Abstract. We describe the limit (for two topologies) of large uniform random square permutations, i.e., permutations where every point is a record. First we describe the global behavior by showing these permutations have a permuton limit which can be described by a random rectangle. We also explore fluctuations about this random rectangle, which we can describe through coupled Brownian motions. Second, we consider the limiting behavior of the neighborhood of a point in the permutation through local limits. As a byproduct, we also determine the random limits of the proportion of occurrences (and consecutive occurrences) of any given pattern in a uniform random square permutation.

1. Introduction

A record of a permutation is a maximum or minimum, either from the left or the right. For example, the point \((i, \sigma(i))\) for the permutation \(\sigma\) is a left-to-right maximum if \(\sigma(i) > \sigma(j)\) for all \(j < i\). We can think of the records as the external points of a permutation. The points of a permutation that do not correspond to records are called internal points. Square permutations are permutations where every point is a record. Alternatively, square permutations are permutations with no internal points (see Fig. 1). We let \(\text{Sq}(n)\) denote the set of square permutations of size \(n\).

Square permutations were first discussed in [31] with connections to grid polygons, that is polygons whose vertices lie on a grid. They computed the generating function for square permutations via the kernel method, and thus obtained the following enumeration.

Theorem 1.1 ([31], 5.1).

\[ |\text{Sq}(n)| = 2(n + 2)4^{n-3} - 4(2n - 5)\binom{2n - 6}{n - 3}. \]
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Square permutations were later discussed in [14] where the generating function was found by a more direct recursive approach, and again in [13] where a specific encoding (similar to that defined in Section 2 of this paper) of square permutations was used to make connections with convex permutominoes. Square permutations also appear in [2], but from a pattern-avoidance perspective. They show that square permutations are precisely the permutations that avoid all 16 patterns of length five with an internal point. They give an alternative approach to the enumeration of this class of permutation based on a context-free language used to describe the class. In this paper they refer to square permutations as \textit{convex permutations}.

We say a permutation \(\sigma\) avoids the pattern \(\pi\) if no subsequence of \(\sigma\) has the same relative order given by \(\pi\). For a set of patterns \(B\) we say \(\sigma\) avoids \(B\) if it avoids every pattern in \(B\). Families of permutations that can be defined by pattern avoidance are called permutation classes. Permutation classes have been widely studied (see [27, 9] for a good introduction). Typically the first question asked is enumerative: how many permutations of size \(n\) are in a particular class? Once a family of permutations has been enumerated, other aspects, such as the behavior of the limiting shape, or the distribution of some statistics of the permutations, can be explored.

Recently, a probabilistic approach to the study of permutation classes has become quite popular. A series of papers have taken this approach, exploring ideas like large deviations for permutations [29, 33, 30, 26], path scaling limits [17, 20], and distributions of statistics associated with a class [18, 19, 34, 32, 23, 25, 24].

Another recent probabilistic framework is the theory of permutons introduced in [21]. A permuton is a probability measure on the square \([0,1]^2\) with uniform marginals. Every permutation can be associated to the permuton induced by the sum of Dirac measures on points of permutations scaled to fit within \([0,1]^2\) (see Section 4 for a precise definition). It is an exercise to show that permutations sampled uniformly at random have a permuton limit given by Lebesgue measure on \([0,1]^2\). The Mallows model is an example of non-uniform measure on permutations that also has deterministic permuton limit [37].

For permutations avoiding patterns of length three, or permutations avoiding longer monotone patterns, or permutations in some monotone grid classes, sampled uniformly at random, the permuton limits are also deterministic [17, 30, 20, 8]. More recently random permuton limits were found in [6, 5]. In these articles the \textit{Brownian separable permuton} was introduced and then a nice description of it in terms of Brownian excursion was given in [28]. This random limiting object is also considered in [11, 4]. These we were the first, and to best of our knowledge only, examples of (non-trivial) random permuton limits known.

We prove in the current paper that square permutations have a random permuton limit, though qualitatively quite different from the previously known random limits. The square permutations converge to a permuton that can be described by a random rectangle embedded in \([0,1]^2\) with edges of slope \(\pm 1\). The bottom corner of the rectangle is uniformly distributed (see Fig. 2 for some examples).

Inspired by the approach in [20], we define a projection from a square permutation, \(\sigma\), to the set of anchored pairs of sequences of labels, where the labels are determined by the record types and the anchor is determined by the value \(\sigma^{-1}(1)\) (see Figure 3). Section 2 gives a precise definition.

In Section 3 we use a slight modification of the ‘Petrov conditions’ found in [17] and again in [20], to define the inverse of the projection map from Section 2 on a subset of all possible anchored pairs of sequences. If the pair of sequences satisfies these Petrov conditions, and the anchored point is not too close to neither 1 nor \(n\), then the inverse projection map is well-defined. Anchored pairs of sequences that satisfy both these conditions are called \textit{regular}. We construct a simple algorithm to produce a square permutation from regular anchored pairs of sequences. We show

\footnote{In some sense this may be a better name for this class of permutations as the term ‘square permutations’ occurs in a completely different context in [36]. Our introduction to these objects was from [14], so we will stick with ‘square permutations’... for now.}
that asymptotically almost all square permutations can be constructed from regular anchored pairs of sequences, thus a permutation sampled uniformly from the set of regular anchored pairs of sequences will produce, asymptotically, a uniform square permutation.

In Section 4 we find the permuton limit of a random square permutation created from regular anchored pairs of sequences sampled uniformly at random. We show that for a large square permutation \( \sigma \) that projects to a regular anchored pair of sequences, the permuton associated with \( \sigma \) is close to a permuton given by a rectangle embedded in \([0, 1]^2\) with sides of slope \( \pm 1 \) and bottom corner at \((\sigma^{-1}(1)/n, 0)\). This distance is uniformly bounded over all permutations of length \( n \) whose projection is regular. This allows us to show that the permuton limit of uniform square permutations is a rectangle embedded in \([0, 1]^2\) with sides of slope \( \pm 1 \) and bottom corner at \((z, 0)\), where \( z \) is a uniform point in the interval \([0, 1]\) (here and throughout the paper we denote random quantities using \textbf{bold} characters).

In Section 5 we show that the fluctuations about the lines of the rectangle of the permuton limit can be described by certain coupled Brownian motions. The Brownian motions arise naturally from the projection map in Section 2. The technical difficulties in the proof come from the random size of the set of points for which we are measuring the fluctuations and the fact that these points are random in both coordinates. The coupling between Brownian motions comes from the fact that the total number of labels of each type on a given interval (either horizontal or vertical) sum to the size of the interval.

We may also view the permutations locally as in [10]. This local topology for permutations is the analogue of the celebrated Benjamini-Schramm convergence for graphs, in the sense that we look at the neighborhood of a random element of the permutation. This viewpoint is explored in Section 6 where we prove that uniform square permutations locally converge (in the quenched sense) to a \textit{random} limiting object described in Section 6.2. This result answered an open question posed by the first author in [10, Section 1.3] of finding a natural (but non-trivial) model for which the quenched local limit is random. Indeed, in all the previously studied cases, that is, permutations avoiding some pattern of length three (see [10]) and permutations in substitution closed-classes (see [11]), the quenched local limit is deterministic.

Finally in Section 7 we easily deduce the random limits of the proportion of occurrences (and consecutive occurrences) of any given pattern in a uniform random square permutation. This result is an immediate consequence of the permuton and quenched-local limits but it is worth mentioning because Janson [24, Remark 1.1] notices that, in some classes, we have concentration for the (non-consecutive) pattern occurrences around their mean, in others not. It would be interesting to
understand in a more general setting when this concentration phenomenon does or does not occur for both pattern occurrences and consecutive pattern occurrences. Our results give another example for when concentration does not occur.

**Possible future extensions.** The approach of assigning labels to the points of a permutation and then projecting these labels both horizontally and vertically is also used in the case of permutations avoiding monotone patterns [20]. However, in this model the total number of labels of each type in the horizontal and vertical projections must agree. Thus, to construct a permutation avoiding a monotone pattern by pairing up labels in an increasing fashion, the sequences must be conditioned to have the same total number for each label. Surprisingly, this precise conditioning on the total number of each label is *not* necessary in the case of square permutations, as long as the underlying anchored pair of sequences is regular. This allows us to sample square permutations (almost) uniformly at random in a much more straightforward manner.

We highlight an interesting aspect of our approximate enumerative approach, that is, sampling uniform permutations from a nicer subset (with asymptotically equal cardinality) of the considered set of permutations: to the best of our knowledge, this is the first technique that allows the study of permutohedral limits for uniform permutations in a fixed class that does not require the exact enumeration of the class (neither the explicit enumeration nor results on the behavior of the associated generating function). Although the enumeration for square permutations is known, this result is not needed (as noted in Remark 2.1).

Our approach seems to be quite generalizable. The following are some ideas for future work.

- A natural question related to this article would be to understand how this model is affected by the introduction of a finite (or slowly increasing) number of internal points. In [12], they give a conjecture on the first order term of the number of permutations with exactly \( k \) internal points. We suspect a modified version of our approach will allow us to compute this first order term and describe how the addition of internal points changes the permutohedral limit.
- Monotone grid classes (introduced in [22] and then studied in many others works \[38\] \[1\] \[3\] \[40\]) seem to be a family of models where our approach fits well. We point out that some initial results on the shape of such permutations were given by Bevan in his Ph.D. thesis [8]. This approach suggests a way to give a description of the fluctuations and local limits of monotone grid classes.
- We also believe that this technique can give an alternative approach to the probabilistic study of \( X \)-permutations first considered in [15] [39] and recently in [4]. In particular this technique could give nice additional results about the fluctuations similar to the ones explored in this paper.

**Notation.** For this paper we view permutations of size \( n \) as a set of points in \([n] \times [n]\) where each column and each row has exactly one point. We denote with \( S^n \) the set of permutations of size \( n \) and with \( \mathcal{S} \) the set of permutations of finite size. Occasionally we may think of permutations as words of size \( n \) or as bijections from \([n] \rightarrow [n]\). The points associated to the four types of records are denoted by \( \text{LRmax}, \text{LRmin}, \text{RLmax}, \text{and RLmin} \). These sets of points are not necessarily disjoint. For any permutation \( \sigma \), \((1, \sigma(1))\) is always in \( \text{LRmax} \cap \text{LRmin} \). Similar statements are true for \((n, \sigma(n)), (\sigma^{-1}(1), 1)\) and \((\sigma^{-1}(n), n)\). We call these the *corners* of a permutation. A permutation will have four corners unless it contains at least one of the points \((1, 1), (1, n), (n, 1), \) or \((n, n)\).

The permutation may also have points that are in \( \text{LRmax} \cap \text{RLmin} \) or \( \text{LRmin} \cap \text{RLmax} \). By the pigeonhole principle the points in \( \text{LRmax} \cap \text{RLmin} \) satisfy \( i = \sigma(i) \) and the points in \( \text{LRmin} \cap \text{RLmax} \) satisfy \( i = n + 1 - \sigma(i) \).

If \( x_1 \ldots x_n \) is a sequence of distinct numbers, let \( \text{std}(x_1 \ldots x_n) \) be the unique permutation \( \pi \) in \( S^n \) that is in the same relative order as \( x_1 \ldots x_n \), i.e., \( \pi_i < \pi_j \) if and only if \( x_i < x_j \). Given a permutation \( \sigma \in S^n \) and a subset of indices \( I \subseteq [n] \), let \( \text{pat}_I(\sigma) \) be the permutation induced by
where the exact enumeration is not known, a similar approach may yield interesting results.

Given two permutations, \( \sigma \in S^n \) for some \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \pi \in S^k \) for some \( k \leq n \), we say that \( \sigma \) contains \( \pi \) as a pattern if \( \sigma \) has a subsequence of entries order-isomorphic to \( \pi \), that is, if there exists a subset \( I \subseteq [n] \) such that \( \sigma_I(\pi) = \pi \). Denoting \( i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k \) the elements of \( I \) in increasing order, the subsequence \( \sigma(i_1)\sigma(i_2)\ldots\sigma(i_k) \) is called an occurrence of \( \pi \) in \( \sigma \). In addition, we say that \( \sigma \) contains \( \pi \) as a consecutive pattern if \( \sigma \) has a subsequence of adjacent entries order-isomorphic to \( \pi \), that is, if there exists an interval \( I \subseteq [n] \) such that \( \sigma_I(\pi) = \pi \). Using the same notation as above, \( \sigma(i_1)\sigma(i_2)\ldots\sigma(i_k) \) is then called a consecutive occurrence of \( \pi \) in \( \sigma \).

**Example 1.2.** The permutation \( \sigma = 1532467 \) contains 1423 as a pattern but not as a consecutive pattern and 321 as consecutive pattern. Indeed \( \text{pat}_{\{1,2,3,5\}}(\sigma) = 1423 \) but no interval of indices of \( \sigma \) induces the permutation 1423. Moreover, \( \text{pat}_{\{2,4\}}(\sigma) = \text{pat}_{\{2,3,4\}}(\sigma) = 321 \).

We denote by \( \widetilde{\#}\text{occ}(\pi,\sigma) \) the proportion of occurrences of a pattern \( \pi \) (of size \( k \)) in \( \sigma \) (of size \( n \)). More formally

\[
\widetilde{\#}\text{occ}(\pi,\sigma) := \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \text{card}\{I \subseteq [n] \text{ of cardinality } k \text{ such that } \sigma_I(\pi) = \pi\}.
\]

We also denote by \( \widetilde{\#}\text{occ}_c(\pi,\sigma) \) the proportion of consecutive occurrences of a pattern \( \pi \) in \( \sigma \). More precisely

\[
\widetilde{\#}\text{occ}_c(\pi,\sigma) := \frac{1}{n} \text{card}\{I \subseteq [n] \text{ of cardinality } k \text{ such that } I \text{ is an interval and } \sigma_I(\pi) = \pi\}.
\]

### 2. Projections for square permutations

Given a square permutation \( \sigma \in S^q(n) \), we associate to it an anchored pair of sequences \( (X, Y, z_0) \), where \( X \in \{U, D\}^n \), \( Y \in \{L, R\}^n \) and \( z_0 \in [n] \) in the following way (cf. Fig. 3). First let \( X_1 = X_n = D \) and \( Y_1 = Y_n = L \). Then, for all \( i \in \{2, \ldots, n-1\} \), we set

- \( X_i = D \) (resp. \( X_i = U \)) if \( (i, \sigma(i)) \in LR_{\min} \cup RL_{\min} \) (resp. \( (i, \sigma(i)) \in LR_{\max} \cup RL_{\max} \))
- \( Y_i = L \) (resp. \( Y_i = R \)) if \( (\sigma^{-1}(i), i) \in LR_{\min} \cup LR_{\max} \) (resp. \( (\sigma^{-1}(i), i) \in RL_{\min} \cup RL_{\max} \))

In the case that \( (i, \sigma(i)) \in LR_{\max} \cap LR_{\min} \) or \( (i, \sigma(i)) \in LR_{\min} \cap RL_{\max} \) we set \( X_i = D \) and \( Y_{\sigma(i)} = L \). Finally, let \( z_0 = \sigma^{-1}(1) \). Note that \( X_{z_0} \) is always equal to \( D \).

Intuitively, the sequence \( X \) tracks if the points in the columns of the diagram of \( \sigma \) are minima or a maxima and the sequence \( Y \) tracks if the points in the rows are left or right records.

We denote with \( \phi \) the map that associates to every square permutation the corresponding anchored pair of sequences, therefore

\[
\phi : S^q(n) \rightarrow \{U, D\}^n \times \{L, R\}^n \times [n].
\]

We say that \( (X, Y, z_0) \) is a good anchored pair of sequences of size \( n \) if \( z_0 \) in an integer number in \( \{1, \cdots, n\} \) and \( X \) and \( Y \) are two sequences in \( \{U, D\}^n \) and \( \{L, R\}^n \) conditioned to satisfy \( X_1 = X_n = X_{z_0} = D \) and \( Y_1 = Y_n = L \). We say that the pair \( (X, Y) \) is anchored at \( z_0 \). The total number of possible good anchored pairs \( (X, Y, z_0) \) of size \( n \) is

\[
2^{n-2}(2 \cdot 2^{n-2} + (n - 2) \cdot 2^{n-3}) = 2(n + 2)4^{n-3}.
\]

**Remark 2.1.** This projection is used in [13]. They show that \( \phi \) is an injective map from \( S^q(n) \) into the space of good anchored pairs of sequences. If we did not have this enumeration, the expression in (2) would be sufficient in the proofs for all of our results. This suggests that for other classes where the exact enumeration is not known, a similar approach may yield interesting results.
3. Constructing a permutation from anchored pairs of sequences

3.1. Anchored pairs of sequences and Petrov conditions. From a good anchored pair we wish to construct a square permutation. For most good anchored pairs this will be possible, though we do need to proceed with caution.

Let $ct_D(i)$ denote the number of $D$s in $X$ up to (and including) position $i$. Similarly define $ct_U(i), ct_L(i)$ and $ct_R(i)$ for the number of $U$s in $X$ and the number of $L$s or $R$s in $Y$, respectively. Let $pos_D(i)$ denote the index of the $i$th $D$ in $X$ with $pos_D(i) = n$ if there are fewer than $i$ indices labeled with $D$ in $X$. Similarly define $pos_U(i), pos_L(i)$ and $pos_R(i)$ for the location of the indices of the other labels.

The following are useful properties of the sequence $X$ (and $Y$, with the appropriate functions):

1. $ct_D(pos_D(j)) = j$ for all $j \leq ct_D(n)$;
2. $ct_U(pos_U(j)) = j$ for all $j \leq ct_U(n)$;
3. If $X_j = D$ then $pos_D(ct_D(j)) = j$;
4. If $X_j = U$ then $pos_U(ct_U(j)) = j$;
5. $ct_U(i) + ct_D(i) = i$ for all $i \in [n]$.

Definition 3.1 (Petrov Conditions). Similar to Definition 2.3 in [17], we say that the label $D$ in $X$ satisfies the Petrov conditions if the following are true:

1. $|ct_D(i) - ct_D(j)| < n^4$ for $|i - j| < n^6$;
2. $|ct_D(i) - ct_D(j) - \frac{1}{2}(i - j)| < \frac{1}{2}|i - j|^6$ for all $|i - j| > n^3$;
3. $|pos_D(i) - pos_D(j) - 2(i - j)| < n^4$ for all $|i - j| < n^6$ and $i, j \leq ct_D(n)$;
4. $|pos_D(i) - pos_D(j) - 2(i - j)| < 2|i - j|^6$ for all $|i - j| > n^3$ and $i, j \leq ct_D(n)$.

A similar definition holds for the label $U$ in $X$ and the labels $L$ and $R$ in $Y$ for the functions $ct_U, ct_L, ct_R$, and $pos_U, pos_R, pos_L$. We say the Petrov conditions hold for the pair of sequences $X$ and $Y$ if the Petrov conditions hold simultaneously for all the labels of $X$ and $Y$.

Lemma 3.2. If $X \in \{U, D\}^n$ satisfies the Petrov conditions then, for all $i \leq n$,

$$i - pos_D(ct_D(i)) \leq n^3.$$
Proof. Fix $i \leq n$. By contradiction suppose that $i - pos_D(ct_D(i)) > n^3$, then using the third Petrov condition we have

\[|ct_U(i) - ct_U(pos_D(ct_D(i))) - \frac{1}{2}(i - pos_D(ct_D(i)))| < |i - pos_D(ct_D(i))|^6.\]

Noting that $pos_D(ct_D(i))$ is the index of the last $D$ before the $i$-th position in $X$, we have that

\[ct_U(i) - ct_U(pos_D(ct_D(i))) = i - pos_D(ct_D(i)),\]

and so we obtain a contradiction in (3). \qed

If the Petrov conditions are satisfied then the functions $pos_U(i)$ and $pos_D(i)$ are closely related. We define

\[
e(i) := pos_U(i) - 2i, \quad \text{for all } i \leq ct_U(n)\]
\[
s(i) := pos_D(i) - 2i + e(i), \quad \text{for all } i \leq \min\{ct_U(n), ct_D(n)\},\]

in order to have the following expressions

\[pos_U(i) = 2i + e(i) \quad \text{and} \quad pos_D(i) = 2i - e(i) + s(i).\]

Lemma 3.3. If $X$ is a sequence that satisfy the Petrov conditions then

\[|s(i)| < 10n^4, \quad \text{for all } i \leq \min\{ct_U(n), ct_D(n)\}.\]

Proof. Fix $i \leq \min\{ct_U(n), ct_D(n)\}$. We first note that

\[ct_D(pos_U(i)) = pos_U(i) - ct_U(pos_U(i)) = pos_U(i) - i.\]

Therefore, applying the operator $pos_D(\cdot)$ on both sides of the previous equation, we obtain

\[pos_D(ct_D(pos_U(i))) = pos_D(pos_U(i) - i).\]

From (4) and Lemma 3.2, we obtain

\[|pos_D(pos_U(i) - i) - pos_U(i)| < n^3.\]

Now, using the Petrov conditions, we have that $|pos_U(i) - 2i| < 2n^6$ and that

\[|pos_D(pos_U(i) - i) - pos_D(i) - 2(pos_U(i) - 2i)| < \max\{n^4, 2(2n^6)^6\} < 4n^4.\]

We can conclude, using (5) and (6), that

\[|s(i)| = |pos_U(i) - pos_D(i) - 2(pos_U(i) - 2i)| < 4n^4 + n^3 < 5n^4.\] \qed

We let $\Omega_n$ denote the space of good anchored pairs of sequences such that both $X$ and $Y$ satisfy the Petrov conditions and $n^9 < z_0 \leq n - n^9$. We will refer to these as regular anchored pairs of sequences.

Lemma 3.4. Let $X$, $Y$ and $z_0$ be chosen independently and uniformly at random from $\{U, D\}^n$, $\{L, R\}^n$ and $\{1, \cdots, n\}$ respectively. Then $\mathbb{P}((X, Y, z_0) \in \Omega_n) \geq 1 - o(1)$.

Proof. Using standard Petrov style moderate deviations \cite{35} for some $c > 0$, both $X$ and $Y$ satisfy the Petrov conditions with probability at least $1 - \exp(-n^c)$ and $n^9 < z_0 < n - n^9$ with probability at least $(1 - 2n^{-1})$. The lemma follows from the independence of $X$, $Y$ and $z_0$. \qed
3.2. From regular anchored pairs of sequences to square permutations. We wish to define a map \( \rho : \Omega_n \to Sq(n) \) by constructing a unique matching between the labels of \( X \) and the labels of \( Y \). The matching will depend on parameter \( z_0 \). Once this map is properly defined we will show the composition \( \phi \circ \rho \) acts as the identity on \( \Omega_n \).

This construction may not be well defined on every good anchored pair of sequences in \( \{\{U, D\}\}^n \times \{L, R\}^n, [n] \) but will be well defined if we restrict to \( \Omega_n \).

First define the following values with respect to \( (X, Y, z_0) \in \Omega_n \):

- \( z_1 = \text{pos}_L(\text{ct}_D(z_0)) \),
- \( z_2 = \text{pos}_U(\text{ct}_L(n) - \text{ct}_D(z_0)) \),
- \( z_3 = \text{pos}_R(\text{ct}_D(n) - \text{ct}_D(z_0)) \).

The following lemma shows that \( z_1 \) through \( z_3 \) are well-defined.

**Lemma 3.5.** If \( (X, Y, z_0) \in \Omega_n \) then \( z_1, z_2 \) and \( z_3 \) are well-defined and \( \max(|z_1 - z_0|, |z_2 - z_3|, |n - z_0 - z_2|) < 10n^6 \).

**Proof.** We will show that \( z_2 \) is well-defined by showing \( 0 < \text{ct}_L(n) - \text{ct}_D(z_0) \leq \text{ct}_U(n) \). A similar approach will work for \( z_1 \) and \( z_3 \). By the Petrov conditions \( \text{ct}_L(n) > n/2 - n^6 \) while \( \text{ct}_D(z_0) < (n - n^9)/2 + n^6 \) proving the first inequality. On the other hand, \( \text{ct}_L(n) < n/2 + n^6 \) and \( \text{ct}_D(z_0) > \frac{1}{2}n^9 \) so

\[
\text{ct}_L(n) - \text{ct}_D(z_0) < n/2 - n^9/2 + n^6 < n/2 - n^6 < \text{ct}_U(n).
\]

By the Petrov conditions

\[
|z_1 - z_0| < |2\text{ct}_D(z_0) - z_0| + |\text{pos}_L(\text{ct}_D(z_0)) - 2\text{ct}_D(z_0)|
\]

\[
< 2|\text{ct}_D(z_0) - z_0/2| + 2|\text{ct}_D(z_0)|^6 < 2n^6 + 2n^6 = 4n^6.
\]

Similar arguments hold to show that \( |z_2 - z_3| \) and \( |n - z_0 - z_2| \) have the same upper bound. \( \square \)

Define the following index sets:

- \( I_1 = \{1, \cdots, \text{ct}_D(z_0)\} \);
- \( I_2 = \{1, \cdots, \text{ct}_U(z_2)\} \);
- \( I_3 = \{\text{ct}_D(z_0) + 1, \cdots, \text{ct}_D(n)\} \);
- \( I_4 = \{\text{ct}_U(z_2) + 1, \cdots, \text{ct}_U(n)\} \).

Using these index sets, we create four sets of points:

- \( \Lambda_1 = \{(\text{pos}_D(i), \text{pos}_L(\text{ct}_D(z_0) + 1 - i))\}_{i \in I_1} \);
- \( \Lambda_2 = \{(\text{pos}_U(i), \text{pos}_L(\text{ct}_D(z_0) + i))\}_{i \in I_2} \);
- \( \Lambda_3 = \{(\text{pos}_D(i), \text{pos}_R(i - \text{ct}_D(z_0)))\}_{i \in I_3} \);
- \( \Lambda_4 = \{(\text{pos}_U(i), \text{pos}_R(n - \text{ct}_D(z_0) + 1 - i))\}_{i \in I_4} \).

Each index associated to a \( U \) or a \( D \) in \( X \) is represented exactly once in one of these sets of points (cf. Fig. 3), thus the union, \( \cup_{i=1}^4 \Lambda_i \), induces a function \( \sigma : [n] \to [n] \). We will show that in fact \( \sigma \) is in \( Sq(n) \) and the assignment \( \rho((X, Y, z_0)) := \sigma \) will be a proper map from \( \Omega_n \) to \( Sq(n) \).

First a few observations about each of the sequences \( \Lambda_i \). The first sequence, \( \Lambda_1 \), is obtained by matching the first \( \text{ct}_D(z_0) \) \( D \)-s in \( X \) with the first \( \text{ct}_D(z_0) \) \( L \)-s in \( Y \) to create a decreasing sequence starting from \( (1, z_1) \) and ending at \( (z_0, 1) \). Note that by the definition of \( z_2 \), \( \text{pos}_L(\text{ct}_U(z_2) + \text{ct}_D(z_0)) = \text{pos}_L(\text{ct}_L(n)) = n \) for \( (X, Y, z_0) \in \Omega_n \) since \( Y_n = L \). Thus, \( \Lambda_2 \) ends at \( (z_2, n) \). The points of \( \Lambda_3 \) are increasing from \( (z_0, 1) \) to \( (n, z_3) \) and the points of \( \Lambda_4 \) decreasing from \( (z_2, n) \) to \( (n, z_3) \). Each sequence of points are mutually disjoint. \( \Lambda_4 \) does not contain the end points \( (z_2, n) \) nor \( (n, z_3) \). \( \Lambda_2 \) and \( \Lambda_3 \) do not contain the starting points \( (1, z_1) \) nor \( (z_0, 1) \) respectively.

The Petrov conditions force even stricter conditions on these sequences.

**Lemma 3.6.** If \( (X, Y, z_0) \in \Omega_n \), then

- \( |s + t - z_0| < 10n^6 \) for \( (s, t) \in \Lambda_1 \),
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Figure 4. An example of square permutation obtained from a regular anchored pair of sequences \((X, Y, z_0)\). We color in orange the labels in the sequence \(X\) corresponding to indexes of \(I_1\) and we also color in orange the points of \(\Lambda_1\). Similarly, we color in blue the labels and the points corresponding to \(I_2\) and \(\Lambda_2\), in green the ones corresponding to \(I_3\) and \(\Lambda_3\), and in purple the ones corresponding to \(I_4\) and \(\Lambda_4\).

Figure 5. An example where the construction of \(\sigma\) from an anchored pair of sequences fails. The last \(L\) does not have a corresponding \(U\) with which to match.

- \(|t - s - z_0| < 10n^6\) for \((s, t) \in \Lambda_2\),
- \(|s - t - z_0| < 10n^6\) for \((s, t) \in \Lambda_3\),
- \(|2n - s - t - z_0| < 10n^6\) for \((s, t) \in \Lambda_4\).

Proof. We give details for points in \(\Lambda_1\). The rest of the proof follows through similar arguments. Let \(i \in I_1\) so that \((\text{pos}_D(i), \text{pos}_L(\text{ct}_D(z_0) - i + 1)) \in \Lambda_1\). By using the Petrov conditions twice

\[|\text{pos}_D(i) + \text{pos}_L(\text{ct}_D(z_0) - i + 1) - z_0| < |2i + 2\text{ct}_D(z_0) - 2i + 2 - z_0| + 4n^6 < |z_0 + 2 - z_0| + 5n^6 < 10n^6.\]

The same argument applies for points in \(\Lambda_2\), \(\Lambda_3\), and \(\Lambda_4\).

Note that for some anchored sequences \((X, Y, z_0)\) that are not in \(\Omega_n\) it is possible that the construction of the map \(\sigma\) might fail (see Fig. 5).
Lemma 3.7. Let \((X,Y,z_0)\) \(\in \Omega_n\) and let \(\sigma = \rho(X,Y,z_0)\) be as above. Then \(\sigma\) is in \(Sq(n)\) with \(LR_{\text{min}} = \Lambda_1\), \(LR_{\text{max}} = \Lambda_2 \cup \{(1,z_1)\}\), \(RL_{\text{min}} = \Lambda_3 \cup \{(z_0,1)\}\) and \(RL_{\text{max}} = \Lambda_4 \cup \{(z_2,n),(n,z_3)\}\). Moreover, \(\rho\) is injective with \(\phi \circ \rho\) acting as the identity on \(\Omega_n\).

Proof. By Lemma 3.5 the values of \(z_1, z_2\) and \(z_3\) are all well-defined and satisfy 
\[
\frac{1}{2} n^9 < z_i < n - \frac{1}{2} n^9 
\]
for \(i = 1, 2, 3\).

Next we need to make sure that the index corresponding to each \(D\) and \(U\) in \(X\) and each \(L\) and \(R\) in \(Y\) are used only once. This is clear for \(U\)s \(D\)s and \(L\)s. The index of each \(R\) will be used exactly once if
\[
ct_D(n) - ct_D(z_0) < n - ct_D(z_0) + 1 - ct_U(n)
\]
which follows from the substitution \(n = ct_U(n) + ct_D(n)\). Therefore by this construction each index of \(X\) is paired with a unique index in \(Y\) so the resulting collection of points must correspond to the points of a permutation. It remains to show that in fact they are the points of a square permutation.

This is true if the sets \(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \cup \{(1,z_1)\}, \Lambda_3 \cup \{(z_0,1)\}\) and \(\Lambda_4 \cup \{(z_2,n),(n,z_3)\}\) must correspond to the record sets \(LR_{\text{min}}, LR_{\text{max}}, RL_{\text{min}},\) and \(RL_{\text{max}}\) respectively. We will focus only on showing that \(LR_{\text{min}} = \Lambda_1\). The proofs of the remaining correspondences will follow in a similar manner.

Suppose \((i,\sigma(i)) \in \Lambda_1\) is not in \(LR_{\text{min}}\). Then there exists \(j < i\) such that \(\sigma(j) < \sigma(i)\). The points in \(\Lambda_1\) are decreasing so \((j,\sigma(j))\) cannot be in \(\Lambda_1\). If \((j,\sigma(j)) \in \Lambda_2\) then \(\sigma(j) > \sigma(i)\). If \((j,\sigma(j)) \in \Lambda_3\) then \(j > z_0 > i\). Thus this may only happen if \((j,\sigma(j)) \in \Lambda_4\) (see Fig. 6).

By Lemma 3.6
\[
\sigma(i) + i < z_0 + 10n^6.
\]
Similarly for \((j,\sigma(j)) \in \Lambda_4\),
\[
\sigma(j) + j > 2n - z_0 - 10n^6.
\]
Subtracting (9) from (8) gives
\[
\sigma(i) - \sigma(j) + i - j < 2z_0 - 2n + 20n^6 < -n^9 + 20n^6 < 0.
\]
Note that if \(i > j\) and \(\sigma(i) > \sigma(j)\) then the left hand side of (10) would be positive. This contradiction shows that \(\Lambda_1 \subseteq LR_{\text{min}}\). The same argument shows that \(\Lambda_4 \subseteq RL_{\text{max}}\). Similar arguments show that \(\Lambda_2 \subseteq LR_{\text{max}}\) and \(\Lambda_3 \subseteq RL_{\text{min}}\).

Finally we note that if \((i,\sigma(i)) \in LR_{\text{min}}\) but not \(\Lambda_1\), then it would have to be in \(\Lambda_4\) as \(\Lambda_1\) contains the corners \((1,z_1)\) and \((z_0,1)\). This would imply \((i,\sigma(i)) \in LR_{\text{max}} \cap LR_{\text{min}}\) and thus
satisfy \( i + \sigma(i) = n + 1 \). Plugging this into (9) creates a contradiction. Therefore \( LR \min = \Lambda_1 \) and similar equalities hold for the other three sets if we ignore the appropriate corners.

Lastly we note that under the map \( \phi, z_0 = \sigma^{-1}(1) \), the corners \((z_0, 1), (1, z_1), (z_2, n), \) and \((n, z_3)\) project to the appropriate labels \((D, L), (D, L) (U, L)\) and \((D, R)\), non-corner points of \( \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \Lambda_3 \) and \( \Lambda_4 \) project onto \((D, L), (U, L), (D, R)\), and \((U, R)\) respectively, so \( \phi(\sigma) \) agrees with \((X, Y, z_0)\). Thus we may conclude that \( \phi \circ \rho \) is the identity on \( \Omega_n \) which also implies that \( \rho \) is injective from \( \Omega_n \) into \( Sq(n) \).

\[ \square \]

**Lemma 3.8.** With probability \( 1 - o(1) \) a uniform random square permutation \( \sigma_n \) of size \( n \) is in \( \rho(\Omega_n) \).

**Proof.** The map \( \rho \) is injective from \( \Omega_n \) into \( Sq(n) \) and thus \( \mathbb{P}(\sigma_n \in \rho(\Omega_n)) = \frac{\Omega_n}{|Sq(n)|} \).

First we note that the negative term in (1), \( (2n - 5)(\frac{2n - 6}{n - 3}) = o(2(n + 2)4^{n-3}) \), so the size of \( Sq(n) \) satisfies

\[ |Sq(n)| = 2(n + 2)4^{n-3}(1 - o(1)). \]

By (2) the number of good anchored pairs of sequences of size \( n \) is \( 2(n + 2)4^{n-3} \). Therefore, using Lemma 3.4 the size of \( \Omega_n \) satisfies

\[ |\Omega_n| = 2(n + 2)4^{n-3}(1 - o(1)). \]

Thus, as \( n \) tends to infinity, \( \mathbb{P}(\sigma_n \in \Omega_n) \to 1. \) \[ \square \]

### 4. Global Behavior

In this section we consider the global behavior of a random square permutation by studying its permuton limit. For an exhaustive introduction to the permuton convergence we refer to [5, Section 2].

A *permuton* \( \mu \) is a Borel probability measure on the unit square \([0,1]^2\) with uniform marginals, that is

\[ \mu([0,1] \times [a, b]) = \mu([a, b] \times [0,1]) = b - a, \]

for all \( 0 \leq a \leq b \leq 1 \). Any permutation \( \sigma \) of size \( n \geq 1 \) may be interpreted as a permuton \( \mu_{\sigma} \) given by the sum of Dirac measures

\[ \mu_{\sigma} = n \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{[(i-1)/n, i/n] \times [(\sigma(i)-1)/n, \sigma(i)/n]}. \]

Let \( \mathcal{M} \) be the set of permutons. We need to equip \( \mathcal{M} \) with a topology. We say that a sequence of (deterministic) permutons \( (\mu_n) \) converges *weakly* to \( \mu \) (simply denoted \( \mu_n \to \mu \)) if

\[ \int_{[0,1]^2} f d\mu_n \to \int_{[0,1]^2} f d\mu, \]

for every bounded and continuous function \( f : [0,1]^2 \to \mathbb{R} \). With this topology, \( \mathcal{M} \) is compact and metrizable by the metric \( d_{\square} \) defined, for every pair of permutons \( (\mu, \mu') \), by

\[ d_{\square}(\mu, \mu') = \sup_{R \in \mathcal{R}} |\mu(R) - \mu'(R)|, \]

where \( \mathcal{R} \) denotes the set of rectangles contained in \([0,1]^2\). Once we have a topology for deterministic permutons we can define the convergence for random permutations as follows.

**Definition 4.1.** We say that a random permutation \( \sigma_n \) converges in distribution to a random permuton \( \mu \) as \( n \to \infty \) if the random permuton \( \mu_{\sigma_n} \) converges in distribution to \( \mu \) with respect to the topology defined above.
Let $z$ be a point in $[0, 1]$. Let $L_1$ and $L_4$ denote the line segments with slope $-1$ connecting $(0, z)$ to $(z, 0)$ and $(1 - z, 1)$ to $(1, 1 - z)$, respectively. Similarly let $L_2$ and $L_3$ denote the line segments with slope 1 connecting $(0, z)$ to $(1 - z, 1)$ and $(z, 0)$ to $(1, 1 - z)$, respectively. The union of $L_1$, $L_2$, $L_3$ and $L_4$ forms a rectangle in $[0, 1]^2$.

For each of the line segments $L_i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) we will define a measure $\mu_i$. Let $\nu$ be Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$. Let $S$ be a Borel measurable set on $[0, 1]^2$. For each $i$, let $S_i = S \cap L_i$. Finally let $\pi_x(S_i)$ be the projection of $S_i$ onto the $x$-axis and $\pi_y(S_i)$ the projection onto the $y$-axis. As each line has slope 1 or $-1$, the measures of the projections satisfy $\nu(\pi_x(S_i)) = \nu(\pi_y(S_i))$. For each $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, define $\mu_i^z(S) := \frac{1}{2}\nu(\pi_x(S_i)) = \frac{1}{2}\nu(\pi_y(S_i))$.

Finally we define the measure $\mu^z = \mu_1^z + \mu_2^z + \mu_3^z + \mu_4^z$.

**Lemma 4.2.** The measure $\mu^z$ is a permuton.

**Proof.** By construction $\mu^z$ is a probability measure. Then all that is left is to check that for $0 \leq a < b \leq 1$, $\mu^z([0, 1] \times [a, b]) = \mu^z([a, b] \times [0, 1]) = b - a$. Let $\mu^z_{up} = \mu_2^z + \mu_4^z$, $\mu^z_{down} = \mu_1^z + \mu_3^z$, $\mu^z_{left} = \mu_1^z + \mu_2^z$ and finally $\mu^z_{right} = \mu_3^z + \mu_4^z$.

Let $S = [a, b] \times [0, 1]$. The projection $\pi_x(S_1)$ is either $[a, b]$, $[a, z]$ or $\emptyset$ depending on if $z > b$, $a \leq z \leq b$, or $z < a$ respectively. Similarly $\pi_x(S_3)$ is either $\emptyset$, $[z, b]$, or $[a, b]$ if $z > b$, $a \leq z \leq b$, or $z < a$ respectively. Thus for any choice of $z$, $\mu^z_{down} = \frac{1}{2}(b - a)$. The set $\pi_x(S_2)$ and $\pi_x(S_4)$ also have a similar structure but instead depend on the location of the point $1 - z$ relative to $a$ and $b$. Thus $\mu^z_{up}(S) = \frac{1}{2}(b - a)$ and $\mu^z(S) = \mu^z_{up}(S) + \mu^z_{down}(S) = b - a$ as desired. The same argument holds for the projection $\pi_y$ on the set $S = [0, 1] \times [b, a]$ with respect to $\mu^z_{right}$ and $\mu^z_{left}$, to show $\mu(S) = \mu^z_{right}(S) + \mu^z_{left}(S) = b - a$, finishing the proof. \qed

The following lemma shows that for $\sigma_n \in \rho(\Omega_n)$ the two permutons, $\mu_{\sigma_n}$ and $\mu^{z_n}$ with $z_n = \sigma_n^{-1}(1)/n$, have distance $d_{\square}(\mu_{\sigma_n}, \mu^{z_n})$ that can be uniformly bounded over all choices of $\sigma_n$.

**Lemma 4.3.** Let $\sigma_n \in \rho(\Omega_n)$ and let $z_n = \sigma_n^{-1}(1)/n$. Then

$$\sup_{\sigma_n \in \Omega_n} d_{\square}(\mu_{\sigma_n}, \mu^{z_n}) < 400n^{-4}.$$ 

**Proof.** Fix $\sigma_n \in \Omega_n$ and $R = (a, b) \times (c, d) \subset [0, 1]^2$. The permutation $\sigma_n$ will consist of four disjoint sets of points $\Lambda_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ (see the discussion before Lemma 3.6). For each of these sets of points we define the measure $\lambda_i$ on $[0, 1]^2$ as

$$\lambda_i(R) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(i,j) \in \Lambda_i} 1_{\{i/n, j/n \in R\}}, \quad \text{for all Borel sets } R \subset [0, 1]^2.$$ 

Noting that $\mu_{\sigma_n} = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4$ we have the bound $|\mu_{\sigma_n}(R) - \mu^{z_n}(R)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^4 |\lambda_i(R) - \mu_i^{z_n}(R)|$. We will show explicitly that $|\lambda_1(R) - \mu_1^{z_n}(R)| < 100n^{-4}$. Similar arguments show the same bound for $i = 2, 3, 4$.

Recall $L_1$ is the line connecting $(0, z_n)$ and $(z_n, 0)$. Let $\ell$ denote the line segment given by $R \cap L_1$ (that we assume non-empty) with end points at $(x_1, y_1)$ and $(x_2, y_2)$ where $x_1 \leq x_2$ and $y_1 \geq y_2$. These endpoints satisfy $x_1 + y_1 = x_2 + y_2 = z_n$. By this construction we have $\mu_1^{z_n}(R) = \frac{1}{2}(x_2 - x_1)$.

Let $(s_1, t_1)$ be the leftmost point in $\Lambda_1 \cap nR$ and $(s_2, t_2)$ the rightmost point. The total number of points in $\Lambda_1 \cap nR$ is given by $ct_D(s_2) - ct_D(s_1) + 1$. Therefore $\lambda_1(R) = \frac{1}{n}(ct_D(s_2) - ct_D(s_1) + 1)$
and so

$$|\lambda_1(R) - \mu_{1n}^0(R)| < \left| \frac{1}{n}(ct_D(s_1) - 1) - \frac{1}{2}x_1 \right| + \left| \frac{1}{n}ct_D(s_2) - \frac{1}{2}x_2 \right|. $$

By Lemma 3.6, the points of $\Lambda_1$ must lie between the lines $nL_1^-$ and $nL_1^+$ given by the equations $x + y = nz_n - 20n^6$ and $x + y = nz_n + 20n^6$ (cf. Fig. 7).

Suppose $L_1$ exits $(a, b) \times (c, d)$ from the top so that $y_1 = d$. Then points in $\Lambda_1$ with first coordinate in the interval $[nx_1 - 40n^6, nx_1 - 20n^6]$ must lie above the line $y = nd$. Similarly, points in $\Lambda_1$ in the interval $[nx_1 + 20n^6, nx_1 + 40n^6]$ must lie below the line $y = nd$. By Lemma 3.2, there is at least one point in $\Lambda_1$ with $x$-coordinate in each of these intervals. Thus the leftmost point $(s_1, t_1)$ must have $s_1$ in the interval $[nx_1 - 40n^6, nx_1 + 40n^6]$. This combined with the Petrov conditions shows that

$$\left| ct_D(s_1) - \frac{1}{2}nx_1 \right| < \left| ct_D(s_1) - \frac{1}{2}s_1 \right| + \left| \frac{1}{2}(s_1 - nx_1) \right| < 2n^6 + 40n^6$$

and thus

$$\left| \frac{1}{n}(ct_D(s_1) - 1) - \frac{1}{2}x_1 \right| < 50n^{-4}. $$

If $L_1$ exits $nR$ on the left so that $x_1 = a$, then a similar argument leads to the same conclusion. Likewise we can show that

$$\left| \frac{1}{n}(ct_D(s_2)) - \frac{1}{2}x_2 \right| < 50n^{-4}$$

and thus

$$|\lambda_1(R) - \mu_{1n}^0(R)| < 100n^{-4}. $$

Similarly, for each $i = 2, 3, 4$, $|\lambda_i(R) - \mu_{zn}^0(R)| < 100n^{-4}$ and thus

$$|\mu_{\sigma_n}(R) - \mu_{zn}^0(R)| < 400n^{-4}. $$

This bound is uniform over all $\sigma_n \in \Omega_n$ and $R \in [0, 1]^2$ and so concludes the proof. □

For $z$ uniformly random on $(0, 1)$, we have a corresponding random permuton $\mu^z$. This is precisely our permuton limit for $\sigma_n \in Sq(n)$.

**Theorem 4.4.** Let $\sigma_n$ be a uniform random element of $Sq(n)$ and let $z$ be a uniform element in $(0, 1)$. The random permuton $\mu_{\sigma_n}$ converges in distribution to the random permuton $\mu^z$. 

\[\text{(11)}\]

\[|\mu_{\sigma_n}(R) - \mu^z(R)| < 400n^{-4}. \]
Proof. By Lemma 3.8 it suffices to only consider permutation chosen uniformly from \( \rho(\Omega_n) \) when showing the distributional limit of \( \mu_{\sigma_n} \). To show convergence in distribution we must show that for any bounded and continuous function \( f : M \to \mathbb{R} \),
\[
E[f \circ \mu_{\sigma_n} - f \circ \mu^z] \to 0.
\] (12)

Let \( z_n = \sigma_n^{-1}(1)/n \). Since \( \sigma_n \) is uniform in \( \rho(\Omega_n) \) then \( z_n \) is uniform in \( (n^{-1}, 1 - n^{-1}) \) and so converges in distribution to \( z \). We may rewrite the left-hand side of (12) as
\[
E[f \circ \mu_{\sigma_n} - f \circ \mu^z_n] + E[f \circ \mu^z_n - f \circ \mu^z] .
\] (13)

The map \( z \to \mu^z \) is continuous as a function form \( (0, 1) \) to \( M \), and thus \( g(z) = f \circ \mu^z \) is bounded and continuous from \( (0, 1) \to \mathbb{R} \). Therefore by convergence in distribution of \( z_n \) to \( z \) we have
\[
E[f \circ \mu^z_n - f \circ \mu^z] = E[g(z_n) - g(z)] \to 0 .
\]

By Lemma 4.3 we have that \( d_\mathcal{M}(\mu_{\sigma_n}, \mu^z_n) \) converges almost surely to zero. Thus for any continuous and bounded \( f \), by dominated convergence, we have
\[
E[f \circ \mu_{\sigma_n} - f \circ \mu^z_n] \to 0 ,
\]
finishing the proof. \( \square \)

5. Fluctuations

We saw in Section 4 that the permuton limit of a sequence of uniform random square permutations is a random rectangle. We now want to study the fluctuations of the dots of the diagram of a uniform square permutation around the four edges of the rectangle.

Let \( \sigma_n \) be a square permutation of size \( n \) and let \( z_0 = z_0(n) = \sigma_n^{-1}(1) \). We assume that
\[
z_0 > \frac{n}{2} + 10n^6 .
\] (14)

We will focus on the following three families of dots of \( \sigma_n \):
- \( DR = DR(n) = \text{RLmin}(\sigma_n) \), highlighted in green in Fig. 8
- \( DL = DL(n) = \{(i, \sigma_n(i)) \in \text{LRmin}(\sigma_n) : \sigma_n(i) \leq n - z_0 + 1\} \), highlighted in red in Fig. 8
- \( UR = UR(n) = \{(i, \sigma_n(i)) \in \text{RLmax}(\sigma_n) : i \geq z_0\} \), highlighted in blue in Fig. 8

Note that \((z_0, 1) \in DR \cap DL \) and \((n, \sigma_n(n)) \in DR \cap UR \).

For each set of points, we perform a particular rotation so that each of the following lines become the new x-axis for the respective set of points
- \( r^{DR} : y = x + (1 - z_0) \), highlighted in green in Fig. 8
- \( r^{DL} : y = -x + (z_0 + 1) \), highlighted in red in Fig. 8
- \( r^{UR} : y = -x + (2n - z_0 + 1) \), highlighted in blue in Fig. 8

More precisely, as shown in Fig. 8, we apply a clockwise rotation of 45 degrees to the first family of points, a clockwise rotation of 135 degrees to the second family, and a counter-clockwise rotation of 45 degrees to the third family. After applying the rotation, we also translate the y-coordinate of all the points in the third family by the distance of the first point from the line \( r^{UR} \) (we made this shift in order to have a sequence of points that starts at height zero, similar to the other two sequences). We denote the three new families of points as \( \mathcal{P}^{DR}, \mathcal{P}^{DL} \) and \( \mathcal{P}^{UR} \).

Given a family of points \( \mathcal{P} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=0}^m \) with \( x_0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \cdots \leq x_m \), we denote with \( F^\mathcal{P}(t) \), for \( t \in [0, 1] \), the linear interpolation among the points \( \{(x_i, \frac{y_i}{\sqrt{m}})\}_{i=0}^m \).

**Theorem 5.1.** Let \( \sigma_n \) be a uniform random square permutation of size \( n \), and let \( B_1(t), B_2(t), B_3(t), \) and \( B_4(t) \) be four independent standard Brownian motions on the interval \([0, 1] \). Fix a sequence of integers \( (t_n)_n \) such that \( \frac{n}{2} + 10n^6 < t_n \leq n - n^9 \). Conditioning on \( z_0 = t_n \), we have the following
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Figure 8. A square permutation \( \sigma \) with the three families \( DR, DL, UR \) highlighted. The dots of \( DR, DL, UR \) are colored in the diagram of \( \sigma \) in green, red and blue respectively. Similarly we paint the lines \( r_{DR} \), \( r_{DL} \) and \( r_{UR} \) in green, red and blue.

On the right of the picture we draw the diagrams of the points in \( P_{UR} \), \( P_{DR} \) and \( P_{DL} \) obtained rotating the families of points \( UR, DR \) and \( DL \) by the indicated angle (with the additional translation for the points in family \( P_{UR} \)).

Convergence in distribution in the space \( C([0,1], \mathbb{R}) \) of the continuous functions from the interval \( [0,1] \) to \( \mathbb{R} \), endowed with the uniform distance:

\[
(F_{P_{DR}(n)}(t), F_{P_{DL}(n)}(t), F_{P_{UR}(n)}(t))_{t \in [0,1]} \xrightarrow{d} (B_1(t) + B_2(t), B_3(t) + B_1(t), B_4(t) + B_2(t))_{t \in [0,1]}
\]

Remark 5.2. Note that Theorem 5.1 not only describes the scaling limit of the families of points \( P_{DR}, P_{DL} \) and \( P_{UR} \), but also describes the dependency relations among them. Indeed, the limit \( \lim_{n \to \infty} F_{P_{DL}(n)}(t) = B_3(t) + B_1(t) \) is independent of the limit \( \lim_{n \to \infty} F_{P_{UR}(n)}(t) = B_4(t) + B_2(t) \). On the other hand, the limit \( \lim_{n \to \infty} F_{P_{DR}(n)}(t) = B_1(t) + B_2(t) \) is correlated with both the limits \( \lim_{n \to \infty} F_{P_{DL}(n)}(t) = B_3(t) + B_1(t) \) and \( \lim_{n \to \infty} F_{P_{UR}(n)}(t) = B_4(t) + B_2(t) \). Moreover, this dependency is completely explicit.

Remark 5.3. We chose to study only the family of points \( DL, DR \) and \( UR \) in order to simplify as much as we can the notation. Nevertheless, the result stated in Theorem 5.1 can be generalized to every possible choice of "a vertical and horizontal strip" in the diagram (under the assumption that they do not contain corner points). In particular, in our case, the vertical strip is the one between the indexes \( z_0 \) and \( n \) and the horizontal strip is the one between the indexes 1 and \( n - z_0 + 1 \).

In order to prove Theorem 5.1 we will consider a uniform random permutation \( \sigma_n \) of \( \rho(\Omega_n) \) with \( \sigma_n^{-1}(1) > \frac{n}{2} + 10n^6 \). We now compute the \( x \)-coordinates and the \( y \)-coordinates of the points in
the three families $DR$, $DL$ and $LT$ for a permutation $\sigma = \rho(X,Y,z_0)$ with $(X,Y,z_0) \in \Omega_n$ and $z_0 > \frac{n}{2} + 10n^6$. Specifically, we are going to write the $x$-coordinates and the $y$-coordinates of the points in terms of the sequences $X$ and $Y$.

**Observation 5.4.** Using Lemma 3.3 the condition $z_0 > \frac{n}{2} + 10n^6$ ensures that $z_2 = \sigma^{-1}(1) < \sigma^{-1}(1) = z_0$, and therefore every $U$ that appears after the $z_0$-th position in the sequence $X$ is used to create only right-to-left maxima in $\sigma$.

We start by noting that $|DR| = ct_D(n) - ct_D(z_0) + 1$, $|DL| = ct_L(n - z_0 + 1)$ and $|UR| = ct_U(n) - ct_U(z_0) + 1$. We denote the points in $DR$ (resp. $DL, UR$) with the letters $\{P^D_{i,n}\}_{i=0}^{\lfloor |DR| - 1 \rfloor}$ (resp. $\{P^D_{i,n}\}_{i=0}^{\lfloor |DL| - 1 \rfloor}, \{P^U_{i,n}\}_{i=0}^{\lfloor |UR| - 1 \rfloor}$) in such a way that $P^D_{0,n} = (z_0,0) = P^D_{0} = P^L_{0}$ and $P^U_{0,n}$ is the point in $UR$ with smallest $x$-coordinate. We are denoting the points respecting the orders indicated by the three small black arrows in Fig. 9.

For all $i \geq 1$, we have

- $\mathcal{P}^D_{i} = (z_0 + \text{pos}^D_{z_0}(i), \text{pos}_{R}(i))$, where $\text{pos}^D_{z_0}(i) := \text{pos}_{D}(ct_D(z_0) + i) - z_0$;
- $\mathcal{P}^L_{i} = (z_0 - \text{pos}^L_{z_0}(i), \text{pos}_{L}(i + 1))$, where $\text{pos}^L_{z_0}(i) := z_0 - \text{pos}_{D}(ct_D(z_0) + i)$;
- $\mathcal{P}^U_{i} = (z_0 + \text{pos}^U_{z_0}(i), \text{pos}_{R}(n - z_0 + 1 + i))$, where $\text{pos}^U_{z_0}(i) := \text{pos}_{R}(ct_U(z_0) + i) - z_0$.

Note that $\text{pos}^D_{z_0}(i)$ denotes the distance from $z_0$ of the $i$-th $D$ after the one at position $z_0$. Similar remarks hold for $\text{pos}^L_{z_0}(i)$ and $\text{pos}^U_{z_0}(i)$.

With some easy computations, we can rewrite the $x$-coordinates and the $y$-coordinates of the points in $\mathcal{P}^D_{i}, \mathcal{P}^L_{i}$ and $\mathcal{P}^U_{i}$ as follow

- $\mathcal{P}^D_{i,n} = \frac{D}{2}(\text{pos}^D_{z_0}(i) + \text{pos}_{R}(i) - 1, -\text{pos}^D_{z_0}(i) + \text{pos}_{R}(i) - 1)$;
- $\mathcal{P}^L_{i,n} = \frac{D}{2}(\text{pos}^L_{z_0}(i), \text{pos}_{L}(i + 1)) - (\text{pos}^L_{z_0}(i) - \text{pos}_{L}(i + 1))$;
- $\mathcal{P}^U_{i,n} = \frac{D}{2}(x_i, y_i)$, where $x_i = \text{pos}^U_{z_0}(i) + 2n - 2z_0 + 1 - \text{pos}_{R}(n - z_0 + 1 + i)$ and $y_i = \text{pos}^U_{z_0}(i) - \text{pos}_{R}(n - z_0 + 1 + i) - \text{pos}_{R}(n - z_0)$.

Note that the $y$-coordinates of the points in the three families depend both from elements coming from one sequence $X$ and the sequence $Y$. Therefore, for each family, we split this dependence introducing the following six additional families of points (see also Fig. 9)

- $\mathcal{X}^D_{i,n} = \{i, -\text{pos}^D_{z_0}(i) + 2i\}_{i=0}^{\lfloor |DR| - 1 \rfloor}$;
- $\mathcal{X}^L_{i,n} = \{i, \text{pos}^L_{z_0}(i) - 2i\}_{i=0}^{\lfloor |DL| - 1 \rfloor}$;
- $\mathcal{X}^U_{i,n} = \{i, \text{pos}^U_{z_0}(i) - \text{pos}_{R}(1 - 2i)\}_{i=0}^{\lfloor |UR| - 1 \rfloor}$.

Note that the $y$-coordinates of the points in $\mathcal{P}^*_i$, for $* = DR, DL, UR$, are respectively the sum of the $y$-coordinates of the points in $\mathcal{X}^*$ and $\mathcal{Y}^*$.

We will prove Theorem 5.1 as follows

- The six families $\mathcal{X}^*$ and $\mathcal{Y}^*$, for $* = DR, DL, UR$ have to be thought as a sort of projection of the points in the families $\mathcal{P}^*$ on the $x$-axis and the $y$-axis of the diagram (see Fig. 9).
- We will first study (see Proposition 5.5 below) the scaling limits of the six families $\mathcal{X}^D, \mathcal{X}^L, \mathcal{X}^U$ and $\mathcal{Y}^U$, proving the convergence of the functions $F_0^{\mathcal{X}^*}(t)$ and $F_0^{\mathcal{Y}^*}(t)$ to six standard Brownian motions (multiplied by a factor $\sqrt{2}$). In particular the functions $F_0^{\mathcal{X}^D}(t)$ and $F_0^{\mathcal{X}^D}(t)$ converge to the same Brownian motion $B_1$ and the families $F_0^{\mathcal{X}^D}(t)$ and $F_0^{\mathcal{X}^U}(t)$ converge to the same Brownian motion $B_2$.\footnote{Note that the indices of the points in the families $|DR|$ and $|DL|$ start from zero, but the indices of the points in $|UR|$ start from one. These choices are made in order to have some simplifications in the following computations.}
• Then we recover the scaling limit for the families $\mathcal{P}^{DR}$, $\mathcal{P}^{DL}$ and $\mathcal{P}^{UR}$ as a linear combinations of the limits obtained for the previous six families. In this case we have to overcome a technical difficulty due to the fact that the points in the families $\mathcal{P}^{DR}$, $\mathcal{P}^{DL}$ and $\mathcal{P}^{UR}$ are random in both coordinates. This problem is solved in Lemma 5.8.

$$\mathcal{P}^{DR}, \mathcal{P}^{DL} \text{ and } \mathcal{P}^{UR}$$

**Figure 9.** A schema summarizing the strategy of the proof for Theorem 5.1

**Proposition 5.5.** Let $\sigma_n$, $(t_n)_n$ and $B_1(t), B_2(t), B_3(t), B_4(t)$ be defined as in Theorem 5.1. Conditioning on $z_0 = t_n$, we have the following convergences in distribution in the space $\mathcal{C}([0,1], \mathbb{R})$,

$$\left(\mathcal{P}^{D^{DR}(n)}, \mathcal{P}^{D^{DL}(n)}, \mathcal{P}^{D^{UR}(n)}, \mathcal{P}^{D^{UR}(n)}\right)_{t \in [0,1]} \xrightarrow{d} \sqrt{2}(B_4(t), B_1(t), B_1(t), B_3(t), B_2(t), B_2(t))_{t \in [0,1]}.$$

Before proving the proposition we have to solve a technical difficulty due to the fact that our families of points have random cardinalities.

**Lemma 5.6.** Let $\mathcal{P} = \{(i, y_i)\}_{i=0}^\ell$ be a family of $\ell$ points. Take $\ell' < \ell$ and consider the family of points $\mathcal{P}' = \{(i, y_i)\}_{i=0}^{\ell'}$ composed by the first $\ell'$ points of $\mathcal{P}$. Then

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |F^\mathcal{P}(t) - F^{\mathcal{P}'}(t)| \leq \sup_{i,j \in [\ell, \ell']} \frac{|y_i - y_{i+j}|}{\sqrt{\ell'}}$$

where $\delta = \ell - \ell' + 2$.

**Proof.** It is enough to note that for fixed $t \in [0,1],

$$|F^\mathcal{P}(t) - F^{\mathcal{P}'}(t)| \leq \max_{s,q \in [0,1]} \frac{|y_{\lfloor tl \rfloor + s} - y_{\lfloor tl' \rfloor + q}|}{\sqrt{\ell'}}$$

and that $\max_{s,q \in [0,1]} \lfloor tl \rfloor + s - \lfloor tl' \rfloor + q \leq \ell - \ell' + 2 = \delta$.

**Lemma 5.7.** Let $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of i.i.d random variables with zero mean and unit variance. Let $S_m = \sum_{i=1}^m X_i$. For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, consider an integer-valued random variable $N = N(m)$ such that a.s. $|N - m| < 2m^6$. Then

$$\sup_{i \in [0,m+2m^6]} \left| \frac{S_i}{\sqrt{m+2m^6}} - \frac{S_{i+N}}{\sqrt{N}} \right| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,$$

where $\delta = m + \lfloor 2m^6 \rfloor - N + 2$. 

**Figure 9.** A schema summarizing the strategy of the proof for Theorem 5.1

**Proposition 5.5.** Let $\sigma_n$, $(t_n)_n$ and $B_1(t), B_2(t), B_3(t), B_4(t)$ be defined as in Theorem 5.1. Conditioning on $z_0 = t_n$, we have the following convergences in distribution in the space $\mathcal{C}([0,1], \mathbb{R})$,

$$\left(\mathcal{P}^{D^{DR}(n)}, \mathcal{P}^{D^{DL}(n)}, \mathcal{P}^{D^{UR}(n)}, \mathcal{P}^{D^{UR}(n)}\right)_{t \in [0,1]} \xrightarrow{d} \sqrt{2}(B_4(t), B_1(t), B_1(t), B_3(t), B_2(t), B_2(t))_{t \in [0,1]}.$$
Proof. Note that
\[
(16) \quad \left| \frac{S_i}{\sqrt{m+\lfloor 2m^6 \rfloor}} - \frac{S_{i+j}}{\sqrt{N}} \right| \leq \left| \frac{S_i}{\sqrt{N}} \right| + \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{m+\lfloor 2m^6 \rfloor}} - 1 \left| \frac{S_i}{\sqrt{N}} \right|
\]

By the law of iterated logarithms the random variable
\[
M := \sup_{n \geq 2} \frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n \log \log n}},
\]
is almost surely finite. Therefore, almost surely, for all \(i \in [0, m + \lfloor 2m^6 \rfloor]\),
\[
\sup_{j \in [-\delta, \delta]} |S_i - S_{i+j}| \leq M \sqrt{\delta \log \log \delta}.
\]

Since \(\frac{M \sqrt{\delta \log \log \delta}}{\sqrt{N}} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0\) we can conclude that
\[
\sup_{i \in [0, m + \lfloor 2m^6 \rfloor]} \sup_{j \in [-\delta, \delta]} \left| \frac{S_i - S_{i+j}}{\sqrt{N}} \right| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.
\]

Similarly,
\[
|\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{m+\lfloor 2m^6 \rfloor}} - 1| \sup_{i \in [0, m + \lfloor 2m^6 \rfloor]} \sup_{j \in [-\delta, \delta]} \left| \frac{S_i}{\sqrt{N}} \right|
\]
\[
\leq \left| \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{m+\lfloor 2m^6 \rfloor}} - 1 \right| M \sqrt{(m + \lfloor 2m^6 \rfloor) \log \log (m + \lfloor 2m^6 \rfloor)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.
\]

The last two equations together with the initial bound in (16) are enough to conclude the proof. \(\Box\)

Proof of Proposition 5.5. It is enough to prove the statement for a uniform random element \(\sigma_n\) of \(\rho(\Omega_n)\). Then the statement for uniform square permutations follows using Lemma 3.8.

We recall that a uniform random element of \(\rho(\Omega_n)\) can be sampled as follows. Let \(z_0\) be an integer chosen uniformly from \((n^9, n - n^9)\) and let \((X, Y)\) be uniform in \(\{U, D\}^n \times \{L, R\}^n\) conditioned to satisfy the Petrov conditions and to have \(Y_{z_0} = D\). Under these assumptions \((X, Y, z_0)\) is a uniform random element of \(\Omega_n\) and consequently \(\sigma_n = \rho((X, Y, z_0))\) is a uniform random element of \(\rho(\Omega_n)\). All the random quantities considered below have to be meant as conditioned to \(z_0 = t_n\).

We start by proving that
\[
(17) \quad (F^{DL(n)}(t), F^{DR(n)}(t))_{t \in [0,1]} \xrightarrow{d} \sqrt{2}(B_1(t), B_1(t))_{t \in [0,1]}.
\]

We recall that \(F^{DL(n)}(t)\) and \(F^{DR(n)}(t)\) are the functions obtained by linear interpolation of the points in the families
\[
\left\{ \left( \frac{i}{|DL(n)|}, \frac{-\text{pos}_L(i + 1) + 1 + 2i}{\sqrt{|DL(n)|}} \right) \right\}_{i=0}^{|DL(n)|-1},
\]
\[
\left\{ \left( \frac{i}{|DR(n)|}, \frac{\text{pos}_R(i) - 1 - 2i}{\sqrt{|DR(n)|}} \right) \right\}_{i=0}^{|DR(n)|-1},
\]
where \(|DL(n)| = ct_L(n - z_0 + 1)\) and \(|DR(n)| = ct_D(n) - ct_D(z_0) + 1\).

In order to prove (17) we are going to apply Donsker’s theorem. Therefore it is enough to prove that the differences between the \(y\)-coordinates of two consecutive points are independent and identically distributed. We also have to pay a bit of attention to the fact that the families of points have random cardinalities.
Using similar notation as the one introduced immediately before Lemma 3.3 (for a sequence of $L$s and $R$s instead of $U$s and $D$s) we can rewrite, the numerator of the $y$-coordinates in the two families in (18) as
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pos}_R(i) - 1 - 2i &= e(i) - 1, \quad \forall i \leq \text{ct}_R(n), \\
- \text{pos}_L(i + 1) + 1 + 2i &= e(i + 1) - s(i + 1) - 1, \quad \forall i \leq \min\{\text{ct}_R(n) - 1, \text{ct}_L(n) - 1\}.
\end{align*}
\]
(19)

Using Lemma 3.3 we have that for all $i \leq \text{ct}_R(n)$, the random variable $e(i + 1) - e(i)$ associated to the random sequence $Y$ has the following distribution, independent of $i$,
\[
|s(i)| < 10n^4 \quad \text{a.s.}
\]
(20)

We also note that, for all $i \leq \text{ct}_R(n)$, the random variable $e(i + 1) - e(i)$ associated to the random sequence $Y$ has the following distribution, independent of $i$,
\[
\mathbb{P}(e(i + 1) - e(i) = k) = \mathbb{P}(\text{pos}_R(i + 1) - \text{pos}_R(i) = k + 2) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k+2}, \quad \text{for all } k \geq -1.
\]
(21)

In the last equality, thanks to Lemma 3.4 we used that the random sequence $Y$ is a uniform sequence in $\{L, R\}^n$, although the sequence $Y$ is conditioned to satisfy the Petrov conditions. In particular $(e(i + 1) - e(i))_i$ are i.i.d. random variables with zero mean and variance equal to 2.

By the Petrov conditions
\[
\begin{align*}
\|DR(n) - (n - z_0)/2\| < |n - z_0|^6 & \quad \text{and} \quad \|DL(n) - (n - z_0)/2\| < |n - z_0|^6, \\
|\text{ct}_R(n) - n/2| < n^6 & \quad \text{and} \quad |\text{ct}_R(n) - n/2| < n^6.
\end{align*}
\]
(22)

Since $z_0 = t_n > \frac{n}{2} + 10n^6$, we have that
\[
\max\{|DR(n)|, |DL(n)|\} < \min\{\text{ct}_R(n), \text{ct}_R(n)\},
\]
and therefore the relations in (19), (20) and (21) hold (for $n$ big enough) a.s. for all the points in the sets in (18).

Inequality (20) guarantees that if $F_{Y,DR(n)}(t)$ is obtained by interpolating the points in the family
\[
\left\{ \left( \frac{i}{|DR(n)|}, \frac{e(i) - 1}{\sqrt{|DR(n)|}} \right) \right\}_{i=0}^{|DR(n)|-1}
\]
instead of the original points
\[
\left\{ \left( \frac{i}{|DR(n)|}, \frac{e(i+1) - s(i+1) - 1}{\sqrt{|DR(n)|}} \right) \right\}_{i=0}^{|DR(n)|-1},
\]
then the distributional limit is the same.

We now consider two additional functions, $F_{1}^m(t)$ and $F_{2}^m(t)$, obtained by linear interpolation of the points in the families
\[
\left\{ \left( \frac{i}{m}, \frac{e_*(i) - 1}{\sqrt{m}} \right) \right\}_{i=0}^m
\]
(23)
\[
\left\{ \left( \frac{i}{m}, \frac{e_*(i) + 1 - 1}{\sqrt{m}} \right) \right\}_{i=0}^m,
\]

where $(e_*(i))_i$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with the same distribution of $e(i)$. Applying Donsker’s theorem, we have that
\[
(F_{1}^m(t), F_{2}^m(t)) \overset{d}{\longrightarrow} \sqrt{2}(B_1(t), B_1(t)).
\]
(24)

Using the inequalities in (22) and applying both Lemma 5.6 with $\ell = \lfloor (n - z_0)/2 + |n - z_0|^6 \rfloor$ and Lemma 5.4 with $m = \lfloor (n - z_0)/2 \rfloor$, we have that
\[
\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| F_{Y,DL(n)}(t) - F_{1}^{\lfloor (n - z_0)/2 + |n - z_0|^6 \rfloor}(t) \right| \overset{a.s.}{\longrightarrow} 0,
\]
\[
\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| F_{Y,DR(n)}(t) - F_{2}^{\lfloor (n - z_0)/2 + |n - z_0|^6 \rfloor}(t) \right| \overset{a.s.}{\longrightarrow} 0.
\]

This with (24) implies (17).
Repeating the same proof as before for $F_{Y(n)}^{U}(t)$, $F_{X(n)}^{DL}(t)$ and $(F_{X(n)}^{DR}(t), F_{X(n)}^{UR}(t))$, we can conclude that

$$F_{Y(n)}^{U}(t) \xrightarrow{d} \sqrt{2}B_{t}(t), \quad \quad F_{X(n)}^{DL}(t) \xrightarrow{d} \sqrt{2}B_{3}(t),$$

$$(F_{X(n)}^{DR}(t), F_{X(n)}^{UR}(t)) \xrightarrow{d} \sqrt{2}(B_{2}(t), B_{2}(t)).$$

Finally, noting that the following four families of points are independent for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{Y}^{UR}, \quad \mathcal{Y}^{DL} \cup \mathcal{Y}^{DR}, \quad \mathcal{X}^{DL}, \quad \mathcal{X}^{DR} \cup \mathcal{X}^{UR},$$

we can immediately conclude that the following four functions are independent for all $n \geq 1$,

$$F_{Y(n)}^{U}(t), \quad (F_{Y(n)}^{DL}(t), F_{Y(n)}^{DR}(t)), \quad F_{X(n)}^{DL}(t), \quad (F_{X(n)}^{DR}(t), F_{X(n)}^{UR}(t)),$$

and since also their limits are independent we can conclude that the joint convergence in distribution in (15) holds.

Before proving Theorem 5.1 we need to state an additional technical lemma. We first introduce some more notation.

Given a family of points $P = \{(x_{i}, y_{i})\}_{i=0}^{m}$, with $x_{1} \leq x_{2} \leq \cdots \leq x_{m}$, we denote with $F_{P}^{X}(t)$, for $t \in [0, 1]$, the linear interpolation among the points $\{(\frac{i}{m}, \frac{y_{i}}{m})\}_{i=0}^{m}$ and with $F_{X}^{P}(t)$, for $t \in [0, 1]$, the linear interpolation among the points $\{(\frac{x_{i}}{m}, \frac{1}{m})\}_{i=0}^{m}$.

Note that

$$F_{P}^{X} = F_{P}^{X} \circ F_{P}^{Y}(t).$$

**Lemma 5.8.** Let for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $P_{n} = \{(x_{i}, y_{i})\}_{i=0}^{m(n)}$ be a family of $N(n)$ random points (where $N(n)$ is a positive integer-valued random variable). Assume that the following two convergences hold in the space $C([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$,

$$F_{X}^{P_{n}}(t) \xrightarrow{d} Id_{[0, 1]}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad F_{Y}^{P_{n}}(t) \xrightarrow{d} B(t),$$

where $Id_{[0, 1]}(t)$ is the identity function on the interval $[0, 1]$ and $B(t)$ is a standard Brownian motion. Then

$$F_{P_{n}}^{X}(t) \xrightarrow{d} B(t).$$

The proof of the previous lemma is based on the following classical analytic result.

**Lemma 5.9.** Let $f_n$ and $g_n$ be two sequences of functions in the space $C([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ that uniformly converge to $f$ and $g$ respectively. Then the sequence $f_n \circ g_n$ converges to $f \circ g$.

**Proof.** We have

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |f_n \circ g_n(t) - f \circ g(t)| \leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |f_n \circ g_n(t) - f \circ g_n(t)| + \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |f \circ g_n(t) - f \circ g(t)|$$

We conclude the proof just noting that the first term in the right-hand-side of the above expression tends to zero since $f_n \to f$ and the second term tends to zero since $f$ is uniformly continuous and $g_n \to g$. \qed

**Proof of Lemma 5.8.** Using Skorokhod’s representation theorem we can assume that

$$F_{X}^{P_{n}}(t) \xrightarrow{a.s.} Id_{[0, 1]}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad F_{Y}^{P_{n}}(t) \xrightarrow{a.s.} B(t),$$

in the space $C([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ equipped with the uniform distance. Then by Lemma 5.9 and the observation done in (25) we can conclude that

$$F_{P_{n}}^{X}(t) = F_{P_{n}}^{P_{n}} \circ F_{X}^{P_{n}}(t) \xrightarrow{a.s.} B(t).$$

We also need the following easy lemma.


Lemma 5.10. For a regular anchored pair of sequences with associated set of points $DR(n)$, and for all $i \leq |DR(n)|$,

$$|pos_D^{\geq z_0}(i) + pos_R(i) - 1 - 4i| < 4n^6 + 1.$$  

Proof. Recalling that $pos_D^{\geq z_0}(i) = pos_D(ct_D(z_0) + i) - z_0$ and that $pos_D(ct_D(z_0)) = z_0$ (since $X_{z_0} = D$) we have

$$|pos_D^{\geq z_0}(i) - 2i| = |pos_D(ct_D(z_0) + i) - z_0 - 2i| = |pos_D(ct_D(z_0) + i) - pos_D(ct_D(z_0)) - 2i| < 2n^6,$$

where in the last inequality we used the Petrov conditions. Using again the Petrov conditions we also have

$$|pos_R(i) - 2i| < 2n^6.$$

The two bounds are enough to conclude the proof. □

We can finally prove the main result of this section.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We first prove that

$$F_{\mathcal{P}^{DR(n)}}(t) \xrightarrow{d} B_1(t) + B_2(t).$$

We recall that that $F_{\mathcal{P}^{DR(n)}}(t)$ is the function obtained by linear interpolation of the family of points

$$\left\{ \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \left( \frac{pos_D^{\geq z_0}(i) + pos_R(i) - 1}{pos_D^{\geq z_0}(|DR(n)|) + pos_R(|DR(n)|) - 1}, -\frac{pos_D^{\geq z_0}(i) + pos_R(i) - 1}{\sqrt{|DR(n)|}} \right) \right\}_{i=0}^{|DR(n)|-1},$$

where $|DR(n)| = ct_D(n) - ct_D(z_0) + 1$.

Note that the points are random in both coordinates. In order to overcome this difficulty we are going to apply Lemma 5.8. Therefore, in order to prove (26) it is enough to prove that

$$F_{\mathcal{P}^{DR(n)}}(t) \xrightarrow{d} Id_{[0,1]}(t),$$

and

$$F_{\mathcal{P}^{DR(n)}}'(t) \xrightarrow{d} B_1(t) + B_2(t).$$

The convergence in (28) follows from Proposition 5.5. Indeed note that

$$F_{\mathcal{P}^{DR(n)}}(t) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \left( F_{\mathcal{P}^{DR(n)}}(t) + F_{\mathcal{P}^{DUR(n)}}(t) \right) \xrightarrow{d} B_1(t) + B_2(t).$$

For the convergence in (27) note that by Lemma 5.10 for all $i \leq |DR(n)|$,

$$|pos_D^{\geq z_0}(i) + pos_R(i) - 1 - 4i| < 4n^6 + 1 \quad a.s.$$  

Therefore,

$$\sup_{i \leq |DR(n)|} \left| \frac{pos_D^{\geq z_0}(i) + pos_R(i) - 1}{pos_D^{\geq z_0}(|DR(n)|) + pos_R(|DR(n)|) - 1} - \frac{i}{|DR(n)|} \right| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

This implies that

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| F_{\mathcal{P}^{DR(n)}}(t) - Id_{[0,1]}(t) \right| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,$$

and so (27) is proved. Using the joint converge proved in Proposition 5.5 and the same proof that we used to prove (26) we have that

$$\left( F_{\mathcal{P}^{DR(n)}}(t), F_{\mathcal{P}^{DL(n)}}(t), F_{\mathcal{P}^{DUR(n)}}(t) \right)_{t \in [0,1]} \xrightarrow{d} (B_1(t) + B_2(t), B_3(t) + B_1(t), B_4(t) + B_2(t))_{t \in [0,1]},$$

concluding the proof. □
6. Local behavior

For local behavior of uniform random permutations in $Sq(n)$ we use the setting of local topology for permutations introduced in [10, Section 2]. We now briefly recall the definition of local topology for permutations.

6.1. Local topology for permutations. A finite rooted permutation is a pair $(\sigma, i)$, where $\sigma \in S^n$ and $i \in [n]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote with $S_n$ the set of rooted permutations of size $n$ and with $S_\bullet := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S^n$ the set of finite rooted permutations. We write sequences of finite rooted permutations in $S_\bullet$ as $(\sigma_n, i_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

To a rooted permutation $(\sigma, i)$, we associate (as shown in the right-hand side of Fig. 10) the pair $(A_{\sigma,i}, \preceq_{\sigma,i})$, where $A_{\sigma,i} := [-i + 1, |\sigma| - i]$ is a finite interval containing 0 and $\preceq_{\sigma,i}$ is a total order on $A_{\sigma,i}$, defined for all $\ell, j \in A_{\sigma,i}$ by

$\ell \preceq_{\sigma,i} j$ if and only if $\sigma(\ell + i) \leq \sigma(j + i)$.

Informally, the elements of $A_{\sigma,i}$ should be thought as the column indices of the diagram of $\sigma$, shifted so that the root is in column 0. The order $\preceq_{\sigma,i}$ then corresponds to the vertical order on the dots in the corresponding columns.

This map is a bijection from the space of finite rooted permutations $S_\bullet$ to the space of total orders on finite integer intervals containing zero. Consequently and throughout this Section 6, we identify every rooted permutation $(\sigma, i)$ with the total order $(A_{\sigma,i}, \preceq_{\sigma,i})$. Thanks to this identification, we call infinite rooted permutation a pair $(A, \preceq)$ where $A$ is an infinite interval of integers containing 0 and $\preceq$ is a total order on $A$. We denote the set of infinite rooted permutations by $S_\infty$.

We highlight that infinite rooted permutations can be thought of as rooted at 0. We set $S_\bullet := S_\bullet \cup S_\infty$, which is the set of all (finite and infinite) rooted permutations.

We finally introduce the following $h$-restriction function around the root defined, for every $h \in \mathbb{N}$, as follows

$r_h : S_\bullet \rightarrow S_\bullet$

$(A, \preceq) \mapsto (A \cap [-h, h], \preceq)$.

We can think of restriction functions as a notion of neighborhood around the root. For finite rooted permutations we also have the equivalent description of the restriction functions $r_h$ in terms of consecutive patterns: if $(\sigma, i) \in S_\bullet$ then $r_h(\sigma, i) = (\text{pat}_{[a,b]}(\sigma), i)$ where we take $a = \max\{1, i - h\}$ and $b = \min\{|\sigma|, i + h\}$. 

Figure 10. Two rooted permutations and the associated total orders. The big red dot indicates the root of the permutation. The vertical gray strip and the relation between the two rooted permutations will be clarified later.

$2 \leq_{\sigma,i} -3 \leq_{\sigma,i} 0 \leq_{\sigma,i} -2 \leq_{\sigma,i} 1 \leq_{\sigma,i} 3 \leq_{\sigma,i} -1 \quad 2 \leq_{\pi,i'} 0 \leq_{\pi,i'} -2 \leq_{\pi,i'} 1 \leq_{\pi,i'} -1$
The local distance $d$ on the set of (possibly infinite) rooted permutations $\mathcal{S}_*$ is defined as follows: given two rooted permutations $(A_1, \preceq_1), (A_2, \preceq_2) \in \mathcal{S}_*$,

\[ d((A_1, \preceq_1), (A_2, \preceq_2)) = 2^{-\sup \{ h \in \mathbb{N} : r_h(A_1, \preceq_1) = r_h(A_2, \preceq_2) \}} , \]

with the classical conventions that $\sup \emptyset = 0$, $\sup \mathbb{N} = +\infty$ and $2^{-\infty} = 0$. The metric space $(\mathcal{S}_*, d)$ is a compact Polish space, i.e., compact, separable and complete (see [10, Theorem 2.18]).

The above distance gives a notion of convergent sequences of rooted permutations. In particular, a sequence is convergent if and only if for all $h \in \mathbb{N}$, the $h$- restrictions of the sequence are eventually constant.

For a sequence $\sigma_n$ of unrooted permutations, we consider the sequence of random rooted $(\sigma_n, i_n)$, where $i_n$ is a uniform random index in $[|\sigma_n|]$. We say that $\sigma_n$ converges in the Benjamini–Schramm sense if the sequence of random rooted permutations $(\sigma_n, i_n)$ converges in distribution for the above distance $d$. This definition is inspired from Benjamini–Schramm convergence for graphs (see [7]).

Benjamini–Schramm convergence can be extended in two different ways for sequences of random permutations $(\sigma_n)_{n \geq 1}$: the annealed and the quenched version of the Benjamini–Schramm convergence. These two different versions come from the fact that there are two sources of randomness, one for the choice of the random permutation $\sigma_n$, and one for the random root $i_n$. Intuitively, in the annealed version, the random permutation and the random root are taken simultaneously, while in the quenched version, the random permutation should be thought as frozen when we take the random root.

We now give the formal definitions. In both cases, $(\sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ denotes a sequence of random permutations in $\mathcal{S}$ and $i_n$ denotes a uniform index of $\sigma_n$, i.e. a uniform integer in $[|\sigma_n|]$.

**Definition 6.1** (Annealed version of the Benjamini–Schramm convergence). We say that $(\sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in the annealed Benjamini–Schramm sense to a random variable $\sigma_\infty$ with values in $\mathcal{S}_*$ if the sequence of random variables $(\sigma_n, i_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in distribution to $\sigma_\infty$ with respect to the local distance $d$. In this case we write $\sigma_n \xrightarrow{aBS} \sigma_\infty$ instead of $(\sigma_n, i_n) \rightarrow d \sigma_\infty$.

**Definition 6.2** (Quenched version of the Benjamini–Schramm convergence). We say that $(\sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in the quenched Benjamini–Schramm sense to a random measure $\nu_\infty$ on $\mathcal{S}_*$ if the sequence of conditional laws $\text{Law}((\sigma_n, i_n) | \sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in distribution to $\nu_\infty$ with respect to the weak topology induced by the local distance $d$. In this case we write $\sigma_n \xrightarrow{qBS} \nu_\infty$ instead of $\text{Law}((\sigma_n, i_n) | \sigma_n) \rightarrow d \nu_\infty$.

We highlight that, in the annealed version, the limiting object is a random variable with values in $\mathcal{S}_*$, while for the quenched version, the limiting object $\nu_\infty$ is a random measure on $\mathcal{S}_*$. We also note that the quenched Benjamini–Schramm convergence implies the annealed one. For several characterizations of the two types of convergence we refer to [10, Theorems 2.26 and 2.34].

### 6.2. The local limit for square permutations

We first give some more explanations about our notation for random quantities that will be used in this section.

**Notation.** We will use a superscript notation on probability measure $P$ (and on the corresponding expectation $E$) to record the source of randomness. Specifically, given two independent random variables $X$ and $Y$ (with values in two spaces $E$ and $F$ respectively) and a set $A \subseteq E \times F$, we write

\[ P^Y((X, Y) \in A) := P((X, Y) \in A|X), \]

and similarly

\[ P^X((X, Y) \in A) := P((X, Y) \in A|Y). \]
Moreover, we recall the following standard relation
\[
P((X, Y) \in A) = \mathbb{E} [1_{(X, Y) \in A}] = \mathbb{E}^{X} \left[ \mathbb{E}^{Y} [1_{(X, Y) \in A}] \right] = \mathbb{E}^{X} \left[ \mathbb{P}^{Y} ((X, Y) \in A) \right]
\]
(32)

Finally, we denote with \( o_{p}(1) \) an unspecified random variable \( Y_{n} \) of a sequence \((Y_{n})_{n}\) that tends to zero in probability.

6.2.2. The construction of the limiting objects and the statement of the theorem. We start this section by introducing the two candidate limiting objects for the annealed and quenched Benjamini–Schramm convergence of square permutations (see Theorem 6.3). Therefore we have to define a random infinite rooted permutation as a random total order \( \leq_{\infty} \) on \( \mathbb{Z} \). We consider the set of integer numbers \( \mathbb{Z} \), and a labeling \( L \in \{+, -\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \) of all integers with “+” or “−”. We set \( L^{+} := \{ x \in \mathbb{Z} : x \text{ has label “+”} \} \) and \( L^{-} := \{ x \in \mathbb{Z} : x \text{ has label “−”} \} \).

Then we define on \( \mathbb{Z} \) four total order \( \leq_{j}^{L} \), \( j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \), saying that, for all \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z} \),
\[
\begin{cases}
  x \leq_{1}^{L} y & \text{if } (x < y \text{ and } x, y \in L^{-}) \text{ or } (x < y \text{ and } x, y \in L^{+}), \\
  x \leq_{2}^{L} y & \text{if } (x > y \text{ and } x, y \in L^{-}) \text{ or } (x < y \text{ and } x, y \in L^{+}), \\
  x \leq_{3}^{L} y & \text{if } (x < y \text{ and } x, y \in L^{-}) \text{ or } (x > y \text{ and } x, y \in L^{+}), \\
  x \leq_{4}^{L} y & \text{if } (x > y \text{ and } x, y \in L^{-}) \text{ or } (x > y \text{ and } x, y \in L^{+}).
\end{cases}
\]

An example of the four constructions is given in Fig. 11.

![Figure 11](image)

**Figure 11.** An example of the four total orders \((\mathbb{Z}, \leq_{j}^{L})\), for \( j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \). For each of the four cases, on the top line, we see the standard total order on \( \mathbb{Z} \) with the integers labeled by “−” signs (painted in orange) and “+” signs (painted in blue). Then, in the bottom line of each of the four cases, we move the “−”-labeled numbers at the beginning of the new total order and the “+”-labeled numbers at the end. Moreover, for \( \leq_{1}^{L} \) we keep the relative order among integers with the same label, for \( \leq_{2}^{L} \) we reverse the order on the “−”-labeled numbers, for \( \leq_{3}^{L} \) we reverse the order on the “+”-labeled numbers and for \( \leq_{4}^{L} \) we reverse the order on both “−”-labeled and “+”-labeled numbers. For each case, reading the bottom line from left to right gives the total order \( \leq_{j}^{L} \) on \( \mathbb{Z} \).
The random total order $\preceq_\infty$ on $\mathbb{Z}$ is defined as follows. We choose a Bernoulli labeling $\mathcal{L}$ of $\mathbb{Z}$, namely, for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$
P(x \text{ has label } \text{“} + \text{”}) = \frac{1}{2} = P(x \text{ has label } \text{“} - \text{”}),$$

independently for different values of $x$. This random labeling determines four random total orders $\preceq_{j}^\mathcal{L}$, $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Finally, we set

$$(33) \quad \preceq_\infty \overset{d}{=} \preceq_{K}^\mathcal{L},$$

where $K$ is a uniform random variable in $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ independent of the random $\{+, -\}$-labeling.

We now also introduce the random measure on $\mathfrak{S}_\bullet$. We start by defining the following function from $[0, 1]^2$ to $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$,

$$(34) \quad J(u, v) = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } u < 1/2 \text{ and } u \leq v \leq 1 - u, \\
2, & \text{if } v < \min\{u, 1 - u\}, \\
3, & \text{if } v > \max\{u, 1 - u\}, \\
4, & \text{if } u \geq 1/2 \text{ and } 1 - u \leq v \leq u.
\end{cases}$$

We consider two independent uniform random variables $U, V$ on the interval $[0, 1]$ and we define the random probability measure $\nu_\infty$ on $\mathfrak{S}_\bullet$ as

$$(35) \quad \nu_\infty = \text{Law}((\mathbb{Z}, \preceq_{J(U,V)}^\mathcal{L}))|U).$$

**Theorem 6.3.** Let $\sigma_n$ be a uniform random element of $S_q(n)$. Then

$$\sigma_n^{BS}, \nu_\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_n^{aBS} \xrightarrow{d} (\mathbb{Z}, \preceq_\infty).$$

Before proving Theorem 6.3, we try to explain the intuition behind the construction of these limiting objects. In order to prove the (quenched and annealed) Benjamini–Schramm convergence for a sequence of uniform square permutations $(\sigma_n)_n$, we must understand, for any fixed $h \in \mathbb{N}$, the behavior of the pattern induced by an $h$-restriction of $\sigma_n$ around a uniform index $i_n$, denoted by $r_h(\sigma_n, i_n)$. Therefore, from now till the end of the section, we fix an integer $h \in \mathbb{N}$. The pattern $r_h(\sigma_n, i_n)$ can have four “different shapes”, according to the relative position of $z_0 = \sigma^{-1}(1)$, $z_2 = \sigma^{-1}(n)$ and $i_n$. In particular (see also Fig. [12]), when $i_n$ is far enough from $z_0$ and $z_2$ (and this will happen with high probability):

- if $z_0 < i_n < z_2$ then $r_h(\sigma_n, i_n)$ is composed by two increasing sequences, one on top of the other;
- if $i_n < \min\{z_0, z_2\}$ then $r_h(\sigma_n, i_n)$ is composed by two sequences, an increasing one on top of a decreasing one, i.e., it has a “<”-shape;
- if $i_n > \max\{z_0, z_2\}$ then $r_h(\sigma_n, i_n)$ is composed by two sequences, an decreasing one on top of a increasing one, i.e., it has a “>”-shape;
- if $z_0 < i_n < z_2$ then $r_h(\sigma_n, i_n)$ is composed by two decreasing sequences, one on top of other.

Note that in the second and in the third case the fact that the two sequences are “disjoint”, i.e., that one is above the other, is trivial. On the other hand, the same result in the first and fourth case is true just with high probability. The goal of Section 6.2.3 is to prove this result (see Proposition 6.4).

The quenched and annealed limiting objects that we introduced at the beginning of this section are constructed keeping in mind these four possible cases. Moreover, for the quenched limiting object $\nu_\infty$, the uniform random variables $U$ and $V$ involved in the definition have to be thought of as the limits of the points $i_n$ and $z_0$ respectively (after rescaling by a factor $n$).

Finally, we explain the choice of the Bernoulli labeling $\mathcal{L}$ used in the construction of the four random total orders $\preceq_{j}^\mathcal{L}$. It is enough to note that every point of the permutation, contained
in a chosen vertical strip around $i_n$, is in the top or bottom sequence with equiprobability and independently of the other points (this is an easy consequence of the construction presented in Section 3).

6.2.3. The existence of the separating line. We introduce some more notation (cf. Fig. 13 below). Recalling the definition of $\Lambda_2$ and $\Lambda_3$ given below Lemma 3.5, given a permutation $\sigma \in Sq(n)$ such that $z_0 = \sigma^{-1}(1) < \sigma^{-1}(n) = z_2$, we define, for all $h \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $i \in [z_0 + h, z_2 - h]$,
\[
\begin{align*}
m_{i,h}^U(\sigma) &:= \min \{ \sigma(j) \mid j \in [i - h, i + h], \; j \in \Lambda_2 \} = \min \{ \sigma(j) \mid j \in [i - h, i + h], \; X(\sigma)_j = U \}, \\
M_{i,h}^D(\sigma) &:= \max \{ \sigma(j) \mid j \in [i - h, i + h], \; j \in \Lambda_3 \} = \max \{ \sigma(j) \mid j \in [i - h, i + h], \; X(\sigma)_j = D \},
\end{align*}
\]
with the conventions that $\min \emptyset = +\infty$ and $\max \emptyset = -\infty$.

We define, for a random square permutation $\sigma$ of size $n$ and a uniform index $i \in [n]$, the following event (conditioning on $\{z_0 < z_2, \; z_0 + h \leq i \leq z_2 - h\}$), for all $h \in \mathbb{N}$,
\[
S_h(\sigma, i) := \{ m_{i,h}^U(\sigma) > M_{i,h}^D(\sigma) \}.
\]

This is the events that the random rooted permutation induced by the $h$-restriction $r_h(\sigma, i)$ splits into two (possibly empty) increasing subsequences with separated values, namely, the minimum of the upper subsequence is greater than the maximum of the lower subsequence. We will say, if this events hold, that “a separating line exists” (in Fig. 13 this separating line is dashed in orange).

**Proposition 6.4.** For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\sigma^n$ be a uniform random square permutation of size $n$. Fix $h \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $i_n$ be uniform in $[n]$ and independent of $\sigma^n$. Then, as $n \to \infty$,
\[
\left| \mathbb{P}^{i_n} \left( S_h(\sigma^n, i_n) \cap \left\{ z_0 < z_2, \; z_0 + h \leq i_n \leq z_2 - h \right\} \right) - \mathbb{P} \left( z_0 < z_2, \; z_0 + h \leq i_n \leq z_2 - h \right) \right| \mathbb{P} \to 0.
\]

Informally, conditional on $\sigma^n$, asymptotically almost surely there exists a separating line in $r_h(\sigma^n, i_n)$.

**Proof.** It is enough to prove the statement for a uniform random element of $\rho(\Omega_n)$. Then, the statement for uniform square permutations follows using Lemma 3.8. We just need to show that
\[
\mathbb{P} \left( S_h(\sigma^n, i_n) \cap E \right) - \mathbb{P}(E) \mathbb{P} \to 0,
\]

for every set $E$. The rest follows as in the case of independent random variables.

**Figure 12.** In blue the approximative shapes of two large square permutations. In the first case $z_0 < z_2$ and in the second case $z_2 < z_0$. The top row shows that the possible shapes of a pattern induced by a vertical strip (six of them are highlighted in gray) around an index $i_n$ is determined by the relative position of $z_0, z_2$ and $i_n$.
Using Lemma 3.5, we have that a.s.,

$$E,$$

where

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_3$$

and using the relations

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_h(\mathbf{\sigma}^n, i_n) \cap E) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{\sigma}^n} \left[ \mathbb{P}^{i_n}(\mathbf{S}_h(\mathbf{\sigma}^n, i_n) \cap E) \right]$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(E) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{\sigma}^n}[\mathbb{P}^{i_n}(E)],$$

we can conclude applying Markov’s inequality to

$$\mathbb{P}^{i_n}(E) - \mathbb{P}^{i_n}(\mathbf{S}_h(\mathbf{\sigma}^n, i_n) \cap E).$$

We therefore study the probability

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_h(\mathbf{\sigma}^n, i_n) \cap E) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_h(\mathbf{\sigma}^n, i_n) | E) \cdot \mathbb{P}(E).$$

We note that (see Fig. 13), thanks to Lemma 3.6, the distance of the points in the sets \( \Lambda_2 \) (resp. \( \Lambda_3 \)) from the line of equation \( y = x + z_0 \) (resp. \( y = x - z_0 \)) is a.s. bounded by \( 10n^6 \). Therefore, conditioning on \( E \), almost surely,

$$m_{i,h}^U(\sigma) > i_n - h + z_0 - 20n^6,$$

$$M_{i,h}^D(\sigma) < i_n + h - z_0 + 20n^6.$$

We obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_h(\mathbf{\sigma}^n, i_n) | E) \geq \mathbb{P}(z_0 > h + 20n^6 | E) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(z_0 \leq h + 20n^6 | z_0 < z_2).$$

Using Lemma 3.3 we have that a.s., \( |z_2 + z_0 - n| < 10n^6 \). Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(z_0 \leq h + 20n^6 | z_0 < z_2) = \mathbb{P}(z_0 \leq h + 20n^6 | z_0 < \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor) + o(1) = \frac{h + 20n^6}{\left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor} + o(1) = o(1).$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_h(\mathbf{\sigma}^n, i_n) \cap E) = (1 + o(1)) \cdot \mathbb{P}(E).$$

This implies (37) and concludes the proof. \( \square \)

6.2.4. The proof of the main theorem. We start by introducing the following notation for a sequence \( X \in \{U, D\}^n \), and an integer \( i \in [h + 1, n - h] \),

$$D_{i,h}(X) := \{ x \in [1, 2h + 1] | X_{x+i-h-1} = D \}$$

i.e., \( D_{i,h}(X) \) denotes the set of indices of \( D_s \) in \( X \) in the interval \( [i - h, i + h] \), shifted in the interval \( [1, 2h + 1] \).
Recall that for a square permutation $\sigma = \rho(X, Y, z_0)$ of size $n$ obtained from the set $\Omega_n$, we have $z_0 = \sigma^{-1}(1)$ and we denote $z_2 = \sigma^{-1}(n)$. We define, for all $h \in \mathbb{N}$, the following map $\varphi_h$, for all rooted square permutations $(\sigma, i)$ such that $\sigma \in \rho(\Omega_n)$,

$$\varphi_h(\sigma, i) := (j, D_{i,h}(X)),$$

where

$$j = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } z_0 \leq z_2 \text{ and } z_0 + h \leq i \leq z_2 - h, \\
2, & \text{if } 1 + h \leq i \leq \min\{z_0, z_2\} - h, \\
3, & \text{if } \max\{z_0, z_2\} + h \leq i \leq n - h, \\
4, & \text{if } z_2 \leq z_0 \text{ and } z_2 + h \leq i \leq z_0 - h, \\
\diamond, & \text{otherwise.} 
\end{cases}$$

Finally, for all $h \in \mathbb{N}$, we define a second map, $\psi_h$, as follows: for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and for all subsets of indexes $D \subseteq [1, 2h + 1]$,

$$\psi_h(j, D) := (\pi, h + 1),$$

where $\pi$ is the unique permutation of size $2h + 1$ such that, letting $\mathcal{U} = [1, 2h + 1] \setminus D$,

$$\pi_i < \pi_j, \quad \text{for all } (i, j) \in D \times \mathcal{U};$$

and

$$\begin{cases} 
\text{pat}_D(\pi) \text{ and } \text{pat}_U(\pi) \text{ are increasing,} & \text{if } j = 1, \\
\text{pat}_D(\pi) \text{ is decreasing and } \text{pat}_U(\pi) \text{ is increasing,} & \text{if } j = 2, \\
\text{pat}_D(\pi) \text{ is increasing and } \text{pat}_U(\pi) \text{ is decreasing,} & \text{if } j = 3, \\
\text{pat}_D(\pi) \text{ and } \text{pat}_U(\pi) \text{ are decreasing,} & \text{if } j = 4.
\end{cases}$$

Note that if $\varphi_h(\sigma, i) = (j, D_{i,h}(X))$ and $j \in \{2, 3\}$ then trivially,

$$\psi_h(\varphi_h(\sigma, i)) = r_h(\sigma, i).$$

On the other hand, if $j = 1$ (or $j = 4$) we have to take a bit of care. Indeed, in full generality, \([38]\) is false (see for instance the example presented in Fig. [6] on page [10]). Nevertheless, if $S_h(\sigma, i)$ holds (see \([36]\) for the notation), i.e., a separating line exists, then \([38]\) is true.

We now consider a uniform square permutation $\sigma_n$ in $\rho(\Omega_n)$ and a uniform index $i_n$ in $[n]$. Noting that

$$\mathbb{P}^{i_n}(\varphi_h(\sigma_n, i_n) \in (\diamond, \cdot)) = o_p(1),$$

and using Proposition 6.4 (and the analogous result for the symmetric case when $z_2 < z_0$), we can conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}^{i_n}(\psi_h(\varphi_h(\sigma, i_n)) \neq r_h(\sigma, i)) = o_p(1).$$

For later convenience we also present a generalization of the \([38]\) for the random total orders $(\mathbb{Z}, \xi_j^L)$. We define for a labeling $\mathcal{L} \in \{+,-\}^\mathbb{Z}$ and an integer $h \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{D}_h(\mathcal{L}) := \{x \in [1, 2h + 1] | \mathcal{L}_{x-h-1} = "-" \},$$

i.e., $\mathcal{D}_h(\mathcal{L})$ denotes the set of indices of “−” in $\mathcal{L}$ in the interval $[-h, h]$, shifted in the interval $[1, 2h + 1]$. It trivially holds that

$$r_h(\mathbb{Z}, \xi_j^L) = \psi_h(j; \mathcal{D}_h(\mathcal{L})).$$

Before proving Theorem 6.3, we state a result regarding the number of occurrences of a fixed pattern in a uniform random sequence $X \in \{U, D\}^n$. Given a pattern $w \in \{U, D\}^k$, for some $k < n$, we denote with $c\text{-occ}(w, X)$ the number of consecutive occurrences of $w$ in $X$. 

Lemma 6.5. With the notation above,
\[ \frac{E[c-occ(w, X)]}{n} \to \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\text{Var}[c-occ(w, X)]}{n^2} \to 0. \]

Proof. This follows from [16 Proposition IX.10.].

We can now prove Theorem 6.3.

Proof of Theorem 6.3. It is enough to prove the statement for a uniform random element of \( \rho(\Omega_n) \). Then, the statement for uniform square permutations follows using Lemma 3.8.

We recall that a uniform random element of \( \rho(\Omega_n) \) can be sampled as follows. Let \( z_0 \) be an integer chosen uniformly from \( (n^9, n - n^9) \) and let \( (X, Y) \) be uniform in \( \{U, D\}^n \times \{L, R\}^n \) conditioned to satisfy the Petrov conditions and to have \( Y_{z_0} = D \). Under these assumptions \( (X, Y, z_0) \) is a uniform random element of \( \Omega_n \) and consequently \( \sigma_n := \rho((X, Y, z_0)) \) is a uniform random element of \( \rho(\Omega_n) \). We also denote with \( z_2 = z_2(n) = \sigma_n^{-1}(n) \).

We denote with \( i_n \) a uniform random index in \([n]\), independent of \( \sigma^n \). We also denote with \( B((\pi, h + 1), 2^{-h}) \), for all \( \pi \in S^{2h+1} \), the ball (w.r.t. the distance introduce in [31]) with center \((\pi, h + 1)\) and radius \(2^{-h}\). Thanks to [10] Theorem 2.34] in other to prove the quenched local convergence, it is enough to check that

\[
\mathbb{P}^{i_n}(r_h(\sigma^n, i_n) = (\pi, h + 1)) \overset{d}{\to} \nu_{\infty}(B((\pi, h + 1), 2^{-h})) \quad \text{w.r.t. the product topology.}
\]

Fix \( h \in \mathbb{N} \). Using (39), for all pattern \( \pi \in S^{2h+1} \),

\[
\mathbb{P}^{i_n}(r_h(\sigma^n, i_n) = (\pi, h + 1)) = \sum_{(j, D) \in \psi^{-1}(\pi, h + 1)} \mathbb{P}^{i_n}(\varphi_h(\sigma^n, i_n) = (j, D)) + o_p(1).
\]

We analyze the terms in (42) that involves \((1, D)\). The other three cases are similar.

Note that, by definition of \( \varphi_h \), the event \( \{\varphi_h(\sigma^n, i_n) = (1, D)\} \) holds if and only if \( z_0 \leq z_2, z_0 + h \leq i_n \leq z_2 - h \) and \( D_{i_n}(X) = D \). Therefore, setting \( E_1 = \{z_0 \leq z_2, z_0 + h \leq i_n \leq z_2 - h\} \), we have

\[
\mathbb{P}^{i_n}(\varphi_h(\sigma^n, i_n) = (1, D)) = \mathbb{P}(E_1 \cap \{D_{i_n}(X) = D\}|z_0, X).
\]

Using Lemma 3.5 we have that a.s., \( |z_2 + z_0 - n| < 10n^6 \). Therefore the above conditional probability can be rewritten as

\[
\mathbb{P}(E_1^* \cap \{D_{i_n}(X) = D\}|z_0, X) + o_p(1),
\]

where \( E_1^* = \{z_0 \leq n - z_0, z_0 + h \leq i_n \leq n - z_0 - h\} \). Noting that, conditioning on \( E_1^* \), \( i_n \) is distributed like a uniform random variable \( i_n^* \) in the interval \([z_0^* + h, n - z_0^* - h]\), where \( z_0^* \) is uniform in \([n^9, \lfloor n^9 \rfloor]\), we have that

\[
\mathbb{P}^{i_n}(\varphi_h(\sigma^n, i_n) = (1, D)) = \mathbb{P}(E_1^*|z_0) \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{i_n^*}(X) = D|z_0^*, X) + o_p(1).
\]

Moreover, noting that

\[
\mathbb{P}(E_1^*|z_0) \overset{d}{\to} \frac{n - 2z_0 - 2h - 1}{n} \mathbbm{1}_{\{z_0 < n - z_0\}},
\]

and using that \( \frac{z_0}{n} \overset{d}{\to} U \), where \( U \) is a uniform random variable in \([0, 1]\), we obtain

\[
\mathbb{P}(E_1^*|z_0) \overset{d}{\to} (1 - 2U) \mathbbm{1}_{\{U < \frac{1}{2}\}}.
\]

We now prove using the Second moment method that

\[
\mathbb{P}(\{D_{i_n^*}(X) = D\}|z_0^*, X) \overset{P}{\to} 2^{-(2h+1)}.
\]
Let $w^D \in \{U, D\}^{2h+1}$ be the unique sequence such that $w_i^D = D$ if and only if $i \in D$. We can rewrite

$$P \{ \{ D_{i_0^*, h}(X) = D \} \mid z_0^*, X \}$$

as

$$c-occ(w^D, X \mid z_0^*, X) \overline{\max \{ n - 2z_0^* - 2h - 1, 1 \}},$$

where $z_0^*$ is uniform in $[n^0, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor]$ and $X \mid z_0^*, X$ denotes the sequence $X$ restricted to the set of indexes between $z_0^*$ and $n - z_0^*$.

By Chebyshev’s inequality, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$P(z_0^*, X) \left( P( \{ D_{i_0^*, h}(X) = D \} \mid z_0^*, X) - \mathbb{E}(z_0^*, X) \left[ P( \{ D_{i_0^*, h}(X) = D \} \mid z_0^*, X) \right] \right) \geq \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \text{Var}(z_0^*, X) \left( P( \{ D_{i_0^*, h}(X) = D \} \mid z_0^*, X) \right).$$

Thanks to Lemma 3.4, we can assume that the random sequence $X$ is a uniform sequence in $\{U, D\}^n$, although the sequence $X$ is conditioned to satisfy the Petrov conditions. Therefore, noting that $z_0^*$ is uniformly distributed and independent of $X$, and using Lemma 6.5, the right-hand side of the previous equation tends to zero and $\mathbb{E}(z_0^*, X) \left[ P( \{ D_{i_0^*, h}(X) = D \} \mid z_0^*, X) \right]$ tends to $2^{-(2h+1)}$, proving (45).

Using the results in (44) and (45) we can conclude that

$$P^{|\nu_h(\sigma^n, i_n) = (1, D)}| \overset{d}{\to} 2^{-(2h+1)} \cdot (1 - 2U) \mathbbm{1}_{\{U < \frac{1}{2}\}}.$$

From (42) and (46), and the natural extension of the second equation to the other three similar cases, we obtain

$$P^{|\nu_h(\sigma^n, i_n) = (\pi, h + 1)}| \overset{d}{\to} 2^{-(2h+1)} \left( e_1(\pi) \cdot (1 - 2U) \mathbbm{1}_{\{U < \frac{1}{2}\}} + e_2(\pi) \cdot \min\{U, 1 - U\} + e_3(\pi) \cdot \max\{U, 1 - U\} + e_4(\pi) \cdot (2U - 1) \mathbbm{1}_{\{U > \frac{1}{2}\}} \right),$$

where $e_\ell(\pi) = |\{D|\psi_\ell(\pi, D) = (\pi, h + 1)\}|$, for all $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

Now, using the definition of $\nu_\infty$ given in (35), we have that

$$\nu_\infty \left( B((\pi, h + 1), 2^{-h}) \right) = P(r_h(Z, \varphi_{J(U,V)}) = (\pi, h + 1)\mid U)$$

$$= P(\psi_h(J(U,V), D_h(L)) = (\pi, h + 1)\mid U),$$

where in the last equality we used the relation in (40). From the definition of the map $J$ given in (34) we conclude that

$$\nu_\infty \left( B((\pi, h + 1), 2^{-h}) \right) = 2^{-(2h+1)} \left( e_1(\pi) \cdot (1 - 2U) \mathbbm{1}_{\{U < \frac{1}{2}\}} + e_2(\pi) \cdot \min\{U, 1 - U\} + e_3(\pi) \cdot \max\{U, 1 - U\} + e_4(\pi) \cdot (2U - 1) \mathbbm{1}_{\{U > \frac{1}{2}\}} \right).$$

Therefore we can conclude that (41) holds component-wise, for all $h \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all pattern $\pi \in \mathcal{S}^{2h+1}$. Finally, noting that all the components of the vector in (41) depends on the same realization of $z_0$ and $X$ we can deduce that (41) holds with respect to the product topology.

Using [10, Proposition 2.37], the annealed statement is an easy corollary of the quenched convergence, noting that

$$\mathbb{E}[\{1 - 2U\} \mathbbm{1}_{\{U < \frac{1}{2}\}}] = \mathbb{E}[\min\{U, 1 - U\}] = \mathbb{E}[\max\{U, 1 - U\}] = \mathbb{E}[(2U - 1) \mathbbm{1}_{\{U > \frac{1}{2}\}}] = \frac{1}{2}.$$
This concludes the proof of the theorem.

We conclude this section computing explicitly the limit of $\mathbb{P}(r_h(\sigma^n, i_n) = (\pi, h+1))$, for all $h \in \mathbb{N}$ and all pattern $\pi \in S^{2h+1}$. A naive thought is that these limiting probabilities, if different from zero, depend only on the size of the involved pattern. We will show in Corollary\[6.6\] that this is not the case. In particular, monotone patterns are more likely.

Before doing that, we introduce six subfamilies of permutations that contain all the possible patterns obtained through the maps $\psi_h$, for all $h \in \mathbb{N}$. We consider only permutations of size strictly greater than 2. An example for each family is given in Fig.\[14\]

- $A_1$ is the family of non-monotone permutations $\pi$ that can be split into exactly two increasing subsequences such that all the values of one subsequence are smaller than the values of the other one. Formally, there exists a unique bipartition of $[|\pi|]$ as $[|\pi|] = D \cup U$ such that for all $(i, j) \in D \times U$ then $\pi(i) < \pi(j)$ and $\text{pat}_D(\pi)$ and $\text{pat}_U(\pi)$ are increasing.

- $A_2$ is the family of permutations $\pi$ that can be split into two subsequences (one increasing and one decreasing) such that all the values of the decreasing subsequence are smaller than the values of the increasing one. Formally, there exists a bipartition of $[|\pi|]$ as $[|\pi|] = D \cup U$ such that for all $(i, j) \in D \times U$ then $\pi(i) < \pi(j)$ and $\text{pat}_D(\pi)$ is decreasing and $\text{pat}_U(\pi)$ is increasing. Note that this bipartition is not unique. More precisely, for all permutation $\pi \in A_2$, the index 1 can be included either in $D$ or in $U$. Therefore, for each $\pi \in A_2$ there are two possible bipartitions of $[|\pi|]$.

- $A_3$ is the family of permutations $\pi$ that can be split into two subsequences (one decreasing and one increasing) such that all the values of the increasing subsequence are smaller than the values of the decreasing one. Remarks similar to the ones done for $A_2$ hold also for this family.

- $A_4$ is the family of non-monotone permutations $\pi$ that can be split into exactly two decreasing subsequences such that all the values of one subsequence are smaller than the values of the other one. Remarks similar to the ones done for $A_1$ hold also for this family.

- $A_5$ is the family of increasing permutations $\pi$. Note that also these permutations can be split into two (possibly empty) increasing subsequences such that all the values of one subsequence are smaller than the values of the other one. More precisely, there exist $|\pi|+1$ bipartitions of $[|\pi|]$ as $[|\pi|] = D \cup U$ such that for all $(i, j) \in D \times U$ then $\pi(i) < \pi(j)$ and $\text{pat}_D(\pi)$ and $\text{pat}_U(\pi)$ are increasing. In particular, $D \in \{\emptyset\} \cup \bigcup_{k \in [1,|\pi|]} \{[1, k]\}$.

- $A_6$ is the family of decreasing permutations $\pi$. As before, also these permutations can be split into two (possibly empty) decreasing subsequences such that all the values of one subsequence are smaller than the values of the other one. In this case, there exist $|\pi|+1$ bipartitions and $D \in \{\emptyset\} \cup \bigcup_{k \in [1,|\pi|]} \{[k, |\pi|]\}$.

We note that these families are not disjoint. For example, note that if $\pi \in A_2$ and there exists a bipartition of $[|\pi|]$ such that $D$ contains a single element then $\pi \in A_1$. Similar remarks hold for every permutation that has a bipartition of $[|\pi|]$ such that one of the two parts has cardinality one.

Given the diagram of a permutation in one of the six families, we call separating line, a horizontal line in the diagram which splits the permutation into two monotone subsequences (we have two possible choices for every permutation in $A_2$ and $A_3$ and $(|\pi|+1)$ possible choices for every permutation $\pi$ in $A_5$ and $A_6$).

We can now prove the following easy consequence of the proof of Theorem\[6.3\]

**Corollary 6.6.** Let $\sigma_n$ be a uniform random element of $Sq(n)$. For all $h \in \mathbb{N}$, and for all $\pi \in S^{2h+1}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(r_h(\sigma^n, i_n) = (\pi, h+1)) \to p(\pi),$$

\[^{3}\text{We recall that a monotone permutation } \sigma \text{ of size } n \text{ is either } \sigma = 12, \ldots, n \text{ or } \sigma = n, \ldots, 21.\]
where
\[ p(\pi) = 2^{-|\pi|-2} \left( 1_{A_1} + 21_{A_2} + 21_{A_3} + 1_{A_4} + (|\pi| + 1)1_{A_5 \cup A_6} \right). \]

**Proof.** From (47) and (48) we have that
\[ \mathbb{P}(r_h(\sigma^n, t_n) = (\pi, h + 1)) \to 2^{-|\pi|-2} \cdot (e_1(\pi) + e_2(\pi) + e_3(\pi) + e_4(\pi)). \]

It remains to compute the values \(e_1(\pi), e_2(\pi), e_3(\pi)\) and \(e_4(\pi)\). We start with \(e_1(\pi)\). Note that, for every subset of indexes \(D \subseteq [1, 2h + 1]\), then \(\psi_h(1, D) \in A_1 \cup A_5\). Moreover, the cardinality \(e_1(\pi) = |\{D| \psi_h(1, D) = (\pi, h + 1)\}|\), for all \(\pi \in A_1 \cup A_5\), is determined by the number of possible choices for the separating lines of \(\pi\). Therefore, using the discussion done during the definitions of the families \(A_1\) and \(A_5\), we conclude that
\[ e_1(\pi) = 1_{A_1} + (|\pi| + 1)1_{A_5}. \]

For \(e_2(\pi)\), note that, for every subset of indexes \(D \subseteq [1, 2h + 1]\), then \(\psi_h(2, D) \in A_2\). Moreover, the cardinality \(e_2(\pi) = |\{D| \psi_h(2, D) = (\pi, h + 1)\}|\), for all \(\pi \in A_2\), is again determined by the number of possible choices for the separating lines of \(\pi\), that is 2. Therefore, we conclude that \(e_2(\pi) = 21_{A_2}\).

With similar arguments, we obtain that
\[ e_3(\pi) = 21_{A_3}, \quad \text{and} \quad e_4(\pi) = 1_{A_4} + (|\pi| + 1)1_{A_6}. \]

**7. Proportion of pattern and consecutive pattern occurrences**

In this final section we directly deduce from Theorems 4.4 and 6.3 that the proportion of occurrences (resp. consecutive occurrences) of any given pattern in a uniform random square permutation converges to a random quantity.

There are various important characterizations for the permuton convergence (see [5, Thm. 2.5]) and the quenched version of the Benjamini–Schramm convergence (see [10, Theorem 2.34]).

In particular, for permuton limits, if \(\sigma_n\) is a random permutation of size \(n\), then the following statements are equivalent:

1. There exists a random permuton \(\mu\) such that \(\mu \sigma_n \overset{d}{\to} \mu\);
(2) The random infinite vector \((\tilde{c}\text{occ}(\pi, \sigma_n))_{\pi \in S}\) converges in distribution in the product topology to some random infinite vector \((\Lambda_\pi)_{\pi \in S}\);

and whenever the assertions (1) or (2) are verified, we have for every pattern \(\pi \in S_k\),

\[
\Lambda_\pi = \mathbb{P}(\text{Perm}_k(\mu) = \pi | \mu),
\]

where \(\text{Perm}_k(\mu)\) denotes the unique permutations induced by \(k\) independent points in \([0, 1]^2\) with common distribution \(\mu\) conditionally on \(\mu\).

On the other hand, for local limits, the following statements are equivalent:

(1) There exist a random measure \(\nu\) on the set of all rooted permutations \(S_\bullet\) such that \(\sigma_n \xrightarrow{qBS} \nu\);

(2) The random infinite vector \((\tilde{c}\text{occ}(\pi, \sigma_n))_{\pi \in S}\) converges in distribution in the product topology to some random infinite vector \((\Delta_\pi)_{\pi \in S}\);

and whenever the assertions (1) or (2) are verified, we have for every pattern \(\pi \in S_{2h+1}, h \in \mathbb{N}\),

\[
\Delta_\pi = \nu(B((\pi, h + 1), 2^{-h})),
\]

where \(B((\pi, h + 1), 2^{-h})\) denotes the ball with center \((\pi, h + 1)\) and radius \(2^{-h}\). We point out that the expressions for patterns of even size can be deduced from the ones of odd size using the relation \(\Delta_\pi = \sum_{m=1}^{n+1} \Delta^{\pi^m}\), where \(\pi^m\) is the permutation obtained by adding an additional final element in the diagram of \(\pi\) immediately below the \(m\)-th raw.

We recall that \(\mu^z\) denote the permuton limit and \(\nu_\infty\) the quenched local limit for a sequence of uniform square permutations.

**Corollary 7.1.** Let \(\sigma_n\) be a uniform random element of \(S_q(n)\). We set

\[
\Lambda_\pi = \mathbb{P}(\text{Perm}_n(\mu^z) = \pi | \mu^z), \quad \text{for all} \quad \pi \in S,
\]

and

\[
\Delta_\pi = \nu_\infty(B((\pi, h + 1), 2^{-h})), \quad \text{for all} \quad h \in \mathbb{N}, \pi \in S_{2h+1}.
\]

The following convergences hold w.r.t. the product topology:

\[
(\tilde{c}\text{occ}(\pi, \sigma_n))_{\pi \in S} \xrightarrow{d} (\Lambda_\pi)_{\pi \in S} \quad \text{and} \quad (\tilde{c}\text{occ}(\pi, \sigma_n))_{\pi \in S} \xrightarrow{d} (\Delta_\pi)_{\pi \in S}.
\]
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