

# The endpoint distribution of directed polymers

Sourav Chatterjee

(Joint work with Erik Bates)

# Beyond the simple random walk

- ▶ “Non-simple” random walks have been a source of fascinating problems for many years.
- ▶ Examples:
  - ▶ Random walk in i.i.d. random environment (RWRE).
  - ▶ Edge-reinforced and vertex-reinforced random walks (ERRW and VRRW).
  - ▶ Directed polymers in random environment.
- ▶ Many open questions.

- ▶ One of the most interesting aspects of such walks is **strong localization**: The position of the walker at time  $n$  is guaranteed to belong to a region of diameter  $O(1)$  with probability  $\rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .
- ▶ Models where this has been proved:
  - ▶ One dimensional RWRE, by Gantert, Peres & Shi (2010), following contributions from Sinai (1982), Golosov (1984), Shi (1998) and Révész (2005).
  - ▶ ERRW in any dimension, by Angel, Crawford & Kozma (2014) and Sabot and Tarrès (2015). Earlier results for one dimension are surveyed in Pemantle (2007).
  - ▶ Directed polymers in one spatial dimension, by Comets & Nguyen (2015), for an exactly solvable model introduced by Seppäläinen (2012).
- ▶ Strong localization in RWRE and directed polymers in dimensions higher than one is out of the reach of available techniques.

# This talk

- ▶ I will start with the definition of directed polymers in random environment.
- ▶ I will then state one of our main results, which proves **subsequential strong localization** in directed polymers in any dimension.
- ▶ Lastly, I will give a sketch of the proof, which uses a new abstract machinery with many other consequences for directed polymers — and hopefully, future applications in other models.

# Directed polymers in random environment

- ▶ Defined in the physics literature by Huse & Henley (1985) and Kardar (1985), as a model of Ising interfaces.
- ▶ First rigorous study by Imbrie & Spencer (1988).
- ▶ Tremendous interest in the probability community since the seminal work of Johansson (2000). Some of the notable contributors, in alphabetical order, are: Amir, Borodin, Carmona, Comets, Corwin, Hairer, Hu, Rassoul-Agha, Remenik, Quastel, Sepäläinen, Shiga, Vargas, Yoshida, ...
- ▶ A lot is known in one spatial dimension due to exact solvability, but not so much in higher dimensions.

# Definition

- ▶ Fix some dimension  $d$ . For each  $n \geq 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , let  $\omega_{n,x}$  be a random weight. Assume that the weights are i.i.d.
- ▶ Take any  $n$ . For any path  $p = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n)$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  with  $x_0 = 0$ , define

$$\omega(p) := \sum_{i=0}^n \omega_{i,x_i}.$$

- ▶ Among the  $(2d)^n$  paths, choose one randomly with probability proportional to  $e^{\beta\omega(p)}$ , where  $\beta \geq 0$  is some given parameter.
- ▶ The path so chosen is called a directed polymer of length  $n$ , at inverse temperature  $\beta$ , in the random environment induced by the random weights.
- ▶ When  $\beta = 0$ , this is just simple symmetric random walk.
- ▶ However, when  $\beta > 0$ , the walk is no longer Markovian. In fact, there is no natural way to connect the walk of length  $n$  with the walk of length  $n + 1$ .

# The endpoint distribution

- ▶ Let  $S_0, \dots, S_n$  be a directed polymer path of length  $n$ .
- ▶ The law of  $S_n$  (conditional on the environment), which we will denote by  $f_n$ , is called the **endpoint distribution at time  $n$** . This is the central object of interest in this talk.
- ▶ Note that  $f_n$  is a **random probability measure** on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ .
- ▶ Unlike RWRE and ERRW, the endpoint distribution of directed polymers is not expected to converge to any deterministic or random limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .
- ▶ Indeed, simulations show that  $f_n$  tends to fluctuate wildly, even with small changes in  $n$ .

# Free energy and phase transition

- ▶ Henceforth, assume that the weights are non-degenerate and have finite moment generating function  $\phi$ . Let  $\lambda := \log \phi$ .
- ▶ The free energy at time  $n$  is defined as

$$F_n(\beta) = \frac{1}{n} \log \sum e^{\beta\omega(p)},$$

where the sum is over all paths of length  $n$  starting at 0.

- ▶ The limiting free energy  $F(\beta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n(\beta)$  exists and is non-random.
- ▶ Comets and Yoshida (2006) proved that in any dimension, there exists  $\beta_c \in [0, \infty)$  such that

$$F(\beta) \begin{cases} = \lambda(\beta) & \text{if } 0 \leq \beta \leq \beta_c, \\ < \lambda(\beta) & \text{if } \beta > \beta_c. \end{cases}$$

- ▶ The region  $0 \leq \beta \leq \beta_c$  is called the **high temperature phase** and the region  $\beta > \beta_c$  is called the **low temperature phase**.



# Weak localization

- ▶ Let  $p_n$  be the mass of the largest atom of the endpoint distribution  $f_n$ .
- ▶ It follows from results of Carmona and Hu (2002) and Comets, Shiga and Yoshida (2003), that almost surely,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_i = 0 \quad \text{if } 0 \leq \beta \leq \beta_c,$$

and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_i > 0 \quad \text{if } \beta > \beta_c.$$

- ▶ This shows delocalization at high temperature, and a weak form of localization at low temperature (existence of at least one non-vanishing atom).

# Our main result

- ▶ Recall that the **lower density** of a set  $A$  of nonnegative integers is defined as

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A \cap \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}|}{n}.$$

- ▶ We will say that a probability measure on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  is  $(\delta, K)$ -localized if it puts mass  $> 1 - \delta$  on a set of diameter  $\leq K$ .

Theorem (Bates & C., 2016)

**Subsequential strong localization:** *For any  $\delta > 0$ , there exist  $K > 0$  and  $\theta > 0$  such that the set of all  $n$  for which the endpoint distribution  $f_n$  is  $(\delta, K)$ -localized has lower density  $\geq \theta$  with probability one.*

**Remark:** If the theorem can be proved with  $\theta = 1$ , that would resolve the strong localization conjecture for directed polymers.

- ▶ At its heart, the proof is an application of Jensen's inequality.
- ▶ However, Jensen's inequality comes after many steps.
- ▶ In particular, we need to build an elaborate abstract machinery, in a new space with a new topology.
- ▶ I will now give an outline of these steps.
- ▶ Hopefully, the ideas and the abstract tools will be useful for other problems in the future.

# Partitioned subprobability measures

- ▶ A sequence of probability measures on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  can have some of the mass “diffuse”, and the rest clump into “blobs” that “fly away” from each other.
- ▶ Suggests that the asymptotic structure can be captured by a subprobability measure  $f$  on  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}^d$ , where the restriction of  $f$  to each  $\{k\} \times \mathbb{Z}^d$  represents a “blob”.
- ▶ Let  $S$  be the set of all such subprobability measures. We define an equivalence relation on  $S$ , and a metric  $\rho$  on the set  $S$  of equivalence classes (called **partitioned subprobability measures**), such that  **$(S, \rho)$  is compact**.
- ▶ Inspired by the method of concentration compactness developed by P.-L. Lions in the 80's, who built on an idea introduced by Parthasarathy, Ranga Rao & Varadhan (1962).
- ▶ A similar construction was carried out in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  by Mukherjee and Varadhan (2014), but with a different metric. We show that the two metrics are equivalent.

# The empirical measure of endpoint distributions: A basic convergence result

- ▶ It is not difficult to show that the sequence of endpoint distributions  $(f_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is a Markov chain on the set of probability measures on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , and hence on  $\mathcal{S}$ .
- ▶ Let  $\mathcal{T}$  denote the transition kernel of this Markov chain.
- ▶  $\mathcal{T}$  acts on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ , the space of probability measures on  $\mathcal{S}$  equipped with the  $L^1$  Wasserstein metric  $W$  induced by the metric  $\rho$  on  $\mathcal{S}$ .
- ▶ Since  $\mathcal{S}$  is compact, there is a nonempty compact set  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$  of invariant measures of  $\mathcal{T}$ .
- ▶ Let  $\mu_n \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$  be the empirical measure of the first  $n$  endpoint distributions, that is,  $\mu_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{f_i}$ .

## Theorem (Bates & C., 2016)

Let  $W(\mu_n, \mathcal{K}) := \inf\{W(\mu_n, \mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{K}\}$ . Then  $W(\mu_n, \mathcal{K}) \rightarrow 0$  almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

# Proof idea

- ▶ The proof of this theorem uses martingales and the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality.
- ▶ It is a special case of the more general heuristic that the empirical measure of a Markov chain run up to time  $n$  must be close to an invariant measure of the chain.
- ▶ Actually, we prove something stronger: There is a compact subset  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$  with some special properties, such that  $W(\mu_n, \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow 0$  almost surely.
- ▶  $\mathcal{M}$  is the set of minimizers of a certain continuous linear functional  $\mathcal{R}$  on  $\mathcal{P}(S)$ .
- ▶  $\mathcal{R}$  is complicated to write down. Let me just say that the free energy  $F_n$  and the empirical measure  $\mu_n$  of the endpoint distributions up to time  $n$  are related by

$$F_n = \mathcal{R}(\mu_n).$$

(There is a natural way to write  $F_n$  as a linear function of  $\mu_n$ , and  $\mathcal{R}$  can be read off from that.)

# How to use the convergence theorem

- ▶ Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be an open subset of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Suppose that we want to show that  $f_n \in \mathcal{V}$  for infinitely many  $n$  almost surely.
- ▶ First, we prove that  $\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \mu(\mathcal{V}) = \theta > 0$ .
- ▶ Since  $W(\mu_n, \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow 0$  a.s., the compactness of  $\mathcal{M}$  implies that any convergent subsequence of  $\mu_n$  must converge to some  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ .
- ▶ Along such a subsequence,

$$\liminf \mu_n(\mathcal{V}) \geq \mu(\mathcal{V}) \geq \theta > 0,$$

since  $\mathcal{V}$  is open.

- ▶ Since any subsequence of  $\mu_n$  contains a convergent subsequence (by compactness of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ ), this shows that the above inequality holds along the full sequence.
- ▶ Finally, since  $\mu_n(\mathcal{V}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_{\{f_i \in \mathcal{V}\}}$ , this proves that  $f_i \in \mathcal{V}$  infinitely often.

# Towards the proof of the localization theorem

- ▶ Let  $f : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a partitioned subprobability measure.
- ▶ We will say that  $f$  is  $(\delta, K)$ -localized if there is a set  $D \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$  of diameter  $\leq K$  such that for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\sum_{x \in D} f(n, x) > 1 - \delta.$$

- ▶ Let  $\mathcal{V}_{\delta, K}$  be the set of all  $(\delta, K)$ -localized partitioned subprobability measures.
- ▶ **Fact:**  $\mathcal{V}_{\delta, K}$  is an open subset of  $\mathcal{S}$ .
- ▶ Thus, by the previous slide, the following lemma suffices.

## Lemma

For any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $K$  such that

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \mu(\mathcal{V}_{\delta, K}) > 0.$$



# Proof of localization, continued

- ▶ Using the compactness of  $\mathcal{M}$  and the lower semi-continuity of the map  $\mu \mapsto \mu(\mathcal{V}_{\delta,K})$ , it is possible to reduce this lemma to the simpler claim that for any  $\delta > 0$  and any  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ , there exists  $K$  such that  $\mu(\mathcal{V}_{\delta,K}) > 0$ .
- ▶ For  $f \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$q_n(f) := \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f(n, x).$$

- ▶ Let  $\mathcal{U}_\delta$  be the set of all  $f$  such that  $q_n(f) > 1 - \delta$  for some  $n$ .
- ▶ Notice that

$$\mathcal{U}_\delta = \bigcup_{K=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{V}_{\delta,K}.$$

- ▶ Thus, we only need to show that for any  $\delta > 0$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_\delta) > 0$ .

# Completing the proof

- ▶ Recall that  $\mathcal{T}$  is the transition kernel of the Markov chain of endpoint distributions.
- ▶ For  $f \in \mathcal{S}$ , let

$$Q(f) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{q_n(f)}{1 - q_n(f)}.$$

- ▶ For  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ , let  $\mu(Q) := \int Q(f) d\mu(f)$ .
- ▶ If  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}$ , then  $\mathcal{T}\mu(Q) = \mu(Q)$ .
- ▶ On the other hand, an argument using **Jensen's inequality** and the non-degeneracy of weights shows that for any  $\mu \neq \delta_0$ , either  $\mu(Q) = \infty$  or  $\mathcal{T}\mu(Q) > \mu(Q)$ .
- ▶ Thus,  $\mu(Q) = \infty$  for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{\delta_0\}$ .
- ▶ A similar argument by Jensen's inequality shows that  $\delta_0 \notin \mathcal{M}$  when  $\beta > \beta_c$ .
- ▶ Lastly observe that if  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_\delta) = 0$  then  $Q(f) \leq (1 - \delta)^{-1}$ .
- ▶ Thus,  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_\delta) > 0$  for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\delta > 0$ .

- ▶ Besides subsequential strong localization and convergence of the empirical measure of endpoint distributions, the abstract machinery developed here gives a number of other results.
- ▶ For example, we can prove the **asymptotic pure atomicity** of the endpoint distribution at low temperature. Previously, this was proved for heavy-tailed environments by Vargas (2007).
- ▶ We also derive a **variational formula for the limiting free energy**, akin to variational formulas in other disordered systems such as spin glasses. The limiting empirical measure of endpoint distributions is the “order parameter”.

# Summary

- ▶ The main result is a subsequential localization theorem for the endpoint of directed polymers.
- ▶ To prove this, we defined a new compactification of probability measures on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , intended to capture localized masses escaping to infinity. We need this because we do not know a priori that the endpoint distribution is localized.
- ▶ In the set of probability measures on this compactified space, we identified the set of all possible limit points of the **empirical measure** of the first  $n$  endpoint distributions as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .
- ▶ The set of possible limit measures was shown to have certain nice properties (using mainly Jensen's inequality), which allowed us to deduce the claimed localization theorem.
- ▶ Many open questions. Foremost: Prove complete (not subsequential) localization.
- ▶ Manuscript on arXiv.