

# A moment approach for the convergence of spatial branching processes to the Continuum Random Tree

Félix Foutel-Rodier<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Oxford

## Abstract

We consider a general class of branching processes in discrete time, where particles have types belonging to a Polish space and reproduce independently according to their type. If the process is critical and the mean distribution of types converges for large times, we prove that the tree structure of the process converges to the Brownian Continuum Random Tree, under a moment assumption. We provide a general approach to prove similar invariance principles for branching processes, which relies on deducing the convergence of the genealogy from computing its moments. These are obtained using a new many-to-few formula, which provides an expression for the moments of order  $k$  of a branching process in terms of a Markov chain indexed by a uniform tree with  $k$  leaves.

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Context and motivation

This article is concerned with scaling limits of the tree structure of spatial branching processes. In discrete time, a spatial branching process is a particle system where each particle has a type in some Polish type space  $E$ , which we think of as a set of spatial locations. At each generation a particle at  $x \in E$  is replaced by its offspring, encoded as a point process

$$\Xi_x = \sum_{i=1}^{|\Xi_x|} \delta_{\xi_{x,i}}, \quad (1)$$

with the interpretation that the parent has  $|\Xi_x|$  children, located at  $(\xi_{x,i})_{i \leq |\Xi_x|}$ . The next generation is obtained by carrying out this step independently for each particle. This formalism encompasses many well-studied branching models such as multi-type branching processes, branching random walks, or any branching diffusion observed at discrete time points [6, 70, 66]. Envisioning the particles as vertices and connecting each vertex to its

parent, this procedure constructs a random tree  $T$  augmented with a collection of random variables  $(X_v)_{v \in T}$  giving the types. Our objective is to study scaling limits of the marked tree  $(T, (X_v)_{v \in T})$ .

Such scaling limits have already been investigated extensively in some special cases. In the absence of types, that is when  $E$  is made of a single element, we recover Bienaymé–Galton–Watson processes. Scaling limits of their tree structure have received considerable attention, starting with seminal work of Aldous on the Brownian Continuum Random Tree (CRT) [3] and subsequently leading to a full classification in the near-critical case and the introduction of Lévy trees [56, 26]. One can extend these results to a special family of spatial branching processes by assuming that the number of offspring  $|\Xi_x|$  in (1) does not depend on  $x$ . In this case, the tree structure  $T$  remains distributed as a Bienaymé–Galton–Watson tree and the spatial locations  $(X_v)_{v \in T}$  can be obtained by running a Markov chain indexed by the vertices of that tree. It is then possible to describe the joint scaling limit of the genealogy and particle locations as a Markov process indexed by a continuous tree, which is tightly connected to the notion of snake [53, 54, 58] and corresponds to the genealogy of the so-called Dawson–Watanabe superprocesses [23, 65, 28]. An important example of such processes is the branching Brownian motion and its scaling, the super-Brownian motion.

However, for general offspring distributions  $T$  fails to be a Bienaymé–Galton–Watson tree and known results become much scarcer, with a few notable exceptions [63, 50, 11, 68]. In this case, the tree structure  $T$  and the particle locations  $(X_v)_{v \in T}$  become strongly dependent: vertices carrying a successful type are typically expected to have a larger degree and more descendants. Several techniques based on encoding trees as paths become difficult to apply because of this dependence, making the analysis of  $T$  challenging. Beyond the technical challenge, letting the number of descendants depend on the particles location leads to a much richer class of random trees  $T$  and opens the possibility of observing new interesting behaviour emerging from the addition of a spatial structure. The references above already provide interesting examples of *binary* branching diffusions where the presence of highly successful types drives the system to the universality class of  $\alpha$ -stable branching processes [11, 71, 34], with the emergence of infinite branch points in the limit. This is in sharp contrast with Bienaymé–Galton–Watson trees where, in the absence of type,  $\alpha$ -stable branching processes can only arise if the offspring distribution has heavy tail. A general theory for these spatial branching processes is still missing, which seems to be an interesting avenue and motivates the introduction of new tools to study their tree structures.

Quite recently, starting with the work of Harris and Roberts [41], some new techniques have been developed under the name of *many-to-few formulas* to study the genealogical properties of general spatial branching processes. They rely on expressing the law of the subtree spanned by  $k$  typical particles in the population using an appropriate random change of measure, in the spirit of the celebrated spinal decomposition results for branching processes [19, 59, 14]. These techniques seem very promising and have already been applied successfully in various contexts [40, 46, 39, 33, 15, 69, 34]. We can now express the main

two goals of the present work.

- Provide a general approach to study scaling limits of the marked tree  $(T, (X_v)_{v \in T})$  that relies on a many-to-few formula and a method of moments.
- Prove an invariance principle to the Brownian CRT for a large class of critical spatial branching processes with an ergodic mean behaviour.

We describe the invariance principle and the assumptions under which it holds in the next section. Our moment approach extends that proposed in [33], which is restricted to studying the *reduced tree* spanned by a single generation. It relies on an adaptation of the method of moments to infinite measures developed in [30] and on a new many-to-few formula, which is another contribution of our work. It is described informally in Section 1.3 and made precise in Section 3. We also refer to the recent work of [37] for a different expression in the same direction.

Before ending this section let us mention that, in addition to being a natural probabilistic problem, extending our understanding of the tree structure of spatial branching processes beyond the class of tree-indexed Markov chains is strongly motivated by applications. Types can be used to model a wide variety of features of interest, ranging from spatial locations, traits, and age in population biology [8, 17, 45, 29], clinical status in epidemiology [16, 31], to positions and velocities in neutron transport [43]. Modeling most real-world phenomena requires to have the offspring law depend on the location, and studying the resulting tree structure often leads to a deeper understanding of the dynamics of the process. This is especially true in population genetics, where genealogies are key to analysing the patterns of genetic diversity. In addition to that, trees and marked trees are central to the study of many combinatorial objects [18, 61, 2], an important example being planar maps, and progress in our understanding of spatial branching processes might also be relevant in that direction.

## 1.2 Invariance principle for critical spatial branching processes

The invariance principle that we derive holds for a class of spatial branching processes such that the average particle location reaches an equilibrium. Our assumptions are almost directly borrowed from [35, 38], which themselves trace back to early work of Asmussen and Hering on general branching processes [42, 5, 4]. We will use the notation  $\mu[f]$  or  $\langle \mu, f \rangle$  for the integral of  $f$  against some measure  $\mu$ , and let  $\mathbb{P}_x$  be the law of the process started from a single ancestor at  $x \in E$ .

**Assumption 1.** The following three points hold.

- (i) There exists a continuous bounded harmonic function  $h: E \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  and a stationary measure  $\pi$  on  $E$  for the mean semi-group of the process, namely

$$\forall x \in E, \quad h(x) = \mathbb{E}[\langle \Xi_x, h \rangle], \quad \pi(dx) = \int_E \mathbb{E}[\Xi_y(dx)]\pi(dy).$$

They are renormalised so that  $\pi$  is a probability measure and  $\langle \pi, h \rangle = 1$ .

(ii) For any continuous bounded  $f: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in E} \left| \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{v \in T, |v|=n} f(X_v) \right] - h(x) \langle \pi, f \rangle \right| = 0. \quad (2)$$

(iii) For any  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in E} \mathbb{E} [ |\Xi_x|^k ] < \infty \quad (3)$$

and the map  $x \mapsto \mathbb{E} [ |\Xi_x|^2 ]$  is continuous.

Point (i) provides the existence of a pair  $(h, \pi)$  of right eigenfunction and left eigenmeasure for the mean semi-group corresponding to the eigenvalue 1. Point (ii) is a stability condition for this semi-group, requiring that it has a Perron–Frobenius-like behaviour as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . These two conditions serve as a notion of criticality for our spatial branching processes. The measure  $\pi$  corresponds to the asymptotic distribution of particles, and the harmonic function  $h$  quantifies the “success” of a type: a particle of type  $x$  will have asymptotically on average  $h(x)$  descendants. Point (iii) will be required for applying our method of moments. We introduce

$$\Sigma^2 := \int_E \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{|\Xi_x|} h(\xi_{x,i}) h(\xi_{x,j}) \right] \pi(dx),$$

which is the key parameter driving the dynamics of the process. It acts as a spatial notion of variance and is clearly finite under Assumption 1.

Let us illustrate rapidly these conditions with a few examples. If  $E$  is finite as in [63], the Perron–Frobenius theorem readily ensures that (i) and (ii) are fulfilled whenever the process is critical, irreducible, and aperiodic. A second example is obtained by observing a branching diffusion killed upon reaching the boundary of a domain  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  at discrete time steps. (Continuous or discrete time makes no difference in our approach, but we chose the latter because it is notationally more convenient for manipulating trees.) If the domain  $E$  is bounded, spectral theory for elliptic operators entails that (i) and (ii) hold if the process is critical [66, 68]. These points also hold for some branching diffusions on unbounded domains if the potential decays sufficiently fast at infinity [20]. Two last examples that we want to mention are critical growth–fragmentation processes [13] and stochastic neutron transport [43], the latter being one the original motivation of [38]. Finally, see [10, 24] for general results allowing one to establish (2).

Assumption 1 is sufficient to derive a first version of our invariance principle. In order to discuss scaling limits of trees, we need to view our branching process as a random *marked metric measure space*. The appropriate state space and topologies are introduced formally

in Section 4. Recall that a spatial branching process defines a random tree  $T$  decorated with a collection of types  $(X_v)_{v \in T}$ , and let  $T$  be rooted at the initial particle  $\rho$ . The tree  $T$  is naturally endowed with its graph distance  $d$  and with a measure  $\mu$  on  $T \times E$  defined as

$$\mu = \sum_{v \in T} \delta_{(v, X_v)}.$$

This measure encodes both the number of individuals and their types. In the terminology of [25],  $\mathcal{T} = (T, d, \rho, \mu)$  is a (pointed) marked metric measure space representing the genealogy and types of the population. We rescale edge lengths by  $n$  and particle masses by  $n^2$  to define

$$\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n := \left(T, \frac{d}{n}, \rho, \frac{\mu}{n^2}\right), \quad (4)$$

and let  $\mathcal{L}_x(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n)$  denote the law of this rescaled metric space, when starting from a single particle at  $x$ . Finally, we let  $\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi} = (T_b, d_b, \rho_b, \mu_b \otimes \pi)$  denote a free Brownian CRT with variance  $\Sigma^2$  and marks  $\pi$ , which is the tree encoded by a Brownian excursion with variance  $4/\Sigma^2$  whose leaves are marked independently according to  $\pi$ . This object is constructed precisely in Section 4.3. We let  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi})$  be its “distribution,” which is the law of this random variable under the infinite excursion measure of Brownian motion.

Even if it is not our main focus here, it comes at no cost with our approach to derive the scaling limit of a second tree: the *reduced tree* spanned by a given generation. Fix  $n \geq 0$  and let us denote by  $U_n$  the  $n$ -th generation of the process defined as

$$U_n := \{v \in T : |v| = n\}.$$

Let  $d_n$  be the restriction of the graph distance  $d$  to  $U_n$  and  $\tilde{\mu}_n$  be the empirical measure of labels and types at generation  $n$ , namely

$$\tilde{\mu}_n = \sum_{v \in U_n} \delta_{(v, X_v)}.$$

The marked metric measure space  $(U_n, d_n, \rho, \tilde{\mu}_n)$  is an *ultrametric space* that encodes the genealogy and types of the  $n$ -th generation of the spatial branching process. We rescale it as above to define

$$\bar{\mathcal{U}}_n := \left(U_n, \frac{d_n}{n}, \rho, \frac{\tilde{\mu}_n}{n}\right). \quad (5)$$

Note the change in mass rescaling compared to (4). Let  $\mathcal{U}_{b,\pi} = (U_{b,\pi}, d_{b,\pi}, \rho_{b,\pi}, \mu_b \otimes \pi)$  be the Brownian coalescent point process (CPP) [67, 51] with variance  $\Sigma^2$  and marks  $\pi$ . This ultrametric space corresponds to the sphere of radius 1 of a Brownian CRT conditioned to have height at least 1, see Section 4.3 for a precise definition. Finally, let us denote by  $Z_n = |U_n|$  the number of particles at generation  $n \geq 0$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *Suppose that Assumption 1 is fulfilled.*

(i) *The convergence*

$$\forall x \in E, \quad n\mathcal{L}_x(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} h(x)\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi})$$

*holds vaguely in the marked Gromov-vague topology, where  $\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi}$  is a free Brownian CRT with variance  $\Sigma^2$  and independent marks  $\pi$ .*

(ii) *There exists  $(\eta_n)_{n \geq 1}$  with  $\eta_n \rightarrow 0$  such that*

$$\forall x \in E, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n\mathbb{P}_x(Z_n \geq \eta_n n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \frac{2h(x)}{\Sigma^2}. \quad (6)$$

*Moreover, conditional on  $\{Z_n > n\eta_n\}$  and starting from one particle at  $x \in E$ ,*

$$\bar{\mathcal{U}}_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathcal{U}_{b,\pi}$$

*in distribution for the marked Gromov-weak topology, where  $\mathcal{U}_{b,\pi}$  is a Brownian CPP with variance  $\Sigma^2$  and marks  $\pi$ .*

**Remark 1.** We conjecture that the assumptions of this result can be relaxed as long as  $\Sigma^2 < \infty$ . In particular  $h$  need not be bounded and  $|\Xi_x|$  need only have finite moments of order  $k = 2$ . Our approach could lead to the latter improvement with some additional effort by truncating the process as in [15], but we restrain from doing so to keep the proofs more transparent. Conversely, we believe that relaxing the former assumption would lead to new behaviours. If  $h$  is unbounded, it is possible that  $\Sigma^2 = \infty$  even if  $|\Xi_x|$  has finite variance. Several examples have shown that, in this case,  $\alpha$ -stable genealogies can arise due to rare excursions of particles to infinity, generating a large offspring in a small number of generations [11, 71, 34]. We believe this to be a generic behaviour of spatial branching processes and that relaxing our assumption to include unbounded  $h$  is an interesting avenue to investigate.

The Gromov-vague convergence obtained above is equivalent to the Gromov-weak convergence (also known as Gromov–Prohorov convergence) of the tree below a height of order  $n$ . This result already covers many interesting applications, including deriving the limit in law of the subtree spanned by  $k$  individuals sampled uniformly from the population before or at a fixed generation, in the spirit of coalescent theory in population genetics [48, 12]. It also provides a weak estimate on the survival probability (6), which gives the probability that the population reaches a “macroscopic” size of order  $n$ .

However, the topologies used above are too weak for other applications, as many natural geometric quantities (such as the diameter and the total height) are not continuous functionals of the Gromov-weak topology. This provides motivation for reinforcing this result to the stronger Gromov–Hausdorff–Prohorov topology. In the context of spatial branching processes, we will show that reinforcing the convergence amounts to sharpening the estimate (6) on the survival probability. This leads us to formulate a second assumption on our branching process, which should be thought of as reinforcing (6).

**Assumption 2.** Suppose that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in E} \left| n\mathbb{P}_x(Z_n > 0) - \frac{2h(x)}{\Sigma^2} \right| = 0. \quad (7)$$

**Remark 2.** In a slightly different setting, [38, 44] have shown that (7) follows from Assumption 1 provided that the process goes extinct almost surely and verifies a mild irreducibility condition. In our notation, the latter condition is that there are some  $K, M > 0$  such that

$$\forall f: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+, \quad \int_E \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \mathbf{1}_{\{|\Xi| \leq M\}} \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^{|\Xi|} f(\xi_i) f(\xi_j) \right] \pi(dx) \geq K \langle \pi, f \rangle.$$

We believe that the proof of [38, 44] could be adapted to the present setting. Since this is not our focus here, we prefer to leave (7) as an additional condition to verify rather than reproducing the arguments in [44].

For Bienaymé–Galton–Watson processes, the asymptotic (7) is known as Kolmogorov’s estimate. More generally, it is expected to hold for critical branching processes with a finite “variance.” For instance, (7) is known to hold in most of the examples mentioned above. With Kolmogorov’s estimate at hand, we can reinforce Theorem 1.1 to the following result.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Suppose that Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 are fulfilled.*

(i) *The convergence*

$$\forall x \in E, \quad n\mathcal{L}_x(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} h(x)\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi})$$

*holds vaguely in the marked Gromov–Hausdorff–Prohorov topology.*

(ii) *Conditional on  $\{Z_n > 0\}$  and starting from one particle at  $x \in E$ ,*

$$\bar{\mathcal{U}}_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathcal{U}_{b,\pi}$$

*in distribution for the marked Gromov–Hausdorff–Prohorov topology.*

Point (i) of the above result might remain daunting as it involves infinite measures and vague convergence. As a direct corollary, we can deduce two more standard types of convergence to the Brownian CRT. The first one is the convergence of the branching process conditioned to survive for a long time  $tn$  to the Brownian CRT conditioned to have height larger than  $t$ . The second one is the convergence of the forest obtained by starting the population from  $n$  ancestors to the forest encoded by a reflected Brownian motion. Let us introduce some notation for the latter case. Suppose that the population starts from a set of  $z_0$  ancestors with positions  $(x_i)_{i \leq z_0}$ , which we record as a measure  $\mathbf{z}_0 = \delta_{x_1} + \dots + \delta_{x_{z_0}}$ . Each ancestor grows an independent tree, and we denote by  $(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_{n,i})_{i \leq z_0}$

the collection of metric measure spaces obtained by applying the rescaling (4) to each tree and re-ordering them in decreasing order of total mass,

$$|\bar{\mathcal{T}}_{n,1}| \geq |\bar{\mathcal{T}}_{n,2}| \geq \dots,$$

breaking ties arbitrarily. We let  $\text{ht}(\mathcal{T})$  denote the height of a tree  $\mathcal{T}$ , see (37).

**Corollary 1.3.** *Suppose that Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 are fulfilled.*

(i) *For any  $t > 0$  and  $x \in E$ ,*

$$\mathcal{L}_x(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n \mid Z_{tn} > 0) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi} \mid \text{ht}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi}) \geq t)$$

*in distribution for the marked Gromov–Hausdorff–Prohorov topology.*

(ii) *Suppose that the population starts from an initial configuration of particles  $\mathbf{z}_{0,n}$  such that  $\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{z}_{0,n} \rightarrow \nu_0$  weakly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for some finite measure  $\nu_0$  on  $E$ . Let  $(\mathcal{T}_{b,i})_{i \geq 1}$  be the atoms of a Poisson point process with intensity measure  $\langle \nu_0, h \rangle \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi})$ , in decreasing order of their total mass. Then*

$$(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_{n,1}, \bar{\mathcal{T}}_{n,2}, \dots) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} (\mathcal{T}_{b,1}, \mathcal{T}_{b,2}, \dots)$$

*in distribution in the finite-dimensional sense, where each coordinate is endowed with the marked Gromov–Hausdorff–Prohorov topology.*

### 1.3 Main proof ideas: moments and many-to-few formula

Our proof of the invariance principle relies on two main ingredients. First, we will deduce the convergence in the Gromov-vague topology from a method of moments. The moments of order  $k \geq 1$  of the random marked tree  $\mathcal{T}$  are quantities of the form

$$\mathbb{E}_x[\Phi(\mathcal{T})] := \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in T^k} \varphi(d(\mathbf{v}), X_{\mathbf{v}}) \right], \quad (8)$$

for a continuous bounded  $\varphi: \mathcal{D}_k \times E^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , where  $\mathcal{D}_k$  is the set of  $(k+1) \times (k+1)$  distance matrices, and where for  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$  we have defined

$$X_{\mathbf{v}} = (X_{v_i})_{1 \leq i \leq k}, \quad d(\mathbf{v}) = (d(v_i, v_j))_{0 \leq i, j \leq k}, \quad v_0 = \rho.$$

Roughly speaking, the moments encapsulate the law of the (rooted) subtree spanned by  $k$  typical vertices in the tree. The method of moments states that, under a mild technical condition, convergence of the moments for  $k \geq 1$  is sufficient to deduce vague convergence of the law of the tree in the Gromov-weak topology. These notions are made precise in Section 4, where the definitions of the appropriate topologies are recalled. This section

also contains some adaptations of known results on random metric spaces to the specific features of our problem (infinite measures and vague convergence, marks, Gromov-vague topology).

The second ingredient of our proofs is a new many-to-few formula to compute these moments. It provides an expression for (8) in terms of a Markov process indexed by the vertices of a “uniform tree” with  $k$  leaves. In our application, in between branch points, this Markov process reduces to a Markov chain  $(\zeta_n)_{n \geq 0}$  defined as the  $h$ -transform of the mean semi-group of the branching process, namely

$$\forall x \in E, \quad \mathbb{E}[f(\zeta_1) \mid \zeta_0 = x] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\langle \Xi_x, hf \rangle]}{h(x)},$$

for any measurable  $f: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ . (This process arises in several formulations of spinal decomposition theorems and is sometimes referred to as the *spine process*.) Upon reaching a branch point of degree  $d$ , the chain splits in  $d$  daughters whose random locations depend on the  $d$ -th moment of the point process  $\Xi_x$ , described in Section 2.2. Let  $\tau$  be a tree and  $(X_v^\tau)_{v \in \tau}$  be this Markov process indexed by  $\tau$ . Let  $\tau_{\mathbf{v}}$  be the subtree spanned by  $\mathbf{v} \in T^k$ . The many-to-few formula establishes that

$$\mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v} \in T^k \\ v_1 < \dots < v_k}} \varphi(\tau_{\mathbf{v}}, (X_w)_{w \in \tau_{\mathbf{v}}}) \right] = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_k} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ (\Delta_k \varphi)(\tau, (X_w^\tau)_{w \in \tau}) \right],$$

where  $\varphi$  is a test function and  $\Delta_k$  is a bias term defined in (16) that only depends on the spatial locations at the leaves and branch points of  $\tau$ . For the previous expression to make sense,  $T$  will be endowed with a natural planar ordering of its vertices and the sum on the right-hand side runs over the set  $\mathcal{T}_k$  of planar rooted trees with  $k$  labeled leaves. The variables  $(X_v^\tau)_{v \in \tau}$  and  $\Delta_k$  are constructed formally in Section 3, where the many-to-few formula (Theorem 3.1) is proved.

Finally, in Section 5, we use Assumption 1 and the many-to-few formula to compute the limit of the moments of our class of spatial branching processes. By the method of moments, this will prove Theorem 1.1. The rest of the section is dedicated to deriving tightness in the Gromov–Hausdorff–Prohorov topology from Assumption 2, which will prove Theorem 1.2. The key is to use an adaptation of the tightness result derived in [7].

## 2 Preliminaries on planar trees

### 2.1 Discrete planar trees

A rooted planar tree is a tree with a distinguished vertex and a total order on the offspring of each vertex. It is standard to encode rooted planar trees as subsets of the set of finite

words

$$\mathcal{V} := \{\emptyset\} \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{N}^n.$$

As usual, we write  $vw$  for the concatenation of  $v$  and  $w$ , and  $|v|$  for the length (or the *generation*) of  $v$ . The set  $\mathcal{V}$  is naturally endowed with the lexicographical order  $\leq$ , and with a partial order  $\preceq$  such that  $v \preceq w$  if  $v$  is an ancestor of  $w$ , that is if  $w = vv'$  for some  $v' \in \mathcal{V}$ . We write  $v \wedge w$  for the most-recent common ancestor of  $v$  and  $w$ , that is the longest word  $u$  such that  $u \preceq v$  and  $u \preceq w$ .

A subset  $\tau \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  is a *planar tree* if

- (i) for every  $v \in \tau$ , if  $w \preceq v$  then  $w \in \tau$ ; and
- (ii) for every  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  there is an integer  $d_v(\tau)$  such that

$$vi \in \tau \iff i \leq d_v(\tau).$$

The integer  $d_v(\tau)$  is called the (*out-*)*degree* of  $v$  in  $\tau$ . We introduce

$$\mathcal{L}(\tau) = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : d_v(\tau) = 0\}, \quad \mathcal{B}(\tau) = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : d_v(\tau) > 1\},$$

the set of *leaves* and *branch points* of  $\tau$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{T}_k$  the set of planar trees with  $k$  leaves

Fix a vector of  $k$  vertices  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_k) \in \mathcal{V}^k$ . We will denote by

$$\tau_{\mathbf{v}} = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \{w \in \mathcal{V} : w \preceq v_i\}$$

the subtree spanned by  $\mathbf{v}$ . Note that, strictly speaking,  $\tau_{\mathbf{v}}$  is not a planar tree as defined above since the children of a given vertex might not be indexed by consecutive integers and hence might not fulfill (ii). However, there is a unique way to relabel the elements of  $\tau_{\mathbf{v}}$  to a planar tree that preserves for each vertex its degree and the ordering of its children. In practice, we do not make a distinction between  $\tau_{\mathbf{v}}$  and this relabeling.

## 2.2 Two constructions of discrete planar trees

In this section, we provide two ways to generate a planar trees with  $k$  leaves. The first one is a recursive construction obtained by decomposing a tree into the branch leading to the first branch point and the subtrees attached to it. It will allow us to obtain recursive formulas for the moments of branching processes in terms of lower order moments. The second one is an encoding of a planar trees as elements of  $\mathbb{N}^{2k-1}$ , obtained by recording the heights of successive leaves and branch points. It is this second construction that will allow us to take a limit to continuous trees.




Figure 1: *Left*: A tree is decomposed at its first branch point into three subtrees  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$ , and  $S_3$ ; the corresponding leaf partition is displayed on top. *Right*: Point process construction of the same tree.

**Recursive construction.** We will need a few definitions, which are all illustrated in the left part of Figure 1. Fix some tree  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_k$  with leaves  $v_1 < \dots < v_k$  and let  $w = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k$  be the first branch point. We construct a partition  $\pi(\tau)$  as

$$i \sim_{\pi(\tau)} j \iff v_i \wedge v_j \neq w.$$

In words, removing  $w$  splits  $\tau$  into smaller children subtrees, and  $i \sim_{\pi(\tau)} j$  if and only if the leaves  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  belong to the same subtree. We let  $|\pi(\tau)|$  denote the number of blocks of the partition, and  $(\pi_i(\tau))_i$  be these blocks, ordered according to their least element. Note that, due to the order structure, the blocks of  $\pi(\tau)$  are made of consecutive integers. Equivalently, we could have recorded the vector of lengths of those blocks as  $c = (|\pi_i(\tau)|)_i$ , which is a vector summing to  $k$  referred to as a *composition of  $k$* . Finally, for  $i \leq d_w(\tau)$ , let us define  $S_i(\tau)$  as the  $i$ -th subtree attached to  $w$ . Namely,

$$\forall i \leq d_w(\tau), \quad S_i(\tau) = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : (w, i, v) \in \tau\}.$$

It should hopefully be clear that the map

$$\tau \mapsto (|w|, (S_i(\tau))_{i \leq |\pi(\tau)|})$$

is a bijection from  $\mathcal{T}_k$  to the set

$$\bigcup_{\pi} \mathbb{N} \times \left( \mathcal{T}_{|\pi_1|} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{T}_{|\pi_{|\pi|}|} \right),$$

where the union runs over all partitions of  $[k]$  with blocks made of consecutive integers, except the partition into singletons  $\{\{i\}, i \leq k\}$ . A short proof is given in Lemma A.1.

**Point process construction.** Fix a tree  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_k$  with leaves  $v_1 < \cdots < v_k$ . We define

$$\forall i \leq k, \quad \ell_i(\tau) = |v_i|, \quad \forall i \leq k-1, \quad b_i(\tau) = |v_i \wedge v_{i+1}|.$$

The vectors  $\boldsymbol{\ell}(\tau) = (\ell_i(\tau))_{i \leq k}$  and  $\mathbf{b}(\tau) = (b_i(\tau))_{i \leq k-1}$  encode, respectively, the heights of the leaves and the heights of the branch points between consecutive leaves. These are illustrated on the right part of Figure 1. Again, it is not hard to see that the map

$$\tau \mapsto (\boldsymbol{\ell}(\tau), \mathbf{b}(\tau))$$

is a bijection from  $\mathcal{T}_k$  to

$$\left\{ (\boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathbb{N}^k \times \mathbb{N}^{k-1} : b_i < \ell_i \wedge \ell_{i+1}, i \leq k-1 \right\}.$$

We provide a short proof of this fact in Lemma A.2. The inverse application is obtained starting from a branch of length  $\ell_1 + 1$ , and iteratively gluing a branch of length  $\ell_{i+1} - b_i$  at the right-most vertex of the tree with height  $b_i$ , see Figure 1.

An interesting consequence of this construction is that the set of all planar trees with  $k$  leaves at height  $\ell$ , called ultrametric trees, has a natural bijection with  $\{0, \dots, \ell-1\}^{k-1}$ . This observation is at the heart of the *coalescent point process* construction of the genealogy of branching processes [67, 51], and more generally of the *comb* encoding of ultrametric spaces [52, 32].

### 2.3 Continuous trees, distance matrices

**Continuous trees.** The point process encoding of planar trees allows us to embed  $\mathcal{T}_k$  into a subset of  $\mathbb{N}^{2k-1}$ . By extending this construction to  $\mathbb{R}_+^{2k-1}$ , we obtain a convenient notion of continuous trees with  $k$  leaves and a topology for these objects. More precisely, define a continuous planar tree as an element  $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{k,c}$ , where

$$\mathcal{T}_{k,c} := \left\{ (\boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^k \times \mathbb{R}_+^{k-1} : b_i < \ell_i \wedge \ell_{i+1}, i \leq k-1 \right\}.$$

We write  $\boldsymbol{\ell}(\theta)$  and  $\mathbf{b}(\theta)$  for the leaves and branch points heights of  $\theta = (\boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathbf{b})$ . As in the discrete case, the tree  $\theta = (\boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathbf{b})$  can be obtained by starting from an initial branch

corresponding to the interval  $[0, \ell_1]$  and inductively gluing an interval  $[b_i, \ell_{i+1}]$  on the rightmost vertex at height  $b_i$  of the tree constructed at step  $i$ . We say that a sequence of planar trees  $(\theta_n)_{n \geq 1}$  converges to  $\theta$  if

$$(\ell(\theta_n), \mathbf{b}(\theta_n)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} (\ell(\theta), \mathbf{b}(\theta)).$$

Moreover, if  $a > 0$ , we let  $a\theta = (a\ell(\theta), a\mathbf{b}(\theta))$  be the tree obtained by rescaling the branch lengths of  $\theta$  by  $a$ . Finally,  $\mathcal{T}_{k,c}$  is endowed with two natural measures. The first one is a “uniform” measure  $\Lambda_k$  defined as

$$\int_{\mathcal{T}_{k,c}} f(\theta) \Lambda_k(d\theta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^k} d\ell \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{k-1}} d\mathbf{b} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{b_i < \ell_i \wedge \ell_{i+1}\}} f(\ell, \mathbf{b}). \quad (9)$$

Note that this measure is infinite and only puts mass on binary trees. The second one is a uniform measure  $\tilde{\Lambda}_k$  on the set of ultrametric trees with  $k$  leaves at height 1, defined as

$$\int_{\mathcal{T}_{k,c}} f(\theta) \tilde{\Lambda}_k(d\theta) = \int_{[0,1]^{k-1}} f(\mathbf{1}_k, \mathbf{b}) d\mathbf{b}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\mathbf{1}_k = (1, \dots, 1)$ .

**Distance matrices.** The (pointed) Gromov-weak topology relies on studying the metric structure of a sample of size  $k$  chosen uniformly from a metric measure space. In its usual formulation, this metric structure is given by a  $(k+1) \times (k+1)$  matrix of pairwise distances between the vector made of the  $k$  points and the root. Let us denote by  $\mathcal{D}_k$  the set of  $(k+1) \times (k+1)$  distance matrices:

$$\mathcal{D}_k = \{(d_{ij})_{0 \leq i, j \leq k} : d_{ii} = 0, d_{ij} = d_{ji}, d_{ij} \leq d_{ip} + d_{pj}, 1 \leq i, j, p \leq k\}. \quad (11)$$

Since all the metric spaces that we consider in this work are trees, it more natural to encode a sample of size  $k$  as an element of  $\mathcal{T}_{k,c}$  rather than as a distance matrix. The two points of view are of course equivalent. To make the connexion explicit, we let  $D(\theta)$  be the  $(k+1) \times (k+1)$  matrix of pairwise distances between the leaves and the root of  $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{k,c}$ ,

$$\forall 0 \leq i < j \leq k, \quad D_{ji}(\theta) = D_{ij}(\theta) = \begin{cases} \ell_j & \text{if } i = 0, \\ \ell_i + \ell_j - \min\{b_i, \dots, b_{j-1}\} & \text{if } i \geq 1, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

and  $D_{ii}(\theta) = 0$ .

## 2.4 Marked trees

The class of branching processes that we are interested in defines a planar tree structure augmented with types (that we also call marks or locations) on the vertices. Formally, if  $E$

is a fixed mark space we define a (discrete) *marked tree* as a pair  $\tau^* = (\tau, (x_v)_{v \in \tau})$ , where  $\tau$  is a planar tree and  $x_v \in E$  for each  $v \in \tau$ . We let  $\mathcal{T}_k^*$  be the set of all discrete marked trees with  $k$  leaves. Without further mention, we extend all of the operations that we have defined on trees to their obvious counterparts for marked trees.

In the continuous setting, the natural extension of this definition would be that a marked tree is a pair  $(\theta, (x_v)_{v \in \theta})$  where the second coordinate is a collection of marks indexed by  $\theta$ . Although this notion is intuitive, giving a formal definition would rapidly become cumbersome. For our purpose we will only need to record the types of the  $k$  leaves of  $\theta$ . Accordingly, we define a continuous marked tree as a pair  $\theta^* = (\theta, (x_i)_{i \leq k})$ , with the interpretation that  $x_i$  is the type of the  $i$ -th leaf of  $\theta$ , and let  $\mathcal{T}_{c,k}^* = \mathcal{T}_k \times E^k$ . We also let  $\mathcal{D}_k^* = \mathcal{D}_k \times E^k$  be the set of marked distance matrices.

### 3 The moments of branching processes

#### 3.1 Notation and tree-index Markov chain

**Construction of the branching process.** We give a brief construction of the spatial branching processes that are described in the introduction. Recall that  $\Xi_x$  stands for the point process encoding the offspring of a particle at  $x \in E$ . We construct iteratively a tree  $T_n$  corresponding to the first  $n$  generations of the branching process as follows:

- Let  $T_0 = \{\emptyset\}$  and  $X_\emptyset = x_0$ .
- For  $n \geq 0$ , conditional on  $(T_n, (X_v)_{v \in T_n})$ , let  $(\Xi_v)_{v \in T_n, |v|=n}$  be independent point processes such that  $\Xi_v = \sum_i \xi_{v,i} \sim \Xi_{X_v}$ . Define

$$T_{n+1} = T_n \cup \bigcup_{v \in T_n, |v|=n} \{vi : i \leq |\Xi_v|\}, \quad X_{vi} = \xi_{v,i}.$$

- Let  $T = \cup_{n \geq 0} T_n$  and  $T^* = (T, (X_v)_{v \in T})$ .

Recall that  $\mathbb{P}_x$  is such that  $T^*$  starts from a single ancestor at  $X_\emptyset = x$  under  $\mathbb{P}_x$ . It will considerably ease the notation to let  $\Xi$  be a generic point process such that, under  $\mathbb{P}_x$ ,  $\Xi$  is distributed as  $\Xi_x$ . We will write its atoms as

$$\Xi = \sum_{i=1}^{|\Xi|} \delta_{\xi_i}.$$

**Biasing function  $\psi$  and spine.** All our results in this section depend on fixing a positive function  $\psi: E \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  that “weights” the contribution of individuals in the population according to their types, in the spirit of [9, 62]. As we shall see later, two important

examples that will lead to simplifications are  $\psi \equiv 1$ , which provides a Feynman–Kac representation of the moments, and  $\psi \equiv h$  where  $h$  is a harmonic function of the dynamics.

Suppose that  $\psi$  has been fixed. Define the  $d$ -th factorial  $\psi$ -moment of the offspring law as

$$\forall d \geq 1, \forall x \in E, \quad m_d^\psi(x) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{\substack{|\Xi| \\ (i_p)_p \text{ distinct}}} \prod_{i=1}^d \psi(\xi_i) \right], \quad (13)$$

and, provided that  $m_d^\psi(x) < \infty$ , let  $(\chi_{i,d})_{i \leq d}$  be the random variables with distribution

$$\forall x \in E, \quad \mathbb{E}_x [f(\chi_{1,d}, \dots, \chi_{d,d})] = \frac{1}{m_d^\psi(x)} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{\substack{|\Xi| \\ (i_p)_p \text{ distinct}}} \prod_{i=1}^d \psi(\xi_i) f(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d) \right]. \quad (14)$$

In words, these random variables are obtained by first biasing the offspring distribution by its  $d$ -th  $\psi$ -moment and then sampling  $d$  particles, each with probability proportional to  $\psi$ .

The case  $d = 1$  will play an essential role. We let  $(\zeta_n)_{n \geq 0}$  denote the Markov chain with transition probability

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\zeta_1) \mid \zeta_0 = x] = \mathbb{E}_x[f(\chi_{1,1})] = \frac{1}{m_1^\psi(x)} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{|\Xi|} \psi(\xi_i) f(\xi_i) \right].$$

We call  $(\zeta_n)_{n \geq 1}$  the *spinal Markov chain* (or spinal process). It is the usual Markov chain that arises in the study of many classes of branching process, through a many-to-one formula or a spinal decomposition result [49, 14, 70]. Let us introduce a final notation

$$\forall x \in E, \quad \lambda^\psi(x) = \frac{\mathbb{E}_x[\langle \Xi, \psi \rangle]}{\psi(x)} = \frac{m_1^\psi(x)}{\psi(x)},$$

which gives the expected growth of the population size, starting from one particle at  $x$  and when size is measured according to  $\psi$ .

**Tree-indexed Markov chain.** Our final task before stating the many-to-few formula is to define the notion of a Markov chain indexed by a tree. It is a simple procedure to assign a collection of types  $(X_v^\tau)_{v \in \tau}$  to the vertices of a fixed tree  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_k$ , which is described for instance in [60]. For  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_k$ , define  $(X_v^\tau)_{v \in \tau}$  as follows:

- Start from  $X_\emptyset^\tau = x$ .
- Conditional on  $(X_v^\tau)_{|v| \leq n}$ , the variables  $(X_{v_i}^\tau)_{i \leq d_v}$  are distributed as

$$(X_{v_1}^\tau, \dots, X_{v_{d_v}}^\tau) \stackrel{(d)}{=} (\chi_{1,d_v}, \dots, \chi_{d_v,d_v}) \text{ under } \mathbb{P}_{X_v},$$

independently for different vertices  $v$ .

We denote by  $\mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau}^\psi$  the distribution of the random marked tree  $(\tau, (X_v^\tau)_{v \in \tau})$ , which is a probability measure on  $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ .

The trees that we consider will typically have a large height of order  $n$  but a fixed number of leaves  $k$ , and thus most of their vertices have degree 1. The image that one should keep in mind is that the process indexed by such a tree is obtained by running independent copies of the spinal process  $(\zeta_n)_{n \geq 0}$  along the branches of the tree, allocating the offspring types as in (14) whenever a branch point is reached.

### 3.2 The many-to-few formula

Fix  $k \geq 1$ . We define the  $k$ -th *planar (factorial) moment* of the branching process as the measure  $M_x^k$  on the space  $\mathcal{T}_k^*$  of marked trees with  $k$  leaves such that

$$M_x^k[F] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v} \in T^k \\ v_1 < \dots < v_k}} F(\tau_{\mathbf{v}}^*) \right], \quad (15)$$

for any non-negative map  $F: \mathcal{T}_k^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and where  $\tau_{\mathbf{v}}^* = (\tau_{\mathbf{v}}, (X_w)_{w \in \tau_{\mathbf{v}}})$  is the marked subtree spanned by  $\tau_{\mathbf{v}}$ . Note that  $\tau_{\mathbf{v}}$  might fail to have  $k$  leaves. In that case we use the convention that  $F(\tau_{\mathbf{v}}^*) = 0$ , which amounts to removing the corresponding terms from the sum.

We can now state the main result of this section, which gives an expression for  $M_x^k$  in terms of the Markov chain indexed by a “uniform” element of  $\mathcal{T}_k$  and an appropriate biasing term defined as

$$\forall \tau^* \in \mathcal{T}_k^*, \quad \Delta_k^\psi(\tau^*) = \prod_{v \in \tau} \lambda^\psi(x_v) \prod_{v \in \mathcal{B}(\tau)} \frac{m_{d_v}^\psi(x_v)}{d_v! \psi(x_v) \lambda^\psi(x_v)} \prod_{v \in \mathcal{L}(\tau)} \frac{1}{\psi(x_v) \lambda^\psi(x_v)}. \quad (16)$$

Recall that  $\mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau}^\psi$  denotes the distribution of the pair  $(\tau, (X_v^\tau)_{v \in \tau})$  started from  $x$ , where  $(X_v^\tau)_{v \in \tau}$  is Markov process indexed by  $\tau$ .

**Theorem 3.1** (Many-to-few at all times). *Fix some functional  $\psi: E \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ . Then,*

$$M_x^k[F] = \psi(x) \sum_{\tau \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k} \mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau}^\psi[\Delta_k^\psi F],$$

for any non-negative functional  $F: \mathcal{T}_k^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ .

**Remark 3.** The idea of using trees to compute the moments of branching processes appears as early as in the work of Dynkin [27] in the superprocess literature, see also [28, Section 2.1]. Our many-to-few formula is very similar in spirit. An important distinction, however, is that the trees appearing here provide information about the genealogy of the branching process, whereas they are only used as a formal tool to compute the moments in [27, 28].

Another interpretation of this result is that the bias term  $\Delta_k^\psi$  is the Radon–Nikodym derivative of  $M_x^k$  with respect to the infinite measure  $\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_k} Q_{x,\tau}^\psi$ . The latter measure is the Markov chain indexed by a “uniform tree” with  $k$  leaves.

This result is proved in the following section. As an intermediate step, we will obtain an equivalent formulation of the many-to-few formula (Proposition 3.3) which can be of independent interest. It provides a recursive expression of the moment measure  $M_x^k$  in terms of lower order moment measures. Before moving to the proofs, let us give a few important examples of choices for  $\psi$ .

**Harmonic function.** Suppose that there exists  $\lambda > 0$  (fixed) and  $h: E \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  such that

$$\forall x \in E, \quad \mathbb{E}_x[\langle \Xi, h \rangle] = \lambda h(x).$$

The pair  $(\lambda, h)$  can be seen as a solution to an eigenproblem for the mean semi-group of the branching process and  $h$  is a *harmonic function*. In that case, letting  $\psi \equiv h$ , we see that  $\lambda^\psi(x) \equiv \lambda$  and the biasing term (16) simply becomes

$$\forall \tau^* \in \mathcal{T}_k^*, \quad \Delta_k(\tau^*) = \lambda^{|\tau^*| - k - b} \prod_{v \in \mathcal{B}(\tau^*)} \frac{m_{d_v}(x_v)}{d_v! h(x_v)} \prod_{v \in \mathcal{L}(\tau^*)} \frac{1}{h(x_v)}.$$

The corresponding spine Markov chain  $(\zeta_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is Doob’s harmonic transform of the mean semi-group of the branching process.

**Feynman–Kac formula.** If  $\psi \equiv 1$ ,  $(\zeta_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is simply obtained by size-biasing the offspring point process and jumping to the location of a uniformly chosen particle. The many-to-one formula (for  $k = 1$ ) then becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{|v|=n} f(X_v) \right] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ f(\zeta_n) \prod_{m=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_m} [|\Xi|] \right],$$

which is the usual Feynman–Kac formula for the mean semi-group of the branching process. For  $k \geq 1$ , the bias term becomes

$$\Delta_k(\tau^*) = \prod_{\substack{v \in \tau^* \\ v \notin \mathcal{L}(\tau^*)}} \frac{1}{d_v!} \mathbb{E}_{x_v} [|\Xi|^{(d_v)}],$$

where  $n^{(d)} = n(n-1)\dots(n-k+1)$ . It only depends on the factorial moments of the offspring point process.

### 3.3 Proof of the many-to-few formula

It will be more convenient to work with the factorial moment of the process biased by  $\psi$ , which we define as the measure  $M_x^{k,\psi}$  on  $\mathcal{T}_k^*$  such that, for any  $F: \mathcal{T}_k^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ ,

$$M_x^{k,\psi}[F] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v} \in T^k \\ v_1 < \dots < v_k}} F(\tau_{\mathbf{v}}^*) \prod_{i=1}^k \psi(X_{v_i}) \right].$$

#### 3.3.1 Many-to-one formula

We start by deriving an expression for the case  $k = 1$ . In that case,  $M_x^{1,\psi}$  can be identified as a measure on the space of (discrete) paths  $\cup_{n \geq 0} E^{n+1}$ .

**Proposition 3.2** (Many-to-one at all times). *For any functional  $F: \cup_{n \geq 0} E^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ ,*

$$\forall x \in E, \quad M_x^{1,\psi}[F] = \psi(x) \sum_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ F((\zeta_i)_{i \leq n}) \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda^\psi(\zeta_i) \right].$$

*Proof.* It is sufficient to show that the identity holds for functionals  $F$  whose support is included in the set of paths with length smaller than  $n$ , for any  $n \geq 0$ . We prove the result by induction on this length  $n \geq 0$ . For  $n = 0$ , by definition

$$M_x^{1,\psi}[F] = \mathbb{E}_x [F(X_\emptyset) \psi(X_\emptyset)] = \psi(x) F(x).$$

For  $n \geq 1$ , applying the branching property after the first reproduction event,

$$\begin{aligned} M_x^{1,\psi}[F] &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{v \in T} F((X_w)_{w \leq v}) \psi(X_v) \right] \\ &= \psi(x) F(x) + \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{|\Xi|} M_{\xi_i}^{1,\psi} [F((x, \cdot))] \right] \\ &\stackrel{(\dagger)}{=} \psi(x) F(x) + \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{|\Xi|} \sum_{n \geq 0} \psi(\xi_i) \mathbb{E}_{\xi_i} \left[ F((x, \zeta_j)_{j \leq n}) \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda^\psi(\zeta_j) \right] \right] \\ &\stackrel{(\ddagger)}{=} \psi(x) F(x) + \sum_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{E}_x [\langle \Xi, \psi \rangle] \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_1} \left[ F((x, \zeta_j)_{j \leq n}) \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda^\psi(\zeta_j) \right] \right] \\ &= \psi(x) \left( F(x) + \lambda^\psi(x) \sum_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ F((\zeta_j)_{j \leq n+1}) \prod_{j=1}^n \lambda^\psi(\zeta_j) \right] \right) \\ &= \psi(x) \sum_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ F((\zeta_j)_{j \leq n}) \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda^\psi(\zeta_j) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we have used our induction in  $(\dagger)$  and the definition of  $(\zeta_n)_{n \geq 0}$  in  $(\ddagger)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.** One could obtain a more precise result. Note that

$$\forall n \geq 0, \quad W_n^\psi = \sum_{v \in T, |v|=n} \psi(X_v) \prod_{w \prec v} \lambda^\psi(X_w)$$

is a martingale. Standard arguments would show that the martingale change of measure  $W_n d\mathbb{P}_x$  can be represented as the law of a spine with distribution  $(\zeta_n)_{n \geq 0}$  on which are grafted independent subtrees distributed as the original process. The many-to-few formula is simply the projection of this result on the law of the spine, see [70, Chapter 4] for instance.

### 3.3.2 Many-to-few formula: factorized form

We establish a first version of our many-to-few formula which provides an inductive expression for the  $k$ -th moment measure in terms of lower order moments. It relies on decomposing a marked tree  $\tau^* \in \mathcal{T}_k^*$  at its first branch point. Recall the notation of Section 2.2, in particular that  $(S_i(\tau^*))_i$  are the marked subtrees obtained by removing the first branch point of  $\tau$ , and that  $\pi(\tau)$  is the corresponding partition of the leaves. We will evaluate the moment measure  $M_x^{k,\psi}$  at *product functionals* of the form

$$\forall \tau^* \in \mathcal{T}_k^*, \quad F(\tau^*) = \mathbf{1}_{\{\pi(\tau)=\pi\}} F_0((x_v)_{v \preceq w}) \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} F_i(\tau_i^*), \quad (17)$$

for some partition  $\pi$  of  $[k]$ , functionals  $F_i: \mathcal{T}_{|\pi_i|}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , and  $F_0: \cup_{n \geq 0} E^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ . (In this expression  $w = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k$ .)

**Proposition 3.3** (Many-to-few, factorized form). *Let  $F$  be a functional of the form (17). Then*

$$M_x^{k,\psi}[F] = \psi(x) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \left( \prod_{m=0}^{n-1} \lambda^\psi(\zeta_m) \right) \frac{F_0((\zeta_m)_{m \leq n})}{|\pi|! \psi(\zeta_n)} \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_n} \left[ \sum_{\substack{r_1, \dots, r_{|\pi|=1} \\ (r_i) \text{ distinct}}}^{|\Xi|} \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} M_{\xi_{r_i}}^{|\pi_i|,\psi}[F_i] \right] \right],$$

where  $(\zeta_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is the spine Markov chain.

*Proof.* Fix some  $v_1 < \dots < v_k$ . If  $\pi(\tau_{\mathbf{v}}) = \pi$  and  $w = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k$ , there exist  $|\pi|$  integers  $r_1 < \dots < r_{|\pi|}$  giving the labels of the children of  $w$  that correspond to the roots of the subtrees  $(S_i(\tau^*))_i$ . More formally,  $\pi(\tau_{\mathbf{v}}) = \pi$  if and only if there is (a unique)  $w \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $r_1 < \dots < r_{|\pi|}$  such that

$$\forall i \leq |\pi|, \forall j \in \pi_i, \quad (w, r_i) \preceq v_j.$$

Thus, we can write

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{\pi(\tau_{\mathbf{v}})=\pi\}} = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{r_1 < \dots < r_{|\pi|}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\forall i \leq |\pi|, \forall j \in \pi_i, (w, r_i) \preceq v_j\}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} M_x^{k,\psi}[F] &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v} \in T \\ v_1 < \dots < v_k}} F(\tau_{\mathbf{v}}^*) \prod_{j=1}^k \psi(X_{v_j}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{w \in \mathcal{V}} F_0((X_v)_{v \preceq w}) \sum_{r_1 < \dots < r_{|\pi|}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v} \in T \\ v_1 < \dots < v_k}} \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} F_i(S_i(\tau_{\mathbf{v}}^*)) \prod_{j \in \pi_i} \psi(X_{v_j}) \mathbf{1}_{\{(w, r_i) \preceq v_j\}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, note that  $(w, r_i) \preceq v_j$  if and only if there exists  $v'_j \in \mathcal{V}$  such that  $v_j = (w, r_i, v'_j)$ , and that in this case  $S_i(\tau_{\mathbf{v}}^*)$  is the subtree spanned by  $\mathbf{v}'_i = (v'_j)_{j \in \pi_i}$ . Therefore,

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v} \in T \\ v_1 < \dots < v_k}} \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} F_i(S_i(\tau_{\mathbf{v}}^*)) \mathbf{1}_{\{\forall j \in \pi_i, (w, r_i) \preceq v_j\}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v}' \in \mathcal{V} \\ v_1 < \dots < v_k}} \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} F_i(\tau_{\mathbf{v}'_i}^*) \mathbf{1}_{\{\forall j \in \pi_i, (w, r_i, v'_j) \in T\}}.$$

The branching property applied at vertices  $(w, r_1), \dots, (w, r_{|\pi|})$  yields that

$$\begin{aligned} M_x^{k,\psi}[F] &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{w \in \mathcal{V}} F_0((X_v)_{v \preceq w}) \sum_{r_1 < \dots < r_{|\pi|}} \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} \mathbf{1}_{\{(w, r_i) \in T\}} M_{X_{(w, r_i)}}^{|\pi_i|, \psi}[F_i] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{w \in \mathcal{V}} F_0((X_v)_{v \preceq w}) \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in T\}} \frac{1}{|\pi|!} \mathbb{E}_{X_w} \left[ \sum_{\substack{r_1, \dots, r_{|\pi|} = 1 \\ (r_i) \text{ distinct}}} \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} M_{\xi_{r_i}}^{|\pi_i|, \psi}[F_i] \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is now ended by applying the many-to-one formula (Proposition 3.2) to the above expression, to obtain that

$$M_x^{k,\psi}[F] = \sum_{n \geq 0} \psi(x) \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \left( \prod_{m=0}^{n-1} \lambda^\psi(\zeta_m) \right) \frac{F_0((\zeta_m)_{m \leq n})}{\psi(\zeta_n) |\pi|!} \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_n} \left[ \sum_{\substack{r_1, \dots, r_{|\pi|} = 1 \\ (r_i) \text{ distinct}}} \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} M_{\xi_{r_i}}^{|\pi_i|, \psi}[F_i] \right] \right]. \quad \square$$

### 3.3.3 Completing the proof

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Fix a partition  $\pi$ , some trees  $\tau_i \in \mathcal{T}_{|\pi_i|}$  for  $i \leq |\pi|$ . Consider a functional  $F$  of the form (17), where each  $F_i$  is itself of the form

$$\forall \tau^* \in \mathcal{T}_{|\pi_i|}^*, \quad F_i(\tau^*) = \tilde{F}_i(\tau^*) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau = \tau_i\}}.$$

Since  $M_x^{k,\psi}$  is obtained by biasing  $M_x^k$  by the product of the weights at the leaves, it is sufficient to prove that

$$M_x^{k,\psi}[F] = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_k} \mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau}^\psi[\tilde{\Delta}_k \cdot F], \quad \tilde{\Delta}_k(\tau^*) = \Delta_k(\tau^*) \prod_{v \in \mathcal{L}(\tau)} \psi(x_v).$$

For  $k = 1$ , this identity is the content of the many-to-one formula, Proposition 3.2. By an induction on the number of leaves and Proposition 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
M_x^{k,\psi}[F] &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \psi(x) \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \left( \prod_{m=0}^{n-1} \lambda^\psi(\zeta_m) \right) \frac{F_0((\zeta_m)_{m \leq n})}{\psi(\zeta_n)|\pi|!} \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_n} \left[ \sum_{\substack{r_1, \dots, r_{|\pi|=1} \\ (r_i) \text{ distinct}}}^{|\Xi|} \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} M_{\xi_{r_i}}^{|\pi_i|, \psi}[F_i] \right] \right] \\
&\stackrel{(\dagger)}{=} \sum_{n \geq 0} \psi(x) \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \left( \prod_{m=0}^{n-1} \lambda^\psi(\zeta_m) \right) \frac{F_0((\zeta_m)_{m \leq n}) m_{|\pi|}^\psi(\zeta_n)}{\psi(\zeta_n)|\pi|!} \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_n} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} \frac{M_{\chi_{i,|\pi|}}^{|\pi_i|, \psi}[F_i]}{\psi(\chi_{i,|\pi|})} \right] \right] \\
&= \sum_{n \geq 0} \psi(x) \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \left( \prod_{m=0}^{n-1} \lambda^\psi(\zeta_m) \right) \frac{F_0((\zeta_m)_{m \leq n}) m_{|\pi|}^\psi(\zeta_n)}{\psi(\zeta_n)|\pi|!} \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_n} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} \mathbb{Q}_{\chi_{i,|\pi|}, \tau_i}^\psi[\tilde{\Delta}_{|\pi_i|} F_i] \right] \right], \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $(\dagger)$  follows by definition of  $(\chi_{i,d})_{i \leq d}$  in (14). The result now follows from two observations. First, if  $G$  is a product functional, namely,

$$\forall \tau^* \in \mathcal{F}_k^*, \quad G(\tau^*) = \mathbf{1}_{\{\pi(\tau) = \pi\}} G_0((x_v)_{v \leq w}) \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} G_i(\tau_i^*),$$

by construction of the tree-indexed Markov chain and a Markov property at the first branch point of  $\tau$

$$\mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau}^\psi[G] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ G_0((\zeta_m)_{m \leq |w|}) \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_{|w|}} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} \mathbb{Q}_{\chi_{i,|\pi|}, \tau_i}^\psi[G_i] \right] \right]. \tag{19}$$

Second, the bias  $\tilde{\Delta}_k$  is itself of the product form:

$$\tilde{\Delta}_k(\tau^*) = \prod_{v \prec w} \lambda^\psi(x_v) \frac{m_{|\pi|}^\psi(x_w)}{|\pi|! \psi(x_w)} \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} \tilde{\Delta}_{|\pi_i|}(\tau_i^*).$$

Therefore, taking as product functional

$$\begin{aligned}
G(\tau^*) &= \left( \prod_{v \prec w} \lambda^\psi(x_v) \right) \frac{F_0((x_v)_{v \leq w}) m_{|\pi|}^\psi(x_w)}{|\pi|! \psi(x_w)} \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} \tilde{\Delta}_{|\pi_i|}(\tau_i^*) F_i(\tau_i^*) \\
&= \tilde{\Delta}_k(\tau^*) F_0((x_v)_{v \leq w}) \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi|} F_i(\tau_i^*) = \tilde{\Delta}_k(\tau^*) F(\tau^*)
\end{aligned}$$

in (19) and plugging the result into (18) yields that

$$M_x^{k,\psi}[F] = \psi(x) \mathbb{Q}_x^{\tau,\psi}[\tilde{\Delta}_k \cdot F].$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Marked metric measure spaces

### 4.1 Gromov topologies

Following [36, 25, 7], a pointed marked metric measure space (mmm-space) is a quadruple  $\mathcal{X} = (X, d, \rho, \mu)$  where  $(X, d)$  is a complete separable metric space,  $\rho \in X$  is a pointed element (the root) and  $\mu$  is a finite measure on  $X \times E$ . We let  $\mathcal{X}$  denote the set of equivalence classes of mmm-spaces, where  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{X}'$  are equivalent if there exists a bijective isometry

$$\iota: \{\rho\} \cup \text{supp}_X \mu \rightarrow \{\rho'\} \cup \text{supp}_{X'} \mu'$$

such that  $\iota(\rho) = \rho'$  and  $\mu \circ \tilde{\iota}^{-1} = \mu'$ , where  $\tilde{\iota}(x, e) = (\iota(x), e)$ . Here we have used the notation  $\text{supp}_X \mu$  for the support of the projection of  $\mu$  on its first coordinate  $X$ . For a Borel set  $A \subseteq X$  we will write  $|A| = \mu(A \times E)$  for its mass. We briefly recall the definition of three topologies on  $\mathcal{X}$  that we will need. Recall that  $\mathcal{D}_k^*$  stands for the set of marked distance matrices defined in (11).

**Gromov-weak topology.** For  $k \geq 1$  and  $\varphi: \mathcal{D}_k^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , define a functional  $\Phi: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$\Phi(\mathcal{X}) = \int_{(X \times E)^k} \varphi(d(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{e}) \mu^{\otimes k}(\mathbf{du}, \mathbf{de}), \quad (20)$$

where

$$\forall \mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{1 \leq i \leq k} \in X^k, \quad d(\mathbf{u}) = (d(u_i, u_j))_{0 \leq i, j \leq k}, \quad u_0 = \rho.$$

In the terminology of [36, 25],  $\Phi$  is called the *monomial* corresponding to  $\varphi$ . The space of (equivalence classes of) mmm-spaces can be endowed with a topology such that  $(\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  converges to  $\mathcal{X}$  if and only if

$$\Phi(\mathcal{X}_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(\mathcal{X})$$

for all  $\Phi$  of the form (20) with  $\varphi$  bounded and continuous. This topology is called the (pointed marked) *Gromov-weak topology*.

**Gromov-vague topology.** The Gromov-vague topology is obtained by restricting the Gromov-weak topology to balls of finite radius around the pointed element of the mmm-space. For an mmm-space  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $R > 0$ , let  $\mathcal{X}^{(R)}$  be the restriction of  $\mathcal{X}$  to the closed ball  $B_R(\mathcal{X})$  of  $(X, d)$  with center  $\rho$  and radius  $R$ . Namely,  $\mathcal{X}^{(R)}$  is the equivalence class of  $(X, d, \rho, \mu^{(R)})$ , where

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{B}(X \times E), \quad \mu^{(R)}(A) = \mu(A \cap (B_R(\mathcal{X}) \times E)).$$

Following the definition of [7], a sequence  $(\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  of mmm-spaces converges to  $\mathcal{X}$  in the (pointed marked) *Gromov-vague topology* if

$$\mathcal{X}_n^{(R)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{X}^{(R)}$$

in the Gromov-weak topology for a.e.  $R > 0$ . It will be convenient to reformulate the Gromov-vague convergence in terms of functionals  $\Phi$  of the form (20). We say that a function  $\varphi: \mathcal{D}_k^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has *bounded support* if there exists  $R > 0$  such that

$$\text{supp } \varphi \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{k,R}^* := \{((d_{ij})_{i,j}, (e_i)_i) \in \mathcal{D}_k^* : \forall i \leq k, d_{0i} \leq R\}. \quad (21)$$

The set appearing in the right-hand side is the set of distance matrices such that the distance of each vertex to the pointed element (with index 0) is at most  $R$ . This definition is designed in such a way that, if  $\varphi$  has bounded support and  $\mathcal{X}$  is an mmm-space,  $\varphi(d(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{e}) = 0$  whenever  $d(\rho, u_i) > R$  for some  $i \leq k$ . Let  $\Pi_b$  denote the set of all functionals  $\Phi$  of the form (20) with  $k \geq 1$ , such that  $\varphi$  is continuous, bounded, and with bounded support. It should be clear that  $\Phi(\mathcal{X}) = \Phi(\mathcal{X}^{(R)})$ , and therefore  $(\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  converges Gromov-vaguely to  $\mathcal{X}$  if and only if

$$\forall \Phi \in \Pi_b, \quad \Phi(\mathcal{X}_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(\mathcal{X}).$$

**Gromov–Hausdorff-weak topology.** Finally, we define a straightforward extension to marked spaces of the Gromov–Hausdorff-weak topology of [7]. We say that  $(\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  converges to  $\mathcal{X}_\infty$  in the (pointed marked) *Gromov–Hausdorff-weak topology* if there exist

1. a complete separable metric space  $(Z, d_Z)$ ;
2. isometries  $\iota_n: \{\rho_n\} \cup \text{supp}_{X_n} \mu_n \rightarrow Z$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots, \infty$ ;

such that

$$\iota_n(\rho_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \iota_\infty(\rho_\infty), \quad \iota_n(\text{supp}_{X_n} \mu_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \iota_\infty(\text{supp}_{X_\infty} \mu_\infty),$$

in  $(Z, d_Z)$  and in the Hausdorff topology respectively, and

$$\mu_n \circ \tilde{\iota}_n^{-1} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_\infty \circ \tilde{\iota}_\infty^{-1}$$

weakly as measures on  $Z \times E$ , where  $\tilde{\iota}_n(x, e) = (\iota_n(x), e)$ . If the mmm-spaces have full support, this notion of convergence coincides with the more standard convergence in the (pointed marked) Gromov–Hausdorff–Prohorov topology [64, 1]. In this case, we can use the two notions of convergence interchangeably, see the discussion in Section 5 of [7]. Although less standard, the Gromov–Hausdorff-weak topology is defined on the same equivalence classes as the Gromov-weak topology, making it a more natural choice when trying to reinforce a Gromov-weak convergence.

## 4.2 Vague convergence and method of moments

Each of the previous three topologies comes with a notion of weak convergence of finite measures on  $\mathcal{X}$ . However, since the limiting measure in our application (the free Brownian

CRT) is infinite, we need to work with an appropriate notion of *vague convergence*. We follow that considered in [30], which is obtained by restricting the measures to sets of mmm-spaces with a large mass, of the form  $\{|X| \geq \eta\}$  for some  $\eta > 0$ . More formally, a measure  $\mathbb{M}$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  is called *locally finite* if

$$\forall \eta > 0, \quad \mathbb{M}(|X| \geq \eta) < \infty.$$

A sequence  $(\mathbb{M}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  of locally finite measures converges *vaguely* to  $\mathbb{M}$  for one of the above topologies if

$$\mathbb{M}_n[F(\mathcal{X}); |X| \geq \eta] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{M}[F(\mathcal{X}); |X| \geq \eta],$$

for any bounded function  $F: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which is continuous in the corresponding topology. Here, we have used the notation  $\mu[F; A] = \int F(x) \mathbf{1}_A(x) \mu(dx)$ . We refer to [34] for a more detailed exposition.

We can now state our method of moments, which provides a connexion between convergence of the moments and vague convergence in the Gromov-vague topology. It is a straightforward adaptation of the main result in [34].

**Proposition 4.1** (Method of moments). *Let  $(\mathbb{M}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence of locally finite measures on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Suppose that*

$$\forall \Phi \in \Pi_b, \quad \mathbb{M}_n[\Phi] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{M}[\Phi], \quad (22)$$

for some limit measure  $\mathbb{M}$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Suppose in addition that

$$\forall R > 0, \quad \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{M}[|\mathcal{X}^{(R)}|^k]^{-\frac{1}{2k}} = \infty. \quad (23)$$

Then  $(\mathbb{M}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  converges to  $\mathbb{M}$  vaguely in the Gromov-vague topology.

*Proof.* For  $k \geq 1$  we can construct some measures  $(\mathbb{M}_n^k)_{n \geq 1}$  and  $\mathbb{M}^k$  on  $\mathcal{D}_k^*$  such that

$$\forall \varphi: \mathcal{D}_k^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+, \quad \mathbb{M}_n^k[\varphi] = \mathbb{M}_n[\Phi], \quad \mathbb{M}^k[\varphi] = \mathbb{M}[\Phi],$$

where  $\Phi$  is as in (20). Recall the notation  $\mathcal{D}_{k,R}^*$  in (21). Our assumption (22) can be reformulated as saying that

$$\mathbb{M}_n^k \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{M}^k$$

in the sense of weak<sup>#</sup> convergence of measures of [21, Section A2.6], where a set  $A \in \mathcal{D}_k^*$  is called bounded if  $A \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{k,R}^*$  for some  $R > 0$ . (This convergence is also called vague convergence in [47, Chapter 4].) It is now standard (see [21, Proposition A2.6.II]) that the restriction of  $\mathbb{M}_n^k$  to  $\mathcal{D}_{k,R}^*$  converges *weakly* to that of  $\mathbb{M}^k$ , for a.e.  $R > 0$ . Reformulating

this in terms of mmm-spaces, we obtain that, for a.e.  $R > 0$  and any continuous bounded  $\varphi: \mathcal{D}_k^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with corresponding polynomial  $\Phi$ ,

$$\mathbb{M}_n[\Phi(\mathcal{X}^{(R)})] = \mathbb{M}_n^k[\varphi; \mathcal{D}_{k,R}^*] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{M}^k[\varphi; \mathcal{D}_{k,R}^*] = \mathbb{M}[\Phi(\mathcal{X}^{(R)})].$$

The method of moments for vague convergence in the Gromov-weak topology [30, Theorem 4.2] shows that the “law” of  $\mathcal{X}^{(R)}$  under  $\mathbb{M}_n$  converges vaguely to that under  $\mathbb{M}$ . (Here we have used that Carleman’s condition (23) is fulfilled for each  $\mathcal{X}^{(R)}$ .) This proves the result.  $\square$

**Remark 5.** An equivalent reformulation of the condition (22) is that the measures  $(\mathbb{M}_n^k)_{n \geq 1}$  appearing in the proof need to converge vaguely to  $\mathbb{M}^k$ . This is the point of view followed in [34], and  $\mathbb{M}^k$  is the  $k$ -th moment measure of  $\mathbb{M}$ . These moment measures can be seen as the unplanar versions of the planar factorial moment defineds in (13).

### 4.3 The Brownian CRT, CPP and their moments

In this section, we provide a brief construction of the Brownian CRT and of the Brownian CPP to set some notation up and give an expression for their moments. For our purpose, it is more natural to work with the “free” Brownian CRT (obtained under the infinite excursion measure) than with the usual Brownian CRT obtained from a normalized excursion.

**The Brownian CRT.** We refer to [57] for a careful exposition. An excursion is a continuous function  $f: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that there is some  $\omega > 0$  (the length of the excursion) verifying that  $f(u) > 0$  for  $u \in (0, \omega)$  and  $f(u) = 0$  otherwise. Define a (pseudo) metric on  $[0, \omega]$  as

$$\forall u < v \in [0, \omega], \quad d_f(u, v) = d_f(v, u) = f(u) + f(v) - 2 \inf_{w \in [u, v]} f(w).$$

Up to taking a quotient,  $\mathcal{T}_f := ([0, \omega], d_f, 0, \text{Leb})$  is a metric measure space rooted at 0. This construction defines a map  $C: f \mapsto \mathcal{T}_f$  (the contour map) from the space of excursions to the space of metric measure spaces. If  $a > 0$ , let us also define the rescaled contour map as  $C_a(f) = C(af)$ .

Following [55], we let  $\mathbf{n}$  be Itô’s excursion measure of a variance one reflected Brownian motion, normalised in such a way that

$$\mathbf{n}\left(\sup_{x \in [0, \omega]} f(x) \geq t\right) = \frac{1}{2t}.$$

We let the Brownian CRT with variance  $\Sigma^2$  be the random variable  $\mathcal{T}_b = (T_b, d_b, \rho_b, \mu_b)$  with “distribution”

$$\frac{2}{\Sigma}(\mathbf{n} \circ C_{2/\Sigma}^{-1}), \tag{24}$$

which is obtained by taking the pushforward of the excursion measure  $\mathbf{n}$  through the rescaling by  $\Sigma/2$  of the contour map  $C$ . (Note that it corresponds to the excursion measure of a Brownian motion with variance  $4/\Sigma^2$ .) In what follows, the expectation of some function of  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{b}}$  should be interpreted as the integral of that function against the (infinite) measure (24).

For a probability measure  $\pi$  on  $E$ , we let  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{b},\pi}$  be the mmm-space obtained by assigning independent marks distributed as  $\pi$  to the leaves of  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{b},\pi}$ . More formally, it is defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{b},\pi} = (T_{\mathbf{b}}, d_{\mathbf{b}}, \rho_{\mathbf{b}}, \mu_{\mathbf{b}} \otimes \pi).$$

Before stating the result, recall that  $\Lambda_k$  stands for the uniform measure on binary trees with  $k$  leaves defined in (9), and that  $D(\theta) \in \mathcal{D}_k$  is the  $(k+1) \times (k+1)$  matrix of pairwise distances between the  $k$  leaves and the root of  $\theta$  defined in (12). For a functional  $\varphi: \mathcal{D}_k^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a permutation  $\sigma$  of  $[k]$ , we let  $\varphi_\sigma$  be the functional obtained by relabeling the leaves according to  $\sigma$ , namely

$$\forall ((d_{ij})_{i,j}, (e_i)_i) \in \mathcal{D}_k^*, \quad \varphi_\sigma((d_{ij})_{i,j}, (e_i)_i) = \varphi((d_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j})_{i,j}, (e_{\sigma_i})_i), \quad \sigma_0 = 0.$$

The set of all permutations of  $[k]$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{P}_k$ . The following expression for the moment is merely a reformulation of [55, Theorem 3].

**Proposition 4.2** (Moment of the Brownian CRT). *For any functional  $\varphi: \mathcal{D}_k^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , the moment of the Brownian CRT for the corresponding polynomial  $\Phi$  is*

$$\mathbb{E}[\Phi(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{b},\pi})] = \left(\frac{\Sigma^2}{2}\right)^{k-1} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_k} \int \varphi_\sigma(D(\theta), (X_i)_{i \leq k}) \Lambda_k(d\theta),$$

where  $(X_i)_{i \leq k}$  are i.i.d. and distributed as  $\pi$ .

*Proof.* Since the sampling measure is of the form  $\mu_{\mathbf{b}} \otimes \pi$ , it is sufficient to prove the result for functionals  $\varphi$  that are independent of the marks, see [33, Corollary 1]. For such a functional, if  $\Phi$  is the corresponding polynomial in (20) and  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{b},\pi}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{b},\pi})] &= \frac{2}{\Sigma} \int \left( \int_{[0,\omega]^k} \varphi(d_{2f/\Sigma}(\mathbf{u})) d\mathbf{u} \right) d\mathbf{n}(f) \\ &= \frac{2}{\Sigma} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_k} \int \left( \int_{0 \leq u_1 < \dots < u_k \leq \omega} \varphi_\sigma\left(\frac{2}{\Sigma} d_f(\mathbf{u})\right) d\mathbf{u} \right) d\mathbf{n}(f). \end{aligned}$$

By [56, Theorem 4 of Chapter III] (which is a reformulation of [55, Theorem 3]),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{2}{\Sigma} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_k} \int \left( \int_{0 \leq u_1 < \dots < u_k \leq \omega} \varphi_\sigma \left( \frac{2}{\Sigma} d_f(\mathbf{u}) \right) d\mathbf{u} \right) d\mathbf{n}(f) \\
&= 2^{k-1} \frac{2}{\Sigma} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_k} \int \varphi_\sigma \left( \frac{2}{\Sigma} D(\theta) \right) \Lambda_k(d\theta) \\
&= \frac{2^k}{\Sigma} \left( \frac{\Sigma}{2} \right)^{2k-1} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_k} \int \varphi_\sigma(D(\theta')) \Lambda_k(d\theta'),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the change of variable  $\theta' = 2\theta/\Sigma$  in (9).  $\square$

**Remark 6.** Note that the balls of the Brownian CRT fulfill Carleman's condition, since their moments can be bounded as

$$\mathbb{E}[|T_b^{(R)}|^k] \leq k! R^{2k-1} \left( \frac{\Sigma^2}{2} \right)^{k-1}.$$

**The Brownian CPP.** The Brownian coalescent point process corresponds to the sphere at height 1 of the Brownian CRT, under the conditional measure that the CRT has height greater than 1. By Itô's theory of excursions, it can be constructed directly from a Poisson point process  $P$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, 1]$  with intensity  $du \otimes \frac{ds}{s^2}$ , which corresponds to the depths of the downwards excursions below level 1 of a Brownian motion, see [67, 33] for more details. Define a distance on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  as

$$\forall u \leq v, \quad d_P(u, v) = d_P(v, u) = 2 \sup\{s : (w, s) \in P, u \leq w \leq v\}$$

(The factor 2 accounts for the fact that the graph distance is twice the time to the most-recent common ancestor.) Let  $Z$  be an independent exponential random variable with mean 1. The Brownian CPP with variance  $\Sigma^2$  is the random mmm-space  $\mathcal{U}_b = (U_b, d_b, \rho_b, \mu_b)$  which is the equivalence class in  $\mathcal{X}$  of  $([0, Z], d_P, \rho, \frac{\Sigma^2}{2} \text{Leb})$ , where  $\rho$  is a point lying at distance 1 from all other points in  $[0, Z]$ .

As above, we let  $\mathcal{U}_{b,\pi}$  be obtained by assigning independent marks distributed as  $\pi$  to the leaves of a Brownian CPP,  $\mathcal{U}_{b,\pi} = (U_b, d_b, \rho_b, \mu_b \otimes \pi)$ . The expression below is proved in [33, Corollary 1], where we recall that  $\tilde{\Lambda}_k$  stands for the uniform measure on ultrametric trees with  $k$  leaves defined in (10).

**Proposition 4.3** (Moment of the Brownian CPP). *For any functional  $\varphi: \mathcal{D}_k^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , the moment of the Brownian CPP for the corresponding polynomial  $\Phi$  is*

$$\mathbb{E}[\Phi(\mathcal{U}_{b,\pi})] = \left( \frac{\Sigma^2}{2} \right)^k \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_k} \int \mathbb{E}[\varphi_\sigma(D(\theta), (X_i)_{i \leq k})] \tilde{\Lambda}_k(d\theta),$$

where  $(X_i)_{i \geq 1}$  are i.i.d. and distributed as  $\pi$ .

#### 4.4 Tightness results

Once convergence is established in the Gromov-vague topology (typically through the method of moments) we will be interested in reinforcing it to a Gromov–Hausdorff–Prohorov convergence. We provide two tightness criteria that we need in this direction. The first one will be used to go from a Gromov-vague to a Gromov-weak convergence, and amounts to controlling the mass escaping at an infinite distance from the pointed vertex. The second one is a simple adaptation of the tightness criterion in the Gromov–Hausdorff–Prohorov topology of [7]. It relies on controlling the *lower mass function*, defined for  $\delta > 0$  and  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{X}$  as

$$m_\delta(\mathcal{X}) = \inf\{|B_{\delta,x}(X)| : (x, e) \in \text{supp } \mu\}, \quad (25)$$

where  $B_{\delta,x}(X)$  is the closed ball of radius  $\delta$  and center  $x$  of  $(X, d)$ .

**Lemma 4.4** (Gromov-vague to Gromov-weak). *Let  $(\mathbb{M}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence of locally finite measures on  $\mathcal{X}$  that converges vaguely to  $\mathbb{M}$  for the Gromov-vague topology. If*

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists R > 0, \quad \limsup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{M}_n(|X \setminus B_R(X)| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon \quad (26)$$

*the convergence occurs vaguely in the Gromov-weak topology.*

*Proof.* The result follows from simple but tedious manipulations. Let  $d_{\text{GP}}$  be the (pointed marked) Gromov–Prohorov distance, which can be defined by adapting [25, Definition 3.1] to take the pointed element into account. It is sufficient for our purpose to know that it induces the Gromov-weak topology and that

$$d_{\text{GP}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}^{(R)}) \leq |X \setminus B_R(X)|, \quad (27)$$

see for instance [15, Lemma 3.3]. Fix a bounded  $F: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which is  $L$ -Lipschitz for the distance  $1 \wedge d_{\text{GP}}$ . For  $\eta, \eta' > 0$  such that  $\eta' < \eta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{M}_n[F(\mathcal{X}); |X| > \eta] &= \mathbb{M}_n[F(\mathcal{X}^{(R)}); |X^{(R)}| > \eta'] \\ &+ \mathbb{M}_n[F(\mathcal{X}) - F(\mathcal{X}^{(R)}); |X^{(R)}| > \eta'] + \mathbb{M}_n[F(\mathcal{X}); |X| > \eta, |X^{(R)}| \leq \eta']. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

By the Gromov-vague convergence

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\eta' \uparrow \eta} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{M}_n[F(\mathcal{X}^{(R)}); |X^{(R)}| > \eta'] = \mathbb{M}[F(\mathcal{X}); |X| \geq \eta],$$

and the result is proved if we can show that the remaining two terms in (28) vanish when limits are taken in the same order. For the last term,

$$\mathbb{M}_n[F(\mathcal{X}); |X| > \eta, |X^{(R)}| \leq \eta'] \leq \|F\|_\infty \mathbb{M}_n(|X \setminus B_R(X)| \geq \eta - \eta'),$$

which by (26) vanishes under our limits. For the second term, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{M}_n[F(\mathcal{X}) - F(\mathcal{X}^{(R)}); |X^{(R)}| > \eta']| &\leq L\mathbb{M}_n[1 \wedge d_{\text{GP}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}^{(R)}); |X^{(R)}| > \eta'] \\ &\leq L\mathbb{M}_n[1 \wedge |X \setminus B_R(X)|; |X^{(R)}| > \eta'] \\ &\leq \varepsilon L\mathbb{M}_n(|B_R(X)| > \eta') + L\mathbb{M}_n(|X \setminus B_R(X)| > \varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (27) in the second line. We can end the proof by noting that, again by (26),

$$\limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{M}_n(|X \setminus B_R(X)| > \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$$

and that

$$\limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\eta' \uparrow \eta} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{M}_n(|B_R(X)| > \eta') \leq \mathbb{M}(|X| \geq \eta)$$

and letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . □

**Lemma 4.5** (Gromov-weak to Gromov–Hausdorff-weak). *Suppose that  $(\mathbb{M}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is a sequence of locally finite measures converging to  $\mathbb{M}$  vaguely in the Gromov-weak topology. Suppose that*

$$\forall \eta, \delta > 0, \quad \limsup_{\eta' \rightarrow 0} \sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{M}_n(|X| > \eta, m_\delta(\mathcal{X}) < \eta') = 0 \quad (29)$$

then  $(\mathbb{M}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  also converges vaguely in the Gromov–Hausdorff-weak topology.

*Proof.* For  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $k \geq 1$ , let  $\varepsilon_k = 2^{-k}\varepsilon$  and  $\delta_k > 0$  be such that  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$ . By our assumption, there exists  $\eta'_k > 0$  such that

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{M}_n(|X| > \eta, m_{\delta_k}(\mathcal{X}) < \eta'_k) \leq \varepsilon_k.$$

We deduce that

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{M}_n(\{|X| > \eta\} \setminus A) \leq \varepsilon, \quad A := \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \{m_{\delta_k}(\mathcal{X}) \geq \eta'_k\}.$$

Using the vague convergence and, for instance, [47, Theorem 4.2] we can find a compact set  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{X}$  for the Gromov-weak topology such that

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{M}_n(\{|X| > \eta\} \setminus \mathcal{K}) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{M}_n(\{|X| > \eta\} \setminus (\mathcal{K} \cap A)) \leq 2\varepsilon,$$

which proves tightness of  $(\mathbb{M}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  (and hence the result) in the Gromov–Hausdorff-weak topology provided that we show that  $\mathcal{K} \cap A$  is compact in that topology. Let  $(\mathcal{X}_p)_{p \geq 1} \in$

$\mathcal{X} \cap A$ . Since  $\mathcal{X}$  is compact we can assume that it admits a subsequence that converges to some limit  $\mathcal{X}$  in the Gromov-weak topology. For each  $\delta > 0$ ,  $m_\delta(\mathcal{X}_p) > \eta'_k$  for  $k$  sufficiently large. Hence, [7, Theorem 6.1] shows that the convergence of the subsequence also holds Gromov–Hausdorff-weakly.  $\square$

**Remark 7.** If, for each  $n \geq 1$ ,  $\mathbb{M}_n$  puts no mass on non-compact mmm-spaces, [7, Lemma 3.4] and the dominated convergence theorem entail that

$$\forall \eta, \delta > 0, \quad \lim_{\eta' \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{M}_n(|X| > \eta, m_\delta(\mathcal{X}) < \eta') = 0$$

and thus (29) can be replaced by the simpler condition

$$\forall \eta, \delta > 0, \quad \lim_{\eta' \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{M}_n(|X| > \eta, m_\delta(\mathcal{X}) < \eta') = 0.$$

## 5 Proof of the invariance principles

We prove the invariance principles by following the approach that was outlined in the introduction. First, in Section 5.1, we compute the moments of the branching process using the many-to-few formula. We deduce convergence in the Gromov-vague topology (Theorem 1.1) from this computation and the method of moments in Section 5.2. Section 5.3 contains results of a technical nature which will show tightness of the sequence in the Gromov–Hausdorff-weak topology, which are used in Section 5.4 to deduce the Gromov–Hausdorff–Prohorov convergence of Theorem 1.2.

### 5.1 Moments asymptotic

We first compute the limit of the moments of the branching process. Recall that we have defined the moment measure  $M_x^k$  of the branching process in (15) as a finite measure on the set  $\mathcal{T}_k^*$  of discrete marked planar trees with  $k$  leaves. By viewing a discrete tree as a continuous tree,  $M_x^k$  can be seen as a measure on  $\mathcal{T}_{k,c}^*$  and we let  $\bar{M}_{x,n}^k$  be obtained by rescaling mass and edge lengths as follows

$$\bar{M}_{x,n}^k[F] := \frac{1}{n^{2k}} M_x^k[F(\frac{1}{n}\theta^*)] = \frac{1}{n^{2k}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v} \in T^k \\ v_1 < \dots < v_k}} F(\frac{1}{n}\tau_{\mathbf{v}}, X_{\mathbf{v}}) \right], \quad (30)$$

for  $F: \mathcal{T}_{k,c}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ . Note that  $\bar{M}_{x,n}^k$  corresponds to the moment measure of the rescaled metric measure space  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n$  defined in (4). Let us define the corresponding measure for the ultrametric measure space  $\bar{\mathcal{U}}_n$  of (5) obtained by restricting the summation to vertices at height  $n$ , namely

$$\tilde{M}_{x,n}^k[F] = \frac{1}{n^k} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v} \in U_n^k \\ v_1 < \dots < v_k}} F(\frac{1}{n}\tau_{\mathbf{v}}, X_{\mathbf{v}}) \right].$$

The objective of this section is to derive the following asymptotic for these moment measures, where we recall that  $\Lambda_k$  stands for the uniform measure on continuous binary trees defined in (9) and  $\tilde{\Lambda}_k$  for that on binary ultrametric trees with height 1, see (10).

**Proposition 5.1.** *Under Assumption 1, for any  $R > 0$  and any continuous bounded  $F: \mathcal{T}_{k,c}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  whose support is included in the set of trees of height at most  $R > 0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \bar{M}_{x,n}^k[F] &= h(x) \left( \frac{\Sigma^2}{2} \right)^{k-1} \int_{\mathcal{T}_{k,c}^*} \mathbb{E}[F(\theta, (X_i)_i)] \Lambda_k(d\theta), \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \tilde{M}_{x,n}^k[F] &= h(x) \left( \frac{\Sigma^2}{2} \right)^{k-1} \int_{\mathcal{T}_{k,c}^*} \mathbb{E}[F(\theta, (X_i)_i)] \tilde{\Lambda}_k(d\theta), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in  $x \in E$ , and where  $(X_i)_{i \leq k}$  are i.i.d. and distributed as  $\pi$ .

We start by showing that the types at the branch points and leaves of the tree-indexed Markov chain are asymptotically independent and distributed as  $h\pi$ . In all this section, we use as biasing function  $\psi \equiv h$  and remove the superscript from all the quantities defined in Section 3.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $(\tau_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \mathcal{T}_k$  be a sequence of discrete trees with  $k$  leaves such that*

$$\frac{1}{n} \tau_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \theta$$

for some binary continuous tree  $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{k,c}$ . Then for any continuous bounded  $F: \mathcal{T}_{k,c}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$h(x) \mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau_n}[\Delta_k F] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} h(x) \left( \frac{\Sigma^2}{2} \right)^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[F(\theta, (X_i)_{i \leq k})]$$

uniformly in  $x \in E$ , where  $(X_i)_{i \geq 1}$  are i.i.d. and distributed as  $\pi$ .

*Proof.* Since the trees are converging deterministically, it is sufficient to prove the result for functionals that only depend on the types of the leaves, namely

$$\forall \theta^* = (\theta, (x_i)_{i \leq k}), \quad F(\theta^*) = \prod_{i=1}^k f_i(x_i),$$

for some continuous bounded  $f_i: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $i \leq k$ . We prove the result by an induction on the number of leaves  $k$ . For  $k = 1$ , the tree  $\tau_n$  is made of a single branch of length  $\ell_1^n$  with  $\ell_1^n \rightarrow \infty$ . The many-to-one formula (Proposition 3.2) applied to the bias  $\psi \equiv h$  yields that

$$h(x) \mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau_n}[\Delta_1 F] = h(x) \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \frac{f_1(\zeta_{\ell_1^n}^1)}{h(\zeta_{\ell_1^n}^1)} \right] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{v \in T, |v| = \ell_1^n} f_1(X_v) \right],$$

and the result is the content of our assumption (2).

Suppose that the result holds for some  $k \geq 1$  and let  $v_1^n < \dots < v_{k+1}^n$  be the leaves of  $\tau_n$ . Since  $\theta$  is binary,  $\tau_n$  is also binary for  $n$  large enough. In that case, the tree spanned by  $(v_1^n, \dots, v_k^n, v_k^n \wedge v_{k+1}^n)$  – obtained by removing the two external branches leading to  $v_k^n$  and  $v_{k+1}^n$  – has  $k$  leaves. Let us denote this subtree by  $\tilde{\tau}_n$ , and let  $\tilde{\tau}_n^* = (\tilde{\tau}_n, (X_u)_{u \in \tilde{\tau}_n})$  be the corresponding marked tree. By construction of the tree-indexed Markov chain we know that, conditional on  $\tilde{\tau}_n^*$ ,

$$(X_{v_k^n}, X_{v_{k+1}^n}) \stackrel{(d)}{=} (\zeta_{\ell_k^n - b_k^n - 1}, \zeta'_{\ell_{k+1}^n - b_k^n - 1}),$$

where  $(\zeta_n)_{n \geq 0}$  and  $(\zeta'_n)_{n \geq 0}$  are two copies of the spine process, with starting points distributed as  $(\chi_{1,2}, \chi_{2,2})$  under  $\mathbb{P}_{X_{v_k^n \wedge v_{k+1}^n}}$  defined in (14), and run independently.

Unfolding the definitions,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}_{x, \tau_n} \left[ \frac{m_2(X_{v_k^n \wedge v_{k+1}^n}) f_k(X_{v_k^n}) f_{k+1}(X_{v_{k+1}^n})}{h(X_{v_k^n}) h(X_{v_{k+1}^n})} \mid \tilde{\tau}_n^* \right] \\ = \mathbb{E}_{X_{v_k^n \wedge v_{k+1}^n}} \left[ \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^{|\Xi|} h(\xi_i) \mathbb{E}_{\xi_i} \left[ \frac{f_k(\zeta_{\ell_k^n - b_k^n - 1})}{h(\zeta_{\ell_k^n - b_k^n - 1})} \right] h(\xi_j) \mathbb{E}_{\xi_j} \left[ \frac{f_{k+1}(\zeta_{\ell_{k+1}^n - b_k^n - 1})}{h(\zeta_{\ell_{k+1}^n - b_k^n - 1})} \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By (2),

$$h(y) \mathbb{E}_y \left[ \frac{f_k(\zeta_{\ell_k^n - b_k^n - 1})}{h(\zeta_{\ell_k^n - b_k^n - 1})} \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} h(y) \langle \pi, f_k \rangle$$

uniformly in  $y \in E$ . Moreover, since

$$\sup_{y \in E} \mathbb{E}_y [|\Xi|^2] < \infty,$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_y \left[ \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^{|\Xi|} h(\xi_i) \mathbb{E}_{\xi_i} \left[ \frac{f_k(\zeta_{\ell_k^n - b_k^n - 1})}{h(\zeta_{\ell_k^n - b_k^n - 1})} \right] h(\xi_j) \mathbb{E}_{\xi_j} \left[ \frac{f_{k+1}(\zeta_{\ell_{k+1}^n - b_k^n - 1})}{h(\zeta_{\ell_{k+1}^n - b_k^n - 1})} \right] \right] \\ \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \pi, f_k \rangle \langle \pi, f_{k+1} \rangle \mathbb{E}_y \left[ \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^{|\Xi|} h(\xi_i) h(\xi_j) \right] = \langle \pi, f_k \rangle \langle \pi, f_{k+1} \rangle m_2(y) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in  $y \in E$ . By decomposing  $\Delta_{k+1}$  as

$$\Delta_{k+1}(\tau_n^*) = \Delta_k(\tilde{\tau}_n^*) \frac{m_2(X_{v_k^n \wedge v_{k+1}^n})}{2h(X_{v_k^n})h(X_{v_{k+1}^n})},$$

our induction and the above uniform convergence show that

$$\begin{aligned}
& h(x)\mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau_n}[\Delta_{k+1}F] \\
&= h(x)\mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau_n}\left[\Delta_k(\tilde{\tau}_n^*)\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}f_i(X_{v_i^n})\mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau_n}\left[\frac{m_2(X_{v_k^n}\wedge v_{k+1}^n)f_k(X_{v_k^n})f_{k+1}(X_{v_{k+1}^n})}{2h(X_{v_k^n})h(X_{v_{k+1}^n})}\Big|\tilde{\tau}_n^*\right]\right] \\
&\xrightarrow{n\rightarrow\infty} h(x)\left(\frac{\Sigma^2}{2}\right)^{k-1}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}\langle\pi,f_i\rangle\times\frac{\langle\pi,m_2\rangle}{2}\langle\pi,f_k\rangle\langle\pi,f_{k+1}\rangle \\
&= h(x)\left(\frac{\Sigma^2}{2}\right)^k\prod_{i=1}^{k+1}\langle\pi,f_i\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly for  $x \in E$ . □

*Proof of Proposition 5.1.* Let us proof the first part of the statement. By the many-to-few formula (Theorem 3.1) applied to  $\psi \equiv h$ , for any functional  $F: \mathcal{T}_{k,c}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
n\bar{M}_{x,n}^k[F] &= \frac{1}{n^{2k-1}}\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_k} h(x)\mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau}[\Delta_k \cdot F(\frac{1}{n}\theta^*)] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^{2k-1}}\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}^k}\sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^{k-1}}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}\mathbf{1}_{\{b_i < \ell_i \wedge \ell_{i+1}\}}h(x)\mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau(\ell,\mathbf{b})}[\Delta_k \cdot F(\frac{1}{n}\theta^*)] \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^k}\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{k-1}}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}\mathbf{1}_{\{b_i < \ell_i \wedge \ell_{i+1}\}}h(x)\mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau_n(\ell,\mathbf{b})}[\Delta_k \cdot F(\frac{1}{n}\theta^*)]d\ell d\mathbf{b}, \quad (31)
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second line it is understood that  $\tau(\ell, \mathbf{b})$  is the tree corresponding to the heights  $(\ell, \mathbf{b})$  and in the last line we let  $\tau_n(\ell, \mathbf{b})$  be the (discrete) tree with leaf heights  $\lfloor n\ell \rfloor$  and branch point heights  $\lfloor n\mathbf{b} \rfloor$ .

Let  $\theta(\ell, \mathbf{b})$  be the (continuous) tree with leaf and branch point heights  $(\ell, \mathbf{b})$ . Clearly,

$$\frac{1}{n}\tau_n(\ell, \mathbf{b}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta(\ell, \mathbf{b})$$

and  $\theta(\ell, \mathbf{b})$  is a binary tree for a.e.  $(\ell, \mathbf{b})$ . Lemma 5.2 shows that

$$h(x)\mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau_n(\ell,\mathbf{b})}[\Delta_k \cdot F(\frac{1}{n}\theta^*)] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x)\left(\frac{\Sigma^2}{2}\right)^{k-1}\mathbb{E}[F(\theta, (X_i)_{i \leq k})].$$

Therefore, our result will follow by dominated convergence provided the integrand in (31) is bounded uniformly in  $(\ell, \mathbf{b})$ . (Recall that the support of  $F$  is included in the set of trees with height at most  $R$ , so that the integral in (31) can be restricted to a bounded domain.)

It is sufficient to prove by an induction on  $k$  that

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_k} \sup_{x \in E} h(x) \mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau}[\Delta_k] < \infty. \quad (32)$$

For  $k = 1$ , if  $\tau$  is the tree made of a single branch of length  $\ell + 1$ ,

$$h(x) \mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau}[\Delta_1] = \mathbb{E}_x[Z_\ell] \xrightarrow{\ell \rightarrow \infty} h(x),$$

uniformly in  $x \in E$  by (2), where  $Z_\ell$  is the number of particles at time  $\ell$ . Therefore (32) holds for  $\ell$  large enough. For  $\ell$  fixed, we use that

$$h(x) \mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau}[\Delta_1] = \mathbb{E}_x[Z_\ell] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{u \in T, |u|=\ell-1} \mathbb{E}_{X_u}[|\Xi|] \right] \leq \left( \sup_{y \in E} \mathbb{E}_y[|\Xi|] \right) \mathbb{E}_x[Z_{\ell-1}]$$

and an induction on  $\ell$  to obtain (32).

For a general  $k \geq 1$  and  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_k$ , note that there exists  $C_k$  independent of  $y$  and  $\tau$  such that

$$m_{|\pi(\tau)|}(y) \mathbb{E}_y \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi(\tau)|} \mathbb{Q}_{\chi_i, S_i(\tau)}[\Delta_{|\pi_i|}] \right] = \mathbb{E}_y \left[ \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_d=1 \\ (i_p) \text{ distinct}}}^{|\Xi|} \prod_{i=1}^d h(\xi_i) \mathbb{Q}_{\xi_i, S_i(\tau)}[\Delta_{|\pi_i|}] \right] < C_k,$$

where we have used our induction and the moment bound (3). Finally, by construction of the tree-indexed Markov chain, if  $w$  is the first branch point of  $\tau$  and  $|w| = p$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) \mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau}[\Delta_k] &= h(x) \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \frac{m_{|\pi(\tau)|}(\zeta_p)}{|\pi(\tau)|! h(\zeta_p)} \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_p} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi(\tau)|} \mathbb{Q}_{\chi_i, S_i(\tau)}[\Delta_{|\pi_i|}] \right] \right] \\ &\leq C_k h(x) \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \frac{1}{h(\zeta_p)} \right], \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude by using the case  $k = 1$ .

We now prove the second part of the statement on ultrametric spaces. By Lemma A.2 or the discussion at the end of Section 2.2, the set of all ultrametric trees with  $k$  leaves at height  $n$  is simply obtained by choosing the depth of the  $k - 1$  successive branching points in  $\{0, \dots, n - 1\}$ . Applying the many-to-few formula and discarding all trees which are not ultrametric, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} n \tilde{M}_{x,n}^k[F] &= \frac{1}{n^{k-1}} \sum_{b_1, \dots, b_{k-1}=0}^{n-1} h(x) \mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau(\mathbf{b})}[\Delta_k \cdot F(\tfrac{1}{n}\theta^*)] \\ &= \int_{[0,1]^{k-1}} h(x) \mathbb{Q}_{x,\tau_n(\mathbf{b})}[\Delta_k \cdot F(\tfrac{1}{n}\theta^*)] d\mathbf{b}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tau(\mathbf{b})$  and  $\tau_n(\mathbf{b})$  are the ultrametric tree with  $k$  leaves at height  $n$  whose branch points are at height  $\mathbf{b}$  and  $\lfloor n\mathbf{b} \rfloor$  respectively. The result follows by dominated convergence as above, using Lemma 5.2 and the bound (32).  $\square$

## 5.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We are ready to prove Theorem 1.1. For later purpose, we will need the convergences in that result to hold uniformly in the initial condition  $x \in E$ . By this, we mean that the convergence holds uniformly with respect to any metric that induces the vague convergence on the Gromov-vague or Gromov-weak topology. For examples of such metrics, see [30, Equation (5.1)] for the Gromov-weak topology, or [21, Equation (A2.6.1)] for general vague convergence.

**Proposition 5.3.** *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Then*

$$n\mathcal{L}_x(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x)\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi}), \quad n\mathcal{L}_x(\bar{\mathcal{U}}_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2h(x)}{\Sigma^2}\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{U}_{b,\pi}), \quad (33)$$

uniformly in  $x \in E$ , vaguely in the Gromov-vague and Gromov-weak topology respectively.

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi: \mathcal{D}_k^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be continuous bounded with support included in  $\mathcal{D}_{k,R}^*$  (defined in (21)) for some  $R > 0$ . Fix a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \geq 1} \in E$ . Since  $h$  is bounded, up to extracting a subsequence, we assume that  $h(x_n) \rightarrow h(x)$  for some  $x \in E$ .

We start with the convergence of  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n$ . The moment of  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n$  evaluated at the polynomial  $\Phi$  corresponding to  $\varphi$  is

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_n}[\Phi(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n)] = \frac{1}{n^{2k}}\mathbb{E}_{x_n}\left[\sum_{\mathbf{v} \in T^k} \varphi\left(\frac{d(\mathbf{v})}{n}, X_{\mathbf{v}}\right)\right]. \quad (34)$$

We will compare this expression to the rescaled moment measure  $\bar{M}_{x_n,n}^k$  in (30) by removing from the sum all terms that do not span a tree with exactly  $k$  leaves. For a tree  $\tau$ , let  $A_k(\tau)$  be the number of  $k$ -tuples of vertices  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_k) \in \tau$  such that  $\tau_{\mathbf{v}}$  has strictly less than  $k$  leaves. By removing these terms from (34) and re-ordering the vertices in increasing planar order,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_n}[\Phi(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n)] = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_k} \bar{M}_{x_n,n}^k[\varphi_{\sigma} \circ D] + B_{x_n,n}, \quad (35)$$

where  $B_{x_n,n}$  can be bounded as

$$|B_{x_n,n}| \leq \frac{\|\varphi\|_{\infty}}{n^{2k}}\mathbb{E}_{x_n}[A_k(T^{(Rn)})].$$

By Lemma A.3, since  $T^{(Rn)}$  has height at most  $Rn$  we obtain the further bound

$$|B_{x_n,n}| \leq \frac{\|\varphi\|_{\infty}}{n^{2k}}C_k Rn \mathbb{E}_{x_n}[|T^{(Rn)}|^{k-1}] = \frac{C'}{n^2}\mathbb{E}_{x_n}[|\bar{T}_n^{(R)}|^{k-1}].$$

It will follow by an induction on  $k$  that

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{x \in E} n \mathbb{E}_x[|\bar{T}_n^{(R)}|^{k-1}] < \infty. \quad (36)$$

Therefore, by Proposition 5.1, letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in (35) shows

$$n\mathbb{E}_{x_n}[\Phi(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n)] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x) \left(\frac{\Sigma^2}{2}\right)^{k-1} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_k} \int \mathbb{E}[\varphi_\sigma(D(\theta), (X_i)_i)] \Lambda_k(d\theta),$$

where  $(X_i)_{i \leq k}$  are i.i.d. and distributed as  $\pi$ . The right-hand side is the moment of the marked Brownian CRT with variance  $\Sigma^2$  computed in Proposition 4.2. The method of moments (Proposition 5.1) shows that

$$n\mathcal{L}_{x_n}(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x)\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi})$$

vaguely in the Gromov-vague topology. (It is straightforward to check from the explicit expression of the moments that Carleman's condition (23) is fulfilled.) This also shows that (36) holds for  $k+1$  and the induction is complete.

The convergence of  $\bar{\mathcal{U}}_n$  follows along the same lines. Re-ordering the terms in the sum,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x_n}[\Phi(\bar{\mathcal{U}}_n)] &= \frac{1}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{x_n} \left[ \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in U_n^k} \varphi\left(\frac{d(\mathbf{v})}{n}, X_{\mathbf{v}}\right) \right] = \frac{1}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{x_n} \left[ \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v} \in U_n^k \\ v_i \neq v_j}} \varphi\left(\frac{d(\mathbf{v})}{n}, X_{\mathbf{v}}\right) \right] + \tilde{B}_{x_n, n} \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_k} \tilde{M}_{x_n, n}^k[\varphi_\sigma \circ D] + \tilde{B}_{x_n, n}. \end{aligned}$$

The error term  $\tilde{B}_{x_n, k}$  is obtained by removing all  $k$ -tuples in the sum which contain duplicate elements of  $U_n$ . By bounding the number of such  $k$ -tuples by  $\tilde{C}_k |U_n|^{k-1}$  (for some combinatorial constant  $\tilde{C}_k$ ),

$$\tilde{B}_{x_n, n} \leq \tilde{C}_k \frac{\|\varphi\|_\infty}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{x_n} [|U_n|^{k-1}].$$

An induction similar to above will prove that  $\tilde{B}_{x_n, n} \rightarrow 0$ , and thus Proposition 5.1 shows that

$$n\mathbb{E}_{x_n}[\Phi(\bar{\mathcal{U}}_n)] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x) \left(\frac{\Sigma^2}{2}\right)^{k-1} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_k} \int \mathbb{E}[\varphi_\sigma(D(\theta), (X_i)_i)] \tilde{\Lambda}_k(d\theta).$$

The right-hand side is, up to a factor  $h(x)\Sigma^2/2$ , the moment of the marked Brownian CPP with variance  $\Sigma^2$  computed in Proposition 4.3. We conclude again using the method of moments, namely Proposition 4.1. Note that, since the metric space  $\bar{\mathcal{U}}_n$  has diameter at most 2, the Gromov-vague and Gromov-weak convergence coincide in that case.

Let us finally argue that these limits hold uniformly. Starting from a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ , we have shown that, given any subsequence of  $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ , we can extract a further subsequence such that both limits in (33) hold. This shows that, for any metric  $d$  that induces the vague convergence,

$$d(n\mathcal{L}_x(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n), h(x_n)\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi})) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad d(n\mathcal{L}_x(\bar{\mathcal{U}}_n), h(x_n)\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{U}_{b,\pi})) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Since  $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is arbitrary, this proves that these limits are uniform in  $x \in E$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Point (i) of the statement has already been proved in Proposition 5.3. For Point (ii), Proposition 5.3 shows that

$$\forall x \in E, \quad \frac{n\Sigma^2}{2h(x)} \mathcal{L}_x(\bar{\mathcal{U}}_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{U}_{b,\pi}),$$

vaguely in the Gromov-weak topology. The result follows from [30, Proposition 3.4].  $\square$

### 5.3 Tightness results

This section provides technical lemmas that will allow us to deduce tightness of the measures. We start by reinforcing the Gromov-vague convergence to a Gromov-weak one using the estimate on the survival probability. It is useful for the proofs to recall the notation  $Z_m$  for the size of the population at generation  $m \geq 0$ .

**Corollary 5.4.** *Suppose that the Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 hold. Then*

$$\mathcal{L}_x(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x) \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi})$$

*vaguely in the Gromov-weak topology and uniformly for  $x \in E$ , where  $\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi}$  is a free Brownian CRT with variance  $\Sigma^2$  and independent marks  $\pi$ .*

*Proof.* Since the convergence holds in the Gromov-vague topology by Proposition 5.3, Lemma 4.4 shows that it is sufficient to prove that, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is some  $R > 0$  such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in E} n \mathbb{P}_x \left( \sum_{m \geq nR} Z_m \geq \varepsilon n^2 \right) \leq \varepsilon,$$

Using the survival probability estimate (7), we directly obtain that

$$n \mathbb{P}_x \left( \sum_{m \geq nR} Z_m \geq \varepsilon n^2 \right) \leq n \mathbb{P}_x(Z_{nR} > 0) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2h(x)}{\Sigma^2 R}$$

uniformly for  $x \in E$ , hence our result.  $\square$

We now prove tightness in the Gromov–Hausdorff-weak topology. Let us give a verbal description of the ideas before moving to the formal proof. The tightness criterion that we use (adapted from [7]) relies on controlling the lower mass function  $m_\delta$  defined in (25). In words, our task is to show that “long” subtrees of  $T$  (with height larger than  $\delta n$ ) have non-vanishing mass (larger than some  $\varepsilon n^2$ ). We start by proving that this property holds for the entire tree  $T$ , and then use a first moment argument and the Markov property to show that it also holds for all subtrees of  $T$ .

Following the notation of Section 4.1, we denote by  $\tau^{(R)}$  the restriction of a tree  $\tau$  to its first  $R$  generations and by  $|\tau|$  the number of its vertices. It will be convenient to introduce a notion of (essential) *height* of an mmm-space as

$$\forall \mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{X}, \quad \text{ht}(\mathcal{X}) = \sup\{d(\rho, x) : (x, e) \in \text{supp } \mu\}. \quad (37)$$

We start with a simple lemma.

**Lemma 5.5.** *The map  $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \text{ht}(\mathcal{X})$  is lower semi-continuous for the Gromov-weak topology.*

*Proof.* Let  $(\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence of mmm-spaces converging to  $\mathcal{X}$  in the Gromov-weak topology and such that  $\text{ht}(\mathcal{X}_n) \leq t$ . Then, by Portmanteau's theorem

$$\int_{X \times E} \mathbf{1}_{\{d(\rho, x) > t\}} \mu(dx, de) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X_n \times E} \mathbf{1}_{\{d_n(\rho_n, x) > t\}} \mu_n(dx, de) = 0.$$

Hence  $\{\mathcal{X} : \text{ht}(\mathcal{X}) \leq t\}$  is closed.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.6.** *For any  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in E} \mathbb{P}_x(Z_{tn} > 0, |T^{(tn)}| < \eta n^2) = 0.$$

*Proof.* We decompose

$$\mathbb{P}_x(Z_{tn} > 0, |T^{(tn)}| < \eta n^2) = \mathbb{P}_x(Z_{tn} > 0) - \mathbb{P}_x(Z_{tn} > 0, |T^{(tn)}| \geq \eta n^2).$$

Since  $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \text{ht}(\mathcal{X})$  is lower semi-continuous by Lemma 5.5, the set  $\{\mathcal{X} : \text{ht}(\mathcal{X}) > t\}$  is open set for Gromov-weak topology. Therefore, Portmanteau's theorem, the vague convergence of  $(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ , and Kolmogorov's estimate (7) allow us to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( n \mathbb{P}_x(Z_{tn} > 0) - n \mathbb{P}_x(Z_{tn} > 0, |T^{(tn)}| \geq \eta n^2) \right) \\ \leq \frac{2h(x)}{\Sigma^2 t} - h(x) \mathbb{P}(|T_b^{(t)}| \geq \eta, \text{ht}(\mathcal{T}_b) > t), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly for  $x \in E$  and where  $\mathcal{T}_b$  is a free Brownian CRT with variance  $\Sigma^2$ . By our definition of the Brownian CRT,

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(|T_b^{(t)}| \geq \eta, \text{ht}(\mathcal{T}_b) > t) = \mathbb{P}(\text{ht}(\mathcal{T}_b) > t) = \frac{2}{\Sigma^2 t},$$

hence the result. (The  $\eta \rightarrow 0$  limit is obtained by noting that the amount of time that a Brownian excursion hitting level  $t$  spends below level  $t$  is positive with probability one.)  $\square$

**Lemma 5.7.** *For any  $\delta, \eta' > 0$ ,*

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in E} n \mathbb{P}_x(m_\delta(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) < \eta, |\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n| > \eta') = 0.$$

*Proof.* First, if  $\eta < \eta'$ ,

$$\{|\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n| > \eta', m_\delta(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) < \eta\} = \{|\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n| > \eta', m_\delta(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) < \eta, \text{ht}(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) > \delta/2\},$$

since  $\text{ht}(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) \leq \delta/2$  implies that the diameter of the metric space is smaller than  $\delta$ , in which case  $m_\delta(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) = |\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n|$ . Moreover, since by (7)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n\mathbb{P}_x(\text{ht}(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) > t) = \frac{2h(x)}{\Sigma^2 t}$$

uniformly for  $x \in E$ , it is sufficient to show that, for any  $K \geq 1$  and  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in E} n\mathbb{P}_x(m_{4\delta}(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) < \eta, \text{ht}(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) \in (\delta, K\delta)) = 0.$$

Now, we construct a family of trees such that (1) each ball of  $(T, d_T)$  of radius  $4\delta n$  contains one such tree and (2) each tree survives for at least  $\delta n$  generations. To do so, define for  $v \in T$

$$T_v^{(2\delta n)} := \{w \in T : v \preceq w, |w| < |v| + 2\delta n\}.$$

This tree is obtained by cutting the subtree rooted at  $v$  at height  $2\delta n$ . For each  $u \in T$ , let  $v_u$  be its ancestor at generation  $\lfloor \delta n \rfloor (\lfloor \frac{|u|}{\delta n} \rfloor - 1)$ . If  $|u| \leq \delta n$ , we set  $v_u = \emptyset$ . Clearly,

$$\forall w \in T_{v_u}^{(2\delta n)}, \quad d_T(w, u) \leq d_T(w, v_u) + d_T(v_u, u) \leq 4\delta n,$$

from which we deduce that

$$T_{v_u}^{(2\delta n)} \subseteq B_{(u, 4\delta)}(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n),$$

the closed ball of  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n$  with center  $u$  and radius  $4\delta$ . The key point is to note that by construction  $T_{v_u}^{(2\delta n)}$  survives at least  $n\delta$  generations. If  $|u| > \delta n$ ,  $u \in T_{v_u}^{(2\delta n)}$  and  $|u| - |v_u| \geq \delta n$ . If  $|u| \leq \delta n$ ,  $v_u = \emptyset$  and  $T_{v_u}^{(2\delta n)} = T^{(2\delta n)}$ , which has height at least  $n\delta$  since we restricted ourselves to that event. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{m_{4\delta}(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) < \eta\} \cap \{\text{ht}(T) \in (\delta n, K\delta n)\} \\ &= \{\exists u \in T : |B_{(u, 4\delta)}(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n)| < \eta n^2\} \cap \{\text{ht}(T) \in (\delta n, K\delta n)\} \\ &\subseteq \{\exists u \in T : |T_{v_u}^{(2\delta n)}| < \eta n^2\} \cap \{\text{ht}(T) \in (\delta n, K\delta n)\} \\ &\subseteq \bigcup_{k=0}^K \{\exists v \in T : |T_v^{(2\delta n)}| < \eta n^2, \text{ht}(T_v^{(2\delta n)}) > \delta n, |v| = k\delta n\}. \end{aligned}$$

By a union bound and the Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned}
n\mathbb{P}_x(m_{4\delta}(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) < \eta, \text{ht}(T) \in (\delta n, K\delta n)) & \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^K n\mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{|v|=k\delta n} \mathbf{1}_{\{|T_v^{(2\delta n)}| < \eta n^2, \text{ht}(T_v^{(2\delta n)}) > \delta n\}} \right] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{|v|=k\delta n} n\mathbb{P}_{X_v}(|T^{(2\delta n)}| < \eta n^2, Z_{\delta n} > 0) \right] \\
&\leq \left( \sup_{y \in E} n\mathbb{P}_y(|T^{(2\delta n)}| < \eta n^2, Z_{\delta n} > 0) \right) \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}_x[Z_{k\delta n}].
\end{aligned}$$

By (2) the second term is bounded uniformly in  $x \in E$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, by Lemma 5.6,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{y \in E} n\mathbb{P}_y(|T^{(2\delta n)}| < \eta n^2, Z_{\delta n} > 0) \xrightarrow{\eta \rightarrow 0} 0,$$

which leads to our result.  $\square$

#### 5.4 Proof of Theorem 1.2

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* By the Gromov–weak convergence obtained in Corollary 5.4 and by Lemma 5.7, the assumptions of Lemma 4.5 are fulfilled and hence

$$\forall x \in E, \quad n\mathcal{L}_x(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x)\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi})$$

vaguely for the Gromov–Hausdorff–weak topology. Note that this convergence holds uniformly in  $x \in E$ . Since each  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n$  has almost surely full support, this convergence also holds vaguely with respect to the Gromov–Hausdorff–Prohorov topology, see for instance [7, Remark 5.2].  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.3.* We start with point (i). Let  $F: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be bounded and continuous for the Gromov–Hausdorff–weak topology and write

$$n\mathbb{E}_x[F(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n)\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{tn} > 0\}}] = n\mathbb{E}_x[F(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n)\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{tn} > 0, |\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n^{(t)}| > \eta\}}] + n\mathbb{E}_x[F(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n)\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{tn} > 0, |\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n^{(t)}| \leq \eta\}}].$$

By Point (i) of Theorem 1.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n\mathbb{E}_x[F(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n)\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{tn} > 0, |\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n^{(t)}| > \eta\}}] &= \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} h(x)\mathbb{E}[F(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi})\mathbf{1}_{\{\text{ht}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi}) > t, |T_{b,\pi}^{(t)}| > \eta\}}] \\
&= h(x)\mathbb{E}[F(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi})\mathbf{1}_{\{\text{ht}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi}) > t\}}] \\
&= \frac{2h(x)}{\Sigma^2 t} \mathbb{E}[F(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi}) \mid \text{ht}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi}) \geq t].
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.6, the second term can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \mathbb{E}_x \left[ F(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{tn} > 0, |\bar{T}_n^{(t)}| \leq \eta\}} \right] \\ \leq \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \|F\|_\infty \mathbb{P}_x(Z_{tn} > 0, |\bar{T}_n^{(t)}| \leq \eta) \\ = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two estimates, dividing by the survival probability and using (7) leads to the result.

We move on to point (ii). Let  $A$  be a continuity set for the free Brownian CRT ( $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi} \in A) = 0$ ) such that  $A \cap \{|X| \leq \eta\} = \emptyset$  for  $\eta$  small enough. Then,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{z_{0,n}} \mathbb{P}_{x_i}(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n \in A) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{z_{0,n}} n \mathbb{P}_{x_i}(\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n \in A) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \nu_0, h \rangle \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi} \in A) \quad (38)$$

since the initial particle configuration converges weakly and the probabilities converge uniformly by the proof of Theorem 1.2. Viewing the forest as a point measure, standard theorems for superposition of independent point processes, see [22, Theorem 11.2.V], show that (38) is enough to deduce that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{z_{0,n}} \delta_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_{n,i}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \geq 1} \delta_{\mathcal{T}_{b,i}}$$

in distribution for the vague topology, where  $(\mathcal{T}_{b,i})_{i \geq 1}$  are the atoms of a Poisson point process with intensity  $\langle \nu_0, h \rangle \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_{b,\pi})$ . A simple adaptation of standard arguments would show that, if  $(\mathcal{T}_i)_{i \geq 1}$  are mmm-spaces such that  $|T_1| > |T_2| > \dots$ , the map  $\sum_i \delta_{\mathcal{T}_i} \mapsto (\mathcal{T}_i)_{i \geq 1}$  from the space of locally finite point measures on  $\mathcal{X}$  to the space of sequences of mmm-spaces with non-increasing mass is a bijection. This bijection is continuous from the vague topology to the product topology, provided that there are no ties in the sequence of masses, which occurs almost surely for the Brownian CRT.  $\square$

## Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank Emmanuel Schertzer for many discussions on topics closely related to the present work and for his comments on an earlier version of the manuscript, Magdalen College Oxford for a senior Demyship, and acknowledges financial support from the Glasstone Research Fellowship.

## References

- [1] Romain Abraham, Jean-François Delmas, and Patrick Hoscheit. A note on the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov distance between (locally) compact metric measure spaces. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 18:1–21, 2013.
- [2] Louigi Addario-Berry, Nicolas Broutin, and Christina Goldschmidt. The continuum limit of critical random graphs. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 152(3):367–406, 2012.
- [3] David Aldous. The Continuum Random Tree III. *The Annals of Probability*, 21(1):248–289, 1993.
- [4] Søren Asmussen and Heinrich Hering. Strong limit theorems for general supercritical branching processes with applications to branching diffusions. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 36(3):195–212, 1976.
- [5] Søren Asmussen and Heinrich Hering. *Limit Theory for Subcritical and Critical Processes*. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1983.
- [6] Krishna Athreya and Peter Ney. *Branching Processes*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1972.
- [7] Siva Athreya, Wolfgang Löhner, and Anita Winter. The gap between Gromov-vague and Gromov-Hausdorff-vague topology. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 126(9):2527–2553, 2016.
- [8] Stuart Baird, Nicolas Barton, and Alison Etheridge. The distribution of surviving blocks of an ancestral genome. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 64(4):451–471, 2003.
- [9] Vincent Bansaye. Spine for interacting populations and sampling. *Bernoulli*, 30(2):1555–1585, 2024.
- [10] Vincent Bansaye, Bertrand Cloez, Pierre Gabriel, and Aline Marguet. A non-conservative Harris ergodic theorem. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 106(3):2459–2510, 2022.
- [11] Julien Berestycki, Nathanaël Berestycki, and Jason Schweinsberg. The genealogy of branching brownian motion with absorption. *The Annals of Probability*, 41(2):527–618, 2013.
- [12] Nathanaël Berestycki. Recent progress in coalescent theory. *Ensaïos Matemáticos*, 16:1–193, 2009.

- [13] Jean Bertoin and Alexander Watson. A probabilistic approach to spectral analysis of growth-fragmentation equations. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 274(8):2163–2204, 2018.
- [14] John Biggins and Andreas Kyprianou. Measure change in multitype branching. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 36(2):544–581, 2004.
- [15] Florin Boenkost, Félix Foutel-Rodier, and Emmanuel Schertzer. The genealogy of nearly critical branching processes in varying environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.11612*, 2022.
- [16] Tom Britton and Gianpaolo Scalia Tomba. Estimation in emerging epidemics: biases and remedies. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 16(150):20180670, 2019.
- [17] Vincent Calvez, Benoît Henry, Sylvie Méléard, and Viet Chi Tran. Dynamics of lineages in adaptation to a gradual environmental change. *Annales Henri Lebesgue*, 5:729–777, 2022.
- [18] Philippe Chassaing and Gilles Schaeffer. Random planar lattices and integrated superbrownian excursion. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 128(2):161–212, 2004.
- [19] Brigitte Chauvin, Alain Rouault, and Anton Wakolbinger. Growing conditioned trees. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 39(1):117–130, 1991.
- [20] Pierre Collet, Sylvie Méléard, and Jaime San Martín. Branching diffusion processes and spectral properties of Feynman-Kac semigroup. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09568*, 2024.
- [21] Daryl Daley and David Vere-Jones. *An introduction to the theory of point processes: Volume I: Elementary theory and methods*. Springer New York, NY, 2 edition, 2003.
- [22] Daryl Daley and David Vere-Jones. *An introduction to the theory of point processes: Volume II: General theory and structure*. Springer New York, NY, 2 edition, 2008.
- [23] Donald Dawson. Measure-valued Markov processes. In *Ecole d’Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXI - 1991*, pages 1–260, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1993. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [24] Pierre Del Moral, Emma Horton, and Ajay Jasra. On the stability of positive semi-groups. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 33(6A):4424–4490, 2023.
- [25] Andrej Depperschmidt, Andreas Greven, and Peter Pfaffelhuber. Marked metric measure spaces. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 16:174–188, 2011.

- [26] Thomas Duquesne and Jean-François Le Gall. *Random trees, Lévy processes and spatial branching processes*, volume 281. Société mathématique de France Paris, France, 2002.
- [27] Eugene Dynkin. Branching particle systems and superprocesses. *The Annals of Probability*, 19(3):1157–1194, 1991.
- [28] Alison Etheridge. *An Introduction to Superprocesses*, volume 20. American Mathematical Society Providence, 2000.
- [29] Alison Etheridge and Sarah Penington. Genealogies in bistable waves. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 27:1–99, 2022.
- [30] Félix Foutel-Rodier. Vague convergence and method of moments for random metric measure spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05097*, 2024.
- [31] Félix Foutel-Rodier, François Blanquart, Philibert Courau, Peter Czappon, Jean-Jil Duchamps, Jasmine Gamblin, Élise Kerdoncuff, Rob Kulathinal, Léo Régnier, Laura Vuduc, Amaury Lambert, and Emmanuel Schertzer. From individual-based epidemic models to McKendrick-von Foerster PDEs: a guide to modeling and inferring COVID-19 dynamics. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 85(4):43, 2022.
- [32] Félix Foutel-Rodier, Amaury Lambert, and Emmanuel Schertzer. Exchangeable coalescents, ultrametric spaces, nested interval-partitions: A unifying approach. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 31(5):2046–2090, 2021.
- [33] Félix Foutel-Rodier and Emmanuel Schertzer. Convergence of genealogies through spinal decomposition with an application to population genetics. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 187(3):697–751, 2023.
- [34] Félix Foutel-Rodier, Emmanuel Schertzer, and Julie Tourniaire. Convergence of spatial branching processes to  $\alpha$ -stable CSBPs: Genealogy of semi-pushed fronts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05096*, 2024.
- [35] Isaac Gonzalez, Emma Horton, and Andreas Kyprianou. Asymptotic moments of spatial branching processes. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 184(3):805–858, 2022.
- [36] Andreas Greven, Peter Pfaffelhuber, and Anita Winter. Convergence in distribution of random metric measure spaces ( $\lambda$ -coalescent measure trees). *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 145(1):285–322, 2009.
- [37] Simon Harris, Emma Horton, Andreas Kyprianou, and Ellen Powell. Many-to-few for non-local branching markov process. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 29:1–26, 2024.

- [38] Simon Harris, Emma Horton, Andreas Kyprianou, and Minmin Wang. Yaglom limit for critical nonlocal branching markov processes. *The Annals of Probability*, 50(6):2373–2408, 2022.
- [39] Simon Harris, Samuel Johnston, and Juan Carlos Pardo. Universality classes for the coalescent structure of heavy-tailed Galton–Watson trees. *The Annals of Probability*, 52(2):387–433, 2024.
- [40] Simon Harris, Sandra Palau, and Juan Carlos Pardo. The coalescent structure of Galton-Watson trees in varying environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.10923*, 2022.
- [41] Simon Harris and Matthew Roberts. The many-to-few lemma and multiple spines. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 53(1):226–242, 2017.
- [42] Heinrich Hering. Critical markov branching processes with general set of types. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 160:185–202, 1971.
- [43] Emma Horton and Andreas Kyprianou. *Stochastic Neutron Transport*. Birkhäuser Cham, 2023.
- [44] Emma Horton, Andreas Kyprianou, Pedro Martín-Chávez, Ellen Powell, and Victor Rivero. Stability of (sub) critical non-local spatial branching processes with and without immigration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05472*, 2024.
- [45] Peter Jagers and Olle Nerman. The growth and composition of branching populations. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 16(2):221–259, 1984.
- [46] Samuel Johnston. The genealogy of Galton-Watson trees. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 24:1–35, 2019.
- [47] Olav Kallenberg. *Random measures, theory and applications*. Springer Cham, 2 edition, 2017.
- [48] John Kingman. The coalescent. *Stochastic processes and their applications*, 13(3):235–248, 1982.
- [49] Thomas Kurtz, Russell Lyons, Robin Pemantle, and Yuval Peres. A conceptual proof of the Kesten-Stigum theorem for multi-type branching processes. *Classical and modern branching processes*, pages 181–185, 1997.
- [50] Amaury Lambert. The contour of splitting trees is a Lévy process. *The Annals of Probability*, 38(1):348–395, 2010.
- [51] Amaury Lambert and Lea Popovic. The coalescent point process of branching trees. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 23(1):99–144, 2013.

- [52] Amaury Lambert and Gerónimo Uribe Bravo. The comb representation of compact ultrametric spaces. *p-Adic Numbers, Ultrametric Analysis and Applications*, 9(1):22–38, 2017.
- [53] Jean-François Le Gall. Brownian excursions, trees and measure-valued branching processes. *The Annals of Probability*, 19(4):1399–1439, 1991.
- [54] Jean-François Le Gall. A class of path-valued markov processes and its applications to superprocesses. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 95(1):25–46, 1993.
- [55] Jean-François Le Gall. The uniform random tree in a brownian excursion. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 96(3):369–383, 1993.
- [56] Jean-François Le Gall. *Spatial branching processes, random snakes and partial differential equations*. Birkhäuser Basel, 1999.
- [57] Jean-François Le Gall. Random trees and applications. *Probability Surveys*, 2:245–311, 2005.
- [58] Jean-François Le Gall and Yves Le Jan. Branching processes in Lévy processes: Laplace functionals of snakes and superprocesses. *The Annals of Probability*, 26(4):1407–1432, 1998.
- [59] Russell Lyons, Robin Pemantle, and Yuval Peres. Conceptual proofs of  $L \log L$  criteria for mean behavior of branching processes. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 1125–1138, 1995.
- [60] Jean-François Marckert. The lineage process in Galton–Watson trees and globally centered discrete snakes. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 18(1):209–244, 2008.
- [61] Jean-François Marckert and Grégory Miermont. Invariance principles for random bipartite planar maps. *The Annals of Probability*, 35(5):1642–1705, 2007.
- [62] Aline Marguet. Uniform sampling in a structured branching population. *Bernoulli*, 25(4A):2649–2695, 2019.
- [63] Grégory Miermont. Invariance principles for spatial multitype Galton-Watson trees. *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, 44(6):1128–1161, 2008.
- [64] Grégory Miermont. Tessellations of random maps of arbitrary genus. *Annales scientifiques de l’École Normale Supérieure*, 42(5):725–781, 2009.
- [65] Edwin Perkins. *Dawson–Watanabe superprocesses and Measure-valued Diffusions*. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Berlin, 2002.

- [66] Ross Pinsky. *Positive harmonic functions and diffusion*, volume 45. Cambridge university press, 1995.
- [67] Lea Popovic. Asymptotic genealogy of a critical branching process. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 14(4):2120–2148, 2004.
- [68] Ellen Powell. An invariance principle for branching diffusions in bounded domains. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 173(3):999–1062, 2019.
- [69] Emmanuel Schertzer and Julie Tourniaire. Spectral analysis and  $k$ -spine decomposition of inhomogeneous branching Brownian motions. Genealogies in fully pushed fronts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.01697*, 2023.
- [70] Zhan Shi. Branching random walks. In *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XLII – 2012*, volume 2151, pages 1–133. Springer Cham, 2015.
- [71] Julie Tourniaire. A branching particle system as a model of semipushed fronts. *The Annals of Probability*, 52(6):2104–2172, 2024.

## A Appendix

This appendix contains several elementary results on discrete planar trees.

**Lemma A.1.** *The application*

$$\tau \mapsto (|w|, (S_i(\tau))_{i \leq |\pi(\tau)|})$$

is a bijection from  $\mathcal{T}_k$  to the set

$$\bigcup_{\pi} \mathbf{N} \times \left( \mathcal{T}_{|\pi_1|} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{T}_{|\pi_{|\pi|}|} \right),$$

where the union runs over all partitions of  $[k]$  whose blocks are made of consecutive integers, but the partition  $\pi = \{i\}$ .

*Proof.* We construct the inverse of the map. Let  $\pi = (\pi_i)_{i \leq d}$  be a non-trivial partition of  $[k]$ ,  $n \geq 0$ , and  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_d$  such that  $\tau_i \in \mathcal{T}_{|\pi_i|}$  and  $c_1 + \cdots + c_d = k$ . Let  $w = (1, \dots, 1)$ , with  $|w| = n$ . We construct the tree

$$\tau = \{v : v \preceq w\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^d \{(w, i, v) : v \in \tau_i\}.$$

Quite clearly,  $w$  is the first branch point of  $\tau$ , it has degree  $d_w(\tau) = d$ , and  $S_i(\tau) = \tau_i$  for  $i \leq d$ .  $\square$

**Lemma A.2.** *The application*

$$\tau \mapsto (\ell_i(\tau))_{i \leq k}, (b_i(\tau))_{i < k}$$

is a bijection from  $\mathcal{T}_k$  to  $\{(\boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathbb{N}^k \times \mathbb{N}^{k-1} : b_i < \ell_i \wedge \ell_{i+1}, i < k\}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(\boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathbb{N}^k \times \mathbb{N}^{k-1}$  be such that  $b_i < \ell_i \wedge \ell_{i+1}$ . We construct a tree inductively. At the first step,  $\tau_1 = \{v : v \preceq v_1\}$ , where  $v_1 = (1, \dots, 1)$  and  $|v_1| = \ell_1$ . Suppose that  $\tau_i$  has been constructed. Let  $v$  be the right-most (in the planar order) vertex of  $\tau_i$  at height  $|b_i|$ . Define  $v_{i+1} = (w, 1, \dots, 1)$  such that  $|v_{i+1}| = \ell_{i+1}$ , and set

$$\tau_{i+1} = \tau_i \cup \{v : v \preceq v_{i+1}\}.$$

Then,  $v_{i+1}$  is the  $i + 1$ -th leaf and  $v_i \wedge v_{i+1} = w$  has height  $b_i$ . □

**Lemma A.3.** *There exists  $C_k$  such that, for any finite planar tree  $T$ ,*

$$\text{Card}\{\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_k) \in T^k : \tau_{\mathbf{v}} \text{ has fewer than } k \text{ leaves}\} \leq C_k |T|^{k-1} \text{ht}(T).$$

*Proof.* Let  $D_k(T)$  denote the quantity that needs to be bounded. The tree  $\tau_{\mathbf{v}}$  has strictly less than  $k$  leaves if either  $\tau_{v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}}$  has strictly less than  $k - 1$  leaves, or if  $\tau_{v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}}$  has  $k - 1$  leaves and  $v_k \in \tau_{v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}}$ . In the first case,  $v_k$  can be any of the  $|T|$  vertices of  $T$ . In the second case,  $v_k$  needs to be one of the vertices of  $\tau_{v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}}$ . There are at most  $(k - 1) \text{ht}(T)$  such vertices and  $|T|^{k-1}$  possible choices for  $(v_1, \dots, v_{k-1})$ . Together, this shows that

$$D_k(T) \leq |T| D_{k-1}(T) + |T|^{k-1} (k - 1) \text{ht}(T).$$

A simple induction now proves the result, given that  $D_1(T) = 0$ . □