GEOMETRY OF GEODESICS THROUGH BUSEMANN MEASURES IN
DIRECTED LAST-PASSAGE PERCOLATION
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Abstract. We consider planar directed last-passage percolation on the square lattice with general i.i.d. weights and study the geometry of the full set of semi-infinite geodesics in a typical realization of the random environment. The structure of the geodesics is studied through the properties of the Busemann functions viewed as a stochastic process indexed by the asymptotic direction. In the exactly solvable exponential model we give the first complete characterization of the uniqueness and coalescence structure of the entire family of semi-infinite geodesics for any model of this type. Our results are further connected to the ergodic program for random Hamilton-Jacobi equations and in particular to infinite shocks. In the exponential model we compute some statistics of shocks, where we discover an unexpected connection to simple symmetric random walk.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Random growth models. Irregular or random growth is a ubiquitous phenomenon in nature, appearing in situations ranging from the growth of tumors, crystals, and bacterial colonies to the propagation of forest fires and the spread of water through a porous medium. Models of random growth have been a driving force in probability theory over the last sixty years and a wellspring of important ideas [1].

The mathematical analysis of such models began in the early 1960s with the introduction of the Eden model by Eden [19] and first-passage percolation (FPP) by Hammersley and Welsh [29]. About two decades later, early forms of a directed variant of FPP, directed last-passage percolation (LPP), appeared in a paper by Muth [40] in connection with series of queues in tandem. Soon after, Rost [45] introduced a random growth model, now known as the corner growth model (CGM), in connection with the totally asymmetric simple exclusion process (TASEP), a model of interacting particles. A decade later, the CGM arose naturally from LPP in queueing theory in the work of Szczotka and Kelly [48] and Glynn and Whitt [27]. Around the same time, the third author [46] connected the CGM and LPP to Hamilton-Jacobi equations and Hopf-Lax-Oleinik semigroups.

Much of this early work was primarily concerned with the deterministic asymptotic shape and large deviations of the randomly growing interface. The breakthrough of Baik, Deift, and Johansson [2] showed that the fluctuations of the Poissonian LPP model have the same limit as the fluctuations of the largest eigenvalue of the Gaussian unitary ensemble derived by Tracy and Widom in [49]. This result was extended to the exactly solvable versions of the CGM by Johansson in [35]. These results marked the CGM and the related LPP and TASEP models as members of the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang (KPZ) universality class. This universality class is conjectured to describe the statistics of a growing interface observed when a rapidly mixing stable state invades a rapidly mixing metastable state. This subject has been a major focus of probability theory and statistical physics over the last three decades. Recent surveys appear in [12, 13, 28, 42, 43].

1.2. Geodesics. A common feature to many models of random growth is the existence of a natural metric-like interpretation of the model, in which there exist paths that can be thought of as geodesics. In these interpretations, the growing interface can be viewed as a sequence of balls of increasing radius and centered at the origin. This connection is essentially exact in the case of FPP, which genuinely describes a random pseudo-metric on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Related models like the CGM and stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi equations have natural extremizers through their Hopf-Lax-Oleinik semi-groups, which share many of the properties of geodesics. For this reason and following the convention in the field, we will call all such paths geodesics.

Considerable effort has been devoted to understanding the geometric structure of semi-infinite geodesics in models of random growth. In the mathematical literature, this program was largely pioneered in the seminal work of Newman and co-authors [31, 32, 38, 41], beginning with his note in the 1994 Proceedings of the ICM [41]. Under strong hypotheses on the curvature of the limit shape, that early work showed that all such geodesics must be asymptotically directed and that for Lebesgue-almost every fixed direction, from each site of the lattice, there exists a unique semi-infinite geodesic with that asymptotic direction and all of these geodesics coalesce. In special cases where the curvature hypotheses are met, Newman’s program was subsequently implemented in LPP models [9–11, 24, 50] and certain stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi equations [3, 4, 6]. In all of the work over the last twenty-five years, the obstruction of needing to work on direction-dependent events of full probability has been a persistent issue and a description of the overall geometric structure of semi-infinite geodesics has remained elusive.
It is known that the picture described by these now-classical methods cannot be complete, because uniqueness fails for countably infinitely many random directions \([14, 23, 25]\). In the CGM, these special directions are the asymptotic directions of competition interfaces which are dual lattice paths that separate geodesics rooted at a fixed site. Competition interface directions are distinguished by the existence of (at least) two geodesics that emanate from the same site, have the same asymptotic direction, but separate immediately in their first step. Once these two geodesics separate, they never intersect again and so in these directions, coalescence also fails.

Borrowing ideas from classical metric geometry, Newman introduced the tool of Busemann functions into the field in \([41]\). In Newman’s work, these Busemann functions are defined as directional limits of differences of metric distances or passage times. Following Newman’s work and the subsequent seminal work of Hoffman in \([30]\), Busemann functions have become a principal tool for understanding the structure of semi-infinite geodesics. The existence of the Busemann limits, however, relies on strong hypotheses on the limit shape. Modern work primarily uses generalized Busemann functions, which exist without assumptions on the limit shape \([15, 16, 25, 26]\).

1.3. Busemann measures. In the present paper, we introduce a new framework that relates geometric properties of geodesics to analytic properties of a measure-valued stochastic process called the Busemann process or Busemann measures. These Busemann measures are Lebesgue-Stieltjes measures of generalized Busemann functions on the space of spatial directions, with the Busemann process being the associated family of distribution functions. Our approach enables us to study the full family of semi-infinite geodesics on a single event of full probability.

We describe, in terms of the supports of the Busemann measures, the random exceptional directions in which uniqueness or coalescence of geodesics fails. Many of our results hold without further assumptions on the weight distribution, but our work also identifies key hypotheses on the Busemann process which are shown to be equivalent to desirable coalescence and uniqueness properties of geodesics. We expect that the methods we use to prove results without hypotheses on the weight distribution should also apply in related models like FPP and stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi equations.

The best results come in the exactly solvable case with i.i.d. exponential weights when we combine our results with previous work from \([14, 24, 25]\). This yields a complete characterization of the uniqueness and coalescence structure of all semi-infinite geodesics on a single event of full probability. Here is a summary:

(i) Every semi-infinite geodesic has an asymptotic direction.
(ii) There exists a random countably infinite dense set of interior directions in which there are exactly two geodesics from each lattice site, a left geodesic and a right geodesic. These two families of left and right geodesics can be constructed from the Busemann process. Each family forms a tree of coalescing geodesics.
(iii) In every other interior direction there is a unique geodesic from each lattice point, which again can be constructed from the Busemann process. In each such direction these geodesics coalesce to form a tree.
(iv) The countable set of directions of non-uniqueness is exactly the set of asymptotic directions of competition interfaces from all lattice points, in addition to being the set of discontinuity directions of the Busemann process.

This gives the first complete accounting of semi-infinite geodesics in a lattice growth model which lies in the KPZ class.

1.4. Shocks. Our results are also connected to the ergodic program for the stochastic Burgers equation initiated by Sinai in \([47]\). Passage times in LPP solve a variational problem that is a discrete version of a Hopf-Lax-Oleinik semigroup. As mentioned in point \((iv)\) above, the exceptional directions in which coalescence fails correspond to directions at which the Busemann process has jump discontinuities as a function of the asymptotic direction. Thus, multiple semi-infinite optimal Lagrangian paths emanate from the spatial locations where the Busemann process has jump discontinuities. These locations then play the role of shocks in the present discrete setting.
The structure of shocks in connection with the Burgers program has been a major line of research [3, 8, 18], with a conjectured relationship between shock statistics and the KPZ universality phenomenon (see Bakhtin and Khanin [5]). These conjectures are entirely open. We study shocks in random exceptional directions, while [3, 5, 8, 18] consider only fixed deterministic directions.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper to consider the structure of shocks in exceptional directions. We note that our model is in a non-compact space setting, where these problems have been considerably more difficult to study. We find that shocks in exceptional directions have a markedly different structure from what has been seen previously in fixed directions. Among the new phenomena we observe, all shocks are bi-infinite and shocks both branch and coalesce. Bi-infinite shocks have previously been observed only when the space is compact and the asymptotic direction is fixed. Branching shocks have not been observed before.

We are able to give further information about the structure of these shocks in the exponential model. In particular, we compute non-trivial exact statistics of shocks in the exponential case, infinite shocks have previously been observed only when the space is compact and the asymptotic direction is fixed. Among the exceptional directions, we find that shocks in exceptional directions have been considerably more difficult to study. We find that shocks in exceptional directions have a markedly different structure from what has been seen previously in fixed directions. Among the new phenomena we observe, all shocks are bi-infinite and shocks both branch and coalesce. Bi-infinite shocks have previously been observed only when the space is compact and the asymptotic direction is fixed. Branching shocks have not been observed before.

We are able to give further information about the structure of these shocks in the exponential model. In particular, we compute non-trivial exact statistics of shocks in the exponential case, infinite shocks have previously been observed only when the space is compact and the asymptotic direction is fixed. Among the exceptional directions, we find that shocks in exceptional directions have been considerably more difficult to study. We find that shocks in exceptional directions have a markedly different structure from what has been seen previously in fixed directions. Among the new phenomena we observe, all shocks are bi-infinite and shocks both branch and coalesce. Bi-infinite shocks have previously been observed only when the space is compact and the asymptotic direction is fixed. Branching shocks have not been observed before.

1.5. Organization of the paper. Section 2 defines the model and summarizes the currently known results on Busemann functions and existence, uniqueness, and coalescence of geodesics. Section 3 contains our main results on Busemann measures and the geometry of geodesics for general weight distributions. Section 4 connects our general results to dynamical systems and studies the web of shocks defined by the discontinuities of the Busemann process. Section 5 specializes to the exponential case to compute non-trivial statistics of the Busemann process. Proofs come in Sections 6–8, with some auxiliary results relegated to Appendices B–D. Appendix A collects the inputs we need from previous work.

1.6. Setting and notation. Throughout this paper, \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) is a Polish probability space equipped with a group \(T = \{T_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2}\) of \(\mathcal{F}\)-measurable \(\mathbb{P}\)-preserving bijections \(T_x : \Omega \to \Omega\) such that \(T_0 = \text{identity and } T_x T_y = T_{x+y}\). \(\mathbb{E}\) is expectation relative to \(\mathbb{P}\). A generic point in this space is denoted by \(\omega \in \Omega\). We assume that there exists a family \(\{\omega_x(x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}\) of real-valued random variables called weights such that

\begin{equation}
\{\omega_x\} \text{ are i.i.d. with a continuous distribution under } \mathbb{P}, \, \forall \omega_0 > 0,
\end{equation}

\(\exists p > 2 : \mathbb{E}[|\omega_0|^p] < \infty\).

We require further that \(\omega_y(T_x(\omega)) = \omega_{x+y}(\omega)\) for all \(x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2\). We use \(P_0\) to denote the marginal distribution of \(\{\omega_x : x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}\) under \(\mathbb{P}\). \(X \sim \text{Exp}(\alpha)\) means that the random variable \(X\) satisfies \(P(X > t) = e^{-\alpha t}\) for \(t > 0\) (rate \(\alpha\) exponential distribution).

The canonical setting is the one where \(\Omega = \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^2}\) is endowed with the product topology, Borel \(\sigma\)-algebra \(\mathcal{F}\), and the natural shifts, \(\omega_x\), are the coordinate projections, and \(\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_0\) is a product shift-invariant measure.

The standard basis vectors of \(\mathbb{R}^2\) are \(e_1 = e_+ = (1, 0)\) and \(e_2 = e_- = (0, 1)\). The \(e_\pm\) notation will conveniently shorten some statements. Additional special vectors are \(\hat{e}_1 = e_1 + e_2, \, \hat{e}_1* = \hat{e}_1/2, \, \hat{e}_2 = e_2 - e_1, \, \hat{e}_2* = \hat{e}_2/2\). In the dynamical view of LPP, \(\hat{e}_1\) is the time coordinate and \(\hat{e}_2\) the space coordinate. See Figure 1.1. The spatial level at time \(t \in \mathbb{Z}\) is denoted by \(\overline{L}_t = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : x \cdot \hat{e}_1 = t\}\). The half-vectors \(\hat{e}_1^*\) and \(\hat{e}_2^*\) connect \(\mathbb{Z}^2\) with its dual lattice \(\mathbb{Z}^* = \hat{e}_1^* + \mathbb{Z}^2\).

A statement with \(\pm\) and possibly also \(\mp\) is a conjunction of two statements: one for the top signs, and another one for the bottom signs. To avoid confusion with such statements we also employ the notational convention that \(\square\) is an element of \(\{-, +\}\).

We use \(\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty), \, \mathbb{Z}_+ = \mathbb{Z} \cap \mathbb{R}_+\) and \(\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}\). For \(x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2\), inequalities such as \(x \leq y\) and \(x < y\), and operations such as \(x \land y = \min(x, y)\) and \(x \lor y = \max(x, y)\) are understood coordinatewise. \(\sqrt{x} = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : x \leq z \leq y\}\). For integers \(i \leq j\), \([i, j]\) denotes the interval \([i, j] \cap \mathbb{Z}\).

For \(m \leq n\) in \(\mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}\) we denote a sequence \(\{a_i : m \leq i \leq n\}\) by \(a_{m,n}\).
A path $\pi_{m,n}$ in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ with $\pi_{i+1} - \pi_i \in \{e_1, e_2\}$ for all $i$ is called an up-right path. Throughout, paths are indexed so that $\pi_1 \cdot \hat{e}_1 = k$.

For vectors $\zeta, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^2$, denote open and closed line segments by $[\zeta, \eta] = \{t\zeta + (1-t)\eta : 0 < t < 1\}$ and $]\zeta, \eta[ = \{t\zeta + (1-t)\eta : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$, with the consistent definitions for $]\zeta, \eta]$ and $[\zeta, \eta]$. $\mathcal{U} = [e_2, e_1]$ with relative interior $\text{ri} \mathcal{U} = ]e_2, e_1[$. See Figure 1.1. A left-to-right ordering of points $\zeta, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\zeta \cdot \hat{e}_1 = \eta \cdot \hat{e}_1$ is defined by $\zeta < \eta$ if $\zeta \cdot e_1 < \eta \cdot e_1$ and $\zeta \leq \eta$ if $\zeta \cdot e_1 = \eta \cdot e_1$. This leads to notions of left and right limits: if $\zeta_n \to \xi$ in $\mathcal{U}$, then $\zeta_n \nrightarrow \xi$ if $\zeta_n < \zeta_{n+1}$ for all $n$, while $\zeta_n \nrightarrow \xi$ if $\zeta_{n+1} < \zeta_n$ for all $n$.

The support $\text{supp} \mu$ of a signed Borel measure $\mu$ is the smallest closed set whose complement has zero measure under the total variation measure $|\mu|$.

2. Preliminaries on last-passage percolation

2.1. The shape function of directed last-passage percolation. Recall the assumption (1.1). For $x \leq y$ in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ satisfying $x \cdot \hat{e}_1 = k$ and $y \cdot \hat{e}_1 = m$, denote by $\Pi^y_k$ the collection of up-right paths $\pi_{k,m}$ which satisfy $\pi_k = x$ and $\pi_m = y$. The last-passage time from $x$ to $y$ is defined by

$$G_{x,y} = G(x,y) = \max_{\pi_{k,m} \in \Pi^y_k} \sum_{i=k}^{m-1} \omega_{\pi_i}.$$  

Paths that maximize in the above display are called geodesics. If the weights have a continuous distribution, then there is almost surely a unique such path.

The shape theorem [39] says there exists a non-random function $g : \mathbb{R}^2_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ such that with probability one

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \max_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : |x|_1 = n} \frac{|G_{0,x} - g(x)|}{n} = 0.$$  

This shape function $g$ is symmetric, concave, and homogeneous of degree one. By homogeneity, the shape function is determined by its values on $\mathcal{U}$. Concavity implies the existence of one-sided derivatives:

$$\nabla g(\xi \pm) \cdot e_1 = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \frac{g(\xi \pm \varepsilon e_1) - g(\xi)}{\pm \varepsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla g(\xi \pm) \cdot e_2 = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \frac{g(\xi \pm \varepsilon e_2) - g(\xi)}{\pm \varepsilon}.$$  

By [33, Lemma 4.7(c)] differentiability of $g$ at $\xi \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U}$ is the same as $\nabla g(\xi+) = \nabla g(\xi-)$. Denote the directions of differentiability by

$$D = \{\xi \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U} : g \text{ is differentiable at } \xi\}.$$  

For $\xi \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U}$, define the maximal linear segments of $g$ with slopes given by the right ($\Box = +$) and the left ($\Box = -$) derivatives of $g$ at $\xi$ to be

$$\mathcal{U}_\Box = \{\xi \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U} : g(\xi) - g(\xi) = \nabla g(\xi \Box) \cdot (\Box - \xi)\}, \quad \Box \in \{-, +\}.$$  

We say $g$ is strictly concave at $\xi \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U}$ if $\mathcal{U}_- = \mathcal{U}_+ = \{\xi\}$. Geometrically this means that $\xi$ does not lie on a nondegenerate closed linear segment of $g$. The usual notion of strict concavity on an open subinterval of $\mathcal{U}$ is the same as having this pointwise strict concavity at all $\xi$ in the interval.

For a given $\xi \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U}$, let $\xi \leq \xi$ denote the endpoints of the (possibly degenerate) interval

$$\mathcal{U}_\xi = \mathcal{U}_- \cup \mathcal{U}_+ = [\xi, \xi].$$
If \( \xi \in \mathcal{D} \) then \( \mathcal{U}_{\xi-} = \mathcal{U}_{\xi+} = \mathcal{U}_\xi \) while if \( \xi \notin \mathcal{D} \) then \( \mathcal{U}_{\xi-} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\xi+} = \{\xi\} \). Set \( \mathcal{U}_{e_i} = \{e_i\} \), for \( i \in \{1, 2\} \).

Additional control over the geometry of geodesics is provided by this regularity condition:

\[
(2.3) \quad \text{The shape function } g \text{ is strictly concave at all } \xi \notin \mathcal{D} \text{ or, equivalently, } g \text{ is differentiable at the endpoints of its linear segments.}
\]

Condition \((2.3)\) holds if \( g \) is either differentiable or strictly concave. Both of these hold for exponential weights and are conjectured to be true more generally. Under the regularity condition \((2.3)\), if both \( \mathcal{U}_{\xi-} \) and \( \mathcal{U}_{\xi+} \) are nondegenerate intervals, then \( \mathcal{U}_{\xi-} = \mathcal{U}_{\xi+} = \mathcal{U}_\xi \) (leftmost graph in Figure 2.1).

To avoid burdening this section with technicalities, we defer the careful statement of some previously known results to Appendix A. We begin by introducing the required background somewhat informally.

2.2. The Busemann process. Under regularity condition \((2.3)\), it is known that for each fixed \( \xi \in \text{ri} U \) and \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \), there is a \( \xi \)-dependent event of full probability on which the limit

\[
(2.4) \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} (G_{x,v_n} - G_{y,v_n}) = B^\xi(x, y),
\]

exists and agrees for all sequences \( v_n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \) such that \( |v_n| \to \infty \) and \( v_n/n \to \xi \). Similar limits appear in metric geometry under the name of Busemann functions.

The goal of this paper is to study the LPP model without a priori hypotheses on the shape function. Hence we do not take limit \((2.4)\) as a starting point. We work with a stochastic process of generalized Busemann functions, indexed by \( \xi \in \text{ri} U \), constructed on an extended probability space. This was done in [34], adapting ideas from [15, 26]. That process agrees with the limit in \((2.4)\) when the limit exists and has many structural properties implied by \((2.4)\) even when the limit does not exist.

The construction produces a probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) with a group of shifts \( T = \{T_z : x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\} \) that satisfies the requirements of Subsection 1.6 and a stochastic process \( \{B^{\square}(x, y) : x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2, \xi \in \text{ri} U, \square \in \{-, +\}\} \) on \( \Omega \), which we will call the Busemann process. We record here those properties of this process that are needed for understanding our results in Sections 3–5 and leave the rest to the appendix.

In general, there is a \( T \)-invariant full measure event on which the following hold. For all \( \xi \in \text{ri} U \), \( x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \), and \( \square \in \{-, +\} \):

\[
(2.5) \quad B^{\square}(x + z, y + z, w) = B^{\square}(x, y, T_z \omega),
\]

\[
(2.6) \quad B^{\square}(x, y, \omega) + B^{\square}(y, z, \omega) = B^{\square}(x, z, \omega),
\]

\[
(2.7) \quad \min\{B^{\square}(x, x + e_1, \omega), B^{\square}(x, x + e_2, \omega)\} = \omega_x, \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
(2.8) \quad \mathbb{E}[B^{\square}(x, x + e_i)] = \nabla g(\xi \square) \cdot e_i.
\]

Properties \((2.5)-(2.6)\) express that each \( B^{\square} \) is a covariant cocycle. The weights recovery property \((2.7)\) is the key property that relates these cocycles to the LPP process. \((2.8)\) shows that the Busemann process is naturally parametrized by the superdifferential of the shape function \( g \). The following monotonicity property is inherited from the path structure: for all \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \) and \( \xi, \xi' \in \text{ri} U \) with \( \xi < \xi' \),

\[
(2.9) \quad B^{\xi'}(x, x + e_1, \omega) \geq B^{\xi'+}(x, x + e_1, \omega) \geq B^{\xi'}(x, x + e_1, \omega) \geq B^{\xi'+}(x, x + e_1, \omega) \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
B^{\xi'}(x, x + e_2, \omega) \leq B^{\xi'+}(x, x + e_2, \omega) \leq B^{\xi'}(x, x + e_2, \omega) \leq B^{\xi'+}(x, x + e_2, \omega).
\]
As a consequence of monotonicity and the cocycle property (2.6), left and right limits exist. The choice of $-$ or $+$ in the definition above corresponds to choosing either left or right continuity: for all $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, all $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{U}$, and all $\square \in \{-, +\}$

\[
B^\xi_-(x, y, \omega) = \lim_{{\mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{U} \ni \zeta \searrow \xi}} B^{\xi_0}(x, y, \omega) \quad \text{and} \quad B^\xi_+(x, y, \omega) = \lim_{{\mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{U} \ni \zeta \nearrow \xi}} B^{\xi_0}(x, y, \omega).
\]

When $B^\xi_+(x, y, \omega) = B^\xi_-(x, y, \omega)$ we drop the $+/-$ distinction and write $B^\xi(x, y, \omega)$.

The complete list of the properties of the Busemann process which are used in the proofs in Sections 6–7 appears in Theorem A.1 in Appendix A.

### 2.3. Semi-infinite geodesics

A path $\pi_{k, \infty}$ with $\pi_{i+1} - \pi_i \in \{e_1, e_2\}$ for all $i \geq k$ is called a semi-infinite geodesic emanating from, or rooted at, $x$ if $\pi_k = x$ and for any $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ with $k \leq m \leq n$, the restricted path $\pi_{m, n}$ is a geodesic between $\pi_m$ and $\pi_n$. A path $\pi_{-\infty, \infty}$ with $\pi_{i+1} - \pi_i \in \{e_1, e_2\}$ for all $i$ is called a bi-infinite geodesic if $\pi_{m, n}$ is a geodesic for any $m \leq n$ in $\mathbb{Z}$. Due to the fact that the set of admissible steps is $\{e_1, e_2\}$, from each site $x$ there are always two trivial semi-infinite geodesics, namely $x + \mathbb{Z}_+e_1$ and $x + \mathbb{Z}_+e_2$, and there are two trivial bi-infinite geodesics going through $x$, namely $x + \mathbb{Z}_1e_1$ and $x + \mathbb{Z}_2e_2$.

A semi-infinite geodesic $\pi_{k, \infty}$, or a bi-infinite geodesic $\pi_{-\infty, \infty}$, is directed into a set $A \subset U$ if the limit points of $\pi_{n, n}/n$ as $n \to \infty$ are all in $A$. When $A = \{\xi\}$ the condition becomes $\lim_{n \to \infty} \pi_{n, n}/n = \xi$ and we say $\pi_{k, \infty}$ is $\xi$-directed.

Using the Busemann process, we construct a semi-infinite path $\gamma^{x, \xi_0}$ for each $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{U}$, both signs $\square \in \{-, +\}$, and all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, via these rules: the initial point is $\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_m = x$ where $m = x \cdot \hat{e}_1$, and for $n \geq m$

\[
\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_{n+1} = \begin{cases} 
\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n + e_1, & \text{if } B^{\xi_0}(\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n, \gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n + e_1) < B^{\xi_0}(\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n, \gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n + e_2), \\
\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n + e_2, & \text{if } B^{\xi_0}(\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n, \gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n + e_1) > B^{\xi_0}(\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n, \gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n + e_2), \\
\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n + e_1, & \text{if } B^{\xi_0}(\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n, \gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n + e_1) = B^{\xi_0}(\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n, \gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n + e_2).
\end{cases}
\]

As above, we dispense with the $\pm$ distinction when $\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_m = \gamma^{x, \xi}_m$. These geodesics inherit an ordering from (2.9): for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2, n \geq x \cdot \hat{e}_1$, and $\zeta < \eta$ in $\mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{U}$,

\[
\gamma^{x, \zeta}_n \leq \gamma^{x, \zeta}_m \leq \gamma^{x, \eta}_n \leq \gamma^{x, \eta}_m.
\]

Similarly, the geodesics inherit one-sided continuity from (2.10) in the sense of convergence of finite length segments: for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2, \xi \in \mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{U}$ and $\square \in \{-, +\}$, if $k = x \cdot \hat{e}_1$ and $m \geq k$ is an integer, then

\[
\lim_{{\mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{U} \ni \eta \nearrow \xi}} \gamma^{x, \eta}_{k, m} = \gamma^{x, \xi}_{k, m} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{{\mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{U} \ni \eta \searrow \xi}} \gamma^{x, \eta}_{k, m} = \gamma^{x, \xi}_{k, m}.
\]

An elementary argument given in [25, Lemma 4.1] shows that properties (2.6) and (2.7) combine to imply that these paths are all semi-infinite geodesics and that, moreover, for all choices of $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2, n \geq x \cdot \hat{e}_1$, $\square \in \{-, +\}$, and $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{U}$, we have

\[
G(x, \gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n) = B^{\xi_0}(x, \gamma^{x, \xi_0}_n).
\]

The regularity condition (2.3) guarantees that $\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_m$ and $\gamma^{x, \xi}_m$ are extreme among the $U_\xi$-directed geodesics out of $x$ in the sense that for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2, \xi \in \mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{U}$, and any $U_\xi$-directed geodesic $\pi$ emanating from $x$, we have

\[
\gamma^{x, \xi}_n \leq \pi_n \leq \gamma^{x, \xi}_m
\]

for all $n \geq x \cdot \hat{e}_1$. We record this fact as Theorem A.3 below. Using extremality, it is possible to study the overall structure of general semi-infinite geodesics through study of $\gamma^{x, \xi}_+$ and $\gamma^{x, \xi}_-$.

Theorem A.4 collects the current state of the art concerning the structure of semi-infinite geodesics under (1.1). The main points are as follows:

(i) Every semi-infinite geodesic is $U_\xi$-directed for some $\xi \in \mathbb{U}$.

(ii) $\gamma^{x, \xi_0}_m$ is $U_\xi$-directed for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{U}$.

(iii) If $\xi, \xi', \xi'' \in D$, then there is a $\xi$-dependent event of full probability on which $\gamma^{x, \xi}_+ = \gamma^{x, \xi}_-$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. 


(iv) There is a \( \xi \)-dependent event of full probability on which \( \gamma^x,\xi \) and \( \gamma^y,\xi \) coalesce for each \( \Box \in \{+,-\} \). That is, for each \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \), there exists \( K \in \mathbb{N} \) such that for all \( k \geq K \),

\[
\gamma^x,\xi_k = \gamma^y,\xi_k.
\]

Under the regularity condition (2.3), part (iii) combined with (2.15) implies that there is a \( \xi \)-dependent event of full probability on which there is a unique \( U_\xi \) directed geodesic from each \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \). Moreover, by part (iv), all of these geodesics coalesce. On the other hand, under the same condition, it is known that there are exceptional random directions at which both uniqueness and coalescence fail. We discuss these directions in the next subsection. Among the main goals of this paper is the study of the structure of semi-infinite geodesics in such exceptional directions and in particular to prove results about the structure of all semi-infinite geodesics on a single event of full probability.

2.4. Non-uniqueness of directed semi-infinite geodesics. A natural direction in which non-uniqueness occurs is that of the competition interface direction, which we denote by \( \xi_\ast(\omega) \). \( \xi_\ast(\omega) \in \mathrm{ri} \mathcal{U} \) is defined to be the unique direction such that

\[
B^{\xi_\ast}(e_1, e_2, \omega) > 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \zeta > \xi_\ast(\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad B^{\xi_\ast}(e_1, e_2, \omega) < 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \zeta < \xi_\ast(\omega).
\] (2.16)

Theorem A.5 records the main properties of competition interface directions, including the existence and uniqueness of such a direction.

Under condition (2.3), we also have the following alternative description of \( \xi_\ast(\omega) \). Fix a site \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \). The uniqueness of finite geodesics implies that the collection of geodesics from \( x \) to all points \( y \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2 \) form a tree \( T_x \) rooted at \( x \) and spanning \( x + \mathbb{Z}_+^2 \). The subtree rooted at \( x + e_1 \) is separated from the subtree rooted at \( x + e_2 \) by a path \( \varphi_{n}^\ast \), \( n \geq x \cdot e_1 \), on the dual lattice \( \hat{e}_1^\ast + \mathbb{Z}_+^2 \), known as the competition interface. See Figure 2.2.
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*Figure 2.2.* The geodesic tree \( T_x \) rooted at \( x \). The competition interface (solid line) emanates from \( x + \hat{e}_1^\ast \) and separates the subtrees of \( T_x \) rooted at \( x + e_1 \) and \( x + e_2 \).

Under condition (2.3), the competition interface itself has an asymptotic direction and this direction agrees with \( \xi_\ast(\omega) \), given by (2.16). Moreover, each of these two trees contains at least one semi-infinite geodesic with asymptotic direction \( \xi_\ast(\omega) \). Indeed, \( \xi_\ast(\omega) \) is the unique direction with the property that there exist at least two semi-infinite geodesics rooted at 0, with asymptotic direction \( \xi_\ast(\omega) \), and which differ in their first step. See Figure 2.3. Theorem A.6 records the fact that when the weights are exponentially distributed, there are no directions \( \xi \) with three \( \xi \)-directed geodesics emanating from the same point.
3. Busemann measures, exceptional directions, and coalescence points

The central theme of this paper is the relationship between analytic properties of the Busemann process and the geometric properties of the geodesics $\gamma_x^{\xi}$ for $\xi \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U}$ and $\square \in \{-, +\}$. It will be convenient in what follows to have a bookkeeping tool for the locations at which the Busemann processes are not locally constant. A natural way to record this information is through the supports of the associated Lebesgue-Stieltjes measures.

As functions of the direction parameter $\xi$, $B^{\xi-}_{x,x+e}$ and $B^{\xi+}_{x,x+e}$ are respectively left- and right-continuous versions of the same monotone function and satisfy the cocycle property (2.6). As a consequence, for each $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, $\square \in \{-, +\}$, $\xi \mapsto B^{\xi\square}(x,y)$ has locally bounded total variation. Hence on each compact subset $K$ of $\text{ri} \mathcal{U}$ there exists a signed Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure $\mu^K_{x,y}$ with the property that whenever $\zeta \preceq \eta$ and $[\zeta, \eta] \subset K$,

$$
\mu^K_{x,y}([\zeta, \eta]) = B^{\eta\square}_{x,y} - B^{\zeta\square}_{x,y} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^K_{x,y}([\zeta, \eta]) = B^{\eta\square}_{x,y} - B^{\zeta\square}_{x,y}.
$$

The restriction to compact sets is a technical point: in general, $B^{\xi\square}_{x,y}$ and $B^{\xi\square}_{x,y}$ are signed sums of monotone functions and thus correspond to formal linear combinations of positive measures. By the limit in (A.1), each of these positive measures assigns infinite mass to the interval $\text{ri} \mathcal{U}$ and if any two of the measures come with different signs, the formal linear combination will not define a signed measure on all of $\text{ri} \mathcal{U}$. We will ignore this technical point in what follows and write $\mu_{x,y}(\cdot)$ for the value of this measure and $|\mu_{x,y}(\cdot)|$ for the value of the total variation measure whenever they are unambiguously defined. In that vein, we define the support of the measure $\mu_{x,y}$ on $\text{ri} \mathcal{U}$ as

$$
\text{supp} \mu_{x,y} = \bigcup_{\zeta, \eta \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U} : \zeta \preceq \eta} \text{supp} \mu^K_{x,y},
$$

where $\text{supp} \mu^K_{x,y}$ is, as usual, the support of the (well-defined) total variation measure $|\mu^K_{x,y}|$. Naturally, this definition agrees with the standard notion of the support of a measure when $\mu_{x,y}$ is a well-defined positive or negative measure on $\mathcal{U}$.

3.1. Coalescence and the Busemann measures. The first result below relates membership in the support with the existence of disjoint Busemann geodesics.

**Theorem 3.1.** The following holds with $\mathbb{P}$-probability one. For all $x \neq y$ in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and $\xi \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U}$ statements (i) and (ii) below are equivalent:

(i) $\xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x,y}$.

(ii) Either $\gamma^{x,\xi-} \cap \gamma^{y,\xi+} = \emptyset$ or $\gamma^{x,\xi+} \cap \gamma^{y,\xi-} = \emptyset$.

Under the regularity condition (2.3), (i) and (ii) are equivalent to

(iii) There exist $\mathcal{U}_{\xi}$-directed semi-infinite geodesics $\pi^x$ and $\pi^y$ out of $x$ and $y$, respectively, such that $\pi^x \cap \pi^y = \emptyset$. 

The difference between statements (ii) and (iii) is that if $\xi \notin \text{supp } \mu_{x,y}$ then (ii) leaves open the possibility that even though $\gamma^{x,\xi^-}$ and $\gamma^{y,\xi^+}$ intersect and $\gamma^{x,\xi^+}$ and $\gamma^{y,\xi^-}$ intersect, there may be other $U_\xi$-directed geodesics out of $x$ and $y$ that do not intersect. This is because without the regularity condition (2.3), we currently do not know whether $\gamma^{x,\xi^+}$ is the rightmost and $\gamma^{x,\xi^-}$ the leftmost $U_\xi$-directed geodesic out of $x$.

The subsequent several results relate the support of Busemann measures to the coalescence geometry of geodesics. For $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, $\xi \in riU$, and signs $\square \in \{-, +\}$, define the \textit{coalescence point} of the geodesics $\gamma^{x,\xi}$ and $\gamma^{y,\xi}$ by

$$Z^{\xi}(x, y) = \begin{cases} \text{first point in } \gamma^{x,\xi} \cap \gamma^{y,\xi}, & \text{if } \gamma^{x,\xi} \cap \gamma^{y,\xi} \neq \emptyset \\ x, & \text{if } \gamma^{x,\xi} \cap \gamma^{y,\xi} = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

(3.3)

The first point $z$ in $\gamma^{x,\xi} \cap \gamma^{y,\xi}$ is identified uniquely by choosing the common point $z = \gamma^{x,\xi}$ that minimizes $k$. In the expression above, $\infty$ is the point added in the one-point compactification of $\mathbb{Z}^2$. If the two geodesics $\gamma^{x,\xi}$ and $\gamma^{y,\xi}$ ever meet, they coalesce due to the local rule in (2.11). We write $Z^{\xi}(x, y)$ when $Z^{\xi}(x, y) = Z^\xi(x, y)$.

As $Z^2 \cup \{x\}$-valued functions, $\xi \mapsto Z^{\xi}(x, y)$ is right-continuous and $\xi \mapsto Z^{\xi}(x, y)$ is left-continuous. Namely, a consequence of (2.13) is that for $\xi \in riU$ and $\square \in \{-, +\}$,

$$\lim_{\text{ri } \xi \searrow \xi} Z^{\xi}(x, y) = Z^\xi(x, y).$$

(3.4)

If $Z^\xi(x, y) = \infty$ this limit still holds in the sense that then $|Z^{\xi}(x, y)| \to \infty$. The analogous statement holds for convergence from the left to $Z^{\xi}(x, y)$.

The next theorem states that an interval of directions outside the support of a Busemann measure corresponds to geodesics following common initial segments to a common coalescence point.

**Theorem 3.2.** With probability one, simultaneously for all $\zeta < \eta$ in $riU$ and all $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, statements (i) and (ii) below are equivalent:

(i) $|\mu_{x,y}(\zeta, \eta)| = 0$.

(ii) Letting $k = x \cdot \hat{e}_1$ and $\ell = y \cdot \hat{e}_1$, there exist a point $z$ with $z \cdot \hat{e}_1 = m \geq k \lor \ell$ and path segments $\pi_{\zeta,m}$ and $\tilde{\pi}_{\ell,m}$ with these properties: $\pi_k = x$, $\tilde{\pi}_\ell = y$, $\pi_m = \tilde{\pi}_m = z$, and for all $\xi \in [\zeta, \eta]$ and $\square \in \{-, +\}$ we have $\gamma^{x,\zeta}_{\xi,m} = \pi_{\zeta,m}$ and $\gamma^{y,\eta}_{\ell,m} = \tilde{\pi}_{\ell,m}$.

By the uniqueness of point-to-point geodesics, statement (ii) is equivalent to $Z^{\zeta}(x, y) = z$ for all $\xi \in [\zeta, \eta]$ and $\square \in \{-, +\}$.

The next lemma verifies that intervals that satisfy statement (i) of Theorem 3.2 almost surely make up a random dense open subset of $riU$. Recall that $U_0$ is an arbitrary countable dense subset of points of differentiability of $g$.

**Lemma 3.3.** The following holds with $\mathbb{P}$-probability one. For every $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ and every $\xi \in U_0$, there exist $\zeta < \xi < \eta$ in $riU$ such that $|\mu_{x,y}(\zeta, \eta)| = 0$.

A further natural question is whether the measure can be Cantor-like with no isolated points of support, or if the support consists entirely of isolated points, or perhaps if both are possible. These features also turn out to have counterparts in coalescence properties. For a set $A \subset U$ we say that $\xi$ is a \textit{limit point of $A$ from the right} if $A$ intersects $[\xi, \eta]$ for each $\eta > \xi$, with a similar definition for limit points from the left.

**Theorem 3.4.** The following statements hold with probability one. For all $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $\xi \in riU$:

(a) $\xi \notin \text{supp } \mu_{x,y} \iff Z^\xi(x, y) = Z^\xi(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

(b) $\xi$ is an isolated point of $\text{supp } \mu_{x,y} \iff Z^\xi(x, y) \neq Z^\xi(x, y) \text{ but both } Z^\xi(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

(c) $\xi$ is a limit point of $\text{supp } \mu_{x,y}$ from the right $\iff Z^\xi(x, y) = \infty$. Similarly, $\xi$ is a limit point of $\text{supp } \mu_{x,y}$ from the left $\iff Z^\xi(x, y) = \infty$. 

This motivates the following condition on the Busemann process which will be invoked in some results in the sequel:

\[(3.5)\quad \text{There exists a full } \mathbb{P}\text{-probability event on which every point of } \text{supp } \mu_{x,y} \text{ is isolated, for all } x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2.\]

Equivalently, condition (3.5) says that \(\xi \mapsto B_{\xi \pm}(x, y)\) is a jump process whose jumps do not accumulate on \(\text{ri } \mathcal{U}\). For this reason, we refer to (3.5) as the jump process condition. It is shown in [20, Theorem 3.4] that (3.5) holds when the weights \(\omega_x\) are i.i.d. exponential random variables. In addition to Lemma 3.3, this is a further reason to expect that (3.5) holds very generally.

Under condition (3.5) Theorem 3.4 extends to a global coalescence statement.

**Theorem 3.5.** There is an event of full \(\mathbb{P}\) probability on which statements (i) and (ii) below are equivalent.

(i) The jump process condition (3.5) holds.

(ii) This holds with \(\mathbb{P}\)-probability one: for all \(x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2\), all \(\xi \in \text{ri } \mathcal{U}\), and both \(\square \in \{-+, +\}\), the geodesics \(\gamma^{x,\xi\square}\) and \(\gamma^{y,\xi\square}\) coalesce.

We introduce the random set of exceptional directions obtained by taking the union of the supports of the Busemann measures:

\[(3.6)\quad \mathcal{V}_\omega = \bigcup_{x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \text{supp } \mu_{x,y}.\]

It turns out that not all pairs \(x, y\) are necessary for the union. It suffices to take pairs of adjacent points along horizontal or vertical lines, or along any bi-infinite path with nonpositive local slopes.

**Lemma 3.6.** The following holds for \(\mathbb{P}\)-almost every \(\omega\). Let \(x_{-\infty, \infty}\) be any bi-infinite path in \(\mathbb{Z}^2\) such that \(\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}, (x_{i+1} - x_i) \cdot e_1 \geq 0\) and \((x_{i+1} - x_i) \cdot e_2 \leq 0\) and not both are zero. Then

\[
\mathcal{V}_\omega = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{supp } \mu_{(x_i, x_{i+1})}.
\]

The remainder of this section addresses (i) characterizations of \(\mathcal{V}_\omega\) and (ii) its significance for uniqueness and coalescence of geodesics. The first item relates the exceptional directions to asymptotic directions of competition interfaces.

**Theorem 3.7.** The following holds for \(\mathbb{P}\)-almost every \(\omega\).

(a) For all \(x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\), \(\{\xi_*(T_x \omega)\} = \text{supp } \mu_{x,x+e_1} \cap \text{supp } \mu_{x,x+e_2}\). In particular, \(\mathcal{V}_\omega \supset \{\xi_*(T_x \omega) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}\).

(b) Under the jump process condition (3.5), \(\mathcal{V}_\omega = \{\xi_*(T_x \omega) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}\).

The next issue is the relationship between membership in \(\mathcal{V}_\omega\) and regularity properties of \(g\).

**Theorem 3.8.** For any \(\xi \in \text{ri } \mathcal{U}\) we have \(\xi \in \mathcal{D}\) if and only if \(\mathbb{P}(\xi \in \mathcal{V}_\omega) = 0\) which itself holds if and only if \(\mathbb{P}(\xi \in \text{supp } \mu_{x,x+e_i}) = 0\) for any (and hence all) \(x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\) and \(i \in \{1, 2\}\).

The following hold for \(\mathbb{P}\)-almost every \(\omega\).

(a) For any \(\zeta < \eta \in \text{ri } \mathcal{U}\), \([\zeta, \eta] \cap \mathcal{V}_\omega \neq \emptyset\) if and only if \(\nabla g(\zeta) \neq -\nabla g(\eta)\).

(b) For any \(\zeta < \eta \in \text{ri } \mathcal{U}\) with \(\nabla g(\zeta) = -\nabla g(\eta)\), \([\zeta, \eta] \cap \mathcal{V}_\omega = \emptyset\). Similarly, if \(\nabla g(\zeta) = -\nabla g(\eta)\), then \([\zeta, \eta] \cap \mathcal{V}_\omega = \emptyset\).

**Remark 3.9.** If the regularity condition (2.3) holds, Lemma B.1 implies that \((\text{ri } \mathcal{U}) \setminus \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{V}_\omega\) for \(\mathbb{P}\)-almost every \(\omega\). In other words, \(\mathcal{V}_\omega\) contains all points of non-differentiability of \(g\) almost surely. This turns the implications in part (b) above into equivalences.

The next theorem identifies \(\mathcal{V}_\omega\) as the set of directions with multiple semi-infinite geodesics. As before, the regularity condition (2.3) allows us to talk about general \(\mathcal{U}_\zeta\)-directed semi-infinite geodesics, instead of only the Busemann geodesics \(\gamma^{x,\xi\square}\).
Theorem 3.10. The following hold for $\mathbb{P}$-almost every $\omega$.

(a) $\xi \in (\ell(\mathcal{U}))(\mathcal{V})$ if and only if the following is true: $\gamma_{x,\xi}^+ = \gamma_{x,\xi}^-$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and all these geodesics coalesce.

(b) Under the regularity condition (2.3), $\xi \in (\ell(\mathcal{U}))(\mathcal{V})$ if and only if the following is true: there exists a unique $U_{\xi}$-directed semi-infinite geodesic out of every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and all these geodesics coalesce.

(c) Under the jump process condition (3.5) the existence of $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $\gamma_{x,\xi}^+ = \gamma_{x,\xi}^-$ implies $\xi \in (\ell(\mathcal{U}))(\mathcal{V})$. This in turn implies that $\gamma_{x,\xi}^+ = \gamma_{x,\xi}^-$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and that all these geodesics coalesce.

(d) Under both the regularity condition (2.3) and the jump process condition (3.5) having $\xi \in (\ell(\mathcal{U}))(\mathcal{V})$ implies that there exists a unique $U_{\xi}$-directed semi-infinite geodesic out of every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and that all these geodesics coalesce.

By the uniqueness of finite geodesics, two geodesics emanating from the same site $x$ cannot intersect after they separate. Consequently, non-uniqueness of semi-infinite directed geodesics implies the existence of non-coalescing semi-infinite directed geodesics. Theorem 3.10(d) shows that under conditions (2.3) and (3.5) also the converse holds: uniqueness of directed geodesics implies their coalescence.

We close this section with a theorem that collects those previously established properties of geodesics which hold when both the regularity condition (2.3) and the jump process condition (3.5) are in force.

Theorem 3.11. Assume the regularity condition (2.3) and the jump process condition (3.5). The following hold for $\mathbb{P}$-almost every $\omega$.

(a) $\xi \in \mathcal{V}_\omega$ if and only if there exist $x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $B_{\xi}^+(x,y) \neq B_{\xi}^-(x,y)$.

(b) $\xi \in \mathcal{V}_\omega$ if and only if there exists $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $\xi = \xi_*(T_{x\omega})$.

(c) If $\xi \in (\ell(\mathcal{U}))(\mathcal{V}_\omega)$, then for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, $\gamma_{x,\xi}^+ = \gamma_{x,\xi}^- = \gamma_{y,\xi}^-$ and this is the unique semi-infinite $U_{\xi}$-directed geodesic out of $x$. For any $x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, $\gamma_{x,\xi}^+$ and $\gamma_{y,\xi}^-$ coalesce.

(d) If $\xi \in \mathcal{V}_\omega$, then from each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ there exist at least two semi-infinite $\xi$-directed semi-infinite geodesics that separate eventually, namely $\gamma_{x,\xi}^+$ and $\gamma_{y,\xi}^-$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, $\gamma_{x,\xi}^+$ and $\gamma_{y,\xi}^-$ coalesce.

3.2. Exponential case. We specialize to the case where

$\{\omega_x : x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ are i.i.d. mean one exponential random variables.

Rost’s classic result [45] gives the shape function

$$g(\xi) = \left(\sqrt{\xi \cdot e_1} + \sqrt{\xi \cdot e_2}\right)^2, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}_+^2.$$  

The regularity condition (2.3) is satisfied as $g$ is strictly concave and differentiable on $\ell(\mathcal{U})$. The supports $\mu_{x,y}$ are unions of inhomogeneous Poisson processes and hence the jump process condition (3.5) is satisfied. This comes from [20, Theorem 3.4] and is described in Section 8.1. Thus Theorem 3.11 holds in the exponential case. Assumption (3.7) allows us to sharpen part (d) of Theorem 3.11.

Theorem 3.12. Assume (3.7). Then the conclusions of Theorem 3.11 hold with $U_{\xi} = \{\xi\}$ for all $\xi \in \ell(\mathcal{U})$. Additionally, the following holds $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely: if $\xi \in \mathcal{V}_\omega$ then from each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ there emanate exactly two semi-infinite $\xi$-directed geodesics that eventually separate, namely $\gamma_{x,\xi}^+$ and $\gamma_{x,\xi}^-$. Theorem 3.12 resolves a number of previously open problems on the geometry of geodesics in the exponential model. It shows that in all but countably many exceptional directions, the collection of geodesics with that asymptotic direction coalesce and form a tree. These exceptional directions are identified both with the directions of discontinuity of the Busemann process and the asymptotic directions of competition interfaces. Moreover, in each exceptional direction $\xi \in \mathcal{V}_\omega$, ...
ahead of each lattice site \( x \), there is a competition interface at which the \( \xi^+ \) and \( \xi^- \) geodesics out of \( x \) split. These are the only two \( \xi \)-directed geodesics rooted at \( x \). Strikingly, each of the two families of \( \xi^+ \) and \( \xi^- \) geodesics has the same structure as the collection of geodesics in a typical direction: each family forms a tree of coalescing semi-infinite paths.

In particular, almost surely, there is no direction in \( \mathbb{r} \mathbb{I} U \) in which there are three or more disjoint semi-infinite geodesics from any three lattice sites. The reason is that among three geodesics, two must have the same sign \( + \) or \( - \) and hence these two coalesce. Theorem 3.12 utilizes Theorem A.6, due to Coupier [14], that rules out three geodesics that have the same direction, emanate from a common vertex, and eventually separate. It appears that the modification argument of [14] cannot rule out three non-coalescing geodesics from distinct roots, and so Theorem 3.12 significantly extends Theorem A.6.

The results of Section 3 are proved in Section 6, except Lemma 3.6 which is proved at the end of Section 7.1.

4. Last-passage percolation as a dynamical system

4.1. Discrete Hamilton-Jacobi equations. We take now a dynamical point of view of LPP. Time proceeds in the negative diagonal direction \(-\hat{e}_1 = -e_1 - e_2\) and the spatial axis is \( \hat{e}_2 = e_2 - e_1 \). For each \( t \in \mathbb{Z} \), the spatial level at time \( t \) is \( L_t = \{ x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : x \cdot \hat{e}_1 = t \} \). For \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \) and \( A \subset \mathbb{Z}^2 \) let \( \Pi^A_x \) denote the set of up-right paths \( \pi_{k,m} \) such that \( \pi_k = x \) and \( \pi_m \in A \), where \( k = x \cdot \hat{e}_1 \) and \( m \) is any integer \( \geq k \) such that \( A \cap \Pi_{k}^m \neq \emptyset \). For each \( \xi \in \mathbb{r} \mathbb{I} U \) and sign \( \square \in \{ -, + \} \), the Busemann function \( B^\xi_\square \) satisfies the following equation: for all \( t \leq t_0 \) and \( x \in L_{t_0} \),

\[
B^\xi_\square(x,0) = \max \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^{t_0-1} \omega_{\pi_t} + B^\xi_\square(\pi_{t_0},0) : \pi \in \Pi^L_{x_{t_0}} \right\}.
\]

The unique maximizing path in (4.1) is the geodesic segment \( \gamma_{t_0}^{L,\xi_\square} \).

Equation (4.1) can be viewed as a discrete Hopf-Lax-Oleinik semigroup. For example, equation (4.1) is an obvious discrete analogue of the variational formula (1.3) of [4]. At first blush the two formulas appear different because (1.3) of [4] contains a kinetic energy term. However, this term is not needed in (4.1) above because all admissible steps are of size one and all paths between two levels have equal length.

Through this analogy with a Hopf-Lax-Oleinik semigroup we can regard \( B^\xi_\square(\cdot,0) \) as a global solution of a Hamilton-Jacobi equation started in the infinite past \( (t_0 \to \infty) \) and driven by the noise \( \omega \). The spatial difference \( B^\xi_\square(x+e_1,x+e_2) = B^\xi_\square(x+e_1,0) - B^\xi_\square(x+e_2,0) \) can then be viewed as a global solution of a discretized stochastic Burgers equation.

By Lemma B.2, if \( g \) is differentiable on \( \mathbb{r} \mathbb{I} U \), then \( B^\xi^+ \) and \( B^\xi^- \) both satisfy for each \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \)

\[
\lim_{|n| \to \infty} \frac{B^{\xi}_\square(x,x+n\hat{e}_2)}{n} = \nabla g(\xi) \cdot \hat{e}_2.
\]

Thus, \( B^{\xi}_\square \) are two solutions with the same value of the conserved quantity. Under the jump process condition (3.5), \( \xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x+e_1,x+e_2} \) if and only if \( B^{\xi}_\square(x+e_1,x+e_2) \neq B^{\xi}_\square(x+e_1,x+e_2) \). This means that the locations \( x \) where \( \xi \notin \text{supp} \mu_{x+e_1,x+e_2} \) are precisely the space-time points at which the two solutions \( B^{\xi}_\square \) differ. Moreover, by Theorem 3.1, \( \xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x+e_1,x+e_2} \) if and only if \( \gamma^{x+e_2} \cap \gamma^{x+e_1} = \emptyset \). This is analogous to two distinct Lagrangian minimizers from the infinite past terminating at a shock.

Significant attention has been devoted to understanding the statistics and structure of shocks in the continuous stochastic Burgers equation [3, 5, 8, 18, 47]. Our interest in the present section is to introduce a natural notion of a shock in our setting, which essentially agrees with the previous description. With these points in mind, we now define what we mean by shocks and then turn to studying their geometric structure.

4.2. Webs of shocks. For \( \xi \in \mathbb{r} \mathbb{I} U \) and \( \square \in \{ -, + \} \), let \( \mathcal{G}_{\xi_\square} \) be the directed graph whose vertex set is \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) and whose edge set includes \( (x,x+e_i) \) whenever \( \gamma_m^{x+e_\square} = x+e_i \). Here \( m = x \cdot \hat{e}_1 \) and we consider both \( i \in \{ 1, 2 \} \). These are the directed graphs of \( \xi_\square \) geodesics defined by (2.11). By
construction, each $G_{\xi\omega}$ is a disjoint union of trees, i.e., a forest, and for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, the geodesic $\gamma^{x,\xi\omega}$ follows the directed edges of $G_{\xi\omega}$.

Let $G^*_{\xi\omega}$ be the graph whose vertex set is the dual lattice $\mathbb{Z}^{2*} = \mathbb{Z}^2 + \hat{e}_1^*$ and whose edge set is defined by this rule: for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, on the dual lattice $x + \hat{e}_1^*$ points to $x + \hat{e}_1^* - e_i$ in $G^*_{\xi\omega}$ if and only if on the original lattice $x$ points to $x + e_i$ in $G_{\xi\omega}$. Pictorially this means that $G^*_{\xi\omega}$ contains all the east and south directed nearest-neighbor edges of $\mathbb{Z}^{2*}$ that do not cross an edge of $G_{\xi\omega}$. See Figure 4.1 for an illustration.

![Figure 4.1](image)

**Figure 4.1.** Left plot: An illustration of the duality relation between the edges of $G_{\xi\omega}$ and those of $G^*_{\xi\omega}$. Right plot: An illustration of a (blue/thick) north-east directed geodesic graph $G_{\xi\omega}$ and its (red/thin) south-west directed dual $G^*_{\xi\omega}$.

For $\zeta \leq \eta$ in $\mathcal{R}\mathcal{U}$ let the graph $G^*_{\zeta \cup [\zeta, \eta]}$ be the union of the two graphs $G^*_{\zeta +}$ and $G^*_{\zeta -}$. That is, the vertex set of $G^*_{\zeta \cup [\zeta, \eta]}$ is $\mathbb{Z}^{2*}$, and the set of edges of $G^*_{\zeta \cup [\zeta, \eta]}$ is the union of the edge sets of $G^*_{\zeta +}$ and $G^*_{\zeta -}$. It follows from the definitions that $G^*_{\zeta \cup [\zeta, \eta]}$ is the union of $G^*_{\zeta \pm}$ over $\xi \in [\zeta, \eta]$.

From each point $x^* \in \hat{e}_1^* + \mathbb{Z}^2$ a directed edge of $G^*_{\zeta \cup [\zeta, \eta]}$ points to $x^* - e_1$ or $x^* - e_2$ or both. Due to the monotonicity (2.9), $x^*$ points to $x^* - e_1$ in $G^*_{\zeta \cup [\zeta, \eta]}$ if and only if $x^* - \hat{e}_1^*$ points to $x^* - \hat{e}_2^*$ in $G_{\zeta +}$ and $x^*$ points to $x^* - e_2$ in $G^*_{\zeta \cup [\zeta, \eta]}$ if and only if $x - \hat{e}_1^*$ points to $x + \hat{e}_2^*$ in $G_{\zeta -}$.

Identify the space-time point $x + \hat{e}_1^* \in \mathbb{Z}^{2*}$ on the dual lattice with the diagonal edge that connects $x + e_1$ and $x + e_2$ on the primal lattice. See Figure 4.2.
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**Figure 4.2.** The edge $[x + e_1, x + e_2]$ is identified with the dual point $x^* = x + \hat{e}_1^*$.

Call dual lattice point $x^* = x + \hat{e}_1^*$ a $[\zeta, \eta]$-shock point if $[\zeta, \eta] \cap \text{supp} \mu_{x+e_1,x+e_2} \neq \emptyset$. If $\zeta = \eta = \xi$, $x^*$ is a $\xi$-shock point. Theorem 3.1 and the ordering (2.12) of geodesics give the following characterization in terms of disjoint geodesics.

**Lemma 4.1.** The following holds for $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{A}$-almost every $\omega$. For $\zeta < \eta$ in $\mathcal{R}\mathcal{U}$, $\xi \in \mathcal{R}\mathcal{U}$, and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, the dual point $x^* = x + \hat{e}_1^*$ is a $[\zeta, \eta]$-shock point if and only if $\gamma^{x+e_2,\xi -} \cap \gamma^{x+1,\eta +} = \emptyset$, and $x^*$ is a $\xi$-shock point if and only if $\gamma^{x+e_2,\xi -} \cap \gamma^{x+1,\xi +} = \emptyset$.

Denote the set of $[\zeta, \eta]$-shock points by $S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]}$. It follows from the definitions that $S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]}$ is the union of $S^*_\xi$ for $\xi \in [\zeta, \eta]$. 
Let $S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$ be the subgraph of $G_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$ with vertex set $S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$ and those directed edges of $G_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$ that point from some $x^* \in S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$ to $x^* - e_i \in S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$, for either $i \in \{1,2\}$. Write $S_{\xi}^*$ and $S_{\eta}^*$ for $S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$ and $S_{[\eta,\xi]}^*$. The following lemma is immediate. See Figures 4.3 and 4.4 for an illustration.

**Lemma 4.2.** The following holds for $\mathbb{P}$-almost every $\omega$. For any $\xi \leq \xi' \leq \eta \leq \eta'$ in $\text{ri}U$, $S_{[\xi',\eta']}^* \subseteq S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$, $G_{[\xi',\eta']}^* \subseteq G_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$, and $S_{[\xi',\eta']}^* \subseteq S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$. Furthermore, for any $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\xi < \eta$ in $\text{ri}U$ there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that if $|\xi' - \xi| < \varepsilon$ and $|\eta' - \eta| < \varepsilon$, then $S_{[\xi',\eta']}^* = S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$, $G_{[\xi',\eta']}^* = G_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$, and $S_{[\xi,\eta]}^* = S_{[\xi',\eta']}^*$ inside the finite square $[-L,L]^2 \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$.
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**Figure 4.3.** Four nested down-left pointing $S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$ graphs in red in the square $[-100,100]^2$. Top to bottom, left to right, in reading order, $[\xi \cdot e_1, \eta \cdot e_1]$ equals $[0.096, 0.772]$, $[0.219, 0.595]$, $[0.318, 0.476]$, and $[0.355, 0.436]$. Two further nested sub-graphs appear in Figure 4.4. In the simulation we chose the direction $\xi$ to be a jump point of the Busemann process on the edge $(0,e_1)$.

We introduce terminology to describe the structure of the graph $S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$. For $x^*, y^* \in S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$ we say that $y^*$ is an *ancestor* of $x^*$ or, equivalently that $x^*$ is a *descendant* of $y^*$, if there is a path of directed edges in the graph $S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$ from $y^*$ to $x^*$. If the path from $y^*$ to $x^*$ is a single edge, in which case $x^* \in \{y^* - e_1, y^* - e_2\}$, we say that $y^*$ is a *parent* of $x^*$ and $x^*$ is an *offspring* of $y^*$. Let $A_{[\xi,\eta]}(x^*)$ denote the set of ancestors of $x^*$ in the graph $S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$. Abbreviate again $A_{[\xi,\eta]}(x^*) = A_{[\xi,\eta]}(x^*)$.

A point $x^* \in S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$ is a *branch point* (for the $(\xi,\eta)$-shocks) if it is an ancestor of both $x^* - e_1$ and $x^* - e_2$. Similarly, $x^* \in S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$ is a *coalescence point* if both $x^* + e_1$ and $x^* + e_2$ are ancestors of $x^*$.

The next theorem collects the main properties of nonempty shock graphs $S_{[\xi,\eta]}^*$. For two parts of the theorem we invoke one more condition, namely, the non-existence of non-trivial bi-infinite
Figure 4.4. Continuing with the simulation setting of Figure 4.3, the top two pictures are $S_{\zeta, \eta}^*$ graphs in $[-100, 100]^2$ with $[\zeta \cdot e_1, \eta \cdot e_1] = [0.374, 0.417]$ (left) and $[0.393, 0.397]$ (right). The two graphs are in fact identical. The pictures on the second row zoom into the framed squares of the top right picture, the left one into the square $[-20, 20]^2$ and the right one into $[-10, 10]^2$. Besides the down-left pointing red $S_{\zeta, \eta}^*$ graphs, the bottom pictures include the up-right pointing graphs $G_{\zeta^+}$ (green/lighter) and $G_{\eta^+}$ (purple/darker). Whenever $G_{\zeta^+}$ and $G_{\eta^+}$ separate at $x$, green points up and purple points right, and $S_{\zeta, \eta}^*$ has a branch point at $x + e_1^*$.

There exists a full $\mathbb{P}$-probability event on which the only bi-infinite geodesics are the trivial ones: $x + Ze_i$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

There exists a full $\mathbb{P}$-probability event on which the only bi-infinite geodesics are the trivial ones: $x + Ze_i$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

The key message of the next theorem is that every shock point has both ancestors and descendants, and hence lies on a bi-infinite path in the graph $S_{\zeta, \eta}^*$. These lines of ancestry branch out exactly at points dual to those where $\zeta^+$ and $\eta^-$ geodesics separate. Under the jump process condition (3.5), any two shock points have a common ancestor. Under the no bi-infinite geodesics condition (4.2) any two shock points also share a common descendant. If both (3.5) and (4.2) hold, there are infinitely many coalescence points. See Figures 4.3 and 4.4, especially the last two figures in 4.4, for simulations.

**Theorem 4.3.** The following hold for $\mathbb{P}$-almost every $\omega$ and all $\zeta \leq \eta$ in $\mathcal{R}_U$ such that $[\zeta, \eta] \cap \mathcal{V}^\omega \neq \emptyset$. The case $\zeta = \eta = \xi$ is included unless otherwise stated.

(a) **Shock points exist:** $S_{\zeta, \eta}^* \neq \emptyset$. 

(b) Any path that starts at a shock point \( x^* \in S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \) and takes steps in \( \{-e_1, -e_2\} \) along edges of \( G^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \) remains entirely in \( S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \). In particular, each \( x^* \in S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \) is the starting point of an infinite path in \( S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \).

(c) For any point \( x^* \in S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \), there exists a semi-infinite up-right path \( x^*_{\infty, x} \) of points in \( S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \) emanating from \( x^*_m = x^* \) and such that for all \( n \geq m \), \( x^*_n - x^*_m \in \{e_1, e_2\} \) and \( x^*_n \) is a parent of \( x^*_m \) in \( S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \). All such paths are \( [\zeta, \eta] \)-directed.

(d) \( x^* \) is a branch point in \( S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \) if and only if \( \xi_s(T_{x^* \to \xi} \omega) \in [\zeta, \eta] \).

(e) If \( \zeta < \eta \), then any \( x^*, y^* \in S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \) have a common descendant: \( \exists z^* \in S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \) such that \( x^*, y^* \in A^*_{[\zeta, \eta]}(z^*) \). If we assume the no bi-infinite geodesics condition (4.2), then the same statement holds if \( \zeta = \eta \).

(f) Assume the jump process condition (3.5). Then any \( x^*, y^* \in S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \) have a common ancestor \( z^* \in A^*_{[\zeta, \eta]}(x^*) \cap A^*_{[\zeta, \eta]}(y^*) \).

(g) If \( \zeta < \eta \) are such that \( [\zeta, \eta] \cap V^\omega \not= \emptyset \), then there are infinitely many branch points and infinitely many coalescence points in \( S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \).

(h) If the jump process condition (3.5) holds and \( \xi \in V^\omega \), then there are infinitely many branch points in \( S^*_\xi \). If additionally the no bi-infinite geodesics condition (4.2) holds, then there are infinitely many coalescence points in \( S^*_\xi \).

Remark 4.4. If regularity condition (2.3) holds, then part (g) holds for \( \zeta < \eta \) with \( [\zeta, \eta] \cap V^\omega \not= \emptyset \). The proof of this is given right after that of Theorem 4.3.

Given that there are infinitely many shock points when shock points exist, it is natural to wonder what their density on the lattice is. We identify the following trichotomy.

Proposition 4.5. Assume the regularity condition (2.3). Then for \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost every \( \omega \) and all \( \xi \in ri\mathcal{U} \), exactly one of the following three scenarios happens:

(a) \( \xi \notin V^\omega \) and hence there are no \( \xi \)-shock points.

(b) \( \xi \in V^\omega \cap \mathcal{D} \) and there are infinitely many \( \xi \)-shock points but they have 0 density.

(c) \( \xi \notin \mathcal{D} \) and \( \xi \)-shock points have positive density.

We return to this question in Section 5 in the solvable case of exponential weights, where we can say significantly more.

4.3. Flow of Busemann measure. As discussed in Section 4.1, we can think of the function \( B^\omega(x + e_1, x + e_2) \) as a global solution of a discretized stochastic Burgers equation. We can assign the value \( B^\omega(x + e_1, x + e_2) \) to the dual point \( x^* = x + \hat{c}_1^* \) that represents the diagonal edge \( (x + e_1, x + e_2) \). Then the cocycle property (2.6) gives us a flow of Busemann measure along the south and west pointing edges of the dual lattice \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \). First decompose the Busemann measure of the edge \( (x + e_1, x + e_2) \) as a sum \( \mu_{x+e_1,x+e_2} = \mu_{x+e_1,x} + \mu_{x+e_2,x} \) of two positive measures. This is justified by the cocycle property (2.6). Then stipulate that measure \( \mu_{x+e_1,x} \) flows south from \( x^* \) to \( x^* - e_2 \) and contributes to Busemann measure \( \mu_{x-e_2,x} \), while measure \( \mu_{x+e_2,x} \) flows west from \( x^* \) to \( x^* - e_1 \) and contributes to Busemann measure \( \mu_{x,x+e_1} \). See Figure 4.5.

The cocycle property also tells us that \( \mu_{x+e_1,x+e_2} \) as the sum of the contributions it receives from the next level up: \( \mu_{x+e_1,x+e_1} \) comes from the east from dual vertex \( x + e_1 + \hat{c}_1^* \), while \( \mu_{x+e_1,x+e_2} \) comes from the north from dual vertex \( x + e_2 + \hat{c}_1^* \).

Now pick a pair of directions \( \zeta \leq \eta \) in \( ri\mathcal{U} \), and consider the graph \( B^\omega_{[\zeta, \eta]} \) on the dual lattice \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) obtained as follows. Include vertex \( x^* = x + \hat{c}_1^* \) if \( [\zeta, \eta] \cap supp \mu_{x+e_1,x+e_1} \not= \emptyset \). For \( i \in \{1, 2\} \), include dual edge \( (x^*, x^* - e_i) \) if \( [\zeta, \eta] \) intersects \( supp \mu_{x+e_{i-1},x} \), or somewhat pictorially, if some of the support in \( [\zeta, \eta] \) flows along the dual edge \( (x^*, x^* - e_i) \).

The results of this section hold \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost surely simultaneously for all \( \zeta \leq \eta \) in \( ri\mathcal{U} \).

Theorem 4.6. The graphs \( B^\omega_{[\zeta, \eta]} \) and \( S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]} \) are the same.
Under the jump condition (3.5), a closed set cannot intersect the support without actually having nonzero measure. Thus under (3.5), Theorem 4.6 tells us that \( S^*_{\zeta, \eta} \) is precisely the graph along which positive Busemann measure in the interval \([\zeta, \eta]\) flows.

Next we describe the “islands” on \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) carved out by the paths of the graph \( S^*_{\zeta, \eta} \) (the islands surrounded by red paths in Figures 4.3 and 4.4). It turns out that these islands are trees, they are the connected components of an intersection of geodesic graphs, and they are the equivalence classes of an equivalence relation defined in terms of the supports of Busemann measures.

Define the graph \( G_{r, \zeta, \eta} = \bigcap_{\xi \in [\zeta, \eta]} (G_{r, \xi -} \cap G_{r, \xi +}) \) on the vertex set \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) by keeping only those edges that lie in each geodesic graph \( G_{r, \xi} \) as \( \xi \) varies over \([\zeta, \eta]\) and \( \square \) over \((-+, +)\). Also, directly from the definitions follows that an edge of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) lies in \( G_{r, \zeta, \eta} \) if and only if the dual edge it crosses does not lie in \( G_{r, \zeta, \eta}^* \), the graph introduced in Section 4.2. Since each \( G_{r, \xi} \) is a forest, \( G_{r, \zeta, \eta} \) is a forest, that is, a union of disjoint trees. A priori these trees can be finite or infinite.

Define an equivalence relation \( [\zeta, \eta] \) on \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) by \( x \equiv_{[\zeta, \eta]} y \) if and only if \( \supp \mu_{x,y} \cap [\zeta, \eta] = \emptyset \). It is an equivalence relation because \( \mu_{x,x} \) is the identically zero measure, and \( B_{[\zeta, \eta]} = B_{[\zeta, \eta]}^* + B_{[\zeta, \eta]}^* \) implies that \( |\mu_{x,z}| \leq |\mu_{x,y}| + |\mu_{y,z}| \). By Propositions 6.1 and 6.2, \( x \equiv_{[\zeta, \eta]} y \) if and only if \( z^{\pm}(x,y) \) remains constant in \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) as \( \xi \) varies across \([\zeta, \eta]\). As usual, replace \( [\zeta, \eta] \) with \( [\xi, \xi] \) when \( [\zeta, \eta] = [\xi, \xi] \).

**Proposition 4.7.** The equivalence classes of the relation \( [\zeta, \eta] \) are exactly the connected components (subtrees) of \( G_{r, [\zeta, \eta]} \).

The next two lemmas indicate how the structure of a subtree of \( G_{r, [\zeta, \eta]} \) is constrained by the fact that it is an intersection of geodesic trees.

**Lemma 4.8.** Let \( \mathcal{K} \) be a subtree of \( G_{r, [\zeta, \eta]} \) and let \( x \) and \( y \) be two distinct vertices of \( \mathcal{K} \). Assume that neither strictly dominates the other in the coordinatewise ordering, that is, both coordinatewise strict inequalities \( x < y \) and \( y < x \) fail. Then the entire rectangle \( [x \wedge y, x \vee y] \) is a subset of the vertex set of \( \mathcal{K} \).

In particular, if for some integers \( \{k, \ell\} \), level-\( t \) lattice points \( (k, t-k) \) and \( (\ell, t-\ell) \) are vertices of a subtree \( \mathcal{K} \), the entire discrete interval \( \{i : i \in [k, \ell]\} \) is a subset of the vertex set of \( \mathcal{K} \). Similarly, points on horizontal and vertical line segments between vertices of a subtree \( \mathcal{K} \) are again vertices of \( \mathcal{K} \).

**Lemma 4.9.** Let \( \mathcal{K} \) be a subtree of \( G_{r, [\zeta, \eta]} \). There is at most one vertex \( x \) in \( \mathcal{K} \) such that \( \{x - e_1, x - e_2\} \cap \mathcal{K} = \emptyset \). Such a point \( x \) exists if and only if \( \inf\{t \in \mathbb{Z} : \mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{L}_t \neq \emptyset\} > -\infty \). In that case \( \mathcal{K} \) lies in \( \{y : y \geq x\} \).

Note that Lemma 4.9 does not say that a subtree has a single leaf. See the last picture in Figure 4.4 where one can clearly see the structure of \( G_{r, [\zeta, \eta]} \) and its subtrees.
Lemma 7.5 showed that nearest-neighbor points are in distinct \([\zeta, \eta]\) equivalence classes if and only if the edge between them is bisected by an edge of the shock graph \(S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]}\). Together with Lemma 4.7 this tells us that the paths of \(S^*_{[\zeta, \eta]}\) are precisely the boundaries that separate distinct connected components of \(G_{\zeta, \eta}\) and the equivalence classes of \(\{\zeta, \eta\}\).

Under the jump condition (3.5) we can give a sharper description of the subtrees of \(G_{\zeta, \eta}\). Let \(D_{[\zeta, \eta]} = \{ z \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \xi_0(T_z) \in [\zeta, \eta] \}\). Assume for the moment that \(D_{[\zeta, \eta]} \neq \emptyset\). By Theorem 3.8, under the jump condition (3.5) this is equivalent to \([\zeta, \eta] \cap V^\omega = \emptyset\).

The graph \(G_{\zeta, \eta}\) has no outgoing up or right edges from a point \(z \in D_{[\zeta, \eta]}\) because geodesics split: \(\gamma^{x, \xi_0(T_z)}\) and \(\{ \gamma^{x, \xi_0(T_z)} : \zeta \leq \xi < \xi_0(T_z) \}\) take the e_2-step at \(z\), while \(\gamma^{x, \xi_0(T_z)}\) and \(\{ \gamma^{x, \xi_0(T_z)} : \xi_0(T_z) < \xi \leq \eta \}\) take the e_1-step at \(z\). Each \(x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus D_{[\zeta, \eta]}\) lies in a unique \(K(z)\) determined by following the common path of the geodesics \(\{ \gamma^{x, \xi_0(T_z)} : \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \}\) until the first point \(z\) at which a split happens. A split must happen eventually because for any \(u \in D_{[\zeta, \eta]}\) the two geodesics \(\gamma^{x, \xi_0(T_z)}\) separate immediately at \(u\), while by Theorem 3.5 the geodesic \(\gamma^{x, \xi_0(T_z)}\) coalesces with \(\gamma^{u, \xi_0(T_z)}\) for both \(\emptyset \in \{-+, +\}\).

**Theorem 4.10.** Assume the jump condition (3.5).

(a) \(G_{\zeta, \eta}\) is a single tree if and only if \([\zeta, \eta] \cap V^\omega = \emptyset\).

(b) If \([\zeta, \eta] \cap V^\omega = \emptyset\), the connected components of \(G_{\zeta, \eta}\) are the trees \(\{K(z) : z \in D_{[\zeta, \eta]}\}\).

The results of Section 4 are proved in Section 7.1.

5. Shock statistics in the exponential model

Under condition (3.7), i.e. when the weights are exponentially distributed, we derive explicit statistics of the shock graphs. For \(\xi \in riU, k \in \mathbb{Z}\), and \(\emptyset \in \{-+, +\}\), abbreviate \(B_k^{\xi, \eta} = B^{\xi, \eta}(ke_1, (k + 1)e_1)\) and write \(B_k^{\eta}\) when there is no ± distinction. For \(\zeta \leq \eta\) in \(riU\) let

\[
\cdots < \tau^{\xi, \eta}(1) < 0 < \tau^{\xi, \eta}(0) < \tau^{\xi, \eta}(1) < \cdots
\]

be the ordered indices such that

\[
B_k^{\xi} > B_k^{\eta} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad k \in \{\tau^{\xi, \eta}(i) : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}.
\]

If \(B_k^{\xi} > B_k^{\eta}\) happens for only finitely many indices \(k\), then some \(\tau^{\xi, \eta}(i)\) are set equal to \(-\infty\) or \(\infty\). It is convenient to parametrize directions in \(riU\) through the increasing bijection

\[
\alpha = \alpha(\zeta) = \frac{(\alpha^2 + (1 - \alpha)^2)(1 - \alpha)^2}{(1 - \alpha)^2 + \alpha^2} \iff \zeta = \zeta(\alpha) = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha \cdot e_1}}{\sqrt{\xi \cdot e_1} + \sqrt{1 - \zeta \cdot e_1}}
\]

between \(\zeta \in riU\) and \(\alpha \in (0, 1)\). Recall that the Catalan numbers \(\{C_n : n \geq 0\}\) are given by \(C_n = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n}\).

**Theorem 5.1.** Assume (3.7). Fix \(\zeta < \eta\) in \(riU\). Conditional on \(B_0^{\xi} > B_0^{\eta}\), \(\{\tau^{\xi, \eta}(i + 1) - \tau^{\xi, \eta}(i), B_{\tau^{\xi, \eta}(i)}^{\xi} - B_{\tau^{\xi, \eta}(i)}^{\eta} : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}\) is an i.i.d. sequence with marginal distribution

\[
P(\tau^{\xi, \eta}(i + 1) - \tau^{\xi, \eta}(i) = n, B_{\tau^{\xi, \eta}(i)}^{\xi} - B_{\tau^{\xi, \eta}(i)}^{\eta} > r | B_0^{\xi} > B_0^{\eta})
\]

\[
= C_{n-1} \frac{\alpha(\zeta)^{n-1} \alpha(\eta)^n}{(\alpha(\zeta) + \alpha(\eta))^{2n-1}} e^{-\alpha(\zeta) r}, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}, n \in \mathbb{N}, r \in \mathbb{R}_+.\]

Abbreviate \(\tau^{\xi}(i) = \tau^{\xi, \eta}(i)\). Our next goal is to describe the joint distribution of processes \(\{\tau^{\xi}(i) : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}, B_{\tau^{\xi}(i)}^{\xi} - B_{\tau^{\xi}(i)}^{\eta}\) of locations and sizes of jumps in direction \(\xi\), conditional on \(B_0^{\xi} > B_0^{\eta}\). For a fixed \(\xi\), however, we have \(B^{\xi, \eta} = B^{\xi} \) almost surely and so this conditioning will need be understood in the Palm sense, which is natural for conditioning on a jump of a point process at a particular location.
In the theorem below, Lebesgue measure on \( \mathcal{U} \) refers to one-dimensional Lebesgue measure (length of a line segment). The Lebesgue-almost every qualifier is in the theorem because the Palm kernel is defined only up to Lebesgue-null sets of the points \( \xi \). We denote Palm conditioning with two vertical lines \( \| \) to distinguish it from ordinary conditioning.

**Theorem 5.2.** Assume (3.7). For Lebesgue-almost every \( \xi \in \mathcal{U} \), under the Palm kernel, conditional on \( B_0^\xi \| B_0^\xi \), \( \{ \tau^\xi(i + 1) - \tau^\xi(i), B_{\tau^\xi(i)}^\xi - B_{\tau^\xi(i)}^\xi : i \in \mathbb{Z} \} \) is an i.i.d. sequence with marginal distribution

\[
P\{ \tau^\xi(i + 1) - \tau^\xi(i) = n, B_{\tau^\xi(i)}^\xi - B_{\tau^\xi(i)}^\xi > r \| B_0^\xi \| B_0^\xi \} = C_{n-1} \frac{1}{2^{2n-1}} e^{-\alpha(\xi) r}, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}, n \in \mathbb{N}, r \in \mathbb{R}_+.
\]

A precise definition of the Palm conditioning in (5.4) appears in equation (8.5) at the end of Section 8.1.

Equation (5.4) connects the Palm distribution of the locations of jumps of the Busemann SSRW, that is, \( S_n \) denote a two-sided SSRW, that is, \( S_n = 0 \) and \( S_n - S_m = \sum_{i=m+1}^{n} Z_i \) for all \( m < n \) in \( \mathbb{Z} \) where \( \{ Z_i \}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \) are i.i.d. with \( P(Z_i = \pm 1) = 1/2 \). Set \( \rho_n = 1_{\{S_{2n} = 0 \}} \) and let \( \mathbf{P} \) be the distribution of \( \rho = \{ \rho_n \}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \) on the sequence space \( \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{Z} \). That is, \( \mathbf{P} \) is the law of the zero set of simple symmetric random walk sampled at even times. The classical inter-arrival distribution of this renewal process is (equ. III.3(3.7) on p. 78 of Feller [21])

\[
\mathbf{P}(\rho_1 = 0, \ldots, \rho_{n-1} = 0, \rho_n = 1) = C_{n-1} \frac{1}{2^{2n-1}}.
\]

Comparison of (5.4) and (5.5) reveals that for Lebesgue-almost every \( \xi \), the Palm distribution of the locations of \( \xi \)-shock points on a line is the same as the law of the zero set of SSRW sampled at every time. (We record this fact precisely as Lemma 8.2.) The next result applies this to show that any translation invariant event which holds with probability one for the zero set of SSRW holds for all of the shock graphs simultaneously almost surely.

**Theorem 5.3.** Suppose \( A \) is a translation-invariant Borel subset of \( \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{Z} \) that satisfies \( \mathbf{P}(A) = 1 \). Then

\[
P\{ \forall \xi \in \mathcal{V}^\omega : \{ 1 \{ B_{\ell_i}^\xi > B_{\ell_i}^\xi \} : \ell \in \mathbb{Z} \} \in A \} = 1.
\]

From (5.6) and known facts about random walk, we can derive a few corollaries. From [44, equation (10.8)], we deduce that

\[
P\{ \forall \xi \in \mathcal{V}^\omega : \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{n} 1 \{ B_{\ell_i}^\xi > B_{\ell_i}^\xi \}}{\sqrt{\log \log n}} = 1 \} = 1.
\]

From [44, Theorem 11.1] we also find that for a nonincreasing \( \delta_n \),

\[
P\{ \forall \xi \in \mathcal{V}^\omega : n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=0}^{n} 1 \{ B_{\ell_i}^\xi > B_{\ell_i}^\xi \} \geq \delta_n \quad \text{for all sufficiently large } n \} = 1
\]

if \( \sum_{n} \delta_n/n < \infty \) and

\[
P\{ \forall \xi \in \mathcal{V}^\omega : n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=0}^{n} 1 \{ B_{\ell_i}^\xi > B_{\ell_i}^\xi \} \leq \delta_n \quad \text{infinitely often} \} = 1
\]

otherwise. Similar statements hold for the sums \( \sum_{n=0}^{n} \). This implies that for \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost every \( \omega \) and any \( \xi \in \mathcal{V}^\omega \), the number of horizontal edges \( (k\ell_1, (k+1)\ell_1) \) with \( \xi \in \text{supp } \mu_{k\ell_1,(k+1)\ell_1} \) and \( -n \leq k \leq n \) is of order \( n^{1/2} \). It suggests the number of such horizontal edges (and thus also vertical edges and \( \xi \)-shock points) in an \( n \times n \) box should be of order \( n^{3/2} \). The next theorem gives the precise statement of the upper bound and we leave the lower bound for future work.
Theorem 5.4. Assume (3.7) and fix $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then for any $\zeta \in \mathfrak{r} \mathfrak{u}$
\[ P \left\{ \exists n_0 : \forall \xi \in [\zeta, \varepsilon_2], \forall n \geq n_0 : \sum_{x \in [0, n]^2} 1 \{ \xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x, x + e_i} \} \leq 2n^{3/2} \log n \} = 1. \]

The same holds when $[0, n]^2$ is replaced by any of $[-n, 0]^2$, $[0, n] \times [-n, 0]$, or $[-n, 0] \times [0, n]$.

This completes the presentation of the main results. The remaining sections cover the proofs.

6. Busemann measures: proofs

The remaining sections of the paper depend on Appendix A, where prior results from the literature are collected. The reader may wish to look through that appendix before proceeding; in particular, we will work on the $T$-invariant full-measure event $\Omega_0$ constructed in (A.9).

Recall the forests $G_{\xi \pm}$ defined in Section 4.2 and the fixed countable dense set $\mathcal{U}_0 \subset \mathcal{D}$ of points of differentiability which appear following Theorem A.1 and are part of the definition of (A.9). Recall the definition (3.3) of the coalescence point $z^{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)$. When $z^{\mathcal{C}}(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, equation (2.14) leads to the following identity, which is fundamental to the analysis that follows:

\[ B^{\mathcal{C}}(x, y) = \log(1 - 2^{-\lambda}) \cdot (x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2. \]

By Theorem A.4(b), for all $\omega \in \Omega_0$, all $\xi \in \mathcal{U}_0$, and all $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, both $z^{\ell}(x, y)$ and $z^{\ell-}(x, y)$ are in $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

We begin with a few results linking analytic properties of the Busemann process and coalescence points.

Proposition 6.1. For all $\omega \in \Omega_0$, for any $\zeta < \eta$ in $\mathfrak{r} \mathfrak{u}$, and any $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, the following statements are equivalent.

(i) $|\mu_{x,y}|(\zeta, \eta) = 0$.

(ii) $B^{\zeta}(x, y) = B^{\eta}(x, y)$ and $z^{\zeta}(x, y), z^{\eta}(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

(iii) There exists $z \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that the following holds. For any $\pi \in \{ (\gamma, x, \zeta, \eta) : \xi \in \zeta, \eta \}$, $\gamma \in \{-, +\}$ and any $\pi' \in \{ (\gamma, x, \zeta, \eta) : \xi \in \zeta, \eta \}$, $\gamma \in \{-, +\}$ and $z$ is the first point where $\pi$ and $\pi'$ intersect: $z \cdot \hat{e}_1 = \min\{ z' \cdot \hat{e}_1 : z' \in \pi \cap \pi' \}$.

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). Under (i) the functions $\xi \mapsto B^{\mathcal{C}}_{x, y}$ match for $\square \in \{-, +\}$ and are constant on the open interval $[\zeta, \eta]$. $B^{\zeta}(x, y) = B^{\eta}(x, y)$ follows by taking limits $\xi \searrow \zeta$ and $\xi \nearrow \eta$.

Since on $[\zeta, \eta] \cap \mathcal{U}_0$, $\xi \mapsto B^{\xi}_{x, y}$ is constant and $z^{\xi}(x, y)$ is constant in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ for all $\xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \cap \mathcal{U}_0$. Since $\mathcal{U}_0$ is dense in $[\zeta, \eta]$, limits (3.4) as $\xi \searrow \zeta$ and $\xi \nearrow \eta$ imply that $z^{\zeta}(x, y), z^{\eta}(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). Set $k = x \cdot \hat{e}_1$, $\ell = y \cdot \hat{e}_1$. With both $z^{\ell}(x, y)$ and $z^{\ell-}(x, y)$ in $\mathbb{Z}^2$, we also set $m = z^{\ell}(x, y) \cdot \hat{e}_1$, and $n = z^{\ell-}(x, y) \cdot \hat{e}_1$. By (6.1),

\[ B^{\zeta}_{x, y} = \log(1 - 2^{-\lambda}) \cdot (x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2. \]

By condition (A.7), $B^{\mathcal{C}}_{x, y} = B^{\mathcal{C}}_{x, y}$ forces $m = n$, $\gamma_{x, m} = \gamma_{k, m}$, and $\gamma_{k, m} = \gamma_{k, m}$. (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv). With $m = z^{\ell}(x, y) \cdot \hat{e}_1 = z^{\ell-}(x, y) \cdot \hat{e}_1$, uniqueness of finite geodesics implies $\gamma_{x, m} = \gamma_{x, m}$ and $\gamma_{k, m} = \gamma_{k, m}$. Then monotonicity (2.12) gives $\gamma_{k, m} = \gamma_{k, m} = \gamma_{k, m}$ and
Proof of Theorem 3.1. Fix \( \omega \in \Omega_0 \) and all \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \), the following are equivalent:

(i) \( \xi \notin \text{supp} \mu_{x,y} \).

(ii) \( z^\xi_\ell(x, y) = z^\xi_\ell(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \).

(iii) \( B^\xi_\ell(x, y) = B^\xi_\ell(x, y) \) and \( z^\xi_\ell(x, y), z^\xi_\ell(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \).

Proof. Let \( x \cdot \hat{c}_1 = k \) and \( y \cdot \hat{c}_1 = \ell \). Take sequences \( \zeta_n, \eta_n \in \mathcal{U}_0 \) with \( \zeta_n \searrow \xi \) and \( \eta_n \searrow \eta \). Since \( \zeta_n, \eta_n \in \mathcal{U}_0 \), we have \( z^{\xi_\ell(x, y)}(x, y), z^{\eta_\ell(x, y)}(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \) for all \( n \). Furthermore, \( B^{\xi_\ell}(x, y) \to B^{\xi_\ell}(x, y) \) and \( B^{\eta_\ell}(x, y) \to B^{\eta_\ell}(x, y) \) as \( n \to \infty \).

(i) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii). If \( \xi \notin \text{supp} \mu_{x,y} \), then \( \xi \to B^{\xi_\ell}(x, y) \) is constant on some neighborhood of \( \xi \). Then (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (iv) from Proposition 6.1 gives (ii).

(ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (iii). Let \( m = z^{\xi_\ell}(x, y) \cdot \hat{c}_1 = z^{\xi_\ell}(x, y) \cdot \hat{c}_1 \). Then uniqueness of finite geodesics implies that \( \gamma_{k,m}^{\xi_\ell} = \gamma_{k,m}^{\xi_\ell} = \gamma_{k,m}^{\eta_\ell} \cdot (2.13) \) implies that for sufficiently large \( n \), \( \gamma_{k,m}^{\xi_\ell} = \gamma_{k,m}^{\xi_\ell} \), \( \gamma_{m}^{\xi_\ell} = \gamma_{m}^{\xi_\ell} \), and \( \gamma_{m}^{\eta_\ell} = \gamma_{m}^{\eta_\ell} \). For these large \( n \),

\[
B^{\xi_\ell}(x, y) = G(x, z^{\xi_\ell}(x, y)) - G(y, z^{\xi_\ell}(x, y))
\]

Taking \( n \to \infty \) gives \( B^{\xi_\ell}(x, y) = B^{\xi_\ell}(x, y) \). Claim (iii) is proved.

(iii) \( \Rightarrow \) (i). By (6.1) and convergence of geodesics (2.13), \( B^{\xi_\ell}(x, y) = B^{\xi_\ell}(x, y) = B^{\eta_\ell}(x, y) \) for sufficiently large \( n \). But now the equivalence between (iii) and (i) in Proposition 6.1 implies that for such \( n \), both processes are constant on the interval \( [\zeta_n, \eta_n] \). Therefore \( \xi \notin \text{supp} \mu_{x,y} \).

With these results in hand, we next turn to the proofs of our main results.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Fix \( \omega \in \Omega_0 \), \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \), and \( \xi \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U} \). Suppose that (i) does not hold, i.e. \( \xi \notin \text{supp} \mu_{x,y} \). By Proposition 6.2, we have \( z^\xi_\ell(x, y) = z^\xi_\ell(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \), in which case both \( \gamma^{x,\xi_\ell} \cap \gamma^{y,\xi_\ell} \) and \( \gamma^{x,\xi_\ell} \cap \gamma^{y,\xi_\ell} \) include this common point and thus (ii) is false. This proves that (ii) implies (i).

Now, suppose that \( \xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x,y} \) and that \( \gamma^{x,\xi_\ell} \cap \gamma^{y,\xi_\ell} \neq \emptyset \) and \( \gamma^{x,\xi_\ell} \cap \gamma^{y,\xi_\ell} \neq \emptyset \). Call \( y \cdot \hat{c}_1 = m \) and \( x \cdot \hat{c}_1 = k \) and without loss of generality assume that \( k \leq m \). Let \( z_1 \) denote the first point at which \( \gamma^{x,\xi_\ell} \) and \( \gamma^{y,\xi_\ell} \) meet and call \( z_2 \) the first point at which \( \gamma^{x,\xi_\ell} \) and \( \gamma^{y,\xi_\ell} \) meet. Let \( \ell_1 = z_1 \cdot \hat{c}_1 \) and \( \ell_2 = z_2 \cdot \hat{c}_1 \). We denote by \( u \) the leftmost (i.e. smallest \( \ell_1 \) coordinates) of the three points \( \gamma_{m}^{x,\xi_\ell}, y, \gamma_{m}^{y,\xi_\ell} \) and let \( v \) the rightmost of these three points. Note that if \( u = v \), then \( z^{\xi_\ell}(x, y) = z^{\xi_\ell}(x, y) \), which would imply that \( \xi \notin \text{supp} \mu_{x,y} \). We thus assume \( u \neq v \) and consider two cases: either \( y \in \{u, v\} \) or not. We show a contradiction in both cases.
First, we work out the case \( v = y \), with the case of \( y = u \) being similar. See the left picture in Figure 6.1 for an illustration. In this case we have, for all \( n \geq m \), \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{+} \leq \gamma_{n,\xi}^{++} \leq \gamma_{n,\xi}^{-} \) and \( \gamma_{n,\xi}^{-} \leq \gamma_{v,\xi}^{-} \leq \gamma_{n,\xi}^{+} \). In words, \( \gamma_{y,\xi}^{+} \) is the rightmost geodesic and \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{-} \) is the leftmost geodesic among the four geodesics \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{+}, \gamma_{x,\xi}^{-} \). By the path ordering (2.12) and planarity, it must then be the case that \( z_1 \) lies on all four geodesics. But then by uniqueness of finite geodesics, it must be the case that \( \gamma_{k,\ell_1}^{+} = \gamma_{m,\ell_1}^{-} \) and similarly \( \gamma_{m,\ell_1}^{+} = \gamma_{m,\ell_1}^{-} \). It follows that \( z_1 = z^{\xi+}(x, y) = z^{\xi-}(x, y) \), contradicting \( \xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x,y} \).

![Figure 6.1](image)

**Figure 6.1.** Proof of Theorem 3.1. \( \xi^{+} \) geodesics are in purple with medium thickness. \( \xi^{-} \) geodesics are in green and thin.

If \( y \notin \{u, v\} \), then we have \( u = \gamma_{m,\xi}^{+}, v = \gamma_{m,\xi}^{-} \). See the right picture in Figure 6.1 for an illustration. In this case, \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{+} \) and \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{-} \) have already split and so cannot meet again by uniqueness of finite geodesics. Similarly, once \( \gamma_{v,\xi}^{-} \) and \( \gamma_{y,\xi}^{+} \) split, they cannot meet again. But we also know that once \( \gamma_{v,\xi}^{+} \) meets with \( \gamma_{y,\xi}^{-} \), they coalesce, which would shield \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{+} \) from meeting \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{-} \) if the geodesics rooted at \( y \) had already split. Therefore in order for it to be possible that \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{-} \) meets with \( \gamma_{y,\xi}^{+} \), it must be the case that \( z_1 \) occurs before any such split happens. The same argument says that \( z_2 \) must occur before the geodesics rooted at \( y \) split. We cannot have \( \ell_1 = \ell_2 \) because this would imply \( z_1 = z_2 \) and we said \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{+} \) and \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{-} \) cannot meet again after splitting. Suppose that \( \ell_1 < \ell_2 \), with the case of \( \ell_1 > \ell_2 \) being similar. In this case, since a split of the \( y \) geodesics cannot occur before \( z_2 \), the geodesics \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{-} \) and \( \gamma_{y,\xi}^{-} \) meet at \( z_1 \). At this point, they coalesce. On the other hand, the two geodesics rooted at \( y \) must also meet with the geodesic \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{+} \) at \( z_2 \). This forces \( z_2 \) to lie on both \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{+} \) and \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{-} \), which contradicts uniqueness of finite geodesics. We have now shown that (i) implies (ii).

(ii) implies (iii) by the directedness in Theorem A.4(a). It remains to prove the reverse implication under the regularity condition (2.3). Without loss of generality we can assume that \( x \cdot \hat{e}_1 \leq y \cdot \hat{e}_1 = k \). If \( \pi_k^x < y \), then the extremality of the geodesics \( \gamma_{\xi,\xi}^{+} \) in Theorem A.3 and the fact that \( \pi_k \cap \pi_k^y = \emptyset \) imply that \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{-} \cap \gamma_{y,\xi}^{+} = \emptyset \). Similarly, if \( \pi_k^x > y \), then we get \( \gamma_{x,\xi}^{+} \cap \gamma_{y,\xi}^{-} = \emptyset \).

**Proof of Theorem 3.2.** The equivalence (i) \( \iff \) (iv) of Proposition 6.1, together with the uniqueness of finite geodesics, gives Theorem 3.2.

**Proof of Lemma 3.3.** For \( \xi \in \mathcal{U}_0 \), almost surely \( z^{\xi+}(x, y) = z^{\xi-}(x, y) = z^{\xi}(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \). Proposition 6.2 implies that \( \xi \) lies in the complement of the closed set \( \text{supp} \mu_{x,y} \).

Next, we prove Theorem 3.4 about the relation between the coalescence points and properties of the support of Busemann measures.

**Proof of Theorem 3.4.** Take \( \omega \in \Omega_0 \). Equivalence (a) follows from Proposition 6.2. Equivalence (b) follows from the equivalences in (a) and (c).

The two equivalences of (c) are proved the same way. We prove the first equivalence in this form: \( \exists \eta > \xi \) such that \( |\mu_{x,y}(\{\xi, \eta\})| = 0 \iff z^{\xi+}(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \).
The implication $\implies$ is contained in (i)$\implies$(ii) of Proposition 6.1.

To prove $\iff$, let $k = x \cdot \hat{\epsilon}_1$ and $\ell = y \cdot \hat{\epsilon}_1$, suppose $z_{k}^{\xi^+}(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, and let $m = z_{\ell}^{\xi^+}(x, y) \cdot \hat{\epsilon}_1$.

Take a sequence $\eta_n \in \mathcal{U}_0$ with $\eta_n \nabla \xi$ as $n \to \infty$. For sufficiently large $n$, $\gamma_{k,m}^{\xi^+} = \gamma_{k,m}^{\eta} = \gamma_{\ell,m}^{\eta,n}$, and hence $z_{\eta}^{\nu,n}(x, y) = z_{m}^{\xi^+}(x, y)$. Implication (iii)$\implies$(i) of Proposition 6.1 gives $|\mu_{x,y}((\xi, \eta_n))| = 0$.

When the jump process condition (3.5) holds, call the event in the statement of that condition $\Omega_0^\xi$. As noted when it was introduced, Theorem 3.5, which gives the equivalence between (3.5) and coalescence of $\xi \circ \mathbb{E}$ geodesics, is essentially an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.4.

**Proof of Theorem 3.5.** Assume the jump process condition (3.5) holds. Fix $\omega \in \Omega_0 \cap \Omega_0^5$, $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, and $\xi \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U}$. If $\xi \notin \text{supp} \mu_{x,y}$, then Proposition 6.2 says that $z_{\gamma}^{\xi^+}(x, y) = z_{\gamma}^{\xi^-}(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. In particular, $\gamma^{x,\xi^+}$ coalesces with $\gamma^{y,\xi^+}$ and $\gamma^{x,\xi^-}$ coalesces with $\gamma^{y,\xi^-}$. If, on the other hand, $\xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x,y}$, then it is an isolated point and now Theorem 3.4 says that $z_{\gamma}^{\xi^\pm}(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ (although now the two points are not equal). Again, $\gamma^{x,\xi^\pm}$ coalesces with $\gamma^{y,\xi^\pm}$, respectively. Claim (ii) is proved.

Now, assume (ii) holds and let $\Omega_0^\xi$ be the full measure event in the statement. Let $\omega \in \Omega_0 \cap \Omega_0^\xi$, $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, and $\xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x,y}$. The fact that $\gamma^{x,\xi^\pm}$ and $\gamma^{y,\xi^\pm}$ coalesce, respectively, says that $z_{\gamma}^{\xi^\pm}(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Since we assumed $\xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x,y}$, Proposition 6.2 implies that the two points are not equal. But then Theorem 3.4 implies that $\xi$ is isolated.

The proof of Lemma 3.6 is delayed to the end of Section 7.1. When (3.5) holds, define

$$\Omega_0^{\text{ump}} = \Omega_0 \cap \Omega_0^5 \cap \Omega_0^\xi.$$  

**Proof of Theorem 3.7.** Part (a). Take $\omega \in \Omega_0$. Let $x \cdot \hat{\epsilon}_1 = k$ and $\xi = \xi_{\omega}(T_\omega \omega)$. Take $T_\omega \omega$ in place of $\omega$ in (2.16), let $\zeta \rightarrow \xi_{\omega}(T_\omega \omega)$, and use (2.5), (2.6), and (2.10), to get $B_{\xi}^\zeta(x, x+e_i) \leq B_{\xi}^\zeta(x, x+e_i + e_1) + B_{\xi}^\zeta(x, x+e_i) \leq B_{\xi}^\zeta(x, x+e_i + e_1)$. Then by definition $\frac{\partial z_{\gamma}^{\xi^\pm}}{\partial \xi} = \gamma_{\gamma}^{x,\xi^\pm} = x, \gamma_{\gamma}^{x,\xi^\pm} = x + e_1, \gamma_{\gamma}^{x,\xi^\pm} = x + e_2$. Therefore we cannot have $z_{\gamma}^{\xi^\pm}(x, x+e_i) = z_{\gamma}^{\xi^\pm}(x, x+e_i + e_1) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ for either $i \in \{1, 2\}$ by uniqueness of finite geodesics. By Proposition 6.2, $\xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x,x+e_1} \cap \text{supp} \mu_{x,x+e_2}$.

For the converse, for $\zeta < \xi_{\omega}(T_\omega \omega) < \eta$ we have $B_{\xi}^{\zeta}(x, x+e_1) < \omega_x = B_{\eta}(x, x+e_1)$. Thus $\text{supp} \mu_{x,x+e_1} \subset \{\xi_{\omega}(T_\omega \omega)\} \cap \{\xi_{\omega}(T_\omega \omega)\}$. Consequently, $\text{supp} \mu_{x,x+e_1} \cap \text{supp} \mu_{x,x+e_2} \subset \{\xi_{\omega}(T_\omega \omega)\}$.

Part (b). We already observed that $\{\xi_{\omega}(T_\omega \omega) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\} \subset \mathbb{V}^\omega$. Assume the jump process condition (3.5) and that $\omega \in \Omega_0^{\text{ump}}$. Suppose $\xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x,y}$. By Theorem 3.4(b) the coalescence points $z_{\gamma}^{\xi^\pm}(x, y)$ are distinct lattice points. Hence the geodesics $\gamma^{x,\xi^\pm}$ and $\gamma^{x,\xi^-}$ separate at some point $z$ where then $\xi_{\omega}(T_\omega \omega) = \zeta$. Same is true for the geodesics $\gamma^{y,\xi^\pm}$ and $\gamma^{y,\xi^-}$.

We turn to the proof of Theorem 3.8, which identifies some properties of $\mathbb{V}^\omega$ and in particular shows that under the jump process condition (3.5), these exceptional directions are all directions of competition interfaces.

**Proof of Theorem 3.8.** Fix $\xi \in \mathcal{D}$. Theorem A.4(b) says that almost surely $z_{\gamma}^{\xi^\pm}(x, x+e_i) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Theorem A.1(l) says that there is no $\pm$ distinction. Hence $\mathbb{P}(z_{\gamma}^{\xi^\pm}(x, x+e_i) = z_{\gamma}^{\xi^-}(x, x+e_i) \in \mathbb{Z}^2) = 1$ and therefore $\mathbb{P}(\xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x,x+e_1}) = 0$ by Proposition 6.2. A union bound implies that $\mathbb{P}(\exists x \in \mathbb{Z}^2, i \in \{1, 2\} : \xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x,x+e_1}) = 0$. The cocycle property (2.6) implies then that $\mathbb{P}(\xi \in \mathbb{V}^\omega) = 0$.

Conversely, suppose that $\xi \notin \mathcal{D}$. By homogeneity $g(\xi) = \xi \cdot \nabla g(\xi)$. This forces $\nabla g(\xi^-) \cdot e_i \neq \nabla g(\xi^+) \cdot e_i$ for both $i \in \{1, 2\}$. By (2.8), $\mathbb{E}[B_{\xi}^{\xi^\pm}(x, x+e_i)] = \mathbb{E}[B_{\xi}^{\xi^\pm}(x, x+e_i)] = \mathbb{P}(\xi \in \mathbb{V}^\omega) \geq \mathbb{P}(\xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x,x+e_1}) \geq \mathbb{P}(B_{\xi}^{\xi^\pm}(x, x+e_i) \neq B_{\xi}^{\xi^\pm}(x, x+e_i)) > 0$.

Now take $\omega \in \Omega_0$. We prove claims (a)–(b).

Part (a). If $\nabla g(\xi^+) \neq \nabla g(\eta^-)$, Theorem A.5(c) says that $[\xi, \eta]$ contains some $\xi_{\omega}(T_\omega \omega)$, which by Theorem a is a member of $\mathbb{V}^\omega$.
If $\nabla g(\zeta^+) = \nabla g(\eta^-)$, then by convexity, $\nabla g(\zeta^+) = \nabla g(\eta^-) = \nabla g(\xi^\square)$ for all $\zeta, \eta$ and $\square \in \{ -, + \}$. By Theorem A.1(d), $B^\square(x, y, \omega)$ is constant over $\xi \in [\zeta, \eta]$ and $\square \in \{ -, + \}$, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. Consequently, for any given $x$, the geodesics $\gamma^{x, \xi^\square}$ match. By Theorem A.4(b), all these geodesics coalesce with probability one. Hence also the coalescence points $B^\square(x, y)$ match. By Theorem 3.4(a), no point $\xi \in [\zeta, \eta]$ is a member of $\mathcal{V}^\omega$.

Part (b). Now $\nabla g(\zeta^-) = \nabla g(\zeta^+) = \nabla g(\eta^-)$. Therefore, part (a) implies that $[\zeta, \eta] \cap \mathcal{V}^\omega = \emptyset$, and we also have $\zeta \in \mathcal{D}$. But then $\nabla g(\zeta^\pm)$ match and equal $\nabla g(\xi^\prime)$, from the proof of (a). The same argument as above implies that $\gamma^{x, \zeta^\pm}$ match and equal $\gamma^{x, \xi^\prime}$ and all these geodesics coalesce. Again, we conclude that $\zeta \notin \mathcal{V}^\omega$. The same works for the case $\nabla g(\zeta^+) = \nabla g(\eta^+)$. □

The next result, Theorem 3.10, also identifies $U \setminus \mathcal{V}^\omega$ in terms of directions in which (Bussemann) geodesic uniqueness holds.

**Proof of Theorem 3.10.** Fix $\omega \in \Omega_0$ and $\xi \in \text{ri}U$. Suppose first that there exists an $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with the property that $\gamma^{x, \zeta^\pm} \neq \gamma^{x, \xi^\pm}$. These geodesics separate at some point $z$ where then $\zeta = \zeta_n(T_z, \omega) \in \mathcal{V}^\omega$. If, on the other hand, $\gamma^{x, \zeta^\pm} = \gamma^{x, \xi^\pm}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, but there exist $x$ and $y$ for which $\gamma^{x, \zeta^\pm}$ and $\gamma^{y, \xi^\pm}$ do not coalesce. Proposition 6.2 implies that $\xi \in \text{supp}\mu_{x, y, \omega} \subset \mathcal{V}^\omega$.

Conversely, suppose $\xi \in \mathcal{V}^\omega$ and let $x, y$ be such that $\xi \in \text{supp}\mu_{x, y}$. Then by Theorem 3.1, possibly after interchanging the roles of $x$ and $y$, we have $\gamma^{x, \zeta^\pm} \cap \gamma^{y, \xi^\pm} = \emptyset$. In particular, these two geodesics do not coalesce. Part (a) is proved.

Next we prove part (c). To this end, assume the jump process condition (3.5) and take $\omega \in \Omega_0^{\text{jump}}$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. That $\xi \notin \mathcal{V}^\omega$ implies $\gamma^{x, \zeta^\pm} = \gamma^{x, \xi^\pm}$ follows from the already proved part (a). For the other implication take a $y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and note that Theorem 3.5 says that for $\square \in \{ -, + \}$, $\gamma^{y, \xi^\square}$ coalesces with $\gamma^{x, \zeta^\square}$. But then this implies that $\gamma^{y, \xi^\pm}$ coalesce and by the uniqueness of finite geodesics these two paths cannot separate to begin with. We have thus shown that $\gamma^{y, \xi^\pm}$ match for all $y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and that all these geodesics coalesce. This and part (a) imply $\xi \notin \mathcal{V}^\omega$.

Parts (b) and (d) follow directly from parts (a) and (c), respectively, once one observes that under the regularity condition (2.3), Theorem A.3 implies that the uniqueness of a $U_{\xi}$-directed geodesic out of $x$ is equivalent to $\gamma^{x, \zeta^\pm} = \gamma^{x, \xi^\pm}$.

**Proof of Theorem 3.12.** The only issue remaining to be established is that for $\xi \in \mathcal{V}^\omega$, $\gamma^{x, \zeta^\pm}$ and $\gamma^{x, \xi^\pm}$ are the only $\xi$-directed geodesics out of $x$. This follows from Theorem A.6. □

7. Webs of shocks: proofs

7.1. Shock points and graphs. Fix $\omega \in \Omega_0$ throughout the whole section.

**Proof of Lemma 4.1.** Suppose $x^\ast$ is a $[\zeta, \eta]$-shock point. Then there exists a direction $\xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \cap \text{supp}\mu_{x^\ast + e_1, x^\ast + e_2}$, which by Theorem 3.1 implies $\gamma^{x^\ast + e_1, \zeta^-} \cap \gamma^{x^\ast + e_2, \xi^+} = \emptyset$. The ordering of geodesics implies then that $\gamma^{x^\ast + e_1, \zeta^-} \cap \gamma^{x^\ast + e_2, \eta^+} = \emptyset$. The case of a $[\zeta, \eta]$-shock point is similar.

If $x^\ast$ is not a $[\zeta, \eta]$-shock point, then combining Propositions 6.1 and 6.2 we have that $z = z^\zeta^\ast = (x + e_1, x + e_2) = z^\xi^\ast = (x + e_1, x + e_2) = z^\eta^\ast = (x + e_1, x + e_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, $\gamma^{x^\ast + e_1, \zeta^-}$ and $\gamma^{x^\ast + e_2, \xi^+}$ match up to $z$ is reached, and $\gamma^{x^\ast + e_2, \zeta^-}$ and $\gamma^{x^\ast + e_2, \eta^+}$ match up to $z$ is reached. In particular, $z \in \gamma^{x^\ast + e_1, \zeta^-} \cap \gamma^{x^\ast + e_2, \eta^+}$. □

The following is immediate from the definitions.

**Lemma 7.1.** Let $\zeta \leq \eta$ in $\text{ri}U$. A directed path in $\mathcal{G}_{\zeta \zeta}(\zeta, \eta)$ can never cross a directed path in $\mathcal{G}_{\eta \eta}$ from right to left nor a directed path in $\mathcal{G}_{\zeta \eta}$ from above to below.

The next lemma gives a characterization of the ancestors of a shock point.

**Lemma 7.2.** Let $\zeta \leq \eta$ in $\text{ri}U$. The following holds for all $x^\ast \in S^\ast_{\zeta \zeta}$. The set $A^\ast_{\zeta \zeta}(x^\ast)$ of the ancestors of $x^\ast$ is exactly the set of vertices $y^\ast \in S^\ast_{\zeta \zeta}$ such that $y^\ast \geq x^\ast$ and $y^\ast$ is between the two geodesics $\gamma^{x^\ast + e_2^\zeta, \zeta^-}$ and $\gamma^{x^\ast + e_2^\zeta, \eta^+}$ (embedded as paths on $\mathbb{R}^2$).
Proof. First, suppose \( y^* \) is an ancestor of \( x^* \). By Lemma 7.1 no directed path in \( G^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \) can go from \( y^* \) to \( x^* \) unless \( y^* \) lies between \( \gamma x^* \circ \hat{e}_2 \) and \( \gamma x^* \circ \hat{e}_+ \).

We prove the converse by induction on \( |y^* - x^*| \). The claim is trivial if \( y^* = x^* \) Suppose \( y^* \geq x^* \) is such that \( y^* \neq x^* \), \( y^* \in S^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \), and it is between \( \gamma x^* \circ \hat{e}_2 \) and \( \gamma x^* \circ \hat{e}_+ \). If \( y^* \) is a parent of both \( y^* - e_1 \) and \( y^* - e_2 \) in \( G^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \), then since \( y^* - e_1 \) is between the two geodesics for at least one \( i \in \{1, 2\} \), the induction hypothesis implies that \( y^* - e_i \in A^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor}(x^*) \) and thus \( y^* \in A^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor}(x^*) \). Suppose next that \( y^* \) is a parent of \( y^* - e_1 \) in \( G^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \) but that the latter is not between the two geodesics. Then, on the one hand, \( y^* - e_2 \) must be between the geodesics and the induction hypothesis implies \( y^* - e_2 \in A^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor}(x^*) \). On the other hand, \( y^* - \hat{e}_1 \) must point to \( y^* + \hat{e}_2 \) in \( G_{\zeta} \) (to prevent \( y^* - e_1 \) from falling between the two geodesics), which implies that \( y^* \) is a parent of \( y^* - e_2 \) in \( G^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \). But now we have \( y^* \in A^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor}(x^*) \). See the right plot in Figure 7.1. The case when \( y^* \) is a parent of \( y^* - e_2 \) and the latter is not between the two geodesics is similar. \( \square \)

**Figure 7.1.** The proofs of Lemma 7.2 (left) and Theorem 4.3(b) (right). \( \eta^+ \) geodesics are in purple with medium thickness. \( \zeta^- \) geodesics are in green and thin. Directed edges in \( G^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \) are in red/thick. White circles are points in \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) while points in \( S^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \) are filled (in red).

**Proof of Theorem 4.3.** Part (a). Take \( \xi \in \lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor \cap \mathcal{V}^\omega \). There exist points \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \) with \( \xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x,y} \). By the cocycle property (2.6) we can write

\[
B^\xi(x,y) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} B^\xi(x_i, x_{i+1})
\]

for any nearest-neighbor path \( x_0, n \) from \( x_0 = x \) to \( x_n = y \). But then it must be the case that \( \xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x_i, x_{i+1}} \) for at least one \( i \). By the monotonicity (2.9) and the cocycle property (2.6)

\[
\text{supp} \mu_{u+e_1, u+e_2} = \text{supp} \mu_{u, u+e_1} \cup \text{supp} \mu_{u, u+e_2} \quad \text{for any } u \in \mathbb{Z}^2.
\]

Therefore, \( x_i + \hat{e}_1 \in S^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \) if \( x_{i+1} \in \{ x_i + e_1, x_i + e_2 \} \) and \( x_{i+1} + \hat{e}_2 \in S^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \) otherwise. Since \( S^*_{\xi} \subset S^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \), part (a) is proved.

**Part (b).** Take \( x^* \in S^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \). Then \( \gamma x^* \circ \hat{e}_2 \) and \( \gamma x^* \circ \hat{e}_+ \) are disjoint. Suppose \( x^* \) is a parent of \( x^* - e_1 \) in \( G^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \). Then \( x^* - \hat{e}_1 \) is a parent of \( x^* - \hat{e}_2 \) in \( G_{\eta^-} \) and \( \gamma x^* - \hat{e}_2 \) first takes an \( e_1 \) step then follows \( \gamma x^* - \hat{e}_2 \). But then it must be the case that \( \gamma x^* - \hat{e}_2 \) is a parent of \( x^* - e_2 \) in \( G^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \) and thus \( x^* - e_2 \in S^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \). See the left plot in Figure 7.1. The case when \( x^* \) is a parent of \( x^* - e_1 \) in \( G^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \) is similar. This proves part (b).

**Part (c).** To prove the existence of the up-right path of points in \( S^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \) it is enough to show that for any \( x^* \in S^*_{\lfloor \zeta, \eta \rfloor} \), \( x^* + e_i \) is a parent of \( x^* \) for at least one \( i \in \{1, 2\} \). Lemma 7.2 says that

\[
\text{supp} \mu_{x_i, x_{i+1}} = \text{supp} \mu_{x_{i+1}, x_i} \quad \text{for any } x_i, x_{i+1} \in \mathbb{Z}^2.
\]
for this it suffices to show that there exist points of $S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$ other than $x^*$ between the geodesics $\gamma_{x^* + \tilde{\varepsilon}_z^*,\zeta^-}$ and $\gamma_{x^* - \tilde{\varepsilon}_z^*,\eta^+}$. We will show that such points exist at all levels above $x^*$.

Consider an antidiagonal $\{z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_k\}$ between the geodesics. That is, for some integer $m > x^* \cdot \tilde{e}_1$, $z_i \cdot \tilde{e}_1 = m$ for each $i$, $z_0 \in \gamma_{x^* + \tilde{\varepsilon}_z^*,\zeta^-}$, $z_k \in \gamma_{x^* - \tilde{\varepsilon}_z^*,\eta^+}$, and $z_i = z_{i-1} - \tilde{e}_2$. Suppose there are no points of $S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$ at any level at or above $m$. Then, $z_i + \tilde{e}_2^* \notin S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$, the geodesics $\gamma_{z_{i-1},\zeta^-}$ and $\gamma_{z_i,\eta^+}$ must intersect. But then they must coalesce because if they separate at $y$, the dual point $y + \tilde{e}_1^*$ lies in $S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$. Consequently also $\gamma_{z_i,\zeta^-}$ coalesces with $\gamma_{z_{i-1},\zeta^-}$ and $\gamma_{z_i,\eta^+}$ because it lies between the two.

To summarize, for $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $\gamma_{z_{i-1},\zeta^-}$, $\gamma_{z_i,\zeta^-}$ and $\gamma_{z_i,\eta^+}$ coalesce. This implies that $\gamma_{z_0,\zeta^-}$ and $\gamma_{z_k,\eta^+}$ coalesce and thereby contradicts the assumption that $x^* \in S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$. We have thus proved that out of any $x^* \in S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$, there exists an up-right path $x^*_n$ such that for any $i \geq n$, $x^*_{i+1}$ is a parent of $x^*_i$.

Since the backward path $x^*_n$ is sandwiched between $\gamma_{z_n^* + \tilde{\varepsilon}_z^*,\zeta^-}$ and $\gamma_{z_n^* - \tilde{\varepsilon}_z^*,\eta^+}$ (for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$), Theorem A.4(n) implies that the limit points of $x^*_n/n$, as $n \to \infty$, are all in the interval $[\zeta, \eta]$. Part (c) is proved.

Part (d). Let $x = x^* - \tilde{e}_\zeta^*$. If $x^*$ is a branch point in $S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$, then $\gamma_{x^*,\zeta^-}$ goes from $x$ to $x + e_2$ and $\gamma_{x^*,\eta^+}$ goes from $x$ to $x + e_1$, which is equivalent to $B^{\zeta^-}(x + e_1, x + e_2) \leq 0 \leq B^{\eta^+}(x + e_1, x + e_2)$, which in turn is equivalent to $\xi_e(T_{z_0}\omega) \in [\zeta, \eta]$.

Conversely, suppose $\xi_e(T_{z_0}\omega) \in [\zeta, \eta]$. Reversing the above equivalences we see that $x^* \in S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$ and points to both $x^* - e_1$ and $x^* - e_2$ in $G_{\zeta\eta}^*$. This and part (b) imply that $x^*$ is a branch point.

Part (e). Start with the case $\zeta < \eta$. Let $\xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \cap U_0$. Then $\Omega_1^\xi \subset \Omega_0$ and parts (b) and (c) of Theorem A.4 imply that $G_{\zeta}$ is a tree that does not contain any bi-infinite up-right paths. (Recall that for $\xi \in U_0$ there is no $\pm$ distinction.) This implies that $G_{\zeta}^*$ is a tree as well, i.e. all down-left paths of $G_{\zeta}^*$ coalesce. Since $G_{\zeta}^* \subset G_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$, one can follow the edges e.g. in $G_{\zeta}^*$ starting from $x^*$ and from $y^*$ to get to a coalescence point $z^*$ that will then be a descendant of both points in $S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$.

The same argument can be repeated if $\zeta = \eta = \xi \in V^\omega$ when condition (4.2) holds, since then both $G_\zeta^\pm$ are trees. Claim (e) is proved.

Part (f). Observe that for any $x^*, y^* \in S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$. Theorem 3.5 says that under the jump process condition (3.5), if $\omega \in \Omega_0^{\text{jump}}$ (defined in (6.2)), then the geodesics $\gamma_{x^* + \tilde{\varepsilon}_z^*,\zeta^-}$ and $\gamma_{y^* + \tilde{\varepsilon}_z^*,\zeta^-}$ coalesce, as do $\gamma_{x^* - \tilde{\varepsilon}_z^*,\eta^+}$ and $\gamma_{y^* - \tilde{\varepsilon}_z^*,\eta^+}$. By Lemma 7.2, any point in $S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$ that is between the two and $-\zeta$ coalesced geodesics is an ancestor to both $x^*$ and $y^*$. Such a point exists. For example, take a point $z$ on $\gamma_{x^* + \tilde{\varepsilon}_z^*,\zeta^-}$ with $z \cdot \tilde{e}_1 \geq (x^* + \tilde{e}_2^*, y^* + \tilde{e}_2^*) \cdot \tilde{e}_1$ or $(z^{\eta^+}(x^* - \tilde{e}_2^*, y^* - \tilde{e}_2^*) \cdot \tilde{e}_1)$. Since $\gamma_{z,\eta^+}$ coalesces with $\gamma_{z,\zeta^-}$, which does not touch $\gamma_{z,\zeta^-}$ (because it is part of $\gamma_{x^* + \tilde{\varepsilon}_z^*,\zeta^-}$), $\gamma_{z,\eta^+}$ must separate from $\gamma_{z,\zeta^-}$ at some point $z'$. This point $z'$ is then in $S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$ and is an ancestor to both $x^*$ and $y^*$. Part (f) is proved.

Part (g). Observe that if $\xi_e(T_{z_0}\omega) \in [\zeta, \eta]$, then (2.16) says that $B^{\zeta^-}(x + e_1, x + e_2) < 0 < B^{\eta^+}(x + e_1, x + e_2)$, which would imply that $x^*$ is a $[\zeta, \eta]$-shock point. Theorem A.5(c) implies that there are infinitely many such points. But such each such point is a branch point in $S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$ because $x$ points to $x + e_2$ in $G_{\zeta}$, and hence also in $G_{\zeta^-}$, and to $x + e_1$ in $G_{\eta^+}$, and hence also in $G_{\eta^-}$. Thus, there are infinitely many branch points in $S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$. The proof of the existence of infinitely many coalescence points in $S_{[\zeta,\eta]}^*$ follows from this and the first claim in part (e) in a way similar to the proof below for the case of $S_{\xi}^*$ (but without the need for any extra conditions) and is therefore omitted.

Part (h). By Theorem 3.1 there exist $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $\gamma_{x,\zeta^-} \cap \gamma_{y,\eta^+} = \emptyset$ and then Theorem 3.5 says that for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, the two geodesics $\gamma_{z,\zeta^-}$ must separate at some point $z_1$ (in order to coalesce with $\gamma_{x,\zeta^-}$ and $\gamma_{y,\eta^+}$, respectively). Uniqueness of finite geodesics implies that $\gamma_{z_1 + \tilde{e}_2^*,\zeta^-}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, cannot touch. Thus, $z_1 + \tilde{e}_2^* \in S_{\xi}^*$. Now define inductively $z_{n+1}$ to be the point where
the geodesics $\gamma^{z_n,\xi}\pm$ separate. We have thus constructed an infinite sequence $\{z_n + \hat{\gamma}_n^\pm : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of points in $S^\xi$. Assume now that condition (4.2) also holds. We prove the second claim in part (h) concerning the coalescence points. For this, we will map every branch point onto a coalescence point as follows. Given a branch point $x^*$, consider the two down-left paths out of $x^*$ along the directed graph $S^\xi_t$. The first path $\pi^*$ starts with a $-e_1$ step and then follows the arrows of $S^\xi_t$ and at sites where both $-e_1$ and $-e_2$ steps are allowed, it takes a $-e_2$ step. The second path $\pi^*$ starts with a $-e_2$ step and at sites where both types of steps are available, it takes a $-e_1$ step. In words, these are the two inner-most paths out of $x^*$ in $S^\xi_t$. In particular, any two other paths in this graph that emanate from $x^*$ and start with steps $e_1$ and $-e_2$ must sandwich $\pi^*$ and $\pi^*$. Moreover, by part (e), $x^* - e_1$ and $x^* - e_2$ have a common ancestor. Thus, paths $\pi^*$ and $\pi^*$ must have at least one common point other than $x^*$. Let $z^* \in \pi^* \cap \pi^* \setminus \{x^*\}$ be the point with the largest $\hat{\gamma}_1$-component. This $z^*$ is the coalescence point that $x^*$ is mapped to.

Note that the last step $\pi^*$ takes before reaching $z^*$ is $-e_2$ and the last step $\pi^*$ takes to get to $z^*$ is $-e_1$. This and planarity imply that if there were another point $y^* \in S^\xi_t$ that mapped to the same coalescence point $z^*$, then there must exist a point $u^* \in S^\xi_t$ strictly inside the region between the segments of the paths $\pi^*$ and $\pi^*$ that start at $x^*$ and end at $z^*$. Part (c) implies then the existence of a semi-infinite path that follows the directed edges of $S^\xi_t$ and ends at $u^*$. But planarity forces such a path to cross $\pi^*$ or $\pi^*$ at some point $v^* \neq x^*$. This would contradict the construction of the paths $\pi^*$ and $\pi^*$. For example, if $v^* \in \pi^*$ then we would get that $v^*$ is a parent to both $v^*-e_1$ and $v^*-e_2$ (because $v^*$ is a point where two paths in $S^\xi_t$ crossed) and yet $\pi^*$ to a $-e_1$ step out of $v^*$ (because the path from $v^*$ to $u^*$ had to take a $-e_2$ step since $u^*$ is between $\pi^*$ and $\pi^*$). This is contrary to the construction of $\pi^*$, which said that since both steps are taken, it should take a $-e_2$ step.

The upshot of the above paragraph is that our mapping assigns a distinct coalescence point to each branch point. Since we already proved that under the jump process condition (3.5) there are infinitely many branch points in $S^\xi$, it now follows that there are also infinitely many coalescence points and part (h) is proved.$\square$

**Proof of the claim in Remark 4.4.** It suffices to consider the case where $[\zeta, \eta] \cap V^\omega = \emptyset$ but $[\zeta, \eta] \cap V^\omega \setminus D \neq \emptyset$. Parts (a) and (b) of Theorem 3.8 imply then that $[\zeta, \eta] \cap V^\omega \setminus D \neq \emptyset$. Suppose, without loss of generality, that $\zeta$ is in this intersection. Then Lemma B.1 implies the existence of infinitely many $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $\xi_x(T_{x,\omega}) = \zeta \in V^\omega$ and part Theorem 4.3(d) says that the corresponding dual points $x^*$ are all branch points in $S^\xi_t \subset S^\eta_{[\zeta, \eta]}$. The claim about coalescence points follows from the just proved finite number of branch points, combined with the first claim in part (e), similarly to the way the claim is proved in Theorem 4.3(h).$\square$

**Lemma 7.3.** For any $\omega \in \Omega_0$, $\zeta \leq \eta$, and $i \in \{1, 2\}$, there does not exist an $x^* \in S^\xi_{[\zeta, \eta]}$ such that $x^* - ne_i \in A^\xi_{[\zeta, \eta]}(x^* - (n + 1)e_i)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and nor does there exist an $x^* \in S^\eta_{[\zeta, \eta]}$ such that $x^* + (n + 1)e_i \in A^\eta_{[\zeta, \eta]}(x^* + ne_i)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

**Proof.** We prove the result for $i = 1$, $i = 2$ being similar. We also only work with paths of the first type. The other type can be treated similarly.

The existence of a path of the first type, with $i = 1$, implies that $x^* - ne_1 - \hat{\gamma}_1^e$ is a parent of $x^* - (n - 1)e_1 - \hat{\gamma}_1^e$ in $G_{\eta,\gamma}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. But this implies that $B^{\nu_\gamma}_1(x^* - ne_1 - \hat{\gamma}_1^e, x^* - (n - 1)e_1 - \hat{\gamma}_1^e) = \omega_{x^* - ne_1 - \hat{\gamma}_1^e}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Take any sequence $\eta_m \in \mathcal{U}_0$ such that $\eta_m \searrow \eta$. Then (2.9) and (2.6) imply that

$$\sum_{k = 1}^{n} \omega_{x^* - ke_1 - \hat{\gamma}_1} = B^{\nu_\gamma}(x^* - ne_1 - \hat{\gamma}_1, x^* - \hat{\gamma}_1) \geq B^{\nu_\gamma}(x^* - ne_1 - \hat{\gamma}_1, x^* - \hat{\gamma}_1).$$

Divide by $n$ and apply the ergodic theorem on the left-hand side and (A.4) on the right-hand side to get $E[\omega_{\gamma}] \geq \epsilon_1 \cdot V_{\gamma}(\eta_m)$ for all $m$. Take $m \to \infty$ to get $E[\omega_{\gamma}] \geq \epsilon_1 \cdot V_{\gamma}(\eta^+)$. But this cannot happen for $\eta \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U}$, given the known asymptotic behavior of $g$ near the boundary of $\mathcal{U}$ (see [39, Theorem 2.4]).$\square$
Proof of Lemma 3.6. A general step of the path can be decomposed as \( x_{i+1} - x_i = \sum_k (y_{k+1} - y_k) \) where each \( y_{k+1} - y_k \in \{e_1, -e_2\} \). Then each \( \mu_{y_{k+1}, y_k} \) is a negative measure, and consequently \( \text{supp} \mu_{x_i, x_{i+1}} = \bigcup_k \text{supp} \mu_{y_k, y_{k+1}} \). Thus we may assume that the path satisfies \( x_{i+1} - x_i \in \{e_1, -e_2\} \) for all \( i \).

One direction is clear: \( \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{supp} \mu_{x_i, x_{i+1}} \subset \mathcal{Y}^\omega \).

For the other direction, take \( \xi \in \mathcal{Y}^\omega \). By part (a) of Theorem 4.3, there exists a shock point \( x^* \in S^*_\xi \). By parts (b) and (c) there is a bi-infinite path \( x^*_{-\infty, \infty} \) through \( x^* \) in \( S^*_\xi \) with increments in \( \{e_1, e_2\} \). By Lemma 7.3 this path must cross any down-right lattice path \( x_{-\infty, \infty} \). This means that there exists an \( i \in \mathbb{Z} \) such that either \( x_{i+1} - x_i = e_1 \) and \( x_i + \hat{e}_1^* \) is a parent of \( x_i - \hat{e}_1^* \) in \( S_{\xi}^* \), i.e. \( x_i \) points to \( x_i + e_2 \) in \( S_{\xi}^* \), or \( x_{i+1} - x_i = -e_2 \) and \( x_i - \hat{e}_2^* \) is a parent of \( x_i - \hat{e}_2^* \) in \( S_{\xi}^* \), i.e. \( x_i \) points to \( x_i + e_1 \) in \( S_{\xi}^* \). In the former case, \( \gamma_{x_i, \xi} \) goes from \( x_i \) to \( x_i + e_2 \) and from there it never touches \( \gamma_{x_i, \xi} = \gamma_{x_i + e_1, \xi} \), since \( x_i + \hat{e}_1^* \in S_{x_i}^* \). Consequently, in this case Theorem 3.1 says that \( \xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x_i, x_{i+1}} \). The other case is similar and again gives \( \xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x_i, x_{i+1}} \). This proves Lemma 3.6.

7.2. Density of shocks on the lattice. For \( \epsilon \leq \eta \) in \( \text{ri} \mathcal{U}, x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \), and \( i \in \{1, 2\} \) let

\[
\rho^i_i(\zeta, \eta) = \mathbb{P}\{ \zeta \cap \text{supp} \mu_{x,x+e_i} \neq \emptyset \}.
\]

We write \( \rho^i_i(\zeta, \epsilon) \) for \( \rho^i_i(\zeta, \eta) \). Recall that \( \rho^1_i(\zeta, \eta) = 1 \) is equivalent to \( x + \hat{e}_1^* \) pointing to \( x + \hat{e}_1^* - e_3 - i \) in \( S^*_{\zeta, \eta} \). By (7.1), \( x^* \in S^*_{\zeta, \eta} \) if and only if \( \rho^1_i(\zeta, \eta) \) and \( \rho^2_i(\zeta, \eta) \) are not both 0. Also, \( \rho^1_i(\zeta, \eta) = \rho^2_i(\zeta, \eta) = 1 \) if and only if \( \xi \in \{T_x \omega \} \). Let

\[
\kappa_i(\zeta, \eta) = \mathbb{P}\{ \rho^i_i(\zeta, \eta) = 1 \}.
\]

Since \( \text{supp} \mu_{x,x+e_i} \) is by definition closed, \( \kappa_i \) is left-continuous in \( \zeta \) and right-continuous in \( \eta \). Furthermore, by Theorem 3.8 \( \kappa_i \) is continuous in each argument at points of differentiability of \( \epsilon \).

Again, we write \( \kappa_i(\zeta) \) for \( \kappa_i(\zeta, \xi) \). We thus have

\[
\kappa_i(\zeta) = \lim_{\zeta \searrow \eta \nearrow \zeta} \kappa_i(\zeta, \eta).
\]

By Theorem 3.8, \( \xi \in \mathcal{D} \) if and only if \( \kappa_i(\xi) = 0 \) for any (and hence both) \( i \in \{1, 2\} \). Let

\[
k_{12}(\zeta, \eta) = \mathbb{P}\{ \rho^1_i(\zeta, \eta) = \rho^2_i(\zeta, \eta) = 1 \} = \mathbb{P}\{ \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \}
\]

and write \( \kappa_{12}(\zeta, \xi) \) for \( k_{12}(\zeta, \xi) \). The last equality above follows because if \( \xi \notin [\zeta, \eta] \), then by recovery (2.7) and by the Busemann characterization (2.16) of \( \xi \), one of the processes \( \xi \rightarrow B(0, e_i) \) for \( i \in \{1, 2\} \) is constant for \( \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \).

The next result essentially follows from the ergodic theorem and gives the density of horizontal and vertical edges, shock points, branch points, and coalescence points. Recall the full measure event \( \Omega^\ast \) introduced in Lemma B.1.

Lemma 7.4. Assume the regularity condition (2.3). There exists a \( T \)-invariant event \( \Omega^\ast_0 \subset \Omega_0 \) with \( \mathbb{P}(\Omega^\ast_0) = 1 \) and such that for all \( \omega \in \Omega + 0', i, j \in \{1, 2\}, a, b, a', b' \in \{0, 1\} \) with \( (b-a)(b'-a') \neq 0 \), and for all \( \zeta \leq \eta \) in \( \text{ri} \mathcal{U} \), we have

\[
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{b-a} \sum_{\eps = an \in \epsilon} \sum_{k = -an}^{bn} \rho^i_{k e_i}(\zeta, \eta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(b-a)(b'-a')} \sum_{x \in [-an,bn] \times [-a'n,b'n]} \rho^i_{x}(\zeta, \eta) = \kappa_{ij}(\zeta, \eta),
\]

\[
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{b-a} \sum_{\epsilon = an \in \epsilon} \sum_{k = -an}^{bn} \mathbb{1}\{ k e_i + \hat{e}_1^* \in S^*_{\zeta, \eta} \}
\]

\[
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(b-a)(b'-a')} \sum_{x \in [-an,bn] \times [-a'n,b'n]} \mathbb{1}\{ x + \hat{e}_1^* \in S^*_{\zeta, \eta} \}
\]

\[
\kappa_{1}(\zeta, \eta) + \kappa_{2}(\zeta, \eta) - \kappa_{12}(\zeta, \eta),
\]
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{(b-a)n} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \rho_{ke}(\zeta, \eta) \rho_{ke}(\zeta, \eta) = \kappa_2(\zeta, \eta).
\]
(7.5)

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{(b-a)(b'-a')} \sum_{x \in [-an, bn] \times [-a'n, b'n]} \rho_x(\zeta, \eta) \rho_x(\zeta, \eta) = \kappa_2(\zeta, \eta).
\]
(7.6)

All of the above limits are positive if and only if \( \nabla g(\zeta) = \nabla g(\eta) \).

**Proof of Lemma 7.4.** As explained in Remark A.2, under the regularity condition (2.3), the Busemann process is a measurable function of \( \{\omega_x : x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\} \). Thus, by the ergodic theorem, there exists a \( T \)-invariant event \( \Omega_0' \subset \Omega_0 \) with \( \mathbb{P}(\Omega_0') = 1 \) and such that for \( \omega \in \Omega_0' \) the limits (7.3-7.6) hold for all \( \zeta, \eta \in \mathcal{U}_0 \cup \left((\mathcal{R}_1U) \setminus \mathcal{D}\right) \).

To justify the equality of the limit in (7.6) with the one in (7.5) observe that since every shock point must have at least one descendant and at least one ancestor, we have

\[
\mathbb{P}\{-\hat{e}_1^* \in S_{[\zeta, \eta]^*}\} = \mathbb{P}\{\rho_{e_1}^1(\zeta, \eta) = 1\} + \mathbb{P}\{\rho_{e_2}^2(\zeta, \eta) = 1\} - \mathbb{P}\{\rho_{e_1}^1(\zeta, \eta) = \rho_{e_2}^2(\zeta, \eta) = 1\}
\]

and

\[
\mathbb{P}\{\hat{e}_1^* \in S_{[\zeta, \eta]^*}\} = \mathbb{P}\{\rho_{e_1}^1(\zeta, \eta) = 1\} + \mathbb{P}\{\rho_{e_2}^2(\zeta, \eta) = 1\} - \mathbb{P}\{\rho_{e_1}^1(\zeta, \eta) = \rho_{e_2}^2(\zeta, \eta) = 1\}.
\]

By shift invariance, the first three probabilities in the first display match the corresponding three probabilities in the second display. Thus,

\[
\mathbb{P}\{\rho_{e_1}^1(\zeta, \eta) = \rho_{e_2}^2(\zeta, \eta) = 1\} = \kappa_2(\zeta, \eta).
\]

We now prove the first limit in (7.3), the rest of the limits in the statement of the lemma being similar. Take \( \omega \in \Omega_0' \) and any \( \zeta < \eta \) in \( \mathcal{R}_1U \). Suppose first \( g \) is differentiable at both \( \zeta \) and \( \eta \). Take sequences \( \zeta_m > \zeta > \zeta_m < \eta_m < \eta < \eta'_m \) and use monotonicity and the continuity of \( \kappa_j \) to get

\[
\kappa_j(\zeta_m, \eta_m) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{(b-a)n} \sum_{k=-an}^{\infty} \rho_{ke}(\zeta_m, \eta_m)
\]

\[
\leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{(b-a)n} \sum_{k=-an}^{\infty} \rho_{ke}(\zeta, \eta) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{(b-a)n} \sum_{k=-an}^{\infty} \rho_{ke}(\zeta, \eta)
\]

\[
\leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{(b-a)n} \sum_{k=-an}^{\infty} \rho_{ke}(\zeta'_m, \eta'_m) = \kappa_j(\zeta'_m, \eta'_m).
\]

Taking \( m \to \infty \) and using continuity of \( \kappa_j \) at \( \zeta \) and \( \eta \) gives that the above liminf and limsup are equal to \( \kappa_j(\zeta, \eta) \). The same proof works if \( \zeta = \eta \) is a point of differentiability of \( g \). In this case, we can use 0 as a lower bound and for the upper bound we have \( \kappa_j(\zeta) = \kappa_j(\eta) = 0 \).

Next, suppose \( \zeta \) is a point of non-differentiability of \( g \), but \( \eta \) is still a point of differentiability. We can repeat the same argument as above, but this time only using the sequences \( \eta_m \) and \( \eta'_m \) and the intervals \( [\zeta, \eta_m] \) and \( [\zeta, \eta'_m] \) for the upper and lower bounds, because \( \zeta \) has been included in the set \( \mathcal{U}_0 \cup (\mathcal{R}_1U) \setminus \mathcal{D} \). A similar argument works if \( \zeta \) is a point of differentiability but \( \eta \) is not. When \( g \) is not differentiable at both \( \zeta \) and \( \eta \), the claimed limits follow from the choice of \( \Omega_0' \).

**Proof of Proposition 4.5.** The claim follows from Lemma 7.4

**7.3. Flow of Busemann measures.**

**Proof of Theorem 4.6.** The vertex set of \( \mathcal{B}^\ast_{[\zeta, \eta]} \) is by definition the same as that of \( \mathcal{S}^\ast_{[\zeta, \eta]} \). That the edges also agree follows from Lemma 7.5 below.
Lemma 7.5. For \( i \in \{1, 2\} \), \([\zeta, \eta] \cap \text{supp} \mu_{x, x+e_i} \neq \emptyset\) if and only if \((x + \hat{e}_1^i, x + \hat{e}_1^i - e_{3-i})\) is an edge in the graph \(S_{[\zeta, \eta]}^*\).

Proof. We argue the case of \( i = 1 \). Assume first that \([\zeta, \eta] \cap \text{supp} \mu_{x, x+e_1} \neq \emptyset\). From \(\mu_{x+e_1, x+e_2} = \mu_{x+e_1, x} + \mu_{x, x+e_2}\) and \(\mu_{x-e_2, x} = \mu_{x-e_2, x+e_1} + \mu_{x+e_1, x}\) (sums of positive measures) we see that both \(x + \hat{e}_1^i, x + \hat{e}_1^i - e_2 \in S_{[\zeta, \eta]}^*\).

Suppose \( \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \cap \text{supp} \mu_{x, x+e_1} \). By Theorem 3.1, \( x \) must point to \( x + e_2 \) in \( G_{\xi} \), which forces the same in \( G_{\zeta} \). Thus \( x + \hat{e}_1^i \) points to \( x + \hat{e}_1^i - e_2 \) in \( G_{\zeta}^* \) and hence also in \( G_{[\zeta, \eta]}^* \).

Conversely, if \( x + \hat{e}_1^i \in S_{[\zeta, \eta]}^* \) then \( \gamma^{x+e_2, \zeta} \) and \( \gamma^{x+e_1, \eta} \) do not intersect. If furthermore \( x + \hat{e}_1^i \) points to \( x + \hat{e}_1^i - e_2 \) in \( G_{[\zeta, \eta]}^* \), then \( x \) points to \( x + e_2 \) in \( G_{\zeta} \) and hence \( \gamma^{x, \zeta} \) joins \( \gamma^{x+e_2, \zeta} \) and does not intersect \( \gamma^{x+e_1, \eta} \).

Let \( \zeta' < \zeta \) and \( \eta' > \eta \). By geodesic ordering (2.12), \( \gamma^{x, \zeta'} \) and \( \gamma^{x+e_1, \eta'} \) are disjoint. In particular, the coalescence points \( \zeta' \cup (x, x + e_1) \) and \( \eta' \cup (x, x + e_1) \) cannot coincide on \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \). By Proposition 6.1, \([\zeta', \eta'][ \cap [\zeta, \eta] \neq \emptyset \). Thus it follows that also \([\zeta, \eta] \) intersects \( \text{supp} \mu_{x, x+e_1} \). □

Proof of Proposition 4.7. Suppose \( \mu_{x, y} \) is a compact set, we can find \( \zeta' < \zeta \) and \( \eta' > \eta \) such that \( |\mu_{x, y}|([\zeta', \eta'][ \cap [\zeta, \eta]) = 0 \). Then by Proposition 6.1, there exists \( z \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \) such that all geodesics \( \gamma^{x, \zeta} \) and \( \gamma^{y, \eta} \) for \( \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \) and \( \square \in \{ -, + \} \) meet at \( z \). Thus \( z \) and \( y \) are in the same subtree of the graph \( G_{[\zeta, \eta]} \).

Conversely, suppose \( x \) and \( y \) are two distinct points in the same subtree \( \mathcal{K} \) of the graph \( G_{[\zeta, \eta]} \). In this tree the following holds.

\[
\text{In } \mathcal{K} \text{ there is a point } z \text{ and a path } \pi \text{ from } x \text{ to } z \text{ and a path } \pi' \text{ from } y \text{ to } z \text{ such that } z \text{ is the first common point of } \pi \text{ and } \pi'. \text{ For each } \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \text{ and both signs } \square \in \{ -, + \}, \text{ all the geodesics } \gamma^{x, \zeta} \text{ follow } \pi \text{ from } x \text{ to } z, \text{ and all the geodesics } \gamma^{y, \eta} \text{ follow } \pi' \text{ from } y \text{ to } z. \]

Consequently each \( \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \) satisfies \( z^\zeta' (x, y) = z^\zeta (x, y) = z \). By Proposition 6.2 each \( \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \) lies outside \( \text{supp} \mu_{x, y} \). □

Proof of Lemma 4.8. The hypotheses imply that, by switching \( x \) and \( y \) around if necessary, \( x \cdot e_1 \leq y \cdot e_1 \) and \( x \cdot e_2 \geq y \cdot e_2 \). Let \( z, \pi, \pi' \) as in (7.7). Let \( u \) be any point of \([x \land y, x \lor y]\). By planarity, each geodesic \( \gamma^{u, \xi} \) for \( \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \) and \( \square \in \{ -, + \} \) must eventually intersect \( \pi \) or \( \pi' \) and then follow this to \( z \). See Figure 7.2. By uniqueness of finite geodesics, all these geodesics \( \gamma^{u, \xi} \) follow the same path \( \pi'' \) from \( u \) to \( z \). Thus \( \pi'' \) is part of the graph \( G_{[\zeta, \eta]} \), and since it comes together with \( \pi \) and \( \pi' \) at \( z \), \( \pi'' \) is part of the same subtree \( \mathcal{K} \). □

Proof of Lemma 4.9. Suppose \( x \) is a such vertex but \( \mathcal{K} \subset \{ y : y \geq x \} \) fails. We claim that then there necessarily exists a vertex \( y \in \mathcal{K} \) such that \( x \) and \( y \) satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 4.8 and one of \( (x - e_1, x - e_2) \) lies in \([x \land y, x \lor y]\). This leads to a contradiction.

To verify the claim, pick \( y \in \mathcal{K} \) such that \( y \geq x \) fails. If \( y < x \) also fails, there are two possible cases:

\[ \text{Figure 7.2. Proof of Lemma 4.8.} \]
\( (i) \ y \cdot e_1 \leq x \cdot e_1 \) and \( y \cdot e_2 \geq x \cdot e_2 \), in which case \( x - e_1 \in \{x \wedge y, x \vee y\} \in \mathcal{K} \);
\( (ii) \ y \cdot e_1 \geq x \cdot e_1 \) and \( y \cdot e_2 \leq x \cdot e_2 \), in which case \( x - e_2 \in \{x \wedge y, x \vee y\} \in \mathcal{K} \).

If \( y < x \) does not fail, follow the geodesics \( \{\gamma \in \xi^\pm : \xi \in [\zeta, \eta]\} \) until they hit the level \( \mathbb{L}_{x, e_1} \) at some point \( y' \). The assumption that neither \( x - e_1 \) nor \( x - e_2 \) lies in \( \mathcal{K} \) implies that \( y' \neq x \). Thus \( y' \) is a point of \( \mathcal{K} \) that fails both \( y' \geq x \) and \( y' < x \). Replace \( y \) with \( y' \) and apply the previous argument.

We have shown that the existence of \( x \in \mathcal{K} \) such that \( \{x - e_1, x - e_2\} \cap \mathcal{K} = \emptyset \) implies that \( \mathcal{K} \subset \{y : y \geq x\} \). That such \( x \) must be unique follows since \( x \) lies outside \( \{y : y \geq x'\} \) for any \( x' \neq x \) that satisfies \( x' \geq x \).

Assuming that \( \inf \{t \in \mathbb{Z} : \mathcal{K} \cap L_t \neq \emptyset\} > -\infty \), pick \( x \in \mathcal{K} \) to minimize the level \( x'_{\mathcal{E}_1} \). \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem 4.10.** Part (a). If \( [\zeta, \eta] \cap \mathcal{V}^\omega = \emptyset \) then the interval \([\zeta, \eta]\) is strictly on one side of \( \xi_\omega(T_2 \omega) \) at every \( x \). Hence the trees \( \{\mathcal{G}_{x, \omega} : \xi \in [\zeta, \eta], \square \in \{-, +\}\} \) are all identical.

Conversely, if \( \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \cap \mathcal{V}^\omega \), then there exist \( x, y \) such that \( \xi \in \supp \mu_{x, y} \) and by Theorem 3.1 there are disjoint geodesics in \( \mathcal{G}_{\zeta, \eta} \).

Part (b). It follows from what was already said that \( \{\mathcal{K}(x) : x \in \mathbb{D}[\zeta, \eta]\} \) are disjoint subtrees of \( \mathcal{G}_{\zeta, \eta} \) and their vertex sets cover \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \). Suppose \( (x, x + e_1) \) is an edge in \( \mathcal{G}_{\zeta, \eta} \). Then all geodesics \( \{\gamma \in \xi^\pm : \xi \in [\zeta, \eta]\} \) go through this edge. Thus this edge must be an edge of the tree \( \mathcal{K}(z) \) that contains both \( x \) and \( x + e_1 \). Hence each edge of \( \mathcal{G}_{\zeta, \eta} \) is an edge of one of the trees \( \mathcal{K}(z) \), and no such edge can connect two trees \( \mathcal{K}(x) \) and \( \mathcal{K}(z') \) for distinct \( z \) and \( z' \). \( \square \)

8. SHOCKS IN THE EXPONENTIAL MODEL: PROOFS

We turn to the proof of the results in Section 5, beginning with a discussion of Palm kernels, which are needed in order to prove Theorems 5.2 and 5.3.

8.1. Palm kernels. Let \( \mathcal{M}_{X \times \tau u} \) denote the space of locally bounded positive Borel measures on the locally compact space \( X \times \tau u \). Consider \( X \times \tau u \) as the disjoint union of copies of \( \tau u \), one copy for each horizontal edge \((k, e_1), (k+1, e_1)\) on the \( x \)-axis. Recall that \( B^\xi(x_0) = B^\xi(k, e_1), (k+1, e_1) \).

We define two random measures \( \nu \) and \( n \) on \( X \times \tau u \) in terms of the Busemann functions \( \xi \mapsto B^\xi_{x_0} \) attached to these edges.

On each subset \( \{k\} \times \tau u \) of \( X \times \tau u \) we (slightly abuse notation and) define the measure \( \nu_k \) by
\[
\nu_k(\{k\} \times [\zeta, \eta]) = \nu_k(\{\zeta, \eta\}) = B^\zeta_{k} + B^\eta_{k}^{-}
\]
for \( \zeta < \eta \) in \( \tau u \). In terms of definition (3.1), \( \nu_k = \mu_{(k+1)e_1, ke_1} \) is a positive measure due to monotonicity (2.9). On \( X \times \tau u \), define the measure \( \nu = \sum_k \nu_k \). In other words, for Borel sets \( A \subset \tau u \), \( \nu(\bigcup_k \{k\} \times A) = \sum_k \nu_k(A) \).

Let \( \mathfrak{n}_k \) denote the simple point process on \( \{k\} \times \tau u \) that records the locations of the jumps of the Busemann function \( \xi \mapsto B^\xi_{k} \): for Borel \( A \subset \tau u \),
\[
\mathfrak{n}_k(\{k\} \times A) = \mathfrak{n}_k(A) = \sum_{\xi \in A} \mathbb{1}\{B_{k}^\xi - B_{k}^\xi > B_{k}^\xi_{-}\}.
\]

The probability distributions of the component measures \( \nu_k \) and \( \mathfrak{n}_k \) were described in Theorem 3.4 of [20]. Marginally, for each \( k \), \( \mathfrak{n}_k \) is a Poisson point process on \( \tau u \) with intensity measure
\[
(8.1) \quad \lambda(\{\zeta, \eta\}) = \lambda_k(\{\zeta, \eta\}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{n}_k(\{\zeta, \eta\})] = \int_{\alpha(\xi)}^{\alpha(\eta)} \frac{ds}{s} = \log \frac{\alpha(\eta)}{\alpha(\zeta)}.
\]
In particular, almost every realization of \( \mathfrak{n}_k \) satisfies \( \mathfrak{n}_k[\zeta, \eta] < \infty \) for all \( \zeta < \eta \) in \( \tau u \).

Create a marked Poisson process by attaching an independent \( \text{Exp}(\alpha(\xi)) \)-distributed weight \( Y_\xi \) to each point \( \xi \) in the support of \( \mathfrak{n}_k \). Then the distribution of \( \nu_k \) is that of the purely atomic measure defined by
\[
(8.2) \quad \nu_k(\{\zeta, \eta\}) = \sum_{\xi \in \tau u, \mathfrak{n}_k(\xi) = 1} Y_\xi \mathbb{1}[\zeta, \eta](\xi) \quad \text{for} \quad \zeta < \eta \text{ in } \tau u.
\]
The random variable $\nu_k([\zeta, \eta])$ has distribution $\text{Ber}(1 - \frac{\lambda(\zeta)}{\lambda(\eta)}) \otimes \text{Exp}(\alpha(\zeta))$ (product of a Bernoulli and an independent exponential) and expectation

$$\mathbb{E}[\nu_k([\zeta, \eta])] = \frac{1}{\alpha(\zeta)} - \frac{1}{\alpha(\eta)}.$$  (8.3)

Note the following technical point. The jumps of $B_k^{\xi \pm}$ concentrate at $e_2$ and $B^{\xi^2} = \infty$. To define $\nu$ and $n$ as locally finite measures, the standard Euclidean topology of $\mathbb{R}^d$ has to be metrized so that $[e_2, \eta]$ is an unbounded set for any $\eta > e_2$. This point makes no difference to our calculations and we already encountered this same issue around definition (3.1) of the Busemann measures. With this convention we can regard $n = \sum_k n_k$ as a simple point process on $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with mean measure $\lambda = (\text{counting measure on } \mathbb{Z}) \otimes \lambda$.

For $(k, \xi) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, let $Q_{(k, \xi)}$ be the Palm kernel of $\nu$ with respect to $n$. That is, $Q_{(k, \xi)}$ is the stochastic kernel from $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ into $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d}$ that gives the distribution of $\nu$, conditional on $n$ having a point at $(k, \xi)$, understood in the Palm sense. Rigorously, the kernel is defined by disintegrating the Campbell measure of the pair $(n, \nu)$ with respect to the mean measure $\lambda$ of $n$ (this is developed in Section 6.1 in [37]): for any nonnegative Borel function $f : (\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d} \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d} f(k, \xi, \nu) n(\text{d}k \otimes \text{d}\xi)\right] = \int_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d}} f(k, \xi, \nu) Q_{(k, \xi)}(\text{d}v) \lambda(\text{d}k \otimes \text{d}\xi).$$  (8.4)

Now we consider the indices $\tau^\xi(i) = \tau^{\xi, \xi'}(i)$ of jumps at $\xi$, defined in (5.1). In terms of the random measures introduced above, for $(k, \xi) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\nu\{(k, \xi)\} > 0 \iff n\{(k, \xi)\} = 1 \iff B_k^{\xi'^-} > B_k^{\xi'^+} \iff k \in \{\tau^\xi(i) : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$  

We condition on the event $\{n(0, \xi) = 1\}$, in other words, consider the distribution of $\{\tau^\xi(i)\}$ under $Q_{(0, \xi)}$. For this to be well-defined, we define these functions also on the space $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d}$ in the obvious way: for $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d}$, the $\mathbb{Z} \times \{\pm \infty\}$-valued functions $\tau^\xi(i) = \tau^\xi(i, \nu)$ are defined by the order requirement

$$\ldots < \tau^\xi(-1, \nu) < 0 \leq \tau^\xi(0, \nu) < \tau^\xi(1, \nu) < \ldots$$

and the condition

$$\text{for } k \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \nu\{(k, \xi)\} > 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad k \in \{\tau^\xi(i, \nu) : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$  

Since $\nu$ is $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely a purely atomic measure, it follows from general theory that $Q_{(0, \xi)}$ is also supported on such measures. Furthermore, the conditioning itself forces $Q_{(0, \xi)}\{\nu : \tau^\xi(0, \nu) = 0\} = 1$. Thus the random integer points $\tau^\xi(i, \nu)$ are not all trivially $\pm \infty$ under $Q_{(0, \xi)}$. Connecting back to the notation of Section 5, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, each finite $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta_i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $r_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ with $i \in A$, the Palm kernel introduced in that section is given by

$$\mathbb{P}\left((\tau^\xi(i) - \tau^\xi(i - 1) = \eta_i, B_k^{\xi'^-} - B_k^{\xi'^+} > r_i : i \in A) \mid B_k^{\xi'^-} > B_k^{\xi'^+}\right)$$

$$= Q_{(k, \xi)}\{\nu : \{\tau^\xi(1, \nu) - \tau^\xi(i, \nu) : i \in A\} > r_i : i \in A\}.$$  (8.5)

8.2. Statistics of shocks. We now turn to the proofs of the theorems of Section 5. Note that these proofs make use of results stated and proved in Appendices C and D.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. By Corollary C.2, the process $\{B_k^{\xi^-} - B_k^{\eta^-}\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ has the same distribution as $\{W_k^+\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ defined in (D.6). An application of the appropriate mapping to these sequences produces the sequence $\left\{B_0^{\eta^-} - B_0^{\eta^-}, \tau^{\xi, \eta}(i + 1) - \tau^{\xi, \eta}(i), B_i^{\xi, \eta'}(n) - B_i^{\eta', \eta}(n) : i \in \mathbb{Z}\right\}$ that appears in Theorem 5.1 and the sequence $\{W_0^+, \sigma_{i+1} - \sigma_i, W_i^+ : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ that appears in Theorem D.2. Hence these sequences also have identical distribution. ($W_0^+ = W_0^+$ by (D.9).) The distributions remain equal when these sequences are conditioned on the positive probability events $B_0^+ = B_0^+ > 0$ and $W_0^+ > 0$. \hfill $\square$
It will be convenient to have notation for the conditional joint distribution that appears in (5.3) in Theorem 5.1. For $0 < \alpha \leq \beta \leq 1$ define probability distributions $q^{\alpha,\beta}$ on the product space $\mathbb{Z}^2 \times [0, \infty)^2$ as follows. Denote the generic variables on this product space by $((\tau_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\Delta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}})$ with $\tau_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 < \Delta_k < \infty$. Given an integer $L > 0$, integers $n_{-L} < \cdots < n_{-2} < n_{-1} < n_0 = 0 < n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_L$, and positive reals $r_{-L}, \ldots, r_L$, abbreviate $b_i = n_{i+1} - n_i$. The measure $q^{\alpha,\beta}$ is defined by

$$q^{\alpha,\beta}\{\tau_i = n_i, \Delta_n_i > r_i \text{ for } i \in [-L, L]\}, \Delta_k = 0 \text{ for } k \in [n_{-L}, n_L]\} = \left(\prod_{i=-L}^{L} C_{b_i-1}\right) \alpha^{b_i-1,1} \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{\alpha + \beta + \beta^2} b_{i-1}\right).$$

(8.6)

To paraphrase the definition, the following holds under $q^{\alpha,\beta}$: $\tau_0 = 0$, $\Delta_k = 0$ for $k \notin \{\tau_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, and the variables $\{\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i, \Delta_{n_i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are mutually independent with marginal distribution

$$q^{\alpha,\beta}\{\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i = n, \Delta_{n_i} > r\} = C_{n-1} \alpha^{n-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha + \beta + \beta^2} b_{n-1}\right).$$

(8.7)

Abbreviate $q^\alpha = q^{\alpha,\alpha}$ which has marginal $q^\alpha\{\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i = n, \Delta_{n_i} > r\} = C_{n-1}\frac{1}{(\alpha + \beta + \beta^2)^{n-1}}$. As $\beta \to \alpha$, $q^{\alpha,\beta}$ converges weakly to $q^\alpha$.

Theorem 5.1 can now be restated by saying that, conditional on $B_0^\zeta > B_0^n$, the variables $((\tau_{\zeta,\eta}(i))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (B_0^\zeta - B_0^n)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}})$ have joint distribution $q^{\alpha(\zeta),\alpha(\eta)}$. Consequently, for a measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^2 \times [0, \infty)^2$,

$$P\left[B_0^\zeta > B_0^n, (\{\tau_{\zeta,\eta}(i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (B_0^\zeta - B_0^n)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in A\right] = P\left(B_0^\zeta > B_0^n\right) P\left((\{\tau_{\zeta,\eta}(i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (B_0^\zeta - B_0^n)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in A \mid B_0^\zeta > B_0^n\right)$$

$$= \frac{\alpha(\eta) - \alpha(\zeta)}{\alpha(\eta)}, q^{\alpha(\zeta),\alpha(\eta)}(A).$$

(8.8)

The first probability on the last line came from (C.6) and the second from Theorem 5.1.

**Proof of Theorem 5.2.** Define $\mathbb{Z} \cup \{\pm \infty\}$-valued ordered indices $\cdots < \tau_{-1,\eta}^\zeta < 0 < \tau_0^\zeta < \tau_1^\zeta < \cdots$ as measurable functions of a locally finite measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{U}}$ by the rule

$$\nu((k) \times [\zeta, \eta]) > 0 \iff k \in \{\tau_i^\zeta < \eta \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

(8.9)

If $\nu((k) \times [\zeta, \eta]) > 0$ does not hold for infinitely many $k > 0$ then $\tau_i^\zeta = \infty$ for large enough $i$, and analogously for $k < 0$. Definition (8.9) applied to the random measure $\nu = \sum_k \nu_k$ reproduces (5.1).

Fix integers $K, N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\ell_{-N} \leq \cdots \leq \ell_{-1} \leq 0 \leq \ell_1 \leq \cdots \leq \ell_N$ and strictly positive reals $r_{-K}, \ldots, r_K$. Define the event

$$H^{\zeta,\eta} = H(\zeta, \eta) = \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq N} \left\{\nu : \tau_{-i}^\zeta \leq \ell_{-i} \text{ and } \tau_i^\zeta \geq \ell_i\right\} \cap \bigcap_{-K \leq k \leq K} \left\{\nu : \nu((k) \times [\zeta, \eta]) < r_k\right\}$$

(8.10)

on the space $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{U}}$. Note the monotonicity

$$H^{\zeta,\eta} \subset H^{\zeta',\eta'} \text{ for } [\zeta', \eta'] \subset [\zeta, \eta].$$

(8.11)

Abbreviate $H^\xi = H^{\zeta,\xi}$. Recall the measures $q^{\alpha,\beta}$ defined in (8.6). The analogous event under the measures $q^{\alpha,\beta}$ on the space $\mathbb{Z}^2 \times [0, \infty)^2$ is denoted by

$$H_q = \{(\tau_{\zeta,\eta}(i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\Delta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \times [0, \infty)^2 \mid \tau_{-i} \leq \ell_{-i} \text{ and } \tau_i \geq \ell_i \text{ for } i \in [1, N], \Delta_k < r_k \text{ for } k \in [-K, K]\}.$$

(8.12)

Fix $\zeta < \eta$ in $\mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{U}$. We prove the theorem by showing that

$$Q_{(0,\zeta)}(H^\xi) = q^{\alpha(\zeta)}(H_q) \text{ for Lebesgue-almost every } \xi \in [\zeta, \eta].$$

(8.13)

This equality comes from separate arguments for upper and lower bounds.
Upper bound proof. Define a sequence of nested partitions \( \zeta = \zeta_0 < \zeta_1 < \cdots < \zeta_n = \eta \). For each \( n \) and \( \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \), let \( [\zeta^n(\xi), \eta^n(\xi)] \) denote the unique interval \([\zeta^n, \zeta^n_{n+1}]\) that contains \( \xi \). Assume that, as \( n \nearrow \infty \), the mesh size max\( |\zeta^n_{n+1} - \zeta^n| \to 0 \). Consequently, for each \( \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \), the intervals \([\zeta^n(\xi), \eta^n(\xi)]\) decrease to the singleton \( \{ \xi \} \).

The key step of this upper bound proof is that for all \( m \) and \( \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \),

\[
Q_{(0, \xi)}(H^{c_m^{\xi}}, \zeta_{n+1}^n) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\{ \nu \in H^{c_m^{\xi}}, \zeta_{n+1}^n \mid n_0([\zeta^n(\xi), \eta^n(\xi)]) \geq 1 \}.
\]

This limit is a special case of Theorem 6.32(iii) in Kallenberg [37], for the simple point process \( \mathbb{P} \) and the sets \( B_n = \{ 0 \} \times ([\zeta^n(\xi), \eta^n(\xi)]) \setminus \{ 0 \}. \) The proof given for Theorem 12.8 of [36] can also be used to establish this limit. Theorem 12.8 of [36] by itself is not quite adequate because we use the Palm kernel for the measure \( \nu \) which is not the same as \( \mathbb{P} \).

If we take \( \xi \in [\zeta^n_m, \zeta^n_{n+1}] \), then for \( n \geq m \), \([\zeta^n(\xi), \eta^n(\xi)] \subseteq [\zeta^n_m, \zeta^n_{n+1}] \). Considering all \( \xi \) in the union \([\zeta, \eta] \cup [\zeta^n_m, \zeta^n_{n+1}] \), we have that for any fixed \( m \) and Lebesgue-a.e. \( \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \),

\[
Q_{(0, \xi)}(H^{c_m^{\xi}}, \zeta^n(\xi)) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\{ \nu \in H^{c_m^{\xi}}, \zeta^n(\xi) \mid n_0([\zeta^n(\xi), \eta^n(\xi)]) \geq 1 \} \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\{ \nu \in H^{c_m^{\xi}}, \zeta^n(\xi) \mid n_0([\zeta^n(\xi), \eta^n(\xi)]) \geq 1 \}.
\]

The inequality is due to (8.11).

Interpreting (8.8) in terms of the random measures \( \nu \) and \( n \) and referring to (8.10) and (8.12) gives the identity

\[
\mathbb{P}\{ \nu \in H^{c_m^{\xi}}, \zeta^n(\xi) \mid n_0([\zeta^n(\xi), \eta^n(\xi)]) \geq 1 \} = q^{\alpha(\zeta^n(\xi)), \alpha(\eta^n(\xi))}(H_q).
\]

As \( ([\zeta^n(\xi), \eta^n(\xi)]) \setminus \{ \xi \} \), the parameters converge: \( \alpha(\zeta^n(\xi)), \alpha(\eta^n(\xi)) \to \alpha(\xi) \). Consequently the distribution \( q^{\alpha(\zeta^n(\xi)), \alpha(\eta^n(\xi))} \) converges to \( q^{\alpha(\xi)} \). Hence

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\{ \nu \in H^{c_m^{\xi}}, \zeta^n(\xi) \mid n_0([\zeta^n(\xi), \eta^n(\xi)]) \geq 1 \} = q^{\alpha(\xi)}(H_q).
\]

In summary, we have for all \( m \) and Lebesgue-a.e. \( \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \),

\[
Q_{(0, \xi)}(H^{c_m^{\xi}}, \zeta^n(\xi)) \leq q^{\alpha(\xi)}(H_q).
\]

Let \( m \nearrow \infty \) so that \( H^{c_m^{\xi}}, \zeta^n(\xi) \nearrow H^\xi \), to obtain the upper bound

\[
Q_{(0, \xi)}(H^\xi) \leq q^{\alpha(\xi)}(H_q)
\]

for Lebesgue-a.e. \( \xi \in [\zeta, \eta] \).

Lower bound proof. Let \( \zeta = \zeta_0 < \zeta_1 < \cdots < \zeta_\ell = \eta \) be a partition of the interval \([\zeta, \eta] \) and set \( \alpha_j = \alpha(\zeta_j) \).

In order to get an estimate below, let \( \mathbf{m} = (m_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N} \) be a \( 2N \)-vector of integers such that \( m_i < \ell_i \) for \( N \) \( \leq i \leq N \) and \( m_i > \ell_i \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq N \). Define the subset \( H^\mathbf{m}_q \) of \( H^\xi_q \) from (8.12) by truncating the coordinates \( \tau_i \):

\[
H^\mathbf{m}_q = \{ (\tau_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \cup \{ \Delta_k \}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{Z}^\mathbb{Z} \times [0, \infty)^\mathbb{Z} : m_{-i} \leq \tau_{-i} \leq \ell_{-i} \text{ and } \ell_i \leq \tau_i \leq m_i \}
\]

for \( i \in [1, N] \), \( \Delta_k < r_k \) for \( k \in [-K, K] \} \).

On the last line in the following computation, \( c_1 \) is a constant that depends on the parameters \( \alpha(\zeta) \) and \( \alpha(\eta) \) and on the quantities in (8.16):

\[
\int_{[\zeta, \eta]} Q_{(0, \xi)}(H^\xi) \lambda_0(d\xi) = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \int_{[\zeta_j, \zeta_{j+1}]} Q_{(0, \xi)}(H^\xi) \lambda_0(d\xi)
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \int_{[\zeta_j, \zeta_{j+1}]} Q_{(0, \xi)}(H^\xi_{\zeta_j, \zeta_{j+1}}) \lambda_0(d\xi) = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \mathbb{E}[n_0([\zeta_j, \zeta_{j+1}]) \cdot 1_{H^\xi_{\zeta_j, \zeta_{j+1}}(\nu)}]
\]
The steps above come as follows. The second equality uses the characterization (8.4) of the kernel \( Q(0,\xi) \). The third equality is from (8.8). The second last inequality is from Lemma 8.1 below, which is valid once the mesh size \( \max \alpha_j + \alpha_j \) is small enough relative to the numbers \( \{m_i, \ell_i\} \).

The function \( \alpha \to q^\alpha(H_q^m) \) is continuous in the Riemann sum approximation on the last line of the calculation above. Let \( \max(\alpha_j + \alpha_j) \to 0 \) to obtain the inequality

\[
\int Q(0,\xi)(H^\xi \lambda_0(d\xi) \geq \int q^\alpha(H_q^m) \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha} = \int q^\alpha(H_q^m) \lambda_0(d\xi).
\]

Let \( m_i \to -\infty \) for \( -N \leq i \leq -1 \) and \( m_i \to \infty \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq N \). The above turns into

(8.17) \[
\int Q(0,\xi)(H^\xi \lambda_0(d\xi) \geq \int q^\alpha(H_q^m) \lambda_0(d\xi).
\]

The upper bound (8.15) and the lower bound (8.17) together imply the conclusion (8.13). \( \square \)

The proof of Theorem 5.2 is complete once we verify the auxiliary lemma used in the calculation above.

**Lemma 8.1.** Let the event \( H_q^m \) be as defined in (8.16). Fix \( 0 < \alpha < \overline{\alpha} < 1 \). Then there exist constants \( \varepsilon, c_1 \in (0, \infty) \) such that

\[
q^\alpha \beta(H_q^m) \geq q^\beta(H_q^m) \cdot (1 - c_1(\beta - \alpha))
\]

for all \( \alpha, \beta \in [\alpha, \overline{\alpha}] \) such that \( \alpha \leq \beta \leq \alpha + \varepsilon \). The constants \( \varepsilon, c_1 \in (0, \infty) \) depend on \( \alpha, \overline{\alpha} \), and the parameters \( \ell_i, m_i \) and \( r_k \) in (8.16).

**Proof.** Let

\[ A = \{ p = (p_i)_{-N \leq i \leq N} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2N+1} : p_0 = 0, p_i < p_j \text{ for } i < j, \]

\[ m_i \leq p_i \leq \ell_{i-1} \text{ and } \ell_i \leq p_i \leq m_i \forall i \in [1, N] \}\]

be the relevant finite set of integer-valued \((2N+1)\)-vectors for the decomposition below. For each \( p \in A \) let \( \mathcal{K}(p) = \{ p_i : i \in [-N, N], p_i \in [-K, K] \} \) be the set of coordinates of \( p \) in \([-K, K]\). Abbreviate \( b_i = p_i + 1 - p_i \). Recall that, under \( q^\alpha, \tau_0 = 0 \), that \( \Delta_k < r_k \) holds with probability one if \( k \notin \{ \tau_i \} \), and the independence in (8.7). The factors \( d_k > 0 \) below that satisfy

\[ 1 - e^{-\alpha r_k} \geq (1 - e^{-\beta r_k})(1 - d_k(\beta - \alpha)) \]

can be chosen uniformly for \( \alpha \leq \beta \in [\alpha, \overline{\alpha}] \), as functions of \( \alpha, \overline{\alpha} \), and \( \{r_k\} \).

Now compute:

\[
q^\alpha \beta(H_q^m) = \sum_{p \in A} q^\alpha \beta \{ m_i \leq \tau_i \leq \ell_{i-1} \text{ and } \ell_i \leq \tau_i \leq m_i \forall i \in [1, N], \Delta_k < r_k \text{ for } k \in [-K, K] \}
\]

\[
= \sum_{p \in A} q^\alpha \beta \{ \tau_i = p_i \text{ for } i \in [-N, N], \Delta_k < r_k \text{ for } k \in [-K, K] \}
\]

\[
= \sum_{p \in A} q^\alpha \beta \{ \tau_{i+1} - \tau_i = b_i \forall i \in [-N, N - 1] \} \cdot \prod_{k \in \mathcal{K}(p)} (1 - e^{-\alpha r_k})
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{p \in A} \left( \prod_{i=-N}^{N-1} C_{b_i-1} \frac{\alpha^{b_i-1} \beta^{b_i}}{(\alpha + \beta)^{2b_i-1}} \cdot \prod_{k \in \mathcal{K}(p)} (1 - e^{-\beta r_k})(1 - d_k(\beta - \alpha)) \right)
\]
\[
\sum_{p \in A} \left( \prod_{i=-N}^{N-1} C_{b_i-1} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{2b_i-1} \right) \left( \prod_{k \in K(p)} \left( 1 - e^{-\beta r_k} \right) \right) \cdot (1 - c_1(\beta - \alpha))
\]

By the definition (8.4) of the Palm kernel, this gives

\[
q^\nu \{ \tau_{i+1} - \tau_i = b_i \} \quad \forall i \in \{-N, N - 1\}, \ \Delta_k < r_k \text{ for } k \in \{-K, K\} \cdot (1 - c_1(\beta - \alpha))
\]

To get the inequality above, (i) apply Lemma B.3 to the first factor in parentheses with \( \varepsilon \) chosen so that \( 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon / b_i \) for all \( p \in A \), and (ii) set \( c_1 = \sum_{k=-K}^{K} d_k \).

In the proofs that follow, we denote the locations of the positive atoms of a measure \( \nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{U}} \) by \( u_k(\nu, \xi) = u_k(\xi) = \mathbb{1}[(k, \xi)] > 0 \) for \( (k, \xi) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{U} \).

**Lemma 8.2.** For Lebesgue-almost every \( \xi \in \mathcal{U} \) and all \( m \in \mathbb{Z} \),

\[
Q_{(m, \xi)}[\nu : \{u_{m+k}(\nu, \xi)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in A] = P(A)
\]

for all Borel sets \( A \subset \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{Z} \).

**Proof.** For \( m = 0 \), (8.18) comes from a comparison of (5.4) and (5.5). For general \( m \) it then follows from the shift-invariance of the weights \( \omega \).

**Proof of Theorem 5.3.** Take \( A \subset \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{Z} \) as in (5.6), fix \( \zeta, \eta \in \mathcal{U} \) with \( \zeta < \eta \) and let \( N \in \mathbb{N} \). Applied to the random measure \( \nu \) this gives \( u_k(\nu, \xi) = n_k(\xi) \). We restrict the integrals below to the compact set \( [\zeta, \eta] \times [-N, N] \) with the indicator

\[
g(k, \xi, \nu) = \mathbb{1}_{[-N, N] \times [\zeta, \eta]}(k, \xi)
\]

and then define on \( \mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{U}} \)

\[
f(k, \xi, \nu) = g(k, \xi, \nu) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{u_k(\xi, \nu) \in A\}}(\xi, \nu).
\]

By the definition (8.4) of the Palm kernel,

\[
E \left[ \int_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{U}} f(k, \xi, \nu) \mathbf{n}(dk \otimes d\xi) \right] = \int_{[\zeta, \eta] \times [-N, N]} Q_{(k, \xi)}((u_{\ell}\{\xi\} : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}) \in A) \lambda(dk \otimes d\xi) = \int_{[\zeta, \eta] \times [-N, N]} \lambda(dk \otimes d\xi) = E \left[ \int_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{U}} g(k, \xi, \nu) \mathbf{n}(dk \otimes d\xi) \right].
\]

The second equality used shift-invariance of \( \mathcal{A} \) and the third equality used (8.18) and \( P(A) = 1 \). The left-hand side and the right-hand side are both finite because the integrals are restricted to the compact set \( [\zeta, \eta] \times [-N, N] \). Since \( \mathbf{n} \) is a positive random measure, it follows that

\[
P \left( \int_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{U}} f(k, \xi, \nu) \mathbf{n}(dk \otimes d\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{U}} g(k, \xi, \nu) \mathbf{n}(dk \otimes d\xi) \right) = 1.
\]

As \( \zeta, \eta \), and \( N \), were arbitrary, we conclude that \( P \)-almost surely \( \{u_{\ell}\{\xi\} : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \in \mathcal{A} \) for all \( (k, \xi) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{U} \) such that \( \mathbf{n}\{(k, \xi)\} = 1 \). Lemma 3.6 applied to the \( x \)-axis \( (x_i = ie_1) \) then shows that \( \xi \in \mathcal{U}^\omega \) if and only if \( \mathbf{n}\{(k, \xi)\} = 1 \) for some \( k \).

**Lemma 8.3.** Assume (3.7). Then for any \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), and \( \zeta \in \mathcal{U} \) we have

\[
P \left\{ 3 \xi \in [\zeta, c_1[ : n(\mathbb{Z} \times \{\xi\}) > 2\delta n + 1 \right\} \leq 2(n + 1) \left( \frac{(1 - \delta / 2)^{2-\delta}}{(1 - \delta)^{1-\delta}} \right)^n \log \alpha(\zeta)^{-1}.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( \{\Delta_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) be i.i.d. random variables with probability mass function \( p(n) = C_{n-1}2^{1-2n} \) for \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). For \( k \in [0, n] \) and \( \xi \in \mathcal{U} \) use a union bound, translation, and (5.4) to write

\[
Q_{(k, \xi)} \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n} u_i(\xi) > 2\delta n + 1 \right\} \leq Q_{(k, \xi)} \left\{ \sum_{i=k-n}^{k+n} u_i(\xi) > 2\delta n + 1 \right\}
\]
Using the generating function $f = \sum_{n>0} C_n s^n = \frac{1}{2} (1 - \sqrt{1 - 4s})$ of Catalan numbers we obtain for $0 < s < 1$,

$$P\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \delta n \rfloor} \Delta_j \leq n \right\} \leq s^{-n} E[s^\Delta]^{\delta n} = s^{-n} \left( 2 \sum_{n=1}^\infty C_{n-1} (s/4)^n \right)^{\delta n} \leq s^{-n} \left( \frac{s}{2} \sum_{k=0}^\infty C_k (s/4)^k \right)^{\delta n} = s^{-n} (1 - \sqrt{1 - s})^{\delta n}.$$ 

Take $s = \frac{4(1-\delta)}{(2-\delta)^2} < 1$ in the upper bound above to get

$$Q_{(k, \xi)} \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n} u_i(\xi) > 2\delta n + 1 \right\} \leq 2 \left( \frac{(1-\delta/2)^2 - \delta}{(1-\delta)^{1-\delta}} \right)^n.$$

Apply (8.4) to write

$$E \left[ \int_{riU} 1 \{ \xi \in [\zeta, e_1[ \} 1 \{ \{0, n] \times \{ \xi \} > 2\delta n + 1 \} n_k(d\xi) \} \right] = \int_{riU} 1 \{ \xi \in [\zeta, e_1[ \} Q_{(k, \xi)} \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n} u_i(\xi) > 2\delta n + 1 \right\} \lambda_k(d\xi) \leq 2 \left( \frac{(1-\delta/2)^2 - \delta}{(1-\delta)^{1-\delta}} \right)^n \int_{riU} 1 \{ \xi \in [\zeta, e_1[ \} \lambda_k(d\xi) \right) \leq 2 \left( \frac{(1-\delta/2)^2 - \delta}{(1-\delta)^{1-\delta}} \right)^n \log \alpha(\zeta)^{-1}.$$

To complete the proof, add over $k \in [0, n]$ and observe that

$$\int_{riU} 1 \{ \xi \in [\zeta, e_1[ \} 1 \{ \{0, n] \times \{ \xi \} > 2\delta n + 1 \} n_k(d\xi) \geq 1 \{ \exists \xi \in [\zeta, e_1[ : n([0, n] \times \{ \xi \}) > 2\delta n + 1 \} \}.$$ 

\begin{proof}
The result follows from Theorem 8.4 below and the observation that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta_n = 2\sqrt{n^{-1}} \log n$ satisfies the summability condition in that theorem.
\end{proof}

\begin{theorem}
Assume (3.7) and fix $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Consider a sequence $\delta_n \in (0, 1)$ such that $\sum n^2 e^{-n\delta_n^2} < \infty$. Then for any $\zeta \in riU$

$$P \left\{ \exists n_0 : \forall \xi \in [\zeta, e_2[, \forall n \geq n_0 : \sum_{x \in \{0, n\}^2} 1 \{ \xi \in \text{supp} \mu_{x, x+e_i} \} \leq n^2 \delta_n \right\} = 1.$$

The same result holds when $[0, n]^2$ is replaced by any one of $[-n, 0]^2$, $[0, n] \times [-n, 0]$, or $[-n, 0] \times [0, n]$.

\begin{proof}
Apply Lemma 8.3 and a union bound to get that for any $j \in \{1, 2\}$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\zeta \in riU$,

$$P \left\{ \exists \xi \in [\zeta, e_1[ : \sum_{x \in \{0, n\}^2} \rho^j_\xi(\xi) \geq (2\delta n + 1)(n + 1) \right\} \leq 2(n + 1)^2 \left( \frac{(1-\delta/2)^2 - \delta}{(1-\delta)^{1-\delta}} \right)^n \log \alpha(\zeta)^{-1}.$$

A Taylor expansion gives

$$\log \left( \frac{(1-\delta/2)^2 - \delta}{(1-\delta)^{1-\delta}} \right) = -\delta^2/4 + O(\delta^3).$$

\end{proof}

\end{theorem}
Thus, we see that for any \( \xi \in \ri \mathcal{U} \), for any sequence \( \delta_n \in (0, 1) \) such that \( \sum n^2e^{-n \delta_n^3} < \infty \), we have

\[
\mathbb{P}\left\{ \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N} : \forall \xi, e_1, \forall n \geq n_0 : \sum_{x \in [0,n]^2} p_x^q(\xi) \leq n^2 \delta_n \right\} = 1.
\]

The result for the other three sums comes similarly.

\[\square\]

**Appendix A. The Geometry of Geodesics: Previously Known Results**

This appendix carefully collects the properties of Busemann functions, geodesics, and competition interfaces which were discussed informally in Section 2.2.

The following result introduces the *Busemann process* and collects its main properties. It combines results following from Theorems 4.4 and 4.7, Lemmas 4.5(c) and 4.6(c), and Remark 4.11 in [34] and Lemmas 4.7 and 5.1 in [25].

**Theorem A.1.** [25, 34] Let \( \mathbb{P}_0 \) be a probability measure on \( \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^2} \) under which the coordinate projections are i.i.d., have positive variance, and have \( p > 2 \) finite moments. There exists a Polish probability space \( (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \) with

1. a group \( \mathcal{T} = \{ T_x \}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \) of \( \mathcal{F} \)-measurable \( \mathbb{P} \)-preserving bijections \( T_x : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega \),
2. a family \( \{ \omega_x(\omega) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \} \) of real-valued random variables \( \omega_x : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) such that \( \omega_y(T_x\omega) = \omega_x(y) \) for all \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \),
3. real-valued measurable functions \( B^{\xi^+}(x, y, \omega, \omega) = B^{\xi^+}_{xy}(\omega) \) and \( B^{\xi^-(x, y, \omega, \omega) = B^{\xi^-}_{xy}(\omega) \) of \( (x, y, \omega, \xi) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \Omega \times \mathcal{U} \),
4. and \( T \)-invariant events \( \Omega_0 \subset \Omega \) and \( \Omega_\xi \subset \Omega_0 \) for each \( \xi \in \ri \mathcal{U} \), with \( \mathbb{P}(\Omega_0) = \mathbb{P}(\Omega_\xi) = 1 \),

such that properties (a)-(l) listed below hold.

(a) \( \{ \omega_x : x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \} \) has distribution \( \mathbb{P}_0 \) under \( \mathbb{P} \).
(b) For any \( I \subset \mathbb{Z}^2 \), the variables

\[
\{(\omega_x, B^{\xi}(x, y, \omega)) : x \in I, y \geq x, \square \in \{-, +\}, \xi \in \ri \mathcal{U} \}
\]

are independent of \( \{ \omega_x : x \in I^c \} \) where \( I^c = \{ x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : x \not\in \mathbb{Z}^2 \} \).
(c) For each \( \xi \in \ri \mathcal{U} \), \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \), and \( \square \in \{-, +\} \), \( B^{\xi}(x, y) \) are integrable and (2.8) holds.
(d) For each \( \omega \in \Omega_0 \), \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \), and \( \square \in \{-, +\} \), if \( \xi, \eta \in \ri \mathcal{U} \) are such that \( \nabla g(\xi \square) = \nabla g(\eta \square) \), then \( B^{\xi}(x, y, \omega) = B^{\eta}(x, y, \omega) \).
(e) For each \( \omega \in \Omega_0 \), \( x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \), \( \xi \in \ri \mathcal{U} \), and \( \square \in \{-, +\} \) properties (2.5), (2.6), and (2.7) hold.
(f) For each \( \omega \in \Omega_0 \), (2.9) holds.
(g) For each \( \omega \in \Omega_\xi \), (2.10) holds.
(h) For each \( \omega \in \Omega_0 \) and each \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \),
\[\text{(A.1)}\]

\[
B^{\xi}(x, x + e_i) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as} \quad \xi \rightarrow e_{3-i}, \quad \text{for} \quad i \in \{1, 2\}.
\]

(i) For each \( \omega \in \Omega_\xi \) and each \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \),
\[\text{(A.2)}\]

\[
\lim_{\ri \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \xi} B^{\xi}(x, y, \omega) = B^{\xi}(x, y, \omega).
\]

(j) If \( \mathbb{P}(\omega_0 \leq r) \) is continuous in \( r \), then for all \( \xi \in \ri \mathcal{U} \), \( \omega \in \Omega_\xi \), \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \), and \( \square \in \{-, +\} \),
\[\text{(A.3)}\]

\[
B^{\xi}(x, x + e_1) \neq B^{\xi}(x, x + e_2).
\]

(k) For all \( \xi \in \ri \mathcal{U} \), \( \omega \in \Omega_\xi \), and \( \square \in \{-, +\} \),
\[\text{(A.4)}\]

\[
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{x \in \ri \mathcal{U} \cap \mathbb{Z}^2} n^{-1} |B^{\xi}(0, x) - x \cdot \nabla g(\xi \square)| = 0.
\]

(l) For all \( \xi \in \mathcal{D} \), \( \omega \in \Omega_\xi \), and \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \)
\[\text{(A.5)}\]

\[
B^{\xi^+}(x, y, \omega) = B^{\xi^-}(x, y, \omega) = B^{\xi}(x, y, \omega).
\]
(m) If $\xi, \xi_2, \xi \in D$ then for all $\omega \in \Omega^1_\xi$, (2.4) holds.

Note that part of the statement of Theorem A.1 is the existence of a probability space on which the conclusions hold. By Theorem 5.3 of [26], under condition (2.3), the conclusions hold on every probability space supporting i.i.d. weights with marginal $P_0$. In the language of stochastic analysis, the difference between these two statements is the usual distinction between weak and strong existence of solutions to stochastic equations.

Remark A.2. The probability measure $P$ is $T$-invariant, but is not shown to be ergodic under any of these shifts in general. One way to ensure $P$ is ergodic under some shifts is to assume the existence of a real number $c$ such that $P(\omega_0 \geq c) = 1$ and apply [26, Theorem 5.2(i)]. That result shows ergodicity of the process $\{B^\xi(x, y) : x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ under $T_{\xi_1}$-shifts, for fixed $\xi \in \Omega \cup \{-, +\}$, and $i \in \{1, 2\}$. This result does not guarantee joint ergodicity of the process or ergodicity under more general shifts.

The regularity condition (2.3) is equivalent to the existence of a countable dense set $D_0 \subset D$ such that $x, \zeta \in D$ for each $\zeta \in D_0$. When this condition holds, [26, Theorem 3.1] shows that for $\zeta$ in $D_0$, $B^\zeta(x, y) = B^{\zeta_{\pm}}(x, y)$ can be realized as an almost sure limit of $G_{x, v_\zeta} - G_{y, v_\zeta}$ when $v_\zeta/n \to \zeta$. Then the remaining values $B^\xi(x, y)$ can be obtained as left and right limits from $\{B^\xi(x, y)\}_{\xi \in D_0}$ as $\zeta \to \xi$. The entire process $\{B^{\xi_1}(x, y) : x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2, \xi \in \Omega \}$ is thus a measurable function of the i.i.d. random weights $\{\omega_x : x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ and thereby ergodic under any shift $T_x$ for $x \neq 0$.

A few comments about two technical points regarding Theorem A.4 are in order. Article [25] assumed that there exists a real constant $c$ such that $P(\omega_0 \geq c) = 1$. This assumption was needed to use queuing theory results to construct the cocycles $B^{\xi_1}$ of Theorem A.1. Article [34] used a different approach that constructed the cocycles without queuing theory and without this assumption. Article [25] also uses ergodicity of cocycles, which is not proven for the cocycles constructed in [34]. This property is in fact not necessary for the results in that paper—stationarity, which still holds, is sufficient. For example, the proof of the directedness claim in Theorem A.4 (a) in [25, Theorem 4.3] depends on the shape theorem for ergodic cocycles, [25, Theorem A.1]. This result is extended to the stationary setting in [34, Theorem 4.4] (see also [33, Appendix B]). The proof of [25, Theorem 4.3] goes through line-by-line after switching the references and applying [34, Lemma 4.5(c)] to identify the correct centering for the cocycle. Similarly, the non-existence of bi-infinite geodesics, [25, Theorem 4.6], again only needs stationarity after minor changes. Essentially the same argument is given in [34, Lemma 6.1] in positive temperature, only assuming stationarity.

Under the assumption that $g$ is differentiable on $\Omega \cup \{-, +\}$, Theorem A.4(c) holds for all $\xi \in \Omega \cup \{-, +\}$. An application of the Fubini-Tonelli theorem gives that the claims in Theorem A.4(b) and Theorem A.4(c) in fact hold on a single full $P$-measure event simultaneously for Lebesgue-almost all directions $\xi \in \Omega \cup \{-, +\}$. It is conjectured that the claim in part (c) holds in fact on a single full-measure event, simultaneously, for all $\xi \in \Omega \cup \{-, +\}$.

Before moving on to the structure of geodesics, we note that under the continuous i.i.d. weights assumption, there exists an event $\Omega_0^1$ with $P(\Omega_0^1) = 1$ such that $\forall \omega \in \Omega_0^1$:

(A.6) For all points $x \leq y$ in $\mathbb{Z}^2$, there exists a unique path (the geodesic) that maximizes on the right-hand side of (2.1).

(A.7) For every nonempty finite subset $I \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ and nonzero integer coefficients $\{a_x\}_{x \in I}$,

$$\sum_{x \in I} a_x \omega_x \neq 0.$$ 

Next, we turn to the previously known results about the structure of geodesics, many of which were summarized in Section 2.2. The next result is a small extension of Lemma 4.4 of [25], achieved by an application of the monotonicity in (2.12).

**Theorem A.3.** Assume the regularity condition (2.3). For any $\omega \in \Omega_0^1 \cap \Omega_0^2$, (2.15) holds.

The following theorem summarizes the state of the art concerning the structure of semi-infinite geodesics in directed last-passage percolation under (1.1).
Theorem A.4. [25, Theorems 2.1, 4.3, 4.5, and 4.6] There exist $T$-invariant events $\Omega^0_0$ and $\Omega^3_\xi \subset \Omega^3_0$ for each $\xi \in ri U$, with $P(\Omega^0_0) = 1$, $P(\Omega^3_\xi) = 1$, and such that the following hold.

(a) For every $\omega \in \Omega^0_0$, for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, $\square \in \{-, +\}$, and $\xi \in ri U$, $\gamma^{x, \xi_\omega}$ is $U_\xi$-directed and every semi-infinite geodesic is $U_\xi$-directed for some $\xi \in U$.

(b) For every $\xi \in ri U$, for every $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, and $\square \in \{-, +\}$, $\gamma^{x, \xi_\omega}$ and $\gamma^{y, \xi_\omega}$ coalesce, i.e. there exists an integer $k \geq x \cdot \hat{e}_1 \vee y \cdot \hat{e}_1$ such that $\gamma^{x, \xi_\omega}_{k, \infty} = \gamma^{y, \xi_\omega}_{k, \infty}$.

(c) For every $\xi \in ri U$, $\omega \in \Omega^3_\xi$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, and $\square \in \{-, +\}$, there exist at most finitely many $z \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $\gamma^{x, \xi_\omega}$ goes through $x$.

(d) If $g$ is strictly concave, then for any $\omega \in \Omega^0_0$ every semi-infinite geodesic is $\xi$-directed for some $\xi \in U$.

(e) If $\xi \in ri U$ is such that $U_{\xi} = [\xi, \xi]$ satisfies $\xi, \xi, \xi \in D$, then for any $\omega \in \Omega^3_\xi$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ we have $\gamma^{x, \xi_\omega} = \gamma^{x, \xi_\omega}$. This is the unique $U_{\xi}$-directed semi-infinite geodesic out of $x$ and, by part (b), all these geodesics coalesce. By part (c), there are no bi-infinite $U_{\xi}$-directed geodesics.

The next theorem says that there are multiple geodesics that are directed in the same asymptotic direction $\xi_\omega$, as the competition interface, which itself can be characterized using the Busemann process. See Figure 2.3.

Theorem A.5. [25, Equation (5.2) and Theorems 2.6, 2.8, and 5.3] There exists a $T$-invariant event $\Omega^4_0$ such that $P(\Omega^4_0) = 1$ and the following hold for all $\omega \in \Omega^4_0$.

(a) There exists a unique point $\xi_\omega(\omega) \in ri U$ such that (2.16) holds.

(b) For any $\xi \in ri U$, $P(\xi_{\omega} = \xi) > 0$ if and only if $\xi \in (ri U) \setminus D$.

(c) For any $\mathcal{C} \ni \mathcal{D}$, $x \in \mathcal{D}$, $x_{\omega} \in \mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{D}_x \ni \mathcal{D}_y$, there exists $y \geq x$ such that $\xi_\omega(T_{\gamma}^\omega) \in [\xi, \eta]$.

If the regularity condition (2.3) holds then the following also hold.

(d) We have the limit

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} n^{-1} \gamma_n^{\omega} \nu_n^{\omega} = 0.
\]

(e) $\xi_\omega(T_{\gamma}^\omega)$ is the unique direction $\xi$ such that there are at least two $U_{\xi}$-directed semi-infinite geodesics from $x$, namely $\gamma^{x, \xi_{\omega} \pm}$, that separate at $x$ and never intersect thereafter.

The same technical points as appeared in the discussion following Theorem A.4 apply here as well. Ergodicity is invoked in the proofs of parts (b) and (c) to apply the cocycle shape theorem. In the same way as in the discussion below Theorem A.4, in our stationary setting this can be replaced with [34, Theorem 4.4] and an application of [34, Lemma 4.5(c)].

The following result for exponential weights, due to Coupiere, states that there are no directions $\xi$ with three $\xi$-directed geodesics emanating from the same site.

Theorem A.6. [14, Theorem 1(2)] Assume that under $P$, the weights $\{\omega_x : x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ are exponentially distributed i.i.d. random variables. Then there exists a $T$-invariant event $\Omega_{\omega_{\text{geo}}}^{\text{geo}}$ with $P(\Omega_{\omega_{\text{geo}}}^{\text{geo}}) = 1$ and such that for any $\omega \in \Omega_{\omega_{\text{geo}}}^{\text{geo}}$, any $\xi \in ri U$, and any $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, there exist at most two $\xi$-directed semi-infinite geodesics out of $x$.

Most of the results in this paper hold on the following event of full $P$-probability:

\[
\Omega_0 = \Omega^0_0 \cap \Omega^3_\xi \cap \left( \bigcap_{\xi \in ri U} [\Omega^1_0 \cap \Omega^2_\xi] \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{\xi \in ri U \setminus D} \Omega^3_\xi \right).
\]

When additional assumptions hold, $\Omega_0$ will be further restricted.
Appendix B. Auxiliary lemmas

As explained in Remark A.2, if the regularity condition (2.3) is assumed, then \( \{ B^{\xi_{\omega}}(x, y) : x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2, \omega \in \{-+, +\}, \xi \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U} \} \) is measurable with respect to the \( \sigma \)-algebra generated by \( \{ \omega_x : x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \} \).

The following lemma is then an immediate consequence of (2.8), Theorem A.5(b), the ergodicity of \( \mathbb{P} \), and the fact that \( (\text{ri} \mathcal{U}) \backslash \mathcal{D} \) is countable.

Lemma B.1. Assume that the regularity condition (2.3) holds. Then there exists a \( T \)-invariant event \( \Omega^{\text{reg}} \subset \Omega_0 \) with \( \mathbb{P}(\Omega^{\text{reg}}) = 1 \) and such that for any \( \omega \in \Omega^{\text{reg}} \) and any \( \xi \in (\text{ri} \mathcal{U}) \backslash \mathcal{D} \), there exist infinitely many \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \) such that \( B^{\xi_+}(x + e_1, x + e_2) > B^{\xi_-}(x + e_1, x + e_2) \) and there also exist infinite many \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \) such that \( \xi_p(T_x \omega) = \xi \).

The next lemma follows from the shape theorem for cocycles (A.4).

Lemma B.2. Suppose \( g \) is differentiable on \( \text{ri} \mathcal{U} \). For any \( \omega \in \Omega_0, \xi \in \text{ri} \mathcal{U} \), and any \( v \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), \( n^{-1} B^{\xi}(0, [nv]) \) both converge to \( v \cdot \nabla g(\xi) \) as \( n \to \infty \).

Proof. The claim is obvious for \( v = 0 \). Suppose \( v \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\} \). The other cases being similar. Take \( \omega \in \Omega_0 \) and \( \zeta, \eta \in \mathcal{U}_0 \) with \( \zeta \cdot e_1 < \xi \cdot e_1 < \eta \cdot e_1 \). Let \( x_n = [nv] = m_ne_1 + \ell_ne_2 \). Then

\[
B^{\xi_+}(0, x_n) = B^{\xi_+}(0, m_ne_1) + B^{\xi_+}(m_ne_1, x_n)
\leq B^\eta(0, m_ne_1) + B^\xi(m_ne_1, x_n)
\leq B^\eta(0, m_ne_1) + B^\xi(0, x_n) - B^\xi(0, m_ne_1).
\]

Divide by \( n \), take it to \( \infty \), and apply the (A.4) to \( B^\zeta \) and \( B^\eta \) to get

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} n^{-1} B^{\xi_+}(0, x_n) \leq (v \cdot e_1)e_1 \cdot \nabla g(\eta) + v \cdot \nabla g(\zeta) - (v \cdot e_1)e_1 \cdot \nabla g(\xi).
\]

Take \( \zeta \) and \( \eta \) to \( \xi \) to get

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} n^{-1} B^{\xi_+}(0, x_n) \leq v \cdot \nabla g(\xi).
\]

The lower bound on the liminf holds similarly and so we have proved the claim for \( B^{\xi_+} \). The same argument works for \( B^{\xi_-} \).

The lemma below is proved by calculus.

Lemma B.3. Fix \( c > 0 \). Then for all \( n \geq 1 \) and all \( a, b \) such that \( c \leq a \leq b \leq a + \frac{c}{n} \),

\[
\frac{a^{n-1}b^n}{(a+b)^{2n}} \geq \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{2n-1}.
\]

Appendix C. M/M/1 queues and Busemann functions

This appendix summarizes results from \[20\] that are needed for the proofs of the results of Section 5. Fix parameters \( 0 < \alpha < \beta \). We formulate a stationary M/M/1 queue in a particular way. The inputs are two independent i.i.d. sequences: an inter-arrival process \( I_i \sim \text{Exp}(\alpha) \) and a service process \( Y_i \sim \text{Exp}(\beta) \). Out of these inputs are produced two outputs: an inter-departure process \( \hat{I}_k \sim (\hat{I}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \) and a sojourn process \( J_k \sim (J_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \), through the following formulas. Let \( G = (G_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \) be any function on \( \mathbb{Z} \) that satisfies \( I_k = G_k - G_{k+1} \). Define the function \( \hat{G} = (\hat{G}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \) by

\[
\hat{G}_k = \sup_{m: m \geq k} \left\{ G_m + \sum_{i=k}^{m} Y_i \right\} = G_k + Y_k + \sup_{m: m \geq k} \sum_{i=k}^{m-1} (Y_{i+1} - I_i).
\]

The convention for the empty sum is \( \sum_{i=k}^{m-1} \hat{G}_k = 0 \). Under the assumption on \( I \) and \( Y \), the supremum in (C.1) is almost surely assumed at some finite \( m \). Then define the outputs by

\[
\hat{I}_k = \hat{G}_k - \hat{G}_{k+1}
\]
and
\begin{equation}
J_k = \hat{G}_k - G_k = Y_k + \sup_{m: m \geq k} \sum_{i=k}^{m-1} (Y_{i+1} - I_i).
\end{equation}

The outputs satisfy the useful iterative equations
\begin{equation}
\tilde{I}_k = Y_k + (I_k - J_{k+1})^+ \quad \text{and} \quad J_k = Y_k + (J_{k+1} - I_k)^+.
\end{equation}
In particular, this implies the inequality \( \tilde{I}_k \geq Y_k \).

It is a basic fact about M/M/1 queues that \( \tilde{I} \) and \( J \) are i.i.d. sequences with marginals \( \tilde{I}_k \sim \text{Exp}(\alpha) \) and \( J_k \sim \text{Exp}(\beta - \alpha) \). Furthermore, the three variables \( (Y_k, I_k, J_{k+1}) \) on the right-hand sides of equations (C.4) are independent. (See for example Appendix A in [20],) But \( \tilde{I} \) and \( J \) are not independent of each other.

The queueing interpretation goes as follows. A service station processes a bi-infinite sequence of customers. Queueing time runs backwards on the lattice \( \mathbb{Z} \). \( I_i \) is the time between the arrivals of customers \( i+1 \) and \( i \) \( (i+1 \text{ arrived before } i) \) and \( Y_i \) is the service time required by customer \( i \). \( \tilde{I}_k \) is the time between the departures of customers \( k+1 \) and \( k \), with \( k+1 \) departing before \( k \). \( J_k \) is the sojourn time of customer \( k \), that is, the total time customer \( k \) spent in the system from arrival to departure. \( J_k \) is the sum of the service time \( Y_k \) and the waiting time of customer \( k \), represented by the last member of (C.3). Because of our unusual convention with the backward indexing, even if \( G_k \) is the moment of arrival of customer \( k \), \( \hat{G}_k \) is not the moment of departure. The definition of \( \hat{G} \) in (C.1) is natural in the present setting because it immediately ties in with LPP. The convention in [20] is different because in [20] geodesics go south and west instead of north and east.

The joint distribution of successive nearest-neighbor increments of two Busemann functions on a horizontal or vertical line can now be described as follows. This is a special case of Theorem 3.2 in [20].

**Theorem C.1.** Let \( \zeta < \eta \) in \( \text{r} \mathcal{U} \) with parameters \( \alpha = \alpha(\zeta) < \alpha(\eta) = \beta \) given by (5.2). Let \( I = (I_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \) and \( Y = (Y_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \) be two independent i.i.d. sequences and define \( \tilde{I} = (\tilde{I}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \) as above through (C.1)-(C.2).

(a) Let \( I_i \sim \text{Exp}(\alpha) \) and \( Y_i \sim \text{Exp}(\beta) \). Then the sequence \( (B^0_{ke_1, (k+1)e_1}, B^n_{ke_2, (k+1)e_2})_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \) has the same joint distribution as the pair \( (\tilde{I}, Y) \).

(b) Let \( I_i \sim \text{Exp}(1-\beta) \) and \( Y_i \sim \text{Exp}(1-\alpha) \). Then the sequence \( (B^0_{ke_2, (k+1)e_2}, B^n_{ke_1, (k+1)e_1})_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \) has the same joint distribution as the pair \( (Y, \tilde{I}) \).

Next we derive a random walk representation for the sequence \( (B^0_{ke_1, (k+1)e_1} - B^n_{ke_2, (k+1)e_2})_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \) of (nonnegative) differences. By Theorem C.1 this sequence is equal in distribution to \( (\tilde{I}_k - Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \). Define a two-sided random walk \( S \) with positive drift \( E[I_{i-1} - Y_i] = \alpha^{-1} - \beta^{-1} \) by
\begin{equation}
S_n = \begin{cases} 0 & n = 0, \\ -\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (I_{i-1} - Y_i) & n < 0, \\ \sum_{i=1}^{n} (I_{i-1} - Y_i) & n > 0. \end{cases}
\end{equation}

Then from (C.4) and (C.3),
\begin{equation}
\tilde{I}_k - Y_k = (I_k - J_{k+1})^+ = \left\{ \inf_{n: n > k} \sum_{i=k+1}^{n} (I_{i-1} - Y_i) \right\}^+ = \left\{ \inf_{n: n > k} (S_n - S_k) \right\}^+.
\end{equation}

From above we can record that for \( r > 0 \),
\begin{equation}
P(B^0_{0,e_1} > B^n_{0,e_1}) = P(I_k > J_{k+1}) = \frac{\beta - \alpha}{\beta}.
\end{equation}
Corollary C.2. Let $\zeta < \eta$ in $\text{ri} \mathcal{U}$ with parameters $\alpha = \alpha(\zeta) < \alpha(\eta) = \beta$ given by (5.2). Let $S$ be the random walk in (C.5) with step distribution $\text{Exp}(\alpha) - \text{Exp}(\beta)$. Then the sequence \( \{ B_{k_{e1},(k+1)e1} - B_{k_{e1},(k+1)e1} \}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \) has the same distribution as the sequence \( \{ \inf_{n \geq k} S_n - S_k \}^+ \}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \).

Appendix D. Random walk

Let $0 < \alpha < \beta$ and let \( \{ X_i \}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \) be a doubly infinite sequence of i.i.d. random variables with marginal distribution $X_i \sim \text{Exp}(\alpha) - \text{Exp}(\beta)$ (difference of two independent exponential random variables). Let $\theta$ denote the shift on the underlying canonical sequence space so that $X_i = X_{k_1} \circ \theta^{m-k}$. Let \( \{ S_n \}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \) be the two-sided random walk such that $S_0 = 0$ and $S_n - S_m = \sum_{i=m+1}^{n} X_i$ for all $m < n$ in $\mathbb{Z}$. Let $(\lambda_i: i \geq 1)$ be the strict ascending ladder epochs of the forward walk. That is, begin with $\lambda_0 = 0$, and for $i \geq 1$ let

$$\lambda_i = \inf \{ n > \lambda_{i-1} : S_n > S_{\lambda_{i-1}} \}.$$ 

The positive drift of $S_n$ ensures that these variables are finite almost surely. For $i \geq 1$ define the increments $L_i = \lambda_i - \lambda_{i-1}$ and $H_i = S_{\lambda_i} - S_{\lambda_{i-1}}$. The variables $(L_i, H_i)_{i \geq 1}$ are mutually independent with marginal distribution

$$P(L_1 = n, H_1 > r) = C_{n-1} \frac{\alpha^{n-1} \beta^n}{(\alpha + \beta)^{2n-1}} e^{-\alpha r}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad r \geq 0. \quad (D.1)$$

Above $C_n = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n}$ for $n \geq 0$ are the Catalan numbers. A small extension of the proof of Lemma B.3 in [20] derives (D.1).

Let

$$W_0 = \inf_{m \geq 0} S_m. \quad (D.2)$$

Note that $W_0 \circ \theta^n > 0$ if and only if $S_n < \inf_{m \geq n} S_m$, that is, $n$ is a last exit time for the random walk. Define successive last exit times (in the language of Doney [17]) by

$$\sigma_0 = \inf \{ n \geq 0 : S_n < \inf_{m > n} S_m \} \quad (D.3)$$

and for $i \geq 1$, $\sigma_i = \inf \{ n > \sigma_{i-1} : S_n < \inf_{m > n} S_m \}$.

Proposition D.1. Conditionally on $W_0 > 0$ (equivalently, on $\sigma_0 = 0$), the pairs $(\sigma_i - \sigma_{i-1}, S_{\sigma_i} - S_{\sigma_{i-1}})_{i \geq 1}$ are i.i.d. with marginal distribution

$$P(\sigma_i - \sigma_{i-1} = n, S_{\sigma_i} - S_{\sigma_{i-1}} > r \mid W_0 > 0) = C_{n-1} \frac{\alpha^{n-1} \beta^n}{(\alpha + \beta)^{2n-1}} e^{-\alpha r} \quad (D.4)$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $r \geq 0$.

Proof. Let $0 = n_0 < n_1 < \cdots < n_\ell$ and $r_1, \ldots, r_\ell > 0$. The dual random walk $S^*_k = S_{n_\ell} - S_{n_{\ell-k}}$ for $0 \leq k \leq n_\ell$ (p. 394 in Feller II [22]) satisfies $(S^*_k)_{0 \leq k \leq n_\ell} \overset{d}{=} (S_k)_{0 \leq k \leq n_\ell}$ and is independent of $W_0 \circ \theta^{n_\ell}$.

$$P(\forall i = 1, \ldots, \ell : \sigma_i - \sigma_{i-1} = n_i - n_{i-1} \text{ and } S_{\sigma_i} - S_{\sigma_{i-1}} > r_i, W_0 > 0)$$

$$= P(\forall i = 1, \ldots, \ell : \sigma_i = n_i \text{ and } S_{\sigma_i} - S_{\sigma_{i-1}} > r_i, W_0 > 0)$$

$$= P(\forall i = 1, \ldots, \ell : S_k > S_{n_i} > S_{n_{i-1}} + r_i \text{ for } k \in \{ n_{i-1}, n_i \}, W_0 \circ \theta^{r_i} > 0)$$

$$= P(\forall j = 1, \ldots, \ell^* : S^*_j < S^*_n - n_\ell < S^*_{n_{\ell-k-1}} - r_j \text{ for } j \in \{ n_\ell - n_i, n_{\ell-1} - n_{\ell-k} \}, W_0 \circ \theta^{n_\ell} > 0)$$

$$= P(\forall k = 1, \ldots, \ell : \lambda_k = n_\ell - n_{\ell-k} \text{ and } H_k > r_{\ell-k+1}, W_0 > 0)$$

$$= P(\forall k = 1, \ldots, \ell : L_k = n_{\ell-k+1} - n_{\ell-k} \text{ and } H_k > r_{\ell-k+1}, W_0 > 0).$$

The claim follows from the independence of $\{ L_k, H_k \}$ and (D.1).

From $\sigma_0$ as defined in (D.3), extend $\sigma_i$ to negative indices by defining, for $i = -1, -2, -3, \ldots$

$$\sigma_i = \max \{ k < \sigma_{i+1} : S_k < S_{\sigma_{i+1}} \}. \quad (D.5)$$
For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ set
\begin{equation}
(D.6) \quad W_k = \inf_{n: n > k} S_n - S_k.
\end{equation}
Then one can check that $\sigma_1 < 0 \leq \sigma_0$, and for all $i, k \in \mathbb{Z}$,
\begin{equation}
(D.7) \quad S_{\sigma_i} = \inf_{n: n > \sigma_{i-1}} S_n,
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
(D.8) \quad W_{\sigma_i} = \inf_{n: n > \sigma_i} S_n - S_{\sigma_i} = S_{\sigma_{i+1}} - S_{\sigma_i},
\end{equation}
and
\begin{equation}
(D.9) \quad W_k > 0 \iff k \in \{\sigma_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}.
\end{equation}

**Theorem D.2.** Conditionally on $\sigma_0 = 0$, equivalently, on $W_0 > 0$, $\{\sigma_{i+1} - \sigma_i, W_{\sigma_i} : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence with marginal distribution
\begin{equation}
(D.10) \quad P(\sigma_{i+1} - \sigma_i = n, W_{\sigma_i} > r \mid W_0 > 0) = C_{n-1} \frac{\alpha^{n-1} \beta^n}{(\beta + \alpha)^{2n-1}} e^{-\alpha r}
\end{equation}
for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $r \geq 0$.

**Proof.** Define the processes $\Psi_+ = \{\sigma_{i+1} - \sigma_i, W_{\sigma_i} : i \geq 0\}$ and $\Psi_- = \{\sigma_{i+1} - \sigma_i, W_{\sigma_i} : i \leq -1\}$. $\Psi_+$ and the conditioning event $W_0 > 0$ depend only on $(S_n)_{n \geq 1}$, while $W_0 > 0$ implies for $n < 0$ that $\inf_{m: m > n} S_m = \inf_{m: n < m \leq 0} S_m$. $\Psi_+$ and $\Psi_-$ have been decoupled.

Define another forward walk with the same step distribution by $\tilde{S}_k = -S_{-k}$ for $k \geq 0$. Let $\lambda_0 = 0$, $(\lambda_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the successive ladder epochs and $H_i = \tilde{S}_{\lambda_i} - \tilde{S}_{\lambda_{i-1}}$ the successive ladder height increments for the $\tilde{S}$ walk.

We claim that on the event $\sigma_0 = 0$,
\begin{equation}
(D.11) \quad \lambda_{-i} = -\sigma_i \quad \text{and} \quad W_{\sigma_i} = H_{-i} \quad \text{for } i \leq -1.
\end{equation}
First by definition, $\lambda_0 = 0 = -\sigma_0$. By the definitions and by induction, for $i \leq -1$,
\begin{align*}
\lambda_{-i} &= \min\{k > \lambda_{-i-1} : \tilde{S}_k > \tilde{S}_{\lambda_{-i-1}}\} = \min\{k > -\sigma_{i+1} : S_{-k} < S_{\sigma_{i+1}}\} \\
&= -\max\{n < \sigma_{i+1} : S_n < S_{\sigma_{i+1}}\} = -\sigma_i
\end{align*}
where the last equality came from (D.5). Then from (D.8),
\begin{equation}
W_{\sigma_i} = S_{\sigma_{i+1}} - S_{\sigma_i} = -\tilde{S}_{-\sigma_{i+1}} + \tilde{S}_{-\sigma_i} = -\tilde{S}_{\lambda_{-i-1}} + \tilde{S}_{\lambda_{-i}} = H_{-i}.
\end{equation}
Claim (D.11) has been verified.

Let $\Psi' = \{\lambda_{-i} - \lambda_{-i-1}, H_{-i} : i \leq -1\}$, a function of $(S_n)_{n \leq -1}$. By (D.11), $\Psi' = \Psi'$ on the event $\sigma_0 = 0$.

Let $A$ and $B$ be suitable measurable sets of infinite sequences.
\begin{align*}
P(\Psi_+ \in A, \Psi_- \in B \mid W_0 > 0) &= \frac{1}{P(W_0 > 0)} P(\Psi_+ \in A, \Psi' \in B, W_0 > 0) \\
&= \frac{P(\Psi_+ \in A, W_0 > 0)}{P(W_0 > 0)} P(\Psi' \in B) = P(\Psi_+ \in A \mid W_0 > 0) P(\Psi' \in B).
\end{align*}
The conclusion follows. By Proposition D.1, conditional on $W_0 > 0$, $\Psi_+$ has the i.i.d. distribution (D.10), which is the same as the i.i.d. distribution (D.1) of $\Psi'$.
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