arXiv: arXiv:0000.0000

A binary embedding of the stable line-breaking construction

Franz Rembart* **and Matthias Winkel**†

Department of Statistics, University of Oxford, 24–29 St Giles, Oxford OX1 3LB
e-mail: rembart@stats.ox.ac.uk; winkel@stats.ox.ac.uk

November 9, 2016

Abstract: We embed Duquesne and Le Gall's stable tree into a binary compact continuum random tree (CRT) in a way that solves an open problem posed by Goldschmidt and Haas. This CRT can be obtained by applying a recursive construction method of compact CRTs as presented in earlier work to a specific distribution of a random string of beads, i.e. a random interval equipped with a random discrete measure. We also express this CRT as a tree built by replacing all branch points of a stable tree by rescaled i.i.d. copies of a Ford CRT. Some of these developments are carried out in a space of ∞-marked metric spaces generalising Miermont's notion of a k-marked metric space.

Keywords and phrases: stable tree, line-breaking construction, string of beads, continuum random tree, marked metric space, recursive distribution equation

.
60J80.

1. Introduction

Stable trees were introduced by Duquesne and Le Gall [14] as a family of continuum random trees (CRTs) parametrised by a self-similarity parameter $\alpha \in (1, 2]$ to describe the genealogical structure of continuous-state branching processes with branching mechanism $\lambda \mapsto \lambda^\alpha$. As such they form a subclass of Lévy trees [33] and contain Aldous's Brownian CRT [2–4] as a special case ($\alpha = 2$). They were studied by Miermont and others [14, 15, 21, 23, 24, 33, 35, 36] in the context of self-similar fragmentations and by several authors to establish invariance principles [7, 11, 13, 22, 30] and other properties [9, 10]. Furthermore, they have deeper connections to random maps and Liouville quantum gravity [12, 32, 38].

We represent trees as $\mathbb{R}$-*trees*, i.e. compact metric spaces $(\mathcal{T}, d)$ such that any two points $x, y \in \mathcal{T}$ are connected by a unique path $[[x, y]]$ in $\mathcal{T}$, which is furthermore required to have length $d(x, y)$. All our $\mathbb{R}$-trees are *rooted* at a distinguished $\rho \in \mathcal{T}$. We refer to a rooted $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho)$ equipped with a probability measure μ as a *weighted* $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, \mu)$, and equip sets of isometry classes of $\mathbb{R}$-trees and weighted $\mathbb{R}$-trees with the Gromov-Hausdorff and the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov topology, respectively.

Ever since Aldous [4], such trees have been built sequentially from a single branch $[[\rho, \Sigma_0]]$, grafting further branches (line segments) $]]J_{k-1}, \Sigma_k]]$ to build trees $\mathcal{T}_k$ spanned by a growing finite number of points $\rho, \Sigma_0, \ldots, \Sigma_k$, $k \geqslant 1$, finally passing to the closure/completion $\mathcal{T}$ of $\bigcup_{k\geqslant 0} \mathcal{T}_k$. In a given weighted $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, \mu)$, a natural sequence $(\Sigma_k, k \geqslant 0)$ may be obtained as an independent sample from μ. For the Brownian CRT, Aldous [4] gave an autonomous description of the resulting tree-growth process $(\mathcal{T}_k, k \geqslant 0)$ by breaking the half-line $[0, \infty)$ at the points $(S_k, k \geqslant 0)$ of an inhomogeneous Poisson process with linearly growing intensity tdt on $[0, \infty)$, each segment $]S_k, S_{k+1}]$ grafted in a point J_k chosen uniformly from the length measure on the structure $\mathcal{T}_k$ already built, with $\mathcal{T}_0 = [0, S_0]$.

In Aldous's construction, the *branch points* J_k, $k \geqslant 0$, are distinct, the trees *binary*. This construction reveals some of the local complexity of the limiting tree, since elementary thinning of Poisson processes shows that every branch receives a dense set of branch points. Goldschmidt and Haas [20] generalised this line-breaking construction to all stable trees $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, \mu)$, which are not binary for $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. They describe

$$\mathcal{T}_k = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k} [[\rho, \Sigma_i]], \quad k \geqslant 0, \qquad \text{for a sample } \Sigma_i \sim \mu, i \geqslant 0, \tag{1.1}$$

not quite autonomously, as Aldous does in the special case $\alpha = 2$, but by assigning weights

$$W_k^{(i)}, \quad i \in [b_k], \quad k \geqslant 0, \tag{1.2}$$

to each branch point v_i of $\mathcal{T}_k$, where $(v_i, i \geqslant 1)$ is the sequence of *distinct branch points* in their order of appearance in $(\mathcal{T}_k, k \geqslant 0)$, and $b_k \geqslant 0$ is the number of branch points of $\mathcal{T}_k$. Here, $[b] := \{1, \ldots, b\}$.

*Supported by EPSRC grant EP/P505666/1
†Supported by EPSRC grant EP/K029797/1

Specifically, it will be convenient to change the usual parametrisation of the stable trees from a parameter $\alpha \in (1,2]$ to an *index* $\beta = 1 - 1/\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$. For $k \geqslant 0$, the sum of the branch point weights $(W_k^{(i)}, i \in [b_k])$ and the total length $L_k = \mathrm{Leb}(\mathcal{T}_k)$ of $\mathcal{T}_k$ is given by S_k, where $(S_k, k \geqslant 0)$ is the *Mittag-Leffler Markov chain* [20, 23, 26] with parameter β, starting from $S_0 \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \beta)$ with transition density

$$f_{S_{k+1}|S_k=z}(y) = f(z,y) = \frac{1-\beta}{\Gamma(1/\beta)}(y-z)^{1/\beta-2}\frac{y g_\beta(y)}{g_\beta(z)}, \quad 0 < z < y, \quad k \geqslant 0.$$

Here, $\mathrm{ML}(\alpha, \theta)$ denotes the Mittag-Leffler distribution with parameters $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\theta > -\alpha$ (cf. Section 3.1), and $g_\beta(\cdot)$ is the density of $\mathrm{ML}(\beta, 0)$. Then $S_k = W_k^{(1)} + \cdots + W_k^{(b_k)} + L_k \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \beta + k)$.

Algorithm 1.1 (Goldschmidt-Haas [20])**.** Let $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$. We grow discrete $\mathbb{R}$-trees $\mathcal{T}_k$ with weights $W_k^{(i)}$ in the branch points v_i, $i \in [b_k]$, of $\mathcal{T}_k$, and edge lengths between vertices, as follows.

0. Let $(\mathcal{T}_0, \rho)$ be isometric to $([0, S_0], 0)$, where $S_0 \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \beta)$; let $b_0 = 0$ and $W_0^{(i)} = 0$, $i \geqslant 1$.

Given $(\mathcal{T}_j, (v_i, i \in [b_j]), (W_j^{(i)}, i \in [b_j]))$, $0 \leqslant j \leqslant k$, and $S_k = L_k + W_k^{(1)} + \cdots + W_k^{(b_k)}$, where $L_k = \mathrm{Leb}(\mathcal{T}_k)$,

1. select $I_k = i$ for each branch point v_i of $\mathcal{T}_k$ with probability proportional to $W_k^{(i)}$, $i \in [b_k]$; or select an edge $E_k \subset \mathcal{T}_k$ with probability proportional to its length and let $b_{k+1} = b_k + 1$, $I_k = b_{k+1}$;
2. if an edge E_k is selected, sample $v_{b_{k+1}}$ from the normalised length measure on E_k;
3. sample S_{k+1} with density $f(S_k, \cdot)$ and an independent $B_k \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1, 1/\beta - 2)$; attach to $\mathcal{T}_k$ at $J_k := v_{I_k}$ a new branch of length $(S_{k+1} - S_k)B_k$ to form $\mathcal{T}_{k+1}$; increase the weight of $J_k = v_{I_k}$ to

$$W_{k+1}^{(I_k)} = W_k^{(I_k)} + (S_{k+1} - S_k)(1 - B_k), \qquad \text{and set} \quad W_{k+1}^{(j)} = W_k^{(j)}, \quad j \neq I_k.$$

When $\beta = 1/2$, we understand $B_k = 1$, so $W_k^{(i)} = 0$ for all $i \geqslant 1$, $k \geqslant 0$, and $L_k = S_k$ for all $k \geqslant 0$. We obtain a sequence of compact binary $\mathbb{R}$-trees whose evolution is determined by attachment points chosen uniformly at random according to the length measure, and the total length given by the Mittag-Leffler Markov chain of parameter $\beta = 1/2$, which can be seen to correspond to an inhomogeneous Poisson process of rate $\frac{1}{2}tdt$. Hence, this reduces to Aldous's line-breaking construction of the Brownian CRT [4].

It was shown in [20] that the sequence of trees $(\mathcal{T}_k, k \geqslant 0)$ in Algorithm 1.1 has the same distribution as the sequence of trees from (1.1), i.e. we can formally define the *stable tree of index* $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$ as the (Gromov-Hausdorff) limit $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{T}_k$, as $k \to \infty$. See also [20] for an alternative line-breaking construction of the sequence $(\mathcal{T}_k, k \geqslant 0)$, where branch point selection is based on vertex degrees instead of weights.

Goldschmidt and Haas [20] asked if there was a sensible way to associate a notion of length with the branch point weights in Algorithm 1.1. We answer this question by using the branch point weights to build rescaled Ford trees whose lengths correspond to these weights. Ford trees arise in the scaling limit of Ford's alpha model studied in [18, 23] and in the context of the alpha-gamma-model [8] for $\gamma = \alpha$, which is also related to the stable tree in the case when $\gamma = 1 - \alpha$. Ford trees are examples of binary self-similar CRTs and have also been constructed via line-breaking:

Algorithm 1.2 (Haas-Miermont-Pitman-Winkel [23, 41])**.** Let $\beta' \in (0, 1)$. We grow $\mathbb{R}$-trees $\mathcal{F}_m$, $m \geqslant 1$:

0. Let $(\mathcal{F}_1, \rho)$ be isometric to $([0, S_1'], 0)$, where $S_1' \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta', 1 - \beta')$.

Given $\mathcal{F}_j$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant m$, let $S_m' = \mathrm{Leb}(\mathcal{F}_m)$ denote the length of $\mathcal{F}_m$;

1. select an edge $E_m \subset \mathcal{F}_m$ with probability proportional to its length;
2. if E_m is external, sample $D_m \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1, 1/\beta' - 1)$ and place $J_m \in E_m$ to split E_m into length proportions D_m and $1 - D_m$; otherwise, sample J_m from the normalised length measure on E_m;
3. sample S_{m+1}' with density $f(S_m', \cdot)$; attach to $\mathcal{F}_m$ at J_m an edge of length $S_{m+1}' - S_m'$ to form $\mathcal{F}_{m+1}$.

The sequence of trees $(\mathcal{F}_m, m \geqslant 1)$ has as its (Gromov-Hausdorff) limit a CRT $\mathcal{F}$ as $k \to \infty$, a so-called *Ford CRT* of index $\beta' \in (0, 1)$, see [23, 41]. We refer to the trees $\mathcal{F}_m$, $m \geqslant 1$, as *Ford trees*. In the case when $\beta' = 1/2$, Algorithm 1.2 corresponds to Aldous's construction of the Brownian CRT.

We combine the line-breaking constructions given in Algorithms 1.1 and 1.2 in the framework of ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees, which we introduce in Section 2.2 as a natural extension of Miermont's notion of k-marked trees [37]. An ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T}, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$ is an $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho)$ with non-empty closed connected subsets $\mathcal{R}^{(i)} \subset \mathcal{T}$, $i \geqslant 1$. We will refer to this setting as a *two-colour* framework, meaning that the *marked* set $\bigcup_{i \geqslant 1} \mathcal{R}^{(i)}$ and the *unmarked* remainder $\mathcal{T} \setminus \bigcup_{i \geqslant 1} \mathcal{R}^{(i)}$ are associated with two different colours. The marked components in the line-breaking construction below correspond to rescaled Ford trees with lengths equal to the branch point weights in Algorithm 1.1 and the unmarked remainder gives rise to a stable tree. Selection of a branch point in Algorithm 1.1 corresponds to an insertion into the respective marked component in the enhanced line-breaking construction given by Algorithm 1.3.



Figure 1: Example of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_5$ with four branch points $v_1, \dots, v_4$.
Branch point weights $W_5^{(1)}, \dots, W_5^{(4)}$ are represented as lengths of marked subtrees $\mathcal{R}_5^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{R}_5^{(4)}$.

Algorithm 1.3 (Two-colour line-breaking construction)**.** Let $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$. We grow ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$, $k \geqslant 0$, as follows.

0. Let $(\mathcal{T}_0^*, \rho)$ be isometric to $([0, S_0], 0)$, where $S_0 \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \beta)$; let $r_0 = 0$ and $\mathcal{R}_0^{(i)} = \{\rho\}$, $i \geqslant 1$.

Given $(\mathcal{T}_j^*, (\mathcal{R}_j^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$, $0 \leqslant j \leqslant k$, let $S_k = \mathrm{Leb}(\mathcal{T}_k^*)$ be the length of $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ and $r_k = \#\{i \geqslant 1 \colon \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)} \neq \{\rho\}\}$;

1. select an edge $E_k^* \subset \mathcal{T}_k^*$ with probability proportional to its length; if $E_k^* \subset \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ for some $i \in [r_k]$, let $I_k = i$; otherwise, i.e. if $E_k^* \subset \mathcal{T}_k^* \backslash \bigcup_{i \in [r_k]} \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, let $r_{k+1} = r_k + 1$, $I_k = r_{k+1}$;
2. if E_k^* is an external edge of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, sample $D_k \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1, 1/\beta - 2)$ and place J_k^* to split E_k^* into length proportions D_k and $1 - D_k$; otherwise, i.e. if $E_k^* \subset \mathcal{T}_k^* \backslash \bigcup_{i \in [r_k]} \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ or if E_k^* is an internal edge of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, sample J_k^* from the normalised length measure on E_k^*;
3. sample S_{k+1} with density $f(S_k, \cdot)$ and an independent $B_k \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1, 1/\beta - 2)$; attach to $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ at J_k^* a new branch of length $S_{k+1} - S_k$ to form $\mathcal{T}_{k+1}^*$, and add to $\mathcal{R}_k^{(I_k)}$ the part of length $(S_{k+1} - S_k)(1 - B_k)$ closest to the root to form $\mathcal{R}_{k+1}^{(I_k)}$; set $\mathcal{R}_{k+1}^{(j)} = \mathcal{R}_k^{(j)}$, $j \neq I_k$.

Indeed, we obtain the correspondence of the branch point weights in Algorithm 1.1 and the lengths of the marked subtrees in Algorithm 1.3, as well as marked subtrees as in Algorithm 1.2, up to scaling:

Theorem 1.4 (Weight-length representation)**.** *Let $(\mathcal{T}_k, (W_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), k \geqslant 0)$ be as in Algorithm 1.1. Let $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), k \geqslant 0)$ be the sequence of ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees constructed in Algorithm 1.3, and let $\widetilde{W}_k^{(i)} = \mathrm{Leb}(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)})$ denote the length of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, $i \geqslant 1$, respectively. For $k \geqslant 1$, contract each component $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ to a single branch point $\widetilde{v}_i$ by using an equivalence relation, and denote the resulting tree by $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k$. Then*

$$\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k, \left(\widetilde{W}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right), k \geqslant 0\right) \stackrel{d}{=} \left(\mathcal{T}_k, \left(W_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right), k \geqslant 0\right). \tag{1.3}$$

See Figure 1. Furthermore, there exist positive random variables $C^{(i)}$ and subsequences $(k_m^{(i)}, m \geqslant 1)$, $i \geqslant 1$, such that the rescaled marked subtrees grow like Ford trees of index $\beta' = \beta/(1-\beta)$, i.e.

$$\left(C^{(i)} \mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}, m \geqslant 1\right) \stackrel{d}{=} (\mathcal{F}_m, m \geqslant 1), \tag{1.4}$$

for all $i \geqslant 1$ where $(C^{(i)} \mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}, m \geqslant 1)$, $i \geqslant 1$, are independent of each other.

To obtain limiting ∞-marked CRTs, we introduce a suitable metric d_{GH}^{∞} in Section 2.

Theorem 1.5 (Convergence of two-colour trees)**.** *Let $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), k \geqslant 0)$ be as above. Then*

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \left(\mathcal{T}_k^*, \left(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right)\right) = \left(\mathcal{T}^*, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right)\right) \quad a.s. \tag{1.5}$$

with respect to d_{GH}^{∞}, where $(\mathcal{T}^*, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$ is a compact ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-tree. Furthermore,

- *the tree $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}$, obtained from $\mathcal{T}^*$ by contracting each component $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}$ to a single branch point $\widetilde{v}_i$, is a stable tree of parameter β;*
- *there exist scaling factors $(C^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1)$ such that the trees $C^{(i)} \mathcal{R}^{(i)}$, $i \geqslant 1$, are i.i.d. copies of a Ford CRT $\mathcal{F}$ of index $\beta' = \beta/(1-\beta)$, and the trees $C^{(i)} \mathcal{R}^{(i)}$, $i \geqslant 1$, are independent of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}$.*

The scaling factors $C^{(i)}$ can be given explicitly in terms of the masses of the subtrees of the stable tree $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}$ above the branch point $\widetilde{v}_i$. We can in fact use this, with the ingredients listed in Theorem 1.5, to construct the two-colour tree $(\mathcal{T}^*, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$ from a stable tree $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ by replacing each branch point by a rescaled independent copy of a Ford CRT:

Theorem 1.6 (Branch point replacement in a stable tree)**.** *Let $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, \mu)$ be a stable tree of index $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$ equipped with an i.i.d. sequence of labelled leaves $(\Sigma_k, k \geqslant 0)$ sampled from μ. Consider the reduced trees $(\mathcal{T}_k, k \geqslant 0)$ as in (1.1) with branch points $(v_i, i \geqslant 1)$ in order of appearance. For each $i \geqslant 1$, consider the path from the root to the leaf with the smallest label above v_i and the following variables:*

- *the total mass $P^{(i)} = \sum_{j \geqslant 1} P_j^{(i)}$ of the subtrees rooted at v_i on this path with masses $(P_j^{(i)}, j \geqslant 1)$, in the order of their smallest labels;*
- *the random variable $D^{(i)} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \big(1 - \sum_{j\in[n]} P_j^{(i)}/P^{(i)}\big)^{1-\beta}(1-\beta)^{\beta-1} n^\beta$ derived from $(P_j^{(i)}, j \geqslant 1)$.*

For $i \geqslant 1$, replace v_i by an independent Ford tree $\mathcal{F}^{(i)}$ of index $\beta' = \beta/(1-\beta)$ with distances rescaled by $\big(C^{(i)}\big)^{-1} = \big(P^{(i)}\big)^\beta \cdot \big(D^{(i)}\big)^{\beta/(1-\beta)} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \big(P^{(i)} - \sum_{j\in[n]} P_j^{(i)}\big)^\beta (1-\beta)^{-\beta} n^{\beta^2/(1-\beta)}$. Specifically, the root of $\mathcal{F}^{(i)}$ is identified with v_i and the subtrees rooted at v_i are attached to leaves of $\mathcal{F}^{(i)}$ in the order of their appearance in Algorithm 1.2. Then the tree $\mathcal{T}^*$ obtained here in the limit after all replacements has the same distribution as the tree $\mathcal{T}^*$ in Theorem 1.5.

We will formalise this construction in Section 5.3. The random variable $D^{(i)}$ is the so-called $(1-\beta)$-*diversity* of the mass partition $(P_j^{(i)}/P^{(i)}, j \geqslant 1) \sim \mathrm{GEM}(1-\beta, -\beta)$, where $\mathrm{GEM}(\alpha, \theta)$ denotes the Griffiths-Engen-McCloskey distribution with parameters $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, $\theta > -\alpha$, whose ranked version is the Poisson-Dirichlet distribution $\mathrm{PD}(\alpha, \theta)$. Note that, when $\beta = 1/3$, we have $\beta' = 1/2$, which means that we replace the branch points of the stable tree by rescaled i.i.d. Brownian CRTs. This should be compared with Le Gall [32], who effectively contracts subtrees in the middle of a Brownian CRT to obtain a stable tree of parameter 3/2. Neither his subtrees nor our $\mathcal{T}^*$ appear to be rescaled Brownian CRTs.

The proofs of Theorems 1.5 and 1.6, in particular the compactness of $\mathcal{T}^*$, are based on an embedding of $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ into a compact CRT whose existence follows from earlier work [45] where we constructed CRTs via i.i.d. copies of a random string of beads, i.e. any random interval equipped with a random discrete probability measure, see Section 5.1 here for details. The distribution ν of the string of beads needed to obtain this compact CRT combines two (β, θ)-strings of beads (for $\theta = \beta$ and $\theta = 1-2\beta$), which arise in the framework of ordered (β, θ)-Chinese restaurant processes as introduced in [41]. A (β, θ)-*string of beads* is an interval of length $K \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \theta)$ equipped with a discrete probability measure whose atom sizes are $\mathrm{PD}(\beta, \theta)$, arranged in a random order that yields a regenerative property. It is crucial for our argument to equip each reduced tree with a mass measure which effectively captures projected subtree masses. This naturally leads to a new line-breaking construction of the stable tree where the selection of the attachment point J_k is based on masses rather than lengths, and where a proportion of the mass in J_k is spread over the new branch, depending on the degree $\deg(J_k, \mathcal{T}_k)$ of J_k in $\mathcal{T}_k$.

Algorithm 1.7 (Line-breaking construction of the stable tree with masses)**.** Let $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$. We grow weighted $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}_k, \mu_k)$, $k \geqslant 0$, as follows.

0. Let $(\mathcal{T}_0, \mu_0)$ be isometric to a (β, β)-string of beads.

Given $(\mathcal{T}_j, \mu_j)$ with $\mu_j = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{T}_j} \mu_j(x)\delta_x$, $0 \leqslant j \leqslant k$,

1.-2. sample J_k from μ_k;
3. given $\deg(J_k, \mathcal{T}_k) = d \geqslant 2$, let $Q_k \sim \mathrm{Beta}(\beta, (d-2)(1-\beta) + 1 - 2\beta)$, and let ξ_k be an independent (β, β)-string of beads; to form $(\mathcal{T}_{k+1}, \mu_{k+1})$, remove $Q_k\mu_k(J_k)\delta_{J_k}$ from μ_k and attach to $\mathcal{T}_k$ at J_k an isometric copy of ξ_k with measure rescaled by $Q_k\mu_k(J_k)$ and metric rescaled by $(Q_k\mu_k(J_k))^\beta$.

Theorem 1.8. *In Algorithm 1.7, $(\mathcal{T}_k, k \geqslant 0)$ has the same distribution as the sequence of trees in (1.1) (and as in Algorithm 1.1). In particular, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathcal{T}_k = \mathcal{T}$ a.s. in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology for a stable tree $\mathcal{T}$. Furthermore, $\lim_{k\to\infty}(\mathcal{T}_k, \mu_k) = (\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ a.s. in the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov topology.*

The proof of Theorem 1.8 is based on the following well-known property of the stable tree, phrased in different terminology in [24, Corollary 10(3)], and [41, discussion after Corollary 8], where the link between (β, β)-strings of beads and a Bessel bridge of dimension 2β was established.

Proposition 1.9. *Let $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ be a stable tree of parameter $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$, and let $\Sigma_0 \sim \mu$. Consider the* spine *$\mathcal{T}_0 = [[\rho, \Sigma_0]]$, and equip $\mathcal{T}_0$ with the mass measure μ_0, capturing the masses of the connected components of $\mathcal{T}\backslash\mathcal{T}_0$ projected onto $\mathcal{T}_0$. Then $(\mathcal{T}_0, \mu_0)$ is a (β, β)-string of beads.*

This paper is structured as follows. We introduce the framework of ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees in Section 2, and collect some preliminary results in Section 3. Section 4 is devoted to the study of the two-colour line-breaking construction, while Section 5 deals with its convergence to compact CRTs, as well as the branch point replacement. In Section 6, we study a discrete two-colour tree-growth process whose two-step scaling limit is the two-colour CRT. An appendix includes some proofs postponed from earlier sections.

2. $\mathbb{R}$-trees and marked metric spaces

2.1. $\mathbb{R}$-trees and the Gromov-Hausdorff topology

A compact metric space $(\mathcal{T}, d)$ is called an $\mathbb{R}$-*tree* [16, 31] if for each $x, y \in \mathcal{T}$ the following holds.

(i) There is an isometry $f_{x,y}\colon [0, d(x,y)] \to \mathcal{T}$ such that $f_{x,y}(0) = x$ and $f_{x,y}(d(x,y)) = y$.
(ii) For all injective paths $g\colon [0,1] \to \mathcal{T}$ with $g(0) = x$ and $g(1) = y$, we have $g([0,1]) = f_{x,y}([0, d(x,y)])$.

We denote the range of $f_{x,y}$ by $[[x,y]] := f_{x,y}([0, d(x,y)])$. All our $\mathbb{R}$-trees will be *rooted* at a distinguished element ρ, the *root* of $\mathcal{T}$. We call two $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho)$ and $(\mathcal{T}', d', \rho')$ *equivalent* if there is an isometry from $\mathcal{T}$ to $\mathcal{T}'$ that maps ρ onto ρ'. We denote by $\mathbb{T}$ the set of equivalence classes of rooted $\mathbb{R}$-trees, which we equip with the Gromov-Hausdorff distance d_{GH} [17] to obtain the Polish space $(\mathbb{T}, d_{\mathrm{GH}})$. The *Gromov-Hausdorff distance* between two $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho)$ and $(\mathcal{T}', d', \rho')$ is defined as

$$d_{\mathrm{GH}}\left((\mathcal{T}, d, \rho), (\mathcal{T}', d', \rho')\right) := \inf_{\varphi, \varphi'} \left\{\max\left\{\delta\left(\varphi(\rho), \varphi'(\rho')\right), \delta_{\mathrm{H}}\left(\varphi(\mathcal{T}), \varphi'(\mathcal{T}')\right)\right\}\right\}, \tag{2.1}$$

where the infimum is taken over all metric spaces $(\mathcal{M}, \delta)$ and all isometric embeddings $\varphi\colon \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{M}$, $\varphi'\colon \mathcal{T}' \to \mathcal{M}$ into the common metric space $(\mathcal{M}, \delta)$, and δ_{H} is the Hausdorff distance between compact subsets of $(\mathcal{M}, \delta)$. It is well-known that the Gromov-Hausdorff distance only depends on equivalence classes of rooted $\mathbb{R}$-trees, and we equip $\mathbb{T}$ with the Borel σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T})$ induced by d_{GH}.

We can enhance a rooted $\mathbb{R}$-tree by considering a probability measure μ on its Borel sets $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{T})$, and call $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, \mu)$ a *weighted* $\mathbb{R}$-tree. We call $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, \mu)$ and $(\mathcal{T}', d', \rho', \mu')$ *equivalent* if there is an isometry from $\mathcal{T}$ to $\mathcal{T}'$ such that ρ is mapped onto ρ' and μ' is the push-forward of μ under this isometry. We let $\mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}$ denote the set of equivalence classes of compact weighted $\mathbb{R}$-trees. Then $\mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}$ is Polish when equipped with the *Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov distance* d_{GHP} induced by

$$d_{\mathrm{GHP}}\left((\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, \mu), (\mathcal{T}', d', \rho', \mu')\right) := \inf_{\varphi, \varphi'} \left\{\max\left\{\delta\left(\varphi(\rho), \varphi'(\rho')\right), \delta_{\mathrm{H}}\left(\varphi(\mathcal{T}), \varphi'(\mathcal{T}')\right), \delta_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\varphi_*\mu, \varphi'_*\mu'\right)\right\}\right\} \tag{2.2}$$

for weighted $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, \mu)$ and $(\mathcal{T}', d', \rho', \mu')$, where $\varphi, \varphi', \delta_{\mathrm{H}}$ are as in (2.1), $\varphi_*\mu$, $\varphi'_*\mu$ are the push-forwards of μ, μ' via φ, φ', respectively, and δ_{P} is the Prokhorov distance on the space of Borel probability measures on $(\mathcal{M}, \delta)$ given by $\delta_{\mathrm{P}}(\mu, \mu') = \inf\{\epsilon > 0\colon \mu(D) \leqslant \mu'(D^\epsilon) + \epsilon \quad \forall D \subset \mathcal{M} \text{ closed}\}$, where $D^\epsilon := \{x \in \mathcal{M}\colon \inf_{y \in D} \delta(x,y) \leqslant \epsilon\}$ denotes the ϵ-*thickening* of D.

While some of our developments are more easily stated in $(\mathbb{T}, d_{\mathrm{GH}})$ or $(\mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}, d_{\mathrm{GHP}})$, others benefit from more explicit embeddings into a particular metric space $(\mathcal{M}, \delta)$, which we will mostly choose as

$$\mathcal{M} = l^1(\mathbb{N}_0^2) := \left\{(s_{i,j})_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in [0,\infty)^{\mathbb{N}_0^2}\colon \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_0} s_{i,j} < \infty\right\}$$

with the metric induced by the l^1-norm. This is a variation of Aldous's [2–4] choice $\mathcal{M} = l^1(\mathbb{N})$. We denote by $\mathbb{T}^{\mathrm{emb}}$ the space of all compact $\mathbb{R}$-trees $\mathcal{T} \subset l^1(\mathbb{N}_0^2)$ with root $0 \in \mathcal{T}$, which we equip with the Hausdorff metric δ_{H}, and by $\mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}^{\mathrm{emb}}$ the space of all weighted compact $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ with $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathrm{emb}}$, which we equip with the metric $\delta_{\mathrm{HP}}((\mathcal{T}, \mu), (\mathcal{T}', \mu')) = \max\{\delta_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}'), \delta_{\mathrm{P}}(\mu, \mu')\}$.

Proposition 2.1 (e.g. [45]). (i) *$(\mathbb{T}^{\mathrm{emb}}, \delta_{\mathrm{H}})$ and $(\mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}^{\mathrm{emb}}, \delta_{\mathrm{HP}})$ are separable and complete.*
(ii) *For all $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}' \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathrm{emb}}$ we have $d_{\mathrm{GH}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \leqslant \delta_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$, and for all $(\mathcal{T}, \mu), (\mathcal{T}', \mu') \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}^{\mathrm{emb}}$, we have $d_{\mathrm{GHP}}((\mathcal{T}, \mu), (\mathcal{T}', \mu')) \leqslant \delta_{\mathrm{HP}}((\mathcal{T}, \mu), (\mathcal{T}', \mu'))$.*
(iii) *Every rooted compact $\mathbb{R}$-tree is equivalent to an element of $\mathbb{T}^{\mathrm{emb}}$, and every rooted weighted compact $\mathbb{R}$-tree is equivalent to an element of $\mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}^{\mathrm{emb}}$.*
(iv) *For $\mathcal{T}_n \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathrm{emb}}$ with $\mathcal{T}_n \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{n+1}$, $n \geqslant 1$, and the closure $\mathcal{T} := \overline{\bigcup_{n \geqslant 1} \mathcal{T}_n}$, we have $(\mathcal{T}_n, n \geqslant 1)$ convergent in $(\mathbb{T}, d_{\mathrm{GH}})$ if and only if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \delta_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{T}_n, \mathcal{T}) = 0$. In particular, in this case $\mathcal{T}$ is compact.*

For $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathrm{emb}}$ and $c > 0$, we define $c\mathcal{T} := \{cx\colon x \in \mathcal{T}\}$. More generally for any $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T}, d)$, we slightly abuse notation and denote by $c\mathcal{T}$ the metric space $(\mathcal{T}, cd)$ obtained when all distances are multiplied by

c. We consider random $\mathbb{R}$-trees whose equivalence class in $\mathbb{T}$ has the distribution of a stable or Ford tree, and also refer to these trees as stable or Ford trees, and to the associated law on $\mathbb{T}$ as their *distribution*.

If $x \in \mathcal{T}\backslash\{\rho\}$ is such that $\mathcal{T}\backslash\{x\}$ is connected, we call x a *leaf* of $\mathcal{T}$. A *branch point* is an element $x \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{T}\backslash\{x\}$ has at least three connected components. We refer to the number of these components as the *degree* $\deg(x, \mathcal{T})$ of x. We denote the sets of all leaves and branch points by $\mathrm{Lf}(\mathcal{T})$ and $\mathrm{Br}(\mathcal{T})$. If $\mathcal{T}\backslash\mathrm{Br}(\mathcal{T})$ has only finitely many connected components, we call $\mathcal{T}$ a *discrete* $\mathbb{R}$-tree and these components (with or without one or both endpoints) *edges*. We denote the set of edges by $\mathrm{Edg}(\mathcal{T})$, and call $\#\mathrm{Lf}(\mathcal{T})$ the *size* of $\mathcal{T}$. Also, $|\mathcal{T}| := \#\mathrm{Edg}(\mathcal{T})$. We call the discrete graph with edge set $\mathrm{Edg}(\mathcal{T})$ the *shape* of $\mathcal{T}$.

In the case of discrete weighted $\mathbb{R}$-trees it will often be of interest how the total mass of 1 is distributed between the edges, with possibly some mass in branch points, which for convenience we will also write in the form $E = \{v\}$. For any weighted $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ with n edges/branch points $E_1, \ldots, E_n$, the vector $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ with $X_i := \mu(E_i)$, $i \in [n]$, is called the *mass split* in $\mathcal{T}$. We will also consider mass splits in subtrees $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{T}$, i.e. mass splits in $(\mathcal{R}, \mu(\mathcal{R})^{-1}\mu\restriction_{\mathcal{R}})$. To distinguish mass splits in the "big" tree $\mathcal{T}$ and in "small" subtrees, we will speak of the *total* and *internal* (or *relative*) mass splits, respectively.

The limiting trees of the weighted $\mathbb{R}$-trees in our constructions will be *continuum trees*, i.e. weighted $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}, d, \mu)$ such that the probability measure μ on $\mathcal{T}$ satisfies the following three properties. (i) μ is supported by the set $\mathrm{Lf}(\mathcal{T})$ of leaves of $\mathcal{T}$. (ii) μ is non-atomic, i.e. for any $x \in \mathrm{Lf}(\mathcal{T})$, $\mu(x) = 0$. (iii) For any $x \in \mathcal{T}\backslash\mathrm{Lf}(\mathcal{T})$ and $\mathcal{T}_x := \{\sigma \in \mathcal{T} \colon x \in [[\rho, \sigma]]\}$, we have $\mu(\mathcal{T}_x) > 0$.

It is an immediate consequence of (i)-(iii) that, for any continuum tree $(\mathcal{T}, d)$, the set of leaves $\mathrm{Lf}(\mathcal{T})$ is uncountable and that it has no isolated points. Finally, we introduce the notion of a *reduced* subtree

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}, x_1, \ldots, x_n) := \bigcup_{i\in[n]} [[\rho, x_i]] \tag{2.3}$$

of an $\mathbb{R}$-tree $\mathcal{T}$ spanned by the root and $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \in \mathrm{Lf}(\mathcal{T})$. Note that $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}, x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is a discrete $\mathbb{R}$-tree with root ρ and leaves $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. We further consider the projection map

$$\pi_k \colon \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}, x_1, \ldots, x_k), \quad y \mapsto f_{\rho,y}\left(\sup\{t \geqslant 0 \colon f_{\rho,y}(t) \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}, x_1, \ldots, x_k)\}\right), \tag{2.4}$$

where $f_{\rho,y} \colon [0, d(\rho, y)] \to \mathcal{T}$ is the unique isometry with $f_{\rho,y}(0) = \rho$ and $f_{\rho,y}(d(\rho, y)) = y$ from the definition of an $\mathbb{R}$-tree. The push-forward of a probability measure μ on $\mathcal{T}$ via this projection map is denoted by $(\pi_k)_*\mu$, i.e.

$$(\pi_k)_*\mu\,(D) = \mu\left(\pi_k^{-1}(D)\right), \qquad D \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}, x_1, \ldots, x_k) \text{ Borel measurable.} \tag{2.5}$$

More details on $\mathbb{R}$-trees and proofs for the statements made in this section can be found in [6, 16, 31].

2.2. ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees

We introduce ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees to capture the framework of an $\mathbb{R}$-tree with infinitely many marked components. This is a generalisation of Miermont's concept of a k-marked metric space, [37, Section 6.4]. In the context of the two-colour line-breaking construction, the marked components correspond to the rescaled Ford trees by which we replace the branch points in the stable line-breaking construction. Each Ford tree, i.e. each connected red component, is related to a new marked subset of the ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-tree.

A *k-marked* $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, (\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}))$, $k \geqslant 1$, is a rooted $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho)$ with non-empty closed connected subsets $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)} \subset \mathcal{T}$. We call two k-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, (\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}))$ and $(\mathcal{T}', d', \rho, (\mathcal{R}'^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}'^{(k)}))$ *equivalent* if there exists an isometry from $\mathcal{T}$ to $\mathcal{T}'$ such that each $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}$ is mapped onto $\mathcal{R}'^{(i)}$, $i \in [k]$, respectively, and ρ is mapped onto ρ'. If $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ are equipped with mass measures μ and μ', we speak of *weighted* k-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees, and we call them *equivalent* if there is an isometry from $\mathcal{T}$ to $\mathcal{T}'$ such that each $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}$ is mapped onto $\mathcal{R}'^{(i)}$, $i \in [k]$, ρ is mapped to ρ' and μ' is the push-forward of μ under this isometry. The set of equivalence classes of k-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees is denoted by $\mathbb{T}^{[k]}$, and $\mathbb{T}^{[k]}_{\mathrm{w}}$ is the set of equivalence classes of weighted k-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees.

For k-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, (\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}))$, $(\mathcal{T}', d', \rho', (\mathcal{R}'^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}'^{(k)})) \in \mathbb{T}^{[k]}$, define

$$\begin{aligned} &d^{[k]}_{\mathrm{GH}}\left(\left(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}\right)\right), \left(\mathcal{T}', d', \rho', \left(\mathcal{R}'^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}'^{(k)}\right)\right)\right) \\ &\quad := \inf_{\varphi,\varphi'}\left\{\max\left\{\delta_{\mathrm{H}}\left(\varphi\left(\mathcal{T}\right), \varphi'\left(\mathcal{T}'\right)\right), \max_{1\leqslant i\leqslant k} \delta_{\mathrm{H}}\left(\varphi\left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}\right), \varphi'\left(\mathcal{R}'^{(i)}\right)\right), \delta\left(\varphi\left(\rho\right), \varphi\left(\rho'\right)\right)\right\}\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

where the infimum is taken over all isometric embeddings φ, φ' of $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{T}'$ into a common metric space $(\mathcal{M}, \delta)$, and δ_{H} is the Hausdorff distance on $(\mathcal{M}, \delta)$. It was shown in [37] that $d^{[k]}_{\mathrm{GH}}$ is a metric on $\mathbb{T}^{[k]}$.

Lemma 2.2 ([37, Proposition 9(ii)]). *The space $(\mathbb{T}^{[k]}, d^{[k]}_{\mathrm{GH}})$ is separable and complete.*

We extend the notion of a k-marked $\mathbb{R}$-tree to an ∞-*marked* $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$. The marked components $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1$, of an ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T}, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$ are themselves $\mathbb{R}$-trees when equipped with the metric restricted to $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}$, and rooted at the point of $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}$ closest to the root of $\mathcal{T}$, $i \geqslant 1$. We will consider ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$ with a discrete branching structure, and distinguish between *internal* and *external* edges of $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}$. External edges of $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}$ are edges connecting a branch point/root and a leaf of $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}$, internal edges connect two branch points or the root and a branch point.

As in the k-marked case, ∞-*marked* $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$, $(\mathcal{T}', d', \rho', (\mathcal{R}'^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$ are *equivalent* if there is an isometry from $\mathcal{T}$ to $\mathcal{T}'$ such that ρ is mapped onto ρ', and each $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}$ is mapped onto $\mathcal{R}'^{(i)}$, $i \geqslant 1$, respectively. We write $\mathbb{T}^\infty$ for the set of equivalence classes of compact ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees, and equip it with the metric $d^\infty_{\mathrm{GH}} := \sum_{k\geqslant 1} 2^{-k} d^{[k]}_{\mathrm{GH}}$, i.e. for $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$, $(\mathcal{T}', d', \rho', (\mathcal{R}'^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1)) \in \mathbb{T}^\infty$,

$$d^\infty_{\mathrm{GH}}\left(\left(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right)\right), \left(\mathcal{T}', d', \rho', \left(\mathcal{R}'^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right)\right)\right) := \sum_{k\geqslant 1} 2^{-k} d^{[k]}_{\mathrm{GH}}\left(\left(\mathcal{T}, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}\right)\right), \left(\mathcal{T}', \left(\mathcal{R}'^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}'^{(k)}\right)\right)\right). \tag{2.7}$$

Corollary 2.3. *The space* $(\mathbb{T}^\infty, d^\infty_{\mathrm{GH}})$ *is separable and complete.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.2, for any $k \geqslant 1$, there exists a countable dense subset $\mathbb{C}_k \subset \mathbb{T}_k$ such that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, (\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)})) \in \mathbb{T}^{[k]}$, there is $(\mathcal{T}', d', \rho', (\mathcal{R}'^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}'^{(k)})) \in \mathbb{C}_k$ with

$$d^{[k]}_{\mathrm{GH}}\left(\left(\mathcal{T}, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}\right)\right), \left(\mathcal{T}', \left(\mathcal{R}'^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}'^{(k)}\right)\right)\right) < \epsilon. \tag{2.8}$$

For any $k \geqslant 1$, the set $\mathbb{C}'_k := \left\{\left(\mathcal{T}', \left(\mathcal{R}^{(1')}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k')}, \{\rho'\}, \{\rho'\}, \ldots\right)\right) : \left(\mathcal{T}', \left(\mathcal{R}'^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}'^{(k)}\right)\right) \in \mathbb{C}_k\right\}$ is countable. For any $(\mathcal{T}, (\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \mathcal{R}^{(2)}, \ldots)) \in \mathbb{T}^\infty$ there is $(\mathcal{T}', (\mathcal{R}'^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}'^{(k)}, \{\rho'\}, \{\rho'\}, \ldots)) \in \mathbb{C}'_k$ such that (2.8) holds when we restrict to the first k marked components, i.e. for $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{T}) = \sup\{d(x, y) : x, y \in \mathcal{T}\}$,

$$d^\infty_{\mathrm{GH}}\left(\left(\mathcal{T}, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right)\right), \left(\mathcal{T}', \left(\mathcal{R}'^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right)\right)\right) \leqslant 2^{-k}\epsilon\left(1 + 2 + \cdots + 2^{k-1}\right) + \sum_{n\geqslant k+1} 2^{-n}\mathrm{diam}\left(\mathcal{T}\right) < \epsilon$$

for k large enough. Therefore, $\mathbb{C}_\infty := \bigcup_{k\geqslant 1} \mathbb{C}'_k$ is countable and dense in $\mathbb{T}^\infty$, i.e. $(\mathbb{T}^\infty, d^\infty_{\mathrm{GH}})$ is separable.

To see that $(\mathbb{T}^\infty, d^\infty_{GH})$ is complete, consider a Cauchy sequence $(\mathcal{T}_n, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_n, i \geqslant 1), n \geqslant 1)$ in $\mathbb{T}^\infty$. By definition of d^∞_{GH}, for any $k \geqslant 1$, the sequence $(\mathcal{T}_n, (\mathcal{R}^{(1)}_n, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}_n), n \geqslant 1)$ is Cauchy in $\mathbb{T}^{[k]}$. By Lemma 2.2, $(\mathbb{T}^{[k]}, d^{[k]}_{\mathrm{GH}})$ is complete, and we conclude that there is $(\mathcal{T}, (\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)})) \in \mathbb{T}^{[k]}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\mathcal{T}, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}_n, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}_n\right)\right) = \left(\mathcal{T}, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}\right)\right). \tag{2.9}$$

Furthermore, the limits (2.9) are easily seen to be consistent as k varies, i.e. given (2.9) for some $k \geqslant 2$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\mathcal{T}, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}_n, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k-1)}_n\right)\right) = \left(\mathcal{T}, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k-1)}\right)\right) \tag{2.10}$$

in $(\mathbb{T}^{[k-1]}, d^{[k-1]}_{\mathrm{GH}})$. We conclude that there is $(\mathcal{T}, (\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \mathcal{R}^{(2)}, \ldots))$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d^\infty_{\mathrm{GH}}\left(\left(\mathcal{T}_n, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_n, i \geqslant 1\right)\right), \left(\mathcal{T}, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right)\right)\right) = 0.$$

□

We can extend $d^{[k]}_{\mathrm{GH}}$ to a metric on $\mathbb{T}^{[k]}_{\mathrm{w}}$ by adding a Prokhorov component to $d^{[k]}_{\mathrm{GH}}$. For any $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $(\mathcal{T}, (\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}), \mu)$, $(\mathcal{T}', (\mathcal{R}'^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}'^{(k)}), \mu') \in \mathbb{T}^{[k]}$, we define

$$d^{[k]}_{\mathrm{GHP}}\left(\left(\mathcal{T}, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}\right), \mu\right), \left(\mathcal{T}', \left(\mathcal{R}'^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}'^{(k)}\right), \mu'\right)\right)$$
$$:= \inf_{\varphi,\varphi'}\left\{\max\left\{\delta_{\mathrm{H}}\left(\varphi\left(\mathcal{T}\right), \varphi'\left(\mathcal{T}'\right)\right), \max_{1\leqslant i\leqslant k}\delta_{\mathrm{H}}\left(\varphi\left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}\right), \varphi'\left(\mathcal{R}'^{(i)}\right)\right), \delta\left(\varphi\left(\rho\right), \varphi'\left(\rho'\right)\right), \delta_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\varphi_*\mu, \varphi'_*\mu'\right)\right\}\right\}$$

where φ, φ' and $\varphi_*\mu$, $\varphi'_*\mu'$ are as in (2.2) and (2.6). In the spirit of (2.7), we define

$$d^\infty_{\mathrm{GHP}}\left(\left(\mathcal{T}, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right), \mu\right), \left(\mathcal{T}', \left(\mathcal{R}'^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right), \mu'\right)\right) = \sum_{k\geqslant 1} 2^{-k} d^{[k]}_{\mathrm{GHP}}\left(\left(\mathcal{T}, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}\right), \mu\right), \left(\mathcal{T}', \left(\mathcal{R}'^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}'^{(k)}\right), \mu'\right)\right) \tag{2.11}$$

for two weighted ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu)$ and $(\mathcal{T}', (\mathcal{R}'^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu')$.

Lemma 2.4. *The function $d_{\mathrm{GHP}}^{[k]}$ defines a distance on $\mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}^{[k]}$, and the space $(\mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}^{[k]}, d_{\mathrm{GHP}}^{[k]})$ is separable and complete, for any $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots; \infty\}$.*

Proof. For $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$, the proof is a direct generalisation of the proof of Lemma 2.2. In particular, it is straightforward to generalise the results about d_{GHP} in [37, Section 6.2/6.3] to $d_{\mathrm{GHP}}^{[k]}$. For $k = \infty$, the claim can then be deduced as in the proof of Corollary 2.3. □

Remark 2.5. Miermont [37] introduced the more general concept of a k-marked metric space, and studied the space $\mathbb{M}^{[k]}$ of equivalence classes of k-marked metric spaces. $\mathbb{T}^{[k]}$ is a closed subset of $\mathbb{M}^{[k+1]}$ ([17, Lemma 2.1]), i.e. the results on $(\mathbb{T}^{[k]}, d_{\mathrm{GH}}^{[k]})$ presented here follow from his study of $(\mathbb{M}^{[k]}, d_{\mathrm{GH}}^{[k]})$, $k \geqslant 0$.

3. Mittag-Leffler distributions, strings of beads and stable trees

3.1. Dirichlet and Mittag-Leffler distributions

In this section, we present the distributional relationships that are key for our constructions. A random variable L follows a (generalised) Mittag-Leffler distribution with parameters (α, θ) for $\alpha > 0$ and $\theta > -\alpha$ if its pth moment is given by

$$\mathbb{E}\left[L^p\right] = \frac{\Gamma(\theta+1)\Gamma(\theta/\alpha+1+p)}{\Gamma(\theta/\alpha+1)\Gamma(\theta+p\alpha+1)}, \quad p \geqslant 1, \tag{3.1}$$

for short $L \sim \mathrm{ML}(\alpha, \theta)$. The moments (3.1) uniquely characterise $\mathrm{ML}(\alpha, \theta)$, cf. [39].

The Mittag-Leffler distribution naturally appears when we study lengths in the trees considered in this paper. To analyse mass and length splits across the branches of these trees we have to consider Dirichlet distributions. We will be able to relate mass and length splits on the edges using the following result.

Proposition 3.1 ([20] Proposition 4.2)**.** *Let $\beta \in (0, 1)$. For $n \geqslant 2$, let $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n > 0$ and let $\theta := \sum_{i\in[n]} \theta_i$. Consider $S \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \theta)$ and an independent vector $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}(\theta_1/\beta, \ldots, \theta_n/\beta)$. Then,*

$$S \cdot (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n) \stackrel{d}{=} \left(X_1^\beta S^{(1)}, \ldots, X_n^\beta S^{(n)}\right) \tag{3.2}$$

where $(X_1, \ldots, X_n) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n)$ and $S^{(i)} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \theta_i)$, $i \in [n]$, are independent.

We will also need some standard properties of the Dirichlet distribution.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n > 0$ and $X := (X_1, \ldots, X_n) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n)$.*

(i) *Symmetry. For any permutation $\sigma\colon [n] \to [n]$, $\left(X_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, X_{\sigma(n)}\right) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\left(\theta_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, \theta_{\sigma(n)}\right)$.*

(ii) *Aggregation and deletion. Let $X' := \left(\sum_{i\in[m]} X_i, X_{m+1}, \ldots, X_n\right)$ for some $m \in [n-1]$. Then the vectors $X' \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\left(\sum_{i\in[m]} \theta_i, \theta_{m+1}, \ldots, \theta_n\right)$ and $X^* := \left(X_1/\sum_{i\in[m]} X_i, \ldots, X_m/\sum_{i\in[m]} X_i\right) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\left(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\right)$ are independent.*

(iii) *Decimation. Let $i \in [n]$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\theta_{i,1}, \ldots, \theta_{i,m} > 0$ be such that $\sum_{j\in[m]} \theta_{i,j} = \theta_i$. Consider an independent random vector $(P_1, \ldots, P_m) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\left(\theta_{i,1}, \ldots, \theta_{i,m}\right)$. Then we have $X'' := \left(X_1, \ldots, X_{i-1}, P_1 X_i, \ldots, P_m X_i, X_{i+1}, \ldots, X_n\right) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\left(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{i-1}, \theta_{i,1}, \ldots, \theta_{i,m}, \theta_{i+1}, \ldots, \theta_n\right)$.*

(iv) *Size-bias. Let $I \in [n]$ be a random index such that $\mathbb{P}(I = i | X_1, \ldots, X_n) = X_i$ a.s. for $i \in [n]$. Then, conditionally given $I = i$, we have $X \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\left(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{i-1}, \theta_i + 1, \theta_{i+1}, \ldots, \theta_n\right)$ for any $i \in [n]$. Furthermore, we have $\mathbb{P}(I = i) = \theta_i / \sum_{j\in[n]} \theta_j$.*

Proof. We refer to [46, Propositions 13-14, Remark 15], and the Gamma variable representation for the Dirichlet distribution. □

3.2. Chinese restaurant processes and strings of beads

We consider (α, θ)-strings of beads for $\alpha \in (0, 1), \theta > 0$, arising in the scaling limit of ordered (α, θ)-Chinese restaurant processes (CRPs), cf. [25, 39, 41]. Consider customers labelled by $[n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}$ sitting at a random number of tables as follows. Let customer 1 sit at the first table. At step $n + 1$, conditionally given that we have k tables with $n_1, \ldots, n_k$ customers, the next customer labelled by $n+1$

- sits at the ith occupied table with probability $(n_i - \alpha)/(n + \theta)$, $i \in [k]$;
- opens a new table to the left of the first table, or between any two tables with probability $\alpha/(k\alpha+\theta)$;
- opens a new table to the right of the last table with probability $\theta/(k\alpha + \theta)$.

This induces the *ordered* (α, θ)-CRP $(\widetilde{\Pi}_n, n \geqslant 1)$. The classical *unordered* (α, θ)-*CRP* $(\Pi_n, n \geqslant 1)$ is obtained from $(\widetilde{\Pi}_n, n \geqslant 1)$ by ordering the blocks by least labels. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\Pi_n = (\Pi_{n,1}, \ldots, \Pi_{n,K_n})$

and $\widetilde{\Pi}_n = (\widetilde{\Pi}_{n,1}, \ldots, \widetilde{\Pi}_{n,K_n})$ for the blocks of the two partitions of $[n]$, where K_n denotes the number of tables at step n. The block sizes at step n form random *compositions* of n, $n \geqslant 1$, i.e. sequences of positive integers $(n_1, \ldots, n_k)$ with sum $n = \sum_{j\in[k]} n_j$. The composition related to $\widetilde{\Pi}_n$, $n \geqslant 1$, can be shown to be *regenerative* in the sense of Gnedin and Pitman [19].

The number of tables K_n at step n, rescaled by n^α, converges a.s., i.e. there is $L_{\alpha,\theta} > 0$ a.s. such that

$$L_{\alpha,\theta} = \lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-\alpha} K_n \quad \text{a.s..} \tag{3.3}$$

The distribution of $L_{\alpha,\theta}$ can be identified as $\mathrm{ML}(\alpha,\theta)$. Furthermore, there are limiting proportions $(P_1, P_2, \ldots)$ of the relative table sizes $n^{-1}\#\Pi_{n,i}$, $i \in [K_n]$, as $n \to \infty$ in order of least labels, i.e.

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(n^{-1}\#\Pi_{n,1}, \ldots, n^{-1}\#\Pi_{n,K_n}\right) = (P_1, P_2, P_3, \ldots) = \left(V_1, \overline{V}_1 V_2, \overline{V}_1\overline{V}_2 V_3, \ldots\right) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{3.4}$$

where $(V_i, i \geqslant 1)$ are independent with $V_i \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1-\alpha, \theta + i\alpha)$, and $\overline{V}_i := 1 - V_i$. The distribution of the vector $(P_1, P_2, \ldots)$ is a *Griffiths-Engen-McCloskey distribution* $\mathrm{GEM}(\alpha,\theta)$. Ranking $(P_i, i \geqslant 1)$ in decreasing order we obtain a Poisson-Dirichlet distribution $(P_i^\downarrow, i \geqslant 1) := (P_i, i \geqslant 1)^\downarrow \sim \mathrm{PD}(\alpha,\theta)$. Each $P_i, i \geqslant 1$, is further associated with a position on the limiting interval $[0, L_{\alpha,\theta}]$ induced by the table order.

Lemma 3.3 ([41, Proposition 6])**.** *Consider an ordered (α,θ)-CRP $(\widetilde{\Pi}_n = (\widetilde{\Pi}_{n,1}, \ldots, \widetilde{\Pi}_{n,K_n}), n \geqslant 1)$ for $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $\theta > 0$. Let $N_{n,j} := \sum_{i\in[j]} \#\widetilde{\Pi}_{n,i}$, $j \in [n]$, be the number of customers at the first j tables from the left. Then,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left\{n^{-1}N_{n,j}, j \geqslant 0\right\} = \mathcal{N}_{\alpha,\theta} := \left\{1 - e^{-G_t}, t \geqslant 0\right\}^{\mathrm{cl}} \quad a.s. \tag{3.5}$$

with respect to the Hausdorff metric on closed subsets of $[0,1]$, where cl *denotes the closure in $[0,1]$, and $(G_t, t \geqslant 0)$ is a subordinator with Laplace exponent $\Phi_{\alpha,\theta}(s) = s\Gamma(s+\theta)\Gamma(1-\alpha)/\Gamma(s+\theta+1-\alpha)$.*

There is a continuous local time process $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{L}(u), u \in [0,1])$ for $\mathcal{L}_n(u) := \#\{j \in [K_n] \colon n^{-1}N_{n,j} \leqslant u\}$, $u \in [0,1]$, such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{u\in[0,1]} |n^{-\alpha}\mathcal{L}_n(u) - \mathcal{L}(u)| = 0 \qquad a.s.$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha,\theta}$ is the set of points at which $\mathcal{L}$ increases a.s..

We refer to the collection of open intervals in $[0,1]\backslash\mathcal{N}_{\alpha,\theta}$ as the *(α,θ)-regenerative interval partition* associated with the local time process $\mathcal{L}$, where $\mathcal{L}(1) = L_{\alpha,\theta}$ a.s.. Note that the joint law of ranked lengths of components of this interval partition is $\mathrm{PD}(\alpha,\theta)$. The inverse local time $\mathcal{L}^{-1}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{L}^{-1} : [0, L_{\alpha,\theta}) \to [0,1), \qquad \mathcal{L}^{-1}(x) := \inf\{u \in [0,1] \colon \mathcal{L}(u) > x\}, \tag{3.6}$$

is right-continuous increasing. We equip the random interval $[0, L_{\alpha,\theta}]$ with the Stieltjes measure $d\mathcal{L}^{-1}$.

Definition 3.4 (String of beads)**.** A *string of beads* (I, λ) is an interval I equipped with a discrete mass measure λ. A measure-preserving isometric copy of $([0, L_{\alpha,\theta}], d\mathcal{L}^{-1})$ associated as above with an (α,θ)-regenerative interval partition $[0,1]\backslash\mathcal{N}_{\alpha,\theta}$ is called an *(α,θ)-string of beads*, for $\alpha \in (0,1), \theta > 0$.

We can view a string of beads $([0,K], \lambda)$ as a weighted $\mathbb{R}$-tree consisting of one single branch connecting the root 0 with a leaf at distance K.

Since the lengths of the interval components of an (α,θ)-regenerative interval partition $[0,1]\backslash\mathcal{N}_{\alpha,\theta}$ are the masses of the atoms of the associated (α,θ)-string of beads, we conclude that the joint law of the masses $(P_i^\downarrow, i \geqslant 1)$ of the atoms of an (α,θ)-string of beads ranked in decreasing order is $\mathrm{PD}(\alpha,\theta)$. It is well-known that the length $L_{\alpha,\theta} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\alpha,\theta)$ of an (α,θ)-string of beads can be recovered from the ranked atom masses $(P_i^\downarrow, i \geqslant 1)$ or the vector $(P_i, i \geqslant 1)$ of the stick-breaking representation (3.4) via

$$L_{\alpha,\theta} = \lim_{i\to\infty} i\Gamma(1-\alpha)(P_i^\downarrow)^\alpha = \lim_{k\to\infty} \left(1 - \sum_{i\in[k]} P_i\right)^\alpha \alpha^{-\alpha} k^{1-\alpha}, \tag{3.7}$$

which is the so-called *α-diversity* of $(P_i^\downarrow, i \geqslant 1) \sim \mathrm{PD}(\alpha,\theta)$, cf. [39, Lemma 3.11].

One of the key properties of (α,θ)-strings of beads is the regenerative nature inherited from the underlying regenerative interval partition, cf. [19]. Pitman and Winkel [41] developed a method ("(α,θ)-coin-tossing sampling") to sample an atom of an (α,θ)-string of beads such that the two strings of beads obtained in this way are rescaled independent (α,α)- and (α,θ)-strings of beads (the first one being the one closer to the origin). The mass split between the two induced interval components and the selected atom is $\mathrm{Dirichlet}(\alpha, 1-\alpha, \theta)$, with parameters assigned in their order on the interval $[0, L_{\alpha,\theta}]$. When $\theta = \alpha$, the special sampling reduces to uniform sampling from the mass measure $d\mathcal{L}^{-1}$.

Proposition 3.5 ([41, Proposition 10/14(b), Corollary 15]). *Let $(I,\lambda) := ([0,L_{\alpha,\theta}], d\mathcal{L}^{-1})$ be an (α,θ)-string of beads for some $\alpha \in (0,1), \theta > 0$. Then there is a random variable $J \in (0, L_{\alpha,\theta})$ on a suitably enlarged probability space such that the following are independent.*

- *The mass split $(\lambda([0,J)), \lambda(J), \lambda((J,L_{\alpha,\theta}])) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}(\alpha, 1-\alpha, \theta)$;*
- *(the isometry class of) the (α,α)-string of beads $(\lambda([0,J))^{-\alpha}[0,J), \lambda([0,J))^{-1}\lambda\restriction_{[0,J)})$;*
- *(the isometry class of) the (α,θ)-string of beads $(\lambda((J,L_{\alpha,\theta}])^{-\alpha}(J,L_{\alpha,\theta}], \lambda((J,L_{\alpha,\theta}])^{-1}\lambda\restriction_{(J,L_{\alpha,\theta}]})$.*

In Section 4 we will formulate the algorithms of the introduction based on masses rather than lengths. In particular, the attachment points in the update step will be mass-sampled, not length-sampled. The following lemma will imply that that the algorithms based on masses induce the length versions.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $(X_1,\dots,X_n) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}(\theta_1,\dots,\theta_n)$ for some $\theta_1,\dots,\theta_n > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $([0,L_i],\lambda_i)$ be independent (α,θ_i)-strings of beads, respectively, $i \in [n]$.*

- *Select $I' = j \in [n]$ with probability X_j and, conditionally given $I' = j$, select $L' \in [0,L_j]$ via (α,θ_j)-coin tossing sampling on $([0,L_j],\lambda_j)$.*
- *Select $I'' = j \in [n]$ with probability proportional to $X_j^\alpha L_j$ and, conditionally given $I'' = j$, select $L'' = BL_j$ where $B \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1,\theta_j/\alpha)$ is independent.*

Then $(I', L_1, \dots, L_{I'-1}, L', L_{I'} - L', L_{I'+1}, \dots L_n) \stackrel{d}{=} (I'', L_1, \dots, L_{I''-1}, L'', L_{I''} - L'', L_{I''+1}, \dots L_n)$.

Proof. We need to show that, for any bounded and continuous function $f\colon \mathbb{R}^{n+2} \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(I', L_1, \dots, L_{I'-1}, L', L_{I'} - L', L_{I'+1}, \dots, L_n\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[f\left(I'', L_1, \dots, L_{I''-1}, L'', L_{I''} - L'', L_{I''+1}, \dots L_n\right)\right]. \tag{3.8}$$

Conditioning on $I' = j$, and using Proposition 3.2(iv), the LHS of (3.8) is

$$\sum_{j\in[n]} \mathbb{E}\left[f\left(I', L_1, \dots, L_{I'-1}, L', L_{I'} - L', L_{I'+1}, \dots L_n\right) \mid I' = j\right] \left(\theta_j \Big/ \sum_{i\in[n]} \theta_i\right).$$

Conditionally given $I' = j$, we select an atom of the (α,θ_j)-string of beads via (α,θ_j)-coin tossing sampling. By Proposition 3.5 and Proposition 3.2(ii), the mass split $(1-\lambda_j(L'))^{-1}\left(\lambda_j\left([0,L')\right), \lambda_j\left((L',L_j]\right)\right) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\left(\alpha,\theta_j\right)$ and the (α,α)- and the (α,θ)-strings of beads given by

$$\left(\lambda\left([0,L')\right)^{-\alpha}[0,L'), \lambda\left([0,L')\right)^{-1}\lambda\restriction_{[0,L')}\right), \quad \left(\lambda\left((L',L_j]\right)^{-\alpha}(L',L_j], \lambda\left((L',L_j]\right)^{-1}\lambda\restriction_{(L',L_j]}\right),$$

respectively, are independent. By Proposition 3.1, we conclude that the relative length split on $[0,L_j]$ is $L'/L_j \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1,\theta_j/\alpha)$. To see (3.8), proceed likewise with the RHS of (3.8), using that, by Proposition 3.1, $(L_1,\dots,L_n) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}(\theta_1/\alpha,\dots,\theta_n/\alpha)$. More precisely, note that $\mathbb{P}(I'' = j) = (\theta_j/\alpha)/(\sum_{i\in[n]}\theta_i/\alpha) = \theta_j/\sum_{i\in[n]}\theta_i$, and that, conditionally given $I'' = j$, we have $L''/L_j \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1,\theta_j/\alpha)$, as before. □

We will also need the following statement about sampling from Poisson-Dirichlet distributions.

Proposition 3.7 (Sampling from $\mathrm{PD}(\alpha,\theta)$, [43, Proposition 34]). *Let $(P_i, i \geqslant 1) \sim \mathrm{PD}(\alpha,\theta)$ for some $0 \leqslant \alpha < 1$ and $\theta > -\alpha$, and let N be an index such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(N = i \mid P_i, i \geqslant 1\right) = P_i, \quad i \geqslant 1.$$

Let $(P_i', i \geqslant 1)$ be obtained from P by deleting P_N, and set $P_i'' := P_i'/(1-P_N)$ for $i \geqslant 1$. Then, $P_N \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1-\alpha,\alpha+\theta)$, and $(P_i'', i \geqslant 1) \sim \mathrm{PD}(\alpha,\alpha+\theta)$ is independent of P_N.

3.3. Line-breaking constructions of the stable tree, and the proof of Theorem 1.8

In this section, we collect some preliminary results on stable trees and prove Theorem 1.8. Recall the line-breaking construction of the stable tree given by Algorithm 1.1 yielding the sequence of compact $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}_k, k \geqslant 0)$. Leaves and branch points have a natural order induced by the time of appearance in the sequence $(\mathcal{T}_k, k \geqslant 0)$, i.e. we can write $(v_i, i \geqslant 1)$ for the branch points, and $W_k^{(i)}$ for the branch point weight of v_i in $\mathcal{T}_k$ (if $v_i \notin \mathrm{Br}(\mathcal{T}_k)$ or $i > b_k$, set $W_k^{(i)} = 0$). We will list the edges $E_k^{(1)},\dots,E_k^{(|\mathcal{T}_k|)}$ of $\mathcal{T}_k$ and their lengths $L_k^{(i)} = \mathrm{Leb}(E_k^{(i)})$, $i \in [|\mathcal{T}_k|]$, in the order encountered on a depth-first search directed by least labels.

Lemma 3.8 ([20, Proposition 3.2]). *For $k \geqslant 1$, given the shapes of $\mathcal{T}_0, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k$, and $|\mathcal{T}_k| - (k+1) = \ell$, i.e. conditionally given that the tree $\mathcal{T}_k$ has $k+1+\ell$ edges and ℓ branch points $(v_i, i \in [\ell])$,*

$$\left(L_k^{(1)}, \dots, L_k^{(k+1+\ell)}, W_k^{(1)}, \dots, W_k^{(\ell)}\right) = S_k \cdot \left(Z_k^{(1)}, \dots, Z_k^{(k+\ell+1)}, Z_k^{(k+\ell+2)}, \dots Z_k^{(k+1+2\ell)}\right) \tag{3.9}$$

where $(Z_k^{(1)}, \dots, Z_k^{(k+\ell+1)}, Z_k^{(k+\ell+2)}, \dots Z_k^{(k+1+2\ell)}) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\,(1, \dots, 1, w(d_1)/\beta, \dots, w(d_\ell)/\beta)$ and $S_k \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \beta+k)$ are independent, $w(d_i) = (d_i - 3)(1-\beta) + 1 - 2\beta$ and $d_i = \deg(v_i, \mathcal{T}_k)$ is the degree of v_i.

Corollary 3.9 (Masses as lengths). *For $k \geqslant 1$, given the shapes of $\mathcal{T}_0, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k$, and $|\mathcal{T}_k| - (k+1) = \ell$,*

$$\left(L_k^{(1)}, \dots, L_k^{(k+1+\ell)}, W_k^{(1)}, \dots, W_k^{(\ell)}\right) = \left(X_1^\beta M_k^{(1)}, \dots, X_{k+1+2\ell}^\beta M_k^{(k+1+2\ell)}\right) \tag{3.10}$$

where the random variables $M_k^{(i)} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \beta)$, $i \in [k+1+\ell]$, $M_k^{(k+1+\ell+i)} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, w(d_i))$, $i \in [\ell]$, and $X = (X_1, \dots, X_{k+1+\ell}, X_{k+2+\ell}, \dots X_{k+1+2\ell}) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\,(\beta, \dots, \beta, w(d_1), \dots, w(d_\ell))$ are independent, and $w(d_i) = (d_i - 3)(1-\beta) + 1 - 2\beta$ with $d_i = \deg(v_i, \mathcal{T}_k)$.

Proof. We apply Lemma 3.8, and Proposition 3.1 with $n = k+1+2\ell$, $\theta_i = \beta, i \in [k+1+\ell]$, and $\theta_{k+1+\ell+i} = w(d_i)$, $i \in [\ell]$. It remains to check that $\theta = \sum_{i \in [n]} \theta_i = \beta + k$, i.e. that

$$(\beta + k)/\beta = k + \ell + 1 + \sum_{i \in [\ell]} \left((d_i - 3)(1/\beta - 1) + (1/\beta - 2)\right).$$

This follows from the fact that the sum of the vertex degrees in a tree with m edges is $2m$, i.e. $\sum_{i \in [\ell]} d_i = 2(k+1+\ell) - (k+1) - 1$, since $\mathcal{T}_k$ has $k+1+\ell$ edges and $(k+1)+1$ degree-1 vertices. □

Haas et al. [24] analysed the stable tree as an example of a self-similar CRT. Let $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho)$ with mass measure μ be the stable tree of parameter $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$, and let $\Sigma \sim \mu$ be a leaf sampled from μ. Consider the *spine*, i.e. the path $[[\rho, \Sigma]]$ from the root to this leaf. Remove all vertices of degree one or two from this path. This yields a sequence of connected components that can a.s. be ranked in decreasing order of mass, and which we denote by $(\overline{\mathcal{S}}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1)$, rooted at vertices $\rho_i \in [[\rho, \Sigma]]$ of a.s. infinite degree, $i \geqslant 1$, respectively. Each $\overline{\mathcal{S}}^{(i)}$ further separates into a sequence $(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}, j \geqslant 1)$ when removing ρ_i.

- The *coarse spinal mass partition* is $\left(\overline{P}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right) := \left(\mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}^{(i)}), i \geqslant 1\right)$,
- The *fine spinal mass partition* is the sequence $\left(\overline{P}_j^{(i)\downarrow}, j \geqslant 1, i \geqslant 1\right)^\downarrow := \left(\mu\left(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}\right), j \geqslant 1, i \geqslant 1\right)^\downarrow$, i.e. the ranked sequence of masses of connected components obtained after removal of the whole spine.

Theorem 3.10 (Mass partition in the stable tree, [24, Corollary 10]). *Let $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$, and let $\mathcal{T}$ be the stable tree of parameter β. Then the following statements hold.*

(i) *The coarse spinal mass partition has a Poisson-Dirichlet distribution with parameters (β, β), i.e.*

$$\left(\overline{P}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right) = \left(\mu\left(\overline{\mathcal{S}}^{(i)}\right), i \geqslant 1\right) \sim \mathrm{PD}\,(\beta, \beta).$$

(ii) *The fine spinal mass partition is a $(1-\beta, -\beta)$-fragmentation of the coarse spinal mass partition, i.e. for each block $\mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}^{(i)})$ of the coarse partition, the relative part sizes $(\mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow})/\mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}^{(i)}), j \geqslant 1)$ are independent with distribution $\mathrm{PD}(1-\beta, -\beta)$, $i \geqslant 1$.*

(iii) *Conditionally given the fine spinal mass partition $(\mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}), j \geqslant 1, i \geqslant 1)^\downarrow$, the rescaled trees equipped with restricted mass measures*

$$\left(\mu\left(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}\right)^{-\beta} \overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}, \mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow})^{-1} \mu\restriction_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}}\right), \quad j \geqslant 1, i \geqslant 1, \tag{3.11}$$

are i.i.d. copies of $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$.

The α-diversities of $\mathrm{PD}(\alpha, \theta)$ partitions can naturally be interpreted as lengths in trees. In particular the β-diversity of the coarse spinal mass partition has distribution $S_0 \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \beta)$, which is the starting point of Goldschmidt-Haas' line-breaking constructions. The fragmenting $\mathrm{PD}(1-\beta, -\beta)$ random partitions for each block of the coarse spinal mass partition capture important information about the branch points that we relate to sizes of the Ford CRTs by which we replace them in Theorem 1.6. Specifically, the independence of these $\mathrm{PD}(1-\beta, -\beta)$ vectors relates to the independence of the Ford trees. Sampling i.i.d. leaves $(\Sigma_k, k \geqslant 0)$ from the measure μ of the stable tree yields a natural random order of $(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}, j \geqslant 1)$, in terms of smallest leaf labels of the subtrees, which we write as $(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)}, j \geqslant 1)$, for each $i \geqslant 1$.

Corollary 3.11. *Let $(\mathcal{T},\mu)$ be a stable tree of index $\beta\in(0,1/2]$ with associated reduced tree sequence $(\mathcal{T}_k,k\geqslant 0)$. Let $\overline{\mathcal{S}}^{(i)}$ be the subtree rooted at $\rho_i\in[[\rho,\Sigma_0]]$, $i\geqslant 1$, related to the coarse spinal mass partition $(\mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}^{(i)}),i\geqslant 1)$. For each $i\geqslant 1$, let $(\overline{\mathcal{S}}^{(i)}_j,j\geqslant 1)$ denote the connected components of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}^{(i)}\backslash\rho_i$, ordered in increasing order of least leaf labels. Then $(\mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}^{(i)}_j)^{-1}\mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}^{(i)}_j),j\geqslant 1)\sim\mathrm{GEM}\,(1-\beta,-\beta)$.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.10(ii) in combination with results on sampling from $\mathrm{PD}(\alpha,\theta)$, cf. Theorem 3.7, and the construction (3.4) of $\mathrm{GEM}(\alpha,\theta)$. □

We now show that the line-breaking construction of the stable tree based on masses (Algorithm 1.7), yields trees $(\mathcal{T}_k,k\geqslant 0)$ as in (1.1) and Algorithm 1.1. The following result will prove Theorem 1.8.

Proposition 3.12. *The sequence of weighted $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}_k,\mu_k,k\geqslant 0)$ from Algorithm 1.7 has the same distribution as the sequence of trees in (1.1) equipped with projected subtree masses, i.e. with the mass measures $(\pi_k)_*\mu,k\geqslant 1$, as in (2.4)-(2.5). Furthermore, conditionally given $|\mathcal{T}_k|=k+1+\ell$, the edges of $\mathcal{T}_k$ equipped with the mass measure μ_k restricted to each edge, are rescaled independent (β,β)-strings of beads given via*

$$\left(\mu_k\left(E_k^{(i)}\right)^{-\beta}E_k^{(i)},\mu_k\left(E_k^{(i)}\right)^{-1}\mu_k\restriction_{E_k^{(i)}}\right),\quad i\in[k+1+\ell],\tag{3.12}$$

and the total mass distribution

$$\left(\mu_k\left(E_k^{(1)}\right),\ldots,\mu_k\left(E_k^{(k+1+\ell)}\right),\mu_k\left(v_1\right),\ldots,\mu_k\left(v_\ell\right)\right)\sim\mathrm{Dirichlet}\left(\beta,\ldots,\beta,w\left(d_1\right),\ldots,w\left(d_\ell\right)\right)$$

where $v_i,i\in[\ell]$, are the branch points of $\mathcal{T}_k$ of degrees $d_i=\deg(v_i,\mathcal{T}_k)$, $i\in[\ell]$, respectively, and $w(d_i)=(d_i-3)(1-\beta)+(1-2\beta)$, $i\in[\ell]$, and where we number the edges $E_k^{(i)},i\in[k+1+\ell]$ by depth-first search.

The proof of Proposition 3.12 is part of Appendix A.1, where we collect several similar proofs. We also record the following consequence of Algorithm 1.7 and Proposition 3.12.

Corollary 3.13. *Let $(\mathcal{T},\mu)$ be a stable tree of index $\beta\in(0,1/2]$, and let $(\mathcal{T}_k,k\geqslant 0)$ be as in (1.1) with branch points $(v_i,i\geqslant 1)$ in order of appearance. Let $k_i:=\inf\{k\geqslant 0\colon[[\rho,\Sigma_k]]\cap[[\rho,v_i]]=[[\rho,v_i]]\}$ and let $(\mathcal{S}_j^{(i)},j\geqslant 1)$ be the subtrees of $\mathcal{T}\backslash[[\rho,\Sigma_{k_i}]]$ rooted at v_i in increasing order of smallest leaf labels, $i\geqslant 1$. Set $P_j^{(i)}:=\mu(\mathcal{S}_j^{(i)})$ and $P^{(i)}=\sum_{j\geqslant 1}\mu(S_j^{(i)})$, $i\geqslant 1$. Then the sequences $(P_j^{(i)}/P^{(i)},j\geqslant 1),i\geqslant 1$, are i.i.d. with distribution $\mathrm{GEM}(1-\beta,-\beta)$.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of the stick-breaking representation (3.4) of $\mathrm{GEM}(1-\beta,-\beta)$ and the random variables $(Q_k,k\geqslant 0)$ splitting branch point mass into subtrees from Algorithm 1.7. Specifically, conditionally given the branch point degrees in the sequence $(\mathcal{T}_k,k\geqslant 0)$, for each branch point v_i, we can find a sequence of random variables $(Q_m^{(i)},m\geqslant 1)$ such that

$$P_j^{(i)}=\mu_{k_1^{(i)}-1}\left(v_i\right)Q_j^{(i)}\prod_{m\in[j-1]}\left(1-Q_m^{(i)}\right),\quad j\geqslant 1,$$

where $Q_m^{(i)}:=Q_{k_m^{(i)}}\sim\mathrm{Beta}(\beta,m(1-\beta)-\beta))$ and $k_m^{(i)}=\inf\{k\geqslant 1\colon\deg(v_i,\mathcal{T}_k)=m+1\}$. Note that, for $m_1,\ldots,m_i\geqslant 1$, the random variables $Q_j^{(i)},j\in[m_i]$, $i\geqslant 1$, have conditional distributions given $k_j^{(i)}$, $j\in[m_i]$, $i\geqslant 1$, that do not depend on $k_j^{(i)}$, $j\in[m_i]$, $i\geqslant 1$, and are hence unconditionally independent. □

4. The binary two-colour line-breaking construction with masses

We present an enhanced version of Algorithm 1.3, which is based on sampling from the mass measure. We use this enhanced version to prove Theorem 1.4.

The following (1-marked) string of beads will be at the centre of our construction. For $\beta\in(0,1/2]$, consider $([0,K_1],\lambda_1)$ and $([0,K_2],\lambda_2)$ two independent $(\beta,1-2\beta)$- and (β,β)-strings of beads, respectively, and an independent $B\sim\mathrm{Beta}(1-2\beta,\beta)$. Then scale the two strings by B and $1-B$, as follows: set

$$K:=B^\beta K_1+(1-B)^\beta K_2,\qquad K':=B^\beta K_1\tag{4.1}$$

and consider the mass measure λ on $[0,K]$ given by

$$\lambda\left([0,x]\right)=\begin{cases}B\lambda_1\left(\left[0,B^{-\beta}x\right]\right) & \text{if } x\in[0,K'],\\ B+(1-B)\,\lambda_2\left(\left[0,(1-B)^{-\beta}\left(x-K'\right)\right]\right) & \text{if } x\in[K',K].\end{cases}\tag{4.2}$$

The string of beads $([0,K],\lambda)$ is called a *β-mixed* string of beads [45]. We denote the distributions of $([0,K],\lambda)$ and $([0,K],[0,K'],\lambda)$ on $\mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}$ and $\mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}^{[1]}$ by ν_β and $\nu_\beta^{[1]}$, respectively.

Remark 4.1. By Proposition 3.1 with $\theta_1 = 1-2\beta, \theta_2 = \beta$, noting that $(B, 1-B) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}(1-2\beta,\beta)$, we have

$$\left(B^\beta K_1, (1-B)^\beta K_2\right) \stackrel{d}{=} L\left(B', 1-B'\right) \tag{4.3}$$

where $B' \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1/\beta-2,1)$ is independent of L, and $L \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta,1-\beta)$. We conclude that for each β-mixed string of beads $\xi = ([0,K],\lambda)$ we have $(\lambda(x)\colon x\in[0,K], \lambda(x)>0)^\downarrow \sim \mathrm{PD}(\beta,1-\beta)$, cf. e.g. [44, Corollary 1.2]. Although the length of a β-mixed string of beads ξ is $\mathrm{ML}(\beta,1-\beta)$ and the atom sizes are $\mathrm{PD}(\beta,1-\beta)$, we cannot expect that ξ is a $(\beta,1-\beta)$-string of beads when $\beta\in(0,1/2)$. Specifically, at the junction point in a $(\beta,1-\beta)$-string of beads, we would expect a $\mathrm{Beta}(\beta,1-2\beta)$ mass split into a rescaled (β,β)- and a rescaled $(\beta,1-2\beta)$-string of beads in this order (and not vice versa).

We will use the notation $\xi = \left([0,K|, \sum_{i\geqslant 1} P_i\delta_{X_i}\right)$ for any (α,θ)- or β-mixed string of beads where K is the length of the string of beads with ranked atomic masses of sizes $1>P_1>P_2>\cdots>0$, a.s., in the points $X_i\in[0,K]$, $i\geqslant 1$, respectively.

Let us now explain how to attach a weighted $\mathbb{R}$-tree onto another weighted $\mathbb{R}$-tree. This clarifies in particular how to construct weighted $\mathbb{R}$-trees by attaching strings of beads as a string of beads can be interpreted as a weighted $\mathbb{R}$-tree consisting of a single branch. For any weighted $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T},d,\rho,\mu)$, a parameter $\beta\in(0,1/2]$, an element $J\in\mathcal{T}$ and another weighted $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T}^+,d^+,\rho^+,\mu^+)$ with $\mathcal{T}\cap\mathcal{T}^+=\varnothing$, the tree $(\mathcal{T}',d',\mu')$ created from $(\mathcal{T},d,\mu)$ by *attaching* to J the tree $(\mathcal{T}^+,d^+,\rho^+,\mu^+)$ with mass measure μ^+ rescaled by $\mu(J)$ and metric d^+ rescaled by $\mu(J)^\beta$ is defined as follows. Specifically, set

$$\mathcal{T}' := \mathcal{T}\backslash\{J\}\sqcup\mathcal{T}^+, \quad d'(x,y) := \begin{cases} d(x,y) & \text{if } x,y\in\mathcal{T},\\ d(x,J)+(\mu(J))^\beta d^+(\rho^+,y) & \text{if } x\in\mathcal{T}, y\in\mathcal{T}^+,\\ (\mu(J))^\beta d^+(x,y) & \text{if } x,y\in\mathcal{T}^+,\end{cases} \qquad \rho'=\rho, \tag{4.4}$$

and equip $(\mathcal{T}',d',\rho')$ with the mass measure μ' given by $\mu'\restriction_{\mathcal{T}\backslash\{J\}} = \mu\restriction_{\mathcal{T}\backslash\{J\}}$, $\mu'(J)=0$, $\mu'\restriction_{\mathcal{T}^+} = \mu(J)\,\mu^+$.

We are now ready to present the two-colour line-breaking construction with masses.

Algorithm 4.2 (Two-colour line-breaking construction with masses)**.** Let $\beta\in(0,1/2]$. We grow weighted ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}_k^*,(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)},i\geqslant 1),\mu_k^*)$, $k\geqslant 0$, as follows.

0. Let $(\mathcal{T}_0^*,\mu_0^*)$ be isometric to a (β,β)-string of beads; let $r_0=0$ and $\mathcal{R}_0^{(i)}=\{\rho\}$, $i\geqslant 1$.

Given $(\mathcal{T}_j^*,(\mathcal{R}_j^{(i)},i\geqslant 1),\mu_j^*)$ with $\mu_j^* = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{T}_j^*}\mu_j^*(x)\delta_x$, $0\leqslant j\leqslant k$, let $r_k = \#\{i\geqslant 1\colon \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}\neq\{\rho\}\}$;

1. select an edge $E_k^*\subset\mathcal{T}_k^*$ with probability proportional to its mass $\mu_k^*(E_k^*)$; if $E_k^*\subset\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ for some $i\in[r_k]$, let $I_k=i$; otherwise, i.e. if $E_k^*\subset\mathcal{T}_k^*\backslash\bigcup_{i\in[r_k]}\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, let $r_{k+1}=r_k+1$, $I_k=r_{k+1}$;
2. if E_k^* is an external edge of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, perform $(\beta,1-2\beta)$-coin tossing sampling on E_k^* to determine $J_k^*\in E_k^*$ (cf. Proposition 3.5); otherwise, i.e. if $E_k^*\subset\mathcal{T}_k^*\backslash\bigcup_{i\in[r_k]}\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ or if E_k^* is an internal edge of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, sample J_k^* from the normalised mass measure on E_k^*;
3. let (E_k^+,R_k^+,μ_k^+) be an independent β-mixed string of beads; to form $(\mathcal{T}_{k+1}^*,\mu_{k+1}^*)$ remove $\mu_k^*(J_k^*)\delta_{J_k^*}$ from μ_k^* and attach to $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ at J_k^* an isometric copy of (E_k^+,μ_k^+) with measure rescaled by $\mu_k^*(J_k^*)$ and metric rescaled by $(\mu_k^*(J_k^*))^\beta$; add to $\mathcal{R}_k^{(I_k)}$ the (image under the isometry of) R_k^+ to form $\mathcal{R}_{k+1}^{(I_k)}$; set $\mathcal{R}_{k+1}^{(i)}=\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, $i\neq I_k$.

4.1. The distribution of two-colour trees

To analyse Algorithm 4.2, we will need some more notation, in particular with regard to the marked subtree growth processes $(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)},k\geqslant 0)$, $i\geqslant 1$. Define the random subsequences $(k_m^{(i)},m\geqslant 1)$, $i\geqslant 1$, by

$$k_1^{(i)} := \inf\left\{n\geqslant 1\colon \mathcal{R}_n^{(i)}\neq\mathcal{R}_0^{(i)}\right\} = \inf\left\{n\geqslant 1\colon \mathcal{R}_n^{(i)}\neq\{\rho\}\right\}, \tag{4.5}$$

and, for $m\geqslant 1$,

$$k_{m+1}^{(i)} := \inf\left\{n\geqslant k_m^{(i)}\colon \mathcal{R}_n^{(i)}\neq\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}\right\}, \tag{4.6}$$

i.e. there is a change in $(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, k \geqslant 1)$ when $k = k_m^{(i)}$ for some $m \geqslant 1$. Note that $\bigcup_{i\geqslant 1}\{k_m^{(i)}, m \geqslant 1\} = \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ is a disjoint union, and that, for any $i \geqslant 1$, $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ is a binary tree for any $k \geqslant 1$. We will also use the convention that $\rho \notin \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ for $k \geqslant k_1^{(i)}$. For $k = k_m^{(i)} - 1$, we write

$$R_k^+ = [[J_k^*, \Omega_m^{(i)}]] \subset E_k^+ = [[J_k^*, \Sigma_{k+1}]], \qquad \text{i.e.} \quad]]J_k^*, \Omega_m^{(i)}]] = \mathcal{R}_{k+1}^{(i)} \backslash \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}.$$

In other words, at step $k = k_m^{(i)} - 1$, $\Omega_m^{(i)}$ and Σ_{k+1} denote the leaves added to $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ and $\mathcal{T}_k^*$, respectively.

We write $\xi_k^{(1)}, \xi_k^{(2)}$ and γ_k for the random variables inducing the β-mixed string of beads (E_k^+, R_k^+, μ_k^+), i.e. $\left(E_k^+, R_k^+, \mu_k^+\right)$ is built from independent $\xi_k^{(1)}, \xi_k^{(2)}$ and γ_k in the same way as $([0, K], [0, K'], \lambda)$ is built from independent $([0, K_1], \lambda_1)$, $([0, K_2], \lambda_2)$ and B in (4.1)-(4.2).

Furthermore, we use an equivalence relation $\sim$ on $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$ to contract each marked component $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, $i \geqslant 1$, of $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ to a single point, i.e.

$$x \sim y \qquad :\Leftrightarrow \qquad x, y \in \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)} \quad \text{for some } i \geqslant 1. \tag{4.7}$$

Note that, for all i with $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)} \neq \{\rho\}$, $x, y \in \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ implies $x, y \in \mathcal{R}_{k'}^{(i)}$ for all $k' \geqslant k$, and hence the equivalence relation $\sim$ is consistent as k varies. Denote the equivalence class related to $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ by $\widetilde{v}_i := [\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}]_\sim$, and let

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k := \mathcal{T}_k^* / \sim \tag{4.8}$$

denote the quotient space of $\mathcal{T}_k^*, k \geqslant 0$, with the canonical quotient metric. Furthermore, for $k \geqslant 0$, let $\widetilde{\mu}_k$ be the push-forward of μ_k^* under the projection map from $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ onto $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k$.

The following characterisation of Ford trees will be useful to obtain the distribution of $\mathcal{T}_k^*$.

Proposition 4.3 ([23, Proposition 18])**.** *Consider the tree growth process $(\mathcal{F}_m, m \geqslant 1)$ from Algorithm 1.2 for some $\beta' \in (0, 1)$. The distribution of $\mathcal{F}_m$ is given in terms of three independent random variables: its shape, the total length $S'_m \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta', m - \beta')$ and the length split between the edges of $\mathcal{F}_m$ which has a* Dirichlet $(1, \ldots, 1, (1-\beta')/\beta', \ldots, (1-\beta')/\beta')$ *distribution, where a parameter of 1 is assigned to each of the $m - 1$ internal edges, and a parameter of $(1-\beta')/\beta'$ to each of the m external edges of $\mathcal{F}_m$.*

We can describe the distribution of the tree $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ as follows.

Proposition 4.4 (Distribution of $\mathcal{T}_k^*$)**.** *Let $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ be as in Algorithm 4.2 for some $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$. The distribution of $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ is characterised by the following independent random variables:*

- *the shape T_k^* of $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ obtained from the shape $\widetilde{T}_k$ of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k$ and the shapes $R_k^{(i)}$ of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, $i \geqslant 1$, as follows;*
  - *$\widetilde{T}_k$ has the distribution of the shape of a stable tree $\mathcal{T}_k$ reduced to the first k leaves, and*
  - *conditionally given that $\widetilde{T}_k$ has ℓ branch points of degrees $d_1, \ldots, d_\ell$, the shapes $R_k^{(1)}, \ldots, R_k^{(\ell)}$ are the shapes of Ford trees with $m_1 := d_1 - 2, \ldots, m_\ell := d_\ell - 2$ leaves, respectively;*
- *the total mass split between the $3k + 1$ edges of $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ has a*

$$\text{Dirichlet}\,(\beta, \ldots, \beta, 1 - 2\beta, \ldots, 1 - 2\beta) \tag{4.9}$$

  distribution, with parameter β for each internal marked and each unmarked edge, and parameter $1 - 2\beta$ for each external marked edge with edges ordered according to depth-first search (first run for unmarked and internal marked edges, then for external marked edges);
- *the $3k + 1$ independent (β, θ)-strings of beads isometric to*

$$\left(\mu_k^*(E)^{-\beta} E, \mu_k^*(E)^{-1} \mu_k^* \restriction_E\right), \quad E \in \mathrm{Edg}\,(\mathcal{T}_k^*), \tag{4.10}$$

  where $\theta = 1 - 2\beta$ if E is an external marked edge of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ for some $i \in [\ell]$, and $\theta = \beta$ otherwise, again listed according to depth-first search.

Proof. This proof is mainly an application of the properties of the Dirichlet distribution, Proposition 3.2, and of coin tossing sampling, Proposition 3.5. We give a brief sketch of the proof via an induction on k.

For $k = 0$, the claim is trivial as $(\mathcal{T}_0^*, \mu_0^*)$ is a (β, β)-string of beads by definition. For the induction step, suppose that the claim holds for some $k \geqslant 0$.

We first consider the shape transition from T_k^* to T_{k+1}^*. Observe that, given $\widetilde{T}_k$ has ℓ branch points of degrees $d_1, \ldots, d_\ell$, we have a Dirichlet $(\beta, \ldots, \beta, w(d_1), \ldots, w(d_\ell))$ mass split in $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k$ with weight β for each

edge and weight $w(d) = (d-2)(1-\beta) - \beta$ for each branch point of degree $d \geqslant 3$. Hence, by Proposition 3.12, the overall edge selection is as in Algorithm 1.7.

Conditionally given that the ith branch point of $\widetilde{T}_k$ is selected, an edge of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ is chosen proportionally to the weights assigned by the relative Dirichlet $(\beta, \ldots, \beta, 1-2\beta, \ldots, 1-2\beta)$ mass split in $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, so each internal edge is chosen with probability $\beta/((d_i-2)(1-2\beta)+(d_i-3)\beta)$, each external edge with probability $(1-2\beta)/((d_i-2)(1-2\beta)+(d_i-3)\beta)$. This corresponds to the shape growth rule in a Ford tree growth process of index $\beta/(1-\beta)$, using obvious cancellations, cf. Algorithm 1.2 and Proposition 4.3.

In the update step from $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ to $\mathcal{T}_{k+1}^*$, we first select an edge of $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ proportionally to mass. By Proposition 3.2(iv), the parameter for this edge in the Dirichlet split (4.9), conditionally given that it has been selected, is then increased by 1. We select an atom J_k^* on this edge via (β, θ)-coin tossing, where $\theta = 1-2\beta$ for external marked edges, and $\theta = \beta$ otherwise, and, by Proposition 3.5, the selected edge is split by J_k^* into a rescaled independent (β, β)- and a rescaled independent (β, θ)-string of beads where the relative mass split on this edge is Dirichlet$(\beta, 1-\beta, \theta)$, which is conditionally independent of the total mass split. Furthermore, the mass $\mu_k^*(J_k^*)$ is split by the independent random variable $\gamma_k \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1-2\beta, \beta)$ into a marked $(\beta, 1-2\beta)$-string of beads, and an unmarked (β, β)-string of beads, which are independent, i.e., by Proposition 3.2(iii), the claims (4.9) and (4.10) follow, as statements conditionally given tree shapes.

Finally, these conditional distributions of the Dirichlet mass split (4.9) and the independent (β, θ)-strings of beads (4.10) do not depend on the shape T_{k+1}^*, and are hence unconditionally independent. □

Remark 4.5. By Proposition 4.4 and Lemma 3.6 we see that Algorithm 4.2 reduces to Algorithm 1.3.

4.2. Identification of the stable line-breaking constructions

We now turn to the trees $(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k, k \geqslant 0)$ obtained from $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), k \geqslant 0)$ by contracting all marked components to single branch points as in (4.7)-(4.8). This description yields another formulation of the atom selection procedure on $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ in Algorithm 4.2.

Given $(\mathcal{T}_j^*, (\mathcal{R}_j^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu_j^*)$, $0 \leqslant j \leqslant k$, and $r_k = \#\{i \geqslant 1 \colon \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)} \neq \{\rho\}\} = \#\{i \geqslant 1 \colon \widetilde{v}_i \neq \{\rho\}\}$,

1.-2. select $\widetilde{J}_k$ from $\widetilde{\mu}_k$; if $\widetilde{J}_k \neq \widetilde{v}_i$ for all $i \in [r_k]$, set $J_k^* = \widetilde{J}_k$; otherwise, if $\widetilde{J}_k = \widetilde{v}_i$ for some $i \in [r_k]$, sample an edge E_k^* of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ proportionally to its mass $\mu_k^*(E_k^*)$; if E_k^* is an internal edge of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, sample J_k^* from the normalised mass measure on E_k^*; if E_k^* is an external edge of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, perform $(\beta, 1-2\beta)$-coin tossing sampling on E_k^* to determine $J_k^* \in E_k^*$.

It is this view on Algorithm 4.2 that we pursue further now. The following theorem contains the desired weight-length transformation, i.e. the branch point weights in Goldschmidt-Haas' stable line-breaking construction (Algorithm 1.1) are indeed as the lengths of the marked subtrees in the two-colour line-breaking construction (Algorithm 4.2). Its proof is given with other similar proofs in the appendix.

Theorem 4.6. *Let the sequence $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ be as in Algorithm 4.2, and associate $(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k, (\widetilde{v}_i = [\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}]_\sim, i \geqslant 1), \widetilde{\mu}_k, k \geqslant 0)$ as in (4.8). Then the following hold.*

(i) *The sequence of trees with mass measures from Algorithm 4.2 and (4.8) has the same distribution as the sequence in Algorithm 1.7, i.e.*

$$\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widetilde{\mu}_k, k \geqslant 0\right) \stackrel{d}{=} (\mathcal{T}_k, \mu_k, k \geqslant 0)\,. \tag{4.11}$$

(ii) *The sequence of trees with marked component lengths from Algorithm 4.2 and (4.8) has the same distribution as the sequence of trees with weights from Algorithm 1.1, i.e.*

$$\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k, \left(\widetilde{W}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right), k \geqslant 0\right) \stackrel{d}{=} \left(\mathcal{T}_k, \left(W_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right), k \geqslant 0\right), \tag{4.12}$$

where $\widetilde{W}_k^{(i)} = \mathrm{Leb}(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)})$ is the length of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1$, respectively. In particular, letting $S_k^* = \mathrm{Leb}(\mathcal{T}_k^*)$ denote the length of $\mathcal{T}_k^*$, the sequence $(S_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ is a Mittag-Leffler Markov chain starting from $\mathrm{ML}(\beta, \beta)$, i.e. $(S_k^*, k \geqslant 0) \stackrel{d}{=} (S_k, k \geqslant 0)$.

Let us pull some threads together and deduce the first assertion of Theorem 1.4 and the limit of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k$.

Proof of (1.3) *in Theorem 1.4.* We noted in Remark 4.5 that the sequence of two-colour trees of Algorithm 4.2 without mass measures has the same joint distribution as the sequence of two-colour trees of Algorithm 1.3. Hence, (4.12) is precisely (1.3). □

Corollary 4.7. *In the setting of Theorem 4.6,* $\lim_{k\to\infty}(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widetilde{\mu}_k) = (\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ *a.s. with respect to the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov distance, where* $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ *is a stable tree of index* β.

Proof. Goldschmidt and Haas [20] showed this for the RHS of (4.12), so it also holds for the LHS. □

4.3. Identification of marked subtree growth processes, and the proof of Theorem 1.4

The main aim of this section is to identify the marked tree growth processes $(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, k \geqslant 1)$, $i \geqslant 1$, as rescaled i.i.d. Ford tree growth processes of index $\beta' = \beta/(1-\beta)$. We will show the following.

Theorem 4.8. *Let* $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, k \geqslant 1), \mu_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ *be the weighted* ∞*-marked tree growth process of Algorithm 4.2 for some* $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$. *Then there exists a sequence of scaling factors* $(C^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1)$ *such that for all* $i \geqslant 1$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)} = \mathcal{R}^{(i)} \quad a.s.$$

in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology where $(C^{(i)}\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1)$ *is a sequence of i.i.d. Ford CRTs of index* $\beta' = \beta/(1-\beta)$. *Furthermore, the sequence* $(C^{(i)}\mathcal{R}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1)$ *is independent of the stable tree* $(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}, \widetilde{\mu}) = \lim_{k\to\infty}(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}, \widetilde{\mu})$ *obtained from* $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ *as in Corollary 4.7.*

We will prove this by carrying out the two-colour line-breaking construction using a given stable tree $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ equipped with a sequence of i.i.d. leaves $(\Sigma_k, k \geqslant 0)$ sampled from μ, and i.i.d. sequences of i.i.d. ordered $(\beta', 1-\beta')$-Chinese restaurant processes $(\widetilde{\Pi}_n^{(i,m)}, n \geqslant 1)$, $i \geqslant 1$, $m \geqslant 1$, cf. Section 3.2.

Definition 4.9 (Labelled bead tree/string of beads)**.** A pair (x, Λ) is called a *labelled bead* if $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{N}$ is an infinite label set. A weighted $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{R}, \mu_{\mathcal{R}})$ equipped with a point process $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} = \sum_{i\geqslant 1} \delta_{(x_i, \Lambda_i)}$ on some countable subset $\{x_i, i \geqslant 1\} \subset \mathcal{R}$, $x_i \neq x_j, i \neq j$, is called a *labelled bead tree* if (x_i, Λ_i) is a labelled bead for every $i \geqslant 1$. If $(\mathcal{R}, \mu_{\mathcal{R}})$ is a string of beads we call $(\mathcal{R}, \mu_{\mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}})$ a *labelled string of beads.*

We will also speak of *labelled* (α, θ)*-strings of beads* for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\theta > 0$, as induced by an ordered (α, θ)-Chinese restaurant process. Specifically, the label sets are the blocks $\Pi_{\infty,i}$, $i \geqslant 1$, of the limiting partition of $\mathbb{N}$, which we relabel by $\mathbb{N}\backslash\{1\}$ using the increasing bijection $\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}\backslash\{1\}$. The locations X_i are the locations of the corresponding atom of size P_i on the string, $i \geqslant 1$. A Ford tree growth process of index $\beta' \in (0, 1)$ as in Algorithm 1.2 can be represented in terms of labelled $(\beta', 1-\beta')$-strings of beads $\widehat{\xi}_m$, $m \geqslant 1$, as follows [41, Corollary 16].

Proposition 4.10 (Ford tree growth via labelled strings of beads)**.** *For* $\beta' \in (0, 1)$, *construct a sequence of labelled bead trees* $(\mathcal{F}_m, \nu_m, \mathcal{P}_m, m \geqslant 1)$ *as follows.*

0. *Let* $\widehat{\xi}_0 = (\mathcal{F}_1, \nu_1, \mathcal{P}_1)$ *be a labelled* $(\beta', 1-\beta')$*-string of beads with label set* $\mathbb{N}\backslash\{1\}$.

Given $(\mathcal{F}_j, \nu_j, \mathcal{P}_j)$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant m$, *with* $\mathcal{P}_m = \sum_{i\geqslant 1} \delta_{X_{m,i}, \Lambda_{m,i}}$, *to construct* $(\mathcal{F}_{m+1}, \nu_{m+1}, \mathcal{P}_{m+1})$,

1.-2. *select the unique* $X_{m,i} \in \mathcal{F}_m$ *such that* $m+1 \in \Lambda_{m,i}$;
3. *to obtain* $(\mathcal{F}_{m+1}, \nu_{m+1}, \mathcal{P}_{m+1})$, *remove* $\nu_m(X_{m,i})\delta_{X_{m,i}}$ *from* ν_m *and* $\delta_{(X_{m,i}, \Lambda_{m,i})}$ *from* $\mathcal{P}_m$; *attach to* $\mathcal{F}_m$ *at* $X_{m,i}$ *an independent copy* $\widehat{\xi}_m$ *of* $\widehat{\xi}_0$ *with metric rescaled by* $\nu_m(X_{m,i})^{\beta'}$, *mass measure by* $\nu_m(X_{m,i})$, *and label sets in* $\widehat{\xi}_m$ *relabelled by the increasing bijection* $\mathbb{N}\backslash\{1\} \to \Lambda_{m,i}\backslash\{m+1\}$.

Then the tree growth process $(\mathcal{F}_m, m \geqslant 1)$ *is a Ford tree growth process of index* $\beta' \in (0, 1)$.

It will be useful to represent two-colour trees in the space $l^1(\mathbb{N}_0^2)$ as follows. We denote by $e_{a,b}$, $a, b \geqslant 0$, the unit coordinate vectors. We will use $e_{k,0}$, $k \geqslant 0$, to embed a given stable tree $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, \mu)$, using $e_{k,0}$ to embed Σ_k, $k \geqslant 0$. Indeed, from now on we assume $(\mathcal{T}, d, \rho, \mu) = (\mathcal{T}, d, 0, \mu) \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}^{\mathrm{emb}}$ is this *embedded stable tree*, with embedded leaves Σ_k, $k \geqslant 0$. We will use $e_{m,i}$, $i \geqslant 1$, $m \geqslant 1$, to embed the mth branch of the ith red component, so the last step of Algorithm 4.2 is:

3. let $([0, L_k], [0, L_k B_k'], \mu_k^+)$ be an independent β-mixed string of beads in the notation of (4.3); denote by M_k the size (number of leaves) of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(I_k)}$; define the scale factor $c = \mu_k^*(J_k^*)$ and set

$$\mathcal{T}_{k+1}^* := \mathcal{T}_k^* \cup \big(J_k^* +]0, L_k B_k' c^\beta] e_{M_k+1, I_k}\big) \cup \big(J_k^* + L_k B_k' c^\beta e_{M_k+1, I_k} +]0, L_k(1-B_k')c^\beta] e_{k+1,0}\big)$$
$$\mathcal{R}_{k+1}^{(I_k)} := \mathcal{R}_k^{(I_k)} \cup \big(J_k^* +]0, L_k B_k' c^\beta] e_{M_k+1, I_k}\big), \quad \mathcal{R}_{k+1}^{(i)} := \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \neq I_k, \qquad \mu_{k+1}^* := \mu_k^* - c\delta_{J_k^*} + \lambda_k^+$$

where
$$\lambda_k^+(J_k^* +]c^\beta s, c^\beta t] e_{M_k+1, I_k}) = c\mu_k^+(]s, t]), \qquad 0 \leqslant s < t \leqslant L_k B_k',$$
$$\lambda_k^+(J_k^* + L_k B_k' c^\beta +]c^\beta s, c^\beta t] e_{M_k+1, I_k}) = c\mu_k^+(L_k B_k' +]s, t]), \qquad 0 \leqslant s < t \leqslant L_k(1-B_k').$$

We will now formulate a modification of Algorithm 4.2 starting from a given stable tree. Let $(\mathcal{T},\mu)$ be a stable tree of index $\beta\in(0,1/2]$ and $(\Sigma_k,k\geqslant 0)$ an i.i.d. sequence of leaves sampled from μ. Consider the sequence of reduced weighted $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}_k,\mu_k,k\geqslant 0)$ where μ_k captures the masses of the connected components of $\mathcal{T}\backslash\mathcal{T}_k$ projected onto $\mathcal{T}_k$ as in (1.1). Let $(v_i,i\geqslant 1)$ be the sequence of branch points of $\mathcal{T}$ in order of appearance in $(\mathcal{T}_k,k\geqslant 0)$, and denote by $(\mathcal{S}_j^{(i)},j\geqslant 1)$ the subtrees of $\mathcal{T}\backslash\mathcal{T}_{k^{(i)}}$ rooted at v_i, $i\geqslant 1$, where $k^{(i)}=\inf\{k\geqslant 0\colon v_i\in\mathcal{T}_k\}$ and where indices are assigned in increasing order of least leaf labels $\min\{\ell\geqslant k^{(i)}\colon \Sigma_\ell\in\mathcal{S}_j^{(i)}\}$, $j\geqslant 1$. For $i,j\geqslant 1$, set $P_j^{(i)}:=\mu(\mathcal{S}_j^{(i)})$,

$$D^{(i)}:=\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(1-\sum_{j\in[n]}P_j^{(i)}/P^{(i)}\right)^{1-\beta}(1-\beta)^{\beta-1}n^\beta,\qquad \text{where } P^{(i)}:=\sum_{j\geqslant 1}P_j^{(i)}. \tag{4.13}$$

This yields an i.i.d. sequence of $(1-\beta)$-diversities $(D^{(i)},i\geqslant 1)$ with $D^{(i)}\sim\mathrm{ML}(1-\beta,-\beta)$, cf. Theorem 3.10 and (3.7). In the following algorithm, we build i.i.d. Ford trees in the branch points of the stable tree $(\mathcal{T},\mu)$ from i.i.d. labelled $(\beta',1-\beta')$-strings of beads $\widehat{\xi}_k,k\geqslant 0$, for $\beta'=\beta/(1-\beta)$. To do so, we consider two separate mass measures: the measures $(\widehat{\mu}_k,k\geqslant 0)$, that equal μ on (shifted) subtrees of the stable tree, and the measures $\widehat{\nu}_k$ on the Ford trees, which, restricted to each Ford tree separately, play the role of the mass measures ν_m, $m\geqslant 1$, in the construction in Proposition 4.10.

Algorithm 4.11 (Algorithm 4.2 with subtrees from a given stable tree)**.** We construct a sequence of weighted ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k,(\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_k^{(i)},i\geqslant 1),\widehat{\mu}_k,\widehat{\nu}_k,(\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{(k)},n\geqslant 0),k\geqslant 0\big)$ embedded in $l^1(\mathbb{N}_0^2)$, each equipped with an infinite leaf sequence $(\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{(k)},n\geqslant 0)$ and an additional finite measure $\widehat{\nu}_k$ as follows.

0. Let $(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_0,(\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_0^{(i)},i\geqslant 1),\widehat{\mu}_0,\widehat{\nu}_0,(\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{(0)},n\geqslant 0))=(\mathcal{T},(\{\rho\},i\geqslant 1),\mu,0,(\Sigma_n,n\geqslant 0))$ be a stable tree.

Given $(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_j,(\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_j^{(i)},i\geqslant 1),\widehat{\mu}_j,\widehat{\nu}_j,(\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{(j)},n\geqslant 0))$, $0\leqslant j\leqslant k$, let $\widehat{r}_k=\#\{i\geqslant 1\colon \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}\neq\{\rho\}\}$;

1.-2. let $\widehat{J}_k\in\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ be the closest point to the leaf $\widehat{\Sigma}_{k+1}^{(k)}$ in $\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k,\widehat{\Sigma}_1^{(k)},\dots,\widehat{\Sigma}_k^{(k)})$; if $\widehat{J}_k\in\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_k^{(i)}$ for some $i\in[\widehat{r}_k]$, set $I_k=i$, otherwise let $I_k=\widehat{r}_k+1$; denote by $M_k\geqslant 0$ the size of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(I_k)}$;

3. let $\widehat{\xi}_k$ be an independent labelled $(\beta',1-\beta')$-string of beads; if $M_k\geqslant 1$, define the scale factor $\widehat{c}=\widehat{\nu}_k(\widehat{J}_k)$, otherwise set $\widehat{c}=1$; write as $([0,K_k],\nu_k,\sum_{j\geqslant 1}\delta_{(X_{k,j},\Lambda_{k,j})})$ the string of beads $\widehat{\xi}_k$ with metric rescaled by $\widehat{c}^{\beta'}(P^{(I_k)})^\beta(D^{(I_k)})^{\beta'}$ and mass measure rescaled by $\widehat{c}$, where $P^{(I_k)}$ and $D^{(I_k)}$ are as in (4.13); denote by $\mathcal{S}_{k,j}$, $j\in\{0,1,2,\dots;\infty\}$, the connected components of $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k\backslash\{\widehat{J}_k\}$, where $\mathcal{S}_{k,\infty}$ contains the root and the other components are ordered by least label; let $X_{k,0}:=K_k$ and set

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{k+1}:=\mathcal{S}_{k,\infty}\cup\mathcal{S}_{k,0}\cup\left(\widehat{J}_k+[0,K_k]e_{M_{k+1},I_k}\right)\cup\bigcup_{j\geqslant 0}\left(X_{k,j}e_{M_{k+1},I_k}+\mathcal{S}_{k,j+1}\right).$$

if $M_k=0$, let $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{k+1}^{(I_k)}=\widehat{J}_k+[0,K_k]e_{M_{k+1},I_k}$, otherwise add this shifted string to $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_k^{(I_k)}$ to form $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{k+1}^{(I_k)}$; retain the other marked components, just shifted by the appropriate $X_{k,j}e_{M_{k+1},I_k}$ if $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_k^{(i)}\subset\mathcal{S}_{j,k}$. Finally, let $\widehat{\mu}_{k+1}$ denote the mass measure obtained from $\widehat{\mu}_k$ by appropriate shifting, and similarly for $\widehat{\nu}_{k+1}$, just with ν_k shifted onto $\widehat{J}_k+[0,K_k]e_{M_{k+1},I_k}$ replacing $\widehat{\nu}_k(\widehat{J}_k)\delta_{\widehat{J}_k}$.

Remark 4.12. Note that the scaling factor $(C^{(i)})^{-1}:=(P^{(i)})^\beta(D^{(i)})^{\beta/(1-\beta)}$ can be rewritten as

$$(C^{(i)})^{-1}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(P^{(i)}-\sum_{j\in[n]}P_j^{(i)}\right)^\beta(1-\beta)^{-\beta}n^{\beta^2/(1-\beta)}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\sum_{j\geqslant n+1}P_j^{(i)}\right)^\beta(1-\beta)^{-\beta}n^{\beta^2/(1-\beta)},$$

or, alternatively, using (3.7), as $(C^{(i)})^{-1}=\lim_{j\to\infty}(j\Gamma(\beta))^{\beta/(1-\beta)}\left(P_j^{(i)\downarrow}\right)^\beta$.

The following result follows directly from the construction in Algorithm 4.11 and Proposition 4.10.

Proposition 4.13. *In the setting of Algorithm 4.11, there exists a sequence of i.i.d. Ford CRTs $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_i,i\geqslant 1)$ of index $\beta'=\beta/(1-\beta)$ which is independent of the stable tree $(\mathcal{T},\mu)$ such that, for all $i\geqslant 1$,*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_k^{(i)}=:\widehat{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}=\left(C^{(i)}\right)^{-1}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_i\qquad \textit{a.s. w.r.t. to the Gromov-Hausdorff topology.}$$

We will now prove that the sequence of reduced ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees constructed in Algorithm 4.11 and the sequence of trees constructed in Algorithm 4.2 are equal in distribution.

Proposition 4.14. *Let* $(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k, (\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \widehat{\mu}_k, (\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{(k)}, n \geqslant 0), k \geqslant 0)$ *and* $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ *be as in Algorithms 4.11 and 4.2, respectively,* $\widehat{\pi}_k \colon \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k \to \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widehat{\Sigma}_0^{(k)}, \ldots, \widehat{\Sigma}_k^{(k)})$ *the projection as in (2.4). Then,*

$$\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widehat{\Sigma}_0^{(k)}, \ldots, \widehat{\Sigma}_k^{(k)}\right), \left(\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right), (\widehat{\pi}_k)_* \widehat{\mu}_k, k \geqslant 0\right) \stackrel{d}{=} \left(\mathcal{T}_k^*, \left(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right), \mu_k^*, k \geqslant 0\right). \tag{4.14}$$

Furthermore, $(P_j^{(x)}, j \geqslant 1)$ *with* $P_j^{(x)} := \widehat{\mu}_k\left(\mathcal{S}_j^{(x)}\right) / \sum_{\ell \geqslant 1} \widehat{\mu}_k\left(\mathcal{S}_\ell^{(x)}\right)$, $j \geqslant 1$, *are i.i.d.* $\mathrm{GEM}(1-\beta, -\beta)$ *for all* $x \in \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widehat{\Sigma}_0^{(k)}, \ldots, \widehat{\Sigma}_k^{(k)})$ *with* $(\widehat{\pi}_k)_* \widehat{\mu}_k(x) > 0$, *where* $(\mathcal{S}_j^{(x)}, j \geqslant 1)$ *are the connected components of* $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k \backslash \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widehat{\Sigma}_0^{(k)}, \ldots, \widehat{\Sigma}_k^{(k)})$ *rooted at* $x \in \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widehat{\Sigma}_0^{(k)}, \ldots, \widehat{\Sigma}_k^{(k)})$, *ranked in increasing order of least leaf labels.*

The following is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.14.

Corollary 4.15. *In Algorithm 4.2, the tree growth processes* $\left(C^{(i)} \mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}, m \geqslant 1\right)$, $i \geqslant 1$, *are i.i.d. Ford tree growth processes of index* $\beta' = \beta/(1-\beta)$ *independent of the stable tree* $(\mathcal{T}, \mu) = \lim_{k \to \infty} (\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widetilde{\mu}_k)$ *of Corollary 4.7, where the scaling factors* $(C^{(i)})^{-1} = (P^{(i)})^{\beta} (D^{(i)})^{\beta/(1-\beta)}$, $i \geqslant 1$, *are as in Remark 4.12.*

To prove Proposition 4.14, we will need a strong form of coagulation-fragmentation duality.

Lemma 4.16. *Let* $P = (P_i, i \geqslant 1) \sim \mathrm{GEM}(\alpha, \theta)$ *with* α*-diversity* S, *and* $\widehat{\xi} = ([0, \widehat{K}], \widehat{\mu}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}} = \sum_{j \geqslant 1} \delta_{(X_j, \widehat{\Lambda}_j)})$ *an independent labelled* $(\beta', \theta/\alpha)$*-string of beads. Use* $([0, \widehat{K}], \widehat{\mu}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}})$ *to coagulate* $(P_i, i \geqslant 1)$ *into* $\mu(\{X_j\}) := \sum_{i \in \widehat{\Lambda}_j} P_i$, *with relative part sizes* $Q_m^{(j)} := P_{\pi_j(m)}/\mu(\{X_j\})$, $m \geqslant 1$, *labelled by the increasing bijection* $\pi_j \colon \mathbb{N} \to \widehat{\Lambda}_j$, $j \geqslant 1$. *Then*

- *the string of beads* $([0, S^{\beta'} \widehat{K}], \mu)$ *is an* $(\alpha\beta', \theta)$*-string of beads,*
- *the sequence of fragments* $(Q_m^{(j)}, m \geqslant 1)$ *has a* $\mathrm{GEM}(\alpha, -\alpha\beta')$ *distribution, for each* $j \geqslant 1$,
- *the string* $([0, S^{\beta'} \widehat{K}], \mu)$ *and the fragments* $(Q_m^{(j)}, m \geqslant 1)$ *of* $\mu(\{X_j\})$, $j \geqslant 1$, *are independent.*

Proof. This is an enriched instance of coagulation-fragmentation duality, see e.g. [39, Section 5.5]. We use a combinatorial approach, with notation $(x)_{n\uparrow\gamma} = x(x+\gamma)\cdots(x+(n-1)\gamma)$ and using known distributions of (ordered and unordered) Chinese restaurant partitions [39, 41]. Fix $n \geqslant 1$.

What is the probability that an ordered $(\beta', \theta/\alpha)$-coagulation groups the tables of an unordered (α, θ)-Chinese restaurant partition of $[n]$ into m groups $(n_{1,1}, \ldots, n_{1,k_1}), \ldots, (n_{m,1}, \ldots, n_{m,k_m})$? If we denote by ℓ the number of new right-most groups opened, and $(\gamma)_{j\uparrow\delta} := \gamma(\gamma+\delta)\cdots(\gamma+(j-1)\delta)$, then it is

$$\frac{(\theta+\alpha)_{k_1+\cdots+k_m-1\uparrow\alpha} \prod_{i\in[m]} \prod_{j\in[k_i]} (1-\alpha)_{n_{ij}\uparrow 1}}{(1+\theta)_{n-1\uparrow 1}} \frac{(\beta')^{m-\ell-1} (\theta/\alpha)^{\ell} \prod_{i\in[m]} (1-\beta')_{k_i-1\uparrow 1}}{(1+\theta/\alpha)_{k_1+\cdots+k_m-1\uparrow 1}}.$$

What is the probability that an unordered $(\alpha, -\alpha\beta')$-fragmentation of an ordered $(\alpha\beta', \theta)$-Chinese restaurant partition of $[n]$ yields m tables further split into $(n_{1,1}, \ldots, n_{1,k_1}), \ldots, (n_{m,1}, \ldots, n_{m,k_m})$? If we denote by ℓ the number of new right-most tables, then it is

$$\frac{(\alpha\beta')^{m-\ell-1} \theta^{\ell} \prod_{i\in[m]} (1-\alpha\beta')_{n_{i,1}+\cdots+n_{i,k_i}-1\uparrow 1}}{(1+\theta)_{n-1\uparrow 1}} \prod_{i\in[m]} \frac{(\alpha-\alpha\beta')_{k_i-1\uparrow\alpha} \prod_{j\in[k_i]} (1-\alpha)_{n_{ij}-1\uparrow 1}}{(1-\alpha\beta')_{n_{i,1}+\cdots+n_{i,k_i}-1\uparrow 1}}.$$

Elementary cancellations show that these two expressions are equal for all $n \geqslant 1$. Since these structured partitions can be constructed in a consistent way, as $n \geqslant 1$ varies, the statement of the lemma merely records different aspects of the limiting arrangement, either asymptotic frequencies in size-biased order of least labels coagulated by a labelled strings of beads, or respectively a string of beads with blocks further fragmented, with fragments in size-biased order of least labels. □

The following result can be proved using the same method.

Lemma 4.17. *Let* $P = (P_i, i \geqslant 1) \sim \mathrm{GEM}(\alpha, \theta)$ *and, for* $\alpha \in (0,1), \theta > 0$, *let* $\widehat{\Lambda} = (\widehat{\Lambda}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\Lambda}_r)$ *be an independent* $\mathrm{Dirichlet}(\theta_1/\alpha, \ldots, \theta_r/\alpha)$ *partition of* $\mathbb{N}$ *with* $\sum_{i\in[r]} \theta_i = \theta$. *Use* $(\widehat{\Lambda}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\Lambda}_r)$ *to coagulate* $(P_i, i \geqslant 1)$ *into* $R_j := \sum_{i \in \widehat{\Lambda}_j} P_i$, *with relative part sizes* $Q_m^{(j)} := P_{\pi_j(m)}/R_j$, $m \geqslant 1$, *labelled by the increasing bijection* $\pi_j \colon \mathbb{N} \to \widehat{\Lambda}_j$, $j \in [r]$. *Then*

- *the vector* $(R_1, \ldots, R_r)$ *of aggregate masses has a* $\mathrm{Dirichlet}(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_r)$ *distribution,*
- *the sequence of fragments* $(Q_m^{(j)}, m \geqslant 1)$ *has a* $\mathrm{GEM}(\alpha, \theta_j)$ *distribution, for each* $j \in [r]$,
- *the vector* $(R_1, \ldots, R_r)$ *and the fragments* $(Q_m^{(j)}, m \geqslant 1)$ *of* R_j, $j \in [r]$, *are independent.*

In the context of Algorithm 4.11, it is useful to adopt the following terminology. Consider a branch point of the reduced stable tree and the associated Ford tree. The (unordered) (α,θ)-Chinese restaurant behind P partitions the total branch point mass into subtrees (unmarked tables) which carry leaf labels of the stable tree (unmarked customers). A transition $k \to k+1$ of the algorithm spreads the subtrees over a new string of beads of the Ford tree. The ordered structures $\widehat{\xi}$ and $\widehat{\Lambda}$, respectively, partition the leaf labels of the Ford tree (marked customers) into marked tables (whose sizes are captured by $\widehat{\nu}$ for each marked component separately). The coagulation takes subtrees as marked customers and so coagulates those unmarked tables that are listed in the same marked table to form a partition of unmarked customers (leaves of the stable tree) into marked tables. The further partition into unmarked tables within each marked table is then a fragmentation of the unmarked customers (leaf labels of the stable tree).

Proof of Proposition 4.14. As the families of weighted discrete ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees in (4.14), suitably represented, are consistent and at step k uniquely determine the trees at steps $0,\dots,k-1$, it suffices to show that for fixed $k \geqslant 0$

$$\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widehat{\Sigma}_0^{(k)}, \dots, \widehat{\Sigma}_k^{(k)}\right), \left(\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right), (\widehat{\pi}_k)_* \widehat{\mu}_k\right) \stackrel{d}{=} \left(\mathcal{T}_k^*, \left(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right), \mu_k^*\right). \tag{4.15}$$

We will prove (4.15) by induction on k, showing that the LHS follows the characterisation of the distribution of the two-colour tree on the RHS given in Proposition 4.4. The case $k=0$ follows from Proposition 1.9 in combination with Corollary 3.13.

For general $k \geqslant 0$, we obtain the shape T_k of a stable tree $\mathcal{T}_k$ reduced to the first $k+1$ leaves from the stable tree growth processes with masses naturally embedded in Algorithm 4.11, and conditionally given its shape with ℓ branch points $v_1,\dots,v_\ell$ of degrees $d_1,\dots,d_\ell$, a Dirichlet$(\beta,\dots,\beta,m_1+(1-2\beta),\dots,m_\ell+(1-2\beta))$ mass split between edges and branch points as in Proposition 3.12 where $m_i := d_i - 2, i \in [\ell]$. We further obtain rescaled independent (β,β)-strings of beads on the branches of the stable tree, i.e. the unmarked branches of $\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widehat{\Sigma}_0^{(k)},\dots,\widehat{\Sigma}_k^{(k)})$, cf. Theorem 3.12 and Proposition 1.9.

From the stick-breaking representation (3.4) of GEM$(\cdot,\cdot)$ and Algorithm 1.7, the relative masses of the subtrees of $\mathcal{T}\backslash\mathcal{T}_k$ rooted at v_i indexed in increasing order of smallest leaf labels form a vector with distribution GEM$(1-\beta, m_i(1-\beta)+(1-2\beta))$, independently for each branch point, $i \in [\ell]$.

From the independent Ford tree growth processes via labelled strings of beads built from the $(\widehat{\xi}_k, k \geqslant 0)$ in Algorithm 4.11, we have the shapes of conditionally independent Ford trees with $m_1,\dots,m_\ell$ leaves, and for each Ford tree conditionally given the shape, independently a Dirichlet$(\beta',\dots,\beta',1-\beta',\dots,1-\beta')$ partition of $\mathbb{N}$ obtained by relabelling the edge-partition of labels $\mathbb{N}\backslash[m_i]$ by the increasing bijection $\mathbb{N}\backslash[m_i] \to \mathbb{N}$. These partitions are further split on each internal edge by a labelled (β',β')-string of beads, and on each external edge by a labelled $(\beta',1-\beta')$-string of beads, again all labelled by $\mathbb{N}$ and obtained by increasing bijections from $\mathbb{N}$ to the label sets of the edges.

We apply Lemma 4.17 with P as the GEM$(1-\beta, m_i(1-\beta)+(1-2\beta))$ split into further subtree masses of the ith marked component and $\widehat{\Lambda}$ as the Dirichlet$(\beta',\dots,\beta',1-\beta',\dots,1-\beta')$ partition of marked Ford labels in the ith component. We note that we eventually place subtrees in their size-biased order in P into the further Ford leaves of the ith component. Therefore, the coagulation of Lemma 4.17 produces a Dirichlet$(\beta,\dots,\beta,1-2\beta,\dots,1-2\beta)$ mass split onto the edges and independent GEM$(1-\beta,\beta)$ and GEM$(1-\beta,1-2\beta)$ sequences of fragments of these edge masses.

We apply Lemma 4.16 for each edge, with P as the GEM$(1-\beta,\beta)$ or GEM$(1-\beta,1-2\beta)$ sequence of fragments and with the labelled (β',β')- or $(\beta',1-\beta')$-string of beads as $\widehat{\xi}$, independent. Again, we note that we eventually place subtrees in their size-biased order in P according to the positions of the labels in the labelled string of beads. Therefore, the coagulation of Lemma 4.16 produces a mass split according to a (β,β)- or $(\beta,1-2\beta)$-string of beads, respectively.

We obtain two-colour shapes as needed for the distribution of the RHS of (4.15) characterised in Proposition 4.4. Conditionally given the two-colour shape, we obtain independent Dirichlet splits onto edges that combine to a Dirichlet$(\beta,\dots,\beta,1-2\beta,\dots,1-2\beta)$ split, with parameters β for unmarked and marked internal edges and $1-2\beta$ for marked external edges. Again conditionally given the two-colour shape, we obtain, independently of the Dirichlet splits, for each unmarked and marked internal edge an independent (β,β)-string of beads, and for each marked external edge a $(\beta,1-2\beta)$-string of beads. If we arrange the edges in the tree shape suitably by depth first search and sort the Dirichlet vectors and the vectors of strings accordingly, their joint conditional distribution does not depend on the two-colour shape, so the two-colour shape, the overall Dirichlet split and the strings of beads are jointly independent.

Finally, Algorithm 4.11 scales the strings of beads. We can write $(P^{(i)})^\beta (D^{(i)})^{\beta'} = (D_{m_i}^{(i)})^{\beta'} (P_{(m_i)}^{(i)})^\beta$, where $D_{m_i}^{(i)}$ is the $(1-\beta)$-diversity of P in the application of Lemma 4.17 above, independent of the

total mass $P^{(i)}_{(m_i)} = \sum_{j\geqslant m_i+1} P^{(i)}_j$ on the ith component, which is further split according to the Dirichlet distribution found above, as required. Altogether, the distribution is the same as in Proposition 4.4. □

Proof of Theorem 4.8 and (1.4) in Theorem 1.4. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.14 and Corollary 4.15. □

In Theorem 4.8, we identified the tree growth processes $(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_k, k \geqslant 1)$, $i \geqslant 1$, as consistent families of tree growth processes which obey the growth rules of a Ford tree growth process of index $\beta' = \beta/(1-\beta)$. Rescaling these processes to obtain i.i.d. sequences of Ford trees requires knowledge of the scaling factor which is incorporated in the limiting stable tree. It is, however, possible to approximate this scaling factor using the tree constructed up to step k only. We are further able to obtain i.i.d. marked subtree growth processes obeying the Ford growth rules (but with wrong starting lengths) applying suitable scaling.

Theorem 4.18 (Embedded Ford trees)**.** *Let $(\mathcal{T}^*_k, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_k, i \geqslant 1), \mu^*_k, k \geqslant 0)$ as in Algorithm 4.2.*

(i) *The normalised tree growth processes in the components, with projected μ-masses, are i.i.d.:*

$$\left(\mathcal{G}^{(i)}_m, \mu^{(i)}_m, m \geqslant 1\right) = \left(\mu^*_{k^{(i)}_1}\left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_{k^{(i)}_1}\right)^{-\beta} \mathcal{R}^{(i)}_{k^{(i)}_m}, \mu^*_{k^{(i)}_1}\left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_{k^{(i)}_1}\right)^{-1} \mu^*_k\restriction_{\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_k}, m \geqslant 1\right), \quad i \geqslant 1. \tag{4.16}$$

(ii) *The processes $\left(\mu^*_{k^{(i)}_1}\left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_{k^{(i)}_1}\right)^{-\beta}\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_{k^{(i)}_m}, m \geqslant 1\right)$, without μ-masses are i.i.d. Ford tree growth processes of index $\beta' = \beta/1-\beta$ as in Algorithm 1.2, $i \geqslant 1$, but starting from $\mathrm{ML}(\beta, 1-2\beta)$, not $\mathrm{ML}(\beta', 1-\beta')$.*

(iii) *For $i \geqslant 1$, define $C^{(i)}_m := (1-\beta)^\beta\, m^{-\beta^2/(1-\beta)} \mu^*_{k^{(i)}_m}\left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_{k^{(i)}_m}\right)^{-\beta}$. The processes $(C^{(i)}_m \mathcal{R}^{(i)}_{k^{(i)}_m}, m \geqslant 1)$ with scaling constant depending on m, $i \geqslant 1$, are i.i.d., $\lim_{m\to\infty} C^{(i)}_m = \left(H^{(i)}\right)^{-\beta/(1-\beta)} \mu^*_{k^{(i)}_1}\left(\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_{k^{(i)}_1}\right)^{-\beta}$ a.s., where $H^{(i)} \sim \mathrm{ML}(1-\beta, 1-2\beta)$, and $\lim_{m\to\infty} C^{(i)}_m \mathcal{R}^{(i)}_{k^{(i)}_m} = \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$ a.s. in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology where $(\mathcal{F}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1)$ are i.i.d. Ford CRTs of index β'.*

Proof. See Section A.2 in the appendix. □

5. Continuum tree asymptotics

In this section, we use embedding to show the convergence of the constructions in Theorems 1.5 and 1.6.

5.1. Embedding of the two-colour line-breaking construction into a binary compact CRT

In [45] we constructed CRTs recursively based on recursive distribution equations as reviewed by Aldous and Bandyopadhyay [5]. This method applied to a β-mixed string of beads yields a compact CRT $(\mathcal{T}^*, \mu^*)$ in which we can embed the two-colour line-breaking construction. Let us briefly recall the recursive construction of $(\mathcal{T}^*, \mu^*)$ from [45, Proposition 4.12] including some useful notation. We only outline the constructions without going into the mathematical details for which we refer to [45].

For $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$, consider a sequence of independent strings of beads $(\xi_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{U})$,

$$\xi_{\mathbf{i}} = \left([0, L_{\mathbf{i}}], \sum_{j\geqslant 1} P_{\mathbf{i}j}\delta_{X_{\mathbf{i}j}}\right), \quad \mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{U},$$

where $\xi_\varnothing$ is a (β,β)-string of beads independent of the β-mixed strings of beads $\xi_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{U}\backslash\{\varnothing\}$, and $\mathbb{U} := \bigcup_{n\geqslant 0}\mathbb{N}^n$ is the infinite Ulam-Harris tree. Let $(\check{\mathcal{T}}_0, \check{\mu}_0) = \xi_\varnothing$, and for $n \geqslant 0$, conditionally given $(\check{\mathcal{T}}_n, \check{\mu}_n)$ with $\check{\mu}_n = \sum_{\mathbf{i}j\in\mathbb{N}^{n+1}} \check{P}_{\mathbf{i}j}\delta_{\check{X}_{\mathbf{i}j}}$, attach to each $\check{X}_{\mathbf{i}j}$ an isometric copy of the string of beads $\xi_{\mathbf{i}j}$

- with metric rescaled by $\check{\mu}_n(\check{X}_{\mathbf{i}j})^\beta$, and mass measure rescaled by $\check{\mu}_n(\check{X}_{\mathbf{i}j})$,
- so that the atom $P_{\mathbf{i}jk}\delta_{X_{\mathbf{i}jk}}$ of $\xi_{\mathbf{i}j}$ is scaled to become an atom of $\check{\mathcal{T}}_{n+1}$ denoted by $\check{P}_{\mathbf{i}jk}\delta_{\check{X}_{\mathbf{i}jk}}$, $k \geqslant 1$,

for all $\mathbf{i}j \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1}$ respectively. Denote the resulting tree by $(\check{\mathcal{T}}_{n+1}, \check{\mu}_{n+1})$.

By construction, $(\check{\mathcal{T}}_n, \check{\mu}_n)$ only carries mass in the points $\check{X}_{\mathbf{i}j}, \mathbf{i}j \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1}$, i.e. $\check{\mu}_n(\check{\mathcal{T}}_n\backslash\check{\mathcal{T}}_{n-1}) = 0$ for $n \geqslant 0$. Note that, for any $\check{X}_{i_1 i_2\cdots i_{n+1}} \in \check{\mathcal{T}}_n$, $n \geqslant 0$,

$$\check{\mu}_n\left(\check{X}_{i_1 i_2\cdots i_{n+1}}\right) = \check{P}_{i_1 i_2\cdots i_{n+1}} = P_{i_1}P_{i_1 i_2}\cdots P_{i_1 i_2\cdots i_{n+1}}.$$

This induces a recursive description of the trees $(\check{\mathcal{T}}_n, \check{\mu}_n, n \geqslant 0)$ via the strings of beads $(\xi_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{U})$.

Theorem 5.1 ([45, Proposition 4.12])**.** *Let $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$ and $(\check{\mathcal{T}}_n, \check{\mu}_n, n \geqslant 0)$ as above. Then there exists a compact CRT $(\mathcal{T}^*, \mu^*)$ such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\check{\mathcal{T}}_n, \check{\mu}_n\right) = (\mathcal{T}^*, \mu^*) \quad a.s.$$

with respect to the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov topology.

We will show that the increasing sequence $(\mathcal{T}^*_k, k \geqslant 0)$ of compact $\mathbb{R}$-trees from Algorithm 4.2 converges a.s. to a tree with the same distribution as $\mathcal{T}^*$. To do this and handle the marked components, we will embed the sequence of weighted ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T}^*_k, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_k, i \geqslant 1), \mu^*_k, k \geqslant 0)$ into a given $(\mathcal{T}^*, \mu^*)$.

Note that the strings of beads $\xi_{\mathbf{i}}$, $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{U}\backslash\{\varnothing\}$, are β-mixed strings of beads as used in Algorithm 4.2 but are not elements of the space of (equivalence classes of) weighted 1-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees $\mathbb{T}^{[1]}_{\mathrm{w}}$, as there is no marked component. As we would like to embed into $(\mathcal{T}^*, \mu^*)$ the two-colour line breaking construction which carries colour marks on β-mixed strings of beads, we need to determine $I_1 = [0, K_1] \subset I = [0, K]$ such that $(I, I_1, \lambda) \sim \nu^{[1]}_\beta$ given some $\xi = (I = [0, K], \lambda) \sim \nu_\beta$, where ν_β and $\nu^{[1]}_\beta$ were introduced at the beginning of Section 4 as distributions on one-branch trees in $\mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}$ and $\mathbb{T}^{[1]}_{\mathrm{w}}$, respectively. The existence of the conditional distribution of the point of the colour change K_1 given ξ is stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\xi \sim \nu_\beta$. Then there exists a unique probability kernel κ from $\mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(K_1 \in \cdot | \xi\right) = \kappa\left(\xi, \cdot\right) \quad a.s.. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. This is a special case of Theorem 6.3 in [29], since $\mathbb{R}$ is a Borel space. □

Given the weighted $\mathbb{R}$-tree $(\mathcal{T}^*, \mu^*)$, we will obtain a sequence of weighted ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees

$$\left(\overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_k, \left(\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}_k, i \geqslant 1\right), \overline{\mu}^*_k, k \geqslant 0\right)$$

with the same distribution as $(\mathcal{T}^*_k, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_k, i \geqslant 1), \mu^*_k, k \geqslant 0)$ as an increasing sequence of subsets $\overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_k \subset \mathcal{T}^*$, $k \geqslant 0$, where the mass measure $\overline{\mu}^*_k$ captures the masses of the connected components of $\mathcal{T}^*\backslash\overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_k$ projected onto $\overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_k$, $k \geqslant 0$. The recursive structure $\xi_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{U}$, provides the i.i.d. strings of beads needed in Algorithm 4.2, which the colour change kernel (5.1) turns into i.i.d. 1-marked strings of beads.

Algorithm 5.3 (Two-colour embedding)**.** Let $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$. We embed into the tree $(\mathcal{T}^*, \mu^*)$ of Theorem 5.1 weighted ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_k, (\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}_k, i \geqslant 1), \overline{\mu}^*_k)$, $k \geqslant 0$, as follows.

0. Let $(\overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_0, \overline{\mu}^*_0) = \xi_\varnothing$ be the initial (β, β)-string of beads; let $\overline{r}_0 = 0$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}_0 = \{\rho\}$, $i \geqslant 1$.

Given $(\overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_j, (\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}_j, i \geqslant 1), \overline{\mu}^*_j)$ with $\overline{\mu}^*_j = \sum_{x\in\overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_j} \overline{\mu}^*_j(x)\delta_x$, $0 \leqslant j \leqslant k$, let $\overline{r}_k = \#\{i \geqslant 1 \colon \overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}_k \neq \{\rho\}\}$;

1. select an edge $\overline{E}^*_k \subset \overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_k$ with probability proportional to its mass $\overline{\mu}^*_k(\overline{E}^*_k)$; if $\overline{E}^*_k \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}_k$ for some $i \in [\overline{r}_k]$, let $\overline{I}_k = i$; otherwise, i.e. if $\overline{E}^*_k \subset \overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_k \backslash \bigcup_{i\in[\overline{r}_k]} \overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}_k$, let $\overline{r}_{k+1} = \overline{r}_k + 1$, $\overline{I}_k = \overline{r}_{k+1}$;
2. if $\overline{E}^*_k$ is an external edge of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}_k$, perform $(\beta, 1-2\beta)$-coin tossing sampling on $\overline{E}^*_k$ to determine $\overline{J}^*_k \in \overline{E}^*_k$; otherwise, i.e. if $\overline{E}^*_k \subset \overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_k \backslash \bigcup_{i\in[\overline{r}_k]} \overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}_k$ or if $\overline{E}^*_k$ is an internal edge of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}_k$, sample $\overline{J}^*_k$ from the normalised mass measure on $\overline{E}^*_k$;
3. let $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $\overline{J}^*_k = \check{X}_{\mathbf{j}}$ and $\overline{\mu}^*_k(\overline{J}^*_k) = \check{P}_{\mathbf{j}}$; sample a point $\overline{\Omega}_k$ from $\kappa(\xi_{\mathbf{j}}, \cdot)$; to form $(\overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_{k+1}, \overline{\mu}^*_{k+1})$, remove $\overline{\mu}^*_k(\overline{J}^*_k)\delta_{\overline{J}^*_k}$ from $\overline{\mu}^*_k$ and add to $\overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_k$ the scaled copy of the string of beads $\xi_{\mathbf{j}}$ with $\overline{\Omega}_k$ embedded in $\mathcal{T}^*$; set $\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(\overline{I}_k)}_{k+1} = \overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(\overline{I}_k)}_k \cup [[\overline{J}^*_k, \overline{\Omega}_k]]$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}_{k+1} = \overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}_k$, $i \neq \overline{I}_k$.

The proof of the following statement can be found in the Appendix A.1, together with similar proofs.

Proposition 5.4. *The sequences of trees constructed in Algorithm 4.2 and Algorithm 5.3 have the same distribution, i.e.* $(\mathcal{T}^*_k, (\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_k, i \geqslant 1), \mu^*_k, k \geqslant 0) \stackrel{d}{=} (\overline{\mathcal{T}}^*_k, (\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}_k, i \geqslant 1), \overline{\mu}^*_k, k \geqslant 0)$.

5.2. Convergence of two-colour trees, and the proof of Theorem 1.5

Theorem 4.6 and Corollary 4.15 demonstrate that the two-colour line-breaking construction naturally combines the stable tree growth process, and infinitely many rescaled subtree growth processes that build

rescaled independent Ford CRTs. We can show that the tree growth process $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ converges to a compact CRT with the same distribution as the CRT $(\mathcal{T}^*, \mu^*)$ constructed in the beginning of Section 5.1, using the embedding of Algorithm 5.3 and Proposition 5.4.

Proposition 5.5 (Convergence of $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, \mu_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$)**.** *Let $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, \mu_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ be the sequence of weighted $\mathbb{R}$-trees from Algorithm 4.2. Then, there is a compact CRT $(\mathcal{T}^*, \mu^*)$ such that*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} d_{\mathrm{GHP}}\left((\mathcal{T}_k^*, \mu_k^*), (\mathcal{T}^*, \mu^*)\right) = 0 \quad a.s.. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. We prove the claim for the sequence of weighted $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\overline{\mathcal{T}}_k^*, \overline{\mu}_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ embedded in a given $(\mathcal{T}^*, \mu^*)$ as in Section 5.1. Then (5.2) will follow from Proposition 5.4.

By Theorem 4.6 and Corollary 4.7, we can couple a stable tree growth process $(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widetilde{\mu}_k) \to (\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ with $(\overline{\mathcal{T}}_k^*, \overline{\mu}_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ in such a way that $\widetilde{\mu}_k$ is a push-forward of $\overline{\mu}_k^*$. In particular, we have

$$\max\{\overline{\mu}_k^*(x), x \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_k^*\} \leqslant \max\{\widetilde{\mu}_k(x), x \in \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k\} \to 0 \qquad \text{a.s..} \tag{5.3}$$

On the other hand, $\overline{\mu}_k^*$ is the pushforward of μ^* under the projection map $\overline{\pi}_k^* \colon \mathcal{T}^* \to \overline{\mathcal{T}}_k^*$. Now assume, for contradiction that $\overline{\bigcup_{k\geqslant 0} \overline{\mathcal{T}}_k^*} \neq \mathcal{T}^*$. Since all leaves are limit points of $\mathcal{T}^* \backslash \mathrm{Lf}(\mathcal{T}^*)$ and by Theorem 5.1, $\mathcal{T}^*$ is a CRT, there is $x \in \mathcal{T}^* \backslash \overline{\bigcup_{k\geqslant 0} \overline{\mathcal{T}}_k^*}$ such that the subtree of $\mathcal{T}^*$ above x has positive mass $c := \mu^*(\mathcal{T}_x^*) > 0$. Since $\overline{\bigcup_{k\geqslant 0} \overline{\mathcal{T}}_k^*}$ is path-connected, $\mathcal{T}_x^* \cap \overline{\bigcup_{k\geqslant 0} \overline{\mathcal{T}}_k^*} = \varnothing$, and hence all $\overline{\mu}_k^*$ must have an atom greater than c, which contradicts (5.3).

We conclude that $\overline{\bigcup_{k\geqslant 0} \overline{\mathcal{T}}_k^*} = \mathcal{T}^*$. Since $\mathcal{T}^*$ is compact and the union is increasing in $k \geqslant 0$, this implies GH-convergence. The convergence in the GHP sense follows since the mass measure $\overline{\mu}_k^*$ is the projection of μ^* onto $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_k^*$, see the proof of [41, Corollary 23] for details of this argument. □

Corollary 5.6 (Convergence of two-colour trees)**.** *Let $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ be the two-colour tree growth process from Algorithm 4.2 for some $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$. Then there exist a compact CRT $(\mathcal{T}^*, \mu^*)$, an i.i.d. sequence $(\mathcal{F}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1)$ of Ford CRTs of index $\beta' = \beta/(1-\beta)$ and scaling factors $(C^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1)$ as in Corollary 4.15 with $\lim_{k\to\infty} d_{\mathrm{GHP}}^{\infty}\big((\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu_k^*), (\mathcal{T}^*, ((C^{(i)})^{-1}\mathcal{F}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu^*)\big) = 0$ a.s..*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 5.5 and Corollary 4.15. □

It will be convenient to use the representation of Algorithm 4.11. We note the following consequences of the construction, in the light of the Proposition 5.5.

Corollary 5.7. *In the setting of Algorithm 4.11*

(i) the closure $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ in $l^1(\mathbb{N}_0^2)$ of the increasing union $\bigcup_{k\geqslant 0} \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widehat{\Sigma}_0^{(k)}, \ldots, \widehat{\Sigma}_k^{(k)})$ is compact;

(ii) the natural projection of $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ onto the subspace spanned by $e_{k,0}$, $k \geqslant 0$, is the stable tree $\mathcal{T}$;

(iii) the natural projection of $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ onto the subspace spanned by $e_{m,i}$, $m \geqslant 1$, scaled by the scaling factor $C^{(i)}$ of Remark 4.12, is a Ford CRT for each $i \geqslant 1$.

Proof. (i) It follows from Propositions 4.14 and 5.5, that the closure $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ in $l^1(\mathbb{N}_0^2)$ of the increasing union is compact. (ii) holds by construction since all steps of Algorithm 4.11 preserve this projection property for the trees $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k$, $k \geqslant 0$. (iii) holds by Corollary 4.15 since the scaled projections of $\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widehat{\Sigma}_0^{(k)}, \ldots, \widehat{\Sigma}_k^{(k)})$ are Ford tree growth processes whose mth growth step is for $k = k_m^{(i)}$, $m \geqslant 1$, $i \geqslant 1$. □

These two corollaries imply Theorem 1.5.

5.3. Branch point replacement in a stable tree, and the proof of Theorem 1.6

The aim of this section is to replace branch points of the stable tree by rescaled independent Ford CRTs. Let us denote the independent Ford tree growth processes underlying Corollary 5.7(iii) by $(\mathcal{F}_m^{(i)}, m \geqslant 1)$, and the Ford CRTs with leaf labels by $(\mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \Omega_m^{(i)}, m \geqslant 1)$, $i \geqslant 1$, all embedded in the appropriate coordinates. Now fix $i \geqslant 1$, and focus on the mth subtree of the ith branch point of $\mathcal{T}$, suppose Σ_n is its smallest label. In Algorithm 4.11, each insertion into the ith marked component shifts some subtrees of the ith branch point, and the subtree we consider stops being shifted at the mth insertion.

The branch point replacement algorithm can be viewed as a change of order of the insertions of Algorithm 4.11. The kth step of Algorithm 4.11 gets Σ_k into its final position $\widehat{\Sigma}_k^{(k)}$ by inserting one

branch of a marked component. The ith step of the branch point replacement algorithm gets the smallest labelled leaf of all subtrees of the ith branch point into their final positions by making all insertions into the ith component. This amounts to shifting the mth subtree of the ith branch point by $\Omega_m^{(i)}$, $m \geqslant 1$.

Algorithm 5.8 (Branch point replacement in the stable tree)**.** We construct a sequence of weighted i-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{B}^{(i)}, (\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(i)}), \mu^{(i)})$. Let $(\mathcal{B}^{(0)}, \mu^{(0)}) = (\mathcal{T}, \mu)$ be the embedded stable tree with leaves $\Sigma_n^{(0)} = \Sigma_n, n \geqslant 0$. For $i \geqslant 1$, conditionally given $(\mathcal{B}^{(i-1)}, (\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(i-1)}), \mu^{(i-1)}, (\Sigma_n^{(i-1)}, n \geqslant 0))$, shift the connected components $\mathcal{S}_m^{(i)}$, $m \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots; \infty)$, of $\mathcal{B}^{(i-1)} \backslash v_i^{(i-1)}$ of the ith branch point $v_i^{(i-1)}$:

$$\mathcal{B}^{(i)} := \mathcal{S}_\infty^{(i)} \cup \mathcal{S}_0^{(i)} \cup \left(v_i^{(i-1)} + \left(C^{(i)}\right)^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{(i)} \right) \cup \bigcup_{m \geqslant 1} \left(\left(C^{(i)}\right)^{-1} \Omega_m^{(i)} + \mathcal{S}_m^{(i)} \right)$$

where $\mathcal{F}^{(i)}$ is the independent Ford CRT with labelled Ford leaves $(\Omega_m^{(i)}, m \geqslant 1)$. Take as $\mu^{(i)}$ the measure $\mu^{(i-1)}$ shifted with each of the connected components and set $\mathcal{R}^{(i)} := \left(v_i^{(i-1)} + \left(C^{(i)}\right)^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{(i)} \right)$.

Theorem 5.9 (Branch point replacement)**.** *The $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{B}^{(i)}, (\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(i)}, \{0\}, \{0\}, \ldots), \mu^{(i)})$, of Algorithm 5.8 converge in $(\mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}^\infty, d_{\mathrm{GHP}}^\infty)$ to a limit with the same distribution as in Corollary 5.6, i.e.*

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} d_{\mathrm{GHP}}^\infty \left(\left(\mathcal{B}^{(i)}, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(i)}, \{0\}, \ldots \right), \mu^{(i)} \right), \left(\mathcal{T}^*, \left(\left(C^{(i)}\right)^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1 \right), \mu^* \right) \right) = 0 \quad a.s..$$

Proof. By construction, the trees spanned by the first k leaves are the same in Algorithms 4.11 and 5.8:

$$\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k, \Sigma_0^{(k)}, \ldots, \Sigma_k^{(k)} \right), \left(\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1 \right), \widehat{\mu}_k^*, k \geqslant 0 \right) = \left(\mathcal{B}_k^{(k)}, \left(\mathcal{U}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1 \right), \lambda_k, k \geqslant 0 \right) \tag{5.4}$$

where $\mathcal{B}_k^{(k)} := \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^{(k)}, \Sigma_0^{(k)}, \ldots, \Sigma_k^{(k)})$, $\mathcal{U}_k^{(i)} := \mathcal{R}^{(i)} \cap \mathcal{B}_k^{(k)}$, and $\lambda_k = (\pi_k^{\mathcal{B}})_* \mu^{(k)}$ denotes the projected mass measure.

By Proposition 4.14 and Corollary 5.6, we have convergence of reduced trees to the claimed limit. In particular, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $k_0 \geqslant 0$ such that for all $k \geqslant k_0$,

$$d_{\mathrm{GHP}}^\infty \left(\left(\mathcal{B}_k^{(k)}, \left(\mathcal{U}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1 \right), \lambda_k \right), \left(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}, \left(\left(C^{(i)}\right)^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1 \right), \widehat{\mu} \right) \right) < \varepsilon/3.$$

But this is only possible if all connected components of $\widehat{\mathcal{T}} \backslash \mathcal{B}_k^{(k)}$ have height less than $2\varepsilon/3$. By construction, the components of $\mathcal{B}^{(k)} \backslash \mathcal{B}_k^{(k)}$ are bounded in height by the corresponding components of height less than $2\varepsilon/3$. Since $\widehat{\mu}$ and $\mu^{(k)}$ have the same projection onto $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_k = \mathcal{B}_k^{(k)}$, we conclude that also

$$d_{\mathrm{GHP}}^\infty \left(\left(\mathcal{B}_k^{(k)}, \left(\mathcal{U}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1 \right), \lambda_k \right), \left(\mathcal{B}^{(k)}, \left(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}, \{0\}, \ldots \right), \mu^{(k)} \right) \right) < 2\varepsilon/3.$$

By the triangle inequality, this completes the proof. □

This formalises and proves Theorem 1.6.

6. Discrete two-colour tree growth processes

Marchal [34] introduced a tree growth model related to the stable tree. Specifically, he built a sequence of discrete trees $(T_n, n \geqslant 0)$, which we view as rooted $\mathbb{R}$-trees with unit edge lengths, equipped with the graph distance, i.e. the distance between two vertices $x, y \in T_n$ is the number of edges between x and y.

Algorithm 6.1 (Marchal's algorithm)**.** Let $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$. We grow discrete trees T_n, $n \geqslant 0$, as follows.

0. Let T_0 consist of a root ρ and a leaf Σ_0, connected by an edge.

Given T_n, with leaves $\Sigma_0, \ldots, \Sigma_n$,

1. distribute a total weight of $n + \beta$ by assigning $(d-3)(1-\beta) + 1 - 2\beta$ to each vertex of degree $d \geqslant 3$ and β to each edge of T_n; select a vertex or an edge in T_n at random according to these weights;
2. if an edge is selected, insert a new vertex, i.e. replace the selected edge by two edges connecting the new vertex to the vertices of the selected edge; proceed with the new vertex as the selected vertex;
3. in all cases, add a new edge from the selected vertex to a new leaf Σ_{n+1} to form T_{n+1}.

Strengthening a result by Marchal [34], Curien and Haas [9] showed that the sequence of trees $(T_n, n \geqslant 0)$ has the stable tree $\mathcal{T}$ of index β as its a.s. scaling limit, in the following strong sense:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-\beta} T_n = \mathcal{T} \quad \text{a.s. in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology.}$$

The trees $(\mathcal{F}_m, m \geqslant 1)$ of a Ford tree growth process can also be obtained as scaling limits of a discrete tree growth process, the so-called Ford alpha-model. Both Marchal's model related to the stable tree and Ford's alpha-model are contained as special cases in the alpha-gamma-model studied in [8].

Definition 6.2 (The alpha-gamma-model)**.** Let $\alpha \in [0,1]$ and $\gamma \in (0,\alpha]$. We grow discrete trees $T_n, n \geqslant 1$:

0. Let T_1 consist of a root ρ and a leaf Σ_1, connected by an edge.

Given T_n, with leaves $\Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_n$,

1. distribute a total weight of $n - \alpha$ by assigning $(d-2)\alpha - \gamma$ to each vertex of T_n of degree $d \geqslant 3$, $1-\alpha$ to each external edge of T_n, and γ to each internal edge of T_n; select a vertex or an edge in T_n at random according to these weights;
2. if an edge is selected, insert a new vertex, i.e. replace the selected edge by two edges connecting the new vertex to the vertices of the selected edge; proceed with the new vertex as the selected vertex;
3. in all cases, add a new edge from the selected vertex to a new leaf Σ_{n+1} to form T_{n+1}.

Note that the case $\gamma = 1-\alpha = \beta$ gives Marchal's model, Algorithm 6.1, while the case $\gamma = \alpha = \beta'$ was introduced by Daniel Ford in his thesis [18] and is referred to as Ford's alpha-model. In the latter, branch points get assigned weight zero after their creation, i.e. the trees in Ford's alpha model are binary.

Lemma 6.3 (Convergence of reduced trees)**.** *Let $(T_n, n \geqslant 1)$ be an alpha-gamma tree-growth process for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $\gamma \in (0,\alpha]$. For $k \geqslant 1$, consider the reduced tree $\mathcal{R}(T_n, \Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_k)$ spanned by the root and the first k leaves, equipped with the graph distance on T_n, i.e. for any edge $a \to b$ in $\mathcal{R}(T_n, \Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_k)$ the number of edges between a and b in T_n. Then there exists an $\mathbb{R}$-tree $\mathcal{R}_k$ such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-\gamma} \mathcal{R}(T_n, \Sigma_0, \ldots, \Sigma_k) = \mathcal{R}_k \quad a.s.$$

in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology. Furthermore, conditionally given that T_k has a total of $k+\ell$ edges, i.e. that T_k has ℓ branch points, the edge lengths of $\mathcal{R}_k$ are given by $L_k V_k^\gamma D_k$ where

$$D_k \sim \text{Dirichlet}\left((1-\alpha)/\gamma, \ldots, (1-\alpha)/\gamma, 1, \ldots, 1\right)$$

with a weight of $(1-\alpha)/\gamma$ for each external edge, and weight 1 for each internal edge, and

$$L_k \sim \text{ML}(\gamma, \ell\gamma + k(1-\alpha)), \quad V_k \sim \text{Beta}\left(k(1-\alpha) + \ell\gamma, (k-1)\alpha - \ell\gamma\right)$$

are conditionally independent.

Note that in the stable case, the total length is a $V_k \sim \text{Beta}((k+\ell)(1-\alpha), (k-1-\ell)\alpha - \ell)$ proportion of $L_k \sim \text{ML}(1-\alpha, (k+\ell)(1-\alpha))$, and is uniformly distributed amongst the $k+\ell$ edges. In Ford's model, we have $\ell = k-1$, and we distribute the "full" length $L_k \sim \text{ML}(\alpha, k-\alpha)$ according to a Dirichlet variable D_k with a parameter of $1/\alpha - 1$ for each external edge and parameter 1 for each internal edge.

In a similar manner, we can obtain the two-colour trees $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$, $k \geqslant 0$, as a.s. scaling limits of the following discrete tree growth process in the space of ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees with unit edge lengths.

Definition 6.4 (The discrete two-colour model)**.** Let $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$. We grow discrete two-colour trees $(T_n^*, (R_n^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$, $n \geqslant 0$, as follows.

0. Let T_0 consist of a root ρ and a leaf Σ_0 connected by an edge, let $R_0^{(i)} = \{\rho\}$, $i \geqslant 1$, and $r_0 = 0$.

Given $(T_n^*, (R_n^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$, with leaves $\Sigma_0, \ldots, \Sigma_n$ and $r_n = \#\{i \geqslant 1 \colon R_n^{(i)} \neq \{\rho\}\}$,

1. distribute a total weight of $n + \beta$ by assigning β to each unmarked and each internal marked edge of T_n, and $1 - 2\beta$ to each external marked edge of T_n; select an edge in T_n at random according to these weights;
2. if the selected edge is unmarked, replace it by two unmarked edges connecting the new vertex to the vertices of the selected edge and set $I_n = r_n + 1$; if the selected edge is a marked edge of $R_n^{(i)}$ for some $i \geqslant 1$, replace it by two marked edges and set $I_n = i$; proceed with the new vertex as the selected vertex;
3. add a new degree-2 vertex, connect it to the selected vertex by a marked edge, and to a new leaf Σ_{n+1} by an unmarked edge; add the marked edge to $R_n^{(I_n)}$ to form $R_{n+1}^{(I_n)}$; set $R_{n+1}^{(i)} = R_n^{(i)}$ for $i \neq I_n$.

Proposition 6.5 (Convergence of the discrete two-colour model)**.** *Consider the discrete two-colour tree growth process* $(T_n^*, (R_n^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), n \geqslant 0)$ *from Definition 6.4, which we view as a sequence of* ∞*-marked* $\mathbb{R}$*-trees with unit edge lengths. For all* $k \geqslant 0$*, let* $\mathcal{R}(T_n^*, (R_n^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \Sigma_0, \ldots, \Sigma_k)$ *denote the reduced tree spanned by the root* ρ *and the leaves* $\Sigma_0, \ldots, \Sigma_k$*. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-\beta}\mathcal{R}\left(T_n^*, \left(R_n^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right), \Sigma_0, \ldots, \Sigma_k\right) = \left(\mathcal{T}_k^*, \left(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right)\right) \quad a.s.$$

with respect to the distance d_{GH}^{∞} *defined in (2.6), where* $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), k \geqslant 0)$ *is as in Algorithm 1.3.*

Conditionally given that T_k^* *has* r_k *marked components* $R_k^{(i)} \neq \{\rho\}$ *with* $d_1 - 2, \ldots, d_{r_k} - 2$ *leaves, the distribution of the edge lengths of* $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1))$ *is given by* $S_k^* D_k$ *where* $S_k^* \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \beta + k)$ *and*

$$D_k \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\,(1, \ldots, 1, 1/\beta - 2, \ldots, 1/\beta - 2)$$

with weight 1 *for each unmarked edge and each internal marked edge, and weight* $1/\beta - 2$ *for each external marked edge, are conditionally independent.*

The proof of Proposition 6.5 is based on exactly the same techniques as the proof of the corresponding result for the alpha-gamma model, cf. [8, Propositions 21 and 22], and the result for (α, θ)-tree growth processes, cf. [41, Proposition 14]. We omit the details.

Remark 6.6. One can obtain the mass measures μ_k^*, $k \geqslant 0$, as the scaling limits of the empirical measures on the leaves of T_n, projected onto the reduced trees, using the same methods as in [41]. In particular, each edge equipped with limiting relative projected subtree masses is a rescaled (β, θ)-string of beads where $\theta = \beta$ for internal marked and unmarked edges, and $\theta = 1 - 2\beta$ for external marked edges. It can be shown directly that these strings of beads are independent of each other and of the mass split on $\mathcal{T}_k^*$, which has distribution Dirichlet$(\beta, \ldots, \beta, 1 - 2\beta, \ldots, 1 - 2\beta)$, with parameter β for each internal marked and unmarked edge, and parameter $1 - 2\beta$ for each external marked edge of $\mathcal{T}_k^*$, as in Proposition 4.4.

Appendix A: Appendix

We present the proofs postponed from earlier parts of this paper.

A.1. Coupling proofs of Proposition 3.12, Theorem 4.6 and Proposition 5.4

The proofs of Proposition 3.12, Theorem 4.6 (i) and (ii), and of Proposition 5.4 are based on coupling arguments and are quite similar to one another. We present the proof of Theorem 4.6(i) first.

Proof of Theorem 4.6(i). Recall the constructions of $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, \mu_k^*)$ in Algorithm 4.2 and $(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widetilde{\mu}_k)$ in (4.8). We couple $(\mathcal{T}_k, \mu_k, k \geqslant 0)$ to $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, \mu_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ and identify the distribution as required for Algorithm 1.7:

- We couple the initial (β, β)-strings of beads to be equal $(\mathcal{T}_0, \mu_0) = (\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_0, \widetilde{\mu}_0) = (\mathcal{T}_0^*, \mu_0^*)$.
- Supposing that $(\mathcal{T}_k, \mu_k) = (\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k, \widetilde{\mu}_k)$ for some $k \geqslant 0$, set $J_k := \widetilde{J}_k = [J_k^*]_\sim$, $\xi_k = \xi_k^{(2)}$, and

$$Q_k := (1 - \gamma_k)\, \mu_k^*(J_k^*)/\widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{J}_k),$$

  where we recall that $(1 - \gamma_k) \sim \mathrm{Beta}(\beta, 1 - 2\beta)$ is the independent scaling factor for $\xi_k^{(2)}$ in the construction of a β-mixed string of beads from $\xi_k^{(1)}$, $\xi_k^{(2)}$ and γ_k, as at the beginning of Section 4. If the selected atom J_k^* is an element of a marked component, Q_k is the proportion of the mass of J_k^* added to this marked component in the form of a rescaled independent (β, β)-string of beads $\xi_k^{(2)}$, while a proportion of $1 - Q_k$ is split into an unmarked rescaled $(\beta, 1 - 2\beta)$-string of beads $\xi_k^{(1)}$.

Since $\widetilde{J}_k$ was sampled from $\widetilde{\mu}_k$, J_k is sampled from μ_k, as required for Algorithm 1.7. It remains to check that the scaling factor $Q_k\widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{J}_k)$ induced by Algorithm 4.2, applied to the (β, β)-string of beads $\xi_k = \xi_k^{(2)}$ that is used in the attachment procedure, is as needed for Algorithm 1.7. We work conditionally given the event that $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k$ has ℓ branch points $\widetilde{v}_j$ of sizes $d_j = \deg(\widetilde{v}_j, \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k)$, $j \in [\ell]$, respectively.

- If $\widetilde{J}_k \neq \widetilde{v}_i$ for $i \in [\ell]$, then $J_k = \widetilde{J}_k = J_k^*$, and a new branch point $\widetilde{J}_k$ of degree $\deg(\widetilde{J}_k, \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{k+1}) = 3 = 1 + \deg(\widetilde{J}_k, \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k)$ is created. The mass $\mu_k^*(J_k^*) = \widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{J}_k)$ is split by the independent random variable $\gamma_k \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1 - 2\beta, \beta)$ into a branch point weight $\widetilde{\mu}_{k+1}(\widetilde{J}_k) = \gamma_k\widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{J}_k)$ and the isometric copy of the (β, β)-string of beads $\xi_k^{(2)} = \xi_k$, scaled by $\widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{J}_k)(1 - \gamma_k) = \widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{J}_k)Q_k$ where $Q_k \sim \mathrm{Beta}(\beta, 1 - 2\beta)$ is conditionally independent of ξ_k and $(\mathcal{T}_k, \mu_k, J_k)$ given $\deg(J_k, \mathcal{T}_k) = 2$, as required.

- If $\widetilde{J}_k = \widetilde{v}_i$ of degree $\deg(\widetilde{v}_i, \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k) = d_i$ for some $i \in [\ell]$, we first select an edge E_k^* of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ from μ_k^* restricted to $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$. Conditionally given that E_k^* has been selected, we choose $J_k^* \in E_k^*$ according to (β, θ)-coin tossing sampling, where $\theta = \beta$ if E_k^* is an internal edge of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, and $\theta = 1-2\beta$ otherwise. By Proposition 3.5 and Proposition 3.2(iii)-(iv), conditionally given $J_k^* \in E_k^*$, the relative mass split in $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ is
$$\text{Dirichlet}\,(\beta, \ldots, \beta, 1-2\beta, \ldots, 1-2\beta, \beta, 1-\beta, \theta)$$
with parameter β for each non-selected internal edge of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, $1-2\beta$ for each non-selected external edge of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, β for the part of E_k^* closer to the root, θ for the other part of E_k^*, and $1-\beta$ for the atom J_k^*. In any case (i.e. no matter if E_k^* is internal or external), we get by Proposition 3.2(i)-(ii) that, conditionally given $\widetilde{J}_k = \widetilde{v}_i$,
$$\mu_k^*(J_k^*)/\widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{J}_k) \sim \text{Beta}\,(1-\beta, (d_i-2)(1-\beta))$$
is independent of $\widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{J}_k)$, as the internal relative mass split in $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ is independent of its total mass, see Proposition 4.4 and Proposition 3.2(ii). Overall, still conditionally given $\widetilde{J}_k = \widetilde{v}_i$, we have that
$$\mu_k^*\left(J_k^*\right)(1-\gamma_k) = (1-\gamma_k)\left(\mu_k^*\left(J_k^*\right)\widetilde{\mu}_k\left(\widetilde{J}_k\right)^{-1}\right)\widetilde{\mu}_k\left(\widetilde{J}_k\right) = Q_k\widetilde{\mu}_k\left(\widetilde{J}_k\right)$$
where $Q_k \sim \text{Beta}(\beta, d_i(1-\beta)-1)$, as is easily checked using Proposition 3.2(i)-(iii). Note that Q_k is also conditionally independent of $\widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{J}_k)$ given $\widetilde{J}_k = \widetilde{v}_i$ and $\deg(\widetilde{v}_j, \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k) = d_i$. This is due to the fact that the mass split within $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$, and the mass split between the edges of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k$ and its branch points are conditionally independent given there are ℓ branch points $\widetilde{v}_j$ with $\deg(\widetilde{v}_j, \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k) = d_j$, $j \in [\ell]$. □

Proof of Proposition 5.4. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 4.6(i), let us couple so that the initial weighted ∞-marked $\mathbb{R}$-trees coincide, i.e. let $(\mathcal{T}_0^*, (\mathcal{R}_0^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu_0^*) := (\overline{\mathcal{T}}_0^*, (\overline{\mathcal{R}}_0^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \overline{\mu}_0^*)$. Then, $(\mathcal{T}_0^*, \mu_0^*)$ is a (β, β)-string of beads, and $\mathcal{R}_0^{(i)} = \{\rho\}$ for all $i \geqslant 1$, as required for Algorithm 4.2.

Supposing that $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu_k^*) = (\overline{\mathcal{T}}_k^*, (\overline{\mathcal{R}}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \overline{\mu}_k^*)$ for some $k \geqslant 0$, set $J_k^* := \overline{J}_k^*$, $I_k := \overline{I}_k$, and if $\overline{J}_k^* = \check{X}_{\mathbf{i}j}$, take as (E_k^+, μ_k^+) the scaled copy of $\xi_{\mathbf{i}j}$ embedded in $\mathcal{T}^*$ and $R_k^+ = [[\overline{J}_k^*, \overline{\Omega}_k]]$. We need to check that the induced update step from $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu_k^*)$ to $(\mathcal{T}_{k+1}^*, (\mathcal{R}_{k+1}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu_{k+1}^*)$ is as required in Algorithm 4.2. Selecting $\overline{J}_k^*$ in Algorithm 5.3, we first select an edge $\overline{E}_k^*$ of $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ proportionally to $\overline{\mu}_k^*(\overline{E}_k^*)$, and perform $(\beta, 1-2\beta)$-coin tossing if $\overline{E}_k^*$ is an external marked edge, and uniform sampling from $\overline{\mu}_k\restriction_{\overline{E}_k^*}$ otherwise, and since $\mu_k^* = \overline{\mu}_k^*$, this means that J_k^* is sampled precisely as required for Algorithm 4.2, and in particular we have $\mu_k^*(J_k^*) = \overline{\mu}_k^*(\overline{J}_k^*)$. Furthermore, (E_k^+, R_k^+, μ_k^+) is an independent β-mixed string of beads, as it is obtained from $\xi_{\mathbf{i}j}$ and the transition kernel $\kappa(\xi_{\mathbf{i}j}, \cdot)$ of Lemma 5.2. Therefore,
$$\left(\left(\mathcal{T}_k^*, \left(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right), \mu_k^*\right), \left(\mathcal{T}_{k+1}^*, \left(\mathcal{R}_{k+1}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1\right), \mu_{k+1}^*\right)\right)$$
has the same distribution as $\left((\overline{\mathcal{T}}_k^*, (\overline{\mathcal{R}}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu_k^*), (\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{k+1}^*, (\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{k+1}^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \overline{\mu}_{k+1}^*)\right)$, which proves Proposition 5.4, as both Algorithm 4.2 and Algorithm 5.3 specify Markov chains. □

Proof of Proposition 3.12. Construction (1.1) and Algorithm 1.7 use the same notation. To avoid confusion in this proof, we denote the sequence of trees of (1.1) by $(\mathcal{T}_k', \mu_k', k \geqslant 0)$. We will couple the construction of $(\mathcal{T}_k, \mu_k, k \geqslant 0)$ of Algorithm 1.7 to the given sequence $(\mathcal{T}_k', \mu_k', k \geqslant 0)$, specifically identifying the sequences $(J_k, k \geqslant 0)$ of attachment points, and $(Q_k, k \geqslant 0)$ of update random variables.

The coupling is as follows. Set $(\mathcal{T}_0, \mu_0) = (\mathcal{T}_0', \mu_0')$, and, given $(\mathcal{T}_k, \mu_k) = (\mathcal{T}_k', \mu_k')$ for some $k \geqslant 0$, set $J_k := J_k'$ where
$$J_k' := \arg\inf\left\{d\,(\rho, x) : x \in \mathcal{T}_{k+1}' \backslash \mathcal{T}_k'\right\},$$
let $Q_k = 1 - \mu_{k+1}'(J_k')/\mu_k'(J_k')$, and $\xi_k := \left(\mu_{k+1}'(\mathcal{T}_{k+1}' \backslash \mathcal{T}_k')^{-\beta}\mathcal{T}_{k+1}' \backslash \mathcal{T}_k',\ \mu_{k+1}'(\mathcal{T}_{k+1}' \backslash \mathcal{T}_k')^{-1}\mu_{k+1}'\restriction_{\mathcal{T}_{k+1}' \backslash \mathcal{T}_k'}\right)$.

By Proposition 1.9, $(\mathcal{T}_0', \mu_0')$ is a (β, β)-string of beads, as required in Algorithm 1.7. Now assume that $(\mathcal{T}_k, \mu_k) = (\mathcal{T}_k', \mu_k')$ for some $k \geqslant 0$ with the distribution claimed in Proposition 3.12. Denote the connected components of $\mathcal{T} \backslash \mathcal{T}_k'$ by $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}$, $j \geqslant 1$, $i \geqslant 1$, completed by their root vertices $\rho_i \in \mathcal{T}_k'$, $i \geqslant 1$, respectively. Note that $\mu_k'(\rho_i) = \sum_{j \geqslant 1} \mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow})$.

Since we sample Σ_{k+1} from the mass measure μ on $\mathcal{T}$, the conditional probability that $\Sigma_{k+1} \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}$, given $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$, $(\mathcal{T}'_k, \mu'_k)$ and $(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}, j \geqslant 1, i \geqslant 1)$, is $\mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}) = \mu'_k(\rho_i)(\mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow})/\mu'_k(\rho_i))$, i.e. we can sample J'_k in two steps: first, select one of the atoms ρ_i of $\mathcal{T}'_k$ proportionally to $\mu'_k(\rho_i)$, and second, select one of the components $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}$ with root ρ_i proportionally to relative mass $\mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow})/\mu'_k(\rho_i)$. By Theorem 3.10(ii) and Proposition 3.7, we further note that conditionally given $(\mathcal{T}'_k, \mu'_k)$ with $\mu'_k = \sum_{i\geqslant 1} \mu'_k(\rho_i)\delta_{\rho_i}$, we have $(\mu(\mathcal{S}_j^{(i)})/\mu'_k(\rho_i), j \geqslant 1)^{\downarrow} \sim \mathrm{PD}(1-\beta, (d_i-3)(1-\beta)+1-2\beta)$ with $d_i = \deg(\rho_i, \mathcal{T}'_k)$, $i \geqslant 1$, independently.

We have $J'_k = \rho_i$ with probability $\mu'_k(\rho_i)$, and hence J_k is sampled from μ_k, as required in Algorithm 1.7. By Theorem 3.10(iii), the weighted $\mathbb{R}$-trees

$$\left(\mu\left(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}\right)^{-\beta} \overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}, \mu\left(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}\right)^{-1} \mu\restriction_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}}\right), \qquad j \geqslant 1,\ i \geqslant 1,$$

are independent copies of $(\mathcal{T}, \mu)$, i.e. conditionally given $\Sigma_{k+1} \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}$, the sampling procedure of $\Sigma_{k+1} \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}$ from $\mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow})^{-1}\mu\restriction_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}}$ is like sampling $\Sigma_0 \in \mathcal{T}$ from μ. Hence, ξ_k is an independent (β, β)-string of beads, as required in Algorithm 1.7.

Let us consider the distribution of Q_k. Conditionally given $\deg(J'_k, \mathcal{T}'_k) = 2$, Σ_{k+1} is a leaf of a connected component $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}$ of $\mathcal{T}\backslash\mathcal{T}'_k$ with root $\rho_i = J'_k$, which is chosen independently and proportionally to relative mass $\mu(\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow})/\mu'_k(\rho_i)$. As noted above, the relative mass partition above J'_k is $\mathrm{PD}(1-\beta, -\beta)$, i.e. by Proposition 3.7, $Q_k \sim \mathrm{Beta}(\beta, 1-2\beta)$, as required in Algorithm 1.7.

Conditionally given $\deg(J'_k, \mathcal{T}'_k) = d$ for some $d \geqslant 3$, Σ_{k+1} is a leaf of a connected component $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_j^{(i)\downarrow}$ of $\mathcal{T}\backslash\mathcal{T}'_k$ with root $\rho_i = J'_k$. Then the relative mass partition of the connected components $\mathcal{T}\backslash\mathcal{T}'_k$ with root ρ_i is $\mathrm{PD}(1-\beta, (d-3)(1-\beta)+1-2\beta)$ where we note that J'_k must have been selected $d-2$ times up step k in order to obtain $\deg(J'_k, \mathcal{T}'_k) = d$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.7, conditionally given $\deg(J'_k, \mathcal{T}'_k) = d$, $Q_k \sim \mathrm{Beta}(\beta, (d-3)(1-\beta)+1-2\beta)$, as required in Algorithm 1.7. Also, by Proposition 3.7, Q_k is conditionally independent of $\mu'_k(J'_k)$ given $\deg(J'_k, \mathcal{T}'_k) = d$. The mass split in $(\mathcal{T}'_{k+1}, \mu'_{k+1})$ is easily found from Proposition 3.2, cf. the proof of Proposition 4.4 for a similar elementary Dirichlet argument. □

Proof of Theorem 4.6(ii). Recall that the ingredients in Algorithm 1.1 to construct the sequence on the RHS of (4.12) are the Mittag-Leffer Markov chain $(S_k, k \geqslant 0)$, attachment points $(J_k, k \geqslant 0)$, and i.i.d. random variables B_k, $k \geqslant 0$, with $B_1 \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1, 1/\beta - 2)$. We recover these ingredients from the random variables incorporated in the construction of the LHS of (4.12) via the following coupling.

- Set $S_0 = S_0^*$, i.e. $S_0 \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \beta)$ is the length of the initial (β, β)-string of beads $(\mathcal{T}_0^*, \mu_0^*) = (\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_0, \widetilde{\mu}_0)$. For $k \geqslant 0$, set S_k equal to the total length of $\mathcal{T}_k^*$, i.e. $S_k = S_k^*$.
- Set $(J_k, k \geqslant 0) = (\widetilde{J}_k, k \geqslant 0)$.
- Set $(B_k, k \geqslant 0) = (B_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$, where B_k^* denotes the length split between the unmarked and the marked part of the independent β-mixed string of beads (E_k^+, R_k^+, μ_k^+) built from $\xi_k^{(1)}$, $\xi_k^{(2)}$ and γ_k. By Remark 4.1, $(B_k, k \geqslant 0)$ is an i.i.d. sequence with $B_1 \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1, 1/\beta - 2)$, as required.

We will show that

$$\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k, \left(\widetilde{W}_j^{(i)}, 0 \leqslant j \leqslant k, i \geqslant 1\right)\right) \stackrel{d}{=} \left(\mathcal{T}_k, \left(W_j^{(i)}, 0 \leqslant j \leqslant k, i \geqslant 1\right)\right) \tag{A.1}$$

for all $k \geqslant 0$, which implies (4.12) as the families of trees $(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k, k \geqslant 0)$ and $(\mathcal{T}_k, k \geqslant 0)$ are consistent, i.e. given the tree $\mathcal{T}_k$ at step k, we can recover the previous steps $\mathcal{T}_{k-1}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_0$ of the tree sequence.

We prove (A.1) by induction on k. For $k = 0$ the claim is trivial. Suppose that (A.1) holds up to k. In the tree growth process $(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k, k \geqslant 0)$ edge and branch point selection is based on masses, whereas in $(\mathcal{T}_k, k \geqslant 0)$ edges are selected based on length and branch points based on weights. We first prove the correspondence of the selection rules, where we work conditionally given the shape of the tree $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k = \mathcal{T}_k$, in particular conditionally given that $\mathcal{T}_k^*$ has ℓ marked components $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)} \neq \{\rho\}$, $i \in [\ell]$, of sizes $d_i - 2$, $i \in [\ell]$, respectively, or, in other words, that $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k$ has ℓ branch points $\widetilde{v}_i, i \in [\ell]$, of degrees $d_i, i \in [\ell]$, respectively, and a total of $k + \ell + 1$ edges. By (i) and Proposition 3.12, the total mass split in $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k$ is

$$\left(\widetilde{\mu}_k\left(E_k^{(1)}\right), \ldots, \widetilde{\mu}_k\left(E_k^{(k+\ell+1)}\right), \widetilde{\mu}_k\left(\widetilde{v}_1\right), \ldots, \widetilde{\mu}_k\left(\widetilde{v}_\ell\right)\right) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\left(\beta, \ldots, \beta, w(d_1), \ldots, w(d_\ell)\right) \tag{A.2}$$

where $w(d_i) = (d_i - 3)(1-\beta) + 1 - 2\beta$ for $i \in [\ell]$. We denote the edge lengths and the branch point weights in $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k$ by

$$\widetilde{L}_k = \left(\widetilde{L}_k^{(1)}, \ldots, \widetilde{L}_k^{(k+\ell+1)}\right), \quad \widetilde{W}_k = \left(\widetilde{W}_k^{(1)}, \ldots, \widetilde{W}_k^{(\ell)}\right), \tag{A.3}$$

and use corresponding notation in $\mathcal{T}_k$. We will show that the joint distributions of edge lengths, weights and the selected attachment points $\widetilde{J}_k$ and J_k in $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k$ and $\mathcal{T}_k$, respectively, are the same in Algorithm 4.2 and Algorithm 1.1, i.e. for any $k \geqslant 0$, and any continuous and bounded function $f\colon \mathbb{R}^{k+2\ell+1} \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\widetilde{L}_k, \widetilde{W}_k\right) \mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{J}_k \in E_k^{(j)}\}}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[f\left(L_k, W_k\right) \mathbb{1}_{\{J_k \in E_k^{(j)}\}}\right] \qquad \text{for any } j \in [k+\ell+1], \tag{A.4}$$

and
$$\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\widetilde{L}_k, \widetilde{W}_k\right) \mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{J}_k = v_j\}}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[f\left(L_k, W_k\right) \mathbb{1}_{\{J_k = v_j\}}\right] \qquad \text{for any } j \in [\ell]. \tag{A.5}$$

Then, together with the coupling, this completes the induction step. It remains to prove (A.4) and (A.5).

- *Proof of* (A.4). Fix some $j \in [k+\ell+1]$, and consider the LHS of (A.4) first. Conditioning on $\widetilde{J}_k \in E_k^{(j)}$, and using the mass split (A.2) and Proposition 3.2(iv), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\widetilde{L}_k, \widetilde{W}_k\right) \mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{J}_k \in E_k^{(j)}\}}\right] = \frac{\beta}{k+\beta}\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\widetilde{L}_k, \widetilde{W}_k\right)\Big|\widetilde{J}_k \in E_k^{(j)}\right].$$

By Proposition 3.2(iv) and (A.2), conditionally given $\widetilde{J}_k \in E_k^{(j)}$, the distribution of the mass split

$$\left(X_k^{(1)}, \ldots, X_k^{(j-1)}, X_k^{(j)}, X_k^{(j+1)}, \ldots, X_k^{(k+\ell+1)}, X_k^{(k+\ell+2)}, \ldots, X_k^{(k+2\ell+1)}\right) \tag{A.6}$$

with $X_k^{(i)} = \widetilde{\mu}_k(E_k^{(i)})$ for $i \in [k+\ell+1]$ and $X_k^{(i)} = \widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{v}_{i-(k+\ell+1)})$ for $i \in [k+2\ell+1]\backslash[k+\ell+1]$ is

$$\text{Dirichlet}\left(\beta, \ldots, \beta, 1+\beta, \beta, \ldots, \beta, w(d_1), \ldots, w(d_\ell)\right). \tag{A.7}$$

Furthermore, still conditionally given $\widetilde{J}_k \in E_k^{(j)}$, $\widetilde{J}_k$ is an atom of mass $\widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{J}_k) =: U_k^{(j)} X_k^{(j)}$ sampled from the rescaled independent (β,β)-string of beads related to $E_k^{(j)}$, splitting $E_k^{(j)}$ into two edges $E_{k+1}^{(j)}$ and $E_{k+1}^{(k+\ell+3)}$ of masses $\widetilde{\mu}_k(E_{k+1}^{(j)}) =: U_k^{(-)} X_k^{(j)}$ and $\widetilde{\mu}_k(E_{k+1}^{(k+\ell+3)}) =: U_k^{(+)} X_k^{(j)}$, respectively. By Proposition 3.5, the relative mass split on $E_k^{(j)}$ is given by

$$\left(U_k^{(-)}, U_k^{(j)}, U_k^{(+)}\right) \sim \text{Dirichlet}\left(\beta, 1-\beta, \beta\right),$$

and is independent of $X_k^{(j)} = \widetilde{\mu}_k(E_k^{(j)})$, since, by (i) and Proposition 3.12, the (β,β)-string of beads

$$\left(\left(X_k^{(j)}\right)^{-\beta} E_k^{(j)}, \left(X_k^{(j)}\right)^{-1} \widetilde{\mu}_k \restriction_{E_k^{(j)}}\right)$$

is independent of the scaling factor $X_k^{(j)}$. We obtain the refined mass split

$$\left(\overline{X}_k^{(1)}, \ldots, \overline{X}_k^{(j-1)}, \overline{X}_k^{(-)}, \overline{X}_k^{(j)}, \overline{X}_k^{(+)}, \overline{X}_k^{(j+1)}, \ldots, \overline{X}_k^{(k+2\ell+1)}\right) \tag{A.8}$$

where $\overline{X}_k^{(i)} = X_k^{(i)}$, $i \in [k+2\ell+1]\backslash\{j,+,-\}$ and $\overline{X}_k^{(-)} = U_k^{(-)} X_k^{(j)}$, $\overline{X}_k^{(j)} = U_k^{(j)} X_k^{(j)}$ and $\overline{X}_k^{(+)} = U_k^{(+)} X_k^{(j)}$. By Proposition 3.2(iii), the distribution of (A.8) is

$$\text{Dirichlet}\left(\beta, \ldots, \beta, \beta, 1-\beta, \beta, \beta, \ldots, \beta, w(d_1), \ldots, w(d_\ell)\right).$$

Furthermore, the atom $\widetilde{J}_k$ induces the two rescaled independent (β,β)-strings of beads

$$\left(\left(X_k^{(-)}\right)^{-\beta} E_{k+1}^{(j)}, \left(X_k^{(-)}\right)^{-1} \widetilde{\mu}_k \restriction_{E_{k+1}^{(j)}}\right), \quad \left(\left(X_k^{(+)}\right)^{-\beta} E_{k+1}^{(k+\ell+3)}, \left(X_k^{(+)}\right)^{-1} \widetilde{\mu}_k \restriction_{E_{k+1}^{(k+\ell+3)}}\right)$$

where $X_k^{(i)} = U_k^{(i)} X_k^{(j)}, i \in \{-,+\}$, i.e. the lengths of the edges $E_{k+1}^{(j)}$ and $E_{k+1}^{(k+\ell+3)}$ are given by

$$\widetilde{L}_{k+1}^{(j)} = \left(U_k^{(-)} X_k^{(j)}\right)^{\beta} M_k^{(-)}, \quad \widetilde{L}_{k+1}^{(k+\ell+3)} = \left(U_k^{(+)} X_k^{(j)}\right)^{\beta} M_k^{(+)},$$

respectively, where $M_k^{(i)} \sim \text{ML}(\beta,\beta)$, $i \in \{-,+\}$, are independent, see Proposition 3.5. Conditionally given $\widetilde{J}_k \in E_k^{(j)}$, by (A.1) and Corollary 3.9, the weights $\widetilde{W}_k^{(i)}$ of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_k$ are therefore

$$\widetilde{W}_k^{(i-(k+\ell+1))} = \left(X_k^{(i)}\right)^{\beta} M_k^{(i)}, \quad i \in [k+2\ell+1]\backslash[k+\ell+1],$$

where the lengths $\widetilde{L}_k^{(i)}$ are

$$\widetilde{L}_k^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \left(X_k^{(i)}\right)^\beta M_k^{(i)}, & i \in [k+\ell+1]\backslash[j], \\ \left(U_k^{(-)} X_k^{(j)}\right)^\beta M_k^{(-)} + \left(U_k^{(+)} X_k^{(j)}\right)^\beta M_k^{(+)}, & i = j, \end{cases}$$

for independent random variables

$$M_k^{(i)} \sim \begin{cases} \mathrm{ML}(\beta,\beta), & i \in [k+\ell+1]\backslash\{j\} \cup \{-,+\}, \\ \mathrm{ML}(\beta, w(d_{i-(k+\ell+1)})), & i \in [k+2\ell+1]\backslash[k+\ell+1]. \end{cases}$$

Also note that, by the definition of $(S_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ and the attachment procedure,

$$S_{k+1}^* - S_k^* = \widetilde{\mu}_k \left(\widetilde{J}_k\right)^\beta M_k^* = \left(U_k^{(j)} X_k^{(j)}\right)^\beta M_k^*$$

where $M_k^* \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, 1-\beta)$ is the length of the attached, independent β-mixed string of beads. We conclude by Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2(i)-(ii) that $S_k^* = A_k^* S_{k+1}^* \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, k+\beta)$ where $S_{k+1}^* \sim \mathrm{ML}\left(\beta, k+1+\beta\right)$ and $A_k^* \sim \mathrm{Beta}(k/\beta+2, 1/\beta-1)$ are independent, and that, conditionally given $\widetilde{J}_k \in E_k^{(j)}$, we have $(\widetilde{L}_k, \widetilde{W}_k) = S_{k+1}^* A_k^* \widetilde{Z}_k$ where

$$\widetilde{Z}_k = \left(\widetilde{Z}_k^{(1)}, \ldots, \widetilde{Z}_k^{(j-1)}, \widetilde{Z}_k^{(j)}, \widetilde{Z}_k^{(j+1)}, \ldots, \widetilde{Z}_k^{(k+\ell+1)}, \widetilde{Z}_k^{(k+\ell+2)}, \ldots, \widetilde{Z}_k^{(k+2\ell+1)}\right)$$

is independent of S_{k+1}^* and A_k^*, and has a $\mathrm{Dirichlet}(1,\ldots,1,2,1,\ldots,1,w(d_1)/\beta,\ldots,w(d_\ell)/\beta)$ distribution. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\widetilde{L}_k, \widetilde{W}_k\right) \mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{J}_k \in E_k^{(j)}\}}\right] = \frac{\beta}{k+\beta} \mathbb{E}\left[f\left(S_k^* \widetilde{Z}_k\right) \middle| \widetilde{J}_k \in E_k^{(j)}\right].$$

We now consider the RHS of (A.4). We condition on $J_k \in E_k^{(j)}$, and apply Lemma 3.8 and Proposition 3.2(iv) to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(L_k^{(1)}, \ldots, L_k^{(k+\ell+1)}, W_k^{(1)}, \ldots, W_k^{(\ell)}\right) \mathbb{1}_{\{J_k \in E_k^{(j)}\}}\right] = \frac{\beta}{k+\beta} \mathbb{E}\left[f\left(S_k Z_k\right) \middle| J_k \in E_k^{(j)}\right]$$

where $S_k \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, k+\beta)$ is independent of

$$Z_k = \left(Z_k^{(1)}, \ldots, Z_k^{(j-1)}, Z_k^{(j)}, Z_k^{(j+1)}, \ldots, Z_k^{(k+\ell+1)}, Z_k^{(k+\ell+2)}, \ldots, Z_k^{(k+2\ell+1)}\right)$$

and $Z_k \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}(1,\ldots,1,2,1,\ldots,1,w(d_1)/\beta,\ldots,w(d_\ell)/\beta)$. Hence, we conclude (A.4).

- *Proof of* (A.5). Consider now the LHS of (A.5). We follow the lines of the proof of (A.4). Conditionally given $\widetilde{J}_k = \widetilde{v}_j$, the mass split (A.6) has distribution

$$\mathrm{Dirichlet}\left(\beta, \ldots, \beta, w(d_1), \ldots, w(d_{j-1}), 1+w(d_j), w(d_j+1), \ldots, w(d_\ell)\right). \tag{A.9}$$

By (i), the mass $\widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{v}_j)$ is split by an independent vector $(Q_k, 1-Q_k) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\left(\beta, w(d_j)+1-\beta\right)$ into a new unmarked (β,β)-string of beads

$$\left(\widetilde{\mu}_{k+1}\left(E_{k+1}^{(k+l+2)}\right)^{-\beta} E_{k+1}^{(k+\ell+2)}, \widetilde{\mu}_{k+1}\left(E_{k+1}^{(k+\ell+2)}\right)^{-1} \widetilde{\mu}_{k+1}\restriction_{E_{k+1}^{(k+\ell+2)}}\right)$$

attached to $\widetilde{v}_j$ and the mass $\widetilde{\mu}_{k+1}(\widetilde{v}_j)$, i.e. $\widetilde{\mu}_{k+1}(E_{k+1}^{(k+\ell+2)}) = Q_k \widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{v}_j)$, $\widetilde{\mu}_{k+1}(\widetilde{v}_j) = (1-Q_k)\widetilde{\mu}_k(\widetilde{v}_j)$. By (i), Proposition 4.4 and the induction hypothesis, we get $\widetilde{W}_{k+1}^{(i-(k+\ell+2))} = \widetilde{\mu}_{k+1}(\widetilde{v}_{i-(k+\ell+2)})^\beta M_{k+1}^{(i)}$ for $i \in [k+2\ell+2]\backslash[k+\ell+2], i \neq j+(k+\ell+2)$ and $\widetilde{L}_{k+1}^{(i)} = \widetilde{\mu}_{k+1}\left(E_{k+1}^{(i)}\right)^\beta M_{k+1}^{(i)}$ for $i \in [k+\ell+2]$ where the random variables $M_{k+1}^{(i)} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta,\beta)$ for $i \in [k+\ell+2]$, $M_{k+1}^{(i)} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, w(d_{i-(k+\ell+2)}))$ for $i \in [k+2\ell+2]\backslash[k+\ell+2], i \neq j+(k+\ell+2)$ and $M_{k+1}^{(i)} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, w(d_{i-(k+\ell+2)})+(1-\beta))$ for $i = j+(k+\ell+2)$, are independent of the mass split (A.9). By Proposition 4.4, $\widetilde{W}_k^{(j)} = B_k^* \widetilde{W}_{k+1}^{(j)}$, where $B_k^* \sim \mathrm{Beta}((d_j-2)(1/\beta-1), 1/\beta-2)$ is independent of $\widetilde{W}_{k+1}^{(j)}$. Note that $\widetilde{W}_{k+1}^{(i)} = \widetilde{W}_k^{(i)}$ for $i \neq j$, $\widetilde{L}_{k+1}^{(i)} = \widetilde{L}_k^{(i)}$ for $i \in [k+\ell+1]$, and hence, $S_{k+1}^* - S_k^* = \widetilde{L}_{k+1}^{(k+\ell+2)} + \left(\widetilde{W}_{k+1}^{(j)} - \widetilde{W}_k^{(j)}\right)$. By Proposition 3.1, $S_k^* = A_k^* S_{k+1}^*$ where $S_{k+1}^* \sim \mathrm{ML}\left(\beta, k+1+\beta\right)$ and $A_k^* \sim \mathrm{Beta}(k/\beta+2, 1/\beta-1)$ are independent. The rest of the proof of (A.5) is analogous to the proof of (A.4). □

A.2. Proof of Theorem 4.18

We first consider the evolution of marked subtrees $(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, k \geqslant 1)$, $i \geqslant 1$. Recall the notation in Algorithm 4.2. Given that $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ has size m, i.e. $k_m^{(i)} \leqslant k \leqslant k_{m+1}^{(i)} - 1$, we denote the edges and the edge lengths of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ by

$$E_{m,i} = \left(E_{m,i}^{(1)}, \ldots, E_{m,i}^{(2m-1)}\right), \quad L_{m,i} = \left(L_{m,i}^{(1)}, \ldots, L_{m,i}^{(2m-1)}\right), \tag{A.10}$$

respectively, where we note that $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ is a binary tree, i.e. it has $2m-1$ edges for $k_m^{(i)} \leqslant k \leqslant k_{m+1}^{(i)} - 1$. Recall that $E_{m,i}^{(j)}$ is an internal edge of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ if $1 \leqslant j \leqslant m-1$, and an external edge if $m \leqslant j \leqslant 2m-1$.

Lemma A.1 (Mass split in marked subtrees)**.** *Let $(\mathcal{T}_k^*, (\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}, i \geqslant 1), \mu_k^*, k \geqslant 0)$ be as in Algorithm 4.2, and fix some $i \geqslant 1$. Then, for $m \geqslant 1$, conditionally given $k_m^{(i)} = k$, the relative mass split in $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ given by*

$$\mu_k^*\left(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}\right)^{-1}\left(\mu_k^*\left(E_{m,i}^{(1)}\right), \ldots, \mu_k^*\left(E_{m,i}^{(m-1)}\right), \mu_k^*\left(E_{m,i}^{(m)}\right), \ldots, \mu_k^*\left(E_{m,i}^{(2m-1)}\right)\right) \tag{A.11}$$

has a Dirichlet $(\beta, \ldots, \beta, 1-2\beta, \ldots, 1-2\beta)$ *distribution and is independent of $\mu_k^*(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)})$ and of the mass split in $\mathcal{T}_k^* \backslash \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$. Furthermore, for $j \in [2m-1]$,*

$$\left(\mu_k^*\left(E_{m,i}^{(j)}\right)^{-\beta} E_{m,i}^{(j)}, \mu_k^*\left(E_{m,i}^{(j)}\right)^{-1} \mu_k^* \restriction_{E_{m,i}^{(j)}}\right) \tag{A.12}$$

is a (β, θ)-strings of beads, where $\theta = \beta$ for $j \in [m-1]$ and $\theta = 1-2\beta$ for $j \in [2m-1] \backslash [m-1]$. The strings of beads (A.12) are independent of each other and of the mass split in $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$ given by (A.11). Conditionally given that $k_{m+1}^{(i)} = k'$,

$$\mu_{k'}^*\left(\mathcal{R}_{k'}^{(i)}\right) = \left(1 - Q_m^{(i)}\right)\mu_k^*\left(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}\right) \tag{A.13}$$

where $Q_m^{(i)} \sim \mathrm{Beta}(\beta, m(1-\beta) + 1 - 2\beta)$ is independent of $\mathcal{R}_{k'}^{(i)}$ normalised to unit mass.

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.4, and Proposition 3.2(ii). To see (A.13), note that $\mathcal{R}_{k'}^{(i)} \backslash \mathcal{R}_k^{(i)} = E_{m+1,i}^{(2m)}$ and that $\mu_{k'}^*(E_{m+1,i}^{(2m)}) = \gamma_k \mu_k^*(J_k^*)$ where $\gamma_k \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1-2\beta, \beta)$ is independent, and apply Proposition 3.2(i)-(ii). □

Corollary A.2 (Length split in marked subtrees)**.** *In the setting of Lemma A.1, let $\widetilde{S}_{m,i} = \sum_{j \in [2m-1]} L_{m,i}^{(j)}$ denote the total length of $\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}$, $m \geqslant 1$. Then, conditionally given $k_m^{(i)} = k$,*

$$\left(L_{m,i}^{(1)}, \ldots, L_{m,i}^{(m-1)}, L_{m,i}^{(m)}, \ldots, L_{m,i}^{(2m-1)}\right) = \mu_k^*\left(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}\right)^{\beta} S_{m,i} \cdot \left(Z_{m,i}^{(1)}, \ldots, Z_{m,i}^{(m-1)}, Z_{m,i}^{(m)}, \ldots, Z_{m,i}^{(2m-1)}\right) \tag{A.14}$$

where $\mu_k^*(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)})$, $S_{m,i} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, (m-1)(1-\beta) + 1 - 2\beta)$ and

$$\left(Z_{m,i}^{(1)}, \ldots, Z_{m,i}^{(m-1)}, Z_{m,i}^{(m)}, \ldots, Z_{m,i}^{(2m-1)}\right) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\left(1, \ldots, 1, 1/\beta - 2, \ldots, 1/\beta - 2\right)$$

are independent. In particular, $\widetilde{S}_{m,i} = \mu_k^*(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)})^{\beta} S_{m,i}$. Furthermore, for $m \geqslant 1$,

$$\widetilde{S}_{m,i} = B_{m,i} \widetilde{S}_{m+1,i} \tag{A.15}$$

where $B_{m,i} \sim \mathrm{Beta}(m(1/\beta - 1), 1/\beta - 2)$ and $\widetilde{S}_{m+1,i}$ are independent, i.e. the sequence of lengths of each marked subtree is a Markov chain with the same transition rule as the Mittag-Leffler Markov chain with parameter $\beta/(1-\beta)$ starting from $\mathrm{ML}(\beta/(1-\beta), (1-2\beta)/(1-\beta))$.

Proof. Fix $i \geqslant 1$, and set $X_j = \mu_{k_m^{(i)}}^*(E_{m,i}^{(j)})$, $j \in [2m-1]$, so that $\sum_{j \in [2m-1]} X_j = \mu_{k_m^{(i)}}^*(\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)})$. By Lemma A.1, the edge lengths $L_{m,i}^{(j)}$, $j \in [2m-1]$, are given by $L_{m,i}^{(j)} = X_j^{\beta} M_m^{(j)}$ where $M_m^{(j)} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \beta)$ for $j \in [m-1]$, $M_m^{(j)} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, 1-2\beta)$ for $j \in [2m-1] \backslash [m-1]$, $\sum_{j \in [2m-1]} X_j$ and

$$\left(\sum_{j \in [2m-1]} X_j\right)^{-1} (X_1, \ldots, X_{m-1}, X_m, \ldots X_{2m-1}) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}\left(\beta, \ldots, \beta, 1-2\beta, \ldots, 1-2\beta\right)$$

are independent. We apply Proposition 3.1 with $n = 2m-1$, $\theta_j = \beta$ for $j \in [m-1]$ and $\theta_j = 1-2\beta$ for $j \in [2m-1]\backslash[m-1]$ to the vector

$$\left(L_{m,i}^{(1)}, \ldots, L_{m,i}^{(2m-1)}\right) = \left(\sum_{j\in[2m-1]} X_j\right)^{\beta} \left(\left(\frac{X_1}{\sum_{j\in[2m-1]} X_j}\right)^{\beta} M_m^{(1)}, \ldots, \left(\frac{X_{2m-1}}{\sum_{j\in[2m-1]} X_j}\right)^{\beta} M_m^{(2m-1)}\right) \tag{A.16}$$

Then $\theta = (m-1)(1-\beta)+1-2\beta$, and hence (A.14) follows.

To see (A.15), recall that $E_{m+1,i}^{(2m)} = \mathcal{R}_{k_{m+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \backslash \mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}$. By (A.16) for $m+1$, and Proposition 3.2(i)-(ii), $\mu^*_{k_m^{(i)}}(\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)})^{\beta} S_{m,i} = B_{m,i}\mu^*_{k_{m+1}^{(i)}}(\mathcal{R}_{k_{m+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)})^{\beta} S_{m+1,i}$ where the variables $S_{m+1,i} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, m(1-\beta)+1-2\beta)$, $B_{m,i} \sim \mathrm{Beta}(m(1/\beta-1), 1/\beta-2)$ and $\mu^*_{k_{m+1}^{(i)}}(\mathcal{R}_{k_{m+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)})$, are independent, i.e. $\widetilde{S}_{m,i} = B_{m,i}\widetilde{S}_{m+1,i}$. □

Proof of Theorem 4.18. (i) Consider a space $\mathbb{T}_{[m]}$ of weighted discrete $\mathbb{R}$-trees $(\mathcal{T},\mu)$ with m leaves labelled by $[m]$ and mass measure μ of total mass $\mu(\mathcal{T}) \in (0,1]$, $m \geqslant 1$, see e.g. [41, Section 3.3] for a formal introduction. We define transition kernels κ_m from $\mathbb{T}_{[m]}$ to $\mathbb{T}_{[m+1]}$, $m \geqslant 1$: given any $(\mathcal{T},\mu) \in \mathbb{T}_{[m]}$,

- select an edge E of $\mathcal{T}$ according to the normalised mass measure $\mu(\mathcal{T})^{-1}\mu$; given E, select an atom J of $\mu\restriction_E$ according to (β,θ)-coin tossing sampling where $\theta = \beta$ if E is internal, and $\theta = 1-2\beta$ if E is external; this determines a selection probability $p_m(x)$ for each atom $x \in \mathcal{T}$;
- given J, let $\gamma \sim \mathrm{Beta}(1-2\beta,\beta)$ be independent, and attach to J an independent $(\beta, 1-2\beta)$-string of beads with mass measure rescaled by $\gamma\mu(J)$ and metric rescaled by $(\gamma\mu(J))^{\beta}$, and label the new leaf by $m+1$.

We use the convention that if no atom is selected, we apply a scaling factor of 0. Note that, in our setting with (β,β)-strings of beads on internal edges and $(\beta,1-2\beta)$-strings of beads on external edges, this does not happen almost surely. Denote by $\kappa_m((\mathcal{T},\mu),\cdot)$ the distribution of the resulting tree. We further consider the kernel $\kappa_0(\cdot) = \kappa_0((\{\rho\},\delta_\rho),\cdot)$ taking the singleton tree $\{\rho\}$ of mass 1, and associating a $(\beta,1-2\beta)$-string of beads with $\{\rho\}$. We will show that each process in (4.16) evolves according to the transition kernels $\kappa_m, m \geqslant 1$, starting from an independent $(\beta,1-2\beta)$-string of beads whose distribution is given by $\kappa_0(\cdot)$.

More formally, for $\ell \geqslant 1$ and some $m_i \geqslant 1$, $i \in [\ell]$, we will show that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i\in[\ell]} f_i\left(\left(\mathcal{G}_m^{(i)}, \mu_m^{(i)}\right), m \in [m_i]\right)\right]\\ &= \prod_{i\in[\ell]} \int\int\cdots\int f_i\left(R_1,\ldots,R_{m_i}\right)\kappa_{m_i-1}\left(R_{m_i-1}, dR_{m_i}\right)\cdots\kappa_1\left(R_1, dR_2\right)\kappa_0\left(dR_1\right)\end{aligned} \tag{A.17}$$

for any bounded continuous functions $f_i\colon \mathbb{T}_{[1]} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{T}_{[m_i]} \to \mathbb{R}$, $i \in [\ell]$.

We first show the equation (A.17) for $\ell = 1$. For notational convenience, we write $(\mathcal{G}_m,\mu_m) = (\mathcal{G}_m^{(1)}, \mu_m^{(1)})$ and $f = f_1$. We further use the notation $\xi_{\beta,\beta}$ and $\xi_{\beta,1-2\beta}$ for (β,β)- and $(\beta,1-2\beta)$-strings of beads, respectively, and recall that we denote by $p_m(x)$ the selection probability of $x \in \mathcal{T}$ for $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_{[m]}$ using the edge selection rule in combination with coin tossing sampling, as described above. $B_{\beta,1-2\beta}(\cdot)$ denotes the density of $\mathrm{Beta}(\beta,1-2\beta)$. We obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\mathcal{G}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{G}_{m_1}\right)\right] = &\sum_{k_1^{(1)}=1,k_2^{(1)},\ldots,k_{m_1}^{(1)}} \int_{\xi_0} \sum_{v\in\xi_0} \mu_0\left(v\right) \int_{x_1} B_{\beta,1-2\beta}(x_1)\\ &\int_{\xi_1} \left(1-\mu_0\left(v\right)\left(1-\overline{x}_1\right)\right)^{k_2^{(1)}-k_1^{(1)}-1} \mu_0\left(v\right)\left(1-\overline{x}_1\right) \sum_{w_1\in R_1} p_1\left(w_1\right) \int_{x_2} B_{\beta,1-2\beta}(x_2)\\ &\int_{\xi_2} \cdots \left(1-\mu_0\left(v\right)\prod_{i\in[m_1-1]}\left(1-\overline{x}_i\right)\right)^{k_{m_1}^{(1)}-k_{m_1-1}^{(1)}-1} \mu_0\left(v\right)\prod_{i\in[m_1-1]}\left(1-\overline{x}_i\right)\\ &\sum_{w_{m_1-1}\in R_{m_1-1}} p_{m_1-1}\left(w_{m_1-1}\right) \int_{x_{m_1}} B_{\beta,1-2\beta}(x_{m_1}) \int_{\xi_{m_1}} f\left(R_1,\ldots,R_{m_1}\right)\\ &\mathbb{P}\left(\xi_{\beta,1-2\beta}\in d\xi_{m_1}\right)dx_{m_1}\cdots\mathbb{P}\left(\xi_{\beta,1-2\beta}\in d\xi_2\right)dx_2\mathbb{P}\left(\xi_{\beta,1-2\beta}\in d\xi_1\right)dx_1\mathbb{P}\left(\xi_{\beta,\beta}\in d\xi_0\right)\end{aligned}$$

where

- μ_0 is the mass measure of ξ_0;
- $R_1 = \xi_1$ with mass measure $\mu_1^{(1)}$ is the initial string of beads, and, for $m \geqslant 2$, R_m with mass measure $\mu_m^{(1)}$ is created by attaching to $w_{m-1} \in R_{m-1}$ the string of beads ξ_m rescaled by the proportion x_{m-1} of the mass of w_{m-1};
- the sequence $(\overline{x}_i, i \geqslant 1)$ is defined by $\overline{x}_1 = x_1$, $\overline{x}_i = 1 - \frac{\mu_{i-1}^{(1)}(w_{i-1})}{\mu_{i-1}^{(1)}(R_{i-1})}(1 - x_i)$, $i = 2, \ldots, m_1$;
- the integrals are taken over the whole ranges of $x_i \in [0,1]$ and the subspaces of $\xi_i \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{w}}$ that correspond to strings of beads.

Note that $\mu_0(v) \prod_{i \in [m-1]}(1 - \overline{x}_i)$ is the relative remaining mass of the first marked component after m transition steps have been carried out in this component.

We can move the sum over $k_1^{(1)}, \ldots, k_{m_1}^{(1)}$ inside the integrals, and note that there is only one term which depends on $k_{m_1}^{(1)}$. Moving the sum over $k_{m_1}^{(1)}$ in front of this factor, we obtain

$$\sum_{k_{m_1}^{(1)} \geqslant k_{m_1-1}^{(1)}+1} \left(1 - \mu_0(v) \prod_{i \in [m_1-1]} (1 - \overline{x}_i)\right)^{k_{m_1}^{(1)} - k_{m_1-1}^{(1)} - 1} \mu_0(v) \prod_{i \in [m_1-1]} (1 - \overline{x}_i) = 1$$

as this is the sum over the probability mass function of a geometric random variable (there are infinitely many insertions into the first marked component almost surely). We can proceed inductively and sum the corresponding geometric probabilities over $k_1^{(1)}, \ldots, k_{m_1-1}^{(1)}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_{m_1}\right)\right] = &\int_{\xi_0} \sum_{v \in \xi_0} \mu_0(v) \int_{x_1} B_{\beta,1-2\beta}(x_1) \int_{\xi_1} \sum_{w_1 \in R_1} p_1(w_1) \int_{x_2} B_{\beta,1-2\beta}(x_2) \\ &\int_{\xi_2} \cdots \sum_{w_{m_1-1} \in R_{m_1-1}} p_{m_1-1}(w_{m_1-1}) \int_{x_{m_1}} B_{\beta,1-2\beta}(x_{m_1}) \int_{\xi_{m_1}} f\left(R_1, \ldots, R_{m_1}\right) \\ &\mathbb{P}\left(\xi_{\beta,1-2\beta} \in d\xi_{m_1}\right) dx_{m_1} \cdots \mathbb{P}\left(\xi_{\beta,1-2\beta} \in d\xi_2\right) dx_2 \mathbb{P}\left(\xi_{\beta,1-2\beta} \in d\xi_1\right) dx_1 \mathbb{P}\left(\xi_{\beta,\beta} \in d\xi_0\right).\end{aligned}$$

We can now take the sum $\sum_{v \in \xi_0} \mu_0(v) = 1$ and the outer integral, as the inner terms are independent of $\mu_0(v)$ and ξ_0. This results in

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_{m_1}\right)\right] = &\int_{x_1} B_{\beta,1-2\beta}(x_1) \int_{\xi_1} \sum_{w_1 \in R_1} p_1(w_1) \int_{x_2} B_{\beta,1-2\beta}(x_2) \\ &\int_{\xi_2} \cdots \sum_{w_{m_1-1} \in R_{m_1-1}} p_{m_1-1}(w_{m_1-1}) \int_{x_{m_1}} B_{\beta,1-2\beta}(x_{m_1}) \int_{\xi_{m_1}} f\left(R_1, \ldots, R_{m_1}\right) \\ &\mathbb{P}\left(\xi_{\beta,1-2\beta} \in d\xi_{m_1}\right) dx_{m_1} \cdots \mathbb{P}\left(\xi_{\beta,1-2\beta} \in d\xi_2\right) dx_2 \mathbb{P}\left(\xi_{\beta,1-2\beta} \in d\xi_1\right) dx_1.\end{aligned}$$

We recognise the definition of the transition kernels $\kappa_m, m \geqslant 1$, and rewrite this integral in the form

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_{m_1}\right)\right] = \int \int \cdots \int f\left(R_1, \ldots, R_m\right) \kappa_{m-1}\left(R_{m-1}, dR_m\right) \cdots \kappa_1\left(R_1, dR_2\right) \kappa_0\left(dR_1\right)$$

To see (A.17) in the general setting, we express the left-hand side in terms of the distribution of $(\mathcal{T}_0^*, \mu_0^*)$ and the two-colour transition kernels, which can be described via Algorithm 4.2, as a sum over $k_j^{(i)}, j \in [m_i], i \in [\ell]$. Then we can proceed as follows.

- First integrate out irrelevant transitions which affect components $i \geqslant \ell + 1$ and parts of earlier transitions such as unmarked strings of beads after the creation of the ℓth component. These transitions do not affect the marked components $i \in [\ell]$.
- Move the sums over $k_{m_\ell}^{(\ell)}, \ldots, k_2^{(\ell)}$ inside the integrals. Notice that there is only one term depending on $k_{m_\ell}^{(\ell)}$, i.e. we obtain the sum over $k_{m_\ell}^{(\ell)} \geqslant k_{m_\ell-1}^{(l)}$, $k_{m_\ell}^{(l)} \neq k_j^{(i)}, j \in [m_i], i \in [\ell-1]$ of the probabilities of selecting the ℓth marked component at step $k_{m_\ell}^{(\ell)}$, skipping indices $k_j^{(i)}$ of insertions into other

marked components $i \in [\ell-1]$, i.e.

$$\sum_{k_{m_\ell}^{(\ell)} \geqslant k_{m_\ell-1}^{(\ell)}+1, k_{m_\ell}^{(l)} \neq k_j^{(i)}, j\in[m_i], i\in[\ell-1]} \left(1-\mu_{k_1^{(\ell)}-1}(v_\ell) \prod_{r\in[m_\ell-1]} \left(1-\overline{x}_r^{(\ell)}\right)\right)^{k(m,\ell)} \mu_{k_1^{(\ell)}-1}(v_\ell) \prod_{r\in[m_\ell-1]} \left(1-\overline{x}_r^{(\ell)}\right),$$

where $k(m,\ell) := k_{m_\ell}^{(\ell)} - k_{m_\ell-1}^{(\ell)} - \#\{k_{m_\ell-1}^{(\ell)} < k < k_{m_\ell}^{(\ell)} \colon k = k_j^{(i)}, j \in [m_i], i \in [\ell-1]\}$, and where the sequences $(x_i^{(\ell)}, i \geqslant 1)$ and $(\overline{x}_i^{(\ell)}, i \geqslant 1)$ are defined as $(x_i, i \geqslant 1)$ and $(\overline{x}_i, i \geqslant 1)$, respectively. Note that

$$\mu_{k_1^{(\ell)}-1}(v_\ell) \prod_{r\in[m-1]} \left(1-\overline{x}_r^{(\ell)}\right)$$

is the mass of the ℓth marked component after m transition steps have been carried out in this component. As we have a sum over the probability mass function of a geometric random variable, no matter when insertions into components $i \in [\ell-1]$ happen, this sum is 1. We can proceed inductively down to $k_2^{(\ell)}$.

- The sum over the insertion point v_ℓ is just a sum over the bead selection probabilities

$$\mu_{k_1^{(\ell)}-1}(v_\ell), \quad k_1^{(\ell)} \geqslant k_1^{(\ell-1)} + 1,$$

which sum to the probability of creating the ℓth component (no matter what the sizes of the other components are at this step). The sum over $k_1^{(\ell)}$ is not geometric but it is a sum over the probabilities of success in a Bernoulli sequence with increasing success probability. This sum is again 1 (as we will open the ℓth marked component with probability one).
- We can put the integrals over the ingredients for the ℓth subtree growth process in front of the other integrals, as they do not depend on anything else.
- Inductively, for $j = \ell-1, \ldots, 1$, repeat these steps to lose all sums over insertion times $k_i^{(j)}$ and first insertion points v_i, $i \in [\ell]$.
- Finally, the integrand of the outer integral over the distribution of ξ_0 is constant, so the integral can be dropped. We obtain precisely the product form of the right-hand side (A.17). □

(ii) Note that, by Lemma A.1 (and Proposition 4.4), for each i and $k = k_m^{(i)} - 1$ for some $m \geqslant 1$, we are in the situation of Lemma 3.6 with $n = 2m-1$, $\theta_1 = \cdots = \theta_{m-1} = \beta$, $\theta_m = \cdots = \theta_{2m-1} = 1-2\beta$, $\alpha = \beta$. We recover Algorithm 1.2 with index $\beta' = \beta/(1-\beta)$ and the "wrong" starting length $\mathrm{ML}(\beta, 1-2\beta)$, cf. Corollary A.2.

(iii) First, note that, by Corollary A.2, the lengths of the trees $C_m^{(i)}\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ do not depend on $\mu^*_{k_m^{(i)}}(\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)})$. Fix some $i \geqslant 1$ and recall from Lemma A.1 that there are independent random variables $Q_m^{(i)} \sim \mathrm{Beta}(\beta, m(1-\beta)+1-2\beta)$ such that

$$\mu^*_{k_{m+1}^{(i)}}\left(\mathcal{R}_{k_{m+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)}\right) = \left(1-Q_m^{(i)}\right)\mu^*_{k_m^{(i)}}\left(\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}\right), \quad m \geqslant 1.$$

Define $P_1^{(i)} := Q_1^{(i)} \sim \mathrm{Beta}(\beta, 2-3\beta)$, and, for $m \geqslant 1$, define $P_m^{(i)} := \overline{Q}_1^{(i)}\overline{Q}_2^{(i)}\cdots\overline{Q}_{m-1}^{(i)}Q_m^{(i)}$, where $\overline{Q} = 1-Q$ for any random variable Q. Note that $P_m^{(i)}$ is the proportion of the mass of $\mu^*_{k_1^{(i)}}(\mathcal{R}_{k_1^{(i)}}^{(i)})$ attached to the $(m+1)$st leaf of the ith marked component.

We recognise the stick-breaking construction (3.4) of a $\mathrm{PD}(1-\beta, 1-2\beta)$ vector $(P_m^{(i)}, m \geqslant 1)^{\downarrow}$, and obtain the corresponding $(1-\beta)$-diversity $H^{(i)}$ by

$$H^{(i)} = \lim_{m\to\infty}\left(1-\sum_{j\in[m]} P_j^{(i)}\right)^{1-\beta} (1-\beta)^{-(1-\beta)}\, m^\beta \sim \mathrm{ML}\left(1-\beta, 1-2\beta\right), \tag{A.18}$$

as in (3.7). Now fix some $m_0 \geqslant 1$ and let $k \geqslant k_{m_0}^{(i)}$. We consider the reduced tree

$$\mathcal{R}\left(C_m^{(i)}\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}, \Omega_1^{(i)}, \ldots, \Omega_{m_0}^{(i)}\right) \tag{A.19}$$

spanned by the root v_i and the leaves $\Omega_1^{(i)}, \ldots, \Omega_{m_0}^{(i)}$ of $\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)}$. Recall from (i), Corollary A.2 and Proposition 4.3 that the shape and the Dirichlet$(1, \ldots, 1, 1/\beta - 2, \ldots, 1/\beta - 2)$ length split between the edges $E_{m_0,i}^{(i)}, \ldots, E_{m_0,i}^{(2m_0-1)}$ of $\mathcal{R}_{k_{m_0}^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ are as required for the reduced tree associated with a Ford CRT of index β'. Scaling by $C_m^{(i)}$ only affects the total length of the reduced tree (A.19). We will show that the total length of (A.19) scaled by $C_m^{(i)}$ converges a.s. to some $S'_{m_0} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta', m_0 - \beta')$, which is the total length of the reduced tree spanned by the root and the first m_0 leaves of a Ford CRT of index β', i.e. that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathrm{Leb}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(C_m^{(i)}\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}, \Omega_1^{(i)}, \ldots, \Omega_{m_0}^{(i)}\right)\right) = S'_{m_0} \sim \mathrm{ML}\left(\beta', m_0 - \beta'\right)$$

where we will use that

$$C_m^{(i)} := (1-\beta)^\beta\, m^{-\beta^2/(1-\beta)} \mu^*_{k_m^{(i)}}\left(\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}\right)^{-\beta} = \left(1 - \sum_{j\in[m]} P_j^{(i)}\right)^{-\beta} (1-\beta)^\beta\, m^{-\beta^2/(1-\beta)} \mu^*_{k_1^{(i)}}\left(\mathcal{R}_{k_1^{(i)}}^{(i)}\right)^{-\beta},$$

since $1 - \sum_{j\in[m]} P_j^{(i)} = \mu^*_{k_m^{(i)}}(\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)})/\mu^*_{k_1^{(i)}}(\mathcal{R}_{k_1^{(i)}}^{(i)})$. Hence $\lim_{m\to\infty} C_i(m) = (H^{(i)})^{-\beta/(1-\beta)}\mu^*_{k_1^{(i)}}(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)})^{-\beta}$ a.s.. Note that $H^{(i)}$ is independent of $\mu^*_{k_1^{(i)}}(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)})$ as it only depends on the sequence of independent random variables $(Q_i, i \geqslant 1)$ which is independent of $\mu^*_{k_1^{(i)}}(\mathcal{R}_k^{(i)})$.

The shape of $\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ has the same distribution as the shape of $\mathcal{F}_m$ where $(\mathcal{F}_m, m \geqslant 1)$ is a Ford tree growth process of index β'. In particular, we already know that the number of edges $N_m + 2m_0 - 1, m \geqslant m_0$, of the reduced trees (A.19) as a subset of $\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ behaves like the number of tables in a $(\beta', m_0 - \beta')$-CRP, started at m_0, i.e. by (3.3),

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} (m - m_0)^{-\beta/(1-\beta)} N_m = \lim_{m\to\infty} m^{-\beta/(1-\beta)} N_m = S'_{m_0} \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{A.20}$$

where $S'_{m_0} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta', m_0 - \beta')$. By Lemma A.1, we conclude that, in the limit, the length of $\mathcal{R}_{k_{m_0}^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ is given by

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mu^*_{k_m^{(i)}}\left(\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}\right)^\beta \sum_{j\in[N_m]} \left(X'_j\right)^\beta M^{(j)} = \mu^*_{k_{m_0}^{(i)}}\left(\mathcal{R}_{k_{m_0}^{(i)}}^{(i)}\right)^\beta S_{m_0,i} = \widetilde{S}_{m_0,i} \tag{A.21}$$

where $X' := (X'_1, \ldots, X'_{m-1}, X'_m, \ldots, X'_{2m-1}) \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}(\beta, \ldots, \beta, 1-2\beta, \ldots, 1-2\beta)$, $\mu^*_{k_m^{(i)}}(\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)})$, $(N_m, m \geqslant 1)$ and the i.i.d. random variables $M^{(j)} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, \beta), j \geqslant 1$, are independent.. Note that we do not consider the lengths of the m_0 external edges leading to the leaves of the reduced tree (A.19) and the initial $m_0 - 1$ internal edges, which does not affect the asymptotics. We will use the representation of a Dirichlet vector $X' \sim \mathrm{Dirichlet}(\beta, \ldots, \beta, 1-2\beta, \ldots, 1-2\beta)$ in terms of independent Gamma variables, i.e.

$$X' \stackrel{d}{=} Y^{-1}\left(Y_1, \ldots, Y_{m-1}, Y'_1, \ldots, Y'_m\right)$$

for independent i.i.d. sequences $(Y_j, j \geqslant 1)$, $(Y'_j, j \geqslant 1)$ with $Y_1 \sim \mathrm{Gamma}(\beta, 1)$, $Y_1 \sim \mathrm{Gamma}(1-2\beta, 1)$, and $Y = \sum_{j\in[m-1]} Y_j + \sum_{j\in[m]} Y'_j \sim \mathrm{Gamma}((m-1)(1-\beta) + 1 - 2\beta, 1)$. By (A.21),

$$C_m^{(i)}\widetilde{S}_{m_0,i} = C_m^{(i)}\mu^*_{k_m^{(i)}}\left(\mathcal{R}_{k_m^{(i)}}^{(i)}\right)^\beta \left(\sum_{j\in[N_m+(m_0-1)]} \left(X'_j\right)^\beta M^{(j)} + \sum_{j=0}^{m_0-1} \left(X'_{j+m}\right)^\beta \overline{M}^{(j)}\right)$$

where $\overline{M}_j$, $j \geqslant 1$, are i.i.d. with $\overline{M}^{(1)} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta, 1-2\beta)$ and independent of X' and N_m, $m \geqslant 1$, and hence $C_m^{(i)}\widetilde{S}_{m_0,i}$ has the same distribution as

$$\frac{N_m\,(1-\beta)^\beta}{m^{\beta/(1-\beta)}} \left(m^{-1}\left(\sum_{j\in[m-1]} Y_j + \sum_{j\in[m]} Y'_j\right)\right)^{-\beta} \left(N_m^{-1}\left(\sum_{j\in[N_m+(m_0-1)]} Y_j^\beta M^{(j)} + \sum_{j\in[m_0]} Y_j'^\beta \overline{M}^{(j)}\right)\right). \tag{A.22}$$

By the strong law of large numbers, we have $\lim_{m\to\infty} N_m^{-1}\sum_{j\in[N_m]} Y_j^\beta M_m^{(j)} = \mathbb{E}[Y_1^\beta M_m^{(j)}] = 1$ a.s. since $N_m \to \infty$ a.s., $\mathbb{E}[Y_1^\beta] = \Gamma(2\beta)/\Gamma(\beta)$, and where we use the first moment of the Mittag-Leffler distribution (3.1). Furthermore, note that $Y_j'' := Y_j + Y_j' \sim \mathrm{Gamma}(1-\beta, 1)$, $j \in [m-1]$, are i.i.d., and hence $m^{-1}(\sum_{j\in[m-1]} Y_j + \sum_{j\in[m]} Y_j') \to \mathbb{E}[Y_1''] = 1-\beta$ a.s.. By (A.20), we conclude that the expression in (A.22) converges to S'_{m_0} a.s. where $S'_{m_0} \sim \mathrm{ML}(\beta', m_0 - \beta')$. We already know that $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_{k_m^{(i)}}$ and the scaling factor $C_m^{(i)}$ converge almost-surely, and hence, by Proposition 4.3,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} C_m^{(i)} \mathcal{R}^{(i)}_{k_{m_0}^{(i)}} = \mathcal{F}^{(i)}_{m_0} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for $(\mathcal{F}_m^{(i)}, m \geqslant 1)$ are i.i.d. Ford tree growth processes of index β', i.e. (ii) follows as $m_0 \to \infty$.

References

[1] L. Addario-Berry, N. Broutin, and C. Goldschmidt. Critical random graphs: limiting constructions and distributional properties. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 15(25):741–775, 2010.

[2] D. Aldous. The Continuum Random Tree, I. *Ann. Probab.*, 19:1–28, 1991.

[3] D. Aldous. The Continuum Random Tree, II. An overview. In *Stochastic Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.

[4] D. Aldous. The Continuum Random Tree, III. *Ann. Probab.*, 21:248–289, 1993.

[5] D. Aldous and A. Bandyopadhyay. A survey of max-type recursive distributional equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 15(2):1047–1110, 2005.

[6] D. Burago, Y. Burago, and S. Ivanov. *A course in metric geometry*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.

[7] L. Chaumont and J. C. Pardo. On the genealogy of conditioned stable Lévy forests. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 6:261–279, 2009.

[8] B. Chen, D. Ford, and M. Winkel. A new family of Markov branching trees: The alpha-gamma model. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 14(15):400–430, 2009.

[9] N. Curien and B. Haas. The stable trees are nested. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 157:847–883, 2013.

[10] N. Curien and I. Kortchemski. Random stable looptrees. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 19(108):35, 2014.

[11] D. Dieuleveut. The vertex-cut-tree of Galton-Watson trees converging to a stable tree. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 25(4):2215–2262, 2015.

[12] B. Duplantier, J. Miller, and S. Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity as a mating of trees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.7055*, 2014.

[13] T. Duquesne. A limit theorem for the contour process of conditioned Galton-Watson trees. *Ann. Probab.*, 31(2):996–1027, 2003.

[14] T. Duquesne and J.-F. Le Gall. Random trees, Lévy processes and spatial branching processes. *Astérisque*, 281, 2002.

[15] T. Duquesne and J.-F. Le Gall. Probabilistic and fractal aspects of Lévy trees. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 131(4), 2005.

[16] S. Evans. Probability and real trees: École d'été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXV-2005. In *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, 2008.

[17] S. Evans, J. Pitman, and A. Winter. Rayleigh processes, real trees, and root growth with re-grafting. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 134:81–126, 2006.

[18] D. Ford. *Probabilities on cladograms: Introduction to the alpha model*. Stanford University, 2005.

[19] A. Gnedin and J. Pitman. Regenerative composition structures. *Ann. Probab.*, 33(2):445–479, 2005.

[20] C. Goldschmidt and B. Haas. A line-breaking construction of the stable trees. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 20(16):1–24, 2015.

[21] B. Haas and G. Miermont. The genealogy of self-similar fragmentations with negative index as a continuum random tree. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 9:57–97, 2004.

[22] B. Haas and G. Miermont. Scaling limits of Markov branching trees with applications to Galton-Watson and random unordered trees. *Ann. Probab.*, 40(6):2589–2666, 2012.

[23] B. Haas, G. Miermont, J. Pitman, and M. Winkel. Continuum tree asymptotics of discrete fragmentations and applications to phylogenetic models. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(5):1790–1837, 2008.

[24] B. Haas, J. Pitman, and M. Winkel. Spinal partitions and invariance under re-rooting of continuum random trees. *Ann. Probab.*, 37(4):1381–1411, 2009.

[25] L. F. James. Poisson calculus for spatial neutral to the right processes. *Ann. Statist.*, 34(1):416–440, 2006.
[26] L. F. James. Generalized Mittag Leffler distributions arising as limits in preferential attachment models. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 1509.07150*, 2015.
[27] B. Jamison, S. Orey, and W. Pruitt. Convergence of weighted averages of independent random variables. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie Verw. Geb.*, 4:40–44, 1965.
[28] O. Kallenberg. Lectures on random measures. *Institute of Statistics Mimeo Series*, (963), 1974.
[29] O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of Modern Probability*. Springer, 2001.
[30] I. Kortchemski. Invariance principles for Galton-Watson trees conditioned on the number of leaves. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 122(9):3126–3172, 2012.
[31] J.-F. Le Gall. Random real trees. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math.*, 41(1):35–62, 2006.
[32] J.-F. Le Gall. Subordination of trees and the Brownian map. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 1605.07601*, 2016.
[33] J.-F. Le Gall and Y. Le Jan. Branching processes in Lévy processes: the exploration process. *Ann. Probab.*, 26(1):213–252, 1998.
[34] P. Marchal. A note on the fragmentation of a stable tree. In *Fifth Colloquium on Mathematics and Computer Science*, volume AI, pages 489–500. Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, 2008.
[35] G. Miermont. Self-similar fragmentations derived from the stable tree I: splitting at heights. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 127(3):423–454, 2003.
[36] G. Miermont. Self-similar fragmentations derived from the stable tree II: splitting at nodes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 131(3):341–375, 2005.
[37] G. Miermont. Tessellations of random maps of arbitrary genus. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.*, 42(5):725–781, 2009.
[38] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. An axiomatic characterization of the Brownian map. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.03806*, 2015.
[39] J. Pitman. Combinatorial stochastic processes: École d'été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXII-2002. In *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, volume 1875. Springer, 2006.
[40] J. Pitman, D. Rizzolo, and M. Winkel. Regenerative tree growth: structural results and convergence. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 19(70):1–27, 2014.
[41] J. Pitman and M. Winkel. Regenerative tree growth: binary self-similar continuum random trees and Poisson-Dirichlet compositions. *Ann. Probab.*, 37(5):1999–2041, 2009.
[42] J. Pitman and M. Winkel. Regenerative tree growth: Markovian embedding of fragmenters, bifurcators, and bead splitting processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(5):2611–2646, 2015.
[43] J. Pitman and M. Yor. The two-parameter Poisson-Dirichlet distribution derived from a stable subordinator. *Ann. Probab.*, 25(2):855–900, 1997.
[44] F. Rembart. Branch merging on continuum trees with applications to regenerative tree growth. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 13:563–603, 2016.
[45] F. Rembart and M. Winkel. Recursive construction of continuum random trees. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 1607.05323*, 2016.
[46] X. Zhang. A very gentle note on the construction of Dirichlet process. http://webdocs.cs.ualberta.ca/~xinhua2/pubDoc/notes/dirichlet_process.pdf, 2008.