

Volume growth and heat kernel estimates for the continuum random tree

David Croydon*

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

February 15, 2019

Abstract

In this article, we prove global and local (point-wise) volume and heat kernel bounds for the continuum random tree. We demonstrate that there are almost-surely logarithmic global fluctuations and log-logarithmic local fluctuations in the volume of balls of radius r about the leading order polynomial term as $r \rightarrow 0$. We also show that the on-diagonal part of the heat kernel exhibits corresponding global and local fluctuations as $t \rightarrow 0$ almost-surely. Finally, we prove that this quenched (almost-sure) behaviour contrasts with the local annealed (averaged over all realisations of the tree) volume and heat kernel behaviour, which is smooth.

1 Introduction

The continuum random tree has, since its introduction by Aldous in [1], become an important object in modern probability theory. As well as being the scaling limit of a variety of discrete tree-like objects, see [1], [3], by a suitable random embedding into \mathbb{R}^d , it is possible to describe the support of the integrated super-Brownian excursion (ISE) using the continuum random tree ([4]). In this article, we investigate and present various bounds for the fundamental solution of the heat equation on the continuum random tree, which can of course be thought of as the transition density of the Brownian motion on the continuum random tree. In the course of doing so, we also prove a collection of asymptotic results about the volume of balls in the continuum random tree. With growing evidence ([20]) to support the fact that in high dimensions the incipient infinite cluster of percolation at criticality scales to the ISE, we hope that these results will eventually contribute to the understanding of the asymptotic behaviour of random walks on these lattice objects.

We shall denote by \mathcal{T} the continuum random tree, which is a random set defined on an underlying probability space with probability measure \mathbf{P} (we shall write \mathbf{E} for the expectation under \mathbf{P}). It has a natural metric, $d_{\mathcal{T}}$, and a natural volume measure, μ . The existence of Brownian motion on \mathcal{T} , as defined in Section 5.2 of [2], has already been proved by Krebs, who constructed a process via a Dirichlet form on \mathcal{T} , which was defined

*Dept of Statistics, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK; d.a.croydon@warwick.ac.uk.

as the limit of differential operators, and then Brownian motion was a time change of this process, see [23]. We provide an alternative construction, using the resistance form techniques developed by Kigami in [21] to define a local, regular Dirichlet form on the measure-metric space $(\mathcal{T}, d_{\mathcal{T}}, \mu)$. Given this Dirichlet form, standard results allow the construction of an associated Markov process, $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with invariant measure μ , which we show is actually Brownian motion on \mathcal{T} . The construction used here seems more natural, allowing us to define the Dirichlet form for Brownian motion directly. Furthermore, the arguments we use to deduce our process satisfies the properties of Brownian motion are more concise, using more recently developed techniques for resistance forms, rather than limiting arguments.

Once a Markov process is established on \mathcal{T} , it is natural to ask whether it has a transition density, and if it does, what form does the transition density take? The current literature on measure-metric spaces equipped with a resistance form seems to indicate that an important part of the answer to this question is the volume growth of the space with respect to the resistance metric, see [9] and [24]. However, for certain random subsets it has been shown that they do not satisfy the kind of uniform volume growth that is often assumed. For example, in [19], Hambly and Jones show how for a certain class random recursive fractals the volume of balls of radius r have fluctuations of order of powers of $\ln r^{-1}$ about a leading order polynomial term, r^α . With the random self-similarity of the continuum random tree ([5]), it is reasonable to expect similar behaviour for the continuum random tree. Indeed, it has already been shown that the continuum random tree and a class of recursive fractals do exhibit the same form of Hausdorff measure function, $r^\alpha (\ln \ln r^{-1})^\theta$, with $\alpha = 2$, $\theta = 1$ in the case of the continuum random tree (see [13], Corollary 1.2 and [17], Theorem 5.2). Motivated by the random fractal examples, heat kernel bounds for measure-metric spaces with volume fluctuations have been established in [12]; these suggest that to establish heat kernel estimates for the continuum random tree, it will be sufficient to determine the volume growth behaviour.

Henceforth, define the ball of radius r around the point $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}$ to be

$$B(\sigma, r) := \{\sigma' : d_{\mathcal{T}}(\sigma, \sigma') < r\}.$$

In the annealed case (Theorem 1.1), we calculate the volume of a ball of radius r around the root exactly. The expression we obtain is easily seen to be asymptotically equal to $2r^2$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. In the quenched case (Theorem 1.2), the behaviour is not as smooth and we see fluctuations in the volume growth of logarithmic order, which confirm the expectations of the previous paragraph. Although it is tight enough to demonstrate the order of the fluctuations, we remark that the upper bound for $\inf_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}} \mu(B(\sigma, r))$ is almost certainly not optimal (as a consequence, neither are the corresponding lower heat kernel bounds). We conjecture that, up to constants, the lower bound for this quantity is sharp.

Theorem 1.1 *Let ρ be the root of \mathcal{T} , then*

$$\mathbf{E}(\mu(B(\rho, r))) = 1 - e^{-2r^2}, \quad \forall r \geq 0.$$

Theorem 1.2 *P-a.s., there exist constants $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that*

$$C_1 r^2 \ln_1 r^{-1} \leq \sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}} \mu(B(\sigma, r)) \leq C_2 r^2 \ln_1 r^{-1},$$

and

$$C_3 r^2 (\ln_1 r^{-1})^{-1} \leq \inf_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}} \mu(B(\sigma, r)) \leq C_4 r^2 \ln_1 \ln_1 r^{-1},$$

for $r \in (0, \text{diam} \mathcal{T})$, where $\text{diam} \mathcal{T}$ is the diameter of $(\mathcal{T}, d_{\mathcal{T}})$ and $\ln_1 x := \ln x \vee 1$.

Locally, we prove the following volume bounds, which show that the volume growth of a ball around a particular point demonstrates fluctuations about r^2 of the order of $\ln \ln r^{-1}$ asymptotically. This exactly mirrors the $\ln \ln r^{-1}$ local fluctuations exhibited by the random recursive fractals of [19]. We remark that the \limsup result has also been proved in the course of deriving the Hausdorff measure function of \mathcal{T} in [13]. However, we include an alternative proof which applies properties of a Brownian excursion directly. Similarly to the global case, we conjecture that the best local lower bound for $\mu(B(\sigma, r))$ is actually a multiple of $r^2 (\ln \ln r^{-1})^{-1}$ and the asymptotic result appearing on the left hand side of (1) is optimal.

Theorem 1.3 *\mathbf{P} -a.s., we have*

$$0 < \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(\sigma, r))}{r^2 \ln \ln r^{-1}} < \infty,$$

and also

$$0 < \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(\sigma, r))}{r^2 (\ln \ln r^{-1})^{-1}}, \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(\sigma, r))}{r^2} < \infty, \quad (1)$$

for μ -a.e. $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}$.

The global volume bounds of Theorem 1.2 mean that the continuum random tree satisfies the non-uniform volume doubling of [12], \mathbf{P} -a.s. Results of that article immediately allow us to deduce the existence of a transition density for the Brownian motion on \mathcal{T} and the following bounds upon it.

Theorem 1.4 *\mathbf{P} -a.s., the Brownian motion $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on \mathcal{T} exists, and furthermore, it has a transition density $(p_t(\sigma, \sigma'))_{\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{T}, t > 0}$, that satisfies, for some constants C_5, C_6, C_7, C_8 , $t_0 > 0$ and deterministic $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3 \in (0, \infty)$,*

$$p_t(\sigma, \sigma') \geq C_5 t^{-\frac{2}{3}} (\ln_1 t^{-1})^{-\theta_1} \exp \left\{ -C_6 \left(\frac{d^3}{t} \right)^{1/2} \ln_1 \left(\frac{d}{t} \right)^{\theta_2} \right\}, \quad (2)$$

and

$$p_t(\sigma, \sigma') \leq C_7 t^{-\frac{2}{3}} (\ln_1 t^{-1})^{1/3} \exp \left\{ -C_8 \left(\frac{d^3}{t} \right)^{1/2} \ln_1 \left(\frac{d}{t} \right)^{-\theta_3} \right\}, \quad (3)$$

for all $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{T}$, $t \in (0, t_0)$, where $d := d_{\mathcal{T}}(\sigma, \sigma')$ and $\ln_1 x := \ln x \vee 1$.

This result demonstrates that the heat kernel decays exponentially away from the diagonal and there can be spatial fluctuations of no more than logarithmic order. The following theorem that we prove for the on-diagonal part of the heat kernel shows that global fluctuations of this order do actually occur. Locally, the results we obtain are not precise enough to demonstrate the \mathbf{P} -a.s. existence of fluctuations, see Theorem 1.6.

However, they do show that there can only be fluctuations of log-logarithmic order, and combined with the annealed result of Proposition 1.7, they prove that log-logarithmic fluctuations occur with positive probability.

Theorem 1.5 *P-a.s., there exist constants $C_9, C_{10}, C_{11}, C_{12}, t_1 > 0$ and deterministic $\theta_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in (0, t_1)$,*

$$C_9 t^{-2/3} (\ln \ln t^{-1})^{-14} \leq \sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}} p_t(\sigma, \sigma) \leq C_{10} t^{-2/3} (\ln t^{-1})^{1/3}, \quad (4)$$

$$C_{11} t^{-2/3} (\ln t^{-1})^{-\theta_4} \leq \inf_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}} p_t(\sigma, \sigma) \leq C_{12} t^{-2/3} (\ln t^{-1})^{-1/3}. \quad (5)$$

Theorem 1.6 *P-a.s., for μ -a.e. $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}$, there exist constants $C_{13}, C_{14}, t_2 > 0$ such that for all $t \in (0, t_2)$,*

$$C_{13} t^{-2/3} (\ln \ln t^{-1})^{-14} \leq p_t(\sigma, \sigma) \leq C_{14} t^{-2/3} (\ln \ln t^{-1})^{1/3},$$

and also

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{p_t(\sigma, \sigma)}{t^{-2/3} (\ln \ln t^{-1})^{-1/3}} < \infty.$$

The final estimates we prove are annealed heat kernel bounds at the root of \mathcal{T} , which show that the expected value of $p_t(\rho, \rho)$ is controlled by $t^{-2/3}$ with at most $O(1)$ fluctuations as $t \rightarrow 0$.

Proposition 1.7 *Let ρ be the root of \mathcal{T} , then there exist constants C_{15}, C_{16} such that*

$$C_{15} t^{-2/3} \leq \mathbf{E}(p_t(\rho, \rho)) \leq C_{16} t^{-2/3}, \quad \forall t \in (0, 1).$$

At this point, a comparison with the results obtained by Barlow and Kumagai for the random walk on the incipient cluster for critical percolation on a regular tree, [8], is pertinent. First, observe that the incipient infinite cluster can be constructed as a particular branching process conditioned to never become extinct and the self-similar continuum random tree (see [2]) can be constructed as the scaling limit of a similar branching process. Note also that the objects studied here and by Barlow and Kumagai are both measure-metric space trees and so similar probabilistic and analytic techniques for estimating the heat kernel may be applied to them. Consequently, it is not surprising that the quenched local heat kernel bounds of [8] exhibit log-logarithmic differences similar to those obtained in this article and furthermore, the annealed heat kernel behaviour at the root is also shown to be the same in both settings. It should be noted though that the volume bounds which are crucial for obtaining these heat kernel bounds are proved in very different ways. Here we use Brownian excursion properties, whereas in [8], branching process arguments are applied. Unlike in [8], we do not prove annealed off-diagonal heat kernel bounds. This is primarily because there is no canonical way of labelling vertices (apart from the root) in the continuum random tree.

The article is organised as follows. In Section 2, we provide definitions of and give a brief introduction to the main objects of the discussion, namely the normalised Brownian

excursion and the continuum random tree. The annealed volume result of Theorem 1.1 is calculated in Section 3. In Section 4 we prove five results about the sample paths of the normalised Brownian excursion, which are then used to obtain the volume bounds in Sections 5 to 7. In Section 9, we explain how already established results about dendrites and measure-metric spaces may be applied to the continuum random tree to construct a process on \mathcal{T} and derive the quenched transition density estimates of Theorems 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6. The annealed heat kernel bounds are proved in Section 10. Finally, we show that the process we have constructed is actually Brownian motion on \mathcal{T} in Section 11.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Normalised Brownian excursion

An important part of the definition of the continuum random tree is the Brownian excursion, normalised to have length 1. In this section, we provide two characterisations of the law of the normalised Brownian excursion, which may be deduced from a standard Brownian motion on \mathbb{R} . We shall denote by $B = (B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ a standard, 1-dimensional Brownian motion starting from 0 under \mathbf{P} .

We begin by defining the space of excursions, U . First, let U' be the space of functions $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ for which there exists a $\tau(f) \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$f(t) > 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad t \in (0, \tau(f)).$$

We shall take $U := U' \cap C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+)$, the restriction to the continuous functions contained in U' . The space of excursions of length 1 is then defined to be $U^{(1)} := \{f \in U : \tau(f) = 1\}$.

Our first description of the law of W involves conditioning the Ito excursion law, which arises from the Poisson process of excursions of B . Since this law has been widely studied, we shall omit most of the technicalities here. For more details of excursion laws for Markov processes, the reader is referred to [29], Chapter VI.

Let L_t be the local time of B at 0, and $L_t^{-1} := \inf\{s > 0 : L_s > t\}$ be its right continuous inverse. Wherever $L_t^{-1} \neq L_t^{-1}$, we define $e_t \in U$ to be the (positive) excursion at local time t . In particular,

$$e_t(s) := \begin{cases} |B_{L_t^{-1}+s}|, & 0 \leq s \leq L_t^{-1} - L_{t-}^{-1}, \\ 0, & s > L_t^{-1} - L_{t-}^{-1}. \end{cases}$$

The set of excursions of B is denoted by $\Pi := \{(t, e_t) : L_t^{-1} \neq L_{t-}^{-1}\}$. The key idea is that Π is a Poisson process on $(0, \infty) \times U$. More specifically, there exists a σ -finite measure, n , on U such that, under \mathbf{P} ,

$$\#(\Pi \cap \cdot) \stackrel{d}{=} N(\cdot),$$

where N is a Poisson random measure on $(0, \infty) \times U$ with intensity $dt \, n(df)$. Bearing this result in mind, even though it has infinite mass, the measure n can be considered to be the “law” of the (unconditional) Brownian excursion.

We now describe the procedure for conditioning this measure. For $c > 0$, the renormalisation operator $\Lambda_c : U \rightarrow U$ is defined by

$$\Lambda_c(f)(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c}} f(ct), \quad \forall t \geq 0, f \in U.$$

Clearly, if $f \in U$, then $\Lambda_{\tau(f)}(f) \in U^{(1)}$. For a measurable $A \subseteq U^{(1)}$, define the probability measure $n^{(1)}$ by

$$n^{(1)}(A) := \frac{n(\Lambda_{\tau(f)}(f) \in A, \tau(f) \geq 1)}{n(\tau(f) \geq 1)} \equiv n(\Lambda_{\tau(f)}(f) \in A | \tau(f) \geq 1).$$

A $U^{(1)}$ valued process which has law $n^{(1)}$ is said to be a normalised Brownian excursion.

Our second description of the law of the normalised Brownian excursion is as the law of the normalisation of the excursion straddling a fixed time. In fact, this description also allows an explicit construction of the normalised Brownian excursion, which we shall denote $W = (W_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$. First, fix $T > 0$ and set $G_T := \sup\{t < T : B_t = 0\}$, $D_T := \inf\{t > T : B_t = 0\}$, which are not equal, \mathbf{P} -a.s. The excursion straddling T is then

$$Z_t := \begin{cases} |B_{G_T+t}|, & 0 \leq t \leq D_T - G_T, \\ 0, & t > D_T - G_T, \end{cases}$$

which takes values in U , \mathbf{P} -a.s. We can normalise Z to have length 1 by setting $W = \Lambda_{D_T - G_T}(Z)$, which takes values in $U^{(1)}$, \mathbf{P} -a.s. By comparing the density formula for $(G_T, D_T, (Z_t)_{t \geq 0})$ of [10], Theorem 6, with the finite dimensional density of $n^{(1)}$ (see [28], Chapter XII), it is elementary to show that the process W has the law $n^{(1)}$, and so the two descriptions of the law of the normalised Brownian excursion are equivalent.

2.2 Continuum random tree

The connection between trees and excursions is an area that has been of much recent interest. In this section, we look to provide a brief introduction to this link and also a definition of the continuum random tree, which is the object of interest of this article.

Given a function $f \in U$, we define a distance on $[0, \tau(f)]$ by setting

$$d_f(s, t) := f(s) + f(t) - 2m_f(s, t), \quad (6)$$

where $m_f(s, t) := \inf\{f(r) : r \in [s \wedge t, s \vee t]\}$. Then, we use the equivalence

$$s \sim t \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad d_f(s, t) = 0,$$

to define $\mathcal{T}_f := [0, \tau(f)] / \sim$. We can write this as $\mathcal{T}_f = \{\sigma_s : s \in [0, \tau(f)]\}$, where $\sigma_s := [s]$, the equivalence class containing s . It is then straightforward to check that

$$d_{\mathcal{T}_f}(\sigma_s, \sigma_t) := d_f(s, t),$$

defines a metric on \mathcal{T}_f , and also that \mathcal{T}_f is a dendrite: a path-wise connected topological space, containing no subset homeomorphic to the circle. Furthermore, the metric $d_{\mathcal{T}_f}$ is a shortest path metric on \mathcal{T}_f , which means that it is additive along the paths of \mathcal{T}_f . The root of the tree \mathcal{T}_f is defined to be the equivalence class σ_0 and is denoted by ρ_f .

A natural volume measure to put on \mathcal{T}_f is the projection of Lebesgue measure on $[0, \tau(f)]$. For open $A \subseteq \mathcal{T}_f$, let

$$\mu_f(A) := \lambda(\{t \in [0, \tau(f)] : \sigma_t \in A\}),$$

where, throughout this article, λ is the usual 1-dimensional Lebesgue measure. This defines a Borel measure on $(\mathcal{T}_f, d_{\mathcal{T}_f})$, with total mass equal to $\tau(f)$.

The continuum random tree is then simply the random dendrite that we get when the function f is chosen according to the law of the normalised Brownian excursion. This differs from the Aldous continuum random tree, which is based on the random function $2W$. Since this extra factor only has the effect of increasing distances by a factor of 2, our results will still apply to Aldous' tree. In keeping with the notation used so far in this section, the measure-metric space should be written $(\mathcal{T}_W, d_{\mathcal{T}_W}, \mu_W)$, the distance on $[0, \tau(W)]$, defined at (6), d_W , and the root, ρ_W . However, we shall omit the subscripts W with the understanding that we are discussing the continuum random tree in this case. We note that $\tau(W) = 1$, \mathbf{P} -a.s., and so $[0, \tau(W)] = [0, 1]$ and μ is a probability measure on \mathcal{T} , \mathbf{P} -a.s. Finally, it follows from the continuity of W that the diameter of \mathcal{T} , $\text{diam}\mathcal{T}$, is finite \mathbf{P} -a.s.

2.3 Other notation

The δ -level oscillations of a function y on the interval $[s, t]$ will be written

$$\text{osc}(y, [s, t], \delta) := \sup_{\substack{r, r' \in [s, t]: \\ |r' - r| \leq \delta}} |y(r) - y(r')|,$$

and we will denote by c constants taking a value in $(0, \infty)$. We shall also continue to use the notation introduced in Theorems 1.2 and 1.4, $\ln_1 x := \ln x \vee 1$.

3 Annealed volume result at the root

The annealed volume result that we prove in this section follows easily from the expected occupation time of $[0, r)$ for normalised Brownian excursion.

Proof of Theorem 1.1: By definition, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B(\rho, r)) &= \lambda(\{s : d_{\mathcal{T}}(\sigma_s, \sigma_0) < r\}) \\ &= \lambda(\{s : W_s < r\}) \\ &= \int_0^1 1_{\{W_s < r\}} ds. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

An expression for the expectation of this random variable is obtained in [15], Section 3, giving

$$\mathbf{E}(\mu(B(\rho, r))) = \int_0^r 4ae^{-2a^2} da.$$

This integral is easily evaluated to give the desired result. \square

Remark 1 *The characterisation of $\mu(B(\rho, r))$ at (7) has as a consequence that the asymptotic results of Theorem 1.3 also apply to the time spent in $[0, r)$ by the normalised Brownian excursion as $r \rightarrow 0$.*

4 Brownian excursion properties

In this section, we use sample path properties of a standard Brownian motion to deduce various sample path properties for the normalised Brownian excursion. The definitions of the random variables B , L_t^{-1} , Π , Z and W should be recalled from Section 2.1.

Lemma 4.1 *\mathbf{P} -a.s.,*

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{osc}(W, [0, 1], \delta)}{\sqrt{\delta \ln \delta^{-1}}} < \infty.$$

Proof: From Levy's 1937 result ([25], Theorem 52.2) on the modulus of continuity of a standard Brownian motion, B , we may easily obtain

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{osc}(B, [s, t], \delta)}{\sqrt{\delta \ln \delta^{-1}}} < \infty, \quad \forall 0 \leq s < t < \infty, \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (8)$$

For $(t, e_t) \in \Pi$, we have that $\text{osc}(e_t, \mathbb{R}_+, \delta) = \text{osc}(B, [L_t^{-1}, L_t^{-1}], \delta)$. Consequently, (8) implies that $e_t \in A$, for all $(t, e_t) \in \Pi$, \mathbf{P} -a.s., where

$$A := \left\{ f \in U : \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{osc}(f, \mathbb{R}_+, \delta)}{\sqrt{\delta \ln \delta^{-1}}} < \infty \right\},$$

Hence $\mathbf{P}(N((0, \infty) \times A^c) > 0) = 0$, where N is the Poisson process with intensity $dt n(df)$, as described in Section 2.1. This means that $0 = \int_0^\infty n(A^c) dt$, whence $n(A^c) = 0$. Since A is invariant under the re-normalisation of excursions, it follows that $n^{(1)}(A^c) = 0$. Since $n^{(1)}$ is the law of W , this completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.2 *\mathbf{P} -a.s.,*

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\inf_{t \in [0, 1-\delta]} \text{osc}(W, [t, t+\delta], \delta)}{\sqrt{\delta (\ln \delta^{-1})^{-1}}} < \infty. \quad (9)$$

Proof: We start by proving the corresponding result for a standard Brownian motion. Fix a constant c_1 and then, for $n \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P} \left(\inf_{j=0, \dots, 2^n-1} \text{osc}(B, [j2^{-n}, (j+1)2^{-n}], 2^{-n}) \geq c_1 2^{-\frac{n}{2}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left(\text{osc}(B, [j2^{-n}, (j+1)2^{-n}], 2^{-n}) \geq c_1 2^{-\frac{n}{2}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}}, j = 0, \dots, 2^n - 1 \right) \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left(\text{osc}(B, [0, 2^{-n}], 2^{-n}) \geq c_1 2^{-\frac{n}{2}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right)^{2^n}, \end{aligned}$$

using the independent increments of a Brownian motion for the second equality. The probability in this expression is bounded above by

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, 2^{-n}]} |B_t| \geq \frac{c_1}{2^{1+\frac{n}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) = \mathbf{P} \left(T_{B_E(0,1)} \leq \frac{4n}{c_1^2} \right) \leq 1 - c_2 e^{-\frac{c_3 n}{c_1^2}},$$

for some constants c_2, c_3 , where $T_{B_E(0,1)}$ represents the exit time of a standard Brownian motion from a Euclidean ball of radius 1 about the origin. The distribution of this random variable is known explicitly, see [11], and the above tail estimate is readily deduced from the expression that is given there. Using the fact that $1 - x \leq e^{-x}$ for $x \geq 0$ and summing over n , we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P} \left(\inf_{j=0, \dots, 2^n-1} \text{osc}(B, [j2^{-n}, (j+1)2^{-n}], 2^{-n}) \geq c_1 2^{-\frac{n}{2}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-2^n c_2 e^{-\frac{c_3 n}{c_1}}},$$

which is finite for c_1 chosen suitably large. Hence Borel-Cantelli implies that, \mathbf{P} -a.s., there exists a constant c_4 such that

$$\inf_{j=0, \dots, 2^n-1} \text{osc}(B, [j2^{-n}, (j+1)2^{-n}], 2^{-n}) \leq c_4 2^{-\frac{n}{2}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

Let $\delta \in (0, 1]$, then $\delta \in [2^{-(n+1)}, 2^{-n}]$ for some $n \geq 0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{t \in [0, 1-\delta]} \text{osc}(B, [t, t+\delta], \delta) &\leq \inf_{t \in [0, 1-2^{-n}]} \text{osc}(B, [t, t+2^{-n}], 2^{-n}) \\ &\leq \inf_{j=0, \dots, 2^n-1} \text{osc}(B, [j2^{-n}, (j+1)2^{-n}], 2^{-n}) \\ &\leq c_4 2^{-\frac{n}{2}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq c_5 \sqrt{\delta (\ln \delta^{-1})^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (9) holds when W is replaced by B . By rescaling, an analogous result holds for any interval with rational endpoints. By countability and a monotonicity argument, this is easily extended to \mathbf{P} -a.s.,

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\inf_{t \in [r, s-\delta]} \text{osc}(B, [t, t+\delta], \delta)}{\sqrt{\delta (\ln \delta^{-1})^{-1}}} < \infty, \quad \forall 0 \leq r < s < \infty.$$

Applying a similar argument to that used in the proof of Lemma 4.1, the result for excursions may be deduced from this by using the Poisson process of excursions and rescaling. \square

Lemma 4.3 \mathbf{P} -a.s.,

$$\lambda \left\{ t \in [0, 1] : \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{|W_{t+\delta} - W_t|}{\sqrt{\delta \ln \ln \delta^{-1}}} < \infty \right\} = 1.$$

Proof: An application of Fubini's theorem allows it to be deduced from the law of the iterated logarithm for the standard Brownian motion, B , that

$$\lambda \left\{ t \geq 0 : \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{|B_{t+\delta} - B_t|}{\sqrt{\delta \ln \ln \delta^{-1}}} > 1 \right\} = 0, \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

For Z , the excursion straddling T , this implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda \left\{ t \in [0, D_T - G_T] : \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{|Z_{t+\delta} - Z_t|}{\sqrt{\delta \ln \ln \delta^{-1}}} > 1 \right\} \\ &= \lambda \left\{ t \in [G_T, D_T] : \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{|B_{t+\delta} - B_t|}{\sqrt{\delta \ln \ln \delta^{-1}}} > 1 \right\} = 0, \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

The result follows easily from this using the normalisation $W = \Lambda_{D_T - G_T}(Z)$, which we have by construction. \square

Lemma 4.4 *P*-a.s.,

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int_0^1 1_{\{W_t < \delta\}} dt}{\delta^2 \ln \ln \delta^{-1}} < \infty.$$

Proof: Letting Z be the excursion straddling T and using the notation $L := D_T - G_T$, we can rewrite the moments of the time spent below level δ by the normalised Brownian excursion as follows. For $k \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\left(\int_0^1 1_{\{W_t < \delta\}} dt \right)^k \right) = \mathbf{E} \left(L^{-k} \mathbf{E} \left(\left(\int_0^L 1_{\{Z_t < \delta \sqrt{L}\}} dt \right)^k \middle| L \right) \right).$$

The conditional expectation in this expression was shown in [10], Theorem 9, to be bounded above by $(k+1)!L^k\delta^{2k}$. Hence we have an upper bound of $(k+1)!\delta^{2k}$ for the non-conditional expectation. Thus, summing over k , this yields, for $\theta \in [0, 1)$, $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbf{E} \left(e^{\theta \delta^{-2} \int_0^1 1_{\{W_t < \delta\}} dt} \right) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(k+1)!\theta^k}{k!} = \frac{1}{(1-\theta)^2}. \quad (10)$$

Hence, for $\theta \in (0, 1)$, $\delta_k := e^{-k}$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P} \left(\frac{\int_0^1 1_{\{W_t < \delta_k\}} dt}{\delta_k^2 \ln \ln \delta_k^{-1}} \geq \frac{2}{\theta} \right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E} \left(e^{\theta \delta_k^{-2} \int_0^1 1_{\{W_t < \delta_k\}} dt - 2 \ln \ln \delta_k^{-1}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{(1-\theta)^2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-2}.$$

Since this is finite, the Borel-Cantelli lemma implies that the result holds along the subsequence $(\delta_k)_{k \geq 1}$. The lemma follows from this by a monotonicity argument. \square

Lemma 4.5 *P*-a.s.,

$$\lambda \left\{ t \in [0, 1] : \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sup_{s \in [0, \delta]} |W_{t+s} - W_t|}{\sqrt{\delta (\ln \ln \delta^{-1})^{-1}}} < \infty \right\} = 1.$$

Proof: In, [27], Section 6, Orey and Taylor prove the analogous result for Brownian motion. By applying Fubini's theorem and rescaling, as in the proof of Lemma 4.3, the lemma follows. \square

5 Global upper volume bound

In this section, we prove a global upper volume bound for \mathcal{T} . The three main ingredients in the proof are the modulus of continuity result proved in Lemma 4.1, a bound on the tail of the distribution of the volume of a ball about the root, and the invariance under random

re-rooting of the continuum random tree. We shall apply this final property repeatedly in later sections. For example, in the local upper volume bounds of Propositions 7.1 and 7.2, we proceed by investigating the volume of a ball around the root, ρ . Random re-rooting then allows the asymptotics we obtain at the root to be extended to μ -a.e. σ in \mathcal{T} . Before proving the main result of this section, we define precisely what we mean by re-rooting and state the invariance result that we will use.

Given W and $s \in [0, 1]$, we define the shifted process $W^{(s)} = (W_t^{(s)})_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ by

$$W_t^{(s)} := \begin{cases} W_s + W_{s+t} - 2m(s, s+t), & 0 \leq t \leq 1-s \\ W_s + W_{s+t-1} - 2m(s+t-1, s), & 1-s \leq t \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

The following lemma tells us that, if we select s according to the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$, independently of W , then the shifted process has the same distribution as the original, see [2], Section 2.7 for further discussion of the result.

Lemma 5.1 *If $W = (W_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ is a normalised Brownian excursion and U is an independent $U[0, 1]$ random variable, then $W^{(U)}$ has the same distribution as W .*

Written down in terms of excursions, it is not immediately clear what this result is telling us about the continuum random tree. Heuristically, it says that the distribution of the continuum random tree is invariant under random re-rooting, when the root is chosen from \mathcal{T} so that it has law μ . Note that, similarly to (7), from the definition of the shifted process $W^{(s)}$ it may be deduced that, for $s \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mu(B(\sigma_s, r)) = \int_0^1 1_{\{W_t^{(s)} < r\}} dt.$$

From this expression, it is easy to deduce from the previous lemma that, if U is a $U[0, 1]$ random variable independent of W , then $(\mu(B(\sigma_U, r)))_{r \geq 0}$ is equal in distribution to $(\mu(B(\rho, r)))_{r \geq 0}$.

Before proceeding with the main result of this section, we prove a simple exponential tail bound for the distribution of the volume of a ball of radius r about the root.

Lemma 5.2 *There exist constants c_6, c_7 such that, for all $r > 0, \lambda \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbf{P}(\mu(B(\rho, r)) \geq r^2 \lambda) \leq c_6 e^{-c_7 \lambda}.$$

Proof: This estimate is a straightforward application of the inequality at (10), for it follows that, for all $\theta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbf{P}(\mu(B(\rho, r)) \geq r^2 \lambda) \leq \mathbf{E} \left(e^{\theta r^{-2} \mu(B(\rho, r)) - \theta \lambda} \right) \leq \frac{e^{-\lambda \theta}}{(1 - \theta)^2}.$$

□

Proposition 5.3 *\mathbf{P} -a.s., there exists a constant c_8 such that*

$$\sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}} \mu(B(\sigma, r)) \leq c_8 r^2 \ln_1 r^{-1}, \quad \forall r \in (0, \text{diam} \mathcal{T}).$$

Proof: In the proof, we shall denote $r_n := e^{-n}$, $\delta_n := r_n^2 (\ln_1 r_n^{-1})^{-1}$, and also write $g(r) := r^2 \ln_1 r^{-1}$. Furthermore, we introduce the notation, for $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$A_\lambda(n_0) := \{\text{osc}(W, [0, 1], \lambda \delta_n) \leq r_n, \forall n \geq n_0\},$$

which represents a collection of sample paths of W which are suitably regular for our purposes. We will start by showing that the claim holds on each set of the form $A_\lambda(n_0)$. Until otherwise stated, we shall assume that λ and n_0 are fixed. Now, consider the sets

$$B_n := \left\{ \sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}} \mu(B(\sigma, r_n)) > c_9 g(r_n) \right\} \cap A_\lambda(n_0),$$

where $n \geq n_0$, and c_9 is a constant we will specify below. Clearly, on the event B_n , the random subset of $[0, 1]$ defined by

$$\mathcal{I}_n := \{t \in [0, 1] : |t - s| < \lambda \delta_n \text{ for some } s \in [0, 1] \text{ with } \mu(B(\sigma_s, r_n)) \geq c_9 g(r_n)\}$$

has Lebesgue measure no less than $\lambda \delta_n$. Thus, if U is a $U[0, 1]$ random variable, independent of W , then

$$\mathbf{P}(U \in \mathcal{I}_n, B_n) = \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{P}(U \in \mathcal{I}_n | W) 1_{B_n}) \geq \lambda \delta_n \mathbf{P}(B_n).$$

Moreover, on the event $\{U \in \mathcal{I}_n\} \cap B_n$, there exists an $s \in [0, 1]$ for which both $|U - s| < \lambda \delta_n$ and $\mu(B(\sigma_s, r_n)) \geq c_9 g(r_n)$ are satisfied. Applying the modulus of continuity property that holds on $A_\lambda(n_0)$, for this s we have that $d_{\mathcal{T}}(\sigma_s, \sigma_U) \leq 3r_n$, and so $\mu(B(\sigma_U, 4r_n)) \geq c_9 g(r_n)$. Hence the above inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \delta_n \mathbf{P}(B_n) &\leq \mathbf{P}(\mu(B(\sigma_U, 4r_n)) \geq c_9 g(r_n)) \\ &= \mathbf{P}(\mu(B(\rho, 4r_n)) \geq c_9 g(r_n)) \\ &\leq c_6 e^{-c_7 c_9 n / 16}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have applied the random re-rooting of Lemma 5.1 to deduce the equality, and the distributional tail bound of Lemma 5.2 to obtain the final line. As a consequence, we have that

$$\sum_{n \geq n_0} \mathbf{P}(B_n) \leq c_6 \lambda^{-1} \sum_{n \geq n_0} n e^{2n} e^{-c_7 c_9 n / 16},$$

which is finite for c_9 chosen suitably large. Appealing to Borel-Cantelli and applying a simple monotonicity argument, this implies that \mathbf{P} -a.s. on $A_\lambda(n_0)$

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}} \mu(B(\sigma, r))}{r^2 \ln_1 r^{-1}} < \infty.$$

By countability, the same must be true on the set $A_\lambda := \cup_{n \geq 1} A_\lambda(n)$. Thus, to deduce the proposition, it remains to be shown that we can choose this set to be arbitrarily large.

However, this is a simple consequence of the sample path property of the Brownian excursion that we proved in Lemma 4.1. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(A_\lambda^c) &= \mathbf{P}(\text{osc}(W, [0, 1], \lambda\delta_n) > r_n \text{ i.o.}) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}\left(\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{osc}(W, [0, 1], \delta)}{\sqrt{\delta \ln \delta^{-1}}} \geq \frac{c_{10}}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

for some constant c_{10} that does not depend on λ . Letting $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, this probability converges to

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{osc}(W, [0, 1], \delta)}{\sqrt{\delta \ln \delta^{-1}}} = \infty\right),$$

which is equal to 0 by Lemma 4.1. This completes the proof. \square

6 Global lower volume bounds

In this section, we prove global lower bounds for the volume of balls of the continuum random tree. The estimates are simple corollaries of the excursion modulus of continuity results proved in Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2.

Proposition 6.1 *\mathbf{P} -a.s., there exists a constant c_{11} such that*

$$\inf_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}} \mu(B(\sigma, r)) \geq c_{11} r^2 (\ln r^{-1})^{-1}, \quad \forall r \in (0, \text{diam} \mathcal{T}).$$

Proof: For $s \in [0, 1]$, $r > 0$, define

$$\alpha_u(s, r) := \inf\{t \geq 0 : |W_{s+t} - W_s| > r\},$$

$$\alpha_l(s, r) := \inf\{t \geq 0 : |W_s - W_{s-t}| > r\},$$

where these expressions are defined to be 1 if the infimum is taken over an empty set, respectively. From the definition of d at (6), it is readily deduced that $d(s, t) \leq r$ for all $t \in (s - \alpha_l(s, r/3), s + \alpha_u(s, r/3))$, from which it follows that $d_{\mathcal{T}}(\sigma_s, \sigma_t) \leq r$ for all t in this range. Hence

$$\mu(B(\sigma_s, r)) \geq \alpha_l(s, r/3) + \alpha_u(s, r/3). \quad (11)$$

We now show how the right hand side of this inequality can be bounded below, uniformly in s , using the uniform modulus of continuity of the Brownian excursion. By Lemma 4.1, \mathbf{P} -a.s. there exist constants $c_{12}, \eta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\text{osc}(W, [0, 1], \delta) \leq c_{12} \sqrt{\delta \ln \delta^{-1}}, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, \eta). \quad (12)$$

Set $r_1 = 3c_{12}\sqrt{\eta \ln \eta^{-1}}$ and then, for $r \in (0, r_1)$, choose $\delta = \delta(r)$ to satisfy $r = 3c_{12}\sqrt{\delta \ln \delta^{-1}}$. It follows from the inequality at (12) that if $r \in (0, r_1)$ and $|W_s - W_t| > r/3$, then $|s - t| > \delta \geq c_{13} r^2 (\ln r^{-1})^{-1}$, where c_{13} is a constant depending only on c_{12} and η . By definition, this implies that

$$\alpha_l(s, r/3) \geq c_{13} r^2 (\ln r^{-1})^{-1} \wedge s, \quad \alpha_u(s, r/3) \geq c_{13} r^2 (\ln r^{-1})^{-1} \wedge (1 - s),$$

for all $s \in [0, 1]$, $r \in (0, r_1)$. Adding these two expressions and taking a suitably small constant, we obtain that \mathbf{P} -a.s., there exists a constant c_{14} such that

$$\inf_{s \in [0, 1]} (\alpha_l(s, r/3) + \alpha_u(s, r/3)) \geq c_{14} r^2 (\ln_1 r^{-1})^{-1}, \quad \forall r \in (0, \text{diam} \mathcal{T}),$$

where we use the fact that $\text{diam} \mathcal{T}$ is \mathbf{P} -a.s. finite. Taking infima in (11) and comparing with the above inequality completes the proof. \square

Proposition 6.2 *\mathbf{P} -a.s., there exists a constant c_{15} such that*

$$\sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}} \mu(B(\sigma, r)) \geq c_{15} r^2 \ln_1 r^{-1}, \quad \forall r \in (0, \text{diam} \mathcal{T}).$$

Proof: By following an argument similar to that used in the proof of the previous proposition to transfer the excursion result to a result about the volume of balls in the CRT, the proposition may be deduced from Lemma 4.2. \square

7 Local volume bounds

In this section, we prove the local volume growth asymptotics of Theorem 1.3 using the properties of the normalised Brownian excursion that were derived in Section 4. We also complete the proof of the global volume bounds of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 7.1 *\mathbf{P} -a.s., we have*

$$0 < \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(\sigma, r))}{r^2 \ln \ln r^{-1}} < \infty, \quad (13)$$

for μ -a.e. $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}$.

Proof: We shall start by proving the lower bound. Since the argument is close to that of Proposition 6.1, we omit some of the details. Now, if $t \in [0, 1)$ is a point which satisfies

$$\liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sup_{s \in [0, \delta]} |W_{t+s} - W_t|}{\sqrt{\delta (\ln \ln \delta^{-1})^{-1}}} < \infty,$$

then it may be deduced, using a similar argument to Proposition 6.1, that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(\sigma_t, r))}{r^2 \ln \ln r^{-1}} > 0.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu \left\{ \sigma \in \mathcal{T} : \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(\sigma, r))}{r^2 \ln \ln r^{-1}} > 0 \right\} \\ & \geq \lambda \left\{ t \in [0, 1) : \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sup_{s \in [0, \delta]} |W_{t+s} - W_t|}{\sqrt{\delta (\ln \ln \delta^{-1})^{-1}}} < \infty \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since, by Lemma 4.5, the last line is equal to 1, \mathbf{P} -a.s., the proof of the lower estimate is complete.

We now prove the upper bound. Recall from (7) that $\mu(B(\rho, r)) = \int_0^1 1_{\{W_t < r\}} dt$. Hence, \mathbf{P} -a.s.,

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(\sigma_0, r))}{r^2 \ln \ln r^{-1}} = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int_0^1 1_{\{W_t < r\}} dt}{r^2 \ln \ln r^{-1}} < \infty, \quad (14)$$

by Lemma 4.4. This gives us the desired result at the root.

Setting $g(r) = r^2 \ln \ln r^{-1}$, and letting U be a $U[0, 1]$ random variable, independent of W , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left(\mu \left\{ \sigma \in \mathcal{T} : \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(\sigma, r))}{g(r)} < \infty \right\} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left(\lambda \left\{ s \in [0, 1] : \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} g(r)^{-1} \int_0^1 1_{\{W_t^{(s)} < r\}} dt < \infty \right\} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^1 1_{\{\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} g(r)^{-1} \int_0^1 1_{\{W_t^{(s)} < r\}} dt < \infty\}} ds \right) \\ &= \int_0^1 \mathbf{P} \left(\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} g(r)^{-1} \int_0^1 1_{\{W_t^{(U)} < r\}} dt < \infty \middle| U = s \right) ds \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left(\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} g(r)^{-1} \int_0^1 1_{\{W_t^{(U)} < r\}} dt < \infty \right) \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left(\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} g(r)^{-1} \int_0^1 1_{\{W_t < r\}} dt < \infty \right) \\ &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the random re-rooting of Lemma 5.1 for the penultimate equality and the result at the root, (14), for the final one. The upper bound follows. \square

Proposition 7.2 *\mathbf{P} -a.s., we have*

$$0 < \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(\sigma, r))}{r^2 (\ln \ln r^{-1})^{-1}}, \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(\sigma, r))}{r^2} < \infty \quad (15)$$

for μ -a.e. $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}$.

Proof: The proof of the left hand inequality is essentially the same as the proof of the lower bound of the previous proposition, with only a few minor changes needed. The key observation is that, if $s \in [0, 1]$ satisfies

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{|W_{s+\delta} - W_s|}{\sqrt{\delta \ln \ln \delta^{-1}}} < \infty, \quad (16)$$

then, again using an argument similar to that of Proposition 6.1, it may be deduced that

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(\sigma_s, r))}{r^2 (\ln \ln r^{-1})^{-1}} > 0.$$

To complete the proof it is then enough to note that, by the local modulus of continuity result of Lemma 4.3, (16) holds for a subset of $[0, 1]$ with Lebesgue measure 1, \mathbf{P} -a.s.

We now prove the right hand inequality. By Fatou's lemma and the expression for the expected volume of a ball around the root of \mathcal{T} , Theorem 1.1, we have,

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(\rho, r))}{r^2} \right) \leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{E}(\mu(B(\rho, r)))}{r^2} = 2.$$

Hence

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(\rho, r))}{r^2} < \infty, \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

which is the result at the root. The proof may be completed by applying random re-rooting, as in the proof of the upper bound of Proposition 7.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2: Propositions 5.3 and 6.2 contain the upper and lower bounds for $\sup \mu(B(\sigma, r))$ respectively. The lower bound for $\inf \mu(B(\sigma, r))$ was proved in Proposition 6.1; the upper bound follows easily from the local upper bound at (13). \square

8 Brownian excursion upcrossings

To complete the proofs of the heat kernel bounds in Sections 9 and 10, as well as the volume estimates we have already obtained, we need some extra information about the local structure of the CRT. This will follow from the results about the upcrossings of a normalised Brownian excursion that we prove in this section.

Henceforth, we define, for $f \in U$,

$$N_a^b(f) := \#\{\text{upcrossings of } [a, b] \text{ by } f\}$$

and $N_a^b := N_a^b(W)$ to be the upcrossings of $[a, b]$ by the normalised Brownian excursion. Also, for $f \in U$, define $h(f) := \sup\{f(t) : t \geq 0\}$, the height of the excursion function. It is well known, (see [28], Chapter XII) that the tail of the “distribution” of $h(f)$ under n is simply given by

$$n(h(f) \geq x) = \frac{1}{x}, \quad \forall x > 0. \quad (17)$$

We now calculate the generating function of $N_\delta^{2\delta}(f)$ under the probability measure $n(\cdot | h(f) \geq \delta)$. Notice that the expression we obtain does not depend on δ .

Lemma 8.1 *For $z < 2$, $\delta > 0$,*

$$n(z^{N_\delta^{2\delta}(f)} | h(f) \geq \delta) = \frac{1}{2 - z}.$$

Proof: Suppose $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a process with law $n(\cdot | h(f) \geq \delta)$, then by Neveu and Pitman's result ([26], Theorem 1.1), about the branching process in a Brownian excursion, the process $(N_a^{a+\delta}(X))_{a \geq 0}$ is a continuous time birth and death process, starting from 1, with stationary transition intensities from i to $i \pm 1$ of i/δ . Standard branching process arguments (see [6], Section 3) allow us to deduce from this observation that

$$\mathbf{E}(z^{N_x^{x+\delta}(X)}) = \frac{\delta z - x(z - 1)}{\delta - x(z - 1)}, \quad \forall z < \frac{x + \delta}{\delta}.$$

The result follows on setting $x = \delta$. \square

In the proof of the following result about the tail of the distribution of $N_\delta^{2\delta}(f)$, we shall use a result of Le Gall and Duquesne that states that the set of excursions above a fixed level form a certain Poisson process. We outline briefly the result here, full details may be found in [14], Section 3.

Fix $a > 0$ and denote by (α_j, β_j) , $j \in \mathcal{J}$, the connected components of the open set $\{s \geq 0 : f(s) > a\}$. For any $j \in \mathcal{J}$, denote by f^j the corresponding excursion of f defined by:

$$f^j(s) := f((\alpha_j + s) \wedge \beta_j) - a, \quad s \geq 0,$$

and let \tilde{f}^a represent the evolution of f below the level a . Applying the Poisson mapping theorem to [14], Corollary 3.2, we find that under the probability measure $n(\cdot | h(f) > a)$ and conditionally on \tilde{f}^a , the point measure

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \delta_{f^j}(df')$$

is distributed as a Poisson random measure on U with intensity given by a multiple of $n(df')$. The relevant scaling factor is given by the local time of f at the level a , which we shall denote by l^a . Note that this is a measurable function of \tilde{f}^a .

Lemma 8.2 For $z \in [1, 2)$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon/2)$,

$$n(N_\delta^{2\delta}(f) \geq \lambda, h(f) \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{2z^{1-\lambda}}{(2-z)^2\varepsilon}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq 0.$$

Proof: For brevity, during this lemma we shall write $h = h(f)$ and $h^j = h(f^j)$, where f^j , $j \in \mathcal{J}$ are the excursions above the level δ . Note that it is elementary to show that the quantity $N_\delta^{2\delta}(f)$ also counts the number of excursions of f above the level δ which hit the level 2δ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} N_\delta^{2\delta}(f) &= \#\{j \in \mathcal{J} : h^j \geq \delta\} \\ &= \#\{j \in \mathcal{J} : h^j \in [\delta, \varepsilon - \delta)\} + \#\{j \in \mathcal{J} : h^j \geq \varepsilon - \delta\}. \end{aligned}$$

We shall denote these two summands N_1 and N_2 , respectively. From the observation preceding this lemma that the excursions above the level δ form a Poisson process on U and the fact that the sets $\{h \in [\delta, \varepsilon - \delta)\}$ and $\{h \geq \varepsilon - \delta\}$ are disjoint, we can conclude that the N_1 and N_2 are independent under the measure $n(\cdot | h \geq \delta)$ and conditional on \tilde{f}^δ . Furthermore, we note that $h \geq \varepsilon$ if and only if $N_2 \geq 1$. Hence, for $z \in (0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} n(z^{N_\delta^{2\delta}(f)} 1_{h \geq \varepsilon} | h \geq \delta) &= n(n(z^{N_1+N_2} 1_{N_2 \geq 1} | \tilde{f}^\delta, h \geq \delta) | h \geq \delta) \\ &= n(n(z^{N_1} | \tilde{f}^\delta, h \geq \delta) n(z^{N_2} 1_{N_2 \geq 1} | \tilde{f}^\delta, h \geq \delta) | h \geq \delta). \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Since on the set $\{h \geq \delta\}$, and conditional on \tilde{f}^δ , N_1 and N_2 are Poisson random variables with means $l^\delta n(h \in [\delta, \varepsilon - \delta))$ and $l^\delta n(h \geq \varepsilon - \delta)$ respectively, it is elementary to conclude that

$$n(z^{N_1} | \tilde{f}^\delta, h \geq \delta) = e^{-l^\delta n(h \in [\delta, \varepsilon - \delta))(1-z)},$$

and also

$$n(z^{N_2} 1_{N_2 \geq 1} \mid \tilde{f}^\delta, h \geq \delta) = e^{-l^\delta n(h \geq \varepsilon - \delta)(1-z)} (1 - e^{-l^\delta n(h \geq \varepsilon - \delta)z}).$$

Substituting these expressions back into (18) and applying the formula for the excursion height distribution that was stated at (17), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} n(z^{N_\delta^{2\delta}(f)} 1_{h \geq \varepsilon} \mid h \geq \delta) &= n(e^{-l^\delta(1-z)\delta^{-1}} \mid h \geq \delta) \\ &\quad - n(e^{-l^\delta[(1-z)\delta^{-1} + z(\varepsilon - \delta)^{-1}]} \mid h \geq \delta). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Now, by [14], equation (13), l^δ satisfies $n(1 - e^{-\lambda l^\delta}) = \lambda(1 + \lambda\delta)^{-1}$, for $\lambda \geq 0$. Thus

$$n(e^{-\lambda l^\delta} \mid h \geq \delta) = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda\delta},$$

which confirms the well-known fact that under $n(\cdot \mid h \geq \delta)$, l^δ behaves as an exponential, mean δ , random variable. Returning to (19), this fact implies that

$$n(z^{N_\delta^{2\delta}(f)} 1_{h \geq \varepsilon} \mid h \geq \delta) = \frac{1}{2-z} - \frac{1}{2-z + \delta z(\varepsilon - \delta)^{-1}}.$$

By a simple analytic continuation argument, we may extend the range of z for which this holds to $[0, 2)$. Finally, for $z \in [1, 2)$, we have that, because $\delta < \varepsilon/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} n(N_\delta^{2\delta}(f) \geq \lambda, h(f) \geq \varepsilon) &\leq n(z^{N_\delta^{2\delta}(f)} 1_{h \geq \varepsilon}) z^{-\lambda} \\ &= n(z^{N_\delta^{2\delta}(f)} 1_{h \geq \varepsilon} \mid h \geq \delta) n(h \geq \delta) z^{-\lambda} \\ &= \frac{1}{\delta z^\lambda} \left(\frac{1}{2-z} - \frac{1}{2-z + \delta z(\varepsilon - \delta)^{-1}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{2z^{1-\lambda}}{(2-z)^2 \varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

We now reach the main results of this section, which give us an upper bound on the upcrossings of $[\delta, 4\delta]$ by the normalised Brownian excursion for small δ and also a distribution tail estimate.

Proposition 8.3 *P-a.s.*,

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{N_\delta^{4\delta}}{\ln \ln \delta^{-1}} < \infty.$$

Proof: Fix $z \in (1, 2)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let λ be a constant. Then, taking m_0 suitably large, we have by the previous lemma that

$$\sum_{m=m_0}^{\infty} n(N_{2^{-m}}^{2^{1-m}}(f) \geq \lambda \ln m, h(f) \geq \varepsilon) \leq \sum_{m=m_0}^{\infty} \frac{2m^{(1-\lambda) \ln z}}{(2-z)^2 \varepsilon} < \infty,$$

for λ chosen suitably large. Hence an application of Borel-Cantelli implies that, on $\{h(f) > \varepsilon\}$,

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_{2^{-m}}^{2^{1-m}}(f)}{\ln m} < \infty, \quad n\text{-a.s.}$$

Now for $\delta \in [2^{-(m+1)}, 2^{-m}]$, we have $[2^{-m}, 2^{1-m}] \subseteq [\delta, 4\delta]$, and so $N_\delta^{4\delta}(f) \leq N_{2^{-m}}^{2^{1-m}}(f)$. Thus, on $\{h(f) > \varepsilon\}$,

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{N_\delta^{4\delta}(f)}{\ln \ln \delta^{-1}} \leq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_{2^{-m}}^{2^{1-m}}(f)}{\ln m} < \infty, \quad n\text{-a.s.}$$

By σ -additivity, this is easily extended to hold on U , n -a.s. A simple rescaling argument allows us to obtain the same result $n^{(1)}$ -a.s. on $U^{(1)}$. Since $n^{(1)}$ is the law of W , we are done. \square

Proposition 8.4 *There exist constants c_{16}, c_{17} such that*

$$\mathbf{P}(N_\delta^{4\delta} \geq \lambda) \leq c_{16}e^{-c_{17}\lambda}, \quad \forall \delta > 0, \lambda \geq 1.$$

Proof: Using the scaling property, $n(A) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c}}n(\Lambda_c(A))$, of the Ito measure, it is possible to deduce the following alternative characterisation of $n^{(1)}$. For measurable $A \subseteq U^{(1)}$, $n^{(1)}(A) = n(\Lambda_\tau(f) \in A \mid \tau \in [1, 2])$. Hence

$$\mathbf{P}(N_\delta^{4\delta} \geq \lambda) = n^{(1)}(N_\delta^{4\delta}(f) \geq \lambda) = c_{18}n(N_{\delta\sqrt{\tau}}^{4\delta\sqrt{\tau}}(f) \geq \lambda, \tau \in [1, 2]).$$

However, for $\tau \in [1, 2]$ we have that $[\sqrt{2}\delta, 2\sqrt{2}\delta] \subseteq [\delta\sqrt{\tau}, 4\delta\sqrt{\tau}]$, and so $N_{\delta\sqrt{\tau}}^{4\delta\sqrt{\tau}}(f) \leq N_{\sqrt{2}\delta}^{2\sqrt{2}\delta}(f)$. Hence

$$\mathbf{P}(N_\delta^{4\delta} \geq \lambda) \leq c_{18}n(N_{\sqrt{2}\delta}^{2\sqrt{2}\delta}(f) \geq \lambda, \tau \in [1, 2]). \quad (20)$$

We now consider the cases $\lambda \leq \delta^{-1}$ and $\lambda \geq \delta^{-1}$ separately. First, suppose $\lambda \geq \delta^{-1}$. Since $\lambda \geq 1$, if $N_{\sqrt{2}\delta}^{2\sqrt{2}\delta}(f) \geq \lambda$, then $h(f) \geq \sqrt{2}\delta$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(N_\delta^{4\delta} \geq \lambda) &\leq c_{18}n(N_{\sqrt{2}\delta}^{2\sqrt{2}\delta}(f) \geq \lambda, h \geq \sqrt{2}\delta) \\ &= \frac{c_{18}}{\sqrt{2}\delta}n\left(N_{\sqrt{2}\delta}^{2\sqrt{2}\delta}(f) \geq \lambda \mid h \geq \sqrt{2}\delta\right) \\ &\leq \frac{c_{18}z^{-\lambda}}{\sqrt{2}\delta}n\left(z^{N_{\sqrt{2}\delta}^{2\sqrt{2}\delta}(f)} \mid h \geq \sqrt{2}\delta\right) \\ &\leq \frac{c_{19}\lambda z^{-\lambda}}{2-z}, \end{aligned}$$

for $z \in (1, 2)$, by Lemma 8.1. By fixing $z \in (1, 2)$, this is clearly bounded above by $c_{20}e^{-c_{21}\lambda}$ for suitable choice of c_{20}, c_{21} .

The case $\lambda \leq \delta^{-1}$ requires a little more work. We first break the upper bound of (20) in two parts. For $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbf{P}(N_\delta^{4\delta} \geq \lambda) \leq c_{18}n(N_{\sqrt{2}\delta}^{2\sqrt{2}\delta}(f) \geq \lambda, h \geq \varepsilon) + c_{18}n(\tau \in [1, 2], h < \varepsilon). \quad (21)$$

An upper bound for the first term of the form $c_{22}e^{-c_{23}\lambda}\varepsilon^{-1}$ is given by Lemma 8.2 when $\delta \leq \varepsilon/2\sqrt{2}$. For the second term, we have the following decomposition, see [28], Chapter XII,

$$n(\tau \in [1, 2], h < \varepsilon) = \int_1^2 n^{(s)}(h < \varepsilon) \frac{ds}{\sqrt{2\pi s^3}},$$

where $n^{(s)}$ is a probability measure that satisfies $n^{(s)}(A) = n^{(1)}(\Lambda_s(A))$. However, this scaling property implies that $n^{(s)}(h < \varepsilon)$ is decreasing in s . Consequently, we have that $n(\tau \in [1, 2], h < \varepsilon) \leq (2\pi)^{-1/2} n^{(1)}(h < \varepsilon)$. The right hand side of this expression represents the distribution of the maximum of a normalised Brownian excursion, which is known exactly, see [10], Theorem 7. In particular, we have that

$$n^{(1)}(h < \varepsilon) = c_{24} \varepsilon^{-3} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^2 e^{-\frac{m^2 \pi^2}{2\varepsilon^2}},$$

and some elementary analysis shows this is bounded above by $c_{25} \varepsilon^{-3} e^{-\frac{c_{26}}{\varepsilon}}$. By taking $\varepsilon = 2\sqrt{2}\lambda^{-1}$, we can use these bounds on the first and second terms of (21) to obtain the desired result. \square

9 Quenched heat kernel bounds

The heat kernel estimates deduced in this section are a straightforward application of two main ideas. Firstly, we apply results of [21], by Kigami, to construct a natural Dirichlet form on $(\mathcal{T}, d_{\mathcal{T}}, \mu)$. Associated with such a form is a Laplacian, $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}$, on \mathcal{T} . Secondly, we use results of [12], which show that the volume bounds we have already obtained are sufficient to deduce the existence of a heat kernel for $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}$ and bounds on it.

The following result is proved by Kigami as Theorem 5.4 of [21]. Most of the terms used are standard, and so we will not define them here. Definition 0.5 of [21] specifies the precise conditions that make a symmetric, non-negative quadratic form a finite resistance form. For more examples of this type of form, see [22]. We shall not explain here how to construct the finite resistance form associated with a shortest path metric on a dendrite. Full details are given in Section 3 of [21].

Lemma 9.1 *Let K be a dendrite and let d be a shortest path metric on K . Suppose (K, d) is locally compact and complete, then $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F} \cap L^2(K, \nu))$, where $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is the finite resistance form associated with (K, d) , is a local, regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(K, \nu)$ for any σ -finite Borel measure ν on K that satisfies $\nu(A) > 0$ for every non-empty open set $A \subseteq K$.*

Consider $f \in U^{(1)}$. As remarked in Section 2.2, \mathcal{T}_f is a dendrite and $d_{\mathcal{T}_f}$ a shortest path metric on \mathcal{T}_f . Using the fact that f is a continuous function on a closed bounded interval, and hence uniformly continuous, elementary analysis allows it to be deduced that $(\mathcal{T}_f, d_{\mathcal{T}_f})$ is compact and hence it is complete and locally compact. (We note that compactness of \mathcal{T} has already been proved in [1], Theorem 3). Finally, using simple path properties of the Brownian excursion, it is easy to check that μ_f satisfies the measure conditions of the lemma for $f \in \tilde{U}$, where $\tilde{U} \subseteq U^{(1)}$ is a set which satisfies $\mathbf{P}(W \in \tilde{U}) = 1$. Hence we have a finite resistance form $(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}})$ associated with $(\mathcal{T}, d_{\mathcal{T}})$ and $(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}} \cap L^2(\mathcal{T}, \mu))$ is a local, regular Dirichlet form on \mathcal{T} , \mathbf{P} -a.s.

In fact, it is also proved in [21] that the correspondence between shortest path metrics on dendrites and resistance forms is one-to-one in a certain sense. Specifically, if $W \in \tilde{U}$ and so $(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}})$ exists, define the resistance function by

$$R(A, B)^{-1} := \inf \{ \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}(u, u) : u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}, u|_A = 1, u|_B = 0 \}, \quad (22)$$

for disjoint subsets A, B of \mathcal{T} . We can recover $d_{\mathcal{T}}$ by taking, for $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{T}$, $\sigma \neq \sigma'$, $d_{\mathcal{T}}(\sigma, \sigma') = R(\{\sigma\}, \{\sigma'\})$ and $d_{\mathcal{T}}(\sigma, \sigma) = 0$. This means that the metric $d_{\mathcal{T}}$ is the effective resistance metric associated with $(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}})$, see Corollary 3.4 of [21] for a proof of this. Using this description of $d_{\mathcal{T}}$ and a standard rescaling argument, it is easily deduced that

$$(u(\sigma) - u(\sigma'))^2 \leq \mathcal{E}(u, u) d_{\mathcal{T}}(\sigma, \sigma'), \quad \forall \sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{T}, u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}, \quad (23)$$

which has as a consequence that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}$ is contained in $C(\mathcal{T})$, the space of continuous functions on $(\mathcal{T}, d_{\mathcal{T}})$. Since \mathcal{T} is compact, we must also have $C(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq L^2(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$, meaning that the Dirichlet form of interest is simply $(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}})$.

Given the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}})$, we can use the standard association to define a non-negative self-adjoint operator, $-\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}$, which has domain dense in $L^2(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ and satisfies

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}(u, v) = - \int_{\mathcal{T}} u \Delta_{\mathcal{T}} v d\mu, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}, v \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}). \quad (24)$$

We can use this to define a reversible strong Markov process,

$$X = ((X_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbf{P}_{\sigma}^{\mathcal{T}}, \sigma \in \mathcal{T}),$$

with semi-group given by $P_t := e^{t\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}}$. In fact, the locality of our Dirichlet form ensures that the process X is a diffusion on \mathcal{T} .

As remarked in the introduction, a key factor in the description of the transition density of X , if it exists, is the volume growth of the space. The volume bounds we have already obtained for \mathcal{T} mean that we can directly apply the bounds obtained in [12] for a resistance form with non-uniform volume doubling. Since stating the full theorem would require a lot of extra notation, we shall omit to do so here. In fact, the only condition of that article which has not already been checked is the separability of $(\mathcal{T}, d_{\mathcal{T}})$. The separability of a dendrite with a shortest path metric is proved to be a consequence of local compactness in Lemma 5.7, [21]. Thus, because $(\mathcal{T}, d_{\mathcal{T}})$ is compact \mathbf{P} -a.s., it is separable, \mathbf{P} -a.s. We are now able to state the main result of this section, which is an application of the volume bounds of earlier sections and Theorem 4.1 of [12].

Theorem 9.2 *\mathbf{P} -a.s., there is a reversible strong Markov diffusion X on \mathcal{T} with invariant measure μ and transition density $(p_t(\sigma, \sigma'))_{\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{T}, t > 0}$, that satisfies the bounds at (2) and (3).*

Since, if it exists, the transition density of the process X is a heat kernel of $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}$, we can state the previous result in the following alternative form. Note, the main difference between a heat kernel and a transition density is that a heat kernel is defined only μ -a.e., whereas the transition density is defined everywhere. Hence, for an arbitrary heat kernel of $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}$, the bounds we have proved will hold only μ -a.e. For full definitions of these two objects, see [18], Sections 2 and 8.

Corollary 9.3 *\mathbf{P} -a.s., there exists a local, regular Dirichlet form associated with the measure-metric space $(\mathcal{T}, d_{\mathcal{T}}, \mu)$. The related non-positive self-adjoint operator, $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}$, admits a heat kernel $(p_t(\sigma, \sigma'))_{\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{T}, t > 0}$, that satisfies the bounds at (2) and (3).*

The proof of the remaining quenched heat kernel bounds also employ the techniques used in [12]. However, as well as the volume bounds, we need to apply the following extra fact about the asymptotics of the resistance from the centre of a ball to its surface, as $r \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma 9.4 *\mathbf{P} -a.s., for μ -a.e. $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}$, there exist constants c_{27}, r_2 such that*

$$c_{27}r (\ln \ln r^{-1})^{-1} \leq R(\{\sigma\}, B(\sigma, r)^c) \leq r, \quad \forall r \in (0, r_2).$$

Proof: Choosing r_2 to be small enough so that σ is connected to $B(\sigma, r)^c$ by a path of length r immediately implies the upper bound. For the lower bound, following the argument of [8], Lemma 4.4 we obtain

$$R(\{\sigma\}, B(\sigma, r)^c)^{-1} \leq \frac{8M(\sigma, r)}{r},$$

where $M(\sigma, r)$ is defined to be the smallest number such that there exists a set $A = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{M(\sigma, r)}\}$ with $d_{\mathcal{T}}(\sigma, \sigma_i) = r/4$ for each i , such that any path from σ to $B(\sigma, r)^c$ must pass through the set A . For the continuum random tree it is elementary to deduce that $M(\rho, r) \leq N_{r/4}^r$, where $N_{r/4}^r$ is the number of upcrossings of $[r/4, r]$ by W , as defined in Section 8. Thus, applying Proposition 8.3, the result holds at the root. This may be extended to hold μ -a.e. using the random re-rooting of Lemma 5.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.6: On measure-metric spaces equipped with a resistance form, an upper bound for the on-diagonal part of the heat kernel of the form

$$p_{2r\mu(B(\sigma, r))}(\sigma, \sigma) \leq \frac{2}{\mu(B(\sigma, r))} \quad (25)$$

follows from a relatively simple analytic argument from the lower bound on the volume growth, see [24], Proposition 4.1 for an example of this kind of proof. Applying this, the two upper bounds of this result follow easily from the lower local volume bounds of Theorem 1.3 and so we omit their proof here.

It remains to prove the lower local heat kernel bound. Again, the proof of this result is standard and so we shall only outline it briefly here. First, the resistance result of Lemma 9.4 and the local volume results of Theorem 1.3 allow us to deduce that \mathbf{P} -a.s. for μ -a.e. $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}$, there exist constants $c_{28}, c_{29}, r_3 > 0$ such that, for $r \in (0, r_3)$,

$$\mathbf{E}_{\sigma'}^{\mathcal{T}} T_{B(\sigma, r)} \leq c_{28} r^3 \ln \ln r^{-1}, \quad \forall \sigma' \in B(\sigma, r),$$

$$\mathbf{E}_{\sigma}^{\mathcal{T}} T_{B(\sigma, r)} \geq c_{29} r^3 (\ln \ln r^{-1})^{-4},$$

by applying an argument similar to the proof of [12], Lemma 6.5. Here, $T_{B(\sigma, r)}$ is the exit time of the process X from the ball $B(\sigma, r)$. Since X is a Markov process we have that

$$\mathbf{E}_{\sigma}^{\mathcal{T}} T_{B(\sigma, r)} \leq t + \mathbf{E}_{\sigma}^{\mathcal{T}} 1_{T_{B(\sigma, r)} > t} \mathbf{E}_{X_t}^{\mathcal{T}} T_{B(\sigma, r)},$$

and so substituting the above bounds for the expected exit times of balls yields

$$\mathbf{P}_\sigma^\mathcal{T}(T_{B(\sigma,r)} > t) \geq \frac{c_{29}}{c_{28}} (\ln \ln r^{-1})^{-5} - \frac{t}{c_{28} r^3 \ln \ln r^{-1}}. \quad (26)$$

A simple Cauchy-Schwarz argument, see [24], Proposition 4.3 for example, gives that

$$\mu(B(\sigma, r)) p_{2t}(\sigma, \sigma) \geq \mathbf{P}_\sigma^\mathcal{T}(T_{B(\sigma,r)} > t)^2.$$

Now, by the volume asymptotics of Theorem 1.3, if we choose r_3 small enough, there exists a constant c_{30} such that $\mu(B(\sigma, r)) \leq c_{30} r^2 \ln \ln r^{-1}$, for $r \in (0, r_3)$. Set $t_3 = \frac{c_{29}}{2} r_3^3 (\ln \ln r_3^{-1})^{-4}$. For $t \in (0, t_3)$, we can choose $r \in (0, r_3)$ such that $t = \frac{c_{29}}{2} r^3 (\ln \ln r^{-1})^{-4}$. Hence the lower bound for the tail of the exit time distribution at (26) implies that

$$p_{2t}(\sigma, \sigma) \geq c_{31} r^{-2} (\ln \ln r^{-1})^{-11} \geq c_{32} t^{-2/3} (\ln \ln t^{-1})^{-14}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.5: The upper bound of (4) and the lower bound of (5) are contained in Theorem 9.2. The lower bound of (4) is a simple consequence of the local lower bound on the heat kernel of Theorem 1.6. The remaining inequality is proved using the analytic technique discussed at (25); the volume bound we need to utilise in this case being the lower bound for $\sup \mu(B(\sigma, r))$ appearing in Theorem 1.2. □

10 Annealed heat kernel bounds

Rather than the \mathbf{P} -a.s. results about $\mu(B(\rho, r))$ and $R(\{\rho\}, B(\rho, r)^c)$ we used to prove the quenched heat kernel bounds, we need to apply estimates on the tails of their distributions to obtain annealed heat kernel bounds. We have already proved one of the necessary bounds in Lemma 5.2; the remaining two bounds we require are proved in the following lemma. To complete the proof of Theorem 1.7, we employ a similar argument to the proof of [8], Theorem 1.4.

Lemma 10.1 *There exist constants c_{33}, \dots, c_{36} such that, for all $r > 0, \lambda \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbf{P}(R(\{\rho\}, B(\rho, r)^c) \leq r \lambda^{-1}) \leq c_{33} e^{-c_{34} \lambda},$$

and when $r^2 \lambda^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{4}$,

$$\mathbf{P}(\mu(B(\rho, r)) < r^2 \lambda^{-1}) \leq c_{35} e^{-c_{36} \lambda}.$$

Proof: Let $r > 0, \lambda \geq 1$. In the proof of Lemma 9.4 it was noted that $R(\{\rho\}, B(\rho, r)^c)^{-1}$ is bounded above by $8r^{-1} N_{r/4}^r$. Thus, by Proposition 8.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(R(\{\rho\}, B(\rho, r)^c) \leq r \lambda^{-1}) &\leq \mathbf{P}(8N_{r/4}^r \geq \lambda) \\ &\leq c_{16} e^{-\frac{c_{17} \lambda}{8}}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the first inequality.

For the second inequality, suppose $r^2\lambda^{-1} \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$. Note that if $\mu(B(\rho, r))$ is strictly less than $r^2\lambda^{-1}$, then the normalised Brownian excursion must hit the level r before time $r^2\lambda^{-1}$. Thus

$$\mathbf{P}(\mu(B(\rho, r)) < r^2\lambda^{-1}) \leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq r^2\lambda^{-1}} W_t \geq r\right).$$

The explicit distribution of the maximum of the Brownian excursion up to a fixed time is known and we can use the formula given in [15], Section 3, to show that the right hand side of this inequality is equal to

$$1 - \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda^3}{\pi r^6(1 - r^2\lambda^{-1})^3}} \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-2m^2r^2} \int_0^r y(2mr + y) e^{-\frac{(y+2mr(1-r^2\lambda^{-1}))^2}{2r^2\lambda^{-1}(1-r^2\lambda^{-1})}} dy.$$

We can neglect the terms with $m > 0$ as removing them only increases this expression. By changing variables in the integral, it is possible to show that the $m = 0$ term is equal to

$$\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_0^{\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{1-r^2\lambda^{-1}}}} u^2 e^{-\frac{u^2}{2}} du.$$

Integrating by parts and applying standard bounds for the error function, it is elementary to obtain that this is bounded below by $1 - c_{37}\sqrt{\lambda}e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}}$. For the remaining terms we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\sqrt{\frac{2\lambda^3}{\pi r^6(1 - r^2\lambda^{-1})^3}} \sum_{m=-\infty}^{-1} e^{-2m^2r^2} \int_0^r y(2mr + y) e^{-\frac{(y+2mr(1-r^2\lambda^{-1}))^2}{2r^2\lambda^{-1}(1-r^2\lambda^{-1})}} dy \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda^3}{\pi r^6(1 - r^2\lambda^{-1})^3}} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \int_0^r 2mr^2 e^{-\frac{(y-2mr(1-r^2\lambda^{-1}))^2}{2r^2\lambda^{-1}(1-r^2\lambda^{-1})}} dy \\ & \leq c_{38}\lambda^{3/2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m e^{-\frac{\lambda(3m-2)^2}{8}}. \end{aligned}$$

The sum in this expression may be bounded above by $c_{39}e^{-\frac{\lambda}{8}}$. Thus

$$\mathbf{P}(\mu(B(\rho, r)) < r^2\lambda^{-1}) \leq c_{37}\sqrt{\lambda}e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}} + c_{38}c_{39}\lambda^{3/2}e^{-\frac{\lambda}{8}} \leq c_{40}e^{-c_{41}\lambda},$$

for suitable choice of c_{40}, c_{41} . □

Proof of Theorem 1.7: Let $t \in (0, 1)$. For $\lambda \geq 2$, define r by $t = 2\lambda r^3$ and $A_{\lambda, t} := \{r^2\lambda^{-1} \leq \mu(B(\rho, r)) \leq r^2\lambda\}$. On $A_{\lambda, t}$, we can use the inequality at (25) to show that

$$p_t(\rho, \rho) \leq \frac{2^{5/3}\lambda^{5/3}}{t^{2/3}}.$$

Define $\Lambda_t := \inf\{\lambda \geq 2 : A_{\lambda, t} \text{ occurs}\}$, then $\mathbf{E}p_t(\rho, \rho) \leq 2^{5/3}t^{-2/3}\mathbf{E}\Lambda_t^{5/3}$. However, for $\lambda \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(\Lambda_t \geq \lambda) & \leq \mathbf{P}(A_{\lambda, t}^c) \\ & \leq \mathbf{P}(\mu(B(\rho, r)) > r^2\lambda) + \mathbf{P}(\mu(B(\rho, r)) < r^2\lambda^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $r^2\lambda^{-1} = t^{2/3}2^{-2/3}\lambda^{-5/3} \leq \frac{1}{4}$, we can apply the tail bounds of Lemmas 5.2 and 10.1 to obtain that $\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_t \geq \lambda) \leq c_{42}e^{-c_{43}\lambda}$, uniformly in $t \in (0, 1)$. Thus $\mathbf{E}\Lambda_t^{5/3} \leq c_{44} < \infty$, uniformly in $t \in (0, 1)$, which proves the upper bound.

For the lower bound we need a slightly different scaling. Let $t \in (0, 1)$, $\lambda \geq 64$ and define r by $t = r^3/32\lambda^4$, and

$$B_{\lambda,t} := \left\{ \mu(B(\rho, r)) \leq r^2\lambda, R(\{\rho\}, B(\rho, r)^c) \geq r\lambda^{-1}, \mu(B(\rho, \frac{r}{4\lambda})) \geq \frac{r^2}{16\lambda^3} \right\}.$$

On $B_{\lambda,t}$, by following a similar argument to that used for the proof of Theorem 1.6, we find that $p_t(\rho, \rho) \geq c_{45}t^{-2/3}\lambda^{-14}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(B_{\lambda,t}^c) &\leq \mathbf{P}(\mu(B(\rho, r)) > r^2\lambda) + \mathbf{P}(R(\{\rho\}, B(\rho, r)^c) < r\lambda^{-1}) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P}(\mu(B(\rho, \frac{r}{4\lambda})) < \frac{r^2}{16\lambda^3}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $r^2/16\lambda^3 = t^{2/3}\lambda^{-1/3} \leq \frac{1}{4}$, again we can apply the bounds of Lemmas 5.2 and 10.1 to find that $\mathbf{P}(B_{\lambda,t}^c) \leq c_{46}e^{-c_{47}\lambda}$, uniformly in $t \in (0, 1)$. Hence we can find a $\lambda_0 \in [64, \infty)$ such that $\mathbf{P}(B_{\lambda_0,t}^c) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. Thus

$$\mathbf{E}p_t(\rho, \rho) \geq \mathbf{P}(B_{\lambda_0,t}) \frac{c_{45}}{\lambda_0^{14}t^{2/3}} \geq c_{48}t^{-2/3}, \quad \forall t \in (0, 1),$$

for some $c_{48} > 0$. □

11 Brownian motion on the CRT

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.4, it remains to show that the Markov process with infinitesimal generator $\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}$ is Brownian motion on \mathcal{T} . Brownian motion on \mathcal{T}_f is defined to be a \mathcal{T}_f -valued process, $X^f = ((X_t^f)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbf{P}_{\sigma^f}^{\mathcal{T}_f}, \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_f)$, with the following properties.

- i) Continuous sample paths.
- ii) Strong Markov.
- iii) Reversible with respect to its invariant measure μ_f .
- iv) For $\sigma^1, \sigma^2 \in \mathcal{T}_f$, $\sigma^1 \neq \sigma^2$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}_{\sigma}^{\mathcal{T}_f}(T_{\sigma^1} < T_{\sigma^2}) = \frac{d_{\mathcal{T}_f}(b(\sigma, \sigma^1, \sigma^2), \sigma^2)}{d_{\mathcal{T}_f}(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)}, \quad \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_f,$$

where $T_{\sigma} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t^f = \sigma\}$ and $b(\sigma, \sigma^1, \sigma^2)$ is the branch point of $\sigma, \sigma^1, \sigma^2$ in \mathcal{T} . In particular, if $[[\sigma, \sigma^1]]$, $[[\sigma^1, \sigma^2]]$, $[[\sigma^2, \sigma]]$ are the unique arcs between the relevant pairs of vertices, then b may be defined by $\{b(\sigma, \sigma^1, \sigma^2)\} = [[\sigma, \sigma^1]] \cap [[\sigma^1, \sigma^2]] \cap [[\sigma^2, \sigma]]$.

- v) For $\sigma^1, \sigma^2 \in \mathcal{T}_f$, the mean occupation measure for the process started at σ^1 and killed on hitting σ^2 has density

$$d_{\mathcal{T}_f}(b(\sigma, \sigma^1, \sigma^2), \sigma^2) \mu(d\sigma), \quad \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_f.$$

As remarked in [2], Section 5.2, these properties are enough for uniqueness of Brownian motion on \mathcal{T}_f . Note that the definition given by Aldous has an extra factor of 2 in property v). This is a result of Aldous' description of the continuum random tree being based on the random function $2W$. By Theorem 9.2, we already have that properties i), ii) and iii) hold for the process X on \mathcal{T} , \mathbf{P} -a.s.

An important tool for the proofs of properties iv) and v) will be the trace operator for Dirichlet forms, which will allow us to deduce results about the Dirichlet form on \mathcal{T} by considering its restriction to finite subsets of \mathcal{T} . We now introduce the notation for this, for more details, see [7], Section 4. Let K be a set and ν a measure on K and suppose we are given a regular Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on $L^2(K, \nu)$. Let \tilde{K} be the closed support of the σ -finite measure $\tilde{\nu}$ on K . The trace of \mathcal{E} on \tilde{K} is defined by

$$\text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}|\tilde{K})(v, v) := \inf\{\mathcal{E}(u, u) : u|_{\tilde{K}} = v\}, \quad v \in L^2(\tilde{K}, \tilde{\nu}),$$

and its domain, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, is the set of functions for which this infimum is finite. Before proceeding with the main results of this section, we first need to prove the following technical result on the capacity of sets of \mathcal{T} , where we use the notation \tilde{U} to represent the set of excursions on which a finite resistance form is defined on \mathcal{T}_f , as in Section 9.

Lemma 11.1 *For $f \in \tilde{U}$, all non-empty subsets of \mathcal{T}_f have strictly positive capacity.*

Proof: For $f \in \tilde{U}$, we are able to construct the associated Dirichlet form, $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}_f}$. By Lemma 3.2.2 of [16], if ν is a positive Radon measure on \mathcal{T}_f with finite energy integral, i.e.,

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{T}_f} |u(\sigma)| \nu(d\sigma) \right)^2 \leq c_{49} \left(\mathcal{E}(u, u) + \int_{\mathcal{T}_f} u(\sigma)^2 \mu(d\sigma) \right), \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{F},$$

for some $c_{49} < \infty$, then ν charges no set of zero capacity. Hence, by monotonicity, it is sufficient to show that δ_σ has finite energy integral for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_f$, where δ_σ is the probability measure putting all its mass at the point σ . For any $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{T}_f$,

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{T}_f} |u(\sigma'')| \delta_\sigma(d\sigma'') \right)^2 = u(\sigma)^2 \leq 2(u(\sigma) - u(\sigma'))^2 + 2u(\sigma')^2.$$

Applying the inequality at (23) to this bound, and integrating with respect to σ' yields

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{T}_f} |u(\sigma')| \delta_\sigma(d\sigma') \right)^2 \leq 2 \text{diam} \mathcal{T}_f \mathcal{E}(u, u) + 2 \int_{\mathcal{T}_f} u(\sigma')^2 \mu(d\sigma'),$$

which completes the proof, because $\text{diam} \mathcal{T}_f$ is finite. \square

The above result allows us to define local times for X , and in the following lemma we use these to define a time-changed process on a finite subset of \mathcal{T} . By considering the

hitting probabilities for the time-changed process, we are able to deduce that X satisfies property iv) of the Brownian motion definition. In particular, we will use the fact that the quadratic for corresponding to our time-changed process is simply the trace of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}$ on the same finite subset.

Lemma 11.2 *\mathbf{P} -a.s., the process X of Theorem 9.2 satisfies property iv) of the definition of Brownian motion on \mathcal{T} .*

Proof: Suppose $W \in \tilde{U}$, so that the resistance form, $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}$, and process, X , are defined for \mathcal{T} . Fix $\sigma, \sigma^1, \sigma^2 \in \mathcal{T}$, $\sigma^1 \neq \sigma^2$, and set $b = b(\sigma, \sigma^1, \sigma^2)$. Write $V_1 = \{\sigma, \sigma^1, \sigma^2, b\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_1 = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}|_{V_1})$. Using simple properties of resistance forms, the following explicit expression for \mathcal{E}_1 can be calculated:

$$\mathcal{E}_1(u, u) = \sum_{\sigma' \in \{\sigma, \sigma^1, \sigma^2\}} \frac{(u(b) - u(\sigma'))^2}{d_{\mathcal{T}}(b, \sigma')}, \quad u \in C(V_1), \quad (27)$$

where, if $b = \sigma'$, the relevant term is defined to be 0.

By the previous lemma, $\{\sigma'\}$ has strictly positive capacity for each $\sigma' \in \mathcal{T}$. As outlined in Section 4 of [7], a result of this is that X has jointly measurable local times $(L_t^{\sigma'}, \sigma' \in \mathcal{T}, t \geq 0)$ such that

$$\int_0^t u(X_s) ds = \int_{\mathcal{T}} u(\sigma') L_t^{\sigma'} \mu(d\sigma'), \quad u \in L^2(\mathcal{T}, \mu).$$

Now, denote $\nu := \frac{1}{|V_1|} \sum_{\sigma' \in V_1} \delta_{\sigma'}$, the uniform distribution on V_1 and define

$$A_t := \int_{\mathcal{T}} L_t^{\sigma'} \nu(d\sigma'), \quad \tau_t := \inf\{s : A_s > t\}.$$

Consider the process $\tilde{X} = (\tilde{X}, \mathbf{P}_{\sigma'}^{\mathcal{T}}, \sigma' \in V_1)$, defined by $\tilde{X}_t := X_{\tau_t}$. As described in [7], \tilde{X} is a ν -symmetric Hunt process and has associated regular Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}_1, C(V_1))$. Using elementary theory for continuous time Markov chains on a finite state space, we obtain the following result for \tilde{X}

$$\mathbf{P}_{\sigma}^{\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{T}_{\sigma^1} < \tilde{T}_{\sigma^2}) = \frac{d_{\mathcal{T}}(b, \sigma^2)}{d_{\mathcal{T}}(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)},$$

where $\tilde{T}_{\sigma'} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \tilde{X}_t = \sigma'\}$. Since the hitting distribution is unaffected by the time change from X to \tilde{X} , this implies

$$\mathbf{P}_{\sigma}^{\mathcal{T}}(T_{\sigma^1} < T_{\sigma^2}) = \frac{d_{\mathcal{T}}(b, \sigma^2)}{d_{\mathcal{T}}(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)},$$

and so, if $W \in \tilde{U}$, the process X satisfies property iv) of the Brownian motion definition. Since $W \in \tilde{U}$, \mathbf{P} -a.s., this completes the proof. \square

A result that will be useful in proving that X satisfies property v) is the following uniqueness result, which is proved in [21], Lemma 3.5.

Lemma 11.3 *Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ be a resistance form on a set K and V be a finite subset of K . Then for any $v \in C(V)$, there exists a unique $u \in \mathcal{F}$ such that*

$$\mathcal{E}(u, u) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}|V)(v, v), \quad u|_V = v.$$

Lemma 11.4 *\mathbf{P} -a.s., the process X of Theorem 9.2 satisfies property v) of the definition of Brownian motion on \mathcal{T} .*

Proof: First, assume $W \in \tilde{U}$, so that the resistance form, $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}$, and process, X , are defined for \mathcal{T} . Fix $\sigma^1, \sigma^2 \in \mathcal{T}$, $\sigma^1 \neq \sigma^2$, and define $D = D(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)$ to be the path connected component of $\mathcal{T} \setminus \{\sigma^2\}$ containing σ^1 . Using the same argument as in [24], Proposition 4.2, we can deduce the existence of a Green kernel $g^D(\cdot, \cdot)$ for the process killed on exiting D which satisfies

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}(g^D(\sigma, \cdot), f) = f(\sigma), \quad \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{T}, f \in \mathcal{F}_D, \quad (28)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_D := \{f \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}} : f|_{D^c} = 0\}$. By standard arguments, this implies that $g^D(\sigma^1, \sigma^1) > 0$;

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}) = \inf\{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}(u, u) : u(\sigma^1) = 1, u(\sigma^2) = 0\}, \quad (29)$$

where $\tilde{g}(\cdot) := g^D(\sigma^1, \cdot)/g^D(\sigma^1, \sigma^1)$; and for μ -measurable f ,

$$\mathbf{E}^{\sigma^1} \int_0^{T_{\sigma^2}} f(X_s) ds = \int_{\mathcal{T}} g^D(\sigma^1, \sigma) f(\sigma) \mu(d\sigma).$$

This means that $g^D(\sigma^1, \sigma) \mu(d\sigma)$ is the mean occupation density of the process started at σ^1 and killed on hitting σ^2 . Furthermore, note that combining (28), (29) and the characterisation of $d_{\mathcal{T}}$ at (22), we can deduce that $g^D(\sigma^1, \sigma^1) = d_{\mathcal{T}}(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)$.

Now, fix $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}$, and define $b := b(\sigma, \sigma^1, \sigma^2)$,

$$V_1 := \{\sigma, \sigma^1, \sigma^2, b\}, \quad \mathcal{E}_1 := \text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}|V_1),$$

$$V_0 := \{\sigma^1, \sigma^2\}, \quad \mathcal{E}_0 := \text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}_1|V_0).$$

Let $f_0 \in C(V_0)$ be defined by $f_0(\sigma^1) = 1$, $f_0(\sigma^2) = 0$; f_1 be the unique (by Lemma 11.3) function in $C(V_1)$ that satisfies $\mathcal{E}_1(f_1, f_1) = \mathcal{E}_0(f_0, f_0)$ and $f_1|_{V_0} = f_0$; and f_2 be the unique function in \mathcal{F} such that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}(f_2, f_2) = \mathcal{E}_1(f_1, f_1)$ and $f_2|_{V_1} = f_1$. Applying the tower property for the trace operator, $\mathcal{E}_0 = \text{Tr}(\text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}|V_1)|V_0) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}|V_0)$, we have that f_2 is the unique function that satisfies

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}(f_2, f_2) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}|V_0)(f_0, f_0), \quad f_2|_{V_0} = f_0.$$

However, we have from (29) that \tilde{g} also has these properties and so it follows from the uniqueness of Lemma 11.3 that $\tilde{g} = f_2$. Thus $\tilde{g}|_{V_1} = f_1$. Recall, the explicit expression for \mathcal{E}_1 given at (27). A simple minimisation of this quadratic polynomial allows us to determine the function f_1 . In particular, we have $\tilde{g}(\sigma) = f_1(\sigma) = d_{\mathcal{T}}(b, \sigma^2) d_{\mathcal{T}}(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)^{-1}$. Hence the mean occupation density of the process started at σ^1 and killed on hitting σ^2 is

$$g^D(\sigma^1, \sigma) \mu(d\sigma) = g^D(\sigma^1, \sigma^1) \tilde{g}(\sigma) \mu(d\sigma) = d_{\mathcal{T}}(b, \sigma^2) \mu(d\sigma).$$

Thus, if $W \in \tilde{U}$, the process X satisfies property v) of the Brownian motion definition. Since $W \in \tilde{U}$, \mathbf{P} -a.s., this completes the proof. \square

Combining the results of Theorem 9.2 and Lemmas 11.2 and 11.4 we immediately have the following.

Corollary 11.5 *P-a.s., the process X of Theorem 9.2 is Brownian motion on \mathcal{T} .*

References

- [1] D. Aldous, *The continuum random tree. I*, Ann. Probab. **19** (1991), no. 1, 1–28.
- [2] ———, *The continuum random tree. II. An overview*, Stochastic analysis (Durham, 1990), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 167, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1991, pp. 23–70.
- [3] ———, *The continuum random tree. III*, Ann. Probab. **21** (1993), no. 1, 248–289.
- [4] ———, *Tree-based models for random distribution of mass*, J. Statist. Phys. **73** (1993), no. 3-4, 625–641.
- [5] ———, *Recursive self-similarity for random trees, random triangulations and Brownian excursion*, Ann. Probab. **22** (1994), no. 2, 527–545.
- [6] K. B. Athreya and P. E. Ney, *Branching processes*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 196.
- [7] M. T. Barlow, *Diffusions on fractals*, Lectures on probability theory and statistics (Saint-Flour, 1995), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1690, Springer, Berlin, 1998, pp. 1–121.
- [8] M. T. Barlow and T. Kumagai, *Random walk on the incipient infinite cluster on trees*, Preprint.
- [9] M.T. Barlow, R.F. Bass, and T. Kumagai, *Stability of parabolic Harnack inequalities on metric measure spaces*, To appear in J. Math. Soc. Japan.
- [10] K. L. Chung, *Excursions in Brownian motion*, Ark. Mat. **14** (1976), no. 2, 155–177.
- [11] Z. Ciesielski and S. J. Taylor, *First passage times and sojourn times for Brownian motion in space and the exact Hausdorff measure of the sample path*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **103** (1962), 434–450.
- [12] D.A. Croydon, *Heat kernel estimates under non-uniform volume growth*, Preprint.
- [13] T. Duquesne and J.-F. Le Gall, *The Hausdorff measure of stable trees*, Preprint.
- [14] ———, *Probabilistic and fractal aspects of Lévy trees*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **131** (2005), no. 4, 553–603.
- [15] R. T. Durrett and D. L. Iglehart, *Functionals of Brownian meander and Brownian excursion*, Ann. Probability **5** (1977), no. 1, 130–135.

- [16] M. Fukushima, *Dirichlet forms and Markov processes*, North-Holland Mathematical Library, vol. 23, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1980.
- [17] S. Graf, R. D. Mauldin, and S. C. Williams, *The exact Hausdorff dimension in random recursive constructions*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **71** (1988), no. 381, x+121.
- [18] A. Grigor'yan, *Heat kernel upper bounds on fractal spaces*, Preprint.
- [19] B. M. Hambly and O. D. Jones, *Thick and thin points for random recursive fractals*, Adv. in Appl. Probab. **35** (2003), no. 1, 251–277.
- [20] T. Hara and G. Slade, *The scaling limit of the incipient infinite cluster in high-dimensional percolation. II. Integrated super-Brownian excursion*, J. Math. Phys. **41** (2000), no. 3, 1244–1293.
- [21] J. Kigami, *Harmonic calculus on limits of networks and its application to dendrites*, J. Funct. Anal. **128** (1995), no. 1, 48–86.
- [22] ———, *Analysis on fractals*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 143, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [23] W. B. Krebs, *Brownian motion on the continuum tree*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **101** (1995), no. 3, 421–433.
- [24] T. Kumagai, *Heat kernel estimates and parabolic Harnack inequalities on graphs and resistance forms*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **40** (2004), no. 3, 793–818.
- [25] P. Levy, *Theorie de l'addition des variables aleatoires*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1937.
- [26] J. Neveu and J. W. Pitman, *The branching process in a Brownian excursion*, Séminaire de Probabilités, XXIII, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1372, Springer, Berlin, 1989, pp. 248–257.
- [27] S. Orey and S. J. Taylor, *How often on a Brownian path does the law of iterated logarithm fail?*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **28** (1974), 174–192.
- [28] D. Revuz and M. Yor, *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, third ed., Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 293, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [29] L. C. G. Rogers and D. Williams, *Diffusions, Markov processes, and martingales. Vol. 2*, Cambridge Mathematical Library, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000, Ito calculus, Reprint of the second (1994) edition.