

CONVERGENCE OF EXCLUSION PROCESSES AND THE KPZ EQUATION TO THE KPZ FIXED POINT

JEREMY QUASTEL AND SOURAV SARKAR

ABSTRACT. We show that under the 1:2:3 scaling, critically probing large space and time, the height function of finite range asymmetric exclusion processes and the KPZ equation converge to the KPZ fixed point, constructed earlier as a limit of the totally asymmetric simple exclusion process through exact formulas. Consequently, based on recent results of [35],[11], the KPZ line ensemble converges to the Airy line ensemble.

For the KPZ equation we are able to start from a continuous function plus a finite collection of narrow wedges. For nearest neighbour exclusions, we can take (discretizations) of continuous functions with $|h(x)| \leq C(1 + \sqrt{|x|})$ for some $C > 0$, or one narrow wedge. For non-nearest neighbour exclusions, we are restricted at the present time to a class of (random) initial data, dense in continuous functions in the topology of uniform convergence on compacts.

The method is by comparison of the transition probabilities of finite range exclusion processes and the totally asymmetric simple exclusion processes using energy estimates.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Kardar-Parisi-Zhang (KPZ) equation,

$$\partial_t h = \lambda(\partial_x h)^2 + \nu \partial_x^2 h + \sqrt{D}\xi, \quad (1.1)$$

where ξ is space-time white noise, the distribution valued delta correlated Gaussian field $\langle \xi(t, x), \xi(s, y) \rangle = \delta(t - s)\delta(x - y)$, was introduced by Kardar, Parisi and Zhang in 1986 [19] as an equation for a randomly evolving height function $h \in \mathbb{R}$ which depends on position $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and time $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. λ, ν and D are physical constants. Its derivative $u = \partial_x h$ satisfies the stochastic Burgers equation

$$\partial_t u = \lambda \partial_x u^2 + \nu \partial_x^2 u + \sqrt{D} \partial_x \xi. \quad (1.2)$$

A dynamic renormalization group analysis was performed on (1.2) in [13] (see also [19], [31]), predicting a dynamical scaling exponent $z = 3/2$ and strong coupling fixed point. In our language, this means that one expects to see a non-trivial universal fluctuation field under the 1:2:3 rescaling

$$h \mapsto \delta h(\delta^{-3}t, \delta^{-2}x). \quad (1.3)$$

Universal is meant in the sense that it is supposed to be the attractor as $\delta \searrow 0$ for a huge class of related models in one dimension; discrete growth models, directed polymer free energies, driven diffusive systems. Since the fluctuations remember the initial state, it is a scaling invariant Markov process. This process, *the KPZ fixed point* (see the discussion after (2.10) for the definition), was characterized in [20] through exact formulas for its transition probabilities, based on the exact solvability of a special member of the KPZ universality class, the totally asymmetric simple exclusion process (TASEP), an interacting particle system whose height function can be thought of as a single step version of (1.1), or at the stochastic Burgers level, as modelling one-way traffic flow.

Exact one point distributions have been found for the KPZ equation, and for a two way version of TASEP known as ASEP or asymmetric simple exclusion process, for a few special initial data (narrow wedge [28],[1],[26], [12], half-Brownian [29], [9],[18], Brownian [30], [17],[4], and a conjectural formula for flat [5], see also [22]). However, it is not known at the present time – nor really expected – that the solvability extends to general initial data, or to multipoint distributions (excepting perhaps the narrow wedge case). On the other hand, it was well understood at a physical level that the 1:2:3 scaling limit of the KPZ equation, as well as any exclusion process with sufficiently local jumps (finite

range asymmetric exclusion processes, or AEP), should coincide with that of TASEP. Note that such a statement contains several well known conjectures such as the convergence of multipoint distributions to those of the Airy process for narrow wedge initial data, and (following recent results [35],[11]) the convergence of the KPZ line ensemble to the Airy line ensemble. The gap was the lack of any analytic methods to prove such a convergence; all one knew how to do was find an exact formula and take its limit.

The main contribution of this article is an analytic method which compares the transition probabilities of any finite range asymmetric exclusion process to TASEP, with a close enough comparison that shows they have the same 1:2:3 scaling limit. In the weakly asymmetric limit it also allows one to prove that the KPZ equation transition probabilities, for very general initial data, converge to the KPZ fixed point transition probabilities.

The key step is an estimate of the difference of the transition probabilities of the two processes, as long as one starts with a bound on the L^2 norm of the Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to a global equilibrium. We call such initial conditions *finite energy measures*. They are dense within admissible initial data in the topology of uniform convergence on compact sets. In this way, the convergence of TASEP to the KPZ fixed point is extended to other models, on a dense set of initial data. Only the exact solvability of TASEP is used, as a black box. The comparison is done in an analytic way, thus bypassing the need for any exact computations at the level of the other models.

The second step of the proof extends the result from such initial data, to a broader class. In the case of the KPZ equation, key tools available are a positive temperature variational formula, and *skew-time reversibility*,

$$\mathbb{P}(h(t, x) \leq g(x), \forall x \mid h(0, \cdot) = f(\cdot)) = \mathbb{P}(h(t, x) \leq -f(x), \forall x \mid h(0, \cdot) = -g(\cdot)). \quad (1.4)$$

In the case of exclusion processes, the first one is missing, while skew-time reversibility holds for ASEP but not in general for AEP. This is because the order of height functions is only preserved in the nearest neighbour case. Therefore the class of initial data for which we can prove the convergence for AEP at this time, while dense in a certain sense, is not as complete as one would wish. For the detailed results, see Theorem 2.2.

While we cannot prove the result for all initial data for exclusion processes at this time, to our knowledge the results for non-nearest neighbour exclusion represent the first results of KPZ universality for any data for any model which is not to some degree algebraically solvable.

Two natural questions arise; 1) Can one solve the *initialization problem* for AEP, i.e. show that starting from initial data having a well defined asymptotic profile, the distribution at any positive time is close enough to a finite energy measure, while not having changed its asymptotic profile? 2) How general is the method? Again, we do not have a satisfactory answer. Here we are perturbing off TASEP, and the argument leading up to (5.2) uses many special properties of that process, which in particular allow us to essentially exactly compute the Dirichlet form of its transition probabilities (see the crucial Lem. 5.1).

At the same time (and place), another proof of KPZ universality for the KPZ equation was obtained by Bálint Virág [34]. Although the proofs are very different, they both use as their launchpad the observation that, for the KPZ equation, it is only necessary to prove the convergence for a dense class of initial data. Virág uses a class of solvable initial data related to the Baik-BenArous-Peché statistics together with novel symmetries with respect to initial and final data satisfied by special solvable polymer models which can be rescaled to the KPZ equation. In this sense, the proof invites extension to further classes of partially solvable polymer models.

The dense class on which we initially prove convergence to the fixed point involves a bound on the L^2 norm of the Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to equilibrium, and this key part of the argument is in Sec.3–6. The results of Sec. 7 prove tightness and convergence in the uniform-on-compact topology for the height functions of any model for which the convergence of probabilities for certain class of sets is known (see Prop. 7.1). Once that is done, one uses known properties of the process to extend to more general initial data. This is done in Sec. 8–9. These arguments are somewhat universal in the sense that the results of Sec. 8 will hold for any model satisfying convergence for finite energy initial data and

skew time reversibility. Appx. B contains the proof of the key Lem. 5.1, representing the gradient of the TASEP transition probabilities as the joint distribution of a max and argmax. Appx. C contains the proof of the main tool to extend the results from nearest neighbour to non-nearest neighbour exclusion processes, which is the *strong sector* bound of Lin Xu [36] and S.R.S.Varadhan [32]. The strong sector condition (see Defn. 3.1) can be thought of in this context as telling one when an operator has the 1:2:4, diffusive, Edwards-Wilkinson scaling. At our 1:2:3 scaling, such an operator can be treated as an error term. Since the method is analytic and independent of solvability of the model, it invites extensions to other particle systems, though it requires as input a comparison system for which the convergence to the KPZ fixed point is already known.

2. MODELS AND MAIN RESULTS

We consider finite range asymmetric exclusion processes (AEP) on $\mathbb{Z}$ with non-zero drift. There are particles on the lattice, with at most one particle per site. The particles attempt jumps $x \mapsto x + v$ at rate $p(v)$ where $\{v \in \mathbb{Z} : p(v) > 0\}$ is finite, and, to avoid degeneracies, is assumed that $\{v \in \mathbb{Z} : p^{\text{sym}}(v) = p(v) + p(-v) > 0\}$ additively generate all of $\mathbb{Z}$, or, in other words, the underlying single particle random walk with jump law $p^{\text{sym}}(\cdot)$ is *irreducible*. In order for our results to hold it is necessary that

$$\sum_v vp(v) \neq 0. \quad (2.1)$$

Otherwise, the process will not move on the scales we are observing¹. We can always assume it is positive, and by multiplying all the rates by a constant (i.e. changing the time scale by a constant) we may as well assume that

$$\sum_v vp(v) = 1. \quad (2.2)$$

The height function at any fixed time t is a simple random walk path $h(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $h(x+1) = h(x) \pm 1$. If $h(x+1) = h(x) + 1$ we say there is a particle at x and write $\eta(x) = 1$ and if $h(x+1) = h(x) - 1$ we say there is no particle at x and write $\eta(x) = 0$. We can alternatively let

$$\hat{\eta}(x) = 2\eta(x) - 1, \quad \text{and write} \quad h(x+1) = h(x) + \hat{\eta}(x). \quad (2.3)$$

When we include the time coordinate in the notation, we write the height function as $h(t, x)$ instead of just $h(x)$.

As we said, a particle at x attempts jumps to site $x + v$ at rate $p(v)$. But the jump takes place only if the target site is unoccupied. This is called exclusion. All the particles are doing this independently of the others, and since time is continuous, there are no ties to break. Note that when the jump occurs, the height function either drops by 2 at sites $x + 1, \dots, x + v$, if $v > 0$, or increases by 2 at sites $x + v + 1, \dots, x$ if $v < 0$.

The special case where $p(\cdot)$ is nearest neighbour is referred to as ASEP (asymmetric simple exclusion process). *Simple* here means nearest neighbour. The further special case when the jump law is $p(1) = 1$ and $p(v) = 0$ otherwise is called TASEP (totally asymmetric simple exclusion process); here jumps only to the right-hand neighbor are allowed.

We rescale the height function by the 1:2:3 KPZ scaling

$$h_\varepsilon(t, x) = \varepsilon^{1/2} h(2\varepsilon^{-3/2}t, 2\varepsilon^{-1}x) + \varepsilon^{-1}t. \quad (2.4)$$

The factors of 2 are put in to coordinate with earlier work. The height function in (2.4) lives on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}$, where the first coordinate represents time. When there is no scope for confusion, we shall often suppress the time coordinate and the dependence on ε in the notation. We now have

$$h(x + \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon) = h(x) + u(x) \quad \text{with} \quad u(x) \in \{-\varepsilon^{1/2}, \varepsilon^{1/2}\}. \quad (2.5)$$

¹If we call $m := \sum_v vp(v)$, it is fairly straightforward to check that the proof shows convergence of $h_\varepsilon(2t, 2x)$ to $\text{sgn}(m)$ times the KPZ fixed point running at speed $|m|$. In particular, if $m = 0$ the argument shows that there is no movement on the KPZ time scale.

The discrete state space $\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon =$ collection of such functions mapping $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z} \mapsto \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}$. These are naturally embedded in the continuous state space $\mathbb{S} =$ continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}$ by connecting $h(x)$ and $h(x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon)$ with straight lines. When we say for example, a continuous function h is initial data for AEP, we mean that at each level $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an initial data h_ε and $h_\varepsilon \rightarrow h$ in the uniform-on-compact topology.

Call $\mu_\varepsilon(d\hat{h})$ the law of the two sided symmetric simple random walk on $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}$, with steps of size $\varepsilon^{1/2}$ with $\hat{h}(0) = 0$. Let $\text{Leb}_\varepsilon(dh(0))$ be the discrete Lebesgue measure giving mass $\varepsilon^{1/2}$ to each $h(0) \in \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}$. An $h \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$ is built out of $h(0)$ and $\hat{h}(x)$, $x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}$ by

$$h(x) = h(0) + \hat{h}(x), \quad (2.6)$$

and the product measure

$$\nu_\varepsilon(dh) = \text{Leb}_\varepsilon(dh(0)) \times \mu_\varepsilon(d\hat{h}) \quad (2.7)$$

is invariant for the process.

Next we turn to the KPZ equation. The solution [3], [15], [14] is a Markov process with state space $\mathbb{S} =$ continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}$. More precisely, we consider the *Cole-Hopf solution*, the logarithm of the solution of the stochastic heat equation (SHE),

$$h = \gamma \log Z, \quad \partial_t Z = \nu \partial_x^2 Z + \gamma^{-1} \sqrt{D} \xi Z. \quad (2.8)$$

where $\gamma = \nu/\lambda$. SHE is one of the few nonlinear² stochastic partial differential equations for which a solvability theory is relatively straightforward; in fact, the solution can be written as an explicit chaos series [24]. Note that the SHE (2.8) can be solved starting from more general initial data. In particular, a *narrow wedge* initial data for KPZ equation means to start the SHE (2.8) with a Dirac delta measure. Multiple narrow wedges just means a sum of such, and one could also add to this a more regular function as initial data. The map $h \mapsto \delta^b h(\delta^{-z}t, \delta^{-1}x)$ transforms the coefficients in (1.1) by $(\lambda, \nu, D) \mapsto (\delta^{2-z-b}\lambda, \delta^{2-z}\nu, \delta^{2b-z+1}D)$, so it is enough to always consider a standardized³ KPZ equation

$$\partial_t h = \frac{1}{4}(\partial_x h)^2 + \frac{1}{4}\partial_x^2 h + \xi \quad (2.9)$$

which is taken by the 1:2:3 scaling (1.3) into what we will call KPZ_δ ,

$$\partial_t h = \frac{1}{4}(\partial_x h)^2 + \frac{\delta}{4}\partial_x^2 h + \delta^{1/2}\xi. \quad (2.10)$$

One of our main results is that as $\delta \searrow 0$ this converges to the *KPZ fixed point*, the 1:2:3 scaling invariant Markov process expected to govern fluctuations for all models in the KPZ class. It can be described in two ways, as a Markov process of evolving height functions $h(t, \cdot)$ through its explicit transition probabilities, or through a variational formulation.

The Markov transition probability of the KPZ fixed point starting from initial height function $h_0(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ which is UC, meaning upper semi-continuous h_0 with $h_0(x) \leq C(1 + |x|)$ for some $C < \infty$, is defined through its finite dimensional distributions given by

$$P_{h_0}(h(t, x_i) \leq r_i, i = 1, \dots, m) = \det(I - \mathbf{K}_{h_0, x_i, r_i, t})_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^m)} \quad (2.11)$$

where the i, j entry of the $m \times m$ matrix operator $\mathbf{K}$ is given by

$$(\mathbf{K}_{h_0, x_i, r_i, t})_{ij} = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\frac{1}{3}t\partial^3 - (x_i+L)\partial^2 + r_i\partial} (\mathbf{P}_{-L, L}^{\text{Hit } h_0} - \mathbf{1}_{x_i < x_j}) e^{\frac{1}{3}t\partial^3 + (x_j-L)\partial^2 - r_j\partial} \quad (2.12)$$

where the integral operator kernel $\mathbf{P}_{-L, L}^{\text{Hit } h_0}(u_1, u_2)$ is the probability that a Brownian bridge from u_1 at time $-L$ to u_2 at time L enters the hypograph of h_0 in between. UC is equipped with the topology of convergence of hypographs in the local Hausdorff topology. For UC functions (2.12) make sense and define Feller transition probabilities, and the process stays in this space. But in fact, one can check

²it is linear in the initial data, but non-linear in the noise.

³The reason for the standard in the nonlinear term is that $-x^2/t$ solves the Hopf equation $\partial_t h = \frac{1}{4}(\partial_x h)^2$ so all the parabolic shifts come without unnecessary constants. The ratio $\nu/D = 1/4$ corresponds to a diffusivity 2 for the invariant Brownian motion (it is invariant for the equation without, or with the non-linear term.) These were the choices made in the definition of the KPZ fixed point in [20]. At the level of naive scaling theory, it ensures that (2.10) converges to the KPZ fixed point without extra rescaling.

directly from the formula that the height function at any strictly positive time is locally Brownian, so for any strictly positive time, it lives in the more regular space of height functions which are locally Hölder of any exponent $< 1/2$. Note that if $h_0 = -\infty$ outside a box of size ℓ , then the expression inside the limit on the right hand side of (2.12) is constant for $L > \ell$. So in that case one doesn't have to take a limit. From the formula one can check that the process is invariant under the 1:2:3 scaling (2.4), and is spatially and temporally homogeneous. Brownian motion with any drift is invariant, except for a non-trivial global height shift, and the process can informally be thought of as a non-trivial evolution of Brownian motions.

An alternate description is given through the fact that the process preserves the max operation, i.e. $h(t, x; h_0^1 \vee h_0^2) = h(t, x; h_0^1) \vee h(t, x; h_0^2)$ where $h(t, x; h_0)$ denotes the solution at time t , evaluated at position x , starting from initial data h_0 . Thus the special initial conditions $\mathfrak{d}_y(x) := 0$ for $x = y$ and $-\infty$ for $x \neq y$ play the role of Dirac delta functions for linear equations. Starting from such an initial condition, and from the 1:2:3 scaling we obtain a solution we can write as

$$h(t, x; \mathfrak{d}_y) := t^{1/3} \mathcal{A}(t^{-2/3}y, t^{-2/3}x) - \frac{1}{t}(y - x)^2. \quad (2.13)$$

The two-parameter stochastic process $\mathcal{A}(x, y)$ is stationary in both variables, and is distributed as an Airy process [20] in each of the two variables separately. It is called the *Airy sheet*. Unfortunately we do not know its joint distributions explicitly. In [10] it is shown to be a (non-explicit) function of the Airy line ensemble, a random sequence of functions $\mathcal{A}_1 > \mathcal{A}_2 > \dots$, introduced by Prähofer and Spohn [23], which is stationary, see also Corwin and Hammond [7]. The top line $\mathcal{A}_1$ is known as the Airy_2 process that, after subtracting a parabola, appear as the limiting spatial fluctuation of random growth models starting from a single point (not to be confused with the Airy_1 process, elsewhere occasionally referred to as $\mathcal{A}_1$, which governs those arising from a *flat* interface). The parabolically shifted version $\mathcal{A}'_i$ defined as $\mathcal{A}'_i(x) = \mathcal{A}_i(x) - x^2$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, will be called the *parabolic Airy line ensemble*. From the max property it is rather easy to see that the KPZ fixed point satisfies the variational principle

$$h(t, x; h_0) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ t^{1/3} \mathcal{A}(t^{-2/3}y, t^{-2/3}x) - \frac{1}{t}(y - x)^2 + h_0(y) \right\}. \quad (2.14)$$

The equality is for fixed t as stochastic processes in x . For fixed t , the Airy sheet is Hölder of any exponent less than $1/2$ in the space coordinates. In particular, from (eq. (104) of) Prop. 10.5 in [10], it follows that for any $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in [-b, b]$ for some $b > 0$, and $d = \sqrt{(x_2 - x_1)^2 + (y_2 - y_1)^2}$, we have

$$\left| t^{1/3} \mathcal{A}(t^{-2/3}x_1, t^{-2/3}y_1) - t^{1/3} \mathcal{A}(t^{-2/3}x_2, t^{-2/3}y_2) \right| \leq C d^{1/2} \log^{1/2}(1 + d^{-1}), \quad (2.15)$$

for some random constant C satisfying $P(C > m) \leq c_1 e^{-c_2 m^2}$ for some positive constants c_1, c_2 that depend on t, b , but not on x_i 's and y_i 's. To include the t in the picture one has to go up one level to the *directed landscape* (see [10]). From Prop. 10.5 in [10] it is easy to see that, as a function of t , $h(t, x)$ is Hölder of any exponent less than $1/3$.

Note that the construction of the directed landscape in [10] uses as input the model of Brownian last passage percolation (BLPP), while the transition probabilities of the KPZ fixed point in [20] are obtained through limits of exact formulas for TASEP. The fact that one obtains the same object is proven by obtaining similar formulas for the KPZ fixed point in the context of BLPP [21].

The following summarizes results of [20] on the convergence of the 1:2:3 rescaled TASEP height function to the KPZ fixed point.

Theorem 2.1 ([20]). *Consider the totally asymmetric simple exclusion process and let $h_\varepsilon(t, x)$ be the 1:2:3 rescaled height function as in (2.4). Let the initial data satisfy $h_\varepsilon(0, x) \rightarrow h_0(x)$ where $h_0(x) \leq C(1 + |x|)$ for some $C < \infty$, in UC (see definition following (2.12)). Then $h_\varepsilon(t, x) \rightarrow h(t, x)$ in distribution, where $h(t, x)$ is the KPZ fixed point starting from $h_0(x)$.*

In the theorem below and in the rest of the paper, convergence of measures always means convergence when tested against bounded continuous functions. All the convergences in the theorem are in the sense of distribution, with $t > 0$ fixed, in the uniform-on-compacts topology on functions of x . We will often

consider target sets B of the form $\text{hyp}(g)$ for nice functions g where $\text{hyp}(g)$ is the set

$$\text{hyp}(g) = \{h : h(x) \leq g(x), x \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (2.16)$$

This is a very slight abuse of the standard notation where $\text{hyp}(g)$ is the hypograph of g ; our $\text{hyp}(g)$ is the set of functions whose hypographs are contained in the hypograph of g .

Theorem 2.2. (1) Suppose that $f_{0,\varepsilon} d\nu_\varepsilon \rightarrow d\rho$ with $\varepsilon^{1/4} \|f_{0,\varepsilon}\|_{L^2(d\nu_\varepsilon)} \rightarrow 0$. Then, started from $f_{0,\varepsilon} d\nu_\varepsilon$, the AEP height function $h_\varepsilon(t, x)$ from (2.4) at fixed time $t > 0$ converges as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$ in distribution in the uniform-on-compact topology to the KPZ fixed point started from ρ .

(2) Let h be continuous with $|h(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|^{1/2})$ for all x for some $C < \infty$. Then under the same scaling as in (2.4) the ASEP height function h_ε starting from a deterministic $h_{0,\varepsilon}$ with $h_{0,\varepsilon} \rightarrow h$ uniformly on compacts, at fixed time $t > 0$, converges in distribution in the uniform-on-compacts topology in x to the KPZ fixed point started from h .

For a single narrow wedge (defined just after (2.8)), Theorem 1.1 of Corwin-Dimitrov [6] gives the tightness of the ASEP height function, and therefore we have for fixed time $t > 0$, convergence in distribution in the uniform-on-compact topology to a (rescaled) Airy₂ process.

For multiple narrow wedge initial data we have convergence of the transition probabilities into sets of the form (2.16) for any continuous g satisfying $|g(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|^{1/2})$ for some $C < \infty$. For continuous initial data h with $h(x) \leq C(1 + |x|^{1/2})$ for all x , we have the convergence of transition probabilities into sets of the same form for g uniformly continuous with $g(x) \geq C_2(1 + |x|)$ for some $C_2 > 0$.

(3) Start KPZ _{δ} (2.10) with a continuous function bounded above by $C(1 + |x|)$ plus a finite collection of narrow wedges. Then, as $\delta \searrow 0$, the solution at fixed time $t > 0$, after addition of the Itô factor $t/12$, converges in distribution, in uniform-on-compacts topology, to the KPZ fixed point. The convergence also holds in distribution, uniformly in compact subsets of spacetime $(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$.

(4) Combining our results with recent results of Xuan Wu [35] and Dimitrov-Matetski [11], the KPZ line ensemble converges to the Airy line ensemble in distribution, in the uniform-on-compacts topology. The KPZ line ensemble, constructed in [8] is a sequence of random continuous curves, possibly intersecting, whose first curve is distributed as the (rescaled) KPZ equation with narrow wedge initial data (see Sec. 10 for a precise definition and Cor. 10.4 for a precise statement of this result).

The space-time convergence is only proved here for the KPZ equation. For the ASEP and AEP, the convergence is only proven for a fixed time, not as a process in t .

The key step of the proof is based on classical semigroup theory; generators and control of differences of transition probabilities through Dirichlet forms. In the next few paragraphs we attempt to provide some intuition. To describe it, and for use later, we need to write down the infinitesimal generators of our various Markov processes on the space of discrete height functions $\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$.

The rescaled AEP (2.4), has generator

$$L_\varepsilon f = 2\varepsilon^{-3/2} \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{v \in \mathbb{Z}} p(v) \nabla_{x,v} f, \quad \nabla_{x,v} f(h) = f(h^{x,v}) - f(h). \quad (2.17)$$

Here $h^{x,v} = h$ unless there is a particle at x and no particle at $x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon v$, in which case $h^{x,v}$ is the new height function after the particle has performed the jump.

The idea is to compare AEP to the rescaled TASEP, which has generator

$$T_\varepsilon f = 2\varepsilon^{-3/2} \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}} \nabla_{x,1} f. \quad (2.18)$$

The operator $\nabla_{x,v}$ has a symmetrized version

$$\nabla_{x,v}^{\text{sym}} f(h) = f(h^{x,v,\text{sym}}) - f(h), \quad (2.19)$$

where $h^{x,v,\text{sym}} = h$ unless there is a particle at x and no particle at $x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon v$ or no particle at x and a particle at $x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon v$, in which cases $h^{x,v,\text{sym}}$ is the new height function after the particle numbers at x and $x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon v$ have been exchanged.

The *symmetric simple exclusion process* (SSEP) which allows flips both ways, has generator

$$S_{\varepsilon,\delta}f := 2\delta\varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}} \nabla_x^{\text{sym}} f \quad (2.20)$$

The symmetric part of the generator L_ε of AEP has the same form, but with non-nearest neighbour terms $\nabla_{x,v}^{\text{sym}}$, and with $\delta = \varepsilon^{1/2}$.

The *weakly asymmetric simple exclusion process* (WASEP), allows flips both ways, with a slight asymmetry. Its generator is

$$L_{\varepsilon,\delta} = T_\varepsilon + S_{\varepsilon,\delta}. \quad (2.21)$$

It is known (see Prop. 6.5) that WASEP converges as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$ to the KPZ equation (1.1) with $(\lambda, \nu, D) = (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{\delta}{4}, \delta)$.

2.1. Heuristics and proof overview. Informally we have $e^{tT_\varepsilon} \rightarrow$ the semigroup of the KPZ fixed point, and $e^{t(T_\varepsilon + S_{\varepsilon,\delta})} \rightarrow$ the semigroup of the KPZ equation (1.1) with $(\lambda, \nu, D) = (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{\delta}{4}, \delta)$. Furthermore a straightforward computation shows that $e^{tS_{\varepsilon,\delta}} \rightarrow$ the semi-group of the linear stochastic differential equation (1.1) with $(\lambda, \nu, D) = (0, \frac{\delta}{4}, \delta)$. We can think of this as saying $S_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \mathcal{O}(\delta)$ in some sense. So one expects

$$e^{t(T_\varepsilon + S_{\varepsilon,\delta})} - e^{tT_\varepsilon} \sim e^{t(T_\varepsilon + \mathcal{O}(\delta))} - e^{tT_\varepsilon} \sim \mathcal{O}(\delta). \quad (2.22)$$

Taking $\varepsilon \searrow 0$, this shows heuristically that the difference between the semigroup of the KPZ equation (1.1) with $(\lambda, \nu, D) = (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{\delta}{4}, \delta)$ and the semigroup of the KPZ fixed point should be of order δ .

The heuristics for the convergence of AEP to the KPZ fixed point are similar, except that now δ is taken to be $\varepsilon^{1/2}$ and one needs an extra fact that the difference of the asymmetric parts of the operators scales like the symmetric part. It is true under condition (2.2) because then the difference is the generator of a mean zero asymmetric exclusion process, which is known to be diffusive [36]. Technically, the necessary estimate is provided by the *strong sector condition* (see (3.9) and Lem. 4.2).

It is unclear how to directly make (2.22) rigorous, or even precise. One comes up against the general problem in infinite particle systems of a lack of controllable norms. We take a different approach. A general formula for the difference of transition probabilities is presented in (3.10). It reduces the problem to the computation of the Dirichlet form of a known quantity, the transition probability of TASEP. It turns out this can be computed without exact formulas, but just using the time reversal invariance of the process. As long as one makes a small average, one can control this term well enough to obtain the convergence. But one loses a square root as compared to (2.22), so the bound one gets is not optimal. It also means one has to start with slightly randomized initial and final conditions.

3. DIFFERENCE OF TWO MARKOV PROCESSES

Consider two time-homogeneous Markov processes $h_t^{(1)}$, and $h_t^{(2)}$, $t \geq 0$ on a state space $\mathbb{S}$ which share a common invariant measure ν . We would like to estimate the difference between their transition probabilities

$$p_t^{(1)}(h, B) := \text{Prob}(h_t^{(1)} \in B \mid h_0^{(1)} = h) \quad \text{and} \quad p_t^{(2)}(h, B) := \text{Prob}(h_t^{(2)} \in B \mid h_0^{(2)} = h). \quad (3.1)$$

We could also start each in a probability measure $f_0(h)\nu(dh)$ and ask for the difference between $p_t^{(i)}(f_0\nu, B) := \int p_t^{(i)}(h, B)f_0(h)\nu(dh)$, $i = 1, 2$, i.e. the difference if we start the two processes with the same distribution $f_0(h)\nu(dh)$. Suppose the two processes have infinitesimal generators L_1 and L_2 . The transition probabilities satisfy Kolmogorov's backward equations

$$\partial_t p_t^{(1)}(h, B) = L_1 p_t^{(1)}(h, B) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t p_t^{(2)}(h, B) = L_2 p_t^{(2)}(h, B). \quad (3.2)$$

Here L_i , $i = 1, 2$ are acting on the h variable. On the other hand, if we start with $f_0(h)$, the processes at time t will have probability distributions $f_t^{(i)}(h)\nu(dh)$ solving the forward equations

$$\partial_t f_t^{(i)} = L_i^* f_t^{(i)}, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (3.3)$$

Thus

$$\partial_s f_{t-s}^{(2)}(h) p_s^{(1)}(h, B) = -L_2^* f_{t-s}^{(2)}(h) p_s^{(1)}(h, B) + f_{t-s}^{(2)}(h) L_1 p_s^{(1)}(h, B). \quad (3.4)$$

Integrating from 0 to t and with respect to ν , we obtain

$$p_t^{(1)}(f_0\nu, B) - p_t^{(2)}(f_0\nu, B) = \int_0^t \int f_{t-s}^{(2)}(h) (L_1 - L_2) p_s^{(1)}(h, B) d\nu(h) ds. \quad (3.5)$$

Here we have used

$$\begin{aligned} \int f_t^{(2)}(h) p_0(h, A) d\nu(h) &= \int_A f_s^{(2)}(h) d\nu(h) = \int \text{Prob}(h_s^{(2)} \in A \mid h_0^{(2)} = h) f_0(h) d\nu(h) \\ &= p_s^{(2)}(f_0\nu, A) \end{aligned}$$

for measurable A , and $L_1 - L_2$ acts on $p_s^{(1)}$ through the variable h .

One could do various things at this point, perhaps take a supremum over measurable subsets $B \in \mathbb{S}$ in order to compute the total variation distance. In our case, the total variation is not expected to be small, and we will be satisfied if we can prove the two probabilities are close for a wide class of fixed B . To study (3.5) it is clear we will need information about both $p_s^{(1)}(h, B)$, and $f_s^{(2)}$, $0 \leq s \leq t$. To learn something about the latter, we might assume $\|f_0\|_2^2 = \int f_0^2 d\nu < \infty$ and study what happens to $\|f_t^{(2)}\|_2^2 = \int (f_s^{(2)})^2 d\nu$:

$$\|f_t^{(2)}\|_2^2 - \|f_0\|_2^2 = 2 \int_0^t \int f_s^{(2)} L_2^* f_s^{(2)} d\nu ds = 2 \int_0^t \int f_s^{(2)} L_2^{\text{sym}} f_s^{(2)} d\nu ds := -2 \int_0^t \mathcal{D}_2(f_s^{(2)}) ds, \quad (3.6)$$

where $L_2^{\text{sym}} = \frac{1}{2}(L_2 + L_2^*)$ is the symmetric part of L_2 . We could do the same thing with the other process to create another *Dirichlet form*, $\mathcal{D}_1$. In the applications we will be interested in, the Dirichlet forms corresponding to T and L are *comparable*, i.e. there is a $0 < c < \infty$ such that

$$c^{-1} \mathcal{D}_1(f) \leq \mathcal{D}_2(f) \leq c \mathcal{D}_1(f). \quad (3.7)$$

In (3.6) the non-positivity of the right hand side tells us that the integral of the Dirichlet form can be controlled by the initial L^2 norm. Together with (3.7), we have

$$\int_0^t \mathcal{D}_1(f_s^{(2)}) ds \leq c \int_0^t \mathcal{D}_2(f_s^{(2)}) ds \leq C \|f_0\|_2^2, \quad (3.8)$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

Definition 3.1. An operator A on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{S}}$ (real valued functions on $\mathbb{S}$) satisfies the *strong sector condition* with respect to $\mathcal{D}$ (or L^{sym}) if there exists $C < \infty$ such that for all $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{S}}$ with $\mathcal{D}(g_1), \mathcal{D}(g_2) < \infty$,

$$\left| \int g_1 A g_2 d\nu \right| \leq C \mathcal{D}(g_1)^{1/2} \mathcal{D}(g_2)^{1/2}. \quad (3.9)$$

By (3.5), (3.9) and (3.8) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

Lemma 3.2. Suppose that $L_1 - L_2$ satisfies the strong sector condition with respect to $\mathcal{D}_1$. Then there exists $0 < C < \infty$ such that

$$\left| p_t^{(1)}(f_0\nu, B) - p_t^{(2)}(f_0\nu, B) \right| \leq C \int_0^t \mathcal{D}_1(f_{t-s}^{(2)})^{1/2} \mathcal{D}_1(p_s^{(1)})^{1/2} ds \leq C \|f_0\|_2 \sqrt{\int_0^t \mathcal{D}_1(p_s^{(1)}) ds}, \quad (3.10)$$

The idea now is that if process 1 is TASEP, then we know a great deal about $p_s^{(1)}$, enough that we can essentially compute the right hand side. The method of attack is to use this bound, with a little bit of extra averaging (see the beginning of Sec. 5), to estimate the difference between the rescaled TASEP and ASEP, respectively, AEP or WASEP.

4. DIRICHLET FORMS

The generators (2.17) and (2.18) are invariant with respect to the (unnormalized) measure ν_ε defined in (2.7), and have Dirichlet forms

$$\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^p(f) := - \int f L_\varepsilon f d\nu_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-3/2} \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{v \in \mathbb{Z}} p(v) \int (\nabla_{x,v}^{\text{sym}} f)^2 d\nu_\varepsilon \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon(f) := - \int f T_\varepsilon f d\nu_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-3/2} \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}} \int (\nabla_x^{\text{sym}} f)^2 d\nu_\varepsilon \quad (4.2)$$

respectively, where ∇_x^{sym} is short for $\nabla_{x,1}^{\text{sym}}$. $\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon$ is in a sense the most basic Dirichlet form, summing the energies from the elementary flips. The philosophy is to compare all other Dirichlet forms to this one. So although it comes from the nearest neighbour $p(\cdot)$ we do not indicate that or given it a special name.

Lemma 4.1. *The Dirichlet forms (4.2) and (4.1) of TASEP and AEP are comparable (in the sense of (3.7)) with a positive constant $c < \infty$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Proof. Introduce the measure preserving transformation $e_{x,y}h = h^{x,2\varepsilon^{-1}(y-x),\text{sym}}$, where $h^{x,v,\text{sym}}$ is defined immediately after (2.19). We have $e_{x,y} = e_{y,x}$ and we can write

$$e_{x,x+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon v} = e_{x_n,x_n+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} \cdots e_{x_1,x_1+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} \quad (4.3)$$

where $n = 2|v| - 2$ and, if $v > 0$, we have $x_1 = x, x_2 = x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon, \dots, x_{v-1} = x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon(v-1), x_v = x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon(v-2), x_{v+1} = x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon(v-3), \dots, x_{2v-2} = x$. In terms of the gradient-of-height variables $\hat{\eta}$ (defined in (2.3)), $e_{x,y}$ exchanges the numbers at x and y , and (4.3) is just the fact that the exchange of numbers at x and $x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon v$ is accomplished through nearest neighbor exchanges first along bonds from $x, x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$ to $x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon(v-1), x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon v$ and then back. To see why this works, note that if the initial particle configuration is denoted by $(\hat{\eta}(x_1), \hat{\eta}(x_2), \dots, \hat{\eta}(x_v))$, then after performing the adjacent swaps at $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{v-1}$, the resulting configuration is $(\hat{\eta}(x_2), \hat{\eta}(x_3), \dots, \hat{\eta}(x_v), \hat{\eta}(x_1))$. Performing the adjacent swaps again at positions $x_{v-2}, x_{v-1}, \dots, x_1$ in that order, the final configuration is $(\hat{\eta}(x_v), \hat{\eta}(x_2), \hat{\eta}(x_3), \dots, \hat{\eta}(x_{v-1}), \hat{\eta}(x_1))$, as desired. If $v < 0$, one does the analogue sequence in the other direction. Hence $\nabla_{x,v}^{\text{sym}} f$ can be written as $\sum_{i=1}^n f(e_{x_i,x_i+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} \cdots e_{x_1,x_1+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} h) - f(e_{x_{i-1},x_{i-1}+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} \cdots e_{x_1,x_1+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} h)$ and by the measure preserving property

$$\int (\nabla_{x,v}^{\text{sym}} f)^2 d\nu_\varepsilon \leq n \sum_{i=1}^n \int (f(e_{x_i,x_i+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} h) - f(h))^2 d\nu_\varepsilon. \quad (4.4)$$

Summing over x and v gives $\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^p(f) \leq C \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon(f)$. The C depends on the jump law $p(\cdot)$ and nothing else.

In the other direction, it is easy to construct f and $p(\cdot)$ so that $\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^p(f) = 0$ but $\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon(f) > 0$. On the other hand, under our assumption that $p^{\text{sym}}(\cdot)$ is irreducible, there is a path $x_1 = x, x_2 = x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon y_1, \dots, x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon = x_{m-1} + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon y_{m-1}$ with $p^{\text{sym}}(y_i) > 0$. In other words, the nearest neighbour move in the Dirichlet form of the TASEP can be achieved by a finite set of allowable moves of the symmetrized AEP. As above, we can write $\nabla_{x,1}^{\text{sym}} f$ as $\sum_{i=1}^n f(e_{x_i,x_i+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon y_i} \cdots e_{x_1,x_1+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon y_1} h) - f(e_{x_{i-1},x_{i-1}+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon y_{i-1}} \cdots e_{x_1,x_1+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon y_1} h)$ and, as before we get a bound $\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon(f) \leq C \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^p(f)$ with a constant C depending only on the law $p^{\text{sym}}(\cdot)$. $\square$

Going back to AEP we can write

$$L_\varepsilon - T_\varepsilon = M_\varepsilon - S_\varepsilon \quad \text{where} \quad M_\varepsilon = L_\varepsilon + T_\varepsilon^*, \quad S_\varepsilon = T_\varepsilon + T_\varepsilon^*, \quad (4.5)$$

where $T_\varepsilon^* = \varepsilon^{-3/2} \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}} \nabla_{x,-1} f$ is just the TASEP with time reversed (or space flipped). Since we have assumed $\sum_v vp(v) = 1$, M_ε is the generator of a *mean zero exclusion*, i.e. it is of the form (2.17) with $\sum_v vp(v) = 0$. The following estimate, which is key to the non-nearest neighbour case, appeared without the heights in the thesis of Lin Xu [36] and for the environment as seen from a tagged particle by S.R.S.Varadhan (Lem. 5.2 of [32]). Our variant with the heights is basically the same as [36]. For completeness we give a proof in Appx. C.

Lemma 4.2. *Any mean zero exclusion generator satisfies the strong sector condition (3.9) with a constant $C < \infty$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$.*

From (4.5), $L_\varepsilon - T_\varepsilon$ satisfies the strong sector condition because we have matched drifts. In the nearest neighbour case, i.e. ASEP, $M_\varepsilon = 0$ and the strong sector condition is obvious.

Example 4.3. Suppose we add to our AEP generator L_ε a generator $L_\varepsilon^{\text{pert}}$ defined through a Dirichlet form, i.e. $-\int f L^{\text{pert}} f d\nu_\varepsilon := \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^{\text{pert}}(f)$ which is comparable to $\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon(f)$. One checks easily that the argument goes through. We have in mind Dirichlet forms of the following type,

$$\varepsilon^{-3/2} \int \left(\sum_{x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}} \alpha_x (\nabla_x^{\text{sym}} f)^2 + \sum_{x, x' \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}} \beta_{x, x'} (\nabla_{x, x'}^{\text{sym}} f)^2 \right) d\nu_\varepsilon \quad (4.6)$$

with functions $\alpha_x, \beta_{x, x'}$ with α_x not depending on the particle numbers at $x - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon, x$ and $\beta_{x, x'}$ not depending on the particle numbers at $x - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon, x, x' - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon, x'$, but on variables in a local (order ε) neighbourhood of both, and $\nabla_{x, x'}^{\text{sym}} f(h) = f(h_{x, x'}^{\text{sym}}) - f(h)$ where the height function $h_{x, x'}^{\text{sym}}$ is flipped *both* at x and x' , and the sum is over $|x - x'| \leq C\varepsilon$. As long as $\alpha_x, \beta_{x, x'}$ are uniformly bounded, the Dirichlet form is comparable to our standard one, and the key part of our argument continues to hold (so that the statement of Thm. 2.2 (1) holds for such processes.) Of course, there are many other examples of this type. The relevance of this example is that such models (i.e. with generator L^{pert}) are expected under appropriate scaling to have a hydrodynamic limit of Cahn-Hilliard type [2],[27]. Therefore they can be thought of as a very simple toy versions of the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation (though with a stabilizing instead of a destabilizing second order term) which has also been conjectured to lie in the KPZ universality class [25].

5. DIRICHLET FORM OF THE TASEP TRANSITION PROBABILITIES

Let $p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, B)$ denote the probability for the rescaled TASEP height function at time t to be in set B , given that initially it was h , and $p_t^{\text{AEP}, \varepsilon}(h, B)$ the analogue for AEP. We will show in Appx. B that $|\nabla_x^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g))|$ is roughly the joint probability

$$R(x, h(0); \hat{h}) := \mathbb{P}^{\text{TASEP}} \left(\arg \max_y \{h_t(y; -g) + h(y)\} = x, h_t(x; -g) + h(x) \in \{\varepsilon^{1/2}, 2\varepsilon^{1/2}\} \right). \quad (5.1)$$

Here $h_t(\cdot; -g)$ denotes the TASEP height function at time t started from $-g$, and $h(x) = h(0) + \hat{h}(x)$. Except for the slightly annoying issue of possible non-uniqueness of the argmax we would have that for each $\hat{h}$, $R(x, h(0); \hat{h})$ is a probability measure on $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z} \times \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}$. More precisely we will prove the following in Appx. B.

Lemma 5.1. *For any $t > 0$ and any $g \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$ such that $g(x) \geq C'(1 + |x|)$ for some $C' > 0$, there exists a universal constant $C < \infty$ such that*

$$\int \left(\sum_{x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{h(0) \in \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}} |\nabla_x^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g))| \right)^2 \mu_\varepsilon(d\hat{h}) \leq C, \quad (5.2)$$

where μ_ε is as defined in (2.6).

From this one might expect $R(x, h(0); \hat{h}) \sim \varepsilon^{3/2}$. However, the Dirichlet form has the sums over $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}$ and $\varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}$ outside the square, and a computation gives $\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon(p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$, from which (3.10) tells us *nothing*. The reason is that for fixed $\hat{h}$, the argmax distribution is highly intermittent in x . We can get around this obstacle by looking at slightly averaged transition probabilities.

We can have our shift operator τ_y use $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and act on functions on $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}$ by $\tau_y h(\cdot) = h(\cdot - [y]_\varepsilon)$ and on the sets B by $\tau_y B = \{h(\cdot) : h(\cdot - [y]_\varepsilon) \in B\}$ where $[y]_\varepsilon$ denotes the nearest point in $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}$. There is another shift, σ_r which does the analogue to the heights themselves, $\sigma_r h(x) = h(x) + [r]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}}$ and $\sigma_r B = \{h(\cdot) : h(\cdot) - [r]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}} \in B\}$, where $[r]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}}$ denotes the nearest point in $\varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}$.

We will perform a little Gaussian average in r and y . Let y_1, y_2 and r be independent, Gaussian, mean 0 and variance a^2 for some $a > 0$ and let

$$\bar{p}_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(f_0\nu, B) := \mathbb{E}[p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(f_0\nu, \sigma_r \tau_{y_1+y_2} B)] \quad (5.3)$$

where $\mathbb{E}$ is the expectation over y_1, y_2, r . The expectation $\mathbb{E}$ has nothing to do with any physical probability space and is just a convenient way to write the small convolution, which smooths out the transition probability, reducing the intermittency. In the proof below, we use several times the symmetry of the convolution. But otherwise, it is not very important that it is Gaussian. We could have combined y_1 and y_2 as $y' = y_1 + y_2$ but writing it this way will clarify the manipulations which follow. Let

$$\hat{p}_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, B) := \mathbb{E}[p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(\tau_{-y_1} h, \sigma_r \tau_{y_2} B)]. \quad (5.4)$$

Lemma 5.2. *With the above notation,*

$$\bar{p}_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(f_0\nu, B) - \bar{p}_t^{\text{AEP}, \varepsilon}(f_0\nu, B) = \int_0^t \int f_{t-s, \varepsilon}(h)(T_\varepsilon - L_\varepsilon) \hat{p}_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, B) d\nu_\varepsilon ds. \quad (5.5)$$

Proof. After the Gaussian smoothing, (3.5) becomes

$$\bar{p}_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(f_0\nu, B) - \bar{p}_t^{\text{AEP}, \varepsilon}(f_0\nu, B) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \int f_{t-s, \varepsilon}(h)(T_\varepsilon - L_\varepsilon) p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \sigma_r \tau_{y_1+y_2} B) d\nu_\varepsilon ds \right]. \quad (5.6)$$

Now

$$\int f_{t-s, \varepsilon}(h)(T_\varepsilon - L_\varepsilon) p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \sigma_r \tau_{y_1+y_2} B) d\nu_\varepsilon = \int (T_\varepsilon - L_\varepsilon)^* f_{t-s, \varepsilon}(h) p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \sigma_r \tau_{y_1+y_2} B) d\nu_\varepsilon \quad (5.7)$$

and from the spatial homogeneity of TASEP,

$$p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \tau_{y_1+y_2} B) = p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(\tau_{-y_1} h, \tau_{y_2} B). \quad (5.8)$$

This gives (5.5). $\square$

Lemma 5.3. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any fixed $t > 0$, with the definitions above, and the Dirichlet form in (4.2),*

$$\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon(\hat{p}_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(\cdot, \text{hyp}(g))) \leq C\varepsilon^{1/2}a^{-2}. \quad (5.9)$$

Proof. Let B be of the form (2.16). If we write out the left hand side of (5.9) we get

$$\varepsilon^{-3/2} \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon} \left(\mathbb{E}[\nabla_x^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(\tau_{-y_1} h, \sigma_r \tau_{y_2} B)] \right)^2 d\nu_\varepsilon, \quad (5.10)$$

where $\nabla_x^{\text{sym}} f(h) = f(h^{x, \text{sym}}) - f(h)$ from (2.19) with $v = 1$. Now

$$(\tau_{-y_1} h)^{x, \text{sym}} = \tau_{-y_1}(h^{x+y_1, \text{sym}}), \quad (5.11)$$

the height shift σ_r commutes with $h \mapsto h^{x, \text{sym}}$, and the TASEP transition probabilities are invariant under spatial and height shifts, i.e. $p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(\tau_y h, \tau_y B) = p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, B)$ and $p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(\sigma_r h, \sigma_r B) =$

$p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(h, B)$. Note that the notations $h^{x+y_1, \text{sym}}$ above and $\nabla_{x+y_1}^{\text{sym}}$ below actually stand for $h^{x+[y_1]_\varepsilon, \text{sym}}$ and $\nabla_{x+[y_1]_\varepsilon}^{\text{sym}}$ respectively. So

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x^{\text{sym}}(p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(\tau_{-y_1}h, \sigma_r\tau_{y_2}B)) &= p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}((\tau_{-y_1}h)^{x, \text{sym}}, \sigma_r\tau_{y_2}B) - p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(\tau_{-y_1}h, \sigma_r\tau_{y_2}B) \\ &= p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(\tau_{-y_1}(h^{x+y_1, \text{sym}}), \sigma_r\tau_{y_2}B) - p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(\tau_{-y_1}h, \sigma_r\tau_{y_2}B) \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

$$= p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(\sigma_{-r}(h^{x+y_1, \text{sym}}), \tau_{y_2+y_1}B) - p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(\sigma_{-r}h, \tau_{y_2+y_1}B). \quad (5.13)$$

So

$$\nabla_x^{\text{sym}}(p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(\tau_{-y_1}h, \sigma_r\tau_{y_2}B)) = (\nabla_{x+y_1}^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon})(\sigma_{-r}h, \tau_{y_2+y_1}B). \quad (5.14)$$

We can rewrite the expectation over y_1, y_2 as the expectation in $y' = y_2 + y_1$ of the expectation of y_1 given y' . Now the distribution of y_1 given y' is Gaussian, mean $y'/2$ and variance $a^2/2$. Furthermore, by Jensen's inequality, we can take the expectation over y' outside of the square. Putting this together, (5.10) is bounded above by

$$\varepsilon^{-5/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon} \varepsilon^{3/2} \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}, h(0) \in \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}} \left(\varepsilon^{3/2} \sum_{y_1 \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}, r \in \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}} \varphi(y_1, r) \nabla_{x+y_1}^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(\sigma_{-r}h, \tau_{y'}B) \right)^2 d\mu_\varepsilon \right], \quad (5.15)$$

where the outside expectation is over y' and $\varphi(y_1, r)$ is the orthogonal projection of the Gaussian density $\frac{e^{-\frac{(y_1-y')^2}{a^2}}}{\sqrt{\pi a^2}} \frac{e^{-\frac{r^2}{2a^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi a^2}}$ onto L^2 of the discrete measure giving mass $\varepsilon^{3/2}$ to each point of $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z} \times \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}$.

With ψ chosen as $\psi(x, r) = \nabla_x^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(\sigma_{-r}h, \tau_{y'}B)$ and since $\varphi(y_1, r) = \varphi(y_1, -r)$, it is easy to see that the term being squared in (5.15) is precisely $\varphi * \psi$. By Young's inequality

$$\|\varphi * \psi\|_2 \leq \|\varphi\|_2 \|\psi\|_1$$

applied on that discrete space, so we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{3/2} \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}, h(0) \in \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}} \left(\varepsilon^{3/2} \sum_{y_1 \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}, r \in \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}} \varphi(y_1, r) \nabla_{x+y_1}^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(\sigma_{-r}h, \tau_{y'}B) \right)^2 \\ \leq C_1 a^{-2} \left(\varepsilon^{3/2} \sum_{x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}, h(0) \in \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}} \left| \nabla_x^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(h, \tau_{y'}B) \right| \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the factor $C_1 a^{-2}$ is the square of the L^2 norm of φ , and we used that the L^2 norm of the projection is bounded by the full L^2 norm. Together with (5.2) this gives (5.9). $\square$

6. CONVERGENCE STARTING FROM FINITE ENERGY INITIAL DATA

Let $p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(h, B)$, $p_t^{\text{AEP},\varepsilon}(h, B)$ and $p_t^{\text{WASEP},\varepsilon}(h, B)$ denote the transition probabilities for TASEP, AEP and WASEP with generators (2.18), (2.17) and (2.21) respectively.

Lemma 6.1. *Let B be of the form (2.16). Let $\bar{p}_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, B)$, $\bar{p}_t^{\text{AEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, B)$ and $\bar{p}_t^{\text{WASEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, B)$ denote the slightly smoothed out transition probabilities as in (5.3), by Gaussians with mean 0 and standard deviation a . Then there is a $C < \infty$ depending only on the jump law $p(\cdot)$, such that*

$$\left| \bar{p}_t^{\text{AEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, B) - \bar{p}_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, B) \right| \leq C a^{-1} \|f_{0,\varepsilon}\|_2 \varepsilon^{1/4} \quad (6.1)$$

and

$$\left| \bar{p}_t^{\text{WASEP},\varepsilon,\delta}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, B) - \bar{p}_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, B) \right| \leq C a^{-1} \|f_{0,\varepsilon}\|_2 \delta^{1/2}. \quad (6.2)$$

Proof. Lem. 5.2 applies in both cases. By the strong sector condition, Lem.4.2, and the equivalence of Dirichlet forms, Lem.4.1, we can replicate (3.10) and use Lem. 5.3 to obtain the desired bounds. $\square$

From here, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 6.2. *Suppose that $f_{0,\varepsilon}d\nu_\varepsilon \rightarrow d\rho$ with $\varepsilon^{1/4}\|f_{0,\varepsilon}\|_2 \rightarrow 0$. Then,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{AEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, \text{hyp}(g)) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(\rho, \text{hyp}(g)). \quad (6.3)$$

uniformly for g uniformly continuous on $\mathbb{R}$ with $g(x) \geq C(1 + |x|)$.

Proof. If B is a set of the type (2.16) where g is uniformly continuous on all of $\mathbb{R}$, the difference of $\tau_z B$ and B can be made arbitrarily small by choosing z sufficiently small. In other words, given $\gamma > 0$, for z sufficiently small, $\text{hyp}(g - \gamma) \subset \tau_z B \subset \text{hyp}(g + \gamma)$. Thus, for any fixed constant $\eta > 0$, we fix a to be sufficiently small so that it follows from (6.1) by taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{AEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, \text{hyp}(g)) \geq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, \text{hyp}(g - 2\gamma)) - \eta. \quad (6.4)$$

As this holds for all $\eta > 0$, we have

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{AEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, \text{hyp}(g)) \geq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, \text{hyp}(g - 2\gamma)) \quad (6.5)$$

and similarly

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{AEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, \text{hyp}(g)) \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}\nu_\varepsilon, \text{hyp}(g + 2\gamma)). \quad (6.6)$$

Since we know from [20] that $p_t^{\text{TASEP},\varepsilon}(f_{0,\varepsilon}d\nu_\varepsilon, \text{hyp}(g \pm 2\gamma)) \rightarrow p_t^{\text{FP}}(\rho, \text{hyp}(g \pm 2\gamma))$, the KPZ fixed point transition probabilities, and (6.5) and (6.6) hold for all $\gamma > 0$, we thus conclude the required proposition. $\square$

Remark 6.3. The initial data is generic in the following sense. $f_{0,\varepsilon}d\nu_\varepsilon \rightarrow d\rho$ with $\|f_{0,\varepsilon}\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, could, for example, follow closely some nice deterministic function inside a box $[-L, L]$ and then be Brownian motion outside, with $f_{0,\varepsilon}d\nu_\varepsilon$ looking like an appropriate discretization. Note however that if the function g is not chosen to go to infinity quickly enough outside the box, the right hand side of (6.3) may vanish, and the Proposition, while true, provides little information. This justifies the growth condition in g .

Remark 6.4. It is easy to see that everything above goes through if we replace the target set B by sets $\text{epi}(g)$ where $\text{epi}(g) = \{h : h(x) \geq g(x), x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ for any uniformly continuous g such that $g(x) \leq C(1 - |x|)$ for some $C > 0$. The only change happens in (5.1), where the $\arg \max$ gets replaced by $\arg \min$. Hence (5.2) still holds and we get the same statement as (6.3) with $\text{hyp}(g)$ replaced by $\text{epi}(g)$ for $g(x) \leq C(1 - |x|)$ for some $C > 0$.

Next we draw conclusions from (6.2). Under TASEP $dh_\varepsilon = -4\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{1}_\wedge dt + dM$ where M is a martingale, while under WASEP, $dh_\varepsilon = [4\delta\varepsilon^{-3/2}(\mathbf{1}_\vee - \mathbf{1}_\wedge) - 4\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{1}_\wedge]dt + d\tilde{M}$ where $\tilde{M}$ is another martingale. The 4 in TASEP is because the height function jumps by $2\varepsilon^{1/2}$ at rate $2\varepsilon^{-3/2}$. On the lattice $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}$,

$$4\mathbf{1}_\wedge = -\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\nabla^- h \nabla^+ h - \frac{\varepsilon^{3/2}}{4}\nabla^- \nabla^+ h + 1, \quad 4\mathbf{1}_\vee = -\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\nabla^- h \nabla^+ h + \frac{\varepsilon^{3/2}}{4}\nabla^- \nabla^+ h + 1, \quad (6.7)$$

where $\nabla^- h(x) = (\varepsilon/2)^{-1}(h(x) - h(x - \varepsilon/2))$, $\nabla^+ h(x) = (\varepsilon/2)^{-1}(h(x + \varepsilon/2) - h(x))$, and the martingales are approximating white noises, one can see that these are discretizations of the KPZ equation. At the same time it is clear that for TASEP the factor in front of the second order discrete derivative is too small ($\varepsilon^{-3/2}$ instead of ε^{-2}) and thus there is no way to scale TASEP to the KPZ equation. From the discrete equation for WASEP one can read off the following result. Note that the Itô factor $t/12$ comes from the difference of the formal expression for the KPZ equation, and the Cole-Hopf solution.

Proposition 6.5 (Bertini, Giacomin [3]). *Let $h_\varepsilon(t, x)$ be the height function at time t of WASEP, ε, δ . Suppose that $h_\varepsilon(0, x) \rightarrow h_0(x)$ where $h_0(x)$ is a continuous function with $h(x) \leq C(1 + |x|)$ for some $C < \infty$. Then $h_\varepsilon(t, x) + \varepsilon^{-1}t + t/12$ converges to the Cole-Hopf solution $h(t, x)$ of the KPZ equation (1.1) with $(\lambda, \nu, D) = (1/4, \delta/4, \delta)$ starting from $h_0(x)$.*

The formal argument above makes it clear why the global height shift $\varepsilon^{-1}t$ is the same in all our models. In (6.2), we first take the limit as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$. The conclusion is that as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$, if $f_{0,\varepsilon}d\nu_\varepsilon \rightarrow d\rho$ the left hand side of (6.2) converges to $|\bar{p}_t^{\text{KPZ},\delta}(\rho, B) - \bar{p}_t^{\text{FP}}(\rho, B)|$ and therefore,

$$|\bar{p}_t^{\text{KPZ},\delta}(\rho, B) - \bar{p}_t^{\text{FP}}(\rho, B)| \leq C\delta^{1/2}a^{-1} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|f_{0,\varepsilon}\|_2.$$

Finally, we take the limit as $\delta \searrow 0$. Again, as in the proof of Prop 6.2, if g is uniformly continuous the averaging makes an arbitrarily small error. So we have

Proposition 6.6. *Suppose that $f_{0,\varepsilon}d\nu_\varepsilon \rightarrow d\rho$ with $\|f_{0,\varepsilon}\|_2 \leq C_1$ for some universal constant C_1 (not depending on ε), and g is uniformly continuous on all of $\mathbb{R}$ with $g(x) \geq C(1 + |x|)$ for some $C > 0$. Then,*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{KPZ},\delta}(d\rho, \text{hyp}(g)) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(d\rho, \text{hyp}(g)). \quad (6.8)$$

Example 6.7. (Randomized wedges, narrow wedges and their approximations) For $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$ the narrow wedge of height b at y for the KPZ fixed point is

$$\mathfrak{d}^{y,b}(x) = b \quad \text{if } x = y, \quad \mathfrak{d}^{y,b}(x) = -\infty \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

For $y_1 < y_2 < \dots < y_k, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k \in \mathbb{R}$ the multiple narrow wedge $\mathfrak{d}^{\vec{y},\vec{b}}$ is $\mathfrak{d}^{\vec{y},\vec{b}}(x) = \max_i \mathfrak{d}^{y_i,b_i}(x)$.

Note that by Prop. 6.6 we know the limit starting with measures which have finite energy. We now build finite energy approximations to narrow wedges and other initial conditions, which we call *randomized wedges*. Asymptotically such a measure has to have a nice Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to Brownian motion. So we are trying to build something close enough to a narrow wedge or other initial conditions, which looks locally like a Brownian motion.

For any $k \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma > 0, y_1 < y_2 < \dots < y_k, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k \in \mathbb{R}$, define $g(x)$ as the piecewise linear function such that $g(x) = b_1$ for $x \leq y_1$, $g(x) = b_k$ for $x \geq y_k$ and $g(x), y_i \leq x \leq y_{i+1}$ is the line segment joining b_i and b_{i+1} for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$. Define the randomized wedge approximating g as

$$g(x) + \Theta(x),$$

where $\Theta(x), x \in \mathbb{R}$ is the following random process: $\Theta(y_i)$ are uniformly distributed on $[0, \gamma]$, $i = 1, \dots, k$; $\Theta(y_1 - x), x > 0$, and $\Theta(y_k + x), x > 0$, are Brownian motions, and $\Theta(x), y_i < x < y_{i+1}$ are Brownian bridges, all of them independent of each other. This particular choice of Θ is fairly arbitrary, particularly the uniform distribution on $[0, \gamma]$ for the $\Theta(y_i)$. We just need something so that the result is absolutely continuous with respect to $\text{Leb} \times \text{Brownian motion}$ (where Leb denotes the Lebesgue measure on the $X = 0$ line), with a Radon-Nikodym derivative bounded in L^2 , but doesn't stray far from 0 on $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\}$.

We give some special cases names and notations. The *narrowish wedge of height b at y* is $\mathfrak{d}_{s,L}^{y,b}(x) = \max\{b - s|x - y|, -L\}$ and the *multiple narrowish wedge* is $\mathfrak{d}_{s,L}^{\vec{y},\vec{b}}(x) = \max_i \mathfrak{d}_{s,L}^{y_i,b_i}(x)$ (we will always take L large enough so that $L > |b_i|$ for all i). The *Brownian multiple narrowish wedge* $\mathfrak{d}_{\gamma,s,L}^{\vec{y},\vec{b}}$ is the randomized wedge approximating it. Note that the definition also makes sense when s and/or L is equal to ∞ . In Appx. A we will show that for any $0 < \gamma, s, L < \infty$, there exist $f_{0,\varepsilon}$ with

$$f_{0,\varepsilon}d\nu_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathfrak{d}_{\gamma,s,L}^{\vec{y},\vec{b}} \quad \|f_{0,\varepsilon}\|_{L^2(d\nu_\varepsilon)} \leq C, \quad (6.9)$$

for some universal constant $C > 0$ independent of ε .

By the skew time reversal invariance (1.4) of the KPZ equation, the ASEP, and the KPZ fixed point, Prop. 6.2 and Prop. 6.6, together with (6.9), we obtain,

Proposition 6.8. *Fix $A > 0$. Then uniformly over the set of initial functions h which are uniformly continuous with $h(x) \leq A(1 - |x|)$,*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{KPZ},\delta}(h, \text{hyp}(-\mathfrak{d}_{\gamma,s,L}^{\vec{y},\vec{b}})) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP},\varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(-\mathfrak{d}_{\gamma,s,L}^{\vec{y},\vec{b}})) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(-\mathfrak{d}_{\gamma,s,L}^{\vec{y},\vec{b}})). \quad (6.10)$$

for any Brownian multiple narrowish wedge or randomized wedge.

Remark 6.9. Here and throughout the rest of the paper, the transition probabilities are averaged over the randomness of the wedges, i.e. if ω denotes the randomness of the wedges, and $\mathbb{E}$ expectation with respect to that variable, we are writing $p_t(h, \text{hyp}(-\mathfrak{d}_{\gamma,s,L}^{\vec{y},\vec{b}}))$ for $\mathbb{E}[p_t(h, \text{hyp}(-\mathfrak{d}_{\gamma,s,L}^{\vec{y},\vec{b}}(\omega)))]$.

The rest of the work of the paper is to use properties of AEP, ASEP and the KPZ equation to extend the result to distributional convergence in the uniform-on-compact topology, and broaden the class of initial data.

7. TIGHTNESS AND CONVERGENCE IN THE UNIFORM-ON-COMPACT TOPOLOGY

The following is our main tool to obtain tightness.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $t > 0$ be fixed and for each $\varepsilon > 0$, let h_ε be a random element of $\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$. Assume that for all g_1, g_2 (uniformly) continuous with $g_1(x) = C_1 + C_2|x - c_3|$ and $g_2(x) = C_1 - C_2|x - c_3|$ for all sufficiently large $|x|$, for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$ and $c_3 \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(h_\varepsilon(x) \leq g_1(x), x \in \mathbb{R}) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(g_1)), \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(h_\varepsilon(x) > g_2(x), x \in \mathbb{R}) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{epi}(g_2)), \quad (7.1)$$

for some function h which is bounded on any compact interval and $|h(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)$ for some $C > 0$. Here $\mathbb{P}$ is the probability with respect to the randomness in h_ε . Then (the distributions of) $\{h_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$ are tight in the uniform-on-compact topology. In particular, we have the following modulus of continuity uniform in ε . For any $b > 0$ small enough,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(\omega_\varepsilon(b) > mb^{1/2} \log^{7/6}(1 + b^{-1})) \leq ce^{-dm^{3/2}}, \quad (7.2)$$

where, for $b \in (0, 1)$, $\omega_\varepsilon(b) := \sup_{|x-y| \leq b, x, y \in [-L, L]} |h_\varepsilon(x) - h_\varepsilon(y)|$ for any fixed compact set $[-L, L]$.

Remark 7.2. Since $\text{hyp}(g)$ sets for uniformly continuous g growing to ∞ at some rate form a separating class for the KPZ fixed point started from any h with $h(x) \leq C(1 + |x|)$, by Prop. 6.2, Rem. 6.4 and Prop. 7.1 we get the uniform-on-compacts part of Thm. 2.2(1).

Note that no attempt is being made to optimise the exponent of the logarithms in Prop. 7.1 and the $7/6$ just comes from the proof.

Let s denote the following function on $\mathbb{R}$

$$s(x) = \min\{|x|^{1/2} \log^{1/2}(1 + |x|^{-1}), 1\} + |x|. \quad (7.3)$$

We make use of the following modulus of continuity estimate for the KPZ fixed point in the proof of Proposition 7.1.

Lemma 7.3. *Fix $t > 0$ and $L < \infty$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let h_t^{FP} denote the KPZ fixed point at time t started from the initial condition h with $|h(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)$ and*

$$\mathcal{E}_k := \{|h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) - h_t^{\text{FP}}(y)| \leq ks(x - y), |h_t^{\text{FP}}(x)| \leq k, \text{ for all } x \in [-L, L], y \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (7.4)$$

Then there are $c < \infty$ and $d > 0$ (depending on L, t but not k) such that

$$P(\mathcal{E}_k) \geq 1 - ce^{-dk^{3/2}}. \quad (7.5)$$

Here we use P to denote probabilities with respect to the KPZ fixed point, while we reserve $\mathbb{P}$ for the approximating processes.

Proof. [10] Cor. 10.7. shows that for the Airy sheet there exists $d > 0$ and $c < \infty$ so that

$$P\left(\sup_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|\mathcal{A}(x, y)|}{\log^2(|x| + |y| + 2)} > m\right) \leq ce^{-dm^{3/2}}. \quad (7.6)$$

Therefore, from the variational formula (2.14) and $h(y) \leq C(1 + |y|)$, there exists perhaps new $c < \infty$ and $d > 0$ so that

$$P\left(\sup_{x \in [-L-1, L+1]} |h_t^{\text{FP}}(x)| > m\right) \leq ce^{-dm^{3/2}}. \quad (7.7)$$

Next we show that for any such $x \in [-L-1, L+1]$ and any initial condition $h(y) \leq C(1+|y|)$, with high probability, the supremum in the variation formula (2.14) for $h_t^{\text{FP}}(x)$ is attained in a compact interval of y . To this end, observe that from $h(y) \leq C(1+|y|)$ and (7.6) and the negative parabola in the variational problem, for fixed $x \in [-L-1, L+1]$,

$$\sup_{|y| \geq \lambda} \left\{ t^{1/3} \mathcal{A}(t^{-2/3}y, t^{-2/3}x) - \frac{1}{t}(y-x)^2 + h(y) \right\} \geq h_t^{\text{FP}}(x)$$

only if $h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) \leq -\alpha\lambda^2$ for some $x \in [-L-1, L+1]$, or, for some y and $\alpha > 0$, $t^{1/3} \mathcal{A}(t^{-2/3}y, t^{-2/3}x) \geq \alpha\lambda^2$. From (7.6) and (7.7) either happens with probability less than some $ce^{-d\lambda^3}$. Thus, if $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$ denotes the event that the absolute value of the argmax in y of $t^{1/3} \mathcal{A}(t^{-2/3}y, t^{-2/3}x) - \frac{1}{t}(y-x)^2 + h(y)$ is at most λ for all $x \in [-L-1, L+1]$, then

$$P(\mathcal{S}_\lambda^c) \leq ce^{-d\lambda^3}.$$

Therefore for any $x \in [-L, L]$ and $y \in [-L-1, L+1]$, on the event $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$, with $A_t(y, x) := t^{1/3} \mathcal{A}(t^{-2/3}y, t^{-2/3}x) - \frac{1}{t}(y-x)^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) - h_t^{\text{FP}}(y)| &\leq \left| \sup_{z \in [-\lambda, \lambda]} (h(z) + A_t(z, x)) - \sup_{z \in [-\lambda, \lambda]} (h(z) + A_t(z, y)) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{z \in [-\lambda, \lambda]} |A_t(z, x) - A_t(z, y)| \\ &\leq \sup_{z \in [-\lambda, \lambda]} |t^{1/3} \mathcal{A}(t^{-2/3}z, t^{-2/3}x) - t^{1/3} \mathcal{A}(t^{-2/3}z, t^{-2/3}y)| + \frac{2(L+\lambda+1)}{t} |x-y| \\ &\leq Ks(x-y) \end{aligned}$$

with $P(K > m) \leq ce^{-dm^{3/2}}$, where the last line follows from (2.15) and c, d are constants depending on L, t .

On the other hand, from the negative parabola in the variational formula (2.14) and (7.6), it follows that for $h(y) \leq C(1+|y|)$ for all y ,

$$h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) \leq K_1(1+|x|) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (7.8)$$

for some random constant K_1 satisfying $P(K_1 > m) \leq ce^{-dm^{3/2}}$. Similarly, for $h(y) \geq -C(1+|y|)$ for all y , it follows from the variational formula (2.14) and (7.6) that

$$h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) \geq t^{1/3} \mathcal{A}(t^{-2/3}x, t^{-2/3}x) + h(x) \geq -K_1(1+|x|) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Thus for all $x \in [-L, L]$ and $|y| > L+1$, using (7.7)

$$\begin{aligned} |h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) - h_t^{\text{FP}}(y)| &\leq |h_t^{\text{FP}}(x)| + |h_t^{\text{FP}}(y)| \leq K_1 + K_1(1+|y|) \\ &\leq K_1|y-x| + K_1(2+L) \leq Ks(x-y), \end{aligned}$$

$P(K > m) \leq ce^{-dm^{3/2}}$ for constants c, d that depend on L . Together, we have the lemma. $\square$

Now, we are ready to prove Prop.7.1.

Proof of Prop.7.1. Without loss of generality we can assume that the compact interval is $[-L, L]$; so it is enough to show that $\{h_\varepsilon|_{[-L, L]}\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ is tight in the uniform topology.

Fix $k > 0$ large and $a, b > 0$ small (to avoid cumbersome notations assume $k, a^{-1}, b^{-1} \in \mathbb{N}$). Consider the rectangle $[-L, L] \times [-k, k]$ and split it into rectangles of vertical and horizontal dimensions a and b . That is, let $x_i = -L + ib$ for $i \in \mathcal{I} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2Lb^{-1}\}$ and $f_j = -k + ja$ for $j \in \mathcal{J} := \{0, 1, \dots, 2ka^{-1}\}$. By our assumption in (7.1), for any i, j ,

$$\mathbb{P}(h_\varepsilon(x) > f_{j+1} + ks(x-x_i) \text{ for some } x \in \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow P(h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) > f_{j+1} + ks(x-x_i) \text{ for some } x \in \mathbb{R}), \quad (7.9)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(h_\varepsilon(x) \leq f_j - ks(x-x_i) \text{ for some } x \in \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow P(h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) \leq f_j - ks(x-x_i) \text{ for some } x \in \mathbb{R}) \quad (7.10)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

On the event $\mathcal{E}_k$ defined in (7.4), we have

$$\{h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) > f_{j+1} + ks(x - x_i) \text{ for some } x \in \mathbb{R}\} \subseteq \{h_t^{\text{FP}}(x_i) > f_{j+1}\}, \quad (7.11)$$

and

$$\{h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) \leq f_j - ks(x - x_i) \text{ for some } x \in \mathbb{R}\} \subseteq \{h_t^{\text{FP}}(x_i) \leq f_j\}. \quad (7.12)$$

Now, let us define the “tube”-sets

$$T_{i,j,k} := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : f_j - ks(x - x_i) < y \leq f_{j+1} + ks(x - x_i)\}.$$

Then, using (7.9), (7.10), (7.11), (7.12) and a union bound,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}((x, h_\varepsilon(x)) \in T_{i,j,k}^c \text{ for some } x \in \mathbb{R}) \leq P(h_t^{\text{FP}}(x_i) \in (f_j, f_{j+1}]^c) + 2P(\mathcal{E}_k^c). \quad (7.13)$$

To put it another way, abusing notation to let h_ε denote the graph $(x, h_\varepsilon(x))$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(h_\varepsilon \in T_{i,j,k}) \geq P(h_t^{\text{FP}}(x_i) \in (f_j, f_{j+1}]) - 2P(\mathcal{E}_k^c). \quad (7.14)$$

For fixed i , the sets $T_{i,j,k}$ are disjoint for all $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 2ka^{-1}$. Summing the above probabilities, we have again by (7.4),

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(h_\varepsilon \in \cup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} T_{i,j,k}) \geq P(h_t^{\text{FP}}(x_i) \in [-k, k]) - (4ka^{-1} + 1)P(\mathcal{E}_k^c) \geq 1 - (4ka^{-1} + 2)P(\mathcal{E}_k^c). \quad (7.15)$$

If we let $\mathcal{G}_{a,b,k}^\varepsilon := \{\forall i \in \mathcal{I}, h_\varepsilon \in \cup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} T_{i,j,k}\}$, this implies by another union bound

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{a,b,k}^\varepsilon) \geq 1 - 10kLa^{-1}b^{-1}P(\mathcal{E}_k^c). \quad (7.16)$$

For any $x, y \in [-L, L]$ with $|x - y| \leq b$, there exists $i \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $|x - x_i|, |y - x_i| \leq b$. On the event $\mathcal{G}_{a,b,k}^\varepsilon$, if $j \in \mathcal{J}$ is such that $h_\varepsilon(x_i) \in (f_j, f_{j+1}]$, we have $h_\varepsilon \in T_{i,j,k}$. Hence for b sufficiently small,

$$|h_\varepsilon(x) - h_\varepsilon(x_i)| \leq a + ks(x - x_i) \leq a + 2kb^{1/2} \log^{1/2}(1 + b^{-1}),$$

and the same holds for $|h_\varepsilon(y) - h_\varepsilon(x_i)|$. Thus $\omega_\varepsilon(b) \leq 2a + 4kb^{1/2} \log^{1/2}(1 + b^{-1})$. Choosing $a = b^{1/2}$, we have for b sufficiently small, by (7.16),

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(\omega_\varepsilon(b) > 5kb^{1/2} \log^{1/2}(1 + b^{-1})) \leq 10kLb^{-3/2}P(\mathcal{E}_k^c). \quad (7.17)$$

Choosing $k = Cm \log^{2/3}(1 + b^{-1})$, and using Lem. 7.3, we obtain (7.2).

From the Arzela-Ascoli theorem, tightness in the uniform-on-compact topology follows from the modulus of continuity estimate (7.2), as long as we also have a bound on $\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(|h_\varepsilon(0)| > k)$. The latter is obtained by an easier version of the same argument, letting one of the x_i equal 0. $\square$

8. DETERMINISTIC INITIAL CONDITIONS FOR ASEP

In this section, we use the skew-time reversibility/order-preserving property of ASEP height function to extend our result in (6.3) to a broader class of initial conditions, thereby proving the three statements in Thm. 2.2(2). Although the results are stated for ASEP, the same proofs work for the KPZ equation, which inherits these properties in the weakly asymmetric limit. They do not however work for finite range exclusions, AEP, because the order of height functions is not necessarily preserved in that generality. The fact that in reverse time, the height function evolves as minus the original height function, is common to all these models. However, the statement (1.4) requires the preservation of order as well.

8.1. Initial conditions decaying to $-\infty$ with target functions going to ∞ . Let h be uniformly continuous and g be continuous with $h(x) \leq C_1(1 - |x|)$ and $g(x) \geq C_2(1 + |x|)$ for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$ and for all x . We will prove now that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(g)). \quad (8.1)$$

Here and henceforth the initial condition h for ASEP at scale ε is to be interpreted as a discrete approximation of h in $\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$. By Prop. 6.8, we have for any *randomized wedge* ρ , and any h as above,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho)) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho)). \quad (8.2)$$

As always, the transition probabilities of the ASEP and the fixed point are averaged over the randomness of the randomized wedge. Starting from h as above, with probability one, for some random positive constants C_0, C'_0 , one has the time t KPZ fixed point h_t^{FP} satisfies

$$h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) \leq C_0 - C'_0|x| \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (8.3)$$

To see this note that, by the variational formula (2.14) and (7.6) and the bound on h , we have for some random constant K ,

$$h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) \leq \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ K \log^2(|x| + |y| + 2) - \frac{1}{t}(y - x)^2 - C_1|y| \right\}.$$

The above supremum over all y such that $|y - x| \geq \frac{1}{2}|x|$ is at most $-\alpha x^2$ for some $\alpha > 0$. The supremum over all y such that $|y - x| \leq \frac{1}{2}|x|$ is clearly at most $2K \log(2 + |x|) - \frac{C_1}{2}|x| \leq C_0 - C'_0|x|$ for some random positive constants C_0, C'_0 .

We claim that for any such h , given any $\eta > 0$, there exists a randomized wedge ρ such that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho)) \geq 1 - \eta. \quad (8.4)$$

Indeed, by choosing the randomized wedge ρ to be $C + U + B$ where C is a large constant, U is Uniform on $[0, 1]$ and B is an independent standard two-sided Brownian motion, we can make $h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) \leq \rho(x)$ with probability at least $1 - \eta$ because of the bound in (8.3). That is,

$$p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho)) \geq 1 - \eta. \quad (8.5)$$

Thus, we have by (8.2) that $\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho)) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho)) \geq 1 - \eta$.

Now fix any $\eta > 0$. For any g as in (8.1), and any large enough $M > 0$, construct two randomized wedges ρ_1, ρ_2 such that $\rho_1 \leq g$ with probability $1 - \eta$; $\rho_2|_{[-M, M]} \geq g|_{[-M, M]}$ with probability $1 - \eta$ and $\rho_2|_{[-M, M]^c} = \rho|_{[-M, M]^c}$ for some randomized wedge ρ that satisfies (8.4) with this $\eta > 0$. Then by (8.2)

$$p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho_1)) - \eta \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g)). \quad (8.6)$$

Moreover, for any fixed $t > 0$, if $h_\varepsilon(\cdot) = h_\varepsilon(t, \cdot)$ denotes the ASEP height function at time t started from h , then on the event that $\rho_2|_{[-M, M]} \geq g|_{[-M, M]}$ and $\rho_2|_{[-M, M]^c} \geq \rho|_{[-M, M]^c}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{h_\varepsilon \leq g\} &\subseteq \{h_\varepsilon(x) \leq g(x) \forall x \in [-M, M]\} \subseteq \{h_\varepsilon(x) \leq \rho_2(x) \forall x \in [-M, M]\} \\ &\subseteq \{h_\varepsilon \leq \rho_2\} \cup \{h_\varepsilon(x) > \rho(x) \text{ for some } x \in [-M, M]^c\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence from (8.4) and (8.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) &\leq \eta + \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho_2)) + \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (1 - p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho))) \\ &\leq p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho_2)) + 2\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Also if M is large enough so that the KPZ fixed point $h_t^{\text{FP}}(x)$ is less than $\rho_1(x), \rho_2(x)$ and $g(x)$ for all $x \in [-M, M]^c$ with probability $1 - \eta$; and $\rho_1|_{[-M, M]}$ and $\rho_2|_{[-M, M]}$ are close to $g|_{[-M, M]}$ such that by the continuity of the KPZ fixed point h_t^{FP} , the probabilities of the events $\{h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) \leq \rho_2(x) \forall x \in$

$[-M, M]\}$, $\{h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) \leq g(x) \forall x \in [-M, M]\}$, and $\{h_t^{\text{FP}}(x) \leq \rho_1(x) \forall x \in [-M, M]\}$ are η -close to each other, then from the last equation we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) - 4\eta &\leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) \\ &\leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) \leq p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) + 5\eta. \end{aligned} \quad (8.7)$$

Since η is arbitrary, we have the result.

The same proof works for the KPZ equation: We record the result here.

Proposition 8.1. *Let h be uniformly continuous and g be continuous with $h(x) \leq C_1(1 - |x|)$ and $g(x) \geq C_2(1 + |x|)$ for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$, for all x large enough. Then*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{KPZ}, \delta}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(g)). \quad (8.8)$$

8.2. General initial conditions with target functions going to ∞ . Let h be a continuous function such that $h(x) \leq C_1(1 + |x|^{1/2})$ for some $C_1 > 0$, and g be uniformly continuous with $g(x) \geq C_2(1 + |x|)$ for some $C_2 > 0$. We will prove in this subsection that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(g)). \quad (8.9)$$

By skew time reversibility, it is equivalent to prove the convergence for h uniformly continuous with $h(x) \leq C_1(1 - |x|)$ for some $C_1 > 0$ and g continuous with $g(x) \geq C_2(1 - |x|^{1/2})$.

First we claim that for any $\eta > 0$ and any randomized wedge ρ , there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho|_{[-M, M]^c})) > 1 - \eta,$$

(where for any $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $\rho|_A$ denotes the function on $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ which is equal to ρ on A and ∞ on A^c). Indeed, by choosing $M > 0$ large enough and a randomized wedge ρ' such that $\rho'|_{[-M, M]^c} = \rho|_{[-M, M]^c}$ and $p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho')) > 1 - \eta$ (as described in (8.5)), one has

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho|_{[-M, M]^c})) \geq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho')) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho')) > 1 - \eta.$$

Now let $\rho(x) = U + \Theta(x)$, where Θ is a standard two-sided Brownian motion and U is uniform in $[C_2 - 1, C_2]$ and Θ and U are independent (where C_2 is the same constant as in g). Then ρ is a randomized wedge and thus there exists $M > 0$ (that depends only on η and C_2) such that $\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(\rho|_{[-M, M]^c})) > 1 - \eta$, that is,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(h_\varepsilon(x) \geq \rho(x) \text{ for some } x \in [-M, M]^c) < \eta. \quad (8.10)$$

where $h_\varepsilon(\cdot) = h_\varepsilon(t, \cdot)$ denotes the ASEP height function at time t started from h for any fixed $t > 0$ (here $\mathbb{P}$ denotes the probability with respect to both the randomness in h_ε and ρ). We claim that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(h_\varepsilon(x) \geq g(x) \text{ for some } x \in [-M, M]^c) \leq \beta\eta, \quad (8.11)$$

where $\beta > 0$ is some constant depending only on C_2 . Indeed let $\beta^{-1} := \mathbb{P}(\Theta(1) < -C_2) = \mathbb{P}(\Theta(x) < -C_2|x|^{1/2})$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Then for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\rho(x) < g(x)) \geq \beta^{-1}.$$

Because of the independence of h_ε and ρ ,

$\mathbb{P}(h_\varepsilon(x) \geq \rho(x) \text{ for some } x \in [-M, M]^c) \geq \mathbb{P}(h_\varepsilon(x) \geq g(x), g(x) > \rho(x) \text{ for some } x \in [-M, M]^c)$ is bounded below by $\beta^{-1}\mathbb{P}(h_\varepsilon(x) \geq g(x) \text{ for some } x \in [-M, M]^c)$. Thus (8.11) follows from (8.10).

Next let g_1 be a continuous function such that $g_1(x) \geq C(1 + |x|)$ for some $C > 0$ and $g_1|_{[-M, M]} = g|_{[-M, M]}$ and $g_1(x) \geq g(x)$ for all x . Then $p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) \leq p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g_1))$. Also, since $g_1|_{[-M, M]} = g|_{[-M, M]}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{h_\varepsilon \leq g_1\} &\subseteq \{h_\varepsilon(x) \leq g_1(x) \forall x \in [-M, M]\} = \{h_\varepsilon(x) \leq g(x) \forall x \in [-M, M]\} \\ &\subseteq \{h_\varepsilon \leq g\} \cup \{h_\varepsilon(x) > g(x) \text{ for some } x \in [-M, M]^c\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by (8.11),

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) \geq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g_1)) - \beta\eta.$$

By (8.1) of the last subsection and the growth condition on g_1 ,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g_1)) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(g_1)).$$

Also if M is large enough so that the KPZ fixed point $h_t^{\text{FP}}(x)$ started from h at time t is less than $g(x)$ and $g_1(x)$ for all $x \in [-M, M]^c$ with probability $1 - \eta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) - (\beta + 2)\eta &\leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) \\ &\leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) \leq p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) + 2\eta. \end{aligned} \quad (8.12)$$

Since η is arbitrary, we have (8.9).

Remark 8.2. Using a similar argument to that above, starting from Rem. 6.4 we will likewise have the following result: Let h be a continuous function such that $C_0(1 + |x|) \geq h(x) \geq C_1(1 - |x|^{1/2})$ for some $C_0, C_1 > 0$, and g be uniformly continuous with $C_2(1 - |x|) \leq g(x) \leq C_3(1 - |x|)$ for some $C_2, C_3 > 0$, for all x large enough. Then $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{epi}(g)) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{epi}(g))$.

Observe that Subsec. (8.2) and Rem 8.2, together with Prop. 7.1 in the previous section, give the tightness of the ASEP height function started from any h continuous such that $|h(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|^{1/2})$ for some $C > 0$ and hence shows the convergence in the uniform-on-compact topology. This proves the first statement in Thm. 2.2 (2).

Now from the convergence in the uniform-on-compact topology we have convergence of finite dimensional distributions, i.e. for any h continuous such that for some $C > 0$, $|h(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|^{1/2})$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(-\mathfrak{d}^{\vec{y}, \vec{b}})) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h, \text{hyp}(-\mathfrak{d}^{\vec{y}, \vec{b}})). \quad (8.13)$$

where $\mathfrak{d}^{\vec{y}, \vec{b}}$ is the multiple narrow wedge defined in Def. 6.7.

By the definition of ASEP height function, it is easy to see that $h_\varepsilon(t, y) \leq b$ for some $y, b \in \mathbb{R}$ is equivalent to $h_\varepsilon(t, y + \varepsilon z) \leq b + \varepsilon^{1/2}|z|$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus if we define for $y, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon^{y, b}(x) = b - \varepsilon^{-1/2}|x - y|$, and for $y_1 < y_2 < \dots < y_k$, $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon^{\vec{y}, \vec{b}}(x) = \max_i \mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon^{y_i, b_i}(x)$, then $p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(-\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon^{\vec{y}, \vec{b}})) = p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(-\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon^{\vec{y}, \vec{b}}))$. Hence, applying skew time reversibility (1.4) to (8.13), we have the convergence for multi-narrow wedge initial condition. That is, for any continuous h such that for some $C > 0$, $|h(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|^{1/2})$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{ASEP}, \varepsilon}(\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon^{\vec{y}, \vec{b}}, \text{hyp}(h)) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(\mathfrak{d}^{\vec{y}, \vec{b}}, \text{hyp}(h)). \quad (8.14)$$

This proves the third statement in Thm. 2.2 (2).

On the other hand, starting with these wedges, we don't have the tightness result. For a single narrow wedge, Theorem 1.1 of [6] gives the tightness of the ASEP height function. Thus (8.14) gives the convergence of the single narrow wedge ASEP height function to the Airy_2 process (after subtracting the required parabola) in the uniform on compact topology for a fixed $t > 0$. This proves the second statement in Thm. 2.2 (2).

9. BOOTSTRAPPING KPZ USING UNIFORM HÖLDER CONTINUITY

Though the results in Sec. 7 and Sec. 8 also work for the KPZ equation, the KPZ equation enjoys additional properties that allow us to extend our results in the previous sections to an even broader class of initial conditions. In this section, we prove Thm. 2.2(3).

The KPZ_δ *proto-Airy sheet* $\mathcal{A}_{\delta, t}(x, y)$ is defined as follows. First of all we consider the white noise in KPZ_δ (2.10) to be fixed and solve with any admissible data using that same white noise, to produce a stochastic flow on the space of admissible data. Note that the solution of KPZ_δ (2.10) with nice initial

data $h(0, x) = h_0(x)$ is simply *defined* as $h(t, x) = 4\delta \log Z(t, x)$ where $Z(t, x)$ is the unique solution of the stochastic heat equation

$$\partial_t Z = \delta \partial_x^2 Z + \frac{1}{4} \delta^{1/2} \xi Z, \quad (9.1)$$

with initial data $Z(0, x) = e^{(4\delta)^{-1} h_0(x)}$. The "initial data" *narrow wedge at y* for $\text{KPZ}_\delta(2.10)$ means $h(t, x) = 4\delta \log Z(t, x)$ where $Z(0, x) = \delta_y(x)$. We call the stationary in x process with the parabola removed $h(t, x) + \frac{1}{t}(x - y)^2 := \mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x, y)$. By linearity in the initial data of the stochastic heat equation (9.1) we have for any nice initial data $h_0(x)$,

$$h(t, y; h_0) = 4\delta \log \int \exp \left\{ (4\delta)^{-1} \left(\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x, y) - \frac{1}{t}(x - y)^2 + h_0(x) \right) \right\} dx. \quad (9.2)$$

where $h(t, y; h_0)$ is the solution of KPZ_δ starting from h_0 .

Let $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha, K}$ denote the Hölder norm $\|f\|_{\alpha, K} = \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in K} \frac{|f(x_2) - f(x_1)|}{|x_2 - x_1|^\alpha}$ where K is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{R}^2$ depending on whether the function has one or two real variables.

Lemma 9.1. (1) For any $0 < \alpha < 1/2$ and $0 < B < \infty$,

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x, y)\|_{\alpha, [-B, B]^2} \geq K) = 0 \quad (9.3)$$

uniformly in $\delta > 0$;

(2) For any $b > 0$, $\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x, y) \geq A + b(|x|^2 + |y|^2)) = 0$ uniformly in $\delta > 0$.

Proof. By the Kolmogorov-Centsov theorem (Thm.(2.1), Ch.1 of [33]), (9.3) would follow from the statement that for each $L \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $C_{L,B} < \infty$ such that for all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in [-B, B]$,

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_1, y_1) - \mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_2, y_2)|^L] \leq C_{L,B}(|x_2 - x_1|^2 + |y_2 - y_1|^2)^{L/4}. \quad (9.4)$$

We can decompose into the increments in each direction,

$$|\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_1, y_1) - \mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_2, y_2)| \leq |\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_1, y_1) - \mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_1, y_2)| + |\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_1, y_2) - \mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_2, y_2)|, \quad (9.5)$$

and using $|U + V|^L \leq C'_L(|U|^L + |V|^L)$, it suffices to show (9.4) in the two cases $x_1 = x_2$ and $y_1 = y_2$.

Since $\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x, y) \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(y, x)$, the two cases are equivalent. Thm.1.3. of [35] along with the stationarity of the process $\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(\cdot, 0)$ and a union bound, and the translation invariance $\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x + z, y + z) \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x, y)$ as processes in (x, y) , show that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_1, y) - \mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_2, y)| \geq \lambda |x_1 - x_2|^{1/2}) \leq C_1(2B + 1)e^{-C_2 \lambda^{3/2}} \quad (9.6)$$

with $C_1 < \infty$ and $C_2 > 0$ independent of δ, t , from which (9.4) for $x_1, x_2, y_1 = y_2 = y \in [-B, B]$ follows.

Part (2) follows from Lemma 4.1 of [8] and the symmetry in the two coordinates of $\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x, y)$ and the translation invariance. $\square$

Suppose our initial data h_0 satisfies $h_0(x) \leq A + b|x|^2$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, for some $b < (2t)^{-1}$. Let $\sigma > 0$. Then, with probability greater than $1 - \sigma$, we can choose B large enough that the integral in (9.2) over $|x| > B$ is bounded by σ , uniformly in $\delta > 0$. The following Hölder bounds are immediate and well-known consequences of (9.2) and Lem. 9.1.

Lemma 9.2. Suppose $h_0(x) \leq A + b|x|^2$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, for some $b < (2t)^{-1}$.

(1) Fix $t > 0$. For any $0 < \alpha < 1/2$ and $B < \infty$,

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{h_0}^{\text{KPZ}, \delta}(\|h(t, \cdot)\|_{\alpha, [-B, B]} \geq K) = 0 \quad (9.7)$$

uniformly in $\delta > 0$.

(2) Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}$. For any $0 < \beta < 1/3$, $t > 0$ and $B < \infty$,

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{h_0}^{\text{KPZ}, \delta}(\|h(\cdot, x)\|_{\beta, [t, B]} \geq K) = 0 \quad (9.8)$$

uniformly in $\delta > 0$.

For example, to see (9.8), from (9.2) and the Markov property, $h(t+s, y) - h(t, y)$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{A}_{\delta,s}(y, y) + 4\delta \log \int \exp \left\{ (4\delta)^{-1} (\mathcal{A}_{\delta,s}(x, y) - \mathcal{A}_{\delta,s}(y, y) - \frac{1}{s}(x-y)^2 + h(t, x) - h(t, y)) \right\} dx.$$

The first term is $\mathcal{O}(s^{1/3})$. Choosing $\alpha < 1/2$ we can estimate the two independent random quantities in the exponent, $|\mathcal{A}_{\delta,s}(x, y) - \mathcal{A}_{\delta,s}(y, y)| \leq C_1|y-x|^\alpha$ and $|h(t, x) - h(t, y)| \leq C_2|y-x|^\alpha$ with C_i bounded in probability, on the set $|x-y| \leq B$. Choosing B large enough and using (2) of Lem. 9.1 and the fact that $C|x-y|^\alpha - \frac{1}{s}(x-y)^2 \leq C's^\beta$ where $\beta = \alpha(2-\alpha)^{-1}$ gives (9.8). The proof of (9.7) is analogous.

For fixed $t > 0$, (1) gives the tightness of $h(t, \cdot)$ in the uniform-on-compacts topology. Together, (1) and (2) give the tightness in the uniform-on-compact subsets of spacetime $(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$.

Suppose in addition that h_0 is uniformly continuous with $h_0(x) \leq A(1-|x|)$ for some large enough A . Let $\sigma > 0$ and $b < t^{-1}$. If A is large enough then the probability that $\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x, y) \leq A+b(|x|^2+|y|^2)$ is larger than $1-\sigma$. It is not hard to see from (9.2) that then there is an L_0 and a $\rho > 0$ so that $h(t, x) \leq L_0 - \rho|x|$, for all x and δ with probability greater than $1-\sigma$. Let g be any continuous function such that $g(x) \leq C(1+|x|)$ for all x for some $0 < C < \rho$. Then there is an $M > 0$ such that for all δ and all x such that $|x| > M$, $h(t, x) \leq -g(x)$ with probability greater than $1-\sigma$. Construct a continuous function g_1 such that $g_1(x) = -g(x)$ for all $x \in [-M, M]$, $g_1(x) \geq -g(x)$ for all x and $g_1(x) > C_1(1+|x|)$ for some $C_1 > 0$ and all large $|x|$. Then by the order-preserving property,

$$p_t^{\text{KPZ},\delta}(h_0, \text{hyp}(g_1)) - \sigma \leq p_t^{\text{KPZ},\delta}(h_0, \text{hyp}(-g)) \leq p_t^{\text{KPZ},\delta}(h_0, \text{hyp}(g_1)). \quad (9.9)$$

By (8.8), since h_0 and g_1 satisfy the conditions in Prop 8.1,

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{KPZ},\delta}(h_0, \text{hyp}(g_1)) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h_0, \text{hyp}(g_1)).$$

Also if M is large enough so that the KPZ fixed point started from h_0 at time t is less than $-g(x)$ and $g_1(x)$ for all $x \in [-M, M]^c$ with probability $1-\sigma$, we get, since σ can be made arbitrarily small,

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{KPZ},\delta}(h_0, \text{hyp}(-g)) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(h_0, \text{hyp}(-g)). \quad (9.10)$$

From (9.10), using skew time reversibility, we get for any continuous g such that for some $C > 0$, $g(x) \leq C(1+|x|)$ for all x and any uniformly continuous h_0 such that $h_0(x) \geq A(1+|x|)$ for some large enough A ,

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} p_t^{\text{KPZ},\delta}(g, \text{hyp}(h_0)) = p_t^{\text{FP}}(g, \text{hyp}(h_0)). \quad (9.11)$$

This, together with the tightness of $h(t, \cdot)$ gives the convergence of the KPZ equation started from g to the KPZ fixed point in distribution in the topology of uniform-on-compacts. The convergence is uniform over sets of such g with bounded C . Furthermore, by approximation, we also have, with the same uniformity in the initial data, convergence of finite dimensional distributions, or expectations $E_{h_0}[\Phi(h(t))]$ for bounded continuous Φ .

Next we work towards multi-narrow wedge initial data where $Z(0, x) = \mathfrak{d}^{\vec{x}, \vec{a}}(x)$. An approximation of it in the α -Hölder class satisfying $h_0(x) \leq A - |x|$ is $\mathfrak{d}_{L,s,A}^{\vec{x}, \vec{a} + (\delta/2) \log(\delta/2)^{-1}s}$ where $\mathfrak{d}_{L,s,A}^{\vec{x}, \vec{a}}(x) = \min\{\mathfrak{d}_{L,s}^{\vec{x}, \vec{a}}(x), A - |x|\}$. Let $\sigma > 0$. On a set with probability greater than $1-\sigma$, the α -Hölder norm in y of $\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x, y)$, on set $[\underline{x} - s^{-1}(\underline{a} + L), \bar{x} + s^{-1}(\bar{a} + L)] \times [-B, B]$ is less than K and $\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x, y) \leq A + b(|x|^2 + |y|^2)$ for some $b < t^{-1}$. Here $\underline{x}, \bar{x}$ are the smallest and largest x_i and $\underline{a}, \bar{a}$ are their corresponding a_i . The second interval is just the smallest interval containing the wedge parts of $\mathfrak{d}_{L,s,A}^{\vec{x}, \vec{a} + \delta \log \frac{1}{2} \delta^{-1}s}$. Since these wedge parts can vary at most $r_{s,\delta,L} := \max_i s^{-1}(a_i + \delta \log \delta^{-1}s + L)$, we have, on this set,

$$\begin{aligned} 4\delta \log \left(\sum \zeta_i e^{(4\delta)^{-1}(a_i + \mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_i, y) - \frac{1}{t}(x_i - y)^2 - Kr_{s,\delta,L}^\alpha)} + R_L(y) \right) &\leq h(t, y; \mathfrak{d}_{L,s,A}^{\vec{x}, \vec{a} + (\delta/2) \log(\delta/2)^{-1}s}) \\ &\leq 4\delta \log \left(\sum \zeta_i e^{(4\delta)^{-1}(a_i + \mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_i, y) - \frac{1}{t}(x_i - y)^2 + Kr_{s,\delta,L}^\alpha)} + R_L(y) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (9.12)$$

where $\zeta_i = \frac{1}{2}(4\delta)^{-1}s \int_{-s^{-1}(a_i+L)}^{s^{-1}(a_i+L)} e^{-(4\delta)^{-1}s|x|} dx$ and

$$R_L(y) := \int \exp \left\{ (4\delta)^{-1} \left(\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x, y) - \frac{1}{t}(x-y)^2 + (-L) \wedge (A - |x|) \right) \right\} dx.$$

Since $\mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x, y) \leq A + b(|x|^2 + |y|^2)$, $R_L \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on compact sets of y as $L \rightarrow \infty$. Now we ask, as functions of y , whether the terms in (9.12) are in $\text{hyp}(-\partial^{\vec{y}, \vec{b}})$. We let $\delta \rightarrow 0$ followed by $L, s \rightarrow \infty$. By what we have shown in the previous paragraph, as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, the middle term in (9.12) converge to the fixed point probability. Using the continuity of those probabilities in the topology of upper semi-continuous functions, as $L, s \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain $p_t^{\text{FP}}(\partial^{\vec{x}, \vec{a}}, \text{hyp}(-\partial^{\vec{y}, \vec{b}}))$. On the other hand, for both the first and third term, the upper and lower bounds in (9.12), we know that any subsequential limit lies in the interval $[\liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} p_\delta, \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} p_\delta]$ where $p_\delta := \mathbb{P}(\max_{i,j} \{a_i + b_j + \mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_i, y_j) - \frac{1}{t}(x_i - y_j)^2\} \leq 0)$. Since the inequalities in (9.12) hold on a set of probability at least $1 - \sigma$ we have proved that

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left| \mathbb{P}(\max_{i,j} \{a_i + b_j + \mathcal{A}_{\delta,t}(x_i, y_j) - \frac{1}{t}(x_i - y_j)^2\} \leq 0) - p_t^{\text{FP}}(\partial^{\vec{x}, \vec{a}}, \text{hyp}(-\partial^{\vec{y}, \vec{b}})) \right| \leq \sigma.$$

Since $\sigma > 0$ is arbitrary, we obtain the convergence of the finite dimensional distributions of the KPZ_δ starting with k narrow wedges to the KPZ fixed point. Together with the tightness of the KPZ_δ height function, we get the distributional convergence in the uniform-on-compact topology. A similar argument proves the same result starting with k narrow wedges plus a continuous function bounded above by some $A(1 + |x|)$.

Finally we want to prove the convergence on space-time compact sets. Lem. 9.2 proves the tightness so it is enough to prove convergence of spacetime finite dimensional distributions. Let $f_1, \dots, f_n$ be smooth real valued functions of compact support on $\mathbb{R}^k$, and $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}$ be given. It suffices to prove $\mathbb{E}^{\text{KPZ}, \delta}[\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(h(t_i))] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^{\text{FP}}[\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(h(t_i))]$ for all such test functions and $0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n$, where $f_i(h(t)) := f_i(h(t, x_1), \dots, h(t, x_k))$. We can write the difference as

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_i}^{\text{KPZ}, \delta}[\Phi_i(h(t_{i+1}))] - \mathbb{E}_{\mu_i}^{\text{FP}}[\Phi_i(h(t_{i+1}))], \quad (9.13)$$

with

$$\mu_i(dh_i) = \int \prod_{j=1}^i f_j(h_j) p_{t_1}^{\text{KPZ}, \delta}(h_0, dh_1) \cdots p_{t_i - t_{i-1}}^{\text{KPZ}, \delta}(h_{i-1}, dh_i), \quad (9.14)$$

where the integration is over $h_1, \dots, h_{i-1} \in \mathbb{S}$, and

$$\Phi_i(h_{i+1}) = \int \prod_{j=i+1}^n f_j(h_j) (p_{t_{i+2} - t_{i+1}}^{\text{FP}}(h_{i+1}, dh_{i+2}) \cdots p_{t_n - t_{n-1}}^{\text{FP}}(h_{n-1}, dh_n)), \quad (9.15)$$

where the integration is over $h_{i+2}, \dots, h_n \in \mathbb{S}$. Here $\mathbb{E}_\mu$ denotes the process starting from a finite measure μ : By linearity, if $\mu = a_+ \mu_+ - a_- \mu_-$ for probability measures μ_+, μ_- , then $\mathbb{E}_\mu := a_+ \mathbb{E}_{\mu_+} - a_- \mathbb{E}_{\mu_-}$ where $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_\pm}$ denote the stochastic process starting with the respective probability measures. By the comments after (9.11) and the fact that Φ_i are bounded continuous and μ_i are supported on h_i satisfying $h_i(x) \leq C(1 + |x|)$ for bounded C , each term of (9.13) goes to 0 as δ goes to 0. The key point is that once one has tightness, very little uniformity is needed to go from convergence of transition probabilities to convergence of finite dimensional distributions.

10. CONVERGENCE OF THE KPZ LINE ENSEMBLE TO THE AIRY LINE ENSEMBLE

This section is devoted to the proof of Thm. 2.2(4). We first define the KPZ_t ensemble, constructed in [8]. The Hamiltonian $\mathbf{H}_t : \mathbb{R} \mapsto [0, \infty)$ is $\mathbf{H}_t(x) = e^{t^{1/3}x}$. Let $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2, \dots)$ be an $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}$ indexed line ensemble. Fix $k_1 \leq k_2$ with $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, an interval $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ and two vectors $\vec{x}, \vec{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{k_2 - k_1 + 1}$. Given two measurable functions $f, g : (a, b) \mapsto \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$, the law $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{H}_t}^{k_1, k_2, (a, b), \vec{x}, \vec{y}, f, g}$ on $\mathcal{L}_{k_1}, \dots, \mathcal{L}_{k_2} : (a, b) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ has the following Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to $\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{k_1, k_2, (a, b), \vec{x}, \vec{y}}$,

the law of $k_2 - k_1 + 1$ independent Brownian bridges with diffusion rate 2 from $\vec{x}$ at “time” a to $\vec{y}$ at “time” b :

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{H}_t}^{k_1, k_2, (a, b), \vec{x}, \vec{y}, f, g}}{\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{k_1, k_2, (a, b), \vec{x}, \vec{y}}}(\mathcal{L}_{k_1}, \dots, \mathcal{L}_{k_2}) = \frac{\exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=k_1-1}^{k_2} \int_a^b \mathbf{H}_t(\mathcal{L}_{i+1}(u) - \mathcal{L}_i(u)) du \right\}}{Z_{\mathbf{H}_t}^{k_1, k_2, (a, b), \vec{x}, \vec{y}, f, g}}, \quad (10.1)$$

with $\mathcal{L}_{k_1-1} = f$ and $\mathcal{L}_{k_2+1} = g$, and $Z_{\mathbf{H}_t}^{k_1, k_2, (a, b), \vec{x}, \vec{y}, f, g}$ is the normalizing constant. Note that “time” is what we think of as space in the rest of the paper. We say that the line ensemble $\mathcal{L}$ has the $\mathbf{H}_t$ -Brownian Gibbs property if for all $K = \{k_1, \dots, k_2\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$, the conditional distribution of $\mathcal{L}|_{K \times (a, b)}$ given $\mathcal{L}|_{(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus (K \times (a, b))}$ is $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{H}_t}^{k_1, k_2, (a, b), \vec{x}, \vec{y}, f, g}$. Here $f = \mathcal{L}_{k_1-1}$ and $g = \mathcal{L}_{k_2+1}$, with the convention that if $k_1 = 1$ then $f \equiv +\infty$.

The scaled, time t , Cole-Hopf solution of the KPZ equation uses $h \mapsto t^{-1/3}h(t, t^{2/3}x)$ to (2.9). That is, to harmonize with the previous sections, we take the parameter t in the first argument of (1.3) to be 1 and then set $\delta = t^{-1/3}$ and take $t \rightarrow \infty$. By Thm. 2.2, we obtain the KPZ fixed point at time 1 with narrow wedge initial data, which is $\mathcal{A}_1(x) - x^2$, the parabolically shifted Airy₂ process.

Note that there has been a change of variables $(t, x) \mapsto (2t, 2x)$ to bring the KPZ coefficients (λ, ν, D) from the standard $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1)$ in [8] to our standard $(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, 1)$ (that is, if $\tilde{h}(t, x)$ is the solution corresponding to the KPZ coefficients $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1)$, then $h(t, x) = \tilde{h}(2t, 2x)$ solves for the coefficients $(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, 1)$).

Theorem 10.1 ([8], Thm. 2.15). *For all $t \geq 1$, there exists an $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}$ indexed line ensemble $\mathfrak{h}^t = (\mathfrak{h}_1^t, \mathfrak{h}_2^t, \dots)$ such that*

- (1) *The lowest indexed curve $\mathfrak{h}_1^t : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is equal in distribution to the scaled time t Cole-Hopf solution to the narrow wedge initial data KPZ equation.*
- (2) *The ensemble $\mathfrak{h}^t$ has the $\mathbf{H}_t$ -Brownian Gibbs property with diffusion rate 2.*

We call any such line ensemble a (scaled) KPZ_t line ensemble.

Note that we have changed the diffusion rate of the Brownian bridges in the definition of the KPZ line ensemble from 1 in [8] to 2, in accordance with the rest of the paper.

On the other hand, consider the stationary Airy line ensemble $\{\mathcal{A}_n(x) : n \in \mathbb{N}, x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The parabolic Airy line ensemble $\mathcal{A}'$ defined as $\mathcal{A}'_i(x) = \mathcal{A}_i(x) - x^2$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$, enjoys the Brownian Gibbs property with diffusion rate 2, as established in Thm. 3.1 of [7] and defined as follows. For any $k, \ell \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ and $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the sigma algebra generated by the set

$$\{\mathcal{A}'_i(x) : (i, x) \notin \{k+1, k+2, \dots, k+\ell\} \times (a, b)\}.$$

Then the conditional distribution of $\mathcal{A}'|_{\{k+1, 2, \dots, k+\ell\} \times [a, b]}$ given $\mathcal{F}$ is equal to the law of ℓ independent Brownian bridges with diffusion rate 2: $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_\ell : [a, b] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that $B_i(a) = \mathcal{A}'_{k+i}(0)$ and $B_i(b) = \mathcal{A}'_{k+i}(b)$, for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$, conditioned on the event

$$\mathcal{A}'_k(r) > B_1(r) > B_2(r) > \dots > B_\ell(r) > \mathcal{A}'_{k+\ell+1}(r)$$

for all $r \in [a, b]$. For this to hold for $k = 0$, we set $\mathcal{A}'_0 \equiv \infty$.

Building on our work in the last section, we are now ready to prove the convergence of the entire (scaled) KPZ_t line ensemble to the Airy line ensemble, thereby proving Conjecture 2.17 of [8]. It follows from our main result combined with the following two recent results:

Theorem 10.2 ([35], Thm. 1.4). *For $t > 0$ the scaled KPZ_t line ensemble is tight and any subsequential limit is a non-intersecting line ensemble with the Brownian Gibbs property (with diffusion rate 2).*

Theorem 10.3 ([11]). *A Brownian Gibbsian line ensemble is completely characterized by the finite-dimensional distributions of its top curve.*

Corollary 10.4. *The $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}$ indexed line ensemble defined by the map $(n, x) \mapsto \mathfrak{h}_n^t(x) + x^2$ converges in distribution as a line ensemble to $\{\mathcal{A}_n(x) : n \in \mathbb{N}, x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, in the uniform-on-compact topology.*

Proof. By Thm. 10.2 and Prohorov's theorem, it is enough to show that any subsequential limit of the scaled KPZ_t line ensemble is the Airy line ensemble (after the parabolic shift). To this end, observe that by our main result Thm. 2.2(3), the finite dimensional distributions of h_1^t , the top line of the scaled KPZ_t line ensemble, which is the scaled time t Cole-Hopf solution to the narrow wedge initial data KPZ equation, converge to those of $\mathcal{A}_1(x) - x^2$, the top line of the parabolic Airy line ensemble. Hence the finite dimensional distributions of the top line of any subsequential limit of the scaled KPZ_t line ensemble match with those of the top line of the Airy line ensemble after the parabolic shift. Since any subsequential limit also has the Brownian Gibbs property (with diffusion rate 2), it follows from Thm. 10.3 that it is the parabolic Airy line ensemble. $\square$

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF (6.9)

First we show that if η_ε^a denotes the random walk approximation in the $\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$ -lattice of a standard Brownian motion with drift $-a$ on $[0, d]$, then the Radon Nikodym derivative f_ε of η_ε^a with respect to η_ε^0 satisfies $\limsup_\varepsilon \int f_\varepsilon^2 d\eta_\varepsilon^0 < \infty$. (By an abuse of notation, η_ε^a denotes both a measure and its realization as a random walk.) Recall that η_ε^a is constructed as follows. Let B be a standard Brownian motion. For any $x \in \{0, 1/2, 1, \dots, [d\varepsilon^{-1}]\}$, if $B((x + \frac{1}{2})\varepsilon) - B(x\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{2}a\varepsilon > 0$ then $\eta_\varepsilon^a((x + \frac{1}{2})\varepsilon) - \eta_\varepsilon^a(x\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{1/2}$, else $\eta_\varepsilon^a((x + \frac{1}{2})\varepsilon) - \eta_\varepsilon^a(x\varepsilon) = -\varepsilon^{1/2}$. Then for any sequence ξ of length $n = 2[d\varepsilon^{-1}]$ with entries in $\pm\varepsilon^{1/2}$, $f_\varepsilon(\xi) = 2^n p_n^{S_n} (1 - p_n)^{n - S_n}$, where $p_n = \mathbb{P}(B(\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{2}a\varepsilon > 0)$ and S_n denotes the number of $\varepsilon^{1/2}$'s in ξ . Thus (here $\mathbb{E}$ denotes expectation with respect to η_ε^0),

$$\mathbb{E} f_\varepsilon^2 = 2^{2n} (1 - p_n)^{2n} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{p_n}{1 - p_n} \right)^{2S_n} = (1 + (2p_n - 1)^2)^n \leq e^{n(2p_n - 1)^2}.$$

Since $\sqrt{n}(p_n - 1/2) = \sqrt{n}(P(B(1) > -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}a\sqrt{\varepsilon}) - 1/2) \rightarrow a\sqrt{d}\phi(0)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, where ϕ is the density of a standard Gaussian variable,

$$\limsup_\varepsilon \int f_\varepsilon^2 d\eta_\varepsilon^0 \leq e^{4a^2 d \phi^2(0)}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Now we prove (6.9). Fix any $0 < \gamma, s, L < \infty$ and $b_i, y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and let $\nu = \mathfrak{d}_{\gamma, s, L}^{\vec{y}, \vec{b}}$ be the Brownian multiple narrowish wedge. Recall that L is large enough so that $L > |b_i|$ for all i . Approximate ν by the corresponding random walk-approximation in the $\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$ -lattice and by replacing y_i by $[y_i]_\varepsilon$, b_i by $[b_i]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}}$, γ by $[\gamma]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}}$, L by $[L]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}}$ (where $[x]_\varepsilon$ denotes the nearest point in $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}$ and $[y]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}}$ denotes the nearest point in $\varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}$).

First, for simplicity, assume that $k = 1$. Recall that $\nu_\varepsilon = \text{Leb}_\varepsilon \times \mu_\varepsilon$ was defined in (2.7). Due to translation invariance of ν_ε , we can assume, without loss of generality, that $y_1 = 0$. Let $f_{0, \varepsilon}$ denote the Radon Nikodym derivative of the random walk approximation of ν with respect to ν_ε . Then for any ρ in $\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$ which is a realization of the random walk approximation of ν , by conditioning on $\rho(0) \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma := \{[b_1]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}}, \dots, [b_1]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}} + [\gamma]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}}\}$ and using (A.1) on $[-s^{-1}(\rho(0) + L), s^{-1}(\rho(0) + L)]$ (we separate the two-sided random walk into two one-sided random walks, on each part we use (A.1) with $d = s^{-1}(\rho(0) + L)$, and $a = s$ and note that $\rho(0) \leq b_1 + \gamma$),

$$\limsup_\varepsilon \int f_{0, \varepsilon}(\rho)^2 d\nu_\varepsilon \leq 2\gamma^{-1} \exp \{8s(b_1 + L + \gamma)\phi^2(0)\}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Here $2\gamma^{-1}$ comes from the density of $\rho(0)$ as follows. As $\rho(0)$ is Uniform on $\mathcal{S}_\gamma$, it puts mass $|\mathcal{S}_\gamma|^{-1}$ to each element in $\mathcal{S}_\gamma$. Its Radon Nikodym derivative with respect to Leb_ε is $\varepsilon^{-1/2} |\mathcal{S}_\gamma|^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{S}_\gamma}$, where $|\cdot|$ is the cardinality of a set and $\mathbf{1}_A(x) = 1$ if and only if $x \in A$ is the indicator function for the set A . So the square of its Radon Nikodym derivative integrated with respect to Leb_ε is

$$\frac{|\mathcal{S}_\gamma| \varepsilon^{1/2}}{\varepsilon |\mathcal{S}_\gamma|^2} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{1/2} |\mathcal{S}_\gamma|} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{1/2} (\gamma \varepsilon^{-1/2} - 1)} \leq 2\gamma^{-1}.$$

Next we prove the proposition for $k = 2$; it is easy to see that the general case is conceptually similar to this with heavier notations. Again we can assume $y_1 = 0$. Let $\mu'_\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon^0$ denote the restrictions of $f_{0, \varepsilon} \nu_\varepsilon$

and ν_ε on $[0, y_2]$ with $\rho(0) \equiv 0$ (that is, η_ε^0 is the random walk measure starting from 0). Because of (A.2) and conditioning on $\rho(0)$, it is enough to prove that the Radon-Nikodym derivative g_ε of μ'_ε with respect to η_ε^0 satisfies $\limsup_\varepsilon \int g_\varepsilon^2 d\eta_\varepsilon^0 < \infty$. Let $\psi(x) = \mathfrak{d}_{\gamma, s, L}^{\vec{y}, \vec{b}}(x)$ with $k = 2$ and $y_1 = 0, b_1 = 0$. Let η_ε^ψ denote the random walk approximation of $B(x) + \psi(x)$ on $[0, y_2]$, where B is a standard Brownian motion. Then for any ρ in $\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$ with $\rho(0) = 0$ and $\rho(y_2) \in \{[b_2]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}}, \dots, [b_2]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}} + [\gamma]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}}\}$,

$$g_\varepsilon(\rho) = \frac{\mu'_\varepsilon(\rho)}{\eta_\varepsilon^0(\rho)} \leq \frac{\eta_\varepsilon^\psi(\rho) \mathbb{P}(U = \rho(y_2) - [b_2]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}})}{\mathbb{P}(\eta_\varepsilon^0(y_2) = \rho(y_2) - [b_2]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}}) \eta_\varepsilon^0(\rho)} \leq C_{\gamma, y_2} \frac{\eta_\varepsilon^\psi(\rho)}{\eta_\varepsilon^0(\rho)}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where U denotes a discrete uniform random variable on $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, [\gamma]_{\varepsilon^{1/2}}\}$ and C_{γ, y_2} is some constant depending only on y_2, γ . Following the same argument as in (A.1), the Radon-Nikodym derivative of η_ε^ψ with respect to η_ε^0 is bounded in $L^2(\eta_\varepsilon^0)$. Hence, from (A.3), it follows that $\limsup_\varepsilon \int g_\varepsilon^2 d\eta_\varepsilon^0 < \infty$.

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF LEM. 5.1

Recall that g is any fixed function in $\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$ such that $g(x) \geq C'(1 + |x|)$ for some $C' > 0$, and $h_t(\cdot; -g)$ denotes the TASEP height function at time t started from $-g$.

Lemma B.1. *Let $X(h_t, \hat{h})$ denote the number of points of maxima of $h_t(\cdot; -g) + \hat{h}(\cdot)$. Then*

$$\sum_{x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{h(0) \in \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}} |\nabla_x^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g))| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \mathbb{P}^{\text{TASEP}}(X(h_t, \hat{h}) = k) = \mathbb{E}^{\text{TASEP}}(X(h_t, \hat{h})). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Recall that $h(\cdot) = h(0) + \hat{h}(\cdot)$ and note that $\hat{h}$ remains fixed throughout this lemma. $\mathbb{P}^{\text{TASEP}}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{\text{TASEP}}$ denote the probability and expectation with respect to the TASEP dynamics only for a fixed $\hat{h}$.

Proof. For simplicity of notation, we denote $h^{x, 1, \text{sym}}$ by h^x . First of all if $h^x = h$, then clearly $\nabla_x^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon} = 0$. On the other hand, if h has a local maximum at x , then, by skew-time reversibility of TASEP height function (see (1.4)), if $h_t(y; -g) = h_t^\varepsilon(y; -g)$ denotes the TASEP height function at scale ε at time t and position y started from $-g$, $|\nabla_x^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g))|$ is given by

$$\left| p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h^x, \text{hyp}(g)) - p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g)) \right| = p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(-g, \text{hyp}(-h^x)) - p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(-g, \text{hyp}(-h)),$$

which is the probability that $h_t(y; -g) \leq -h^x(y)$ for all $y \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}$, but for some y , $h_t(y; -g) > -h(y)$. Of course, necessarily $y = x$, and one can see that this is the probability that $h_t(y; -g) + h(y) \leq 0$ for all y and $h_t(x; -g) + h(x)$ is $\varepsilon^{1/2}$ or $2\varepsilon^{1/2}$. Thus $|\nabla_x^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g))|$ is at most

$$\mathbb{P}^{\text{TASEP}}\left(\arg \max_y \{h_t(y; -g) + h(y)\} = x, h_t(x; -g) + h(x) \in \{\varepsilon^{1/2}, 2\varepsilon^{1/2}\}\right).$$

Here $\mathbb{P}^{\text{TASEP}}$ denotes the probability with respect to the TASEP dynamics for a fixed h . The quantity above is equal to

$$\mathbb{P}^{\text{TASEP}}(\arg \max_y \{h_t(y; -g) + \hat{h}(y)\} = x, h_t(x; -g) + \hat{h}(x) \in \{\varepsilon^{1/2} - h(0), 2\varepsilon^{1/2} - h(0)\}),$$

so this probability summed over all $h(0) \in \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}$ for each fixed $\hat{h}$ equals $\mathbb{P}^{\text{TASEP}}(\arg \max_y \{h_t(y; -g) + \hat{h}(y)\} = x)$. Note that only one of the two possibilities $h_t(x; -g) + h(x) = \varepsilon^{1/2}$, $h_t(x; -g) + h(x) = 2\varepsilon^{1/2}$ happens; it is because there is a parity conservation in the model.

On the other hand, if h has a local minimum at x , $|\nabla_x^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g))|$ is given by the probability that $h_t(y; -g) \leq -h(y)$ for all $y \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}$, but for some y , $h_t(y; -g) > -h^x(y)$. Clearly again $y = x$ and $h_t(x; -g) = -h^x(x) + \varepsilon^{1/2}$ or $+2\varepsilon^{1/2}$. Since $-h(x) = -h^x(x) + 2\varepsilon^{1/2}$, again by the parity conservation of the model, the last statement is the probability that $h_t(y; -g) + h(y) \leq 0$ for all y and $h_t(x; -g) + h(x) = 0$; or $h_t(y; -g) + h(y) \leq -\varepsilon^{1/2}$ for all y and $h_t(x; -g) + h(x) = -\varepsilon^{1/2}$. That is, $|\nabla_x^{\text{sym}} p_t^{\text{TASEP}, \varepsilon}(h, \text{hyp}(g))|$ is given by

$$\mathbb{P}^{\text{TASEP}}(\arg \max_y \{h_t(y; -g) + h(y)\} = x, h_t(x; -g) + h(x) \in \{-\varepsilon^{1/2}, 0\}).$$

As in the last paragraph, summed over all $h(0) \in \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}$ for each fixed $\hat{h}$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}^{\text{TASEP}}(\arg \max_y \{h_t(y; -g) + \hat{h}(y)\} = x).$$

Considering the possibility of multiple points of maxima, we have (B.1) when we sum over all $x \in \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}$. $\square$

Thus the square of the left hand side of (B.1) is bounded by $\mathbb{E}^{\text{TASEP}}[(X(h_t, \hat{h}))^2]$. Till now $\hat{h}$ was fixed; now we take an expectation over $\mu_\varepsilon(d\hat{h})$, so that the left-hand side of (5.2) is bounded by $\mathbb{E}[(X(h_t, \hat{h}))^2] = \sum k^2 \mathbb{P}(X(h_t, \hat{h}) = k)$, where $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^{\text{TASEP}} \times \mu_\varepsilon$ denotes the product measure of the TASEP dynamics and the random walk measure μ_ε for $\hat{h}$, and $\mathbb{E}$ denotes the corresponding expectation. Recall that $\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$ denotes the collection of functions f mapping $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathbb{Z} \mapsto \varepsilon^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}$. Conditioning on $h_t(\cdot; -g)$ (the TASEP dynamics), to get (5.2) it is enough to show

Lemma B.2. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \geq 1$ and any fixed function $f(\cdot) \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$ such that $f(x) + \hat{h}(x) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ a.s., there are absolute constants $C, c > 0$ (not depending on ε, f, k) such that*

$$\mu_\varepsilon(X(f, \hat{h}) = k) \leq C e^{-ck^{1/4}}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Note that as $-g(x) \leq -C(1 + |x|)$, one has that for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ almost surely the TASEP height function at time t , $h_t(x; -g) + \hat{h}(x) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. In fact, one can get the same linear bounds with a slightly worse constant and a height shift. To see this, note that we can bound the initial data above by both $-C(1 + x)$ or $-C(1 - x)$. By adjusting the drift, we can put a random walk height function above each of these. Because the TASEP height function preserves order, at a later time the height function will be dominated by the evolution of either one of these random walk initial data. Besides the height shift, these two are equilibria, and so we conclude that our height function is again bounded by the two random walks with drift at time t . These, in turn can be bounded above by $C'(1 - x)$ and $C'(1 + x)$.

The proof of Lem. B.2 is adapted from [16] who consider $f \equiv 0$ on a finite interval. Intuitively, $f \equiv 0$ is the worst case, and it is plausible one could avoid what follows by making this intuition rigorous.

Proof of Lem. B.2. Fix $k > 1$ and any function $f \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$ such that $f(x) + \hat{h}(x) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ a.s.. Because of the decay condition on $f + \hat{h}$, all maxima are attained in a compact interval almost surely, that is, there exists $L_k > 0$ such that all points of maxima for $f + \hat{h}$ are in $[-L_k, L_k]$ with probability at least $1 - e^{-k}$. Let us call this event $\mathcal{A}_k$. Henceforth, we restrict ourselves to points only in the compact set $[-L_k, L_k]$.

First observe that $\hat{h} + f$ can attain its maximum at consecutive points. Let $\mathcal{G}_k$ denote the event that there is a string of $\sqrt{k}$ consecutive points at which $f + \hat{h}$ attains the maximum. Then we show that

$$\mu_\varepsilon(\mathcal{G}_k) \leq C e^{-c\sqrt{k}}$$

for some absolute constants $C, c > 0$.

To this end, on the event $\mathcal{G}_k$, let $\{x^*, x^* + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon, \dots, x^* + \frac{1}{2}b\varepsilon\}$ be the first string of at least $\sqrt{k}$ points at which $f + \hat{h}$ attains the maximum. To avoid cumbersome notations, we assume b is a multiple of 6, and write

$$\mathcal{G}_k = \mathcal{P}_k \cup \mathcal{N}_k,$$

where $\mathcal{P}_k$ is the event where $u(x^* + \frac{1}{4}b\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{1/2}$ and $\mathcal{N}_k$ is the event where $u(x^* + \frac{1}{4}b\varepsilon) = -\varepsilon^{1/2}$, where u is as defined in (2.5). First consider the event $\mathcal{P}_k$. If m denotes the maximum value of $f + \hat{h}$, we have that

$$m = \hat{h}(x) + f(x) = \hat{h}\left(x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\right) + f\left(x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\right), \quad \text{that is,}$$

$$u(x) = f(x) - f\left(x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\right), \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{I} := \left\{x^*, x^* + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon, \dots, x^* + \left(\frac{b}{4} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\varepsilon\right\}.$$

Thus, given the function f , the values of $u(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{I}$ are fixed. Let $\mathcal{I}_0 \subset \mathcal{I}$ denote the last $b/6$ elements in $\mathcal{I}$ (clearly, then $|\mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{I}_0| = b/3$). Now for each configuration of u in $\mathcal{P}_k$, we construct $2^{b/6}$ new and distinct configurations by assigning different values of $u(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{I}_0$ and setting $u(x^* + \frac{1}{4}b\varepsilon) = -\varepsilon^{1/2}$. If we define this map as ϕ , then for each configuration $u \in \mathcal{P}_k$, $\phi(u)$ is a set of $2^{b/6}$ elements and we shall prove that the sets are disjoint for different configurations u .

To see the disjointness, observe that it is easy to recognize the map ϕ^{-1} . To this end, fix any $u_* \in \phi(u)$ and let the walk $\hat{h}_*$ be defined from the sequence u_* as $\hat{h}_*(x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon) = \hat{h}_*(x) + u_*(x)$. First observe that, by changing the value of u at $x^* + \frac{1}{4}b\varepsilon$ from $\varepsilon^{1/2}$ to $-\varepsilon^{1/2}$ (and since $x^* + (\frac{b}{4} + \frac{1}{2})\varepsilon$ was a point of maxima), we have ensured that $\hat{h}_* + f$ does not have a maximum at any point $x > x^* + \frac{1}{4}b\varepsilon$. Now there are two possibilities:

- either $(\hat{h}_* + f)(x) > m$ for some $x \in \mathcal{I}_0$, in which case the number of points of maxima of $\hat{h}_* + f$ is at most $b/6$ (as the maximum is attained at some point $x \in \mathcal{I}_0$ which has cardinality $b/6$), and we can recover u by identifying the last string of length at least $b/3$ of consecutive points where $\hat{h}_* + f$ is flat before a point of maximum.
- On the other hand, if $(\hat{h}_* + f)(x) \leq m$ for all $x \in \mathcal{I}_0$, the number of points of maxima of $\hat{h}_* + f$ is at least $b/3$ and we can recover u by identifying the last string of points of maxima of length at least $b/3$.

This proves the disjointness. Hence we have

$$\mu_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P}_k \cap \mathcal{A}_k) \leq 2^{-b/6} \leq 2^{-\sqrt{k}/6}.$$

For the event $\mathcal{N}_k$, we reverse the sequence u and switch $\varepsilon^{1/2}$ to $-\varepsilon^{1/2}$ and vice versa, so that as before we have $\mu_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}_k \cap \mathcal{A}_k) \leq 2^{-\sqrt{k}/6}$. Together, we have

$$\mu_\varepsilon(\mathcal{G}_k \cap \mathcal{A}_k) \leq 2^{-\sqrt{k}/6+1}.$$

Now on the event $\mathcal{G}_k^c \cap \{X(f, \hat{h}) = k\}$, there are at least $\sqrt{k}$ disjoint blocks of points of maxima for $\hat{h} + f$, each of size less than $\sqrt{k}$. That is, let $\{x_i, x_i + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon, \dots, x_i + \frac{1}{2}(b_i - 1)\varepsilon\}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$ be the points of maxima for $\hat{h} + f$, where $b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_\ell = k$ and $x_i + \frac{1}{2}b_i\varepsilon < x_{i+1}$, $b_i < \sqrt{k}$ for all i and hence $\ell \geq \sqrt{k}$. First assume that, in addition to the above, there are at least $k^{1/3}$ blocks among them such that in each block, there is an x with $u(x - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon) = -\varepsilon^{1/2}$. Let us call this event $\mathcal{G}_k^1$ and enumerate these blocks as before, with $\ell \geq k^{1/3}$ this time. Now for any $i = 1, 2, \dots, k^{1/4}$, and any configuration $u \in \mathcal{G}_k^1$, we define a new configuration $\Phi_i(u) = u_*$ as follows. Let y_i be the first x such that $x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$ is in the $(\ell - i)$ -th block and $u(y_i) = -\varepsilon^{1/2}$. Define $u_*(y_i) = \varepsilon^{1/2}$ and $u_*(x) = u(x)$ for all other x ; and define the walk $\hat{h}_*$ from the sequence u_* as $\hat{h}_*(x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon) = \hat{h}_*(x) + u_*(x)$. Then $(\hat{h}_* + f)(x) = m + 2\varepsilon^{1/2}$ for $x \in \{x_j, x_j + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon, \dots, x_j + \frac{1}{2}(b_j - 1)\varepsilon\}$ for all $\ell - i + 1 \leq j \leq \ell$ and for all points in the $(\ell - i)$ -th block after y_i . Let $\Phi_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m} := \Phi_{j_1} \circ \dots \circ \Phi_{j_m}$ and denote the set

$$\Phi(u) = \{\Phi_S(u) : S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, k^{1/4}\}\}$$

for each $u \in \mathcal{G}_k^1$. Thus $\Phi(u)$ has $2^{k^{1/4}}$ elements and for different configurations u the sets $\Phi(u)$ are disjoint. Observe that the disjointness follows because we can identify u from u_* by first finding the maximum value m_* attained for the first time at x_* say, and then the highest value less than m_* that is attained in at least $k^{1/3}/2$ blocks of points less than x_* . Hence

$$\mu_\varepsilon(\mathcal{G}_k^1) \leq 2^{-k^{1/4}}.$$

Similarly if there are at least $k^{1/3}$ blocks such that in each block, there is an x such that $u(x) = \varepsilon^{1/2}$, and we call this event $\mathcal{G}_k^2$, then reversing the sequence u and switching the $\varepsilon^{1/2}$ to $-\varepsilon^{1/2}$ and vice versa, we see as before that

$$\mu_\varepsilon(\mathcal{G}_k^2) \leq 2^{-k^{1/4}}.$$

On the event that there does not exist such $k^{1/3}$ blocks with x such that $u(x) = \varepsilon^{1/2}$ or $k^{1/3}$ blocks with x such that $u(x) = -\varepsilon^{1/2}$, it means that there are at most $2k^{1/3}$ blocks of size at least 2, that

is, there are at least $k/2$ blocks of points of maxima that are all of size 1 (since $k - 2k^{1/3} \geq k/2$ for k large). We call this event $\mathcal{G}_k^3$. Note that on this event, there exists a sequence of at least $\sqrt{k}$ consecutive blocks of maxima, all of size 1. If for a sequence u of finite length, there are $\sqrt{k}$ points of maxima and each maximum is attained at a block of size 1, then by defining the map ψ_i as $\psi_i(u) = u_*$ where $u_*(x_i) = \varepsilon^{1/2}$ and $u_*(x) = u(x)$ for all other x , where x_i is the i -th point of maximum counted from the right (note that $u(x_i) = -\varepsilon^{1/2}$ since x_i is a point of maxima and $x_i + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$ is not) and $\psi(u) = \{\psi_S(u) : S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, k^{1/3}\}\}$, we see that $\psi(u)$ has $2^{k^{1/3}}$ elements and for different configurations u the sets $\psi(u)$ are disjoint (the proof is similar to that in the last paragraph). This implies that $\mu_\varepsilon(\mathcal{G}_k^3) \leq 2^{-k^{1/3}}$. Thus

$$\mu_\varepsilon(\{X(f, \hat{h}) = k\} \cap \mathcal{G}_k^c \cap \mathcal{A}_k) \leq 2^{-k^{1/4}+2}.$$

Putting all this together we have

$$\mu_\varepsilon(X(f, \hat{h}) = k) \leq \mu_\varepsilon(\{X(f, \hat{h}) = k\} \cap \mathcal{G}_k^c \cap \mathcal{A}_k) + \mu_\varepsilon(\mathcal{G}_k \cap \mathcal{A}_k) + \mu_\varepsilon(\mathcal{A}_k^c) \leq Ce^{-ck^{1/4}}$$

for some absolute constants $C, c > 0$. $\square$

APPENDIX C. PROOF OF LEM. 4.2

We recall the proof in [36] as recounted in [32], and describe the minor modifications necessary to include the height $h(0)$. We start with a definition. An *irreducible cycle* C is a sequence of integers $y_0, \dots, y_k$ with $y_0 = y_k = 0$ and $y_i \neq y_j$ for any other $i \neq j$. $\pi_C(a_j) = \frac{1}{k}$ for $a_j = y_j - y_{j-1}$ and zero otherwise. Then it is shown in [36] that any $p(\cdot)$ with mean 0 and finite support can be written as a finite sum $p(x) = \sum_i w_i \pi_{C_i}(x)$ where $w_i > 0$, $\sum_i w_i = 1$ and C_i are irreducible cycles. From this one obtains the representation

$$Mf = \sum_i \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} M_{C_i+x} \quad M_{C+x} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \eta(x + y_i)(1 - \eta(x + y_{i+1})) \nabla_{x+y_i, a_{i+1}} f \quad (\text{C.1})$$

We have a Markov generator $A = M_{C+x}$ acting on functions on particle configurations $\eta \in \{0, 1\}^\mathcal{C}$ on $\mathcal{C} := \{y_0+x, \dots, y_{k-1}+x\}$. We can furthermore restrict to the subset $\mathcal{U}_\ell$ of particle configurations with a fixed number ℓ of particles and our measure just becomes the uniform measure. Let $\bar{A} = \frac{1}{2}(A + A^*)$ denote the symmetrization of A . It has the same range as A , namely mean zero functions (since the uniform measure is uniquely invariant for both). Since the configuration space is finite, there is a finite B such that

$$\sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{U}_\ell} Ag(\eta)(-\bar{A})^{-1}Ag(\eta) \leq B^2 \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{U}_\ell} g(\eta)(-\bar{A}g)(\eta). \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Equivalently, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for any $\alpha > 0$,

$$\sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{U}_\ell} f(\eta)Ag(\eta) \leq \frac{B\alpha}{2} \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{U}_\ell} f(\eta)(-A)f(\eta) + \frac{B}{2\alpha} \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{U}_\ell} g(\eta)(-A)g(\eta). \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Now let f and g be functions of $h(0)$ and $\eta \in \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{Z}$. We can think of a general function f or g of $h(0) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta \in \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{Z}$ of being first of all a function of $\eta|_{\mathcal{U}_\ell}$, then of ℓ , then of all the other variables $h(0)$ and $\eta(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathcal{C}$. The inequality (C.3) clearly holds, with these general functions, and the dependence on the extra variables ℓ and $\eta(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathcal{C}$ there but not written. Nothing in (C.3) affects the variables $\eta(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathcal{C}$. In terms of $h(0)$, there are two cases. If all elements of $\mathcal{C}$ are either in $\{0, 1, \dots\}$ or in $\{\dots, -2, -1\}$ then no move of A affects $h(0)$. Averaging the inequality over the measure ν gives in this case

$$\int f M_{C+x} g d\nu \leq \frac{B\alpha}{2} \int f(-M_{C+x}f) d\nu + \frac{B}{2\alpha} \int g(-M_{C+x}g) d\nu. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

In the second case we have elements of $\mathcal{C}$ in both $\{0, 1, \dots\}$ and in $\{\dots, -2, -1\}$, so some moves affect $h(0)$. We claim the same inequality holds. For suppose $y_i + x \leq -1$ and $y_{i+1} + x \geq 0$. The

corresponding term in each term of our inequality on $\mathcal{U}_\ell$ reads either

$$\sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{U}_\ell} f(h(0), \eta) \eta_{y_i+x} (1 - \eta_{y_{i+1}+x}) (g(h(0) - 2, \eta^{y_i+x, y_{i+1}+x}) - g(h(0), \eta)) \quad (\text{C.5})$$

on the left hand side, or the same thing with two f 's or two g 's on the right hand side. We can take the sum over $h(0) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and pass it through the finite sum over $\mathcal{U}_\ell$, then take the expectation with respect to the marginal distribution of ℓ and the $\eta(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathcal{C}$ under ν . It is clearly the same if we had instead $y_i + x \geq 0$ and $y_{i+1} + x \leq -1$, with the -2 replaced by a $+2$. Doing this to all the terms shows that (C.4) holds in the second case as well.

Now we can sum (C.4) over $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and C_i with weights w_i to obtain

$$\int f M g d\nu \leq \frac{B\alpha}{2} \int f(-Mf) d\nu + \frac{B}{2\alpha} \int g(-Mg) d\nu. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Optimizing over $\alpha > 0$ gives (3.9).

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Bálint Virág for enlightening discussions and Patrik Ferrari for a careful reading of the paper and comments. The authors are also very grateful to an anonymous referee whose detailed comments led to a new version with considerably improved presentation. Both authors were supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

REFERENCES

1. Gideon Amir, Ivan Corwin, and Jeremy Quastel, *Probability distribution of the free energy of the continuum directed random polymer in 1 + 1 dimensions*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **64** (2011), no. 4, 466–537. MR 2796514
2. L. Bertini, C. Landim, and S. Olla, *Derivation of Cahn-Hilliard equations from Ginzburg-Landau models*, J. Statist. Phys. **88** (1997), no. 1-2, 365–381. MR 1468389
3. Lorenzo Bertini and Giambattista Giacomin, *Stochastic Burgers and KPZ equations from particle systems*, Comm. Math. Phys. **183** (1997), no. 3, 571–607. MR 1462228
4. Alexei Borodin, Ivan Corwin, Patrik Ferrari, and Bálint Vető, *Height fluctuations for the stationary KPZ equation*, Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **18** (2015), no. 1, Art. 20, 95. MR 3366125
5. Pasquale Calabrese and Pierre Le Doussal, *Interaction quench in a Lieb-Liniger model and the KPZ equation with flat initial conditions*, J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp. (2014), no. 5, P05004, 19. MR 3224219
6. Ivan Corwin and Evgeni Dimitrov, *Transversal fluctuations of the ASEP, stochastic six vertex model, and Hall-Littlewood Gibbsian line ensembles*, Comm. Math. Phys. **363** (2018), no. 2, 435–501. MR 3851820
7. Ivan Corwin and Alan Hammond, *Brownian Gibbs property for Airy line ensembles*, Inventiones mathematicae **195** (2014), no. 2, 441–508.
8. ———, *KPZ line ensemble*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **166** (2016), no. 1-2, 67–185.
9. Ivan Corwin and Jeremy Quastel, *Crossover distributions at the edge of the rarefaction fan*, Ann. Probab. **41** (2013), no. 3A, 1243–1314. MR 3098678
10. Duncan Dauvergne, Janosch Ortmann, and Bálint Virág, *The directed landscape*, arXiv:1812.00309 (2018).
11. Evgeni Dimitrov and Konstantin Matetski, *Characterization of Brownian Gibbsian line ensembles*, arXiv:2002.00684 (2020).
12. Victor Dotsenko, *Distribution function of the endpoint fluctuations of one-dimensional directed polymers in a random potential*, J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp. (2013), no. 2, P02012, 20. MR 3041935
13. D. Forster, David R. Nelson, and Michael J. Stephen, *Large-distance and long-time properties of a randomly stirred fluid*, Phys. Rev. A (3) **16** (1977), no. 2, 732–749. MR 459274
14. Massimiliano Gubinelli and Nicolas Perkowski, *KPZ reloaded*, Comm. Math. Phys. **349** (2017), no. 1, 165–269. MR 3592748
15. M. Hairer, *Solving the KPZ equation*, XVIIth International Congress on Mathematical Physics, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2014, p. 419. MR 3204494
16. Joseph Helfer and Daniel T. Wise, *A note on maxima in random walks*, Electron. J. Combin. **23** (2016), no. 1, Paper 1.17, 10. MR 3484722
17. T. Imamura and T. Sasamoto, *Fluctuations of the one-dimensional polynuclear growth model with external sources*, Nuclear Phys. B **699** (2004), no. 3, 503–544. MR 2098552
18. Takashi Imamura and Tomohiro Sasamoto, *Replica approach to the KPZ equation with the half Brownian motion initial condition*, J. Phys. A **44** (2011), no. 38, 385001, 29. MR 2835150
19. Mehran Kardar, Giorgio Parisi, and Yi-Cheng Zhang, *Dynamic scaling of growing interfaces*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56** (1986), 889–892.

20. Konstantin Matetski, Jeremy Quastel, and Daniel Remenik, *The KPZ fixed point*, arXiv:1701.00018 (2016), to appear in *Acta Mathematica*.
21. Mihai Nica, Jeremy Quastel, and Daniel Remenik, *One-sided reflected Brownian motions and the KPZ fixed point*, arXiv:2002.02922 (2020).
22. Janosch Ortmann, Jeremy Quastel, and Daniel Remenik, *A Pfaffian representation for flat ASEP*, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **70** (2017), no. 1, 3–89. MR 3581823
23. Michael Prähofer and Herbert Spohn, *Scale invariance of the PNG droplet and the Airy process*, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **108** (2002), no. 5-6, 1071–1106.
24. Jeremy Quastel, *Introduction to KPZ*, *Current developments in mathematics*, 2011, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2012, pp. 125–194. MR 3098078
25. Dipankar Roy and Rahul Pandit, *One-dimensional Kardar-Parisi-Zhang and Kuramoto-Sivashinsky universality class: limit distributions*, *Phys. Rev. E* **101** (2020), no. 3, 030103(R), 6. MR 4083969
26. Tomohiro Sasamoto and Herbert Spohn, *Exact height distributions for the KPZ equation with narrow wedge initial condition*, *Nuclear Phys. B* **834** (2010), no. 3, 523–542. MR 2628936
27. Anamaria Savu, *Hydrodynamic scaling limit of continuum solid-on-solid model*, *J. Appl. Math.* (2006), Art. ID 69101, 37. MR 2231983
28. Craig A. Tracy and Harold Widom, *Asymptotics in ASEP with step initial condition*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **290** (2009), no. 1, 129–154. MR 2520510
29. ———, *On ASEP with step Bernoulli initial condition*, *J. Stat. Phys.* **137** (2009), no. 5-6, 825–838. MR 2570751
30. ———, *Formulas for ASEP with two-sided Bernoulli initial condition*, *J. Stat. Phys.* **140** (2010), no. 4, 619–634. MR 2670733
31. H. van Beijeren, R. Kutner, and H. Spohn, *Excess noise for driven diffusive systems*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54** (1985), no. 18, 2026–2029. MR 789756
32. S. R. S. Varadhan, *Self-diffusion of a tagged particle in equilibrium for asymmetric mean zero random walk with simple exclusion*, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **31** (1995), no. 1, 273–285. MR 1340041
33. D. Revuz, M. Yor, *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion*, Third Ed. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
34. Bálint Virág, *The heat and the landscape I*, arXiv: 2008.07241 (2020).
35. Xuan Wu, *Tightness and local fluctuation estimates for the KPZ line ensemble*, arXiv:2106.08051 (2021).
36. Lin Xu, *Diffusive scaling limit for mean zero asymmetric simple exclusion processes*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1993, Thesis (Ph.D.)—New York University. MR 2690363

(J. Quastel) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, 40 ST. GEORGE STREET, TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA M5S 2E4

Email address: quastel@math.toronto.edu

(S. Sarkar) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, 40 ST. GEORGE STREET, TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA M5S 2E4

Email address: sourav.sarkar@utoronto.ca