TIGHTNESS AND LOCAL FLUCTUATION ESTIMATES FOR THE KPZ LINE ENSEMBLE
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Abstract. In this paper we study the KPZ line ensemble $\mathcal{H}_t = \{\mathcal{H}_n^t\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ under the $t^{1/3}$ vertical and $t^{2/3}$ horizontal scaling. We prove quantitative (uniformly in $t$) local fluctuation estimates on curves in $\mathcal{H}_t$ in Theorem 1.3, which enables us to show the tightness of the scaled KPZ line ensembles as $t$ varies (Theorem 1.4(i)). Furthermore, as $t$ increases, the curves in the scaled KPZ line ensemble become more and more ordered. The limit is non-intersecting and enjoys the Brownian Gibbs property, see Theorem 1.4(ii). Together with the recent results in [QS20], [Vir] and [DM], the KPZ line ensemble converges to the Airy line ensemble. We will employ the current estimates in a forthcoming paper [Wu21] to study the Brownian regularity for the scaled KPZ line ensemble.

1. Introduction

1.1. Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation. The main object of study in this paper, the KPZ line ensemble, can be viewed as a multi-layer extension to the well-known Kardar-Parisi-Zhang (KPZ) equation. The KPZ equation was introduced in 1986 by Kardar, Parisi and Zhang [KPZ] as a model for random interface growth. In one-spatial dimension (sometimes also called (1+1)-dimension to emphasize that time is one dimension too), it describes the evolution of a function $\mathcal{H}(t, x)$ recording the height of an interface at time $t > 0$ above position $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The KPZ equation is written formally as a stochastic partial differential equation (sPDE),

$$\partial_t \mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_x^2 \mathcal{H} + \frac{1}{4} (\partial_x \mathcal{H})^2 + \dot{W},$$

where $\dot{W}$ is a space-time white noise (for mathematical background or literature review, see [Cor, QS15] for instance).

The KPZ equation (1.1) is associated with a famous universality class, the KPZ universality class, which bears the same name. The KPZ equation is a canonical member of the associated KPZ universality class and a model belongs to the KPZ universality class if it bears the same long-time, large-scale behavior as the KPZ equation. The KPZ universality class hosts a large class of models, which covers a wide range of mathematical and physical systems of distinct origins, including interacting particle systems, random matrices, traffic models, directed polymers in random media and non-linear stochastic PDEs.

All models in the KPZ universality class can be transformed to a kinetically growing interface reflecting the competition between growth in a direction normal to the surface, a surface tension smoothing force, and a stochastic term which tends to roughen the interface. These features may be illustrated by the Laplacian $\frac{1}{2} \partial_x^2 \mathcal{H}$, non-linear term $\frac{1}{4} (\partial_x \mathcal{H})^2$ and white noise $\dot{W}$ in the KPZ equation (1.1). Numerical simulations along with some theoretical results have confirmed that in the long time $t$ scaling limit, fluctuations in the height of such evolving interfaces scale like $t^{1/3}$ and display non-trivial spatial correlations in the scale $t^{2/3}$ (known as the 3 : 2 : 1 KPZ scaling).

The KPZ equation is related to the stochastic heat equation (SHE) with multiplicative noise through the Hopf–Cole transformation. Denote $Z(t, x)$ as the solution to the following SHE,

$$\partial_t Z = \frac{1}{2} \partial_x^2 Z + Z^2 \dot{W}.$$


The Hopf-Cole solution to the KPZ equation (1.1) is defined through taking
\[
\mathcal{H}(t, x) = \log Z(t, x).
\]

It was first proved in [Mue] that \( Z(t, x) \) is almost surely strictly positive, which justifies the validity of the transform. The fundamental solution \( Z^{nw}(t, x) \) to SHE (1.2) is of great importance. It solves (1.2) with a delta mass initial value problem at origin, i.e. \( Z(0, x) = \delta_{x=0} \). Meanwhile \( \mathcal{H}^{nw}(t, x) = \log Z^{nw}(t, x) \) is known as the narrow wedge solution to the KPZ equation. The initial condition of \( \mathcal{H}^{nw}(0, x) \) is not well-defined; however \( \mathcal{H}^{nw}(t, x) \) is stationary around a parabola \(-\frac{x^2}{2t}\), which resembles a sharp wedge for small \( t \), hence known as the narrow wedge initial condition.

Using the Feynman-Kac representation, \( Z^{nw}(t, x) \) formally take the following expression,
\[
Z^{nw}(t, x) = p(t, x) \mathbb{E} \left[ : \exp \left( \int_0^t \dot{\mathscr{W}}(s, B_s) ds \right) : \right],
\]
where \( p(t, x) = (2\pi t)^{-1/2} \exp(-x^2/2t) \) is the heat kernel, the expectation is taken with respect to a Brownian bridge \( (B_s, s \leq t) \) which starts at origin at time \( 0 \) and arrives at \( x \) at time \( t \). The \( : \exp : \) is the Wick exponential, see [Jan] for instance. This bridge representation arises because of the \( \delta_{x=0} \) initial condition, and hence the factor \( p(t, x) \). This Feynman-Kac representation is mostly formal since the integral of white noise over a Brownian path is not well-defined pathwise or to exponentiate the integral.

We adopt this representation to emphasize on its interpretation as being the partition function of a continuum directed random polymer (CDRP) that is modeled by a continuous path interacting with a space-time white noise. We emphasize that this approach is very useful for a generalization to the multi-layer scenario which involves multiple Brownian bridges, see an illustration in Figure 1. We will make sense of the expression (1.3) through a chaos expansion after we introduce its multi-layer extension below.

1.2. The KPZ line ensemble and CDRP partition functions. Motivated by recent developments on solvable directed polymer models, [OW] generalizes the above Feynman-Kac representation / continuum polymer partition function \( Z(t, x) \) to accommodate multiple non-intersecting Brownian bridges. More precisely, they defined a hierarchy of partition functions \( Z_n(t, x) \), formally written as
\[
Z_n(t, x) = p(t, x)^n \mathbb{E} \left[ : \exp \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \dot{\mathscr{W}}(s, B_i(s)) ds \right) : \right],
\]
where the expectation is taken with respect to the law on \( n \) independent Brownian bridges \( \{B_i\}_{i=1}^n \) starting at \( 0 \) at time \( 0 \) and ending at \( x \) at time \( t \). Intuitively these path integrals represent energies of non-intersecting paths, and thus the expectation of their exponential represents the partition function for this path (or directed polymer) model. It is worth noting that the first layer, \( Z_1 \), is the same as the fundamental solution \( Z^{nw} \) to the SHE (1.2). These partition functions \( Z_n(t, x) \) also solve a multi-layer extension of SHE (1.2), see [OW].

For \( n \in \mathbb{N}, t \geq 0 \) and \( x \in \mathbb{R} \), \( Z_n(t, x) \) is rigorously defined via the following chaos expansion,
\[
Z_n(t, x) = p(t, x)^n \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{\Delta_k(t)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} P^{(n)}_k ((t_1, x_1), \ldots, (t_k, x_k)) \mathcal{W}(dt_1dx_1) \cdots \mathcal{W}(dt_kdx_k),
\]
where \( \Delta_k(t) = \{ 0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k < t \} \), and \( P^{(n)}_k \) is the \( k \)-point correlation function for a collection of \( n \) non-intersecting Brownian bridges each of which starts at \( 0 \) at time \( 0 \) and ends at \( x \) at time \( t \). For notational simplicity, set \( Z_0(t, x) \equiv 1 \). For details about integration with respect to a white noise, we refer to [Jan].
Figure 1. On the left, the CDRP can be formulated in terms of the general directed polymer framework, i.e. a random path interacting with a random environment. More precisely, the underlying path measure is that of a Brownian bridge which starts at 0 at time 0 and ends at \( x \) at time \( t \); and the random environment is the white noise \( \dot{W} \). The multi-layer extension on the right involves non-intersecting Brownian bridges and is defined similarly.

[1] show that for any \( t > 0 \), with probability 1, for all \( x \in \mathbb{R} \) and all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( Z_n(t, x) > 0 \). The positivity result permits the following important definition of the KPZ line ensemble \( \mathcal{H}_n(x) \), a process given by the logarithm of ratios of partition functions \( Z_n \).

**Definition 1.1.** For \( t > 0 \) fixed, the KPZ \( t \) line ensemble is a continuous \( \mathbb{N} \)-indexed line ensemble \( \mathcal{H}^t = \{ \mathcal{H}^t_n \}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) on \( \mathbb{R} \) given by

\[
\mathcal{H}^t_n(x) = \log \left( \frac{Z_n(t, x)}{Z_{n-1}(t, x)} \right).
\]

Note that \( \mathcal{H}^1(t, \cdot) \) equals \( \mathcal{H}(t, \cdot) \), the time \( t \) spatial process of the Hopf-Cole solution to the KPZ equation (1.1) with narrow-wedge initial data. Sometimes we will omit \( t \) and just write the KPZ line ensemble as \( \mathcal{H} \).

The KPZ line ensemble arises as scaling limits of O’Connell-Yor semi-discrete direct polymers [OY] and log-gamma discrete directed polymers [Sep]. For O’Connell-Yor semi-discrete direct polymers, the convergence follows from the subsequential compactness result in [CH16] and finite dimensional convergence in [Nic]. Moreover, [CH16] introduced a resampling invariance / Gibbs property (discussed in Section 1.4), which also plays a key role in their estimates, for the the prelimit line ensemble and proved that the Gibbs property is inherited by the KPZ line ensemble. The analogue result about sequential compactness and limiting Gibbs property for log-gamma line ensemble was carried out in [Wu19].

### 1.3. Main results

This paper aims to investigate the KPZ line ensemble under the KPZ scaling. The scaled KPZ line ensemble \( \mathcal{F}^t \) is defined as follows.

**Definition 1.2.** For \( t > 0 \) fixed, the scaled KPZ \( t \) line ensemble is a continuous \( \mathbb{N} \)-indexed line ensemble \( \mathcal{F}^t = \{ \mathcal{F}^t_n \}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) on \( \mathbb{R} \) given by

\[
\mathcal{F}^t_n(x) := \frac{\mathcal{H}^t_n(t^{2/3}x) + t}{t^{1/3}}.
\]

Sometimes we will omit \( t \) and just write \( \mathcal{F} \).

The main results in this paper are Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4. We established a quantitative local fluctuation estimate in Theorem 1.3. The analogue of Theorem 1.3 for the Airy line ensemble is proved in [Ham1], Theorem 2.14. With the local fluctuation estimates, we are able to show the tightness of the scaled KPZ line ensembles \( \mathcal{F}^t \) as \( t \) varies (Theorem 1.4(i)). Furthermore, as \( t \) increases, curves in \( \mathcal{F}^t \) becomes more and more ordered and the limit satisfies non-intersecting
Brownian Gibbs property, see Theorem 1.4(ii). In a forthcoming work [Wu21] we will rely on the local fluctuation estimate to study the Brownian regularity of the curves in \( \mathcal{Y}^t \) (with an affine shift) with respect to Brownian bridges.

**Theorem 1.3** (Local fluctuation estimates). Fix \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). There exists a constant \( D_0 := D_0(k) \) depending only on \( k \) such that the following statement holds. For all \( t \geq 1 \), \( d \in (0, 1] \) and \( K \geq 0 \), we have

\[
\mathbb{P}\left( \sup_{x, y \in [0, d]} |\mathcal{Y}^t_k(x) - \mathcal{Y}^t_k(y)| \geq K d^{1/2} \right) \leq D_0^{-1} e^{-D_0 K^{3/2}}.
\]

**Theorem 1.4** (Tightness of the scaled KPZ line ensemble).

(i) As \( t \) varies, \( \mathcal{Y}^t \) is tight in the following sense. Given an increasing sequence \( t_N \to \infty \), there exists a subsequence, denoted by \( t_{N_j} \), such that \( \mathcal{Y}^{t_{N_j}} \) converges weakly (see Definition 2.2) as \( \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} \)-indexed line ensembles.

(ii) Any subsequential limit \( \mathcal{Y}^\infty \) is a non-intersecting line ensemble and enjoys the Brownian Gibbs property.

**Remark 1.5.** Because \( e^{-K^2} \) decays much faster than \( e^{-K^{3/2}} \), the fluctuation bound (Theorem 1.3) is weaker compared to the one for Brownian motions (Lemma 1.2). This may be viewed as the positive temperature analogue of the high jump difficulty discussed in [Ham1]. In the upcoming work [Wu21], we will modify the jump ensemble method in [Ham1] to address this issue. See more detailed discussion in Section 1.7.

A longstanding conjecture about the KPZ equation is that its solution converges to the KPZ fixed point under 3:2:1 scaling. The one point convergence was proved in [SS, ACQ] for narrow wedge initial condition. This conjecture was further strengthen in [CH16] that the the KPZ line ensemble should converge to the Airy line ensemble [CH14] under the same scaling. The following Corollary 1.7 is a main application of Theorem 1.4 and it proves the conjectural convergence of \( \mathcal{Y}^t \) to the Airy line ensemble, together with the recent work in [QS20], [Vir] and [DM]. [QS20] and [Vir] independently made breakthrough on the convergence of the top curve, i.e. convergence of the solution to KPZ equation while [DM] showed that the Airy line ensemble could be characterized by the law of its top curve and the Brownian Gibbs property.

**Definition 1.6.** The Airy line ensemble \( \mathcal{A} = \{ \mathcal{A}_1 > \mathcal{A}_2 > \cdots \} \), is a collection of non-intersecting continuous random curves indexed by \( \mathbb{N} \). The law of \( \mathcal{A} \) is uniquely determined by its determinantal structure. More precisely, for any finite set \( I = \{ x_1, \cdots, x_n \} \subset \mathbb{R} \), the point process on \( I \times \mathbb{R} \) given by \( \{(s, \mathcal{A}_n(s)) : n \in \mathbb{N}, s \in I\} \) is a determinantal point process with kernel given by the extended Airy2 kernel \( K^\text{ext} \),

\[
K^\text{ext}(s_1, x_1; s_2, x_2) = \begin{cases} 
\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda(s_1-s_2)} Ai(x_1 + z)Ai(x_2 + z)dz & \text{if } s_1 \geq s_2, \\
-\int_\infty^0 e^{-\lambda(s_1-s_2)} Ai(x_1 + z)Ai(x_2 + z)dz & \text{if } s_1 < s_2.
\end{cases}
\]

where \( Ai \) is the Airy function. See [CH16] for the first realization of a continuous process of the Airy line ensemble. See Figure 3 for some basic properties of the Airy line ensemble \( \mathcal{A} \) and for a construction.

**Corollary 1.7.** The KPZ line ensemble converges to the Airy line ensemble in the locally uniform topology. More precisely, \( \{2^{1/3}(\mathcal{Y}^t(x) + \frac{x^2}{2}) : x \in \mathbb{R}\} \) converges weakly to \( \{\mathcal{A}(x), x \in \mathbb{R}\} \) as \( t \) tends to infinity, see Definition 2.2.
The Airy line ensemble and its Gibbs property. There is a large class of stochastic integrable models from random matrix theory, interacting particle systems, last passage percolation, directed polymers that naturally carry the structure of random paths with some Gibbsian resampling invariance. The KPZ line ensemble, which carries a rich integrable structure, as well, enjoys such a Gibbsian resampling invariance [CH16]. The algebraic origin of Gibbsian line ensembles could be traced through various versions of RSK correspondence. Our focus in this article is to exploit the Gibbs property and establish quantitative estimates about the curves in the scaled KPZ line ensemble. We begin with an illustration of the Gibbsian resampling invariance via a particularly interesting and famous example, the Airy line ensemble [CH14].

The Airy line ensemble $\mathcal{A}$ has been proven to be a universal edge scaling limit of a wide range of models, e.g. Gaussian unitary ensemble, Dyson Brownian motion, Brownian last passage percolation, polynuclear growth model, see [OY, PS, DNV]. Another beautiful aspect about Airy line ensemble $A$ is that the Airy$_2$ process and the Airy point process are embedded together into $\mathcal{A}$, respectively as the top curve $A_1$ and the point process at $x=0$.

The construction of the Airy line ensemble [PS, AM, CH14] is a marriage of integrability and probability, which replies heavily on the Brownian Gibbs property of the parabolic Airy line ensemble $\mathcal{A}$, defined as $\mathcal{A} := \{A_n(x)|A_n(x) := 2^{-1/2} \left(A_n(x) - x^2\right), n \in \mathbb{N}, x \in \mathbb{R}\}$. The Brownian Gibbs property, is a spatial Markov property and furthermore a global resampling invariance under the following resampling procedure. Taking any $a < b \in \mathbb{R}, k \in \mathbb{N}$, first remove the trajectory of the $k$-th curve $A_k$ between $[a, b]$ and then resample a trajectory according to the law of a Brownian bridge which avoids the upper curve $A_{k-1}$ and the lower curve $A_{k+1}$ (note that we could run the same process for finite adjacent curves by resampling non-intersecting Brownian bridges).

In other words, conditioned on the values of $\mathcal{A}$ outside a compact set $C = \{k_1, k_1 + 1, \ldots, k_2\} \times [a, b]$, the law of $\mathcal{A}$ inside $C$ only depends on the boundary data (i.e. independent of values of $L$ outside $C$). Furthermore, this conditional law of $\mathcal{A}$ on $C$ is equivalent to the law of Brownian bridges with endpoints to be $\vec{x} = (\tilde{A}_{k_1}(a), \ldots, \tilde{A}_{k_2}(a))$ and $\vec{y} = (\tilde{A}_{k_1}(b), \ldots, \tilde{A}_{k_2}(b))$ conditioned not to intersect (including not to touch upper and lower boundaries $\tilde{A}_{k_{1-1}}$ and $\tilde{A}_{k_{2+1}}$).

Upon discovery, the Brownian Gibbs property has served as a powerful probabilistic tool. Recently, one of the authors of [CH14], developed a more delicate treatment in [Ham] for Brownian Gibbs resampling invariance to estimate the modulus of continuity for line ensembles with Brownian Gibbs property (e.g. the Airy line ensemble and the line ensemble associated with Brownian last
Figure 3. Airy line ensemble was first constructed through taking a functional limit of Brownian watermelon under the edge scaling. In the top left we have a Brownian watermelon $\mathcal{B} := \{B_1, \ldots, B_N\}$, a collection of $N$ Brownian bridges $B_i: [-N, N] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, B_i(-N) = B_i(N) = 0, 1 \leq i \leq N$, conditioned not to intersect. The edge scaling limit of this system is obtained by taking a weak limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ of the collection of curves scaled so that the point $(0, 2^{1/2}/N)$ is fixed and space is squeezed, horizontally by a factor of $N^{2/3}$ and vertically by $N^{1/3}$. Tightness under such edge scaling was established in [CH14] by extensively exploiting the Brownian Gibbs property of Brownian watermelon (which naturally holds by the construction of Brownian watermelon). Moreover, it is demonstrated in [CH14] that this Brownian Gibbs property survives under weak convergence of line ensembles, i.e. $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ enjoys the Brownian Gibbs property.

passage percolation). [Ham1] also established $L^p$-norm bounds (for finite $p > 0$) on Radon-Nikodym derivative of the line ensemble curves (with an affine shift) with respect to Brownian bridges and other refined regularity properties. Furthermore in the subsequent papers [Ham2, Ham3, Ham4], the work in [Ham1] was applied to understanding the geometry of last passage paths in Brownian last passage percolation with more general initial data. Another breakthrough is the construction of the directed landscape [DOV], the conjectural central limit of the KPZ universality class [CQR]. They discovered that the Airy sheet is already embedded in the Airy line ensemble and the Brownian Gibbs property is a key input of their estimates.

1.5. New resampling method for the KPZ line ensemble. Non-intersecting property for the parabolic Airy line ensemble $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is a nature of the zero-temperature models; however, the curves of KPZ line ensemble $\mathcal{H}^t$ may go out of order but subject to an exponential penalization. More precisely, the KPZ line ensemble enjoys the $\mathcal{H}$-Brownian Gibbs property with $\mathcal{H}(x) = e^x$ (see Definition 2.4), which is a more general type of Gibbs property compared to Brownian Gibbs property. The $\mathcal{H}$-Brownian Gibbs property for $\mathcal{H}^t$ is as well a spatial Markov property and it specifies the law of $\mathcal{H}^t$ inside a compact set $C := [k_1, k_2] \times [a, b]$ conditioned on the values of $\mathcal{H}^t$ outside $C$ such that the conditional law is equivalent to that of a few independent Brownian bridges reweighted by a penalization factor for being out order, see an illustration in Figure 4.

Most of the results about the Airy line ensemble, especially the quantitative ones, rely on the non-intersecting nature of those line ensembles. In contrast, the Gibbs property enjoyed by the
Curves may go out of order
• Top curve $\mathcal{H}_1$ is time $t$ solution to KPZ equation with narrow wedge initial condition.
• Stationary around parabola $-x^2/2t$.
• $\mathbf{H}$-Brownian Gibbs property.

Figure 4. An overview of KPZ$_t$ line ensemble $\mathcal{H}_t$ for fixed time $t$. Curves $\mathcal{H}_1^t(\cdot)$ through $\mathcal{H}_4^t(\cdot)$ are sampled. The lowest indexed curve $\mathcal{H}_1^t$ is distributed according to the time $t$ solution to KPZ equation with narrow wedge initial data. The dotted first two curves $\mathcal{H}_1^t$ and $\mathcal{H}_2^t$ between $a$ and $b$ indicate a possible resampling according to two independent Brownian bridges which subject to an exponential penalization for going out of order (Definition 2.4), as a demonstration for the $\mathbf{H}$-Brownian Gibbs property.

KPZ line ensemble is softer and allows curves to intersect with each other. When the curves stay in order, the Gibbs property tells us they behave like independent Brownian bridges. However, when some of the curves are (even slightly) out of order, the Boltzmann weight becomes extremely small and the line ensemble could potentially be very singular. This is the main difficulty to use Gibbs property to study the KPZ line ensemble and other Gibbs line ensembles allowing intersections. This paper is our first attempt to develop new resampling methods adapted to the intersecting nature of such line ensembles.

The main technical result in this paper is Proposition 3.1, which uniformly in $t$ bounds the normalizing constant (see (2.2)), when resampling multiple curves. A lower bound on the normalizing constant allows us to give a local fluctuation estimates in Theorem 1.3, and will be further exploited in [Wu21] to study the Brownian regularity for the KPZ line ensemble. This is a generalization of [CH16, Proposition 6.5], which uniformly (in $t$) bounds the normalizing constant when resampling only the top curve, which suffices for their applications therein.

The main difficulty dates back to estimating the Boltzmann weight when curves go out of order, in particular, when there are multiple curves interacting with their neighbors simultaneously. We consider a novel inductive two-step resampling procedure to force curves to stay in the preferable region, see more detailed discussions in Section 4 with an illustration in Figure 8 therein. The main inputs of our estimates are one-point tail bounds $\mathbf{CG1} \mathbf{CG2}$ of $\mathcal{H}^t_1$ (the top curve in scaled KPZ line ensemble) and stationarity of $\mathcal{H}^t$ around $-x^2/2t$. The main tools are $\mathbf{H}$-Brownian Gibbs property of $\mathcal{H}^t$ together with some fundamental properties of such Gibbsian line ensembles, e.g. stochastic monotonicity and strong Markov property, which are developed in [CH16].

1.6. Ideas of the proofs. In this section we would like to illustrate the argument structure and emphasize on the main technical estimate behind the proof of the local fluctuation estimates. For simplicity, we only consider the top layer $\mathcal{H}_1$ and do not keep track of the constant dependence. For $\varepsilon > 0, K > 0$, denote

$$\text{BigFluc} := \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq x < y \leq \varepsilon} |\mathcal{H}_1(x) - \mathcal{H}_1(y)| \geq K \sqrt{\varepsilon} \right\}$$

Denote $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as the law of the scaled KPZ line ensemble $\mathcal{H}$. We seek to show that for any $\varepsilon, K$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{BigFluc}) \leq e^{-O(1)K^{3/2}}.$$
We will use Gibbs resampling over the interval \([-1, 1]\), see an illustration in Figure 5. For now denote \( P_{\text{free}} \) as the measure of a Brownian bridge connecting \( H_1(-1) \) and \( H_1(1) \) and denote

\[
W := e^{-\left( \int_{-1}^{1} \exp(\delta_2(x) - \delta_1(x)) \, dx \right)}.
\]

Define a resampling measure \( P_{\text{re}} \) though the following Radon-Nikodym relation

\[
\frac{dP_{\text{re}}}{dP_{\text{free}}} (\delta_{1e}) := \frac{W(\delta_{1e})}{Z_{\text{bdd}}},
\]

where the normalizing constant \( Z_{\text{bdd}} = \mathbb{E}_{\text{free}}[W] \) only depends on \( H_1(\pm 1) \) and \( H_2(x), x \in [-1, 1] \), known as the boundary data.

The Gibbs property of \( H \) says that conditioning on the boundary data, the law of \( H_1 \) restricted on \([-1, 1]\) distributes according to \( P_{\text{re}} \). See detailed definitions in Section 2.4.

\[\text{Figure 5. The blue trajectory is resampled over } [-1, 1] \text{ according to the measure } P_{\text{re}} \text{ in (1.9). The law of } H \text{ is invariant under such resampling. We seek to control the local fluctuation of the resampled trajectory.}\]

Write \( P_{\delta}(\text{BigFluc}) = \int \mathbb{1}_{\text{BigFluc}}. \) By the Radon-Nikodym relation in (1.9), we have

\[
\int \mathbb{1}_{\text{BigFluc}} dP_{\delta} = \mathbb{E}_{\text{bdd}} \left[ \int \mathbb{1}_{\text{BigFluc}} \frac{W(\delta_{1e})}{Z_{\text{bdd}}} \, dP_{\text{free}}(\delta_{1e}) \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\text{bdd}} \left[ \frac{1}{Z_{\text{bdd}}} \int \mathbb{1}_{\text{BigFluc}} dP_{\text{free}}(L) \right].
\]

Here \( \mathbb{E}_{\text{bdd}} \) means taking expectation over all possible boundary data.

Let us emphasize that the the normalizing constant \( Z_{\delta_1(\ell), \delta_1(r), \delta_2} \) inherits randomness from the boundary data \( \delta_1(\ell), \delta_1(r), \delta_2 \). This causes one of the main difficulties towards understanding the marginal law of \( \delta_1 \) on \([0, 1]\). Intuitively, a quantitative control of \( Z_{\delta_1(\ell), \delta_1(r), \delta_2} \) will be very helpful for a quantitative comparison between the law of \( \delta_1 \) with respect to a Brownian bridge. Proposition 4.3 is the key technical estimate in this paper, where we obtain the following quantitative control on \( Z_{\text{bdd}} \). For any \( R > 0 \), we have

\[
P_{\delta} \left( Z_{\text{bdd}} < e^{-R^2} \right) < e^{-O(1)R^{3/2}}.
\]

Denote \( \text{GoodBoundary} := \{ Z_{\text{bdd}} \geq e^{-R^2} \} \), hence \( P_{\delta}(\neg \text{GoodBoundary}) \leq e^{-R^{3/2}}. \)

\[
P_{\delta}(\text{BigFluc}) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\text{bdd}} \left[ \mathbb{1}_{\text{GoodBoundary}} \cdot \frac{1}{Z_{\text{bdd}}} \int \mathbb{1}_{\text{BigFluc}} dP_{\text{free}} \right] + P_{\delta}(\neg \text{GoodBoundary})
\]

For Brownian bridges, we have \( \int \mathbb{1}_{\text{BigFluc}} dP_{\text{free}} \leq e^{-K^2} \). Therefore

\[
P_{\delta}(\text{BigFluc}) \leq e^{R^2} \int \mathbb{1}_{\text{BigFluc}} dP_{\text{free}} + e^{-R^{3/2}} \leq e^{R^2} \cdot e^{-K^2} + e^{-R^{3/2}} = e^{-O(1)K^{3/2}}
\]
Last inequality follows by taking $K = O(1)R$ for some large enough constant $O(1)$.

1.7. Three stages of exploiting Gibbs property towards the Brownian regularity of the scaled KPZ line ensemble $\mathcal{H}$. The Gibbs property provides a precise Radon-Nikodym description of the paths in $\mathcal{H}$ with respect to Brownian bridges, which immediately implies the absolute continuity of the paths in $\mathcal{H}$ (up to an affine shift) with respect to a standard Brownian bridge measure $\mathbb{P}_{BB}$. A natural question arises here.

**Question:** take an arbitrary event $A$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{BB}[A] = \varepsilon$. How comparable is $\mathbb{P}_H[A]$ with respect to $\varepsilon$? Notice that the computation for $\mathbb{P}(\text{BigFluc})$ in the previous section does not rely any specific events, hence the same argument will imply that for any event $A$

$$\mathbb{P}_H[A] \leq e^{R^2} \int 1_A d\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}} + e^{-R^3/2} = e^{R^2} \varepsilon + e^{-R^3/2}$$

Let $e^{-R^2} = \varepsilon^{1/2}$, then $e^{-R^3/2} = \exp(-\log(\varepsilon^{-1})^{3/4})$ and we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}_H[A] \leq \exp(-\log(\varepsilon^{-1})^{3/4}) = \varepsilon^{o(1)}.$$  

However it is expected that $\mathbb{P}_H[A]$ is of the order $\varepsilon^{1-o(1)}$, which implies the $L^p$ integrability of the Radon-Nikodym derivative for any $p > 0$ (known as $L^\infty$ regularity). This simple reasoning reveals the fact the current resampling method and estimate of the normalizing constant is not satisfying enough to obtain good comparison between the curves in $\mathcal{H}$ and Brownian bridges. This difficulty has been identified as the high jump difficulty in [Ham1]. We will further adapt the jump ensemble techniques developed therein to enhance the comparison between the curves in $\mathcal{H}$ and Brownian bridges.

We conclude this section with a brief comparison of the different stages of the resampling methods developed towards the $L^\infty$ regularity of the curves in the scaled KPZ line ensemble, see Figure 6. The first two stages are developed in this paper and the third stage will be developed in [Wu21], which builds on the first two stages. We take the one-point tail estimates in [CG1, Theorem 1.1] and [CG2, Theorem 1.11] as the inputs for the first stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Simple resampling</td>
<td>Uniform tail bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Inductive middle reconstruction</td>
<td>Local fluctuation, Tightness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>&quot;Soft&quot; jump ensemble</td>
<td>$L^\infty$ Brownian regularity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.** Overview of the resampling methods for $\mathcal{H}^t$ and corresponding applications. The inputs for the first stage are the one point tail estimates of the top layer $\mathcal{H}^1_t$ and stationarity of $\mathcal{H}^t$ around parabola $x^2/2$. Then the results of previous layers will serve as inputs for the next one. In the first stage, the resampling is straightforward and uniform tail estimates are established for each layer $\mathcal{H}^k_t$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In the second stage, we use an inductive middle reconstruction to separate curves to obtain quantitative control of the normalizing constant, developed in Section 4. A more delicate resampling technique, the soft jump ensemble, developed in [Wu21], is an adaption of the jump ensemble method developed in [Ham1] for non-intersecting line ensembles.
1.8. **Outline.** Section 2.1 contains various definitions necessary to describe Gibbsian line ensembles. Section 2.2 records lemmas about stochastic monotonicity and strong Markov property. Main results are stated in Section 1.3 and are proved in Section 3. The main technical results Proposition 3.1 is proved in Section 4. We also record basics estimates in Appendix A and deduce tail estimates for each layer in Appendix B.

1.9. **Notations.** We would like to explain some notation here. The natural numbers are defined to be \( \mathbb{N} = 1, 2, ..., \). Events are denoted in a special font \( \mathbb{E} \), their indicator function is written either as \( \mathbb{1}_E \) and their complement is written as \( \mathbb{E}^c \).

Universal constants will be generally denoted by \( C \) and constants depending only on \( k \) will be denoted as \( D(k) \). We label the ones in statements of theorems, lemmas and propositions with subscripts (e.g. \( D_1(k), D_2(k), ... \) based on their order of occurrence) but the constants in proofs may change value from line to line.

1.10. **Acknowledgment.** The author thanks Ivan Corwin for many helpful comments concerning a draft version of this paper. The author also extend many thanks to the three Minerva lectures that Alan Hammond has given at Columbia in Spring 2019 about Gibbsian resampling techniques and open questions about the KPZ line ensemble, including this one and the Brownian regularity project.

2. **KPZ line ensemble and \( \mathbf{H} \)-Brownian Gibbs property**

In this section we introduce the notion of \( \mathbf{H} \)-Brownian Gibbsian line ensembles. We first introduce the basic notions of line ensembles in Subsection 2.1 and then provide properties of such Gibbsian line ensembles.

2.1. **Line ensembles and the \( \mathbf{H} \)-Brownian Gibbs property.**

**Definition 2.1 (Line ensembles).** Let \( \Sigma \) be an interval of \( \mathbb{Z} \) and let \( \Lambda \) be a subset of \( \mathbb{R} \). Consider the set \( C(\Sigma \times \Lambda, \mathbb{R}) \) of continuous functions \( f : \Sigma \times \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) endowed with the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets of \( \Sigma \times \Lambda \), and let \( C(\Sigma \times \Lambda, \mathbb{R}) \) denote the sigma-field generated by Borel sets in \( C(\Sigma \times \Lambda, \mathbb{R}) \). A \( \Sigma \times \Lambda \)-indexed line ensemble \( \mathcal{L} \) is a random variable on a probability space \( (\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P}) \), taking values in \( C(\Sigma \times \Lambda, \mathbb{R}) \) such that \( \mathcal{L} \) is a measurable function from \( \mathcal{B} \) to \( C(\Sigma \times \Lambda, \mathbb{R}) \).

We think of such line ensembles as multi-layer random curves. For integers \( k_1 < k_2 \), let \( [k_1, k_2]_\mathbb{Z} := \{k_1, k_1 + 1, \ldots, k_2\} \). We will generally write \( \mathcal{L} : \Sigma \times \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) even though it is not \( \mathcal{L} \), but rather \( \mathcal{L}(\omega) \) for each \( \omega \in \Omega \) which is such a function. We will also sometimes specify a line ensemble by only giving its law without reference to the underlying probability space. We write \( \mathcal{L}_i(\cdot) := (\mathcal{L}(\omega))(i, \cdot) \) for the label \( i \in \Sigma \) curve of the ensemble \( \mathcal{L} \).

**Definition 2.2 (Convergence of line ensembles).** Given a \( \Sigma \times \Lambda \)-indexed line ensemble \( \mathcal{L} \) and a sequence of such ensembles \( \{\mathcal{L}^N\}_{N \geq 1} \), we will say that \( \mathcal{L}^N \) converges to \( \mathcal{L} \) weakly as a line ensemble if for all bounded continuous functions \( F : C(\Sigma \times \Lambda, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \), it holds that as \( N \rightarrow \infty \),

\[
\int F(\mathcal{L}^N(\omega))d\mathbb{P}^N(\omega) \rightarrow \int F(\mathcal{L}(\omega))d\mathbb{P}(\omega).
\]

This is equivalent to weak-* convergence in \( C(\Sigma \times \Lambda, \mathbb{R}) \) endowed with the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets of \( \Sigma \times \Lambda \).

We now start to formulate the \( \mathbf{H} \)-Brownian Gibbs property, a key property of KPZ line ensemble. We adopt the convention that all Brownian motions and bridges have diffusion parameter one.
Definition 2.3 (H-Brownian bridge 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 \( \vec{x}, \vec{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{k_2-k_1+1} \). A \([k_1, k_2]_{\mathbb{Z}} \times [a, b]-\text{indexed line ensemble} \) \( \mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{L}_{k_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_{k_2}) \) is called a free Brownian bridge line ensemble with entrance data \( \vec{x} \) and exit data \( \vec{y} \) if its law \( \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y}} \) is that of \( k_2-k_1+1 \) independent standard Brownian bridges starting at time \( a \) at the points \( \vec{x} \) and ending at time \( b \) at the points \( \vec{y} \).

A Hamiltonian \( H \) is defined to be a measurable function \( H : \mathbb{R} \to [0, \infty] \). Throughout, we will make use of the special Hamiltonian

\[
(2.1) \quad H_t(x) = e^{1/3}x.
\]

Given a Hamiltonian \( H \) and two measurable function \( f, g : (a, b) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm \infty\} \), we define the \( H \)-Brownian bridge line ensemble with entrance data \( \vec{x} \), exit data \( \vec{y} \) and boundary data \((f, g)\) to be a \([k_1, k_2]_{\mathbb{Z}} \times (a, b)-\text{indexed line ensemble} \) \( \mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{L}_{k_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_{k_2}) \) with law \( \mathbb{P}_{H}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y},f,g} \) given according to the following Radon-Nikodym derivative relation:

\[
\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{H}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y},f,g}}{d\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y}}}(\mathcal{L}) := \frac{W_{H}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y},f,g}(\mathcal{L})}{Z_{H}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y},f,g}}.
\]

Here we adopt conventions that \( \mathcal{L}_{k_1-1} = f \), \( \mathcal{L}_{k_2+1} = g \) and define the Boltzmann weight

\[
(2.2) \quad W_{H}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y},f,g}(\mathcal{L}) := \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=k_1-1}^{k_2} \int_{a}^{b} H \left( \mathcal{L}_{i+1}(u) - \mathcal{L}_{i}(u) \right) du \right\},
\]

and the normalizing constant

\[
(2.3) \quad Z_{H}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y},f,g} := \mathbb{E}_{\text{free}}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y}} \left[ W_{H}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y},f,g}(\mathcal{L}) \right].
\]

where \( \mathcal{L} \) in the above expectation is distributed according to the measure \( \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y}} \).

H-Brownian Gibbs property could be viewed as a spatial Markov property, more specifically, it provides a description of the conditional law inside a compact set.

Definition 2.4 (H-Brownian Gibbs property). A \( \Sigma \times \Lambda \)-indexed line ensemble \( \mathcal{L} \) satisfies the H-Brownian Gibbs property if for all \( K = \{k_1, \ldots, k_2\} \subset \Sigma \) and \((a, b) \subset \Lambda \), its conditional law inside \( K \) takes the following form,

\[
\text{Law} \left( \mathcal{L} \mid K \times (a,b) \right) \text{ conditional on } \mathcal{L} \mid (\Sigma \times \Lambda) \setminus (K \times (a,b)) = \mathbb{P}
\]

Here \( f := \mathcal{L}_{k_1-1} \) and \( g := \mathcal{L}_{k_2+1} \) with the convention that if \( k_1-1 \notin \Sigma \) then \( f \equiv +\infty \) and likewise if \( k_2+1 \notin \Sigma \) then \( g \equiv -\infty \); we have also set \( \vec{x} = (\mathcal{L}_{k_1}(a), \ldots, \mathcal{L}_{k_2}(a)) \) and \( \vec{y} = (\mathcal{L}_{k_1}(b), \ldots, \mathcal{L}_{k_2}(b)) \).

This following description of Gibbs property using conditional expectation is equivalent and is convenient for computations sometimes. For \( K \subset \mathbb{Z} \) and \( S \subset \mathbb{R} \), let \( C(K \times S, \mathbb{R}) \) be the space of continuous functions from \( K \times S \to \mathbb{R} \). Then a \( \Sigma \times \Lambda \)-indexed line ensemble \( \mathcal{L} \) enjoys the H-Brownian Gibbs property if and only if for any \( K = \{k_1, \ldots, k_2\} \subset \Sigma \) and \((a, b) \subset \Lambda \), and any Borel function \( F \) from \( C(K \times (a,b), \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R} \), \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost surely

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ F(\mathcal{L}_{k_1} \mid (a,b), \ldots, \mathcal{L}_{k_2} \mid (a,b)) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{H}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y},f,g} \left[ F(\mathcal{L}_{k_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_{k_2}) \right],
\]

where \( \vec{x}, \vec{y}, f \) and \( g \) are defined in the previous paragraph and where

\[
(2.4) \quad \mathcal{F}_{\text{ext}}(K \times (a,b)) := \sigma(\mathcal{L}_{i}(s) : (i, s) \in \Sigma \times \Lambda \setminus K \times (a,b))
\]

is the exterior sigma-field generated by the line ensemble outside \( K \times (a,b) \). On the left-hand side of the above equality \( \mathcal{L}_{k_1} \mid (a,b), \ldots, \mathcal{L}_{k_2} \mid (a,b) \) are the restriction to \((a, b)\) of curves distributed according to \( \mathbb{P} \), while on the right-hand side \( \mathcal{L}_{k_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_{k_2} \) are curves on \((a, b)\) distributed according to \( \mathbb{P}_{H}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y},f,g} \).
2.2. Strong Gibbs property and stochastic monotonicity. We record some important properties, developed in [CH10, Section 2], about $H$-Gibbsian line ensembles in this section. We begin with the strong Gibbs property, which enable us to resample the trajectory within a stopping domain as opposed to a deterministic interval.

**Definition 2.5.** Let $\Sigma$ be an interval of $\mathbb{Z}$, and $\Lambda$ be an interval of $\mathbb{R}$. Consider a $\Sigma \times \Lambda$-indexed line ensemble $L$ which has the $H$-Brownian Gibbs property for some Hamiltonian $H$.

For $K = \{k_1, \ldots, k_2\} \subseteq \Sigma$ and $(\ell, r) \subseteq \Lambda$, $F_{\text{ext}}(K \times (\ell, r))$ denotes the sigma field generated by the data outside $K \times (\ell, r)$. The random variable $(l, r)$ is called a $K$-stopping domain if for all $\ell < r$,

$$\{l \leq \ell, r \geq r\} \in F_{\text{ext}}(K \times (\ell, r)).$$

For $K = \{k_1, \ldots, k_2\} \subseteq \Sigma$, define

$$C^K := \{(l, r, f_{k_1}, \ldots, f_{k_2}) : \ell < r, (f_{k_1}, \ldots, f_{k_2}) \in C(K \times (\ell, r))\}.$$  

**Lemma 2.6.** Consider a $\Sigma \times \Lambda$-indexed line ensemble $L$ which has the $H$-Brownian Gibbs property. Fix $K = \{k_1, \ldots, k_2\} \subseteq \Sigma$. For all random variables $(l, r)$ which are $K$-stopping domains for $L$, the following strong $H$-Brownian Gibbs property holds: for all Borel functions $F : C^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely,

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbb{E}\left[F(l, r, L_{k_1}|_{(l,t)}, \ldots, L_{k_2}|_{(l,t)}) \big| F_{\text{ext}}(K \times (l, r))\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[F(a, b, L_{k_1}, \ldots, L_{k_2})\right],$$

where $a = l$, $b = r$, $\vec{x} = \{L_i(1)\}_{i=k_1}^{k_2}$, $\vec{y} = \{L_i(t)\}_{i=k_1}^{k_2}$, $f(\cdot) = L_{k_1-1}(\cdot)$ (or $\infty$ if $k_1 - 1 \notin \Sigma$), $g(\cdot) = L_{k_2+1}(\cdot)$ (or $-\infty$ if $k_2 + 1 \notin \Sigma$). On the left-hand side $L_{k_1}|_{(l,t)}, \ldots, L_{k_2}|_{(l,t)}$ is the restriction of curves distributed according to $\mathbb{P}$ and on the right-hand side $L_{k_1}, \ldots, L_{k_2}$ is distributed according to $\mathbb{P}$.

For a convex Hamiltonian $H$ (such as $H_t$), $H$-Brownian bridge line ensembles enjoy stochastic monotonicity.

**Lemma 2.7.** Fix $k_1 \leq k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a < b$, two vectors $\vec{x}, \vec{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{k_2-k_1+1}$ and two pairs of measurable functions $(f^{(i)}, g^{(i)})$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $f^{(i)} : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, $g^{(i)} : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ and for all $s \in (a, b)$, $f^{(1)}(s) \geq f^{(2)}(s)$ and $g^{(1)}(s) \geq g^{(2)}(s)$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $Q^{(i)} = \{Q_j^{(i)}\}_{j=k_1}^{k_2}$ be a $\{k_1, \ldots, k_2\} \times (a, b)$-indexed line ensemble on a probability space $(\Omega^{(i)}, \mathcal{B}^{(i)}, \mathbb{P}^{(i)})$ where $\mathbb{P}^{(i)}$ equals $\mathbb{P}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x},\vec{y},f^{(i)},g^{(i)}}$ (i.e. $Q^{(i)}$ has the $H$-Brownian Gibbs property with entrance data $\vec{x}$, exit data $\vec{y}$ and boundary data $(f^{(i)}, g^{(i)})$).

If the Hamiltonian $H : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is convex then there exists a coupling of the probability measures $\mathbb{P}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbb{P}^{(2)}$ such that almost surely $Q_j^{(1)}(s) \leq Q_j^{(2)}(s)$ for all $j \in \{k_1, \ldots, k_2\}$ and all $s \in (a, b)$.

**Lemma 2.8.** Fix $k_1 \leq k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a < b$ and two measurable functions $(f, g)$ such that $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, $g : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$. Consider two pairs of vectors $\vec{x}^{(i)}, \vec{y}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{k_2-k_1+1}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $x_j^{(1)} < x_j^{(2)}$ and $y_j^{(1)} < y_j^{(2)}$ for all $j = k_1, \ldots, k_2$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $Q^{(i)} = \{Q_j^{(i)}\}_{j=k_1}^{k_2}$ be a $\{k_1, \ldots, k_2\} \times (a, b)$-indexed line ensemble on a probability space $(\Omega^{(i)}, \mathcal{B}^{(i)}, \mathbb{P}^{(i)})$ where $\mathbb{P}^{(i)}$ equals $\mathbb{P}^{k_1,k_2,(a,b),\vec{x}^{(i)},\vec{y}^{(i)},f,g}$ (i.e. $Q^{(i)}$ has the $H$-Brownian Gibbs property with entrance data $\vec{x}^{(i)}$, exit data $\vec{y}^{(i)}$ and boundary data $(f, g)$).

If the Hamiltonian $H : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is convex then there exists a coupling of the probability measures $\mathbb{P}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbb{P}^{(2)}$ such that almost surely $Q_j^{(1)}(s) \leq Q_j^{(2)}(s)$ for all $j \in \{k_1, \ldots, k_2\}$ and all $s \in (a, b)$. 


3. Proof of main results

In this section we prove our main results Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4. The proofs rely heavily on Proposition 3.1 which provides a quantitative estimate on the normalization constant $Z$. We state Proposition 3.1 below and postpone the proof to next section.

**Proposition 3.1.** Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L \geq 1$. There exists a constant $D_1 := D_1(k)$ such that the following statement holds. For all $t \geq 1$ and $K \geq L^2$, we have

\[
\mathbb{P}\left( \sum_{i=1}^{k,(-L,L)} x_i y_i + \infty \right) < D_1^{-1} e^{-D_1 L^{-1} K^2} < e^{-K^{3/2}},
\]

where $\vec{x} = (\delta_i^k(-L))_{i=1}^k$ and $\vec{y} = (\delta_i^k(L))_{i=1}^k$.

**3.1. Proof of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4(i).** We begin with proving Theorem 1.3 and then deduce Corollary 3.2 which is applied in the proof of Theorem 1.4(i).

**Proof of Theorem 1.3** Fix $L = 1$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, e^{-1})$. We will exploit Gibbs resampling on $[1, k] \times [-1, 1]$. We start with controlling the boundary values $\delta_i^k(\pm 1)$. Let $D' = \max\{D_9, D_{10}\}$ with $D_9, D_{10}$ from Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2, set

\[
r := \left(D' \log \varepsilon^{-1} + D' \log(2D')\right)^{2/3}
\]

and denote

\[
E_1 := \left\{ \sup_{x \in [-1,1]} |\delta_i^k(x) + 2^{-1} x^2| < r \right\}.
\]

By the tail estimates in Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2, we have $\mathbb{P}(E_1^c) < \varepsilon$.

Recall the convention that $\vec{x} = (\delta_i^k(-L))_{i=1}^k$ and $\vec{y} = (\delta_i^k(L))_{i=1}^k$ and denote

\[
E_2 := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k,(-L,L)} x_i y_i + \infty \geq \delta \right\}
\]

Let $D_1$ be the constant in Proposition 3.1. Apply Proposition 3.1 with $L = 1$ and the right hand side being $\varepsilon \in (0, e^{-1}]$. It is easy to check that $\mathbb{P}(E_2^c) < \varepsilon$ by picking

\[
\delta := D_1^{-1} e^{-D_1 (\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{k/3}}.
\]

Let $B : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a free Brownian bridge with $B(\pm 1) = 0$ and write $\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}$ to represent the law of $B$. Let $C_0$ be the universal constant in Lemma A.2. For all $K \geq 0$ and all $d \in (0, 1]$,

\[
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}\left( \sup_{x,y \in [0,d]} |B(x) - B(y)| \geq K d^{1/2} \right) \leq C_0 e^{-C_0^{-1} K^2}.
\]

Define $K = K(\varepsilon)$ as

\[
K(\varepsilon) := \max\{2r, (8C_0 D_1)^{1/2} (\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{2/3}\}.
\]

Let

\[
\delta_i^k[-1,1](x) := \delta_i^k(x) - (2^{-1}(1-x)\delta_i^k(-1) + 2^{-1}(x-1)\delta_i^k(1)).
\]

Define the events

\[
G := \left\{ \sup_{x,y \in [0,d]} |\delta_i^k(x) - \delta_i^k(y)| \geq K d^{1/2} \right\}.
\]

\[
G' := \left\{ \sup_{x,y \in [0,d]} |\delta_i^k[-1,1](x) - \delta_i^k[-1,1](y)| \geq K d^{1/2} \right\}.
\]
Note that
\[ \sup_{x,y \in [0,d]} |\vec{\delta}_k^t(x) - \vec{\delta}_k^t(y)| \leq \sup_{x,y \in [0,d]} \left| \vec{\delta}_k^t([-1,1]) - \vec{\delta}_k^t([-1,1]) \right| + 2^{-1}d|\vec{\delta}_k^t(1) - \vec{\delta}_k^t(-1)|. \]
As \( E_1 \) occurs and \( d \leq 1 \), we have,
\[ 2^{-1}d|\vec{\delta}_k^t(1) - \vec{\delta}_k^t(-1)| \leq rd \leq rd^{1/2}. \]
As \( K \geq 2r \), we deduce that
\[ 2^{-1}d|\vec{\delta}_k^t(1) - \vec{\delta}_k^t(-1)| \leq 2^{-1}Kd^{1/2}. \]
Therefore we have \( G \cap E_1 \subset G' \cap E_1 \). Applying the Gibbs property (see Definition 2.4), we obtain that
\[ \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G} \cap E_1 \cap E_2) + \mathbb{P}(E_1^c) + \mathbb{P}(E_2^c) \leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}' \cap E_1 \cap E_2} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{G}' \cap \mathcal{F}_{\text{ext}}([1,k]) \times (-1,1)]] + \mathbb{P}(E_1^c) + \mathbb{P}(E_2^c) \leq \delta^{-1}C_0 e^{-4^{-1}K^2} + 2\varepsilon. \]
Recall definitions of \( \delta \) in (3.2) and \( K \) in (3.3), it is easily checked that \( \delta^{-1} \leq D_1 e^{-8^{-1}K^2} \). Moreover there exists \( D = D(k) \) such that \( K \leq D^{2/3} (\log e^{-1})^{2/3} \). Hence we obtain that
\[ \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}) \leq C_0 D_1 e^{-8^{-1}K^2} + 2\varepsilon \leq C_0 D_1 e^{-8^{-1}K^2} + 2e^{-D^{-1}K^{3/2}} \leq C_0 D_1 e^{-8^{-1}K^{3/2}} + 2e^{-D^{-1}K^{3/2}}. \]
Picking \( D_0(k) = 2 \max \{ C_0 D_1, 8C_0, D, 2 \} \), we have
\[ \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}) \leq \frac{1}{2} D_0 e^{-D_0^{-1}K^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{2} D_0 e^{-D_0^{-1}K^{3/2}} \leq D_0 e^{-D_0^{-1}K^{3/2}}. \]
The proof is finished. \( \square \)

**Corollary 3.2.** Fix \( k \in \mathbb{N}, L \geq 1 \) and \( d \in (0,1] \). There exists a constant \( D_2 := D_2(k) \) such that the following statement holds. Suppose that \( K \geq 4Ld^{1/2} \), then for all \( t \geq 1 \),
\[ \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [-L,L], |x-y| \leq d} |\vec{\delta}_k^t(x) - \vec{\delta}_k^t(y)| \geq Kd^{1/2} \right) \leq d^{-1} LD_2 e^{-D_2^{-1}K^{3/2}}. \]
Proof. Because

\[ \left\{ \sup_{x,y \in [-L,L], |x-y| \leq d} |\delta^j_k(x) - \delta^j_k(y)| \geq K d^{1/2} \right\} \subset \left\{ \sup_{x,y \in [-L,L], |x-y| \leq 2^{-1}d} |\delta^j_k(x) - \delta^j_k(y)| \geq 2^{-1} K d^{1/2} \right\} , \]

it suffices to prove the assertion for \( d \leq 2^{-1} \). From now on we assume \( d \in (0, 2^{-1}] \).

Let \( m = \lfloor d^{-1} L \rfloor \). For \( j \in [-m, m] \), define

\[ E_j := \left\{ |\delta^j_k(x) - \delta^j_k(y)| \geq K d^{1/2} \text{ for some } x, y \in [jd, (j+2)d] \right\} . \]

As

\[ \left\{ \sup_{x,y \in [-L,L], |x-y| \leq d} |\delta^j_k(x) - \delta^j_k(y)| \geq K d^{1/2} \right\} \subset \bigcup_{j=-m}^{m} E_j , \]

it suffices to show that there exists \( D_3 = D_3(k) \) such that \( \mathbb{P}(E_j) \leq \frac{1}{3} D_3 e^{-D_3^{-1} K^{3/2}} \).

Fix \( j \in [-m, m] \). By stationarity of \( \delta^j_k(x) + 2^{-1} x^2 \), \( \delta^j_k(x) \overset{(d)}{=} \delta^j_k(x-T) - T(x-T) - 2^{-1} T^2 \) as a process in \( x \) for any \( T \in \mathbb{R} \). Therefore,

\[ \mathbb{P}(E_j) = \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [0,2d]} |\delta^j_k(x) - \delta^j_k(y) - jd(x-y)| \geq K d^{1/2} \right) \]
\[ \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [0,2d]} |\delta^j_k(x) - \delta^j_k(y)| \geq K d^{1/2} - d(L+1) \right) \]
\[ \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [0,2d]} |\delta^j_k(x) - \delta^j_k(y)| \geq K d^{1/2} - 2dL \right) \]
\[ \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [0,2d]} |\delta^j_k(x) - \delta^j_k(y)| \geq 2^{-1} K d^{1/2} \right) . \]

We have used \( |jd(x-y)| \leq d(L+1) \), \( L \geq 1 \) and \( K \geq 4Ld^{1/2} \).

From Theorem \ref{thm:1.3} there exists \( D = D(k) \) such that for all \( j \in [-m, m] \), we have \( \mathbb{P}(E_j) \leq De^{-D^{-1} K^{3/2}} \). In conclusion,

\[ \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [-L,L], |x-y| \leq d} |\delta^j_k(x) - \delta^j_k(y)| \geq K d^{1/2} \right) \leq \sum_{j=-m}^{m} \mathbb{P}(E_j) \leq 3d^{-1} L De^{-D^{-1} K^{3/2}} . \]

The proof is finished by taking \( D_2 = 3D \). \qed

Proof of Theorem \ref{thm:1.4}(i). Let \( t_N \to \infty \) be an increasing sequence. Without loss of generality, we assume \( t_N \geq 1 \). Given \( \varepsilon > 0 \), we need to find a compact subset \( S \subset C(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \) (with respect to the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets in Definition \ref{def:2.1}) such that for all \( N \), we have

\[ \mathbb{P}(\delta^{t_N} \in S) \geq 1 - \varepsilon . \]
For \( i \in \mathbb{N} \), let \( r_i > 0 \) and \( d_{i,\ell} > 0 \) with \( \ell \in \mathbb{N} \) be positive numbers to be determined soon. Consider closed subsets of \( C(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \) as follows,

\[
S_{i,0} := \left\{ \sup_{1 \leq j \leq i} \left| \mathcal{L}_j(0) \right| \leq r_i \right\},
\]

\[
S_{i,\ell} := \left\{ \sup_{1 \leq j \leq i} \sup_{x,y \in [-i,0], |x-y| \leq d_{i,\ell}} \left| \mathcal{L}_j(x) - \mathcal{L}_j(y) \right| \leq \ell^{-1} \right\},
\]

\[
S_i := S_{i,0} \cap \bigcap_{\ell=1}^{\infty} S_{i,\ell}.
\]

It suffices to pick constants \( r_i \) and \( d_{i,\ell} \) such that for all \( t \geq 1 \), we have

\[
(3.4) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{\ell}^t \notin S_i) \leq 2^{-i} \varepsilon.
\]

We now explain how \( r_i \) and \( d_{i,\ell} \) are chosen, based on Propositions \[ \text{B.1} \] and \[ \text{B.2} \] and Corollary \[ \text{3.2} \]. Let \( D_9(k) \) and \( D_{10}(k) \) be the constants in Propositions \[ \text{B.1} \] and \[ \text{B.2} \]. Then Propositions \[ \text{B.1} \] and \[ \text{B.2} \] implies that for all \( t \geq 1 \) we have

\[
\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{\ell}^t \notin S_{i,0}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{i} \left( D_{10}(j)e^{-D_{10}(j)^{-1}r_i^{-3/2}} + D_9(j)e^{-D_9(j)^{-1}r_i^{-3/2}} \right).
\]

Similarly, let \( D_2(k) \) be the constant in Corollary \[ \text{3.2} \]. Then for all \( t \geq 1 \) we have

\[
\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{\ell}^t \notin S_{i,\ell}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{i} id_{i,\ell}^{-1} D_2(j)e^{-D_2(j)^{-1}d_{i,\ell}^{-3/2}}
\]

provided \( \ell^{-1}d_{i,\ell}^{-1/2} \geq 4id_{i,\ell}^{1/2} \). By choosing \( r_i \) large enough and \( d_{i,\ell} \) small enough, we have \( \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{\ell}^t \notin S_{i,0}) \leq 2^{-i-1} \varepsilon \) and \( \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{\ell}^t \notin S_{i,\ell}) \leq 2^{-i-\ell-1} \varepsilon \). Then \( (3.4) \) follows.

Let \( S := \cap_{i=1}^{\infty} S_i \). From the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem and a diagonal argument, any sequence in \( S \) has a convergent subsequence. Together with the closedness of \( S \), \( S \) is sequentially compact. Because the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets on \( C(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \) is metrizable, \( S \) is a compact subset of \( C(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \). Furthermore, \( (3.4) \) implies \( \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{\ell}^t \in S) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \) for all \( t \geq 1 \). The proof is finished. \( \square \)

3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.4(ii). The purpose of this section is to show any subsequential limit of \( \mathbf{\ell}^t \) is non-intersecting and satisfies the Brownian Gibbs property, as enjoyed by the parabolic Airy line ensemble. We start by showing that \( \mathbf{\ell}^t \) is asymptotically strictly ordered.

**Proposition 3.3.** For any \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1] \), there exist \( \rho = \rho(\varepsilon, k) > 0 \) and \( t_0 = t_0(\varepsilon, k) \geq 1 \) such that for all \( t \geq t_0 \)

\[
\mathbb{P}\left( \inf_{x \in [-1,1]} (\mathbf{\ell}^t_k(x) - \mathbf{\ell}^t_{k+1}(x)) < \rho \right) \leq \varepsilon.
\]

**Proof.** For any \( \rho, d > 0 \) consider the events

\[
D_1 := \left\{ \inf_{x \in [-1,1]} (\mathbf{\ell}^t_k(x) - \mathbf{\ell}^t_{k+1}(x)) \in (-\rho, \rho) \right\},
\]

\[
D_2 := \left\{ \inf_{x \in [-1,1]} (\mathbf{\ell}^t_k(x) - \mathbf{\ell}^t_{k+1}(x)) \leq -\rho \right\}.
\]
and
\[ D_3 := \left\{ \sup_{x,y \in [-1,1], |x-y| \leq d} |(\delta^i_k(x) - \delta^i_{k+1}(x)) - (\delta^j_k(y) - \delta^j_{k+1}(y))| < 2^{-1}\rho \right\}. \]

For two positive numbers \( M \) and \( \delta \) to be determined soon, define the event
\[ G := \left\{ Z_{H_t}^{1,k+1,(-1,1),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,\delta_{k+2}} \geq \delta \right\} \cap \left\{ |\delta^i_k(\pm 1)|, |\delta^j_{k+1}(\pm 1)| \leq M \right\}, \]
with \( \bar{x} = (\delta^i_j(-1))_{j=1}^{k+1}, \bar{y} = (\delta^j_j(1))_{j=1}^{k+1} \). By Proposition 3.1, Proposition B.1 and Proposition B.2 there exist \( \delta \) and \( M \), depending only on \( \epsilon \) and \( k \) such that \( \mathbb{P}(G) \geq 1 - \epsilon \).

**Claim 3.4.** There exists \( \rho > 0 \), depending only on \( \epsilon \delta \) and \( M \), such that
\[ 1_G \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}[1,k+1,(-1,1),\bar{x},\bar{y}(D_1)] < \epsilon \delta \cdot 1_G. \]

*Proof.* Under the law of \( \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}[1,k+1,(-1,1),\bar{x},\bar{y}] \), \( 2^{-1}(B_k(2x-1) - B_{k+1}(2x-1)) \) is a standard Brownian bridge defined on \([0,1]\) and has boundary values \( 2^{-1}(\delta^i_k(-1) - \delta^i_{k+1}(-1)) =: 2^{-1}a \) and \( 2^{-1}(\delta^j_k(1) - \delta^j_{k+1}(1)) =: 2^{-1}b \). From Lemma A.1 we have
\[ \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}[1,k+1,(-1,1),\bar{x},\bar{y}](D_1) = e^{-2^{-1}(a-\rho_+)(b-\rho_+)} - e^{-2^{-1}(a-\rho_-)(b-\rho_-)}. \]
Here \( \rho_+ = \min\{\rho, \rho_+, \rho_-\} \) and \( \rho_- = \min\{-\rho, \rho_-, \rho_\} \). \( G \) implies \( a, b \in [-2M, 2M] \). Therefore for \( \rho > 0 \) small enough depending on \( \delta \epsilon \) and \( M \), we have
\[ 1_G \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}[1,k+1,(-1,1),\bar{x},\bar{y}](D_1) < \epsilon \delta \cdot 1_G. \]
\[ \square \]

From now on we fix such \( \rho > 0 \). Applying the Gibbs Property, we deduce
\[ \mathbb{P}(D_1 \cap G) = \mathbb{E}[1_G \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_{\text{ext}}([1, k + 1]_Z \times (-1, 1))]] \]
\[ = \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_G \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\text{free}}[1,k+1,(-1,1),\bar{x},\bar{y},\delta_i \theta_{k+2} \mathcal{D}_1] \right] \]
\[ \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_G \cdot \delta^{-1} \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}[1,k+1,(-1,1),\bar{x},\bar{y}](D_1) \right] \leq \epsilon. \]

**Claim 3.5.** There exists \( d \in (0,1] \), depending only on \( \epsilon \delta \) and \( M \), such that
\[ 1_G \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}[1,k+1,(-1,1),\bar{x},\bar{y}](D_3) < \epsilon \delta \cdot 1_G. \]

*Proof.* Under the law of \( \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}[1,k+1,(-1,1),\bar{x},\bar{y}] \), \( 2^{-1/2}(B_k(x) - B_{k+1}(x)) \) is a standard Brownian bridge defined on \([-1,1]\) and has boundary values \( 2^{-1/2}(\delta^i_k(-1) - \delta^i_{k+1}(-1)) =: 2^{-1/2}a \) and \( 2^{-1/2}(\delta^j_k(1) - \delta^j_{k+1}(1)) =: 2^{-1/2}b \). \[ \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}[1,k+1,(-1,1),\bar{x},\bar{y}](D_3) \]
\[ = \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}[1,(-1,1),2^{-1/2}a,2^{-1/2}b] \left( \sup_{x,y \in [-1,1], |x-y| \leq d} |B(x) - B(y)| \geq 2^{-3/2}\rho \right). \]
\[ \leq \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}[1,(-1,1),0,0] \left( \sup_{x,y \in [-1,1], |x-y| \leq d} |B(x) - B(y)| \geq 2^{-3/2}\rho - 2^{-3/2}\rho b \right). \]
As $G$ occurs, $|b - a| \leq 4M$. Hence by taking $d \leq 8^{-1} \rho M$,

$$1_G \cdot P_{\text{free}}^{1,k+1,(-1,1),\vec{x},\vec{y}}(D_3)$$

$$\leq 1_G \cdot P_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(-1,1),0,0,0} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [-1,1], |x-y| \leq d} |B(x) - B(y)| \geq 2^{-3/2} |B(0) - B(1)| \right)$$

$$\leq 1_G \cdot P_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(-1,1),0,0,0} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [-1,1], |x-y| \leq d} |B(x) - B(y)| \geq 2^{-3/2} (\rho - 4dM) \right)$$

$$\leq 1_G \cdot P_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(-1,1),0,0,0} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [-1,1], |x-y| \leq d} |B(x) - B(y)| \geq 2^{-5/2} \right).$$

Applying Lemma A.2, we conclude that for $d$ small enough,

$$1_G \cdot P_{\text{free}}^{1,k+1,(-1,1),\vec{x},\vec{y}}(D_3) \leq 1_G \cdot C e^{-C^{-1}d^{-1}\rho^2} \leq 1_G \cdot \varepsilon.$$

□

From now on we fix such $d$. Applying the Gibbs Property, we deduce

$$P(D_3^c \cap G) = E[1_G \cdot E[1_{D_3} | F_{\text{ext}}([1, k + 1] \times (-1, 1))]]$$

$$= E \left[ 1_G \cdot \frac{E_{\text{free}}^{1,k+1,(-1,1),\vec{x},\vec{y}}[1_{D_3} \cdot W_{H_t}^{1,k+1,(-1,1),\vec{x},\vec{y},+\infty,\delta_{k+2}^t}]}{Z_{H_t}^{1,k+1,(-1,1),\vec{x},\vec{y},+\infty,\delta_{k+2}^t}} \right]$$

$$\leq E \left[ 1_G \cdot \delta^{-1} P_{\text{free}}^{1,k+1,(-1,1),\vec{x},\vec{y}}(D_3^c) \right] \leq \varepsilon.$$

As $D_2 \cap D_3$ occurs, there exists an interval of $[-1, 1]$ with length $d$ in which $B_1(x) - B_2(x) \leq 2^{-1} \rho$. As a consequence

$$W_{H_t}^{1,k+1,(-1,1),\vec{x},\vec{y},+\infty,\delta_{k+2}^t} \cdot 1_{D_2 \cap D_3} \leq \exp \left( -de^{-2^{-1}\rho t^{1/3}} \right) \cdot 1_{D_2 \cap D_3}.$$ 

Now we can take $t$ large such that $\exp \left( -de^{-2^{-1}\rho t^{1/3}} \right) \leq \varepsilon\delta$. Applying the Gibbs Property, we deduce

$$P(D_2 \cap D_3 \cap G) = E[1_G \cdot E[1_{D_2 \cap D_3} | F_{\text{ext}}([1, k + 1] \times (-1, 1))]]$$

$$= E \left[ 1_G \cdot \frac{E_{\text{free}}^{1,k+1,(-1,1),\vec{x},\vec{y}}[1_{D_2 \cap D_3} \cdot W_{H_t}^{1,k+1,(-1,1),\vec{x},\vec{y},+\infty,\delta_{k+2}^t}]}{Z_{H_t}^{1,k+1,(-1,1),\vec{x},\vec{y},+\infty,\delta_{k+2}^t}} \right]$$

$$\leq E \left[ 1_G \cdot \varepsilon \right] \leq \varepsilon.$$

In conclusion, we obtain

$$P(D_1 \cup D_2) \leq P((D_1 \cup D_2) \cap G) + P(G^c)$$

$$\leq P(D_1 \cap G) + P(D_2 \cap D_3 \cap G) + P(D_3^c \cap G) + P(G^c)$$

$$\leq 4\varepsilon.$$

The proof is finished. □

From the stationarity of $\delta^t(x) + 2^{-1}x^2$, we immediately obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.6. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$. Let $\rho = \rho(\varepsilon, k)$ and $t_0 = t_0(\varepsilon, k) \geq 1$ be the constants in Proposition 3.3. Then for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$P \left( \inf_{x \in [x_0, x_0 + 2]} (\delta^t_k(x) - \delta^t_{k+1}(x)) < \rho \right) < \varepsilon.$$
and $H$ and $H$ and $H$ indexed line ensembles, see Definition 2.2. Recall the interaction Hamiltonian is

\[
H \quad \text{for simplicity, we denote}\]

\[H \rightarrow H \quad \text{as used in [CH16, proof of Proposition 5.2]. We also take care of the issue that the interaction Hamiltonian varies in $t$ ensembles in Proposition 3.7. We adopt a coupling argument as used in [CH16, Theorem 1.14(ii)] now immediately follows from Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.7.}

**Proposition 3.7.** Any subsequential limit of $H^t$ satisfies the Brownian Gibbs property.

**Proof.** Let $t_N \rightarrow \infty$ be an increasing sequence such that $H^t_N$ converges weakly to $H^t_{\infty}$ as $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}$-indexed line ensembles, see Definition 2.2. Recall the interaction Hamiltonian is $H_t(x) = e^{t/\beta}$. For simplicity, we denote $H^N = H^t_N$ and $H_N = H^\omega_N$.

Fix an index $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and two numbers $a < b$. We will show that the law of $H^\infty$ is unchanged when one resamples the trajectory of $H^\infty_i$ between $a$ and $b$ according a Brownian bridge which avoids $H^\infty_{i-1}$ and $H^\infty_{i+1}$. The argument can be easily generalized to take care of multiple curves resampling so we choose to illustrate the argument with the single curve resampling, see Figure 7 for an illustration. Note that the Brownian Gibbs property is equivalent to this resampling invariance, hence finishing the proof.

Note that $C(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ (with the topology in Definition 2.1) is separable due to the Stone–Weierstrass theorem. Hence the Skorohod representation theorem [Bil, Theorem 6.7] applies. There exists a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P})$ on which $H^N$ for $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ are defined and almost surely $H^N(\omega) \rightarrow H^\infty(\omega)$ in the topology of $C(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$.

Let $\{B^\ell\}_{\ell \geq 1}$ be a sequence of independent Brownian bridges defined on $[a, b]$ with $B^\ell(a) = B^\ell(b) = 0$. Let $\{U_\ell\}_{\ell \geq 1}$ be a sequence of independent uniform distributions on $[0, 1]$. We augment the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P})$ to accommodate all of $\{B^\ell\}_{\ell \geq 1}$ and $\{U_\ell\}_{\ell \geq 1}$ in an independent manner.

**Step one**, we define the $\ell$-th candidate of the resampling trajectory. For $x \in [a, b]$, define

\[
H^N_i(x) := H^N_i(a) + B^\ell(x) + \frac{x-a}{b-a} \cdot (H^N_i(b) - H^N_i(a)),
\]

and $H^\infty_i(x) := H^\infty_i(x)$ for $x \in (-\infty, a) \cap (b, \infty)$. Similarly,

\[
H^\infty_i(x) := H^\infty_i(a) + B^\ell(x) + \frac{b-a}{a-b} \cdot (H^\infty_i(b) - H^\infty_i(a)),
\]

and $H^\infty_i(x) := H^\infty_i(x)$ for $x \in (-\infty, a) \cap (b, \infty)$.

**Step two**, we check whether

\[
U_\ell \leq W(N, \ell) := W_{H^N_{i,i}(a, b), H^N_i(a), H^N_i(b), H^N_{i-1}, H^N_{i+1}}(H^N_i, \ell),
\]

**Figure 7.** (1) is equivalent to the Brownian Gibbs property when resampling a single curve. The **goal** is to prove (1)', which implies the Brownian Gibbs property for the subsequential limit line ensemble. (1)' follows from the convergence in (2) and (2)'. (2) follows from the Skorohod representation theorem and (2)' is proved in Lemma 3.9 and Lemma 3.10.
We have similarly, we accept the candidate resampling $\mathcal{S}_i^{N,\ell}$ if this event occurs. Similarly, we accept the candidate resampling $\mathcal{S}_i^{\infty,\ell}$ if it does not intersect $\mathcal{S}_i^{\infty}\cup\mathcal{S}_i^{\infty}$ in $[a,b]$. For $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, define $\ell(N)$ to be the minimal value of $\ell$ of which we accept $\mathcal{S}_i^{N,\ell}$. Write $\mathcal{S}_i^{N,\ell}$ for the line ensemble with the $i$-th curve replaced by $\mathcal{S}_i^{N,\ell}(N)$. The line ensemble $\mathcal{S}_i^{N,\ell}$ satisfies the $\mathbf{H}_N$-Brownian Gibbs property on $\{i\} \times [a,b]$. More precisely, we have the following.

**Claim 3.8.** Let $\mathcal{F}_N^{i,\ell}(\{i\} \times (a,b))$ be the $\sigma$-algebra generated by $\mathcal{S}_i^{N}$ restricted on $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} \setminus \{i\} \times (a,b)$. Then for any Borel function $F : C(\{i\} \times [a,b]) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[F(\mathcal{S}_i^{N,\ell}|_{\{a,b\}}, \mathcal{F}_N^{i,\ell}(\{i\} \times (a,b))\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{H}_N}^{i,i,(a,b),\mathcal{S}_i^{N}(a),\mathcal{S}_i^{N}(b),\mathcal{S}_i^{N}(L)}\mathcal{F}_N^{i,\ell}(\mathcal{L}).
$$

**Proof.**

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[F(\mathcal{S}_i^{N,\ell}|_{\{a,b\}}), \mathcal{F}_N^{i,\ell}(\{i\} \times (a,b))\right] = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[F(\mathcal{S}_i^{N,\ell}|_{\{a,b\}}) \cdot 1\{\ell = \ell(N)\}, \mathcal{F}_N^{i,\ell}(\{i\} \times (a,b))\right].
$$

Because $B^j$ and $U_j$ are independent and

$$
\{\ell = \ell(N)\} = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \{W(N,j) < U_j\} \cap \{W(N,\ell) \geq U_\ell\},
$$

we have

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[F(\mathcal{S}_i^{N,\ell}|_{\{a,b\}}) \cdot 1\{\ell = \ell(N)\}, \mathcal{F}_N^{i,\ell}(\{i\} \times (a,b))\right] = \prod_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \mathbb{E}\left[1\{W(N,j) < U_j\}, \mathcal{F}_N^{i,\ell}(\{i\} \times (a,b))\right]
\times \mathbb{E}\left[F(\mathcal{S}_i^{N,\ell}|_{\{a,b\}}) \cdot 1\{W(N,\ell) \geq U_\ell\}, \mathcal{F}_N^{i,\ell}(\{i\} \times (a,b))\right].
$$

From the definition of $B^i, U_j, S_i^{N,\ell}$ and $W(N, j)$, we have

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[1\{W(N,j) < U_j\}, \mathcal{F}_N^{i,\ell}(\{i\} \times (a,b))\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[1 - W(N,j), \mathcal{F}_N^{i,\ell}(\{i\} \times (a,b))\right]
= 1 - Z_{\mathbf{H}_N}^{i,i,(a,b),\mathcal{S}_i^{N}(a),\mathcal{S}_i^{N}(b),\mathcal{S}_i^{N}(\mathcal{L})}.
$$

Similarly,

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[F(\mathcal{S}_i^{N,\ell}|_{\{a,b\}}) \cdot 1\{W(N,\ell) \geq U_\ell\}, \mathcal{F}_N^{i,\ell}(\{i\} \times (a,b))\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[F(\mathcal{S}_i^{N,\ell}|_{\{a,b\}}) \cdot W(N,\ell), \mathcal{F}_N^{i,\ell}(\{i\} \times (a,b))\right]
= \mathbb{E}_{\text{free}}^{i,i,(a,b),\mathcal{S}_i^{N}(a),\mathcal{S}_i^{N}(b)}\left[F(\mathcal{L}) \cdot W_{\text{free}}^{i,i,(a,b),\mathcal{S}_i^{N}(a),\mathcal{S}_i^{N}(b),\mathcal{S}_i^{N}(\mathcal{L})} \mathcal{F}_N^{i,\ell}(\mathcal{L})\right].
$$
As a result,

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ F(\mathcal{Y}^{N,re}_{i}|(a,b)) \mid \mathcal{F}^{N}_{ext}(\{i\} \times (a,b)) \right] \\
= \mathbb{E}_{\text{free}}^{i,i,(a,b),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i}((a),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i+1}((b)) \left[ F(\mathcal{L}) \cdot W_{\mathcal{H}_N}^{i,i,(a,b),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i}((a),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i+1}((b)),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i-1},\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i+1+1}(\mathcal{L})) \right] \\
\times \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - Z_{\mathcal{H}_N}^{i,i,(a,b),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i}((a),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i+1}((b)),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i-1},\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i+1+1}) \right)^{\ell-1} \\
= \mathbb{E}_{\text{free}}^{i,i,(a,b),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i}((a),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i+1}((b)) = \frac{F(\mathcal{L}) \cdot W_{\mathcal{H}_N}^{i,i,(a,b),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i}((a),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i+1}((b)),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i-1},\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i+1+1}(\mathcal{L}))} {Z_{\mathcal{H}_N}^{i,i,(a,b),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i}((a),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i+1}((b)),\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i-1},\mathcal{Y}^{N}_{i+1+1}) \left[ F(\mathcal{L}) \right]}. \\
\]

\[\boxdot\]

By Claim 3.8, the H_{\ell}-Brownian Gibbs property implies that for N \in \mathbb{N},

(3.5) \quad \mathcal{Y}^{N,re} \overset{(d)}{=} \mathcal{Y}^{N}.

Furthermore, (3.5) holds for all i \in \mathbb{N} and a < b implies that \mathcal{Y}^{N} satisfies H_{N}-Brownian Gibbs property provided only one line is resampled. Our goal is to show that (3.5) holds for N = \infty. As a result, \mathcal{Y}^{\infty} satisfies the Brownian Gibbs property when resampling a single curve.

It suffices to show that almost surely \ell(\infty) is finite and that almost surely \ell(N) converges to \ell(\infty). Suppose these two hold, then \mathcal{Y}^{N,re} converges to \mathcal{Y}^{\infty,re} in C(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) almost surely. Hence we have \mathcal{Y}^{N,re} converges weakly to \mathcal{Y}^{\infty,re} as \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}-indexed line ensembles. See Definition 2.2. As a consequence, \mathcal{Y}^{\infty,re} has the same distribution as \mathcal{Y}^{\infty}.

Lemma 3.9. Almost surely \ell(\infty) is finite.

Proof. Let \mathcal{F}^{\infty}_{ext}(\{i\} \times (a,b)) be the \sigma-algebra generated by \mathcal{Y}^{\infty} restricted on \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} \setminus \{i\} \times (a,b). Then

\[
\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\ell(\infty) \geq \ell\} \mid \mathcal{F}^{\infty}_{ext}(\{i\} \times (a,b)))] = \left( 1 - Z^{i,i,(a,b),\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i}((a),\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i+1}((b)),\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i-1},\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i+1+1})(\mathcal{L}(x) < \mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i+1}(x) in [a,b]) \right)^{\ell-1}.
\]

Here

\[
Z^{i,i,(a,b),\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i}((a),\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i+1}((b)),\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i-1},\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i+1+1})} = \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{i,i,(a,b),\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i}((a),\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i+1}((b)),\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i-1},\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i+1+1})} \{\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i-1}(x) < \mathcal{L}(x) < \mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i+1}(x) in [a,b]\}.
\]

Define the event

\[
S := \{\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i-1}(x) < \mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i+1}(x) in [a,b]\} \cap \{\mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i-1}(x) < \mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i+1}(x) for x \in \{a,b\}\}.
\]

As S occurs, \mathbb{P}(\{\ell(\infty) = \infty\}) = \mathbb{P}(\{\ell(\infty) = \infty\} \cap S) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_S \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\ell(\infty) = \infty\} \mid \mathcal{F}^{\infty}_{ext}(\{i\} \times (a,b)))] = 0.

Lemma 3.10. Almost surely \ell(N) converges to \ell(\infty).

Proof. Let E be the event such that the following five conditions hold

(1) \ell(\infty) < \infty
(2) U_\ell \in (0,1) for all \ell \in \mathbb{N}
(3) \sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathcal{Y}^{\infty,\ell}_{i}(x) - \mathcal{Y}^{\infty}_{i-1}(x) \neq 0 for all \ell \in \mathbb{N}
As a consequence, \( \ell \) is large enough.

Hence \( \ell \) is large enough.

By the definition of \( \ell(\infty) \) and \( E \), there exists a \( \delta > 0 \) such that

\[
\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathcal{H}_i^{\infty, \ell(\infty)}(x) - \mathcal{H}_{i-1}^{\infty, \ell(\infty)}(x) \leq -2\delta < 0,
\]

\[
\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathcal{H}_{i+1}^{\infty}(x) - \mathcal{H}_i^{\infty, \ell(\infty)}(x) \leq -2\delta < 0.
\]

Moreover, since \( \mathcal{H}^N \) converges uniformly to \( \mathcal{H}^{\infty} \) on \([1, i + 1] \times [a, b] \), we have for \( N \) large enough,

\[
\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathcal{H}_i^{N, \ell(\infty)}(x) - \mathcal{H}_{i-1}^{N, \ell(\infty)}(x) \leq -\delta < 0,
\]

\[
\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathcal{H}_{i+1}^{N}(x) - \mathcal{H}_i^{N, \ell(\infty)}(x) \leq -\delta < 0.
\]

As a consequence,

\[
W(N, \ell(\infty)) \geq \exp(-2(b - a)e^{-l(\infty)N^{1/3}}\delta)
\]

which converges to 1. Because \( U_{\ell(\infty)} < 1 \), we have \( W(N, \ell(\infty)) > U_{\ell(\infty)} \) for \( N \) large enough. Hence

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \sup N(\ell) \leq \ell(\infty).
\]

On the other hand, for all \( 1 \leq \ell < \ell(\infty) \), we have either

\[
\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathcal{H}_i^{\infty, \ell}(x) - \mathcal{H}_{i-1}^{\infty}(x) > 0
\]

or

\[
\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathcal{H}_{i+1}^{\infty}(x) - \mathcal{H}_i^{\infty, \ell}(x) > 0.
\]

We assume that \( \sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathcal{H}_i^{\infty, \ell}(x) - \mathcal{H}_{i-1}^{\infty}(x) > 0 \) occurs and denote \( 4\delta = \sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathcal{H}_i^{\infty, \ell}(x) - \mathcal{H}_{i-1}^{\infty}(x) \).

By the continuity of \( \mathcal{H}_i^{\infty, \ell}(x) - \mathcal{H}_{i-1}^{\infty}(x) \), there exists an interval \( I \subset [a, b] \) such that \( \inf_{x \in I} \mathcal{H}_i^{\infty, \ell}(x) - \mathcal{H}_{i-1}^{\infty}(x) \geq 2\delta \). Because \( \mathcal{H}^N \) converges uniformly to \( \mathcal{H}^{\infty} \) on \([1, i + 1] \times [a, b] \), we have for \( N \) large enough,

\[
\inf_{x \in I} \mathcal{H}_i^{\infty, \ell}(x) - \mathcal{H}_{i-1}^{\infty}(x) \geq \delta.
\]

As a consequence,

\[
W(N, \ell) \leq \exp(-|I|e^{-l(\infty)N^{1/3}}\delta)
\]

which converges to 0. Because \( U_{\ell} > 0 \), we obtain that for \( N \) large enough,

\[
W(N, \ell) < U_{\ell}.
\]

Since the above argument holds for all \( 1 \leq \ell < \ell(\infty) \), we deduce

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \inf \ell(N) \geq \ell(\infty).
\]

Hence \( \ell(N) \) converges to \( \ell(\infty) \) and the proof is finished. \( \Box \)
4. Proof of Proposition 3.1

In this section we seek to prove a quantitative estimate, Proposition 3.1, on the normalizing constant

\[ Z_{H_k}^{1,k; (\ell_1, r_1), \bar{x}, \bar{y}, +\infty, f_k+1} \]

when resampling multiple curves. Proposition 3.1 is the main technical result of this paper and will be further exploited in [Wu21] to study the Brownian regularity for the KPZ line ensemble. This is a generalization of [CH16, Proposition 6.5], which uniformly (in \( t \)) bounds the normalizing constant when resampling only the top curve, which suffices for their applications therein.

The main difficulty dates back to estimating the Boltzmann weight when curves go out of order, in particular, when there are multiple curves interacting with their neighbors simultaneously. We consider a novel inductive two-step resampling procedure / inductive middle reconstruction, which first raises the curves one by one starting from the lowest index curve and then lowers them in a reversed order. In doing so, we force curves to stay in the preferable region, see an illustration in Figure 8. More precisely, we establish an estimate on the probability of curves being well-separated in Proposition 4.1, which enables us to estimate the Boltzmann weight and furthermore provide a positive lower bound of the normalizing constant in Corollary 4.2. We then adopt an idea in [CH16, Proposition 6.5] to upgrade the lower bound in Proposition 4.3.

We begin with setting some parameters. Fix \( k \in \mathbb{N}, L \geq 1, t \geq 1 \) and take

\[ M \geq L^{1/2}. \]
For $1 \leq j \leq k+1$, let
\[ \ell_j := -(k+2-j)L, \quad r_j := (k+2-j)L. \]

We refer to the following boundary conditions as $M$-**Good** boundary conditions.

- For each $1 \leq j \leq k$, $f_j \in C([\ell_j, \ell_j] \cup [r_j, r_1], \mathbb{R})$ with $|f_j| \leq M$
- $f_{k+1} \in C([\ell_1, r_1], \mathbb{R})$ with $|f_{k+1}| \leq M$.

We will consider line ensembles defined on $\bigcup_{j=1}^{k} \{j\} \times [\ell_j, r_j]$. Given curves
\[ \mathcal{L} \in C \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} \{j\} \times [\ell_j, r_j], \mathbb{R} \right), \]
for later national convenience we extend the domain of each layer $\mathcal{L}_j$ to $[\ell_1, r_1]$ by denoting that
\[
\mathcal{L}_{j,f}(x) := \begin{cases} 
\mathcal{L}_j(x) & x \in [\ell_j, r_j], \\
 f_j(x) & x \in [\ell_j, \ell_j] \cup (r_j, r_1].
\end{cases}
\]

Note that $\mathcal{L}_f \in C([1, k] \times [\ell_1, r_1], \mathbb{R})$ is a $k$-curve line ensemble with entrance and exit data $\mathcal{L}_j(\ell_j) = f_j(\ell_j)$ and $\mathcal{L}_j(r_1) = f_j(r_1)$ for all $j \in [1, k] \mathbb{Z}$.

For $1 \leq j \leq k$, let $B_j$ be independent Brownian bridges defined on $[\ell_j, r_j]$ with $B_j(\ell_j) = f_j(\ell_j)$ and $B_j(r_j) = f_j(r_j)$. The law of $B_j$ is given by $\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j)}$ and we denote by $\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}$ the joint law of
\[ B := (B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_k). \]

Consider two line ensembles $\mathcal{L}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ defined through specifying their Radon-Nikodym derivatives with respect to $\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}$ as follows. The law of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}$ are determined by
\[
\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{L}}}{d\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}}(B) = \frac{1}{Z} W_{1,k,(\ell_1, r_1), \vec{x}, \vec{y}, +\infty, f_{k+1}}(B_f),
\]
\[
\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}}{d\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}}(B) = \frac{1}{\tilde{Z}} W_{1,k,(\ell_1, r_1), \vec{x}, \vec{y}, +\infty, f_{k+1}}(B_f),
\]
where
\[
Z := \mathbb{E}_{\text{free}} \left[ W_{1,k,(\ell_1, r_1), \vec{x}, \vec{y}, +\infty, f_{k+1}}(B_f) \right],
\]
\[
\tilde{Z} := \mathbb{E}_{\text{free}} \left[ W_{1,k,(\ell_1, r_1), \vec{x}, \vec{y}, +\infty, f_{k+1}}(B_f) \right],
\]
and $\vec{x} = (f_j(\ell_j))_{j=1}^{k}$, $\vec{y} = (f_j(r_1))_{j=1}^{k}$.

Consider the event such that under law $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$, curve are well separated by order $M$ at the endpoints of interval $[-L, L]$.
\[
E := \bigcap_{j=1}^{k} \left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(-L), \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(L) \in [(4k - 4j + 3)M, (4k - 4j + 5)M] \right\}.
\]

Proposition 4.1 below provides a lower bound of $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}(E)$ and will be proved at the end of this section.

**Proposition 4.1.** Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L \geq 1$. Under $M$-**Good** boundary conditions, there exist a constant $D_3 = D_3(k)$ such that
\[
\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}(E) \geq D_3^{-1} e^{-D_3(L^{-1}M^2 + L)}.
\]
We first prove a lower bound of the normalizing constant $Z_{\mathbf{H}}$ under the law of $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}$ (Corollary 4.2) and then upgrade it to get an estimate of $Z_{\mathbf{H}}$ under the law of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{L}}$ (Proposition 4.3).

**Corollary 4.2.** Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L \geq 1$. Under $M$-**Good** boundary conditions, there exists a constant $D_4 = D_4(k)$ such that

$$
\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}(Z_{\mathbf{H}}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}} \geq D_4^{-1}e^{-2kL}) \geq D_4^{-1}e^{-D_4(L^{-1}M^2+L)}.
$$

Here $\bar{x} = (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(-L))_{j=1}^k$, $\bar{y} = (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(L))_{j=1}^k$.

**Proof.** Note that

$$
2^{-1}L^{-1} \left( (x+L)\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(L) + (L-x)\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(-L) \right)
$$

is the interpolation function connecting $(-L, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(-L))$ and $(L, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(L))$. Consider the following event $\text{Osc}$ where every layer $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j, j = 1, 2, \cdots, k$ does not deviate from the linear interpolation by $M$,

$$
\text{Osc} := \left\{ \sup_{1 \leq j \leq k} \sup_{x \in [-L,L]} |\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(x) - 2^{-1}L^{-1} ((x+L)\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(L) + (L-x)\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(-L))| \leq M \right\}.
$$

Recall that event $\mathcal{E}$ says that the boundary values, i.e. $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ are separated by at least $2M$. Suppose $\mathcal{E}$ and $\text{Osc}$ both occur, then $(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2, \ldots, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_k, f_{k+1})$ remains ordered on $[-L, L]$. In particular, the Boltzmann weight is bounded below,

$$
W_{\mathbf{H}}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}) \cdot \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{E} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\text{Osc}} \geq e^{-2kL} \cdot \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{E} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\text{Osc}}.
$$

Under the condition (4.1), $M \geq L^{1/2}$, there exists $D = D(k)$ such that

$$
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y}}(\text{Osc}) = \prod_{j=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{j,j,(-L,L),0,0} \left( \sup_{x \in [-L,L]} |B_j(x)| \leq M \right) \geq D^{-1}.
$$

Recall the definition in (23),

$$
Z_{\mathbf{H}}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}} := \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y}} \left[ W_{\mathbf{H}}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}} \right].
$$

Therefore we have

$$
Z_{\mathbf{H}}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{E} \geq D^{-1}e^{-2kL} \cdot \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{E}.
$$

This implies that $\mathcal{E} \subset \left\{ Z_{\mathbf{H}}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}} \geq D^{-1}e^{-2kL} \right\}$ and the desired result then follows from Proposition 4.1. \hfill \Box

**Proposition 4.3.** Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L \geq 1$. Under $M$-**Good** boundary conditions, there exist a constant $D_5 = D_5(k)$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, we have

$$
\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{L}} \left( Z_{\mathbf{H}}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}} \leq \varepsilon D_5^{-1}e^{-D_5(L^{-1}M^2+L)} \right) \leq \varepsilon.
$$

**Proof.** Note that

$$
\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{L}}}{d\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}}(B) \propto W_{\mathbf{H}}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}}(B|_{[1,k]_2 \times [-L,L]}),
$$

where $\bar{x} = (B_j(-L))_{j=1}^k$ and $\bar{y} = (B_j(L))_{j=1}^k$.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ be the line ensembles obtained by the restriction of $\mathcal{L}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ on the interval $[\ell_1, \ell_{k+1}] \cup [r_{k+1}, r_1]$ respectively. The Radon-Nikodym derivative of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{L}}$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}$, is given by

$$
\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{L}}}{d\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}}(B) = \frac{1}{Z} Z_{\mathbf{H}}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}}.
$$
Here \( \bar{x} = (B_j(-L))_{j=1}^k, \bar{y} = (B_j(L))_{j=1}^k \) and \( Z' \) is a normalizing constant,
\[
Z' = E_{E'} \left[ Z_{H_t}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}} \right].
\]

From Corollary 4.2,
\[
Z' = E_{E'} \left[ Z_{H_t}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}} \right] \geq D_4^{-2} e^{-D_4(L^{-1}M^2+L) - 2kL} =: \delta.
\]

Thus
\[
\mathbb{P}_{E'} \left( \frac{Z_{H_t}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}}}{} \leq \varepsilon \delta \right) = \mathbb{P}_{E'} \left( \frac{Z_{H_t}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}}}{} \leq \varepsilon \right)
\]
\[
= E_{E'} \left[ \frac{1}{Z} Z_{H_t}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}} \cdot 1 \left\{ Z_{H_t}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}} \leq \varepsilon \delta \right\} \right]
\]
\[
\leq \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{Z} E_{E'} \left[ 1 \left\{ Z_{H_t}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \right]
\]
\[
\leq \varepsilon.
\]

Thus the assertion follows by picking \( D_5(k) = \max\{D_4^2, D_4 + 2k\} \).

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 3.1.

Proof of Proposition 3.1: Fix \( K \geq L^2 \) and let \( M > 0 \) be a large number to be determined soon. Let \( \text{GoodBoundary} \) (shorthanded as \( GB \)) be the the event that the \( M \)-Good boundary conditions hold, i.e.
\[
\text{GoodBoundary} := \left\{ \sup_{x \in [\ell_i, r_i]} |\mathcal{F}_{k+1}(x)| \leq M \right\} \cap \left\{ \sup_{x \in [\ell_j, r_j]} |\mathcal{F}_j| \leq M \right\}.
\]

From Corollary 3.3, by taking \( M = D'K \) with suitably large \( D' \geq 1 \), we have
\[
\mathbb{P}(\text{GoodBoundary}) \leq 2^{-1} e^{-K^{3/2}}.
\]

In particular, (4.1) holds. Let \( \mathcal{F}_{ext}^* \) be the \( \sigma \)-algebra generated by \( \mathcal{F}_j^* \) restricted on
\[
\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N} \setminus \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^k \{ j \} \times [\ell_j, r_j] \right).
\]

By the Gibbs Property,
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ 1 \{ Z_{H_t}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,\mathcal{F}_{k+1}} \leq 2^{-1} e^{-D_5^{-1} e^{-D_5(L^{-1}M^2+L)}} \} \bigg| \mathcal{F}_{ext}^* \right]
\]
with \( \bar{x} = (\mathcal{F}_j^*(-L))_{j=1}^k \) and \( \bar{y} = (\mathcal{F}_j(L))_{j=1}^k \) equals
\[
\mathbb{P}_{E'} \left( Z_{H_t}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,f_{k+1}} \leq 2^{-1} e^{-D_5^{-1} e^{-D_5(L^{-1}M^2+L)}} \right),
\]
where \( \mathbb{P}_{E'} \) is defined in (3.3) with \( f_j = \mathcal{F}_j^* \) in \( [\ell_j, r_j] \cup [r_j, r_1], j \in [1, k] \) and \( f_{k+1} = \mathcal{F}_{k+1}^* \) in \( [\ell_1, r_1] \).

Applying Proposition 3.3 with \( \varepsilon = 2^{-1} e^{-K^{3/2}} \), we deduce that
\[
\mathbb{I}_{GB} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ 1 \{ Z_{H_t}^{1,k,(-L,L),\bar{x},\bar{y},+\infty,\mathcal{F}_{k+1}} \leq 2^{-1} e^{-D_5^{-1} e^{-D_5(L^{-1}M^2+L)}} \} \bigg| \mathcal{F}_{ext}^* \right] \leq 2^{-1} e^{-K^{3/2}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{GB}.
\]
Thus we have
\[
\mathbb{P}\left(Z_{\mathbf{1},\mathbf{k},(-L,L),\bar{\mathbf{y}},+\infty,f_{k+1}}^{1,2} \leq 2^{-1} \epsilon D_5^{-1} e^{-D_5(L^{-1}M^2+L)}\right)
= \mathbb{P}\left[\mathbf{1}_{E} \cdot 1 \left\{ Z_{\mathbf{1},\mathbf{k},(-L,L),\bar{\mathbf{y}},+\infty,f_{k+1}}^{1,2} \leq 2^{-1} D_5^{-1} e^{-K^{3/2} - D_5(L^{-1}M^2+L)}\right\}\right] + \mathbb{P}(E^c)
\leq e^{-K^{3/2}}.
\]

Because \( K \geq L^2 \) and \( M = D'K \), \( 2^{-1} D_5^{-1} e^{-K^{3/2} - D_5(L^{-1}M^2+L)} \geq D^{-1} e^{-DL^{-1}K^2} \), we finish the proof.

The rest of this section is devoted to proving Proposition 4.1. We will run a two-step inductive resampling. For \( j \in [1, k] \), consider a sequence of events
\[
A_j := \left\{ \inf_{x \in [\ell_{j+1}, r_{j+1}]} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_j(x) \geq (4k - 4j + 4)M \right\}.
\]
The first step is carried out inductively in Lemma 4.4 to raise curves and hence give a lower bound of \( \mathbb{P}\left( \bigcap_{j=1}^k A_j \right) \). Denote
\[
F_j := \left\{ \hat{\mathcal{L}}_j \in [(4k - 4j + 3)M, (4k - 4j + 5)M] \text{ in } [\ell_{j+1}, r_{j+1}] \right\} \cap \left\{ \hat{\mathcal{L}}_j \leq (4k - 4j + 5)M \text{ in } [\ell_j, r_j] \right\}.
\]
The second step is carried out inductively to lower curve properly in order to separate them in the desired region. See Lemma 4.5 which gives a lower bound of \( \mathbb{P}\left( \bigcap_{j=1}^k F_j \right) \). Proposition 4.1 follows directly from the Lemma 4.5 as \( \bigcap_{j=1}^k F_j \subset E \).

**Lemma 4.4.** Fix \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( L \geq 1 \). Under \( M \)-Good boundary conditions, there exists a constant \( D_6 = D_6(k) \) depending only on \( k \) such that
\[
\mathbb{P}\left( \bigcap_{j=1}^k A_j \right) \geq D_6^{-1} e^{-D_6(L^{-1}M^2+L)}.
\]

**Proof.** We start by showing the lower bound for \( \mathbb{P}\left( A_1 \right) \). From the Gibbs property,
\[
\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{A}_1 | \mathcal{F}_{ext}(\{1\} \times (\ell_1, r_1))] = \mathbb{P}_{H_t,(-L,L)}^{1,1,((\ell_1, r_1), f_1(\ell_1), f_1(r_1),+\infty, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{2,f}(A_1)}
\]
with \( \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{2,f} \) defined by (4.2). Note that equivalently we have
\[
\mathbb{P}_{H_t,(-L,L)}^{1,1,((\ell_1, r_1), f_1(\ell_1), f_1(r_1),+\infty, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{2,f})} = \mathbb{P}_{H_t}^{1,1,((\ell_1, r_1), f_1(\ell_1), f_1(r_1),+\infty, g_2}
\]
with
\[
g_2(x) := \begin{cases} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{2,f}(x) & x \in [\ell_1, -L) \cup (L, r_1], \\ -\infty & x \in [-L, L]. \end{cases}
\]
Using the stochastic monotonicity, we have
\[
\mathbb{P}_{H_t}^{1,1,((\ell_1, r_1), f_1(\ell_1), f_1(r_1),+\infty, g_2}(A_1) \geq \mathbb{P}_{H_t}^{1,1,((\ell_1, r_1), f_1(\ell_1), f_1(r_1),+\infty, -\infty}(A_1)
= \mathbb{P}_{free}^{1,1,((\ell_1, r_1), f_1(\ell_1), f_1(r_1)}(A_1).
\]
Let
\[ a_1 := \inf \left\{ \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(\ell_1,r_1),x,y}(A_1) \mid |x| \leq M, \ |y| \leq M \right\}. \]

Under \textit{M-Good} boundary conditions, \( M \geq L^{1/2} \), we seek for a lower bound of \( a_1 \). To realize \( A_1 \), it suffices to have the Brownian bridge \( B_1 \) first jump over a height \((4k + 2)M\) within the interval \([\ell_1, \ell_2]\), secondly remain above \( 4kM \) within the interval \([\ell_2, r_2]\), and thirdly drop down a height \((4k + 2)M\) within \([r_2, r_1]\). \( a_1 \) is bounded below by the Brownian kinetic cost of such trajectory. Note that \(|\ell_2 - \ell_1| = |r_2 - r_1| = L\) and \(|\ell_2 - r_2| = 2kL\), there exists \( D = D(k) \) such that
\[ a_1 \geq D^{-1}e^{-DL^{-1}M^2}. \]

Thus under \textit{M-Good} boundary conditions, we have
\[
\mathbb{P}(A_1) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{ext}}} \left[ \mathbb{1}_{A_1} \mid \{1\} \times (\ell_1, r_1) \right] \right] \\
\geq \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(\ell_1,r_1),f_1(\ell_1),f_1(r_1)}(A_1) \geq D^{-1}e^{-DL^{-1}M^2}. 
\]

Now we proceed by induction on \( j \). Assume for \( 2 \leq j \leq k \), we have
\[
\mathbb{P}(\bigcap_{i=1}^{j-1} A_i) \geq De^{-D(L^{-1}M^2 + L)}. 
\]

We aim to show
\[
\mathbb{P}(\bigcap_{i=1}^j A_i) \geq D^{-1}e^{-D(L^{-1}M^2 + L)}. 
\]
By the Gibbs property,
\[ \mathbb{E}_\mathcal{L}[\mathbb{I}_{A_j} | \mathcal{F}_{\text{ext}}(\{j\} \times (\ell_j, r_j))] = \mathbb{P}^{j,j,(\ell_j, r_j), f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j), \mathcal{L}_{j-1}, \mathcal{L}_{j+1}, f(A_j), -L, L)}_L \]
with \( \mathcal{L}_{j+1} \) defined in (4.2) and we adopt the convention that \( \mathcal{L}_{k+1} = f_{k+1} \). Note that
\[ \mathbb{P}^{j,j,(\ell_j, r_j), f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j), \mathcal{L}_{j-1}, \mathcal{L}_{j+1}, f(A_j), -L, L)}_L = \mathbb{P}^{j,j,(\ell_j, r_j), f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j), g_{j-1}, g_{j+1}}_L \]
with
\[ g_{j-1}(x) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_{j-1}(x), & x \in [\ell_j, -L) \cup (L, r_j], \\ +\infty, & x \in [-L, L], \end{cases} \]
and
\[ g_{j+1}(x) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_{j+1,f}(x), & x \in [\ell_j, -L) \cup (L, r_j], \\ -\infty, & x \in [-L, L]. \end{cases} \]
We deduce that
\[ \mathbb{E}_\mathcal{L}[\mathbb{I}_{A_j} | \mathcal{F}_{\text{ext}}(\{j\} \times (\ell_j, r_j))] = \mathbb{P}^{j,j,(\ell_j, r_j), f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j), g_{j-1}, g_{j+1}}(A_j) \]
\[ \geq \frac{1}{Z_{\mathcal{H}_t}} \mathbb{E}^{j,j,(\ell_j, r_j), f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j), -\infty}_\text{free} \left[ \mathbb{I}_{A_j} \cdot W^{j,j,(\ell_j, r_j), f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j), g_{j-1}, g_{j+1}, -\infty}_\mathcal{H}_t \right]. \]
Here the in the second equality we use \( Z_{\mathcal{H}_t} \) to abbreviate
\[ Z_{\mathcal{H}_t} := \mathbb{E}^{j,j,(\ell_j, r_j), f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j), -\infty}_\text{free} \left[ W^{j,j,(\ell_j, r_j), f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j), g_{j-1}, -\infty}_\mathcal{H}_t \right]. \]
In the first inequality we apply stochastic monotonicity and in the second inequality we use the fact that normalizing constant is bounded from above by 1.
Now we proceed to find a lower bound for
\[ \mathbb{E}^{j,j,(\ell_j, r_j), f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j)}_\text{free} \left[ \mathbb{I}_{A_j} \cdot W^{j,j,(\ell_j, r_j), f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j), g_{j-1}, -\infty}_\mathcal{H}_t \right] \]
conditional on \( A_{j-1} \) by arguing that the interaction with \( g_{j-1} \) causes no trouble. Consider the event
\[ D_j := \left\{ \inf_{x \in [\ell_{j+1}, r_{j+1}]} \mathcal{L}_j(x) \geq (4k - 4j + 4)M \right\} \cap \left\{ \sup_{x \in [\ell_j, r_j]} \mathcal{L}_j(x) \leq (4k - 4j + 8)M \right\}. \]
Note that \( D_j \subset A_j \). As \( D_j \) and \( A_{j-1} \) occur, \( \mathcal{L}_{j-1} \geq \mathcal{L}_j \) in \([\ell_j, r_j]\) and hence
\[ W^{j,j,(\ell_j, r_j), f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j), g_{j-1}, -\infty}_\mathcal{H}_t \cdot \mathbb{I}_{D_j} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{j-1}} \geq e^{-2(k+1-j)L} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{D_j} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{j-1}}. \]
Consequently
\[ \mathbb{I}_{A_{j-1}} \cdot \mathbb{E}^{j,j,(\ell_j, r_j), f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j)}_\text{free} \left[ \mathbb{I}_{A_j} \cdot W^{j,j,(\ell_j, r_j), f_j(\ell_j), f_j(\ell_j), g_{j-1}, -\infty}_\mathcal{H}_t \right] \]
\[ \geq \mathbb{I}_{A_{j-1}} \cdot e^{-2(k+1-j)L} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{D_j} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{j-1}}. \]
Under $M - \text{Good}$ boundary conditions, there exists $D = D(k)$ such that
\[
a_j := \inf \left\{ \mathbb{P}^{\text{free}}_{\tilde{L}} \left( \left| x \right| \leq M, \left| y \right| \leq M \right) \right\} \geq D^{-1}e^{-DL^{-1}M^2}.
\]
Now by induction we have
\[
\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{L}} \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^{j} A_i \right) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{L}} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \mathbb{I}_{A_i} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{L}}[\mathbb{I}_{A_j} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\text{ext}}(\{j\} \times (\ell_j, r_j))] \right] 
\geq a_j \cdot e^{-2(k+1-j)L} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{L}} \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^{j-1} A_i \right) 
\geq D^{-1}e^{-D(L^{-1}M^2+L)}.
\]
This completes the induction argument and hence proves the desired result. \hfill \Box

For $j \in [1, k] \mathbb{Z}$, recall the events
\[
F_j := \left\{ \tilde{L}_j \in [(4k - 4j + 3)M, (4k - 4j + 5)M] \text{ in } [\ell_{j+1}, r_{j+1}] \right\} 
\cap \left\{ \tilde{L}_j \leq (4k - 4j + 5)M \text{ in } [\ell_j, r_j] \right\}.
\]

In the following Lemma 4.5, we give a lower bound for $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{L}} \left( \bigcap_{j=1}^{k} F_j \right)$.

**Lemma 4.5.** Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L \geq 1$. Under $M - \text{Good}$ boundary conditions, there exists a constant $D_7 = D_7(k)$ such that
\[
\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{L}} \left( \bigcap_{j=1}^{k} F_j \right) \geq D_7^{-1}e^{-D_7(L^{-1}M^2+L)}.
\]

**Proof.** We will run a resampling in a reversed order starting from the $k$-layer and argue inductively. More precisely, we start by showing a lower bound for $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{L}} \left( \bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} A_j \cap F_k \right)$.

Let $[l_k, r_k]$ be a $\{k\}$-stopping domain such that
\[
l_k := \inf \left\{ x_0 \in [\ell_k, \ell_{k+1}] \mid \tilde{L}_k(x) \leq 4M \text{ for all } x \in [\ell_k, x_0] \right\},
\]
\[
r_k := \sup \left\{ x_0 \in [r_{k+1}, r_k] \mid \tilde{L}_k(x) \leq 4M \text{ for all } x \in [x_0, r_k] \right\},
\]
where we set $l_k = \ell_k$ or $r_k = r_k$ if the set is empty respectively. Consider the event
\[
F'_k := \left\{ \tilde{L}_k(l_k) = \tilde{L}_k(r_k) = 4M \right\}.
\]

Because $\tilde{L}_k(\ell_k), \tilde{L}_k(r_k) \in [-M, M]$, we have $A_k \subset F'_k$. From the view of Lemma 4.4
\[
\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{L}} \left( \bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} A_j \cap F'_k \right) \geq D^{-1}e^{-D(L^{-1}M^2+L)}.
\]
We would like to have $\tilde{L}_k$ stay in the preferable region $[3M, 5M]$ over $[l_k, r_k]$. Let
\[
F''_k := \{ \tilde{L}_k \in [3M, 5M] \text{ in } [l_k, r_k] \}.
\]
Note that the occurrence of $A_{k-1} \cap F_k''$ implies ordering between $\tilde{L}_{k-1}$ and $\tilde{L}_k$, i.e.

$$A_{k-1} \cap F_k'' \subset \{ \tilde{L}_{k-1} \geq \tilde{L}_k \geq f_{k+1} \text{ in } [i_k, r_k] \}.$$ 

Hence

$$W_{H_{r_s}}^{k,k,(l_k,r_k),\tilde{L}_k,(l_k),\tilde{L}_k,(r_k),\tilde{L}_{k-1},f_{k+1}} \cdot 1_{A_{k-1}} \cdot 1_{F_k''} \geq e^{-4L} \cdot 1_{A_{k-1}} \cdot 1_{F_k''}.$$ 

And

$$1_{A_{k-1}} \cdot 1_{F_k'} \cdot E_{L}[1_{F_k''}|\mathcal{F}_{\text{ext}}(\{k\} \times (i_k, r_k))]$$

$$= 1_{A_{k-1}} \cdot 1_{F_k'} \cdot P_{H_{r_s},(-L,L)}^{k,k,(l_k,r_k),\tilde{L}_k,(l_k),\tilde{L}_k,(r_k),\tilde{L}_{k-1},f_{k+1}}(F_k'')$$

$$\geq 1_{A_{k-1}} \cdot 1_{F_k'} \cdot e^{-4L} \cdot P_{H_{r_s},(-L,L)}^{k,k,(l_k,r_k),4M,4M}(F_k'').$$

Under $M$-Good boundary conditions, there exist $D = D(k)$ such that

$$b_k := \inf \left\{ P_{\text{free}}^{k,k,(l,r),4M,4M} (B_k \in [3M,5M]) \right\} \geq D^{-1}.$$ 

The infimum is taken over all $\ell \in [\ell_k, \ell_{k+1}]$ and $r \in [r_{k+1}, r_k]$. Moreover

$$\bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} A_j \cap F_k' \cap F_k'' \subset \bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} A_j \cap F_k,$$
hence we have
\[ \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}(\bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} A_j \cap F_k) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}(\bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} A_j \cap F'_k \cap F''_k) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{1}_{A_j} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F'_k} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}[\mathbb{1}_{F''_k} | \mathcal{F}_{\text{ext}}(\{k\} \times (t_k, r_k))] \right] \]
\[ \geq b_k \cdot e^{-4L} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}(\bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} A_j \cap F'_k) \geq D^{-1} e^{-D(L^{-1}M^2+L)}. \]

We now proceed by a reversed induction. Assume for some \(1 \leq i \leq k-1\), we have
\[ \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}(\bigcap_{j=1}^{i} A_j \cap \bigcap_{j=i+1}^{k} F_j) \geq D^{-1} e^{-D(L^{-1}M^2+L)}. \]

We aim to show
\[ \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}(\bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} A_j \cap \bigcap_{j=i}^{k} F_j) \geq D^{-1} e^{-D(L^{-1}M^2+L)} \]
and we adopt the convention that \(\bigcap_{j=1}^{0} A_j\) means the total probability space.

Let \([l_i, r_i]\) be a \(\{i\}\)-stopping domain such that
\[ l_i := \sup \left\{ x_0 \in [l_i, \ell_{i+1}] | \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(x) \leq (4k - 4i + 4)M \text{ for all } x \in [l_i, x_0] \right\}, \]
\[ r_i := \inf \left\{ x_0 \in [r_{i+1}, r_i] | \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(x) \leq (4k - 4i + 4)M \text{ for all } x \in [x_0, r_i] \right\}, \]
where we set \(l_k = \ell_i\) or \(r_i = r_i\) if the set is empty respectively. Consider the event
\[ F'_i := \left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(l_i) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(r_i) = (4k - 4i + 4)M \right\}. \]

Because \(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(l_i), \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(r_i) \in [-M, M]\), we have \(A_i \subset F'_i\). We would like to have \(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i\) stay in the preferable region \([(4k - 4i + 3)M, (4k - 4i + 5)M]\) over \([l_i, r_i]\). Let
\[ F''_i := \{ B_i \in [(4k - 4i + 3)M, (4k - 4i + 5)M] \text{ in } [l_i, r_i] \}. \]

Note that the occurrence of \(A_{i-1} \cap F''_i \cap F_{i+1}\) implies ordering between \(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i-1}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i\) and \(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i+1,f}\), i.e.
\[ A_{i-1} \cap F''_i \cap F_{i+1} \subset \{ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i-1} \geq \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i \geq \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i+1,f} \text{ in } [l_i, r_i] \}. \]

Hence
\[ W_{H_i(-L,L)}^{i,i,(l_i,r_i),\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i-1},\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i,\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i+1,f},1} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{A_{i-1}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F''_i} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F_{i+1}} \geq c^{-4L} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{A_{i-1}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F''_i} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F_{i+1}}. \]

And
\[ \mathbb{1}_{A_{i-1}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F'_i} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}'}[\mathbb{1}_{F''_i} | \mathcal{F}_{\text{ext}}(\{i\} \times (l_i, r_i))] \]
\[ = \mathbb{1}_{A_{i-1}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F'_i} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{H_i(-L,L)}^{i,i,(l_i,r_i),\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i-1},\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i,\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i+1,f}}(F''_i) \]
\[ \geq \mathbb{1}_{A_{i-1}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F'_i} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{H_i(-L,L)}^{i,i,(l_i,r_i),\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i-1},\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i}(1 \cdot W_{H_i(-L,L)}^{i,i,(l_i,r_i),\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i-1},\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i,\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{i+1,f}}(F''_i) \cdot F_{i+1}) \]
\[ \geq \mathbb{1}_{A_{i-1}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F'_i} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F_{i+1}} \cdot e^{-4L} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{A_{i-1}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F''_i} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F_{i+1}} \cdot e^{-4L} = \mathbb{1}_{A_{i-1}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F'_i} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{F_{i+1}}. \]

Under \textbf{M-Good} boundary conditions, there exist \(D = D(k)\) such that
\[ b_i := \inf \left\{ \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{i,i,(l_i,r_i),(4k-4i+4)M,(4k-4i+4)M}(B_i \in [(4k - 4i + 3)M, (4k - 4i + 5)M]) \right\} \geq D^{-1}. \]
The infimum is taken over all \(l \in [l_i, \ell_{i+1}]\) and \(r \in [r_{i+1}, r_i]\). Moreover
\[ F'_i \cap F''_i \subset F_i. \]
Consequently we have
\[
\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{E}} \left( \bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} A_j \cap \bigcap_{j=i}^{k} F_j \right) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{E}} \left( \bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} A_j \cap \bigcap_{j=i}^{k} F_j \cap F_i' \cap F_i'' \right) \\
= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{E}} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbbm{1}_{A_j} \cdot \prod_{j=i+1}^{k} \mathbbm{1}_{F_j} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{E}} [\mathbb{1}_{F_i'} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\text{ext}}(\{i\} \times (i, \tau_i))] \right] \\
\geq b_i \cdot e^{-4(k+1-i)L} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{E}} \left( \bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} A_j \cap \bigcap_{j=i+1}^{k} F_j \right) \\
\geq b_i \cdot e^{-4(k+1-i)L} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{E}} \left( \bigcap_{j=1}^{i} A_j \cap \bigcap_{j=i+1}^{k} F_j \right) \\
\geq D^{-1} e^{-D(L^{-1}M^2+L)}.
\]

We used \( A_i \subset F_i' \) in the second to last inequality and used the induction hypothesis to the last inequality. The induction argument is finished. \( \square \)

**Appendix A. Results on Brownian Bridges**

We record in this section some properties of Brownian bridges that we need. Recall that we denote \( \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(a,b),u,v} \) for the law of a Brownian bridge \( B \) defined on \([a, b]\) with \( B(a) = u \) and \( B(b) = v \). The next lemma is an analogue of [KS, Chapter 4 (3.40)], where the supremum is considered.

**Lemma A.1.**

\[
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(a,b),u,v} \left( \inf_{x \in [a,b]} B(x) \leq \beta \right) = e^{-2(b-a)^{-1}(u-\min\{\beta,u,v\})(v-\min\{\beta,u,v\})}.
\]

**Proof.** By [KS, Chapter 4 (3.40)], we have that
\[
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(a,b),u,v} \left( \sup_{x \in [a,b]} B(x) \leq \beta \right) = e^{2(b-a)^{-1}(\max\{\beta,u,v\}-u)(\max\{\beta,u,v\}-v)}.
\]

Assume \( B \) enjoys law \( \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(a,b),u,v} \), the law of \( \tilde{B} := -B \) is \( \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(a,b),-u,-v} \). Hence
\[
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(a,b),u,v} \left( \inf_{x \in [a,b]} B(x) \leq \beta \right) = \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(a,b),-u,-v} \left( \sup_{x \in [a,b]} \tilde{B}(x) \geq -\beta \right) \\
= e^{-2(b-a)^{-1}(\max\{-\beta,-u,-v\}+u)(\max\{-\beta,-u,-v\}+v)} \\
= e^{-2(b-a)^{-1}(u-\min\{\beta,u,v\})(v-\min\{\beta,u,v\})}.
\]

\( \square \)

The following lemma can be found in [Ham1, Lemma 5.13]. We present the proof for completeness.

**Lemma A.2.** There exists a constant \( C_0 \) such that for all \( d \in (0,1] \) and \( K \geq 0 \),
\[
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(0,1),0,0} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [0,1], |x-y| \leq d} |B(x) - B(y)| > Kd^{1/2} \right) \leq d^{-1} C_0 e^{-C_0^{-1} K^2}.
\]
Lemma A.3. There exists a constant $C_1$ such that for all $\ell < r$ in $[0,1]$ and $K \geq 0$,
\[
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,0,0,0}\left( \sup_{x,y \in [\ell, r]} |B(x) - B(y)| > K(r - \ell)^{1/2} \right) < C_1 e^{-C_1^{-1}K^2}.
\]

Proof of Lemma A.3. Suppose $d \in [4^{-1}, 1]$, the assertion of Lemma A.2 follows easily by applying Lemma A.3 with $\ell = 0$ and $r = 1$. From now on we assume $d \in (0, 4^{-1})$. Let $m = \lfloor d^{-1} \rfloor$. For $j \in [1, m]$, define
\[
E_j := \left\{ \sup_{x,y \in [\ell, r]} |B(x) - B(y)| > Kd^{1/2} \right\}.
\]
As
\[
\left\{ \sup_{x,y \in [\ell, r]} |B(x) - B(y)| > K(r - \ell)^{1/2} \right\} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^m E_j,
\]
by Lemma A.3 there exists a universal constant $C_0$ such that
\[
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,0,0,0}\left( \sup_{x,y \in [0,1], |x-y| \leq d} |B(x) - B(y)| > Kd^{1/2} \right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,0,0,0}(E_j) \leq d^{-1} C_0 e^{-C_0^{-1}K^2}.
\]
The proof is finished. \hfill \square

Given $\sigma > 0$ and $a < b \in [-\infty, \infty]$, let
\[
\nu_{\sigma^2}(a, b) := \int_a^b (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-1/2} e^{-x^2/2} dx.
\]
Directly from change of variables, we have $\nu_{\sigma^2}(a, b) = \nu_1(\sigma^{-1}a, \sigma^{-1}b)$. From [Wil, Section 14.8], for all $a > 0$,
\[
(A.1) \quad \nu_1(a, \infty) \leq (2\pi)^{-1/2} \cdot a^{-1} e^{-2^{-1}a^2}.
\]

Proof of Lemma A.3. For notational simplicity, we denote $\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,0,0,0}$ by $\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}$. Suppose $K \leq 1$, by choosing $C_1$ large, we can get and $C_1 e^{-C_1^{-1}K^2} \geq 1$ and the assertion holds trivially. From now on we assume $K \geq 1$. Let $X(t)$ be a standard Brownian motion. The argument is based on the following property,
\[
B(x) \overset{(d)}{=} (1-x)X \left( \frac{x}{1-x} \right).
\]
Suppose first $r - \ell \geq 2^{-1}$. Then
\[
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}\left( \sup_{x,y \in [\ell, r]} |B(x) - B(y)| > K(r - \ell)^{1/2} \right) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}\left( \sup_{x,y \in [0,1]} |B(x) - B(y)| > 2^{-1/2}K \right)
\]
\[
\leq \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}\left( \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |B(x)| > 2^{-3/2}K \right) \leq 2\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}\left( \sup_{x \in [0,2^{-1}]} |B(x)| > 2^{-3/2}K \right)
\]
\[
= 2\mathbb{P}\left( \sup_{x \in [0,2^{-1}]} (1-x) \left| X \left( \frac{x}{1-x} \right) \right| > 2^{-3/2}K \right)
\]
\[
\leq 2\mathbb{P}\left( \sup_{x' \in [0,1]} \left| X \left( x' \right) \right| > 2^{-3/2}K \right) = 4\nu_1(2^{-3/2}K, \infty).
\]
Then we have \( k \) only on Lemma A.4. The proof is finished. □

Here we used the reflection principle for the last equality. Because \( K \geq 1 \), from (A.1) that there exists a constant \( C \) such that

\[
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [\ell, r]} |B(x) - B(y)| > K(r - \ell)^{1/2} \right) \leq C e^{-C^{-1}K^2}.
\]

From now on, we assume \( r - \ell < 2^{-1} \). Because \( B(x) \overset{d}{=} B(1 - x) \), we can assume without loss of generality that \([r, \ell] \subset [0, \frac{3}{4}]\). Given \( x, y \in [\ell, r] \)

\[
|B(x) - B(y)| \overset{d}{=} \left| (1 - x)X \left( \frac{x}{1 - x} \right) - (1 - y)X \left( \frac{y}{1 - y} \right) \right|
\leq (1 - x) \left| X \left( \frac{x}{1 - x} \right) - X \left( \frac{y}{1 - y} \right) \right| + |x - y| \left| X \left( \frac{y}{1 - y} \right) \right|
\leq \left| X \left( \frac{x}{1 - x} \right) - X \left( \frac{y}{1 - y} \right) \right| + (r - \ell) \left| X \left( \frac{y}{1 - y} \right) \right|.
\]

Thus, by setting \( \ell' = \frac{\ell}{1 - \ell} \) and \( r' = \frac{r}{1 - \ell} \),

\[
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [\ell, r]} |B(x) - B(y)| > K(r - \ell)^{1/2} \right)
\leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x', y' \in [\ell', r']} |X(x') - X(y')| > 2^{-1}K(r - \ell)^{1/2} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x' \in [\ell', r']} |X(x')| > 2^{-1}K(r - \ell)^{-1/2} \right).
\]

As \( \frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{t}{1 - t} \right) = \frac{1}{(1 - t)^2} \leq 16 \) for \( t \in [0, \frac{3}{4}] \), we have \( r' - \ell' \leq 16(r - \ell) \). Together with \( r' \leq 3 \) and \( r - \ell \leq 2^{-1} \), we deduce

\[
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [\ell, r]} |B(x) - B(y)| > K(r - \ell)^{1/2} \right)
\leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x' \in [\ell', r']} |X(x') - X(\ell')| > 4^{-1}K(r - \ell)^{-1/2} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x' \in [0, 3]} |X(x')| > 2^{-1}K(r - \ell)^{-1/2} \right)
\]

\[= 2\nu_1(4^{-1}(r - \ell)^{1/2}(r' - \ell')^{-1/2}K, \infty) + 2\nu_1(2^{-1}(r - \ell)^{-1/2}3^{-1/2}K, \infty)\]

\[\leq 2\nu_1(16^{-1}K, \infty) + 2\nu_1(6^{-1/2}K, \infty)\]

Because \( K \geq 1 \), from the view of (A.1), we conclude that there exists a universal constant \( C_1 \) such that

\[
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}} \left( \sup_{x,y \in [\ell, r]} |B(x) - B(y)| > K(r - \ell)^{1/2} \right) \leq C e^{-C^{-1}K^2}.
\]

The proof is finished. □

Lemma A.4. Fix \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), \( L \geq 1 \) and \( M \geq L^{1/2} \). There exists a constant \( D_8 = D_8(k) \) depending only on \( k \) such that the following statement holds. Let \( \ell, r, \lambda, x \) and \( y \) be numbers that satisfy \( 4L \leq r - \ell \leq (2k + 2)L \), \( 4 \leq \lambda \leq 4k \) and \( |x|, |y| \leq M \). Let

\[
J := \left\{ \inf_{u \in [\ell]} B(u) \geq \lambda M, \sup_{u \in [\ell, r]} B(u) \geq (\lambda + 4)M \right\}.
\]

Then we have

\[
\mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1, 1, (\ell, r), x, y} (J) \leq D_8 e^{-D_8^{-1}L^{-1}M^2}.
\]
Proof. Consider the following events
\[ J_1 := \{ B(\ell + L), B(r - L) \in [(\lambda + 1)M, (\lambda + 3)M] \}, \]
\[ J_2 := \left\{ \sup_{u \in [\ell, \ell + L]} |B(u) - L^{-1}(u - \ell)B(\ell + L) + (\ell + L - u)x| \leq M \right\}, \]
\[ J_3 := \left\{ \sup_{u \in [\ell + L, r - L]} |B(u) - (r - \ell - 2L)^{-1}(u - \ell - L)B(r - L) + (r - L - u)B(\ell + L)| \leq M \right\}, \]
\[ J_4 := \left\{ \sup_{u \in [r - L, r]} |B(u) - L^{-1}(u - r + L)\gamma + (r - u)B(r - L)| \leq M \right\}. \]

It is straightforward to check that \( \cap_{i=1}^4 J_i \subset J \). Furthermore, \( J_i \) are independent.

\[ \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,1}(\ell, r, x, y)(J_2) = \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,1}(0, L, 0, 0) \left( \sup_{u \in [0, L]} |B(x)| \leq M \right) \]
\[ = \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,1}(0,1,0,0) \left( \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |B(x)| \leq L^{-1/2}M \right) \]
\[ \geq \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,1}(0,1,0,0) \left( \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |B(x)| \leq 1 \right) \]
\[ \geq C^{-1}. \]

We used \( M \geq L^{1/2} \). Similarly,

\[ \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,1,1}(\ell, r, x, y)(J_4) \geq C^{-1}, \]

and

\[ \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,1,1}(\ell, r, x, y)(J_3) = \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,1,1}(0,1,0,0) \left( \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |B(x)| \leq (r - \ell - 2L)^{-1/2}M \right) \]
\[ \geq \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,1,1}(0,1,0,0) \left( \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |B(x)| \leq (2k)^{-1/2} \right) \geq D^{-1}. \]

Define
\[ J_{1,-} := \{ B(\ell + L) \in [(\lambda + 1)M, (\lambda + 3)M] \}, \]
\[ J_{1,+} := \{ B(r - L) \in [(\lambda + 1)M, (\lambda + 3)M] \}. \]

Under the law \( \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,1,1}(\ell, r, x, y) \), \( B(\ell + L) \) is a normal distribution with mean and variance
\[ m_- = (\ell - r)^{-1}(Ly + (r - \ell - L)x), \quad \sigma_-^2 = (r - \ell)^{-1}L(r - \ell - L). \]

Therefore
\[ \mathbb{P}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,1,1}(\ell, r, x, y)(J_{1,-}) = \nu_1(\sigma_-^{-1}((\lambda + 1)M - m_-), \sigma_-^{-1}((\lambda + 3)M - m_-)). \]

From the assumption, \( |m_-| \leq M \) and \( \frac{3}{4}L \leq \sigma_-^2 \leq L \). Hence
\[ \sigma_-^{-1}((\lambda + 1)M - m_-) \leq 2(\lambda + 2) \cdot 3^{-1/2}L^{-1/2}M \leq 3^{-1/2}(8k + 4)L^{-1/2}M, \]
and
\[ \sigma_-^{-1}((\lambda + 3)M - m_-) - \sigma_-^{-1}((\lambda + 1)M - m_-) = 2\sigma_-^{-1}M \geq 2L^{-1/2}M \geq 2. \]
Therefore,
\[ P_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(\ell,r),x,y}(J_{1,-}) = \nu_1(\sigma_{-1}((\lambda + 1)M - m_-), \sigma_{-1}((\lambda + 3)M - m_-)) \]
\[ \geq \nu_1(3^{-1/2}(8k + 4)L^{-1/2}M, 3^{-1/2}(8k + 4)L^{-1/2}M + 2) \]
\[ \geq C^{-1}e^{CL^{-1}M^2}. \]
Conditioned on the event $J_{1,-}$, $B(r - L)$ is a normal distribution with mean and variance
\[ m_+ = (r - \ell - L)^{-1}((r - \ell - 2L)y + LB(\ell + L)), \sigma_+^2 = (r - \ell - L)^{-1}L(r - \ell - 2L). \]
Therefore,
\[ P_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(\ell,r),x,y}(J_{1,+}) = \nu_1(\sigma_{+1}((\lambda + 1)M - m_+), \sigma_{+1}((\lambda + 3)M - m_+)) \]
\[ \square \]

**Appendix B. Tail Bounds**

In this section we prove quantitative tail estimates, Propositions [B.1] and [B.2] for the scaled KPZ line ensemble $\mathcal{F}^t$. These two propositions are used as key inputs for Proposition 3.1, a quantitative estimate on the normalizing constant. We combine ideas from [CH16] Section 7 and [Ham1] Appendix A.2, where [CH16] obtains uniform tail estimates (non-quantitative) for KPZ line ensemble and [Ham1] studies non-intersecting line ensembles.

**Proposition B.1.** Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. There exist a constant $D_9 = D_9(k) > 0$ such that for all $t \geq 1$ and $r \geq 0$,
\[ P \left( \inf_{x \in [-1,1]} (\mathcal{F}^t_k(x) + 2^{-1}x^2) \leq -r \right) \leq D_9e^{-D_9^{-1}r^{3/2}}. \]

**Proposition B.2.** Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. There exist a constant $D_{10} = D_{10}(k) > 0$ such that for all $t \geq 1$ and $r \geq 0$,
\[ P \left( \sup_{x \in [-1,1]} (\mathcal{F}^t_k(x) + 2^{-1}x^2) \geq r \right) \leq D_{10}e^{-D_{10}^{-1}r^{3/2}}. \]

Since $\mathcal{F}^t_k(x) + 2^{-1}x^2$ is stationary in $x$, we have the following corollary.

**Corollary B.3.** Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval and $|I|$ be the length of $I$. Then for all $k \geq 1$, $t \geq 1$ and $r \geq 0$,
\[ P \left( \inf_{x \in I} (\mathcal{F}^t_k(x) + 2^{-1}x^2) \leq -r \right) \leq (|I|/2 + 1)D_9e^{-D_9^{-1}r^{3/2}}. \]
\[ P \left( \sup_{x \in I} (\mathcal{F}^t_k(x) + 2^{-1}x^2) \geq r \right) \leq (|I|/2 + 1)D_{10}e^{-D_{10}^{-1}r^{3/2}}. \]

We will run induction on $k$. The case $k = 1$ follows the tail bounds for the solution to $KPZ$ equation with the narrow wedge initial condition [CG1],[CG2]. In the rest of this section, we consider $k \geq 2$ and assume Propositions [B.1] and [B.2] hold for $1, 2, \ldots, k - 1$. In particular, Corollary B.3 holds for $1, 2, \ldots, k - 1$. 
B.1. Proof of Proposition B.1. For \( \tau > 0 \), define the events
\[
\text{Low}_k^{[-4\tau,-2\tau]} = \left\{ \sup_{x \in [-4\tau,-2\tau]} (\psi_k^t(x) + 2^{-1}x^2) \leq -4^{-1}\tau^2 - \tau^{1/2} \right\},
\]
\[
\text{Low}_k^{[2\tau,4\tau]} = \left\{ \sup_{x \in [2\tau,4\tau]} (\psi_k^t(x) + 2^{-1}x^2) \leq -4^{-1}\tau^2 - \tau^{1/2} \right\}.
\]

Lemma B.4. There exist constants \( D_{11} = D_{11}(k) \) and \( \tau_0 > 0 \) such that for all \( t \geq 1 \) and \( \tau \geq \tau_0 \),
\[
\mathbb{P}(\text{Low}_k^{[-4\tau,-2\tau]}) \leq D_{11}e^{-D_{11}^{-1}\tau^3}.
\]

Proof. Because of the stationarity of \( \psi_k^t(x) + 2^{-1}x^2 \), it suffices to prove
\[
\mathbb{P}(\text{Low}_k^{[-4\tau,4\tau]}) \leq \bar{E}_k e^{-\bar{E}_k\tau^3}
\]
with
\[
\text{Low}_k^{[-4\tau,4\tau]} = \left\{ \sup_{x \in [-4\tau,4\tau]} (\psi_k^t(x) + 2^{-1}x^2) \leq -4^{-1}\tau^2 - \tau^{1/2} \right\}.
\]

Let \( g_{k-1} = \{\psi_{k-1}(\tau) + 2^{-1}\tau^2 \leq 4^{-1}\tau^2\} \cap \{\psi_{k-1}(\tau) + 2^{-1}\tau^2 \leq 4^{-1}\tau^2\} \) and
\[
A_k = \text{Low}_k^{[-4\tau,4\tau]} \cap g_{k-1}.
\]

Consider the random curve \( \mathcal{L} \) with the law
\[
\mathbb{P}^{k-1,k-1,(-\tau,\tau),-\tau^2/4,-\tau^2/4,\infty,-x^2/2-\tau^2/4-\tau^{-1/2}}_{\mathcal{L}} W_{H_k}^{k-1,k-1,(-\tau,\tau),-\tau^2/4,-\tau^2/4,\infty,-x^2/2-\tau^2/4-\tau^{-1/2}}.
\]

Let \( Z \) be the normalizing constant as
\[
Z = \mathbb{P}^{k-1,k-1,(-\tau,\tau),-\tau^2/4,-\tau^2/4}_{\text{free}} \left[ W_{H_k}^{k-1,k-1,(-\tau,\tau),-\tau^2/4,-\tau^2/4,\infty,-x^2/2-\tau^2/4-\tau^{-1/2}} \right].
\]

Let \( B(x) \) be a Brownian bridge. As the event \( \inf_{x \in [-\tau,\tau]} B(x) \geq -\tau^2/4 - \tau^{-1/2} \) occurs, \( B(x) \) lies above \( -x^2/2 - \tau^2/4 - \tau^{-1/2} \) and
\[
W_{H_k}^{k-1,k-1,(-\tau,\tau),-\tau^2/4,-\tau^2/4,\infty,-x^2/2-\tau^2/4-\tau^{-1/2}} (B) \geq e^{-2\tau}.
\]

Therefore,
\[
Z \geq e^{-2\tau} \mathbb{P}^{k-1,k-1,(-\tau,\tau),-\tau^2/4,-\tau^2/4}_{\text{free}} \left( \inf_{x \in [-\tau,\tau]} B(x) \geq -\tau^2/4 - \tau^{-1/2} \right)
\]
\[
= e^{2\tau} \mathbb{P}^{1,1,(-1,1),0,0}_{\text{free}} \left( \inf_{x \in [-1,1]} B(x) \geq -1 \right) \geq C^{-1} e^{-2\tau}.
\]

Recall that we use \( C \) to denote a universal constant that may change from line to line. By the stochastic monotonicity, \( \psi_{k-1}^{\tau}[-\tau,\tau] \) conditioned on \( A_k \) is stochastically dominated by \( \mathcal{L} \). In particular,
\[
\mathbb{P} \left( \psi_{k-1}^{\tau}(0) \geq -8^{-1}\tau^2 \left| A_k \right. \right) \leq \mathbb{P}^{k-1,k-1,(-\tau,\tau),-\tau^2/4,-\tau^2/4,\infty,-x^2/2-\tau^2/4-\tau^{-1/2}}_{\mathcal{L}} (L(0) \geq -8^{-1}\tau^2)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{Z} \mathbb{P}^{1,1,(-1,1),0,0}_{\text{free}} (B(0) \geq -8^{-1}\tau^2)
\]
\[
\leq C e^{2\tau} \mathbb{P}^{1,1,(-1,1),0,0}_{\text{free}} (B(0) \geq 8^{-1}\tau^3/2)
\]
\[
\leq C e^{2\tau} - C^{-1}\tau^3.
\]
Therefore, there exists $\tau_0$ such that for all $\tau \geq \tau_0$,
\[ P\left( S_{k-1}^f(0) < -8^{-1}\tau^2 \bigg| A_k \right) \geq 2^{-1}. \]

Then
\[ P(A_k) \leq 2P\left( S_{k-1}^f(0) < -8^{-1}\tau^2 \right) \leq De^{-D^{-1}\tau^3} \]

and
\[ P(\text{Low}^k_{-\tau,\tau}] \leq P(A_k) + P(G_{k-1}^c) \leq De^{-D^{-1}\tau^3}. \]

The proof is finished. \(\square\)

Now we are ready to prove Proposition [B.1]

**proof of Proposition [B.1]** Let $\tau_0$ be the number in Lemma [B.4] and $\tau \geq \max\{2,\tau_0\}$. Define the events
\[ U_{p_{k-1}} \{ -4,4 \} = \left\{ \inf_{x \in [-4,4]} \left( S_{k-1}^f(x) + 2^{-1}x^2 \right) \geq -2^{-1}\tau^2 \right\}, \]
\[ E = U_{p_{k-1}} \{ -4,4 \} \cap \left( \text{Low}^k_{-\tau,\tau} \right)^c \cap \left( \text{Low}^k_{2\tau,4\tau} \right)^c. \]

By Lemma [B.4] and Corollary [B.3]
\[ P(E^c) \leq (4\tau + 1)D e^{-D^{-1}\tau^3}. \]

Define
\[ \sigma_1 = \inf \left\{ x \in [-4\tau,-2\tau] \mid S_{k-1}^f(x) + 2^{-1}x^2 \geq -4^{-1}\tau^2 - \tau^{1/2} \right\}, \]
\[ \sigma_2 = \sup \left\{ x \in [2\tau,4\tau] \mid S_{k-1}^f(x) + 2^{-1}x^2 \geq -4^{-1}\tau^2 - \tau^{1/2} \right\}. \]

As $E$ occurs, $\sigma_1 \in [-4\tau,-2\tau],\sigma_2 \in [2\tau,4\tau]$ and
\[ S_{k-1}^f(\sigma_1), S_{k-1}^f(\sigma_2) \geq -8\tau^2 - 4^{-1}\tau^2 - \tau^{1/2} \geq -9\tau^2. \]

Here we used $\tau \geq 2$. Consider the random curve $\mathcal{L}$ with the law
\[ P_{W_{H_t}}^{k,k,(\sigma_1,\sigma_2),-9\tau^2,-9\tau^2,-x^2,-\tau^2,-\infty}. \]

Let $Z$ be the normalizing constant as
\[ Z = \mathbb{E}_{\text{free}}^{k,k,(\sigma_1,\sigma_2),-9\tau^2,-9\tau^2}[W_{H_t}^{k,k,(\sigma_1,\sigma_2),-9\tau^2,-9\tau^2,-x^2,-\tau^2,-\infty}]. \]

Let $B(x)$ be a Brownian bridge. As the event $\sup_{x \in [\sigma_1,\sigma_2]} B(x) \leq -(17/2)\tau^2$ occurs, $B(x)$ lies below $-x^2/2 - \tau^2/2$ and
\[ W_{H_t}^{k,k,(\sigma_1,\sigma_2),-9\tau^2,-9\tau^2,-x^2,-\tau^2,-\infty}(B) \geq e^{-8\tau}. \]

Therefore
\[ Z \geq e^{-8\tau} \mathbb{E}_{\text{free}}^{k,k,(\sigma_1,\sigma_2),-9\tau^2,-9\tau^2}[\left( \sup_{x \in [\sigma_1,\sigma_2]} B(x) \leq \frac{17}{2}\tau^2 \right)], \]
\[ = e^{-8\tau} \mathbb{E}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(1,1),0,0,0}[\left( \sup_{x \in [-1,1]} B(x) \leq \frac{\tau^2}{2} \right) / \left( \frac{\sigma_2 - \sigma_1}{2} \right)^{1/2}], \]
\[ \geq e^{-8\tau} \mathbb{E}_{\text{free}}^{1,1,(1,1),0,0,0}[\left( \sup_{x \in [-1,1]} B(x) \leq \frac{\tau^3}{4} \right)]. \]
By requiring $\tau \geq \tau_1$ with $\tau_1$ large enough, we ensure 
$$Z \geq 2^{-1} e^{-8\tau}.$$ 

By the stochastic monotonicity, $\mathcal{S}_k^{\hat{t}}|_{[\sigma_1, \sigma_2]}$ conditioned on $E$ stochastically dominates $L$. In particular, 
$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{x \in [-\tau, 2\tau]} \mathcal{S}_k^{\hat{t}}(x) \leq -10\tau^2 \middle| E\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{x \in [-\tau, 2\tau]} \mathcal{S}_k^{\hat{t}}(x) \leq -10\tau^2 \middle| H_{\text{free}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}^{1,1,(-1,1),0,0}_{\text{free}}\left(\inf_{x \in [-\tau, 2\tau]} B(x) \leq -10\tau^2 \middle/ \left(\frac{\sigma_2 - \sigma_1}{2}\right)^{1/2}\right) \leq 2e^{8\tau}\mathbb{P}^{1,1,(-1,1),0,0}_{\text{free}}\left(\inf_{x \in [-\tau, 2\tau]} B(x) \leq -\frac{\tau^2}{2}\right) \leq Ce^{8\tau}\exp(-C^{-1}2^{-2}\tau^3).$$ 
Thus 
$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{x \in [-\tau, 2\tau]} \mathcal{S}_k^{\hat{t}}(x) \leq -10\tau^2 \right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{x \in [-\tau, 2\tau]} \mathcal{S}_k^{\hat{t}}(x) \leq -10\tau^2 \middle| E\right) + \mathbb{P}(E^c) \leq Ce^{8\tau}\exp(-C^{-1}2^{-2}\tau^3) + (4\tau + 1)De^{-D^{-1}\tau^3} \leq De^{-D^{-1}\tau^3}.$$

As $[-1, 1] \subset [-\tau, 2\tau]$, we conclude for all $\tau \geq \max\{2, \tau_0, \tau_1\}$ 
$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{x \in [-1, 1]} \mathcal{S}_k^{\hat{t}}(x) \leq -10\tau^2 \right) \leq E_k^\prime \exp(-c_k\tau^3).$$

by setting $r = 10\tau^2$, we have for $r \geq 10\max\{4, \tau_0^2, \tau_1^2\}$ 
$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{x \in [-1, 1]} \mathcal{S}_k^{\hat{t}}(x) \leq -r \right) \leq De^{-D^{-1}\tau^3}.$$

Thus (B.2) follows. 

### B.2. Proof of Proposition B.2

For any real number $\hat{R}$, define the event 
$$E_k(\hat{R}) = \left\{ \sup_{x \in [0, 1/2]} \left( \mathcal{S}_k^{\hat{t}}(x) + 2^{-1}x^2 \right) \geq \hat{R} \right\}$$

Let 
$$\chi(\hat{R}) = \inf \left\{ x \in [0, 1/2] \middle| \mathcal{S}_k^{\hat{t}}(x) + 2^{-1}x^2 \geq \hat{R} \right\}$$

For simplicity, we denote 
$$\chi = \chi(\hat{R}).$$

As $E_k(\hat{R})$ occurs, $\chi \in [0, 1/2]$. For any real numbers $K$, $R$ and $R'$, define the events 
$$Q_{k-2}(K) = \left\{ \inf_{x \in [\chi, 2]} \mathcal{S}_k^{\hat{t}}(x) + 2^{-1}x^2 \geq -K \right\},$$

$$A_{k-1,k}(R) = \left\{ \mathcal{S}_k^{\hat{t}}(\chi) + 2^{-1}\chi^2 \geq -R \right\} \cap \left\{ \mathcal{S}_j^{\hat{t}}(2) + 2^{-1}2^2 \geq -R, \ j = k - 1 \text{ and } j = k \right\},$$

$$B_{k-1}(R') = \left\{ \sup_{x \in [\chi, 2]} \left( \mathcal{S}_k^{\hat{t}}(x) + 2^{-1}x^2 \right) \geq R' \right\}.$$
By the stochastic monotonicity,
\[ \mathbb{P}(B_{k-1}(R')|E_k(\hat{R}) \cap Q_{k-2}(K) \cap A_{k-1,k}(R)) \geq \inf_{\chi \in [0,1/2]} p_{\chi,t}(R, K, \hat{R}, R'), \]
where
\[ p_{\chi,t}(R, K, \hat{R}, R') = \mathbb{P}^{k-1,k,\chi,t}(R, K, \hat{R}, R'). \]

The following proposition is a simplified version of [CH16, Proposition 7.6]

**Proposition B.5.** There exists functions \( K^0(R), \hat{R}^0(R, K) \) and \( R^0(\hat{R}) \) such that the following holds. For all \( R > 1, K > K^0(R), \hat{R} > \hat{R}^0(R, K) \), all \( t \geq 1 \) and \( \chi \in [0,1/2] \),
\[ p_{\chi,t}(R, K, \hat{R}, R^0(\hat{R})) \geq \frac{1}{2} \]
Furthermore, the functions \( K^0(R), \hat{R}^0(R, K) \) and \( R^0(\hat{R}) \) are of the form
\[ K^0(R) = \max\{R, C_1\}, \hat{R}^0(R, K) = \max\{1600R, 1600K, C_2\}, R^0(\hat{R}) = 6400^{-1} \hat{R} - 1 \]
with some universal constants \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \).

**Remark B.6.** Compared to [CH16, Proposition 7.6], we made the following simplifications. \( \mu \) is chosen to be \( 2^{-1} \). The extra minus one in \( R^0(\hat{R}) \) comes from [CH16, Lemma 7.7]. On page 75 of [CH16], the choice of \( R^0 \) is arbitrary and we pick 1. On the same page, \( \delta \) can be \( 1600^{-1} \). The form of \( K^0(R) \) and \( \hat{R}^0(R, K) \) can also be found on page 75 of [CH16].

From the view of Proposition B.5, suppose
\[ R \geq 2, K \geq 2 \max\{R, C_1\}, \hat{R} \geq 2 \max\{1600R, 1600K, C_2, 6400\}. \]
Then
\[ \mathbb{P}\left(B_{k-1}\left(\hat{R}^0(\hat{R})\right) \mid E_k(\hat{R}) \cap Q_{k-2}(K) \cap A_{k-1,k}(R)\right) \geq \frac{1}{2}. \]
Hence
\[ \mathbb{P}\left(E_k(\hat{R}) \cap Q_{k-2}(K) \cap A_{k-1,k}(R)\right) \leq 2\mathbb{P}\left(B_{k-1}\left(\hat{R}^0(\hat{R})\right)\right) \leq D \exp\left(-D^{-1} \left(\hat{R}^0(\hat{R})\right)^{3/2}\right) \]
Here we used (B.2) for \( k = 1 \). Similarly, from (B.1) for \( k = 2, k = 1 \)
\[ \mathbb{P}(Q_{k-2}(K)^c) \leq De^{-D^{-1}K^{3/2}}, \]
\[ \mathbb{P}(A_{k-1,k}(R)^c) \leq De^{-D^{-1}R^{3/2}}. \]
Thus, provided (B.5) holds, \( \mathbb{P}\left(E_k(\hat{R})\right) \) is bounded from above by
\[ D \exp\left(-D^{-1} \left(\hat{R}^0(\hat{R})\right)^{3/2}\right) + De^{-D^{-1}R^{3/2}}. \]
For any \( \hat{R} \geq \max\{2C_0', 3200C_0, 12800\} \), take \( 2R = K = 3200^{-1} \hat{R} \). Then (B.5) holds and \( R^0(\hat{R}) \geq 12800^{-1} \hat{R} \). Thus
\[ \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in [0,1/2]} \left(\hat{R}^0_k(x) + 2^{-1}x^2\right) \geq \hat{R}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(E_k(\hat{R})\right) \leq D \exp(-D^{-1} \hat{R}^{-3/2}). \]
Together with the stationarity of $\mathcal{H}_t^k(x) + 2^{-1}x^2$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x \in [-1, 1]} (\mathcal{H}_t^k(x) + 2^{-1}x^2) \geq \tilde{R} \right) \leq D \exp(-D^{-1}\tilde{R}^{-3/2}).$$

provided $\tilde{R} \geq \max\{2C_2, 3200C_1, 12800\}$. Thus (B.2) follows and this finishes the proof.
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