brownian scaling. In the next section we will use the random sequence \( \lambda(\lambda) \) to describe certain metric measure spaces that will appear in our proofs.

### 3.4 Real trees and \( \mathbb{R} \)-graphs.

For any metric space \( (X, d) \), a geodesic between \( x_1, x_2 \in X \) is an isometric embedding \( f : [0, d(x_1, x_2)] \to X \) such that \( f(0) = x_1 \) and \( f(d(x_1, x_2)) = x_2 \). \( (X, d) \) is a geodesic space if there is a geodesic between any two points in \( X \). An embedded cycle in \( X \) is a subset of \( X \) that is a homeomorphic image of \( S^1 \).

**Definition 3.6** (Real trees [39, 61]). A compact geodesic metric space \( (X, d) \) is called a real tree if it has no embedded cycles.

**Definition 3.7** (\( \mathbb{R} \)-graphs [5]). A compact geodesic metric space \( (X, d) \) is called an \( \mathbb{R} \)-graph if for every \( x \in X \), there exists \( \epsilon > 0 \) such that \( (B(x, \epsilon), d|_{B(x, \epsilon)}) \) is a real tree. A measured \( \mathbb{R} \)-graph is an \( \mathbb{R} \)-graph with a probability measure on its Borel \( \sigma \)-algebra.

The core of an \( \mathbb{R} \)-graph \( (X, d) \), denoted by \( \text{Core}(X) \), is the union of all the simple arcs having both endpoints in embedded cycles of \( X \). If it is non-empty, then \( \text{Core}(X, d) \) is an \( \mathbb{R} \)-graph with no leaves. We define \( \text{Conn}(X) \) to be the set of all \( x \in X \) such that \( x \) belongs to an embedded cycle in \( X \).

Clearly, \( \text{Conn}(X) \subset \text{Core}(X) \). On any \( \mathbb{R} \)-graph \( (X, d) \) there exists a unique \( \sigma \)-finite Borel measure \( \ell \), called the length measure, such that if \( x_1, x_2 \in X \) and \([x_1, x_2]\) is a geodesic path between \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) then \( \ell([x_1, x_2]) = d(x_1, x_2) \). By [5, Theorem 2.7], if \( X \) is an \( \mathbb{R} \)-graph with a non-empty core, then \( \text{Core}(X, d) \) can be represented as \( (k(X), e(X), \text{len}) \), where \( (k(X), e(X)) \) is a finite connected multigraph in which all vertices have degree at least 3 and \( \text{len} : e(X) \to (0, \infty) \) gives the edge-lengths of this multigraph. We denote by \( sp(X) \) the number of surplus edges in \( (k(X), e(X)) \). Further, we define

\[
L(X) := \sum_{e \in e(X)} \text{len}(e) = \ell(\text{Core}(X)).
\]

(3.3)
Note that $\ell(\text{Conn}(X)) \leq \ell(\text{Core}(X)) < \infty$. If $\text{Conn}(X) \neq \emptyset$ (in which case $\ell(\text{Conn}(X)) > 0$), we write $\ell_{\text{Conn}(X)}$ for the restriction of the length measure to $\text{Conn}(X)$ normalized to be a probability measure, i.e.,

$$
\ell_{\text{Conn}(X)}(\cdot) = \frac{\ell(\cdot)}{\ell(\text{Conn}(X))}.
$$

Note that any finite connected multigraph, viewed as a metric space, is an $\mathbb{R}$-graph. So the above definitions make sense for any finite connected multigraph $H$. Note the difference between $e(H)$ defined above and $E(H)$ - the set of edges in $H$. Note also that in this case, the above definition of Core$(H)$ coincides with the graph theoretic 2-core of $H$. We will use Core$(H)$ to denote both the metric space and the graph theoretic 2-core, and the meaning will be clear from the context. Clearly, for any finite connected multigraph $H$ with unit edge-lengths, $L(H) = |E(\text{Core}(H))|$. Further, if $H = (V, E, \text{len})$ is a finite connected multigraph with edge lengths, then

$$
\ell(H) = \sum_{e \in E} \text{len}(e). \quad (3.4)
$$

We will write $\ell(H)$ to mean the above even when $H$ is not connected.

Functions encoding excursions from zero can be used to construct real trees via a simple procedure. We now describe this construction. An excursion on $[0, 1]$ is a continuous function $h \in C([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ with $h(0) = 0 = h(1)$ and $h(t) > 0$ for $t \in (0, 1)$. Let $\mathcal{E}_1$ be the space of all excursions on the interval $[0, 1]$. Given an excursion $h \in \mathcal{E}_1$, one can construct a real tree as follows. Define the pseudo-metric $d_h$ on $[0, 1]$:

$$
d_h(s, t) := h(s) + h(t) - 2 \inf_{u \in [s, t]} h(u), \quad \text{for } s, t \in [0, 1]. \quad (3.5)
$$

Define the equivalence relation $s \sim t \iff d_h(s, t) = 0$. Let $[0, 1]/\sim$ denote the corresponding quotient space and consider the metric space $\mathcal{T}_h := ([0, 1]/\sim, d_h)$, where $d_h$ is the metric on the equivalence classes induced by $d_h$. Then $\mathcal{T}_h$ is a real tree ([39, 61]). Let $q_h : [0, 1] \to \mathcal{T}_h$ be the canonical projection and write $\mu_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ for the push-forward of the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$ onto $\mathcal{T}_h$ via $q_h$. Further, we assume that $\mathcal{T}_h$ is rooted at $\rho := q_h(0)$. Equipped with $\mu_{\mathcal{T}_h}$, $\mathcal{T}_h$ is now a rooted compact metric measure space. Note that by construction, for any $x \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the function $h$ is constant on $q_h^{-1}(x)$. Thus for each $x \in [0, 1]$, we write $\text{ht}(x) = h(q_h^{-1}(x))$ for the height of this vertex.

The Brownian continuum random tree defined below is a fundamental object in the literature of random real trees.

**Definition 3.8** (Aldous's Brownian continuum random tree (CRT) [8]). Let $e$ be a standard Brownian excursion on $[0, 1]$. The real tree $\mathcal{T}_{2e}$ constructed as in (3.5) is called the Brownian CRT.

It is well-known [8, 9] that the associated measure $\mu_{\mathcal{T}_{2e}}$ (also called the mass measure) is supported on the collection of leaves of $\mathcal{T}_{2e}$ almost surely. We will now define the space $\mathcal{H}^{(s)}$ for $s \geq 2$ using the Brownian CRT. The space $\mathcal{H}^{(s)}$ is the building block for the scaling limits of critical random graphs as we will see later. Recall the definition of $\mathcal{G}_{n,3}$ from Section 1.2.
Construction 3.9 (The space \( \mathcal{H}^{(s)} \)). Fix an integer \( s \geq 2 \), and let \( n = 2(s - 1) \) and \( r = 3(s - 1) \).

(a) Let \( \mathcal{K}_{n,3} \) be distributed as \( \mathcal{G}_{n,3} \) conditioned to be connected. Label its edges arbitrarily as \((u_i, v_i), 1 \leq i \leq r\).

(b) Independently of the above, sample \((X_1, \ldots, X_r)\) from a Dirichlet\((\frac{1}{2}, \ldots, \frac{1}{2})\) distribution.

(c) Independently of the above, sample i.i.d. Brownian CRTs \( \mathcal{T}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_r \). For \( 1 \leq i \leq r \), let \( \rho_i \) be the root of \( \mathcal{T}_i \) and \( z_i \) be a point sampled according to its mass measure.

(d) For \( 1 \leq i \leq r \), construct the space \( \mathcal{T}_i' \) from \( \mathcal{T}_i \) by multiplying the distance between each two points by \( \sqrt{\lambda_i} \) and multiplying the measure of each Borel set by \( \lambda_i \). We continue to denote the points corresponding to \( \rho_i \) and \( z_i \) by the same notation.

(e) Form a new space \( \mathcal{H}^{(s)} \) from \( \mathcal{K}_{n,3} \) by replacing the edge \((u_i, v_i)\) by \( \mathcal{T}_i' \) identifying \( \rho_i \) with \( u_i \) and \( z_i \) with \( v_i \), \( 1 \leq i \leq r \).

Note that \( \text{Core}(\mathcal{H}^{(s)}) \) is given by the multigraph \( \mathcal{K}_{n,3} \) with associated edge-lengths \( d_{\mathcal{T}_i}(\rho_i, z_i) = \sqrt{\lambda_i} \cdot d_{\mathcal{T}_i}(\rho_i, z_i), 1 \leq i \leq r \), where \( d_{\mathcal{T}_i} \) denotes the metric on \( \mathcal{T}_i \). The above construction of \( \mathcal{H}^{(s)} \) was given in [2, Procedure 1] and is closely related to the structure of the critical Erdős-Rényi random graph. The reader is referred to [2, 3] for details. (The reader can also consult [56, 67] for various structural properties of the critical Erdős-Rényi random graph, and in particular, for other results about how the shape of the core of the largest component of the Erdős-Rényi process evolves as a process.)

Next recall the random sequence \( \zeta(\lambda) \) from Theorem 3.5.

Construction 3.10 (The sequence \( S(\lambda) \)). Sample \( \zeta(\lambda) = ((\xi_i(\lambda), N_i(\lambda)), i \geq 1) \). For simplicity, write \( \xi_i = \xi_i(\lambda) \), and \( N_i = N_i(\lambda) \). Conditional on \( \zeta(\lambda) \), construct the spaces \( S_i(\lambda) \) independently for \( i \geq 1 \), where

\[
S_i(\lambda) \overset{d}{=} \sqrt{\xi_i} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{(N_i)}.
\]

Set \( S(\lambda) = (S_1(\lambda), S_2(\lambda), \ldots) \).

Note that the spaces \( \mathcal{H}^{(s)} \) and \( S_i(\lambda), i \geq 1 \), are \( \mathbb{R} \)-graphs (recall Definition 3.7).

3.5. Geometry of critical random graphs. We will state four results in this section that will be needed in our proofs.

Theorem 3.11 (Geometry of uniform connected graphs with a given surplus). Fix an integer \( s \geq 2 \). Let \( \mathcal{H}_{m,s} \) be uniformly distributed over the set of all connected labeled graphs on \( [m] \) with surplus \( s \). Recall the notation \( \{k(\cdot), e(\cdot), \text{len}(\cdot)\} \) and \( L(\cdot) \) introduced around (3.3). Let \( r = 3(s - 1) \).

(a) We have,

\[
\lim_{m \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \text{Core}(\mathcal{H}_{m,s}) \text{ is a 3-regular multigraph with edge lengths} \right) = 1. \quad (3.6)
\]

In particular,

\[
\lim_{m \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( |e(\mathcal{H}_{m,s})| = r \right) = 1.
\]
Let $e_1^{(m)}, \ldots, e_r^{(m)}$ (resp. $e_1, \ldots, e_r$) be an enumeration of $\{ e : e \in e(\mathcal{H}_{m,s}) \}$ (resp. $\{ e : e \in e(\mathcal{H}^{(s)}) \}$). Then as $m \to \infty$,
\[
\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \mathcal{H}_{m,s} , \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \cdot \{ \text{len}(e_i), 1 \leq i \leq r \} \right) \overset{d}{\to} \left( \mathcal{H}^{(s)}, \{ \text{len}(e_i), 1 \leq i \leq r \} \right),
\]
where the convergence in the first coordinate is with respect to GHP topology. Further, for any $\alpha > 0$,
\[
\sup_m \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( \alpha m^{-1/2} L(\mathcal{H}_{m,s}) \right) \right] < \infty.
\]
As a consequence of (3.7), for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $r_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all large $m$,
\[
m^{-1/2} L(\mathcal{H}_{m,s}) \leq 1/ r_\varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad m^{-1/2} \min_{e \in e(\mathcal{H}_{m,s})} \text{len}(e) \geq r_\varepsilon
\]
with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$.

(b) Let $V_i^{(m)}$ be the set of vertices in $\mathcal{H}_{m,s}$ that are connected to Core$(\mathcal{H}_{m,s})$ via $e_i^{(m)}$, $1 \leq i \leq r$. (The common endpoints of multiple $e \in e(\mathcal{H}_{m,s})$ and their pendant subtrees are assigned to only of the $V_i^{(m)}$’s in an arbitrary way.) Recall the real trees $T_i$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, from Construction 3.9. Denote the measure on $\mathcal{H}^{(s)}$ by $\mu^{(s)}$. Then as $m \to \infty$,
\[
\frac{1}{m} \left( |V_i^{(m)}|, 1 \leq i \leq r \right) \overset{d}{\to} (\mu^{(s)}(T_i), 1 \leq i \leq r) \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\frac{1}{2}, \ldots, \frac{1}{2}).
\]

(3.6) follows from [56, Theorem 7]. The rest of the assertions can be proved by following the arguments used in [3]. An outline of the proof is given in Section A.1.

**Theorem 3.12** (Scaling limit of ER($n, \lambda$)). Fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $\mathcal{C}_i^{n,er}(\lambda)$ denote the $i$-th largest component of ER($n, \lambda$). Then
\[
n^{-1/3} \left( \mathcal{C}_1^{n,er}(\lambda), \mathcal{C}_2^{n,er}(\lambda), \ldots \right) \overset{d}{\to} S(\lambda) = (S_1(\lambda), S_2(\lambda), \ldots)
\]
with respect to the product topology on $\mathcal{G}_1^{\infty}$ as discussed at the end of Section 3.2.

This result is the content of [3, Theorem 2]. That the limiting sequence of spaces is same as $S(\lambda)$ follows from the discussion around [2, Equation 1].

In [25, Theorem 2.4], the metric space scaling limit of random graphs with a critical degree sequence was established. (See also [22], where a similar result for critical percolation on the supercritical configuration model was derived as an application of a more general universality principle.) The next result gives a variant of [25, Theorem 2.4]. This result follows from arguments similar to those used in [25]. A sketch of proof is given in Section A.2.

**Theorem 3.13.** Suppose $\{ d^{(n)} \}_{n \geq 1}$ is a sequence of degree sequences satisfying Assumption 3.4 with limiting empirical distribution $v$. Further, suppose $f : \{ 1, 2, \ldots \} \to [0, \infty)$ satisfies
\[
\max \{ f(d_v) : v \in [n] \} = o(n^{2/3}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k \geq 1} f(k) v(k) > 0.
\]
(i) Let $\mathcal{C}_j^n$ be the $j$-th largest component of $\mathcal{G}_{n,d}$. Endow $\mathcal{C}_j^n$ with the graph distance, and assign mass $f(d_v)$ to $v \in \mathcal{C}_j^n$ and normalize it to make it a probability measure.
(If \( \sum_{v \in V} f(d_v) = 0 \) then simply take the uniform measure on the vertices.) Denote the resulting metric measure space by \( \mathcal{C}_j^{n,f} \). Then

\[
n^{-1/3}(\mathcal{C}_1^{n,f}, \mathcal{C}_2^{n,f}, \ldots) \overset{d}{\longrightarrow} \frac{\sigma_1(v)}{\left(\sigma_3(v) - 4\sigma_1(v)\right)^{2/3}} \cdot S(\lambda)
\]

with respect to the product topology on \( \mathcal{G}^N_{\text{GHP}} \) jointly with the convergence in (3.2).

(ii) The conclusion of part (i) continues to hold with the same limiting sequence of metric measure spaces if we replace \( \mathcal{G}_{n,d} \) by \( \overline{\mathcal{G}}_{n,d} \).

Next we state a result about the core of the components of a critical graph with given degree sequence.

**Theorem 3.14.** Suppose \( \{d^{(n)}\}_{n \geq 1} \) is a sequence of degree sequences satisfying Assumption 3.4 with limiting empirical distribution \( v \). Let \( \mathcal{C}_1^n \) denote the largest component of \( \mathcal{G}_{n,d} \), and write \( \mathcal{C}_1^n = |E(\mathcal{C}_1^n)| \). We will drop the superscript \( n \) for convenience. Let \( \Gamma_1^{(1)}, \Gamma_1^{(2)}, \ldots \) be i.i.d. Exponential(1) random variables independent of \( \mathcal{G}_{n,d} \).

(a) Recall the notation \( (k(\cdot), e(\cdot), \text{len}) \) and \( L(\cdot) \) introduced around (3.3). Then

\[
n^{-1/3}(L(\mathcal{C}_1), \min_{e \in e(\mathcal{C}_1)} \text{len}(e)) \overset{d}{\longrightarrow} \frac{\sigma_1(v)}{\left(\sigma_3(v) - 4\sigma_1(v)\right)^{2/3}} \cdot \left(L(S_1(\lambda)), \min_{e \in e(S_1(\lambda))} \text{len}(e)\right).
\]

In particular, for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists \( r_\varepsilon > 0 \) such that for all large \( n \),

\[
\text{sp}(\mathcal{C}_1) \leq 1/r_\varepsilon, \quad \frac{L(\mathcal{C}_1)}{n^{1/3}} \leq 1/r_\varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{e \in e(\mathcal{C}_1)} \frac{\text{len}(e)}{n^{1/3}} \geq r_\varepsilon
\]

with probability at least \( 1 - \varepsilon \).

(b) Assign lengths \( \Gamma_1^{(1)}, \ldots, \Gamma_1^{(\text{len})} \) to the edges of \( \mathcal{C}_1 \), and call the resulting graph with edge-lengths \( \mathcal{C}_1^{\exp} \). Then the conclusion in (a) continues to hold with \( \mathcal{C}_1^{\exp} \) in place of \( \mathcal{C}_1 \).

By Theorem 3.5, \( \text{sp}(\mathcal{C}_1^n) \overset{d}{\longrightarrow} N_1(\lambda) \). The other claims in Theorem 3.14(a) follow from the arguments used in the proof of [25, Theorem 2.6]. The claim in (b) can be proved in an identical manner.

## 4. Properties of minimal spanning trees

In this section we discuss various properties of MSTs and give another description of the space \( \mathcal{M} \) appearing in Theorem 1.1.

### 4.1. MST and percolation

Suppose \( G = (V, E, w) \) is a weighted, connected, and labeled graph. Assume that \( w(e) \neq w(e') \) whenever \( e \neq e' \). We now state a useful property of the MST.

**Lemma 4.1** (Minimax paths property). Let \( G = (V, E, w) \) be as above and let \( T \) be its MST. Then any path \((x_0, \ldots, x_n)\) with \( x_i \in V \) and \( \{x_i, x_{i+1}\} \in E(T) \) satisfies

\[
\max_i w(\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}) \leq \max_j w(\{x'_j, x'_{j+1}\})
\]
for any path \((x'_0, \ldots, x'_m)\) with \((x'_j, x'_{j+1}) \in E\) and \(x_0 = x'_0\) and \(x_n = x'_m\). In words, the maximum edge-weight in the path in the MST connecting two given vertices is smallest among all paths in \(G\) connecting those two vertices.

The above lemma is just a restatement of [60, Lemma 2]. We record the following useful observations:

**Observation 1.** Using Lemma 4.1, we see that the MST can be constructed just from the ranks of the different edge-weights. Thus the law of the MST constructed using exchangeable edge-weights that are almost surely pairwise distinct does not depend on the distribution of the weights.

**Observation 2.** Let \(G = (V, E, w)\) be a connected and labeled graph with pairwise distinct edge-weights. Let \(u \in [0, \infty)\) and \(\mathcal{C}\) be a component of the graph \(G^u = (V, E^u)\), where \(E^u \subset E\) contains only those edges \(e\) for which \(w(e) \leq u\). If \(v, v' \in \mathcal{C}\), then there exists a path in \(G\) connecting \(v\) and \(v'\) such that all edge-weights along this path is at most \(u\). By Lemma 4.1, it follows that all edge-weights in the path in the MST of \((V, E, w)\) connecting \(v\) and \(v'\) is also smaller than \(u\). Thus the restriction of the MST of \((V, E, w)\) to \(\mathcal{C}\) is a spanning tree of \(\mathcal{C}\). Since the restriction of the MST of \((V, E, w)\) to \(\mathcal{C}\) also satisfies the minimax path property, it is the MST of \(\mathcal{C}\) (constructed using the restriction of the weight function \(w(\cdot)\) to the edges of \(\mathcal{C}\)). This fact is extremely useful as it can be used to connect the structure of the MST to the geometry of components of the graph under percolation.

**Observation 3.** Let \(G = (V, E, w)\) be a connected and labeled graph with pairwise distinct edge-weights. Recall the notation \(\text{Conne}(\cdot)\) from Section 3.1. Let \(e \in \text{Conne}(G)\) be the edge with the maximum weight among all edges in \(\text{Conne}(G)\). Then \(G' = (V, E \setminus \{e\}, w')\) is connected, where \(w'\) is the restriction of \(w\) to \(E \setminus \{e\}\). Further, by Lemma 4.1, \(e\) is not contained in the MST of \(G\). Thus, the MST of \(G'\) is the same as the MST of \(G\). We can use this algorithm inductively to remove edges until we are left with a tree, and this tree will be the MST of \(G\).

### 4.2. Cycle-breaking and modified cycle-breaking

In this section we define two procedures that can be applied to \(\mathbb{R}\)-graphs and multigraphs. Recall the definitions of \(\mathbb{R}\)-graphs and length measures from Section 3.4.

**Definition 4.2** (Cycle-breaking (CB)). Let \(X\) be an \(\mathbb{R}\)-graph. If \(X\) has no embedded cycles, then set \(\text{CB}(X) = X\). Otherwise, sample \(x\) from \(\text{Conne}(X)\) using the measure \(\ell_{\text{Conne}(X)}\), and set \(\text{CB}(X)\) to be the completion of \(X \setminus \{x\}\). (Thus \(\text{CB}(X)\) is also an \(\mathbb{R}\)-graph.)

For \(k \geq 2\), we inductively define \(\text{CB}^k(X)\) to be the space \(\text{CB}(\text{CB}^{k-1}(X))\). (Thus at the \(k\)-th step, if \(\text{CB}^{k-1}(X)\) has an embedded cycle, then we are using the measure to \(\ell_{\text{Conne}(\text{CB}^{k-1}(X))}\) to sample a point.)

The spaces \(\text{CB}^k(X)\) are the same for all large values of \(k\), i.e., they remain the same after all the cycles have been cut open. We denote this final space (which is a real tree) by \(\text{CB}^\infty(X)\).

Next we define a cycle-breaking process for discrete multigraphs. We will use a variation of the above process. More precisely, we will sample edges with replacement. This will turn out to be very convenient.
Definition 4.3 (Cycle-breaking for discrete graphs (CBD)). Let $H = (V, E, \text{len})$ be a finite (not necessarily connected) multigraph with edge-lengths given by the function $\text{len} : E \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. Set $\text{CBD}_0(H) = H$. For $k \geq 1$, we inductively define $\text{CBD}_k(H)$ as follows: Sample $e_k$ from $E$ with probability proportional to $\text{len}(e_k)$. If $e_k$ is not an edge in $\text{CBD}_{k-1}(H)$, set $\text{CBD}_k(H) = \text{CBD}_{k-1}(H)$. Otherwise, if $\mathcal{C}$ is the component of $\text{CBD}_{k-1}(H)$ containing $e_k$ and $e_k \in \text{Conne}(\mathcal{C})$, then set $\text{CBD}_k(H) = \text{CBD}_{k-1}(H) \setminus e_k$; and if $e_k \notin \text{Conne}(\mathcal{C})$, then sample a point $x$ uniformly on the edge $e_k$ and color $x$ red, and set $\text{CBD}_k(H)$ to be $\text{CBD}_{k-1}(H)$ with the point $x$ colored red.

Ignoring the colored points, the multigraphs $\text{CBD}_k(H)$ are the same (and are all forests) for all large values of $k$. We denote the tree (without any colored points) in this forest with the most number of vertices by $\text{CBD}_\infty(H)$.

Suppose $H$ is a finite connected multigraph with edge-lengths, and view $H$ as an $\mathbb{R}$-graph. Then there is a natural coupling between the processes $(\text{CBD}^k(H), k \geq 1)$ and $(\text{CBD}_k(H), k \geq 1)$ such that for each $j \geq 1$, the $j$-th edge cut open in the former is also the $j$-th edge removed in the latter. In this coupling,

$$d_H(\text{CBD}_\infty(H), \text{CBD}^\infty(H)) \leq \max_{e \in E} \text{len}(e). \quad (4.1)$$

Further, suppose $G_1$ (resp. $G_2$) is a finite connected graph with edge-lengths and $u_1$ (resp. $u_2$) is one of its vertices. Denote by $(G_1, u_1) \xrightarrow{\ell} (u_2, G_2)$ the graph obtained by joining $u_1$ and $u_2$ by an edge of length $\ell$. Then

$$\text{CBD}_\infty(G_1, u_1) \xrightarrow{\ell} (u_2, \text{CBD}_\infty(G_2)). \quad (4.2)$$

Remark 2. We will work with edge-lengths as well as edge-weights. To avoid confusion, we make a note here that we use edge-weights to construct the MST (as in (1.1)), and edge-lengths to perform cycle-breaking.

We now record a useful observation that we will use in the proofs. The proof of this result is elementary, so we omit it.

Lemma 4.4. Suppose $H = (V, E, \text{len})$ is a finite multigraph with edge-lengths.

(a) Assume that $\text{len}(e), e \in E$, are exchangeable random variables. For $1 \leq i \leq |E|$, let $\mathcal{E}_i$ denote the $i$-th distinct edge sampled in the process $(\text{CBD}_k(H), k \geq 1)$. Then for any $j \in \{1, \ldots, |E| - 1\}$ and collection of distinct edges $e_1, \ldots, e_j$, conditional on the event $\{\mathcal{E}_i = e_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq j\}$, $\mathcal{E}_{j+1}$ is uniformly distributed over $E \setminus \{e_1, \ldots, e_j\}$.

(b) Assume that $H$ is connected and that $\text{len}(e), e \in \text{Conne}(H)$, are exchangeable random variables. For $1 \leq i \leq \text{sp}(H)$, let $\mathcal{E}_i$ denote the $i$-th edge removed in the process $(\text{CBD}_k(H), k \geq 1)$. Consider $j \in \{1, \ldots, \text{sp}(H) - 1\}$ and a collection of edges $e_1, \ldots, e_j$ satisfying $e_i \in \text{Conne}(H \setminus \{e_1, \ldots, e_{i-1}\})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq j$. Then conditional on the event $\{\mathcal{E}_i = e_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq j\}$, $\mathcal{E}_{j+1}$ is uniformly distributed over $\text{Conne}(H \setminus \{e_1, \ldots, e_j\})$.

For any finite multigraph $H = (V, E, \text{len})$ having edge-lengths (and possibly points colored red on its edges), we write $\text{Shape}(H)$ to denote the multigraph $(V, E)$ (without any red points). We also define $\text{Rem}(H)$ to be the multigraph with edge-lengths obtained by removing all edges of $H$ that have at least one red point on them. We now state a lemma that connects cycle-breaking to MSTs.
Lemma 4.5. Suppose $H = (V, E, \text{len})$ is a finite connected multigraph with random edge-lengths. Assume that $\text{len}(e), e \in \text{Conne}(H)$, are exchangeable random variables. Then $\text{Shape}[\text{CBD}_\infty(H)]$ has the same law as the MST of $\text{Shape}[H]$ constructed by assigning exchangeable pairwise distinct weights to the edges in $\text{Conne}(H)$ and any arbitrary weights to the other edges.

Note that in the setting of Lemma 4.5, $\text{Shape}[\text{CBD}_\infty(H)]$ is not the MST of the weighted graph $(\text{Shape}[H], w)$ where $w(e) = \text{len}(e)$, even though they have the same law provided the edge-lengths are almost surely pairwise distinct.

Proof of Lemma 4.5: Let $\mathcal{E}_j^i$ be the $j$-th edge removed in the CBD process. Then by Lemma 4.4(b), $\mathcal{E}_j^i$ is uniformly distributed over $\text{Conne}(H)$. In general, conditional on $\mathcal{E}_j^i, 1 \leq i \leq k - 1$, $\mathcal{E}_j^i$ is uniformly distributed over $\text{Conne} \{H \setminus \{\mathcal{E}_j^1, \ldots, \mathcal{E}_j^{i-1}\}\}$.

Now, consider edge-weights $(w(e), e \in E)$, such that $w(e), e \in \text{Conne}(H)$, are exchangeable and almost surely pairwise distinct. Then using Observation 3 above, the MST of $(\text{Shape}[H], w)$ can be constructed by sequentially removing the edges having maximum weight among all edges whose removal do not disconnect the current graph. By the assumptions on the weights, the edge to be removed at each step is uniformly distributed over the set of all edges whose removal do not disconnect the current graph. In other words, the sequence of edges removed in the algorithm described in Observation 3 above has the same law as $\{\mathcal{E}_j^i\}_{k \geq 1}$. It thus follows that $\text{CBD}_\infty(H)$ has the same law as the MST of $(\text{Shape}[H], w)$, which completes the proof.

Recall the notation $k(X), e(X), (\text{len}(e), e \in e(X)), \text{sp}(X)$, and $L(X)$ introduced below Definition 3.7. For $r \in (0, 1)$ define $\mathcal{A}_r$ to be the set of all measured $\mathbb{R}$-graphs $X$ that satisfy $\text{sp}(X) + L(X) \leq 1/r$, and $\min_{e \in e(X)} \text{len}(e) \geq r$.

The following theorem will allow us to prove convergence of MSTs from GHP convergence of the underlying graphs.

Theorem 4.6. Fix $r \in (0, 1)$. Suppose $(X, d, \mu)$ and $(X_n, d_n, \mu_n), n \geq 1$, are measured $\mathbb{R}$-graphs in $\mathcal{A}_r$ such that $(X_n, d_n, \mu_n) \rightarrow (X, d, \mu)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ w.r.t. GHP topology.

(a) Then $\text{CB}^\infty(X_n) \rightarrow \text{CB}^\infty(X)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ w.r.t. GHP topology.

(b) Suppose for each $n \geq 1$, $(X_n, d_n, \mu_n)$ is the metric measure space associated with $(V_n, E_n, \text{len})$—a finite connected multigraph with edge-lengths. If $\max_{e \in E_n} \text{len}(e) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\text{CBD}_\infty(X_n) \rightarrow \text{CB}^\infty(X)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ w.r.t. GHP topology.

The result in Theorem 4.6(a) is from [5, Theorem 3.3], while the the claim in (b) follows from (4.1).

4.3. Alternate descriptions of the space $\mathcal{M}$. Recall the construction of the process $\text{ER}(n, \cdot)$ using the random variables $U_{ij}$ from Definition 1.2. Let $\mathcal{C}_{i,er}^n(\lambda)$ be the largest component of $\text{ER}(n, \lambda)$ and let $M_{\lambda}^{n,er}$ be the MST of $\mathcal{C}_{i,er}^n(\lambda)$ constructed using the random weights $U_{ij}, (i, j) \in E(\mathcal{C}_{i,er}^n(\lambda))$. Then $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} M_{\lambda}^{n,er} = M_\infty^{n,er}$, where $M_\infty^{n,er}$ is the MST of $K_n$ constructed using the random weights $U_{ij}$. Theorem 1.1 says that $n^{-1/3} M_\infty^{n,er} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ w.r.t. GHP topology. The natural question to ask here is whether the order in
which the limits are taken can be interchanged, i.e., can we first take limit as $n \to \infty$ for fixed $\lambda$, and then let $\lambda \to \infty$? Now by Lemma 4.5, $M_{\lambda}^{n,er} \overset{d}{=} \text{CBD}_{\infty}\left(\mathcal{G}_{1, er}(\lambda)\right)$. Thus, by Theorems 3.12, 4.6, and 3.14, it follows that $n^{-1/3} M_{\lambda}^{n,er} \overset{d}{=} \text{CB}^{\infty}(S(\lambda))$ as $n \to \infty$ w.r.t. GHP topology. Then the following theorem answers the above question in the affirmative.

**Theorem 4.7** ([5], Theorem 4.9). As $\lambda \to \infty$,

$$\text{CB}^{\infty}(S(\lambda)) \overset{d}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{M}$$

with respect to GHP topology.

The space $S(\lambda)$ has a random number of cycles. The following theorem gives a derandomized version of Theorem 4.7.

**Theorem 4.8.** Recall the space $\mathcal{H}^{(s)}$ from Construction 3.9. Then

$$\left(12s\right)^{1/6} \cdot \text{CB}^{\infty}(\mathcal{H}^{(s)}) \overset{d}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{M} \text{ as } s \to \infty$$

with respect to GHP topology.

Theorem 4.8 plays a crucial role in our argument. The proof of this result can be read independently of the rest and is deferred to Section 5.9.

5. Proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.8

We divide the argument into several steps. In Section 5.1, we prove a weaker version of Theorem 2.1 that only deals with convergence w.r.t. GH topology. The proof of this result depends on several propositions whose proofs are given in Sections 5.2–5.5. The proof of Theorem 2.1 is then completed in Section 5.6. The proof of Theorem 2.2 is given in Section 5.7. The proof of Theorem 2.3 is given in Section 5.8. Finally, the proof of Theorem 4.8 is given in Section 5.9.

5.1. GH convergence of the MST of $\mathcal{G}_{n,3}$. In this section we prove the following weaker version of Theorem 2.1.

**Theorem 5.1.** Let $M_{n}$ be as in Theorem 2.1. Then $n^{-1/3} \cdot M_{n} \overset{d}{\longrightarrow} 6^{1/3} \mathcal{M}$ with respect to GH topology.

This convergence will be strengthened to GHP convergence in Section 5.6. The proof of the above theorem relies on the following four propositions.

**Proposition 5.2.** For all $r \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $c > 0$ small such that the following holds: Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite graph with maximum degree at most $r$. Let $\Gamma_{1}^{(e)}$, $e \in E$, be i.i.d. Exponential(1) random variables. Then for all $m \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(G \text{ contains a self-avoiding path } P \text{ with } |P| \geq m \text{ and } \sum_{e \in P} \Gamma_{1}^{(e)} \leq c|P| \right) \leq |V| \cdot \exp(-m),$$

where $|P|$ denotes the length of the path $P$. 


**Proposition 5.3.** Assign i.i.d. Exponential(1) lengths to the edges of $G_{n,3}$ and denote this multigraph with edge-lengths by $G_{n,3}^{\text{exp}}$. Then

$$n^{-1/3} \text{CBD}_\infty(G_{n,3}^{\text{exp}}) \xrightarrow{d} (0.75)^{1/3} \cdot \mathcal{M}, \text{ as } n \to \infty$$

with respect to GH topology.

**Remark 3.** By Lemma 4.5, $M_n \overset{d}{=} \text{Shape}[\text{CBD}_\infty(G_{n,3}^{\text{exp}})]$. However, conditional on $\text{Shape}[\text{CBD}_\infty(G_{n,3}^{\text{exp}})]$, the edge-lengths of $\text{CBD}_\infty(G_{n,3}^{\text{exp}})$ are not exchangeable, which is why Theorem 5.1 cannot be proved by just using Proposition 5.3, and it takes quite a bit of additional work. Note however that Proposition 5.3 implies that

$$\text{diam}(\text{CBD}_\infty(G_{n,3}^{\text{exp}})) = \Theta_P(n^{1/3}).$$

This observation together with Proposition 5.2 implies that $\text{diam}(M_n) = O_P(n^{1/3})$. As noted before in (1.2) in the case of the complete graph, using Observation 2 in Section 4.1 and Theorem 3.13, it follows that $\text{diam}(M_n) = \Omega_P(n^{1/3})$. Thus we get that $\text{diam}(M_n) = \Theta_P(n^{1/3})$. By a standard conditioning argument (see (5.40) and (5.41)), this also implies that $\text{diam}(\tilde{M}_n) = \Theta_P(n^{1/3})$.

Recall the notation $\text{Shape}[\cdot]$ and $\text{Rem}(\cdot)$ introduced right before Lemma 4.5. Recall also the meaning of $\ell(H)$ from (3.4) for finite multigraphs with edge lengths.

**Proposition 5.4.** Let $S_1(\cdot)$ and $G_{n,3}^{\text{exp}}$ be as in Construction 3.10 and Proposition 5.3 respectively. For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, let $t_{n,\lambda}$ be given by

$$\frac{1}{1 + t_{n,\lambda}} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\lambda}{n^{1/3}}.$$

Let $R_{n,\lambda}$ be a Poisson$(t_{n,\lambda} \cdot \ell(G_{n,3}^{\text{exp}}))$ random variable. Let $G_1(n, \lambda)$ be the largest component of $\text{Rem}(\text{CBD}_{R_{n,\lambda}}(G_{n,3}^{\text{exp}}))$. Let $G_1(n, \lambda) := \text{Shape}[G_1(n, \lambda)]$. Then

$$n^{-1/3} \text{CBD}_\infty(G_1(n, \lambda)) \xrightarrow{d} (6^{1/3} \cdot \text{CB}_\infty(S_1((48)^{1/3} \cdot \lambda))), \text{ and } (5.1)$$

$$n^{-1/3} \text{CBD}_\infty(G_1(n, \lambda)) \xrightarrow{d} (0.75)^{1/3} \cdot \text{CB}_\infty(S_1((48)^{1/3} \cdot \lambda))) \text{ (5.2)}$$

with respect to GH topology.

Recall the marked topology from Section 3.2.

**Proposition 5.5.** Suppose $\{(X_n^+, d_n, X_n)\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a sequence of random compact marked metric spaces such that

$$X_n^+ \xrightarrow{d} Z, \text{ and } X_n \xrightarrow{d} Z, \text{ as } n \to \infty$$

with respect to the GH topology for some random compact metric space $Z$. Then $d_H(X_n, X_n^+) \overset{p}{\to} 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

We first prove Theorem 5.1 assuming the above four propositions. The proofs of Propositions 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 will be given in the next four sections.
Proof of Theorem 5.1: Using Lemma 4.4(a), there exists a coupling of the processes (CBD$_i$($\mathcal{G}_{n,3}$), $i \geq 1$) and (CBD$_t$($\mathcal{G}_{n,3}$), $t \geq 1$) such that the $j$-th distinct edge sampled is the same in both processes, $1 \leq j \leq 3n/2$. Let $B_n$ be as in (2.1). Note that on the event $B_n$, the space CBD$_{R,n,\lambda}$($\mathcal{G}_{n,3}^{\text{exp}}$) is simply $\mathcal{G}_1(n, \lambda)$ together with some additional connected multigraphs (with edge-lengths and red points) each of which is attached to a vertex of $\mathcal{G}_1(n, \lambda)$ via a single edge that has red point(s) on it. Thus, by (4.2), on the event $B_n$, CBD$_{\infty}$($\mathcal{G}_{n,3}^{\text{exp}}$) is CBD$_{\infty}$($\mathcal{G}_1(n, \lambda)$) with some additional trees, say $\mathcal{F}^{(j)}_{n,\lambda}$, $1 \leq j \leq k_n(\lambda)$, each of which is attached to a vertex of CBD$_{\infty}$($\mathcal{G}_1(n, \lambda)$) via a single edge. Then in the above coupling, on the event $B_n$, CBD$_{\infty}$($\mathcal{G}_{n,3}$) is CBD$_{\infty}$($G_1(n, \lambda)$) with Shape[$\mathcal{F}^{(j)}_{n,\lambda}$], $1 \leq j \leq k_n(\lambda)$, attached to its vertices via an edge. Define $k_n(\lambda) = 0$ on $B_n^c$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

Now using (5.1), (5.2), and Theorem 4.7, it follows that there exists a $\mathbb{Z}$-valued sequence $\{\lambda^*_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ with $\lambda^*_n \uparrow \infty$ such that for any $\mathbb{Z}$-valued sequence $\lambda_n \uparrow \infty$ satisfying $\lambda_n \leq \lambda^*_n$,

$$n^{-1/3} \text{CBD}_{\infty}(G_1(n, \lambda_n)) \xrightarrow{d} 6^{1/3} \cdot \mathcal{M}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{(5.3)}$$

$$n^{-1/3} \text{CBD}_{\infty}(\mathcal{G}_1(n, \lambda_n)) \xrightarrow{d} (0.75)^{1/3} \cdot \mathcal{M} \quad \text{(5.4)}$$

with respect to GH topology. Using (5.4) in conjunction with Proposition 5.3, Proposition 5.5, and (2.2), it follows that for any $\lambda_n \uparrow \infty$ with $\lambda_n \leq \lambda^*_n$,

$$n^{-1/3} \max_{1 \leq j \leq k_n(\lambda_n)} \text{diam}(\mathcal{F}^{(j)}_{n,\lambda}) \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad \text{(5.5)}$$

Denoting the edge-lengths of $\mathcal{G}_{n,3}^{\text{exp}}$ by $\Gamma^e_1$, $e \in E(\mathcal{G}_{n,3})$, we have, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $c > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \max_{1 \leq j \leq k_n(\lambda_n)} \text{diam}(\text{Shape}[\mathcal{F}^{(j)}_{n,\lambda}]) \geq \varepsilon n^{1/3} \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{1 \leq j \leq k_n(\lambda_n)} \text{diam}(\mathcal{F}^{(j)}_{n,\lambda}) \geq c\varepsilon n^{1/3} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left( \mathcal{G}_{n,3} \text{ contains a self-avoiding path } P \text{ with } |P| \geq \varepsilon n^{1/3} \text{ and } \sum_{e \in P} \Gamma^e_1 \leq c\varepsilon n^{1/3} \right).$$

Thus, using Proposition 5.2 together with (5.5), we get

$$n^{-1/3} \max_{1 \leq j \leq k_n(\lambda_n)} \text{diam}(\text{Shape}[\mathcal{F}^{(j)}_{n,\lambda}]) \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \text{(5.6)}$$

which in turn shows that

$$n^{-1/3} d_{H}(\text{CBD}_{\infty}(\mathcal{G}_{n,3}), \text{CBD}_{\infty}(G_1(n, \lambda_n))) \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad \text{(5.7)}$$

Finally, by Lemma 4.5,

$$M_n \xrightarrow{d} \text{CBD}_{\infty}(\mathcal{G}_{n,3}). \quad \text{(5.8)}$$

The result now follows from (5.3) and (5.7). \hfill \blacksquare

5.2. Proof of Proposition 5.2. Fix $k \geq m$ and a self-avoiding path $P$ in $G$ with $|P| = k$. Then for any $c > 0$ and any $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{e \in P} \Gamma^e_1 \leq c k \right) = \mathbb{P} \left( Z \geq k \right) \leq e^{-tk} \mathbb{E}[\exp(tZ)] = \exp \left( -k(t - c(e^t - 1)) \right), \quad \text{(5.9)}$$
where $Z$ is a Poisson($ck$) random variable. Hence,
\[
\mathbb{P}\left(G \text{ contains a self-avoiding path } P \text{ with } |P| \geq m \text{ and } \sum_{e \in P} \Gamma_1^{(e)} \leq c|P|\right)
\leq \sum_{k \geq m} \mathbb{P}\left(G \text{ contains a self-avoiding path } P \text{ with } |P| = k \text{ and } \sum_{e \in P} \Gamma_1^{(e)} \leq ck\right)
\leq \sum_{k \geq m} |V|r^k \exp\left(-k\left(t - c(e^t - 1)\right)\right)
= |V| \sum_{k \geq m} \exp\left(-k\left(t - \log r - c(e^t - 1)\right)\right) \leq |V|e^{-m},
\]
where the second inequality uses (5.9) and the fact that there are at most $|V|r^k$ many self-avoiding paths of length $k$ in $G$, and the last step follows if we choose $t$ sufficiently large and $c$ sufficiently small. This completes the proof.

5.3. **Proof of Proposition 5.3.** Recall Construction 3.9. Let $s$, $n$, $r$, $\mathcal{K}_{n,3}$, $\mathcal{F}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_r$, $\rho_i$, $z_i$, and $(X_1, \ldots, X_r)$ be as in Construction 3.9. Using (2.2), we can assume that $\mathcal{K}_{n,3}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{n,3}$ are coupled in a way so that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{K}_{n,3} \neq \mathcal{G}_{n,3}\right) = 0. \tag{5.10}
\]
Let $\{\Gamma_{1/2}^{(j)}\}_{1 \leq j \leq s}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. Gamma$(1/2, 1)$ random variables. Then
\[
(X_1, \ldots, X_r) \overset{d}{=} \left(\Gamma_{1/2}^{(1)}, \ldots, \Gamma_{1/2}^{(r)}\right) / \Gamma_{r/2},
\]
where $\Gamma_{r/2} = \sum_{j=1}^r \Gamma_{1/2}^{(j)}$. Note also that
\[
r^{-1} \Gamma_{r/2} \overset{p}{\to} 1/2, \text{ as } r \to \infty. \tag{5.11}
\]
Let $Y_i := d(\rho_i, z_i)$. Then $Y_i$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, are i.i.d. Rayleigh random variables [8, 9] with density $f(y) = y \exp(-y^2/2)$, $y > 0$. Hence $Y_1^2 \overset{d}{=} 2\Gamma_1$, where $\Gamma_1 \sim \text{Exponential}(1)$. By [69], for $i = 1, \ldots, r$, $Z_i^2 := Y_i^2 \Gamma_{1/2}^{(i)} \overset{d}{=} \Gamma_{1/2}^{(i)}$. Hence
\[
\left\{\sqrt{2}Z_i\right\}_{1 \leq i \leq s} \text{ is an i.i.d. sequence of Exponential}(1) \text{ random variables.} \tag{5.12}
\]
Let $\Omega_{n,3}$ be the multigraph with edge-lengths obtained by assigning length $Y_i \sqrt{X_i} = Z_i/\sqrt{\Gamma_{r/2}}$ to the $i$-th edge of $\mathcal{K}_{n,3}$, $1 \leq i \leq r$. From Construction 3.9, there is a natural way of viewing $\Omega_{n,3}$ as a subspace of $\mathcal{H}^{(s)}$. In this embedding, using the natural coupling between $\text{CBD}_\infty(\Omega_{n,3})$ and $\text{CB}_\infty(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})$,
\[
(12s)^{1/6} \cdot d_H\left(\text{CBD}_\infty(\Omega_{n,3}), \text{CB}_\infty(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})\right)
\leq (12s)^{1/6} \cdot d_H\left(\text{CBD}_\infty(\Omega_{n,3}), \text{CB}_\infty(\Omega_{n,3})\right)
+ (12s)^{1/6} \cdot d_H\left(\text{CB}_\infty(\Omega_{n,3}), \text{CB}_\infty(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})\right)
\leq (12s)^{1/6} \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} Z_i/\sqrt{\Gamma_{r/2}} + (12s)^{1/6} \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \sqrt{X_i} \cdot \text{diam}(\mathcal{F}_i)
=: T_1 + T_2,
\]
where the second inequality uses (4.1). It follows from (5.11) and the fact \( \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} Z_i = O_p(\log r) \) that \( T_1 \overset{p}{\to} 0 \). Further,

\[
\max_{1 \leq i \leq r} X_i = O_p(\log r / r) \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \text{diam}(\mathcal{F}_i) = O_p(\sqrt{\log r}).
\]

It thus follows that \( T_2 \overset{p}{\to} 0 \). Combining these observations with (5.13) and Theorem 4.8, we get as \( n \to \infty \),

\[
\left(12s\right)^{1/6} \text{CBD}_\infty(\Omega_{n,3}) \overset{d}{\to} \mathcal{M} \quad \text{w.r.t. GH topology.} \tag{5.14}
\]

Finally, using (5.11), we see that the length of the \( i \)-th edge in \( \left(12s\right)^{1/6} \Omega_{n,3} \) is

\[
\left(12s\right)^{1/6} \frac{Z_i}{\sqrt{\Gamma_{r/2}}} = \left(1 + a_p(1)\right) \cdot \left(\frac{4}{3n}\right)^{1/3} \sqrt{2} \cdot Z_i,
\]

which together with (5.14) implies that as \( n \to \infty \),

\[
\left(\frac{4}{3n}\right)^{1/3} \cdot \text{CBD}_\infty(\mathcal{K}_{n,3}^{\text{exp}}) \overset{d}{\to} \mathcal{M} \quad \text{w.r.t. GH topology,} \tag{5.15}
\]

where \( \mathcal{K}_{n,3}^{\text{exp}} \) is the multigraph obtained by assigning lengths \( \sqrt{\Gamma_{r/2}} Z_i, 1 \leq i \leq r \) (which, by (5.12), are i.i.d. Exponential(1) random variables) lengths to the edges of \( \mathcal{K}_{n,3} \). We complete the proof by combining (5.15) and (5.10).

**5.4. Proof of Proposition 5.4.** For any graph \( H \) and \( p \in [0, 1] \), let \( \text{Perc}(H, p) \) denote the random subgraph of \( H \) obtained by removing edges of \( H \) independently with probability \( 1 - p \). The proof of Proposition 5.4 relies on the following three lemmas.

**Lemma 5.6.** Let \( H \) be a finite multigraph. Let \( H^{\text{exp}} \) be the multigraph with edge-lengths obtained by assigning i.i.d. Exponential(1) lengths to the edges of \( H \). Fix \( t > 0 \), and let \( R(t) \) be a Poisson\( \{t \cdot \ell(H^{\text{exp}})\} \) random variable. Then

\[
\text{Shape}\left[\text{Rem}(\text{CBD}_{R(t)}(H^{\text{exp}}))\right], \text{Rem}(\text{CBD}_{R(t)}(H^{\text{exp}}))
\]

has the same distribution as

\[
\left(\text{Perc}(H, \frac{1}{1 + t}), \frac{1}{1 + t} \cdot \left(\text{Perc}(H, \frac{1}{1 + t})^{\text{exp}}\right)\right),
\]

where the last graph denotes the multigraph obtained by assigning i.i.d. Exponential(1) lengths to the edges of \( \text{Perc}(H, 1/(1 + t)) \), and then rescaling the lengths by \( 1/(1 + t) \) (or equivalently, assigning i.i.d. exponential lengths with mean \( 1/(1 + t) \) to the edges of \( \text{Perc}(H, 1/(1 + t)) \)).

Next we state two results about the behavior of the configuration model when a uniform subset of edges of given size is removed. Recall the notation \( \mathcal{G}_{n,d} \) from Definition 1.4.
Lemma 5.7. Suppose \( d = (d_1, \ldots, d_n) \) is a degree sequence and \( \ell_n = \sum_{i \in [n]} d_i \). Let \( m \leq \ell_n/2 \) and define \( \ell'_n = \ell_n - 2m \). Out of the \( \ell_n/2 \) edges of \( G_{n,d} \), sample a subset of \( m \) edges uniformly. Let \( G_{n,d}^{(m)} \) be the graph obtained by removing those \( m \) edges. Then

\[
\left( G_{n,d}, G_{n,d}^{(m)} \right) \overset{d}{=} \left( Q_{n,d,m}^{(2)}, Q_{n,d,m}^{(1)} \right),
\]

where the pair \( (Q_{n,d,m}^{(2)}, Q_{n,d,m}^{(1)}) \) is constructed as follows: Start with the vertex set \([n]\) with \( d_i \) many half-edges attached to vertex \( i \). Sample \( \ell'_n \) many half-edges uniformly, and construct \( Q_{n,d,m}^{(1)} \) by uniformly pairing up those \( \ell'_n \) half-edges. Conditional on this step, uniformly pair the rest of the half-edges to form \( Q_{n,d,m}^{(2)} \).

The result that \( G_{n,d}^{(m)} \overset{d}{=} Q_{n,d,m}^{(1)} \) also follows from [41, Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2]. See also [54] for a related construction.

Lemma 5.8. Suppose \( m = m(n) \) satisfies

\[
n^{-2/3}(3n - 4m) \to \lambda_0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty,
\]

for some \( \lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R} \). Let \( G_{n,3}^{(m)} \) be the graph obtained by removing a uniform subset of \( m \) edges from \( G_{n,3} \). Let \( d' := (d'_1, \ldots, d'_n) \), where \( d'_v \) is the (random) degree of \( v \) in \( G_{n,3}^{(m)} \). Let \( \nu \) be the Binomial(3,1/2) distribution. Then

\[
\frac{1}{n} \# \{ v \in [n] : d'_v = i \} \xrightarrow{p} \nu(i), \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3,
\]

\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in [n]} (d'_v)^3 \xrightarrow{p} \frac{3}{1} \sum_{i=0}^{3} i^3 \nu(i), \quad \text{and} \quad n^{1/3} \left( \frac{\sum_{v \in [n]} (d'_v)^2}{\sum_{v \in [n]} d'_v} - 2 \right) \xrightarrow{p} \frac{\lambda_0}{3}.
\]

Loosely speaking, Lemma 5.8 says that the random degree sequence \( d' \) satisfies Assumption 3.4 in probability. We now prove Proposition 5.4 assuming the above three lemmas.

**Completing the proof of Proposition 5.4:** We first note that if \( \nu \) is the Binomial(3,1/2) distribution, then

\[
\sigma_1(\nu) = 3/2, \quad \sigma_2(\nu) = 3, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_3(\nu) = 27/4.
\]

Next, by Lemma 5.6,

\[
\text{Shape}[\text{Rem}\left( \text{CBD}_{R_{n,1}}(G_{n,3}^{exp}) \right)] \overset{d}{=} \text{Perc}(G_{n,3}^{(1)}, 1/2 + \lambda n^{-1/3}).
\]

Now, for any \( p \in [0,1] \), the number of edges removed from \( G_{n,3} \) to construct \( \text{Perc}(G_{n,3}, p) \) is a Binomial(3n/2, 1 - p) random variable. In particular, when \( p = 1/2 + \lambda n^{-1/3} \), the number of edges removed is

\[
m = \frac{3n}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\lambda}{n^{1/3}} \right) + O_P(\sqrt{n}),
\]

which satisfies (5.16) with \( \lambda_0 = 6\lambda \). Further, conditional on \( G_{n,3} \) and \( m \), \( \text{Perc}(G_{n,3}, 1/2 + \lambda n^{-1/3}) \) is distributed as \( G_{n,3}^{(m)} \) (where the notation is as in Lemma 5.8). Thus, by Lemma 5.8, the (random) degree sequence of \( \text{Perc}(G_{n,3}, 1/2 + \lambda n^{-1/3}) \) satisfies (5.17) and (5.18) with limiting parameter \( \lambda_0/3 = 2\lambda \). Finally, using Lemma 5.7, it follows that
\( \text{Perc}(\mathcal{G}_{n,3}, 1/2 + \lambda n^{-1/3}) \), conditional on its degree sequence, is distributed as a configuration model with that degree sequence. Hence by Theorem 3.5, Theorem 3.13, (5.19), and (5.20),

\[
\mathcal{V} = \Theta_p(n^{2/3}), \quad \mathcal{E} = \Theta_p(n^{2/3}), \quad \mathcal{S} = \Theta_p(1), \quad \mathcal{D} = \Theta_p(n^{1/3}), \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
n^{-1/3} \cdot \mathcal{G}_1(n, \lambda) \xrightarrow{d} 6^{1/3} \cdot S_1\left( (48)^{1/3} \cdot \lambda \right) \quad \text{w.r.t. GH topology},
\]

(5.22)

where \( \mathcal{V} = |G_1(n, \lambda)|, \mathcal{E} = |E(G_1(n, \lambda))|, \mathcal{S} = \operatorname{sp}(G_1(n, \lambda)), \) and \( \mathcal{D} \) denotes the diameter of \( G_1(n, \lambda) \). By Lemma 5.6, conditional on \( G_1(n, \lambda) \), the lengths of the edges of \( \mathcal{G}_1(n, \lambda) \) are

\[
\left( 1/2 + \lambda n^{-1/3} \right) \cdot \left[ \Gamma_1^{(1)} \ldots, \Gamma_1^{(\mathcal{E})} \right],
\]

(5.23)

where \( \Gamma_1^{(1)}, \ldots, \Gamma_1^{(\mathcal{E})} \) are i.i.d. Exponential(1) random variables. Further, for any two vertices in \( G_1(n, \lambda) \), there are at most \( 2^\mathcal{E} \) many self-avoiding paths connecting them, and the length of any such self-avoiding path is at most \( 6(\mathcal{S} + 1)\mathcal{D} \). For any such self-avoiding path \( P \) and any \( \eta > 0 \), by standard concentration inequalities,

\[
\mathbb{P}_{G_1} \left( \left| \sum_{j \in P} \Gamma_1^{(j)} - 1 \right| \geq \left( 6(\mathcal{S} + 1)\mathcal{D} \right)^{1/2 + \eta} \right) \leq \exp \left( -c \left( 6(\mathcal{S} + 1)\mathcal{D} \right)^{2\eta} \right)
\]

(5.24)

where \( \mathbb{P}_{G_1} \) denotes probability conditional on \( G_1(n, \lambda) \). Let \( G_1^{\text{exp}}(n, \lambda) \) be the graph with edge-lengths obtained by assigning lengths \( \Gamma_1^{(1)} \ldots, \Gamma_1^{(\mathcal{E})} \) to the edges of \( G_1(n, \lambda) \). Then by (5.24),

\[
\mathbb{P}_{G_1} \left( d_{\text{GH}}(G_1^{\text{exp}}(n, \lambda), G_1(n, \lambda)) \geq \left( 6(\mathcal{S} + 1)\mathcal{D} \right)^{1/2 + \eta} \right) \leq \mathcal{Y}^2 \cdot 2^\mathcal{E} \exp \left( -c \left( 6(\mathcal{S} + 1)\mathcal{D} \right)^{2\eta} \right).
\]

Thus, by (5.21) and (5.22),

\[
n^{-1/3} \cdot G_1^{\text{exp}}(n, \lambda) \xrightarrow{d} 6^{1/3} \cdot S_1\left( (48)^{1/3} \cdot \lambda \right) \quad \text{w.r.t. GH topology},
\]

which together with (5.23) implies

\[
n^{-1/3} \cdot \mathcal{G}_1(n, \lambda) \xrightarrow{d} \frac{1}{2} \cdot G_1^{\text{exp}}(n, \lambda)
\]

(5.25)

w.r.t. GH topology. The claim now follows from (5.22) and (5.25) by using Theorem 4.6 and Theorem 3.14.

The rest of this section is devoted to the proofs of Lemmas 5.6, 5.7, and 5.8.

**Proof of Lemma 5.6:** Let \( |E(H)| = r \). Run two independent Poisson point processes (PPP), a ‘red’ PPP and a ‘blue’ PPP, with intensities \( t \) and 1 respectively. Let \( X_1 < \ldots < X_r \) be the locations of the first \( r \) blue points. Enumerate the edges of \( H \) in any way, and assign length \((X_i - X_{i-1})\) to the \( i \)-th edge, \( i = 1, \ldots, r \), where \( X_0 = 0 \). Call the resulting graph with edge lengths \( H_1 \). Let \( \tilde{R} \) be the number of red points in \([0, X_m]\). Identifying the \( i \)-th edge of \( H_1 \) with the interval \([X_{i-1}, X_i]\), \( i = 1, \ldots, r \), place a red point on \( H_1 \) corresponding to the location of each of the \( \tilde{R} \) red points in \([0, X_m]\). Call the resulting graph with red points \( H_2 \).

Now first note that \( H_1 \xrightarrow{d} H^{\text{exp}} \). Next, conditional on the blue PPP, \( \tilde{R} \) follows a Poisson\((tX_m) \equiv \text{Poisson}(t \cdot \ell(H_1))\) distribution. Thus,

\[
\{H_1, \tilde{R} \} \xrightarrow{d} \{H^{\text{exp}}, R(t)\}.
\]
Finally, conditional on the blue PPP and $\bar{R}$, the locations of the red points in $[0, X_m]$ are i.i.d. Uniform$[0, X]$ random variables, which implies that

$$\text{Rem}(\text{CBD}_{R(t)}(H^{\text{exp}})) \overset{d}{=} \text{Rem}(H_2).$$

(5.26)

Now $\text{Rem}(H_2)$ can be generated in the following alternate way: Sample independent random variables $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r$, where $Z_i \sim \text{Poisson}(t(X_i - X_{i-1}))$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$. (Here $Z_i$ corresponds to the number of red points in $[X_{i-1}, X_i]$.) Remove the $i$-th edge of $H$ iff $Z_i \geq 1$, and assign independent lengths $Y_i$ to the remaining edges, where $Y_i \overset{d}{=} ((X_i - X_{i-1}|Z_i = 0)$.

Combining (5.26) with the facts that $\mathbb{1}_{Z_i = 0}, i \geq 1$, are i.i.d. Bernoulli$(1/(1 + t))$ random variables, and $((X_i - X_{i-1}|Z_i = 0)$ has an exponential distribution with mean $1/(1 + t)$, it follows that

$$\text{Rem}(\text{CBD}_{R(t)}(H^{\text{exp}})) \overset{d}{=} \frac{1}{1 + t} \left( \text{Perc}(H, \frac{1}{1 + t}) \right)^{\exp}.$$  

Now the result follows immediately.

Proof of Lemma 5.7: Let $G$ be a graph on $[n]$ with degree sequence $d$. Let $G'$ be a subgraph of $G$. Let $d' = (d'_1, \ldots, d'_n)$ be the degree sequence of $G'$. Let $x_{ij}$ (resp. $x'_{ij}$) be the number of edges between $i$ and $j$ in $G$ (resp. $G'$), $i \neq j$, and let $x_{ii}$ (resp. $x'_{ii}$) denote the number of loops attached to vertex $i$ in $G$ (resp. $G'$). Using (1.3) it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{n,d} = G, \mathcal{G}'_{n,d} = G') = \frac{1}{(\ell' - 1)!!} \prod_{i \in [n]} d_i! \prod_{i \leq j} x_{ij}! \prod_{i \leq j} x'_{ij}! \prod_{i \leq j} \left( \frac{x_{ij}}{x'_{ij}} \right),$$

(5.27)

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Q}_{n,d,m}^{(1)} = G', \mathcal{Q}_{n,d,m}^{(2)} = G) = \frac{\prod_{i \in [n]} \left( \frac{d_i}{d'_i} \right)}{\ell_n} \frac{1}{(\ell' - 1)!!} \prod_{i \in [n]} d_i! \prod_{i \leq j} x_{ij}! \prod_{i \leq j} x'_{ij}! \prod_{i \in [n]} (d_i - d'_i)! \prod_{i \leq j} x_{ij}! \prod_{i \leq j} (x_{ij} - x'_{ij})!

(5.28)

A direct computation shows that the right sides of (5.27) and (5.28) are equal. This completes the proof.

Proof of Lemma 5.8: We use the alternate construction of $\mathcal{G}_n^{(m)}$ from Lemma 5.7. For each $v \in [n]$, let $f_{v,i}$ denote the $i$-th half edge attached to $v$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Let $E_{v,i}$ denote the event that $f_{v,i}$ is one of the $3n - 2m$ selected half edges. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{v,i}) = (3n - 2m)/3n, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq 3.$$
and
\[ P\left( E_{v_1,i_1} \cap E_{v_2,i_2}\right) = \frac{(3n-2m)(3n-2m-1)}{3n(3n-1)}, \]
whenever \((v_1,i_1) \neq (v_2,i_2)\).

Since \(d'_v = \sum_{j=1}^{3} 1\{E_{v,j}\}\),
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{v \in [n]} d'_v^2 \right] = n \cdot \mathbb{E}[d'^2] = n \left[ 3 \times \frac{(3n-2m)}{3n} + 6 \times \frac{(3n-2m)(3n-2m-1)}{3n(3n-1)} \right],
\]
Using this relation, (5.16), and the fact that \(\sum_{v \in [n]} d'_v = 3n - 2m\), a direct computation shows that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} n^{1/3} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{v \in [n]} d'_v^2 \right]}{\sum_{v \in [n]} d'_v} - 2 \right) = \frac{\lambda_0}{3}. \tag{5.29}
\]
Now it is straightforward to check that for any four distinct pairs \((v_j, i_j), 1 \leq j \leq 4\), each of the quantities \(\text{Cov}\left( 1\{E_{v_1,i_1}\}, 1\{E_{v_2,i_2}\}\right), \text{Cov}\left( 1\{E_{v_1,i_1} \cap E_{v_2,i_2}\}, 1\{E_{v_3,i_3}\}\right), \text{Cov}\left( 1\{E_{v_1,i_1} \cap E_{v_2,i_2}\}, 1\{E_{v_3,i_3} \cap E_{v_4,i_4}\}\right)\) is negative. Thus for any \(v_1 \neq v_2\), \(\text{Cov}(d'^2_{v_1}, d'^2_{v_2}) < 0\), which implies that
\[
\text{Var}\left( \sum_{v \in [n]} d'_v \right) \leq \sum_{v \in [n]} \text{Var}(d'_v) = O(n).
\]
This combined with (5.29) shows that \(d'\) satisfies (3.1) with \(\lambda = \lambda_0/3\) in the sense of convergence in probability.

Next, for \(v \in [n]\) and \(k = 0, 1, 2, 3\),
\[
P\left( d'_v = k \right) = \binom{3}{k} \left( 3n - 3 \right) \left( 2m + k - 3 \right) / \left( 2m \right),
\]
which together with (5.16) yields
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}\left[ \#\{v \in [n] : d'_v = k\} \right] = \lim_{n \to \infty} P\left( d'_v = k \right) = v(k).
\]
A little computation will show that \(\text{Var}\left[ \#\{v \in [n] : d'_v = k\} \right] = O(n)\) for \(k = 0, 1, 2, 3\). This completes the proof. \(\blacksquare\)

5.5. **Proof of Proposition 5.5.** We will use the following lemmas in the proof:

**Lemma 5.9.** Suppose \(X_1\) and \(X_2\) are two real valued random variables defined on the same probability space such that \(X_1 \leq X_2\) almost surely. Suppose further that \(X_1 \overset{d}{=} X_2\). Then \(X_1 = X_2\) almost surely.

This is an elementary lemma, and we omit the proof.

**Lemma 5.10.** Suppose \((Z_{n}^+, d_n, Z_n)\) is a sequence in \(\mathcal{G}^*\) satisfying \((Z_{n}^+, d_n, Z_n) \to (Z_0^+, d, Z_0)\) for some marked space \((Z_0^+, d, Z_0)\). Then
\[
d_H(Z_{n}^+, Z_n) \to d_H(Z_0^+, Z_0).
\]
Proof: For any isometric embeddings $\phi_n : Z_n^+ \to Z^*$ and $\psi_n : Z_0^+ \to Z^*$ into some common space $Z^*$, we have
\[ d_H(Z_n^+, Z_n) \leq d_H(\phi_n(Z_n^+), \psi_n(Z_0^+)) + d_H(Z_0^+, Z_0) + d_H(\psi_n(Z_0), \phi_n(Z_n)). \]
Using symmetry, we see that
\[ |d_H(Z_n^+, Z_n) - d_H(Z_0^+, Z_0)| \leq d_H(\phi_n(Z_n^+), \psi_n(Z_0^+)) + d_H(\psi_n(Z_0), \phi_n(Z_n)). \tag{5.30} \]
Using the fact $(Z_n^+, d_n, Z_n) \to (Z_0^+, d, Z_0)$, we can choose $\phi_n, \psi_n$ in a way so that the right side of (5.30) goes to zero as $n \to \infty$. 

We will now complete the proof of Proposition 5.5. For any compact metric space $(X, d)$ and $\delta > 0$, let $N_\delta(X)$ be the minimum number of closed $\delta$ balls needed to cover $X$.

Since $X_n^+ \xrightarrow{d} Z$, the sequence $\{X_n^+, d_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is relatively compact w.r.t. GH topology. Using Lemma 3.1(b), the sequence $\{X_n^+, d_n, X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is relatively compact w.r.t. the marked topology. Thus there exists a subsequence $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ and a random marked space $(Z_0^+, d, Z_0)$ such that
\[ (X_{n_k}^+, d_{n_k}, X_{n_k}) \xrightarrow{d} (Z_0^+, d, Z_0) \]
as $k \to \infty$ with respect to the marked topology. Since $X_n^+ \xrightarrow{d} Z$ and $X_n \xrightarrow{d} Z$, we must have $Z_0^+ \xrightarrow{d} Z \xrightarrow{d} Z_0$ as compact metric spaces. In particular, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,
\[ N_\varepsilon(Z_0^+) \overset{d}{=} N_\varepsilon(Z_0). \tag{5.31} \]
Since $Z_0$ is a closed subset of $Z_0^+$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $N_\varepsilon(Z_0) \leq N_\varepsilon(Z_0^+)$ almost surely. Then it follows from (5.31) and Lemma 5.9 that
\[ \mathbb{P}(N_\varepsilon(Z_0^+) = N_\varepsilon(Z_0)) = 1 \]
for every $\varepsilon > 0$. This implies that $\mathbb{P}(d_H(Z_0^+, Z_0) = 0) = 1$. Thus, using Lemma 5.10, we conclude that $d_H(X_{n_k}^+\lambda, X_{n_k}) \xrightarrow{p} 0$.

Now for any subsequence $\{m_\ell\}_{\ell \geq 1}$, using the above argument, we can extract a further subsequence $\{m_{\ell_k}\}_{k \geq 1}$ such that $d_H(X_{m_{\ell_k}}^+\lambda, X_{m_{\ell_k}}) \xrightarrow{p} 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Thus the claim follows.

5.6. GHP convergence of the MST of $G_{n,3}$. In this section we improve the convergence in Theorem 5.1 to GHP convergence, thus completing the proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $G_1(n, \lambda)$ and $G_1(n, \lambda)$ be as in the statement of Proposition 5.4, and let $k_n(\lambda)$ and $\Xi_n(\lambda)$, $1 \leq j \leq k_n(\lambda)$, be as in the proof of Theorem 5.1. For $v \in G_1(n, \lambda)$, let $d_{v,\lambda}$ be the degree of $v$ in $G_1(n, \lambda)$, and define $d_{v,\lambda}^\text{avail} := 3 - d_{v,\lambda}$. Thus $d_{v,\lambda}^\text{avail}$ denotes the number of distinct edges sampled in the process $(\text{CBD}_i(G_{n,3}))$, $i \leq R_{n,\lambda}$ that were incident to $v$, and one can picture this degree deficiency as ‘available half-edges’ attached to $v$.

Recall from the proof of Theorem 5.1 that $k_n(\lambda) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ on $B_n^c$. Further, on the event $B_n$, CBD$_\infty(G_{n,3})$ is CBD$_\infty(G_1(n, \lambda))$ with Shape[$\Xi_n(\lambda)$], $1 \leq j \leq k_n(\lambda)$, attached to its vertices via a single edge; let $T^{(i)}_{n,\lambda}(v)$, $1 \leq i \leq d_{v,\lambda}^\text{avail}$, be the trees attached to $v$, where some of these trees may be empty (in which case there is no edge connecting
them to \( v \) either). On \( B_n^c \), we define \( T_{n,\lambda}^{(i)}(v) \) to be the empty tree for every \( 1 \leq i \leq d_{\text{avail}} \) and \( v \in \text{CBD}_\infty(G_1(n, \lambda)) \). Thus the collection of the non-empty trees among \( T_{n,\lambda}^{(i)}(v) \), \( 1 \leq i \leq d_{\text{avail}} \), \( v \in \text{CBD}_\infty(G_1(n, \lambda)) \), is simply \( \text{Shape}[\xi_{n,\lambda}^{(j)}], 1 \leq j \leq k_n(\lambda), \) in some order. Construct the spaces \( M_{n,\lambda}^{\text{avail}} \) and \( M_{n,\lambda}^{\text{attach}} \) by endowing \( \text{CBD}_\infty(G_1(n, \lambda)) \) with the tree distance and respectively assigning mass

\[
p_{v,\lambda}^{\text{avail}} := \frac{d_{v,\lambda}^{\text{avail}}}{\sum_{u \in G_1(n, \lambda)} d_{u,\lambda}^{\text{avail}}}
\quad \text{and} \quad
p_{v,\lambda}^{\text{attach}} := \frac{1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d_{\text{avail}}} |T_{n,\lambda}^{(i)}(v)|}{n \cdot 1_{B_n} + |G_1(n, \lambda)| \cdot 1_{B_n^c}}
\]

(5.32)
to \( v \in \text{CBD}_\infty(G_1(n, \lambda)) \). Note that \( \sum_{v \in G_1(n, \lambda)} p_{v,\lambda}^{\text{attach}} = 1 \).

**Lemma 5.11.** Let \( \lambda_n^* \) be as in the proof of Theorem 5.1. Then for all \( \lambda_n \uparrow \infty \) with \( \lambda_n \leq \lambda_n^* 
\)

\[
n^{-1/3} d_{\text{GHP}}(\text{CBD}_\infty(G_{n,3}), \mathcal{M}_{n,\lambda_n}^{\text{attach}}) \xrightarrow{P} 0.
\]

**Lemma 5.12.** There exists \( \lambda_n^+ \uparrow \infty \) such that for all \( \lambda_n \uparrow \infty \) with \( \lambda_n \leq \lambda_n^+ 
\)

\[
n^{-1/3} \mathcal{M}_{n,\lambda_n}^{\text{attach}} \xrightarrow{d} 6^{1/3} \cdot S_1(48)^{1/3} \cdot \lambda \quad \text{w.r.t. the GHP topology.}
\]

**Lemma 5.13.** There exists \( \lambda_n^* \uparrow \infty \) such that for all \( \lambda_n \uparrow \infty \) with \( \lambda_n \leq \lambda_n^* 
\)

\[
n^{-1/3} d_{\text{GHP}}(\mathcal{M}_{n,\lambda_n}^{\text{attach}}, \mathcal{M}_{n,\lambda_n}^{\text{avail}}) \xrightarrow{P} 0.
\]

**Completing the proof of Theorem 2.1:** The result follows upon combining Lemma 5.11, Lemma 5.12, Lemma 5.13, and (5.8).

**Proof of Lemma 5.11:** On the event \( B_n \), define the correspondence \( C \) between \( \mathcal{M}_{n,\lambda_n}^{\text{attach}} \) and \( \text{CBD}_\infty(G_{n,3}) \) as follows:

\[
C := \{ (v, u) : v \in \mathcal{M}_{n,\lambda_n}^{\text{attach}} \quad \text{and} \quad u \in [v] \cup \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{d_{\text{avail}}} T_{n,\lambda_n}^{(i)}(v) \right) \}.
\]

Let \( \pi \) be a measure on \( \mathcal{M}_{n,\lambda_n}^{\text{attach}} \times \text{CBD}_\infty(G_{n,3}) \) given by \( \pi([(v, u)]) = 1/n \) for \( (v, u) \in C \). Then with this choice of \( C \) and \( \pi \), the claim follows immediately if we use (5.6).

**Proof of Lemma 5.12:** Assign mass \( p_{v,\lambda}^{\text{avail}} \) to \( v \in G_1(n, \lambda) \) and call the resulting metric measure space \( G_1^{\text{avail}}(n, \lambda) \). Using Theorem 3.13 with \( f(k) = 3 - k, \ k = 0, \ldots, 3 \), and the arguments used to prove (5.22), we see that \( n^{-1/3} G_1^{\text{avail}}(n, \lambda) \xrightarrow{d} 6^{1/3} \cdot S_1(48)^{1/3} \cdot \lambda \) w.r.t. GHP topology. Using Theorem 3.14 and Theorem 4.6, it follows that for each \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
n^{-1/3} \mathcal{M}_{n,\lambda}^{\text{avail}} \xrightarrow{d} 6^{1/3} \cdot \text{CBD}_\infty(S_1((48)^{1/3} \cdot \lambda)) \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty
\]

w.r.t. GHP topology. The claim now follows from Theorem 4.7.

To prove Lemma 5.13 we will make use of Lemma 5.14 stated below.
Lemma 5.14. Let $\lambda_n^*$ be as in the proof of Theorem 5.1. Suppose $\lambda_n \uparrow \infty$ with $\lambda_n \leq \lambda_n^*$. Then for any enumeration $\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots$ of the vertices of $G_1(n, \lambda_n)$ measurable w.r.t. the $\sigma$-field generated by $\text{CBD}_\infty(G_1(n, \lambda_n))$,

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq |G_1(n, \lambda_n)|} \left| \sum_{s=1}^{j} \sum_{i=1}^{d_{\text{avail}}_{v_{s}, \lambda_n}} \frac{|T_{n, \lambda_n}^{(i)}(v_s)|}{n - |G_1(n, \lambda_n)|} - \sum_{s=1}^{j} p_{v_{s}, \lambda_n}^{\text{avail}} \right| \overset{P}{\rightarrow} 0,$$

where $p_{v_{s}, \lambda_n}^{\text{avail}}$ is as defined in (5.32).

We first prove Lemma 5.13 assuming Lemma 5.14.

Proof of Lemma 5.13: On the event $B_n$, construct $\mathcal{M}_{\text{modi}}$ by endowing $\text{CBD}_\infty(G_1(n, \lambda))$ with the tree distance and assigning mass

$$p_{v_{s}, \lambda_n}^{\text{modi}} := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d_{\text{avail}}_{v_{s}, \lambda_n}} |T_{n, \lambda_n}^{(i)}(v)|}{n - |G_1(n, \lambda)|}$$

to $v \in \text{CBD}_\infty(G_1(n, \lambda))$. On $B_n$, set $\mathcal{M}_{\text{modi}} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{attach}}$. As observed in (5.21), $|G_1(n, \lambda)| = \Theta_P(n^{2/3})$. Thus,

$$\sum_{v \in G_1(n, \lambda)} |p_{v_{s}, \lambda_n}^{\text{modi}} - p_{v_{s}, \lambda_n}^{\text{attach}}| = O_P(n^{-1/3}).$$

It follows that for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $d_{\text{GHP}}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{modi}}_{\lambda_n}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{attach}}_{\lambda_n}) \overset{P}{\rightarrow} 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus we can choose $\lambda_n^\oplus \uparrow \infty$ such that for all $\lambda_n \uparrow \infty$ with $\lambda_n \leq \lambda_n^\oplus$,

$$d_{\text{GHP}}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{modi}}_{\lambda_n^\oplus}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{attach}}_{\lambda_n^\oplus}) \overset{P}{\rightarrow} 0. \tag{5.33}$$

Set $\lambda_n^\oplus := \min\{\lambda_n^\oplus, \lambda_n^\delta\}$, where $\lambda_n^\delta$ is as in Lemma 5.12. Fix a sequence $\lambda_n \uparrow \infty$ with $\lambda_n \leq \lambda_n^\delta$. Fix $\delta > 0$. Let $N_{\delta}^{(n)} = N_{\delta n^{1/3}}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{modi}}_{\lambda_n^\oplus})$ be the minimum number of closed $\delta n^{1/3}$ balls needed to cover $\mathcal{M}_{\text{modi}}_{\lambda_n^\oplus}$. By Lemma 5.12, $\{N_{\delta}^{(n)}(A_j) \mid j \geq 1\}$ is tight. Let $A_1, \ldots, A_{N_{\delta}^{(n)}}$ be disjoint sets that cover $\mathcal{M}_{\text{modi}}_{\lambda_n^\oplus}$ and satisfy $\text{diam}(A_j) \leq 2\delta n^{1/3}$, $1 \leq j \leq N_{\delta}^{(n)}$. Let $\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots$ be a labeling of the vertices of $G_1(n, \lambda_n)$ such that for each $j \leq N_{\delta}^{(n)}$, all vertices $v \in A_j$ appear successively. By Lemma 5.14,

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq N_{\delta}^{(n)}} \left| \sum_{v \in A_j} (p_{v_{s}, \lambda_n}^{\text{modi}} - p_{v_{s}, \lambda_n}^{\text{avail}}) \right| \overset{P}{\rightarrow} 0. \tag{5.34}$$

Let $\mu_{\text{modi}}^{(n)}$ be the measure on $\mathcal{X}_n := \{A_1, \ldots, A_{N_{\delta}^{(n)}}\}$ given by $\mu_{\text{modi}}^{(n)}(A_j) = \sum_{v \in A_j} p_{v_{s}, \lambda_n}^{\text{modi}}$. Define $\mu_{\text{modi}}^{(n)}$ on $\mathcal{X}_n$ analogously. Then the total variation distance between $\mu_{\text{modi}}^{(n)}$ and $\mu_{\text{modi}}^{(n)}$ satisfies

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_{\text{modi}}^{(n)}, \mu_{\text{modi}}^{(n)}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \times N_{\delta}^{(n)} \times \max_{1 \leq j \leq N_{\delta}^{(n)}} \left| \sum_{v \in A_j} (p_{v_{s}, \lambda_n}^{\text{modi}} - p_{v_{s}, \lambda_n}^{\text{avail}}) \right| \overset{P}{\rightarrow} 0,$$

where the last step uses (5.34) and the fact that $\{N_{\delta}^{(n)}(A_j) \mid j \geq 1\}$ is tight. Thus for each $n$, we can construct $\mathcal{X}_n$-valued random variables $X_{\text{modi}}^{(n)}$ and $X_{\text{avail}}^{(n)}$ distributed as $\mu_{\text{modi}}^{(n)}$ and $\mu_{\text{modi}}^{(n)}$ respectively such that $\mathbb{P}(X_{\text{modi}}^{(n)} \neq X_{\text{avail}}^{(n)}) \overset{P}{\rightarrow} 0$. Using $X_{\text{modi}}^{(n)}$ and $X_{\text{avail}}^{(n)}$, there is a natural
way to construct $\text{CBD}_\infty(G_1(n, \lambda_n))$-valued random variables $Y_n^{\text{modi}}$ and $Y_n^{\text{avail}}$ such that
\[
P\left(Y_n^{\text{modi}} = v\right) = p_n^{\text{modi}}, \quad \text{and} \quad P\left(Y_n^{\text{avail}} = v\right) = p_n^{\text{avail}} \quad \text{for all} \quad v \in \text{CBD}_\infty(G_1(n, \lambda_n)),
\]
and further,
\[
P\left(d(Y_n^{\text{modi}}, Y_n^{\text{avail}}) > 2\delta n^{1/3}\right) \underset{P}{\longrightarrow} 0.
\]
Since $\delta > 0$ was arbitrary, we get $n^{-1/3} d_{\text{GHP}}(Y_n^{\text{modi}}, Y_n^{\text{avail}}) \underset{P}{\longrightarrow} 0$, which combined with (5.33) completes the proof.

The proof of Lemma 5.14 relies on the next two lemmas.

**Lemma 5.15.** There exist universal constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for any $m \geq 1$ and probability vector $p := (p_1, \ldots, p_m)$,
\[
P\left( \max_{j \in [m]} \left| \sum_{i=1}^j p_{\pi(i)} - \frac{j}{m} \right| \geq x\sigma(p) \right) \leq \exp\left(-c_1 x \log \log x\right), \quad \text{for} \quad x \geq c_2,
\]
where $\pi$ is a uniform permutation on $[m]$, and $\sigma(p) := \sqrt{p_1^2 + \ldots + p_m^2}$. Consequently, using the relation $\sigma(p) \leq \max_j \sqrt{p_j}$,
\[
P\left( \max_{j_1 < j_2} \left| \sum_{i=j_1+1}^{j_2} p_{\pi(i)} - \frac{j_2 - j_1}{m} \right| \geq x \cdot \max_j \sqrt{p_j} \right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-c_1 x \log \log x\right), \quad \text{for} \quad x \geq c_2.
\]

This result gives a quantitative concentration inequality for the partial sums of exchangeable random variables. The result can be found in the above form in [25, Lemma 6.5], but was essentially already contained in [24, Lemma 4.9].

**Lemma 5.16.** (i) Conditional on $\text{Shape}[\text{Rem}(\text{CBD}_{G_{n,3}}(\emptyset))], the sequence
\[
\{ \left| T_{n,\lambda}^{(i)}(v) \right| \}_{1 \leq i \leq d_{\text{avail}}^{\text{v,\lambda}}, \forall \in G_1(n, \lambda)}
\]
is exchangeable.

(ii) Let $\lambda_n^*$ be as in the proof of Theorem 5.1. Then for any $\lambda_n \uparrow \infty$ with $\lambda_n \leq \lambda_n^*$,
\[
\max_{1 \leq i \leq d_{\text{avail}}^{\text{v,\lambda}}} |T_{n,\lambda}^{(i)}(v)| \quad \text{P} \underset{n}{\longrightarrow} 0,
\]
where maximum is taken over $1 \leq i \leq d_{\text{avail}}^{\text{v,\lambda}}, \forall \in \text{CBD}_\infty(G_1(n, \lambda))$.

**Proof of Lemma 5.14:** The claim follows from (2.2), Lemma 5.16, and Lemma 5.15.

**Proof of Lemma 5.16(i):** Consider a finite (non-random) graph $H$ and $t > 0$, and let $H^{\text{exp}}$ and $R(t)$ be as in the statement of Lemma 5.6. Then conditional on $\text{Shape}[\text{Rem}(\text{CBD}_{R(t)}(H^{\text{exp}}))] = H_0$, the order in which the edges in $E(H) \setminus E(H_0)$ were sampled for the first time in the CBD process is a uniform permutation on $E(H) \setminus E(H_0)$.

Using the above observation, Lemma 5.6, and Lemma 5.7, $\text{Shape}[\text{Rem}(\text{CBD}_{G_{n,3}}(\emptyset)), \emptyset_{n,3}$, and $(|T_{n,\lambda}^{(i)}(v)|, 1 \leq i \leq d_{\text{avail}}^{\text{v,\lambda}}, \forall \in G_1(n, \lambda)$ can be jointly generated as follows:

(a) Sample a Binomial$(3n/2, 1/2 - \lambda n^{-1/3})$ random variable. For simplicity, we denote the realization by $m$. 
(b) Conditional on the above, sample $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}_{n,3,m}$ as in Lemma 5.7, where $3 = (3, \ldots, 3)$. Then $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}_{n,3,m}$ has the same law as $\text{Shape}[\text{Rem}(\text{CBD}_{n,3}((\mathcal{G}^{\exp}_{n,3})))$ and the largest component of $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}_{n,3,m}$, say $\mathcal{C}_1$, has the same law as $G_1(n, \lambda)$. Let $d_v$ be the degree of $v \in \mathcal{C}_1$. Then each $v \in \mathcal{C}_1$ has $3 - d_v$ many 'available' half-edges.

(c) Conditional on the above, generate $\mathcal{D}^{(2)}_{n,3,m}$ as in Lemma 5.7. Then $\mathcal{D}^{(2)}_{n,3,m}$ has the same law as $\mathcal{G}_{n,3}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{E}_m$ be the edges that are in $\mathcal{D}^{(2)}_{n,3,m}$ but not in $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}_{n,3,m}$.

(d) If $\mathcal{D}^{(2)}_{n,3,m}$ is not connected, then go to the next step. Otherwise, let $\pi$ be a uniform permutation of $m$ elements independent of the above. Consider the edges $\mathcal{E}_{\pi(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{E}_{\pi(m)}$ sequentially in this order, and at each step, remove the edge being considered from $\mathcal{D}^{(2)}_{n,3,m}$ if its removal does not disconnect the current graph. Denote the resulting graph by $\mathcal{D}$. Then $\mathcal{D}$ has the same law as $\text{Shape}[\text{CBD}_{n,3}((\mathcal{G}^{\exp}_{n,3})].$

(e) If $\mathcal{D}^{(2)}_{n,3,m}$ is not connected, define $Q^{(i)}(v)$ to be the empty graph for $1 \leq i \leq 3 - d_v$, $v \in \mathcal{E}_1$. If $\mathcal{D}^{(2)}_{n,3,m}$ is connected, let $\{Q^{(i)}(v) : 1 \leq i \leq 3 - d_v, v \in \mathcal{E}_1\}$ be the collection of multigraphs such that $\mathcal{D}$ can be constructed by connecting each non-empty $Q^{(i)}(v)$ to $v \in \mathcal{E}_1$ via an edge. Then

$$\{|Q^{(i)}(v)|, 1 \leq i \leq 3 - d_v, v \in \mathcal{E}_1\} \overset{d}{=} \{|T^{(i)}_{n,3}(v)|, 1 \leq i \leq d_{v,\lambda}^{\text{avail}}, v \in G_1(n, \lambda)\}.$$

Conditional on steps (a) and (b) above, the rest of the procedure is symmetric with respect to the available half-edges attached to the vertices of $\mathcal{E}_1$. Thus the claim follows.

We need the following result before proceeding to the proof of Lemma 5.16(ii). Recall the notation $m(\cdot, \cdot)$ from Section 3.1.

**Lemma 5.17.** Suppose $(Z_n, d_n, \mu_n) \to (Z, d, \mu)$ as $n \to \infty$ in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{GHP}}$. If $\mu$ is non-atomic, then

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} m(\varepsilon, Z_n) = 0.$$

**Proof:** Using the convergence $(Z_n, d_n, \mu_n) \to (Z, d, \mu)$, it is easy to see that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large $n$,

$$m(\varepsilon, Z_n) \leq m(2\varepsilon, Z) + \varepsilon.$$

It follows easily from the compactness of $(Z, d)$ and the non-atomicity of $\mu$ that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} m(2\varepsilon, Z) = 0.$$

Thus the claim follows. ■

We now continue with **Proof of Lemma 5.16**(ii): Recall the notation from Construction 3.9. Let $\Gamma_{r/2}$ and $\mathcal{K}^{\exp}_{n,3}$ be as in the proof of Proposition 5.3. Then there is a natural isometric embedding of $\mathcal{K}^{\exp}_{n,3}$ into $\sqrt{2\Gamma_{r/2}} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{(s)}$. More precisely, $\sqrt{2\Gamma_{r/2}} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{(s)}$ can be obtained by attaching countably many real trees to $\mathcal{K}^{\exp}_{n,3}$. Let $(\mathcal{K}^{\exp}_{n,3}, \mu_n)$ be the measured $\mathbb{R}$-graph derived by endowing $\mathcal{K}^{\exp}_{n,3}$ by the measure obtained by projecting the measure from $\sqrt{2\Gamma_{r/2}} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{(s)}$ onto the attachment points in $\mathcal{K}^{\exp}_{n,3}$. Arguing as in (5.13), it is easy to show that as $n \to \infty$,

$$n^{-1/3} d_{\text{GHP}}(\text{CB}^{\infty}(\sqrt{2\Gamma_{r/2}} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{(s)}), \text{CB}^{\infty}(\mathcal{K}^{\exp}_{n,3})) \overset{p}{\to} 0.$$
Combining this with Theorem 4.8 and (5.11), we get
\[ n^{-1/3} \text{CB}^\infty(\mathcal{H}_{n,3}) \overset{d}{\rightarrow} (0.75)^{1/3} \cdot \mathcal{M} \text{ w.r.t. GHP topology.} \] 
(5.36)

Suppose \( \mathcal{G}_{n,3} \) and \( \mathcal{K}_{n,3} \) are coupled as in (5.10). On the event \( \{ \mathcal{K}_{n,3} = \mathcal{G}_{n,3} \} \), the tree \( \text{CB}^\infty(\mathcal{H}_{n,3}) \) can be obtained by (i) attaching \( \mathcal{T}_{n,\lambda_n}^{(j)}, 1 \leq j \leq k_n(\lambda_n) \), to \( \text{CBD}^\infty(\mathcal{G}_{1,\lambda_n}) \) via a single edge, and then (ii) attaching some additional line segments to the space thus obtained. (Recall that in the CB process edges are cut open, while in the CBD process edges are removed. Because of this difference these additional line segments need to be attached.) Thus using (5.36), Theorem 2.3, (5.5), together with Lemma 5.17, we see that
\[ \max_{1 \leq j \leq k_n(\lambda_n)} \mathbb{E}_{\{ \mathcal{G}_{n,3} = \mathcal{K}_{n,3} \}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{T}_{n,\lambda_n}^{(j)}} \mathbb{E}_{n,\lambda_n} \mathcal{X}_{(i)} \rightarrow 0. \] 
(5.37)

Let \( E_{\text{max}} \) denote the maximum number of edges in \( \mathcal{T}_{n,\lambda_n}^{(j)}, 1 \leq j \leq k_n(\lambda_n) \). On the event \( \{ \mathcal{G}_{n,3} = \mathcal{K}_{n,3} \} \),
\[ \max_{1 \leq j \leq k_n(\lambda_n)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{T}_{n,\lambda_n}^{(j)}} \mathcal{X}_{(i)} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{r} X_{(i)} \] 
(5.38)

where \( X_{(1)} < \ldots < X_{(r)} \) are the order statistics corresponding to \( (X_1, \ldots, X_r) \). Now for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \),
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{r} X_{(i)} \rightarrow 2 \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \Gamma_{1/2} \mathbb{1}_{[\Gamma_{1/2} \leq Q_\varepsilon]} \right], \] 
(5.39)

where \( \Gamma_{1/2} \sim \text{Gamma}(1/2, 1) \) and \( \mathbb{P} \left[ \Gamma_{1/2} \leq Q_\varepsilon \right] = \varepsilon \). It now follows from (5.37), (5.38) and (5.39) that
\[ E_{\text{max}} / r \rightarrow 0, \] 
which in turn implies (5.35). This completes the proof. ■

5.7. **GHP convergence of the MST of \( \overline{\mathcal{G}_{n,3}} \).** In this section we prove Theorem 2.2. We first state two fundamental results about the configuration model and uniform simple graphs with prescribed degree.

(a) From (1.3) (see also [28, 71]), it follows that conditional on being simple, the configuration model has the same distribution as \( \mathcal{G}_{n,d} \), i.e.,
\[ \mathbb{P} \left( \mathcal{G}_{n,d} \in \cdot \right) = \mathbb{P} \left( \mathcal{G}_{n,d} \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{G}_{n,d} \text{ is simple} \right). \] 
(5.40)

(b) By [55, Theorem 1.1], if \( \sum_{v \in [n]} d_v^2 = O(\sum_{v \in [n]} d_v) \), then the probability that \( \mathcal{G}_{n,d} \) is simple satisfies
\[ \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \mathcal{G}_{n,d} \text{ is simple} \right) > 0. \] 
(5.41)

Let \( \mathcal{M}_{n,\lambda} \) be as defined around (5.32). Define the spaces \( \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{n,\lambda}^{\text{avail}} \) and \( \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{n,\lambda}^{\text{attach}} \) analogously for \( \overline{\mathcal{G}}_{n,3} \). Using (5.40) and (5.41), it follows that the analogues
of Lemma 5.11 and Lemma 5.13 hold for $\mathcal{G}_{n,3}$: Fix $\delta > 0$ and let $\lambda_n \uparrow \infty$ with $\lambda_n \leq \min(\lambda^*_n, \lambda^+_n, \lambda^0_n)$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(d_{GHP}(CBD_\infty(\mathcal{G}_{n,3}), M^\text{attach}_{n,\lambda_n}) > \delta n^{1/3}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(d_{GHP}(CBD_\infty(\mathcal{G}_{n,3}), M^\text{attach}_{n,\lambda_n}) > \delta n^{1/3} \mid \mathcal{G}_{n,3} \text{ is simple}\right) \to 0,$$

as $n \to \infty$. Similarly

$$n^{-1/3} d_{GHP}(M^\text{attach}_{n,\lambda_n}, M^\text{avail}_{n,\lambda_n}) \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

To complete the proof, we have to show that the analogue of Lemma 5.12 remains true for $M^\text{avail}_{n,\lambda_n}$. Thus it suffices to prove that for each fixed $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$n^{-1/3} \cdot \frac{\text{diam}^\text{avail}_{n,\lambda}}{n} \xrightarrow{d} 6^{1/3} \cdot \mathcal{CB}^\infty(S_1((48)^{1/3} \cdot \lambda)), \quad n \to \infty$$

w.r.t. GHP topology. Let $f : \mathcal{G}_{\text{GHP}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be bounded continuous. Then it suffices to show that as $n \to \infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f(n^{-1/3} \text{diam}^\text{avail}_{n,\lambda} \mid \mathcal{G}_{n,3} \text{ is simple})\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[f(n^{-1/3} \text{diam}^\text{avail}_{n,\lambda})\right] \to 0,$$

or equivalently

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f(n^{-1/3} \text{diam}^\text{avail}_{n,\lambda} \mid \mathcal{G}_{n,3} \text{ is simple})\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[f(n^{-1/3} \text{diam}^\text{avail}_{n,\lambda})\right] \times \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{n,3} \text{ is simple}) \to 0.$$

This can be proved by using techniques similar to the ones used in the proof of [23, Theorem 2.2]; see the argument given in [23, Section 8.7]. We omit the details.

5.8. **Proof of Theorem 2.3.** Let $M^{n,\text{er}}$ be as defined at the beginning of Section 4.3. Using Observation 2 in Section 4.1, $M^{n,\text{er}}$ is a subtree of $M^{n,\text{er}}_\infty$. Consider the forest obtained from $M^{n,\text{er}}_\infty$ by deleting all edges in $M^{n,\text{er}}$, and for every $v \in V(M^{n,\text{er}})$, let $T^{n,\text{er}}_v$ be the tree in this forest that contains $v$. Define $p^{n,\text{er}}_{v,\lambda} := |T^{n,\text{er}}_v|/n$. We now state two lemmas that will be needed in the proof.

**Lemma 5.18.** For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, conditional on ER$(n, \lambda)$, the sequence $\{p^{n,\text{er}}_{v,\lambda} \mid v \in V(M^{n,\text{er}})\}$ is exchangeable.

The above exchangeability, conditional on $M^{n,\text{er}}$, was used in the proof of [5, Proposition 4.8]. We outline the proof of Lemma 5.18 briefly. Using Lemma 4.1, conditional on the graph ER$(n, \lambda)$, $M^{n,\text{er}}_\infty$ can be generated as follows:

(i) Let $E_{\text{out}}$ denote the set of edges of the complete graph $K_n$ whose endpoints are in two different components of ER$(n, \lambda)$. Let $E_{\text{in}}$ denote the set of edges of ER$(n, \lambda)$. Construct the graph ER$(n, \lambda) \cup E_{\text{out}}$. Assign i.i.d. Uniform$[n^{-1} + \lambda^{-1} - 3/4, 1]$ weights to the edges in $E_{\text{out}}$, and independently of this, assign i.i.d. Uniform$[0, n^{-1} + \lambda^{-1} - 3/4]$ weights to the edges in $E_{\text{in}}$. Denote the weight assigned to an edge $e$ by $w_e$.

(ii) From the graph ER$(n, \lambda) \cup E_{\text{out}}$, delete all edges $e \in E_{\text{out}}$ that are part of a cycle $\pi$ in ER$(n, \lambda) \cup E_{\text{out}}$ and $w_e$ is maximum among all edge weights in $\pi$.

(iii) For each $i \geq 1$, delete all edges $e \in E(E_i^{n,\text{er}}(\lambda))$ that are part of a cycle $\pi$ in $E_i^{n,\text{er}}(\lambda)$ and $w_e$ is maximum among all edge weights in $\pi$. 
The marginal distribution of the resulting tree will be the same as that of $M_{\infty,Er}^n$. Consider two distinct vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V(\mathcal{E}_1^{n,er}(\lambda))$. If we interchange the values $w_{(v_1,u)}$ and $w_{(v_2,u)}$ for every vertex $u \notin V(\mathcal{E}_1^{n,er}(\lambda))$, then it is easy to check that in the above procedure, the set of edges removed in Step (iii) remains the same, and the set of edges in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}}$ that are not incident to $v_1$ or $v_2$ and are removed in Step (ii) remains the same. Further, if $\{v_1, u\} \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}}$ (resp. $\{v_2, u\} \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}}$) was removed in Step (ii) before the interchange of edge weights, then the edge $\{v_2, u\}$ (resp. the edge $\{v_1, u\}$) will be removed in Step (ii) after the interchange. Consequently, the values of $p_{v_1, \lambda}$ and $p_{v_2, \lambda}$ would be swapped as a result of the interchange of edge weights. This shows that the law of $(p_{v, \lambda}, v \in V(M_{\lambda}^{n,er}))$ is invariant under transpositions. We can repeat the same argument with any permutation of $V(\mathcal{E}_1^{n,er}(\lambda))$ to get the claimed exchangeability.

**Lemma 5.19** (Lemma 4.11 of [5]). Let $\Delta_{n,\lambda} := \max_{v \in V(M_{\lambda}^n)} p_{v, \lambda}^{n,er}$. Then for every $\delta > 0$,

$$\limsup_{\lambda \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} P(\Delta_{n,\lambda} > \delta) = 0$$

Now observe the following facts:

(a) Fix $s \geq 2$ and let $r = 3(s - 1)$. Let $e_1, \ldots, e_r$ be an enumeration of $e(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})$. Then

$$\left(\text{len}(e_i), 1 \leq i \leq r\right) \overset{d}{=} \left(Y_i \cdot \left(\frac{\Gamma(i)}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} \Gamma(j)}\right)^{1/2}, 1 \leq i \leq r\right),$$

where $Y_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$, are i.i.d. Rayleigh random variables independent of $\Gamma(i), 1 \leq i \leq r$, which are i.i.d. Gamma$(1/2, 1)$ random variables. As observed in (5.12), $\sqrt{2} \cdot Y_i \sqrt{\Gamma(i)}$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, are i.i.d. Exponential$(1)$ random variables. Thus, for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} P\left(\min_{e \in e(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})} \text{len}(e) \geq s^{3/2 - \delta}\right) = 1.$$

(b) By (3.7), for any $s \geq 2$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \min_{e \in e(\mathcal{H}_{m,s})} \text{len}(e) \overset{d}{\to} \min_{e \in e(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})} \text{len}(e) \text{ as } m \to \infty.$$

(c) $\mathcal{E}_1^{n,er}(\lambda)$ can be generated as follows: (i) Sample $|\mathcal{E}_1^{n,er}(\lambda)|$ and $\text{sp}(\mathcal{E}_1^{n,er}(\lambda))$. Denote the realizations by $m$ and $s$ respectively. (ii) Conditional on the previous step, generate $\mathcal{H}_{m,s}$ and set this graph to be $\mathcal{E}_1^{n,er}(\lambda)$.

(d) By Lemma 3.3, $P(\xi_1(\lambda) \leq \lambda) + P(N_1(\lambda) < \lambda^3/2) \to 0$ as $\lambda \to \infty$.

(e) By Theorem 3.2, $\left(n^{-2/3}|\mathcal{E}_1^{n,er}(\lambda)|, \text{sp}(\mathcal{E}_1^{n,er}(\lambda))\right) \overset{d}{\to} (\xi_1(\lambda), N_1(\lambda))$ as $n \to \infty$.

Combining the above, we see that

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} P\left(\min_{e \in e(\mathcal{E}_1^{n,er}(\lambda))} \text{len}(e) \leq n^{1/3}/\lambda^5\right) =: \epsilon_1(\lambda) \to 0, \text{ as } \lambda \to \infty. \quad (5.42)$$
Using the convergences \( \text{sp}(\mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda)) \xrightarrow{d} N_{1}(\lambda) \) as \( n \to \infty \) and \( N_{1}(\lambda)/\lambda^{3} \xrightarrow{p} 2/3 \) as \( \lambda \to \infty \) together with (3.6), we see that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \text{Core}(\mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda)) \text{ is not a 3-regular multigraph} \right) = \mathbb{P}\left( N_{1}(\lambda) \leq 1 \right) =: \varepsilon(\lambda) \to 0, \text{ as } \lambda \to \infty. \tag{5.43}
\]

Let \( e_{i}^{n,er}(\lambda), 1 \leq i \leq 3(\text{sp}(\mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda)) - 1) \), be an enumeration of \( e(\mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda)) \). Let \( V_{i}^{n,er}(\lambda) \) be the set of vertices in \( \mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda) \) that are connected to \( \text{Core}(\mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda)) \) via \( e_{i}^{n,er}(\lambda) \). (As before, the common endpoints of multiple \( e \in e(\mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda)) \) and their pendant subtrees are assigned to only of the \( V_{i}^{n,er}(\lambda) \)’s in an arbitrary way.) From (3.10) and arguments as above,

\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \max_{i} \frac{|V_{i}^{n,er}(\lambda)|}{|\mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda)|} \geq (\log \lambda)^{2}/\lambda^{3} \right) =: \varepsilon(\lambda) \to 0, \text{ as } \lambda \to \infty. \tag{5.44}
\]

Denote the complements of the events in (5.42), (5.43), and (5.44) by \( E_{1,n,\lambda}, E_{2,n,\lambda}, \) and \( E_{3,n,\lambda} \) respectively. Let \( E_{n,\lambda} := \bigcap_{i=1}^{3} E_{i,n,\lambda}^{(j)} \). Note that on the event \( E_{n,\lambda} \), any \( U \subseteq V(\mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda)) \) with \( \text{diam}(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda)) \leq n^{1/3}/(2\lambda^{5}) \) can intersect \( V_{i}^{n,er}(\lambda) \) for at most three values of \( i \).

Let \( \mathcal{Z}_{n,\lambda}^{v,er} \) be the graph obtained by attaching, for each \( v \in \mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda) \), the tree \( T_{n,\lambda}^{v,er} \) to \( \mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda) \) via identification of the vertices labeled \( v \). Consider \( \mathcal{U} \subseteq [n] \) with \( \text{diam}(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{Z}_{n,\lambda}^{v,er}) \leq n^{1/3}/(2\lambda^{5}) \). Let

\[
\mathcal{U} = \{ v \in \mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda) : T_{n,\lambda}^{v,er} \cap \mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset \}.
\]

Then \( \text{diam}(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda)) \leq n^{1/3}/(2\lambda^{5}) \). Consequently, on the event \( E_{n,\lambda} \),

\[
\frac{1}{n} \cdot |\mathcal{U}| \leq \sum_{v \in \mathcal{U}} \frac{|T_{n,\lambda}^{v,er}|}{n} \leq 3 \times \max_{i} \left( \sum_{v \in V_{i}^{n,er}(\lambda)} p_{v,\lambda}^{n,er} \right)
\leq 3 \times \max_{i} \left( \sum_{v \in V_{i}^{n,er}(\lambda)} p_{v,\lambda}^{n,er} - \frac{|V_{i}^{n,er}(\lambda)|}{|\mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda)|} + 3(\log \lambda)^{2}/\lambda^{3} \right).
\tag{5.45}
\]

Arrange the vertices in \( \mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda) \) in a sequence so that for each \( i \), the vertices in \( V_{i}^{n,er}(\lambda) \) appear consecutively. This arrangement is measurable w.r.t. the sigma field generated by ER\((n, \lambda)\). By Lemma 5.18, conditional on this arrangement, \( \{ p_{v,\lambda}^{n,er} \}_{v \in V(\mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda))} \) is an exchangeable sequence. Using Lemma 5.15 with \( x = \Delta_{n,\lambda}^{-1/4} \), we see that

\[
\varepsilon_{4}^{(n)}(\lambda) := \mathbb{P}\left( \max_{i} \left| \sum_{v \in V_{i}^{n,er}(\lambda)} p_{v,\lambda}^{n,er} - \frac{|V_{i}^{n,er}(\lambda)|}{|\mathcal{C}_{2}^{n,er}(\lambda)|} \right| \geq 2\Delta_{n,\lambda}^{-1/4} \right)
\leq \mathbb{P}\left( \Delta_{n,\lambda}^{-1/4} \leq c_{2} + 2 \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( -c\Delta_{n,\lambda}^{-1/4} \log \log \Delta_{n,\lambda}^{-1/4} \right) \right] \right),
\tag{5.46}
\]

where \( c_{2} \) is as in Lemma 5.15. Combining (5.45) and (5.46), we see that

\[
\mathbb{P}\left( m(2\lambda^{-5})^{-1} ; n^{-1/3} \mathcal{Z}_{n,\lambda}^{v,er} \right) \geq 6\Delta_{n,\lambda}^{1/4} + 3 \cdot (\log \lambda)^{2} \cdot \lambda^{-3} \leq \mathbb{P}(E_{n,\lambda}) + \varepsilon_{4}^{(n)}(\lambda).
\]
Since \( M^\ast_{n,\epsilon} \) is a subtree of \( \mathcal{Z}^\ast_{\lambda}, \) \( m(\delta; M^\ast_{n,\epsilon}) \leq m(\delta; \mathcal{Z}^\ast_{\lambda}) \) for every \( \delta > 0. \) Thus using Theorem 1.1, we conclude that for every \( \eta > 0 \) and \( \lambda > 1, \)
\[
\mathbb{P}\left( m(4\lambda^3)^{-1} ; \mathcal{M} \right) \geq \eta + 3 \cdot (\log \lambda)^2 \cdot \lambda^{-3}
\]
\[
\leq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( 6\Delta_{n,\lambda}^{1/4} > \eta \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \epsilon_i(\lambda) + \limsup_{n \to \infty} \epsilon_4^{(n)}(\lambda).
\]
The result follows upon using Lemma 5.19 and noting that the right side of (5.47) tends to zero as \( \lambda \to \infty. \)

5.9. Proof of Theorem 4.8. For \( p \in (0, 1) \) and \( m \in \mathbb{N}, \) let \( G^m_p \) be distributed as follows: For any connected graph \( H \) on \( [m] \) having \( r \) edges,
\[
\mathbb{P}(G^m_p = H) \propto p^r (1 - p)^{-r}.
\]
That is, \( G^m_p \) is an Erdős-Rényi random graph conditioned to be connected. We start with the following lemma:

**Lemma 5.20.** If \( pm^{3/2} \leq 1, \) then
\[
\mathbb{P}\left( \operatorname{sp}(G^m_p) \geq 2 \right) \leq Cp^2 m^3
\]
for some universal constant \( C. \) Consequently, for any \( \epsilon > 0 \) there exists \( \lambda(\epsilon) > 0 \) such that for all \( \lambda \geq \lambda(\epsilon), \)
\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \operatorname{sp}(m^\ast_{n,\epsilon}(\lambda)) \geq 2 \text{ for some } i \geq 2 \right) \leq \epsilon.
\]

**Proof:** Suppose \( t \) is a rooted tree on \( [m]. \) For \( v \in [m] \) define
\[
R(\overrightarrow{v}^{(k)}; v, t) := \{ u \in [m] : \overrightarrow{u} = \overrightarrow{v}^{(k)} \text{ and } u > v^{(k-1)} \}, \text{ for } 1 \leq k \leq \operatorname{ht}(v, t), \text{ and }\]
\[
R(v, t) := \bigcup_{k=1}^{\operatorname{ht}(v, t)} R(\overrightarrow{v}^{(k)}; v, t).
\]
Let \( g(t) := \sum_{v \in [m]} |R(v, t)| \) and \( MR(t) = \max_{v \in [m]} |R(v, t)|. \) Let \( T_m \) denote a rooted uniform spanning tree on \( [m] \) and let \( \tilde{T}_m \) be distributed as
\[
\mathbb{P}(\tilde{T}_m = t) = \frac{(1 - p)^{-g(t)}}{\mathbb{E}[(1 - p)^{-g(T_m)}]}.
\]
Then by [3, Proposition 8], \( G^m_p \) has the same law as the random graph obtained from \( \tilde{T}_m \) by placing an edge with probability \( p \) independently between every pair of vertices \( v \) and \( u, \) where \( v \in [m] \) and \( u \in R(v, \tilde{T}_m), \) and then forgetting about the root of \( \tilde{T}_m. \) In particular, \( \operatorname{sp}(G^m_p) \) is distributed as \( \text{Binomial}(N, p) \) where \( N \overset{d}{=} g(\tilde{T}_m). \) Hence
\[
\mathbb{P}\left( \operatorname{sp}(G^m_p) \geq 2 \right) \leq p^2 \mathbb{E}\left[ g(\tilde{T}_m)^2 \right] \leq p^2 m^2 \mathbb{E}\left[ MR(\tilde{T}_m)^2 \right].
\]
It follows from (5.52) that for any \( x > 0, \)
\[
\mathbb{P}\left( MR(\tilde{T}_m) \geq x \sqrt{m} \right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left[ (1 - p)^{-g(T_m)} 1_{\{MR(T_m) \geq x \sqrt{m}\}} \right]
\]
\[
\leq \left[ \mathbb{P}\left( MR(T_m) \geq x \sqrt{m} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[ \mathbb{E}(1 - p)^{-2g(T_m)} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq Ce^{-C'x^2} e^{C''p^2m^3},
\]
where the last step uses [3, Lemmas 13 and 14]. Using the fact that $p^2 m^3 \leq 1$, it follows that $\mathbb{E}[MR(\overline{T}_m)] \leq Cm$. This in conjunction with (5.53) yields (5.48).

Next note that by [57, Theorem A.1], for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\lambda(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \geq \lambda(\varepsilon)$,

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \sum_{i \geq 2} \left| \mathcal{E}^n_{i, \varepsilon}(\lambda) \right|^2 \geq \varepsilon n^{4/3} \right) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (5.54)$$

Denote the event on the left side of (5.54) by $F(n, \lambda; \varepsilon)$. Now conditional on the component sizes of $\text{ER}(n, \lambda)$ being equal to $m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_r$, the components are distributed as $G_{m_1}, \ldots, G_{m_r}$ with $p = n^{-1} + \lambda n^{-4/3}$. Further, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ and large $n$, $pm_{i}^{3/2} \leq 1$ if $m_{i}^{2} \leq \varepsilon n^{4/3}$. Hence, using (5.48),

$$\mathbb{P}\left( \text{sp}(\mathcal{E}^n_{i, \varepsilon}(\lambda)) \geq 2 \text{ for some } i \geq 2 \right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left( F(n, \lambda; \varepsilon) \right) + C \mathbb{E}\left[ 1 \{ F(n, \lambda; \varepsilon) \} \cdot n^{-2} \sum_{i \geq 2} \left| \mathcal{E}^n_{i, \varepsilon}(\lambda) \right|^3 \right] \leq \mathbb{P}\left( F(n, \lambda; \varepsilon) \right) + C \varepsilon. \quad (5.55)$$

(5.55) together with (5.54) yields (5.49).

Our next lemma roughly states that inside the critical window, the number of surplus edges in the largest component of the Erdős-Rényi random graph takes all large integer values with high probability, and during this time of the evolution, every other component is either a tree or is unicyclic.

**Lemma 5.21.** For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $s_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all integers $s \geq s_\varepsilon$,

$$\liminf_n \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}[s_\varepsilon, s]) \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \quad (5.56)$$

where $\mathcal{A}[s_\varepsilon, s]$ denotes the event that there exist $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$ such that in the interval $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$, the process $\text{sp}(\mathcal{E}^n_{i, \varepsilon}(\cdot))$ assumes all values in $\{s_\varepsilon, s_\varepsilon + 1, \ldots, s\}$, and $\text{sp}(\mathcal{E}^n_{i, \varepsilon}(\lambda)) \leq 1$ for all $i \geq 2$ and $\lambda \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$.

**Proof:** For $k \geq 1$, define

$$\beta(k) = \frac{k(k+1)}{(k+1/6)(k+5/6)}. \quad (5.57)$$

We say that the "leader changes in $\text{ER}(n, \cdot)$ after time $\lambda$" if there exists $\lambda' > \lambda$ such that the component in $\text{ER}(n, \lambda')$ containing $\mathcal{E}^n_{1, \varepsilon}(\lambda)$ is not $\mathcal{E}^n_{1, \varepsilon}(\lambda')$. Fix $\eta > 0$ and choose $\lambda(\eta)$ such that the following hold:

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \text{The leader does not change in } \text{ER}(n, \cdot) \text{ after time } \lambda(\eta) \right) \geq 1 - \eta, \quad (5.57)$$

$$\prod_{j \geq 0} \beta\left( \frac{[\lambda(\eta)^{3/3} + j]}{\lambda(\eta)^{3/3}} \right) \geq 1 - \eta, \quad (5.58)$$

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \text{sp}(\mathcal{E}^n_{i, \varepsilon}(\lambda(\eta))) \leq 1 \text{ for all } i \geq 2 \right) \geq 1 - \eta, \quad (5.59)$$

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \lambda(\eta)^{3/3} < \text{sp}(\mathcal{E}^n_{1, \varepsilon}(\lambda(\eta))) < \lambda(\eta)^{3/3} \right) \geq 1 - \eta. \quad (5.60)$$

(5.57) uses [65, Theorem 7] (see also [4]). (5.58) uses the fact that $\prod_{k \geq 1} \beta(k) > 0$. (5.59) uses (5.49), (5.60) uses Lemma 3.3 and Theorem 3.2.
Let $F^n_k$ denote the event that there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the random graph $\text{ER}(n, \lambda)$ has exactly one component with surplus $k + 1$ and the surplus of every other component is at most one. Then by (5.59) and (5.60),

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \bigcup_{k=\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 \rfloor}^{\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 / 3 \rfloor} F^n_k \right) \geq 1 - 2\eta. \quad (5.61)$$

By [58, Theorem 5.28], for $[\lambda(n)^3 / 3] \leq k \leq [\lambda(n)^3]$ and any $s \geq [\lambda(n)^3] + 1$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \bigcap_{j=k+1}^{s} F^n_j \right) = \prod_{j=k+1}^{s} \beta(j). \quad (5.62)$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{P}\left( \bigcap_{j=\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 \rfloor}^{\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 / 3 \rfloor} F^n_j \right) \geq \sum_{k=\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 / 3 \rfloor}^{\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 \rfloor} \mathbb{P}\left( \bigcap_{j=k+1}^{s} F^n_j \right) \geq \sum_{k=\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 / 3 \rfloor}^{\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 \rfloor} \mathbb{P}\left( \bigcap_{j=\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 / 3 \rfloor}^{\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 \rfloor} F^n_j \right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left( \bigcup_{k=\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 / 3 \rfloor}^{\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 \rfloor} F^n_k \right) \geq \min_* \mathbb{P}\left( \bigcap_{j=\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 / 3 \rfloor}^{\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 \rfloor} F^n_j \right),$$

where $\min_*$ is minimum taken over $[\lambda(n)^3 / 3] \leq k \leq [\lambda(n)^3]$. Thus (5.61), (5.62), and (5.58) give

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \bigcap_{j=\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 \rfloor}^{\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 / 3 \rfloor} F^n_j \right) \geq (1 - 2\eta)(1 - \eta).$$

Combining this with (5.59) and (5.60), we see that

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{ \bigcap_{j=\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 \rfloor}^{\lfloor \lambda(n)^3 / 3 \rfloor} F^n_j \right\} \geq 1 - 5\eta.$$

Thus, for all large $n$, in the process $\left( \text{ER}(n, \lambda), \lambda \geq \lambda(n) \right)$, with probability at least $1 - 5\eta$, the surplus of the component containing $\mathcal{C}_1^{n,\text{ER}}(\lambda(n))$ assumes all values in $\{[\lambda(n)^3] + 1, \ldots, s\}$, and during this part of the evolution, the surplus of the other components remains at most one. By (5.57), the component containing $\mathcal{C}_1^{n,\text{ER}}(\lambda(n))$ remains the largest component after time $\lambda(n)$ with probability at least $1 - \eta$. Thus (5.56) follows if we take $s_\epsilon = [\lambda(n)^3] + 1$ with $\eta = \epsilon / 6$. \hfill \blacksquare

Let $H_n$ be as in Theorem 3.11 and let $L(\cdot)$ be as in (3.3). Define $\widetilde{H}_{n,s}$ and $\widetilde{H}^{(s)}$ via

$$\mathbb{E}\left[ f(\widetilde{H}_{n,s}) \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[ f(\widetilde{H}_{n,s}) L(\widetilde{H}_{n,s}) \right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[ L(\widetilde{H}_{n,s}) \right]} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}\left[ f(\widetilde{H}^{(s)}) \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[ f(\widetilde{H}^{(s)}) L(\widetilde{H}^{(s)}) \right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[ L(\widetilde{H}^{(s)}) \right]}$$

for every bounded measurable $f : \mathcal{G}_{\text{GHP}} \to \mathbb{R}$. For $s \geq 2$ define

$$\tau_s = \inf\{ \lambda : \text{sp}(\mathcal{C}^*) = s \text{ for some component } \mathcal{C}^* \text{ of } \text{ER}(n, \lambda) \} \quad (5.63)$$

and $\text{sp}(\mathcal{C}) \leq 1$ for every other component $\mathcal{C}$ of $\text{ER}(n, \lambda)$. 

If $\tau_s < \infty$, define $\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*}$ to be the (unique) component of $\text{ER}(n, \tau_s)$ with $\text{sp}(\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*}) = s$. If $\tau_s = \infty$, define $\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*}$ to be the one-point space.

**Lemma 5.22.** Fix $s \geq 2$. Let $U_{ij}, 1 \leq i < j \leq n$, be the i.i.d. Uniform$[0,1]$ random variables used in the construction of $\text{ER}(n, \cdot)$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{n,s}$ be independent of $(U_{ij}, 1 \leq i < j \leq n)$. Define $M_{\tau_s}^{n,*}$ to be the MST of $\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*}$ constructed using the weights $U_{ij}$ if $\tau_s < \infty$ and $|\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*}| \geq \log n$, and set $M_{\tau_s}^{n,*} = \text{CBD}_\infty(\mathcal{F}_{n,s})$ otherwise. Then as $n \to \infty$,

$$\left[\frac{1}{n^2} M_{\tau_s}^{n,*}\right]^{1/2} \xrightarrow{d} \text{CB}_\infty(\mathcal{F}(s)) \text{ w.r.t. GHP topology.}$$

**Proof:** For any subgraph $H$ of the complete graph on $[n]$, define the event

$$F_H := \{\tau_s < \infty, \text{ER}(n, \tau_s) \setminus \mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*} = H\}.$$

Fix any $H$ with $\mathbb{P}(F_H) > 0$. Then $\mathbb{P}(F_H \cap \{\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*} = H_1\}) > 0$ for any connected graph $H_1$ with $V(H_1) = [n] \setminus V(H)$, and $\text{sp}(H_1) = s$. (5.64)

Now for any $H_1$ satisfying (5.64), the realizations $(u_{ij}, 1 \leq i < j \leq n)$ of the random variables $U_{ij}$ for which $F_H \cap \{\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*} = H_1\}$ holds are given by

$$F_H \cap \{\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*} = H_1\} = \left\{\max\{u_{ij} : (i, j) \in E(H_1) \cup E(H)\} < \min\{u_{ij} : (i, j) \notin E(H_1) \cup E(H)\}\right\},$$

and for any such realization $(u_{ij})$, we have $\left(u_{\pi(i,j)}, 1 \leq i < j \leq n\right) \in F_H \cap \{\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*} = H_1\}$ for any permutation $\pi$ of $\{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$ satisfying $\pi(i, j) = (i, j)$ for all $(i, j) \notin E(\text{Core}(H_1))$. Hence, conditional on $\tau_s < \infty$ and $\text{ER}(n, \tau_s)$, the random variables $U_{i,j}, (i, j) \in \text{Core}(\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*})$, are exchangeable. Using Lemma 4.5, we see that the following equality of conditional distributions hold for any $m \geq \log n$:

$$\left(M_{\tau_s}^{n,*} \mid \tau_s < \infty, |\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*}| = m\right) \overset{d}{=} \left(\text{CBD}_\infty(\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*}) \mid \tau_s < \infty, |\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*}| = m\right)$$

(5.65)

Next, for any two graphs $G_1, G_2$ on $[n]$, write $\mathbb{P}^{\text{er}}(G_1, G_2)$ to denote the probability that there exist $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ such that $\text{ER}(n, \lambda_1) = G_1$ and $\text{ER}(n, \lambda_2) = G_2$. Thus if $G_1$ is a subgraph of $G_2$, then

$$\mathbb{P}^{\text{er}}(G_1, G_2) = \frac{1}{N!} \cdot |E(G_1)|! \cdot (|E(G_2)| - |E(G_1)|)! \cdot (N - |E(G_2)|)!,$$

(5.66)

where $N = \binom{n}{2}$. Now for any $H_1$ satisfying (5.64),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*} = H_1 \mid F_H\right) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(F_H)} \mathbb{P}\left(\tau_s < \infty, \text{ER}(n, \tau_s) = H_1 \cup H\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(F_H)} \sum_{e \in E(\text{Core}(H_1))} \mathbb{P}^{\text{er}}\left((H_1 \setminus e) \cup H, H_1 \cup H\right) \propto |E(\text{Core}(H_1))| = L(H_1),$$

where in the penultimate step we have used (5.66) to deduce that the summands are the same for any $H_1$ satisfying (5.64). Thus, for any $m \geq \log n$, the conditional distribution of $\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*}$ given $\tau_s < \infty$ and $|\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*}| = m$ satisfies

$$\left(\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*} \mid \tau_s < \infty, |\mathcal{C}_{\tau_s}^{n,*}| = m\right) \overset{d}{=} \mathcal{H}_{m,s}.$$  (5.67)
Now for any bounded continuous $f : \mathcal{G}_{GHP} \to \mathbb{R}$,
\[
\lim_{m \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ f \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \mathcal{H}_{m,s} \right) \right] = \lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ f \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \mathcal{H}_{m,s} \right) L(\mathcal{H}_{m,s}) \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[ L(\mathcal{H}_{m,s}) \right]} = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ f \left( \mathcal{H}^{(s)} \right) L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)}) \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[ L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)}) \right]} = \mathbb{E} \left[ f \left( \mathcal{H}^{(s)} \right) \right],
\]
where the second step uses (3.7) and (3.8). Hence $m^{-1/2} \mathcal{H}_{m,s} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{H}^{(s)}$ as $m \to \infty$ w.r.t. GHP topology. Using Theorem 4.6 and (3.9), it follows that as $m \to \infty$,
\[
m^{-1/2} \text{CBD}_{\infty} \left( \mathcal{H}_{m,s} \right) \xrightarrow{d} \text{CB}^\infty \left( \mathcal{H}^{(s)} \right)
\]
w.r.t. GHP topology. Now the claim follows from (5.65) and (5.67).

**Proof of Theorem 4.8:** Fix $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$. For $s \geq 2$, define $\lambda_s$ by the relation $2\lambda_s^2 = 3s$. Define
\[
E_s := \left\{ \alpha [s,s] \cap \{ \text{the leader does not change in ER}(n, \cdot) after time } \lambda_s/2 \right\},
\]
where $\alpha [\cdot, \cdot]$ is as in Lemma 5.21. Using (5.56) and (5.57), choose $s_1$ large so that
\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( E_s \right) \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } s \geq s_1. \tag{5.69}
\]
Let $M_{\lambda}^{n,\text{er}}$ denote the MST of $\mathcal{G}_{1}^{n,\text{er}}(\lambda)$ constructed using the same i.i.d. Uniform[0,1] random variables $U_{ij}$ used to construct the process ER(n, ·). If the leader does not change after time $\lambda$, then using Observation 2 in Section 4.1, we see that $M_{\lambda}^{n,\text{er}}$ is a subtree of $M_{\lambda'}^{n,\text{er}}$ for any $\lambda' > \lambda$. Thus, using [5, Lemma 4.5], we can choose $s_2$ large enough so that
\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( d_H \left( M_{\lambda}^{n,\text{er}}, M_{\lambda'}^{n,\text{er}} \right) > \varepsilon n^{1/3} \right) \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } \lambda, \lambda' \geq \lambda_{s_2}. \tag{5.70}
\]
Next, using Lemma 3.3, Theorem 3.2, and (5.68), choose $s_3$ large enough so that
\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( F_{s_3}^c \right) \leq 2\varepsilon \text{ for all } s \geq s_3, \tag{5.71}
\]
where
\[
F_{s_3} := E_s \cap \left\{ \left| \mathcal{G}_{1}^{n,\text{er}}(\lambda_s) \right| \geq 2 \lambda_s(1 - \varepsilon) n^{2/3} \right\} \cap \left\{ 1 \leq \text{sp} \left( \mathcal{G}_{1}^{n,\text{er}}(\lambda_s) \right) \leq s - 1 \right\} \cap \left\{ |\mathcal{G}_{1}^{n,\text{er}}(\lambda_s) \| \leq 2 \lambda_s(1 + \varepsilon) n^{2/3} \right\} \cap \left\{ \text{sp} \left( \mathcal{G}_{1}^{n,\text{er}}(\lambda_s) \right) \geq s + 1 \right\},
\]
and $\lambda_{s_3} = \lambda_s(1 + \varepsilon)$ and $\lambda_{s_2} = \lambda_s(1 - \varepsilon)$. Set $s_0 := \max \{ s_2, s_3 \}$. From now on, we will only consider $s \geq s_0$.

Let $\tau_s$ be as in (5.63). If $\tau_s < \infty$, let $M_{\tau_s}^{n,\text{er}}$ be the MST of $\mathcal{G}_{1}^{n,\text{er}}(\tau_s)$ constructed using the edge-weights $U_{ij}$. If $\tau_s = \infty$, set $\mathcal{G}_{1}^{n,\text{er}}(\tau_s)$ to be the complete graph $K_n$, and let $M_{\tau_s}^{n,\text{er}} = M_{\tau_s}^{n,\text{er}}$--the the MST of $K_n$ constructed using the edge-weights $U_{ij}$. Note that on the event $F_{s_3, \epsilon} < \tau_s < \lambda_{s_3}$, $\mathcal{G}_{1}^{n,\text{er}}(\tau_s) = \mathcal{G}_{1}^{n,\text{er}}$, and $M_{\tau_s}^{n,\text{er}} = M_{\tau_s}^{n,\text{er}}$. Thus, writing $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ and $d_{\text{PR}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ to denote the law of a random metric measure space and the Prokhorov distance between two measures respectively, it follows from Lemma 5.22 that
\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} d_{\text{PR}} \left( \mathcal{L} \left( \frac{(12s)^{1/6}}{|\mathcal{G}_{1}^{n,\text{er}}(\tau_s)|^{1/2}} M_{\tau_s}^{n,\text{er}} \right), \mathcal{L} \left( (12s)^{1/6} \cdot \text{CB}^\infty(\mathcal{H}^{(s)}) \right) \right) \leq 2\varepsilon. \tag{5.72}
\]
Next note that on $F_{s, \epsilon}$, $M^{n, \text{er}} \subset M^{n, \text{er}} \subset \overline{M^{n, \text{er}}}$, and for every $i \in M^{n, \text{er}}$, let
$$V_i := \{ j \in M^{n, \text{er}} : \text{the path connecting } j \text{ and } i \text{ in } M^{n, \text{er}} \text{ intersects } M^{n, \text{er}} \text{ only at } i \}.$$ Note that $i \in V_i$. Let $C$ be the correspondence $\{(i, j) : i \in M^{n, \text{er}}, \ j \in V_i\}$, and set $\pi((i, j)) = 1/|\mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{A}_s)|$ for every $i \in M^{n, \text{er}}$ and $j \in V_i$. Then on the event $F_{s, \epsilon}$,
$$\text{dis}(C) \leq \frac{1}{2}d_H(M^{n, \text{er}}, \overline{M^{n, \text{er}}}), \quad \pi(C) = 0.$$ Further, writing $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ for the uniform probability measures on $M^{n, \text{er}}$ and $\overline{M^{n, \text{er}}}$ respectively, on the event $F_{s, \epsilon}$,
$$D(\pi; \mu_1, \mu_2) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{T}_s)} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{T}_s)|} |V_i| = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{T}_s)} \left( |\mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{T}_s)| - |\mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{A}_s)| \right) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{T}_s)} \frac{|V_i| - 1}{|\mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{A}_s)|}$$
$$\leq 2 \times \frac{|\mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{A}_s)| - |\mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{A}_s)|}{|\mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{A}_s)|}.$$ By (5.69), (5.70), (5.71), and (5.73), it follows that
$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(d_{\text{GHP}}(n^{-\frac{1}{6}} \cdot M^{n, \text{er}}, n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \overline{M^{n, \text{er}}}) > 20 \epsilon \right) \leq 3 \epsilon.$$ Note that
$$\left\{ 2 \mathcal{A}_s (1 - \epsilon) n^{2/3} \leq |\mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{T}_s)| \leq 2 \mathcal{A}_s (1 + \epsilon) n^{2/3} \right\} \subseteq F_{s, \epsilon},$$ Hence, on the event $F_{s, \epsilon}$,
$$d_{\text{GHP}}\left( \frac{(12s)^{1/6}}{|\mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{T}_s)|^{1/2}} M^{n, \text{er}}, \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} M^{n, \text{er}} \right) \leq \text{diam}(M^{n, \text{er}}) \left| \frac{(12s)^{1/6}}{|\mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{T}_s)|^{1/2}} - \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \right| \leq \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \times \text{diam}(M^{n, \text{er}}) \times 3 \epsilon.$$ It thus follows from (5.69), (5.71), (5.74), (5.75), and Theorem 1.1 that
$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( d_{\text{GHP}}\left( \frac{(12s)^{1/6}}{|\mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{T}_s)|^{1/2}} M^{n, \text{er}}, \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} M^{n, \text{er}} \right) > \sqrt{\epsilon} \right) \leq \delta \epsilon,$$ where $\delta \epsilon$ is a decreasing function of $\epsilon$ such that $\delta \epsilon \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.

By Theorem 3.12 and Theorem 4.6, $n^{-1/3} M^{n, \text{er}} \xrightarrow{d} \text{CB}^\infty(S_1(\mathcal{A}_s))$ as $n \to \infty$. Combining this with (5.76) and (5.72), we see that
$$d_{\text{PR}}\left( \mathcal{L}\left( \frac{(12s)^{1/6}}{|\mathcal{E}_1^{n, \text{er}}(\mathcal{T}_s)|^{1/2}} \cdot \text{CB}^\infty\left( \mathcal{H}(s) \right) \right), \mathcal{L}\left( \text{CB}^\infty(S_1(\mathcal{A}_s)) \right) \right) \leq 2 \epsilon + \delta \epsilon + \sqrt{\epsilon}.$$
Finally, by Theorem 4.7, \( CB^\infty(S_1(\lambda_k)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{M} \) as \( k \to \infty \) w.r.t. GHP topology. Combining this observation with (5.77) implies that

\[
\left(12s\right)^{1/6} \cdot CB^\infty(\mathcal{H}^{(s)}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{M} \quad \text{as} \quad s \to \infty
\]

w.r.t. GHP topology. Now the proof is completed by using Lemma 5.23 stated below.

**Lemma 5.23.** For any bounded measurable \( f : \mathcal{G}_{\text{GHP}} \to \mathbb{R} \),

\[
E[f\left((12s)^{1/6} \cdot CB^\infty(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})\right)] - E[f\left((12s)^{1/6} \cdot CB^\infty(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})\right)] \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad s \to \infty.
\]

**Proof:** Let \( r = 3(s - 1) \). Let \( (X_1, \ldots, X_r) \) be as in Construction 3.9 and \( Y_i, Z_i, 1 \leq i \leq r \), and \( \Gamma_{r/2} \) be as in the proof of Proposition 5.3. Then \( \sqrt{r}Z_i, 1 \leq i \leq r \), are i.i.d. Exponential(1) random variables and \( \Gamma_{r/2} \sim \text{Gamma}(r/2, 1) \). Hence

\[
L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)}) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} Y_i \sqrt{X_i} = r \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{Z_i}{\sqrt{\Gamma_{r/2}}} = \sqrt{r} \cdot (1 + o_p(1)). \tag{5.78}
\]

Further, for any \( s \geq 3 \),

\[
E\left[ \frac{L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})^2}{r} \right] \leq \frac{1}{r} \cdot \left( E\left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^{r} Z_i \right)^4 \right] \right)^{1/2} \cdot \left( E[\Gamma_{r/2}^{-2}] \right)^{1/2} \leq C \tag{5.79}
\]

for a universal constant \( C \). It follows from (5.78) and (5.79) that

\[
\lim_{s \to \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \cdot E[L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})] = 1, \tag{5.80}
\]

which in turn implies that \( r^{-1/2}\left(L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)}) - E[L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})]\right) \xrightarrow{p} 0 \) as \( s \to \infty \). Now

\[
E\left[ \left( L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)}) - E[L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})]\right)^2 \right] \leq E[L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})^2] \leq Cr \]

by using (5.79). It thus follows that

\[
\lim_{s \to \infty} r^{-1/2}E\left| L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)}) - E[L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})]\right| = 0. \tag{5.81}
\]

Hence

\[
\left| E\left[ f\left((12s)^{1/6} \cdot CB^\infty(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})\right)\right] - E\left[ f\left((12s)^{1/6} \cdot CB^\infty(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})\right)\right] \right| \leq \|f\|_\infty \cdot \frac{E[L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)}) - E[L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})]]}{E[L(\mathcal{H}^{(s)})]} \to 0
\]

as \( s \to \infty \), where the last step follows from (5.80) and (5.81).

6. **Discussion**

Here we briefly discuss universality of the scaling limit of the MST and related open problems.

(a) **Universality of MST scaling limit for models exhibiting mean-field behavior:** The geometry of the MST of an underlying discrete structure is closely related to the geometry of the structure under critical percolation. The behavior under critical percolation of several models exhibiting mean-field behavior is well-understood. In [3], the metric space scaling limit of the critical Erdős-Rényi random graph was established. Soon after
this work, an abstract universality principle was developed in [22, 26] which was used to establish Erdős-Rényi type scaling limits for a wide array of critical random graph models including the configuration model under critical percolation, various models of inhomogeneous random graphs, and the Bohman-Frieze process. In [25], the metric space scaling limit of random graphs with critical degree sequence having finite third moment was established. Further, existing literature suggests that the components of the high-dimensional discrete torus [48, 49, 52] and the hypercube [50] under critical percolation, and the critical quantum random graph model [36] also share the Erdős-Rényi scaling limit. It is believed that the scaling limit of the MST of each of these models exists and has the same law as \( \mathcal{M} \) up to a scaling factor.

As mentioned earlier in Section 1, the scaling limit of the MST for many of these random graph models can be established using arguments similar to the ones used in this paper and an additional technical result. Loosely speaking, part of the proof requires one to show that under barely-supercritical percolation, all but one of the components of the MST of a random 3-regular graph is ‘small’ both in diameter and in measure. We accomplish this in (5.5), (5.6), (5.35) by using general results involving metric measure spaces (Proposition 5.5 and Lemma 5.17) and comparison arguments (Proposition 5.2, (5.37), and the argument that follows). Proving this result about ‘smallness’ of these components directly, and then using it together with Theorem 4.8 and existing results about behavior at criticality would enable one to extend the rest of the techniques to graphs with general degree sequences. A similar ‘smallness’ result and a variation of the techniques used in this paper can be used to establish the scaling limit of the MST for inhomogeneous random graphs. Thus, universality of the scaling limit of the MST for many standard random graph models will follow with this one additional estimate about ‘smallness.’ Proving such results for the high-dimensional discrete torus and the hypercube is more subtle and will require new ideas.

(b) MST scaling limit in the heavy-tailed regime: This regime seems more interesting. Consider scale-free random graphs on \( n \) vertices where the tail of the empirical degree distribution \( v_n \) asymptotically decays like \( v_n([x, \infty)) \sim x^{1-\tau} \) for some \( \tau \in (3, 4) \). (In particular, the degree distribution asymptotically has infinite third moment and finite second moment.) It is predicted [29, 30] that distances on the MST of such graphs scale like \( n^{(\tau-3)/\tau} \). In this regime, the scaling limit at criticality was first established in [24] for inhomogeneous random graphs, and in [23] for random graphs with given degree sequences. The recent preprint [31] studies scaling limits of critical inhomogeneous random graphs in greater generality. The works in progress [35, 47] study scaling limits of critical random graphs with i.i.d. heavy-tailed degree sequences and alternate constructions of the limiting spaces. So far, there is no result in the literature about the geometry of the MST in this regime. We expect that under some general assumptions, the scaling limit of the MST in this regime exists, is compact, and has Minkowski dimension \( (\tau - 1)/\tau - 3 \). The scaling limit in this case should be a novel object that will describe a new universality class.
APPENDIX A.

Our aim in this section is to briefly describe the ideas needed to prove Theorems 3.11 and 3.13.

A.1. **Sketch of proof of Theorem 3.11.** Suppose \( t \) is a rooted tree with vertices labeled by \([m]\) and let \( R(\cdot, t) \) be as in (5.51). For \( s \geq 1 \), let
\[
A_s(t) := \{ (v_1, u_{i_1}, \ldots, v_s, u_s) : u_i \in R(v_i, t), v_1 \leq \ldots \leq v_s, (v_i, u_i) \neq (v_j, u_j) \text{ if } i \neq j \}.
\]
Note that \( s! \times |A_s(t)| \leq |A_1(t)|^s \). Let \( T_m \) denote a rooted uniform spanning tree on \([m]\), and let \( \overline{T}_m \) be distributed as
\[
\mathbb{P}(\overline{T}_m = t) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(T_m = t) \cdot |A_s(t)|}{\mathbb{E}(|A_s(T_m)|)}.
\]
The following result is then immediate:

**Theorem A.1.** Fix \( s \geq 1 \). Sample \( \overline{T}_m \), and conditional on the realization, sample \((\overline{v}_{1,m}, \overline{u}_{1,m}, \ldots, \overline{v}_{s,m}, \overline{u}_{s,m})\) from \( A_s(\overline{T}_m) \) uniformly. Place an edge between \( \overline{v}_{i,m} \) and \( \overline{u}_{i,m} \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq s \), and then forget about the root of \( \overline{T}_m \). Call the resulting graph \( \overline{\mathcal{H}}_{m,s} \). Then \( \overline{\mathcal{H}}_{m,s} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{H}_{m,s} \).

For any tree \( t \) on \([m]\) rooted at \( \rho \), endow the children of each vertex in \( t \) with the linear order induced by their labels. Let \( \rho = \omega_0, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{m-1} \) be the vertices of \( t \) in order of appearance in a depth-first exploration (see, e.g., [70] for definition) of \( t \) using the above order. Let \( H_t : [0, m] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) be the height function of \( t \) given by \( H_t(m) = 0 \), and
\[
H_t(x) = ht(\omega_{\lfloor x \rfloor}, t), \quad x \in [0, m).
\]
The following lemma is a collection of standard results about \( T_m \):

**Lemma A.2.** (i) **The following convergences hold:**
\[
m^{-1/2} H_{T_m}(\cdot / m) \xrightarrow{d} 2e(\cdot), \quad \text{and} \quad m^{-1/2} \max_{v \in [m]} |2|R(v, T_m)| - ht(v, T_m)| \xrightarrow{p} 0,
\]
where the convergence in (A.1) is w.r.t. the Skorohod \( J_1 \) topology.
(ii) **For all \( m \geq 1 \),** \( \mathbb{P} \left(|ht(T_m)| \geq x \sqrt{m}\right) \leq c \exp(-x^2/2) \).
(iii) **For all \( x \geq 0 \) and \( m \geq 1 \),**
\[
\mathbb{P} \left( \max_{v \in [m]} |R(v, T_m)| \geq x \sqrt{m} \right) \leq c \exp(-c' x^2).
\]
Using the bounds \( |A_s(T_m)| \times s! \leq |A_1(T_m)|^s \) and \( A_1(T_m) \leq m \max_{v \in [m]} |R(v, T_m)| \), we further have
\[
\mathbb{P} \left( |A_s(T_m)| \geq x m^{3s/2} \right) \leq c \exp(-c' x^{2/s})
\]
for any \( s \geq 1, x \geq 0, \) and \( m \geq 1 \).
(iv) **For any \( s \geq 1 \),** \( m^{-3s/2} \left( |A_1(T_m)|^s - |A_s(T_m)| \times s! \right) \xrightarrow{p} 0.\)
Lemma A.2(i) follows from [70]. (ii) follows from [66, Corollary 1]. (iii) is the content of [3, Lemma 13]. The proof of (iv) is similar to that of [25, Lemma 6.3(iii)].

**Sketch of proof of (3.8):** In view of Theorem A.1, \( s \cdot (\mathbb{T}_m + 1) \) dominates \( L(\mathcal{H}_{m,s}) \) stochastically for any \( s \geq 1 \). Thus (3.8) follows from Lemma A.2 (ii) and (iii).

To prove the other assertions in Theorem 3.11 it will be convenient to work with two slightly different spaces \( \mathcal{H}_{m,s}^\circ \) and \( \mathcal{H}_{m,s} \) which we define next. Recall the notation \( R(\cdot, \cdot) \) from (5.50). Sample \( T_m^s \) according to distribution

\[
P(T_m^s = t) = \frac{P(T_m = t) \cdot |A_1(t)|^s}{E[|A_1(T_m)|^s]}, \quad t \text{ rooted tree on } [m].
\]  

(A.2)

Conditional on \( T_m^s \), sample an i.i.d. sequence of triples \((v_{i,m}^o, u_{i,m}^o, f_{i,m}^o)\), \( 1 \leq i \leq s \), where

\[
P(v_{i,m}^o = v | T_m^s) = |R(v, T_m)|/|A_1(T_m)|, \quad v \in [m],
\]

\[
P(u_{i,m}^o = u | T_m^s, v_{i,m}^o) = |R(u, v_{i,m}^o, T_m^s)|/|R(u, T_m)|, \quad u \in \{v_{i,m}^o : 1 \leq k \leq \text{ht}(v_{i,m}^o)\}, \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
P(f_{i,m}^o = f | T_m^s, v_{i,m}^o, u_{i,m}^o) = 1/|R(u_{i,m}^o, v_{i,m}^o, T_m^s)|, \quad f \in R(u_{i,m}^o, v_{i,m}^o, T_m^s).
\]

Let \( \mathcal{H}_{m,s}^\dagger \) (resp. \( \mathcal{H}_{m,s}^{\circ} \)) be the space obtained by adding an edge between \( v_{i,m}^o \) and \( f_{i,m}^o \) (resp. between \( v_{i,m}^o \) and \( u_{i,m}^o \)) for \( 1 \leq i \leq s \), and then forgetting about the root of \( T_m^s \). It follows from Lemma A.2 (iii) and (iv) that the total variation distance between the laws of \( \mathcal{H}_{m,s} \) and \( \mathcal{H}_{m,s}^{\dagger} \) tends to zero as \( m \to \infty \). It thus follows from Theorem A.1 that there exists a coupling of \( \mathcal{H}_{m,s} \) and \( \mathcal{H}_{m,s}^{\dagger} \) such that

\[
P(\mathcal{H}_{m,s} \neq \mathcal{H}_{m,s}^\dagger) \to 0, \quad \text{as } m \to \infty.
\]  

(A.3)

We will now recall an alternate construction of \( \mathcal{H}^{(s)} \) which is essentially given in [3]; see also the discussion below [2, Equation (1)]. We first introduce some notation. For any \( f : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}, x \in [0, 1], \) and \( h > 0 \), let

\[
\text{prev}(x, h; f) = \sup \{ y \in [0, x) : f(y) = h \}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{next}(x, h; f) = \inf \{ y \in (x, 1] : f(y) < h \},
\]

where \( \sup\{\} = -\infty \) and \( \inf\{\} = \infty \) by convention.

**Construction A.3** (Alternate construction of \( \mathcal{H}^{(s)} \)). Fix an integer \( s \geq 2 \).

(a) Sample \( e^o \) with law given by

\[
\mathbb{E}[f(e^o)] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[f(e)(\int_0^1 e(t)dt)^s]}{\mathbb{E}[(\int_0^1 e(t)dt)^s]}.
\]

(b) Conditional on \( e^o \), sample i.i.d. points \( y_1^s, \ldots, y_s^o \) having density \( e^o(y)/\int_0^1 e^o(t)dt \).

(c) Conditional on the above, sample \( h_1^i, \ldots, h_s^i \) independently, where \( h_i^i \sim \text{Unif}[0, e^o(y_i^o)] \).

Set \( x_i^o = \text{prev}(y_i^o, h_i^e; e^o) \).

(d) Form the quotient space \( \mathcal{F} e^i/\sim \), where \( \sim \) is the equivalence relation under which

\[
d e^o(x_i^o) \sim d e^o(y_i^o), \quad 1 \leq i \leq s.
\]

Then \( \mathcal{H}^{(s)} \overset{d}{=} 2 \cdot (\mathcal{F} e^i/\sim) \).
Now observe that $\mathcal{H}_{m,s}^o$ has a similar alternate construction: First sample $T_m^o$ as in (A.2). Let $w_0, \ldots, w_{m-1}$ be the vertices of $T_m^o$ in order of appearance in a depth-first exploration of $T_m^o$. Let $Ht^o$ be the height function of $T_m^o$. Conditional on $T_m^o$, sample i.i.d. random variables $y_{1,m}^o, \ldots, y_{s,m}^o$, where

$$P\left(y_{i,m}^o = j \mid T_m^o\right) = \frac{|R(w_j, T_m^o)|}{|A(T_m^o)|}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq m - 1.$$  

Conditional on the above, sample $h_{1,m}^o, \ldots, h_{s,m}^o$ independently via

$$P\left(h_{i,m}^o = Ht^o(y_{i,m}^o) - k \mid T_m^o, y_{1,m}^o, \ldots, y_{s,m}^o\right) = \frac{|R(y_{i,m}^o, T_m^o)|}{|R(T_m^o)|}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq Ht^o(y_{i,m}^o),$$

where $v = w_{y_{i,m}^o}$. Let $x_{i,m}^o = \text{prev}(y_{i,m}^o, h_{i,m}^o; Ht^o) - 1$. Then $\mathcal{H}_{m,s}^o$ has the same distribution as the space obtained by placing an edge in $T_m^o$ between $w_{y_{i,m}^o}$ and $w_{x_{i,m}^o}$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$.

**Sketch of proof of (3.7):** Using Lemma A.2 (i) and (iii), it can be shown that the following convergences hold jointly:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}Ht^o(\cdot, m) \xrightarrow{d} 2e^o(\cdot), \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{x_{i,m}^o, y_{i,m}^o, h_{i,m}^o}{\sqrt{m}}\right) \xrightarrow{d} (x_i^o, y_i^o, 2h_i^o), \quad 1 \leq i \leq s \quad (A.4)$$

as $m \to \infty$. Using Construction A.3 and the above alternate construction of $\mathcal{H}_{m,s}^o$, it is now routine to prove the assertion in (3.7) for $\mathcal{H}_{m,s}^o$, from which it follows that the same is true for $\mathcal{H}_{m,s}^o$. The desired result now follows from (A.3).

Let $y_{(i),m}^o$ (resp. $y_i^o$), $1 \leq i \leq s$, be $y_{i,m}^o$ (resp. $y_i^o$), $1 \leq i \leq s$, arranged in an increasing order. For $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$ define $z_{i,m}^o$ and $z_{i}^o$ via

$$z_{i,m}^o = \min\left\{t \in [y_{(i),m}^o, y_{(i+1),m}^o] : Ht^o(t) = \min\left\{Ht^o(a) : y_{(i),m}^o \leq a \leq y_{(i+1),m}^o\right\}\right\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{e}^o(z_i^o) = \inf\{\mathbf{e}^o(t) : y_i^o \leq t \leq y_{(i+1)}^o\}.$$  

Further, define

$$x_{i,m}^{o,+} = \text{next}(x_{i,m}^o, h_{i,m}^o; 1; Ht^o), \quad x_i^{o,+} = \text{next}(x_i^o, h_i^o; \mathbf{e}^o), \quad 1 \leq i \leq s,$$

$$z_{i,m}^{o,-} = \text{prev}(z_{i,m}^o, Ht^o(z_{i,m}^o) - 1; Ht^o) - 1, \quad z_i^{o,-} = \text{prev}(z_i^o, \mathbf{e}^o(z_i^o); \mathbf{e}^o), \quad 1 \leq i \leq s - 1,$$

$$z_{i,m}^{o,+} = \text{next}(z_{i,m}^o, Ht^o(z_{i,m}^o); Ht^o) - 1, \quad z_i^{o,+} = \text{next}(z_i^o, \mathbf{e}^o(z_i^o); \mathbf{e}^o), \quad 1 \leq i \leq s - 1.$$  

**Sketch of proof of (3.10):** From (A.4) it follows that the following convergence holds jointly with the convergence in (A.4): As $m \to \infty$,

$$\frac{x_{i,m}^{o,+}}{m} \xrightarrow{d} x_i^{o,+}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq s, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{m}(z_{i,m}^{o,-}, z_{i,m}^{o,+}, z_{i,m}^o) \xrightarrow{d} (z_i^{o,-}, z_i^{o,+}, z_i^o), \quad 1 \leq i \leq s - 1 \quad (A.5)$$

Arrange $x_i^o, x_i^{o,+}, y_i^o, 1 \leq i \leq s$, and $z_i^o, z_i^{o,-}, z_i^{o,+}, 1 \leq i \leq s - 1$, (resp. $x_{i,m}^o, x_{i,m}^{o,+}, y_{i,m}^o, 1 \leq i \leq s$, and $z_{i,m}^o, z_{i,m}^{o,-}, z_{i,m}^{o,+}, 1 \leq i \leq s - 1$) in increasing order as $a_1, \ldots, a_{6s-3}$ (resp. as $a_1, \ldots, a_{6s-3}$, $m$). Let

$$\Delta_j = a_{j+1} - a_j, \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_j = a_{j+1,m} - a_{j,m}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq 6s - 4.$$
Then it follows from (A.5) and the second convergence in (A.4) that
\[
(\Delta_{j,m}, 1 \leq j \leq 6s - 4) \xrightarrow{d} (\Delta_j, 1 \leq j \leq 6s - 4), \text{ as } m \to \infty \tag{A.6}
\]
jointly with (A.4) and (A.5).

Recall the notation used in (3.10), and note that there exists a partition \( \mathcal{P} = [\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_r] \) of \([6s - 4]\) that depends only on the realizations of \( e^o \) and \( x_i^o, y_i^o, 1 \leq i \leq s \), such that
\[
(\mu^{(s)}(T'_j)^r, 1 \leq i \leq s) \xrightarrow{d} (\sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_i} \Delta_j, 1 \leq i \leq r). \tag{A.7}
\]

Further, it follows from (A.4) that for large \( m \), the vector consisting of the numbers of vertices in \( \mathcal{H}_{m,s} \) that are connected to the different elements of \( e(\mathcal{H}_{m,s}) \) is given by \( (\sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_i} \Delta_{j,m}, 1 \leq i \leq r) \), where the common endpoints of multiple \( e \in e(\mathcal{H}_{m,s}) \) and the vertices in their pendant subtrees have been accounted for in \( \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_i} \Delta_{j,m} \) for exactly one value of \( i \) in a specific way. Using (A.6) and (A.7), we get the analogue of (3.10) for \( \mathcal{H}_{m,s} \) for the above specific way of assigning the common endpoints of multiple \( e \in e(\mathcal{H}_{m,s}) \) and the vertices in their pendant subtrees to the different terms \( \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_i} \Delta_{j,m} \). If this result remained true for an arbitrary assignment, then it would follow that the same result holds for \( \mathcal{H}_{m,s} \), which together with (A.3) would complete the proof. That this result holds for an arbitrary assignment follows from the following facts:

(A) \( Y_{i,m} = o_P(m), 1 \leq i \leq s \), where \( Y_{i,m} \) denotes the number of descendants of \( v_{i,m}^o \) in \( T_{m}^o \).

(B) \( X_{i,m} = o_P(m), 1 \leq i \leq s \), where \( X_{i,m} \) denotes the number of descendants of \( u_{i,m}^o \) in \( T_{m}^o \) that are not in the subtree that contains \( v_{i,m}^o \).

(C) For every \( \varepsilon > 0 \),
\[
\mathbb{P}(\exists v \in T_{m}^o : v \text{ has at least three subtrees in } T_{m}^o \text{ each of size } \geq \varepsilon m) \to 0 \text{ as } m \to \infty.
\]

(A) and (C) follow from (A.4) and the facts that \( qe^o(Y_i^o) \) is almost surely a leaf in \( T_{e^o} \) and that \( T_{e^o} \) is almost surely binary. The proof of (B) is also routine.

A.2. Sketch of proof of Theorem 3.13. Assume that for each \( m \geq 1 \), \( k^{(m)}_i = (k^{(m)}_{1i}, i \geq 0) \), where \( k^{(m)}_i \) are nonnegative integers satisfying \( \sum_{i \geq 0} k^{(m)}_{1i} = m \) and \( \sum_{i \geq 0} i k^{(m)}_{1i} = m - 1 \). Then there exist trees on \( m \) vertices in which for each \( i \geq 0 \), there are exactly \( k^{(m)}_i \) many vertices with \( i \) children. We call \( k^{(m)}_i \) the child sequence of such a tree. Assumption 3.4 gives the criterion for graphs with given degree sequences to be critical. The following assumption gives the analogous criterion for plane trees with given child sequences.

**Assumption A.4.** There exists a pmf \( (p_0, p_1, \ldots) \) with
\[
p_0 > 0, \quad \sum_{i \geq 1} i p_i = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \geq 1} i^2 p_i < \infty
\]
such that
\[
\frac{k^{(m)}_i}{m} \to p_i \text{ for } i \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \geq 0} i^2 k^{(m)}_i \to \sum_{i \geq 1} i^2 p_i.
\]

We will write \( \sigma^2 = \sum_i i^2 p_i - 1 \) for the variance associated with the pmf \( (p_0, p_1, \ldots) \).
Let $\mathcal{T}_{k(m)}$ be the set of plane trees with child sequence $k^{(m)}$. Let $\mathcal{T}_{k(m)}^1$ be a uniform element of $\mathcal{T}_{k(m)}$ endowed with the tree distance and the uniform probability measure on $m$ vertices and viewed as a metric measure space. Broutin and Marckert [32] showed that under Assumption A.4, $\sigma m^{-1/2} \mathcal{T}_{k(m)}^1 \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{T}_{2\mathbb{E}}$ w.r.t. GHP topology. The following variant of this result follows from [25, Lemma 6.4 and Lemma 6.6]:

**Lemma A.5.** Suppose $k^{(m)}$ satisfies Assumption A.4. Further, suppose $f_m : \{0, 1, \ldots\} \to [0, 1]$ is such that

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} k_i^{(m)} f_m(i) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m \to \infty} \max_{i : k_i^{(m)} > 0} f_m(i) = 0.$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_{k(m)}^{f_m}$ be a uniform element of $\mathcal{T}_{k(m)}$ endowed with the tree distance and the measure that assigns probability $f_m(i)$ to any node that has $i$ children, $i \geq 0$. Then

$$\sigma m^{-1/2} \cdot \mathcal{T}_{k(m)}^{f_m} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{T}_{2\mathbb{E}} \text{ w.r.t. GHP topology.}$$

Now we can prove Theorem 3.13 using the above lemma and the techniques used in the proof of [25, Theorem 2.4].
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