

PROBABILITY ON TREES AND NETWORKS



Russell Lyons
with Yuval Peres

A love and respect of trees has been characteristic of mankind since the beginning of human evolution. Instinctively, we understood the importance of trees to our lives before we were able to ascribe reasons for our dependence on them.

— *America's Garden Book*, James and Louise Bush-Brown, rev. ed. by The New York Botanical Garden, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1980, p. 142.

Table of Contents

Preface	vi
Chapter 1: Some Highlights	1
1. Branching Number	1
2. Electric Current	5
3. Random Walks	5
4. Percolation	7
5. Branching Processes	8
6. Random Spanning Trees	9
7. Hausdorff Dimension	12
8. Capacity	13
9. Embedding Trees into Euclidean Space	15
Chapter 2: Random Walks and Electric Networks	17
1. Circuit Basics and Harmonic Functions	17
2. More Probabilistic Interpretations	22
3. Network Reduction	25
4. Energy	29
5. Transience and Recurrence	34
6. Flows and Random Paths	42
7. Trees	45
8. Growth of Trees	47
9. Cayley Graphs	52
10. Notes	56
11. Additional Exercises	57
Chapter 3: Infinite Electrical Networks and Dirichlet Functions	64
1. Free and Wired Electrical Currents	64
2. Planar Duality	66
3. Harmonic Dirichlet Functions	68
4. Planar Graphs and Hyperbolic Lattices	74
5. Notes	78
6. Additional Exercises	79

Chapter 4: Percolation on Trees	81
1. Galton-Watson Branching Processes	81
2. The First-Moment Method	86
3. The Weighted Second-Moment Method	91
4. Reversing the Second-Moment Inequality	96
5. Galton-Watson Networks	98
6. Additional Exercises	100
Chapter 5: Isoperimetric Inequalities	103
1. Flows and Submodularity	103
2. Spectral Radius	109
3. Planar Graphs	114
4. Notes	118
5. Additional Exercises	119
Chapter 6: Percolation on Transitive Graphs	121
1. Groups and Amenability	122
2. Tolerance, Ergodicity, and Harris's Inequality	125
3. The Number of Infinite Clusters	129
4. Inequalities for p_c	131
5. Merging Infinite Clusters and Invasion Percolation	138
6. Upper Bounds for p_u	142
7. Lower Bounds for p_u	145
8. Notes	151
9. Additional Exercises	152
Chapter 7: The Mass-Transport Technique and Percolation	154
1. The Mass-Transport Principle for Cayley Graphs	154
2. Beyond Cayley Graphs: Unimodularity	157
3. Infinite Clusters in Invariant Percolation	161
4. Critical Percolation on Nonamenable Transitive Unimodular Graphs	165
5. Percolation on Planar Cayley Graphs	167
6. Properties of Infinite Clusters	171
7. Notes	174
8. Additional Exercises	176
Chapter 8: Random Spanning Trees	179
1. Generating Random Spanning Trees	179
2. Electrical Interpretations	185
3. The Square Lattice \mathbb{Z}^2	192
4. Notes	196
5. Additional Exercises	199

Chapter 9: Random Spanning Forests	202
1. Basic Properties	202
2. Ergodic Properties	212
3. Trees and Ends	215
4. Application: Harmonic Measure From Infinity	222
5. Application: Harmonic Dirichlet Functions	223
6. Minimal Spanning Trees	227
7. Minimal Spanning Forests	229
8. Open Questions	231
9. Notes	234
10. Additional Exercises	235
Chapter 10: Limit Theorems for Galton-Watson Processes	237
1. Size-biased Trees and Immigration	237
2. Supercritical Processes: Proof of the Kesten-Stigum Theorem	241
3. Subcritical Processes	244
4. Critical Processes	246
5. Decomposition	248
6. Notes	251
7. Additional Exercises	251
Chapter 11: Speed of Random Walks	253
1. The Varopoulos-Carne Bounds	253
2. Branching Number of a Graph	255
3. Stationary Measures on Trees	257
4. Galton-Watson Trees	264
5. Biased Random Walks on Galton-Watson Trees	271
6. Notes	271
7. Additional Exercises	271
Chapter 12: Hausdorff Dimension	273
1. Basics	273
2. Coding by Trees	277
3. Galton-Watson Fractals	283
4. Hölder Exponent	286
5. Derived Trees	288
6. Additional Exercises	291

Chapter 13: Capacity	293
1. Definitions	293
2. Percolation on Trees	296
3. Euclidean Space	297
4. Generalized Diameters and Average Meeting Height on Trees	300
5. Notes	303
6. Additional Exercises	304
Chapter 14: Harmonic Measure on Galton-Watson Trees	306
1. Introduction	306
2. Markov Chains on the Space of Trees	307
3. The Hölder Exponent of Limit Uniform Measure	312
4. Dimension Drop for Other Flow Rules	315
5. Harmonic-Stationary Measure	316
6. Calculations	321
7. Additional Exercises	326
Comments on Exercises	329
Bibliography	355
Glossary of Notation	370

Preface

This book began as lecture notes for an advanced graduate course called “Probability on Trees” that Lyons gave in Spring 1993. We are grateful to Rabi Bhattacharya for having suggested that he teach such a course. We have attempted to preserve the informal flavor of lectures. Many exercises are also included, so that real courses can be given based on the book. Indeed, previous versions have already been used for courses or seminars in several countries. The most current version of the book can be found on the web. A few of the authors’ results and proofs appear here for the first time. At this point, almost all of the actual writing was done by Lyons. We hope to have a more balanced co-authorship eventually.

This book is concerned with certain aspects of discrete probability on infinite graphs that are currently in vigorous development. We feel that there are three main classes of graphs on which discrete probability is most interesting, namely, trees, Cayley graphs of groups (or more generally, transitive, or even quasi-transitive, graphs), and planar graphs. Thus, this book develops the general theory of certain probabilistic processes and then specializes to these particular classes. In addition, there are several reasons for a special study of trees. Since in most cases, analysis is easier on trees, analysis can be carried further. Then one can often either apply to other situations the results from trees or can transfer to other situations the techniques developed by working on trees. Trees also occur naturally in many situations, either combinatorially or as descriptions of compact sets in euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d . (More classical probability, of course, has tended to focus on the special and important case of the euclidean lattices \mathbb{Z}^d .)

It is well known that there are many connections among probability, trees, and groups. We survey only some of them, concentrating on recent developments of the past fifteen years. We discuss some of those results that are most interesting, most beautiful, or easiest to prove without much background. Of course, we are biased by our own research interests and knowledge. We include the best proofs available of recent as well as classic results. Much more is known about almost every subject we present. The only prerequisite is knowledge of conditional expectation with respect to a σ -algebra, and even that is rarely used. For part of Chapter 11 and all of Chapter 14, basic knowledge of ergodic theory is also required.

Exercises that appear in the text, as opposed to those at the end of the chapters, are ones that ought to be done when they are reached, as they are either essential to a proper understanding or will be used later in the text.

Some notation we use is $\langle \cdot \cdot \cdot \rangle$ for a sequence (or, sometimes, more general function), \upharpoonright for the restriction of a function or measure to a set, $\mathbf{E}[X; A]$ for the expectation of X on the event A , and $|\cdot|$ for the cardinality of a set. Some definitions are repeated in different

chapters to enable more selective reading.

Unattributed results are usually not due to us.

Lyons is grateful to the Institute for Advanced Studies and the Institute of Mathematics, both at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, for support during some of the writing. We are grateful to Jochen Geiger, Janko Gravner, Svante Janson, Peter Mörters, Jason Schweinsberg, and *Ádám Timár* for noting several corrections to the manuscript.

RUSSELL LYONS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, IN 47405-5701, USA

rdlyons@indiana.edu

<http://mypage.iu.edu/~rdlyons/>

YUVAL PERES, DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIF., BERKELEY, CA 94720-3860, USA

peres@stat.berkeley.edu

<http://www.stat.berkeley.edu/~peres/>

Chapter 1

Some Highlights

This chapter gives some of the highlights to be encountered in this book. Some of the topics in the book do not appear at all here since they are not as suitable to a quick overview. Also, we concentrate in this overview on trees since it is easiest to use them to illustrate most of the themes.

Items such as theorems are numbered in this book as $C.n$, where C is the chapter number and n is the item number in that chapter; C is omitted when the item appears in the same chapter as the reference to it. In particular, in this chapter, items to be encountered later are numbered as they appear later.

§1.1. Branching Number.

A tree is called **locally finite** if the degree of each vertex is finite (but not necessarily uniformly bounded). Our trees will be rooted, meaning that some vertex is designated as the root, denoted o . We imagine the tree as growing (upwards) away from its root. Each vertex then has branches leading to its children, which are its neighbors that are further from the root. For the purposes of this chapter, we do not allow the possibility of leaves, i.e., vertices without children.

How do we assign an average branching number to an arbitrary infinite locally finite tree? If the tree is a binary tree, as in Figure 1.1, then clearly the answer will be “2”. But in the general case, since the tree is infinite, no straight average is available. We must take some kind of limit or use some other procedure.




Figure 1.1. The binary tree.

One simple idea is as follows. Let T_n be the set of vertices at distance n from the root, o . Define the **lower growth rate** of the tree to be

$$\underline{\text{gr}} T := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |T_n|^{1/n}.$$

This certainly will give the number “2” to the binary tree. One can also define the **upper growth rate**

$$\overline{\text{gr}} T := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |T_n|^{1/n}$$

and the **growth rate**

$$\text{gr} T := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |T_n|^{1/n}$$

when the limit exists. However, notice that these notions of growth barely account for the structure of the tree: only $|T_n|$ matters, not how the vertices at different levels are connected to each other.

Thus, we will use a different approach. Consider the tree as a network of pipes and imagine water entering the network at the root. However much water enters a pipe leaves at the other end and splits up among the outgoing pipes (edges). Consider the following sort of restriction: Given $\lambda \geq 1$, suppose that the amount of water that can flow through an edge at distance n from o is only λ^{-n} . If λ is too big, then perhaps no water can flow. In fact, consider the binary tree. A moment’s thought shows that water can still flow throughout the tree provided that $\lambda \leq 2$, but that as soon as $\lambda > 2$, then no water at all can flow. Obviously, this critical value of 2 for λ is the same as the branching number of the binary tree. So let us make a general definition: the **branching number** of a tree T is the supremum of those λ that admit a positive amount of water to flow through T ; denote this critical value of λ by $\text{br} T$. As we will see, this definition is the exponential of what Furstenberg (1970) called the “dimension” of a tree, which is the Hausdorff dimension of its boundary.

It is not hard to check that $\text{br} T$ is related to $\underline{\text{gr}} T$ by

$$\text{br} T \leq \underline{\text{gr}} T. \tag{1.1}$$

Often, as in the case of the binary tree, equality holds here. However, there are many examples of strict inequality.

▷ EXERCISE 1.1.

Prove (1.1).

EXAMPLE 1.1. If T is a tree such that vertices at even distances from o have 2 children while the rest have 3 children, then $\text{br } T = \text{gr } T = \sqrt{6}$. It is easy to see that $\text{gr } T = \sqrt{6}$, whence by (1.1), it remains to show that $\text{br } T \geq \sqrt{6}$, i.e., given $\lambda < \sqrt{6}$, to show that a positive amount of water can flow to infinity with the constraints given. Indeed, we can use the water flow with amount $6^{-n/2}$ flowing on those edges at distance n from the root when n is even and with amount $6^{-(n-1)/2}/3$ flowing on those edges at distance n from the root when n is odd.

EXAMPLE 1.2. Let T be a tree embedded in the upper half plane with o at the origin. List T_n in clockwise order as $\langle x_1^n, \dots, x_{2^n}^n \rangle$. Let x_k^n have 1 child if $k \leq 2^{n-1}$ and 3 children otherwise; see Figure 1.2. Now, a **ray** is an infinite path from the root that doesn't backtrack. If x is a vertex of T that does not have the form $x_{2^n}^n$, then there are only finitely many rays that pass through x . This means that water cannot flow to infinity through such a vertex x when $\lambda > 1$. That leaves only the possibility of water flowing along the single ray consisting of the vertices $x_{2^n}^n$, which is impossible too. Hence $\text{br } T = 1$, yet $\text{gr } T = 2$.




Figure 1.2. A tree with branching number 1 and growth rate 2.

EXAMPLE 1.3. If $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(2)}$ are trees, form a new tree $T^{(1)} \vee T^{(2)}$ from disjoint copies of $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(2)}$ by joining their roots to a new point taken as the root of $T^{(1)} \vee T^{(2)}$ (Figure 1.3). Then

$$\text{br}(T^{(1)} \vee T^{(2)}) = \text{br } T^{(1)} \vee \text{br } T^{(2)}$$

since water can flow in the join $T^{(1)} \vee T^{(2)}$ iff water can flow in one of the trees.

We will denote by $|x|$ the distance of a vertex x to the root.

EXAMPLE 1.4. We will put two trees together such that $\text{br}(T^{(1)} \vee T^{(2)}) = 1$ but $\text{gr}(T^{(1)} \vee T^{(2)}) > 1$. Let $n_k \uparrow \infty$. Let $T^{(1)}$ (resp., $T^{(2)}$) be a tree such that x has 1 child (resp.,




Figure 1.3. Joining two trees.

2 children) for $n_{2k} \leq |x| \leq n_{2k+1}$ and 2 (resp., 1) otherwise. If n_k increases sufficiently rapidly, then $\text{br } T^{(1)} = \text{br } T^{(2)} = 1$, so $\text{br}(T^{(1)} \vee T^{(2)}) = 1$. But if n_k increases sufficiently rapidly, then $\underline{\text{gr}}(T^{(1)} \vee T^{(2)}) = \sqrt{2}$.




Figure 1.4. A schematic representation of a tree with branching number 1 and growth rate $\sqrt{2}$.

▷ EXERCISE 1.2.

Verify that if $\langle n_k \rangle$ increases sufficiently rapidly, then $\underline{\text{gr}}(T^{(1)} \vee T^{(2)}) = \sqrt{2}$. Furthermore, show that the set of possible values of $\underline{\text{gr}}(T^{(1)} \vee T^{(2)})$ over *all* sequences $\langle n_k \rangle$ is $[\sqrt{2}, 2]$.

While $\underline{\text{gr}} T$ is easy to compute, $\text{br } T$ may not be. Nevertheless, it is the branching number which is much more important. Fortunately, Furstenberg (1967) gave a useful condition sufficient for equality in (1.1): Given a vertex x in T , let T^x denote the subtree of T formed by the descendants of x . This tree is rooted at x .

THEOREM 2.22. *If for all vertices $x \in T$, there is an isomorphism of T^x as a rooted tree to a subtree of T rooted at o , then $\text{br } T = \underline{\text{gr}} T$.*

We call trees satisfying the hypothesis of this theorem **subperiodic**; actually, we will later broaden slightly this definition. As we will see, subperiodic trees arise naturally, which accounts for the importance of Furstenberg’s theorem.

§1.2. Electric Current.

We can ask another flow question on trees, namely: If λ^{-n} is the conductance of edges at distance n from the root of T and a battery is connected between the root and “infinity”, will current flow? Of course, what we mean is that we establish a unit potential between the root and level N of T , let $N \rightarrow \infty$, and see whether the limiting current is positive. If so, the tree is said to have positive effective conductance and finite effective resistance. (All electrical terms will be carefully explained in Chapter 2.)

EXAMPLE 1.5. Consider the binary tree. By symmetry, all the vertices at a given distance from o have the same potential, so they may be identified (“soldered” together) without changing any voltages or currents. This gives a new graph whose vertices may be identified with \mathbb{N} , while there are 2^n edges joining $n - 1$ to n . These edges are in parallel, so they may be replaced by a single edge whose conductance is their sum, $(2/\lambda)^n$. Now we have edges in series, so the effective resistance is the sum of the edge resistances, $\sum_n (\lambda/2)^n$. This is finite iff $\lambda < 2$. Thus, current flows in the infinite binary tree iff $\lambda < 2$. Note the slight difference to water flow: when $\lambda = 2$, water can still flow on the binary tree.

In general, there will be a critical value of λ below which current flows and above which it does not. It turns out that this critical value is the same as that for water flow (Lyons, 1990):

THEOREM 1.6. *If $\lambda < \text{br } T$, then electrical current flows, but if $\lambda > \text{br } T$, then it does not.*

§1.3. Random Walks.

There is a well-known and easily established correspondence between electrical networks and random walks that holds for all graphs. Namely, given a finite connected graph G with conductances assigned to the edges, we consider the random walk that can go from a vertex only to an adjacent vertex and whose transition probabilities from a vertex are proportional to the conductances along the edges to be taken. That is, if x is a vertex with neighbors y_1, \dots, y_d and the conductance of the edge (x, y_i) is c_i , then $p(x, y_j) = c_j / \sum_{i=1}^d c_i$. Now consider two fixed vertices a_0 and a_1 of G . Suppose that a battery is connected across them so that the voltage at a_i equals i ($i = 0, 1$). Then certain currents will flow along the edges and establish certain voltages at the other vertices in accordance with Kirchoff’s law and Ohm’s law. The following proposition provides the basic connection between random walks and electrical networks:

PROPOSITION 1.7. *For any vertex x , the voltage at x equals the probability that the corresponding random walk visits a_1 before it visits a_0 when it starts at x .*

In fact, the proof of this proposition is simple: there is a discrete Laplacian (a difference operator) for which both the voltage and the probability mentioned are harmonic functions of x . The two functions clearly have the same values at a_i (the boundary points) and the uniqueness principle holds for this Laplacian, whence the functions agree at all vertices x . This is developed in detail in Section 2.1. A superb elementary exposition of this correspondence is given by Doyle and Snell (1984).

What does this say about our trees? Given N , identify all the vertices of level N , i.e., T_N , to one vertex, a_1 (see Figure 1.5). Use the root as a_0 . Then according to Proposition 1.7, the voltage at x is the probability that the random walk visits level N before it visits the root when it starts from x . When $N \rightarrow \infty$, the limiting voltages are all 0 iff the limiting probabilities are all 0, which is the same thing as saying that on the infinite tree, the probability of visiting the root from any vertex is 1, i.e., the random walk is recurrent. Since no current flows across edges whose endpoints have the same voltage, we see that no electrical current flows iff the random walk is recurrent.




Figure 1.5. Identifying a level to a vertex, a_1 .




Figure 1.6. The relative weights at a vertex. The tree is growing upwards.

Now when the conductances decrease by a factor of λ as the distance increases, the relative weights at a vertex other than the root are as shown in Figure 1.6. That is, the edge leading back toward the root is λ times as likely to be taken as each other edge. Denoting the dependence of the random walk on the parameter λ by RW_λ , we may translate Theorem 1.6 into the following theorem (Lyons, 1990):

THEOREM 2.19. *If $\lambda < \text{br}T$, then RW_λ is transient, while if $\lambda > \text{br}T$, then RW_λ is recurrent.*

Is this intuitive? Consider a vertex other than the root with, say, d children. If we consider only the distance from o , which increases or decreases at each step of the random walk, a balance between increasing and decreasing occurs when $\lambda = d$. If d were constant, it is easy to see that indeed d would be the critical value separating transience from recurrence. What Theorem 2.19 says is that this same heuristic can be used in the general case, provided we substitute the “average” $\text{br}T$ for d .

We will also see how to use electrical networks to prove Pólya’s wonderful theorem that simple random walk on the hypercubic lattice \mathbb{Z}^d is recurrent for $d \leq 2$ and transient for $d \geq 3$.

§1.4. Percolation.

Suppose that we remove edges at random from T . To be specific, keep each edge with some fixed probability p and make these decisions independently for different edges. This random process is called **percolation**. By Kolmogorov’s 0-1 law, the probability that an infinite connected component remains in the tree is either 0 or 1. On the other hand, this probability is monotonic in p , whence there is a critical value $p_c(T)$ where it changes from 0 to 1. It is also clear that the “bigger” the tree, the more likely it is that there will be an infinite component for a given p . That is, the “bigger” the tree, the smaller the critical value p_c . Thus, p_c is vaguely inversely related to a notion of average branching number. Actually, this vague heuristic is precise (Lyons, 1990):

THEOREM 4.16. *For any tree, $p_c(T) = 1/\text{br}T$.*

Let us look more closely at the intuition behind this. If a vertex x has d children, then the expected number of children after percolation is dp . If dp is “usually” less than 1, one would not expect that an infinite component would remain, while if dp is “usually” greater than 1, then one might guess that an infinite component would be present. Theorem 4.16 says that this intuition becomes correct when one replaces the “usual” d by $\text{br}T$.

Note that there is an infinite component with probability 1 iff the component of the root is infinite with positive probability.

§1.5. Branching Processes.

Percolation on a fixed tree produces random trees by random pruning, but there is a way to grow trees randomly due to Bienaymé in 1845. Given probabilities p_k adding to 1 ($k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$), we begin with one individual and let it reproduce according to these probabilities, i.e., it has k children with probability p_k . Each of these children (if there are any) then reproduce independently with the same law, and so on forever or until some generation goes extinct. The family trees produced by such a process are called **(Bienaymé)-Galton-Watson trees**. A fundamental theorem in the subject is that extinction is a.s. iff $m \leq 1$ and $p_1 < 1$, where $m := \sum_k k p_k$ is the mean number of offspring. This provides further justification for the intuition we sketched behind Theorem 4.16. It also raises a natural question: Given that a Galton-Watson tree is nonextinct (infinite), what is its branching number? All the intuition suggests that it is m a.s., and indeed it is. This was first proved by Hawkes (1981). But here is the idea of a very simple proof (Lyons, 1990).

According to Theorem 4.16, to determine $\text{br} T$, we may determine $p_c(T)$. Thus, let T grow according to a Galton-Watson process, then perform percolation on T , i.e., keep edges with probability p . We are interested in the component of the root. Looked at as a random tree in itself, this component appears simply as some other Galton-Watson tree; its mean is mp by independence of the growing and the “pruning” (percolation). Hence, the component of the root is infinite w.p.p. iff $mp > 1$. This says that $p_c = 1/m$ a.s. on nonextinction, i.e., $\text{br} T = m$.

Let Z_n be the size of the n th generation in a Galton-Watson process. How quickly does Z_n grow? It will be easy to calculate that $\mathbf{E}[Z_n] = m^n$. Moreover, a martingale argument will show that the limit $W := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Z_n/m^n$ always exists (and is finite). When $1 < m < \infty$, do we have that $W > 0$ on the event of nonextinction? The answer is “yes”, under a very mild hypothesis:

THE KESTEN-STIGUM THEOREM (1966). *The following are equivalent when $1 < m < \infty$:*

- (i) $W > 0$ a.s. on the event of nonextinction;
- (ii) $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p_k k \log k < \infty$.

This will be shown in Section 10.2. Although condition (ii) appears technical, we will enjoy a conceptual proof of the theorem that uses only the crudest estimates.

§1.6. Random Spanning Trees.

This fertile and fascinating field is one of the oldest areas to be studied in this book, but one of the newest to be explored in depth. A **spanning tree** of a (connected) graph is a subgraph that is connected, contains every vertex of the whole graph, and contains no cycle: see Figure 1.7 for an example. The subject of random spanning trees of a graph goes back to Kirchhoff (1847), who showed its relation to electrical networks. (Actually, Kirchhoff did not think probabilistically, but, rather, he considered quotients of the number of spanning trees with a certain property divided by the total number of spanning trees.) One of these relations gives the probability that a uniformly chosen spanning tree will contain a given edge in terms of electrical current in the graph.




Figure 1.7. A spanning tree in a graph, where the edges of the graph not in the tree are dashed.

Let's begin with a very simple finite graph. Namely, consider the ladder graph of Figure 1.8. Among all spanning trees of this graph, what proportion contain the bottom rung (edge)? In other words, if we were to choose at random a spanning tree, what is the chance that it would contain the bottom rung? We have illustrated the entire probability spaces for the smallest ladder graphs in Figure 1.9.

As shown, the probabilities in these cases are $1/1$, $3/4$, and $11/15$. The next one is $41/56$. Is the pattern clear? One thing that is fairly evident is that these numbers are decreasing, but hardly changing. It turns out that they come from every other term of the continued fraction expansion of $\sqrt{3} - 1 = 0.73^+$ and, in particular, converge to $\sqrt{3} - 1$. In the limit, then, the probability of using the bottom rung is $\sqrt{3} - 1$ and, even before




Figure 1.8. A ladder graph.




Figure 1.9. The ladder graphs of heights 0, 1, and 2, together with their spanning trees.

taking the limit, this gives an excellent approximation to the probability. How can we easily calculate such numbers? In this case, there is a rather easy recursion to set up and solve, but we will use this example to illustrate the more general theorem of Kirchhoff that we mentioned above. In fact, Kirchhoff’s theorem will show us why these probabilities are decreasing even before we calculate them.

Suppose that each edge of our graph is an electric conductor of unit conductance. Hook up a battery between the endpoints of any edge e , say the bottom rung (Figure 1.10). Kirchhoff (1847) showed that the proportion of current that flows directly along e is then equal to the probability that e belongs to a randomly chosen spanning tree!

Coming back to the ladder graph and its bottom rung, e , we see that current flows in two ways: some flows directly across e and some flows through the rest of the network.




Figure 1.10. A battery is hooked up between the endpoints of e .

It is intuitively clear (and justified by Rayleigh’s monotonicity principle) that the higher the ladder, the greater the effective conductance of the ladder minus the bottom rung, hence, by Kirchhoff’s theorem, the less the chance that a random spanning tree contains the bottom rung. This confirms our observations.

It turns out that generating spanning trees at random according to the uniform measure is of interest to computer scientists, who have developed various algorithms over the years for random generation of spanning trees. In particular, this is closely connected to generating a random state from any Markov chain. See Propp and Wilson (1998) for more on this issue.

Early algorithms for generating a random spanning tree used the Matrix-Tree Theorem, which counts the number of spanning trees in a graph via a determinant. A better algorithm than these early ones, especially for probabilists, was introduced by Aldous (1990) and Broder (1989). It says that if you start a simple random walk at *any* vertex of a finite (connected) graph G and draw every edge it traverses except when it would complete a cycle (i.e., except when it arrives at a previously-visited vertex), then when no more edges can be added without creating a cycle, what will be drawn is a uniformly chosen spanning tree of G . (To be precise: if X_n ($n \geq 0$) is the path* of the random walk, then the associated spanning tree is the set of edges $\{[X_n, X_{n+1}]; X_{n+1} \notin \{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_n\}\}$.) This beautiful algorithm is quite efficient and useful for theoretical analysis, yet Wilson (1996) found an even better one that we’ll describe in Section 8.1.

Return for a moment to the ladder graphs. We saw that as the height of the ladder tends to infinity, there is a limiting probability that the bottom rung of the ladder graph

* In graph theory, a “path” is necessarily self-avoiding. What we call a “path” is called in graph theory a “walk”. However, to avoid confusion with random walks, we do not adopt that terminology. When a path does not pass through any vertex (resp., edge) more than once, we will call it **vertex simple** (resp., **edge simple**).

belongs to a uniform spanning tree. This suggests looking at uniform spanning trees on general infinite graphs. So suppose that G is an infinite graph. Let G_n be finite subgraphs with $G_1 \subset G_2 \subset G_3 \subset \dots$ and $\bigcup G_n = G$. Pemantle (1991) showed that the weak limit of the uniform spanning tree measures on G_n exists, as conjectured by Lyons. (In other words, if μ_n denotes the uniform spanning tree measure on G_n and B, B' are finite sets of edges, then $\lim_n \mu_n(B \subset T, B' \cap T = \emptyset)$ exists, where T denotes a random spanning tree.) This limit is now called the **free uniform spanning forest*** on G , denoted FUSF. Considerations of electrical networks play the dominant role in Pemantle’s proof. Pemantle (1991) discovered the amazing fact that on \mathbb{Z}^d , the uniform spanning forest is a single tree a.s. if $d \leq 4$; but when $d \geq 5$, there are infinitely many trees a.s.!

§1.7. Hausdorff Dimension.

Consider again any finite connected graph with two distinguished vertices a and z . This time, the edges e have assigned positive numbers $c(e)$ that represent the maximum amount of water that can flow through the edge (in either direction). How much water can flow into a and out of z ? Consider any set Π of edges that separates a from z , i.e., the removal of all edges in Π would leave a and z in different components. Such a set Π is called a **cutset**. Since all the water must flow through Π , an upper bound for the maximum flow from a to z is $\sum_{e \in \Pi} c(e)$. The beautiful Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem of Ford and Fulkerson (1962) says that these are the only constraints: the maximum flow equals $\min_{\Pi \text{ a cutset}} \sum_{e \in \Pi} c(e)$.

Applying this theorem to our tree situation where the amount of water that can flow through an edge at distance n from the root is limited to λ^{-n} , we see that the maximum flow from the root to infinity is

$$\inf \left\{ \sum_{x \in \Pi} \lambda^{-|x|} ; \Pi \text{ cuts the root from infinity} \right\}.$$

Here, we identify a set of vertices Π with their preceding edges when considering cutsets.

By analogy with the leaves of a finite tree, we call the set of rays of T the **boundary** (at infinity) of T , denoted ∂T . (It does not include any leaves of T .) Now there is a natural metric on ∂T : if $\xi, \eta \in \partial T$ have exactly n edges in common, define their distance to be

* In graph theory, “spanning forest” usually means a maximal subgraph without cycles, i.e., a spanning tree in each connected component. We mean, instead, a subgraph without cycles that contains every vertex.

$d(\xi, \eta) := e^{-n}$. Thus, if $x \in T$ has more than one child with infinitely many descendants, the set of rays going through x ,

$$B_x := \{\xi \in \partial T; \xi|_x = x\},$$

has diameter $\text{diam } B_x = e^{-|x|}$. We call a collection \mathcal{C} of subsets of ∂T a **cover** if

$$\bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{C}} B = \partial T.$$

Note that Π is a cutset iff $\{B_x; x \in \Pi\}$ is a cover. The **Hausdorff dimension** of ∂T is defined to be

$$\dim \partial T := \sup \left\{ \alpha; \inf_{\mathcal{C} \text{ a countable cover}} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{C}} (\text{diam } B)^\alpha > 0 \right\}.$$

This is, in fact, already familiar to us, since

$$\begin{aligned} \text{br } T &= \sup \{ \lambda; \text{ water can flow through pipe capacities } \lambda^{-|x|} \} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \lambda; \inf_{\Pi \text{ a cutset}} \sum_{x \in \Pi} \lambda^{-|x|} > 0 \right\} \\ &= \exp \sup \left\{ \alpha; \inf_{\Pi \text{ a cutset}} \sum_{x \in \Pi} e^{-\alpha|x|} > 0 \right\} \\ &= \exp \sup \left\{ \alpha; \inf_{\mathcal{C} \text{ a cover}} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{C}} (\text{diam } B)^\alpha > 0 \right\} \\ &= \exp \dim \partial T. \end{aligned}$$

§1.8. Capacity.

An important tool in analyzing electrical networks is that of energy. Thomson's principle says that, given a finite graph and two distinguished vertices a, z , the unit current flow from a to z is the unit flow from a to z that minimizes energy, where, if the conductances are $c(e)$, the **energy** of a flow θ is defined to be $\sum_{e \text{ an edge}} \theta(e)^2/c(e)$. (It turns out that the energy of the unit current flow is equal to the effective resistance from a to z .) Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{electrical current flows from the root of an infinite tree} \\ \iff & \\ &\text{there is a flow with finite energy.} \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

Now on a tree, a unit flow can be identified with a function θ on the vertices of T that is 1 at the root and has the property that for all vertices x ,

$$\theta(x) = \sum_i \theta(y_i),$$

where y_i are the children of x . The energy of a flow is then

$$\sum_{x \in T} \theta(x)^2 \lambda^{|x|},$$

whence

$$\text{br } T = \sup \left\{ \lambda; \text{ there exists a unit flow } \theta \quad \sum_{x \in T} \theta(x)^2 \lambda^{|x|} < \infty \right\}. \quad (1.3)$$

We can also identify unit flows on T with Borel probability measures μ on ∂T via

$$\mu(B_x) = \theta(x).$$

A bit of algebra shows that (1.3) is equivalent to

$$\text{br } T = \exp \sup \left\{ \alpha; \exists \text{ a probability measure } \mu \text{ on } \partial T \quad \iint \frac{d\mu(\xi) d\mu(\eta)}{d(\xi, \eta)^\alpha} < \infty \right\}.$$

For $\alpha > 0$, define the α -**capacity** to be the reciprocal of the minimum e^α -energy:

$$\text{cap}_\alpha(\partial T)^{-1} := \inf \left\{ \iint \frac{d\mu(\xi) d\mu(\eta)}{d(\xi, \eta)^\alpha}; \mu \text{ a probability measure on } \partial T \right\}.$$

Then statement (1.2) says that for $\alpha > 0$,

$$\text{random walk with parameter } \lambda = e^\alpha \text{ is transient} \iff \text{cap}_\alpha(\partial T) > 0. \quad (1.4)$$

It follows from Theorem 2.19 that

$$\text{the critical value of } \alpha \text{ for positivity of } \text{cap}_\alpha(\partial T) \text{ is } \dim \partial T. \quad (1.5)$$

A refinement of Theorem 4.16 is (Lyons, 1992):

THEOREM 13.3. *For $\alpha > 0$, percolation with parameter $p = e^{-\alpha}$ yields an infinite component a.s. iff $\text{cap}_\alpha(\partial T) > 0$. Moreover,*

$$\text{cap}_\alpha(\partial T) \leq \mathbf{P}[\text{the component of the root is infinite}] \leq 2 \text{cap}_\alpha(\partial T).$$

When T is spherically symmetric and $p = e^{-\alpha}$, we have (Exercise 13.1)

$$\text{cap}_\alpha(\partial T) = \left(1 + (1 - p) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^n |T_n|} \right)^{-1}.$$

The case of the first part of this theorem where all the degrees are uniformly bounded was shown first by Fan (1989, 1990).

One way to use this theorem is to combine it with (1.4); this allows us to translate problems freely between the domains of random walks and percolation (Lyons, 1992). The theorem actually holds in a much wider context (on trees) than that mentioned here: Fan allowed the probabilities p to vary depending on the generation and Lyons allowed the probabilities as well as the tree to be completely arbitrary.

§1.9. Embedding Trees into Euclidean Space.

The results described above, especially those concerning percolation, can be translated to give results on closed sets in Euclidean space. We will describe only the simplest such correspondence here, which was the one that was part of Furstenberg’s motivation in 1970. Namely, for a closed nonempty set $E \subseteq [0, 1]$ and for any integer $b \geq 2$, consider the system of b -adic subintervals of $[0, 1]$. Those whose intersection with E is non-empty will form the vertices of the associated tree. Two such intervals are connected by an edge iff one contains the other and the ratio of their lengths is b . The root of this tree is $[0, 1]$. We denote the tree by $T_{[b]}(E)$. Were it not for the fact that certain numbers have two representations in base b , we could identify $\partial T_{[b]}(E)$ with E . Note that such an identification would be Hölder continuous in one direction (only).




Figure 1.11. In this case $b = 4$.

Hausdorff dimension is defined for subsets of $[0, 1]$ just as it was for ∂T :

$$\dim E := \sup \left\{ \alpha; \inf_{\mathcal{C} \text{ a cover of } E} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{C}} (\text{diam } B)^\alpha > 0 \right\},$$

where $\text{diam } B$ denotes the (Euclidean) diameter of E . Covers of $\partial T_{[b]}(E)$ by sets of the form B_x correspond to covers of E by b -adic intervals, but of diameter $b^{-|x|}$, rather than $e^{-|x|}$. It is easy to show that restricting to such covers does not change the computation of Hausdorff dimension, whence we may conclude (compare the calculation at the end of Section 1.7) that

$$\dim E = \frac{\dim \partial T_{[b]}(E)}{\log b} = \log_b(\text{br } T_{[b]}(E)).$$

For example, the Hausdorff dimension of the Cantor middle-thirds set is $\log 2 / \log 3$, which we see by using the base $b = 3$. It is interesting that if we use a different base, we will still have $\text{br } T_{[b]}(E) = 2$ when E is the Cantor set.

Capacity is also defined as it was on the boundary of a tree:

$$(\text{cap}_\alpha E)^{-1} := \inf \left\{ \iint \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{|x - y|^\alpha}; \mu \text{ a probability measure on } E \right\}.$$

It was shown by Benjamini and Peres (1992) (see Section 13.3) that

$$(\text{cap}_\alpha E)/3 \leq \text{cap}_{\alpha \log b}(\partial T_{[b]}(E)) \leq b \text{cap}_\alpha E. \tag{1.6}$$

This means that the percolation criterion Theorem 13.3 can be used in Euclidean space. In fact, inequalities such as (1.6) also hold for more general kernels than distance to a power and for higher-dimensional Euclidean spaces. Nice applications to the path of Brownian motion were found by Peres (1996) by replacing the path by an “intersection-equivalent” random fractal that is much easier to analyze, being an embedding of a Galton-Watson tree. (This is planned for future inclusion in the book.)

Also, the fact (1.5) translates into the analogous statement about subsets $E \subseteq [0, 1]$; this is a classical theorem of Frostman (1935).

Chapter 2

Random Walks and Electric Networks

There are profound and detailed connections between potential theory and probability; see, e.g., Doob (1984). We will look at a simple discrete version of this connection that is very useful. A superb elementary introduction to the ideas of the first five sections of this chapter is given by Doyle and Snell (1984).

§2.1. Circuit Basics and Harmonic Functions.

Our principal interest in this chapter centers around transience and recurrence of irreducible Markov chains. If the chain starts at a state x , then we want to know whether the chance that it ever visits a state a is 1 or not.

In fact, we are interested only in reversible Markov chains, where we call a Markov chain **reversible** if there is a positive function $x \mapsto \pi(x)$ on the state space such that the transition probabilities satisfy $\pi(x)p_{xy} = \pi(y)p_{yx}$ for all pairs of states x, y . (Such a function $\pi(\bullet)$ will then provide a stationary measure: see Exercise 2.1. *Note that $\pi(\bullet)$ is not generally a probability measure.*) In this case, make a graph G by taking the states of the Markov chain for vertices and joining two vertices x, y by an edge when $p_{xy} > 0$. Assign weight

$$c(x, y) := \pi(x)p_{xy} \tag{2.1}$$

to that edge; note that the condition of reversibility ensures that this weight is the same no matter in what order we take the endpoints of the edge. With this graph in hand, the Markov chain may be described as a random walk on G : when the walk is at a vertex x , it chooses randomly among the vertices adjacent to x with transition probabilities proportional to the weights of the edges. Conversely, every connected graph with weights on the edges such that the sum of the weights incident to every vertex is finite gives rise to a random walk with transition probabilities proportional to the weights. Such a random walk is an irreducible reversible Markov chain: define $\pi(x)$ to be the sum of the weights incident to x .*

* Suppose that we consider an edge e of G to have length $c(e)^{-1}$. Run a Brownian motion on G and

▷ EXERCISE 2.1.

(a) Show that if a Markov chain is reversible, then $\forall x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$,

$$\pi(x_1) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} p_{x_i x_{i+1}} = \pi(x_n) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} p_{x_{n+1-i} x_{n-i}},$$

whence $\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} p_{x_i x_{i+1}} = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} p_{x_{n+1-i} x_{n-i}}$ if $x_1 = x_n$. This last equation also characterizes reversibility.

(b) Let $\langle X_n \rangle$ be a random walk on G and let x and y be two vertices in G . Let \mathcal{P} be a path from x to y and \mathcal{P}' its reversal, a path from y to x . Show that

$$\mathbf{P}_x[\langle X_n; n \leq \tau_y \rangle = \mathcal{P} \mid \tau_y < \tau_x^+] = \mathbf{P}_y[\langle X_n; n \leq \tau_x \rangle = \mathcal{P}' \mid \tau_x < \tau_y^+],$$

where τ_w denotes the first time the random walk visits w , τ_w^+ denotes the first time after 0 that the random walk visits w , and \mathbf{P}_u denotes the law of random walk started at u . In words, paths between two states that don't return to the starting point and stop at the first visit to the endpoint have the same distribution in both directions of time.

(c) Consider a random walk on G that is either transient or is stopped on the first visit to a set of vertices Z . Let $\mathcal{G}(x, y)$ be the expected number of visits to y for a random walk started at x ; if the walk is stopped at Z , we count only those visits that occur strictly before visiting Z . Show that for every pair of vertices x and y ,

$$\pi(x)\mathcal{G}(x, y) = \pi(y)\mathcal{G}(y, x).$$

(d) Show that random walk on G is positive recurrent (sometimes called ergodic) iff $\sum_{x,y} c(x, y) < \infty$, in which case the stationary probability distribution is proportional to $\pi(\bullet)$. Show that if the random walk is not positive recurrent, then $\pi(\bullet)$ is a stationary infinite measure.

We begin by studying random walks on finite graphs. Let G be a finite connected graph, x a vertex of G , and A, Z disjoint subsets of vertices of G . Let τ_A be the first time that the random walk visits (“hits”) some vertex in A ; if the random walk happens

observe it only when it reaches a vertex different from the previous one. Then we see the random walk on G just described. There are various equivalent ways to define rigorously Brownian motion on G . The essential point is that for Brownian motion on \mathbb{R} started at 0 and for $a, b > 0$, if X is the first of $\{-a, b\}$ visited, then $\mathbf{P}[X = -a] = a/(a + b)$.

to start in A , then this is 0. Occasionally, we will use τ_A^+ , which is the first time after 0 that the walk visits A ; this is different from τ_A only when the walk starts in A . Usually A and Z will be singletons. Often, all the edge weights are equal; we call this case **simple random walk**.

Consider the probability that the random walk visits A before it visits Z as a function of its starting point x :

$$F(x) := \mathbf{P}_x[\tau_A < \tau_Z]. \tag{2.2}$$

Recall that \upharpoonright indicates the restriction of a function to a set. Clearly $F\upharpoonright A \equiv 1$, $F\upharpoonright Z \equiv 0$, and for $x \notin A \cup Z$,

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= \sum_y \mathbf{P}_x[\text{first step is to } y] \mathbf{P}_x[\tau_A < \tau_Z \mid \text{first step is to } y] \\ &= \sum_{x \sim y} p_{xy} F(y) = \frac{1}{\pi(x)} \sum_{x \sim y} c(x, y) F(y), \end{aligned}$$

where $x \sim y$ indicates that x, y are adjacent in G . In the special case of simple random walk, this equation becomes

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{\deg x} \sum_{x \sim y} F(y),$$

where $\deg x$ is the degree of x , i.e., the number of edges incident to x . That is, $F(x)$ is the average of the values of F at the neighbors of x . In general, this is still true, but the average is taken with weights.

We say that a function f is **harmonic** at x when

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{\pi(x)} \sum_{x \sim y} c(x, y) f(y).$$

If f is harmonic at each point of a set H , then we say that f is harmonic on H . Harmonic functions satisfy a maximum principle: For $H \subseteq G$, write \overline{H} for the set of vertices that are either in H or are adjacent to some vertex in H . When we say that a function is defined on a graph, we mean that it is defined on its vertex set.

MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE. *Let G be a finite or infinite graph. If $H \subseteq G$, H is connected, $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, f is harmonic on H , and the maximum of f on H is achieved and is equal to the supremum of f on G , then $f\upharpoonright \overline{H} \equiv \max f$.*

Proof. Let $K := \{y \in \overline{H}; f(y) = \max f\}$. Note that if $x \in H$, $x \sim y$, and $f(x) = \max f$, then $f(y) = \max f$ by harmonicity of f at x . Thus, $\overline{K} \cap \overline{H} = K$. Since H is connected and $K \neq \emptyset$, it follows that $K = \overline{H}$. ◀

This leads to the

UNIQUENESS PRINCIPLE. *Let G be a finite or infinite connected graph. Let H be a finite subgraph of G that does not contain all vertices of G . If $f, g : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, f, g are harmonic on H , and $f|_{(G \setminus H)} = g|_{(G \setminus H)}$, then $f = g$.*

Proof. Let $h := f - g$. We claim that $h \leq 0$. This suffices to establish the corollary since then $h \geq 0$ by symmetry, whence $h = 0$.

Now $h = 0$ off H , so if $h \not\leq 0$ on H , then h is positive somewhere on H , whence $\max h|_H = \max h$. Let K be a component of H where h achieves its maximum. According to the maximum principle, h is a positive constant on \overline{K} . In particular, $h > 0$ on the non-empty set $\overline{K} \setminus K$. However, $\overline{K} \setminus K \subseteq G \setminus H$, whence $h = 0$ on $\overline{K} \setminus K$. This is a contradiction. \blacktriangleleft

Thus, the harmonicity of the function $x \mapsto \mathbf{P}_x[\tau_A < \tau_Z]$ (together with its values where it is not harmonic) characterizes it.

If f, f_1 , and f_2 are harmonic functions on H and $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $f = a_1 f_1 + a_2 f_2$ on $G \setminus H$, then $f = a_1 f_1 + a_2 f_2$ by the uniqueness principle. This is one form of the **superposition principle**.

EXISTENCE PRINCIPLE. *Let G be a finite or infinite graph. If $H \subsetneq G$ and $f_0 : G \setminus H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded or nonnegative, then $\exists f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f|_{(G \setminus H)} = f_0$ and f is harmonic on H .*

Proof. For any starting point x of the network random walk, let X be the first vertex in $G \setminus H$ visited by the random walk if $G \setminus H$ is indeed visited. Let $Y := f_0(X)$ when $G \setminus H$ is visited and $Y := 0$ otherwise. It is easily checked that $f(x) := \mathbf{E}_x[Y]$ works. \blacktriangleleft

This is the solution to the so-called Dirichlet problem. The function F of (2.2) is the particular case $H = G \setminus (A \cup Z)$, $f_0|_A \equiv 1$, and $f_0|_Z \equiv 0$.

In fact, for finite networks, we could have immediately deduced existence from uniqueness or vice versa: The Dirichlet problem on a finite network consists of a finite number of linear equations, one for each vertex in H . Since the number of unknowns is equal to the number of equations, we get the equivalence of the uniqueness principle and the existence principle.

In order to study the solution to the Dirichlet problem, especially for a sequence of subgraphs of an infinite graph, we will discover that electrical networks are useful. Electrical networks, of course, have a physical meaning whose intuition is useful to us, but also they can be used as a rigorous mathematical tool.

Mathematically, an electrical network is just a weighted graph. But now we call the weights of the edges **conductances**; their reciprocals are called **resistances**. (Note that later, we will encounter effective conductances and resistances; these are not the same.) We hook up a battery or batteries (this is just intuition) between A and Z so that the **voltage** at every vertex in A is 1 and in Z is 0 (more generally, so that the voltages on $G \setminus H$ are given by f_0). (Sometimes, voltages are called **potentials** or potential differences.) **Voltages** v are then established at every vertex and **current** i runs through the edges. These functions are implicitly defined and uniquely determined on finite graphs, as we will see, by two “laws”:

Ohm’s Law : If $x \sim y$, the current flowing from x to y satisfies

$$v(x) - v(y) = i(x, y)r(x, y).$$

Kirchhoff’s Node Law: The sum of all currents flowing out of a given vertex is 0, provided the vertex is not connected to a battery.

Physically, Ohm’s law, which is usually stated as $v = ir$ in engineering, is an empirical statement about linear response to voltage differences — certain components obey this law over a wide range of voltage differences. Kirchhoff’s node law expresses the fact that charge does not build up at a node (current being the passage rate of charge per unit time). If we add wires corresponding to the batteries, then the proviso in Kirchhoff’s node law is unnecessary.

Mathematically, we’ll take Ohm’s law to be the definition of current in terms of voltage. In particular, $i(x, y) = -i(y, x)$. Then Kirchhoff’s node law presents a constraint on what kind of function v can be. Indeed, it determines v uniquely: Current flows into G at A and out at Z . Thus, we may combine the two laws on $G \setminus (A \cup Z)$ to obtain

$$\forall x \notin A \cup Z \quad 0 = \sum_{x \sim y} i(x, y) = \sum_{x \sim y} [v(x) - v(y)]c(x, y),$$

or

$$v(x) = \frac{1}{\pi(x)} \sum_{x \sim y} c(x, y)v(y).$$

That is, $v(\bullet)$ is harmonic on $G \setminus (A \cup Z)$. Since $v|_A \equiv 1$ and $v|_Z \equiv 0$, it follows that if G is finite, then $v = F$; in particular, we have uniqueness and existence of voltages. The voltage function is just the solution to the Dirichlet problem.

Now if we sum the differences of a function, such as the voltage v , on the edges of a cycle, we get 0. Thus, by Ohm's Law, we deduce:

Kirchhoff's Cycle Law: If $x_1 \sim x_2 \sim \dots \sim x_n \sim x_{n+1} = x_1$ is a cycle, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n i(x_i, x_{i+1})r(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 0.$$

One can also deduce Ohm's Law from Kirchhoff's Laws:

▷ EXERCISE 2.2.

Suppose that an antisymmetric function j (meaning that $j(x, y) = -j(y, x)$) on the edges of a finite network satisfies Kirchhoff's Cycle Law and Kirchhoff's Node Law in the form $\sum_{x \sim y} j(x, y) = 0$ for all $x \notin H$. Show that j is the current determined by imposing voltages on H and that the voltage function is unique up to an additive constant.

§2.2. More Probabilistic Interpretations.

Suppose that $A = \{a\}$ is a singleton. What is the chance that a random walk starting at a will hit Z before it returns to a ? Write this as

$$\mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow Z] := \mathbf{P}_a[\tau_Z < \tau_{\{a\}}^+].$$

Impose a voltage of $v(a)$ at a and 0 on Z . Since $v(\bullet)$ is linear in $v(a)$ by the superposition principle, we have that $\mathbf{P}_x[\tau_{\{a\}} < \tau_Z] = v(x)/v(a)$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow Z] &= \sum_x p_{ax} \left(1 - \mathbf{P}_x[\tau_{\{a\}} < \tau_Z] \right) = \sum_x \frac{c(a, x)}{\pi(a)} [1 - v(x)/v(a)] \\ &= \frac{1}{v(a)\pi(a)} \sum_x c(a, x)[v(a) - v(x)] = \frac{1}{v(a)\pi(a)} \sum_x i(a, x). \end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$v(a) = \frac{\sum_x i(a, x)}{\pi(a)\mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow Z]}. \tag{2.3}$$

Since $\sum_x i(a, x)$ is the total amount of current flowing into the circuit at a , we may regard the entire circuit between a and Z as a single conductor of **effective conductance**

$$C_{\text{eff}} := \pi(a)\mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow Z] =: \mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow Z), \tag{2.4}$$

where the last notation indicates the dependence on a and Z . The similarity to (2.1) can provide a good mnemonic, but the analogy should not be pushed too far. We define the **effective resistance** $\mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow Z)$ to be its reciprocal. One answer to our question above is thus $\mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow Z] = \mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow Z)/\pi(a)$. In Sections 2.3 and 2.4, we will see some ways to compute effective conductance.

Now the number of visits to a before hitting Z is a geometric random variable with mean $\mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow Z]^{-1} = \pi(a)\mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow Z)$. According to (2.3), this can also be expressed as $\pi(a)v(a)$ when there is unit current flowing from a to Z and the voltage is 0 on Z . This generalizes as follows. Let $\mathcal{G}(a, x)$ be the expected number of visits to x strictly before hitting Z by a random walk started at a . Thus, $\mathcal{G}(a, x) = 0$ for $x \in Z$. The function $\mathcal{G}(\bullet, \bullet)$ is the **Green** function for the random walk absorbed on Z .

PROPOSITION 2.1. *Let G be a finite graph. When a voltage is imposed so that a unit current flows from a to Z and the voltage is 0 on Z , then $v(x) = \mathcal{G}(a, x)/\pi(x)$ for all x .*

Proof. We have just shown that this is true for $x \in \{a\} \cup Z$, so it suffices to establish that $\mathcal{G}(a, x)/\pi(x)$ is harmonic elsewhere. But by Exercise 2.1, we have that $\mathcal{G}(a, x)/\pi(x) = \mathcal{G}(x, a)/\pi(a)$ and the harmonicity of $\mathcal{G}(x, a)$ is established just as for the function of (2.2). ◀

Given that we have two probabilistic interpretations of voltage, we naturally wonder whether current has a probabilistic interpretation. We might guess one by the following unrealistic but simple model of electricity: positive particles enter the circuit at a , they do Brownian motion on G (being less likely to pass through small conductors) and, when they hit Z , they are removed. The net flow of particles across an edge would then be the current on that edge. It turns out that in our mathematical model, this is correct:

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Let G be a finite graph. Start a random walk at a and absorb it when it first visits Z . For $x \sim y$, let S_{xy} be the number of transitions from x to y . Then $\mathbf{E}[S_{xy}] = \mathcal{G}(a, x)p_{xy}$ and $\mathbf{E}[S_{xy} - S_{yx}] = i(x, y)$, where i is the current in G when a potential is applied between a and Z in such an amount that unit current flows in at a .*

Note that we count a transition from y to x when $y \notin Z$ but $x \in Z$, although we do not count this as a visit to x in computing $\mathcal{G}(a, x)$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[S_{xy}] &= \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_k=x\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{k+1}=y\}}\right] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}[X_k = x, X_{k+1} = y] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}[X_k = x] p_{xy} = \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_k=x\}}\right] p_{xy} = \mathcal{G}(a, x)p_{xy}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x, y \quad \mathbf{E}[S_{xy} - S_{yx}] &= \mathcal{G}(a, x)p_{xy} - \mathcal{G}(a, y)p_{yx} \\ &= v(x)\pi(x)p_{xy} - v(y)\pi(y)p_{yx} = [v(x) - v(y)]c(x, y) = i(x, y). \blacktriangleleft \end{aligned}$$

Effective conductance is a key quantity because of the following relationship to the question of transience and recurrence when G is infinite. Recall that for an infinite graph G , we assume that

$$\forall x \quad \sum_{x \sim y} c(x, y) < \infty, \tag{2.5}$$

so that the associated random walk is well defined. (Of course, this is true when G is **locally finite** — i.e., the number of edges incident to every given vertex is finite.) We allow more than one edge between a given pair of vertices: each such edge has its own conductance. Loops are also allowed (edges with only one endpoint), but these may be ignored for our present purposes since they only delay the random walk. Strictly speaking, then, G may be a **multigraph**, not a graph. However, we will ignore this distinction.

▷ EXERCISE 2.3.

In fact, we have not yet used anywhere that G has only finitely many edges. Verify that Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 are valid when the number of edges is infinite but the number of vertices is finite.

Let $\langle G_n \rangle$ be any sequence of finite subgraphs of G that **exhaust** G , i.e., $G_n \subseteq G_{n+1}$ and $G = \bigcup G_n$. Let Z_n be the set of vertices in $G \setminus G_n$. (Note that if Z_n is contracted to a point, the graph will have finitely many vertices but may have infinitely many edges even when loops are deleted.) Then for every $a \in G$, the limit $\lim_n \mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow Z_n]$ is the probability of never returning to a in G — the escape probability from a . This is positive iff the random walk on G is transient. Hence by (2.4), $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow Z_n) > 0$ iff the random walk on G is transient. We call $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow Z_n)$ the **effective conductance** from a to ∞ in G and denote it by $\mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow \infty)$ or, if a is understood, by C_{eff} . Its reciprocal, **effective resistance**, is denoted R_{eff} . We have shown:

THEOREM 2.3. *Random walk on an infinite connected network is transient iff the effective conductance from any of its vertices to infinity is positive.*

▷ EXERCISE 2.4.

For a fixed vertex a in G , show that $\lim_n \mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow Z_n)$ is the same for every sequence $\langle G_n \rangle$ that exhausts G .


▷ EXERCISE 2.5.

When G is finite but A is not a singleton, define $\mathcal{C}(A \leftrightarrow Z)$ to be $\mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow Z)$ if all the vertices in A were to be identified to a single vertex, a . Show that if voltages are applied at the vertices of $A \cup Z$ so that $v|_A$ and $v|_Z$ are constants, then $v|_A - v|_Z = \mathcal{I}_{AZ} \mathcal{R}(A \leftrightarrow Z)$, where $\mathcal{I}_{AZ} := \sum_{x \in A} \sum_y i(x, y)$ is the total amount of current flowing from A to Z .

§2.3. Network Reduction.

How do we calculate effective conductance of a network? Since we want to replace a network by an equivalent single conductor, it is natural to attempt this by replacing more and more of G through simple transformations. There are, in fact, three such simple transformations, series, parallel, and star-triangle, and it turns out that they suffice to reduce all finite planar networks by a theorem of Epifanov; see Truemper (1989).

I. Series. Two resistors r_1 and r_2 in series are equivalent to a single resistor $r_1 + r_2$. In other words, if $w \in G \setminus (A \cup Z)$ is a node of degree 2 with neighbors u_1, u_2 and we replace the edges (u_i, w) by a single edge (u_1, u_2) having resistance $r(u_1, w) + r(w, u_2)$, then all potentials and currents in $G \setminus \{w\}$ are unchanged and the current that flows from u_1 to u_2 equals $i(u_1, w)$.



Proof. It suffices to check that Ohm’s and Kirchhoff’s laws are satisfied on the new network for the voltages and currents given. This is easy. ◀


▷ EXERCISE 2.6.

Give two harder but instructive proofs of the series equivalence: Since voltages determine currents, it suffices to check that the voltages are as claimed on the new network G' . (1) Show that $v(x)$ ($x \in G \setminus \{w\}$) is harmonic on $G' \setminus (A \cup Z)$. (2) Use the “craps principle” (Pitman (1993), p. 210) to show that $\mathbf{P}_x[\tau_A < \tau_Z]$ is unchanged for $x \in G \setminus \{w\}$.

EXAMPLE 2.4. Consider simple random walk on \mathbb{Z} . Let $0 \leq k \leq n$. What is $\mathbf{P}_k[\tau_0 < \tau_n]$? It is the voltage at k when there is a unit voltage imposed at 0 and zero voltage at n . If we replace the resistors in series from 0 to k by a single resistor with resistance k and the resistors from k to n by a single resistor of resistance $n - k$, then the voltage at k does not

change. But now this voltage is simply the probability of taking a step to 0, which is thus $(n - k)/n$.

II. Parallel. Two conductors c_1 and c_2 in parallel are equivalent to one conductor $c_1 + c_2$. In other words, if two edges e_1 and e_2 that both join vertices $w_1, w_2 \in G$ are replaced by a single edge e joining w_1, w_2 of conductance $c(e) := c(e_1) + c(e_2)$, then all voltages and currents in $G \setminus \{e_1, e_2\}$ are unchanged and the current $i(e)$ equals $i(e_1) + i(e_2)$ (if e_1 and e_2 have the “same” orientations, i.e., same tail and head). The same is true for an infinite number of edges in parallel.




Proof. Check Ohm’s and Kirchhoff’s laws with $i(e) := i(e_1) + i(e_2)$. ◀

▷ EXERCISE 2.7.


Give two more proofs of the parallel equivalence as in Exercise 2.6.

EXAMPLE 2.5. Suppose that each edge in the following network has equal conductance. What is $\mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow z]$? Following the transformations indicated in the figure, we obtain $\mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow z) = 7/12$, so that

$$\mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow z] = \frac{\mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow z)}{\pi(a)} = \frac{7/12}{3} = \frac{7}{36}.$$



EXAMPLE 2.6. What is $\mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow z]$ in the following network?



There are 2 ways to deal with the vertical edge:

(1) Remove it: by symmetry, the voltages at its endpoints are equal, whence no current flows on it.

(2) Contract it, i.e., remove it but combine its endpoints into one vertex (we could also combine the other two unlabelled vertices with each other): the voltages are the same, so they may be combined.

In either case, we get $\mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow z) = 2/3$, whence $\mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow z] = 1/3$.

▷ EXERCISE 2.8.

Let (G, c) be a **spherically symmetric** network, meaning that if x and y are any two vertices at the same distance from o , then there is an automorphism of (G, c) that leaves o fixed and that takes x to y . (A **network automorphism** is a map $\phi : G \rightarrow G$ that is a bijection of the vertex set with itself and a bijection of the edge set with itself such that if x and e are incident, then so are $\phi(x)$ and $\phi(e)$ and such that $c(e) = c(\phi(e))$ for all edges e .) Let C_n be the sum of $c(e)$ over all edges e with $d(e^-, o) = n$ and $d(e^+, o) = n + 1$. Show that the network random walk on G is transient iff

$$\sum_n \frac{1}{C_n} < \infty.$$


III. Star-triangle. The configurations below are equivalent when

$$\forall i \in \{1, 2, 3\} \quad c(w, u_i)c(u_{i-1}, u_{i+1}) = \gamma,$$

where indices are taken mod 3 and

$$\gamma := \frac{\prod_i c(w, u_i)}{\sum_i c(w, u_i)} = \frac{\sum_i r(u_{i-1}, u_{i+1})}{\prod_i r(u_{i-1}, u_{i+1})}.$$

We won't use this equivalence except in Example 2.7 and the exercises. This is also called the “Y- Δ ” or “Wye-Delta” transformation.



▷ EXERCISE 2.9.

Give at least one proof of star-triangle equivalence.

Actually, there is a fourth trivial transformation: we may prune (or add) vertices of degree 1 (and attendant edges) as well as loops.


▷ EXERCISE 2.10.

Find a (finite) graph that can't be reduced to a single edge by these four transformations.

Either of the transformations star-triangle or triangle-star can also be used to reduce the network in Example 2.6.

EXAMPLE 2.7. What is $\mathbf{P}_x[\tau_a < \tau_z]$ in the following network? Following the transformations indicated in the figure, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}_x[\tau_a < \tau_z] = \frac{20/33}{20/33 + 15/22} = \frac{8}{17}.$$



§2.4. Energy.

We now come to another extremely useful concept, energy. (Although the term “energy” is used for mathematical reasons, the physical concept is actually power dissipation.) We will begin with some convenient notation and some facts about this notation. Unfortunately, there is actually a fair bit of notation. But once we have it all in place, we will be able to quickly reap some powerful consequences.

For a finite (multi)graph $G = (V, E)$ with vertex set V and edge set E , write $e^-, e^+ \in V$ for the tail and head of $e \in E$; the edge is oriented from its tail to its head. Write \check{e} for the reverse orientation: *From now on, each edge occurs with both orientations.* Also, “finite” means that V is finite. Define $\ell^2(V)$ to be the usual real Hilbert space of functions on V with inner product

$$(f, g) := \sum_{x \in V} f(x)g(x).$$

Since we are interested in flows on E , it is natural to consider that what flows one way is the negative of what flows the other. Thus, define $\ell^2_-(E)$ to be the space of **antisymmetric**

functions θ on \mathbf{E} (i.e., $\theta(\check{e}) = -\theta(e)$ for each edge e) with inner product

$$(\theta, \theta') := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in \mathbf{E}} \theta(e)\theta'(e) = \sum_{e \in \mathbf{E}_{1/2}} \theta(e)\theta'(e),$$

where $\mathbf{E}_{1/2} \subset \mathbf{E}$ is a set of edges containing exactly one of each pair e, \check{e} . Since voltage differences across edges lead to currents, define the **coboundary operator** $d : \ell^2(\mathbf{V}) \rightarrow \ell^2_-(\mathbf{E})$ by

$$(dF)(e) := F(e^-) - F(e^+).$$

(Note that this is the negative of the more natural definition; since current flows from greater to lesser voltage, however, it is the more useful definition for us.) This operator is clearly linear. Conversely, given an antisymmetric function on the edges, we are interested in the net flow out of a vertex, whence we define the **boundary operator** $d^* : \ell^2_-(\mathbf{E}) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbf{V})$ by

$$(d^*\theta)(x) := \sum_{e^- = x} \theta(e).$$

This operator is also clearly linear. We use the superscript $*$ because these two operators are adjoints of each other:

$$\forall F \in \ell^2(\mathbf{V}) \quad \forall \theta \in \ell^2_-(\mathbf{E}) \quad (\theta, dF) = (d^*\theta, F).$$

▷ EXERCISE 2.11.

Prove that d and d^* are adjoints of each other.

One use of this notation is that the calculation left here for Exercise 2.11 need not be repeated every time it arises — and it arises a lot. Another use is the following compact forms of the network laws. Let i be a current.

Ohm's Law: $dv = ir, \text{ i.e., } \forall e \in \mathbf{E} \quad dv(e) = i(e)r(e).$

Kirchhoff's Node Law: $d^*i(x) = 0$ if no battery is connected at x .

It will be useful to study flows other than current in order to discover a special property of the current flow. We can imagine water flowing through a network of pipes. The amount of water flowing into the network at a vertex a is $d^*\theta(a)$. Thus, we call $\theta \in \ell^2_-(\mathbf{E})$ a **flow from** A to Z if $d^*\theta$ is 0 off of A and Z , is nonnegative on A , and nonpositive on Z . The total amount flowing into the network is then $\sum_{a \in A} d^*\theta(a)$; as the next lemma shows, this is also the total amount flowing out of the network. We call

$$\text{Strength}(\theta) := \sum_{a \in A} d^*\theta(a)$$

the **strength** of the flow θ . A flow of strength 1 is called a **unit flow**.

LEMMA 2.8. *Let G be a finite graph and A and Z be two disjoint subsets of its vertices. If θ is a flow from A to Z , then*

$$\sum_{a \in A} d^* \theta(a) = - \sum_{z \in Z} d^* \theta(z).$$

Proof. We have

$$\sum_{x \in A} d^* \theta(x) + \sum_{x \in Z} d^* \theta(x) = \sum_{x \in A \cup Z} d^* \theta(x) = (d^* \theta, \mathbf{1}) = (\theta, d\mathbf{1}) = (\theta, 0) = 0$$

since $d^* \theta(x) = 0$ for $x \notin A \cup Z$. ◀

The following consequence will be useful in a moment.

LEMMA 2.9. *Let G be a finite graph and A and Z be two disjoint subsets of its vertices. If θ is a flow from A to Z and $F|_A, F|_Z$ are constant functions, then*

$$(\theta, dF) = \text{Strength}(\theta)[F(A) - F(Z)].$$

Proof. We have $(\theta, dF) = (d^* \theta, F) = \sum_{a \in A} d^* \theta(a)F(a) + \sum_{z \in Z} d^* \theta(z)F(z)$. Now apply Lemma 2.8. ◀

When a current i flows through a resistor of resistance r and voltage difference v , energy is dissipated at rate $P = iv = i^2 r = i^2 / c = v^2 c = v^2 / r$. We are interested in the total power (= energy per unit time) dissipated.

NOTATION. Write

$$(f, g)_h := (fh, g) = (f, gh)$$

and

$$\|f\|_h := \sqrt{(f, f)_h}.$$

DEFINITION. For an antisymmetric function θ , define its **energy** to be

$$\mathcal{E}(\theta) := \|\theta\|_r^2,$$

where r is the collection of resistances.

Thus $\mathcal{E}(i) = (i, i)_r = (i, dv)$. If i is a unit current flow from A to Z with voltages constant on A and on Z , then by Lemma 2.9 and Exercise 2.5,

$$\mathcal{E}(i) = v(A) - v(Z) = \mathcal{R}(A \leftrightarrow Z). \tag{2.6}$$

The inner product $(\bullet, \bullet)_r$ is important not only for its squared norm $\mathcal{E}(\bullet)$. For example, we may express Kirchhoff's laws as follows. Let $\chi^e := \mathbf{1}_{\{e\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{e}\}}$ denote the unit flow along e represented as an antisymmetric function in $\ell^2_-(\mathbf{E})$. Note that for every antisymmetric function θ and every e , we have

$$(\chi^e, \theta)_r = \theta(e)r(e),$$

so that

$$\left(\sum_{e^- = x} c(e)\chi^e, \theta \right)_r = d^*\theta(x). \tag{2.7}$$

Let i be any current.

Kirchhoff's Node Law: For every vertex x , we have

$$\left(\sum_{e^- = x} c(e)\chi^e, i \right)_r = 0$$

except if a battery is connected at x .

Kirchhoff's Cycle Law: If e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n is an oriented cycle in G , then

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \chi^{e_i}, i \right)_r = 0.$$

Now for our last bit of notation before everything comes into focus, let \star denote the subspace in $\ell^2_-(\mathbf{E})$ spanned by the **stars** $\sum_{e^- = x} c(e)\chi^e$ and let \diamond denote the subspace spanned by the **cycles** $\sum_{i=1}^n \chi^{e_i}$, where e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n forms an oriented cycle. We call these subspaces the **star space** and the **cycle space** of G . These subspaces are clearly orthogonal; here and subsequently, orthogonality refers to the inner product $(\bullet, \bullet)_r$. Moreover, the sum of \star and \diamond is all of $\ell^2_-(\mathbf{E})$, which is the same as saying that only the zero vector is orthogonal to both \star and \diamond . To see that this is the case, suppose that $\theta \in \ell^2_-(\mathbf{E})$ is orthogonal to both \star and \diamond . Since θ is orthogonal to \diamond , there is a function F such that $\theta = c dF$. Indeed, choose a vertex $o \in G$ and define $F(o) := 0$. For any other vertex x , let e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n be a path from o to x . Define $F(x) := \sum_{i=1}^n \theta(e_i)r(e_i)$. This value of $F(x)$ does not depend on the path chosen from o to x precisely because of the fact that $\theta \perp \diamond$. (We are assuming that G is connected. If not, we define F on each connected component of G by the preceding procedure.) Since θ is orthogonal to \star , the function F is harmonic. Since G is finite, the uniqueness principle implies that F is constant on each component of G , whence $\theta = 0$, as desired.

Thus, Kirchhoff's Cycle Law says that i , being orthogonal to \diamond , is in \star . Now if θ is any flow with the same sources and sinks as i , more precisely, if θ is any antisymmetric function such that $d^*\theta = d^*i$, then $\theta - i$ is a sourceless flow, i.e., by (2.7), is orthogonal to \star and thus an element of \diamond . Therefore, the expression

$$\theta = i + (\theta - i)$$

is the orthogonal decomposition of θ relative to $\ell_-^2(\mathbf{E}) = \star \oplus \diamond$. This shows that the orthogonal projection P_\star plays a crucial role in network theory. In particular,

$$i = P_\star \theta \tag{2.8}$$

and

$$\|\theta\|_r^2 = \|i\|_r^2 + \|\theta - i\|_r^2. \tag{2.9}$$

THOMSON'S PRINCIPLE. *Let G be a finite network and A and Z be two disjoint subsets of its vertices. Let θ be a flow from A to Z and i be the current flow from A to Z with $d^*i = d^*\theta$. Then $\mathcal{E}(\theta) > \mathcal{E}(i)$ unless $\theta = i$.*

Proof. The result is an immediate consequence of (2.9). ◀

Recall that $\mathbf{E}_{1/2} \subset \mathbf{E}$ is a set of edges containing exactly one of each pair e, \check{e} . What is the matrix of P_\star in the orthogonal basis $\{\chi^e; e \in \mathbf{E}_{1/2}\}$? We have

$$(P_\star \chi^e, \chi^f)_r = (i^e, \chi^f)_r = i^e(f)r(f), \tag{2.10}$$

where i^e is the unit current from e^- to e^+ . In other words, the matrix coefficient at (e, f) is the voltage difference across f when a unit current is imposed between the endpoints of e . This matrix is called the **transfer impedance matrix**. The related matrix with entries $Y(e, f) := i^e(f)$ is called, naturally enough, the **transfer current matrix**. This latter matrix will be extremely useful for our study of random spanning trees and forests in Chapters 8 and 9. Since P_\star , being an orthogonal projection, is self-adjoint, the transfer impedance matrix is symmetric. Therefore

$$Y(e, f)r(f) = Y(f, e)r(e). \tag{2.11}$$

This is called the **reciprocity law**.

Consider $\mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow Z]$. How does this change when an edge is removed from G ? when an edge is added? when the conductance of an edge is changed? These questions are not easy to answer probabilistically, but yield to the ideas we have developed. Since $\mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow Z] = \mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow Z)/\pi(a)$, if no edge incident to a is affected, then we need analyze only the change in effective conductance.

▷ EXERCISE 2.12.

Show that $\mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow Z]$ can increase in some situations and decrease in others when an edge incident to a is removed.

Effective conductance changes as follows. We use subscripts to indicate the edge conductances or resistances used; though this is an abuse of notation, whether conductance or resistance is meant will be clear from the notation and context.

RAYLEIGH'S MONOTONICITY LAW. *Let G be a finite network and A and Z two disjoint subsets of its vertices. If c and c' are two assignments of conductances on the same graph with $c \leq c'$, then $\mathcal{C}_c(A \leftrightarrow Z) \leq \mathcal{C}_{c'}(A \leftrightarrow Z)$.*

Proof. By (2.6), we have $\mathcal{C}(A \leftrightarrow Z) = 1/\mathcal{E}(i)$ for a unit current flow i from A to Z . Now

$$\mathcal{E}_c(i_c) \geq \mathcal{E}_{c'}(i_c) \geq \mathcal{E}_{c'}(i_{c'}),$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of energy and the second from Thomson's principle. Taking reciprocals gives the result. ◀

In particular, removing an edge decreases effective conductance, so if the edge is not incident to a , then its removal decreases $\mathbf{P}[a \rightarrow Z]$.

§2.5. Transience and Recurrence.

We have seen that effective conductance from any vertex is positive iff the random walk is transient. We will formulate this as an energy criterion.

If $G = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$ is a denumerable network, let

$$\ell^2(\mathbf{V}) := \{f : \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; \sum_{x \in \mathbf{V}} f(x)^2 < \infty\}$$

with the inner product $(f, g) := \sum_{x \in \mathbf{V}} f(x)g(x)$. Define the Hilbert space

$$\ell^2_-(\mathbf{E}) := \{\theta : \mathbf{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; \forall e \quad \theta(\check{e}) = -\theta(e) \text{ and } \sum_{e \in \mathbf{E}} \theta(e)^2 r(e) < \infty\}$$

with the inner product $(\theta, \theta')_r := \sum_{e \in \mathbf{E}_{1/2}} \theta(e)\theta'(e)r(e)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\theta) := (\theta, \theta)_r$. Define $df(e) := f(e^-) - f(e^+)$ as before. If $\sum_{e^- = x} |\theta(e)| < \infty$, then we also define $(d^*\theta)(x) := \sum_{e^- = x} \theta(e)$. If \mathbf{V} is finite and $\sum_e |\theta(e)| < \infty$, then the calculation of Exercise 2.11 shows that we still have $(\theta, dF) = (d^*\theta, F)$ for all F . Likewise, under these hypotheses, we have Lemma 2.8 and Lemma 2.9 still holding.

Now the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives that $\forall x \in \mathbf{V}$

$$\sum_{e^- = x} |\theta(e)| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{e^- = x} \theta(e)^2 / c(e)} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{e^- = x} c(e)} \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{E}(\theta)\pi(x)}. \quad (2.12)$$

In particular, if $\mathcal{E}(\theta) < \infty$, then $d^*\theta$ is defined.

▷ EXERCISE 2.13.

Let $G = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$ be denumerable and $\theta_n \in \ell_-^2(\mathbf{E})$ be such that $\mathcal{E}(\theta_n) \leq M < \infty$ and $\forall e \in \mathbf{E} \theta_n(e) \rightarrow \theta(e)$. Show that θ is antisymmetric, $\mathcal{E}(\theta) \leq \liminf_n \mathcal{E}(\theta_n) \leq M$, and $\forall x \in \mathbf{V} \ d^*\theta_n(x) \rightarrow d^*\theta(x)$.

Call an antisymmetric function θ on \mathbf{E} a **unit flow** from $a \in \mathbf{V}$ to ∞ if

$$\forall x \in \mathbf{V} \ \sum_{e^- = x} |\theta(e)| < \infty$$

and $(d^*\theta)(x) = \mathbf{1}_{\{a\}}(x)$. Our main theorem is the following criterion for transience.

THEOREM 2.10. (T. LYONS, 1983) *Let G be a denumerable network. Random walk on G is transient iff there is a unit flow on G of finite energy from some (every) vertex to ∞ .*

Proof. Let G_n be finite subgraphs that exhaust G . Let $G^{(n)}$ be the graph obtained from G by contracting the vertices outside G_n to a single vertex, z_n . In other words, identify these vertices and throw away resulting loops (but keep multiple edges). Fix any vertex $a \in G$, which, without loss of generality, belongs to each G_n . We have, by definition, $\mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow \infty) = \lim \mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow z_n)$. Let i_n be the unit current flow in $G^{(n)}$ from a to z_n . Then $\mathcal{E}(i_n) = \mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow z_n)$, so $\mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow \infty) < \infty \Leftrightarrow \lim \mathcal{E}(i_n) < \infty$.

Note that each edge of $G^{(n)}$ comes from an edge in G and may be identified with it, even though one endpoint may be different.

If θ is a unit flow on G from a to ∞ and of finite energy, then the restriction $\theta|_{G^{(n)}}$ of θ to $G^{(n)}$ is a unit flow from a to z_n , whence Thomson's principle gives $\mathcal{E}(i_n) \leq \mathcal{E}(\theta|_{G^{(n)}}) \leq \mathcal{E}(\theta) < \infty$. In particular, $\lim \mathcal{E}(i_n) < \infty$ and so the random walk is transient.

Conversely, if $\mathcal{E}(i_n) \leq M < \infty$, then we may find a subsequence i_{n_k} converging pointwise (i.e., edgewise) to some function θ . Exercise 2.13 ensures that θ is a unit flow of finite energy from a to ∞ . ◀

This allows us to carry over the remainder of the electrical apparatus to infinite networks:

PROPOSITION 2.11. *Let G be a transient network and G_n be finite subgraphs containing a vertex a that exhaust G . Contract the vertices outside G_n to z_n , forming $G^{(n)}$. Let i_n be the unit current flow in $G^{(n)}$ from a to z_n . Then $\langle i_n \rangle$ has a pointwise limit i on G , which is the unique unit flow on G from a to ∞ of minimum energy. Let v_n be the voltages on $G^{(n)}$ corresponding to i_n and with $v_n(z_n) := 0$. Then $v := \lim v_n$ exists on G and has the following properties:*

$$dv = ir,$$

$$v(a) = \mathcal{E}(i) = \mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow \infty),$$

$$\forall x \quad v(x)/v(a) = \mathbf{P}_x[\tau_a < \infty].$$

Start a random walk at a . For all vertices x , the expected number of visits to x is $\mathcal{G}(a, x) = \pi(x)v(x)$. For all edges e , the expected signed number of crossings of e is $i(e)$.

Proof. We first establish existence and uniqueness of a unit flow with minimum energy. Suppose that θ_n are unit flows on G such that $\lim \mathcal{E}(\theta_n) = \inf\{\mathcal{E}(\theta); \theta \text{ a unit flow on } G\}$. Then as in the proof of the theorem, $\langle \theta_n \rangle$ has a limit point θ_∞ which is a unit flow with $\mathcal{E}(\theta_\infty) \leq \liminf \mathcal{E}(\theta_n)$, i.e., θ_∞ has minimum energy. To show uniqueness of the minimizer, note that $\forall \theta, \theta'$

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}(\theta) + \mathcal{E}(\theta')}{2} = \mathcal{E}\left(\frac{\theta + \theta'}{2}\right) + \mathcal{E}\left(\frac{\theta - \theta'}{2}\right). \quad (2.13)$$

Therefore, if θ and θ' both have minimum energy, so does $(\theta + \theta')/2$ and hence $\mathcal{E}((\theta - \theta')/2) = 0$, which gives $\theta = \theta'$.

Now let j be the unit flow of minimum energy. As in the proof of the theorem, $\mathcal{E}(i_n) \leq \mathcal{E}(j)$, whence every limit point of $\{i_n\}$ has minimum energy, whence is j . That is, $i_n \rightarrow j$ and $i = j$.

On the other hand, by Exercise 2.13, $\mathcal{E}(i) \leq \liminf \mathcal{E}(i_n)$ too, so that $\mathcal{E}(i) = \lim \mathcal{E}(i_n) = \lim v_n(a) = v(a)$. This also equals $\lim \mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow z_n) = \mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow \infty)$. Since the events $\{\tau_a < \tau_{G \setminus G_n}\}$ are increasing in n with union $\{\tau_a < \infty\}$, we have (with superscript indicating on which network the random walk takes place)

$$\lim_n \mathbf{P}_x^{G^{(n)}}[\tau_a < \tau_{z_n}] = \lim_n \mathbf{P}_x^G[\tau_a < \tau_{G \setminus G_n}] = \mathbf{P}_x^G[\tau_a < \infty],$$

whence $\lim v_n(x)/v_n(a) = v(x)/v(a)$ exists and equals $\mathbf{P}_x^G[\tau_a < \infty]$. Since $dv_n = i_n r$, taking limits gives $dv = ir$.

Let $Y_n(x)$ be the number of visits to x before hitting $G \setminus G_n$ and $Y(x)$ be the total number of visits to x . Then $Y_n(x)$ increases to $Y(x)$, whence the Monotone Convergence Theorem implies that $\mathcal{G}(a, x) = \mathbf{E}[Y(x)] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[Y_n(x)] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi(x)v_n(x) = \pi(x)v(x)$. Finally, the proof of Proposition 2.2 now applies as written for the last claim of the proposition. \blacktriangleleft

Thus, we may call i the unit current flow and v the voltage on G . We may regard G as grounded at infinity.

By Theorem 2.10 and Rayleigh's monotonicity law, the **type** of a random walk, i.e., whether it is transient or recurrent, does not change when the conductances are changed by bounded factors. An extensive generalization of this is given in Theorem 2.15.

How do we determine whether there is a flow from a to ∞ of finite energy? Notice that if there is and if i is the unit current flow, then $|i| = |c \cdot dv| \leq v(a)c$. In particular, there is a non-0 flow bounded on each edge by c (viz, $i/v(a)$) — and to determine whether there is a non-0 flow bounded by c , we turn to the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem of Ford and Fulkerson (1962). For finite graphs, the theorem reads as follows. We call a set Π of edges a **cutset** separating A and Z if every path joining a vertex in A to a vertex in Z includes an edge in Π . We call $c(e)$ the **capacity** of e in this context. Think of water flowing through pipes. Recall that the strength of a flow from A to Z , i.e., the total amount flowing into the network at vertices in A (and out at Z) is $\text{Strength}(\theta) = \sum_{a \in A} d^* \theta(a)$. Since all the water must flow through every cutset Π , it is intuitively clear that the strength of every flow bounded by c is at most $\inf_{\Pi} \sum_{e \in \Pi} c(e)$. Remarkably, this upper bound is always achieved.

It will be useful for the proof, as well as later, to establish a more general statement about flows in directed networks. In a directed network, we require flows to satisfy $\theta(e) \geq 0$ for every (directed) edge e ; in particular, they are *not* antisymmetric functions. Also, the capacity function of edges is not necessarily symmetric, even if both orientations of an edge occur. Define

$$\phi(x, e) := \mathbf{1}_{\{e^- = x\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{e^+ = x\}}.$$

Other than the source and sink vertices, we require for all x that $\sum_e \phi(x, e)\theta(e) = 0$. The **strength** of a flow with source set A is $\sum_{x \in A} \sum_e \phi(x, e)\theta(e)$. **Cutsets** separating a source set A from a sink set Z are required to intersect every directed path from A to Z . To reduce the study of undirected networks to that of directed ones, we simply replace each undirected edge by a pair of parallel directed edges with opposite orientations and the same capacity. A flow on the undirected network is replaced by a flow on the directed network that is nonzero on only one edge of each new parallel pair, while a flow on the resulting directed network yields a flow on the undirected network by subtracting the values on each parallel pair of edges.

THE MAX-FLOW MIN-CUT THEOREM. *Let A and Z be disjoint set of vertices in a (directed or undirected) finite network G . The maximum possible flow from A to Z equals the minimum cutset sum of the capacities:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \left\{ \text{Strength}(\theta); \theta \text{ a flow from } A \text{ to } Z \text{ satisfying } \forall e \ 0 \leq \theta(e) \leq c(e) \right\} \\ & = \min \left\{ \sum_{e \in \Pi} c(e); \Pi \text{ a cutset separating } A \text{ and } Z \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We assume that the network is directed. If θ is a flow from A to Z bounded by c and Π is any cutset separating A from Z , let A' denote the set of vertices that are not separated from A by Π . Since $A' \cap Z = \emptyset$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Strength}(\theta) &= \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{e \in E} \phi(x, e) \theta(e) = \sum_{x \in A'} \sum_{e \in E} \phi(x, e) \theta(e) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E} \theta(e) \sum_{x \in A'} \phi(x, e) \leq \sum_{e \in \Pi} \theta(e) \leq \sum_{e \in \Pi} c(e), \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

since $\sum_{x \in A'} \phi(x, e)$ is 0 when e joins two vertices in A' , is 1 when e leads out of A' , and is -1 when e leads into A' . This proves one half of the desired equality.

Now let θ be a flow of maximal strength among flows from A to Z that are bounded by c . A sequence of vertices x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k is called an **augmentable path** if $x_0 \in A$ and for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, either there is an edge e from x_{i-1} to x_i with $\theta(e) < c(e)$ or there is an edge e' from x_i to x_{i-1} with $\theta(e') > 0$. Let B denote the set of vertices x such that there exists an augmentable path (possibly empty) from a vertex of A to x . If there were an augmentable path x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k with $x_k \in Z$, then we could obtain from θ a stronger flow bounded by c as follows: For each $i = 1, \dots, k$ where there is an edge e from x_{i-1} to x_i , let $\theta^*(e) = \theta(e) + \epsilon$, while if there is an edge e' from x_i to x_{i-1} let $\theta^*(e') = \theta(e') - \epsilon$. By taking $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we would contradict maximality of θ . Therefore $Z \subset B^c$. Let Π be the set of edges connecting B to B^c . Then Π is a cutset separating A from Z . For every edge e leading from B to B^c , necessarily $\theta(e) = c(e)$, while θ must vanish on every edge from B^c to B . Therefore a calculation as in (2.14) shows that

$$\text{Strength}(\theta) = \sum_{e \in \Pi} \theta(e) = \sum_{e \in \Pi} c(e).$$

In conjunction with (2.14), this completes the proof. ◀

For infinite locally finite G , we conclude by the usual method of exhaustion of G that the maximum flow from a to ∞ equals the infimum of the cutset sums of the capacities, where we consider cutsets separating a and ∞ , i.e., sets of edges Π such that every path from a that includes infinitely many (distinct) edges must include an edge in Π . Actually, in place of local finiteness, if we assume that $\forall x \sum_{e^- = x} c(e) < \infty$, then a flow maximizing $\text{Strength}(\theta)$ exists since a maximizing sequence of flows has an edgewise limit point which is a maximizing flow bounded by c in light of Weierstrass' M-test. Hence if G is transient, this infimum cutset sum is positive. In fact, we will now show that these cutset sums $\rightarrow \infty$ “quickly” as the cutsets recede from a .

THE NASH-WILLIAMS CRITERION (1959). *If $\langle \Pi_n \rangle$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint cutsets in a network G that separate a from ∞ , then*

$$\mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow \infty) \geq \sum_n \left(\sum_{e \in \Pi_n} c(e) \right)^{-1}. \quad (2.15)$$

In particular, if the right-hand side is infinite, then G is recurrent.

Proof. By Proposition 2.11, it suffices to show that every unit flow θ from a to ∞ has energy at least the right-hand side. The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives

$$\sum_{e \in \Pi_n} \theta(e)^2 r(e) \sum_{e \in \Pi_n} c(e) \geq \left(\sum_{e \in \Pi_n} |\theta(e)| \right)^2 \geq 1.$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{E}(\theta) \geq \sum_n \sum_{e \in \Pi_n} \theta(e)^2 r(e) \geq \sum_n \left(\sum_{e \in \Pi_n} c(e) \right)^{-1}. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

REMARK 2.12. If the cutsets can be ordered so that Π_1 separates a from Π_2 and for $n > 1$, Π_n separates Π_{n-1} from Π_{n+1} , then the sum appearing in the statement of this criterion has a natural interpretation: Short together (i.e., join by edges of infinite conductance) all the vertices between Π_n and Π_{n+1} into one vertex U_n . Short all the vertices that Π_1 separates from ∞ into one vertex U_0 . Then only edges of Π_n join U_{n-1} to U_n . Replace these edges by a single edge of resistance $(\sum_{e \in \Pi_n} c(e))^{-1}$. This new network is a series network with effective resistance from U_0 to ∞ equal to the right-hand side of (2.15). Thus, Rayleigh's monotonicity law shows that the effective resistance from a to ∞ in G is at least the right-hand side of (2.15).

We now give T. Lyons's 1983 proof of Pólya's famous theorem concerning random walk on the integer lattices.

PÓLYA'S THEOREM. *Simple random walk on the nearest-neighbor graph of \mathbb{Z}^d is recurrent for $d = 1, 2$ and transient for all $d \geq 3$.*

Proof. For $d = 1, 2$, we can use the Nash-Williams criterion with cutsets

$$\Pi_n := \{e; d(o, e^-) = n, |d(o, e^-) - d(o, e^+)| = 1\},$$

where o is the origin and $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the graph distance.

For the other cases, by Rayleigh's Monotonicity Law, it suffices to do $d = 3$. For an edge e , let \mathbf{e} denote the unit vector in \mathbb{R}^3 from e^- to e^+ and let S_e denote the unit square

perpendicular to \mathbf{e} with the midpoint of \mathbf{e} being at the center of S_e . Define the flow θ through an edge e as the signed area of the radial projection of S_e on the unit sphere centered at o . That is, the area has the same sign as the inner product of \mathbf{e} with the vector from o to the center of e . If Q_x denotes the unit cube centered at x and bounded by the unit squares S_e ($e^- = x$), then the net area of the projection of the sides of Q_x is zero since each point of the projection is covered twice, once with each sign, when $x \neq o$. Therefore θ is a flow from the origin to infinity.

There is clearly a constant $A < \infty$ such that if the center of e is at euclidean distance R from the origin, then $|\theta(e)| \leq A/R^2$. Since all edge centers are separated from each other by euclidean distance at least 1, there is also a finite constant B such that there are at most Bn^2 edge centers whose distance from the origin is between n and $n+1$. It follows that the energy of θ is at most $\sum_n A^2 B n^2 n^{-4}$, which is finite. Now transience follows from Theorem 2.10. ◀

REMARK 2.13. The continuous case, i.e., Brownian motion in \mathbb{R}^3 , is easier to handle (after establishing a similar relationship to an electrical framework) because of the spherical symmetry; see Section 2.10. Here, we are approximating this continuous case in our solution. One can in fact use the transience of the continuous case to deduce that of the discrete case (or vice versa).

Since simple random walk on \mathbb{Z}^2 is recurrent, the effective resistance from the origin to distance n tends to infinity — but how quickly? Our techniques are good enough to answer this within a constant factor:

PROPOSITION 2.14. *There are constants C_1, C_2 such that if one identifies to a single vertex z_n all vertices of \mathbb{Z}^2 that are at distance more than n from o , then*

$$C_1 \log n \leq \mathcal{R}(o \leftrightarrow z_n) \leq C_2 \log n.$$

Proof. The lower bound is an immediate consequence of (2.15) applied to the cutsets Π_n used in our proof of Pólya’s theorem. Moreover, the upper bound follows from the estimate of the energy of the unit flow analogous to that used for the transience of \mathbb{Z}^3 . That is, $\theta(e)$ is defined to be the signed length of the projection onto the unit circle of a unit segment perpendicular to \mathbf{e} . Then θ defines a unit flow from o to z_n and its energy is bounded by $C_2 \log n$. ◀

The most direct proof of Pólya’s theorem goes by calculation of the Green function and is not hard. However, that calculation depends on the precise structure of the graph. The proof here begins to show that the type doesn’t change when fairly drastic changes

are made in the lattice graph. Suppose, for example, that diagonal edges are added to the square lattice. Then clearly we can still use Nash-Williams' criterion to show recurrence. Of course, a similar addition of edges in higher dimensions preserves transience simply by Rayleigh's Monotonicity Law. But suppose that in \mathbb{Z}^3 , we remove each edge $[(x, y, z), (x, y, z + 1)]$ with $x + y$ odd. Is the resulting graph still transient? If so, by how much has the effective resistance to infinity changed?

Notice that graph distances haven't changed much after these edges are removed. In a general network, if we think of the resistances r as the lengths of edges, then we are led to the following definition.

Given two networks G and G' with resistances r and r' , we say that a map ϕ from the vertices of G to the vertices of G' is a **rough embedding** if there are constants $\alpha, \beta < \infty$ and a map Φ defined on the edges of G such that

- (i) for every edge $[x, y] \in G$, $\Phi(x, y)$ is a non-empty simple oriented path of edges in G' joining $\phi(x)$ and $\phi(y)$ with

$$\sum_{e' \in \Phi(x, y)} r'(e') \leq \alpha r(x, y)$$

and $\Phi(y, x)$ is the reverse of $\Phi(x, y)$;

- (ii) for every edge $e' \in G'$, there are no more than β edges in G whose image under Φ contains e' .

If we need to refer to the constants, we call the map (α, β) -**rough**. We call two networks **roughly equivalent** if there are rough embeddings in both directions. For example, every two euclidean lattices of the same dimension are roughly equivalent.

THEOREM 2.15. (KANAI, 1986) *If G and G' are roughly equivalent networks, then G is transient iff G' is transient. In fact, if there is a rough embedding from G to G' and G is transient, then G' is transient.*

Proof. Suppose that G is transient and ϕ is an (α, β) -rough embedding from G to G' . Let θ be a unit flow on G of finite energy from a to infinity. We will use ϕ to carry the flow θ to a unit flow θ' on G' that will have finite energy. Namely, define

$$\theta'(e') := \sum_{e \in \Phi(e')} \pm \theta(e).$$

Here, the sum means that for every $e \in G$ for which the path $\Phi(e)$ contains e' , we add $\pm \theta(e)$, with a $+$ sign when the path from $\phi(e^-)$ to $\phi(e^+)$ uses e' and with a $-$ sign when

it uses the reversed edge \check{e}' . It is easy to see that $d^*\theta'(y) = \sum_{y \in \phi(x)} d^*\theta(x)$ for all $y \in G'$. Thus, θ' is a unit flow from $\phi(a)$ to infinity.

Now

$$(\theta'(e'))^2 \leq \beta \sum_{e' \in \Phi(e)} \theta(e)^2$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the condition (ii). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e' \in G'} \theta'(e')^2 r'(e') &\leq \beta \sum_{e' \in G'} \sum_{e' \in \Phi(e)} \theta(e)^2 r'(e') = \beta \sum_{e \in G} \sum_{e' \in \Phi(e)} \theta(e)^2 r'(e') \\ &\leq \alpha \beta \sum_{e \in G} \theta(e)^2 r(e) < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

▷ EXERCISE 2.14.

Show that the removal of edges in \mathbb{Z}^3 as above gives a transient graph with effective resistance to infinity at most 6 times what it was before removal.

§2.6. Flows and Random Paths.

There is a useful relationship between flows and random paths. For simplicity, we will write it out only in the case of a graph (without weights), not a multigraph.

Suppose first that \mathbf{P} is a probability measure on paths $\langle Y_n \rangle$ from a to z on a finite graph or from a to ∞ on an infinite graph. Define

$$\theta(e) := \sum_{n \geq 0} \{ \mathbf{P}[\langle Y_n, Y_{n+1} \rangle = e] - \mathbf{P}[\langle Y_{n+1}, Y_n \rangle = e] \}.$$

Since each path is a unit flow from a to z (or to ∞), so is θ as an expectation of paths. We saw in Propositions 2.2 and 2.11 that this is precisely how network random walks and unit electric current are related. However, there are other useful pairs of random paths and their expected flows as well. If we pick two paths $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2$ independently according to the same law, how many common edges will they have? For simplicity, assume that the paths are edge simple. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[|\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_2|] &= \sum_{e \in E} \mathbf{P}[e \in \mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_2] = \sum_{e \in E} \mathbf{P}[e \in \mathcal{P}_1] \mathbf{P}[e \in \mathcal{P}_2] \\ &= \sum_{e \in E} \mathbf{P}[e \in \mathcal{P}_1]^2 \geq (\theta, \theta). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we are interested in proving transience of simple random walk on an infinite graph, it suffices to find random paths such that two independent copies have a finite expected number of intersections.

Here is one application. Since the harmonic series, which arises in the recurrence of \mathbb{Z}^2 , just barely diverges, it seems that the change from recurrence to transience occurs “just after” dimension 2, rather than somewhere else in $[2, 3]$. One way to make sense of this is to ask about the type of spaces intermediate between \mathbb{Z}^2 and \mathbb{Z}^3 . For example, consider the wedge

$$W_f := \{(x, y, z); |z| \leq f(|x|)\},$$

where $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is an increasing function. The number of edges that leave $W_f \cap \{(x, y, z); |x| \vee |y| \leq n\}$ is of the order $n(f(n) + 1)$, so that according to the Nash-Williams criterion,

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n(f(n) + 1)} = \infty \tag{2.16}$$

is sufficient for recurrence.

▷ EXERCISE 2.15.

Show that (2.16) is also necessary for recurrence if $f(n + 1) \leq f(n) + 1$ for all n .

Above, we have constructed a unit flow from a random path. Now we do the reverse. Suppose that θ is a unit flow from a to z on a finite graph or from a to ∞ on an infinite graph such that if $e^- = a$, then $\theta(e) \geq 0$ and, in the finite case, if $e^+ = z$, then $\theta(e) \geq 0$. Use θ to define a random path as the trajectory of a Markov chain $\langle Y_n \rangle$ as follows. The initial state is $Y_0 := a$ and z is an absorbing state. For a vertex $x \neq z$, set

$$\theta_{\text{out}}(x) := \sum_{\substack{e^- = x \\ \theta(e) > 0}} \theta(e),$$

the amount flowing out of x . The transition probability from x to w is then $(\theta(x, w) \vee 0) / \theta_{\text{out}}(x)$. Define

$$\theta'(e) := \sum_{n \geq 0} \{\mathbf{P}[\langle Y_n, Y_{n+1} \rangle = e] - \mathbf{P}[\langle Y_{n+1}, Y_n \rangle = e]\}.$$

As above, θ' is also a unit flow. We call θ **acyclic** if there is no cycle of oriented edges on each of which $\theta > 0$.

PROPOSITION 2.16. *Suppose that θ is acyclic. With the above notation, for every edge e with $\theta(e) > 0$, we have*

$$0 \leq \theta'(e) \leq \theta(e) \tag{2.17}$$

with equality on the right if G is finite or if θ is the unit current flow from a to ∞ .

Proof. Since the Markov chain only travels in the direction of θ , it clear that $\theta'(e) \geq 0$ when $\theta(e) > 0$.

For edges e with $\theta(e) > 0$, set

$$p_N(e) := \mathbf{P}[\exists n \leq N \langle Y_n, Y_{n+1} \rangle = e].$$

Because θ is acyclic, $p_N(e) \rightarrow \theta'(e)$. Thus, in order to show that $\theta'(e) \leq \theta(e)$, it suffices to show that $p_N(e) \leq \theta(e)$ for all N . We proceed by induction on N . This is clear for $N = 0$. For vertices x , define $p_N(x) := \mathbf{P}[\exists n \leq N Y_n = x]$. Suppose that $p_N(e) \leq \theta(e)$ for all edges e . Then also $p_N(x) \leq \sum_{e^+=x, \theta(e)>0} \theta(e) = \theta_{\text{out}}(x)$ for all vertices $x \neq a$. Hence $p_N(x) \leq \theta_{\text{out}}(x)$ for all vertices x . Therefore, for every edge e coming out of a vertex x , we have $p_{N+1}(e) = p_N(x)\theta(e)/\theta_{\text{out}}(x) \leq \theta(e)$. This completes the induction.

If G is finite, then $\theta'' := \theta - \theta'$ is a sourceless acyclic flow since it is positive only where θ is positive. If there were an edge e_1 where $\theta''(e_1) > 0$, then there would exist an edge e_2 whose head is the tail of e_1 where also $\theta''(e_2) > 0$, and so on. Eventually, this would close a cycle, which is impossible.

If θ is the unit current flow from a to ∞ , then θ has minimum energy among all unit flows from a to ∞ . Thus, (2.17) implies that $\theta' = \theta$. ◀

REMARK. Of course, other random paths or other rules for transporting mass through the network according to the flow θ will lead to the same result.

▷ EXERCISE 2.16.

Show that for every transient graph, there is a random edge-simple path from a to ∞ such that the expected number of edges common to two independent paths is equal to $\mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow \infty)$.

COROLLARY 2.17. *Let G be a transient connected network and v the voltage function from the unit current flow θ from a vertex a to ∞ with $v(\infty) = 0$. For every vertex x , there is a path of vertices from a to x along which v is monotone.*

Proof. Let W be the set of vertices incident to some edge e with $\theta(e) > 0$. By Proposition 2.16, a path $\langle Y_n \rangle$ chosen at random will, with positive probability, cross every edge e

where $\theta(e) > 0$, whence will visit every vertex in W with positive probability. Clearly v is monotone along every path $\langle Y_n \rangle$. Thus, there is a path from a to any vertex in W along which v is monotone. Now any vertex x not in W can be connected to some $w \in W$ by edges along which $\theta = 0$. Extending the path from a to w by such a path from w to x gives the required path from a to x . ◀

Curiously, we do not know a deterministic construction of a path satisfying the conclusion of Corollary 2.17.

§2.7. Trees.

A partial converse to the Nash-Williams criterion for *trees* can be stated as follows. Fix a root o in a tree T and denote by $|e|$ the distance from an edge $e \in T$ to o , i.e., the number of edges between e and o . Choose a unique orientation for each edge, namely, the one leading away from o .

▷ EXERCISE 2.17.

Let T be a locally finite tree and Π be a finite cutset separating o from ∞ such that no edge of Π is on the shortest path joining o to any other edge of Π . Let θ be a flow from o to ∞ . Show that

$$\text{Strength}(\theta) = \sum_{e \in \Pi} \theta(e).$$

PROPOSITION 2.18. *Let c be conductances on a locally finite infinite tree T and w_n be positive numbers with $\sum_{n \geq 0} w_n < \infty$. Any flow θ on T satisfying $0 \leq \theta(e) \leq w_{|e|}c(e)$ for all edges e has finite energy.*

Proof. Apply Exercise 2.17 to the cutset formed by the edges at distance n from o to obtain

$$\sum_{e \in T} \theta(e)^2 r(e) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{|e|=n} \theta(e)[\theta(e)r(e)] \leq \sum_{n \geq 0} w_n \sum_{|e|=n} \theta(e) = \sum_{n \geq 0} w_n \text{Strength}(\theta) < \infty. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Let's consider some particular conductances. Since trees tend to grow exponentially, let the conductance of an edge decrease exponentially with distance from o , say, $c(e) := \lambda^{-|e|}$, where $\lambda > 1$. Let $\lambda_c = \lambda_c(T)$ denote the critical λ for water flow from o to ∞ , in other words, water can flow for $\lambda < \lambda_c$ but not for $\lambda > \lambda_c$. What is the critical λ for current flow? We saw that if current flows for a certain value of λ (i.e., the associated random walk is transient), then so does water, whence $\lambda \leq \lambda_c$. Conversely, for $\lambda < \lambda_c$, we claim

that current flows: choose $\lambda' \in (\lambda, \lambda_c)$ and set $w_n := (\lambda/\lambda')^n$. Of course, $\sum_n w_n < \infty$; by definition of λ_c , there is a non-zero flow θ satisfying $0 \leq \theta(e) \leq (\lambda')^{-|e|} = w_{|e|} \lambda^{-|e|}$, whence Proposition 2.18 shows that this flow has finite energy and so current indeed flows. Thus, the same λ_c is the critical value for current flow. Since λ_c balances the growth of T while taking into account the structure of the tree, we call it the **branching number** of T :

$$\text{br } T := \sup \left\{ \lambda; \exists \text{ a non-zero flow } \theta \text{ on } T \text{ with } \forall e \in T \quad 0 \leq \theta(e) \leq \lambda^{-|e|} \right\}.$$

Of course, the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem gives an equivalent formulation as

$$\text{br } T = \sup \left\{ \lambda; \inf_{\Pi} \sum_{e \in \Pi} \lambda^{-|e|} > 0 \right\}, \tag{2.18}$$

where the inf is over cutsets Π separating o from ∞ . Denote by RW_λ the random walk associated to the conductances $e \mapsto \lambda^{-|e|}$. We may summarize some of our work as follows.

THEOREM 2.19. (LYONS, 1990) *If T is a locally finite infinite tree, then $\lambda < \text{br } T \Rightarrow \text{RW}_\lambda$ is transient and $\lambda > \text{br } T \Rightarrow \text{RW}_\lambda$ is recurrent.*

In particular, we see that for simple random walk to be transient, it is sufficient that $\text{br } T > 1$.

▷ EXERCISE 2.18.

For simple random walk on T to be transient, is it necessary that $\text{br } T > 1$?

We might call RW_λ **homesick random walk** for $\lambda > 1$ since the random walker has a tendency to walk towards its starting place, the root.

▷ EXERCISE 2.19.

Find an example where $\text{RW}_{\text{br } T}$ is transient and an example where it is recurrent.

▷ EXERCISE 2.20.

Show that $\text{br } T$ is independent of which vertex in T is the root.

Let's try to understand the significance of $\text{br } T$. If T is an n -ary tree (i.e., every vertex has n children), then the distance of RW_λ from o is simply a biased random walk on \mathbb{N} . It follows that $\text{br } T = n$.

▷ EXERCISE 2.21.

Show directly from the definition that $\text{br } T = n$ for an n -ary tree T . Show that if every vertex of T has between n_1 and n_2 children, then $\text{br } T$ is between n_1 and n_2 .

Since λ_c balances the number of edges leading away from a vertex over all of T , it is reasonable to think of $\text{br } T$ as an average number of branches per vertex. For a vertex $x \in T$, let $|x|$ denote its distance from o . Occasionally, we will use $|x - y|$ to denote the distance between x and y .

§2.8. Growth of Trees.

In this section, we consider only locally finite infinite trees. Define the **lower growth rate** of a tree T by

$$\underline{\text{gr}} T := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |T_n|^{1/n},$$

where $T_n := \{x \in T; |x| = n\}$ is **level** n of T . Similarly, the **upper growth rate** of T is $\overline{\text{gr}} T := \limsup |T_n|^{1/n}$. If $\underline{\text{gr}} T = \overline{\text{gr}} T$, then the common value is called the **growth rate** of T and denoted $\text{gr } T$.

In most of the examples of trees so far, the branching number was equal to the lower growth rate. In general, we have the inequality

$$\text{br } T \leq \underline{\text{gr}} T,$$

since

$$\underline{\text{gr}} T = \sup\{\lambda; \inf_n \sum_{x \in T_n} \lambda^{-|x|} > 0\} \quad (2.19)$$

and $\{e(x); x \in T_n\}$ are cutsets, where $e(x)$ is the edge from the parent of x to x . Of course, the **parent** of a vertex $x \neq o$ is the neighbor of x that is closer to o .

▷ EXERCISE 2.22.

Show (2.19).

There are various ways to construct a tree whose branching number is different from its growth: see Section 1.1.

▷ EXERCISE 2.23.

We have seen that if $\text{br } T > 1$, then simple random walk on T is transient. Is $\underline{\text{gr}} T > 1$ sufficient for transience?

We call T **spherically symmetric** if $\deg x$ depends only on $|x|$.

▷ EXERCISE 2.24.

Show that $\text{br } T = \underline{\text{gr}} T$ when T is spherically symmetric.

NOTATION. Write $x \leq y$ if x is on the shortest path from o to y ; $x < y$ if $x \leq y$ and $x \neq y$; $x \rightarrow y$ if $x \leq y$ and $|y| = |x| + 1$ (i.e., y is a child of x); and T^x for the subtree of T containing the vertices $y \geq x$.

There is an important class of trees whose structure is “periodic” in a certain sense. To exhibit these trees, we review some elementary notions from combinatorial topology. Let G be a finite connected graph and x_0 be any vertex in G . Define the tree T to have as vertices the finite paths $\langle x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \rangle$ that never backtrack, i.e., $x_i \neq x_{i+2}$ for $0 \leq i \leq n - 2$. Join two vertices in T by an edge when one path is an extension by one vertex of the other. The tree T is called the **universal cover** (based at x_0) of G . See Figure 2.1 for an example.




Figure 2.1. A graph and part of its universal cover.

In fact, this idea can be extended. Suppose that G is a finite directed multigraph and x_0 be any vertex in G . That is, edges are not required to appear with both orientations and two vertices can have many edges joining them. Loops are also allowed. Define the **directed cover** (based at x_0) of G to be the tree T whose vertices are the finite paths $\langle x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \rangle$ such that $\langle x_i, x_{i+1} \rangle$ is an edge of G and $n \geq 0$. We join two vertices in T as we did before. See Figure 2.2 for an example.

The periodic aspect of these trees can be formalized as follows.

DEFINITION. Let $N \geq 0$. An infinite tree T is called **N -periodic** (resp., **N -subperiodic**) if $\forall x \in T$ there exists an adjacency-preserving bijection (resp., injection) $f : T^x \rightarrow T^{f(x)}$ with $|f(x)| \leq N$. A tree is **periodic** (resp., **subperiodic**) if there is some N for which it is N -periodic (resp., N -subperiodic).

All universal and directed covers are periodic. Conversely, every periodic tree is a directed cover of a finite graph, G : If T is an N -periodic tree, take $\{x \in T; |x| \leq N\}$ for the vertex set of G . For $|x| \leq N$, let f_x be the identity map and for $x \in T_{N+1}$, let f_x




Figure 2.2. A graph and part of its directed cover. This tree is also called the **Fibonacci tree**.

be a bijection as guaranteed by the definition. Let the edges of G be $\{\langle x, f_y(y) \rangle; |x| \leq N \text{ and } y \text{ is a child of } x\}$. Then T is the directed cover of G based at the root.

If two (sub)periodic trees are joined as in Example 1.3, then clearly the resulting tree is also (sub)periodic.

EXAMPLE 2.20. Consider the finite paths in the lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 that go through no vertex more than once. These paths are called self-avoiding and are of substantial interest to mathematical physicists. Form a tree T whose vertices are the finite self-avoiding paths and with two such vertices joined when one path is an extension by one step of the other. Then T is 0-subperiodic and has infinitely many leaves. Its growth rate has been estimated at about 2.64; see Madras and Slade (1993).

EXAMPLE 2.21. Suppose that E is a closed set in $[0, 1]$ and $T_{[b]}(E)$ is the associated tree that represents E in base b , as in Section 1.9. Then $T_{[b]}(E)$ is 0-subperiodic iff E is invariant under the map $x \mapsto bx \pmod{1}$, i.e., iff the fractional part of bx lies in E for every $x \in E$.

How can we calculate the growth rate of a periodic tree? If T is a periodic tree, let G be a finite directed graph of which T is the directed cover based at x_0 . We may assume that G contains only vertices that can be reached from x_0 , since the others do not contribute to T . Let A be the directed adjacency matrix of G , i.e., A is a square matrix indexed by the vertices of G with the (x, y) entry equal to the number of edges from x to y . Since all entries of A are nonnegative, the Perron-Frobenius Theorem (Minc (1988), Theorem 4.2) says that the spectral radius of A is equal to its largest positive eigenvalue, λ_* , and that there is a λ_* -eigenvector v_* all of whose entries are nonnegative. If $\mathbf{1}$ denotes a column vector all of whose entries are 1, then the number of paths in G with n edges, which is $|T_n|$, is $\mathbf{1}_{x_0}^T A^n \mathbf{1}$. Since the spectral radius of A equals $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A^n\|^{1/n}$, it follows that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |T_n|^{1/n} \leq \lambda_*$. On the other hand, let x be any vertex such that $v_*(x) > 0$, let

j be such that $A^j(x_0, x) > 0$, and let $c > 0$ be such that $\mathbf{1} \geq cv_*$. Then

$$|T_{j+n}| \geq \mathbf{1}_x^T A^n \mathbf{1} \geq c \mathbf{1}_x^T A^n v_* = c \lambda_*^n \mathbf{1}_x^T v_* = cv_*(x) \lambda_*^n.$$

Therefore $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |T_n|^{1/n} \geq \lambda_*$. We conclude that $\text{gr } T = \lambda_*$.

It turns out that subperiodicity is enough for equality of $\text{br } T$ and $\text{gr } T$. This is analogous to a classical fact about sequences of reals, known as Fekete's Lemma (see Exercise 2.25). A sequence $\langle a_n \rangle$ of real numbers is called **subadditive** if

$$\forall m, n \geq 1 \quad a_{m+n} \leq a_m + a_n.$$

A simple example is $a_n := \lceil \beta n \rceil$ for some real $\beta > 0$.

▷ EXERCISE 2.25.

(a) (Fekete's Lemma) Show that every subadditive sequence $\langle a_n \rangle$ satisfies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n}{n} = \inf \frac{a_n}{n}.$$

(b) Show that Fekete's Lemma holds even if a finite number of the a_n are infinite.

(c) Show that for every 0-subperiodic tree T , the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |T_n|^{1/n}$ exists.

The following theorem is due to Furstenberg (1967). Given $\lambda > 0$ and a cutset Π in a tree T , denote

$$\|\Pi\|_\lambda := \sum_{e(x) \in \Pi} \lambda^{-|x|}.$$

THEOREM 2.22. *For every subperiodic infinite tree T , the growth rate exists and $\text{br } T = \text{gr } T$. Moreover,*

$$\inf_{\Pi} \|\Pi\|_{\text{br } T} > 0.$$

Proof. First, suppose that T has no leaves and is 0-subperiodic. We shall show that if for some cutset Π and some $\lambda_1 > 0$, we have

$$\|\Pi\|_{\lambda_1} < 1, \tag{2.20}$$

then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |T_n|^{1/n} < \lambda_1. \tag{2.21}$$

Since $\inf_{\Pi} \|\Pi\|_{\lambda_1} = 0$ for all $\lambda_1 > \text{br } T$, this implies that

$$\text{br } T = \text{gr } T \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\Pi} \|\Pi\|_{\text{br } T} \geq 1. \tag{2.22}$$

So suppose that (2.20) holds. We may assume that Π is finite and minimal with respect to inclusion by Exercise 2.72. Now there certainly exists $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ such that

$$\|\Pi\|_\lambda < 1. \tag{2.23}$$

Let $d := \max_{e(x) \in \Pi} |x|$ denote the maximal level of Π . By 0-subperiodicity, for each $e(x)$ in Π , there is a cutset $\Pi(x)$ of T^x such that $\sum_{e(w) \in \Pi(x)} \lambda^{-|w-x|} \leq \|\Pi\|_\lambda < 1$ and $\max_{e(w) \in \Pi(x)} |w-x| \leq d$. Thus, $\|\Pi(x)\|_\lambda = \sum_{e(w) \in \Pi(x)} \lambda^{-|w|} < \lambda^{-|x|}$. (Note that $|w|$ always denotes the distance from w to the root of T .) Thus, if we replace those edges $e(x)$ in Π by the edges of the corresponding $\Pi(x)$ for $e(x) \in A \subseteq \Pi$, we obtain a cutset $\tilde{\Pi} := \bigcup_{e(x) \in A} \Pi(x) \cup (\Pi \setminus A)$ that satisfies $\|\tilde{\Pi}\|_\lambda = \sum_{e(x) \in A} \|\Pi(x)\|_\lambda + \sum_{e(x) \in \Pi \setminus A} \lambda^{-|x|} \leq \|\Pi\|_\lambda < 1$.

Given $n > d$, we may iterate this process for all edges $e(x)$ in the cutset with $|x| < n$ until we obtain a cutset Π^* lying between levels n and $n+d$ with $\|\Pi^*\|_\lambda < 1$. Therefore $|T_n| \lambda^{-(n+d)} \leq \|\Pi^*\|_\lambda < 1$, so that $\limsup |T_n|^{1/n} \leq \limsup \lambda^{1+d/n} = \lambda < \lambda_1$. This establishes (2.21).

Now let T be N -subperiodic. Let Γ be the union of disjoint copies of the descendant trees $\{T^x : |x| \leq N\}$ with their roots identified (which is not exactly the same as Example 1.3). It is easy to check that Γ is 0-subperiodic and $\text{gr } \Gamma \geq \overline{\text{gr}} T$. Moreover, for every cutset Π of T with $\min_{e(x) \in \Pi} |x| \geq N$, there is a corresponding cutset Π' of Γ such that

$$\forall \lambda > 0 \quad \|\Pi'\|_\lambda \leq (1 + \lambda + \dots + \lambda^N) \|\Pi\|_\lambda,$$

whence $\text{br } \Gamma = \text{br } T$. In conjunction with (2.22) for Γ , this completes the proof.

Finally, if T has leaves, consider the tree T' obtained from T by adding to each leaf of T an infinite ray. Then T' is subperiodic, so

$$\limsup |T_n|^{1/n} \geq \text{br } T = \text{br } T' = \limsup |T'_n|^{1/n} \geq \limsup |T_n|^{1/n}$$

and every cutset Π of T can be extended to a cutset Π' of T' with $\|\Pi'\|_{\text{br } T}$ arbitrarily close to $\|\Pi\|_{\text{br } T}$. ◀

For another proof of Theorem 2.22, see Section 12.5.

Next, we consider a notion dual to subperiodicity.

DEFINITION. Let $N \geq 0$. A tree T is called **N -superperiodic** if $\forall x \in T$ there is an adjacency-preserving injection $f : T \rightarrow T^{f(o)}$ with $f(o) \in T^x$ and $|f(o)| - |x| \leq N$.

THEOREM 2.23. *Let $N \geq 0$. Any N -superperiodic tree T with $\overline{\text{gr}} T < \infty$ satisfies $\text{br} T = \text{gr} T$ and $|T_n| \leq C(\text{gr} T)^n$ for some constant $C < \infty$ and all n .*

Proof. Consider the case $N = 0$. In this case, $|T_{n+m}| \geq |T_n| \cdot |T_m|$. By Exercise 2.25, $\text{gr} T$ exists and $|T_n| \leq (\text{gr} T)^n$ for all n . Fix any positive integer k . Let θ be the unit flow from o to T_k that is uniform on T_k . By 0-superperiodicity, we can extend θ in a periodic fashion to a flow from o to infinity that satisfies $\theta(e(x)) \leq |T_k|^{-\lfloor |x|/k \rfloor}$ for all vertices x . Consequently, $\text{br} T \geq |T_k|^{1/k}$. Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ completes the proof for $N = 0$. ◀

▷ EXERCISE 2.26.

Prove the case $N > 0$ of Theorem 2.23.

§2.9. Cayley Graphs.

Suppose we investigate RW_λ on graphs other than trees. What does RW_λ mean in this context? Fix a vertex o in a graph G . If e is an edge at distance n from o , let the conductance of e be λ^{-n} . Again, there is a critical value of λ , denoted $\lambda_c(G)$, that separates the transient regime from the recurrent regime. In order to understand what $\lambda_c(G)$ measures, consider the class of spherically symmetric graphs, where we call G **spherically symmetric** about o if for all pairs of vertices x, y at the same distance from o , there is an automorphism of G fixing o that takes x to y . Let \tilde{M}_n be the number of edges that lead from a vertex at distance $n - 1$ from o to a vertex at distance n . Then the critical value of λ is the growth rate of G :

$$\lambda_c(G) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{M}_n^{1/n}.$$

In fact, we have the following more precise criterion for transience:

▷ EXERCISE 2.27.

Show that if G is spherically symmetric about o , then RW_λ is transient iff $\sum_n \lambda^n / \tilde{M}_n < \infty$.

Next, consider the **Cayley graphs** of finitely generated groups: if Γ is a group generated by $\langle g_1, \dots, g_k \rangle$, then we form a graph G with vertices Γ and (unoriented) edges $\{(x, xg_i); x \in G, 1 \leq i \leq k\}$. Because $\langle g_i \rangle$ generates Γ , the graph is connected. Cayley graphs are highly symmetric: they look the same from every vertex since left multiplication by yx^{-1} is an automorphism of G that carries x to y .

In order to present some interesting Cayley graphs to keep in mind besides euclidean lattices, we look at some constructions of groups. First recall the **cartesian** or **direct**

product of two groups Γ and Γ' , where the multiplication on $\Gamma \times \Gamma'$ is defined coordinate-wise: $(\gamma_1, \gamma'_1)(\gamma_2, \gamma'_2) := (\gamma_1\gamma_2, \gamma'_1\gamma'_2)$. A similar definition is made for the direct product of any set of groups. It is convenient to rephrase this definition in terms of presentations. Recall that the group defined by the **presentation** $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ is the quotient of the free group generated by the set S by the normal subgroup generated by the set R , where R consists of finite words in the elements of S . (We think of R as giving a list of products that must equal the identity; other identities are consequences of these ones and of the definition of a group.) For example, the free group on two letters \mathbb{F}_2 is $\langle \{a, b\} \mid \emptyset \rangle$, usually written $\langle a, b \mid \rangle$, while \mathbb{Z}^2 is (isomorphic to) $\langle \{a, b\} \mid \{aba^{-1}b^{-1}\} \rangle$, usually written $\langle a, b \mid aba^{-1}b^{-1} \rangle$, also known as the **free abelian group** on two letters (or of **rank 2**). In this notation, if $\Gamma = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ and $\Gamma' = \langle S' \mid R' \rangle$ with $S \cap S' = \emptyset$, then $\Gamma \times \Gamma' = \langle S \cup S' \mid R \cup R' \cup [S, S'] \rangle$, where $[S, S'] := \{\gamma\gamma'\gamma^{-1}\gamma'^{-1}; \gamma \in S, \gamma' \in S'\}$. On the other hand, the **free product** of Γ and Γ' is $\Gamma * \Gamma' := \langle S \cup S' \mid R \cup R' \rangle$. A similar definition is made for the free product of any set of groups. Write \mathbb{T}_{b+1} for the regular tree of degree $b + 1$ (so it has branching number b). Interesting free products to keep in mind as we examine various phenomena are $\mathbb{Z} * \mathbb{Z}$ (the free group on two letters), $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, $\mathbb{Z} * \mathbb{Z}_2$ (whose Cayley graph is isomorphic to that of $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, i.e., \mathbb{T}_{2+1} , when the usual generators are used), $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_3$, $\mathbb{Z}^2 * \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{Z}^2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, and $\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z}^d$. Some examples of Cayley graphs with respect to natural generating sets appear in Figure 2.3.




Figure 2.3. Some Cayley graphs.

A presentation is called **finite** when it uses only finite sets of generators and relations. For example, $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_3$ has the presentation $\langle a, b \mid a^2, b^3 \rangle$ and the graph of Figure 2.4 is the Cayley graph corresponding to the presentation $\langle a, b, c, d, e \mid a^2, b^2, c^2, d^2, e^2, abcde \rangle$.

Fundamental groups of compact topological manifolds are finitely presentable, and each finitely presentable group is the fundamental group of a compact 4-manifold (see, e.g., Massey (1991), pp. 114-115). Thus, finitely presentable groups arise often “in practice”.




Figure 2.4. A Cayley graph in the hyperbolic disc formed from regular hyperbolic pentagons of interior angle $2\pi/5$.

The fundamental group of a compact manifold is quasi-isometric to the universal cover of the manifold.

Despite the symmetry of Cayley graphs, they are rarely spherically symmetric. Still, if M_n denotes the number of vertices at distance n from the identity, then $\text{gr}(G) := \lim M_n^{1/n}$ exists since $M_{m+n} \leq M_m M_n$; thus, we may apply Fekete’s lemma (Exercise 2.25) to $\langle \log M_n \rangle$. Is $\lambda_c(G) = \lim M_n^{1/n}$?

First of all, if $\lambda > \lim M_n^{1/n}$, then RW_λ is positive recurrent since for such λ ,

$$\sum_{e \in E_{1/2}} c(e) < 2k \sum_{x \in G} \lambda^{-|x|} = 2k \sum_{n \geq 0} M_n \lambda^{-n} < \infty,$$

where $|x|$ denotes the distance of x to the identity. (One could also use the Nash-Williams criterion to get merely recurrence.) To prove transience for a given λ , it suffices, by Rayleigh’s monotonicity principle, to prove that a subgraph is transient. The easiest subgraph to analyze would be a subtree of G , while in order to have the greatest likelihood of being transient, it should be as big as possible, i.e., a **spanning tree** (one that includes every vertex). Here is one: Assume that the inverse of each generator is also in the generating set. For each $x \in G$, there is a unique word $(g_{i_1}, g_{i_2}, \dots, g_{i_n})$ in the generators such that $x = g_{i_1} g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_n}$, $n = |x|$, and $(g_{i_1}, \dots, g_{i_n})$ is **lexicographically minimal** with these properties, i.e., if $(g_{i'_1}, \dots, g_{i'_n})$ is another and m is the first j such that $i_j \neq i'_j$, then $i_m < i'_m$. Call this word w_x . Let T be the subgraph of G containing all vertices and with u adjacent to x when either $|u| + 1 = |x|$ and w_u is an initial segment of w_x or vice versa.

▷ EXERCISE 2.28.

Show that T is a subperiodic tree when rooted at the identity.

Since T is spanning and since distances to the identity in T are the same as in G , we have $\text{gr } T = \lim M_n^{1/n}$. Since T is subperiodic, we have $\text{br } T = \lim M_n^{1/n}$. Hence RW_λ is transient on T for $\lambda < \lim M_n^{1/n}$, whence on G as well. We have proved:

THEOREM 2.24. (LYONS, 1995) *RW_λ on an infinite Cayley graph has critical value λ_c equal to the growth rate of the graph.*

Of course, this theorem makes Cayley graphs look spherically symmetric from a probabilistic point of view. Such a conclusion, however, should not be pushed too far, for there are Cayley graphs with the following very surprising properties; the lamplighter group defined in Section 6.1 is one such. Define the **speed** (or rate of escape) of RW_λ as the limit of the distance from the identity at time n divided by n as $n \rightarrow \infty$, if the limit exists. The speed is monotonically decreasing in λ on spherically symmetric graphs and is positive for any positive λ less than the growth rate. However, there are groups of exponential growth for which the speed of simple random walk is 0. This already shows that the Cayley graph is far from spherically symmetric. Even more surprisingly, on the lamplighter group, which has growth rate $(1 + \sqrt{5})/2$, the speed is 0 at $\lambda = 1$, yet is strictly positive when $1 < \lambda < (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ (Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres, 1996b). Perhaps this is part of a general phenomenon:

Open Question. If G is a Cayley graph and $1 < \lambda < \text{gr}(G)$, must the speed of RW_λ exist and be positive?

Open Question. If T is a spanning tree of a graph G rooted at some vertex o , we call T **geodesic** if $\text{dist}(o, x)$ is the same in T as in G for all vertices x . If T is a geodesic spanning tree of the Cayley graph of a finitely generated group G , is $\text{br } T = \text{gr } G$?

§2.10. Notes.

There is a similar relationship to an electrical framework for reversible diffusions, even on Riemannian manifolds: Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold. Given a function $\sigma(x)$ which is Borel-measurable, locally bounded and locally bounded below, called the **(scalar) conductivity**, we associate the diffusion whose generator is $\left(2\sigma(x)\sqrt{g(x)}\right)^{-1} \sum \partial_i \sigma(x) \sqrt{g(x)} g^{ij}(x) \partial_j$ in coordinates, where the metric is g_{ij} with inverse g^{ij} and determinant g . In coordinate-free notation, this is $(1/2)\Delta + (1/2)\nabla \log \sigma$. In other words, the diffusion is Brownian motion with drift of half the gradient of the log of the conductivity. The main result of Ichihara (1978) [see also the exposition by Durrett (1986), p. 75; Fukushima (1980), Theorem 1.5.1, and Fukushima (1985); or Grigor'yan (1985)] gives the following test for transience, an analogue to Exercise 2.60.

THEOREM 2.25. *On a complete Riemannian manifold, the diffusion corresponding to the scalar conductivity $\sigma(x)$ is transient iff*

$$\inf \left\{ \int |\nabla u(x)|^2 \sigma(x) dx; u \in C_0^\infty(M), u \upharpoonright B_1(0) \equiv 1 \right\} > 0,$$

where dx is the volume form.

A graph G is called an ϵ -**net** of M if the vertices of G form a maximal ϵ -separated subset of M and edges join distinct vertices iff their distance in M is at most 3ϵ . When a conductivity σ is given on M , we assign conductances c to the edges of G by

$$c(u, w) := \int_{B_\epsilon(u)} \sigma(x) dx + \int_{B_\epsilon(w)} \sigma(x) dx.$$

An evident modification of the proof of Theorem 2 of Kanai (1986) shows the following analogue to Theorem 2.15. A manifold M is said to have **bounded geometry** if its Ricci curvature is bounded below and the injectivity radius is positive. If the Ricci curvature is bounded below, then nets have bounded degree (Kanai (1985), Lemma 2.3). We shall say that σ is ϵ -**slowly varying** if

$$\sup\{\sigma(x)/\sigma(y); \text{dist}(x, y) \leq \epsilon\} < \infty.$$

THEOREM 2.26. *Suppose that M is a complete Riemannian manifold of bounded geometry, that ϵ is at most half the injectivity radius of M , that σ is an ϵ -slowly varying Borel-measurable conductivity on M , and that G is an ϵ -net in M . Then the associated diffusion on M is transient iff the associated random walk on G is transient.*

The transformations of a network described in Section 2.3 can be used for several other purposes as well. As we will see (Chapter 8), spanning trees are intimately connected to electrical networks, so it will not be surprising that such network reductions can be used to count the number of spanning trees of a graph. See Colbourn, Provan, and Vertigan (1995) for this, as well as for applications to the Ising model and perfect matchings (also known as domino tilings). For a connection to knot theory, see Goldman and Kauffman (1993).

Denote the growth rate of a group G with respect to a finite generating set F by $\text{gr}_F G$. It is easy to show that if $\text{gr}_F G > 1$ for some generating set, then $\text{gr}_F G > 1$ for every generating set. In this case, is $\inf_F \text{gr}_F G > 1$? For a long time, this question was open. It is known to hold for certain classes of groups, but recently a counterexample was found by Wilson (2004).

§2.11. Additional Exercises.

2.29. Let G be a transient network and $x, y \in V$. Show that

$$\pi(x)\mathbf{P}_x[\tau_y < \infty]\mathcal{G}(y, y) = \pi(y)\mathbf{P}_y[\tau_x < \infty]\mathcal{G}(x, x).$$

2.30. Given a finite graph G and two of its vertices a and z , let $i_c(\bullet)$ be the unit current flow from a to z when conductances $c(\bullet)$ are assigned to the edges. Show that i_c is a continuous function of $c(\bullet)$.

2.31. If h is a strictly positive function that is harmonic at every vertex of a network G , there is another Markov chain associated to h called **Doob's h -transform**; its transition probabilities are defined to be $p_{xy}^h := p_{xy}h(y)/h(x)$. Check that these are indeed transition probabilities for a Markov chain. Find corresponding conductances.

2.32. Show that on every finite network $|\mathbf{E}[S_{xy}] - \mathbf{E}[S_{yx}]| \leq 1$ for all x, y , where S_{xy} is defined as in Proposition 2.2.

2.33. When a voltage is imposed so that a unit current flows from a to Z in a finite network and $v \upharpoonright Z \equiv 0$, show that the expected total number of times an edge $[x, y]$ is crossed by a random walk starting at a and absorbed at Z equals $c(x, y)[v(x) + v(y)]$.

2.34. Show that $\mathbf{E}_a[\tau_Z] = \sum_{x \in V} \pi(x)v(x)$ when a voltage is imposed so that a unit current flows from a to Z in a finite network and $v \upharpoonright Z \equiv 0$.

2.35. Let G be a network such that $\gamma := \sum_{e \in G} c(e) < \infty$ (for example, G could be finite). For every vertex $a \in G$, show that the expected time for a random walk started at a to return to a is $2\gamma/\pi(a)$.

2.36. Let G be a network such that $\gamma := \sum_{e \in G} c(e) < \infty$ and let a and z be two vertices of G . Let $x \sim y$ in G . Show that the expected number of transitions from x to y for a random walk started at a and stopped at the first return to a that occurs after visiting z is $c(x, y)\mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow z)$. This is, of course, invariant under multiplication of the edge conductances by a constant.

2.37. Let G be a network such that $\gamma := \sum_{e \in G} c(e) < \infty$ and let a and z be two vertices of G . Show that the expected time for a random walk started at a to visit z and then return to a , the so-called “commute time” between a and z , is $2\gamma\mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow z)$.

2.38. Show that if G is a recurrent network, then there are no bounded harmonic functions on G other than the constants.

2.39. Prove that if $\langle X_n \rangle$ and $\langle X'_n \rangle$ are independent simple random walks on a transient tree, then a.s. they converge to distinct rays.

2.40. Let $\langle X_n \rangle$ be a Markov chain and Z be a set of states such that $\tau_Z < \infty$ a.s. The distribution of X_{τ_Z} is called **harmonic measure** on Z . In the case that $\langle X_n \rangle$ is a random walk on a network $G = (V, E)$ starting from a vertex a and $Z \subseteq V$ is finite, let μ be harmonic measure and define

$$\nu(x) := \mathbf{P}_x[\tau_a < \tau_Z^+]$$

for $x \in Z$.

(a) Show that

$$\mu(x) = \mathbf{P}_a[\tau_x < \tau_{Z \setminus \{x\}} \mid \tau_Z < \tau_a^+]$$

for $x \in Z$.


(b) Show that the measures μ and $\pi(\cdot)\nu$ are proportional.

2.41. Let G be a transient network with a fixed vertex, a . Fix $z \in (0, 1)$. Add a new vertex, Δ , which is joined to each vertex x with an edge of conductance $w(x)$ chosen so that at x , the probability of taking a step to Δ is equal to z . Call the new network G' . Define the effective conductance between a and $\{\Delta, \infty\}$ to be the limit of the effective conductance between a and $G' \setminus G_n$, where G_n is an exhaustion of G (not of G'). Let $\pi'(a)$ denote the sum of the conductances at a in G' . Prove that the limit defining the effective conductance between a and $\{\Delta, \infty\}$ exists and is equal to $\pi'(a)$ times


$$\sum_{k \geq 0} p_k z^k,$$

where p_k is the probability that the network random walk on G (not on G') starting from a is back at a at time k . The series above is the generating function for the return probabilities and is sometimes called the “Green function”, despite the other notion of Green function defined in this chapter.


2.42. In the following networks, each edge has unit conductance. (More exercises can be found in Doyle and Snell (1984).)



What are $\mathbf{P}_x[\tau_a < \tau_z]$, $\mathbf{P}_a[\tau_x < \tau_z]$, and $\mathbf{P}_z[\tau_x < \tau_a]$?



What is $\mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow z)$? (Or: show a sequence of transformations that could be used to calculate $\mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow z)$.)



What is $\mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow z)$? (Or: show a sequence of transformations that could be used to calculate $\mathcal{C}(a \leftrightarrow z)$.)

2.43. Let H be a set of vertices in G . Let $j \in \ell^2_-(\mathbf{E})$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^n j(e_i)r(e_i) = 0$ whenever $\langle e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n \rangle$ is a cycle; and $d^*j \upharpoonright (G \setminus H) = 0$. According to Exercise 2.2, the values of $d^*j \upharpoonright H$ determine j uniquely. Show that the map $d^*j \upharpoonright H \mapsto j$ is linear. This is another form of the superposition principle.

2.44. A **cut** in a graph G is a set of edges of the form $\{\langle x, y \rangle; x \in A, y \notin A\}$ for some proper non-empty vertex set A of G . Show that for every finite network G , the linear span of $\{\sum_{e \in W} c(e)\chi^e; W \text{ is a cut of } G\}$ equals the star space.

2.45. Let G be a finite network. Show that if a unit-voltage battery is connected between a and z , then the current flow from a to z is the projection of the star at a on the orthocomplement of the span of all the other stars except that at z .

2.46. Given disjoint vertex sets A, Z in a finite network, we may express the effective resistance between A and Z by Thomson's Principle as

$$\mathcal{R}(A \leftrightarrow Z) = \min \left\{ \sum_{e \in \mathbf{E}_{1/2}} r(e)i(e)^2; i \text{ is a unit flow from } A \text{ to } Z \right\}.$$

Prove the following dual expressions for the effective conductance:

(a) (Dirichlet's principle)

$$\mathcal{C}(A \leftrightarrow Z) = \min \left\{ \sum_{e \in \mathbf{E}_{1/2}} c(e)dF(e)^2 \right\},$$

where F is a function that is 1 on A and 0 on Z .

(b) (Extremal length)

$$\mathcal{C}(A \leftrightarrow Z) = \min \left\{ \sum_{e \in \mathbf{E}_{1/2}} c(e)\ell(e)^2 \right\},$$

where ℓ is an assignment of nonnegative lengths so that the minimum distance from every point in A to every point in Z is 1.

2.47. Extend part (a) of Exercise 2.46 to the full form of Dirichlet's principle in the finite setting: Let $A \subset \mathbf{V}$ and let $F_0 : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given. Let $F : \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the extension of F_0 that is harmonic at each vertex not in A . Then F is the unique extension of F_0 that minimizes $\mathcal{E}(c dF)$.

2.48. Show that R_{eff} is a concave function of the collection of resistances $\langle r(e) \rangle$.

2.49. Show that C_{eff} is a concave function of the collection of conductances $\langle c(e) \rangle$.

2.50. Show that in every finite network, for every three vertices u, x and w , we have

$$\mathcal{R}(u \leftrightarrow x) + \mathcal{R}(x \leftrightarrow w) \geq \mathcal{R}(u \leftrightarrow w).$$

2.51. Show that in every finite network, for every three vertices a, x, z , we have

$$\mathbf{P}_x[\tau_z < \tau_a] = \frac{\mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow x) - \mathcal{R}(x \leftrightarrow z) + \mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow z)}{2\mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow z)}.$$

2.52. Show that in every finite network,

$$\mathbf{E}_a[\tau_z] = (1/2) \sum_{u \in V} \pi(u) [\mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow z) + \mathcal{R}(z \leftrightarrow u) - \mathcal{R}(u \leftrightarrow a)].$$

2.53. Show the following quantitative form of Rayleigh's Monotonicity Law in every finite network: if $r(e)$ denotes the resistance of the edge e and i is the unit current flow, then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r(e)} R_{\text{eff}} = i(e)^2.$$

2.54. Show that if a unit voltage is imposed between two vertices of a finite network, then for each fixed edge e , we have that $|dv(e)|$ is a decreasing function of $c(e)$.

2.55. Give another proof of Rayleigh's Monotonicity Law using Exercise 2.46.

2.56. It follows from (2.13) that the function $\theta \mapsto \mathcal{E}(\theta)$ is convex. Show the stronger statement that $\theta \mapsto \mathcal{E}(\theta)^{1/2}$ is a convex function. Why is this a stronger inequality?

2.57. Let i be the unit current flow from a to z on a finite graph or from a to ∞ on a transient infinite graph. Consider the random walk started at a and stopped at z . Let S_e be the number of times the edge e is traversed.

(a) Show that $i(e) = \mathbf{E}[S_e - S_{\bar{e}} \mid \tau_a^+ < \infty]$.

(b) Show that if $e^- = a$, then $i(e)$ is the probability that e is traversed following the last visit to a .

2.58. Deduce from Proposition 2.11 an analogous statement for recurrent networks: Let G be a recurrent network with two vertices a and z . Let G_n be finite subgraphs containing a and z that exhaust G . Contract the vertices outside G_n to z_n , forming $G^{(n)}$. Let i_n be the unit current flow in $G^{(n)}$ from a to z . Then $\langle i_n \rangle$ has a pointwise limit i on G which is the unique unit flow on G from a to z of minimum energy. Let v_n be the voltages on $G^{(n)}$. Then $v := \lim v_n$ exists on G and has the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} dv &= ir, \\ v(a) &= \mathcal{E}(i) = \mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow z), \\ \forall x \quad v(x)/v(a) &= \mathbf{P}_x[\tau_a < \tau_z]. \end{aligned}$$

Start a random walk at a and stop it at z . For all vertices $x \neq z$, the expected number of visits to x is $\pi(x)v(x)$. For all edges e , the expected signed number of crossings of e is $i(e)$.

2.59. Let G be a transient network and $\langle X_n \rangle$ the corresponding random walk. Show that if v is the unit voltage between a and ∞ (with $v(a) = 1$), then $v(X_n) \rightarrow 0$ a.s.

2.60. Show that if G is infinite and A is a finite subset of vertices, then

$$\inf \left\{ \sum_{e \in E_{1/2}} dF(e)^2 c(e); F \upharpoonright A \equiv 1 \quad \text{and } F \text{ has finite support} \right\} = \mathcal{C}(A \leftrightarrow \infty).$$

2.61. There are two other versions of the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem that are useful. We state them for directed networks using the notation of our proof of the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem.

- (a) Suppose that each vertex x is given a capacity $c(x)$, meaning that a flow θ satisfies $\theta(e) \geq 0$ for all edges e and for all x other than the sources A and sinks Z , $\sum_{e \in E} \phi(x, e)\theta(e) = 0$ and $\sum_{e^+ = x} \theta(e) \leq c(x)$. A cutset now consists of vertices that intersect every directed path from A to Z . Show that the maximum possible flow from A to Z equals the minimum cutset sum of the capacities.
- (b) Suppose that each edge and each vertex has a capacity, with the restrictions that both of these imply. A cutset now consists of both vertices and edges. Again, show that the maximum possible flow from A to Z equals the minimum cutset sum of the capacities.

2.62. Show that if all the edge capacities $c(e)$ in a network are integers, then there is a flow θ of maximal strength such that all $\theta(e)$ are also integers. Show the same for networks with capacities assigned to the vertices or to both edges and vertices, as in Exercise 2.61.

2.63. (Menger's Theorem) Let a and z be vertices in a graph that are not adjacent. Show that the maximum number paths from a to z that are pairwise disjoint (except at a and z) is equal to the minimum cardinality of a set W of vertices such that every path from a to z passes through W .

2.64. Show that the maximum possible flow from A to Z (in an undirected network) also equals

$$\min \left\{ \sum_{e \in E_{1/2}} c(e)\ell(e) \right\},$$

where ℓ is an assignment of nonnegative lengths so that the minimum distance from every point in A to every point in Z is 1.

2.65. Find a counterexample to the converse of the Nash-Williams criterion. More specifically, find a tree of bounded degree on which simple random walk is recurrent, yet every sequence $\langle \Pi_n \rangle$ of pairwise disjoint cutsets satisfies $\sum_n |\Pi_n|^{-1} < \infty$.

2.66. Show that if $\langle \Pi_n \rangle$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint cutsets of a tree T without leaves, then $\sum_n |\Pi_n|^{-1} \leq \sum_n |T_n|^{-1}$.

2.67. Give a probabilistic proof as follows of the Nash-Williams criterion in case the cutsets are nested as in Remark 2.12.

- (a) Show that it suffices to prove the criterion for all networks but only for cutsets that consist of all edges incident to some set of vertices.
- (b) Let Π_n be the set of edges incident to the set of vertices W_n . Let A_n be the event that a random walk starting at a visits W_n exactly once before returning to a . Let μ_n be the distribution of the first vertex of W_n visited by a random walk started at a . Show that

$$\mathbf{P}[A_n] \geq \mathcal{G}(a, a)^{-1} \sum_{x \in W_n} \pi(x)^{-1} \mu_n(x)^2 \geq \mathcal{G}(a, a)^{-1} \left(\sum_{x \in W_n} \pi(x) \right)^{-1} = \mathcal{G}(a, a)^{-1} \left(\sum_{e \in \Pi_n} c(e) \right)^{-1}.$$

- (c) Conclude by Borel-Cantelli.

2.68. Give another proof of Theorem 2.15 by using Exercise 2.60.

2.69. Let (G, r) and (G', r') be two finite networks. Let $\phi : (G, r) \rightarrow (G', r')$ be an (α, β) -rough embedding. Show that for all vertices $x, y \in G$, we have $\mathcal{R}(\phi(x) \leftrightarrow \phi(y)) \leq \alpha\beta\mathcal{R}(x \leftrightarrow y)$.

2.70. Let G be a finite network and a and z be two of its vertices. Show that $\mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow z)$ is the minimum of $\sum_{e \in E_{1/2}} r(e) \mathbf{P}[e \in \mathcal{P}]^2$ over all probability measures \mathbf{P} on paths \mathcal{P} from a to z .

2.71. Let G be a finite graph and a, z be two vertices of G . Let the edges be labelled by positive resistances $r(\bullet)$. Two players, a passenger and a troll, simultaneously pick edge-simple paths from a to z . The passenger then pays the troll the sum of $\pm r(e)$ for all the edges e common to both paths; if e is traversed in the same direction by the two paths, then the $+$ sign is used, otherwise the $-$ sign is used. Show that the troll has a strategy of picking a random path in such a way that no matter what path is picked by the passenger, the troll's gain has expectation equal to the effective resistance between a to z . Show further that the passenger has a similar strategy that has expected loss equal to $\mathcal{R}(a \leftrightarrow z)$ no matter what the troll does.

2.72. Let T be a locally finite tree and Π be a cutset separating o from ∞ . Show that there is a finite cutset $\Pi' \subseteq \Pi$ separating o from ∞ that does not properly contain any other cutset.

2.73. Show that a network (T, c) on a tree is transient iff there exists a function F on the vertices of T such that $F \geq 0$, $\forall e \ dF(e) \geq 0$, and $\inf_{\Pi} \sum_{e \in \Pi} dF(e)c(e) > 0$.

2.74. Given a tree T and $k \geq 1$, form the tree $T^{[k]}$ by taking the vertices x of T for which $|x|$ is a multiple of k and joining x and y in $T^{[k]}$ when their distance is k in T . Show that $\text{br } T^{[k]} = (\text{br } T)^k$.

2.75. Show that RW_λ is positive recurrent on a tree T if $\lambda > \overline{\text{gr}} T$.

2.76. Let $U(T)$ be the set of unit flows on a tree T (from o to ∞). For $\theta \in U(T)$, define its **Frostman exponent** to be

$$\text{Frost}(\theta) := \liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \theta(x)^{-1/|x|}.$$

Show that

$$\text{br } T = \sup_{\theta \in U(T)} \text{Frost}(\theta).$$

2.77. Let $k \geq 1$. Show that if T is a 0-periodic (resp., 0-subperiodic) tree, then for all vertices x with $|x| \geq k$, there is an adjacency-preserving bijection (resp., injection) $f : T^x \rightarrow T$ with $|f(x)| = k$.

2.78. Given a finite *directed* multigraph G , one can also define another covering tree by using as vertices all directed paths of the form $\langle x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$ or $\langle x_{-n}, \dots, x_{-1}, x_0 \rangle$, with the former a child of $\langle x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1} \rangle$ and the latter a child of $\langle x_{-(n-1)}, \dots, x_{-1}, x_0 \rangle$. Show that this tree is also periodic.

2.79. Given an integer $k \geq 0$, construct a periodic tree T with $|T_n|$ approximately equal to n^k for all n .

2.80. Show that critical homesick random walk (i.e., $\text{RW}_{\text{br}T}$) is recurrent on each periodic tree.

2.81. Construct a subperiodic tree for which critical homesick random walk (i.e., $\text{RW}_{\text{br}T}$) is transient.

2.82. Let $N \geq 0$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$. Identify the binary tree with the set of all finite sequences of 0's and 1's. Let T be the subtree of the binary tree which contains the vertex corresponding to (x_1, \dots, x_n) iff $\forall k \leq n \sum_{i=1}^k x_i \leq \alpha(n + N)$. Show that T is N -superperiodic but not $(N - 1)$ -superperiodic. Also, determine $\text{br}T$.

2.83. We have defined the right Cayley graph of a finitely generated group and noted that left multiplication is a graph automorphism. The left Cayley graph is defined similarly. Show that the right and left Cayley graphs are isomorphic.

Chapter 3

Infinite Electrical Networks and Dirichlet Functions

§3.1. Free and Wired Electrical Currents.

We have been defining electrical current on infinite networks via limits of currents on finite subgraphs. It turns out that there is a second natural way of taking limits. These two currents will be important to our study of random spanning forests in Chapter 9. Our approach in this section will be to give definitions of both these currents using Hilbert space; then we will show how they correspond to limits of currents on finite subgraphs.

Let (G, c) be a network such that $\sum_{y \sim x} c([x, y]) < \infty$ for each vertex $x \in G$, so that the stars of G have finite energy (and the network random walk is defined on G). Let \star denote the closure of the linear span of the stars and \diamond the closure of the linear span of the cycles of a graph $G = (V, E)$. Since every star and every cycle are orthogonal, it is still true that $\star \perp \diamond$. However, it is no longer necessarily the case that $\ell^2_-(E) = \star \oplus \diamond$. Thus, we are led to define two possibly different currents,

$$i_{\mathbb{F}}^e := P_{\diamond}^{\perp} \chi^e, \tag{3.1}$$

the **unit free current** between the endpoints of e (also called the “limit current”), and

$$i_{\mathbb{W}}^e := P_{\star} \chi^e, \tag{3.2}$$

the **unit wired current** between the endpoints of e (also called the “minimal current”).

▷ EXERCISE 3.1.

Calculate $i_{\mathbb{F}}^e$ and $i_{\mathbb{W}}^e$ in a regular tree.

The names for these currents are explained by the following two propositions.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Let G be an infinite network exhausted by finite subnetworks $\langle G_n \rangle$. Let e be an edge in G_1 and i_n be the unit current flow in G_n from e^- to e^+ . Then $\|i_n - i_{\mathbb{F}}^e\|_r \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\mathcal{E}(i_{\mathbb{F}}^e) = i_{\mathbb{F}}^e(e)r(e)$.*

Proof. Decompose $\ell_-^2(\mathbf{E}_n) = \star_n \oplus \diamond_n$ on G_n into the spaces spanned by the stars and cycles in G_n and recall that $i_n = \chi^e - P_{\diamond_n} \chi^e$. We may regard the spaces \diamond_n as lying in $\ell_-^2(\mathbf{E})$, where they form an increasing sequence. (Each cycle in G_n lies in G_{n+1} , but the same is not true of the stars.) Note that the projection on \diamond_n of any element of $\ell_-^2(\mathbf{E}_n)$ is the same as its projection on \diamond_n in $\ell_-^2(\mathbf{E})$ since $\chi^f \perp \ell_-^2(\mathbf{E}_n)$ for $f \in \mathbf{E} \setminus \mathbf{E}_n$. Thus, the fact that $\|i_n - i_{\mathbb{F}}^e\|_r \rightarrow 0$ follows from the standard result given below in Exercise 3.2. Also, we have that

$$i_{\mathbb{F}}^e(e)r(e) = (i_{\mathbb{F}}^e, \chi^e)_r = (i_{\mathbb{F}}^e, P_{\diamond}^{\perp} \chi^e)_r = \mathcal{E}(i_{\mathbb{F}}^e). \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

▷ EXERCISE 3.2.

Let H_n be increasing closed subspaces of a Hilbert space H and P_n be the orthogonal projection on H_n . Let P be the orthogonal projection on the closure of $\bigcup H_n$. Show that for all $u \in H$, we have $\|P_n u - P u\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Let G be an infinite network exhausted by finite subnetworks $\langle G_n \rangle$. Let G_n^W formed by identifying the complement of G_n to a single vertex. Let e be an edge in G_1 and i_n be the unit current flow in G_n^W from e^- to e^+ . Then $\|i_n - i_{\mathbb{W}}^e\|_r \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\mathcal{E}(i_{\mathbb{W}}^e) = i_{\mathbb{W}}^e(e)r(e)$, which is the minimal energy among all unit flows from e^- to e^+ .*

▷ EXERCISE 3.3.

Prove Proposition 3.2.

Since $\mathcal{E}(i_{\mathbb{W}}^e) \leq \mathcal{E}(i_{\mathbb{F}}^e)$ with equality iff $i_{\mathbb{W}}^e = i_{\mathbb{F}}^e$, we get that $i_{\mathbb{W}}^e(e) \leq i_{\mathbb{F}}^e(e)$ with equality iff $i_{\mathbb{W}}^e = i_{\mathbb{F}}^e$.

PROPOSITION 3.3. *For any network, $i_{\mathbb{W}}^e = i_{\mathbb{F}}^e$ for every edge e iff $\ell_-^2(\mathbf{E}) = \star \oplus \diamond$.*

Proof. Note that $\ell_-^2(\mathbf{E}) = \star \oplus \diamond$ is equivalent to $P_{\star} = P_{\diamond}^{\perp}$. Since $\{\chi^e; e \in \mathbf{E}_{1/2}\}$ is a basis for $\ell_-^2(\mathbf{E})$, this is also equivalent to $P_{\star} \chi^e = P_{\diamond}^{\perp} \chi^e$ for all edges e , as desired. \blacktriangleleft

We call $\|i_{\mathbb{F}}^e\|_r^2$ and $\|i_{\mathbb{W}}^e\|_r^2$ the **free** and **wired effective resistance**, respectively, of (G, c) between the endpoints of e . Note that these are equal to the limits of $\|i_n\|_r^2$ on G_n or G_n^W , respectively, since for any sequence of vectors u_n converging in norm to a vector u , we have $\|u_n\| \rightarrow \|u\|$; indeed, $|\|u_n\| - \|u\|| \leq \|u_n - u\|$ by the triangle inequality. More generally, if e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n is an oriented path from a to z , then the **free effective**

resistance between a and z is defined to be $\|\sum_{i=1}^n i_F^{e_i}\|_r^2$, and likewise for the wired analogue.

▷ EXERCISE 3.4.

Show that the choice of path from a to z does not influence the effective resistance.

§3.2. Planar Duality.

Planar graphs are generally the only ones we can draw in a nice way and gaze at. That is one good reason for studying them separately. But a more important reason is that they often exhibit special behavior, as we will see, and there are special techniques available as well. In this section, we define the basic notions of duality for planar graphs and show how the dual graphs give related electrical networks.

If G is a graph drawn in the plane in such a way that edges do not cross and such that each bounded set in the plane contains only finitely many vertices of G , then G is said to be **properly embedded** in the plane. We will always assume without further mention that planar graphs are properly embedded. If G is a planar (multi)graph, then the **planar dual** G^\dagger of G (really, of this particular embedding of G) is the (multi)graph formed as follows: The vertices of G^\dagger are the faces formed by G . Two faces of G are joined by an edge in G^\dagger precisely when they share an edge in G . Thus, $E(G)$ and $E(G^\dagger)$ are in a natural one-to-one correspondence. Furthermore, if one draws each vertex of G^\dagger in the interior of the corresponding face of G and each edge of G^\dagger so that it crosses the corresponding edge of G , then the dual of G^\dagger is G .

We choose orientations of the edges so that for $e \in \mathbf{E}$, the corresponding edge e^\dagger of the dual crosses e from right to left as viewed from the direction of e . Thus, the orientation of the pair (e, e^\dagger) is the same as that of \mathbb{R}^2 .

If conductances $c(e)$ are assigned to the edges e of G , then we define the conductance $c(e^\dagger)$ of e^\dagger to be the *resistance* $r(e)$. In this case, we shall assume without mention that G is such that $\sum_{y \sim x} c([x, y]) < \infty$ for each vertex $x \in G^\dagger$, so that the stars of G^\dagger have finite energy.

The bijection $e \mapsto e^\dagger$ provides a natural isometric isomorphism $\dagger : \ell_-^2(E(G)) \rightarrow \ell_-^2(E(G^\dagger))$ via $f^\dagger(e^\dagger) := r(e)f(e)$. That is, $f \mapsto f^\dagger$ is a linear map such that for all $f, g \in \ell_-^2(E(G))$, we have $f^\dagger \in \ell_-^2(E(G^\dagger))$ and $\sum_{e \in E(G)} f(e)g(e)r(e) = \sum_{e \in E(G^\dagger)} f^\dagger(e)g^\dagger(e)r(e)$.

It is clear that if f is a star in $\ell_-^2(E(G))$, then f^\dagger is a cycle in $\ell_-^2(E(G^\dagger))$. Indeed, it is easy to see that \dagger induces an isomorphism from the star space on G to the cycle space

on G^\dagger and from the cycle space on G to the star space on G^\dagger . For an edge $e \in G$, consider the orthogonal decomposition

$$\chi^e = i_{\mathbb{W}}^e + f,$$

where $i_{\mathbb{W}}^e \in \star(G)$ and $f \in \star(G)^\perp$. Applying the map \dagger , we obtain

$$r(e)\chi^{e^\dagger} = (\chi^e)^\dagger = (i_{\mathbb{W}}^e)^\dagger + f^\dagger,$$

whence

$$\chi^{e^\dagger} = c(e)(i_{\mathbb{W}}^e)^\dagger + c(e)f^\dagger,$$

where the first term on the right is a vector in $\diamond(G^\dagger)$ and the second is in $\diamond(G^\dagger)^\perp$. It follows from the definition (3.1) that

$$i_{\mathbb{F}}^{e^\dagger} = c(e)f^\dagger = c(e)[(\chi^e)^\dagger - (i_{\mathbb{W}}^e)^\dagger] = \chi^{e^\dagger} - c(e)(i_{\mathbb{W}}^e)^\dagger.$$

Likewise, one can check that

$$i_{\mathbb{W}}^{e^\dagger} = \chi^{e^\dagger} - c(e)(i_{\mathbb{F}}^e)^\dagger.$$

In particular, we obtain

$$i_{\mathbb{F}}^{e^\dagger}(e^\dagger) = \chi^{e^\dagger}(e^\dagger) - c(e)(i_{\mathbb{W}}^e)^\dagger(e^\dagger) = 1 - c(e)r(e)i_{\mathbb{W}}^e(e) = 1 - i_{\mathbb{W}}^e(e) \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$i_{\mathbb{W}}^{e^\dagger}(e^\dagger) = 1 - i_{\mathbb{F}}^e(e).$$

This has the following interesting consequence:

PROPOSITION 3.4. *Let G be an infinite planar network and $[a, z]$ be an edge of G . Let the dual edge be $[b, y]$. Suppose that the graph G' obtained by deleting the edge $[a, z]$ from G is connected and that the graph $(G^\dagger)'$ obtained by deleting the edge $[b, y]$ is connected. Then the free effective resistance between a and z in G' equals the wired effective conductance between b and y in $(G^\dagger)'$.*

▷ **EXERCISE 3.5.**

Prove Proposition 3.4.

§3.3. Harmonic Dirichlet Functions.

Here we give some conditions for equality of wired and free current.

Define the **gradient** of a function f on \mathbf{V} to be the antisymmetric function

$$\nabla f := c df$$

on \mathbf{E} . (Thinking of resistance of an edge as its length makes this a natural name.) Define the space of **Dirichlet** functions

$$\mathbf{D} := \{f; \nabla f \in \ell^2_-(\mathbf{E})\}.$$

Given a vertex $o \in \mathbf{V}$, we use the inner product on \mathbf{D}

$$\langle f, g \rangle := f(o)g(o) + (\nabla f, \nabla g)_r = f(o)g(o) + (df, dg)_c.$$

This makes \mathbf{D} a Hilbert space. The quantity $\|df\|_c^2$ is called the **Dirichlet energy** of f .^{*} Of course, the constant functions, which we identify as \mathbb{R} , lie in \mathbf{D} . Since it is the gradient of a function that matters most here, we usually work with \mathbf{D}/\mathbb{R} using the inner product

$$\langle f + \mathbb{R}, g + \mathbb{R} \rangle := (df, dg)_c.$$

Then \mathbf{D}/\mathbb{R} is a Hilbert space.

Recall that \star denotes the closed span of the stars in $\ell^2_-(\mathbf{E})$ and \diamond the closed span of the cycles in $\ell^2_-(\mathbf{E})$. Then the gradient map $\nabla : \mathbf{D}/\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \diamond^\perp$ is an isometry. Just as we reasoned in Section 2.4, an element $\theta \in (\star \oplus \diamond)^\perp$ is the gradient of a harmonic function $f \in \mathbf{D}$. Thus, if \mathbf{HD} denotes the set of $f \in \mathbf{D}$ that are harmonic, we have the orthogonal decomposition

$$\ell^2_-(\mathbf{E}) = \star \oplus \diamond \oplus \nabla \mathbf{HD}. \tag{3.4}$$

Since $\ell^2_-(\mathbf{E}) = \star \oplus \diamond$ iff $\nabla \mathbf{HD} = \mathbf{0}$ iff $\mathbf{HD} = \mathbb{R}$, we may add the condition that there are no nonconstant harmonic Dirichlet functions to those in Proposition 3.3:

THEOREM 3.5. (DOYLE, 1988) *Let G be a denumerable network. $\mathbf{HD} = \mathbb{R}$ iff $i_{\mathbf{W}}^e = i_{\mathbf{F}}^e$ for each $e \in \mathbf{E}$.*

Doyle's theorem is often stated another way as a criterion for uniqueness of currents. We call the elements i of \diamond^\perp **currents** (with sources where $d^*i > 0$ and sinks where $d^*i < 0$). We say that **currents are unique** if whenever i, i' are currents with $d^*i = d^*i'$, we have $i = i'$. Observe that by subtraction and by (2.7), this is the same as saying that $\mathbf{HD} = \mathbb{R}$.

Let \mathbf{D}_0 be the closure in \mathbf{D} of the set of $f \in \mathbf{D}$ with finite support.

* The classical Dirichlet energy of a smooth function f in a domain Ω is $\int_\Omega |\nabla f|^2 dA$, where dA is area measure.

▷ EXERCISE 3.6.

- (a) Show that $\nabla \mathbf{D}_0 = \star$.
- (b) Show that $\mathbf{D}/\mathbb{R} = \mathbf{D}_0/\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbf{HD}/\mathbb{R}$ if $\mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathbf{D}_0$ and $\mathbf{D}/\mathbb{R} = \mathbf{D}_0 \oplus \mathbf{HD}/\mathbb{R}$ otherwise.
- (c) Show that currents are unique iff $\mathbf{D}/\mathbb{R} = \mathbf{D}_0/\mathbb{R}$.
- (d) Show that $\|\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{D}_0\|_{\mathbf{D}}^2 = \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)/[1 + \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)]$.
- (e) Show that G is recurrent iff $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbf{D}_0$ iff $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}_0$. In particular, currents are unique if G is recurrent.
- (f) (Royden Decomposition) Show that if G is transient, then every $f \in \mathbf{D}$ has a unique decomposition $f = g + h$ with $g \in \mathbf{D}_0$ and $h \in \mathbf{HD}$. Note that this is not an orthogonal decomposition.
- (g) With the assumptions and notation of part (f), show that $g(x) = (\nabla f, i_x)_r$ and that $|g(x)|^2 \leq \|df\|_c^2 \mathcal{G}(x, x)/\pi(x)$, where i_x is the unit current flow from x to infinity and $\mathcal{G}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Green function.
- (h) Show that if G is transient, then $\nabla : \mathbf{D}_0 \rightarrow \star$ is invertible with bounded inverse.

The following criterion generalizing a result of Thomassen (1989) is analogous to the Nash-Williams criterion. It shows that connectedness of cutsets, rather than their size, can determine whether currents are unique. Let $\mathcal{R}(x \leftrightarrow y; A)$ denote the effective resistance between vertices x and y in a finite network A . We will use this when A is a subnetwork of G ; in this case, the effective resistance is computed purely in terms of the network A . Let

$$D(A) := \sup\{\mathcal{R}(x \leftrightarrow y; A); x, y \in A\}$$

be the “effective-resistance diameter” of A . Note that in the case of unit conductances on the edges, $D(A)$ is at most the graph diameter of A .

THEOREM 3.6. *If $\langle W_n \rangle$ is a sequence of pairwise edge-disjoint finite subnetworks of a network G such that each vertex is separated from ∞ by all but finitely many W_n and such that*

$$\sum_n 1/D(W_n) = \infty,$$

then G has unique currents.

Proof. Let f be any nonconstant harmonic function. Take an edge e_0 whose endpoints have different values for f , i.e., $df(e_0) \neq 0$. Suppose that W_n separates e_0 from infinity for $n \geq n_0$. Let H_n be the set of vertices that W_n separates from infinity, including the vertices of W_n . Let x_n and y_n be points of H_n where f takes its maximum and minimum on H_n . By the maximum principle, we may assume that $x_n, y_n \in W_n$. Thus,

for $n \geq n_0$, we have $f(x_n) - f(y_n) \geq |df(e_0)|$. Define F_n on \mathbf{V} to be the function $F_n := (f - f(y_n))/(f(x_n) - f(y_n))$. Then $|dF| \leq |df|/|df(e_0)|$. By Dirichlet's principle (Exercise 2.46), we have

$$1/D(W_n) \leq \mathcal{C}(x_n \leftrightarrow y_n; W_n) \leq \sum_{e \in W_n} c(e)dF_n(e)^2 \leq \sum_{e \in W_n} c(e)df(e)^2/df(e_0)^2.$$

Since edges of the networks W_n are disjoint, it follows that

$$\sum_{n \geq n_0} 1/D(W_n) \leq \sum_{n \geq n_0} \sum_{e \in W_n} c(e)df(e)^2/df(e_0)^2 \leq \langle f, f \rangle / df(e_0)^2.$$

Therefore our hypothesis implies that f is not Dirichlet. ◀

▷ EXERCISE 3.7.

One can define the product of two networks in various ways. For example, given two networks $G_i = (\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{E}_i)$ with conductances c_i ($i = 1, 2$), define the **cartesian product** $G = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$ with conductances c by $\mathbf{V} := \mathbf{V}_1 \times \mathbf{V}_2$, $\mathbf{E} := (\mathbf{V}_1 \times \mathbf{E}_2) \cup (\mathbf{E}_1 \times \mathbf{V}_2)$, by which we mean

$$\{((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)); (x_1 = y_1, (x_2, y_2) \in \mathbf{E}_2) \text{ or } ((x_1, y_1) \in \mathbf{E}_1, x_2 = y_2)\},$$

and

$$c((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)) := \begin{cases} c(x_2, y_2) & \text{if } x_1 = y_1, \\ c(x_1, y_1) & \text{if } x_2 = y_2. \end{cases}$$

Show that if G_i are infinite graphs with unit conductances, then G has unique currents.

If one network is “similar” to another, must they both have unique currents or both not? One such case that is easy to decide is a graph with two assignments on conductances, c and c' . If $c \asymp c'$, then c has unique currents iff c' does. Indeed, from Exercise 3.6, currents are unique iff the functions with finite support span a dense subspace of \mathbf{D}/\mathbb{R} . Since the two norms on \mathbf{D}/\mathbb{R} for the different conductances c and c' are equivalent, density is the same for both. This has a useful generalization due to Soardi (1993). Given two graphs $G = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$ and $G' = (\mathbf{V}', \mathbf{E}')$, call a function $\phi : \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}'$ a **rough isometry** if there are positive constants α and β such that for all $x, y \in \mathbf{V}$,

$$\alpha d(x, y) - \alpha \leq d'(\phi(x), \phi(y)) \leq \beta d(x, y) + \beta \tag{3.5}$$

and such that every vertex in G' is within distance β of the image of \mathbf{V} . Here, d and d' denote the usual graph distances on G and G' . Being roughly isometric is an equivalence relation.

THEOREM 3.7. *Let G and G' be two infinite networks with conductances c and c' . Suppose that c, c', c^{-1}, c'^{-1} are all bounded, that the degrees in G and G' are all bounded, and that $\phi : \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}'$ is a rough isometry. Then G has unique currents iff G' does.*

Proof. Since $c \asymp \mathbf{1}$ and $c' \asymp \mathbf{1}$, we may assume that actually $c = \mathbf{1}$ and $c' = \mathbf{1}$.

Suppose first that ϕ is a bijection. We claim that the map $\Phi : f \mapsto f \circ \phi$ from \mathbf{D}/\mathbb{R} to \mathbf{D}'/\mathbb{R} is an isomorphism of Banach spaces, where \mathbf{D}' is the space of Dirichlet functions on G' . Since the minimum distance between distinct vertices is 1, the fact that ϕ is a rough isometry implies that ϕ is actually bi-Lipschitz: for some constant γ_1 , we have

$$\gamma_1^{-1}d(x, y) \leq d(\phi(x), \phi(y)) \leq \gamma_1 d(x, y)$$

for $x, y \in \mathbf{V}$. For $e' = (\phi(x), \phi(y)) \in \mathbf{E}'$, let $\mathcal{P}(e')$ be a path of $d(x, y) \leq \gamma_1$ edges in \mathbf{E} joining x to y . The left-hand inequality of (3.5) together with the boundedness of the degrees in G implies that for some constant γ_2 , no edge in \mathbf{E} appears in more than γ_2 paths of the form $\mathcal{P}(e')$ for $e' \in \mathbf{E}'$. Therefore, for $f \in \mathbf{D}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f \circ \phi + \mathbb{R}\|^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e' \in \mathbf{E}'} \nabla(f \circ \phi)(e')^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e' \in \mathbf{E}'} \left(\sum_{e \in \mathcal{P}(e')} \nabla f(e) \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma_1}{2} \sum_{e' \in \mathbf{E}'} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{P}(e')} \nabla f(e)^2 \leq \frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2}{2} \sum_{e \in \mathbf{E}} \nabla f(e)^2 = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \|f + \mathbb{R}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that Φ is a bounded map; symmetry gives the boundedness of Φ^{-1} , establishing our claim.

Now clearly Φ is a bijection between the subspaces of Dirichlet functions with finite support. Hence Φ also gives an isomorphism between \mathbf{D}_0/\mathbb{R} and \mathbf{D}'_0/\mathbb{R} . Therefore, the result follows from Exercise 3.6.

Now consider the case that ϕ is not a bijection. We will “fluff up” the graphs G and G' to extend ϕ to a bijection so as to use the result we have just established. Because the image of \mathbf{V} comes within distance b of every vertex in G' and because G' has bounded degrees, \mathbf{V}' can be partitioned into subsets $N'(\phi(x))$ ($x \in \mathbf{V}$) of bounded size in such a way that every vertex in $N'(\phi(x))$ lies within distance b of $\phi(x)$. Also, because ϕ does not shrink distances too much and the degrees in G are bounded, the sizes of the preimages $\phi^{-1}(x)$ ($x \in \mathbf{V}'$) are bounded. For each $x \in \phi(\mathbf{V})$, let $\phi_1(x)$ denote some vertex in $\phi^{-1}(x)$. Create a new graph G_* by joining each vertex $\phi_1(x)$ ($x \in \mathbf{V}'$) to new vertices $x_1, \dots, x_{|N'(\phi(x))|-1}$ by new edges. Also, create a new graph G'_* by joining each vertex $\phi(x)$ ($x \in \mathbf{V}$) to new vertices $x_1, \dots, x_{|\phi^{-1}(\phi(x))|-1}$ by new edges. Then G_* and G'_* have bounded degrees.

Define $\phi_* : G_* \rightarrow G'_*$ as follows: For $x \in V'$, let $\phi_*(\phi_1(x)) := x$ and let ϕ_* be a bijection from $x_1, \dots, x_{|N'(x)|-1}$ to $N'(x) \setminus \{x\}$. For $x \in V$, let $\phi_*(\phi_1(\phi(x))) := \phi(x)$ and let ϕ_* be a bijection from $\phi^{-1}(\phi(x)) \setminus \{\phi_1(\phi(x))\}$ to $x_1, \dots, x_{|\phi^{-1}(\phi(x))|-1}$. Then ϕ_* is a bijective rough isometry. By the first part of the proof, we have unique currents on G_* iff we do on G'_* . Since every harmonic function on G_* has the same value on x_i as on $\phi_1(x)$ ($x \in V'$), it follows that G_* has unique currents iff G does. The same holds for G'_* and G' , which proves the theorem. \blacktriangleleft

In the following section, we will use the fact that $\langle f(X_n) \rangle$ converges a.s. for all $f \in \mathbf{D}$ on planar transient networks. Since this is true not only on planar networks, but on all transient networks, we will treat it here. We will use the result of the following exercise.

▷ EXERCISE 3.8.

Let G be transient and let $f \in \mathbf{D}_0$. Show that there is a unique $g \in \mathbf{D}_0$ having minimal energy such that $g \geq |f|$. Show that this g is superharmonic.

THEOREM 3.8. *If G is a transient network, $\langle X_n \rangle$ the corresponding random walk, and $f \in \mathbf{D}$, then $\langle f(X_n) \rangle$ has a finite limit a.s. and in L^2 . If $f = f_{\mathbf{D}_0} + f_{\mathbf{HD}}$ is the Royden decomposition of f , then $\lim f(X_n) = \lim f_{\mathbf{HD}}(X_n)$ a.s.*

This is due to Ancona, Lyons, and Peres (1999).

Proof. The following notation will be handy:

$$\mathcal{E}_f(x) := \sum_y p(x, y) [f(y) - f(x)]^2 = \mathbf{E}_x [|f(X_1) - f(X_0)|^2].$$

Thus, we have

$$\|df\|_c^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in V} \pi(x) \mathcal{E}_f(x).$$

Since o is arbitrary, we take $o = X_0$. We first observe that for any $f \in \mathbf{D}$, it is easy to bound the sum of squared increments along the random walk. For any Markov chain, we have $\mathcal{G}(y, o) = \mathbf{P}_y[\tau_o < \infty] \mathcal{G}(o, o) \leq \mathcal{G}(o, o)$. In our reversible case, Exercise 2.1(c) tells us that $\pi(o) \mathcal{G}(o, y) = \pi(y) \mathcal{G}(y, o) \leq \pi(y) \mathcal{G}(o, o)$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E} [|f(X_k) - f(X_{k-1})|^2] &= \sum_{y \in V} \mathcal{G}(o, y) \mathcal{E}_f(y) \leq \frac{\mathcal{G}(o, o)}{\pi(o)} \sum_{y \in V} \pi(y) \mathcal{E}_f(y) \\ &= 2 \frac{\mathcal{G}(o, o)}{\pi(o)} \|df\|_c^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}[f(X_k)^2 - f(X_{k-1})^2] &= \mathbf{E}[|f(X_k) - f(X_{k-1})|^2] + 2\mathbf{E}[(f(X_k) - f(X_{k-1}))f(X_{k-1})] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}[|f(X_k) - f(X_{k-1})|^2]\end{aligned}$$

in case f is superharmonic and nonnegative (since then $\langle f(X_n) \rangle$ is a supermartingale) or f is harmonic (since then $\langle f(X_n) \rangle$ is a martingale). In either of these two latter cases, we obtain by summing these inequalities for $k = 1, \dots, n$ that

$$\mathbf{E}[f(X_n)^2 - f(X_0)^2] \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{E}[|f(X_k) - f(X_{k-1})|^2] \leq 2 \frac{\mathcal{G}(o, o)}{\pi(o)} \|df\|_c^2$$

by (3.6). That is,

$$\mathbf{E}[f(X_n)^2] \leq 2 \frac{\mathcal{G}(o, o)}{\pi(o)} \|df\|_c^2 + f(o)^2 \quad (3.7)$$

in case f is superharmonic and nonnegative or f is harmonic.

It follows from (3.7) applied to $f_{\mathbf{HD}}$ that $\langle f_{\mathbf{HD}}(X_n) \rangle$ is a martingale bounded in L^2 , whence it converges a.s. and in L^2 . It remains to show that $f_{\mathbf{D}_0}$ converges to 0 a.s. and in L^2 . Given $\epsilon > 0$, write $f_{\mathbf{D}_0} = f_1 + f_2$, where f_1 is finitely supported and $\|df_2\|_c^2 < \pi(o)\epsilon/(3\mathcal{G}(o, o))$. Exercise 3.8 applied to $f_2 \in \mathbf{D}_0$ yields a superharmonic function $g \in \mathbf{D}_0$ that satisfies $g \geq |f_2|$ and $\|dg\|_c^2 \leq \|df_2\|_c^2$. Also, $g(o)^2 \leq \mathcal{G}(o, o)\|dg\|_c^2/\pi(o)$ by Exercise 3.6(g) applied to $g \in \mathbf{D}_0$ (that is, $g = g + \mathbf{0}$ is its Royden decomposition). Combining this with (3.7) applied to g , we get that $\mathbf{E}[g(X_n)^2] \leq \epsilon$ for all n . Since $\langle g(X_n) \rangle$ is a nonnegative supermartingale, it converges a.s. and in L^2 to a limit whose second moment is at most ϵ . Since $|f_2(X_n)| \leq g(X_n)$, it follows that both $\mathbf{E}[\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_2(X_n)^2]$ and $\mathbf{E}[f_2(X_n)^2]$ are at most ϵ . Now transience implies that both $f_1(X_n) \rightarrow 0$ a.s. and $\mathbf{E}[f_1(X_n)^2] = \sum_y f_1(y)^2 \mathbf{P}[X_n = y] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, it follows that $\mathbf{E}[\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{\mathbf{D}_0}(X_n)^2] \leq \epsilon$ and $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[f_{\mathbf{D}_0}(X_n)^2] \leq \epsilon$. Since ϵ was arbitrary, $\langle f_{\mathbf{D}_0}(X_n) \rangle$ must tend to 0 a.s. and in L^2 . This completes the proof. ◀

§3.4. Planar Graphs and Hyperbolic Lattices.

There is an interesting phase transition between dimensions 2 and 3 in hyperbolic space \mathbb{H}^d : currents are not unique for co-compact lattices in \mathbb{H}^2 , but for $d \geq 3$, currents are unique for co-compact lattices in \mathbb{H}^d . We first treat the case of \mathbb{H}^2 . This is, in fact, a general result for planar graphs of Benjamini and Schramm (1996a, 1996c):

THEOREM 3.9. *Suppose that G is a transient planar network. Let $\pi(x)$ denote the sum of the conductances of the edges incident to x . If π is bounded, then currents are not unique.*

For simplicity, we will assume from now on that G is a proper plane network.

To show Theorem 3.9, we show that in some sense, random walk on G is like Brownian motion in the hyperbolic disc. Benjamini and Schramm showed this in two geometric senses: one used circle packing (1996a) and the other used square tiling (1996c). We will show this in a combinatorial sense that is essentially the same as the approach with square tiling.

Our first goal is to establish a (polar) coordinate system on \mathbb{V} . Pick a vertex $o \in \mathbb{V}$. Let i_o be the unit current flow on G from o to ∞ and let v be the voltage function which is 0 at o and 1 at ∞ , i.e., $v(x)$ is the probability that a random walk started at x will never visit o .

Define $i_o^\times(e^\dagger) := i_o(e)$. Now any face of G^\dagger contains a vertex of G in its interior. If i_o^\times is summed counterclockwise around a face of G^\dagger surrounding x , then we obtain $d^*i_o(x)$, which is 0 unless $x = o$, in which case it is 1. Since any cycle in G^\dagger can be written as a sum of cycles surrounding faces, it follows that the sum of i_o^\times along any cycle is an integer. Therefore, we may define $v^\times : G^\dagger \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ by picking any vertex $o^\dagger \in G^\dagger$ and setting $v^\times(x^\dagger)$ to be the sum of i_o^\times along any path in G^\dagger from o^\dagger to x^\dagger .

We now have the essence of the polar coordinates on \mathbb{V} , with v giving the radial distance and v^\times giving the angle; however, v^\times is not yet defined on \mathbb{V} . In fact, we prefer to assign to each $x \in \mathbb{V}$ an arc $J(x)$ of angles. To do this, let $\text{Out}(x) := \{e; e^- = x, i_o(e) \geq 0\}$ and $\text{In}(x) := \{e; e^+ = x, i_o(e) > 0\}$. For example, $\text{In}(o)$ is empty.

LEMMA 3.10. *Let G be a transient simple plane graph. For every $x \in \mathbb{V}$, the sets $\text{Out}(x)$ and $\text{In}(x)$ do not interleave, i.e., their union can be ordered counterclockwise so that no edge of $\text{In}(x)$ precedes any edge of $\text{Out}(x)$.*

Proof. Consider any x and any two edges $\langle y, x \rangle, \langle z, x \rangle \in \text{In}(x)$. We have $v(y) < v(x)$ and $v(z) < v(x)$ by definition of $\text{In}(x)$. By Corollary 2.17, there are paths from o to y and o to z using only vertices with $v < v(x)$. These paths bound a region in the plane. By the

maximum principle, any vertices in this region also have $v < v(x)$. In particular, there can be none that are endpoints of edges in $\text{Out}(x)$. ◀

If $J(e)$ denotes the counterclockwise arc from $v^\times((e^\dagger)^-)$ to $v^\times((e^\dagger)^+)$, then we may let

$$J(x) := \bigcup_{e \in \text{Out}(x)} J(e).$$

Note that by Lemma 3.10, for each ϑ not in the range of v^\times , if $\vartheta \in J(e)$ for some $e \in \text{In}(x)$, then there is exactly one $e \in \text{Out}(x)$ with $\vartheta \in J(e)$. Therefore, given any ϑ not in the range of v^\times , there is a unique infinite path \mathcal{P}_ϑ starting at o and containing exactly those vertices x with $\vartheta \in J(x)$. These paths correspond to the radial lines in the hyperbolic disc. Note that for every edge e with $i_o(e) > 0$, the Lebesgue measure of $\{\vartheta; e \in \mathcal{P}_\vartheta\}$ is the length of $J(e)$, i.e., $i_o(e)$.

LEMMA 3.11. *For almost every $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ in the sense of Lebesgue measure, $\sup\{v(x); x \in \mathcal{P}_\vartheta\} = 1$.*

Proof. Let $h(\vartheta) := \sup\{v(x); x \in \mathcal{P}_\vartheta\}$. Then $h \leq 1$ everywhere. Also,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} h(\vartheta) d\vartheta = \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{P}_\vartheta} |dv(e)| d\vartheta = \sum_{i(e) > 0} |dv(e)| i_o(e) = 1$$

since $|dv(e)| = i_o(e)r(e)/\mathcal{E}(i_o)$ (recall that v is not exactly the voltage function corresponding to i_o). Therefore, $h = 1$ a.e. ◀

Therefore, for $0 \leq \rho < 1$ and for a.e. ϑ , we may define $x(\rho, \vartheta)$ to be the vertex $x \in \mathcal{P}_\vartheta$ where $v(x) \leq \rho$ and $v(x)$ is maximum. We now come to the key calculation made possible by our coordinate system.

LEMMA 3.12. *For any $f \in \mathbf{D}$,*

$$\bar{f}(\vartheta) := \lim_{\rho \uparrow 1} f(x(\rho, \vartheta))$$

exists for almost every ϑ and satisfies

$$\|\bar{f}\|_{L^1} \leq \sqrt{1 + \mathcal{E}(i_o)} \|f\|_{\mathbf{D}}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{P}_\vartheta} |df(e)| d\vartheta = \sum_{i_o(e) > 0} |df(e)| i_o(e) \leq \|\nabla f\|_c \|i_o\|_r < \infty,$$

whence the integrand is finite a.e. This proves that

$$\lim_{\rho \uparrow 1} f(x(\rho, \vartheta)) = f(o) - \lim_{\rho \uparrow 1} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{P}_\vartheta, v(e^+) \leq \rho} df(e) \quad (3.8)$$

exists a.e. and has L^1 norm at most

$$|f(o)| + \|df\|_c \|i_o\|_r \leq \sqrt{1 + \mathcal{E}(i_o)} \|f\|_{\mathbf{D}}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. ◀

▷ EXERCISE 3.9.

Show that $\|f(x(\rho, \bullet)) - \bar{f}\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0$ as $\rho \uparrow 1$.

If f has finite support, then of course $\bar{f} \equiv 0$. Thus, for $f \in \mathbf{D}_0$, we have $\bar{f} = 0$ a.e. [for any $\epsilon > 0$, write $f \in \mathbf{D}_0$ as $f = g + h$ with g having finite support and $\|h\|_{\mathbf{D}} < \epsilon$; then $\bar{f} = \bar{g} + \bar{h} = \bar{h}$ has norm $< \epsilon$, whence has norm 0]. Therefore, if $f = f_{\mathbf{D}_0} + f_{\mathbf{HD}}$ is the Royden decomposition of f (see Exercise 3.6), we have $\bar{f} = \bar{f}_{\mathbf{HD}}$ a.e. To show that $\mathbf{HD} \neq \mathbb{R}$, then, it suffices to show that there is a Dirichlet function f with \bar{f} not an a.e. constant. Such an f is given by the angle function v^\times . More precisely, since v^\times is defined on G^\dagger rather than on G and since, moreover, v^\times takes values in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} , we make the following modifications. Let F_x be any face of G with x as one of its vertices. Let $|\vartheta|$ denote the distance of (any representative of) ϑ to the integers. Set $\psi(x) := |v^\times(F_x)|$.

LEMMA 3.13. *If π is bounded, then $\psi \in \mathbf{D}$.*

Proof. Let $\pi \leq M$. Given adjacent vertices x, y in G , there is a path of edges $e_1^\dagger, \dots, e_j^\dagger$ in G^\dagger from F_x to F_y with each e_i incident to either x or y (see Figure 3.1). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} d\psi(x, y)^2 &\leq |v^\times(F_x) - v^\times(F_y)|^2 = \left(\sum_{i=1}^j i_o(e_i) \right)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^j i_o(e_i)^2 r(e_i) \sum_{i=1}^j c(e_i) \leq 2M \sum_{e^- \in \{x, y\}} i_o(e)^2 r(e) \end{aligned}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. It follows that

$$\|d\psi\|_{\mathbf{D}}^2 = \sum_{e \in \mathbf{E}_{1/2}} d\psi(e)^2 c(e) \leq 2M \sum_{e \in \mathbf{E}_{1/2}} i_o(e)^2 r(e) \sum_{e' \in \mathbf{E}_{1/2}, e'^- \in \{e^-, e^+\}} c(e) \leq 4M^2 \mathcal{E}(i_o) < \infty. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$




Figure 3.1.

Since $v^\times(F_x) \in J(x)$ and $J(x)$ has length tending to zero as the distance from x to o tends to infinity, we have that $\lim_{r \uparrow 1} \psi(x(r, \vartheta)) = |\vartheta|$ for every ϑ for which $\sup\{v(x); x \in \mathcal{P}_\vartheta\} = 1$, i.e., for a.e. ϑ . Thus, ψ is the sought-for Dirichlet function with $\bar{\psi}$ not an a.e. constant. This proves Theorem 3.9.

By Theorem 3.8, $v^\times(F_{X_n})$ converges a.s. Benjamini and Schramm (1996c) also showed that its limiting distribution is Lebesgue measure. Of course, the choice of faces F_x has no effect since the lengths of the intervals $J(X_n)$ tend to 0 a.s. One way this convergence is relevant to spanning forests is that if the wired spanning forest has only one end in each tree, as is often the case (see Theorem 9.22), then the end containing any given vertex has a limiting direction that is distributed according to Lebesgue measure (by Wilson’s algorithm rooted at infinity).

THEOREM 3.14. (BENJAMINI AND SCHRAMM, 1996C) *If G is a transient simple plane network with π bounded, then $J(X_n)$ tends to a point on the circle \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} a.s. The distribution of the limiting point is Lebesgue measure when $X_0 = o$.*

Proof. That $J(X_n)$ tends to a point a.s. follows from the a.s. convergence of $v^\times(F_{X_n})$. To say that the limiting distribution is Lebesgue measure is to say that for any arc A ,

$$\mathbf{P}_o[\lim v^\times(F_{X_n}) \in A] = \int \mathbf{1}_A(\vartheta) d\vartheta.$$

This is implied by the statement

$$\mathbf{E}_o[\lim f(X_n)] = \int \bar{f}(\vartheta) d\vartheta$$

for every Lipschitz function \bar{f} on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} , where f is defined by

$$f(x) := \bar{f}(v^\times(F_x)).$$

By the same argument as we used to prove Lemma 3.13, we see that all such f are Dirichlet functions and

$$\lim_{r \uparrow 1} f(x(r, \vartheta)) = \bar{f}(\vartheta)$$

for all ϑ for which $\sup\{v(x); x \in \mathcal{P}_\vartheta\} = 1$. Now for any $f \in \mathbf{D}$, Theorem 3.8 gives that

$$\mathbf{E}_o[\lim f(X_n)] = \mathbf{E}_o[\lim f_{\mathbf{HD}}(X_n)] = \lim \mathbf{E}_o[f_{\mathbf{HD}}(X_n)] = f_{\mathbf{HD}}(o),$$

where we use the convergence in L^1 in the last step. On the other hand, integrating (3.8) gives

$$\int \bar{f}(\vartheta) d\vartheta = f(o) - (\nabla f, i_o)_r = f_{\mathbf{HD}}(o)$$

by Exercise 3.6. ◀

That co-compact lattices in \mathbb{H}^d are transient follows from Theorem 2.26. Thus, by Theorem 3.9, they do not have unique currents when $d = 2$. However, the situation is reversed in higher dimensions:

THEOREM 3.15. *If G is a net in \mathbb{H}^d for some $d \geq 3$, then currents are unique on G .*

Proof. This follows from the theorem of Holopainen and Soardi (1997), together with the theorem of Dodziuk (1979). We give a direct proof. By Theorem 3.7, it suffices to prove this for a particular net. Choose ... ◀

§3.5. Notes.

Equation (3.4) is an elementary form of the Hodge decomposition of L^2 1-cochains. To see this, for each cycle θ of some spanning set of cycles, add an oriented 2-cell with boundary θ .

Proposition 3.4 is classical in the case of a finite planar network and its dual. The finite case can also be proved using Kirchhoff's laws and Ohm's law, combined with the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem: The cycle law for i implies the node law for i^\dagger , while the node law for i implies the cycle law for i^\dagger .

Theorem 3.6 is due to the authors and is published here for the first time. Thomassen (1989) proved the weaker result where $D(A)$ is replaced by the diameter of A .

The proof we have given of Theorem 3.7 was communicated to us by O. Schramm.

Infinite Kazhdan groups have unique currents: see Bekka and Valette (1997). [****MAKE** into an exercise.]

Our proof of Theorem 3.9 was influenced by the proof of a related result by Kenyon (1998).

It follows from Exercise 3.14 that if there are no nonconstant bounded harmonic functions on a network, then currents are unique. The following is due to Blackwell (1955) and later generalized by Choquet and Deny (1960) Since every abelian group is amenable (Exercise 8.3), it strengthens the result of Exercise 9.9.

COROLLARY 3.16. *If G is an abelian group and μ is a probability measure on G with countable support, then there are no nonconstant bounded μ -harmonic functions.*

REMARK. Recall that u is μ -harmonic if for all x , we have $u(x) = \sum_{\mu(g)>0} \mu(g)u(gx)$.

Proof. (Due to Dynkin and Maljutov (1961).) Let u be a harmonic function. For any element g of the support of μ , the function $w_g(x) := u(x) - u(gx)$ is also harmonic because G is abelian. If u is not constant, then for some g , the function w_g is not identically 0, whence it takes, say, a positive value. Let $M := \sup w_g$. If $M = \infty$, then u is not bounded. Otherwise, for any x , we have

$$w_g(x) = \sum_{\mu(h)>0} \mu(h)w_g(hx) \leq M(1 - \mu(g)) + \mu(g)w_g(gx),$$

which is to say that

$$M - w_g(gx) \leq (M - w_g(x))/\mu(g).$$

Iterating this inequality gives for all $n \geq 1$,

$$M - w_g(g^n x) \leq (M - w_g(x))/\mu(g)^n.$$

Choose x so that $M - w_g(x) < M\mu(g)^n/2$. Then $w_g(g^k x) > M/2$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$, whence $w_g(x) + w_g(gx) + \dots + w_g(g^n x) = u(x) - u(g^{n+1}x) > M(n+1)/2$. Since n is arbitrary, u is not bounded. ◀

▷ **EXERCISE 3.10.**

Give another proof of Corollary 3.16 using the Kreĭn-Milman theorem.

[ALSO, proofs using Hewitt-Savage, shift-coupling]

§3.6. Additional Exercises.

3.11. Let (G, c) be a finite planar network. In the notation of Proposition 3.4, show that the maximum flow from a to z in G' when the conductances are regarded as capacities is equal to the distance between b and y in $(G^\dagger)'$ when the resistances are regarded as edge lengths.

3.12. Suppose that G is a planar graph with bounded degree and bounded number of sides of its faces. Show that G is transient iff G^\dagger is transient.

3.13. (a) Show that G is recurrent iff every [or some] star lies in the closed span of the other stars.

(b) Show that if G is transient, then the current flow from any vertex a to infinity corresponding to unit voltage at a and zero voltage at infinity is the orthogonal projection of the star at a on the orthocomplement of the other stars. (Here, the current flow is as defined in Chapter 2; it has minimal energy among those flows of equal strength.)

3.14. (a) Show that the bounded harmonic Dirichlet functions are dense in **HD**.

(b) Show that the bounded Dirichlet functions are dense in **D**.

3.15. Let $H \subseteq V$ be such that for all $x \in V$, random walk started at x eventually visits $G \setminus H$, i.e., $\mathbf{P}_x[\tau_{G \setminus H} < \infty] = 1$. Show that if $f \in \mathbf{D}$ is supported on H and is harmonic at all vertices in H , then $f \equiv 0$.

3.16. Extend Theorem 3.7 to show that under the same assumptions, \mathbf{HD} and \mathbf{HD}' have the same dimensions.

3.17. Complete an alternative proof of Theorem 3.14 as follows. Show that by adding vertices to edges as necessary, we may assume that for each k , there is a set of vertices Π_k where $v = 1 - 1/k$ and such that the random walk visits Π_k a.s. Show that the harmonic measure on Π_k “converges” to Lebesgue measure on the circle.

Chapter 4

Percolation on Trees

Consider groundwater percolating down through soil and rock. How can we model the effects of the irregularities of the medium through which the water percolates? One common approach is to use a model in which the medium is random. More specifically, the pathways by which the water can travel are randomly chosen out of some regular set of possible pathways. For example, one may treat the ground as a half-space in which possible pathways are the rectangular lattice lines. Thus, we consider the nearest-neighbor graph on $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}^-$ and each edge is independently chosen to be open (allowing water to flow) or closed. Commonly, the marginal probability that an edge is open, p , is the same for all edges. In this case, the only parameter in the model is p and one studies how p affects large-scale behavior of possible water flow.

In fact, this model of percolation is used in many other contexts in order to have a simple model that nevertheless captures some important aspects of an irregular situation. In particular, it has an interesting phase transition. In this chapter, we will consider percolation on trees, rather than on lattices. This turns out to be interesting and also useful for other seemingly unrelated probabilistic processes and questions. In Chapter 6, we will look at percolation on transitive graphs, especially, on nonamenable graphs.

§4.1. Galton-Watson Branching Processes.

Percolation on a tree breaks up the tree into random subtrees. Historically, the first random trees to be considered were a model of genealogical (family) trees. Since such trees will be an important source of examples and an important tool in later work, we too will consider their basic theory before turning to percolation.

Galton-Watson branching processes* are generally defined as Markov chains $\langle Z_n ; n \geq 0 \rangle$ on the nonnegative integers, but we will be interested as well in the family trees that they produce. Given numbers $p_k \in [0, 1]$ with $\sum_{k \geq 0} p_k = 1$, the process is defined as

* These processes are sometimes called Bienaymé-Galton-Watson since Bienaymé, in 1845, was the first to give the fundamental theorem, Proposition 4.4. However, while he stated the correct result, he gave barely a hint of his proof. See Heyde and Seneta (1977), pp. 116–120 for some of the history.

follows. We start with one particle, $Z_0 \equiv 1$, unless specified otherwise. It has k children with probability p_k . Then each of these children (should there be any) also have children with the same progeny (or “offspring”) distribution, independently of each other and of their parent. This continues forever or until there are no more children. To be formal, let L be a random variable with $\mathbf{P}[L = k] = p_k$ and let $\langle L_i^{(n)}; n, i \geq 1 \rangle$ be independent copies of L . The generation sizes of the branching process are then defined inductively by

$$Z_{n+1} := \sum_{i=1}^{Z_n} L_i^{(n+1)}. \tag{4.1}$$

The **probability generating function (p.g.f.)** of L is very useful and is denoted

$$f(s) := \mathbf{E}[s^L] = \sum_{k \geq 0} p_k s^k.$$

We call the event $\{\exists n Z_n = 0\}$ ($= \{Z_n \rightarrow 0\}$) **extinction**. We will often omit the superscripts on L when not needed. The family (or genealogical) tree associated to a branching process is obtained simply by having one vertex for each particle ever produced and joining two by an edge if one is the parent of the other. See Figure 4.1 for an example.




Figure 4.1. A typical Galton-Watson tree for $f(s) = (s + s^2)/2$.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *On the event of nonextinction, $Z_n \rightarrow \infty$ a.s. provided $p_1 \neq 1$.*

Proof. We want to see that 0 is the only nontransient state. If $p_0 = 0$, this is clear, while if $p_0 > 0$, then from any state $n \geq 1$, eventually returning to n requires not immediately becoming extinct, whence has probability $\leq 1 - p_0^n < 1$. ◀

What is $q := \mathbf{P}[\text{extinction}]$? To find out, we need:

PROPOSITION 4.2. $\mathbf{E}[s^{Z_n}] = \underbrace{f \circ \dots \circ f}_n(s) =: f^{(n)}(s)$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[s^{Z_n}] &= \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[s^{\sum_{i=1}^{Z_{n-1}} L_i} \mid Z_{n-1}\right]\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{Z_{n-1}} s^{L_i} \mid Z_{n-1}\right]\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{Z_{n-1}} \mathbf{E}[s^{L_i}]\right] = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[s^L]^{Z_{n-1}}] = \mathbf{E}[f(s)^{Z_{n-1}}] \end{aligned}$$

since the L_i are independent with the same distribution as L . Iterate this equation n times. ◀

Note that within this proof is the result that

$$\mathbf{E}[s^{Z_n} \mid Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_{n-1}] = f(s)^{Z_{n-1}}. \tag{4.2}$$

COROLLARY 4.3. $q = \lim_n f^{(n)}(0)$.

Proof. Since extinction is the increasing union of the events $\{Z_n = 0\}$, we have $q = \lim_n \mathbf{P}[Z_n = 0] = \lim_n f^{(n)}(0)$. ◀




Figure 4.2. Typical graphs of f when $m > 1$ and $m \leq 1$.

Looking at a graph of the increasing convex function f (Figure 4.2), we discover the most-used result in the field and the answer to our question:

PROPOSITION 4.4. *Provided $p_1 \neq 1$, we have*

- (i) $q = 1 \Leftrightarrow f'(1) \leq 1$;
- (ii) q is the smallest root of $f(s) = s$ in $[0, 1]$ — the only other possible root being 1.

When we differentiate f at 1, we mean the left-hand derivative. Note that

$$f'(1) = \mathbf{E}[L] =: m = \sum k p_k, \tag{4.3}$$

the mean number of offspring. We call m simply the **mean** of the branching process.

▷ EXERCISE 4.1.

Justify the differentiation in (4.3). Show too that $\lim_{s \uparrow 1} f'(s) = m$.

Because of Proposition 4.4, a branching process is called **subcritical** if $m < 1$, **critical** if $m = 1$, and **supercritical** if $m > 1$.

How quickly does $Z_n \rightarrow \infty$ on the event of nonextinction? We begin this analysis by dividing Z_n by m^n , which, it results, is its mean:

PROPOSITION 4.5. *The sequence $\langle Z_n/m^n \rangle$ is a martingale when $0 < m < \infty$.*

In particular, $\mathbf{E}[Z_n] = m^n$ since $\mathbf{E}[Z_0] = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}] = 1$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[Z_{n+1}/m^{n+1} \mid Z_n] &= \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^{n+1}} \sum_{i=1}^{Z_n} L_i^{(n+1)} \mid Z_n\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m^{n+1}} \sum_{i=1}^{Z_n} \mathbf{E}[L_i^{(n+1)} \mid Z_n] = \frac{1}{m^{n+1}} \sum_{i=1}^{Z_n} m = Z_n/m^n. \quad \blacktriangleleft \end{aligned}$$

Since this martingale $\langle Z_n/m^n \rangle$ is nonnegative, it has a finite limit a.s., called W . Thus, when $W > 0$, the generation sizes Z_n grow as expected, i.e., like m^n up to a random factor. Otherwise, they grow more slowly. Our attention is thus focussed on the following two questions.

Question 1. *When is $W > 0$?*

Question 2. *When $W = 0$ and the process does not become extinct, what is the rate at which $Z_n \rightarrow \infty$?*

We first note a general zero-one property of Galton-Watson branching processes. Call a property of trees **inherited** if whenever a tree has this property, so do *all* the descendant trees of the children of the root, and if every finite tree has this property.

PROPOSITION 4.6. *Every inherited property has probability either 0 or 1 given nonextinction.*

Proof. Let A be the set of trees possessing a given inherited property. For a tree T with k children of the root, let $T^{(1)}, \dots, T^{(k)}$ be the descendant trees of these children. Then

$$\mathbf{P}[A] = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{P}[T \in A \mid Z_1]] \leq \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{P}[T^{(1)} \in A, \dots, T^{(Z_1)} \in A \mid Z_1]]$$

by definition of inherited. Since $T^{(1)}, \dots, T^{(Z_1)}$ are i.i.d. given Z_1 , the last quantity above is equal to $\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{P}[A]^{Z_1}] = f(\mathbf{P}[A])$. Thus, $\mathbf{P}[A] \leq f(\mathbf{P}[A])$. On the other hand, $\mathbf{P}[A] \geq q$ since every finite tree is in A . It follows upon inspection of a graph of f that $\mathbf{P}[A] \in \{q, 1\}$, from which the desired conclusion follows. \blacktriangleleft

COROLLARY 4.7. *Suppose that $0 < m < \infty$. Either $W = 0$ a.s. or $W > 0$ a.s. on nonextinction. I.e., $\mathbf{P}[W = 0] \in \{q, 1\}$.*

Proof. The property that $W = 0$ is clearly inherited, whence this is an immediate consequence of Proposition 4.6. \blacktriangleleft

In answer to the above two questions, we have the following two theorems.

THE KESTEN-STIGUM THEOREM (1966). *The following are equivalent when $1 < m < \infty$:*

- (i) $\mathbf{P}[W = 0] = q$;
- (ii) $\mathbf{E}[W] = 1$;
- (iii) $\mathbf{E}[L \log^+ L] < \infty$.

This will be shown in Section 10.2. Since (iii) requires barely more than the existence of a mean, generation sizes “typically” do grow as expected. When (iii) fails, however, the means m^n overestimate the rate of growth. Yet there is still a deterministic rate of growth, as shown by Seneta (1968) and Heyde (1970):

THE SENETA-HEYDE THEOREM. *If $1 < m < \infty$, then there exist constants c_n such that*

- (i) $\lim Z_n/c_n$ exists a.s. in $[0, \infty)$;
- (ii) $\mathbf{P}[\lim Z_n/c_n = 0] = q$;
- (iii) $c_{n+1}/c_n \rightarrow m$.

Proof. Choose $s_0 \in (q, 1)$ and set $s_{n+1} := f^{-1}(s_n)$ for $n \geq 0$. Then $s_n \uparrow 1$. By (4.2), we have that $\langle s_n^{Z_n} \rangle$ is a martingale. Being positive and bounded, it converges a.s. and in L^1 to a limit $Y \in [0, 1]$ such that $\mathbf{E}[Y] = \mathbf{E}[s_0^{Z_0}] = s_0$. Set $c_n := -1/\log s_n$. Then $s_n^{Z_n} = e^{-Z_n/c_n}$, so that $\lim Z_n/c_n$ exists a.s. in $[0, \infty]$. By l'Hôpital's rule and Exercise 4.1,

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \frac{-\log f(s)}{-\log s} = \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \frac{f'(s)s}{f(s)} = m.$$

Considering this limit along the sequence $\langle s_n \rangle$, we get (iii). It follows from (iii) that the property that $\lim Z_n/c_n = 0$ is inherited, whence by Proposition 4.6 and the fact that $\mathbf{E}[Y] = s_0 < 1$, we deduce (ii). Likewise, the property that $\lim Z_n/c_n < \infty$ is inherited and has probability 1 since $\mathbf{E}[Y] > q$. This implies (i). ◀

The proof of the Seneta-Heyde theorem gives a prescription for calculating the constants c_n , but does not immediately provide estimates for them. Another approach gives a different prescription that leads sometimes to an explicit estimate; see Asmussen and Hering (1983), pp. 45–49.

▷ EXERCISE 4.2.

Show that for any Galton-Watson process with mean $m > 1$, the family tree T has growth rate $\text{gr } T = m$ a.s. given nonextinction.

§4.2. The First-Moment Method.

Let G be a countable, possibly unconnected, graph. The most common percolation on G is **Bernoulli bond percolation with constant survival parameter p** , or **Bernoulli(p) percolation** for short; here, for fixed $p \in [0, 1]$, each edge is kept with probability p and removed otherwise, independently of the other edges. Denote the random subgraph of G that remains by $G(\omega)$. Given a vertex x of G , one is often interested in knowing the chance that diameter of the connected component of x in $G(\omega)$ is infinite. The first-moment method explained in this section gives a simple upper bound on this probability. In fact, this method is so simple that it works in complete generality: Suppose that $G(\omega)$ is *any* random subgraph of G . The only measurability needed is that for each vertex x and each edge e , the sets $\{\omega; x \in G(\omega)\}$ and $\{\omega; e \in G(\omega)\}$ are measurable. We will call such a random subgraph a **general percolation** on G . We will say that a set Π of edges of G **separates x from infinity** if the removal of Π leaves x in a component of finite diameter. Denote by $\{x \leftrightarrow e\}$ the event that e is in the connected component of x and by $\{x \leftrightarrow \infty\}$ that x is in a connected component of infinite diameter.

▷ EXERCISE 4.3.

Show that for a general percolation, the events $\{x \leftrightarrow e\}$ and $\{x \leftrightarrow \infty\}$ are indeed measurable.

PROPOSITION 4.8. *Given a general percolation on G ,*

$$\mathbf{P}[x \leftrightarrow \infty] \leq \inf \left\{ \sum_{e \in \Pi} \mathbf{P}[x \leftrightarrow e]; \Pi \text{ separates } x \text{ from infinity} \right\}. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. For any Π separating x from infinity, we have

$$\{x \leftrightarrow \infty\} \subseteq \bigcup_{e \in \Pi} \{x \leftrightarrow e\}$$

by definition. Therefore $\mathbf{P}[x \leftrightarrow \infty] \leq \sum_{e \in \Pi} \mathbf{P}[x \leftrightarrow e]$. ◀

Returning to Bernoulli percolation with constant survival parameter p , denote the law of $G(\omega)$ by \mathbf{P}_p . By Kolmogorov's zero-one law,

$$\mathbf{P}_p[G(\omega) \text{ has a connected component of infinite diameter}] \in \{0, 1\}.$$

It is intuitively clear that this probability is increasing in p . For a rigorous proof of this, we couple all the percolation processes at once as follows. Let U_e be i.i.d. uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables indexed by the edges of G . If $G_p(\omega)$ is the graph containing all the vertices of G and exactly those edges e with $U_e \leq p$, then the law of $G_p(\omega)$ will be precisely \mathbf{P}_p . This coupling is referred to as the **standard coupling** of Bernoulli percolation. But now when $p \leq q$, the event that $G_p(\omega)$ has a connected component of infinite diameter is contained in the event that $G_q(\omega)$ has a connected component of infinite diameter. Hence the probability of the first event is at most the probability of the second. This leads us to define the **critical probability**

$$p_c(G) := \sup\{p; \mathbf{P}_p[\exists \text{ infinite-diameter component of } G(\omega)] = 0\}.$$

If G is connected and x is any given vertex of G , then

$$p_c(G) = \sup\{p; \mathbf{P}_p[x \leftrightarrow \infty] = 0\}.$$

▷ EXERCISE 4.4.

Prove this.

Again, the coupling provides a rigorous proof that $\mathbf{P}_p[x \leftrightarrow \infty]$ is increasing in p .

Generally, $p_c(G)$ is extremely difficult to calculate. Clearly $p_c(\mathbb{Z}) = 1$. After long efforts, it was shown that $p_c(\mathbb{Z}^2) = 1/2$ (Kesten, 1980). There is not even a conjecture for the value of $p_c(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ for any $d \geq 3$. Now Proposition 4.8 provides a lower bound for

p_c provided we can estimate $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e]$. If G is a tree T , this is easy: $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e] = p^{|e|+1}$. Hence,

$$p_c(T) \geq 1/\text{br } T. \tag{4.5}$$

In fact, we have equality here (Theorem 4.16), but this requires the second-moment method. Nevertheless, there are some cases among non-lattice graphs where it is easy to determine p_c exactly, even without the first-moment method. One example is given in the next exercise:

▷ EXERCISE 4.5.

Show that for $p \geq p_c(G)$, $p_c(G_p(\omega)) = p_c(G)/p$ \mathbf{P}_p -a.s. Physicists often refer to p as the “density” of edges in $G(\omega)$ and this helps the intuition.

For another example, if T is an n -ary tree, then the component of the root under percolation is a Galton-Watson tree with progeny distribution $\text{Bin}(n, p)$. Thus, this component is infinite w.p.p. iff $np > 1$, whence $p_c(T) = 1/n$. This reasoning may be extended to all Galton-Watson trees (in which case, $p_c(T)$ is a random variable):

PROPOSITION 4.9. (LYONS, 1990) *Let T be the family tree of a Galton-Watson process with mean $m > 1$. Then $p_c(T) = 1/m$ a.s. given nonextinction.*

Proof. Let T be a given tree and write $T'(\omega)$ for the component of the root of T after percolation on T with survival parameter p . When T has the law of a Galton-Watson tree with mean m , we claim that $T'(\omega)$ has the law of another Galton-Watson tree having mean mp : if Y_i represent i.i.d. $\text{Bin}(1, p)$ random variables that are also independent of T , then

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^L Y_i\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^L Y_i \mid L\right]\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^L \mathbf{E}[Y_i]\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^L p\right] = pm.$$

Hence $T'(\omega)$ is finite a.s. iff $mp \leq 1$. Since

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{P}[|T'(\omega)| < \infty \mid T]] = \mathbf{P}[|T'(\omega)| < \infty], \tag{4.6}$$

this means that for almost every Galton-Watson tree T , the component of its root is finite a.s. if $p \leq 1/m$. On the other hand, for fixed p , the property $\{T; \mathbf{P}_p[|T'(\omega)| < \infty] = 1\}$ is inherited, so has probability q or 1. If it has probability 1, then (4.6) shows that $mp \leq 1$. That is, if $mp > 1$, this property has probability q , so that the component of the root of T will be infinite with positive probability a.s. on the event of nonextinction. Considering a sequence $p_n \downarrow 1/m$, we see that this holds a.s. on the event of nonextinction for all $p > 1/m$ at once, not just for a fixed p . We conclude that $p_c(T) = 1/m$ a.s. on nonextinction. ◀

COROLLARY 4.10. (LYONS, 1990) *If T is a Galton-Watson tree with mean $m > 1$, then $\text{br } T = m$ a.s. given nonextinction.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.9 and (4.5), we have $\text{br } T \geq m$ a.s. given nonextinction. On the other hand, $\text{br } T \leq \text{gr } T = m$ a.s. given nonextinction by Exercise 4.2. ◀

This corollary was shown in the language of Hausdorff dimension (which will be explained in Chapter 12) by Hawkes (1981) under the assumption that $\mathbf{E}[L(\log L)^2] < \infty$.

A recent area of investigation concerns the rate of escape, or speed, of random walks on trees. We will give a simple result here as an application of the first-moment method of percolation and continue in Chapter 11. The basic question is: after n steps, how far is a random walk likely to be from its starting point? In particular, is the distance roughly linear in n ? For simple random walk, is it sufficient that the tree have growth rate or branching number larger than 1? Is it necessary?

Of course, simple random walk on \mathbb{Z} is likely to be at distance only $O(\sqrt{n})$ from its starting point after n steps. Moreover, given $0 < s < 1$, the chance that the distance is at least sn is at most $2e^{-nI(s)}$, where

$$I(s) := \frac{(1+s)\log(1+s) + (1-s)\log(1-s)}{2}.$$

(REF such as Durrett) On a tree, however, there may be sufficient “push” away from the root that the distance grows linearly. This is clearly the case if every vertex has at least 2 children. A more general sufficient condition is given in the following exercise.

▷ EXERCISE 4.6.

Let T be a tree without leaves such that for every vertex u , there is some vertex $x \geq u$ with at least two children and with $|x| < |u| + N$. Show that if $\langle X_n \rangle$ is simple random walk on T , then

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X_n|}{n} \geq \frac{1}{3N} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

▷ EXERCISE 4.7.

It does not suffice that $\text{br } T > 1$ for the speed of simple random walk on T to be positive. Show this for the tree T , which is a binary tree to every vertex of which is joined a unary tree; see Figure 4.3.

In the other direction, we have the following condition necessary for positive speed:




Figure 4.3.

PROPOSITION 4.11. (PERES) *If simple random walk on T escapes at a linear rate, then $\text{br } T > 1$. More precisely, if $\langle X_n \rangle$ is simple random walk on T and*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X_n|}{n} \geq s$$

with positive probability, then $\text{br } T \geq e^{I(s)/s}$.

Proof. We may assume that T has no leaves since leaves only slow the random walk and do not change the branching number. (The slowing effect of leaves can be proved rigorously by coupling a random walk $\langle X_n \rangle$ on T with a random walk $\langle X'_n \rangle$ on T' , where T' is the result of removing the leaves from T . They can be coupled so that $\liminf |X'_n|/n \geq \liminf |X_n|/n$ by letting $\langle X'_n \rangle$ take only the moves of $\langle X_n \rangle$ that do not lead to vertices with no infinite line of descent.) Given $0 < s' < s$, there is some L such that

$$q := \mathbf{P}[\forall n \geq L \quad |X_n| > s'n] > 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Define the general percolation on T by keeping those edges $e(x)$ such that $|x| \leq s'L$ or $\exists n < |x|/s' \quad X_n = x$. According to (4.7), the component of the root in this percolation is infinite with probability at least q . On the other hand, if $|x| > s'L$, then $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x]$ is bounded above by the probability that simple random walk $\langle S_k \rangle$ on \mathbb{Z} moves distance at least $|x|$ in $|x|/s'$ steps:

$$\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x] \leq \mathbf{P}[\max_{n < |x|/s'} |S_n| \geq |x|]. \tag{4.8}$$

(This is proved rigorously by coupling the random walk on T to a random walk $\langle Y_n \rangle$ on \mathbb{Z} by letting $\langle Y_n \rangle$ take only the moves of $\langle X_n \rangle$ that lie on the shortest path between o and x .) Now by the reflection principle,

$$\mathbf{P}[\max_{n \leq N} |S_n| \geq j] \leq 2\mathbf{P}[\max_{n \leq N} S_n \geq j] \leq 4\mathbf{P}[S_N \geq j].$$

We have seen that $\mathbf{P}[S_N \geq j] \leq e^{-NI(j/N)}$. Therefore, (4.8) gives $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x] \leq 4e^{-|x|I(s')/s'}$. In light of Proposition 4.8, this means that for any cutset Π with all edges at level $> s'L$, we have

$$q \leq \sum_{e(x) \in \Pi} 4e^{-|x|I(s')/s'}.$$

Therefore, $\text{br } T \geq e^{I(s')/s'}$. Since this holds for all $s' < s$, the result follows. \blacktriangleleft

§4.3. The Weighted Second-Moment Method.

A lower bound on $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty]$ for a general percolation on a graph G can be obtained by the second-moment method. Fix $o \in G$ and let Π be a set of edges. Assume for simplicity that $\mathbf{P}[e \in G(\omega)] > 0$ for each $e \in \mathbf{E}$. Let $\mathcal{P}(\Pi)$ be the set of probability measures μ on Π . The second moment method consists in calculating the second moment of the number of edges in Π that are connected to o . However, we will see that it can be much better to use a weighted count, rather than a pure count, of the number of connected edges. We will use $\mu \in \mathcal{P}$ to make such weights.

Namely, if we write $G_o(\omega)$ for the connected component of o in the percolation graph $G(\omega)$ and if we set

$$X(\mu) := \sum_{e \in \Pi} \mu(e) \mathbf{1}_{\{e \in G_o(\omega)\}} / \mathbf{P}[e \in G_o(\omega)],$$

then

$$\mathbf{E}[X(\mu)] = 1.$$

Write $o \leftrightarrow \Pi$ for the event that $o \leftrightarrow e$ for some $e \in \Pi$. This event is implied by the event that $X(\mu) > 0$. We are looking for a lower bound on the probability of $o \leftrightarrow \infty$. Since

$$\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty] = \inf\{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \Pi]; \Pi \text{ separates } o \text{ from } \infty\} \quad (4.9),$$

we therefore seek a lower bound on $\mathbf{P}[X(\mu) > 0]$. This will be a consequence of an upper bound on the second moment of $X(\mu)$ as follows.

PROPOSITION 4.12. *Given a general percolation on G ,*

$$\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \Pi] \geq 1/\mathbf{E}[X(\mu)^2]$$

for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Pi)$.

Proof. Given $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Pi)$, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \mathbf{E}[X(\mu)]^2 = \mathbf{E}[X(\mu) \mathbf{1}_{\{X(\mu) > 0\}}]^2 \leq \mathbf{E}[X(\mu)^2] \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{X(\mu) > 0\}}^2] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[X(\mu)^2] \mathbf{P}[X(\mu) > 0] \leq \mathbf{E}[X(\mu)^2] \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \Pi] \end{aligned}$$

since $X(\mu) > 0$ implies $o \leftrightarrow \Pi$. Therefore, $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \Pi] \geq 1/\mathbf{E}[X(\mu)^2]$. \blacktriangleleft

Clearly, we want to choose the weight function $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Pi)$ that optimizes this lower bound. Now

$$\mathbf{E}[X(\mu)^2] = \sum_{e_1, e_2 \in \Pi} \mu(e_1)\mu(e_2) \frac{\mathbf{P}[e_1, e_2 \in G_o(\omega)]}{\mathbf{P}[e_1 \in G_o(\omega)]\mathbf{P}[e_2 \in G_o(\omega)]}. \quad (4.10)$$

We denote this quantity by $\mathcal{E}(\mu)$ and call it the **energy** of μ .

Why is this called an “energy”? In general, like the energy of a flow in Chapter 2, energy is a quadratic form, usually positive definite. In electrostatics, if μ is a charge distribution confined to a conducting region Ω in space, then μ will minimize the energy

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{|x - y|^2}.$$

One could also write (4.10) as a double integral to put it in closer form to this. We too are interested in minimizing the energy. Thus, from Proposition 4.12, we obtain

PROPOSITION 4.13. *Given a general percolation on G ,*

$$\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty] \geq \inf \left\{ \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Pi)} 1/\mathcal{E}(\mu); \Pi \text{ separates } o \text{ from infinity} \right\}.$$

Proof. We have shown that $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \Pi] \geq 1/\mathcal{E}(\mu)$ for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Pi)$. Hence, the same holds when we take the sup of the right-hand side over μ . Then the result follows from (4.9). ◀

Of course, for Proposition 4.13 to be useful, one has to find a way to estimate such energies. As for the first-moment method, the case of trees is most amenable to such analysis.

Consider first the case of **independent percolation**, i.e., with $\{e \in T(\omega)\}$ mutually independent events for all edges e . If $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Pi)$, write $\mu(x)$ for $\mu(e(x))$. Then we have

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) = \sum_{e(x), e(y) \in \Pi} \mu(x)\mu(y) \frac{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x, o \leftrightarrow y]}{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x]\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow y]} = \sum_{e(x), e(y) \in \Pi} \mu(x)\mu(y)/\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x \wedge y], \quad (4.11)$$

where $x \wedge y$ denotes the furthest vertex from o that is a common ancestor of both x and y . This looks suspiciously similar to the result of the following calculation: Consider conductances on a finite tree T and some flow θ from o to the **leaves** $\partial_L T$ of T . Write $\theta(x)$ for $\theta(e(x))$.

LEMMA 4.14. *Let θ be a flow on a finite tree T from o to $\partial_L T$. Then*

$$\mathcal{E}(\theta) = \sum_{x,y \in \partial_L T} \theta(x)\theta(y)\mathcal{R}(o \leftrightarrow x \wedge y).$$

Proof. We use the fact that $\sum_{\{x \in \partial_L T; e \leq x\}} \theta(x) = \theta(e)$ for any edge e (see Exercise 2.17). Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x,y \in \partial_L T} \theta(x)\theta(y)\mathcal{R}(o \leftrightarrow x \wedge y) &= \sum_{x,y \in \partial_L T} \theta(x)\theta(y) \sum_{e \leq x \wedge y} r(e) \\ &= \sum_{e \in T} r(e) \sum_{\substack{x,y \in \partial_L T \\ x,y \geq e}} \theta(x)\theta(y) = \sum_{e \in T} r(e)\theta(e)^2 = \mathcal{E}(\theta). \quad \blacktriangleleft \end{aligned}$$

Write $\bar{\Pi} := \{x; e(x) \in \Pi\}$. If we happen to have $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x] = \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow x)$ and if θ is the flow induced by μ from o to $\bar{\Pi}$, i.e.,

$$\theta(e) := \sum_{e \leq x \in \bar{\Pi}} \mu(x),$$

then we see from (4.11) and Lemma 4.14 that $\mathcal{E}(\mu) = \mathcal{E}(\theta)$ and we can hope to profit from our understanding of electrical networks and random walks. However, if $x = o$, then the desired equation cannot hold since $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow o] = 1$ and $\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow o) = \infty$. But suppose we have, instead, that

$$1/\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x] = 1 + \mathcal{R}(o \leftrightarrow x) \tag{4.12}$$

for all vertices x . Then we find that

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) = 1 + \mathcal{E}(\theta),$$

which is hardly worse. This suggests that given a percolation problem, we choose conductances so that (4.12) holds in order to use our knowledge of electrical networks. Let us say that conductances are **adapted** to a percolation, and vice versa, if (4.12) holds.

Let the survival probability of $e(x)$ be p_x . To solve (4.12) explicitly for the conductances in terms of the survival parameters, write \tilde{x} for the parent of x . Note that the right-hand side of (4.12) is a resistance of a series, whence

$$\begin{aligned} r(e(x)) &= [1 + \mathcal{R}(o \leftrightarrow x)] - [1 + \mathcal{R}(o \leftrightarrow \tilde{x})] = 1/\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x] - 1/\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \tilde{x}] \\ &= (1 - p_x)/\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x], \end{aligned}$$

or, in other words,

$$c(e(x)) = \frac{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x]}{1 - p_x} = \frac{1}{1 - p_x} \prod_{o < u \leq x} p_u.$$

In particular, for a given $p \in (0, 1)$, we have that $p_x \equiv p$ iff $c(e(x)) = (1 - p)^{-1}p^{|x|}$; these conductances correspond to the random walk $\text{RW}_{1/p}$ defined in Section 2.7.

▷ EXERCISE 4.8.

Show that, conversely, the survival parameters adapted to given edge resistances are

$$p_x = \frac{1 + \sum_{o < u < x} r(e(u))}{1 + \sum_{o < u \leq x} r(e(u))}.$$

For example, simple random walk ($c \equiv 1$) is adapted to $p_x = |x|/(|x| + 1)$.

THEOREM 4.15. (LYONS, 1992) *For an independent percolation and adapted conductances on the same tree, we have*

$$\frac{\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)}{1 + \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)} \leq \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty].$$

Proof. We first estimate the sup in Proposition 4.13: given Π , let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Pi)$ be the measure in $\mathcal{P}(\Pi)$ that has minimum energy and let θ be the flow induced by μ . We have

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) = 1 + \mathcal{E}(\theta) = 1 + \mathcal{R}(o \leftrightarrow \bar{\Pi}).$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty] \geq \inf_{\Pi} 1/[1 + \mathcal{R}(o \leftrightarrow \bar{\Pi})] = 1/[1 + \mathcal{R}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)],$$

as desired. ◀

An immediate corollary of this combined with (4.5) and Theorems 2.3 and 2.19 is:

THEOREM 4.16. (LYONS, 1990) *For any locally finite infinite tree T ,*

$$p_c(T) = \frac{1}{\text{br } T}.$$

This reinforces the idea of $\text{br } T$ as an average number of branches per vertex.

Open Question. This result shows that the first-moment method correctly identifies the critical value for Bernoulli percolation on trees. Does it in general? In other words, if the right-hand side of (4.4) is strictly positive for Bernoulli(p) percolation on a connected graph G , then must it be the case that $p \geq p_c(G)$? This is known to hold on \mathbb{Z}^d and on “tree-like” graphs; see Lyons (1989). However, Kahn (2004) gives a counterexample and suggests the following modification of the question: Write $A(x, e, \Pi)$ for the event that there is an open path from x to e that is disjoint from $\Pi \setminus \{e\}$. If

$$\inf \left\{ \sum_{e \in \Pi} \mathbf{P}_p[A(x, e, \Pi)]; \Pi \text{ separates } x \text{ from infinity} \right\} > 0,$$

then is $p \geq p_c(G)$?

It turns out that the inequality in Theorem 4.15 can be reversed up to a factor of 2. This requires a stopping-time method, which will be the topic of the next section.

We will now consider other applications of the second-moment method to percolation on trees. We call a percolation **quasi-independent*** if $\exists M < \infty \forall x, y$ with $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x \wedge y] > 0$,

$$\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x, o \leftrightarrow y \mid o \leftrightarrow x \wedge y] \leq M \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x \mid o \leftrightarrow x \wedge y] \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow y \mid o \leftrightarrow x \wedge y],$$

or, what is the same, if $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x] \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow y] > 0$, then

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x, o \leftrightarrow y]}{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x] \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow y]} \leq M / \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x \wedge y].$$

This occurs in many situations where we do not have independent percolation.

EXAMPLE 4.17. If $\inf_{x \neq o} \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x \mid o \leftrightarrow \tilde{x}] > 0$ and if

$$\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x, o \leftrightarrow y \mid o \leftrightarrow x \wedge y] = \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x \mid o \leftrightarrow \tilde{x}] \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \tilde{x}, o \leftrightarrow y \mid o \leftrightarrow \tilde{x} \wedge y]$$

whenever $\tilde{x} \neq x \wedge y$, then the percolation is quasi-independent.

▷ EXERCISE 4.9.

Verify the assertion of Example 4.17.

[GIVE AN EXAMPLE OF QUASI-INDEPENDENT PERCOLATION: label edges ± 1 and take those x with $|S_x| \leq N$]

THEOREM 4.18. (LYONS, 1989) *For a quasi-independent percolation with constant M and adapted conductances, we have*

$$\frac{1}{M} \frac{\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)}{1 + \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)} \leq \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty].$$

Proof. For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Pi)$, write

$$\mathcal{E}'(\mu) := \sum_{e(x), e(y) \in \Pi} \mu(x) \mu(y) / \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x \wedge y].$$

Then the definition of quasi-independent gives $\mathcal{E}(\mu) \leq M \mathcal{E}'(\mu)$. Also, if θ is the flow induced by μ , then $\mathcal{E}'(\mu) = 1 + \mathcal{E}(\theta)$. Hence

$$\mathbf{E}[X(\mu)^2] = \mathcal{E}(\mu) \leq M \mathcal{E}'(\mu) = M[1 + \mathcal{E}(\theta)],$$

and the rest of the proof of Theorem 4.15 can be followed to the desired conclusion. ◀

[PUT IN MORE EXAMPLES AND EXERCISES.]

* This was called “quasi-Bernoulli” in Lyons (1989, 1992).

§4.4. Reversing the Second-Moment Inequality.

The first- and second-moment methods give inequalities in very general situations. These two inequalities usually give fairly close estimates of a probability, but do not agree up to a constant factor. Thus, one must search for additional information. Usually, the estimate that the second-moment method gives is sharper than the one provided by the first moment. A method for showing the sharpness of the estimate given by the second-moment method will be described here in the context of percolation; it depends on a Markov-like structure (see also Exercise 13.6).

This method seems to be due to Hawkes (1970/71) and Shepp (1972). It was applied to trees in Lyons (1992) and to Markov chains (with a slight improvement) by Benjamini, Pemantle, and Peres (1995) (see Exercise 13.6). Consider independent percolation on a tree. Embed the tree in the upper half-plane with its root at the origin. Given a minimal cutset Π separating o from ∞ , order Π clockwise. Call this linear ordering \preceq . This has the property that for all $e \in \Pi$, the events $\{o \leftrightarrow e'\}$ for $e' \preceq e$ are conditionally independent of the events $\{o \leftrightarrow e''\}$ for $e'' \succ e$ given that $o \leftrightarrow e$. On the event $o \leftrightarrow \Pi$, define e^* to be the (random) least edge in Π that is in the connected component of o ; on $o \nleftrightarrow \Pi$, define e^* to take some value not in Π . Let σ be the (possibly defective) hitting measure

$$\sigma(e) := \mathbf{P}[e^* = e] \quad (e \in \Pi),$$

so that

$$\sigma(\Pi) = \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \Pi].$$

Provided $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \Pi] > 0$, we may define

$$\mu := \sigma / \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \Pi] \in \mathcal{P}(\Pi).$$

For all $e \in \Pi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e' \preceq e} \sigma(e') \frac{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e', o \leftrightarrow e]}{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e']} &= \sum_{e' \preceq e} \mathbf{P}[e^* = e'] \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e \mid o \leftrightarrow e'] \\ &= \sum_{e' \preceq e} \mathbf{P}[e^* = e'] \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e \mid e^* = e'] \\ &= \sum_{e' \in \Pi} \mathbf{P}[e^* = e'] \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e \mid e^* = e'] = \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\sum_{e' \preceq e} \mu(e') \frac{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e', o \leftrightarrow e]}{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e'] \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e]} = 1 / \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \Pi].$$

By symmetry, it follows that

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) \leq 2 \sum_{e \in \Pi} \sum_{e' \preceq e} \mu(e)\mu(e') \frac{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e', o \leftrightarrow e]}{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e']\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow e]} = 2 \sum_{e \in \Pi} \mu(e)/\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \Pi] = 2/\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \Pi].$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \Pi] \leq 2/\mathcal{E}(\mu) \leq 2 \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\Pi)} 1/\mathcal{E}(\nu).$$

To sum up, provided such orderings on cutsets Π exist, we are able to reverse the inequality of Proposition 4.13 up to a factor of 2.

THEOREM 4.19. (LYONS, 1992) *For an independent percolation on a tree with adapted conductances, we have*

$$\frac{\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)}{1 + \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)} \leq \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty] \leq 2 \frac{\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)}{1 + \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)}, \quad (4.13)$$

which is the same as

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty]}{2 - \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty]} \leq \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty) \leq \frac{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty]}{1 - \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty]}.$$

Consequently, we obtain a sharp refinement of Theorem 4.16:

COROLLARY 4.20. *Percolation occurs (i.e., $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty] > 0$) iff random walk on T is transient.*

Sometimes it is useful to consider percolation on a finite portion of T (which is, in fact, how our proofs have proceeded). We have shown that for finite trees,

$$\frac{\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \partial_L T)}{1 + \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \partial_L T)} \leq \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \partial_L T] \leq 2 \frac{\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \partial_L T)}{1 + \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \partial_L T)}, \quad (4.14)$$

which is the same as

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \partial_L T]}{2 - \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \partial_L T]} \leq \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \partial_L T) \leq \frac{\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \partial_L T]}{1 - \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \partial_L T]}.$$

REMARK. Add a vertex Δ to T joined to o by an edge of conductance 1. Then doing random walk on $T \cup \{\Delta\}$, we have

$$\frac{\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \partial_L T)}{1 + \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \partial_L T)} = \mathbf{P}_o[\tau_{\partial_L T} \leq \tau_\Delta],$$

so (4.14) is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{P}_o[\tau_{\partial_L T} \leq \tau_\Delta] \leq \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \partial_L T] \leq 2\mathbf{P}_o[\tau_{\partial_L T} \leq \tau_\Delta].$$

Likewise, on an infinite tree, (4.13) is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{P}_o[\tau_\Delta = \infty] \leq \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \partial T] \leq 2\mathbf{P}_o[\tau_\Delta = \infty].$$

Note also that the condition of being adapted, (4.12), becomes

$$\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x] = \mathcal{C}(\Delta \leftrightarrow x).$$

▷ EXERCISE 4.10.

Give a tree for which percolation does and a tree for which percolation does not occur at criticality.

▷ EXERCISE 4.11.

Show that critical homesick random walk on Galton-Watson trees is a.s. recurrent in two ways: (1) by using this theorem; (2) by using the Nash-Williams criterion.

As in Exercise 4.32, Theorem 4.19 can be used to solve problems about random walk on deterministic or random trees. Indeed, sometimes percolation is crucial to such solutions (see, e.g., Lyons (1992)).

§4.5. Galton-Watson Networks.

In the preceding sections, we have seen some examples of the application of percolation to questions that do not appear to involve percolation (Corollary 4.10, Proposition 4.11, and Exercise 4.32). We will give another example in this section. Consider the following Galton-Watson “networks” generated by a random variable $\mathcal{L} := (L, A_1, \dots, A_L)$, $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $A_i \in (0, 1]$. First, use L as an offspring random variable to generate a Galton-Watson tree. Then give each individual x of the tree an i.i.d. copy \mathcal{L}_x of \mathcal{L} ; thus, $\mathcal{L}_x = (L_x, A_{y_1}, \dots, A_{y_{L_x}})$, where y_1, \dots, y_{L_x} are the children of x . Use these random variables to assign edge capacities (or weights or conductances)

$$c(e(x)) := \prod_{w \leq x} A_w.$$

We will see the usefulness of such networks for the study of random fractals in Section 12.3. When can water flow to ∞ ? Note that if $A_i \equiv 1$, then water can flow to ∞ iff the tree is infinite. Let

$$\gamma := \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^L A_i \right].$$

The following theorem of Falconer (1986) shows that the condition for positive flow to infinity with positive probability on these Galton-Watson networks is $\gamma > 1$. Of course, when $A_i \equiv 1$, this reduces to the usual survival criterion for Galton-Watson processes. In general, this theorem confirms the intuition that in order for flow to infinity to be possible, more water must be able to flow from parent to children, on average, than from grandparent to parent.

THEOREM 4.21. (FALCONER, 1986) *If $\gamma \leq 1$, then a.s. no flow is possible unless $\sum_1^L A_i = 1$ a.s. If $\gamma > 1$, then flow is possible a.s. on nonextinction.*

Proof. (Lyons and Peres) As usual, let T_1 denote the set of individuals (or vertices) of the first generation. Let F be the maximum strength of an admissible flow.

The proof of the first part of the theorem uses the same idea as the proof of Lemma 4.4(b) of Falconer (1987). For $x \in T_1$, let F_x be the maximum strength of an admissible flow from x to infinity through the subtree T^x with capacities $e \mapsto c(e)/A_x$. Thus, F_x has the same law as F has. It is easily seen that

$$F = \sum_{x \in T_1} (A_x \wedge (A_x F_x)) = \sum_{x \in T_1} A_x (1 \wedge F_x).$$

Now suppose that $\gamma \leq 1$. Taking expectations in the preceding equation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[F] &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[F \mid \mathcal{L}_o]] = \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{x \in T_1} A_x (1 \wedge F_x) \mid \mathcal{L}_o\right]\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{x \in T_1} \mathbf{E}[A_x (1 \wedge F_x) \mid \mathcal{L}_o]\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{x \in T_1} A_x \mathbf{E}[1 \wedge F_x \mid \mathcal{L}_o]\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{x \in T_1} A_x \mathbf{E}[1 \wedge F]\right] = \gamma \mathbf{E}[1 \wedge F] \leq \mathbf{E}[1 \wedge F]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $F \leq 1$ almost surely and $\mathbf{P}[F > 0] > 0$ only if $\gamma = 1$. In addition, we have, by independence,

$$\|F\|_\infty = \left\| \sum_{x \in T_1} A_x \right\|_\infty \cdot \|F\|_\infty.$$

If $\|F\|_\infty > 0$, it follows that $\left\| \sum_{x \in T_1} A_x \right\|_\infty = 1$. In combination with $\gamma = 1$, this implies that $\sum_{x \in T_1} A_x = 1$ a.s.

For the second part, we introduce percolation as in the proof of Corollary 4.10 via Proposition 4.9. Namely, augment the probability space so that for each vertex $u \neq o$, there is a random variable X_u taking the value 1 with probability A_u and 0 otherwise, with $\langle X_u \rangle$ conditionally independent given all \mathcal{L}_u . Denote by \mathcal{F} the σ -field generated by the random variables \mathcal{L}_u . Consider the subtree of the Galton-Watson tree consisting of the initial individual o together with those individuals u such that $\prod_{w \leq u} X_w = 1$. This subtree has, unconditionally, the law of a Galton-Watson branching process with progeny distribution the unconditional law of

$$\sum_{u \in T_1} X_u.$$

Let \mathcal{Q} be the probability that this subtree is infinite conditional on \mathcal{F} . Now the unconditional mean of the new process is

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{u \in T_1} X_u\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{u \in T_1} X_u \mid \mathcal{L}_o\right]\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{u \in T_1} A_u\right] = \gamma,$$

whence if $\gamma > 1$, then this new Galton-Watson branching process survives with positive probability, say, Q . Of course, $Q = \mathbf{E}[Q]$. On the other hand, for any cutset Π of the original Galton-Watson tree, $\sum_{e \in \Pi} c(e)$ is the expected number, given \mathcal{F} , of edges in Π that are also in the subtree. This expectation is at least the probability that the number of such edges is at least one, which, in turn, is at least Q :

$$F = \inf_{\Pi} \sum_{e \in \Pi} c(e) \geq Q.$$

Hence $F > 0$ on the event $Q > 0$. The event $Q > 0$ has positive probability since $Q > 0$, whence $\mathbf{P}[F > 0] > 0$. Since the event that $F = 0$ is clearly inherited, it follows that $\mathbf{P}[F = 0] = q$. ◀

We will return to percolation on trees in Chapter 13.

§4.6. Additional Exercises.

4.12. Suppose that L_n are offspring random variables that converge in law to an offspring random variable L . Let the corresponding extinction probabilities be q_n and q . Show that $q_n \rightarrow q$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

4.13. Give another proof that $m \leq 1 \Rightarrow$ a.s. extinction unless $p_1 = 1$ as follows. Let Z_1^* be the number of particles of the first generation with an infinite line of descent. Let $Z_1^{(i)*}$ be the number of children of the i th particle of the first generation with an infinite line of descent. Show that $Z_1^* = \sum_{i=1}^{Z_1} 1 \wedge Z_1^{(i)*}$. Take the L^1 and L^∞ norms of this equation to get the desired conclusion.

4.14. Give another proof of Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.4 as follows. Write

$$Z_{n+1} = Z_n + \sum_{i=1}^{Z_n} \left(L_i^{(n+1)} - 1\right).$$

This is a randomly sampled random walk. Apply the strong law of large numbers or the Chung-Fuchs theorem (Durrett (1996), p. 189), as appropriate.

4.15. Show that $\langle Z_n \rangle$ is a nonnegative supermartingale when $m \leq 1$ to give another proof of a.s. extinction when $m \leq 1$ and $p_1 \neq 1$.

4.16. Show that if $0 < r < 1$ satisfies $f(r) = r$, then $\langle r^{Z_n} \rangle$ is a martingale. Use this to give another proof of Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.4 in the case $m > 1$.

4.17. (Grey, 1980) Let $\langle Z_n \rangle, \langle Z'_n \rangle$ be independent Galton-Watson processes with identical offspring distribution and arbitrary, possibly random, Z_0, Z'_0 with $Z_0 + Z'_0 \geq 1$ a.s., and set

$$Y_n := \begin{cases} Z_n/(Z_n + Z'_n) & \text{if } Z_n + Z'_n \neq 0; \\ Y_{n-1} & \text{if } Z_n + Z'_n = 0. \end{cases}$$

(a) Fix n . Let A be the event

$$A := \{Z_{n+1} + Z'_{n+1} \neq 0\}$$

and \mathcal{F}_n be the σ -field generated by $Z_0, \dots, Z_n, Z'_0, \dots, Z'_n$. Use symmetry to show that $\mathbf{E}[L_i^{(n+1)} / (Z_{n+1} + Z'_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = 1 / (Z_n + Z'_n)$ on the event A .

(b) Show that $\langle Y_n \rangle$ is a martingale with a.s. limit Y .

(c) If $1 < m < \infty$, show that $0 < Y < 1$ a.s. on the event $Z_n \not\rightarrow 0$ and $Z'_n \not\rightarrow 0$. *Hint:* Let $Y^{(k)} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Z_n / (Z_n + Z'_{k+n})$. Then $\mathbf{E}[Y^{(k)} \mid Z_0, Z'_k] = Z_0 / (Z_0 + Z'_k)$ and $\mathbf{P}[Y = 1, Z_n \not\rightarrow 0, Z'_n \not\rightarrow 0] = \mathbf{P}[Y^{(k)} = 1, Z_n \not\rightarrow 0, Z'_n \not\rightarrow 0] \leq \mathbf{E}[Y^{(k)} \mathbf{1}_{\{Z'_k > 0\}}] \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

4.18. In the notation of Exercise 4.17, show that if $Z_0 \equiv Z'_0 \equiv 1$ and $m < \infty$, then

$$\mathbf{P}[Y \in (0, 1)] = (1 - q)^2 + p_0^2 + \sum_{n \geq 1} [f^{(n+1)}(0) - f^{(n)}(0)]^2.$$

4.19. Deduce the Seneta-Heyde theorem from Grey's theorem (Exercise 4.17).

4.20. Show that $Z_{n+1}/Z_n \rightarrow m$ a.s. on nonextinction if $m < \infty$.

4.21. Deduce Corollary 4.10 from Hawkes's earlier result (that is, from the special case where it is assumed that $\mathbf{E}[L(\log L)^2] < \infty$) by considering truncation of the progeny random variable, L .

4.22. Let $\theta_n(p)$ denote the probability that the root of an n -ary tree has an infinite component under Bernoulli(p) percolation. Thus, $\theta_n(p) = 0$ iff $p \leq 1/n$. Calculate and graph $\theta_2(p)$ and $\theta_3(p)$. Show that for all $n \geq 2$, the left-hand derivative of θ_n at 1 is 0 and the right-hand derivative of θ_n at $1/n$ is $2n^2/(n-1)$.

4.23. Prove the analogue of Proposition 4.11 for RW_λ . Show, in particular, that if the speed of RW_λ is positive with positive probability, then $\text{br } T > \lambda$.

4.24. Show that for $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\Pi)$,

$$\mathcal{E}\left(\frac{\mu_1 + \mu_2}{2}\right) + \mathcal{E}\left(\frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{2}\right) = \frac{\mathcal{E}(\mu_1) + \mathcal{E}(\mu_2)}{2},$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\bullet)$ is extended in the obvious way to non-probability measures.

4.25. Show that if G is locally finite and $\mathbf{P}[e_1, e_2 \subseteq G_o(\omega)] \neq 0$ for every pair $e_1, e_2 \in \Pi$, then $\mathcal{E}(\bullet)$ has a unique minimum on $\mathcal{P}(\Pi)$.

4.26. Let T be the family tree of a supercritical Galton-Watson process. Show that a.s. on the event of nonextinction, simple random walk on T is transient.

4.27. Given a quasi-independent percolation on a locally finite tree T with $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow u \mid o \leftrightarrow \tilde{u}] \equiv p$, show that if $p < (\text{br } T)^{-1}$, then $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty] = 0$ while if $p > (\text{br } T)^{-1}$, then $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty] > 0$.

4.28. Let T be any tree on which simple random walk is transient. Let U be a random variable uniform on $[0, 1]$. Define the percolation on T by taking the subtree of all edges at distance at most $1/U$. Show that the inequality of Theorem 4.18 fails if conductances are adapted to this percolation.

4.29. Let T be any tree. Let U_x be i.i.d. random variables uniform on $[0, 1]$ indexed by the vertices of T . Define the percolation on T by taking the subgraph spanned by all vertices x such that $U_x \leq U_o$. Show that percolation occurs iff $\text{br } T > 1$. Show that this percolation is not quasi-independent.

4.30. Let $T(n)$ be a binary tree of height n and consider Bernoulli(1/2) percolation. For large n , which inequalities in (4.14) are closest to equalities?

4.31. Let T be a binary tree and consider Bernoulli(p) percolation with $p \in (1/2, 1)$. Which inequalities in Theorem 4.19 have the ratios of the two sides closest to 1?

4.32. Randomly stretch a tree T by adding vertices to the edges to make the edge $e(x)$ a path of length $L_x(\omega)$ with L_x i.i.d. Call the resulting tree $T(\omega)$. Calculate $\text{br } T(\omega)$. Show that $\text{br } T > 1 \Rightarrow \text{br } T(\omega) > 1$ a.s. If we assume only that simple random walk on T is transient, is simple random walk on $T(\omega)$ transient a.s.?

4.33. Consider a percolation on T such that there is some $M' > 0$ such that, for all $x, y \in T$ and $A \subseteq T$ with the property that the removal of $x \wedge y$ would disconnect y from every vertex in A ,

$$\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow y \mid o \leftrightarrow x, o \leftrightarrow A] \geq M' \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x \mid o \leftrightarrow x \wedge y].$$

Show that the adapted conductances satisfy

$$\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \infty] \leq \frac{2}{M'} \frac{\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)}{1 + \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)}.$$

Chapter 5

Isoperimetric Inequalities

Just as the branching number of a tree is for most purposes more important than the growth rate, there is a number for a general graph that is more important for many purposes than its growth rate. In the present chapter, we consider this number, or, rather, several variants of it, called isoperimetric constants. This is not an extension of the branching number, however; for that, the reader can see Section 11.2. Also, see Virág (2000b) for a more powerful extension of branching number to graphs and even to networks on trees.

§5.1. Flows and Submodularity.

A common illegal scheme for making money, known as a pyramid scheme or Ponzi scheme, goes essentially as follows. You convince 10 people to send you \$100 each and to ask 10 others in turn to send them \$100. Everyone who manages to do this will profit \$900 (and you will profit \$1000). Of course, some people will lose \$100 in the end. But suppose that we had an infinite number of people. Then no one need lose money and indeed everyone can profit \$900. Suppose, however, that people can ask only people they know. For simplicity, suppose that people are at the vertices of the square lattice and know only their 4 nearest neighbors. Is it now possible for everyone to profit \$900 (we now do not assume that only \$100 can be passed from one person to another)? Well, if the amount of money allowed to change hands (i.e., the amount crossing any edge) is unbounded, then certainly this is possible. But suppose the amount is bounded by, say, \$1,000,000? The answer now is “no” (although it is still possible for everyone to profit, but the profit cannot be bounded away from 0).

Why is this? Consider first the case that there are only a finite number of people. If we simply add up the total net gains, we obtain 0, whence it is impossible for everyone to gain a strictly positive amount. For the lattice case, consider all the people lying within distance n of the origin. What is the *average* net gain of these people? The only reason this average might not be 0 is that money can cross the boundary. However, because of our assumption that the money crossing any edge is bounded, it follows that for the average

net gain, this boundary crossing is negligible in the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence the average net gain of everyone is 0 and it cannot be that everyone profits \$900 (or even just one cent).

But what if the neighbor graph was that of Figure 2.4? The figure suggests that the preceding argument, which depended on finding finite subsets of vertices with relatively few edges leading out of them, will not work. Does that mean everyone could profit \$900? What is the maximum profit everyone could make? The picture also suggests that the graph is somewhat like a tree, which suggests that significant profit is possible. Indeed, this is true, as we now show. We will generalize this problem a little by restricting the amount that can flow over edge e to be at most $c(e)$ and by supposing that the person at location x has as a goal to profit $D(x)$. We ask what the maximum α is such that each person x can profit $\alpha D(x)$. Thus, on the euclidean lattice, we saw that $\alpha = 0$ when c is bounded above and D is bounded below.

Let now G be a graph. Weight the edges by positive numbers $c(e)$ and the vertices by positive numbers $D(x)$. We call (G, c, D) a **network**. We assume that G is locally finite, or, more generally, that for each x ,

$$\sum_{e^- = x} c(e) < \infty. \tag{5.1}$$

For $K \subset V$, we define the **edge boundary** $\partial_E K := \{e \in E; e^- \in K, e^+ \notin K\}$. Write

$$|K|_D := \sum_{x \in K} D(x)$$

and

$$|\partial_E K|_c := \sum_{e \in \partial_E K} c(e).$$

Define the (c, D) -**isoperimetric constant** of G by

$$\iota_E(G) := \inf \left\{ \frac{|\partial_E K|_c}{|K|_D}; \emptyset \neq K \subset V \text{ is finite} \right\}.$$

This is a measure of how small we can make the boundary effects in our argument above. The most common choices for (c, D) are $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$ and $(\mathbf{1}, \text{deg})$. For a network with conductances c , one often chooses (c, π) (as in Section 5.2 below). When $\iota_E(G) = 0$, we say the network is **amenable**, since there is then a reasonable way of taking averages (“means”). When c and D are understood, we refer to $\iota_E(G)$ as the **edge isoperimetric constant** of G . Thus, the square lattice is amenable; but note that there are large sets in \mathbb{Z}^2 that also have large boundary. The point is that there exist sets that have relatively small boundary. This is impossible for a regular tree of degree at least 3.

▷ EXERCISE 5.1.

Show that $\iota_{\mathbb{E}}(\mathbb{T}_{b+1}) = b - 1$ for all $b \geq 1$.

The opposite of “amenable” is **nonamenable**; one also says that a nonamenable network satisfies a **strong isoperimetric inequality**.

The following theorem shows that $\iota_{\mathbb{E}}(G)$ is precisely the maximum proportional profit α that we seek (actually, because of our choice of d^* , we need to take the negative of the function θ guaranteed by Theorem 5.1). The theorem thus dualizes the inf in $\iota_{\mathbb{E}}(G)$ not only to a sup, but to a max. It is due to Benjamini, Lyons, Peres, and Schramm (1999b), hereinafter referred to as BLPS (1999).

THEOREM 5.1. *For any network (G, c, D) , we have*

$$\iota_{\mathbb{E}}(G) = \max\{\alpha \geq 0; \exists \theta \forall e |\theta(e)| \leq c(e) \text{ and } \forall x d^*\theta(x) = \alpha D(x)\},$$

where θ runs over the antisymmetric functions on \mathbb{E} .

Proof. Denote by A the set of α of which the maximum is taken on the right-hand side of the desired equation. Thus, we want to show that $\max A = \iota_{\mathbb{E}}(G)$. In fact, we will show that $A = [0, \iota_{\mathbb{E}}(G)]$.

Given $\alpha \geq 0$ and any finite nonempty $K \subset \mathbb{V}$, define the network G_K with vertices K and two extra vertices, a and z . The edges are those of G with both endpoints in K , those in $\partial_{\mathbb{E}}K$ where the endpoint not in K is replaced by z , and an edge between a and each point in K . Give all edges e with both endpoints in K the capacity $c(e)$. Give the edges $[x, z]$ the capacity of the corresponding edge in $\partial_{\mathbb{E}}K$. Give the other edges capacity $c(a, x) := \alpha D(x)$.

In view of the cutset consisting of all edges incident to z , it is clear that any flow from a to z in G_K has strength at most $|\partial_{\mathbb{E}}K|_c$. Suppose that $\alpha \in A$. Then there is a function θ satisfying $\forall e |\theta(e)| \leq c(e)$ and $\forall x d^*\theta(x) = \alpha D(x)$. This function θ induces a flow on G_K from a to z meeting the capacity constraints and of strength $\alpha|K|_D$, whence $\alpha \leq |\partial_{\mathbb{E}}K|_c/|K|_D$. Since this holds for all K , we get $\alpha \leq \iota_{\mathbb{E}}(G)$.

In the other direction, if $\alpha \leq \iota_{\mathbb{E}}(G)$, then for all finite K , we claim that there is a flow from a to z in G_K of strength $\alpha|K|_D$. Consider any cutset Π separating a and z . Let K' be the vertices in K that Π separates from z . Then $\partial_{\mathbb{E}}K' \subseteq \Pi$ and $[a, x] \in \Pi$ for all $x \in K \setminus K'$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in \Pi} c(e) &\geq |\partial_{\mathbb{E}}K'|_c + \alpha|K \setminus K'|_D \geq \iota_{\mathbb{E}}(G)|K'|_D + \alpha|K \setminus K'|_D \\ &\geq \alpha|K'|_D + \alpha|K \setminus K'|_D = \alpha|K|_D. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the claim follows from the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem. Note that the flow along $[a, x]$ is $\alpha D(x)$ for every $x \in K$.

Now let K_n be finite sets increasing to \mathbf{V} and let θ_n be the corresponding flows on G_{K_n} . There is a subsequence $\langle n_i \rangle$ such that for all edges $e \in \mathbf{E}$, the limit $\theta(e) := \theta_{n_i}(e)$ exists; clearly, $\forall e |\theta(e)| \leq c(e)$ and, by (5.1) and the Weierstrass M -test, $\forall x d^*\theta(x) = \alpha D(x)$. Thus, $\alpha \in A$. \blacktriangleleft

Is the infimum in the definition of $\iota_{\mathbf{E}}(G)$ a minimum? Certainly not in the amenable case. The reader should find an example where it is a minimum, however. It turns out that in the transitive case, it is never a minimum. Here, we say that a network is **transitive** if there is an automorphism of the underlying graph that preserves the edge weights c and vertex weights D . In order to prove that transitive networks do not have minimizing sets, we will use the following concept.

A function b on finite subsets of \mathbf{V} is called **submodular** if

$$\forall K, K' \quad b(K \cup K') + b(K \cap K') \leq b(K) + b(K'). \quad (5.2)$$

For example, $K \mapsto |K|_D$ is obviously submodular with equality holding in (5.2). The identity

$$|\partial_{\mathbf{E}}(K \cup K')|_c + |\partial_{\mathbf{E}}(K \cap K')|_c + 2|\partial_{\mathbf{E}}(K \setminus K') \cap \partial_{\mathbf{E}}(K' \setminus K)|_c = |\partial_{\mathbf{E}}K|_c + |\partial_{\mathbf{E}}K'|_c, \quad (5.3)$$

is easy, though tedious, to check. It shows that $K \mapsto |\partial_{\mathbf{E}}K|_c$ is submodular, with equality holding in (5.2) iff $\partial_{\mathbf{E}}(K \setminus K') \cap \partial_{\mathbf{E}}(K' \setminus K) = \emptyset$, which is the same as $K \setminus K'$ not adjacent to $K' \setminus K$.

THEOREM 5.2. (BLPS (1999)) *If (G, c, D) is an infinite transitive network, then for all finite nonempty $K \subset \mathbf{V}$, we have $|\partial_{\mathbf{E}}K|_c/|K|_D > \iota_{\mathbf{E}}(G)$.*

Proof. At first, we do not need to suppose that G is transitive. By the submodularity of $b(K) := |\partial_{\mathbf{E}}K|_c$ and the fact that

$$\forall K, K' \quad |K \cup K'|_D + |K \cap K'|_D = |K|_D + |K'|_D,$$

we have for any finite K and K' ,

$$\frac{b(K \cup K') + b(K \cap K')}{|K \cup K'|_D + |K \cap K'|_D} \leq \frac{b(K) + b(K')}{|K|_D + |K'|_D},$$

with equality iff $K \setminus K'$ is not adjacent to $K' \setminus K$. Now when a, b, c, d are positive numbers, we have

$$\min\{a/b, c/d\} \leq (a + c)/(b + d) \leq \max\{a/b, c/d\}.$$

Therefore

$$\min \left\{ \frac{b(K \cup K')}{|K \cup K'|_D}, \frac{b(K \cap K')}{|K \cap K'|_D} \right\} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{b(K)}{|K|_D}, \frac{b(K')}{|K'|_D} \right\}, \quad (5.4)$$

with equality iff $K \setminus K'$ is not adjacent to $K' \setminus K$ and all four quotients appearing in (5.4) are equal. (In case $K \cap K'$ is empty, omit it on the left-hand side.)

Now suppose that G is transitive. Suppose for a contradiction that there is some finite set K with $b(K)/|K|_D = \iota_E(G)$. Choose some such set K of minimal cardinality. Let $o \in K$ and choose an automorphism γ such that γo is outside K but adjacent to some vertex in K . Define $K' := \gamma K$. Note that $b(K')/|K'|_D = b(K)/|K|_D$. If $K \cap K' \neq \emptyset$, then our choice of K implies that equality cannot hold in (5.4), whence $K \cup K'$ has a strictly smaller quotient, a contradiction. But if $K \cap K' = \emptyset$, then $K \setminus K'$ and $K' \setminus K$ are adjacent, whence (5.4) shows again that $K \cup K'$ has a strictly smaller quotient, a contradiction. ◀

Sometimes it is useful to look at boundary vertices rather than boundary edges. Thus, given positive numbers $D(x)$ on the vertices of a graph G , define the **(external) vertex boundary**

$$\partial_V K := \{x \notin K; \exists y \in K, y \sim x\}$$

and

$$\iota_V(G) := \inf \left\{ \frac{|\partial_V K|_D}{|K|_D}; \emptyset \neq K \subset V \text{ is finite} \right\},$$

the **D -isoperimetric constant** of G . The most common choice is $D = \mathbf{1}$. The analogue of Theorem 5.1 involves the amount flowing along edges into vertices,

$$\text{flow}_+(\theta, x) := \sum_{e^+ = x} (\theta(e) \vee 0).$$

THEOREM 5.3. (BENJAMINI AND SCHRAMM, 1997) *For any graph G with vertex weights D , we have*

$$\iota_V(G) = \max\{\alpha \geq 0; \exists \theta \forall x \text{ flow}_+(\theta, x) \leq D(x) \text{ and } d^* \theta(x) = \alpha D(x)\},$$

where θ runs over the antisymmetric functions on E .

Proof. Given $\alpha \geq 0$ and any finite nonempty $K \subset V$, define the network G_K with vertices $K \cup \partial_V K$ and two extra vertices, a and z . The edges are those of G that have both endpoints in $K \cup \partial_V K$, an edge between a and each point in K , and an edge between z and each point in $\partial_V K$. Give all edges incident to a capacity $c(a, x) := \alpha D(x)$. Let the capacity of the vertices in K be $c(x) := (\alpha + 1)D(x)$ and those in $\partial_V K$ be $D(x)$. The remaining edges and vertices are given infinite capacity.

In view of the cutset consisting of all vertices in $\partial_V K$, it is clear that any flow from a to z in G_K has strength at most $|\partial_V K|_D$. Now a function θ satisfying $\forall x \text{ flow}_+(\theta, x) \leq D(x)$ and $d^*\theta(x) = \alpha D(x)$ induces a flow on G_K from a to z meeting the capacity constraints and of strength $\alpha|K|_D$, whence $\alpha \leq |\partial_V K|_D/|K|_D$. Since this holds for all K , we get $\alpha \leq \iota_V(G)$.

In the other direction, if $\alpha \leq \iota_V(G)$, then for all nonempty K , we claim that there is a flow from a to z in G_K of strength $\alpha|K|_D$. Consider any cutset Π of edges and vertices separating a and z . Let K' be the vertices in K that Π separates from z . Then $\partial_V K \subset \Pi$ and $[a, x] \in \Pi$ for all $x \in K \setminus K'$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{e \in \Pi \cap E} c(e) + \sum_{x \in \Pi \cap V} c(x) \geq \alpha|K \setminus K'|_D + |\partial_V K'|_D \geq \alpha|K \setminus K'|_D + \iota_V(G)|K'|_D \geq \alpha|K|_D.$$

Thus, the claim follows from the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem (the version in Exercise 2.61). Note that the flow along $[a, x]$ is $\alpha D(x)$ for every $x \in K$.

Now let K_n be finite nonempty sets increasing to V and let θ_n be the corresponding flows on G_{K_n} . There is a subsequence $\langle n_i \rangle$ such that for all edges $e \in E$, the limit $\theta(e) := \theta_{n_i}(e)$ exists; clearly, $\forall x \text{ flow}_+(\theta, x) \leq D(x)$ and $d^*\theta(x) = \alpha D(x)$. ◀

It is easy to check that the function $K \mapsto |\partial_V K|_D$ is submodular. In fact, the following identity holds, where $\overline{K} := K \cup \partial_V K$:

$$|\partial_V(K \cup K')|_D + |\partial_V(K \cap K')|_D + |(\overline{K} \cap \overline{K'}) \setminus \overline{K \cap K'}|_D = |\partial_V K|_D + |\partial_V K'|_D. \quad (5.5)$$

THEOREM 5.4. (BLPS (1999)) *If G is an infinite transitive graph, then for all finite nonempty $K \subset V$, we have $|\partial_V K|/|K| > \iota_V(G)$.*

Proof. By the submodularity of $b(K) := |\partial_V K|$, we have for any finite K and K' , as in the proof of Theorem 5.2,

$$\min \left\{ \frac{b(K \cup K')}{|K \cup K'|}, \frac{b(K \cap K')}{|K \cap K'|} \right\} \leq \frac{b(K) + b(K')}{|K| + |K'|}, \quad (5.6)$$

with equality iff both terms on the left-hand side are equal to the right-hand side. (In case $K \cap K'$ is empty, omit it on the left-hand side.)

Now suppose that G is transitive and that K is a finite set minimizing $|K|$ among those K with $b(K)/|K| = \iota_V(G)$. Let γ be any automorphism such that $\gamma K \cap K \neq \emptyset$. Define $K' := \gamma K$. Then (5.6) shows that $K' = K$. In other words, if, instead, we choose γ so that $\gamma K \cap \partial_V K \neq \emptyset$, then $\gamma K \cap K = \emptyset$, whence (5.5) shows that $K'' := K \cup \gamma K$ satisfies $b(K'')/|K''| < b(K)/|K|$, a contradiction. ◀

An interesting aspect of Theorem 5.3 is that it enables us to find (virtually) regular subtrees in many nonamenable graphs:

THEOREM 5.5. (BENJAMINI AND SCHRAMM, 1997) *Let G be any graph with $n := \lfloor \iota_V(G) \rfloor \geq 1$. Then G has a spanning forest in which every tree is $(n + 1)$ -ary (i.e., one vertex has degree $n + 1$ and all others have degree $n + 2$).*

Proof. The proof of Theorem 5.3 in combination with Exercise 2.62 shows that there is an integer-valued θ satisfying

$$\forall x \text{ flow}_+(\theta, x) \leq 1 \text{ and } d^*\theta(x) = n. \tag{5.7}$$

If there is an oriented cycle along which $\theta = 1$, then we may change the values of θ to be 0 on the edges of this cycle without changing the validity of (5.7). Thus, we may assume that there is no such oriented cycle. After this, there is no (unoriented) cycle in the support of θ since this would force a flow $\text{flow}_+(\theta, x) \geq 2$ into some vertex x on the cycle. We may similarly assume that there is no oriented bi-infinite path along which $\theta = 1$. Thus, (5.7) shows that for every x with $\text{flow}_+(\theta, x) = 1$, there are exactly $n + 1$ edges leaving x with flow out of x equal to 1. Furthermore, the lack of an oriented bi-infinite path of flows shows that each component of the support of θ contains a vertex into which there is no flow. Thus, the support of θ is the desired spanning forest. ◀

This result can be extended to graphs with $\iota_V > 0$, but it is more complicated; see Benjamini and Schramm (1997).

§5.2. Spectral Radius.

As in Chapter 2, write

$$(f, g)_h := (fh, g) = (f, gh)$$

and

$$\|f\|_h := \sqrt{(f, f)_h}.$$

Also, let \mathbf{D}_{00} denote the collection of functions on V with finite support.

Suppose that $\langle X_n \rangle$ is a Markov chain on a countable state space V with a stationary measure π . We define

$$(Pf)(x) := \mathbf{E}_x[f(X_1)] = \sum_{y \in V} p(x, y)f(y).$$

Then P maps $\ell^2(V, \pi)$ to itself with norm

$$\|P\|_\pi := \|P\|_{\ell^2(V, \pi)} := \sup \left\{ \frac{\|Pf\|_\pi}{\|f\|_\pi} ; f \neq \mathbf{0} \right\}$$

at most 1.

▷ EXERCISE 5.2.

Prove this.

As the reader should recall, we have that

$$(P^n f)(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbf{V}} p_n(x, y) f(y)$$

when $p_n(x, y) := \mathbf{P}_x[X_n = y]$.

Let G be a (connected) graph with conductances $c(e) > 0$ on the edges and $\pi(x)$ be the sum of the conductances incident to a vertex x . The operator P that we defined above is self-adjoint: for functions $f, g \in \mathbf{D}_{00}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (Pf, g)_\pi &= \sum_{x \in \mathbf{V}} \pi(x) (Pf)(x) g(x) = \sum_{x \in \mathbf{V}} \pi(x) \left[\sum_{y \in \mathbf{V}} p(x, y) f(y) \right] g(x) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathbf{V}} \sum_{y \in \mathbf{V}} c(x, y) f(y) g(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since this is symmetric in f and g , it follows that $(Pf, g)_\pi = (f, Pg)_\pi$. Since the functions with finite support are dense in $\ell^2(\mathbf{V}, \pi)$, we get this identity for all $f, g \in \ell^2(\mathbf{V}, \pi)$.

▷ EXERCISE 5.3.

Show that

$$\|P\|_\pi = \sup \left\{ \frac{|(Pf, f)_\pi|}{(f, f)_\pi}; f \in \mathbf{D}_{00} \setminus \{0\} \right\} = \sup \left\{ \frac{(Pf, f)_\pi}{(f, f)_\pi}; f \in \mathbf{D}_{00} \setminus \{0\} \right\}.$$

The norm $\|P\|_\pi$ is usually called the spectral radius* due to the following fact:

▷ EXERCISE 5.4.

Show that for any two vertices $x, y \in \mathbf{V}$, we have

$$\|P\|_\pi = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_z (p_n(x, z) / \sqrt{\pi(z)})^{1/n} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n(x, y)^{1/n}.$$

Moreover,

$$\forall n \quad p_n(x, y) \leq \sqrt{\pi(y)/\pi(x)} \|P\|_\pi^n.$$

In probability theory, $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n(x, y)^{1/n}$ is referred to as the **spectral radius** of the Markov chain, denoted $\rho(G)$.

* For a general operator on a Banach space, its spectral radius is defined to be $\max |z|$ for z in the spectrum of the operator. This agrees with the usage in probability theory, but we shall not need this representation explicitly.

In Section 11.2, we will give some necessary conditions for random walk on a network to have positive speed. Here, we give some sufficient conditions based on the following simple observation:

PROPOSITION 5.6. *Let G be a graph with exponential upper growth rate (i.e., $1 < \overline{\text{gr}} G < \infty$) and fix some vertex $o \in G$. Suppose that the edges are labelled so that the spectral radius $\rho(G) < 1$ and π is bounded. Consider the network random walk $\langle X_n \rangle$ on G . Then the liminf speed is positive:*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}_G(o, X_n)/n \geq -\log \rho(G) / \log \overline{\text{gr}} G \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Note that $\text{dist}_G(\bullet, \bullet)$ denotes the graph distance, so that the quotient whose limit we are taking is distance divided by time. This is the reason we call it “speed”.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $X_0 = o$. Let $\alpha < -\log \rho(G) / \log \overline{\text{gr}} G$, so that $\rho(G)(\overline{\text{gr}} G)^\alpha < 1$. Choose $\lambda > \overline{\text{gr}} G$ so that $\rho(G)\lambda^\alpha < 1$. By Exercise 5.4 and our assumption that π is bounded, there is some $c < \infty$ so that for all n ,

$$\forall u \quad p_n(o, u) \leq c\rho(G)^n$$

and

$$|\{u; \text{dist}_G(o, u) \leq n\}| \leq c\lambda^n,$$

whence

$$\mathbf{P}_o[\text{dist}_G(o, X_n) \leq \alpha n] = \sum_{\text{dist}_G(o, u) \leq \alpha n} p_n(o, u) \leq c^2 \rho(G)^n \lambda^{\alpha n} = c^2 (\rho(G)\lambda^\alpha)^n.$$

Since this is summable in n , it follows by the Borel-Cantelli lemma that $\text{dist}_G(o, X_n) \leq \alpha n$ only finitely often a.s. ◀

Thus, we are interested to know when the spectral radius is less than 1. We shall show that this is equivalent to nonamenability and, in fact, there are inequalities relating the spectral radius to the (c, π) -isoperimetric constant.

Now another way to write $\iota_E(G)$ is

$$\iota_E(G)^{-1} = \sup \{(\mathbf{1}_K, \mathbf{1}_K)_\pi / (d\mathbf{1}_K, d\mathbf{1}_K)_c; \emptyset \neq K \subset \mathbf{V} \text{ is finite}\} < \infty.$$

This suggests the definition

$$\text{SD}(G) := \sup \{(f, f)_\pi / (df, df)_c; f \in \mathbf{D}_{00} \setminus \{0\}\}.$$

Of course, $\iota_E(G)^{-1} \leq \text{SD}(G)$ by substitution of $f := \mathbf{1}_K$. In fact, there is an inequality in the opposite direction as well and an identity relating $\text{SD}(G)$ to $\rho(G)$.

THEOREM 5.7. *The following are equivalent for any network:*

- (i) $\iota_E(G) > 0$;
- (ii) $SD(G) < \infty$;
- (iii) $\rho(G) < 1$.

In fact, we have

$$\iota_E(G)^2/2 \leq 1 - \sqrt{1 - \iota_E(G)^2} \leq SD(G)^{-1} \leq \iota_E(G) \quad (5.8)$$

and

$$1 - SD(G)^{-1} = \rho(G). \quad (5.9)$$

REMARK. Condition (ii) is known as a Sobolev-Dirichlet inequality.

To show this, we will use the following easy calculation:

▷ EXERCISE 5.5.

Show that for $f \in \mathbf{D}_{00}$, we have $d^*(cdf) = \pi(f - Pf)$.

The meaning of the equation in this exercise is as follows. Recall that $\nabla f := cdf$. If we define the divergence by $\operatorname{div} \theta := \pi^{-1}d^*\theta$, then Exercise 5.5 says that $\operatorname{div} \nabla = I - P$, where I is the identity. This is the discrete probabilistic Laplace operator. (For example, consider the definition of “harmonic”.)

By Exercise 5.5, we have that for $f \in \mathbf{D}_{00}$,

$$(df, df)_c = (cdf, df) = (d^*(cdf), f) = (\pi(f - Pf), f) = (f, f)_\pi - (Pf, f)_\pi. \quad (5.10)$$

Proof of Theorem 5.7. To prove (5.9), use Exercises 5.3 and 5.4, together with (5.10), to write

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(G) &= \sup \left\{ \frac{(Pf, f)_\pi}{(f, f)_\pi}; f \in \mathbf{D}_{00} \setminus \{0\} \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \frac{(f, f)_\pi - (df, df)_c}{(f, f)_\pi}; f \in \mathbf{D}_{00} \setminus \{0\} \right\} \\ &= 1 - \left(\sup \{ (f, f)_\pi / (df, df)_c; f \in \mathbf{D}_{00} \setminus \{0\} \} \right)^{-1} \\ &= 1 - SD(G)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

◀

The first inequality in (5.8) comes from the elementary inequality $1 - x/2 \geq \sqrt{1 - x}$. The last inequality in (5.8) has been observed already. To prove the crucial middle inequality, let θ be an antisymmetric function on \mathbf{E} such that $|\theta| \leq c$ and $d^*\theta = \iota_{\mathbf{E}}(G)\pi$, as guaranteed by Theorem 5.1. Then for all $f \in \mathbf{D}_{00}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (f, f)_{\pi}^2 &= (f^2, \pi)^2 = \iota_{\mathbf{E}}(G)^{-2} (f^2, d^*\theta)^2 = \iota_{\mathbf{E}}(G)^{-2} (d(f^2), \theta)^2 \\
 &\leq \iota_{\mathbf{E}}(G)^{-2} \left(\sum_{e \in \mathbf{E}_{1/2}} c(e) |f(e^+)^2 - f(e^-)^2| \right)^2 \\
 &= \iota_{\mathbf{E}}(G)^{-2} \left(\sum_e c(e) |f(e^+) - f(e^-)| \cdot |f(e^+) + f(e^-)| \right)^2 \\
 &\leq \iota_{\mathbf{E}}(G)^{-2} \left(\sum_e c(e) df(e)^2 \right) \left(\sum_e c(e) (f(e^+) + f(e^-))^2 \right)
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. The last factor is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_e c(e) [f(e^+)^2 + f(e^-)^2 + 2f(e^+)f(e^-)] &= \sum_x \pi(x) f(x)^2 + \sum_{x \sim y} c(x, y) f(x) f(y) \\
 &= (f, f)_{\pi} + \sum_x f(x) \pi(x) \sum_{y \sim x} p(x, y) f(y) \\
 &= (f, f)_{\pi} + (f, Pf)_{\pi} = 2(f, f)_{\pi} - (df, df)_c
 \end{aligned}$$

by (5.10). Therefore,

$$(f, f)_{\pi}^2 \leq \iota_{\mathbf{E}}(G)^{-2} [2(f, f)_{\pi} - (df, df)_c] (df, df)_c.$$

After a little algebra, this is transformed to

$$\left(1 - \frac{(df, df)_c}{(f, f)_{\pi}} \right)^2 \leq 1 - \iota_{\mathbf{E}}(G)^2.$$

This gives the middle inequality of (5.8). ◀

▷ EXERCISE 5.6.

Show that for simple random walk on \mathbb{T}_{b+1} , we have $\rho(\mathbb{T}_{b+1}) = 2\sqrt{b}/(b+1)$.

§5.3. Planar Graphs.

In this section, drawn from Häggström, Jonasson, and Lyons (2002), we will calculate the edge isoperimetric constants of certain regular planar graphs that arise from tessellations of the hyperbolic plane. The same results were found independently (with different proofs) by Higuchi and Shirai (2000). Of course, edge graphs of euclidean tessellations are amenable, whence their isoperimetric constants are 0. During this section, we assume that G and its planar dual G^\dagger are locally finite, whence each graph has one end. We first examine the combinatorial difference between euclidean and hyperbolic tessellations.

A regular euclidean polygon of d^\dagger sides has interior angles $\pi(1 - 2/d^\dagger)$. In order for such polygons to form a tessellation of the plane with d polygons meeting at each vertex, we must have $\pi(1 - 2/d^\dagger) = 2\pi/d$, i.e., $1/d + 1/d^\dagger = 1/2$, or, equivalently, $(d - 2)(d^\dagger - 2) = 4$. There are three such cases, and in all three, tessellations have been well known since antiquity. In the hyperbolic plane, the interior angles can take any value in $(0, \pi(1 - 2/d^\dagger))$, whence a tessellation exists only if $1/d + 1/d^\dagger < 1/2$, or, equivalently, $(d - 2)(d^\dagger - 2) > 4$; again, this condition is also sufficient for the existence of a hyperbolic tessellation, as has been known since the 19th century. Furthermore, in the hyperbolic plane, any two d -gons with interior angles all equal to some number α are congruent. (There are no homotheties of the hyperbolic plane.) The edges of a tessellation form the associated **edge graph**. Clearly, when the tessellation is any of the above ones, the associated edge graph is regular and its dual is regular as well. An example is drawn in Figure 2.4. (We remark that the cases $(d - 2)(d^\dagger - 2) < 4$ correspond to the spherical tessellations that arise from the five regular solids.)

Moreover, we claim that if G is a planar regular graph with regular dual, then G is transitive, as is G^\dagger , and G is the edge graph of a tessellation by congruent regular polygons. The proof of this claim is a nice application of geometry to graph theory.

First, suppose we are given the edge graphs of any two tessellations by congruent regular polygons (in the euclidean or hyperbolic plane, as necessary) of the same type (d, d^\dagger) and one fixed vertex in each edge graph. Then there is an isomorphism of the two edge graphs that takes one fixed vertex to the other. This is easy to see by going out ring by ring around a starting polygon. Thus, such edge graphs are transitive.

To prove the general statement, we claim that any (proper) tessellation of a plane with degree d and codegree d^\dagger has an edge graph that is isomorphic to the edge graph of the corresponding tessellation above. In case $(d - 2)(d^\dagger - 2) = 4$, replace each face by a congruent copy of a flat polygon; in case $(d - 2)(d^\dagger - 2) > 4$, replace it by a congruent copy of a regular hyperbolic polygon (with curvature -1) of d^\dagger sides and interior angles

$2\pi/d$; while if $(d-2)(d^\dagger-2) < 4$, replace it by a congruent copy of a regular spherical polygon (with curvature $+1$) of d^\dagger sides and interior angles $2\pi/d$. Glue these together along the edges. We get a metrically complete Riemannian surface of curvature 0 , -1 , or $+1$, correspondingly, that is homeomorphic to the plane since our assumption is that the plane is the union of the faces, edges, and vertices of the tessellation, without needing any limit points. A theorem of Riemann says that the surface is isometric to either the euclidean plane or the hyperbolic plane (the spherical case is impossible). That is, we now have a tessellation by congruent polygons. (One could also prove the existence of such tessellations, referred to above, in a similar manner. We also remark that either the graph or its dual is a Cayley graph; see Chaboud and Kenyon (1996).)

We write d_G for the degree of vertices in G when G is regular. Our main result will be the following calculation of the $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$ -isoperimetric constant $\iota_E(G)$:

THEOREM 5.8. *If G is a planar regular graph with regular dual G^\dagger , then*

$$\iota_E(G) = (d_G - 2) \sqrt{1 - \frac{4}{(d_G - 2)(d_{G^\dagger} - 2)}}.$$

Compare this to the regular tree of degree d , where the left-hand side is equal to $d-2$ (Exercise 5.1). (Note that in the preceding section, $\iota_E(G)$ denoted the $(\mathbf{1}, \pi)$ -isoperimetric constant, which differs in the regular case by a factor of d_G from the $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$ -isoperimetric constant used here.)

To prove Theorem 5.8, we need to introduce a few more isoperimetric constants. For $K \subseteq \mathbb{V}$, recall that $E(K) := \{[x, y] \in E; x, y \in K\}$ and set $E^*(K) := \{[x, y] \in E; x \in K \text{ or } y \in K\}$. Thus, $\partial_E K = E^*(K) \setminus E(K)$. Define $G(K) := (K, E(K))$. Write

$$\begin{aligned} \iota'_E(G) &:= \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{|\partial_E K|}{|K|}; K \subset \mathbb{V}, G(K) \text{ connected}, N \leq |K| < \infty \right\}, \\ \beta(G) &:= \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{|K|}{|E(K)|}; K \subset \mathbb{V}, G(K) \text{ connected}, N \leq |K| < \infty \right\}, \\ \delta(G) &:= \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{|K|}{|E^*(K)|}; K \subset \mathbb{V}, G(K) \text{ connected}, N \leq |K| < \infty \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

When G is regular, we have for all finite K that $2|E(K)| = d_G|K| - |\partial_E K|$ and $2|E^*(K)| = d_G|K| + |\partial_E K|$, whence

$$\beta(G) = \frac{2}{d_G - \iota'_E(G)} \tag{5.12}$$

and

$$\delta(G) = \frac{2}{d_G + \iota'_E(G)}. \tag{5.13}$$

Combining this with Theorem 5.2, we see that when G is transitive,

$$\delta(G) = \sup \left\{ \frac{|K|}{|E^*(K)|} ; K \subset V \text{ finite and nonempty} \right\}. \quad (5.14)$$

A short bit of algebra shows that Theorem 5.8 follows from applying the following identity to G , as well as to G^\dagger , then solving the resulting two equations using (5.12) and (5.13):

THEOREM 5.9. *For any planar regular graph G with regular dual G^\dagger , we have*

$$\beta(G) + \delta(G^\dagger) = 1.$$

Proof. We begin with a sketch of the proof in the simplest case. Suppose that $K \subset V(G)$ and that the graph $G(K)$ looks like Figure 5.1 in the following sense. Let K^f be the vertices of G^\dagger that are faces of $G(K)$. Then K^f consists of all the faces, other than the outer face, of $G(K)$. Further, $|E(K)| = |E^*(K^f)|$. In this nice case, Euler's formula applied to the graph $G(K)$ gives

$$|K| - |E(K)| + [|K^f| + 1] = 2,$$

which is equivalent to

$$|K|/|E(K)| + |K^f|/|E^*(K^f)| = 1 + 1/|E(K)|.$$

Now if we also assume that K can be chosen so that the first term above is arbitrarily close to $\beta(G)$ and the second term is arbitrarily close to $\delta(G^\dagger)$ with $|E(K)|$ arbitrarily large, then the desired formula follows at once. Thus, our work will consist in reducing or comparing things to such a nice situation.




Figure 5.1. The simplest case.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and let K be a finite set in $\mathbf{V}(G^\dagger)$ such that $G(K)$ is connected, $|K|/|E^*(K)| \geq \delta(G^\dagger) - \epsilon$, and $|E^*(K)| > 1/\epsilon$. Regarding each element of K as a face of G , let $K' \subset \mathbf{V}(G)$ be the set of vertices bounding these faces and let $E' \subset \mathbf{E}(G)$ be the set of edges bounding these faces. Then $|E(K')| \geq |E'| = |E^*(K)|$. Since the number of faces F of the graph (K', E') is at least $|K| + 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |K'|/|E(K')| + |K|/|E^*(K)| &\leq |K'|/|E'| + |K|/|E'| \\ &\leq |K'|/|E'| + (F - 1)/|E'| \\ &= 1 + 1/|E'| < 1 + \epsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

where the identity comes from Euler's formula applied to the graph (K', E') . Our choice of K then implies that

$$|K'|/|E(K')| + \delta(G^\dagger) \leq 1 + 2\epsilon.$$

Since $G(K')$ is connected and $|K'| \rightarrow \infty$ when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, it follows that $\beta(G) + \delta(G^\dagger) \leq 1$.

To prove that $\beta(G) + \delta(G^\dagger) \geq 1$, note that the constant $\iota'_E(G)$ is unchanged if, in its definition, we require K to be connected and simply connected when K is regarded as a union of closed faces of G^\dagger in the plane. This is because filling in holes increases $|K|$ and decreases $|\partial_E K|$. Since G is regular, the same holds for $\beta(G)$ by (5.12). Now let $\epsilon > 0$. Let $K \subset \mathbf{V}(G)$ be connected and simply connected (when regarded as a union of closed faces of G^\dagger in the plane) such that $|K|/|E(K)| \leq \beta(G) + \epsilon$. Let K^f be the set of vertices in G^\dagger that correspond to faces of $G(K)$. Since $|E^*(K^f)| \leq |E(K)|$ and the number of faces of the graph $G(K)$ is precisely $|K^f| + 1$, we have

$$|K|/|E(K)| + |K^f|/|E^*(K^f)| \geq |K|/|E(K)| + |K^f|/|E(K)| = 1 + 1/|E(K)| \geq 1$$

by Euler's formula applied to the graph $G(K)$. (In case K^f is empty, a comparable calculation shows that $|K|/|E(K)| \geq 1$.) Because G^\dagger is transitive, (5.14) allows us to conclude that

$$\beta(G) + \delta(G^\dagger) + \epsilon \geq \beta(G) + \epsilon + |K^f|/|E^*(K^f)| \geq |K|/|E(K)| + |K^f|/|E^*(K^f)| \geq 1.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, the desired inequality follows. ◀

Open Question. What is $\iota_V(G)$ for regular co-regular planar graphs G ? What are $\iota_E(G)$ and $\iota_V(G)$ for more general transitive planar graphs G ?

Open Question. Suppose that G is a planar graph with all degrees in $[d_1, d_2]$ and all co-degrees in $[d_1^\dagger, d_2^\dagger]$. Do we have

$$(d_1 - 2) \sqrt{1 - \frac{4}{(d_1 - 2)(d_1^\dagger - 2)}} \leq \iota_E(G) \leq (d_2 - 2) \sqrt{1 - \frac{4}{(d_2 - 2)(d_2^\dagger - 2)}} \quad ?$$

For partial results, see Lawrencenko, Plummer, and Zha (2002) and the references therein.

§5.4. Notes.

The reason for the term “amenable” is the following. Let Γ be any countable group and $\ell^\infty(\Gamma)$ be the Banach space of bounded real-valued functions on Γ . A linear functional on $\ell^\infty(\Gamma)$ is called a **mean** if it maps the constant function $\mathbf{1}$ to 1 and nonnegative functions to nonnegative numbers. If $f \in \ell^\infty(\Gamma)$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$, we write $L_\gamma f(\gamma') := f(\gamma\gamma')$. We call a mean μ **invariant** if $\mu(L_\gamma f) = \mu(f)$ for all $f \in \ell^\infty(\Gamma)$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Finally, we say that Γ is **amenable** if there is an invariant mean on $\ell^\infty(\Gamma)$. A more concrete yet necessary and sufficient condition for amenability was given by Følner (1955), namely, that for every nonempty finite $B \subset \Gamma$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there is a nonempty finite set $A \subset \Gamma$ such that $|BA\Delta A| \leq \epsilon|A|$; see Paterson (1988), Theorem 4.13, for a proof. In this case, one often refers informally to A as a Følner set.

For a group generated by a finite set S , we may phrase this in yet another, very geometric, way: It is enough to consider $B = S$, in which case $BA\Delta A$ is a boundary of A in the Cayley graph G of Γ determined by S . Then Følner’s theorem may be rephrased as saying that Γ is amenable iff $\iota_V(G) = 0$.

Kesten (1959a, 1959b) proved the qualitative statement that a countable group G is amenable iff some (or every) symmetric random walk with support generating G has spectral radius less than 1. Making this quantitative, as in Theorem 5.7, was accomplished by Cheeger (1970) in the continuous setting; he dealt with the bottom of the spectrum of the Laplacian, rather than the spectral radius, but this is equivalent: in the discrete case, the Laplacian is $I - P$. Cheeger’s result was transferred to the discrete setting in various contexts by Dodziuk (1984), Dodziuk and Kendall (1986), Varopoulos (1985a), Ancona (1988), Gerl (1988), Biggs, Mohar, and Shawe-Taylor (1988), and Kaimanovich (1992). Cheeger’s method of proof is used in all of these. We have incorporated an improvement due to Mohar (1988). Similar inequalities have been proven independently for finite graphs, again inspired by Cheeger (1970). See Alon (1986) for one of the first such papers. This paper of Alon also used the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem, which inspired our shortened proof of Theorem 5.7.

We thank Prasad Tetali for suggesting, by analogy with the proof in Alon (1986), that Theorem 5.1 might be used to shorten the proof of Theorem 5.7, as we have done. The usual proof of Theorem 5.7 derives (5.11) as follows, instead of relying on Theorem 5.1. Define on \mathbf{D}_{00} ,

$$\|f\|_{\ell_1(\pi)} := \sum_{x \in V} \pi(x)|f(x)| \quad \text{and} \quad \|df\|_{\ell_1(c)} := \sum_{e \in E} c(e)|df(e)|.$$

In this notation, we have

$$\iota_E(G)^{-1} = \sup\{\|\mathbf{1}_K\|_{\ell_1(\pi)} / \|d\mathbf{1}_K\|_{\ell_1(c)} ; K \subset V \text{ is finite}\}.$$

For any $f \in \mathbf{D}_{00}$ that is nonnegative, let $0 = a_0 < a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_n$ be the range of f and write $f = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \mathbf{1}_{K_i}$, where $b_i := a_i - a_{i-1}$ and $K_i := \{x ; f(x) \geq a_i\}$. Now

$$\|f\|_{\ell_1(\pi)} = \sum b_i \|\mathbf{1}_{K_i}\|_{\ell_1(\pi)} \leq \iota_E(G)^{-1} \sum b_i \|d\mathbf{1}_{K_i}\|_{\ell_1(c)}.$$

Also, $\|df\|_{\ell_1(c)} = \sum b_i \|d\mathbf{1}_{K_i}\|_{\ell_1(c)}$ since given $e \in E$, all terms $d\mathbf{1}_{K_i}(e)$ are nonnegative or all are nonpositive. Thus, we conclude that $\|f\|_{\ell_1(\pi)} \leq \iota_E(G)^{-1} \|df\|_{\ell_1(c)}$. Hence for all $f \in \mathbf{D}_{00}$,

$$(f, f)_\pi^2 = \|f\|_{\ell_1(\pi)}^2 \leq \iota_E(G)^{-2} (\|df\|_{\ell_1(c)})^2.$$

This is (5.11).

The fact proved in Section 5.3 that proper tessellations of the same type are isomorphic and transitive is folklore.

§5.5. Additional Exercises.

5.7. If (G_1, c_1, D_1) and (G_2, c_2, D_2) are networks, define weights c, D on the cartesian product graph (defined in Exercise 3.7) $G_1 \times G_2$ by setting $D((x_1, x_2)) := D(x_1)D(x_2)$ on the vertices and

$$c([(x_1, x_2), (x_1, y_2)]) := D(x_1)c_2([x_2, y_2]) \quad \text{and} \quad c([(x_1, x_2), (y_1, x_2)]) := D(x_2)c_1([x_1, y_1])$$

on the edges. Show that with these weights, $\iota_E(G_1 \times G_2) = \iota_E(G_1) + \iota_E(G_2)$.

5.8. Suppose that G_1 and G_2 are roughly isometric graphs with bounded degrees. Show that if the $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$ -isoperimetric constant of G_1 is positive, then the same holds of G_2 .

5.9. Use Theorem 5.1 and its proof to give another proof of Theorem 5.2.

5.10. Refine Theorem 5.2 to show that if K is any finite vertex set in a transitive infinite graph G , then $|\partial_E K|/|K| \geq \iota_E(G) + 1/|K|$.

5.11. Show that if G is a transitive graph of degree d and the $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$ -isoperimetric constant $\iota_E(G) = d - 2$, then G is a tree.

5.12. Show that if G is a finite transitive network, then the minimum of $|\partial_E K|_c/|K|$ over all K of size at most $|V|/2$ occurs only for $|K| > |V|/4$.

5.13. Use Theorem 5.3 and its proof to give another proof of Theorem 5.4.

5.14. Refine Theorem 5.4 to show that if K is any finite vertex set in a transitive infinite graph G , then $|\partial_V K|/|K| \geq \iota_V(G) + 1/|K|$.

5.15. Let G be a transitive graph and b be a submodular function that is invariant under the automorphisms of G and is such that if K and K' are disjoint but adjacent, then strict inequality holds in (5.2). Show that there is no finite set K that minimizes $b(K)/|K|$.

5.16. Show that a transitive graph G is nonamenable iff there exists a function $f : V(G) \rightarrow V(G)$ such that $\sup_{x \in V(G)} \text{dist}_G(x, f(x)) < \infty$ and for all $x \in V(G)$, the cardinality of $f^{-1}(x)$ is at least 2.

5.17. Consider a random walk on a graph with spectral radius ρ . Suppose that we introduce a delay so that each step goes nowhere with probability p_{delay} , and otherwise chooses a neighbor with the same distribution as before. Show that the new spectral radius equals $p_{\text{delay}} + (1 - p_{\text{delay}})\rho$.

*Given two graphs $G = (V, E)$ and $G' = (V', E')$ with edges weighted by c, c' , respectively, and vertices weighted by D, D' , respectively, call a surjection $\phi : V \rightarrow V'$ a **covering map** if it preserves adjacency, if $D'(\phi(x)) = D(x)$ and $c'([\phi(x), \phi(y)]) = c([x, y])$ for all $[x, y] \in E$, and if for every vertex $x \in V$ and every neighbor y' of $\phi(x)$, there is some neighbor y of x such that $\phi(y) = y'$. If there is such a covering map, then we call G a **covering network** of G' .*

5.18. Show that if G is a covering network of G' , then $\iota_E(G) \geq \iota_E(G')$ and $\iota_V(G) \geq \iota_V(G')$. Also, $\rho(G) \leq \rho(G')$.

5.19. Show that if G is a graph of maximum degree d , then the $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$ -isoperimetric constant $\iota_E(G) \leq d - 2$.

5.20. Show that if G is a regular graph of degree d and $\rho(G) = 2\sqrt{d-1}/d$, then G is a tree.

5.21. Show that for a network G with weights c, D , we have

$$\iota_E(G) = \inf \left\{ \frac{\|df\|_{\ell_1(c)}}{\|f\|_{\ell_1(D)}}; 0 < \|f\|_{\ell_1(D)} < \infty \right\}.$$

5.22. For a network (G, c, D) with $0 < |\mathbf{V}(G)|_D < \infty$, we define the **(finitistic) isoperimetric constant** (also known as the **conductance**)

$$\iota_{c,D}(G) := \inf \left\{ \frac{|\partial_E K|_c}{\min\{|K|_D, |\mathbf{V} \setminus K|_D\}}; K \subset \mathbf{V}, 0 < |K|_D < |\mathbf{V}|_D \right\}.$$

Show that

$$\iota_{c,D}(G) = \inf \left\{ \frac{\|df\|_{\ell_1(c)}}{\inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \|f - a\|_{\ell_1(D)}}; 0 < \|f\|_{\ell_1(D)} < \infty \right\}.$$

5.23. Show that G is not amenable iff $\ell^2(\mathbf{V}) = \mathbf{D}_0$.

5.24. Let G be a network with spectral radius $\rho(G)$ and let A be a set of vertices in G . Show that for any $x \in \mathbf{V}$, we have $\mathbf{P}_x[X_n \in A] \leq \rho(G)^n \sqrt{|A|_\pi / \pi(x)}$.

5.25. Suppose that G is a network with bounded π . Improve Proposition 5.6 to show, in the notation there, that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |X_n|/n \geq -2 \log \rho(G) / \log \overline{\text{gr}} G \quad \text{a.s.}$$

5.26. Show that if G is a planar regular graph with regular dual, then $\iota_E(G)$ is either 0 or irrational.

5.27. Show that if G is a planar regular graph with nonamenable regular dual G^\dagger , then

$$\beta(G) + \beta(G^\dagger) > 1.$$

5.28. Let G be a planar regular graph with regular dual G^\dagger . Write K' for the set of vertices incident to the faces corresponding to K , for both $K \subset \mathbf{V}$ and for $K \subset \mathbf{V}^\dagger$. Likewise, let \widehat{K} denote the faces inside the outermost cycle of $E(K')$. Let $K_0 \subset \mathbf{V}$ be an arbitrary finite connected set and recursively define $L_n := (\widehat{K}_n)' \subset \mathbf{V}^\dagger$ and $K_{n+1} := (\widehat{L}_n)' \subset \mathbf{V}$. Show that $|\partial_E K_n|/|K_n| \rightarrow \iota'_E(G)$ and $|\partial_E L_n|/|L_n| \rightarrow \iota'_E(G^\dagger)$.

Chapter 6

Percolation on Transitive Graphs

In this chapter, all graphs are assumed to be locally finite without explicit mention. Many natural graphs look the same from every vertex. To make this notion precise, define an **automorphism** of a graph $G = (V, E)$ to be a bijection $\phi : V \rightarrow V$ such that $[\phi(x), \phi(y)] \in E$ whenever $[x, y] \in E$. We write $\text{Aut}(G)$ for the group of automorphisms of G . If G has the property that for every pair of vertices x, y , there is an automorphism of G that takes x to y , then G is called **(vertex-) transitive**. The most prominent examples of transitive graphs are Cayley graphs, defined in Section 2.9. Of course, these include the usual euclidean lattices \mathbb{Z}^d , on which the classical theory of percolation has been built.

A slight generalization of transitive graphs is the class of **quasi-transitive** graphs, which are those that have only finitely many equivalence classes of vertices under the equivalence relation that makes two vertices equivalent if there is an automorphism that takes one vertex to the other. Most results concerning quasi-transitive graphs can be deduced from corresponding results for transitive graphs or can be deduced in a similar fashion but with some additional attention to details. In this context, the following construction is useful: Suppose that $\Gamma \subseteq \text{Aut}(G)$ acts **quasi-transitively**, i.e., V/Γ is finite. Let o be a vertex in G . Let r be such that every vertex in G is within distance r of some vertex in Γo . Form the graph G' from the vertices Γo by joining two vertices by an edge if their distance in G is at most $2r + 1$. It is easy to see that G' is connected. Also, restriction of the elements of Γ to G' yields a subgroup $\Gamma' \subseteq \text{Aut}(G')$ that acts transitively on G' , i.e., V' is a single orbit. We call G' a **transitive representation** of G .

Our purpose is not to develop the classical theory of percolation, for which Grimmett (1999) is an excellent source, but we will now briefly state some of the important facts from that theory that motivate some of the questions that we shall treat. Recall the probability measure \mathbf{P}_p defining Bernoulli percolation from Section 4.2 and the critical probability p_c . Actually, we should distinguish between two types of percolation, one on vertices (called sites) and one on edges (called bonds). When we need different notation for these two processes, we use $\mathbf{P}_p^{\text{site}}$ and $\mathbf{P}_p^{\text{bond}}$ for the two product measures on 2^V and 2^E , respectively, and p_c^{site} and p_c^{bond} for the two critical probabilities. It is known (and

we shall prove below) that for all $d \geq 2$, we have $0 < p_c(\mathbb{Z}^d) < 1$. It was conjectured about 1955 that $p_c(\mathbb{Z}^2) = 1/2$, but this was not proved until Kesten (1980). How many infinite clusters are there when $p \geq p_c$? We will see in Theorem 6.5 that for each p , this number is a random variable that is constant a.s. More precisely, Aizenman, Kesten, and Newman (1987) showed that there is only one infinite cluster when $p > p_c(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, and one of the central conjectures in the field is that there is no infinite cluster when $p = p_c(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ ($d \geq 2$). This was proved for $d = 2$ by Harris (1960) and Kesten (1980) and for $d \geq 19$ (and for $d \geq 7$ when bonds between all pairs of vertices within distance L of each other are added, for some L) by Hara and Slade (1990, 1994).

The conventional notation for $\mathbf{P}_p[x \text{ belongs to an infinite cluster}]$ is $\theta_x(p)$, not to be confused with the notation for a flow, used in other chapters. For a transitive graph, it is clear that this probability does not depend on x , so the subscript is usually omitted. For all $d \geq 2$, van den Berg and Keane (1984) showed that $\theta(p)$ is continuous for all $p \neq p_c$ and is continuous at p_c iff $\theta(p_c) = 0$. Thus, θ is a continuous function iff the conjecture above [that $\theta(p_c) = 0$] holds. Results that lend support to this conjecture are that for all $d \geq 2$,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} p_c(\mathbb{Z}^2 \times [0, k]^{d-2}) = p_c(\mathbb{Z}^d) = p_c(\mathbb{Z}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{Z}^+)$$

(Grimmett and Marstrand, 1990) and $\theta(p_c) = 0$ on the graph $\mathbb{Z}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{Z}^+$ (Barsky, Grimmett, and Newman, 1991).

§6.1. Groups and Amenability.

In Section 2.9, we looked at some basic constructions of groups. Another useful but more complex construction is that of amalgamation. Suppose that $\Gamma_1 = \langle S_1 \mid R_1 \rangle$ and $\Gamma_2 = \langle S_2 \mid R_2 \rangle$ are groups that both have a subgroup isomorphic to Γ' . More precisely, suppose that $\phi_i : \Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma_i$ are isomorphisms for $i = 1, 2$. Let $R := \{\phi_1(\gamma)\phi_2^{-1}(\gamma) ; \gamma \in \Gamma'\}$. Then the group $\langle S_1 \cup S_2 \mid R_1 \cup R_2 \cup R \rangle$ is called the **amalgamation of Γ_1 and Γ_2 over Γ'** and denoted $\Gamma_1 *_{\Gamma'} \Gamma_2$. (The name and notation do not reflect the role of the maps ϕ_i , even though they are crucial.) For example, $\mathbb{Z} *_{2\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z} = \langle a, b \mid a^2b^{-2} \rangle$ has a Cayley graph that, if its edges are not labelled, looks just like the usual square lattice; see Figure 6.1. However, $\mathbb{Z} *_{3\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z} = \langle a, b \mid a^3b^{-3} \rangle$ is quite different: it is nonamenable, having the quotient $\mathbb{Z}_3 * \mathbb{Z}_3$.

In this chapter, we shall use $\iota_E(G)$ to mean always the **(1, 1)**-isoperimetric constant and $\iota_V(G)$ to mean always the **1**-isoperimetric constant. Since $|\partial_E K| \geq |\partial_V K|$, we have $\iota_E(G) \geq \iota_V(G)$. In the other direction, for any graph of bounded degree, if $\iota_E(G) > 0$, then also $\iota_V(G) > 0$. For a tree T , it is clear that $\iota_E(T) = \iota_V(T)$. See Section 5.3 for the




Figure 6.1. A portion of the edge-labelled Cayley graph of $\mathbb{Z} *_\mathbb{Z} \mathbb{Z}$.

calculation of $\iota_E(G)$ when G arises from certain hyperbolic tessellations; e.g., $\iota_E(G) = \sqrt{5}$ for the graph in Figure 2.4.

▷ EXERCISE 6.1.

Let T be a tree that has no vertices of degree 1. Let B be the set of vertices of degree at least 3. Let K be a finite nonempty subset of vertices of T . Show that $|\partial_E K| \geq |K \cap B| + 2$.

Note also that for any graph G ,

$$\underline{\text{gr}}(G) \geq 1 + \iota_V(G) \tag{6.1}$$

by considering balls in G . In particular, if Γ is nonamenable, then all its Cayley graphs G have exponential growth.

It is not obvious that the converse fails, but various classes of counterexamples are known. One counterexample is the group G_1 , also known as the **lamplighter group**. It is defined as a semidirect product $G_1 := \mathbb{Z} \ltimes \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_2$ of \mathbb{Z} with the direct sum of copies of \mathbb{Z}_2 indexed by \mathbb{Z} ; for $m, m' \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta, \eta' \in \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_2$, the group operation is

$$(m, \eta)(m', \eta') := (m + m', \eta \oplus \mathcal{S}^{-m} \eta'),$$

where \mathcal{S} is the left shift, $\mathcal{S}(\eta)(j) := \eta(j + 1)$, and \oplus is componentwise addition modulo 2. We call an element $\eta \in \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_2$ a **configuration** and call $\eta(k)$ the **bit** at k . We identify \mathbb{Z}_2 with $\{0, 1\}$. The first component of an element $x = (m, \eta) \in G_1$ is called the **position of the marker in the state x** . Generators of G_1 are $(1, \mathbf{0})$, $(-1, \mathbf{0})$, and $(0, \mathbf{1}_{\{0\}})$. The reason for the name of this group is that we may think of a street lamp at each integer with the configuration η representing which lights are on, namely, those where $\eta = 1$. We also may imagine a lamplighter at the position of the marker. The first two generators of G_1 correspond to the lamplighter taking a step either to the right or to the left (leaving the lights unchanged); the third generator corresponds to flipping the light at the position of the lamplighter. See Figure 6.2. If Γ denotes the subgroup of G_1 where the lamplighter is at 0, then the amalgamation $G_1 *_\Gamma G_1$ is the **double lamplighter group**. For this group, we can think of two lamplighters who work on the same set of street lamps.




Figure 6.2. A typical element of G_1 .

Other examples of nonamenable Cayley graphs arise from hyperbolic tessellations. In fact, many of these graphs are not Cayley graphs, but are still transitive graphs. The graph in Figure 2.4 is a Cayley graph; see Chaboud and Kenyon (1996) for an analysis of which regular tessellations are Cayley graphs.

Some other transitive graphs that are not Cayley graphs can be constructed as follows.

EXAMPLE 6.1. Let ξ be a fixed end of a regular tree T of degree at least 3. That is, for every vertex x in T , there is a unique ray $x_\xi := \langle x_0 = x, x_1, x_2, \dots \rangle$ starting at x such that x_ξ and y_ξ differ by only finitely many vertices for any pair x, y . Call x_2 the ξ -grandparent of x . Let G be the graph obtained from T by adding the edges $[x, x_2]$ between each x and its ξ -grandparent. Then G is a transitive graph that is not the Cayley graph of any group. A proof that this is not a Cayley graph is given in Section 7.2. These examples were described by Trofimov (1985).

EXAMPLE 6.2. Let $T(1)$ be a 3-regular tree with edges oriented towards some distinguished end, and let $T(2)$ be a 4-regular tree with edges oriented towards some distinguished end. Let \mathbf{V} be the cartesian product of the vertices of $T(1)$ and the vertices of $T(2)$. Join $(u_1, u_2), (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbf{V}$ by an edge if $[u_1, v_1]$ is an edge of $T(1)$ and $[u_2, v_2]$ is an edge of $T(2)$,

and precisely one of these edges goes against the orientation. The resulting graph has infinitely many components, any two components being isomorphic. Each component is a transitive graph, but not a Cayley graph for the same reason as in Example 6.1. One way to describe this graph is as a family graph: Suppose that there is an infinity of individuals, each of which has 2 parents and 3 children. The children are shared by the parents, as is the case in the real world. If an edge is drawn between each individual and his parent, then one obtains this graph (with one component if each individual is related to every other individual). This graph is not a tree: If, say, John and Jane are both parents of Alice, Betty, and Carl, then one cycle in the family graph is from John to Alice to Jane to Betty to John. This example of a transitive graph was first discovered by Diestel and Leader (2001) for the purpose of providing a potential example of a transitive graph that is not quasi-isometric to any Cayley graph. However, this question is still open; see Woess (1991).

§6.2. Tolerance, Ergodicity, and Harris's Inequality.

This section is devoted to some quite general properties of the measures \mathbf{P}_p . Notation we will use throughout is that 2^A denotes the collection of subsets of A . It also denotes $\{0, 1\}^A$, the set of functions from A to $\{0, 1\}$. These are identified by identifying a subset with its indicator function.

The first probabilistic property that we treat is that \mathbf{P}_p is insertion tolerant, which means the following. Given a configuration $\omega \in 2^{\mathbb{E}}$ and an edge $e \in \mathbb{E}$, write

$$\Pi_e \omega := \omega \cup \{e\},$$

where we regard ω as the subset of open edges. Extend this notation to events A by

$$\Pi_e A := \{\Pi_e \omega; \omega \in A\}.$$

Also, for any set F of edges, write

$$\Pi_F \omega := \omega \cup F$$

and extend to events as above. A bond percolation process \mathbf{P} on G is **insertion tolerant** if $\mathbf{P}[\Pi_e A] > 0$ for every $e \in \mathbb{E}$ and every measurable $A \subset 2^{\mathbb{E}}$ satisfying $\mathbf{P}[A] > 0$. For Bernoulli(p) percolation, we have

$$\mathbf{P}_p[\Pi_e A] \geq p \mathbf{P}_p[A]. \tag{6.2}$$

▷ EXERCISE 6.2.

Prove (6.2).

Likewise, a bond percolation process \mathbf{P} on G is **deletion tolerant** if $\mathbf{P}[\Pi_{\neg e}A] > 0$ whenever $e \in \mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{P}[A] > 0$, where $\Pi_{\neg e}\omega := \omega \setminus \{e\}$. We extend this notation to sets F by $\Pi_{\neg F}\omega := \omega \setminus F$. Clearly, Bernoulli percolation is also deletion tolerant, with

$$\mathbf{P}_p[\Pi_{\neg e}A] \geq (1 - p)\mathbf{P}_p[A].$$

Similar definitions hold for site percolation processes.

▷ EXERCISE 6.3.

Prove that if $\theta_y(p) > 0$ for some y , then for any x , also $\theta_x(p) > 0$.

We will use insertion and deletion tolerance often. Another crucial pair of properties is invariance and ergodicity. Suppose that Γ is a group of automorphisms of a graph G . A measure \mathbf{P} on $2^{\mathbf{E}}$, on $2^{\mathbf{V}}$, or on $2^{\mathbf{E} \cup \mathbf{V}}$ is called a Γ -**invariant** percolation if $\mathbf{P}[\gamma A] = \mathbf{P}[A]$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and all events A ; also, in the case of a measure on $2^{\mathbf{E} \cup \mathbf{V}}$, we assume that \mathbf{P} is concentrated on subgraphs of G , i.e., whenever an edge lies in a configuration, so do both of its endpoints. Let \mathcal{B}_Γ denote the σ -field of events that are invariant under all elements of Γ . The measure \mathbf{P} is called Γ -**ergodic** if for each $A \in \mathcal{B}_\Gamma$, we have either $\mathbf{P}[A] = 0$ or $\mathbf{P}[\neg A] = 0$. Bernoulli percolation on any Cayley graph is both invariant and ergodic with respect to translations. The invariance is obvious, while ergodicity is proved in the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 6.3. *If Γ acts on a connected locally finite graph G in such a way that each vertex has an infinite orbit, then \mathbf{P}_p is ergodic.*

We note that if some vertex in G has an infinite Γ -orbit, then every vertex has an infinite Γ -orbit.

Proof. Our notation will be for bond percolation. The proof for site percolation is identical. Let $A \in \mathcal{B}_\Gamma$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Because A is measurable, there is an event B that depends only on $\omega(e)$ for those e in some *finite* set F such that $\mathbf{P}_p[A \Delta B] < \epsilon$. For all $\gamma \in \Gamma$, we have $\mathbf{P}_p[\gamma A \Delta \gamma B] = \mathbf{P}_p[\gamma(A \Delta B)] < \epsilon$. By the assumption that vertices have infinite orbits, there is some γ such that F and γF are disjoint. Since γB depends only on γF , it follows that B and γB are independent. Now for any events C_1, C_2, D , we have

$$|\mathbf{P}_p[C_1 \cap D] - \mathbf{P}_p[C_2 \cap D]| \leq \mathbf{P}_p[(C_1 \cap D) \Delta (C_2 \cap D)] \leq \mathbf{P}_p[C_1 \Delta C_2].$$

Therefore,

$$|\mathbf{P}_p[A] - \mathbf{P}_p[A]^2| = |\mathbf{P}_p[A \cap \gamma A] - \mathbf{P}_p[A]^2|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq |\mathbf{P}_p[A \cap \gamma A] - \mathbf{P}_p[B \cap \gamma A]| + |\mathbf{P}_p[B \cap \gamma A] - \mathbf{P}_p[B \cap \gamma B]| \\
&\quad + |\mathbf{P}_p[B \cap \gamma B] - \mathbf{P}_p[B]^2| + |\mathbf{P}_p[B]^2 - \mathbf{P}_p[A]^2| \\
&\leq \mathbf{P}_p[A \Delta B] + \mathbf{P}_p[\gamma A \Delta \gamma B] + |\mathbf{P}_p[B] \mathbf{P}_p[\gamma B] - \mathbf{P}_p[B]^2| \\
&\quad + |\mathbf{P}_p[B] - \mathbf{P}_p[A]|(\mathbf{P}_p[B] + \mathbf{P}_p[A]) \\
&< \epsilon + \epsilon + 0 + 2\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\mathbf{P}_p[A] \in \{0, 1\}$, as desired. \blacktriangleleft

Another property that is valid for Bernoulli percolation on any graph is an inequality due to Harris (1960), though it is nowadays usually called the FKG inequality due to an extension by Fortuin, Kasteleyn, and Ginibre (1971). We will not use it, but it is a crucial tool in proving other results in percolation theory.

Harris's inequality permits us to conclude such things as the positive correlation of the events $\{x \leftrightarrow y\}$ and $\{u \leftrightarrow v\}$ for any vertices $x, y, u,$ and v . The special property that these two events have is that they are increasing, where an event $A \subseteq 2^E$ is called **increasing** if whenever $\omega \in A$ and $\omega \subseteq \omega'$, then $\omega' \in A$. As a natural extension, we call a random variable X on 2^E **increasing** if $X(\omega) \leq X(\omega')$ whenever $\omega \subseteq \omega'$. Thus, $\mathbf{1}_A$ is increasing iff A is increasing. Similar definitions apply for site processes.

HARRIS'S INEQUALITY. (a) *If A and B are both increasing events, then $\mathbf{P}_p[AB] \geq \mathbf{P}_p[A] \mathbf{P}_p[B]$.*

(b) *If X and Y are both increasing random variables with finite second moments, then $\mathbf{E}_p[XY] \geq \mathbf{E}_p[X] \mathbf{E}_p[Y]$.*

▷ EXERCISE 6.4.

Suppose that X is an increasing random variable and \mathcal{F} is the σ -field generated by $\omega(e)$ for the edges e belonging to some subset of E . Show that $\mathbf{E}_p[X \mid \mathcal{F}]$ is an increasing random variable.

LEMMA 6.4. *Suppose that μ_1, \dots, μ_d are probability measures on \mathbb{R} and $\mu := \mu_1 \times \dots \times \mu_d$. Let $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu)$ be functions that are increasing in each coordinate. Then*

$$\int fg \, d\mu \geq \int f \, d\mu \int g \, d\mu.$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on d . Suppose first that $d = 1$. Note that

$$[f(x) - f(y)][g(x) - g(y)] \geq 0$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore

$$0 \leq \iint [f(x) - f(y)][g(x) - g(y)] d\mu(x) d\mu(y) = 2 \int fg d\mu - 2 \int f d\mu \int g d\mu,$$

which gives the desired inequality.

Now suppose that the inequality holds for $d = k$ and let us prove the case $d = k + 1$. Define

$$f_1(x_1) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k+1}) d\mu_2(x_2) \cdots d\mu_{k+1}(x_{k+1})$$

and similarly define g_1 . Clearly, f_1 and g_1 are increasing functions, whence

$$\int f_1 g_1 d\mu_1 \geq \int f_1 d\mu_1 \int g_1 d\mu_1 = \int f d\mu \int g d\mu. \tag{6.3}$$

On the other hand, the inductive hypothesis tells us that for each fixed x_1 ,

$$f_1(x_1)g_1(x_1) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k+1})g(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k+1}) d\mu_2(x_2) \cdots d\mu_{k+1}(x_{k+1}),$$

whence $\int f_1 g_1 d\mu_1 \leq \int fg d\mu$. In combination with (6.3), this proves the inequality for $d = k + 1$ and completes the proof. ◀

Proof of Harris's Inequality. The proofs for bond and site processes are identical; our notation will be for bond processes.

Since (a) derives from (b) by using indicator random variables, it suffices to prove (b). If X and Y depend on only finitely many edges, then the inequality is a consequence of Lemma 6.4 since $\omega(e)$ are mutually independent random variables for all e . To prove it in general, write $\mathbf{E} = \{e_1, e_2, \dots\}$. Let X_n and Y_n be the expectations of X and Y conditioned on $\omega(e_1), \dots, \omega(e_n)$. According to Exercise 6.4, the random variables X_n and Y_n are increasing, whence $\mathbf{E}_p[X_n Y_n] \geq \mathbf{E}_p[X_n] \mathbf{E}_p[Y_n]$. Since $X_n \rightarrow X$ and $Y_n \rightarrow Y$ in L^2 by the martingale convergence theorem, which implies that $X_n Y_n \rightarrow XY$ in L^1 , we may deduce the desired inequality for X and Y . ◀

▷ EXERCISE 6.5.

Use Harris's inequality to do Exercise 6.3.

§6.3. The Number of Infinite Clusters.

Newman and Schulman (1981) proved the following theorem:

THEOREM 6.5. *If G is a transitive connected graph, then the number of infinite clusters is constant a.s. and equal to either 0, 1, or ∞ . In fact, it suffices that vertices have infinite orbits under the automorphism group of G .*

Proof. Let N_∞ denote the number of infinite clusters and Γ denote the automorphism group of G . The action of any element of Γ on a configuration does not change N_∞ . That is, N_∞ is measurable with respect to the σ -field \mathcal{B}_Γ of events that are invariant under all elements of Γ . By ergodicity (Proposition 6.3), this means that N_∞ is constant a.s.

Now suppose that $N_\infty \in [2, \infty)$ a.s. Then there must exist two vertices x and y that belong to distinct infinite clusters with positive probability. For bond percolation, let e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n be a path of edges from x to y . If A denotes the event that x and y belong to distinct infinite clusters and B denotes the event $\Pi_{e_1} \Pi_{e_2} \cdots \Pi_{e_n} A$, then by insertion tolerance, we have $\mathbf{P}_p[B] > 0$. Yet N_∞ takes a strictly smaller value on B than on A , which contradicts the constancy of N_∞ . (The proof for site percolation is parallel.) ◀

The result mentioned in the introduction that there is at most one infinite cluster for percolation on \mathbb{Z}^d , due to Aizenman, Kesten, and Newman (1987), was extended and simplified until the following result appeared, due to Burton and Keane (1989) and Gandolfi, Keane, and Newman (1992). Let $E_R(x)$ denote the set of edges that have at least one endpoint at distance at most $R - 1$ from x . This is the edge-interior of the ball of radius R about x . We will denote the component of x in a percolation configuration by $K(x)$. Call a vertex x a **furcation** of a configuration ω if closing all edges incident to x would split $K(x)$ into at least 3 infinite clusters*.

THEOREM 6.6. *If G is a connected transitive amenable graph, then \mathbf{P}_p -a.s. there is at most one infinite cluster.*

Proof. We will do the proof for bond percolation; the case of site percolation is exactly analogous. Let $0 < p < 1$. Let $\Lambda = \Lambda(\omega)$ denote the set of furcations of ω . We claim that if there is more than one infinite cluster with positive probability, then there are sufficiently many furcations as to create tree-like structures that force G to be nonamenable. To be precise, we claim first that

$$c := \mathbf{P}_p[o \in \Lambda] > 0$$

* In Burton and Keane (1989), these vertices were called **encounter points**. When $K(x)$ is split into exactly 3 infinite clusters, then x is called a **trifurcation** by Grimmett (1999).

and, second, that for each finite set $K \subset V$,

$$|\partial_E K| \geq c|K|. \tag{6.4}$$

These two claims together imply that G is nonamenable.

Now our assumption that there is more than one infinite cluster with positive probability implies that there are, in fact, infinitely many infinite clusters a.s. by Theorem 6.5. Let x, y, z be three vertices such that $\mathbf{P}_p[A] > 0$, where A is the event that x, y, z belong to distinct infinite clusters. Since any infinite cluster contains points at all but finitely many distances from o , we may assume that x, y, z are at the same distance, R , from o . Furthermore, we may assume that on $\Pi_{-E_R(o)}A$, the points x, y , and z still belong to infinite clusters. Join o to x by a path \mathcal{P}_x of length R . There is a path \mathcal{P}_y of length R that joins o to y and such that $\mathcal{P}_x \cup \mathcal{P}_y$ does not contain a cycle. Finally, there is also a path \mathcal{P}_z of length R that joins o to z and such that $T := \mathcal{P}_x \cup \mathcal{P}_y \cup \mathcal{P}_z$ does not contain a cycle. Necessarily there is a vertex u such that x, y, z are in distinct components of $T \setminus \{u\}$. By insertion and deletion tolerance, $\mathbf{P}_p[A'] > 0$, where $A' := \Pi_T \Pi_{-E_R(o)}A$. Furthermore, u is a furcation on the event A' . Hence $c = \mathbf{P}_p[o \in \Lambda] = \mathbf{P}_p[u \in \Lambda] \geq \mathbf{P}_p[A'] > 0$.

It follows that for every finite $K \subset V$,

$$\mathbf{E}_p[|K \cap \Lambda|] = \sum_{x \in K} \mathbf{P}_p[x \in \Lambda] = c|K|. \tag{6.5}$$

We next claim that

$$|\partial_E K| \geq |K \cap \Lambda|. \tag{6.6}$$

Taking the expectation of (6.6) and using (6.5) shows (6.4).

To see why (6.6) is true, let T be a spanning tree of an infinite component η of ω . Remove all vertices of degree 1 from T and iterate until there are no more vertices of degree 1; call the resulting tree $T(\eta)$. Note that every furcation in η has degree ≥ 3 in $T(\eta)$. Apply Exercise 6.1 to conclude that

$$|(\partial_E K) \cap T(\eta)| = |\partial_{E(T(\eta))}(K \cap T(\eta))| \geq |K \cap \Lambda \cap T(\eta)| = |K \cap \Lambda \cap \eta|.$$

If we sum this over all possible η , we arrive at (6.6). ◀

There is an extension of Theorem 6.6 to invariant insertion-tolerant percolation that was proved in the original papers. Since this theorem is so important, we use the opportunity to prove the extension by a technique from BLPS (1999). This technique will itself be important in Chapter 7.

LEMMA 6.7. *Let \mathbf{P} be a Γ -invariant bond percolation process on a graph G . If with positive probability there is a component of ω with at least three ends, then (on a larger probability space) there is a random forest $\mathfrak{F} \subset \omega$ such that the distribution of the pair (\mathfrak{F}, ω) is Γ -invariant and with positive probability, there is a component of \mathfrak{F} that has at least three ends.*

Proof. Assign independent uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables to the edges (independently of ω) to define the free minimal spanning forest \mathfrak{F} of ω . By definition, this means that an edge $e \in \omega$ is present in \mathfrak{F} iff there is no cycle in ω containing e in which e is assigned the maximum value. There is no cycle in \mathfrak{F} since the edge with the largest label in any cycle could not belong to \mathfrak{F} . (Minimal spanning forests will be studied in greater depth in Chapter 9.)

Suppose that $K(x)$ has at least 3 ends with positive probability. Choose any ball A about x with edge set $E(A)$ so that $K(x) \setminus E(A)$ has at least 3 infinite components with positive probability. Then with positive probability, $K(x) \setminus E(A)$ has at least 3 infinite components, all edges in A are assigned values less than $1/2$, and all edges in $\partial_E A$ are assigned values greater than $1/2$. On this event, \mathfrak{F} contains a spanning tree of $A \cap \omega$ that is part of a tree in \mathfrak{F} with at least 3 ends. ◀

THEOREM 6.8. *If Γ acts transitively on a connected amenable graph G and \mathbf{P} is a Γ -invariant insertion-tolerant percolation process on G , then \mathbf{P} -a.s. there is at most one infinite cluster.*

Proof. It suffices to prove the case of bond percolation, since graphs induced by the components of site percolation form a bond percolation process. Let \mathfrak{F} be as in Lemma 6.7. Since \mathfrak{F} has a component with at least 3 ends with positive probability, there is a furcation of \mathfrak{F} with positive probability. This shows (6.5) for some $c > 0$ with Λ equal to the furcations of \mathfrak{F} . Now apply the rest of the proof of Theorem 6.6 to \mathfrak{F} to deduce the result. ◀

§6.4. Inequalities for p_c .

Sometimes it is useful to compare site with bond percolation:

PROPOSITION 6.9. (GRIMMETT, 1997) *For any graph G , any $p \in (0, 1)$, and any vertex $o \in G$, we have $\theta_o^{\text{site}}(p) \leq \theta_o^{\text{bond}}(p)$. Therefore $p_c^{\text{site}}(G) \geq p_c^{\text{bond}}(G)$.*

Proof. We will construct a coupling of the two percolation measures. That is, given $\xi \in 2^V$, we will define $\omega \in 2^E$ in such a way that, first, if ξ has distribution $\mathbf{P}_p^{\text{site}}$ on G , then ω

has distribution $\mathbf{P}_p^{\text{bond}}$ on G ; and, second, if $K_\xi(o)$ is infinite, then so is $K_\omega(o)$, where the subscript indicates which configuration determines the cluster of o .

Choose any ordering of $\mathbf{V} = \langle x_1, x_2, \dots \rangle$ with $x_1 = o$. Let $\langle Y_e \rangle_{e \in \mathbf{E}}$ be $\{0, 1\}$ -valued Bernoulli(p) random variables.

We will look at a finite or infinite subsequence of vertices $\langle x_{n_j} \rangle$ via a recursive procedure. If $\xi(o) = 0$, then stop. Otherwise, let $V_1 := \{o\}$ and set $n_1 := 1$. Suppose that $V_k := \{x_{n_1}, \dots, x_{n_k}\}$ have been selected. Let n_{k+1} be the smallest index of a vertex in $\mathbf{V} \setminus V_k$ that neighbors some vertex in V_k and for which $\xi(x_{n_{k+1}}) = 1$, if any. In this case, let x'_{k+1} be the vertex in V_k that neighbors $x_{n_{k+1}}$ and that has smallest index, and set $\omega([x'_{k+1}, x_{n_{k+1}}]) := \xi_{k+1}$. Otherwise, stop; $K_\xi(o)$ is finite and we set $\omega(e) := Y_e$ for the remaining edges $e \in \mathbf{E}$ for which we have not yet specified $\omega(e)$.

If this procedure never ends, then both $K_\xi(o)$ and $K_\omega(o)$ are infinite; assigning $\omega(e) := Y_e$ for any remaining edges $e \in \mathbf{E}$ gives a fair sample of Bernoulli(p) bond percolation on G when $\xi \sim \mathbf{P}_p^{\text{site}}$. This gives the desired inequality. \blacktriangleleft

In the other direction, we have

PROPOSITION 6.10. (GRIMMETT AND STACEY, 1998) *For any graph G of maximal degree d , any $p \in (0, 1)$, and any vertex $o \in G$ of degree d_o , we have*

$$\theta_o^{\text{site}}(1 - (1 - p)^{d-1}) \geq [1 - (1 - p)^{d_o}] \theta_o^{\text{bond}}(p).$$

Therefore

$$p_c^{\text{site}}(G) \leq 1 - (1 - p_c^{\text{bond}}(G))^{d-1}.$$

Proof. We will again construct a coupling of the two percolation measures. This time, given $\omega \in 2^{\mathbf{E}}$, we will define $\xi \in 2^{\mathbf{V}}$ in such a way that, first, if ω has distribution $\mathbf{P}_p^{\text{bond}}$ on G , then ξ has a distribution that is dominated by $\mathbf{P}_q^{\text{site}}$ on G conditioned on $\xi(o) = 1$, where $q := 1 - (1 - p)^{d-1}$; and, second, if $K_\omega(o)$ is infinite, then so is $K_\xi(o)$.

Choose any ordering of $\mathbf{V} = \langle x_1, x_2, \dots \rangle$ with $x_1 = o$. Let $\langle Y_x \rangle_{x \in \mathbf{V}}$ be $\{0, 1\}$ -valued Bernoulli(q) random variables.

We will look at a finite or infinite subsequence of vertices $\langle x_{n_j} \rangle$ via a recursive procedure. If $\omega(e) = 0$ for all edges e incident to o , then stop. Otherwise, let $V_1 := \{o\}$, set $\xi(o) = 1$, and set $n_1 := 1$. Note that the probability that some edge incident to o is open is $1 - (1 - p)^{d_o}$. Also set $W_1 := \emptyset$.

Suppose that V_k and W_k have been selected. Let n_{k+1} be the smallest index of a vertex in $\mathbf{V} \setminus (V_k \cup W_k)$ that neighbors some vertex in V_k , if any. Define $\xi(x_{n_{k+1}})$ to be the indicator that there is some vertex x not in $V_k \cup W_k$ for which $\omega([x_{n_{k+1}}, x]) = 1$. Note that

the conditional probability that $\xi(x_{n_{k+1}}) = 1$ is $1 - (1 - p)^r \leq q$, where r is the degree of $x_{n_{k+1}}$ in $G \setminus (V_k \cup W_k)$. Put $V_{k+1} := V_k \cup \{x_{n_{k+1}}\}$ if $\xi(x_{n_{k+1}}) = 1$ and $W_{k+1} := W_k$, and otherwise put $W_{k+1} := W_k \cup \{x_{n_{k+1}}\}$ and $V_{k+1} := V_k$. When n_{k+1} is not defined, stop; $K_\omega(o)$ is finite and we set $\xi(x) := Y_x$ for the remaining vertices $x \in V \setminus V_k$.

If this procedure never ends, then $K_\xi(o)$ (though perhaps not $K_\omega(o)$) is infinite; assigning $\xi(x) := Y_x$ for any remaining vertices $x \in V$ gives a law of ξ that is dominated by Bernoulli(q) site percolation on G conditioned to have $\xi(o) = 1$. This gives the desired inequality. \blacktriangleleft

In Example 2.20, we described a tree formed from the self-avoiding walks in \mathbb{Z}^2 . If G is any graph, not necessarily transitive, we may again form the tree T^{SAW} of self-avoiding walks of G , where all walks begin at some fixed base point o . Its upper growth rate, $\mu(G) := \overline{\text{gr}} T^{\text{SAW}}$, is called the **connective constant** of G . This does not depend on choice of o , although that will not matter for us. If G is transitive, then T^{SAW} is 0-subperiodic, whence $\mu(G) = \text{br} T^{\text{SAW}}$ in such a case by Theorem 2.22.

PROPOSITION 6.11. *For any connected graph G , we have $p_c(G) \geq 1/\mu(G)$. In particular, if G has bounded degree, then $p_c(G) > 0$.*

Proof. In view of Proposition 6.9, it suffices to prove the inequality for bond percolation.

Write $K_n(o)$ for the self-avoiding walks of length n within $K(o)$. Thus, $K_n(o) \subseteq T_n^{\text{SAW}}$. Suppose $K(o)$ is infinite. Then for each n , we have $K_n(o) \neq \emptyset$, so that $\sum_n |K_n(o)| = \infty$. Since $K(o)$ is infinite with positive probability whenever $p > p_c^{\text{bond}}$, it follows that

$$\infty = \mathbf{E}_p^{\text{bond}} \left[\sum_n |K_n(o)| \right] = \sum_n \mathbf{E}_p^{\text{bond}} \left[|K_n(o)| \right] = \sum_n p^n |T_n^{\text{SAW}}|,$$

whence $p \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |T_n^{\text{SAW}}|^{-1/n} = 1/\mu(G)$. \blacktriangleleft

Upper bounds for p_c are more difficult. In fact, we have seen examples of graphs (trees) that have exponential growth, bounded degree, and $p_c = 1$. The transitive case is better behaved according to the following conjecture:

CONJECTURE 6.12. (BENJAMINI AND SCHRAMM, 1996B) *If G is a transitive graph with at least quadratic growth (i.e., the ball of size n grows at least as fast as some quadratic function of n), then $p_c(G) < 1$.*

Most cases of this conjecture have been established, as we shall see. Now given a group, certainly the value of p_c depends on which generators are used. Nevertheless, whether $p_c < 1$ does not depend on the generating set chosen. To prove this, consider two

generating sets S_1, S_2 of a group Γ . Let G_1, G_2 be the corresponding Cayley graphs. We shall transfer Bernoulli percolation on G_1 to a dependent percolation on G_2 by making an edge of G_2 open iff a corresponding path in G_1 is open. We then want to compare this dependent percolation to Bernoulli percolation on G_2 . To do this, we first establish a weak form of a result of Liggett, Schonmann, and Stacey (1997). This form, due to Lyons and Schramm (1999), Remark 6.2, is much easier to prove.

PROPOSITION 6.13. *Write \mathbf{P}_p^A for the Bernoulli(p) product measure on a set 2^A . Let A and B be two sets and $D \subseteq A \times B$. Write $D_a := \{a\} \times B \cap D$ and $D^b := A \times \{b\} \cap D$. Suppose that $m := \sup_{a \in A} |D_a| < \infty$ and that $n := \sup_{b \in B} |D^b| < \infty$. Given $0 < p < 1$, let $q := (1 - (1 - p)^{1/m})^n$. Given $\omega \in 2^A$, define $\omega' \in 2^B$ by*

$$\omega'(b) := \min\{\omega(a); a \in D^b\}.$$

Let \mathbf{P} be the law of ω' when ω has the law of \mathbf{P}_p^A . Then \mathbf{P} stochastically dominates \mathbf{P}_q^B .

Proof. Let η have law $\mathbf{P}_{q^{1/n}}^{A \times B}$. Define

$$\zeta(a) := \max\{\eta(a, b); b \in D_a\} \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta'(b) := \min\{\eta(a, b); a \in D^b\}.$$

Then the collection ζ' has a law μ' that dominates \mathbf{P}_q^B since $\zeta'(b)$ are mutually independent for $b \in B$ and

$$\mathbf{P}_{q^{1/n}}^{A \times B}[\zeta'(b) = 1] = (q^{1/n})^{|D^b|} \geq q.$$

Similarly, \mathbf{P}_p^A dominates the law μ of ζ since $\zeta(a)$ are mutually independent for $a \in A$ and

$$\mathbf{P}_{q^{1/n}}^{A \times B}[\zeta(a) = 0] = (1 - q^{1/n})^{|D_a|} = (1 - p)^{|D_a|/m} \geq 1 - p.$$

Therefore, we may couple ω and ζ so that $\omega \geq \zeta$. Since $\zeta(a) \geq \eta(a, b)$, we have that for each fixed b , under our coupling,

$$\omega'(b) = \min\{\omega(a); a \in D^b\} \geq \min\{\zeta(a); a \in D^b\} \geq \min\{\eta(a, b); a \in D^b\} = \zeta'(b).$$

It follows that $\mathbf{P} \succcurlyeq \mu' \succcurlyeq \mathbf{P}_q^B$, as desired. ◀

THEOREM 6.14. *Let S_1 and S_2 be two finite generating sets for a countable group Γ , yielding corresponding Cayley graphs G_1 and G_2 . Then $p_c(G_1) < 1$ iff $p_c(G_2) < 1$.*

Proof. Left and right Cayley graphs with respect to a given set of generators are isomorphic via $x \mapsto x^{-1}$, so we consider only right Cayley graphs. We also give the proof only for bond percolation, as site percolation is treated analogously.

Express each element $s \in S_2$ in terms of a minimal-length word $\varphi(s) \in S_1$. Let ω_1 be Bernoulli(p) percolation on G_1 and define ω_2 on G_2 by letting $[x, xs] \in \omega_2$ (for $s \in S_2$) iff the path from x to xs in G_1 determined by $\varphi(s)$ lies in ω_1 . Then we may apply Proposition 6.13 with A the set of edges of G_1 , B the set of edges of G_2 , $n := \max\{|\varphi(s)|; s \in S_2\}$, and $m \leq |S_2|$ to conclude that ω_2 stochastically dominates Bernoulli(q) percolation on G_2 . Since o lies in an infinite cluster with respect to ω_1 iff it lies in an infinite cluster with respect to ω_2 , it follows that if $q > p_c(G_2)$, then $p \geq p_c(G_1)$, showing that $p_c(G_2) < 1$ implies $p_c(G_1) < 1$. ◀

We now show that the euclidean lattices \mathbb{Z}^d have a true phase transition for Bernoulli percolation in that $p_c < 1$.

THEOREM 6.15. *For all $d \geq 2$, we have $p_c(\mathbb{Z}^d) < 1$.*

Proof. We use the standard generators of \mathbb{Z}^d . In view of Proposition 6.10, it suffices to consider bond percolation. Also, since \mathbb{Z}^d contains a copy of \mathbb{Z}^2 , it suffices to prove this for $d = 2$. Consider the planar dual lattice $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^\dagger$. (See Section 3.2 for the definition.) To each configuration ω in 2^E , we associate the dual configuration ω^\times in 2^{E^\dagger} by $\omega^\times(e^\dagger) := 1 - \omega(e)$. Those edges of $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^\dagger$ that lie in ω^\times we call “open”. If $K(o)$ is finite, then $\partial_E K(o)^\dagger$ contains a simple cycle of open edges in $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^\dagger$ that surrounds o . Now each edge in $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^\dagger$ is open with probability $1 - p$. Furthermore, the number of simple cycles in $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^\dagger$ of length n surrounding o is at most $n3^n$ since each one must intersect the x -axis somewhere in $(0, n)$. Let $M(n)$ be the total number of open simple cycles in $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^\dagger$ of length n surrounding o . Then

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \theta(p) &= \mathbf{P}_p[|K(o)| < \infty] = \mathbf{P}_p\left[\sum_n M(n) \geq 1\right] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}_p\left[\sum_n M(n)\right] = \sum_n \mathbf{E}_p[M(n)] \leq \sum_n (n3^n)(1 - p)^n. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing p sufficiently close to 1, we may make this last sum less than 1. ◀

In Theorems 6.16 and 6.17, we establish Conjecture 6.12 for the “majority” of groups. We say that a group **almost** has a property is it has a subgroup of finite index that has the property in question.

THEOREM 6.16. *If G is a Cayley graph of a group Γ with at most polynomial growth, then either Γ is almost (isomorphic to) \mathbb{Z} or $p_c(G) < 1$.*

Proof. We claim that if Γ is not almost \mathbb{Z} , then Γ contains a subgroup isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^2 , whence the result follows from Theorem 6.15 and Theorem 6.14.

The principal fact we need is the difficult theorem of Gromov (1981), who showed that Γ is almost a nilpotent group. (The converse is true as well; see Wolf (1968).) Now every finitely generated nilpotent group is almost torsion-free*, while the upper central series of a torsion-free finitely generated nilpotent group has all factors isomorphic to free abelian groups (Kargapolov and Merzljakov (1979), Theorem 17.2.2 and its proof). Thus, Γ has a subgroup Γ' of finite index that is torsion-free and either Γ' equals its center, C , or there is a subgroup C' of Γ' such that C'/C is the center of Γ'/C and C'/C is free abelian of rank at least 1. If the rank of C is at least 2, then C already contains \mathbb{Z}^2 , so suppose that $C \approx \mathbb{Z}$. If $\Gamma' = C$, then Γ is almost \mathbb{Z} . If not, then let C'' be a subgroup of C' such that C''/C is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} . We claim that C'' is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^2 , and thus that C'' provides the subgroup we seek. Choose $\gamma \in C''$ such that γC generates C''/C . Let D be the group generated by γ . Then clearly $D \approx \mathbb{Z}$. Since $C'' = DC$ and C lies in the center of C'' , it follows that $C'' \approx D \times C \approx \mathbb{Z}^2$. ◀

THEOREM 6.17. (LYONS, 1995) *If G is a Cayley graph of a group with exponential growth, then $p_c(G) < 1$.*

Proof. Let $T^{\text{lexmin}}(G)$ be the lexicographically-minimal spanning tree constructed in Section 2.9. This subperiodic tree is isomorphic to a subgraph of G , whence

$$p_c(G) \leq p_c(T^{\text{lexmin}}) = 1/\text{br}(T^{\text{lexmin}}) = 1/\text{gr}(T^{\text{lexmin}}) = 1/\text{gr}(G) < 1 \quad (6.7)$$

by Theorems 4.16 and 2.22. ◀

▷ EXERCISE 6.6.

Extend Theorem 6.17 to quasi-transitive graphs.

There exist groups that have superpolynomial growth but subexponential growth, the groups of so-called “intermediate growth”. The examples constructed by Grigorchuk (1983) also have $p_c < 1$ (Muchnik and Pak, 2001). It is not proved that other groups of intermediate growth have $p_c < 1$. These are the only cases of Conjecture 6.12 that remain unresolved.

The inequality (6.7) is valid for both bond and site percolation. For site percolation, it implies that

$$p_c^{\text{site}}(G) \leq 1/(1 + \nu_V(G)) \quad (6.8)$$

by (6.1). The analogue for bond percolation is true, but requires a different proof. Moreover, it, as well as (6.8), holds for all graphs:

* A group is torsion-free if all its elements have infinite order.

THEOREM 6.18. (BENJAMINI AND SCHRAMM, 1996B) *For any graph G , we have $p_c^{\text{bond}}(G) \leq 1/(1 + \iota_E(G))$ and $p_c^{\text{site}}(G) \leq 1/(1 + \iota_V(G))$.*

Note that equality holds in both inequalities when G is a regular tree.

Proof. The proofs of both inequalities are completely analogous, so we prove only the first.

Choose any ordering of $\mathbf{E} = \langle e_1, e_2, \dots \rangle$ so that o is an endpoint of e_1 . Fix $p > 1/(1 + \iota_E(G))$ and let $\langle Y_k \rangle$ and $\langle Y'_k \rangle$ be independent $\{0, 1\}$ -valued Bernoulli(p) random variables. If A is the event that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n Y_k > \frac{1}{1 + \iota_E(G)}$$

for all $n \geq 1$, then A has positive probability.

Define $E_0 := \emptyset$. We will look at a finite or infinite subsequence of edges $\langle e_{n_j} \rangle$ via a recursive procedure. Suppose that the edges $E_k := \langle e_{n_1}, \dots, e_{n_k} \rangle$ have been selected and that $\omega(e_{n_j}) = Y_j$ for $j \leq k$. Let V_k be the union of $\{o\}$ and the endpoints of the open edges of E_k . Let n_{k+1} be the smallest index of an edge in $\mathbf{E} \setminus E_k$ that has exactly one endpoint in V_k that is open, if any. If there are none, then stop; $K(o)$ is finite and we set $\omega(e_j) := Y'_j$ for the remaining edges $e_j \in \mathbf{E} \setminus E_k$. Otherwise, let $\omega(e_{n_{k+1}}) := Y_{k+1}$.

If this procedure never ends, then $K(o)$ is infinite; assign $\omega(e_j) := Y'_j$ for any remaining edges $e_j \in \mathbf{E} \setminus E_k$.

In both cases (whether $K(o)$ is finite or infinite), we obtain a fair sample of Bernoulli(p) percolation on G .

We claim that $K(o)$ is infinite on the event A . This would mean that $p \geq p_c^{\text{bond}}(G)$ and would complete the proof.

For suppose that $K(o)$ is finite and contains m vertices. Let E_n be the final set of selected edges. Note that E_n consists of $\partial_E K(o)$ (all edges of which are closed) together with a spanning tree of $K(o)$ (all edges of which are open). This means that $n = |\partial_E K(o)| + m - 1$ and $\sum_{k=1}^n Y_k = m - 1$. Since $|\partial_E K(o)|/m \geq \iota_E(G)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n Y_k = \frac{m - 1}{|\partial_E K(o)| + m - 1} = \frac{1}{1 + |\partial_E K(o)|/(m - 1)} < \frac{1}{1 + |\partial_E K(o)|/m} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \iota_E(G)}$$

and the event A does not occur. ◀

Similar ideas show the following general property. Given two graphs $G = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$ and $G' = (\mathbf{V}', \mathbf{E}')$, call a surjection $\phi : \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}'$ a **covering map** if for every vertex $x \in \mathbf{V}$ and every neighbor y' of $\phi(x)$, there is some neighbor y of x such that $\phi(y) = y'$. For example, if $\phi : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma'$ is a group homomorphism that maps a generating set S for Γ onto a generating set S' for Γ' , and if G, G' are the corresponding Cayley graphs, then ϕ is also a covering map.

THEOREM 6.19. (BENJAMINI AND SCHRAMM, 1996B) *Suppose that ϕ is a covering map from G to G' . Then for any $x \in V$ and $p \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\theta_x(p) \geq \theta_{\phi(x)}(p).$$

Therefore $p_c(G) \leq p_c(G')$.

Proof. We will construct a coupling of the percolation measures on the two graphs. That is, given $\omega' \in 2^{E'}$, we will define $\omega \in 2^E$ in such a way that, first, if ω' has distribution \mathbf{P}_p on G' , then ω has distribution \mathbf{P}_p on G ; and, second, if $K(\phi(x))$ is infinite, then so is $K(x)$.

Choose any ordering of $E' = \langle e'_1, e'_2, \dots \rangle$ so that $\phi(x)$ is an endpoint of e'_1 and so that for each $k > 1$, one endpoint of e'_k is also an endpoint of some e'_j with $j < k$.

Let e_1 be any edge that ϕ maps to e'_1 . Define $\omega(e_1) := \omega'(e'_1)$ and set $n_1 := 1$. We will select a subsequence of edges $\langle e'_{n_j} \rangle$ via a recursive procedure. Suppose that $E'_k := \{e'_{n_1}, \dots, e'_{n_k}\}$ have been selected and edges e_j that ϕ maps onto e'_{n_j} ($j \leq k$) have been chosen. Let n_{k+1} be the smallest index of an edge in $E' \setminus E'_k$ that shares an endpoint with at least one of the open edges in E'_k , if any. If there are none, then stop; $K(\phi(x))$ is finite and $\omega(e)$ for the remaining edges $e \in E$ may be assigned independently in any order. Otherwise, if $e'_{n_{k+1}}$ is incident with e'_{n_j} , then let e_{k+1} be any edge that ϕ maps to $e'_{n_{k+1}}$ and that is incident with e_j ; such an edge exists because ϕ is a covering map. Set $\omega(e_{k+1}) := \omega'(e'_{n_{k+1}})$.

If this procedure never ends, then $K(\phi(x))$ is infinite; assigning $\omega(e)$ for any remaining edges $e \in E$ independently in any order gives a fair sample of Bernoulli percolation on G that has $K(x)$ infinite. This proves the theorem. \blacktriangleleft

§6.5. Merging Infinite Clusters and Invasion Percolation.

As p is increased, Bernoulli(p) percolation adds more edges, whence if there is an infinite cluster a.s. at p_0 , then there is also an infinite cluster a.s. at each $p > p_0$. This intuition was made precise by using the standard coupling defined in Section 4.2. How does the number of infinite clusters vary as p is increased through the range where there is at least one infinite cluster? There are two competing features of increasing p : the fact that finite clusters can join means that new infinite clusters could form, while the fact that infinite clusters can join or can absorb finite clusters means that the number of infinite clusters could decrease. For general graphs, either one of these two features could be dominant. For example, if the Cayley graph of \mathbb{Z}^2 is joined by an edge to a tree T

with branching number in $(1, 1/p_c(\mathbb{Z}^2))$, then for $p_c(\mathbb{Z}^2) < p < 1/\text{br} T$, there is a unique infinite cluster, while for $1/\text{br} T < p < 1$, there are infinitely many infinite clusters. On the other hand, we will see in Theorem 7.19 that for the graph in Figure 2.4, the number of infinite clusters is first 0 in an interval of p , then ∞ , and then 1. By combining examples such as these, one can obtain more complicated behavior of the number of infinite clusters. However, on quasi-transitive graphs, it turns out that once there is a unique infinite cluster, then that remains the case for all larger values of p . To prove this, we use the standard coupling and prove something stronger:

THEOREM 6.20. (HÄGGSTRÖM, PERES, AND SCHONMANN, 1999) *Let G be a quasi-transitive graph. If $p_1 < 1$ is such that there exists a unique infinite cluster \mathbf{P}_{p_1} -a.s., then for all $p_2 > p_1$, there is a unique infinite cluster \mathbf{P}_{p_2} -a.s. Furthermore, in the standard coupling of Bernoulli percolation processes, a.s. for all $p_2 > p_1 > p_c(G)$, every infinite p_2 -cluster contains an infinite p_1 -cluster.*

If we define

$$p_u(G) := \inf \{p; \text{there is a unique infinite cluster in Bernoulli}(p) \text{ percolation}\}, \quad (6.9)$$

then it follows from Theorem 6.20 that when G is a quasi-transitive graph,

$$p_u(G) = \sup \{p; \text{there is not a unique infinite cluster in Bernoulli}(p) \text{ percolation}\}.$$

Of course, two new questions immediately arise: When is $p_u < 1$? When is $p_c < p_u$? We will address these questions in Sections 6.6 and 6.7.

Our first order of business, however, is to prove Theorem 6.20. For this, we introduce invasion percolation, which will also be important in our study of minimal spanning forests in Chapter 9. We describe first invasion bond percolation. Fix distinct labels $U(e) \in [0, 1]$ for $e \in \mathbf{E}$, usually a sample of independent uniform random variables. Fix a vertex x . Imagine $U(e)$ as the height of e and the height of x as 0. If we pour water gradually on x , when the water reaches the height of the lowest edge incident to x , then water will flow along that edge. As we keep pouring, the water will “invade” the lowest edge that it touches. This is invasion percolation. More precisely, let $I_1(x)$ be the lowest edge incident to x and define $I_n(x)$ recursively thereafter by letting $I_{n+1}(x) := I_n(x) \cup \{e\}$, where e is the lowest edge incident to $I_n(x)$. Finally, define the **invasion basin** of x to be $I(x) := \bigcup_n I_n(x)$. Invasion site percolation is similar, but the vertices are labelled rather than the edges and the invasion basin is a set of vertices, rather than a set of edges. For invasion site percolation, we start with $I_1(x) := \{x\}$.

The first connection to Bernoulli percolation is that if x belongs to an infinite cluster η of ω_p , then $I(x) \subseteq \eta$. More generally, if an endpoint of some edge e in $I(x)$ belongs to an infinite cluster of ω_p , then $I(x)$ contains some edge (possibly not e) in an infinite cluster of ω_p . A deeper connection is the following:

THEOREM 6.21. (HÄGGSTRÖM, PERES, AND SCHONMANN, 1999) *Let G be a quasi-transitive graph. Then in the standard coupling of Bernoulli percolation processes, a.s. for all $p > p_c(G)$ and all $x \in \mathbf{V}$, there is some infinite p -cluster that intersects $I(x)$.*

Before proving this, we show how it implies Theorem 6.20.

Proof of Theorem 6.20. We give the proof for bond percolation, as site percolation is treated in an identical manner. Let A be the event of probability 1 that all edge labels are distinct and that for all $p > p_c(G)$ and all $x \in \mathbf{V}$, there is some infinite p -cluster that intersects $I(x)$. On A , for each infinite cluster η_2 of ω_{p_2} and each $x \in \eta_2$, there is some infinite cluster η_1 of ω_{p_1} that intersects $I(x)$. Since $I(x) \subseteq \eta_2$, it follows that η_1 intersects η_2 , whence $\eta_1 \subseteq \eta_2$ on A , as desired. \blacktriangleleft

The proof of Theorem 6.21 is rather tricky. The main steps will be to show that $I(x)$ contains arbitrarily large balls, that it comes infinitely often within distance 1 of an infinite p -cluster, and finally that it actually invades some infinite p -cluster. We present the proof for invasion bond percolation, as the site case is similar.

LEMMA 6.22. *Let G be any graph with bounded degrees, $x \in \mathbf{V}$, and $R \in \mathbb{N}$. Then \mathbf{P} -a.s. there is some $y \in \mathbf{V}$ such that $E_R(y) \subset I(x)$.*

Proof. The idea is that as the invasion from x proceeds, it will encounter balls of radius R for the first time infinitely often. Each time, the ball might have all its labels fairly small, in which case that ball would eventually be contained in the invasion basin. Since the encountered balls can be chosen far apart, these events are independent and therefore one of them will eventually happen.

To make this precise, fix an enumeration of \mathbf{V} . Let d be the maximum degree in G ,

$$S_r := \{y; \text{dist}_G(x, y) = r\},$$

and

$$\tau_n := \inf \left\{ k; d(I_k(x), S_{2nR}) = R \right\}.$$

Since $I(x)$ is infinite, $\tau_n < \infty$. Let Y_n be the first vertex in the enumeration of \mathbf{V} such that $Y_n \in S_{2nR}$ and $d(I_{\tau_n}(x), Y_n) = R$. Let A be the event of probability 1 that there is no infinite p -cluster for any $p < p_c(G)$ and consider the events

$$A_n := \left\{ \forall e \in E_R(Y_n) \quad U(e) < p_c(G) \right\}.$$

On the event $A \cap A_n$, we have $E_R(Y_n) \subset I(x)$, so that it suffices to show that some A_n occurs a.s. The sets $E_R(Y_n)$ are disjoint for different n . Also, the invasion process up to time τ_n gives no information about the labels of $E_R(Y_n)$. Thus, the events A_n are independent. Since $|E_R(y)| \leq d^R$ for all y , we have $\mathbf{P}[A_n | Y_n] = p_c(G)^{|E_R(Y_n)|} \geq p_c(G)^{d^R}$, so that $\mathbf{P}[A_n] \geq p_c(G)^{d^R}$. Since $p_c(G) > 0$ by Proposition 6.11, it follows that some A_n occurs a.s. \blacktriangleleft

Let $\xi_p(x)$ be the number of edges that join $I(x)$ to some infinite p -cluster.

LEMMA 6.23. *If G is a quasi-transitive graph, $p > p_c(G)$, and $x \in \mathbf{V}$, then $\xi_p(x) = \infty$ a.s.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Because G is quasi-transitive, there is some R so that

$$\forall y \in \mathbf{V} \quad \mathbf{P}[\text{some infinite } p\text{-cluster comes within distance } R \text{ of } y] \geq 1 - \epsilon. \quad (6.10)$$

We need to reformulate this. Given a set of edges F , write $V(F)$ for the set of its endpoints. By (6.10), if $F \subset \mathbf{E}$ and contains some set $E_R(y)$, then with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, the set F is incident to some infinite p -cluster. Let $A(F)$ be the event that there is an infinite path in ω_p that starts at distance 1 from $V(F)$ and that does not use any vertex in $V(F)$. Our reformulation of (6.10) is that if $F \subset \mathbf{E}$ is *finite* and contains some set $E_R(y)$, then $\mathbf{P}[A(F)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$.

By Lemma 6.22, there is a.s. a smallest finite k for which $I_k(x)$ contains some $E_R(y)$. Call this smallest time τ . Since the invasion process up to time τ gives no information about the labels of edges that are not adjacent to $I_\tau(x)$, we have $\mathbf{P}[A(I_\tau(x)) | I_\tau(x)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$, whence $\mathbf{P}[A(I_\tau(x))] \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Since $\xi_p(x) \geq 1$ on the event $A(I_\tau(x))$ and since ϵ was arbitrary, we obtain $\mathbf{P}[\xi_p(x) \geq 1] = 1$.

Now suppose that $\mathbf{P}[\xi_p(x) = n] > 0$ for some finite n . Closing only finitely many edges moves a configuration with $\xi_p(x) = n$ to a configuration with $\xi_p(x) = 0$. Thus, deletion tolerance and the preceding conclusion shows this to be impossible. This establishes that $\xi_p(x) = \infty$ a.s. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Theorem 6.21. First fix p_1, p_2 with $p_c(G) < p_1 < p_2$ and fix $x \in \mathbf{V}$. Given a labelling of the edges, color an edge blue if it lies in an infinite p_1 -cluster. Color an edge red if it is adjacent to some blue edge but is not itself blue. Observe that for red edges e , the labels $U(e)$ are independent and uniform on $(p_1, 1]$.

Now consider invasion from x given this coloring information. We claim that a.s., $I(x)$ is adjacent to some edge e with label $U(e) < p_2$. By Lemma 6.23, $\xi_{p_1}(x) = \infty$ a.s., so that $I(x)$ is adjacent to infinitely many colored edges. If it is adjacent to even one blue edge, then the claim is immediate. On the other hand, suppose that $I(x)$ is adjacent to

infinitely many red edges. When invasion from x first becomes adjacent to a red edge, e , the distribution of $U(e)$, conditional on all colors and the invasion process so far, is still uniform on $(p_1, 1]$. Hence $U(e) < p_2$ with conditional probability $(p_2 - p_1)/(1 - p_1) > 0$. Since this is the same every time a red edge is encountered, there must be one adjacent red edge with label less than p_2 a.s. This proves the claim.

Now the claim we have just established implies that $I(x)$ a.s. intersects some infinite p_2 -cluster by the observation preceding the statement of Theorem 6.21.

Apply this result to a sequence of values of p_2 approaching $p_c(G)$ to get the theorem. ◀

§6.6. Upper Bounds for p_u .

If G is a regular tree, then it is easy to see that $p_u(G) = 1$. (In fact, this is true for any tree; see Exercise 6.22.) What about the Cayley graph of a free group with respect to a non-free generating set? A special case of the following exercise shows that this still has $p_u(G) = 1$. This exercise uses the important notion of ends of graphs. Let $G = (V, E)$ be any graph. The **number of ends** of G is defined to be the supremum of the number of infinite components of $G \setminus K$ over all finite subsets K of G . In particular, G has no ends iff G is finite and only 1 end iff the complement of each finite set in G has exactly 1 infinite component. This definition suffices for our purposes, but nevertheless, what is an end? To define an end, we make two preliminary definitions. First, an infinite set of vertices $V_0 \subset V$ is **end convergent** if for every finite $K \subset V$, there is a component of $G \setminus K$ that contains all but finitely many vertices of V_0 . Second, two end-convergent sets V_0, V_1 are **equivalent** if $V_0 \cup V_1$ is end convergent. Now, an **end** of G is an equivalence class of end-convergent sets. For example, \mathbb{Z} has two ends, which we could call $+\infty$ and $-\infty$. For a tree, the ends are in natural one-to-one correspondence with the boundary.

▷ EXERCISE 6.7.

Show that if G is a Cayley graph with infinitely many ends, then $p_u(G) = 1$. Show that for any finitely generated group, the number of ends is the same for all of its Cayley graphs.

▷ EXERCISE 6.8.

Show that if G and G' are any two infinite connected graphs, then $G \times G'$ has only one end.

▷ EXERCISE 6.9.

Show that if Γ and Γ' are any two infinite finitely generated groups, then $\Gamma * \Gamma'$ has infinitely many ends.

In fact, one can show that the property $p_u(G) < 1$ does not depend on the generating set for any group (Lyons and Schramm, 1999), but this would be subsumed by the following conjecture, suggested by a question of Benjamini and Schramm (1996b):

CONJECTURE 6.24. *If G is a quasi-transitive graph with one end, then $p_u(G) < 1$.*

This conjecture has been verified in many cases, most notably, when G is the Cayley graph of a finitely presented group. A key ingredient in that case is the following combinatorial fact.

LEMMA 6.25. *Suppose that G is a graph that has a set K of cycles of length at most t such that every cycle belongs to the linear span (in $\ell_-^2(\mathbf{E})$) of K . Let Π be a (possibly infinite) cutset of edges that separates two given vertices and that is minimal with respect to inclusion. Then for each nontrivial partition $\Pi = \Pi_1 \cup \Pi_2$, there exist vertices $x_i \in \mathbf{V}(\Pi_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$) such that the distance between x_1 and x_2 is at most $t/2$.*

This lemma is due to Babson and Benjamini (1999), who used topological definitions and proofs. We give a proof due to Ádám Timár. If instead of hypothesizing that K spans the cycles in $\ell_-^2(\mathbf{E}; \mathbb{R})$, one assumes that K spans the cycles in $\ell_-^2(\mathbf{E}; \mathbf{F}_2)$, where \mathbf{F}_2 is the field of two elements, then the same statement is true with a very similar proof. Note that when a presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ has relators (elements of R) with length at most t , then the associated Cayley graph satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 6.25.

Proof. It suffices to show that there is some cycle of K that intersects both Π_i . Let x and y be two vertices separated by Π . By the assumption of minimality, for $i = 1, 2$, there is a path \mathcal{P}_i from x to y that does not intersect Π_{3-i} . Considering \mathcal{P}_i as elements of $\ell_-^2(\mathbf{E})$, we may write the sum of cycles $\mathcal{P}_1 - \mathcal{P}_2$ as a linear combination $\sum_{c \in K'} a_c c$ for some finite set $K' \subset K$ with $a_c \in \mathbb{R}$. Let K'_1 denote the cycles of K' that intersect Π_1 and $K'_2 := K' \setminus K'_1$. We have

$$\theta := \mathcal{P}_1 - \sum_{c \in K'_1} a_c c = \mathcal{P}_2 + \sum_{c \in K'_2} a_c c.$$

The right-hand side is composed of paths and cycles that do not intersect Π_1 , whence the inner product of θ with χ^e is 0 for all $e \in \Pi_1$. Since θ is a unit flow from x to y , it follows that θ includes an edge from Π_2 . Since \mathcal{P}_1 does not, we deduce that some cycle in K'_1 does. This provides the sort of cycle we sought. ◀

Write $\mathbf{V}_E := \{(e, f) \in \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{E}; e, f \text{ are incident}\}$ in order to define the **line graph*** of

* Since site percolation on G_E is equivalent to bond percolation on G , one might wonder why we study bond percolation separately. There are two principal reasons for this: One is that other sorts of bond percolation processes have no natural site analogue. Another is that planar duality is quite different for bonds than for sites.

G as $G_E := (E, V_E)$. Write $E^t := \{(x, y) \in V \times V; \text{dist}_G(x, y) \leq t\}$ in order to define the t -**fuzz** of G as $G^t := (V, E^t)$. Finally, write $G_E^t := (G_E)^t$. If every cycle can be written as a (finite) linear combination of cycles with length at most $2t$, then according to Lemma 6.25,

$$\text{every minimal cutset in } G \text{ is the vertex set of a connected subgraph of } G_E^t. \quad (6.11)$$

THEOREM 6.26. (BABSON AND BENJAMINI, 1999) *If G is the Cayley graph of a nonamenable finitely presented group with one end, then $p_u(G) < 1$. In fact, the same holds for any nonamenable quasi-transitive graph G with one end such that there is a set of cycles with bounded length whose linear span contains all cycles.*

An extension to the amenable case (where $p_u = p_c$) is given in Exercise 6.28.

Proof. Let $2t$ be an upper bound for the lengths of cycles of some generating set. We do the case of bond percolation and prove that

$$p_u^{\text{bond}}(G) \leq \max\{p_c^{\text{bond}}(G), 1 - p_c^{\text{site}}(G_E^t)\}.$$

The case of site percolation is left as Exercise 6.24. Choose $p < 1$ so that $p > p_c^{\text{bond}}(G)$ and $p > 1 - p_c^{\text{site}}(G_E^t)$. This is possible by Theorem 6.17 and Proposition 6.11. Because G has only one end, any two open infinite clusters must be separated by a closed infinite minimal cutset (indeed, one within the edge boundary of one of the open infinite clusters). Combining this with (6.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{p,G}^{\text{bond}}[\exists \text{ at least 2 open infinite clusters}] &\leq \mathbf{P}_{p,G}^{\text{bond}}[\exists \text{ a closed infinite minimal cutset in } G] \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}_{p,G_E^t}^{\text{site}}[\exists \text{ a closed infinite cluster in } G_E^t] \\ &= \mathbf{P}_{1-p,G_E^t}^{\text{site}}[\exists \text{ an open infinite cluster in } G_E^t] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $\mathbf{P}_{p,G}^{\text{bond}}[\exists \text{ at least 1 open infinite cluster}] = 1$ since $p > p_c^{\text{bond}}(G)$. This proves the result. \blacktriangleleft

§6.7. Lower Bounds for p_u .

According to Theorem 6.6, when G is amenable and transitive, there can never be infinitely many infinite clusters, whence $p_c(G) = p_u(G)$. Behavior that is truly different from the amenable case arises when there *are* infinitely many infinite clusters. This has been conjectured always to be the case on nonamenable transitive graphs for some interval of p :

CONJECTURE 6.27. (BENJAMINI AND SCHRAMM, 1996B) *If G is a quasi-transitive non-amenable graph, then $p_c(G) < p_u(G)$.*

In order to give some examples where $0 < p_c < p_u < 1$, so that we have three phases in Bernoulli percolation, we will use the following lower bound for p_u . Recall that a **simple cycle** is a cycle that does not use any vertex or edge more than once. Let $a_n(G)$ be the number of simple cycles of length n in G that contain o and

$$\gamma(G) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n(G)^{1/n}, \quad (6.12)$$

where a cycle is counted only as a set without regard to ordering or orientation. (We do not know whether $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n(G)^{1/n}$ exists for every transitive, or even every Cayley, graph.)

▷ EXERCISE 6.10.

Let G be a graph and x a vertex in G .

- (a) Show that if every pair of infinite rays starting at x have in common another vertex, then there is some sphere S about x such that every pair of paths from x to S have in common another vertex.
- (b) Show that if every pair of infinite rays starting at x have in common infinitely many vertices, then there is an infinite set of vertices that belongs to every infinite ray starting at x .

THEOREM 6.28. (SCHRAMM, 1997) *Let G be a transitive graph with $\gamma(G) > 1$. Then*

$$p_u(G) \geq 1/\gamma(G). \quad (6.13)$$

Proof. We give the proof for site percolation, the proof for bond percolation being similar. Let $U(x)$ be independent uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables indexed by V . If $p_u(G) = 1$, then there is nothing to show. Otherwise, take $p > p' > p_u \geq p_c$. In order to show that $p_u(G) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n(G)^{-1/n}$, we shall show that $\sum_n a_n(G)p^n = \infty$. Let ω be the open

subgraph formed by the vertices x with $U(x) \leq p$. First, observe that since ω contains a.s. a unique infinite cluster, that infinite cluster K has only one end, since otherwise removing a finite number of sites would create more than one infinite cluster. (We are implicitly appealing to deletion tolerance here.)

Second, with positive probability, there are two (edge- and vertex-) disjoint infinite rays in K . For if not, then for $x \in K$, let E_x be the set of vertices y such that the component of x in $K \setminus \{y\}$ is finite. By Exercise 6.10 and our supposition, for any vertex $x \in K$, a.s. the set E_x is infinite. But given ω , given any such vertex x , and given E_x , for some $y \in E_x$, we must have $U(y) > p'$ a.s. (The conditionings here only tell us that $U(y)$ are uniformly distributed on $[0, p]$ for $y \in E_x$.) This means that $K(x)$ is finite $\mathbf{P}_{p'}$ -a.s. But a.s. K contains every infinite p' -cluster by Theorem 6.20, so there are no infinite clusters $\mathbf{P}_{p'}$ -a.s. This contradicts $p' > p_c$.

Therefore, with positive probability there are two infinite rays $\langle y_n^i \rangle_{n \geq 1}$ ($i = 1, 2$) in ω starting at o that are disjoint except at o . Since K has only one end, for any R , there are some y_{nR}^i that may be connected by paths in ω that stay at distance $\geq R$ from o . In particular, there are an infinite number of simple cycles in ω through o (*viz.*, for each n , some simple cycle contained in the cycle from o to y_{nR}^1 to y_{nR}^2 to o). Since this holds with positive probability, the expected number of simple cycles through o in ω must be infinite. That is, $\sum_n a_n(G)p^n = \infty$. ◀

It seems difficult to calculate $\gamma(G)$, although Hammersley (1961) showed that $\gamma(\mathbb{Z}^d) = \mu(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ for all $d \geq 2$; in particular, $\gamma(\mathbb{Z}^2) \approx 2.64$ (Madras and Slade, 1993). However, although it is crude, quite a useful estimate of $\gamma(G)$ arises from the spectral radius of G , which is much easier to calculate. For any graph G , the **spectral radius** of (simple random walk on) G is defined to be

$$\rho(G) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_o[X_n = o]^{1/n},$$

where $(\langle X_n \rangle, \mathbf{P}_o)$ denotes simple random walk on G starting at o .

▷ EXERCISE 6.11.

Show that for any graph G , $\rho(G) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_o[X_{2n} = o]^{1/2n}$ and $\mathbf{P}_o[X_n = o] \leq \rho(G)^n$ for all n .

LEMMA 6.29. *For any graph G of maximum degree d , we have $\gamma(G) \leq \rho(G)d$.*

Proof. For any simple cycle $o = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n = o$, one way that simple random walk could return to o at time n is by following this cycle. That event has probability at least $1/d^n$. Therefore $\mathbf{P}_o[X_n = o] \geq a_n(G)/d^n$, which gives the result. ◀

PROPOSITION 6.30. *Let G and G' be transitive graphs of degrees d_G and $d_{G'}$. We have*

$$\rho(G \times G') = \frac{d_G}{d_G + d_{G'}} \rho(G) + \frac{d_{G'}}{d_G + d_{G'}} \rho(G').$$

Proof. We first sketch the calculation, then show how to make it rigorous. We will use superscripts on \mathbf{P}_o to denote on which graph the walk is taking place. The degree in $G \times G'$ is $d_G + d_{G'}$, whence each step of simple random walk has chance $d_G/(d_G + d_{G'})$ to be along an edge coming from G . Take o in $G \times G'$ to be the product of the basepoints in the two graphs. Then a walk of n steps from o in $G \times G'$ that takes k steps along edges from G and the rest from G' is back at o iff the k steps in G lead back to o in G and likewise for the $n - k$ steps in G' . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_o^{G \times G'} [X_n = o] &= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} \left(\frac{d_G}{d_G + d_{G'}} \right)^k \left(\frac{d_{G'}}{d_G + d_{G'}} \right)^{n-k} \mathbf{P}_o^G [X_k = o] \mathbf{P}_o^{G'} [X_{n-k} = o] \\ &\approx \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} \left(\frac{d_G}{d_G + d_{G'}} \right)^k \left(\frac{d_{G'}}{d_G + d_{G'}} \right)^{n-k} \rho(G)^k \rho(G')^{n-k} \\ &= \left(\frac{d_G \rho(G) + d_{G'} \rho(G')}{d_G + d_{G'}} \right)^n. \end{aligned}$$

Taking n th roots gives the result.

To make this argument rigorous, we will replace the vague approximation by inequalities in both directions.

For an upper bound, we may use the inequality of Exercise 6.11.

For a lower bound, we note that according to Exercise 6.11, it suffices to consider only even n , which we now do. Then we may sum over even k only (for a lower bound) and use $\mathbf{P}_o^G [X_k = o] \geq C(\rho(G) - \epsilon)^k$ and $\mathbf{P}_o^{G'} [X_{n-k} = o] \geq C(\rho(G') - \epsilon)^{n-k}$ for some constant C and arbitrarily small ϵ . Note that for any $0 < p < 1$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{2n}{2k} p^{2k} (1-p)^{2n-2k} = 1/2.$$

Putting these ingredients together completes the proof. ◀

Since $\rho(\mathbb{Z}) = 1$, it follows that $\rho(\mathbb{Z}^d) = 1$ as well, a fact that is also easy to verify directly. Another particular value of ρ that is useful for us is that of trees:

PROPOSITION 6.31. *For all $b \geq 1$, we have*

$$\rho(\mathbb{T}_{b+1}) = \frac{2\sqrt{b}}{b+1}.$$

Proof. If X_n is simple random walk on \mathbb{T}_{b+1} , then $|X_n|$ is a biased random walk on \mathbb{N} , with probability $p := b/(b+1)$ to increase by 1 and $q := 1/(b+1)$ to decrease by 1 when $X_n \neq 0$. Let $\tau_0^+ := \inf\{n \geq 1; |X_n| = 0\}$. Now the number of paths of length $2n$ from 0 to 0 in \mathbb{N} that do not visit 0 in between is equal to the number of paths of length $2n-2$ from 1 to 1 in \mathbb{Z} minus the number of the latter that visit 0. The former number is clearly $\binom{2n-2}{n-1}$. The latter number is $\binom{2n-2}{n}$, since reflection after the first visit to 0 of a path from 1 to 1 that visits 0 yields a bijection to the set of paths from 1 to -1 of length $2n-2$. Hence, the difference is

$$\binom{2n-2}{n-1} - \binom{2n-2}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \binom{2n-2}{n-1}.$$

Each path of length $2n$ from 0 to 0 in \mathbb{N} that does not visit 0 has probability $p^{n-1}q^n$, whence we have

$$\mathbf{P}[\tau_0^+ = 2n] = \frac{1}{n} \binom{2n-2}{n-1} p^{n-1}q^n = \frac{-1}{2} (-4)^n \binom{1/2}{n} p^{n-1}q^n.$$

Therefore, provided $|z|$ is sufficiently small,

$$g(z) := \mathbf{E}[z^{\tau_0^+}] = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{-1}{2} (-4)^n \binom{1/2}{n} p^{n-1}q^n z^{2n} = (1 - \sqrt{1 - 4pqz^2})/(2p).$$

The radius of convergence of the power series for g is therefore $1/(2\sqrt{pq})$. Since

$$G(z) := \sum_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{P}[|X_n| = 0] z^n = \frac{1}{1 - g(z)},$$

it follows that the radius of convergence of G is also $1/(2\sqrt{pq})$, which shows that the spectral radius is $2\sqrt{pq}$, as desired.

(See Exercise 5.6 for another proof.) ◀

Combining this with Proposition 6.30, we get:

COROLLARY 6.32. *For all $b \geq 1$, we have*

$$\rho(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z}) = \frac{2\sqrt{b+2}}{b+3}. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

We now have enough tools at our disposal to give our first example of a graph with two phase transitions; this was also historically the first example ever given.

THEOREM 6.33. (GRIMMETT AND NEWMAN, 1990) *For all $b \geq 8$, we have*

$$0 < p_c(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z}) < p_u(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z}) < 1.$$

Proof. The first inequality follows from Proposition 6.11. Since \mathbb{T}_{b+1} and \mathbb{Z} are both finitely presentable, so is their product, whence the last inequality is a consequence of Theorem 6.26. To prove the middle inequality, note that by Theorem 6.28,

$$p_c(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z}) \leq p_c(\mathbb{T}_{b+1}) = 1/b < 1/\gamma(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z}) \leq p_u(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z})$$

if $\gamma(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z}) < b$. Combining Lemma 6.29 and Corollary 6.32, we obtain $\gamma(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z}) \leq \rho(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z})(b+3) = 2\sqrt{b} + 2$. This last quantity is less than b for $b \geq 8$. ◀

To establish some more cases of Conjecture 6.27, we use the following consequence of (5.8) and (5.9):

THEOREM 6.34. *If G is a regular graph of degree d , then*

$$\rho(G)^2 + \left(\frac{\iota_E(G)}{d} \right)^2 \leq 1 \tag{6.14}$$

and

$$\rho(G) + \frac{\iota_E(G)}{d} \geq 1. \tag{6.15}$$

◀

The following corollary is due to Schonmann (2001) (parts (i) and (ii)) and Pak and Smirnova-Nagnibeda (2000) (part (iii)).

COROLLARY 6.35. *Let G be a transitive graph.*

- (i) *If $\iota_E(G)/d_G \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$, then $p_c^{\text{bond}}(G) < p_u^{\text{bond}}(G)$.*
- (ii) *If $\iota_V(G)/d_G \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$, then $p_c^{\text{site}}(G) < p_u^{\text{site}}(G)$.*
- (iii) *If $\rho(G) \leq 1/2$, then $p_c^{\text{bond}}(G) < p_u^{\text{bond}}(G)$.*

Proof. We shall use the following implications:

$$\rho(G)d_G \leq \iota_E(G) \implies p_c^{\text{bond}}(G) < p_u^{\text{bond}}(G), \tag{6.16}$$

$$\rho(G)d_G \leq \iota_V(G) \implies p_c^{\text{site}}(G) < p_u^{\text{site}}(G). \tag{6.17}$$

To prove (6.16), use Theorem 6.18, Lemma 6.29, and Theorem 6.28 to see that when $\rho(G)d_G \leq \iota_E(G)$, we have

$$p_c^{\text{bond}}(G) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \iota_E(G)} < \frac{1}{\iota_E(G)} \leq \frac{1}{\rho(G)d_G} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma(G)} \leq p_u^{\text{bond}}(G).$$

To prove (6.17), use (6.8), Lemma 6.29, and Theorem 6.28 to see that when $\rho(G)d_G \leq \iota_V(G)$, we have

$$p_c^{\text{site}}(G) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \iota_V(G)} < \frac{1}{\iota_V(G)} \leq \frac{1}{\rho(G)d_G} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma(G)} \leq p_u^{\text{site}}(G).$$

Part (i) is now an immediate consequence of (6.14) and (6.16). Part (ii) follows similarly from (6.14) and (6.17), with the observation that $\iota_E(G) \geq \iota_V(G)$, so that if $\iota_V(G)/d_G \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$, then also $\iota_E(G)/d_G \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$, so that $\rho(G)d_G \leq d_G/\sqrt{2} \leq \iota_V(G)$. Part (iii) follows from (6.15) and (6.16). ◀

To get a sense of the strength of the hypotheses of Corollary 6.35, note that by Exercise 5.1, we have $\iota(\mathbb{T}_{b+1})/d_{\mathbb{T}_{b+1}} = (b-1)/(b+1)$. Also, for a given degree, the regular tree maximizes ι over all graphs by Exercise 5.19.

It turns out that any nonamenable group has a generating set that gives a Cayley graph satisfying the hypotheses of Corollary 6.35(iii). To show this, consider the following construction. Let G be a graph and $k \geq 1$. Define a new multigraph $G^{[k]}$ to have vertex set $V(G)$ and to have one edge joining $x, y \in V(G)$ for every path in G of length exactly k that joins x and y . Thus $G^{[1]} = G$. Further, if G is the Cayley graph of Γ corresponding to generators S , then for any odd k , we have that $G^{[k]}$ is the Cayley graph of the same group Γ , but presented as $\langle S^{[k]} \mid R^{[k]} \rangle$, where

$$S^{[k]} := \{x_{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k} ; w_i \in S\}$$

and $R^{[k]}$ is the set of products $x_{w_{1,1}, w_{1,2}, \dots, w_{1,j}} x_{w_{2,1}, w_{2,2}, \dots, w_{2,j}} \cdots x_{w_{n,1}, w_{n,2}, \dots, w_{n,j}}$ of elements from $S^{[k]}$ such that $w_{1,1}w_{1,2} \cdots w_{1,j}w_{2,1}w_{2,2} \cdots w_{2,j} \cdots w_{n,1}w_{n,2} \cdots w_{n,j} = \mathbf{1}_\Gamma$. (If G is not bipartite, then the same statement holds for even k .)

COROLLARY 6.36. (PAK AND SMIRNOVA-NAGNIBEDA (2000)) *If G is any nonamenable transitive graph, then $p_c^{\text{bond}}(G^{[k]}) < p_u^{\text{bond}}(G^{[k]})$ for all odd $k \geq -\log 2 / \log \rho(G)$. In particular, every finitely generated nonamenable group has a generating set whose Cayley graph satisfies $p_c^{\text{bond}} < p_u^{\text{bond}}$.*

Proof. Let k be as given. Then $\rho(G)^k \leq 1/2$. Now simple random walk on $G^{[k]}$ is the same as simple random walk on G sampled every k steps. Therefore $\rho(G^{[k]}) = \rho(G)^k$ by Exercise 6.11. This means that $\rho(G^{[k]}) \leq 1/2$, whence the result follows from Corollary 6.35. ◀

Corollary 6.36 would confirm Conjecture 6.27 if the following conjecture were established:

CONJECTURE 6.37. (BENJAMINI AND SCHRAMM, 1996B) *If G and G' are roughly isometric quasi-transitive graphs and $p_c(G) < p_u(G)$, then $p_c(G') < p_u(G')$.*

More detailed information about percolation requires additional tools. Unfortunately, these tools are not available for all quasi-transitive graphs. The next chapter is devoted to them.

§6.8. Notes.

Inequality (6.7) also follows from the following result:

THEOREM 6.38. (AIZENMAN AND BARSKY, 1987) *If G is any transitive graph and $p < p_c(G)$, then $\mathbf{E}_p[|K(o)|] < \infty$.*

Aizenman and Barsky (1987) worked only on \mathbb{Z}^d , but their proof works in greater generality.

The proof of Theorem 6.18 actually gives better bounds, with $\iota_E(G)$ and $\iota_V(G)$ replaced by

$$\iota_E^*(G) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \left\{ \frac{|\partial_E K|}{|K|}; o \in K \subset V, K \text{ is connected, } n \leq |K| < \infty \right\}$$

and

$$\iota_V^*(G) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \left\{ \frac{|\partial_V K|}{|K|}; o \in K \subset V, K \text{ is connected, } n \leq |K| < \infty \right\},$$

respectively, the **anchored expansion constants** introduced in Benjamini, Lyons, and Schramm (1999) and studied by Virág (2000a).

The first part of Theorem 6.20 and a weakening of the second part, when p_1 and p_2 are fixed in advance, was shown first by Häggström and Peres (1999) for Cayley graphs and other unimodular transitive graphs, then by Schonmann (1999b) in general. This answered affirmatively a question of Benjamini and Schramm (1996b).

Conjecture 6.24 on whether $p_u < 1$ has been shown not only for finitely presented groups, as in Theorem 6.26, but also for planar quasi-transitive graphs, which will be shown in Section 7.5 and which also follows from Theorem 6.26. In addition, other techniques have established the conjecture for the cartesian product of two infinite graphs (Häggström, Peres, and Schonmann, 1999) and for Cayley graphs of Kazhdan groups, i.e., groups with Kazhdan’s property T (Lyons and Schramm, 1999).

The inequality $p_u(G) \geq 1/(\rho(G)d)$ for quasi-transitive graphs of maximum degree d , which follows from Theorem 6.28 combined with Lemma 6.29, was proved earlier by Benjamini and Schramm (1996b).

The only groups for which it is known that all its Cayley graphs satisfy $p_c < p_u$ are the groups of “cost” larger than 1. This includes, first, free groups of rank at least 2 and fundamental groups of compact surfaces of genus larger than 1. Second, let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be two groups of finite cost with Γ_1 having cost larger than 1. Then every amalgamation of Γ_1 and Γ_2 over an amenable group has cost larger than 1. Third, every HNN extension of Γ_1 over an amenable group has cost larger than 1. Also, every HNN extension of an infinite group over a finite group has cost larger than 1. Finally, every group with strictly positive first ℓ^2 -Betti number has cost larger than 1. For the definition of cost and proofs that these groups have cost larger than 1, see Gaboriau (1998, 2000, 2002). The proof that $p_c(G) < p_u(G)$ follows fairly easily from Theorem 7.17 in the next

chapter, as noted by Lyons (2000). If Γ is a group with a Cayley graph G and the free and wired uniform spanning forest measures on G differ, then Γ has cost larger than 1; possibly these are exactly the groups of cost larger than 1. See Questions 9.58 and 9.59.

§6.9. Additional Exercises.

6.12. Show that if G' is a transitive representation of G , then G is amenable iff G' is amenable.

6.13. Find the Cayley graph of the lamplighter group G_1 with respect to the 4 generators $(1, \mathbf{0})$, $(-1, \mathbf{0})$, $(1, \mathbf{1}_{\{0\}})$, and $(-1, \mathbf{1}_{\{0\}})$.

6.14. Show that $\text{gr}(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z}^d) = b$ for all $b \geq 2$ and $d \geq 0$.

6.15. Suppose that ω is an invariant percolation on a transitive graph G . Let Λ be the set of vertices x that belong to an infinite component η of ω such that $\eta \setminus \{x\}$ has at least 3 infinite components. Show that $\nu_E(G) \geq \mathbf{P}[o \in \Lambda]$.

6.16. Extend Theorem 6.8 to quasi-transitive amenable graphs.

6.17. Refine Proposition 6.9 to prove that $\theta_o^{\text{site}}(p) \leq p\theta_o^{\text{bond}}(p)$.

6.18. Strengthen Proposition 6.11 to show that for any graph G , we have $p_c(G) \geq 1/\text{br } T^{\text{SAW}}$.

6.19. Prove that $p_c^{\text{bond}}(\mathbb{Z}^2) \leq 1 - 1/\mu(\mathbb{Z}^2)$.

6.20. Suppose that G is a graph such that for some constant $C < \infty$ and all $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\left| \left\{ K \subset V; o \in K, K \text{ is finite, } (K, E \cap K \times K) \text{ is connected, } |\partial_E K| = n \right\} \right| \leq Ce^{Cn}.$$

Show that $p_c(G) < 1$.

6.21. Write out the proof of the second inequality of Theorem 6.18.

6.22. Show that if T is any tree and $p < 1$, then Bernoulli(p) percolation on T has either no infinite clusters a.s. or infinitely many infinite clusters a.s.

6.23. Show that if G is a Cayley graph with at least 3 ends, then G has infinitely many ends.

6.24. Prove Theorem 6.26 for site percolation.

6.25. Let $G = (V, E)$ be any graph all of whose vertices have degrees at most d . For any fixed $o \in V$, let a_n be the number of connected subgraphs of G that contain o and have exactly n vertices. Show that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n^{1/n} < ed$, where e is the base of natural logarithms.

6.26. Let $G = (V, E)$ be any graph all of whose vertices have degrees at most d . For any fixed $o \in V$, let b_n be the number of connected subgraphs of G that contain o and have exactly n edges. Show that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n^{1/n} < e(d-1)$, where e is the base of natural logarithms.

6.27. A sequence of vertices $\langle x_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is called a **bi-infinite geodesic** if $\text{dist}_G(x_j, x_k) = |j - k|$ for all $j, k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Show that a transitive graph contains a bi-infinite geodesic passing through o .

6.28. Show that if G is a transitive graph G such that there is a set of cycles with bounded length whose linear span contains all cycles, then $p_c(G) < 1$.

6.29. Let G be any graph and let b_n be the number of paths of length n from o to o . Show that if $p > 1/\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n^{1/n}$, then there is a unique infinite cluster \mathbf{P}_p -a.s.

6.30. Let G and G' be transitive networks with conductance sums at vertices π, π' , respectively. (These are constants by transitivity.) If the cartesian product network is defined as in Exercise 5.7, then show that

$$\rho(G \times G') = \frac{\pi}{\pi + \pi'} \rho(G) + \frac{\pi'}{\pi + \pi'} \rho(G').$$

6.31. Prove that $p_c^{\text{bond}}(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z}) < p_u^{\text{bond}}(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z})$ for $b = 7$.

6.32. Prove that for every transitive graph G , if b is sufficiently large, then $p_c(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times G) < p_u(\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times G)$.

6.33. Show that Corollary 6.35 holds for quasi-transitive graphs when d_G is replaced by the maximum degree in G .

Chapter 7

The Mass-Transport Technique and Percolation

In this chapter, all graphs are assumed to be locally finite without explicit mention. We shall develop the Mass-Transport Principle in the context of percolation, where it has become indispensable, but we shall find it quite useful in Chapters 9 and 11 as well.

§7.1. The Mass-Transport Principle for Cayley Graphs.

Early forms of the mass-transport technique were used by Adams (1990) and van den Berg and Meester (1991). It was introduced in the study of percolation by Häggström (1997) and developed further in BLPS (1999). This method is useful far beyond Bernoulli percolation. The principle on which it depends is best stated in a form that does not mention percolation or even probability at all. However, to motivate it, we first consider processes that are invariant with respect to a *countable* group Γ , meaning, in its greatest generality, a probability measure \mathbf{P} on a space Ω on which Γ acts in such a way as to preserve \mathbf{P} . For example, we could take $\mathbf{P} := \mathbf{P}_p$ and $\Omega := 2^{\mathbf{E}}$, where \mathbf{E} is the edge set of a Cayley graph of Γ . Let $F(x, y; \omega) \in [0, \infty]$ be a function of $x, y \in \Gamma$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. Suppose that F is invariant under the diagonal action of Γ ; that is, $F(\gamma x, \gamma y; \gamma \omega) = F(x, y, \omega)$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$. We think of giving each element $x \in \Gamma$ some initial mass, possibly depending on ω , then redistributing it so that x sends y the mass $F(x, y; \omega)$. With this terminology, one hopes for “conservation” of mass, at least in expectation. Of course, the total amount of mass is usually infinite. Nevertheless, there is a sense in which mass is conserved: the expected mass at an element before transport equals the expected mass at an element afterwards. Since F enters this equation only in expectation, it is convenient to set $f(x, y) := \mathbf{E}F(x, y; \omega)$. Then f is also diagonally invariant, i.e., $f(\gamma x, \gamma y) = f(x, y)$ for all $\gamma, x, y \in \Gamma$, because \mathbf{P} is invariant.

THE MASS-TRANSPORT PRINCIPLE FOR COUNTABLE GROUPS. *Let Γ be a countable group. If $f : \Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is diagonally invariant, then*

$$\sum_{x \in \Gamma} f(o, x) = \sum_{x \in \Gamma} f(x, o).$$

Proof. Just note that $f(o, x) = f(x^{-1}o, x^{-1}x) = f(x^{-1}, o)$ and that summation of $f(x^{-1}, o)$ over all x^{-1} is the same $\sum_{x \in \Gamma} f(x, o)$ since inversion is a bijection of Γ . ◀

Before we use the Mass-Transport Principle in a significant way, we examine a few simple questions to illustrate where it is needed and how it is different from simpler principles. Let G be a Cayley graph of the group Γ and let \mathbf{P} be an invariant percolation, i.e., an invariant measure on $2^{\mathbf{V}}$, on $2^{\mathbf{E}}$, or even on $2^{\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{E}}$. Let ω be a configuration with distribution \mathbf{P} .

EXAMPLE 7.1. Could it be that ω is a single vertex? I.e., is there an invariant way to pick a vertex at random?

No: If there were, the assumptions would imply that the probability p of picking x is the same for all x , whence an infinite sum of p would equal 1, an impossibility.

EXAMPLE 7.2. Could it be that ω is a finite nonempty vertex set? I.e., is there an invariant way to pick a finite set of vertices at random?

No: If there were, then we could pick one of the vertices of the finite set at random (uniformly), thereby obtaining an invariant probability measure on singletons.

EXAMPLE 7.3. The number of *finite* components is \mathbf{P} -a.s. 0 or ∞ . For if not, then we could condition on the number of finite components being finite and positive, then take the set of their vertices and arrive at an invariant probability measure on $2^{\mathbf{V}}$ that is concentrated on finite sets.

EXAMPLE 7.4. The number of furcations is \mathbf{P} -a.s. 0 or ∞ . For the set of furcations has an invariant distribution on $2^{\mathbf{V}}$.

EXAMPLE 7.5. \mathbf{P} -a.s. each component has 0 or ∞ furcations.

This does not follow from elementary considerations as the previous examples do, but requires the Mass-Transport Principle. Namely, given the configuration ω , define $F(x, y; \omega)$ to be 0 if $K(x)$ has 0 or ∞ furcations, but to be $1/N$ if y is one of N furcations of $K(x)$ and $1 \leq N < \infty$. Then F is diagonally invariant, whence the Mass-Transport Principle applies to $f(x, y) := \mathbf{E}F(x, y; \omega)$. Since $\sum_y F(x, y; \omega) \leq 1$, we have

$$\sum_x f(o, x) \leq 1. \tag{7.1}$$

If any component has a finite positive number of furcations, then each of them receives infinite mass. More precisely, if o is one of a finite number of furcations of $K(o)$, then

$\sum_x F(x, o; \omega) = \infty$. Therefore, if with positive probability some component has a finite positive number of furcations, then with positive probability o is one of a finite number of furcations of $K(o)$, and therefore $\mathbf{E} \left[\sum_x F(x, o; \omega) \right] = \infty$. That is, $\sum_x f(x, o) = \infty$, which contradicts the Mass-Transport Principle and (7.1).

This is a typical application of the Mass-Transport Principle. Most applications are qualitative, like this one. For example, a combination of Examples 7.2 and 7.5 is:

EXAMPLE 7.6. If there are infinite clusters with positive probability, then there is no invariant way to pick a finite nonempty subset from one or more infinite clusters, whether deterministically or with additional randomness. More precisely, there is no invariant measure on pairs (ω, ϕ) whose marginal on the first coordinate is \mathbf{P} and such that $\phi : \mathbf{V} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbf{V}}$ is a function such that $\phi(x)$ is finite for all x , nonempty for at least one x belonging to an infinite ω -cluster, and such that whenever x and y lie in the same ω -cluster, $\phi(x) = \phi(y)$.

To illustrate a deeper use of the Mass-Transport Principle, we now give another proof that in the standard coupling of Bernoulli bond percolation on a Cayley graph, G , for all $p_c(G) < p_1 < p_2$, a.s. every infinite p_2 -cluster contains some infinite p_1 -cluster.

Let $\omega_1 \subseteq \omega_2$ be the configurations in the standard coupling of the two Bernoulli percolations. Note that (ω_1, ω_2) is invariant and enjoys versions of insertion tolerance, such as $\mathbf{P}[(\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \Pi_e^2 A] \geq \min\{1, (p_2 - p_1)/(1 - p_2)\} \mathbf{P}[(\omega_1, \omega_2) \in A]$, where $\Pi_e^2(\omega_1, \omega_2) := (\omega_1, \Pi_e \omega_2)$. Write $K_2(x)$ for the infinite cluster of x in ω_2 .

Let η denote the union of all infinite clusters of ω_1 . Define $F(x, y; (\omega_1, \omega_2))$ to be 1 if x and y belong to the same ω_2 -cluster and y is the unique vertex in η that is closest in ω_2 to x ; otherwise, define $F(x, y; (\omega_1, \omega_2)) := 0$. Note that if there is not a unique such y , then x does not send any mass anywhere. Then F is diagonally invariant and $\sum_y F(x, y; (\omega_1, \omega_2)) \leq 1$.

Suppose that with positive probability there is an infinite cluster of ω_2 that is disjoint from η . Let $A(z, y, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$ be the event that $K_2(z)$ is infinite and disjoint from η , that $y \in \eta$, and that e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n form a path of edges from z to y that lies outside $K_2(z) \cup \eta$. Whenever there is an infinite cluster of ω_2 that is disjoint from η , there must exist two vertices z and y and some edges e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n for which $A(z, y, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$ holds. Hence, there exists z, y, e_1, \dots, e_n such that $\mathbf{P}(A(z, y, e_1, \dots, e_n)) > 0$. If B denotes the event $\Pi_{e_1}^2 \Pi_{e_2}^2 \cdots \Pi_{e_n}^2 A(z, y, e_1, \dots, e_n)$, then $\mathbf{P}(B) > 0$. On the event B , we have $F(x, y; (\omega_1, \omega_2)) = 1$ for all $x \in K_2(z)$, whence $\sum_x \mathbf{E} F(x, y; (\omega_1, \omega_2)) = \infty$, which contradicts the Mass-Transport Principle.

§7.2. Beyond Cayley Graphs: Unimodularity.

The Mass-Transport Principle does not hold for all transitive graphs in the form given in Section 7.1. For example, if G is the graph of Example 6.1 with T having degree 3, then consider the function $f(x, y)$ that is the indicator of y being the ξ -grandparent of x .

▷ EXERCISE 7.1.

Show that every automorphism of G fixes the end ξ and therefore that f is diagonally invariant.

Although f is diagonally invariant, we have that $\sum_{x \in T} f(o, x) = 1$, yet $\sum_{x \in T} f(x, o) = 4$. In particular, G is not a Cayley graph.

▷ EXERCISE 7.2.

Show that the graph of Example 6.2 is not a Cayley graph.

Nevertheless, there are many transitive graphs for which the Mass-Transport Principle does hold, the so-called unimodular graphs, and there is a generalization that holds for all graphs. The case of unimodular (quasi-transitive) graphs is the most important case and the one that we will focus on in the rest of this chapter.

Let G be a graph (locally finite, as always), and let Γ be a group of automorphisms of G . Let $S(x) := \{\gamma \in \Gamma; \gamma x = x\}$ denote the **stabilizer** of x . The assumption that G is locally finite ensures that for all x and y , the set $S(x)y$ is finite.

THEOREM 7.7. (MASS-TRANSPORT PRINCIPLE) *If Γ is a group of automorphisms of a graph $G = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$, $f : \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{V} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is invariant under the diagonal action of Γ , and $u, v \in \mathbf{V}$, then*

$$\sum_{z \in \Gamma v} f(u, z) = \sum_{y \in \Gamma u} f(y, v) \frac{|S(y)v|}{|S(v)y|}. \tag{7.2}$$

This formula is too complicated to remember, but note the form it takes when Γ is transitive:

COROLLARY 7.8. *If Γ is a transitive group of automorphisms of a graph $G = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$, $f : \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{V} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is invariant under the diagonal action of Γ , and $o \in \mathbf{V}$, then*

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbf{V}} f(o, x) = \sum_{x \in \mathbf{V}} f(x, o) \frac{|S(x)o|}{|S(o)x|}.$$

In particular, when Γ is **unimodular**, meaning that $|S(x)y| = |S(y)x|$ for all pairs (x, y) such that $y \in \Gamma x$, and also transitive, then we obtain

$$\sum_{x \in V} f(o, x) = \sum_{x \in V} f(x, o). \quad (7.3)$$

We shall also say that a graph is **unimodular** when its automorphism group is. Thus, all the applications of the Mass-Transport Principle in Section 7.1 apply (with the same proofs) to transitive unimodular graphs. In fact, they apply as well to all quasi-transitive unimodular graphs since for such graphs, $|S(x)y|/|S(y)x|$ is bounded over all pairs (x, y) by Theorem 7.10 and Exercise 7.7 below, and we may sum (7.2) over all pairs (u, v) chosen from a complete set of orbit representatives.

To prove Theorem 7.7, let

$$\Gamma_{x,y} := \{\gamma \in \Gamma; \gamma x = y\}.$$

Note that for any $\gamma \in \Gamma_{x,y}$, we have

$$\Gamma_{x,y} = \gamma S(x) = S(y)\gamma.$$

Therefore, for all x, y, z and any $\gamma \in \Gamma_{x,y}$,

$$|\Gamma_{x,y}z| = |\gamma S(x)z| = |S(x)z| \quad (7.4)$$

and, writing $w := \gamma z$, we have

$$|\Gamma_{x,y}z| = |S(y)\gamma z| = |S(y)w|. \quad (7.5)$$

Since $\gamma^{-1}w = z$ and $\gamma^{-1} \in \Gamma_{y,x}$, we have

$$w \in \Gamma_{x,y}z \iff z \in \Gamma_{y,x}w. \quad (7.6)$$

Proof of Theorem 7.7. Let $z \in \Gamma v$, so that $v = \gamma z$ for some $\gamma \in \Gamma_{z,v}$. If $y := \gamma u$, then $f(u, z) = f(\gamma u, \gamma z) = f(y, v)$. That is, $f(u, z) = f(y, v)$ whenever $y \in \Gamma_{z,v}u$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{z \in \Gamma v} f(u, z) = \sum_{z \in \Gamma v} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_{z,v}u|} \sum_{y \in \Gamma_{z,v}u} f(y, v) = \sum_{y \in \Gamma u} f(y, v) \sum_{z \in \Gamma_{y,u}v} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_{z,v}u|}$$

because of (7.6). Using (7.5) and then (7.4), we may rewrite this as

$$\sum_{y \in \Gamma u} f(y, v) \frac{|\Gamma_{y,u}v|}{|S(v)y|} = \sum_{y \in \Gamma u} f(y, v) \frac{|S(y)v|}{|S(v)y|}. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

▷ EXERCISE 7.3.

Let Γ be a transitive group of automorphisms of a graph that satisfies (7.3). Show that Γ is unimodular.

▷ EXERCISE 7.4.

Show that if Γ is a transitive unimodular group of automorphisms and Γ' is a larger group of automorphisms of the same graph, then Γ' is also transitive and unimodular.

By Exercise 7.3, every Cayley graph is unimodular. We will generalize this in Proposition 7.9. Call a group Γ of automorphisms **discrete** if all stabilizers are finite. Recall that $[\Gamma : \Gamma']$ denotes the index of a subgroup Γ' in a group Γ , i.e., the number of cosets of Γ' in Γ .

▷ EXERCISE 7.5.

Show that if Γ is a group of automorphisms of a connected graph and $S(x_1) \cap S(x_2) \cap \cdots \cap S(x_n)$ is finite for some x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n , then Γ is discrete.

▷ EXERCISE 7.6.

Show that for all x and y , we have $|S(x)y| = [S(x) : S(x) \cap S(y)]$.

PROPOSITION 7.9. *If Γ is a discrete group of automorphisms, then Γ is unimodular.*

Proof. Suppose that $y = \gamma x$. Then $|S(x)| = |S(y)|$, whence

$$\frac{|S(x)y|}{|S(y)x|} = \frac{[S(x) : S(x) \cap S(y)]}{[S(y) : S(x) \cap S(y)]} = \frac{|S(x)|/|S(x) \cap S(y)|}{|S(y)|/|S(x) \cap S(y)|} = \frac{|S(x)|}{|S(y)|} = 1. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Sometimes we can make additional use of the Mass-Transport Principle from the following fact.

THEOREM 7.10. *If Γ is a group of automorphisms of any graph G , then there are numbers μ_x ($x \in \mathcal{V}$) that are unique up to a constant multiple such that for all x, y ,*

$$\frac{\mu_x}{\mu_y} = \frac{|S(x)y|}{|S(y)x|}. \quad (7.7)$$

Proof. Recall the following standard extension of Lagrange's theorem: if Γ_3 is a subgroup of Γ_2 , which in turn is a subgroup of Γ_1 , then

$$[\Gamma_1 : \Gamma_2][\Gamma_2 : \Gamma_3] = [\Gamma_1 : \Gamma_3]. \quad (7.8)$$

By (7.8), we have

$$\frac{[S(x) : S(x) \cap S(y)]}{[S(y) : S(x) \cap S(y)]} = \frac{[S(x) : S(x) \cap S(y) \cap S(z)]}{[S(y) : S(x) \cap S(y) \cap S(z)]}.$$

Combining this with Exercise 7.6, we obtain the cocycle identity

$$\frac{|S(x)y| |S(y)z|}{|S(y)x| |S(z)y|} = \frac{|S(x)z|}{|S(z)x|} \tag{7.9}$$

for all x, y, z .

Thus, if we fix $o \in \mathbf{V}$, choose $\mu_o \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, and define $\mu_x := \mu_o |S(x)o| / |S(o)x|$, then for all x, y , we have

$$\frac{\mu_x}{\mu_y} = \frac{\mu_o |S(x)o| / |S(o)x|}{\mu_o |S(y)o| / |S(o)y|} = \frac{|S(x)y|}{|S(y)x|}$$

by (7.9). On the other hand, if μ'_x ($x \in \mathbf{V}$) also satisfies (7.7), then

$$\frac{\mu_x}{\mu'_x} = \frac{\mu_o |S(x)o| / |S(o)x|}{\mu'_o |S(x)o| / |S(o)x|} = \frac{\mu_o}{\mu'_o}$$

for all x . ◀

▷ EXERCISE 7.7.

Show that if $y \in \Gamma x$, then $\mu_y = \mu_x$.

The following exercise makes it easier to check the definition of unimodularity.

▷ EXERCISE 7.8.

Show that if G is transitive, then G is unimodular iff $|S(x)y| = |S(y)x|$ for all edges $[x, y]$, where stabilizers are taken in $\text{Aut}(G)$.

▷ EXERCISE 7.9.

Show that if G is transitive and for all edges $[x, y]$, there is some $\gamma \in \text{Aut}(G)$ such that $\gamma x = y$ and $\gamma y = x$, then G is unimodular.

Using the numbers μ_x , we may write (7.2) as

$$\sum_{z \in \Gamma v} f(u, z) \mu_v = \sum_{y \in \Gamma u} f(y, v) \mu_y .$$

If one knows about Haar measure, it is not hard to show that μ_x is the left-invariant Haar measure of $S(x)$ (in the closure of Γ if Γ is not already closed). One can also use Haar measure to give a simple proof of Theorem 7.7; see BLPS (1999) for such a proof (due to Woess). In the amenable quasi-transitive case, Exercise 7.23 gives another interpretation of the weights μ_x .

It is nice to know that when one is in the amenable setting, unimodularity is automatic:

PROPOSITION 7.11. (SOARDI AND WOESS, 1990) *Any transitive group Γ of automorphisms of an amenable graph G is unimodular.*

Proof. Let $\langle F_n \rangle$ be a sequence of finite sets of vertices in G such that $|\overline{F_n}|/|F_n| \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\overline{F_n} := F_n \cup \partial_V F_n$ is the union of F_n with its exterior vertex boundary.

Fix vertices x, y . We count the number of pairs (z, w) such that $z \in F_n$ and $w \in \Gamma_{x,zy}$ (or equivalently, $z \in \Gamma_{y,wx}$) in two ways: by summing over z first or over w first. In view of (7.4), this gives

$$|F_n||S(x)y| = \sum_{z \in F_n} \sum_{w \in \Gamma_{x,zy}} 1 \leq \sum_{w \in \overline{F_n}} \sum_{z \in \Gamma_{y,wx}} 1 = |\overline{F_n}||S(y)x|.$$

Dividing both sides by $|F_n|$ and taking a limit, we get $|S(x)y| \leq |S(y)x|$. By symmetry, we are done. ◀

§7.3. Infinite Clusters in Invariant Percolation.

What happens in Bernoulli percolation at p_c itself, i.e., is there an infinite cluster a.s.? Extending the classical conjecture for euclidean lattices, Benjamini and Schramm (1996b) made the following conjecture:

CONJECTURE 7.12. *If G is any quasi-transitive graph with $p_c(G) < 1$, then $\theta(p_c(G)) = 0$.*

In the next section, we will establish this conjecture when G is a nonamenable transitive unimodular graph. This will utilize in a crucial way more general invariant percolation processes, which is the topic of the present section. What is the advantage conferred by nonamenability that allows a resolution of this conjecture? In essence, it is that *all* finite sets have a comparatively large boundary; since clusters are chosen at random in percolation, this is an advantage, compared to knowing, in the amenable case, that *certain* large sets have comparatively small boundary.

We first present a simple but powerful result on a threshold for having infinite clusters and then discuss the number of ends in infinite clusters. Write $\deg_K(x)$ for the degree of x as a vertex in a subgraph K .

THEOREM 7.13. *Let G be a transitive unimodular graph of degree d_G and \mathbf{P} be a translation-invariant probability measure on 2^E . If \mathbf{P} -a.s. all clusters are finite, then*

$$\mathbf{E}[\deg_\omega o] \leq d_G - \iota_E(G).$$

This was first proved for regular trees by Häggström (1997) and then extended by BLPS (1999). Häggström (1997) shows that the threshold is sharp for regular trees. Of

course, it is useless when G is amenable. For Bernoulli percolation, the bound it gives on p_c is worse than Theorem 6.18. But it is extremely useful for a wide variety of other percolation processes.

To prove Theorem 7.13, define for finite subgraphs $K = (V(K), E(K)) \subset G$

$$\alpha_K := \frac{1}{|V(K)|} \sum_{x \in K} \deg_K(x),$$

the average (internal) degree of K . Then set

$$\alpha(G) := \sup\{\alpha_K; K \subset G \text{ is finite}\}.$$

If G is a regular graph of degree d_G , then

$$\alpha(G) + \iota_{\mathbb{E}}(G) = d_G. \tag{7.10}$$

This is because we may restrict attention to those subgraphs K where $E(K) = K \times K \cap \mathbb{E}$, and for such subgraphs, $\sum_{x \in K} \deg_K(x) + |\partial_{\mathbb{E}} K|$ counts each edge in $E(K)$ twice and each edge in $\partial_{\mathbb{E}} K$ once, as does $d_G |V(K)|$. Dividing by $|V(K)|$ gives (7.10). (We remark that $\beta(G) = 2/\alpha(G)$, with $\beta(G)$ defined as in Section 5.3, except that β was defined with a liminf, rather than an infimum.)

In view of (7.10), we may write the conclusion of Theorem 7.13 as

$$\mathbf{E}[\deg_{\omega} o] \leq \alpha(G). \tag{7.11}$$

This inequality is actually rather intuitive: It says that random finite clusters have average degree no more than the supremum average degree of arbitrary finite subgraphs. Of course, the first sense of “average” is “expectation”, while the second is “arithmetic mean”. This is reminiscent of the ergodic theorem, which says that a spatial average (expectation) is the limit of time averages (means).

Proof of Theorem 7.13. We use the Mass-Transport Principle (7.3). Start with mass $\deg_{\omega} x$ at each vertex x and redistribute it equally among the vertices in its cluster $K(x)$ (including x itself). After transport, the mass at x is $\alpha_{K(x)}$. This is an invariant transport, so that if $f(x, y)$ denotes the expected mass taken from x and transported to y , then we have

$$\mathbf{E}[\deg_{\omega} o] = \sum_x f(o, x) = \sum_x f(x, o) = \mathbf{E}[\alpha_{K(o)}].$$

By definition, $\alpha_{K(o)} \leq \alpha(G)$, whence (7.11) follows. ◀

COROLLARY 7.14. *Let G be a quasi-transitive nonamenable unimodular graph. There is some $\epsilon > 0$ such that if \mathbf{P} is a translation-invariant probability measure on 2^E with all clusters finite \mathbf{P} -a.s., then for all $x \in V$,*

$$\mathbf{P}[\deg_\omega x] \leq \deg_G x - \epsilon.$$

Proof. Let G' be a transitive representation of G . Then \mathbf{P} induces an invariant percolation \mathbf{P}' on G' by letting an edge $[x, y]$ in G' be open iff x and y are joined by a path of open edges in G' of length at most $2r + 1$ (where r is as in the definition of transitive representation). If \mathbf{P} has a high marginal, then so does \mathbf{P}' , whence the conclusion follows easily from Theorem 7.13. \blacktriangleleft

Some variations on Theorem 7.13 are contained in the following exercises, as well as in others at the end of the chapter.

▷ EXERCISE 7.10.

Show that for any invariant percolation \mathbf{P} on subgraphs of a transitive unimodular graph that has only finite clusters a.s., $\mathbf{E}[\deg_\omega o \mid o \in \omega] \leq \alpha(G)$.

▷ EXERCISE 7.11.

Let \mathbf{P} be an invariant percolation on subgraphs of a transitive unimodular graph such that all clusters are finite trees a.s. Show that $\mathbf{E}[\deg_\omega o \mid o \in \omega] < 2$.

One consequence of Exercise 7.11 concerns the number of ends and the branching number of trees in invariant percolation:

THEOREM 7.15. (BLPS (1999)) *Let G be a transitive unimodular graph. Let \mathfrak{F} be the configuration of an invariant percolation on G such that \mathfrak{F} is a forest a.s. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *some component of \mathfrak{F} has at least 3 ends with positive probability;*
- (ii) *some component of \mathfrak{F} has $p_c < 1$ with positive probability;*
- (iii) $\mathbf{E}[\deg_{\mathfrak{F}} o \mid |K(o)| = \infty] > 2$.

Of course, by Theorem 4.16, (ii) is equivalent to saying that some component of \mathfrak{F} has branching number > 1 with positive probability.

Proof. Assume (i). Then there are furcations with positive probability. Remove from \mathfrak{F} all edges with an endpoint of degree 1 and iterate until no such edges remain. Since there are furcations with positive probability, the remaining edges, \mathfrak{F}' , form a nonempty forest with positive probability. Consider the following random orientation ζ of the edges

of \mathfrak{F} : If $e \in \mathfrak{F} \setminus \mathfrak{F}'$, then orient e so that it points towards \mathfrak{F}' (in \mathfrak{F}). The edges of \mathfrak{F}' can be partitioned into maximal paths that do not cross any furcation. For each such maximal path, orient all its edges simultaneously in one of the two possible consistent fashions with probability $1/2$ each, independently of the other paths' orientations. Given an orientation ζ , send mass 1 along each oriented edge; that is, let $F(x, y; \zeta)$ be the indicator of the event that $[x, y]$ lies in \mathfrak{F} with orientation from x to y in ζ . Since ζ is invariant, we may apply the Mass-Transport Principle to $f(x, y) := \mathbf{E}F(x, y, \zeta)$ to conclude that $\sum_x f(o, x) = \sum_x f(x, o)$. Since each edge in \mathfrak{F} is oriented one way or the other, we have $\sum_x (f(o, x) + f(x, o)) = \mathbf{E}[\deg_{\mathfrak{F}} o; |K(o)| = \infty]$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}[\deg_{\mathfrak{F}} o; |K(o)| = \infty] &= \sum_x f(o, x) \\ &= \mathbf{P}[|K(o)| = \infty, o \notin \mathfrak{F}'] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}[\deg_{\mathfrak{F}'} o] \\ &> \mathbf{P}[|K(o)| = \infty] \end{aligned}$$

since $\deg_{\mathfrak{F}'} o$ is at least 2 whenever $o \in \mathfrak{F}'$ and is at least 3 when o is a furcation. This proves (iii).

Now assume (iii). Let \mathfrak{F}' be the mixed (site and bond) percolation obtained from \mathfrak{F} by retaining only those vertices and edges that belong to an infinite cluster. Then we have $\mathbf{E}[\deg_{\mathfrak{F}'} o \mid o \in \mathfrak{F}'] > 2$. Let p be sufficiently close to 1 that independent Bernoulli(p) bond percolation on \mathfrak{F}' yields a configuration \mathfrak{F}'' with $\mathbf{E}[\deg_{\mathfrak{F}''} o \mid o \in \mathfrak{F}''] > 2$. According to Exercise 7.11, we have that \mathfrak{F}'' contains infinite clusters with positive probability, whence (ii) follows.

Finally, (ii) implies (i) trivially. ◀

COROLLARY 7.16. (BLPS (1999)) *Let G be a transitive unimodular graph. Let \mathfrak{F} be the configuration of an invariant percolation on G such that \mathfrak{F} is a forest a.s. Then almost surely every component that has at least 3 ends has $p_c < 1$.*

Proof. If not, condition on having some component with at least 3 ends and $p_c = 1$. Then the collection of all such components gives an invariant percolation that contradicts Theorem 7.15. ◀

§7.4. Critical Percolation on Nonamenable Transitive Unimodular Graphs.

Here we establish Conjecture 7.12 for nonamenable transitive unimodular graphs. This was shown by BLPS (1999), with a more direct proof given in Benjamini, Lyons, Peres, and Schramm (1999a). The proof here is a mixture of the two proofs.

THEOREM 7.17. *If G is a nonamenable transitive unimodular graph, then $\theta(p_c(G)) = 0$.*

We remark that this also implies that $p_c(G) < 1$.

Proof. The proof for site percolation is similar to that for bond, so we treat only bond percolation.

In light of Theorem 6.5, we must rule out the possibilities that the number of infinite clusters is 1 or ∞ at criticality. We do these separately and use the standard coupling of percolation arising from i.i.d. uniform $[0, 1]$ -valued random variables $U(e)$ on the edges. Let ω_p consist of the edges e with $U(e) \leq p$.

First suppose that there is a unique infinite cluster in ω_{p_c} . Let ω' be that infinite cluster. For each $\epsilon > 0$, define a new bond percolation ξ_ϵ consisting of those edges $[x, y] \in \mathbf{E}$ such that

- (a) $\text{dist}_G(x, \omega') < 1/\epsilon$;
- (b) $\text{dist}_G(y, \omega') < 1/\epsilon$; and
- (c) if x' is any of the points in ω' of minimal distance (in G) to x and y' is any of the points in ω' of minimal distance to y , then x' and y' are in the same cluster in $\omega_{p_c - \epsilon}$.

Then $\xi_\epsilon \subseteq \xi_{\epsilon'}$ for $\epsilon > \epsilon'$ and $\bigcup_\epsilon \xi_\epsilon = \mathbf{E}$, whence

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{P}[[x, y] \in \xi_\epsilon] = 1.$$

By Theorem 7.13, it follows that for small enough ϵ , there is an infinite cluster in ξ_ϵ with positive probability. But whenever ξ_ϵ contains an infinite cluster, so must $\omega_{p_c - \epsilon}$ by (c). This contradicts the definition of p_c and proves that a unique infinite cluster is impossible at p_c .

Now suppose that there are infinitely many infinite clusters in ω_{p_c} . Let \mathfrak{F} consist of those edges $[x, y]$ such that $U([x, y]) \leq p_c$ and such that there is no path from x to y that uses only edges e with $U(e) < U([x, y])$. (This is the minimal spanning forest of ω_{p_c} , a topic to be studied in Section 9.7.) We claim that \mathfrak{F} contains a spanning tree in each infinite cluster of ω_{p_c} (a.s.). First, it is clear that \mathfrak{F} contains no cycles, as the edge with the largest label in any cycle cannot be in \mathfrak{F} . Second, if the edges from \mathfrak{F} yield more than one tree (including the possibility of an isolated vertex) in some infinite cluster of ω_{p_c} ,

then there is some edge $[x, y] \in \omega_{p_c}$ whose endpoints belong to different trees in \mathfrak{F} . Then some path in ω_{p_c} from x to y uses only edges e with $U(e) < U([x, y])$, and every such path contains an edge e' that itself can be replaced by a path joining its endpoints and using only edges with values smaller than $U(e')$. This implies that there is an infinite cluster of edges with $U(e) < U([x, y])$, which contradicts the fact that $U([x, y]) < p_c$. This proves our claim.

Now by insertion tolerance, as in the proof of Theorem 6.6, some infinite cluster has at least 3 ends, whence so does some tree in \mathfrak{F} . According to Theorem 7.15, this implies that some tree in \mathfrak{F} has $p_c < 1$, whence the same is true of its containing cluster in ω_{p_c} . But this contradicts the definition of p_c . ◀

▷ EXERCISE 7.12.

Suppose that \mathbf{P} is an invariant percolation on a nonamenable quasi-transitive unimodular graph that has a unique infinite cluster ω' a.s. Show that $p_c(\omega') < 1$ a.s.

Sometimes the following generalization of Theorem 7.17 is useful. Given a family of probability measures μ_p ($0 \leq p \leq 1$) on, say, $2^{\mathbb{E}}$, we say that the family is **smoothly parameterized** if for each edge e , the function $p \mapsto \mu_p[\omega(e) = 1]$ is continuous from the left. A **monotone coupling** of the family, if it exists, is a random field $Z : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that for each p , the law of $\{e; Z(e) \leq p\}$ is μ_p . Also, let us call a probability measure \mathbf{P} **end insertion tolerant** if there is a function $f : \mathbb{E} \times 2^{\mathbb{E}} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{E}}$ such that

- (i) for all e and all ω , we have $\omega \cup \{e\} \subseteq f(e, \omega)$;
- (ii) for all e , all ω , and all x , if $K(x)$ is infinite in ω , then the infinite cluster of x in $f(e, \omega)$ has at least as many ends as has $K(x)$; and
- (iii) for all e and each event A of positive probability, the image of A under $f(e, \bullet)$ is an event of positive probability.

Of course, an insertion tolerant probability measure satisfies this definition with $f(e, \omega) := \omega \cup \{e\}$. More generally, (ii) is satisfied whenever $f(e, \omega) \setminus [\omega \cup \{e\}]$ is finite for all e, ω ; when this condition holds in place of (ii), we call \mathbf{P} **weakly insertion tolerant**. **Weak deletion tolerance** has a similar definition.

THEOREM 7.18. *Let G be a nonamenable transitive unimodular graph. Let μ_p be a smoothly parameterized family of ergodic end insertion-tolerant probability measures on $2^{\mathbb{E}}$. Suppose that the family has a monotone coupling by a random field Z whose law is invariant under automorphisms. Assume that $p_c := \sup\{p; \mu_p[|K(o)| < \infty] = 1\} > 0$. Then $\mu_{p_c}[|K(o)| < \infty] = 1$.*

▷ EXERCISE 7.13.

Prove Theorem 7.18.

▷ EXERCISE 7.14.

Let x and y be two vertices of any graph and define $\tau_p(x, y) := \mathbf{P}_p[x \leftrightarrow y]$. Show that τ is continuous from the left as a function of p .

▷ EXERCISE 7.15.

Prove that Theorem 7.17 holds in the quasi-transitive case as well.

§7.5. Percolation on Planar Cayley Graphs.

For planar nonamenable Cayley graphs with one end, we can answer all the most basic questions about percolation. It should not be hard to do the same for planar nonamenable Cayley graphs with infinitely many ends, but no one has done this yet. Of course, the case of two ends is trivial. This entire section is adapted from Benjamini and Schramm (2001).

▷ EXERCISE 7.16.

Show that a planar (properly embedded locally finite) quasi-transitive graph with one end has no face with an infinite number of sides.

Planarity is used in order to exploit properties of percolation on the planar dual of the original graph. However, this dual is not necessarily a Cayley graph; indeed, it is not necessarily even transitive. But it is always quasi-transitive. Furthermore, it is always unimodular, as we shall see.

THEOREM 7.19. *Let G be a nonamenable planar quasi-transitive graph with one end. Then $0 < p_c(G) < p_u(G) < 1$ and Bernoulli(p_u) percolation on G has a unique infinite cluster a.s.*

This result was proved for certain planar Cayley graphs earlier by Lalley (1998). It is not known which Cayley graphs have the property that there is a unique infinite cluster \mathbf{P}_{p_u} -a.s. For example, Schonmann (1999a) proved that this does *not* happen on $\mathbb{T}_{b+1} \times \mathbb{Z}$ with $b \geq 2$, which Peres (2000) extended to all nonamenable cartesian products of infinite transitive graphs.

We need the following fundamental fact whose proof is given in the notes to this chapter.

THEOREM 7.20. *If G is a planar quasi-transitive graph with one end, then $\text{Aut}(G)$ is unimodular.*

We shall assume for the rest of this section that G is a **nonamenable planar quasi-transitive graph with one end** and ω is the configuration of an **invariant percolation on G** . When more restrictions are needed, we will be explicit about them. We define the dual configuration ω^\times on the planar dual graph G^\dagger by

$$\omega^\times(e^\dagger) := 1 - \omega(e).$$

For a set A of edges, we let A^\dagger denote the set of edges e^\dagger for $e \in A$. Write N_∞ for the number of infinite clusters of ω and N_∞^\times for the number of infinite clusters of ω^\times .

LEMMA 7.21. $N_\infty + N_\infty^\times \geq 1$ *a.s.*

Proof. Suppose that $N_\infty + N_\infty^\times = 0$ with positive probability. Then by conditioning on that event, we may assume that it holds surely. In this case, for each (open) cluster K of ω , there is a unique infinite component of $G \setminus K$ since K is finite and G has only one end. This means that there is a unique open component of $(\partial_E K)^\dagger$ that “surrounds” K ; this component of $(\partial_E K)^\dagger$ is contained in some cluster, K' , of ω^\times . Since our assumption implies that K' is also finite, this same procedure yields a cluster K'' of ω that surrounds K' and hence surrounds K .

Let \mathcal{K}_0 denote the collection of all clusters of ω . Define inductively $\mathcal{K}_{j+1} := \{K''; K \in \mathcal{K}_j\}$ for $j \geq 0$. Since $\bigcap_j \mathcal{K}_j = \emptyset$, we may define

$$r(K) := \max\{j; K \in \mathcal{K}_j\}$$

for all clusters $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$. Given $N \geq 0$, let ω^N be those edges whose endpoints belong to (possibly different) clusters K with $r(K) \leq N$, i.e., the “interiors” of the clusters in \mathcal{K}_{N+1} . Then $\omega^N \subseteq \omega^{N+1}$ for all N and $\bigcup_N \omega^N = E$. Also ω^N is an invariant percolation for each N . Since $\deg_{\omega^N} o \rightarrow \deg_G o$, it follows from Corollary 7.14 that for sufficiently large N , with positive probability ω^N has infinite clusters. Yet the interiors of the clusters of \mathcal{K}_{N+1} are finite and disjoint. This is a contradiction. \blacktriangleleft

LEMMA 7.22. (BLPS (1999)) $N_\infty \in \{0, 1, \infty\}$ *a.s.*

Proof. If not, we may condition on $2 \leq N_\infty < \infty$. In this case, we may pick uniformly at random two distinct infinite clusters of ω , call them K_1 and K_2 . Let τ consist of those edges $[x, y]$ such that $x \in K_1$ and y belongs to the component of $G \setminus K_1$ that contains K_2 . Then τ^\times is a bi-infinite path in G^\times and is an invariant percolation on G^\times . But the fact that $p_c(\tau^\times) = 1$ contradicts Exercise 7.12. \blacktriangleleft

COROLLARY 7.23. $N_\infty + N_\infty^\times \in \{0, 1, \infty\}$ *a.s.*

Proof. Draw G and G^\dagger in the plane in such a way that every edge e intersects e^\dagger in one point, v_e , and there is no other intersection of G and G^\dagger . For $e \in \omega$, write \hat{e} for the pair of edges that result from the division of e by v_e , and likewise for \hat{e}^\dagger . This defines a new graph \hat{G} , whose vertices are $V(G) \cup V(G^\dagger) \cup \{v_e; e \in E(G)\}$ and whose edges are $\bigcup_{e \in E(G)} (\hat{e} \cup \hat{e}^\dagger)$. Note that \hat{G} is quasi-transitive.

Consider the percolation

$$\omega' := \bigcup_{e \in \omega} \hat{e} \cup \bigcup_{e^\dagger \in \omega^\times} \hat{e}^\dagger$$

on \hat{G} . This percolation is invariant under $\text{Aut}(\hat{G})$. The number of infinite components of ω' is $N_\infty + N_\infty^\times$. Applying Lemma 7.22 to ω' , we obtain our desired conclusion. ◀

THEOREM 7.24. $(N_\infty, N_\infty^\times) \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (1, \infty), (\infty, 1), (\infty, \infty)\}$ *a.s.*

Proof. Lemma 7.22 gives $N_\infty, N_\infty^\times \in \{0, 1, \infty\}$. Lemma 7.21 rules out $(N_\infty, N_\infty^\times) = (0, 0)$. Since every two infinite clusters of ω must be separated by at least 1 infinite cluster of ω^\times (*viz*, the one containing the path τ in the proof of Lemma 7.22), the case $(N_\infty, N_\infty^\times) = (\infty, 0)$ is impossible. Dual reasoning shows that $(N_\infty, N_\infty^\times) = (0, \infty)$ cannot happen. Corollary 7.23 rules out $(N_\infty, N_\infty^\times) = (1, 1)$. This leaves the cases mentioned. ◀

We now come to the place where more assumptions on the percolation are needed. In particular, insertion and deletion tolerance become crucial. In order to treat site percolation as well as bond percolation, we shall use the bond percolation ω^ξ associated to a site percolation ξ as follows:

$$\omega^\xi := \{[x, y]; x, y \in \xi\}. \tag{7.12}$$

Note that even when ξ is Bernoulli percolation, ω^ξ is neither insertion tolerant nor deletion tolerant. However, ω^ξ is still weakly insertion tolerant. More generally, it is clear that when ξ is insertion [resp., deletion] tolerant, then ω^ξ is weakly insertion [resp., deletion] tolerant. It is also clear that when ξ is Bernoulli percolation, ω^ξ is ergodic.

THEOREM 7.25. *Assume that ω is ergodic, weakly insertion tolerant, and weakly deletion tolerant. Then a.s.*

$$(N_\infty, N_\infty^\times) \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (\infty, \infty)\}.$$

Proof. By Theorem 7.24, it is enough to rule out the cases $(1, \infty)$ and $(\infty, 1)$. Let K be a finite connected subgraph of G . If K intersects distinct infinite clusters of ω , then $\omega^\times \setminus \{e^\dagger; e \in E(K)\}$ must have at least 2 infinite clusters by planarity. If $N_\infty = \infty$ *a.s.*, then there is some finite subgraph K such that the event $A(K)$ that K intersects

distinct infinite clusters of ω with positive probability. Fix some such K and write its edge set as $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. Let $f(e, \omega)$ be a function witnessing the weak insertion tolerance. Define $f(e, A) := \{f(e, \omega); \omega \in A\}$. Let $B(K) := f(e_1, f(e_2, \dots f(e_n, A(K)) \dots))$. Then $B(K)$ has positive probability and we have $N_\infty^\times > 1$ on $B(K)$. But ergodicity implies that $(N_\infty, N_\infty^\times)$ is an a.s. constant. Hence it is (∞, ∞) . A dual argument rules out $(1, \infty)$. ◀

Theorem 7.25 allows us to deduce precisely the value of N_∞ from the value of N_∞^\times and thus critical values on G from those on G^\dagger .

THEOREM 7.26. $p_c^{\text{bond}}(G^\dagger) + p_u^{\text{bond}}(G) = 1$ and $N_\infty = 1$ \mathbf{P}_{p_u} -a.s.

Proof. Let ω_p be Bernoulli(p) bond percolation on G . Then ω_p^\times is Bernoulli($1 - p$) bond percolation on G^\dagger . It follows from Theorem 7.25 that

$$p > p_u^{\text{bond}}(G) \implies N_\infty = 1 \implies N_\infty^\times = 0 \implies 1 - p \leq p_c^{\text{bond}}(G^\dagger)$$

and

$$p < p_u^{\text{bond}}(G) \implies N_\infty \neq 1 \implies N_\infty^\times \neq 0 \implies 1 - p \geq p_c^{\text{bond}}(G^\dagger).$$

This gives us $p_c^{\text{bond}}(G^\dagger) + p_u^{\text{bond}}(G) = 1$. Furthermore, according to Exercise 7.15, we have $N_\infty^\times = 0$ $\mathbf{P}_{p_c^{\text{bond}}(G^\dagger)}^{G^\dagger}$ -a.s., whence Theorem 7.25 tells us that $N_\infty = 1$ $\mathbf{P}_{p_u^{\text{bond}}(G)}^G$ -a.s.

For site percolation, we must prove that $N_\infty = 1$ $\mathbf{P}_{p_u^{\text{site}}}$ -a.s. Let ξ_p be the standard coupling of site percolation and ω^{ξ_p} the corresponding bond percolation processes. As above, we may conclude that for $p > p_u^{\text{site}}(G)$, we have that $(\omega^{\xi_p})^\dagger$ has no infinite clusters a.s., while for $p < p_u^{\text{site}}(G)$, we have that $(\omega^{\xi_p})^\dagger$ has infinite clusters a.s. Because $(\omega^{\xi_{1-p}})^\dagger$ satisfies all the hypotheses of Theorem 7.18, it follows that for $p = p_u^{\text{site}}(G)$, we have that $(\omega^{\xi_p})^\dagger$ has no infinite clusters a.s. This gives us the result we want. ◀

Proof of Theorem 7.19. We already know that $p_c > 0$ from Proposition 6.11. Applying this to G^\dagger and using Theorem 7.26, we obtain that $p_u^{\text{bond}} < 1$. In light of Proposition 6.13, given $\epsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that if $p > 1 - \delta$ and $\xi \sim \mathbf{P}_p^{\text{site}}$, then ω^ξ stochastically dominates $\mathbf{P}_q^{\text{bond}}$ for all $q > 1 - \epsilon$, whence for such p , $(\omega^\xi)^\dagger$ has no infinite clusters a.s. and thus ω^ξ has a unique infinite cluster a.s. This proves that $p_u^{\text{site}} < 1$ too. (The result that $p_u < 1$ also follow from Theorem 6.26.) Comparing Exercise 7.15 and Theorem 7.26, we see that it is impossible that $p_c = p_u$, whence $p_c < p_u$. ◀

§7.6. Properties of Infinite Clusters.

In the proof of Theorem 6.6, we saw that if Bernoulli(p) percolation produces infinitely many infinite clusters a.s., then a.s. at least one of them has a furcation, whence at least 3 ends. This was a relatively simple consequence of insertion and deletion tolerance. Likewise, deletion tolerance implies that if there is a unique infinite cluster (and $p < 1$), then that cluster has a unique end a.s.

As the reader might suspect from Example 7.5, one can derive stronger results from the Mass-Transport Principle. By using only the properties of invariance and weak insertion tolerance, we will prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 7.27. *Let \mathbf{P} be an invariant weakly insertion-tolerant percolation process on a nonamenable quasi-transitive unimodular graph G . If there are infinitely many infinite clusters a.s., then a.s. every infinite cluster has continuum many ends, no isolated end, and is transient for simple random walk.*

Here, we are using a topology on the set of ends of a graph, defined as follows. Let G be a graph with fixed base point o . Let B_n be the ball of radius n about o . Let \mathbf{Ends} be the set of ends of G . Define a metric on \mathbf{Ends} by putting

$$d(\xi, \zeta) := \inf \{ 1/n; n = 1 \text{ or } \forall A \in \xi \ \forall B \in \zeta \ \exists \text{ a component } C \text{ of } G \setminus B_n \\ |A \setminus C| + |B \setminus C| < \infty \}.$$

It is easy to verify that this is a metric; in fact, it is an ultrametric, i.e., for any $\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3 \in \mathbf{Ends}$, we have $d(\xi_1, \xi_2) \leq \max\{d(\xi_1, \xi_2), d(\xi_2, \xi_3)\}$. Since G is locally finite, it is easy to check that \mathbf{Ends} is compact in this metric. Finally, it is easy to see that the topology on \mathbf{Ends} does not depend on choice of base point. A set of vertices that, for some n , contains the component of $G \setminus B_n$ that has an infinite intersection with every set in ξ will be called a **vertex-neighborhood** of ξ .

The set of isolated points in any compact metric space is countable; the nonisolated points form a perfect subset (the Cantor-Bendixson Theorem), whence, if there are any, they have the cardinality of the continuum (see, e.g., Kuratowski, 1966).

In the case of site percolation ξ , by transience of ξ we mean transience of ω^ξ , as defined in (7.12).

The history of Theorem 7.27 is as follows. Benjamini and Schramm (1996b) conjectured that for Bernoulli percolation on any quasi-transitive graph, if there are infinitely many infinite clusters, then a.s. every infinite cluster has continuum many ends. This was proved by Häggström and Peres (1999) for transitive unimodular graphs and then

by Häggström, Peres, and Schonmann (1999) in general. Our proof is from Lyons and Schramm (1999), which also proved the statement about transience. It is also true that for any invariant insertion-tolerant percolation process on a nonamenable quasi-transitive unimodular graph with a unique infinite cluster a.s., that cluster is transient, but this is more difficult; see Benjamini, Lyons, and Schramm (1999) for a proof. (Of course, if Conjecture 6.27 were proven, then this would also follow from Theorem 7.27 and the Rayleigh Monotonicity Law.) For amenable transient quasi-transitive graphs, Benjamini, Lyons, and Schramm (1999) conjectured that infinite clusters are transient a.s. for Bernoulli percolation; in \mathbb{Z}^d , $d > 2$, this was established by Grimmett, Kesten, and Zhang (1993) (see Benjamini, Pemantle, and Peres (1998) for a different proof).

We begin with the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 7.28. *Let \mathbf{P} be an invariant percolation process on a nonamenable quasi-transitive unimodular graph G . Almost surely each infinite cluster that has at least 3 ends has no isolated ends.*

Of course, it follows that each infinite cluster has 1, 2, or ∞ ends, a fact proved in the same manner in BLPS (1999).

Proof. For each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, let A_n be the union of all vertex sets A that are contained in some percolation cluster $K(A)$, have diameter at most n in the metric of the percolation cluster, and such that $K(A) \setminus A$ has at least 3 infinite components. Note that if ξ is an isolated end of a percolation cluster K , then for each n , some vertex-neighborhood of ξ in K is disjoint from A_n . Also observe that if K is a cluster with at least 3 ends, then K intersects A_n for some n .

Fix some $n \geq 1$. Consider the mass transport that sends one unit of mass from each vertex x in a percolation cluster that intersects A_n and distributes it equally among the vertices in A_n that are closest to x in the metric of $K(x)$. In other words, let $C(x)$ be the set of vertices in $K(x) \cap A_n$ that are closest to x in the metric of ω , and set $F(x, y; \omega) := |C(x)|^{-1}$ if $y \in C(x)$ and otherwise $F(x, y; \omega) := 0$. Then $F(x, y; \omega)$ is invariant under the diagonal action. If ξ is an isolated end of an infinite cluster K that intersects A_n , then there is a finite set of vertices B that gets all the mass from all the vertices in a vertex-neighborhood of ξ . But the Mass-Transport Principle tells us that the expected mass transported to a vertex is finite. Hence, a.s. clusters that intersect A_n do not have isolated ends. Since this holds for all n , we gather that a.s. infinite clusters with isolated ends do not intersect $\bigcup_n A_n$, whence they have at most two ends. ◀

PROPOSITION 7.29. *Let \mathbf{P} be an invariant weakly insertion-tolerant bond percolation process on a nonamenable quasi-transitive unimodular graph G . If there are infinitely many*

infinite clusters a.s., then a.s. every infinite cluster has continuum many ends and no isolated end.

Proof. It suffices to prove that there are no isolated ends of clusters. To prove this in turn, observe that if some cluster has an isolated end, then because of weak insertion tolerance, with positive probability, some cluster will have at least 3 ends with one of them being isolated. Hence Proposition 7.29 follows from Proposition 7.28. ◀

We proved a weak form of the following principle in Lemma 6.7 and used a special case of it in our proof of Theorem 7.17.

LEMMA 7.30. (BLPS (1999)) *Let \mathbf{P} be an invariant bond percolation process on a non-amenable quasi-transitive unimodular graph G . If a.s. there is a component of ω with at least three ends, then (on a larger probability space) there is a random forest $\mathfrak{F} \subset \omega$ such that the distribution of the pair (\mathfrak{F}, ω) is Γ -invariant and a.s. whenever a component K of ω has at least three ends, there is a component of $K \cap \mathfrak{F}$ that has infinitely many ends.*

Proof. We begin as in the proof of Lemma 6.7. We use independent uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables assigned to the edges (independently of ω) to define the free minimal spanning forest \mathfrak{F} of ω . This means that an edge $e \in \omega$ is present in \mathfrak{F} iff there is no cycle in ω containing e in which e is assigned the maximum value. As before, we have (a.s.) that \mathfrak{F} is a forest with each tree having the same vertex-cardinality as the cluster of ω in which it lies.

Suppose that $K(x)$ has at least 3 ends with positive probability. Choose any ball A about x with edge set $E(A)$ so that $K(x) \setminus E(A)$ has at least 3 infinite components with positive probability. Then with positive probability, $K(x) \setminus E(A)$ has at least 3 infinite components, all edges in A are assigned values less than $1/2$, and all edges in $\partial_E A$ are assigned values greater than $1/2$. On this event, \mathfrak{F} contains a spanning tree of $A \cap \omega$ that is part of a tree in \mathfrak{F} with at least 3 ends.

To convert this event of positive probability to an event of probability 1, let $r_x = r(x, \omega)$ be the least radius r of a ball $B(y, r)$ in G such that $K(x) \setminus B(y, r)$ has at least 3 infinite components, if such an r exists. If not, set $r(x, \omega) := \infty$. Note that $r(x, \omega) < \infty$ iff $K(x)$ has at least 3 ends. By Example 7.6, if r_x is finite, then there are a.s. infinitely many such balls $B(y, r_x)$ in $K(x)$. Therefore, given that $K(x)$ has at least 3 ends, there are a.s. infinitely many $y \in K(x)$ at pairwise distance at least $2r_x + 2$ from each other such that $K(x) \setminus B(y, r_x)$ has at least 3 infinite components. For such y , the events that all edges in $B(y, r_x)$ are assigned values less than $1/2$ and all edges in $\partial_E B(y, r_x)$ are assigned values greater than $1/2$ are independent and have probability bounded below, whence an infinite

number of these events occur a.s. Therefore, there is a component of $K(x) \cap \mathfrak{F}$ that has at least 3 ends a.s., whence, by Proposition 7.28, has infinitely many ends a.s. ◀

PROPOSITION 7.31. *Let \mathbf{P} be an invariant weakly insertion-tolerant percolation process on a nonamenable quasi-transitive unimodular graph G . If there are infinitely many infinite clusters a.s., then a.s. each infinite cluster is transient.*

Proof. It suffices to consider bond percolation. By Proposition 7.29, every infinite cluster of ω has infinitely many ends. Consequently, there is an invariant random forest $\mathfrak{F} \subset \omega$ such that a.s. each infinite cluster K of ω contains a tree of \mathfrak{F} with infinitely many ends by Lemma 7.30. If G is transitive, then by Theorem 7.15, we know that any such tree has $p_c < 1$. Since it has branching number > 1 , it follows that such a tree is transient by Theorem 2.19. The Rayleigh Monotonicity Law then implies that K is transient. The quasi-transitive case is left to Exercise 7.17. ◀

▷ EXERCISE 7.17.

Finish the proof of Proposition 7.31.

Theorem 7.27 now follows from Propositions 7.29 and 7.31.

§7.7. Notes.

The proof of uniqueness monotonicity given in Section 7.1 is essentially that of Häggström and Peres (1999).

Theorem 7.19 was proved in the transitive case by Benjamini and Schramm (2001). The quasi-transitive case is new, but not essentially different.

Theorem 7.20 was known in the transitive case (Benjamini and Schramm, 2001), but the quasi-transitive case is due to R. Lyons and is published here for the first time. We now give its proof.

We need several lemmas. Our approach is based on some ideas we heard from O. Schramm. The transitive case is easier to prove, as this proof simplifies to show that the graph is 3-connected.

A graph $G = (V, E)$ is called **k -connected** if $|V| \geq k + 1$ and whenever at most $k - 1$ vertices are removed from G (together with their incident edges), the resulting graph is connected. For the next lemmas, let $K(x)$ denote the set of vertices that lie in finite components of $G \setminus \{x\}$, and let $K(x, y)$ denote the set of vertices, other than $K(x) \cup K(y)$, that lie in finite components of $G \setminus \{x, y\}$. Note that $x \notin K(x)$ and $x \notin K(x, y)$.

LEMMA 7.32. *If G is a quasi-transitive graph, then $\sup_{x \in V} |K(x)| < \infty$.*

Proof. Since x has finite degree, $G \setminus \{x\}$ has a finite number of components, whence $K(x)$ is finite. If x and y are in the same orbit, then $|K(x)| = |K(y)|$. Since there are only finitely many orbits, the result follows. ◀

LEMMA 7.33. *If G is a quasi-transitive graph with one end, then $\sup_{x,y \in V} |K(x,y)| < \infty$.*

Proof. Suppose not. Since there are only a finite number of orbits, there must be some x and y_n such that $d(x, y_n) \rightarrow \infty$ and $K(x, y_n) \neq \emptyset$ for all n . Because of Lemma 7.32, for all large n , we have $x \notin K(y_n)$, whence for all large n , there are neighbors a_n, b_n of x that cannot be joined by a path in $G \setminus \{x, y_n\}$, but such that a_n lies in an infinite component of $G \setminus \{x, y_n\}$ and b_n can be joined to y_n using only vertices in $K(x, y_n) \cup \{y_n\}$. There is some pair of neighbors a, b of x for which $a = a_n$ and $b = b_n$ for infinitely many n . But then a and b lie in distinct infinite components of $G \setminus \{x\}$, contradicting the assumption that G has one end. ◀

We partially order the collection of sets $K(x, y)$ by inclusion.

LEMMA 7.34. *Let G be any graph. If $K(x, y)$ and $K(z, w)$ are maximal, then either $K(x, y) = K(z, w)$ or $K(x, y) \cap K(z, w) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose that there is some $a \in K(x, y) \cap K(z, w)$. Then every infinite simple path from a must pass through $\{x, y\}$ and through $\{z, w\}$. Consider an infinite simple path from a . Without loss of generality, suppose that the first point among $\{x, y, z, w\}$ that it visits is z . Then $z \in K(x, y) \cup \{x, y\}$. Now we cannot have $w \in K(x, y)$ since we would then have $K(z, w) \subsetneq K(x, y)$.

Suppose that $z \in K(x, y)$. Since there is a path from z to w using only vertices in $K(z, w) \cup \{z, w\}$, this path must include either x or y , say, y . Therefore $y \in K(z, w) \cup \{w\}$. We cannot have $y = w$ since we would again have $K(z, w) \subsetneq K(x, y)$.

Thus $y \in K(z, w)$. Consider any infinite simple path starting from any vertex in $K(x, y) \cup K(z, w)$. We claim it must visit x or w . For if not, then it must visit z or y . If the last vertex among $\{z, y\}$ that it visits is z , then it must visit x since $z \in K(x, y)$, a contradiction. If the last vertex among $\{z, y\}$ that it visits is y , then it must visit w since $y \in K(z, w)$, a contradiction. This proves our claim, whence $K(x, w) \supseteq K(x, y) \cup K(z, w)$. But this contradicts maximality of $K(x, y)$.

Therefore z is equal to x or y , say, x . Now there is also an infinite simple path from a such that the first point among $\{x, y, w\}$ is not x . Say it is w . Then $w \in K(x, y) \cup \{y\}$. If $w \in K(x, y)$, then we would have $K(z, w) \subsetneq K(x, y)$, a contradiction. Therefore $w = y$ and this proves the lemma. ◀

Every embedding ϕ of a planar graph into the plane induces a cyclic ordering $[\phi(x)]$ of the edges incident to any vertex x . Two cyclic orderings are considered the same if they differ only by a cyclic permutation. Two cyclic orderings are inverses if they can be written in opposite order from each other.

The following extends a theorem of Whitney (1954):

LEMMA 7.35. (IMRICH, 1975) *If G is a planar 3-connected graph and ϕ and ψ are two embeddings of G in the plane, then either for all x , we have $[\phi(x)] = [\psi(x)]$ or for all x , we have that $[\phi(x)]$ and $[\psi(x)]$ are inverses.*

Proof. Imrich (1975) gives a proof that is valid for graphs that are not necessarily properly embedded nor locally finite. In order to simplify the proof, we shall assume that the graph is not only properly embedded and locally finite, but also quasi-transitive and has only one end. This is the only case we shall use.

Given any vertices $x \neq y$, Menger's theorem shows that we can find three paths joining x and y that are disjoint except at x and y . Comparison of the first edges e_1, e_2, e_3 and the last edges f_1, f_2, f_3 of these paths shows that the cyclic ordering of $\phi(e_i)$ is opposite to that of $\phi(f_i)$, and likewise for ψ . Therefore, it suffices to prove that for each x separately, we have either $[\phi(x)] = [\psi(x)]$ or $[\phi(x)]$ and $[\psi(x)]$ are inverses. For this, it suffices to show that if e_1 and e_2 are

two edges incident to x and $\phi(e_1)$ is adjacent to $\phi(e_2)$ in the cyclic ordering $[\phi(x)]$, then $\psi(e_1)$ is adjacent to $\psi(e_2)$ in the cyclic ordering $[\psi(x)]$.

So let $\phi([x, y])$ and $\phi([x, z])$ be adjacent in $[\phi(x)]$. Assume that $\psi([x, y])$ and $\psi([x, z])$ are not adjacent in $[\psi(x)]$. Let C be the cycle such that $\phi(C)$ is the border of the (unique) face having sides that include both $\phi([x, y])$ and $\phi([x, z])$. (This exists by Exercise 7.16.)

Now by our assumption, there are two neighbors v and w of x such that the cyclic ordering $[\psi(x)]$ induces the cyclic order $\psi(y), \psi(v), \psi(z), \psi(w)$ on these latter 4 points. The Jordan curve theorem tells us that the ψ -image of every path from v to w must intersect $\psi(C)$, i.e., that every path from v to w must intersect C .

However, if we return to the picture provided by ϕ , then since there are 3 paths joining v to w that are disjoint except at their endpoints, at least 2 of these paths do not contain x and hence at least one, \mathcal{P}' , is mapped by ϕ to a curve that does not intersect $\phi(C)$. But this means \mathcal{P}' does not intersect C , a contradiction. ◀

LEMMA 7.36. *If G is a planar 3-connected graph, then $\text{Aut}(G)$ is discrete.*

Proof. Let x be any vertex. Note that the degree of x is at least 3. By Exercise 7.5, it suffices to show that only the identity fixes x and all its neighbors. Let ϕ be an embedding of G in the plane and let $\gamma \in \text{Aut}(G)$ fix x and all its neighbors. Then $\phi \circ \gamma$ is an embedding of G in the plane that induces the same cyclic ordering of the edges of x as does ϕ . By Lemma 7.35, it follows that $[(\phi \circ \gamma)(y)] = [\phi(y)]$ for all y . By induction on the distance of y to x , it is easy to deduce that $\gamma(y) = y$ for all y , which proves the claim. ◀

Proof of Theorem 7.20. Let G' be the graph formed from G by removing all vertices in $\bigcup_{x,y \in V} K(x) \cup K(x,y)$ and by adding new edges $[x, y]$ between each pair of vertices x, y for which $K(x, y)$ is maximal. Because of Lemma 7.32 and Lemma 7.33, the graph G' is not empty and has one end. Since each new edge may be placed along the trace of a path of edges in G , Lemma 7.34 guarantees that G' is planar. Furthermore, by construction, G' is 3-connected (and quasi-transitive with only one end). Lemma 7.36 shows that $\text{Aut}(G')$ is discrete, whence unimodular by Proposition 7.9. For any pair $x, y \in V(G')$, the set $S(x)y$ is the same for the stabilizer in $\text{Aut}(G')$ as in $\text{Aut}(G)$. Since the orbits of $\text{Aut}(G')$ acting on $V(G')$ are the same as the orbits of $\text{Aut}(G)$ acting on $V(G')$, $\text{Aut}(G)$ is unimodular by Exercise 7.20. ◀

Indistinguishability, questions on the nonunimodular case, light/heavy clusters, EITs?

§7.8. Additional Exercises.

7.18. Refine the conclusion of Example 7.5 to show that either \mathbf{P} -a.s. each infinite cluster has no furcations or \mathbf{P} -a.s. each infinite cluster has infinitely many furcations. That is, there is no chance of having differing numbers of furcations among the infinite clusters.

7.19. Give $\text{Aut}(G)$ the weak topology generated by its action on G . Show that if Γ is a closed countable subgroup of $\text{Aut}(G)$, then Γ is discrete.

7.20. Show that if Γ is not unimodular and μ_x are the weights of Theorem 7.10, then $\sup_x \mu_x = \infty$ and $\inf_x \mu_x = 0$. In fact, the supremum and infimum may each be taken over any single orbit.

7.21. Let G' be a transitive representation of a quasi-transitive graph G .

(a) Show that $\text{Aut}(G')$ is unimodular iff $\text{Aut}(G)$ is unimodular.

(b) Let Γ act quasi-transitively on G . Show that Γ is unimodular iff $\text{Aut}(G')$ is unimodular.

7.22. Show that Proposition 7.11 is also valid for quasi-transitive automorphism groups.

7.23. Let G be an amenable graph and $\Gamma \subseteq \text{Aut}(G)$ be a closed quasi-transitive subgroup. Choose a complete set $\{o_1, \dots, o_L\}$ of representatives in V of the orbits of Γ . Choose the weights μ_{o_i} of Theorem 7.10 so that $\sum_i \mu_{o_i}^{-1} = 1$. Show that if K_n is any sequence of finite subsets of vertices such that $|\partial_V K_n|/|K_n| \rightarrow 0$, then for all i ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\Gamma o_i \cap K_n|}{|K_n|} = \mu_i^{-1}.$$

7.24. Show that if Γ is a compact group of automorphisms of a graph, then Γ is unimodular.

7.25. Sharpen Theorem 7.13 to conclude that $\mathbf{E}[\text{deg}_\omega o] < d_G - \iota_E(G)$ by showing that there is some invariant \mathbf{P}' with all clusters finite and with $\mathbf{E}[\text{deg}_\omega o] < \mathbf{E}'[\text{deg}_\omega o]$.

7.26. Show that for any invariant bond percolation \mathbf{P} on a transitive unimodular graph that has finite clusters with positive probability, $\mathbf{E}[\text{deg}_\omega o \mid |K(o)| < \infty] \leq \alpha(G)$.

7.27. Let \mathbf{P} be an invariant site percolation on a transitive unimodular graph such that all clusters are finite a.s. Show that $\mathbf{P}[o \in \omega] < d_G/(d_G + \iota_V(G))$.

7.28. Let G be a planar transitive graph with one end. Show that

$$\frac{1}{\mu(G^\dagger)} + \frac{1}{\gamma(G)} \leq 1,$$

where μ is the connective constant and γ is defined as in (6.12). Deduce that

$$\gamma(G) \geq \frac{d_{G^\dagger} - 1}{d_{G^\dagger} - 2},$$

where d_{G^\dagger} is the degree of G .

7.29. Let \mathbf{P} be an invariant bond percolation on a transitive unimodular graph such that all clusters are infinite a.s. Show that $\mathbf{E}[\text{deg}_\omega o] \geq 2$.

7.30. Suppose that \mathbf{P} is an invariant percolation on an amenable transitive graph. Show that all infinite clusters have at most 2 ends a.s.

7.31. Let ω be the configuration of an invariant percolation on a transitive unimodular graph G . Show that if

- (i) some component of ω has at least 3 ends with positive probability,
- then
- (ii) a.s. every component of ω with at least 3 ends has $p_c < 1$ and
 - (iii) $\mathbf{E}[\text{deg}_\omega o \mid |K(o)| = \infty] > 2$.

7.32. Let \mathbf{P} be an invariant percolation on a transitive unimodular graph G . Let F_o be the event that $K(o)$ is an infinite tree with finitely many ends, and let F'_o be the event that $K(o)$ is a finite tree. Show the following.

- (i) If $P[F_o] > 0$, then $\mathbf{E}[D(o) \mid F_o] = 2$.
- (ii) If $P[F'_o] > 0$, then $\mathbf{E}[D(o) \mid F'_o] < 2$.

7.33. Give an example of an invariant random forest on a transitive graph where each component has 3 ends, but the expected degree of each vertex is smaller than 2.

7.34. Give an example of an invariant random forest on a transitive graph where each tree has one end and the expected degree of each vertex is greater than 2.

Chapter 8

Random Spanning Trees

Every connected graph has a **spanning tree**, i.e., a subgraph that is a tree and that includes every vertex. Special spanning trees of Cayley graphs were used in Section 2.9. Here, we consider arbitrary recurrent graphs and properties of their spanning trees when such trees are chosen randomly.

Let G be a finite graph and e and f be edges of G . If T is a random spanning tree chosen uniformly from all spanning trees of G , then it is intuitively clear that the events $\{e \in T\}$ and $\{f \in T\}$ are negatively correlated: The presence of f would make e less needed for connecting everything *and* more likely to create a cycle. We will indeed prove this negative correlation by a method that relies upon random walks and electrical networks. Interestingly, no direct proof is known.

NOTATION. In an undirected graph, a spanning tree is also composed of undirected edges. However, we will be using the ideas and notations of preceding chapters concerning random walks and electrical networks, so that we will be making use of directed edges as well. Sometimes, e will even denote an undirected edge on one side of an equation and a directed edge on the other side; see, e.g., Corollary 8.4. This abuse of notation, we hope, will cause less confusion than would the use of different notations for directed and undirected edges.

§8.1. Generating Random Spanning Trees.

A graph typically has an enormous number of spanning trees. Because of this, it is not obvious how to choose one at random in a reasonable amount of time. We are going to present an algorithm that works quickly by exploiting some hidden independence in Markov chains. This algorithm is of enormous theoretical importance for us. Although we are interested in spanning trees of undirected graphs, it turns out that it is just as easy to work with directed graphs coming from Markov chains.

Let $p(\cdot, \cdot)$ be the transition probability of a finite-state irreducible Markov chain. The directed graph associated to this chain has for vertices the states and for edges all (x, y) for which $p(x, y) > 0$. Edges e are oriented from tail e^- to head e^+ . We call a connected

subgraph a **spanning tree*** if it includes every vertex and there is one vertex, the **root**, such that every vertex other than the root is the tail of exactly one edge in the tree; furthermore, the root is not the tail of any edge. Thus, the edges in a spanning tree point towards its root. For any vertex r , there is at least one spanning tree rooted at r : Pick some vertex other than r and draw a path from it to r that does not contain any cycles. Such a path exists by irreducibility. This starts the tree. Then continue with another vertex not on the part of the tree already drawn, draw a cycle-free path from it to the partial tree, and so on. Remarkably, with a little care, this naive method of drawing spanning trees leads to a very powerful algorithm.

We are going to choose spanning trees at random according not only to uniform measure, but, in general, proportional to their weights, where, for a spanning tree T , we define its **weight** to be

$$\alpha(T) := \prod_{e \in T} p(e).$$

In case the original Markov chain $\langle X_n \rangle$ is reversible, let us see what the weights $\alpha(T)$ are. Given conductances $c(e)$ with $\pi(x) = \sum_{e^- = x} c(e)$, the transition probabilities are $p(e) := c(e)/\pi(e^-)$, so the weight of a spanning tree T is

$$\alpha(T) = \prod_{e \in T} p(e) = \prod_{e \in T} c(e) \bigg/ \prod_{\substack{x \in G \\ x \neq \text{root}(T)}} \pi(x).$$

Thus, $\alpha(T)/\pi(\text{root}(T))$ is proportional to

$$\beta(T) := \prod_{e \in T} c(e).$$

Note that $\beta(T)$ is independent of the root of T .

Now suppose we have some method of choosing a spanning tree at random proportionally to the weights α . Consider any vertex u on a weighted undirected graph. If we choose a random spanning tree rooted at u proportionally to the weights α [equivalently, choose a spanning tree according to α and condition on the root being u] and forget about the orientation of its edges and also about the root, we obtain an unrooted spanning tree of the undirected graph, chosen proportionally to the weights β . In particular, if the conductances are all equal, corresponding to the Markov chain being simple random walk, we get a uniformly chosen spanning tree.

* For directed graphs, these are usually called “spanning arborescences”.

The method we now describe for generating random spanning trees is the fastest method known. It is due to Wilson (1996) (see also Propp and Wilson (1998)).

To describe Wilson’s method, we define the important idea of loop erasure* of a path. If \mathcal{P} is any finite path $\langle x_0, x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle$ in G , we define the **loop erasure** of \mathcal{P} , denoted $\text{LE}(\mathcal{P}) = \langle u_0, u_1, \dots, u_m \rangle$, by erasing cycles in \mathcal{P} in the order they appear. More precisely, set $u_0 := x_0$. If $x_l = x_0$, we set $m = 0$ and terminate; otherwise, let u_1 be the first vertex in \mathcal{P} after the last visit to x_0 , i.e., $u_1 := x_{i+1}$, where $i := \max\{j; x_j = x_0\}$. If $x_l = u_1$, then we set $m = 1$ and terminate; otherwise, let u_2 be the first vertex in \mathcal{P} after the last visit to u_1 , and so on.

Now in order to generate a random spanning tree with a given root r , create a growing sequence of trees $T(i)$ ($i \geq 0$) as follows. Choose any ordering of the vertices $V \setminus \{r\}$. Let $T(0) := \{r\}$. Suppose that $T(i)$ is known. If $T(i)$ spans G , we are done. Otherwise, pick the first vertex x in our ordering of V that is not in $T(i)$ and take an independent sample from the Markov chain beginning at x until it hits $T(i)$. Now create $T(i+1)$ by adding to $T(i)$ the loop erasure of this path from x to $T(i)$. We claim that the final tree in this growing sequence has the desired distribution. We call this **Wilson’s method** of generating random spanning trees.

THEOREM 8.1. *Given any finite-state irreducible Markov chain and any state r , Wilson’s method yields a random spanning tree rooted at r with distribution proportional to α . Therefore, for any finite connected undirected graph, Wilson’s method yields a random spanning tree that, when the orientation and root are forgotten, has distribution proportional to β .*

In fact, we will show that not only does the distribution of the spanning tree resulting from Wilson’s method not depend on the choice made in ordering V , but, in some sense, neither does the tree itself.

In order to state this precisely, we construct the Markov chain in a particular way. Every time we are at a state x , the next state will have a given probability distribution; and the choices of which states follow the visits to x are independent of each other. This, of course, is just part of the definition of a Markov chain. Constructively, however, we implement this as follows. Let $\langle S_i^x; x \text{ is a state and } i \geq 1 \rangle$ be independent with each S_i^x having the transition probability distribution from x . For each x , think of $\langle S_i^x; i \geq 1 \rangle$ as a stack lying under the state x . To run the Markov chain starting from a distribution π , we simply pick the first state according to π and then “pop off” the top state of the stack lying under the current state as long as we want to run the chain. In other words, we begin with the current state picked according to π . Then, from the current state at

* This ought to be called “cycle erasure”, but we will keep to the name already given to this concept.

any time, the next state is the first state in the stack under the current state. This state is then removed from that stack and we repeat with the next state as the current state.

In order to generate a random spanning tree rooted at r , however, we make one small variation: give r an empty stack. Rather than generating the Markov chain, we observe that at any time, the top items of the stacks determine a directed graph, namely, the directed graph whose vertices are the states and whose edges are the pairs (x, y) where y is the top item of the stack under x . Call this the **visible graph** at that time. If it happens that the visible graph contains no (directed) cycles, then it is a spanning tree rooted at r . Otherwise, we **pop** a cycle, meaning that we remove the top items of the stacks under the vertices of a cycle. Then we pop a remaining cycle, if any, and so on. We claim that this process will stop with probability 1 at a spanning tree and that this spanning tree has the desired distribution conditional on being rooted at r . Note that we do not pop the top of a stack unless it belongs to a cycle.

Say that the edges (x, S_i^x) of the visible graph at any time have **color** i . Thus, the initial visible graph has all edges colored 1, but, unless this has no cycles, later visible graphs will not generally have all their edges the same color. A cycle in a visible graph is thus a colored cycle, so that while a cycle of vertices can be popped many times, a colored cycle can be popped at most once. See Figure 8.1.




Figure 8.1. This Markov chain has 6 states, one called r , which is the root. The first 5 elements of each stack are listed under the corresponding states. Colored cycles are popped as shown clockwise, leaving the colored spanning tree shown.

LEMMA 8.2. *Given any stacks under the states, the order in which cycles are popped is irrelevant in the sense that every order pops an infinite number of cycles or every order pops the same (finite number of) colored cycles, thus leaving the same colored spanning tree.*

Proof. We will show that if C is any colored cycle that can be popped, i.e., there is some sequence $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n = C$ that may be popped in that order, but some colored cycle

$C' \neq C_1$ happens to be the first colored cycle popped, then $C = C'$ or else C can still be popped in the graph visible after C' is popped. Once we show this, we are done, since if there are an infinite number of colored cycles that can be popped, the popping can never stop; while in the alternative case, every colored cycle that can be popped will be popped.

Now if all the vertices of C' are disjoint from those of C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n , then of course C can still be popped. Otherwise, let C_k be the first cycle that has a vertex in common with C' . Now, all the edges of C' have color 1. Consider any vertex x in $C' \cap C_k$. Since $x \notin C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \dots \cup C_{k-1}$, the edge in C_k leading out of x also has color 1, so it leads to the same vertex as it does in C' . We can repeat the argument for this successor vertex of x , then for its successor, and so on, until we arrive at the conclusion that $C' = C_k$. Thus, $C' = C$ or we can pop C in the order $C', C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{k-1}, C_{k+1}, \dots, C_n$. ◀

Proof of Theorem 8.1. Wilson's method certainly stops with probability 1 at a spanning tree. Using stacks to run the Markov chain and noting that loop erasure in order of cycle creation is the same as cycle popping, we see that Wilson's method pops all the cycles lying over a spanning tree. Because of Lemma 8.2, popping cycles in any other manner also stops with probability 1 and with the same distribution. Furthermore, if we think of the stacks as given in advance, then we see that all our choices inherent in Wilson's method have no effect at all on the resulting spanning tree.

Now to show that the distribution is the desired one, think of a given set of stacks as defining a set \mathbf{C} of colored cycles lying over a noncolored spanning tree T . Note that the colors of the spanning tree can be recovered from the colors of the cycles. Let X be the set of all pairs (\mathbf{C}, T) that can arise from stacks under our given Markov chain. If $(\mathbf{C}, T) \in X$, then also $(\mathbf{C}, T') \in X$ for any other spanning tree T' : indeed, anything at all can be in the stacks under the colored cycles \mathbf{C} . That is, X is a product space of certain sets of colored cycles and all noncolored spanning trees. Extend our definition of α to colored cycles by $\alpha(C) := \prod_{e \in C} p(e)$ and to sets of colored cycles by $\alpha(\mathbf{C}) := \prod_{C \in \mathbf{C}} \alpha(C)$. What is the chance of seeing a given set of colored cycles \mathbf{C} lying over a given spanning tree T ? It is simply the probability of seeing all the arrows in $\bigcup \mathbf{C} \cup T$ in their respective places, which is simply the product of $\alpha(e)$ for all $e \in \bigcup \mathbf{C} \cup T$, i.e., $\alpha(\mathbf{C})\alpha(T)$. Therefore, the set of colored cycles seen is independent of the colored spanning tree and the probability of seeing the tree T is proportional to $\alpha(T)$. This shows that Wilson's method does what we claimed it does. ◀

To illustrate one use of Wilson's method, we give a new proof of Cayley's formula for the number of spanning trees on a complete graph. ("Complete" means that every pair of distinct vertices is joined by an edge.) A number of proofs are known of this result; for a

collection of them, see Moon (1967). The following proof is inspired by the one of Aldous (1990), Prop. 19.

COROLLARY 8.3. (CAYLEY, 1889) *The number of labelled unrooted trees with n vertices is n^{n-2} . Here, a labelled tree is one whose vertices are labelled 1 through n .*

To prove this, we use the result of the following exercise.

▷ **EXERCISE 8.1.**

Suppose that A is a set of states in a Markov chain and that x_0 is a state not in A . Assume that when the Markov chain is started in x_0 , then it visits A with probability 1. Define the random path Y_0, Y_1, \dots by $Y_0 := x_0$ and then recursively by letting Y_{n+1} have the distribution of one step of the Markov chain starting from Y_n given that the chain will visit A before visiting any of Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_n again. However, if $Y_n \in A$, then the path is stopped and Y_{n+1} is not defined. Show that $\langle Y_n \rangle$ has the same distribution as loop-erasing a sample of the Markov chain started from x_0 and stopped when it reaches A . In the case of a random walk, the conditioned path $\langle Y_n \rangle$ is called the **Laplacian random walk** from x_0 to A .

Proof of Corollary 8.3. We show that the uniform probability of a specific spanning tree of the complete graph on $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is $1/n^{n-2}$. Take the tree to be the path $\langle 1, 2, 3, \dots, n \rangle$. We will calculate the probability of this tree by using Wilson’s algorithm started at 1 and rooted at n . Since the root is n and the tree is a path from 1 to n , this tree probability is just the chance that loop-erased random walk from 1 to n is this particular path. By Exercise 8.1, we must show that the chance that the Laplacian random walk $\langle Y_n \rangle$ from 1 to n is equal to this path is $1/n^{n-2}$. Recall the following notation from Chapter 2: \mathbf{P}_i denotes simple random walk started at state i and τ_k denotes the first time the walk visits state k .

Consider the distribution of Y_1 . We have

$$\mathbf{P}[Y_1 = i] = \frac{1}{n-1} \frac{\mathbf{P}_i[\tau_n < \tau_1]}{A},$$

where A is a normalizing constant. Since this is the same for all i , it follows that

$$A = (n-2) \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{n-1} + \frac{1}{n-1},$$

whence

$$\mathbf{P}[Y_1 = i] = \frac{1}{n}.$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbf{P}[Y_j = j + 1 \mid Y_1 = 2, \dots, Y_{j-1} = j] = 1/n$$

for all $j \in [1, n - 2]$, while, of course,

$$\mathbf{P}[Y_{n-1} = n \mid Y_1 = 2, \dots, Y_{n-2} = n - 1] = 1.$$

Multiplying together these conditional probabilities gives the result. ◀

§8.2. Electrical Interpretations.

We return now to undirected graphs and networks, except for occasional parenthetical remarks about more general Markov chains. Wilson’s method for generating spanning trees will also give a random spanning tree (a.s.) on any recurrent network (or for any recurrent Markov chain). How should we interpret it? Suppose that G' is a subnetwork of G and consider T_G and $T_{G'}$, random spanning trees generated by Wilson’s method. After describing a connection to electrical networks, we will show that for any event B depending on only finitely many edges, we can make $|\mathbf{P}[T_G \in B] - \mathbf{P}[T_{G'} \in B]|$ arbitrarily small by choosing G' sufficiently large*. Thus, the random spanning tree of G looks locally like a tree chosen with probability proportional to α . In particular, when simple random walk is recurrent, such as on \mathbb{Z}^2 , we may regard T as a uniform random spanning tree. Also, this will show that Wilson’s method on a recurrent network generates a random spanning tree whose distribution again does not depend on the choice of root nor on the ordering of vertices**.

Let G be a graph. For a subgraph $G' = (V', E')$ of G , let

$$\partial G' := \{e \in G; e^- \in V', e^+ \notin V'\}.$$

We say that G is **amenable** if there is an exhaustion $G_n = (V_n, E_n)$ of G with

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\partial G'_n|/|V_n| = 0.$$

In this case, it is reasonable to take averages over the sets V_n ; calling a limit of such averages a “mean” is what led to the word “amenable”. Thus, a finitely generated group is amenable if its Cayley graph is.***

* This can also be proved by coupling the constructions using Wilson’s method.

** This can also be shown directly for any recurrent Markov chain.

*** Amenability is also defined for groups that are not finitely generated; such groups will not be discussed in this book.

▷ EXERCISE 8.2.

Show that if one Cayley graph of a given finitely generated group is amenable, then so is every Cayley graph of that group. Therefore, amenability is a property of the group, not of its Cayley graph.

▷ EXERCISE 8.3.

Show that every finitely generated abelian group is amenable.

▷ EXERCISE 8.4.

Let G be a recurrent amenable infinite network as witnessed by the exhaustion $\langle G_n \rangle$. Show that the average degree of vertices in any spanning tree of G is 2. That is, if $\deg_T(x)$ denotes the degree of x in a spanning tree T of G , then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\mathbf{V}_n|^{-1} \sum_{x \in \mathbf{V}_n} \deg_T(x) = 2.$$

Deduce that when a spanning tree is chosen at random,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\mathbf{V}_n|^{-1} \sum_{x \in \mathbf{V}_n} \mathbf{E}[\deg_T(x)] = 2.$$

In particular, if G is also transitive, such as \mathbb{Z}^2 , meaning that for every pair of vertices x and y , there is a bijection of \mathbf{V} with itself that preserves adjacency and takes x to y , then every vertex has expected degree 2.

We will study random spanning trees on recurrent networks further and also random spanning forests on transient networks in Chapter 9. For now, though, we will deduce some important theoretical consequences of the connection between random walk and spanning trees which hold for finite as well as for recurrent graphs.

COROLLARY 8.4. *Let T be an unrooted random spanning tree of a recurrent network G and e an edge of G . Then*

$$\mathbf{P}[e \in T] = \mathbf{P}_{e^-}[\text{1st hit } e^+ \text{ via traveling along } e] = i(e) = c(e)\mathcal{R}(e^- \leftrightarrow e^+)$$

when a unit current enters e^- and exits e^+ .

REMARK. That $\mathbf{P}[e \in T] = i(e)$ is due to Kirchhoff (1847).

Proof. The first equality follows by taking the vertex e^+ as the root of T and then starting the construction at e^- . The second equality then follows from the probabilistic interpretation, Exercise 2.58, of i as the expected number of crossings of e minus the expected number of crossings of the reversed edge \check{e} for a random walk started at e^- and stopped at e^+ : e is crossed once or not at all and \check{e} is never crossed. The third equality comes from the definition of effective resistance. ◀

▷ EXERCISE 8.5.

Consider the ladder graph L_n of height n shown in Figure 1.8. Choose a spanning tree $T(n)$ of L_n uniformly. Use Corollary 8.4 to determine $\mathbf{P}[\text{rung 1 is in } T(n)]$ and its limiting behavior as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We can use Corollary 8.4 to compute the chance that certain edges are in T and certain others are not. To see this, denote the dependence of T on G by T_G . The **contraction** G/e of a graph G along an edge e is obtained by removing the edge e and identifying its endpoints. Simply deleting e gives the graph denoted $G \setminus e$. Now the distribution of T_G/e (the contraction of T_G along e) given $e \in T_G$ is the same as that of $T_{G/e}$ and the distribution of T_G given $e \notin T$ is the same as that of $T_{G \setminus e}$. This gives a recursive method to compute $\mathbf{P}[e_1, \dots, e_k \in T, e_{k+1}, \dots, e_l \notin T]$: for example, we have

$$\mathbf{P}[e, f \in T_G] = \mathbf{P}[e \in T_G] \mathbf{P}[f \in T_G \mid e \in T_G] = \mathbf{P}[e \in T_G] \mathbf{P}[f \in T_{G/e}]$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}[e \notin T_G, f \in T_G] = \mathbf{P}[e \notin T_G] \mathbf{P}[f \in T_{G \setminus e}].$$

Thus, we may deduce that the events $e \in T$ and $f \in T$ are negatively correlated:

▷ EXERCISE 8.6.

Show that the events $e \in T$ and $f \in T$ are negatively correlated by using Corollary 8.4.

We can now also establish our claim at the beginning of this section that on a recurrent graph, the random spanning tree looks locally like that of large finite subnetworks. For example, given an edge e and a subnetwork G' of G , the current in G' flowing along e arising from a unit current between the endpoints of e will be very close to the corresponding current along e in G , provided G' is sufficiently large, by Exercise 2.58. That means that $\mathbf{P}[e \in T_{G'}]$ will be very close to $\mathbf{P}[e \in T_G]$.

▷ EXERCISE 8.7.

Write out the rest of the proof that for any event B depending on only finitely many edges, $|\mathbf{P}[T_{G'} \in B] - \mathbf{P}[T_G \in B]|$ is arbitrarily small for sufficiently large G' .

What does contraction of some edges do to a current in the setting of the inner-product space $\ell^2_-(\mathbf{E})$? Let i^e denote the unit current from the tail of e to the head of e . Contract the edges $f \in F$ and let \widehat{i}^e be the unit current flowing in G/F , where $e \notin F$ and, moreover, e does not form any undirected cycle with the edges of F , so that e is not itself contracted

when the edges of F are contracted. Note that the restriction of any $\theta \in \ell_-^2(\mathbf{E})$ to $\mathbf{E} \setminus F$ yields an antisymmetric function on the edges of the contracted graph G/F . Let Z be the linear span of $\{i^f; f \in F\}$. We claim that

$$\widehat{i}^e = (P_Z^\perp i^e) \upharpoonright (\mathbf{E} \setminus F) \tag{8.1}$$

and

$$(P_Z^\perp i^e) \upharpoonright F \equiv 0, \tag{8.2}$$

where P_Z^\perp denotes the orthogonal projection onto the orthocomplement of Z .

To prove this, note that since $Z \subseteq \star$ and $i^e \in \star$, also $P_Z^\perp i^e = i^e - P_Z i^e \in \star$. Therefore, for $f \in F$,

$$(P_Z^\perp i^e, \chi^f)_R = (P_\star P_Z^\perp i^e, \chi^f)_R = (P_Z^\perp i^e, P_\star \chi^f)_R = (P_Z^\perp i^e, i^f)_R = 0.$$

That is, there is no flow across any edge in F for $P_Z^\perp i^e$, which is (8.2). Since $P_Z^\perp i^e \in \star$ satisfies the cycle law in G , it follows from this that $(P_Z^\perp i^e) \upharpoonright (\mathbf{E} \setminus F)$ satisfies the cycle law in G/F . To verify Kirchhoff's Node Law and finish the proof, write

$$P_Z^\perp i^e = i^e - \sum_{f \in F} \alpha_f i^f$$

for some constants α_f . Note that the stars in G/F are sums of stars in G . Since i^e is orthogonal to all the stars except those at the endpoints of e , so is its restriction to $\mathbf{E} \setminus F$. Likewise, the restrictions of all i^f become orthogonal to *all* the stars in G/F . Therefore, $i^e - \sum_{f \in F} \alpha_f i^f$ is orthogonal to all the stars in G/F except those at the endpoints of e , where the inner products are ± 1 . This proves (8.1).

Although we have indicated that successive contractions can be used for computing $\mathbf{P}[e_1, \dots, e_k \in T]$, this requires computations of effective resistance on k different graphs. In order to stick with the same graph, we may use a wonderful theorem of Burton and Pemantle (1993):

THE TRANSFER CURRENT THEOREM. *For any distinct edges $e_1, \dots, e_k \in G$,*

$$\mathbf{P}[e_1, \dots, e_k \in T] = \det[Y(e_i, e_j)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}. \tag{8.3}$$

Recall that $Y(e, f) = i^e(f)$. Note that, in particular, we get a quantitative version of the negative correlation between $\mathbf{1}_{\{e \in T\}}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\{f \in T\}}$: for distinct edges e, f , we have

$$\text{Cov}(\mathbf{1}_{\{e \in T\}}, \mathbf{1}_{\{f \in T\}}) = -Y(e, f)Y(f, e) = -c(e)R(f)Y(e, f)^2$$

by the reciprocity law ((2.11)).

Proof. Note that if some cycle can be formed from the edges e_1, \dots, e_k , then a linear combination of the corresponding columns of $[Y(e_i, e_j)]$ is zero: suppose that such a cycle is $\sum_j a_j \chi^{e_j}$, where $a_j \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. Then

$$\sum_j a_j R(e_j) Y(e_m, e_j) = \sum_j a_j (i^{e_m}, \chi^{e_j})_R = (i^{e_m}, \sum_j a_j \chi^{e_j})_R = 0$$

by the cycle law applied to the current i^{e_m} . Therefore, both sides of (8.3) are 0. For the remainder of the proof, then, we may assume that there are no such cycles.

We will proceed by induction. When $k = 1$, (8.3) is the same as Corollary 8.4. Now since P_\star is self-adjoint and its own square, (2.10) gives that for any two edges e and f ,

$$Y(e, f) = c(f) (P_\star \chi^e, \chi^f)_R = c(f) (P_\star \chi^e, P_\star \chi^f)_R = c(f) (i^e, i^f)_R.$$

For $1 \leq m \leq k$, let

$$Y_m := [Y(e_i, e_j)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq m}. \tag{8.4}$$

To carry the induction from $m = k - 1$ to $m = k$, we must show that

$$\det Y_k = \mathbf{P}[e_k \in T \mid e_1, \dots, e_{k-1} \in T] \det Y_{k-1}.$$

Now we know that $\mathbf{P}[e_k \in T \mid e_1, \dots, e_{k-1} \in T] = \widehat{i}^{e_k}(e_k)$ in the graph $G/\{e_1, \dots, e_{k-1}\}$. Applying (8.1) and (8.2) gives that

$$\widehat{i}^{e_k}(e_k) = c(e_k) \mathcal{E}(\widehat{i}^{e_k}) = c(e_k) \mathcal{E}(P_Z^\perp i^{e_k}) = c(e_k) \|P_Z^\perp i^{e_k}\|_R^2,$$

where Z is the linear span of $i^{e_1}, \dots, i^{e_{k-1}}$. On the other hand,

$$P_Z^\perp i^{e_k} = i^{e_k} - \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} a_m i^{e_m}$$

for some constants a_m . Subtracting these same multiples of the first $k - 1$ rows from the last row of Y_k leads to the matrix whose (m, j) -entry is that of Y_{k-1} for $m, j < k$ and to

$$\begin{aligned} c(e_j) (i^{e_k}, i^{e_j})_R - \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} a_m c(e_j) (i^{e_m}, i^{e_j})_R &= c(e_j) (i^{e_k} - \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} a_m i^{e_m}, i^{e_j})_R \\ &= c(e_j) (P_Z^\perp i^{e_k}, i^{e_j})_R \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j < k, \\ c(e_k) \|P_Z^\perp i^{e_k}\|_R^2 & \text{if } j = k, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

if $i = k$, where in the last step, we used the fact that P_Z^\perp is its own square and self-adjoint. Therefore expansion of $\det Y_k$ along the k th row is very simple and gives that

$$\det Y_k = c(e_k) \|P_Z^\perp i^{e_k}\|_R^2 \det Y_{k-1}.$$

[At bottom, we are using (or proving) the fact that the determinant of a Gram matrix is the square of the volume of the parallelepiped determined by the vectors whose inner products give the entries.] ◀

▷ EXERCISE 8.8.

Given any numbers x_i ($i = 1, \dots, k$), let X be the diagonal matrix with entries x_1, \dots, x_k . Show that $\det(Y_k + X) = \mathbf{E}[\prod_i (\mathbf{1}_{\{e_i \in T\}} + x_i)]$, where Y_k is as in (8.4). Deduce that $\mathbf{P}[e_1, \dots, e_m \notin T, e_{m+1}, \dots, e_k \in T] = \det Z_m$, where

$$Z_m(i, j) := \begin{cases} 1 - Y(e_i, e_j) & \text{if } j = i \leq m, \\ -Y(e_i, e_j) & \text{if } j \neq i \leq m, \\ Y(e_i, e_j) & \text{if } i > m. \end{cases}$$

It turns out that there is a more general negative correlation than that between the presence of two given edges. Regard a spanning tree as simply a subgraph. Call an event A **upwardly closed** if the addition of any edge to any subgraph in A results in another subgraph in A . For example, A could be the collection of all subgraphs of G that contain at least two of the edges $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$. Now let A be an upwardly closed event that ignores some edge e , i.e., if e is present in any subgraph in A , then removing e from that subgraph gives another subgraph in A . Following the example given, e is ignored provided $e \notin \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$.

▷ EXERCISE 8.9.

Suppose that A is an upwardly closed event on a graph G and $e \in \mathbf{E}$. Define $A/e := \{H \subseteq G/e; H \cup \{e\} \in A\}$ and $A \setminus e := \{H \subseteq G \setminus e; H \in A\}$. Show that these are upwardly closed events in G/e and $G \setminus e$, respectively.

Pemantle conjectured (personal communication, 1990) that A and $e \in T$ are negatively correlated. Independently of Pemantle's conjecture, Feder and Mihail (1992) proved it:

THEOREM 8.5. *If A is an upwardly closed event that ignores some edge e , then $\mathbf{P}[A \mid e \in T] \leq \mathbf{P}[A]$.*

Proof. We induct on the number of edges in G . The case of exactly one (undirected) edge is trivial, but it is also the only place we use the fact that A is upwardly closed! Now assume that the number of (undirected) edges is $E \geq 2$ and that we know the result for graphs with $E - 1$ edges. Now G/e has only $E - 1$ edges and every spanning tree of G/e has $|\mathbf{V}| - 2$ edges. Thus, given A and e , we have

$$\sum_{f \in \mathbf{E} \setminus e} \mathbf{P}[A, f \in T \mid e \in T] = (|\mathbf{V}| - 2) \mathbf{P}[A \mid e \in T] = \mathbf{P}[A \mid e \in T] \sum_{f \in \mathbf{E} \setminus e} \mathbf{P}[f \in T \mid e \in T].$$

Therefore there is some $f \in \mathbf{E} \setminus e$ such that $\mathbf{P}[A \mid f, e \in T] \geq \mathbf{P}[A \mid e \in T]$. This also means that

$$\mathbf{P}[A \mid f, e \in T] \geq \mathbf{P}[A \mid f \notin T, e \in T]. \tag{8.5}$$

Now

$$\mathbf{P}[A \mid e \in T] = \mathbf{P}[f \in T \mid e \in T]\mathbf{P}[A \mid f, e \in T] + \mathbf{P}[f \notin T \mid e \in T]\mathbf{P}[A \mid f \notin T, e \in T].$$

We have

$$\mathbf{P}[f \in T \mid e \in T] \leq \mathbf{P}[f \in T] \tag{8.6}$$

by Exercise 8.6,

$$\mathbf{P}[A \mid f, e \in T] \leq \mathbf{P}[A \mid f \in T] \tag{8.7}$$

by the induction hypothesis applied to the event A/f on the network G/f (see Exercise 8.9), and

$$\mathbf{P}[A \mid f \notin T, e \in T] \leq \mathbf{P}[A \mid f \notin T] \tag{8.8}$$

by the induction hypothesis applied to the event $A \setminus f$ on the network $G \setminus f$. From (8.6) and (8.5), we have

$$\mathbf{P}[A \mid e \in T] \leq \mathbf{P}[f \in T]\mathbf{P}[A \mid f, e \in T] + \mathbf{P}[f \notin T]\mathbf{P}[A \mid f \notin T, e \in T] : \tag{8.9}$$

we have replaced a convex combination in (8.5) by another in (8.9) that puts more weight on the larger term. By (8.7) and (8.8), we have that the right-hand side of (8.9) is

$$\leq \mathbf{P}[f \in T]\mathbf{P}[A \mid f \in T] + \mathbf{P}[f \notin T]\mathbf{P}[A \mid f \notin T] = \mathbf{P}[A]. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

▷ EXERCISE 8.10.

More generally, show that if A and B are both upwardly closed events and they depend on disjoint sets of edges (i.e., there exists a complementary pair of sets of edges such that A ignores one and B ignores the other), then they are negatively correlated. Still more generally, show that if X and Y are increasing random variables with finite second moments that depend on disjoint sets of edges (Z is **increasing** if $Z(H) \leq Z(H')$ when $H \subset H'$), then $\mathbf{E}[XY] \leq \mathbf{E}[X]\mathbf{E}[Y]$.




Figure 8.2. A portion of a uniformly chosen spanning tree on \mathbb{Z}^2 , drawn by David Wilson.

§8.3. The Square Lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 .

Uniform spanning trees on the nearest-neighbor graph on the square lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 are particularly interesting. A portion of one is shown in Figure 8.2. This can be thought of as an infinite maze. In Chapter 9, we show that there is exactly one way to get from any square to any other square without backtracking and exactly one way to get from any square to infinity without backtracking.

We saw that the expected degree of a vertex in the uniform spanning tree of \mathbb{Z}^2 is 2. We will use the Transfer Current Theorem to calculate the distribution of the degree,

which is rather surprising. Namely, it has the following distribution:

Degree	Probability	
1	$\frac{8}{\pi^2} \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\right)$	$= .294^+$
2	$\frac{4}{\pi} \left(2 - \frac{9}{\pi} + \frac{12}{\pi^2}\right)$	$= .447^-$
3	$2 \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\right) \left(1 - \frac{6}{\pi} + \frac{12}{\pi^2}\right)$	$= .222^+$
4	$\left(\frac{4}{\pi} - 1\right) \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\right)^2$	$= .036^+$

(8.10)

In order to find the transfer currents $Y(e, f)$, we will first find voltages, then use $i = dv$. (We assume unit conductances on the edges.) When i is a unit flow from x to y , we have $d^*i = \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{y\}}$. Hence the voltages satisfy $\Delta v := d^*dv = \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{y\}}$. We are interested in solving this equation when $x := e^-$, $y := e^+$ and then computing $v(f^-) - v(f^+)$. Our method is to use Fourier analysis. We begin with a formal (i.e., heuristic) derivation of the solution, then prove that our formula is correct.

Let $\mathbb{T}^2 := (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2$ be the 2-dimensional torus. For $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in \mathbb{T}^2$, write $(x_1, x_2) \cdot (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) := x_1\alpha_1 + x_2\alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. For a function f on \mathbb{Z}^2 , define the function \widehat{f} on \mathbb{T}^2 by

$$\widehat{f}(\alpha) := \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2} f(x) e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \alpha}.$$

We are not worrying here about whether this converges in any sense, but certainly $\widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}}(\alpha) = e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \alpha}$. Now a formal calculation shows that for a function f on \mathbb{Z}^2 , we have

$$\widehat{\Delta f}(\alpha) = \widehat{f}(\alpha) \varphi(\alpha),$$

where

$$\varphi((\alpha_1, \alpha_2)) := 4 - (e^{2\pi i \alpha_1} + e^{-2\pi i \alpha_1} + e^{2\pi i \alpha_2} + e^{-2\pi i \alpha_2}) = 4 - 2(\cos 2\pi \alpha_1 + \cos 2\pi \alpha_2).$$

Hence, to solve $\Delta f = g$, we may try to solve $\widehat{\Delta f} = \widehat{g}$ by using $\widehat{f} := \widehat{g}/\varphi$ and then finding f . In fact, a formal calculation shows that we may recover f from \widehat{f} by the formula

$$f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \widehat{f}(\alpha) e^{2\pi i x \cdot \alpha} d\alpha,$$

where the integration is with respect to Lebesgue measure. This is the approach we will follow. Note that we need to be careful about the nonuniqueness of solutions to $\Delta f = g$ since there are non-zero functions f with $\Delta f = 0$.

▷ EXERCISE 8.11.

Show that $(\widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}} - \widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{y\}}})/\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^2)$.

▷ EXERCISE 8.12.

Show that if $F \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^2)$ and $f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} F(\alpha) e^{2\pi i x \cdot \alpha} d\alpha$, then $\Delta f = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} F(\alpha) e^{2\pi i x \cdot \alpha} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha$.

PROPOSITION 8.6. *The voltage at u when a unit current flows from x to y in \mathbb{Z}^2 is*

$$v(u) = v'(u) - v'(y),$$

where

$$v'(u) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}}(\alpha) - \widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{y\}}}(\alpha)}{\varphi(\alpha)} e^{2\pi i u \cdot \alpha} d\alpha.$$

Proof. By Exercises 8.11 and 8.12, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta v'(u) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}}(\alpha) - \widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{y\}}}(\alpha)}{\varphi(\alpha)} e^{2\pi i u \cdot \alpha} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \left(\widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}}(\alpha) - \widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{y\}}}(\alpha) \right) e^{2\pi i u \cdot \alpha} d\alpha \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \alpha} - e^{-2\pi i y \cdot \alpha}) e^{2\pi i u \cdot \alpha} d\alpha = \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}(u) - \mathbf{1}_{\{y\}}(u). \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\Delta v' = \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{y\}}$. Since v satisfies the same equation, we have $\Delta(v' - v) = 0$. In other words, $v' - v$ is harmonic at every point in \mathbb{Z}^2 . Furthermore, v' is bounded in absolute value by the L^1 norm of $(\widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}} - \widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{y\}}})/\varphi$. Since v is also bounded (by $v(x)$), it follows that $v' - v$ is bounded. Since the only bounded harmonic functions on \mathbb{Z}^2 are the constants (by, say, Exercise 2.38), this means that $v' - v$ is constant. Since $v(y) = 0$, we obtain $v = v' - v'(y)$, as desired. ◀

We now need to find a good method to compute the integral v' . Set

$$H(u) := 4 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \frac{1 - e^{2\pi i u \cdot \alpha}}{\varphi(\alpha)} d\alpha.$$

Note that the integrand is integrable by Exercise 8.11 applied with $x := (0, 0)$ and $y := -u$. The integral H is useful because $v'(u) = [H(u - y) - H(u - x)]/4$. (The factor of 4 is introduced in H in order to conform to the usage of other authors.) Putting $x := e^-$ and $y := e^+$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} Y(e, f) &= v(f^-) - v(f^+) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} [H(f^- - e^+) - H(f^- - e^-) - H(f^+ - e^+) + H(f^+ - e^-)]. \end{aligned} \quad (8.11)$$

Thus, we concentrate on calculating H . Now $H(0,0) = 0$ and a direct calculation as in Exercise 8.12 shows that $\Delta H = -4 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{(0,0)\}}$. Furthermore, the symmetries of φ show that H is invariant under reflection in the axes and in the 45° line. Therefore, all the values of H can be computed from those on the 45° line by computing values at gradually increasing distance from the origin and from the 45° line. (For example, we first compute $H(1,0)$, then $H(2,1)$, then $H(2,0)$, then $H(3,2)$, etc.) Now the symmetries of Lebesgue measure show that H is real, whence for $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} H(n, n) &= 4 \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \frac{1 - \cos 2\pi n(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)}{\varphi(\alpha)} d\alpha \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{1 - \cos 2\pi n(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)}{1 - \cos(\pi(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)) \cos(\pi(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2))} d\alpha_1 d\alpha_2. \end{aligned}$$

Change variables to $\theta_1 := \pi(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)$ and $\theta_2 := \pi(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)$. This gives

$$H(n, n) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \iint_{|\theta_1| + |\theta_2| \leq \pi} \frac{1 - \cos 2n\theta_1}{1 - \cos \theta_1 \cos \theta_2} d\theta_1 d\theta_2.$$

Symmetries of the integrand such as

$$\frac{1 - \cos 2n(\pi - \theta_1)}{1 - \cos(\pi - \theta_1) \cos(\pi - \theta_2)} = \frac{1 - \cos 2n\theta_1}{1 - \cos \theta_1 \cos \theta_2}$$

allow us to write this as

$$H(n, n) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{1 - \cos 2n\theta_1}{1 - \cos \theta_1 \cos \theta_2} d\theta_1 d\theta_2.$$

We can integrate on θ_2 by using, say, the substitution $z := \tan(\theta_2/2)$, which gives us

$$H(n, n) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{1 - \cos 2n\theta_1}{|\sin \theta_1|} d\theta_1 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} \frac{1 - \cos 2n\theta_1}{\sin \theta_1} d\theta_1.$$

Now $(1 - \cos 2n\theta_1)/\sin \theta_1 = 2 \sum_{k=1}^n \sin(2k-1)\theta_1$, as can be seen by using complex notation.

Therefore

$$H(n, n) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} \sum_{k=1}^n \sin(2k-1)\theta_1 d\theta_1 = \frac{4}{\pi} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{2k-1}.$$

▷ EXERCISE 8.13.

Deduce (8.10).

We may also make use of the above work, without the actual values being needed, to prove the following remarkable fact. Edges along diagonals are like fair coin flips! To be precise:

THEOREM 8.7. *Let e be any edge of \mathbb{Z}^2 . For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, let X_n be the indicator that $e + (n, n)$ lies in the spanning tree. Then X_n are i.i.d. Likewise for $e + (n, -n)$.*

Proof. The proof of the second part is identical to that of the first part, so we prove only the first part. Furthermore, we may assume that e is the edge from the origin to $(1, 0)$. By the Transfer Current Theorem, it suffices to show that $Y(e, e + (n, n)) = 0$ for all $n \neq 0$. The formula (8.11) shows that

$$4Y(e, e + (n, n)) = H(n + 1, n) - H(n, n) - H(n, n) + H(n - 1, n).$$

Now the symmetries we have noted already of the function $H(\bullet, \bullet)$ show that $H(n, n + 1) = H(n + 1, n)$ and $H(n, n - 1) = H(n - 1, n)$. Since $H(n, n)$ is the average of these four numbers for $n \neq 0$, it follows that $H(n + 1, n) - H(n, n) = H(n, n) - H(n - 1, n)$. This proves the result. ◀

§8.4. Notes.

There is another connection of spanning trees to Markov chains:

THE MARKOV CHAIN TREE THEOREM. *The stationary distribution of a finite-state irreducible Markov chain is proportional to the measure that assigns the state x the measure*

$$\sum_{\text{root}(T)=x} \alpha(T).$$

It is for this reason that generating spanning trees at random is very closely tied to generating a state of a Markov chain at random according to its stationary distribution. This latter topic is especially interesting in computer science. See Propp and Wilson (1998) for more details.

To prove the Markov Chain Tree Theorem, one can associate to the original Markov chain a new Markov chain on spanning trees. Given a spanning tree T and an edge e with $e^- = \text{root}(T)$, define two new spanning trees:

“forward procedure” This creates the new spanning tree $F(T, e)$. First, add e to T . This creates a cycle. Delete the edge $f \in T$ out of e^+ that breaks the cycle. See Figure 8.3.

“backward procedure” This creates the new spanning tree $B(T, e)$. Again, first add e to T . This creates a cycle. Break it by removing the appropriate edge $g \in T$ into e^- . See Figure 8.3.




Figure 8.3.

Note that in both procedures, it is possible that $f = e$ or $g = e$. Also, note that

$$B(F(T, e), f) = F(B(T, e), g) = T,$$

where f and g are as specified in the definitions of the forward and backward procedures.

Now define transition probabilities on the set of spanning trees by

$$p(T, F(T, e)) := p(e) = p\left(\text{root}(T), \text{root}(F(T, e))\right). \tag{8.12}$$

$$\text{Thus } p(T, \tilde{T}) > 0 \iff \exists e \tilde{T} = F(T, e) \iff \exists g T = B(\tilde{T}, g).$$

▷ EXERCISE 8.14.

Prove that this new Markov chain on trees is irreducible.

▷ EXERCISE 8.15.

- (a) Show that the weight α is a stationary measure for this Markov chain on trees.
- (b) Prove the Markov Chain Tree Theorem.

Another way to express the relationship between the original Markov chain and this associated one on trees is as follows. Recall that one can create a stationary Markov chain $\langle X_n \rangle_{-\infty}^{\infty}$ indexed by \mathbb{Z} with the original transition probabilities $p(\bullet, \bullet)$ by, say, Kolmogorov's existence theorem. Set

$$L_n(w) := \max\{m < n; X_m = w\}.$$

This is well defined a.s. by recurrence. Let Y_n be the tree formed by the edges

$$\{(w, X_{L_n(w)+1})\}_{w \in G, w \neq X_n}.$$

Then Y_n is rooted at X_n and $\langle Y_n \rangle$ is a stationary Markov chain with the transition probabilities (8.12).

An older method due to Aldous (1990) and Broder (1989) of generating random spanning trees comes from reversing these Markov chains; related ideas were in the air at that time. Let

$\langle X_n \rangle_{-\infty}^{\infty}$ be a stationary Markov chain on a finite state space. Then so is the **reversed** process $\langle X_{-n} \rangle$: the definition of the Markov property via independence of the past and the future given the present gives this immediately. We can also find the transition probabilities \tilde{p} for the reversed chain: Let π be the stationary probability $\pi(a) := \mathbf{P}[X_0 = a]$. Then clearly π is also the stationary probability for the reversed chain. Comparing the chance of seeing state a followed by state b for the forward chain with the equal probability of seeing state b followed by state a for the reversed chain, we see that

$$\pi(a)p(a, b) = \pi(b)\tilde{p}(b, a),$$

whence

$$\tilde{p}(b, a) = \frac{\pi(a)}{\pi(b)}p(a, b).$$

As discussed in Section 2.1, the chain is reversible iff $\tilde{p} = p$.

If we reverse the above chains $\langle X_n \rangle$ and $\langle Y_n \rangle$, then we find that Y_{-n} can be expressed in terms of X_{-n} as follows: let

$$H_n(w) := \min\{m > n; X_{-m} = w\}.$$

Then Y_{-n} has edges $\{(w, X_{-[H_n(w)-1]})\}_{w \in G, w \neq X_{-n}}$.

▷ EXERCISE 8.16.

Prove that the transition probabilities of Y_{-n} are

$$\tilde{p}(T, B(T, e)) = p(e).$$

Since the stationary measure of $\langle Y_n \rangle$ is still proportional to α , we get the following algorithm for generating a random spanning tree with distribution proportional to α : find the stationary probability π of the chain giving rise to the weights α , run the reversed chain starting at a state chosen according to π , and construct the tree via H_0 . That is, we draw an edge from u to w the first time ≥ 1 that the reversed chain hits u , where w is the state preceding the visit to u .

In case the chain is reversible, this construction simplifies. From the discussion in Section 8.1, we have:

COROLLARY 8.8. *Let $\langle X_n \rangle_0^{\infty}$ be a random walk on a finite connected graph G with X_0 arbitrary (not necessarily random). Let $H(u) := \min\{m > 0; X_m = u\}$ and let T be the unrooted tree with edges $\{(u, X_{H(u)-1}); X_0 \neq u \in G\}$. Then the distribution of T is proportional to β . In particular, simple random walk on a finite connected graph gives a uniform unrooted random spanning tree.*

This method of generating random spanning trees can be and was used in place of Wilson's for the purposes of this chapter. However, Wilson's method is much better suited to the study of random spanning forests, the topic of Chapter 9.

The Transfer Current Theorem was shown for the case of two edges in Brooks, Smith, Stone, and Tutte (1940). The proof here is new.

We are grateful to David Wilson for permission to include Figure 8.2. It was created using the linear algebraic techniques of Wilson (1997) for generating domino tilings; the needed matrix inversion was accomplished using the formulas of Kenyon (1997). The resulting tiling gives dual spanning trees by the bijection of Temperley (see Kenyon, Propp, and Wilson (2000)). One of the trees is Figure 8.2.

Theorem 8.7 is due to R. Lyons and is published here for the first time.

Finally, we remark that other methods in Burton and Pemantle (1993) show that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \log[\text{number of spanning trees of } [1, n]^2 \text{ in } \mathbb{Z}^2] \\ = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \log(4 - 2 \cos 2\pi x - 2 \cos 2\pi y) \, dx \, dy \\ = \frac{4}{\pi} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(2k+1)^2} = 1.166^+ \end{aligned}$$

(see Kasteleyn (1961) or Montroll (1964) for the evaluation of the integral; also, this result was proved independently and earlier, implicitly, by combining the entropy result for domino tilings proved by Montroll (1964) with the Temperley (1974) bijection.). Thus, $e^{1.166^+} = 3.21^-$ can be thought of as the average number of independent choices per vertex for spanning trees of \mathbb{Z}^2 .

§8.5. Additional Exercises.

8.17. Show that not every probability distribution on spanning trees of an undirected graph is proportional to a weight.

8.18. Show that the following procedure also gives a.s. a random spanning tree rooted at r with distribution proportional to α . Let $G_0 := \{r\}$. Given G_i , if G_i spans G , stop. Otherwise, choose any vertex $x \neq r$ that does not have an edge in G_i that leads out of x and add a (directed) edge from x picked according to the transition probability $p(x, \bullet)$ independently of the past. Add this edge to G_i and remove any cycle it creates to make G_{i+1} .

8.19. How efficient is Wilson’s method? What takes time is to generate a random successor state of a given state. Call this a step of the algorithm. Show that the expected number of steps to generate a random spanning tree rooted at r is

$$\sum_{x \text{ a state}} \pi(x)(\mathbf{E}_x[\tau_r] + \mathbf{E}_r[\tau_x]),$$

where π is the stationary distribution for the Markov chain. In the case of a random walk on a network (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E}) , this is

$$\sum_{e \in \mathbf{E}_{1/2}} c(e)(\mathcal{R}(e^- \leftrightarrow r) + \mathcal{R}(e^+ \leftrightarrow r)),$$

where edge e has conductance $c(e)$ and endpoints e^- and e^+ ; and \mathcal{R} denotes effective resistance.

8.20. Prove Cayley’s formula another way as follows: let t_n be a spanning tree of the complete graph on n vertices and $t_1 \subset t_2 \subset \dots \subset t_{n-1} \subset t_n$ subtrees such that t_{i+1} has one more edge than t_i does. Then

$$\mathbf{P}[T = t_n] = \mathbf{P}[t_1 \subseteq T] \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbf{P}[t_{i+1} \subseteq T \mid t_i \subseteq T].$$

Show that

$$\mathbf{P}[t_{i+1} \subseteq T \mid t_i \subseteq T] = \frac{i+1}{ni}.$$

8.21. Show that every subgroup of an amenable finitely generated group is itself amenable.

8.22. Show that if G has n vertices, then $\sum_{e \in G} c(e) \mathcal{R}(e^- \leftrightarrow e^+) = n - 1$.

8.23. Kirchhoff (1847) generalized Corollary 8.4 in two ways. To express them, denote the sum of $\beta(T)$ over all spanning trees of G by $\beta(G)$.

(a) Given a finite network G and vertices $a, z \in G$, show that the effective conductance from a to z is given by

$$C(a \leftrightarrow z) = \frac{\beta(G)}{\beta(G/\{a, z\})}, \quad (8.13)$$

where $G/\{a, z\}$ indicates the network G with a and z identified.

(b) Given a finite network G and $a, z \in G$, let $\beta_a^z(e)$ denote the sum of the weights $\beta(T)$ of trees T such that the path in T from a to z passes along e . Show that the unit current flow from a to z is

$$\forall e \quad i(e) = \frac{\beta_a^z(e) - \beta_a^z(\check{e})}{\beta(G)}.$$

(Hint: Use Wilson's method and Proposition 2.2.)

8.24. Consider the doubly infinite ladder graph, the Cayley graph of $G := \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ in its natural generators. Show that the uniform spanning tree T on G has the following description: the “rungs” $[(n, 0), (n, 1)]$ in T form a stationary renewal process with inter-rung distance being k with probability $2k(2 - \sqrt{3})^k$ ($k \geq 1$). Given two successive rungs in T , all the other edges of the form $[(n, 0), (n + 1, 0)]$ and $[(n, 1), (n + 1, 1)]$ lie in T with one exception chosen uniformly and independently for different pairs of successive rungs.

8.25. Let G be a finite network. Let e and f be two edges not sharing the same two endpoints. Let \hat{i}^e be the unit current in G/f between the endpoints of e and let \tilde{i}^e be the unit current in $G \setminus f$ between the endpoints of e . Let

$$i_c^e(g) := \begin{cases} \hat{i}^e(g) & \text{if } g \neq f, \\ 0 & \text{if } g = f, \end{cases}$$

and

$$i_d^e(g) := \begin{cases} \tilde{i}^e(g) & \text{if } g \neq f, \\ 0 & \text{if } g = f. \end{cases}$$

(a) From (8.1), we have $i_c^e = P_{if}^\perp i^e$. Show that

$$i^e = i_c^e + \frac{Y(e, f)}{Y(f, f)} i^f.$$

(b) Show that $\chi^e - i_d^e = P_{\chi^f - if}^\perp (\chi^e - i^e)$ and that

$$i^e = i_d^e + \frac{Y(e, f)}{1 - Y(f, f)} (\chi^f - i^f).$$

(c) Show that

$$i^e = Y(f, f) i_c^e + [1 - Y(f, f)] i_d^e + Y(e, f) \chi^f$$

and that the three terms on the right-hand side are pairwise orthogonal.

8.26. Let G be a finite network and i a current on G . If all the conductances are the same except that on edge f , which is changed to $c'(f)$, let i' be the current with the same sources and sinks, i.e., so that $d^*i' = d^*i$. Show that

$$i = i' + \frac{[c(f) - c'(f)]i(f)}{c(f)[1 - Y(f, f)] + c'(f)Y(f, f)}(\chi^f - i^f)$$

and deduce that

$$\frac{di}{dc(f)} = i(f)R(f)(\chi^f - i^f).$$

8.27. Give another proof of Cayley's formula (Corollary 8.3) by using the Transfer Current Theorem.

8.28. Let (G, c) be a finite network. Let e a fixed edge in G and A an upwardly closed event that ignores e . Suppose that a new network is formed from (G, c) by increasing the conductance on e while leaving unchanged all other conductances. Show that in the new network, the chance of A under the weighted spanning tree measure is no larger than it was in the original network.

8.29. Let E be a finite set and $k < |E|$. Let \mathbf{P} be uniform measure on subsets of E of size k . Show that if X and Y are increasing random variables with finite second moments that depend on disjoint subsets of E , as defined in Exercise 8.10, then $\mathbf{E}[XY] \leq \mathbf{E}[X]\mathbf{E}[Y]$.

8.30. Let E be a finite set and $k < |E|$. Let X be a uniform random subset of E of size k . Show that if A is an upwardly closed event that depends only on $F \subset E$, then the conditional distribution of $|X \cap F|$ given A stochastically dominates the unconditional distribution of $|X \cap F|$.

8.31. For a function $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^2)$ and integers x, y , define

$$\widehat{f}(x, y) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} f(\alpha) e^{-2\pi i(x\alpha_1 + y\alpha_2)} d\alpha.$$

Let Y be the transfer current matrix for the square lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 . Let $e_{x,y}^h := [(x, y), (x + 1, y)]$ and $e_{x,y}^v := [(x, y), (x, y + 1)]$. Show that $Y(e_{0,0}^h, e_{x,y}^h) = \widehat{f}(x, y)$ and $Y(e_{0,0}^h, e_{x,y}^v) = \widehat{g}(x, y)$, where

$$f(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) := \frac{\sin^2 \pi \alpha_1}{\sin^2 \pi \alpha_1 + \sin^2 \pi \alpha_2}$$

and

$$g(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) := \frac{(1 - e^{-2\pi i \alpha_1})(1 - e^{-2\pi i \alpha_2})}{4(\sin^2 \pi \alpha_1 + \sin^2 \pi \alpha_2)}.$$

Chapter 9

Random Spanning Forests

There is more than one way to extend the ideas of the preceding chapter to arbitrary connected infinite graphs. Sometimes we end up with spanning trees, but other times, with spanning forests, all of whose trees are infinite. Most unattributed results in this chapter are from Benjamini, Lyons, Peres, and Schramm (2001), hereinafter referred to as BLPS (2001).

We will discover several remarkable things. Besides the intimate connections between spanning trees, random walks, and electric networks exposed in Chapter 8 and deepened here, we will also find an intimate connection to harmonic Dirichlet functions. We will see some remarkable phase transitions of uniform spanning forests in euclidean space as the dimension increases, and then again in hyperbolic space. Our last model, minimal spanning forests, is connected to percolation, rather than to random walks. Many interesting open questions remain. Some are collected in the last section.

§9.1. Basic Properties.

Let G be an infinite connected network and $G_n = (V_n, E_n)$ be finite subgraphs that **exhaust** G , i.e., $G_n \subseteq G_{n+1}$ and $G = \bigcup G_n$. Let μ_n^F be the weighted spanning tree probability measure on G_n (the superscript F stands for “free” and will be explained below). Given a finite set B of edges, $B \subseteq E_n$ for large enough n and, for such n , we claim that $\mu_n^F(B \subseteq T)$ is decreasing in n . To see this, let $i(e; H)$ be the current that flows along e when a unit current is imposed across e in the network H . Write $B = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$. By Corollary 8.4, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n^F(B \subseteq T) &= \prod_{k=1}^m \mu_n^F(e_k \in T \mid \forall j < k \quad e_j \in T) = \prod_{k=1}^m i(e_k; G_n / \{e_j; j < k\}) \\ &\geq \prod_{k=1}^m i(e_k; G_{n+1} / \{e_j; j < k\}) \quad \text{by Rayleigh's monotonicity principle} \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^m \mu_{n+1}^F(e_k \in T \mid \forall j < k \quad e_j \in T) = \mu_{n+1}^F(B \subseteq T). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\mu^F(B \subseteq T) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n^F(B \subseteq T)$ exists. It follows that we may define μ^F on all **elementary cylinder** sets (i.e., $\mu^F(B_1 \subseteq T, B_2 \cap T = \emptyset)$ for finite disjoint sets $B_1, B_2 \subset E$) by the inclusion-exclusion formula:

$$\mu^F(B_1 \subseteq T, B_2 \cap T = \emptyset) := \sum_{S \subset B_2} \mu^F(B_1, S \subseteq T) (-1)^{|S|}.$$

This lets us define μ^F on **cylinder** sets, i.e., finite (disjoint) unions of elementary cylinder sets, and hence uniquely defines a probability measure μ^F on subgraphs of G . We call μ^F the **(weighted) free spanning forest** measure on G , denoted FSF, since clearly it is carried by the set of spanning forests of G . In the case where all the edges of G have equal weight, we call μ^F the **free uniform spanning forest**, denoted FUSF. The term “free” will be explained in a moment.

How can it be that the limit FSF may not be concentrated on the set of spanning trees of G ? This happens if, given $x, y \in V$, the μ_n^F -distributions of the distance in T between x and y do not form a tight family. For example, if G is the lattice graph \mathbb{Z}^d , Pemantle (1991) proved the remarkable theorem that FSF is concentrated on spanning trees iff $d \leq 4$ (see Theorem 9.17).

Now there is another possibility for taking similar limits. In disregarding the complement of G_n , we are disregarding the possibility that a spanning tree or forest of G may connect the boundary vertices of G_n in ways that would affect the possible connections within G_n itself. An alternative approach takes the opposite view and forces all connections outside of G_n : Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2.10, let G_n^W be the graph obtained from G_n by identifying all the boundary vertices of G_n (i.e., those with a neighbor in $G \setminus G_n$) to a single vertex, z_n . (The superscript W stands for “wired” since we think of G_n^W as having its boundary “wired” together.) Let μ_n^W be the random spanning tree measure on G_n^W . Now $\mu_n^W(B \subseteq T)$ is increasing in n by Corollary 8.4 and Rayleigh’s monotonicity principle (we may effectuate the wiring of the boundary of G_n by adding edges of infinite conductance). Thus, we may again define the limiting probability measure μ^W , called the **(weighted) wired spanning forest** and denoted WSF. Again, when all the edges of G have equal weight, we call μ^W the **wired uniform spanning forest**, denoted WUSF. In the case where G is itself a tree, the free spanning forest is trivially concentrated on just $\{G\}$, while the wired spanning forest is usually more interesting (see Exercise 9.12). In statistical mechanics, measures on infinite configurations are also defined using limiting procedures similar to those employed here to define FSF and WSF. One needs to specify boundary conditions, just as we did. The terms “free” and “wired” have analogous uses there. We also note that an equivalent definition of WSF is the limit of uniform spanning

forests of \mathcal{G}_n , where we only consider those spanning forests such that each component tree includes a vertex of the boundary of G_n .

As we will see, the wired spanning forest is much better understood than the free case. Indeed, there is a direct construction of it that avoids exhaustions: Let G be a transient network. Run a loop-erased random walk from any vertex for infinite time; this is defined by transience. Then run an independent loop-erased random walk from another vertex either for infinite time or until it encounters the previous path. Add this to the first path. Then run another independent loop-erased random walk from any vertex not already included in the union of the first two paths for infinite time or until it encounters the previous paths, and so on. The same reasoning as in Section 8.1 shows that the resulting distribution on forests is independent of the order in which we choose starting vertices as long as the order is such as to guarantee that all vertices are eventually chosen, i.e., so that we get a spanning forest. We will refer to this method of generating a random spanning forest as **Wilson’s method rooted at infinity**.

PROPOSITION 9.1. *The wired spanning forest on any transient network G is the same as the random spanning forest generated by Wilson’s method rooted at infinity.*

Proof. For any path $\langle x_k \rangle$ that visits no vertex infinitely often, $\text{LE}(\langle x_k; k \leq K \rangle) \rightarrow \text{LE}(\langle x_k; k \geq 0 \rangle)$ as $K \rightarrow \infty$. That is, if $\text{LE}(\langle x_k; k \leq K \rangle) = \langle u_i^K; i \leq m_K \rangle$ and $\text{LE}(\langle x_k; k \geq 0 \rangle) = \langle u_i; i \geq 0 \rangle$, then for each i and all large K , we have $u_i^K = u_i$; this follows from the definition of loop-erasure. Since G is transient, it follows that $\text{LE}(\langle X_k; k \leq K \rangle) \rightarrow \text{LE}(\langle X_k; k \geq 0 \rangle)$ as $K \rightarrow \infty$ a.s., where $\langle X_k \rangle$ is a random walk starting from any fixed vertex.

Let G_n be an exhaustion of G and G_n^W the graph formed by contracting the vertices outside G_n to a vertex z_n . Let $T(n)$ be a random spanning tree on G_n^W and T the limit of $T(n)$ in law. Given $e_1, \dots, e_M \in \mathbf{E}$, let $\langle X_k(u_i) \rangle$ be independent random walks starting from the endpoints u_1, \dots, u_L of e_1, \dots, e_M . Run Wilson’s method rooted at z_n from the vertices u_1, \dots, u_L in that order; let τ_j^n be the time that $\langle X_k(u_j) \rangle$ reaches the portion of the spanning tree created by the preceding random walks $\langle X_k(u_l) \rangle$ ($l < j$). Then

$$\mathbf{P}[e_i \in T(n) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq M] = \mathbf{P} \left[e_i \in \bigcup_{j=1}^L \text{LE}(\langle X_k(u_j); k \leq \tau_j^n \rangle) \right].$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}[e_i \in T \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq M] = \mathbf{P} \left[e_i \in \bigcup_{j=1}^L \text{LE}(\langle X_k(u_j); k \leq \tau_j \rangle) \right],$$

where τ_j are the stopping times corresponding to Wilson's method rooted at infinity. That is, T has the same law as the random spanning forest generated by Wilson's method rooted at infinity. ◀

We will see that in many important cases, such as \mathbb{Z}^d , the free and wired spanning forests agree.

▷ EXERCISE 9.1.

The choice of exhaustion $\langle G_n \rangle$ does not change the resulting measure WSF by Proposition 9.1. Show that the choice also does not change the resulting measure FSF.

An **automorphism** of a network is an automorphism of the underlying graph that preserves edge weights.

▷ EXERCISE 9.2.

Show that FSF and WSF are invariant under any automorphisms that the network may have.

▷ EXERCISE 9.3.

Show that if G is an infinite recurrent network, then the wired spanning forest on G is the same as the free spanning forest, i.e., the random spanning tree of Section 8.2.

▷ EXERCISE 9.4.

Let G be a network with at least 2 transient ends, meaning that there is a finite subset of edges whose removal from G leaves at least 2 transient components. Show that the free and wired spanning forests are different on G .

PROPOSITION 9.2. *Let G be a locally finite network. For both FSF and WSF, all trees are a.s. infinite.*

Proof. A finite tree, if it occurs, must occur with positive probability at some specific location, meaning that certain specific edges are present and certain other specific edges surrounding the edges of the tree are absent. But every such event has probability 0 for the approximations μ_n^F and μ_n^W and there are only countably many such events. ◀

▷ EXERCISE 9.5.

Let G be an amenable infinite network as witnessed by the sequence $\langle G_n \rangle$ with vertex sets $\langle V_n \rangle$ (see Section 8.2).

- (a) Let F be any spanning forest all of whose components (trees) are infinite. Show that if k_n denotes the number of trees of $F \cap G_n$, then $k_n = o(|V_n|)$.
- (b) Show that the average degree of vertices in both the free spanning forest and the wired spanning forest is 2:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |V_n|^{-1} \sum_{x \in V_n} \deg_T(x) = 2$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |V_n|^{-1} \sum_{x \in V_n} \mathbf{E}[\deg_T(x)] = 2.$$

In particular, if G is a Cayley graph such as \mathbb{Z}^d , then every vertex has expected degree 2 in both the free spanning forest and the wired spanning forest.

Often $\text{FSF} = \text{WSF}$ and it will turn out to be quite interesting to see when this happens. In all cases, though, there is a simple inequality between these two probability measures, namely,

$$\forall e \in E \quad \text{FSF}(e \in T) \geq \text{WSF}(e \in T) \tag{9.1}$$

since this is true for μ_n^F and μ_n^W by Rayleigh's monotonicity principle. More generally, we claim that for every upwardly-closed cylinder set C , we have

$$\text{FSF}(C) \geq \text{WSF}(C). \tag{9.2}$$

We therefore say that **FSF stochastically dominates WSF** and we write $\text{FSF} \succcurlyeq \text{WSF}$. To show (9.2), it suffices to show that for each n we have $\mu_n^F \succcurlyeq \mu_n^W$. So let C be an upwardly-closed event in the edge set E_n and consider the network G'_n formed by adding a new edge e of unit conductance between two boundary vertices of G_n . Also, let $G''_n := G'_n/e$. Let $\mu_n'^F$ be the weighted spanning tree measure on G'_n and let $\mu_n''^F$ be the weighted spanning tree measure on G''_n . Now

$$\mu_n'^F(C) = \mu_n'^F(e \in T) \mu_n'^F(C \mid e \in T) + \mu_n'^F(e \notin T) \mu_n'^F(C \mid e \notin T),$$

so that by Theorem 8.5, we have

$$\mu_n''^F(C) = \mu_n'^F(C \mid e \in T) \leq \mu_n'^F(C \mid e \notin T) = \mu_n^F(C).$$

We may repeat this idea by adding just enough edges to connect the boundary of G_n ; at the end, we conclude that

$$\mu_n^W(C) \leq \mu_n^F(C),$$

as desired.

The stochastic inequality $\text{FSF} \succcurlyeq \text{WSF}$ implies that the two measures, FSF and WSF, can be **monotonically coupled**. What this means is that there is a probability measure on the set

$$\left\{ (T(1), T(2)) ; T(i) \text{ is a spanning forest of } G \text{ and } T(1) \subseteq T(2) \right\}$$

that projects in the first coordinate to WSF and in the second to FSF. This is quite a general result:

THEOREM 9.3. (STRASSEN, 1965) *Let (X, \preccurlyeq) be a partially ordered finite set with two probability measures, μ_1 and μ_2 . The following are equivalent:*

- (i) *There is a probability measure ν on $\{(x, y) \in X \times X ; x \preccurlyeq y\}$ whose coordinate projections are μ_i .*
- (ii) *For each subset $A \subseteq X$ such that if $x \in A$ and $x \preccurlyeq y$, then $y \in A$, we have $\mu_1(A) \leq \mu_2(A)$.*

We are interested in the case where X consists of the subsets of edges of a finite graph, ordered by \subseteq .

Proof. The coupling of (i) is a way to distribute the μ_1 -mass of each point $x \in X$ among the points $y \succcurlyeq x$ in such a way as to obtain the distribution of μ_2 . This is just a more graphic way of expressing the requirements of (i) that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \quad \sum_{y \succcurlyeq x} \nu(x, y) &= \mu_1(x), \\ \forall y \quad \sum_{x \preccurlyeq y} \nu(x, y) &= \mu_2(y). \end{aligned}$$

If we make a directed graph whose vertices are $(X \times \{1\}) \cup (X \times \{2\}) \cup \{\Delta_1, \Delta_2\}$ with edges from Δ_1 to each vertex of $X \times \{1\}$, from each vertex of $X \times \{2\}$ to Δ_2 , and from $(x, 1)$ to $(y, 2)$ whenever $x \preccurlyeq y$, then we can think of ν as a flow from Δ_1 to Δ_2 . To put this into the framework of the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem, let the capacity of the edge joining Δ_i with (x, i) be $\mu_i(x)$ for $i = 1, 2$ and the capacity of all other edges be 1. It is evident that the condition (i) is that the maximum flow from Δ_1 to Δ_2 is 1. We claim that the condition (ii) is that the minimum cutset sum is 1, from which the theorem follows. To see this, note that any cutset of minimum sum does not use any edges of the form $\langle (x, 1), (y, 2) \rangle$ since these all have capacity 1. Thus, given a minimum cutset sum, let $B \times \{1\}$ be the set of

vertices that are *not* separated from Δ_1 by the cutset. By minimality, we have that the set of vertices that *are* separated from Δ_2 is $A \times \{2\}$, where

$$A := \{y \in X ; \exists x \in B \ x \preceq y\}.$$

Thus, the cutset sum is $\mu_2(A) + 1 - \mu_1(B)$. Now minimality again shows that $B = A$, whence the cutset sum is $\mu_2(A) + 1 - \mu_1(A)$. Thus, the minimum cutset sum equals 1 iff (ii) holds, as claimed. ◀

By Theorem 9.3, we may couple the measures induced by FSF and WSF on any finite subgraph of G . By taking an exhaustion of G and a weak limit point of these couplings, we obtain a coupling of FSF and WSF on all of G .

Open Question. Is there a “natural” monotone coupling of FSF and WSF?

▷ EXERCISE 9.6.

Show that the number of trees in the free spanning forest on a network is stochastically dominated by the number in the wired spanning forest on the network. If the number of trees in the free spanning forest is a.s. finite, then it equals the number in the wired spanning forest iff FSF = WSF.

So when are the free and wired spanning forests the same? As a preliminary result due to Häggström (1995) , we have the following:

PROPOSITION 9.4. *If FSF and WSF agree on single-edge probabilities, i.e., if equality holds in (9.1), then FSF = WSF.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that the induced measures agree on any finite subgraph. Note that the expected number of edges present in the finite subgraph is the same by hypothesis. Hence, coupling the measures shows that the measures agree. ◀

Note that this proof works for any pair of measures where one stochastically dominates the other.

▷ EXERCISE 9.7.

Show that if $\mathbf{E}[\deg_T(x)]$ is the same under FSF and WSF for every $x \in V$, then FSF = WSF.

We may now deduce that FUSF = WUSF for many graphs, including Cayley graphs of abelian groups such as \mathbb{Z}^d . Call a graph or network **transitive** if for every pair of vertices x and y , there is an automorphism of the graph or network that takes x to y .

The following is essentially due to Häggström (1995).

COROLLARY 9.5. *On any transitive amenable network, FSF = WSF.*

Proof. By transitivity and Exercise 9.5, $\mathbf{E}[\deg_T(x)] = 2$ for both FSF and WSF. Apply Exercise 9.7. ◀

▷ EXERCISE 9.8.

Give an amenable graph on which FUSF \neq WUSF.




Figure 9.1. A uniformly chosen wired spanning tree on a subgraph of \mathbb{Z}^2 , drawn by Wilson (see Propp and Wilson (1998)).

Examination of Figure 9.1 reveals two spanning trees: one in white, the other in black on the planar dual graph. (See Section 3.2 for the definition of dual.) Note that in the dual, the outer boundary of the grid is identified to a single vertex. In general, suppose that G is a simple plane network whose planar dual G^\dagger is locally finite. Given a finite connected network G_n of G , let G_n^\dagger be its planar dual. Note that G_n^\dagger can be regarded as a finite subnetwork of G^\dagger , but with the outer boundary vertices identified to a single vertex. Spanning trees T of G_n are in one-to-one correspondence with spanning trees T^\times of G_n^\dagger in the same way as in Figure 9.1:

$$e \in T \iff e^\dagger \notin T^\times. \tag{9.3}$$

Furthermore, this correspondence preserves the relative weights. Therefore, the FSF of G is “dual” to the WSF of G^\dagger ; that is, the relation (9.3) transforms one to the other.

We turn now to an electrical criterion for the equality of FSF and WSF. As we saw in Chapter 3, there are two natural ways of defining currents between vertices of a graph, corresponding to the two ways of defining spanning forests.

We may add to Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 3.5 as follows:

PROPOSITION 9.6. *For any network, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\text{FSF} = \text{WSF}$;
- (ii) $i_W^e = i_F^e$ for every edge e ;
- (iii) $\ell_-^2(\mathbf{E}) = \star \oplus \diamond$;
- (iv) $\mathbf{HD} = \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. From Corollary 8.4 and Propositions 3.1 and 3.2, we have that $\text{FSF}(e \in T) = i_F^e(e)$ and $\text{WSF}(e \in T) = i_W^e(e)$. Now use Proposition 9.4 to deduce that (i) and (ii) are equivalent. The other equivalences were proved already. ◀

Combining this with Theorem 3.6, we get another proof that $\text{FUSF} = \text{WUSF}$ on \mathbb{Z}^d .

▷ EXERCISE 9.9.

Show that every transitive amenable network has unique currents.

Let $Y_F(e, f) := i_F^e(f)$ and $Y_W(e, f) := i_W^e(f)$ be the free and wired transfer current matrices.

THEOREM 9.7. *Given any network G and any distinct edges $e_1, \dots, e_k \in G$, we have*

$$\text{FSF}[e_1, \dots, e_k \in T] = \det[Y_F(e_i, e_j)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}$$

and

$$\text{WSF}[e_1, \dots, e_k \in T] = \det[Y_W(e_i, e_j)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}.$$

Proof. This is immediate from the Transfer Current Theorem of Section 8.2 and Propositions 3.1 and 3.2. ◀

This result (for $k = 1$) and the definition (9.3) explain (3.3).

Let's see what this says more explicitly for unit conductances on the hypercubic lattice \mathbb{Z}^d . The case $d = 2$ was treated already in Section 8.3 and Exercise 8.31. The transient case $d \geq 3$ is actually easier, but the approach is the same as in Section 8.3. In order to find the transfer currents $Y(e, f)$, we will first find voltages, then use $i = dv$. When i is a unit flow from x to y , we have $d^*i = \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{y\}}$. Hence the voltages satisfy $\Delta v := d^*dv = \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{y\}}$. We are interested in solving this equation when $x := e^-$,

$y := e^+$ and then computing $v(f^-) - v(f^+)$. Now, however, we can solve $\Delta v = \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}$, i.e., the voltage v from x to infinity. Again, we begin with a formal (i.e., heuristic) derivation of the solution, then prove that our formula is correct.

Let $\mathbb{T}^d := (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d$ be the d -dimensional torus. For $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{T}^d$, write $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \cdot (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) := x_1\alpha_1 + \dots + x_d\alpha_d \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. For a function f on \mathbb{Z}^d , define the function \widehat{f} on \mathbb{T}^d by

$$\widehat{f}(\alpha) := \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f(x) e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \alpha}.$$

For example, $\widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}}(\alpha) = e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \alpha}$. Now a formal calculation shows that

$$\widehat{\Delta f}(\alpha) = \widehat{f}(\alpha) \varphi(\alpha),$$

where

$$\varphi((\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)) := 2d - \sum_{k=1}^d (e^{2\pi i \alpha_k} + e^{-2\pi i \alpha_k}) = 2d - 2 \sum_{k=1}^d \cos 2\pi \alpha_k.$$

Hence, to solve $\Delta f = g$, we may try to solve $\widehat{\Delta f} = \widehat{g}$ by using $\widehat{f} := \widehat{g}/\varphi$ and then finding f . In fact, a formal calculation shows that we may recover f from \widehat{f} by the formula

$$f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \widehat{f}(\alpha) e^{2\pi i x \cdot \alpha} d\alpha,$$

where the integration is with respect to Lebesgue measure. What makes the transient case easier is that $1/\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$.

▷ EXERCISE 9.10.

(The Riemann-Lebesgue Lemma.) Show that if $F \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} F(\alpha) e^{2\pi i x \cdot \alpha} d\alpha$, then $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = 0$. *Hint:* This is obvious if F is a finite linear combination of functions $\alpha \mapsto e^{2\pi i x \cdot \alpha}$. The Stone-Weierstrass theorem implies that such functions are dense in $L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$.

PROPOSITION 9.8. *The voltage at x when a unit current flows from $\mathbf{0}$ to ∞ in \mathbb{Z}^d is*

$$v(x) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{e^{2\pi i x \cdot \alpha}}{\varphi(\alpha)} d\alpha. \quad (9.4)$$

Proof. Define v' to be the integral. By the analogue of Exercise 8.12 for $d \geq 3$, we have

$$\Delta v'(x) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{0}\}}}(\alpha)}{\varphi(\alpha)} e^{2\pi i x \cdot \alpha} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} e^{2\pi i x \cdot \alpha} d\alpha = \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{0}\}}(x).$$

That is, $\Delta v' = \mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}$. Since v satisfies the same equation, we have $\Delta(v' - v) = 0$. In other words, $v' - v$ is harmonic at every point in \mathbb{Z}^d . Furthermore, v' is bounded in absolute value by the L^1 norm of $\widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}}/\varphi$, whence $v' - v$ is bounded. Since the only bounded harmonic functions on \mathbb{Z}^d are the constants (by, say, Exercise 2.38), this means that $v' - v$ is constant. Now the Riemann-Lebesgue Lemma (Exercise 9.10) implies that v' vanishes at infinity. Since v also vanishes at infinity, this constant is 0. Therefore, $v' = v$, as desired. \blacktriangleleft

One could avoid the Riemann-Lebesgue Lemma by solving the more complicated equation $\Delta v = \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{y\}}$ instead, as in Section 8.3.

Now one can compute

$$Y(e, f) = v(f^- - e^-) - v(f^+ - e^-) - v(f^- - e^+) + v(f^+ - e^+)$$

using (9.4).

§9.2. Ergodic Properties.

COROLLARY 9.9. *For any network and $\mathbf{P} = \text{FSF}$ or WSF , if A is a cylinder set and $k \geq 1$, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_B (\mathbf{P}[A, B] - \mathbf{P}[A]\mathbf{P}[B]) = 0,$$

where the supremum is over cylinder sets B depending on at most k edges, all of whose distances from those on which A depends are at least n .

Proof. For a finite set of edges C , let $y(C) := \det[Y(e, f)]_{e, f \in C}$, where $Y = Y_F$ or Y_W as appropriate. The finiteness of the energy of the appropriate current implies that $Y(e, f) \rightarrow 0$ as $\text{dist}(e, f) \rightarrow \infty$ for fixed e . Hence for any C and any $k \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{y(C \cup C') - y(C)y(C'); |C'| \leq k, \text{dist}(C, C') \geq n\} = 0,$$

i.e.,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{\mathbf{P}[C \subset T, C' \subset T] - \mathbf{P}[C \subset T]\mathbf{P}[C' \subset T]; |C'| \leq k, \text{dist}(C, C') \geq n\} = 0.$$

The result now follows for elementary cylinder events by subtraction of such probabilities and then for all cylinder events by addition. \blacktriangleleft

If H is a group of automorphisms of a network or graph G , we say that H **acts** on G . Any action extends in the obvious way to an action on the collection of subnetworks or subgraphs of G . For an action of H , we write $g \rightarrow \infty$ in H if $|x - gx| \rightarrow \infty$ for some (hence all) $x \in V$. We say that the action is **mixing** for a probability measure \mathbf{P} on subnetworks or subgraphs of G if for any pair of events A and B ,

$$\lim_{g \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}[A, gB] = \mathbf{P}[A]\mathbf{P}[B]. \quad (9.5)$$

More generally, for $k \geq 1$, we say that it is **mixing of order k** (or **k -mixing**) if for any events A_1, \dots, A_{k+1} , we have

$$\lim_{g_1, \dots, g_k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}[A_1, g_1 A_2, g_2 g_1 A_3, \dots, g_k g_{k-1} \cdots g_2 g_1 A_{k+1}] = \mathbf{P}[A_1]\mathbf{P}[A_2] \cdots \mathbf{P}[A_{k+1}].$$

Note that, as usual, mixing implies ergodicity: if A is an invariant event, meaning that $\mathbf{P}[A \Delta gA] = 0$ for all $g \in H$, then $\mathbf{P}[A]$ is 0 or 1. To see this, just set $B = A$ in (9.5).

COROLLARY 9.10. *If H is a group acting on a network G with every vertex having an infinite orbit, then the action is mixing of all orders for FSF and for WSF.*

Proof. We show mixing and leave higher orders to Exercise 9.11. Let \mathbf{P} be either FSF or WSF. Let A and B be two events. The equation (9.5) follows immediately from Corollary 9.9 in case A and B are cylinders. If not, let $\epsilon > 0$ and let C and D be cylinders such that $\mathbf{P}[A \Delta C] + \mathbf{P}[B \Delta D] < \epsilon$. Since \mathbf{P} is invariant under H (Exercise 9.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{P}[A, gB] - \mathbf{P}[A]\mathbf{P}[B]| &\leq |\mathbf{P}[C, gD] - \mathbf{P}[C]\mathbf{P}[D]| + \mathbf{P}[A \Delta C, gB] + \mathbf{P}[C, g(B \Delta D)] \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P}[A \Delta C]\mathbf{P}[B] + \mathbf{P}[C]\mathbf{P}[B \Delta D] \\ &\leq |\mathbf{P}[C, gD] - \mathbf{P}[C]\mathbf{P}[D]| + 2\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Taking g to infinity, we get that $\limsup_{g \rightarrow \infty} |\mathbf{P}[A, gB] - \mathbf{P}[A]\mathbf{P}[B]| \leq 2\epsilon$. Since ϵ is arbitrary, this completes the proof of mixing. ◀

▷ **EXERCISE 9.11.**

Complete the proof of Corollary 9.10.

COROLLARY 9.11. *Let G be an infinite network such that $\text{Aut}(G)$ has an infinite orbit. Then WSF and FSF are ergodic measures for the action of $\text{Aut}(G)$. If WSF and FSF on G are distinct, then they are singular measures on the space 2^E .*

We do not know if the singularity assertion above holds without the hypothesis on $\text{Aut}(G)$; see Question 9.54.

Proof. The hypothesis implies that every orbit of $\text{Aut}(G)$ is infinite. If A is an $\text{Aut}(G)$ invariant event, then approximating A by cylinder sets, we see from Corollary 9.9 that A is independent of itself, so it has probability 0 or 1. Finally, distinct ergodic measures under any group action are always singular; see, e.g., Furstenberg (1981). ◀

In fact, we have a much stronger property than mixing, namely, tail triviality. For a set of edges $K \subseteq E$, let $\mathcal{F}(K)$ denote the σ -field of events depending only on K . Define the **tail** σ -field to be the intersection of $\mathcal{F}(K)$ over all co-finite K (where “co-finite” means the complement of a finite set).

THEOREM 9.12. (BLPS (2001)) *The WSF and FSF have trivial tail on every network.*

Proof. Let G be an infinite network exhausted by finite subnetworks $\langle G_n \rangle$. Recall from Section 9.1 that μ_n^F denotes the weighted spanning tree measure on G_n and μ_n^W denotes the weighted spanning tree measure on the “wired” graph G_n^W . Let ν_n be any “partially wired” measure, i.e., the weighted spanning tree measure on a graph G_n^* obtained from a finite network G'_n satisfying $G_n \subset G'_n \subset G$ by contracting some of the edges in G'_n that are not in G_n . Repeated applications of Theorem 8.5 give that any increasing event B measurable with respect to edges in G_n satisfies

$$\mu_n^W(B) \leq \nu_n(B) \leq \mu_n^F(B). \tag{9.6}$$

Let $M > n$ and let A be a cylinder event that is measurable with respect to the edges in $G_M - G_n$ and such that $\mu_M^W(A) > 0$. For each event B as in (9.6), we have

$$\mu_n^W(B) \leq \mu_M^W(B | A). \tag{9.7}$$

To see this, condition separately on each possible configuration of edges of $G_M \setminus G_n$ that is in A , and use (9.6). Fixing A and letting $M \rightarrow \infty$ in (9.7) gives

$$\mu_n^W(B) \leq \text{WSF}(B | A). \tag{9.8}$$

This applies to all cylinder events A that are measurable with respect to the complement of G_n with $\text{WSF}(A) > 0$, and therefore the assumption that A is a cylinder event can be dropped. Thus (9.8) holds for all tail events A of positive probability. Taking $n \rightarrow \infty$ there gives

$$\text{WSF}(B) \leq \text{WSF}(B | A), \tag{9.9}$$

where B is any increasing cylinder event and A is any tail event. Thus, (9.9) also applies to the complement A^c . Since $\text{WSF}(B) = \text{WSF}(A)\text{WSF}(B | A) + \text{WSF}(A^c)\text{WSF}(B | A^c)$, it follows that $\text{WSF}(B) = \text{WSF}(B | A)$. Therefore, every tail event A is independent of every increasing cylinder event, whence A is trivial. The argument for the FSF is similar. ◀

Before Theorem 9.12 was proved, Pemantle (1991) had earlier proved a special case, namely, the case when $\text{FSF} = \text{WSF}$, and actually proved something stronger:

THEOREM 9.13. *If $\text{FSF} = \text{WSF}$, then for all cylinder events A and $\epsilon > 0$, there is a finite set of edges K such that*

$$\sup\{|\text{WSF}[A \mid B] - \text{WSF}[A]|; B \in \mathcal{F}(E \setminus K)\} < \epsilon.$$

Proof. Let $\langle G_n \rangle$ be an exhaustion of G with edge set E_n . Given n , let $K \subset E \setminus E_n$. Let A be an elementary cylinder event of the form $\{D \subseteq T\}$ for some set of edges $D \subseteq E_n$ and let B be a cylinder event in $\mathcal{F}(K)$ with positive probability. By Rayleigh monotonicity, we have for all sufficiently large $m \geq n$,

$$\mu_n^W(A) \leq \mu_m^F(A \mid B) \leq \mu_n^F(A).$$

Therefore $\mu_n^W(A) \leq \text{FSF}(A \mid B) \leq \mu_n^F(A)$ and so the same is true of any $B \in \mathcal{F}(K)$ of positive probability (not just cylinders B). The hypothesis that $\text{FSF} = \text{WSF}$ now gives the result. \blacktriangleleft

▷ EXERCISE 9.12.

Show that if G is a tree, then $\text{FSF} = \text{WSF}$ iff G is recurrent.

§9.3. Trees and Ends.

When is the free spanning forest or the wired spanning forest a single tree, as in the recurrent case? The following answer for the wired spanning forest is due to Pemantle (1991). It is obvious from Proposition 9.1 (which wasn't available to Pemantle at the time). The case of the free spanning forest (when it differs from the wired) is largely unknown. See Theorem 9.26 for one case that is known.

PROPOSITION 9.14. *Let G be any network. The wired spanning forest is a single tree a.s. iff from every (or some) vertex, random walk and independent loop-erased random walk intersect infinitely often a.s. Moreover, the chance that x and y belong to the same tree equals the probability that random walk from x intersects independent loop-erased random walk from y .*

In fact, it turns out that for any transient Markov chain, two independent paths started at any different states intersect with probability 1 iff they intersect a.s. even after one is loop-erased; see [**CHAPTER on 2nd moment method]. This makes it considerably easier to decide whether the wired spanning forest is a single tree. More generally, given that two independent paths intersect i.o., the probability that the loop erasure of one intersects the other i.o. is 1. Thus:

THEOREM 9.15. *Let G be any network. The wired spanning forest is a single tree a.s. iff two independent paths started at any different states intersect with probability 1.*

How many trees are in the wired spanning forest when the condition of this theorem does not hold? Usually infinitely many a.s., but there can be only finitely many:

▷ **EXERCISE 9.13.**

Join two copies of the usual nearest-neighbor graph of \mathbb{Z}^3 by an edge at their origins. How many trees does the free uniform spanning forest have? How many does the wired uniform spanning forest have?

To give the general answer, we use the following quantity: let $\alpha(w_1, \dots, w_K)$ be the probability that independent random walks started at w_1, \dots, w_K have no pairwise intersections.

THEOREM 9.16. *If G is any network, the number of trees of WSF is a.s.*

$$\sup\{K; \exists w_1, \dots, w_K \alpha(w_1, \dots, w_K) > 0\}.$$

In particular, if the probability that two independent random walks from every (or some) vertex x intersect infinitely often is 0, then number of trees of WSF is a.s. infinite.

Proof. Let $\langle X_n(u) \rangle$ be a collection of independent random walks starting at u for $u \in V$.

Write $A_{-\infty}(w_1, \dots, w_K)$ for the event that the number of pairwise intersections among the random walks $\langle X_n(w_i) \rangle$ is finite; let $\alpha_{-\infty}(w_1, \dots, w_K)$ be its probability. We claim that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(X_n(w_1), \dots, X_n(w_K)) = \mathbf{1}_{A_{-\infty}(w_1, \dots, w_K)} \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{9.10}$$

To see this, note that by the Lévy 0-1 Law, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{-\infty}(X_n(w_1), \dots, X_n(w_K)) = \mathbf{1}_{A_{-\infty}(w_1, \dots, w_K)} \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{9.11}$$

Also, $A_{-\infty}(w_1, \dots, w_K)$ is the increasing union over N of the events that there is no pairwise intersection among the random walks $\langle X_m(w_i); m \geq N \rangle$, whence

$$\alpha_{-\infty}(w_1, \dots, w_K) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[\alpha(X_N(w_1), \dots, X_N(w_K))].$$

Applying this to the points $(X_n(w_1), \dots, X_n(w_K))$ gives us

$$\alpha_{-\infty}(X_n(w_1), \dots, X_n(w_K)) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[\alpha(X_N(w_1), \dots, X_N(w_K)) \mid X_n(w_1), \dots, X_n(w_K)]. \tag{9.12}$$

Furthermore, it is easily seen that $\langle \alpha(X_N(w_1), \dots, X_N(w_K)) \rangle$ is a bounded supermartingale, whence we may apply the martingale convergence theorem to transform (9.12) to

$$\alpha_{-\infty}(X_n(w_1), \dots, X_n(w_K)) = \mathbf{E}[\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(X_N(w_1), \dots, X_N(w_K)) \mid X_n(w_1), \dots, X_n(w_K)]. \quad (9.13)$$

However, by the Lévy 0-1 Law again,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(X_N(w_1), \dots, X_N(w_K)) \mid X_n(w_1), \dots, X_n(w_K)] \\ = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(X_N(w_1), \dots, X_N(w_K)) \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (9.14)$$

Thus, (9.10) follows from (9.11), (9.13), and (9.14).

Now let K_0 be the supremum indicated in the statement of the theorem. By Wilson's method rooted at infinity, the probability that there are $\geq K$ distinct trees is at least $\alpha(w_1, \dots, w_K)$ for any distinct w_1, \dots, w_K . If $\alpha(w_1, \dots, w_K) > 0$ for some w_1, \dots, w_K , then certainly $\alpha_{-\infty}(w_1, \dots, w_K) > 0$, whence by (9.10), $\sup\{\alpha(w_1, \dots, w_K); w_i \in \mathbf{V}\} = 1$. Therefore, the number of trees is WSF-a.s. at least K . Hence, the number of trees is WSF-a.s. at least K_0 .

On the other hand, suppose that there are at least K trees with positive probability. Then there are w_1, \dots, w_K such that with positive probability, they belong to different trees. We claim that with positive probability, $\alpha(X_n(w_1), \dots, X_n(w_K)) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For if not, then by (9.10), there would a.s. exist $i \neq j$ with infinitely many intersections between $\langle X_n(w_i) \rangle$ and $\langle X_n(w_j) \rangle$, whence also between $\langle X_n(w_i) \rangle$ and the loop-erasure of $\langle X_n(w_j) \rangle$. But then w_i and w_j could not belong to different trees, contradicting our assumption. This proves the claim and that the number of trees is WSF-a.s. at most K_0 .

The last sentence again follows from (9.10). \blacktriangleleft

From Corollary 9.5, it follows that FUSF = WUSF on \mathbb{Z}^d (this also follows from the next section), whence we can use Theorems 9.15 and 9.16 to analyze the free uniform spanning forest as well. Indeed, from the results of [**AN EXPANDED SECTION on the 2nd-moment method, with an application to intersections of random walks, as by LeGall and Rosen, e.g.], we obtain the following wonderful result of Pemantle (1991), which is stunning without the understanding of the approach using random walks:

THEOREM 9.17. *The uniform spanning forest on \mathbb{Z}^d has one tree a.s. for $d \leq 4$ and infinitely many trees a.s. for $d \geq 5$.*

We now ask about the topology of the trees of a random spanning forest. Call an infinite path in a tree that starts at any vertex and does not backtrack a **ray**. Call two

rays **equivalent** if they have infinitely many vertices in common. An equivalence class of rays is called an **end**. How many ends do the trees of a random spanning forest have?

Let's begin by thinking about the case of the wired uniform spanning forest on a regular tree of degree $d + 1$. Choose a vertex, o . Begin Wilson's method rooted at infinity from o . We obtain a ray ξ from o to start our forest. Now o has d other neighbors, x_1, \dots, x_d . By beginning random walks at each of them in turn, we see that the events $A_i := \{x_i \text{ connected to } o\}$ are independent. Furthermore, the resistance of the descendant subtree of x_i (we think of o as the parent of x_i) is $1/d + 1/d^2 + 1/d^3 + \dots = 1/(d-1)$, whence the probability that random walk started at x_i ever hits o is $1/d$. This is the probability of A_i . On the event A_i , we add only the edge (o, x_i) to the forest and then we repeat the analysis from x_i . Thus, the tree containing o includes, apart from the ray ξ , a critical Galton-Watson tree with binomial distribution $(d, 1/d)$. In addition, each vertex on ξ has another random subtree attached to it; its first generation has binomial distribution $(d - 1, 1/d)$, but subsequent generations yield Galton-Watson trees with binomial distribution $(d, 1/d)$. In particular, a.s. every tree added to ξ is finite. This means that the tree containing o has only one end, the equivalence class of ξ . This analysis is easily extended to form a complete description of the entire wired spanning forest. In fact, if we work on the d -ary tree instead, the description is slightly simpler: each tree in the forest is a size-biased Galton-Watson tree grown from its lowest vertex, generated from the binomial offspring distribution $(d, 1/d)$ (see Section 10.1). The resulting description is due to Häggström (1998), whose work predates Wilson's algorithm.

Now in general, we see that if we begin Wilson's algorithm at a vertex o in a graph, it immediately generates one end of the tree containing o . In order for this tree to have more than one end, however, we need a succession of "coincidences" to occur, building up other ends by gradually adding on finite pieces. This is possible (see Exercises 9.14, 9.29, or 9.30), but it suggests that usually, the wired spanning forest has trees with only one end each. Indeed, we will show that this is very often the case.

▷ EXERCISE 9.14.

Give a transient graph such that the wired uniform spanning forest has a single tree with more than one end.

First, we consider the planar recurrent case, which has an amazingly simple solution:

THEOREM 9.18. *Suppose that G is a simple plane recurrent network and G^\dagger its planar dual. Assume that G^\dagger is locally finite and recurrent. Then the weighted random spanning tree on G has only one end a.s.*

Proof. Because both networks are recurrent, their free and wired spanning forests coincide and are a single tree a.s. We observed in Section 9.1 that the spanning tree T of G is dual to that of G^\dagger . If T had at least two ends, the bi-infinite path in T joining them would separate T^\times into at least two trees. Since we know that T^\times is a single tree, this is impossible. ◀

REMARK. It is shown in BLPS (2001) that the same is true on any recurrent transitive network. This was first stated for \mathbb{Z}^2 by Pemantle (1991).

REMARK. Loop-erased random walk is easily defined in any transient network. It is not well defined on recurrent networks in general, but this theorem provides a simple way to define loop-erased random walk from any vertex x on networks G that satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 9.18: just take the ray from x in the spanning tree.

REMARK. We can also define harmonic measure from infinity and even random walk and LERW from infinity. [**ADD DETAILS]

Similar reasoning shows:

PROPOSITION 9.19. *Suppose that G is a simple plane network and G^\dagger its planar dual. Assume that G^\dagger is locally finite. If each tree of the WSF of G has only one end a.s., then the FSF of G^\dagger has only one tree a.s. If, in addition, the WSF of G has infinitely many trees a.s., then the tree of the FSF of G^\dagger has infinitely many ends a.s.*

To handle the transient transitive case, we begin with the following result.

PROPOSITION 9.20. *If G is a transient transitive network, the WSF-expected degree of every vertex is 2.*

REMARK. The same is true in a recurrent transitive network, since it is then amenable [**DETAILS and lemmas].

Proof. Think of the wired spanning forest as oriented toward infinity from Wilson's algorithm; i.e., in drawing the forest, draw an arrow along each edge traversed in the direction it is traversed when the edge is included in the forest. Then the out-degree of every vertex is 1. Fix a vertex o . We need to show that the expected in-degree of o is 1. For this, it suffices to prove that for every neighbor x of o , the probability of the edge $x \rightarrow o$ is the same as the probability of the edge $o \rightarrow x$.

Now the probability of the edge $o \rightarrow x$ is $(\pi(o)\mathbf{P}_o[\tau_0^+ = \infty])^{-1}\mathbf{P}_x[\tau_o = \infty]$. We have

$$\mathbf{P}_x[\tau_o < \infty] = \mathbf{P}_o[\tau_x < \infty] \tag{9.15}$$

since $\pi_x = \pi_o$ and $\mathcal{G}(x, x) = \mathcal{G}(o, o)$ by transitivity; see Exercise 2.29. This gives the result. ◀

By Proposition 9.20 and Theorem 7.15, it follows that if G is a transient transitive network, each tree of the wired spanning forest has almost surely one or two ends. We will show that there is only one end in each tree a.s. in the unimodular case. We begin with the case where the forest is a single tree:

THEOREM 9.21. *If G is a transient transitive unimodular network and its wired spanning forest is a single tree a.s., then that tree has a single end a.s.*

Proof. If the tree T has 2 ends, then there is a unique bi-infinite path that does not backtrack such that one direction gives one end of T and the other direction gives the other end. Call this bi-infinite path the **trunk** of the tree. Let p be the probability that a vertex is on the trunk, which is the same for all vertices by transitivity. We want to show that $p = 0$.

Now by mixing (Corollary 9.10), the probability that x and y are both on the trunk tends to p^2 as their distance tends to infinity. By Wilson’s algorithm, for x and y to be on the trunk means that if loop-erased random walk is run from x , then random walk from y first hits this path at x . In particular, it hits x . However, the probability that random walk from y hits x goes to 0 as the distance between x and y tends to infinity:

$$\lim_{|y-x| \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_x[\exists n \geq 2|y-x| \quad X_n = x] = 0$$

by transience and

$$\mathbf{P}_x[\exists n \geq 2|y-x| \quad X_n = x] \geq \mathbf{P}_x[\tau_y < \infty] \mathbf{P}_y[\tau_x < \infty] = \mathbf{P}_y[\tau_x < \infty]^2$$

by (9.15). Thus, $\lim_{|y-x| \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_y[\tau_x < \infty] = 0$, as claimed. ◀

Finally, we deal with the general transient case. [**WELL, Cayley]

THEOREM 9.22. *If G is a transient Cayley network, then WSF-a.e. tree has only one end.*

Combining this with the above, we see that all Cayley graphs of groups that are not finite extensions of \mathbb{Z} have the property that WSF-a.e. tree has only one end. [**REFS]

The proof also works in case G is not Cayley, but only transitive with a unimodular automorphism group.

Proof. Coming soon. ◀

In contrast, we have:

PROPOSITION 9.23. *If G is a transitive network with $\text{WSF} \neq \text{FSF}$, then FSF-a.s., there is a tree with infinitely many ends — in fact, with branching number > 1 .*

Proof. We have that $\mathbf{E}_{\text{WSF}}[\text{deg}_T x] = 2$ for all x , whence $\mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}[\text{deg}_T x] > 2$ for all x . Apply Section 11.3 or Theorem 7.15 and ergodicity (Corollary 9.10). ◀

Open Question. Under the hypotheses of Proposition 9.23, does FSF-a.e. tree have infinitely many ends? Presumably, the answer is “yes”. It would suffice to know that delayed simple random walk on the free spanning forest is ergodic.

REMARK 9.24. Let $N_F = N_F(G)$ be the number of components of the FSF in a network G . If $\text{Aut}(G)$ has an infinite orbit, then ergodicity (Corollary 9.11) shows that $N_F(G)$ is a.s. constant. For general G , we have $\text{FSF}(N_F < \infty) \in \{0, 1\}$ by tail triviality (Theorem 9.12). To illustrate that N_F may be finite and larger than 1, we provide the following example: Let G_0 be formed by two copies of \mathbb{Z}^3 joined by an edge $[x, y]$; put $G := G_0 \times \mathbb{Z}$. By Proposition 9.6 and Exercise 3.7, $\text{FSF}(G) = \text{WSF}(G)$. Transience of \mathbb{Z}^3 implies that with positive probability, independent random walks in G_0 started at x and y have disjoint paths. Since simple random walk in G projects on G_0 to a (delayed) simple random walk, it follows that $N_F(G) \geq 2$ a.s. by Theorem 9.16. But by Pemantle’s theorem (Theorem 9.17 for \mathbb{Z}^4), $N_F(G) \leq 2$ a.s.

Finally, we mention the following beautiful extension of Pemantle’s Theorem 9.17; see Benjamini, Kesten, Peres, and Schramm (2001).

THEOREM 9.25. *Identify each tree in the uniform spanning forest on \mathbb{Z}^d to a single point. In the induced metric, the diameter of the resulting (locally infinite) graph is a.s. $\lfloor (d-1)/4 \rfloor$.*

Taking stock, we arrive at the following surprising results:

THEOREM 9.26. *If G is a self-dual planar Cayley graph “nicely” embedded in \mathbb{H}^2 , then the WSF of G has infinitely many trees a.s., each having one end a.s., while the FSF of G has one tree a.s. with infinitely many ends a.s. If G is a Cayley graph “nicely” embedded in \mathbb{H}^d for $d \geq 3$, then the WSF = FSF of G has infinitely many trees a.s., each having one end a.s.*

Proof. Use Theorems 2.26, 3.15, 9.22, and 3.5, and Propositions 9.6 and 9.19. ◀

An example of a self-dual planar Cayley graph “nicely” embedded in \mathbb{H}^2 was shown in Fig. 2.4.

Here is a summary of the phase transitions. It is quite surprising that the free spanning forest undergoes 3 phase transitions as the dimension increases. (We think of hyperbolic space as having infinitely many euclidean dimensions, since volume grows exponentially in

hyperbolic space, but only polynomially in euclidean space.)

	\mathbb{Z}^d		\mathbb{H}^d	
d	2 – 4	≥ 5	2	≥ 3
FSF: trees	1	∞	1	∞
ends	1	1	∞	1
WSF: trees	1	∞	∞	∞
ends	1	1	1	1

§9.4. Application: Harmonic Measure From Infinity.

Infinite loop-erased random walk is defined in any transient network by chronologically erasing cycles from the random walk path. On a recurrent network, the natural substitute is to run random walk until it first reaches distance n from its starting point, erase cycles, and take a weak limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

▷ EXERCISE 9.15.

Show that on a general recurrent network, such a weak limit need not exist.

In \mathbb{Z}^2 , weak convergence was established by Lawler (1988) using Harnack inequalities (see Lawler (1991), Prop. 7.4.2). Lawler’s approach yields explicit estimates of the rate of convergence, but is difficult to extend to other networks. Using spanning trees, we obtain the following general result.

▷ EXERCISE 9.16.

Let $\langle G_n \rangle$ be an exhaustion of a recurrent network G . Consider the network random walk $\langle X_o(k) \rangle$ started from $o \in G$. Denote by $\tau_{G_n^c}$ the first exit time of G_n , and let L_n be the loop erasure of the path $\langle X_o(k); 0 \leq k \leq \tau_{G_n^c} \rangle$. Show that if the random spanning tree T_G in G has one end a.s., then the random paths L_n converge weakly to the law of the unique ray from o in T_G . In particular, show that this applies if G is a proper planar network with a locally finite recurrent dual.

Let A be a finite set of vertices in a recurrent network G . Denote by τ_A the hitting time of A , and by h_u^A the harmonic measure from u on A :

$$\forall B \subseteq A \quad h_u^A(B) := \mathbf{P}_u[X_u(\tau_A) \in B].$$

If the measures h_u^A converge when $\text{dist}(u, A) \rightarrow \infty$, then it is natural to refer to the limit as **harmonic measure from ∞ on A** . This convergence fails in some recurrent networks (e.g., in \mathbb{Z}), but it does hold in \mathbb{Z}^2 ; see Lawler (1991), Thm. 2.1.3.

THEOREM 9.27. *Let G be a recurrent network and A be a finite set of vertices. Suppose that the random spanning tree T_G in G has one end a.s. Then the harmonic measures h_u^A converge as $\text{dist}(u, A) \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Add a finite set B of edges to G to form a graph G' in which the subgraph (A, B) is connected, and suppose that B is minimal with respect to this property. Assign unit conductance to the edges of B . Note that having at most one end in T is a tail event. Since $T_{G'}$ conditioned on $T_{G'} \cap B = \emptyset$ has the same distribution as T_G , by tail triviality (Theorem 9.12), a.s. $T_{G'}$ has one end. Similarly, because $T_{G'}$ conditioned on $T_{G'} \cap B = B$ has the same distribution as $T_{G'/B}$, also $T_{G'/B}$ has one end a.s.

The path from u to A in $T_{G'/B}$ is constructed by running a random walk from u until it hits A and then loop erasing. Thus, when $\text{dist}(u, A) \rightarrow \infty$, the measures h_u^A must tend to the conditional distribution, given $T_{G'} \cap B = B$, of the point in A that is closest (in $T_{G'/B}$) to the unique end of $T_{G'/B}$. ◀

§9.5. Application: Harmonic Dirichlet Functions.

This section is drawn from Benjamini, Lyons, and Schramm (1999).

The unique infinite percolation cluster of supercritical Bernoulli percolation on a graph, if there is such, can be viewed as a random perturbation of the graph. It is then natural to ask which properties of the graph are inherited by such a percolation cluster.

Let $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$ denote the class of networks that do not admit any nonconstant harmonic Dirichlet functions. We know from Exercise 9.9 that amenable transitive networks are in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$. We also know from Theorem 3.7 that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$ is invariant under rough isometries. Thus, it is natural to wonder how $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$ behaves under “percolation perturbations”. As we shall see below, the picture in the nonamenable situation is rather involved and our understanding is far from complete. In the amenable case, we have

THEOREM 9.28. *If G is an amenable Cayley graph and ω is Bernoulli percolation, then a.s. every cluster of ω is in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$.*

(See Theorem 9.32.)

A positive answer to the following question would extend Theorem 9.28:

QUESTION 9.29. Let G be a Cayley graph, and suppose that $G \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$. Let ω be Bernoulli percolation on G in the uniqueness phase. Does it follow that a.s. the infinite cluster of ω is in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$? We do not know the answer even in the case that G is the direct product of a tree and \mathbb{Z} or is a lattice in hyperbolic space \mathbb{H}^d ($d \geq 3$).

▷ EXERCISE 9.17.

Show that in the nonuniqueness phase of Bernoulli percolation on a (nonamenable) Cayley graph G , the infinite clusters are not in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$.

In the other direction, for graphs admitting nonconstant harmonic Dirichlet functions, we believe:

CONJECTURE 9.30. *Let G be a Cayley graph, $G \notin \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$. Then a.s. all infinite clusters of p -Bernoulli percolation are not in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$.*

We can prove this for p sufficiently large:

THEOREM 9.31. *Let G be a Cayley graph. If $G \notin \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$, then there is some $p_0 < 1$ such that for every $p \geq p_0$, almost surely no infinite cluster of p -Bernoulli percolation is in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$.*

(See Theorem 9.36.)

Write $\mathbf{E}_{\text{WSF}}^G, \mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}^G$ for expectation with respect to the random spanning forests on G .

We will prove our results for more general invariant percolation than Bernoulli percolation. Let \mathbf{E} refer to the probability measure of the percolation. Fix any base point $o \in V(G)$ and let \mathcal{A}_o be the event that the cluster $K(o)$ of o is infinite. Extending the notation above, we write $\mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}^\omega$ and $\mathbf{E}_{\text{WSF}}^\omega$ for expectation with respect to the free and wired spanning forest measures on ω (given ω).

THEOREM 9.32. ($\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$ STABILITY WHEN AMENABLE) *Let G be an amenable graph with a transitive automorphism group $\Gamma \subset \text{Aut}(G)$ and ω a Γ -invariant percolation. Then a.s. every component of ω is in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{HD}}$.*

Proof. We show that the measures FSF and WSF coincide on $K(o)$ a.s. given \mathcal{A}_o . By Exercise 7.30, a.s. no component in any invariant percolation on G can have more than 2 ends. Applying this to the percolations given by taking the FSF or the WSF of each component (independently for each component) of ω in conjunction with Exercise 7.32, we obtain that

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}_{\text{WSF}}^\omega[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}}^\omega o] \mid \mathcal{A}_o] = 2 = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}^\omega[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}}^\omega o] \mid \mathcal{A}_o].$$

Hence, the result follows from Exercise 9.7. ◀

LEMMA 9.33. (EXPECTED DEGREE FOR RECURRENT TREES) *Let G be a graph with a transitive unimodular closed automorphism group $\Gamma \subset \text{Aut}(G)$. Let ω be a Γ -invariant random forest in G . Suppose that a.s. all components of ω are recurrent. Then $\mathbf{E}[\text{deg}_\omega o] \leq 2$.*

Proof. From Theorem 7.15 and Exercise 7.32, we know that if the expected degree is larger than 2, then some component would have $p_c < 1$. Since the branching number of that component would then be larger than 1, it would follow from Theorem 2.19 that this component would be transient. ◀

DEFINITION 9.34. (ORIENTED WSF) Let G be a transient network and use Wilson’s method rooted at ∞ to get the wired spanning forest \mathfrak{F} . For every edge e of \mathfrak{F} , choose the orientation that agrees with the direction of the loop-erased walk of the method that inserted e into \mathfrak{F} . Call the resulting oriented graph the **wired spanning forest oriented towards infinity**, and let OWSF denote its law.

PROPOSITION 9.35. (AUTOMORPHISM INVARIANCE) *On a transient network, the OWSF is automorphism invariant.*

Proof. One needs to show only that when using Wilson’s method rooted at infinity, the order in which the starting vertices of the random walks are picked does not affect the distribution of the forest. Since this holds for finite graphs, the invariance of the OWSF follows by taking an exhaustion of G and using the proof of Proposition 9.1. Alternatively, the proof of Wilson’s algorithm in Section 8.1 also applies to the OWSF on a transient network. ◀

THEOREM 9.36. ($-\mathcal{O}_{\text{HD}}$ STABILITY WHEN HIGH MARGINALS) *Let G be a graph with a transitive unimodular closed automorphism group $\Gamma \subset \text{Aut}(G)$. If $G \notin \mathcal{O}_{\text{HD}}$, then there is some $p_0 < 1$ such that for every Γ -invariant bond percolation ω with $\inf_{e \in E} \mathbf{P}[e \in \omega] > p_0$, some component of ω is not in \mathcal{O}_{HD} with positive probability. If ω is ergodic and has indistinguishable components, then the same hypotheses imply that a.s., no infinite component of ω is in \mathcal{O}_{HD} .*

Proof. We show that $p_0 := 2/\mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}^G[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}} o]$ works.

First, $p_0 < 1$ by Proposition 9.6, Exercise 9.7, and Proposition 9.20. Let \mathcal{T}_o be the event that $K(o)$, the component of o in ω , is transient. We claim that

$$\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{T}_o] > 0 \tag{9.16}$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}_{\text{WSF}}^\omega[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}} o] \mid \mathcal{T}_o] = 2 < \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}^\omega[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}} o] \mid \mathcal{T}_o]. \tag{9.17}$$

This suffices for the first statement by Exercise 9.7. The second statement then follows by ergodicity.

Let \mathfrak{F}' be the union of components of \mathfrak{F} that are contained in recurrent components of ω . Lemma 9.33 implies that if $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{T}_o] < 1$, then $\mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}^\omega[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}} o \mid o \in \mathfrak{F}'] \leq 2$, which

means $\mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}^\omega[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}} o \mid \neg \mathcal{T}_o] \leq 2$. Consequently, (9.16) and the inequality in (9.17) will be established once we prove

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}^\omega[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}} o]] > p_0 \mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}^G[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}} o] = 2.$$

Now

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}^\omega[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}} o] = \sum_{x \sim o} \mathbf{P}_{\text{FSF}}^\omega[[o, x] \in \mathfrak{F}] = \sum_{\substack{x \sim o \\ [o, x] \in \omega}} \mathbf{P}_{\text{FSF}}^\omega[[o, x] \in \mathfrak{F}]. \quad (9.18)$$

Let B_n be the ball of radius n centered at o in G . By Kirchhoff's theorem (Corollary 8.4) and Rayleigh's Monotonicity Law, for each n and each $e \in \omega$,

$$\mathbf{P}_{\text{FSF}}^{\omega \cap B_n}[e \in \mathfrak{F}] \geq \mathbf{P}_{\text{FSF}}^{B_n}[e \in \mathfrak{F}].$$

Taking a limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}_{\text{FSF}}^\omega[e \in \mathfrak{F}] \geq \mathbf{P}_{\text{FSF}}[e \in \mathfrak{F}]$$

by the definition of the FUSF, whence (9.18) gives

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}^\omega[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}} o] \geq \sum_{\substack{x \sim o \\ [o, x] \in \omega}} \mathbf{P}_{\text{FSF}}^G[e \in \mathfrak{F}].$$

Taking expectation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}^\omega[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}} o]] &\geq \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{x \sim o} \mathbf{1}_{[o, x] \in \omega} \mathbf{P}_{\text{FSF}}^G[[o, x] \in \mathfrak{F}]\right] \\ &= \sum_{x \sim o} \mathbf{P}[[o, x] \in \omega] \mathbf{P}_{\text{FSF}}^G[[o, x] \in \mathfrak{F}] \\ &> \sum_{x \sim o} p_0 \mathbf{P}_{\text{FSF}}^G[[o, x] \in \mathfrak{F}] \\ &= p_0 \mathbf{E}_{\text{FSF}}^G[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}} o], \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

For the equality in (9.17), we use the oriented wired spanning forest, OWSF, on each transient component of ω , chosen independently on each component. Let $\varphi(x, y)$ be the probability that $(K(x)$ is transient and that) $[x, y]$ belongs to the oriented wired spanning forest of ω . Since OWSF is Γ -invariant, φ is invariant under the diagonal action of Γ , whence the Mass-Transport Principle says that

$$\sum_x \varphi(o, x) = \sum_x \varphi(x, o).$$

The left-hand side is the expected outdegree of o , which is $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{T}_o]$. Hence, the right-hand side, the expected in-degree of o , is also $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{T}_o]$. This shows that $\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}_{\text{WSF}}^\omega[\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{F}} o] \mid \mathcal{T}_o] = 2$. ◀

EXAMPLE 9.37. It does not suffice in Theorem 9.36 to assume merely that the components of ω are infinite. For example, if ω is given by the WUSF, then every component is a tree with one end (Theorem 9.21), whence is recurrent and in \mathcal{O}_{HD} . However, as stated in Conjecture 9.30, we believe that this *is* sufficient for Bernoulli percolation.

EXAMPLE 9.38. The hypothesis that Γ be unimodular cannot be omitted in Theorem 9.36. For example, let G be a regular tree of degree 3 and ξ be an end of G . Let Γ be the group of automorphisms of G that fix ξ . Let H_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, be the horocycles with respect to ξ . (More precisely, fix a base point $o \in \mathbf{V}$, let $\langle x_m \rangle$ be a sequence converging to ξ . Then a vertex x is in H_n iff $\text{dist}(x_m, x) - \text{dist}(x_m, o) = n$ for all but finitely many m .) To define ω , we first define a percolation η . Given any $p_0 < 1$, for each n independently, let all the edges joining H_n to H_{n+1} be in η with probability p_0 . Each component of η is a finite tree a.s. For each component K of η , let $n(K)$ be the largest n such that $K \cap H_n \neq \emptyset$. Choose an edge joining $K \cap H_{n(K)}$ to $H_{n(K)+1}$ at random uniformly among all such edges and independently for each K ; let η' be the set of the chosen edges (over all K). Now let $\omega := \eta \cup \eta'$. Each component of ω is a tree with exactly one end, so is recurrent and in \mathcal{O}_{HD} . Yet $G \notin \mathcal{O}_{\text{HD}}$.

QUESTION 9.39. Does Theorem 9.36 hold for Bernoulli percolation when the unimodularity assumption is omitted?

§9.6. Minimal Spanning Trees.

There is another way to specify a probability measure on the set of spanning trees of a finite graph $G = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$. Namely, suppose that we are given a total ordering of the edges, \prec . Define T to be the subgraph formed by all edges e whose endpoints cannot be joined by a path all of whose edges are smaller than e . We claim that T is a spanning tree. To see that T is a forest, suppose there were a cycle \mathcal{P} . Then since every edge in \mathcal{P} is in T , every edge in \mathcal{P} is smaller than every other edge in \mathcal{P} , an impossibility. To see that T is a tree (hence spanning), suppose that T had more than one component. Let e be the least edge joining two components of T . Then every other path joining the endpoints of e has some edge not lying in T , hence (by choice of e) larger than e . But then $e \in T$ by definition of T , a contradiction. If we think of the ordering as specifying (relative) lengths between the vertices and think of the vertices as rocks in a stream, then a hiker trying to get from x to y prefers the path in T in order to avoid getting wet. A probability measure μ on orderings \prec of \mathbf{E} induces a probability measure on spanning trees of G , the μ -**minimal spanning tree**. If the ordering of \mathbf{E} is given by an injection of \mathbf{E} into \mathbb{R} and uses the usual ordering of \mathbb{R} , then T is the spanning tree with minimal edge sum.

EXAMPLE 9.40. Given conductances on E and a vertex $x_0 \in V$, start a random walk at x_0 and order E by order of first traversal. This ordering induces the probability measure of Section 8.2, as we see from the Aldous-Broder method described in Section 8.4.

EXAMPLE 9.41. Let $Z(e)$ be independent uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables for $e \in E$. Then a.s. all $Z(e)$ are distinct, so their ordering in \mathbb{R} a.s. specifies a total ordering of E . The corresponding μ -minimal measure is called the **minimal spanning tree**.

▷ EXERCISE 9.18.

Show that every probability measure on spanning trees of a finite graph is a μ -minimal measure.

▷ EXERCISE 9.19.

Let G be the graph in Figure 9.2. There are 11 spanning trees of G . Show that under the minimal spanning tree measure, they are not all equally likely and calculate their probabilities. Show, however, that there are conductances giving the minimal spanning tree measure.




Figure 9.2.

▷ EXERCISE 9.20.

Let G be complete graph on 4 vertices (i.e., all pairs of vertices are joined by an edge). Calculate the minimal spanning tree measure and show that there are no conductances that give the minimal spanning tree measure.

We have an easy monotonicity principle for the minimal spanning tree measure:

PROPOSITION 9.42. *Let H be a subgraph of G and let e be an edge of H . Let μ_H and μ_G be the corresponding minimal spanning tree measures. Then $\mu_H(e \in T) \geq \mu_G(e \in T)$.*

§9.7. Minimal Spanning Forests.

On an infinite graph, we may take weak limits of the minimal spanning tree measures on a (free or wired) exhaustion, just as we did for the weighted spanning tree measures in Section 9.1. However, we may also define the limits directly on the graph. Since we will not need the definitions by exhaustion, we will give only the direct definitions. Given a total ordering \prec on the edges of a graph G , let $T(\prec)$ be the spanning forest given by the set of all edges e whose endpoints cannot be joined by any (finite) path all of whose edges are smaller than e . When the ordering \prec is random, given by independent uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables, which is a.s. a total ordering, the distribution of $T(\prec)$ is the **free minimal spanning forest**, denoted FMSF. On the other hand, given a total ordering \prec on the edges of a graph G , if e is an edge from each of whose endpoints there is an infinite path all of whose edges are smaller than e , say that the endpoints of e are joined by an infinite path all of whose edges are smaller than e . Let $T^*(\prec)$ be the spanning forest given by the set of all edges e whose endpoints cannot be joined by any finite or infinite path all of whose edges are smaller than e . When the ordering is given by independent uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables, the distribution of $T^*(\prec)$ is the **wired minimal spanning forest**, denoted WMSF.

▷ EXERCISE 9.21.

Show that all the trees in the free and wired minimal spanning forests are infinite.

Clearly $T^*(\prec) \subseteq T(\prec)$. That is, the free and wired minimal spanning forests are naturally coupled and the free minimal spanning forest stochastically dominates the wired minimal spanning forest. We therefore have the analogues of several results on weighted spanning forests, such as Exercise 9.5, Exercise 9.6, Proposition 9.4, Exercise 9.7, Corollary 9.5, and Theorem 9.13. That is:

- In an amenable graph, the average expected degree of vertices in both the free and wired minimal spanning forests is two.
- The free and wired minimal spanning forests are the same if they have a.s. the same finite number of trees, if they have the same single-edge probabilities, or if the expected degree of every vertex is the same for both measures.
- The free and wired minimal spanning forests are the same on any transitive amenable graph.

▷ EXERCISE 9.22.

Given a total ordering \prec of the edges of a graph, the **invasion tree** of a vertex x is defined as the union of the subgraphs G_n , where $G_0 := \{x\}$ and G_{n+1} is G_n together with the

smallest edge joining G_n to a vertex not in G_n . Let T be the union of all the invasion trees. (The invasion trees are not disjoint!) Show that T is also $T^*(\prec)$ as defined above.

[MORE EXERCISES ON INVASION PERCOLATION]

▷ EXERCISE 9.23.

Show that for the ladder graph of Exercise 8.5, the minimal spanning forest is a tree and calculate the chance that the bottom rung of the ladder is in the minimal spanning tree.

▷ EXERCISE 9.24.

Let $f(p)$ be the probability that two given neighbors in \mathbb{Z}^d are in different components in Bernoulli(p) percolation. Show that

$$\int_0^1 \frac{f(p)}{1-p} dp = \frac{1}{d}.$$

When are the free and wired minimal spanning forests the same? Say that a graph G has **almost everywhere uniqueness** (of the infinite cluster) if for almost every $p \in (0, 1)$ in the sense of Lebesgue measure, there is a.s. at most one infinite cluster for Bernoulli(p) percolation on G .

PROPOSITION 9.43. *On any graph G , we have $FMSF = WMSF$ iff G has almost everywhere uniqueness.*

Proof. Denote the label of an edge e by $Z(e)$. Suppose first that $FMSF \neq WMSF$. Then there is some edge e with $FMSF(e \in T) \neq WMSF(e \in T)$. Fix such an edge e . Then the event A that the endpoints of e are joined by an infinite path of edges with value $< Z(e)$ while not being joined by any finite path of edges with value $< Z(e)$ has positive probability. In particular, on A , the endpoints of e belong to distinct infinite clusters of edges with value $< Z(e)$. Thus, by Fubini's theorem, the values of $Z(e)$ on A form a set B of positive Lebesgue measure such that for almost every $p \in B$, there is with positive probability more than one infinite cluster for Bernoulli(p) percolation on $G \setminus e$, whence on G . That is, G does not have almost everywhere uniqueness.

For the converse, suppose that almost everywhere uniqueness does not hold. Then there is a set B of positive Lebesgue measure and there are two vertices x, y such that for a.e. $p \in B$, Bernoulli(p) percolation leaves the vertices x and y in distinct infinite clusters with positive probability. Considering any fixed finite path \mathcal{P} joining x and y , we see that the same is true for some pair of adjacent vertices on \mathcal{P} , whence we may assume that x and y are themselves joined by an edge e . Therefore, given $Z(e) \in B$, there is positive probability that x and y are joined by an infinite path while not being joined by a finite path. That is, $FMSF \neq WMSF$. ◀

Since \mathbb{Z}^d is an amenable transitive graph, it follows that it has almost everywhere uniqueness. In fact, it has uniqueness for *every* value of the survival parameter (Burton and Keane (1989); see Theorem 6.6).

▷ EXERCISE 9.25.

Show that if G is a tree, then the free and wired minimal spanning forests are the same iff $p_c(G) = 1$.

THEOREM 9.44. (CHAYES, CHAYES, AND NEWMAN, 1985) *The minimal spanning forest of \mathbb{Z}^2 is a.s. a tree.*

Proof. ... ◀

Open Question. For which d is the minimal spanning forest of \mathbb{Z}^d is a.s. a tree?

§9.8. Open Questions.

There are many open questions related to spanning forests.

CONJECTURE 9.45. *Each component tree of the wired uniform spanning forest on any graph G is recurrent a.s. for simple random walk. More generally, if the edges in the components of the WSF on a network with bounded conductance are given the conductances they have in the network, then all the components are recurrent a.s.*

This conjecture has been proved by Morris (2003); the proof will appear here soon. Morris's proof will also be used to give a simpler proof and generalization of parts of Theorem 9.22.

QUESTION 9.46. Let G be a proper transient planar graph with bounded degree and a bounded number of sides to its faces. Is the free spanning forest a single tree a.s.? If true, this would strengthen Theorem 3.9: that theorem implies that WUSF \neq FUSF. Also, WUSF has infinitely many trees [**NEEDS MORE EXPLANATION and should be in the text].

QUESTION 9.47. If a graph has spectral radius < 1 , must each tree in its wired uniform spanning forest have one end a.s.?

QUESTION 9.48. Does each component in the wired uniform spanning forest on an infinite supercritical Galton-Watson tree have one end a.s.?

The following question was suggested by O. Häggström:

QUESTION 9.49. Let G be a transitive network. By Remark 9.24, the number of trees of the FSF is a.s. constant. Is it 1 or ∞ a.s.?

QUESTION 9.50. Under the hypotheses of Proposition 9.23, does FSF-a.e. tree have infinitely many ends?

QUESTION 9.51. Let G be a transitive network with $\text{WSF} \neq \text{FSF}$. Must *all* components of the FSF have infinitely many ends a.s.?

In view of Proposition 9.23, this would follow in the unimodular case from a proof of the following conjecture:

CONJECTURE 9.52. *The components of the FSF on a unimodular transitive graph are indistinguishable in the sense that for every automorphism-invariant property \mathcal{A} of subgraphs, either a.s. all components satisfy \mathcal{A} or a.s. they all do not. The same holds for the WSF.*

This fails in the nonunimodular setting, as an example in Lyons and Schramm (1999) shows.

QUESTION 9.53. Is there a “natural” monotone coupling of FSF and WSF? For example, if G is a Cayley graph, is there a monotone coupling that is invariant under multiplication by elements of G ?

QUESTION 9.54. Let G be an infinite network such that $\text{WSF} \neq \text{FSF}$ on G . Does it follow that WSF and FSF are mutually singular measures?

This question has a positive answer for trees (there is exactly one component FSF-a.s. on a tree, while the number of components is a constant WSF-a.s. by Theorem 9.16) and for networks G where $\text{Aut}(G)$ has an infinite orbit (Corollary 9.11).

CONJECTURE 9.55. *Let T_o be the component of the identity o in the WSF on a Cayley graph, and let $\xi = \langle x_n; n \geq 0 \rangle$ be the unique ray from o in T_o . The sequence of “bushes” $\langle b_n \rangle$ observed along ξ converges in distribution. (Formally, b_n is the connected component of x_n in $T \setminus x_{n-1} - x_{n+1}$, multiplied on the left by x_n^{-1} .)*

QUESTION 9.56. (This question was also asked by Propp (1997).) One may consider the uniform spanning tree on \mathbb{Z}^2 embedded in \mathbb{R}^2 . In fact, consider it on $\epsilon\mathbb{Z}^2$ in \mathbb{R}^2 and let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. In what sense should a limit be taken, and how can one show the limit exists? Does the limit have some conformal invariance property?

Some reasonable answers to the question of how to define the scaling limit have been given by Aizenman, Burchard, Newman, and Wilson (1999) and Schramm (2000). Still, the existence and conformal invariance of the limit remain open.

The invariance asked for in Question 9.56 could be expected on the basis of conformal invariance of simple random walk. It is also supported by some computer simulations of O. Schramm. In addition, the uniform spanning tree is intimately tied to random domino tiling of \mathbb{Z}^2 : see, e.g., Burton and Pemantle (1993). Kenyon (2000a) shows that domino tilings have a strong form of conformal invariance and proves the conformal invariance of certain properties in Kenyon (2000b). Nonrigorous conformal field theory was used by Duplantier (1992) and Majumdar (1992) to estimate the rate of escape of loop-erased walks in \mathbb{Z}^2 . Finally, critical Bernoulli percolation is believed to have conformal invariance in the limit (see, e.g., Langlands, Pouliot, and Saint-Aubin (1994) and Benjamini and Schramm (1998)) and the uniform spanning tree is a critical model, as explained in BLPS (2001), Section 13. This conformal invariance has been proved for site percolation on the triangular lattice by Smirnov (2001).




Figure 9.3. The inside of this lattice-filling curve is a uniform spanning tree on a square grid, while the outside is another on the dual grid (wired).

Tóth and Werner (1998), §11, explain the connection between certain self-repelling random walks on \mathbb{Z} and simple oriented random walk on \mathbb{Z}^2 that is oriented so that only steps to the right and up are possible. Of course, simple oriented random walk never visits any state more than once. Tóth and Werner consider coalescing paths of this Markov

chain; these paths form the wired random spanning tree of \mathbb{Z}^2 that is associated to this chain by Wilson’s method rooted at infinity (analogously to the reversible case studied here). The dual of this tree is considered, as well as the lattice-filling curve that “threads” between the two trees; see Figure 9.3 for the lattice-filling curve of a *uniform* spanning tree. Their paper is devoted to analyzing the continuous analogue of these objects in the *oriented* case. In particular, a stochastic differential equation describes their space-filling curve. Note that the lattice-filling curve completely determines the tree and its dual. There is also a stochastic differential equation that is conjectured to determine the space-filling curve that presumably is the limit as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ of the lattice-filling curves threading between the uniform spanning tree and its dual on $\epsilon\mathbb{Z}^2$. More details on this conjecture appear in Schramm (2000). In fact, the conjecture has not been proved; see Lawler, Schramm, and Werner (2004).

QUESTION 9.57. If T is a tree, does the WSF on T corresponding to RW_λ have all its trees with branching number λ a.s., provided λ is at most the branching number of T ? See Exercise 9.29.

QUESTION 9.58. If G is a Cayley graph of a finitely presented group Γ , is the FUSF-expected degree of o a rational number? It can be shown that this expected degree is the same for all Cayley graphs of Γ , equal to the first L^2 -Betti number of Γ . Atiyah has conjectured that all the L^2 -Betti numbers are rational if Γ is finitely presented.

QUESTION 9.59. If G is a Cayley graph, \mathfrak{F} is the FUSF on G , and $\epsilon > 0$, is there an invariant connected percolation ω containing \mathfrak{F} such that for every edge e , the probability that $e \in \omega \setminus \mathfrak{F}$ is less than ϵ ? This question was asked by D. Gaboriau (personal communication, 2001), since a positive answer would imply that the cost of each group is equal to 1 plus its first L^2 -Betti number. See Gaboriau (2002).

QUESTION 9.60. For which d is the minimal spanning forest of \mathbb{Z}^d a.s. a tree?

§9.9. Notes.

The free spanning forest was first suggested by Lyons, but its existence was proved by Pemantle (1991). Pemantle also implicitly proved the existence of the wired spanning forest and showed that the free and wired uniform spanning forests are the same on euclidean lattices \mathbb{Z}^d . The first explicit construction of the wired spanning forest is due to Häggström (1995). In an entirely different context, that of euclidean functionals (such as length of the minimal spanning tree), it has also been recently discovered that comparing to a “wired” version is extremely useful: see Redmond and Yukich (1994) and Yukich (1996b, 1996a), for example.

The version we present of Strassen’s theorem, Theorem 9.3, is only a special case of what he proved.

Pemantle (1991) proved the precursor of Theorem 9.16, namely, that in \mathbb{Z}^d for $d \geq 5$, the uniform spanning forest has infinitely many trees a.s. His reasoning was completely different. He also showed that for $d = 3, 4$, the tree has only one end a.s., while for $d \geq 5$, each tree has at most 2 ends a.s.

§9.10. Additional Exercises.

9.26. Let G be a planar Cayley graph. Show that simple random walk on G is recurrent iff G is amenable iff the growth rate of G is 1 (i.e., G has subexponential growth).

9.27. For a function $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, define

$$\widehat{f}(x) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f(\alpha) e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \alpha} d\alpha.$$

Let Y be the transfer current matrix for the hypercubic lattice \mathbb{Z}^d . Write $u_k := \mathbf{1}_{\{k\}}$ for the vector with a 1 in the k th place and 0s elsewhere. Let $e_x^k := [x, x + u_k]$. Show that $Y(e_0^1, e_x^k) = \widehat{f}_k(x)$, where

$$f_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) := \frac{\sin^2 \pi \alpha_1}{\sum_{j=1}^d \sin^2 \pi \alpha_j}$$

and

$$f_k(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) := \frac{(1 - e^{-2\pi i \alpha_1})(1 - e^{-2\pi i \alpha_k})}{4 \sum_{j=1}^d \sin^2 \pi \alpha_j}.$$

9.28. Let $d \geq 3$ and let e be any edge of \mathbb{Z}^d . For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, let X_n be the indicator that $e + (n, n, \dots, n)$ lies in the uniform spanning forest of \mathbb{Z}^d . Show that X_n are i.i.d. The same holds for the other 2^{d-1} collections of translates given by possibly changing the signs of the last $d - 1$ coordinates.

9.29. Show that a.s. all the trees in the wired spanning forest on a d -ary tree corresponding to the random walk RW_λ have branching number λ for $1 \leq \lambda \leq d$.

9.30. Let T be an arbitrary tree with arbitrary conductances and root o . For a vertex $x \in T$, let $\alpha(x)$ denote the effective conductance of T^x (from x to infinity). Consider the independent percolation on T that keeps the edge preceding x with probability $1/(1 + \alpha(x))$. Show that the WSF on T has a tree with more than one end with positive probability iff percolation on T occurs. In the case of WUSF on a spherically symmetric tree, show that this is equivalent to

$$\sum_n \frac{1}{|T_n|^2 \rho_n} \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{|T_k| \rho_k} \right) < \infty,$$

where $\rho_n := \sum_{k>n} 1/|T_k|$. In particular, show that this holds if $|T_n| \approx n^a$ for $a > 1$.

9.31. Suppose that each edge e of a transitive graph G has a random conductance $c(e) \in [0, \infty)$. The random variables $c(e)$ are the **environment** of the random walk, and such a walk is called a **random walk in a random environment** (RWRE). Show that if the distribution of the random environment is automorphism invariant, then a.s. each component of $(\mathbf{V}(G), \{e; c(e) > 0\})$ is in \mathcal{O}_{HD} (where \mathcal{O}_{HD} refers to harmonic Dirichlet functions with respect to the conductances).

9.32. Consider the Cayley graph corresponding to the presentation $\langle a, b, c, d \mid a^2, b^2, c^2, abd^{-1} \rangle$. Show that the expected degree of a vertex in the FMSF is $17/5$.

Chapter 10

Limit Theorems for Galton-Watson Processes

Our first section contains a conceptual tool that will be used for proving some classical limit theorems for Galton-Watson branching processes. The relationship between trees with $p_0 > 0$ and those with $p_0 = 0$ will be described in Section 10.5.

§10.1. Size-biased Trees and Immigration.

This section and the next two are adapted from Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres (1995a). Recall from Section 4.1

THE KESTEN-STIGUM THEOREM (1966). *The following are equivalent when $1 < m < \infty$:*

- (i) $\mathbf{P}[W = 0] = q$;
- (ii) $\mathbf{E}[W] = 1$;
- (iii) $\mathbf{E}[L \log^+ L] < \infty$.

Although condition (iii) appears technical, there is a conceptual proof of the theorem that uses only the crudest estimates. The dichotomy of Corollary 4.7 as expanded in the Kesten-Stigum theorem turns out to arise from the following elementary dichotomy:

LEMMA 10.1. *Let X, X_1, X_2, \dots be nonnegative i.i.d. random variables. Then a.s.*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} X_n = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{E}[X] < \infty, \\ \infty & \text{if } \mathbf{E}[X] = \infty. \end{cases}$$

▷ EXERCISE 10.1.

Prove this by using the Borel-Cantelli lemma.

▷ EXERCISE 10.2.

Given X, X_n as in Lemma 10.1, show that if $\mathbf{E}[X] < \infty$, then $\sum_n e^{X_n} c^n < \infty$ for all $c \in (0, 1)$, while if $\mathbf{E}[X] = \infty$, then $\sum_n e^{X_n} c^n = \infty$ for all $c \in (0, 1)$.

This dichotomy will be applied to an auxiliary random variable. Let \widehat{L} be a random variable whose distribution is that of **size-biased** L ; i.e.,

$$\mathbf{P}[\widehat{L} = k] = \frac{k p_k}{m}.$$

Then

$$\mathbf{E}[\log^+ \widehat{L}] = \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{E}[L \log^+ L].$$

Lemma 10.1 will be applied to $\log^+ \widehat{L}$.

▷ EXERCISE 10.3.

Let X be a nonnegative random variable with $0 < \mathbf{E}[X] < \infty$. We say that \widehat{X} has the **size-biased distribution** of X if $\mathbf{P}[\widehat{X} \in A] = \mathbf{E}[X \mathbf{1}_A(X)] / \mathbf{E}[X]$ for intervals $A \subseteq [0, \infty)$. Show that this is equivalent to $\mathbf{E}[f(\widehat{X})] = \mathbf{E}[X f(X)] / \mathbf{E}[X]$ for all Borel $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$.

▷ EXERCISE 10.4.

Suppose that X_n are nonnegative random variables such that $\mathbf{P}[X_n > 0] / \mathbf{E}[X_n] \rightarrow 0$. Show that \widehat{X}_n tends to infinity in probability.

We will now define certain “size-biased” random trees, called **size-biased Galton-Watson trees**. Note that this, as well as the usual Galton-Watson process, will be a way of putting a measure on the space of trees, which we think of as rooted and labelled. We will show that the Kesten-Stigum dichotomy is equivalent to the following: these two measures on the space of trees are either mutually absolutely continuous or mutually singular. The law of this random tree will be denoted $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$, whereas the law of an ordinary Galton-Watson tree is denoted \mathbf{GW} .

▷ EXERCISE 10.5.

To be rigorous, we should say just what the space of trees is. One approach is as follows. A **rooted labelled tree** T is a non-empty collection of finite sequences of positive integers such that if $\langle i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n \rangle \in T$, then for every $k \in [0, n]$, also the initial segment $\langle i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k \rangle \in T$, where the case $i = 0$ means the empty sequence; and for every $j \in [1, i_n]$, also the sequence $\langle i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{n-1}, j \rangle \in T$. The root of the tree is the empty sequence, \emptyset . Thus, $\langle i_1, \dots, i_n \rangle$ is the i_n th child of the i_{n-1} th child of ... of the i_1 th child of the root. The **height** of a tree is the supremum of the lengths of the sequences in the tree. If T is a tree and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, write the **truncation** of T to its first n levels as $T \upharpoonright n := \{ \langle i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k \rangle \in T; k \leq n \}$. This is a tree of height at most n . A tree is called **locally finite** if its truncation to every finite level is finite. Let \mathcal{T}

be the space of rooted labelled locally finite trees. We define a metric on \mathcal{T} by setting $d(T, T') := (1 + \sup\{n; T|_n = T'|_n\})^{-1}$. Verify that d is a metric and that \mathcal{T} is complete and separable.

▷ EXERCISE 10.6.

Define the measure \mathbf{GW} formally on the space \mathcal{T} of Exercise 10.5.

The construction of size-biased trees can be motivated by the general principle that in order to study asymptotics, it is useful to construct a suitable limiting object first. In the supercritical case, to study the asymptotic behavior of the martingale $W_n := Z_n/m^n$ with respect to \mathbf{GW} , it is natural to multiply the martingale times the measure and investigate the resulting sequence of measures $W_n \cdot \mathbf{GW}$; these will converge weakly to $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$. When $m \leq 1$, the size-biased tree may be obtained by conditioning a Galton-Watson tree to survive forever. Now since W_n is the normalized size of the n th generation, a probabilistic way of biasing \mathbf{GW} according to W_n is to choose uniformly a random vertex in the n th generation; the resulting joint distribution will be called $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$. These remarks will not be used explicitly, but they motivate the definitions that follow.

For a tree t with Z_n vertices at level n , write $W_n(t) := Z_n/m^n$. For any rooted tree t and any $n \geq 0$, denote by $[t]_n$ the set of rooted trees whose first n levels agree with those of t . (In particular, if the height of t is less than n , then $[t]_n = \{t\}$.) If v is a vertex at the n th level of t , then let $[t; v]_n$ denote the set of **trees with distinguished paths** such that the tree is in $[t]_n$ and the path starts from the root, does not backtrack, and goes through v .

In order to construct $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$, we will construct a measure $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$ on the set of infinite trees with infinite distinguished paths; this measure will satisfy

$$\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*[t; v]_n = \frac{1}{m^n} \mathbf{GW}[t]_n \quad (10.1)$$

for all n and all $[t; v]_n$ as above. By using the branching property and the fact that the expected number of children of v is m , it is easy to verify consistency of these finite-height distributions. Kolmogorov's existence theorem thus provides such a measure $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$. However, this verification may be skipped, as we will give a more useful direct construction of a measure with these marginals in a moment.

Note that *if* a measure $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$ satisfying (10.1) exists, then its projection to the space of trees, which is denoted simply by $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$, automatically satisfies

$$\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}[t]_n = W_n(t) \mathbf{GW}[t]_n \quad (10.2)$$

for all n and all trees t . It is for this reason that we call $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$ “size-biased”.

How do we define $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$? Assuming still that (10.1) holds, note that the recursive structure of Galton-Watson trees yields a recursion for $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$. Assume that t is a tree of height at least $n + 1$ and that the root of t has k children with descendant trees $t^{(1)}, t^{(2)}, \dots, t^{(k)}$. Any vertex v in level $n + 1$ of t is in one of these, say $t^{(i)}$. Now

$$\mathbf{GW}[t]_{n+1} = p_k \prod_{j=1}^k \mathbf{GW}[t^{(j)}]_n = kp_k \cdot \frac{1}{k} \cdot \mathbf{GW}[t^{(i)}]_n \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} \mathbf{GW}[t^{(j)}]_n.$$

Thus any measure $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$ that satisfies (10.1) must satisfy the recursion

$$\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*[t; v]_{n+1} = \frac{kp_k}{m} \cdot \frac{1}{k} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*[t^{(i)}; v]_n \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} \mathbf{GW}[t^{(j)}]_n. \quad (10.3)$$

Conversely, if a probability measure $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$ on the set of trees with distinguished paths satisfies this recursion, then by induction it satisfies (10.1); this observation leads to the following direct construction of $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$.

Recall that \widehat{L} is a random variable whose distribution is that of size-biased L , i.e., $\mathbf{P}[\widehat{L} = k] = kp_k/m$. To construct a size-biased Galton-Watson tree \widehat{T} , start with an initial particle v_0 . Give it a random number \widehat{L}_1 of children, where \widehat{L}_1 has the law of \widehat{L} . Pick one of these children at random, v_1 . Give the *other* children independently ordinary Galton-Watson descendant trees and give v_1 an independent size-biased number \widehat{L}_2 of children. Again, pick one of the children of v_1 at random, call it v_2 , and give the others ordinary Galton-Watson descendant trees. Continue in this way indefinitely. (See Figure 10.1.) Note that since $\widehat{L} \geq 1$, size-biased Galton-Watson trees are always infinite (there is no extinction).

Now we can finally **define** the measure $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$ as the joint distribution of the random tree \widehat{T} and the random path $\langle v_0, v_1, v_2, \dots \rangle$. This measure clearly satisfies the recursion (10.3), and hence also (10.1).

Note that, given the first n levels of the tree \widehat{T} , the measure $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$ makes the vertex v_n in the random path $\langle v_0, v_1, \dots \rangle$ uniformly distributed on the n th level of \widehat{T} ; this is not obvious from the explicit construction of this random path, but it is immediate from the formula (10.1) in which the right-hand side does not depend on v .

▷ EXERCISE 10.7.

Define $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$ formally on a space analogous to the space \mathcal{T} of Exercise 10.5 and define $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$ formally on \mathcal{T} .




Figure 10.1. Schematic representation of size-biased Galton-Watson trees.

The vertices off the distinguished path $\langle v_0, v_1, \dots \rangle$ of the size-biased tree form a **branching process with immigration**. In general, such a process is defined by two distributions, an offspring distribution and an immigration distribution. The process starts with no particles, say, and at every generation $n \geq 1$, there is an immigration of Y_n particles, where Y_n are i.i.d. with the given immigration law. Meanwhile, each particle has, independently, an ordinary Galton-Watson descendant tree with the given offspring distribution.

Thus, the $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$ -law of $Z_n - 1$ is the same as that of the generation sizes of an immigration process with $Y_n = \widehat{L}_n - 1$. The probabilistic content of the assumption $\mathbf{E}[L \log^+ L] < \infty$ will arise in applying Lemma 10.1 to the variables $\langle \log^+ Y_n \rangle$, since $\mathbf{E}[\log^+(\widehat{L} - 1)] = m^{-1} \mathbf{E}[L \log^+(L - 1)]$.

§10.2. Supercritical Processes: Proof of the Kesten-Stigum Theorem.

The following lemma is more or less standard.

LEMMA 10.2. *Let μ be a finite measure and ν a probability measure on a σ -field \mathcal{F} . Suppose that \mathcal{F}_n are increasing sub- σ -fields whose union generates \mathcal{F} and that $(\mu|\mathcal{F}_n)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $(\nu|\mathcal{F}_n)$ with Radon-Nikodým derivative X_n . Set $X := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n$. Then*

$$\mu \ll \nu \iff X < \infty \quad \mu\text{-a.e.} \iff \int X \, d\nu = \int d\mu$$

and

$$\mu \perp \nu \iff X = \infty \quad \mu\text{-a.e.} \iff \int X d\nu = 0.$$

Proof. As $\langle (X_n, \mathcal{F}_n) \rangle$ is a nonnegative martingale with respect to ν (see Exercise 10.16), it converges to X ν -a.s. and $X < \infty$ ν -a.s. We claim that the lemma follows from the following decomposition of μ into a ν -absolutely continuous part and a ν -singular part:

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{F} \quad \mu(A) = \int_A X d\nu + \mu(A \cap \{X = \infty\}). \quad (10.4)$$

For if $\mu \ll \nu$, then $X < \infty$ μ -a.e.; if $X < \infty$ μ -a.e., then by (10.4), $\int X d\nu = \int d\mu$; and if $\int X d\nu = \int d\mu$, then by (10.4), $X < \infty$ μ -a.e. and $\mu \ll \nu$. On the other hand, if $\mu \perp \nu$, then there is a set A with $\mu(A^c) = 0 = \nu(A)$, which, by (10.4), implies $\mu(A \cap \{X = \infty\}) = \mu(A)$, whence $X = \infty$ μ -a.e.; if $X = \infty$ μ -a.e., then by (10.4), $\int X d\nu = 0$; and if $\int X d\nu = 0$, then by (10.4), $X = \infty$ μ -a.e., whence $\mu \perp \nu$.

To establish (10.4), suppose first that $\mu \ll \nu$ with Radon-Nikodým derivative \tilde{X} . Then X_n is (a version of) the conditional expectation of \tilde{X} given \mathcal{F}_n (with respect to ν), whence $X_n \rightarrow \tilde{X}$ ν -a.s. by the martingale convergence theorem. In particular, $X = \tilde{X}$ ν -a.s., so the decomposition is simply the definition of Radon-Nikodým derivative.

In order to treat the general case, we use a common trick: define the probability measure $\rho := (\mu + \nu)/C$, where $C := \int d(\mu + \nu)$. Then $\mu, \nu \ll \rho$, so that we may apply what we have just shown to the variables $U_n := d(\mu|\mathcal{F}_n)/d(\rho|\mathcal{F}_n)$ and $V_n := d(\nu|\mathcal{F}_n)/d(\rho|\mathcal{F}_n)$. Let $U := \limsup U_n$ and $V := \limsup V_n$. Since $U_n + V_n = C$ ρ -a.s., it follows that $\rho(\{U = V = 0\}) = 0$ and thus

$$U/V = \lim U_n / \lim V_n = \lim(U_n/V_n) = \lim X_n = X \quad \rho\text{-a.s.}$$

Therefore, for $A \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\mu(A) = \int_A U d\rho = \int_A X V d\rho + \int_A \mathbf{1}_{\{V=0\}} U d\rho,$$

which is the same as (10.4). ◀

The Kesten-Stigum theorem will be an immediate consequence of the following theorem on the growth rate of immigration processes.

THEOREM 10.3. (SENETA, 1970) *Let Z_n be the generation sizes of a Galton-Watson process with immigration Y_n . Let $m := \mathbf{E}[L] > 1$ be the mean of the offspring law and let*

Y have the same law as Y_n . If $\mathbf{E}[\log^+ Y] < \infty$, then $\lim Z_n/m^n$ exists and is finite a.s., while if $\mathbf{E}[\log^+ Y] = \infty$, then $\limsup Z_n/c^n = \infty$ a.s. for every constant $c > 0$.

Proof. (Asmussen and Hering (1983), pp. 50–51) Assume first that $\mathbf{E}[\log^+ Y] = \infty$. By Lemma 10.1, $\limsup Y_n/c^n = \infty$ a.s. Since $Z_n \geq Y_n$, the result follows.

Now assume that $\mathbf{E}[\log^+ Y] < \infty$. Let \mathcal{G} be the σ -field generated by $\{Y_k; k \geq 1\}$. Let $Z_{n,k}$ be the number of descendants at level n of the particles that immigrated in generation k . Thus, the total number of vertices at level n is $\sum_{k=1}^n Z_{n,k}$. Note that conditioning on \mathcal{G} is just fixing values for all Y_k ; since Y_k are independent of all other random variables, conditioning on \mathcal{G} amounts to using Fubini’s theorem. With our new notation, we have

$$\mathbf{E}[Z_n/m^n \mid \mathcal{G}] = \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^n} \sum_{k=1}^n Z_{n,k} \mid \mathcal{G}\right] = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{m^k} \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{Z_{n,k}}{m^{n-k}} \mid \mathcal{G}\right].$$

Now for $k \leq n$, the random variable $Z_{n,k}/m^{n-k}$ is the $(n - k)$ th element of the ordinary Galton-Watson martingale sequence starting, however, with Y_k particles. Therefore, its conditional expectation is just Y_k and so

$$\mathbf{E}[Z_n/m^n \mid \mathcal{G}] = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{Y_k}{m^k}.$$

Our assumption gives, by Exercise 10.2, that this series converges a.s. This implies by Fatou’s lemma that $\liminf Z_n/m^n < \infty$ a.s. Finally, since $\langle Z_n/m^n \rangle$ is a submartingale when conditioned on \mathcal{G} with bounded expectation (given \mathcal{G}), it converges a.s. ◀

Proof of the Kesten-Stigum Theorem. (Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres, 1995a) Rewrite (10.2) as follows. Let \mathcal{F}_n be the σ -field generated by the first n levels of trees. Then (10.2) is the same as

$$\frac{d(\widehat{\mathbf{GW}} \mid \mathcal{F}_n)}{d(\mathbf{GW} \mid \mathcal{F}_n)}(t) = W_n(t). \tag{10.5}$$

In order to define W for every infinite tree t , set

$$W(t) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_n(t).$$

From (10.5) and Lemma 10.2 follows the key dichotomy:

$$\int W d\mathbf{GW} = 1 \iff \widehat{\mathbf{GW}} \ll \mathbf{GW} \iff W < \infty \quad \widehat{\mathbf{GW}}\text{-a.s.} \tag{10.6}$$

while

$$W = 0 \quad \mathbf{GW}\text{-a.s.} \iff \mathbf{GW} \perp \widehat{\mathbf{GW}} \iff W = \infty \quad \widehat{\mathbf{GW}}\text{-a.s.} \tag{10.7}$$

This is key because it allows us to change the problem from one about the **GW**-behavior of W to one about the $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$ -behavior of W . Indeed, since the $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$ -behavior of W is described by Theorem 10.3, the theorem is immediate: if $\mathbf{E}[L \log^+ L] < \infty$, i.e., $\mathbf{E}[\log^+ \widehat{L}] < \infty$, then $W < \infty$ $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$ -a.s. by Theorem 10.3, whence $\int W d\mathbf{GW} = 1$ by (10.6); while if $\mathbf{E}[L \log^+ L] = \infty$, then $W = \infty$ $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$ -a.s. by Theorem 10.3, whence $W = 0$ **GW**-a.s. by (10.7). ◀

§10.3. Subcritical Processes.

When a Galton-Watson process is subcritical or critical, the questions we asked in Section 4.1 about rate of growth are inappropriate. Other questions come to mind, however, such as: How quickly does the process die out? One way to make this question precise is to ask for the decay rate of $\mathbf{P}[Z_n > 0]$. An easy estimate in the subcritical case is

$$\mathbf{P}[Z_n > 0] \leq \mathbf{E}[Z_n] = m^n. \tag{10.8}$$

We will determine in this section when m^n is the right decay rate (up to some factor), while in the next section, we will treat the critical case.

THEOREM 10.4. (HEATHCOTE, SENETA, AND VERE-JONES, 1967) *For any Galton-Watson process with $0 < m < \infty$, the sequence $\langle \mathbf{P}[Z_n > 0]/m^n \rangle$ is decreasing. If $m < 1$, then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}[Z_n > 0]/m^n > 0$;
- (ii) $\sup \mathbf{E}[Z_n \mid Z_n > 0] < \infty$;
- (iii) $\mathbf{E}[L \log^+ L] < \infty$.

The fact that (i) holds when $\mathbf{E}[L^2] < \infty$ was proved by Kolmogorov (1938).

In order to prove Theorem 10.4, we use an approach analogous to that in the preceding section: We combine a general lemma with a result on immigration.

LEMMA 10.5. *Let $\langle \nu_n \rangle$ be a sequence of probability measures on the positive integers with finite means a_n . Let $\widehat{\nu}_n$ be size-biased, i.e., $\widehat{\nu}_n(k) = k\nu_n(k)/a_n$. If $\{\widehat{\nu}_n\}$ is tight, then $\sup a_n < \infty$, while if $\widehat{\nu}_n \rightarrow \infty$ in distribution, then $a_n \rightarrow \infty$.*

▷ EXERCISE 10.8.

Prove Lemma 10.5.

THEOREM 10.6. (HEATHCOTE, 1966) *Let Z_n be the generation sizes of a Galton-Watson process with immigration Y_n . Let Y have the same law as Y_n . Suppose that the mean m of the offspring random variable L is less than 1. If $\mathbf{E}[\log^+ Y] < \infty$, then Z_n converges in distribution to a proper random variable, while if $\mathbf{E}[\log^+ Y] = \infty$, then Z_n converges in probability to infinity.*

The following proof is a slight improvement on Asmussen and Hering (1983), pp. 52–53.

Proof. Let \mathcal{G} be the σ -field generated by $\{Y_k; k \geq 1\}$. For any n , let $Z_{n,k}$ be the number of descendants at level n of the vertices that immigrated in generation k . Thus, the total number of vertices at level n is $\sum_{k=1}^n Z_{n,k}$. Since the distribution of $Z_{n,k}$ depends only on $n - k$, this total Z_n has the same distribution as $\sum_{k=1}^n Z_{2k-1,k}$. This latter sum increases in n to some limit Z'_∞ . By Kolmogorov's zero-one law, Z'_∞ is a.s. finite or a.s. infinite. Hence, we need only to show that $Z'_\infty < \infty$ a.s. iff $\mathbf{E}[\log^+ Y] < \infty$.

Assume that $\mathbf{E}[\log^+ Y] < \infty$. Now $\mathbf{E}[Z'_\infty | \mathcal{G}] = \sum_{k=1}^\infty Y_k m^{k-1}$. Since $\langle Y_k \rangle$ is almost surely subexponential in k by Lemma 10.1, this sum converges a.s. (see Exercise 10.2). Therefore, Z'_∞ is finite a.s.

Now assume that $Z'_\infty < \infty$ a.s. Writing $Z_{2k-1,k} = \sum_{i=1}^{Y_k} \zeta_k(i)$, where $\zeta_k(i)$ are the sizes of generation $k - 1$ of i.i.d. Galton-Watson branching processes with one initial particle, we have $Z'_\infty = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \sum_{i=1}^{Y_k} \zeta_k(i)$ written as a random sum of independent random variables. Only a finite number of the $\zeta_k(i)$ are at least one, whence by the Borel-Cantelli lemma conditioned on \mathcal{G} , we get $\sum_{k=1}^\infty Y_k \mathbf{GW}(Z_{k-1} \geq 1) < \infty$ a.s. Since $\mathbf{GW}(Z_{k-1} \geq 1) \geq \mathbf{P}[L > 0]^{k-1}$, it follows by Lemma 10.1 (see Exercise 10.2) that $\mathbf{E}[\log^+ Y] < \infty$. ◀

Proof of Theorem 10.4. (Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres, 1995a) Let μ_n be the law of Z_n conditioned on $Z_n > 0$. For any tree t with $Z_n > 0$, let $\xi_n(t)$ be the leftmost child of the root that has at least one descendant in generation n . If $Z_n > 0$, let $H_n(t)$ be the number of descendants of $\xi_n(t)$ in generation n ; otherwise, let $H_n(t) := 0$. It is easy to see that

$$\mathbf{P}[H_n = k | Z_n > 0] = \mathbf{P}[H_n = k | Z_n > 0, \xi_n = x] = \mathbf{P}[Z_{n-1} = k | Z_{n-1} > 0]$$

for all children x of the root. Since $H_n \leq Z_n$, this shows that $\langle \mu_n \rangle$ increases stochastically as n increases. Now

$$\mathbf{P}[Z_n > 0] = \frac{\mathbf{E}[Z_n]}{\mathbf{E}[Z_n | Z_n > 0]} = \frac{m^n}{\int x d\mu_n(x)}.$$

Therefore, $\langle \mathbf{P}[Z_n > 0]/m^n \rangle$ is decreasing and (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii).

Now $\widehat{\mu}_n$ is not only the size-biased version of μ_n , but also the law of the size-biased random variable \widehat{Z}_n . Thus, from Section 10.1, we know that $\langle \widehat{\mu}_n \rangle$ describes the generation sizes (plus 1) of a process with immigration $\widehat{L} - 1$. Suppose that $m < 1$. If (ii) holds, i.e., the means of μ_n are bounded, then by Lemma 10.5, the laws $\widehat{\mu}_n$ do not tend to infinity. Applying Theorem 10.6 to the associated immigration process, we see that (iii) holds. Conversely, if (iii) holds, then by Theorem 10.6, $\langle \widehat{\mu}_n \rangle$ converges, whence is tight. In light of Lemma 10.5, (ii) follows. ◀

§10.4. Critical Processes.

In the critical case, the easy estimate (10.8) is useless. What then is the rate of decay?

THEOREM 10.7. (KESTEN, NEY, AND SPITZER, 1966) *Suppose that $m = 1$ and let $\sigma^2 := \text{Var}(L) = \mathbf{E}[L^2] - 1 \leq \infty$. Then we have*

(i) *Kolmogorov's estimate:*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n\mathbf{P}[Z_n > 0] = \frac{2}{\sigma^2};$$

(ii) *Yaglom's limit law: If $\sigma < \infty$, then the conditional distribution of Z_n/n given $Z_n > 0$ converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to an exponential law with mean $\sigma^2/2$.*

Under a third moment assumption, parts (i) and (ii) of this theorem are due to Kolmogorov (1938) and Yaglom (1947), respectively. We give a proof that uses ideas of Geiger (1999) and Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres (1995a). The exponential limit law in part (ii) will arise from the following characterization of exponential random variables due to Pakes and Khattree (1992):

▷ EXERCISE 10.9.

Let A be a nonnegative random variable with a positive finite mean and let \widehat{A} have the corresponding size-biased distribution. Denote by U a uniform random variable in $[0, 1]$ that is independent of \widehat{A} . Prove that $U \cdot \widehat{A}$ and A have the same distribution iff A is exponential.

▷ EXERCISE 10.10.

Suppose that A, A_n are nonnegative random variables with positive finite means such that $A_n \rightarrow A$ in law and $\widehat{A}_n \rightarrow B$ in law. Show that if B is a proper random variable, then B has the law of \widehat{A} .

▷ EXERCISE 10.11.

Let A be a random variable independent of the random variables B and C . Suppose that the function $x \mapsto \mathbf{P}[C \leq x]/\mathbf{P}[B \leq x]$ is increasing, that $\mathbf{P}[A \geq B] > 0$, and that $\mathbf{P}[A \geq C] > 0$. Show that the law of A given that $A \geq B$ is stochastically dominated by the law of A given that $A \geq C$. Show that the hypothesis on B and C is satisfied when they are geometric random variables with B having a larger parameter than C .

Proof of Theorem 10.7. Since each child of the initial progenitor independently has a descendant in generation n with probability $\mathbf{P}[Z_{n-1} > 0]$, we have that the law of Z_1 given that $Z_n > 0$ is the law of Z_1 given that $Z_1 \geq D_n$, where D_n is a geometric random variable independent of Z_1 with mean $1/\mathbf{P}[Z_{n-1} > 0]$. Since $\mathbf{P}[Z_{n-1} > 0] > \mathbf{P}[Z_n > 0]$, Exercise 10.11 implies that the conditional distribution of Z_1 given $Z_n > 0$ stochastically increases with n . Let Y_n be the number of individuals of the first generation that have a descendant in generation n . Since $\mathbf{P}[Z_n > 0] \rightarrow 0$, it follows that $\mathbf{P}[Y_n = 1 \mid Z_n > 0] \rightarrow 1$, that the conditional distribution of Z_1 given $Z_n > 0$ tends to the distribution of the size-biased \widehat{L} , and that the conditional distribution of the left-most individual of the first generation that has a descendant in generation n tends to a uniform pick among the individuals of the first generation. Since $\mathbf{P}[Z_1 \geq k \mid Z_n > 0]$ increases with n , the tail formula for expectation yields $\mathbf{E}[Z_1 \mid Z_n > 0] \rightarrow \mathbf{E}[\widehat{L}] = \sigma^2 + 1$.

Let u_n^n be the left-most individual in generation n when $Z_n > 0$. Let its ancestors back to the initial progenitor be u_{n-1}^n, \dots, u_0^n , where u_i^n is in generation i . Let X'_i denote the number of descendants of u_i^n in generation n that are not descendants of u_{i+1}^n . Let X_i be the number of children of u_i^n that are to the right of u_{i+1}^n . Then $Z_n = 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} X'_i$ and $\mathbf{E}[X'_i \mid Z_n > 0] = \mathbf{E}[X_i \mid Z_n > 0]$ since each of these X_i individuals generates an independent critical Galton-Watson descendant tree (with offspring law the same as that of the original process). We have seen that the conditional distribution of X_i given that $Z_n > 0$ tends to that of $[U \cdot \widehat{L}]$, where U denotes a uniform $[0, 1]$ -random variable that is independent of \widehat{L} . Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{n\mathbf{P}[Z_n > 0]} = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{E}[Z_n \mid Z_n > 0] = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{E}[X_i \mid Z_n > 0].$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[X_i \mid Z_n > 0] = \mathbf{E}[[U \cdot \widehat{L}]] = \sigma^2/2$, we obtain Kolmogorov's estimate.

Because the conditional distribution of u_{i+1}^n among the children of u_i^n tends to the uniform as $n \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that μ_n , the conditional distribution of Z_n/n given $Z_n > 0$, has the same limit as has the law of R_n/n , where R_n is the number of individuals in

generation n to the right of v_n in the size-biased tree. However, we must first show that this limit exists. In fact, we will do this at the same time as we identify its limit.

Suppose that $\sigma < \infty$. Then the $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$ laws of Z_n/n have uniformly bounded means and so are tight. Thus, so are μ_n and the $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$ laws of R_n/n . Therefore, we can find $n_k \rightarrow \infty$ so that μ_{n_k} and the $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$ law of R_{n_k}/n_k converge to the law of a (proper) random variable A and the $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$ laws of Z_{n_k}/n_k converge to the law of a (proper) random variable B . Note that the $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}$ law of Z_n/n can also be gotten by size-biasing μ_n . By virtue of Exercise 10.10 and Kolmogorov’s estimate, therefore, the variables \widehat{A} and B are identically distributed. As R_n is a uniform pick from $\{1, 2, \dots, Z_n\}$, we also have that A has the same law as $U \cdot B$, i.e., as $U \cdot \widehat{A}$. By Exercise 10.9, it follows that A is an exponential random variable with mean $\sigma^2/2$. In particular, the limit of μ_{n_k} is independent of the sequence $\langle n_k \rangle$, and hence we actually have convergence in law of the whole sequence μ_n to A , as desired. \blacktriangleleft

§10.5. Decomposition.

There is a conceptually interesting relationship between $\langle Z_n \rangle$ and $\langle Z_n^* \rangle$, where Z_n^* is the number of particles in generation n with an infinite line of descent. A little thought shows that $\langle Z_n^* \rangle$ is a Galton-Watson process. In order to calculate its p.g.f. and get further information, we will also show a general decomposition. A little thought shows that $\langle Z_n \rangle$ is also a Galton-Watson process given extinction. A little more thought shows that the family tree of $\langle Z_n \rangle$ has the same law as a tree grown first by $\langle Z_n^* \rangle$, then adding “bushes” independently and in the appropriate number to each node. We calculate (and prove) all this as follows.

Let T denote the genealogical tree of a Galton-Watson process with p.g.f. f and T' denote the **reduced** subtree of particles with an infinite line of descent. (It may be that $T' = \emptyset$.) Let $Y_{i,j}^{(n)}$ be the indicator of the j th child of the i th particle in generation n having an infinite line of descent. Write

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{q} &:= 1 - q, \\ L_i^{*(n+1)} &:= \sum_{j=1}^{L_i^{(n)}} Y_{i,j}^{(n)}, \\ Z_{n+1}^* &:= \sum_{i=1}^{Z_n} L_i^{*(n+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $Z_0^* = \mathbf{1}_{\text{nonextinction}}$.

PROPOSITION 10.8. *Suppose that $m > 1$.*

(i) *The law of T' given nonextinction is the same as that of a Galton-Watson process with p.g.f.*

$$f^*(s) := [f(q + \bar{q}s) - q]/\bar{q}.$$

(ii) *The law of T given extinction is the same as that of a Galton-Watson process with p.g.f.*

$$\tilde{f}(s) := f(qs)/q.$$

(iii) *The joint p.g.f. of $L - L^*$ and L^* is*

$$\mathbf{E}[s^{L-L^*} t^{L^*}] = f(qs + \bar{q}t).$$

The joint p.g.f. of $Z_n - Z_n^$ and Z_n^* is*


$$\mathbf{E}[s^{Z_n - Z_n^*} t^{Z_n^*}] = f^{(n)}(qs + \bar{q}t).$$

(iv) *The law of T given nonextinction is the same as that of a tree \bar{T} generated as follows: Let T^* be the tree of a Galton-Watson process with p.g.f. f^* as in (i). To each vertex σ of T^* having d_σ children, attach U_σ independent copies of a Galton-Watson tree with p.g.f. \tilde{f} as in (ii), where U_σ has the p.g.f.*

$$\mathbf{E}[s^{U_\sigma}] = \frac{(D^{d_\sigma} f)(qs)}{(D^{d_\sigma} f)(q)},$$

where d_σ derivatives of f are indicated; all U_σ and all trees added are mutually independent given T^ . The resultant tree is \bar{T} .*

REMARK. Part (iv) is not so interesting in terms of growth (Z_n , etc.) alone.



Proof. We begin with (iii). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[s^{L-L^*} t^{L^*}] &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[s^{L-L^*} t^{L^*} \mid L]] = \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[s^{\sum_{j=1}^L (1-Y_j)} t^{\sum_{j=1}^L Y_j} \mid L\right]\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[s^{1-Y_1} t^{Y_1}]^L] = \mathbf{E}[(qs + \bar{q}t)^L] = f(qs + \bar{q}t). \end{aligned}$$

The other part of (iii) follows by a precisely parallel calculation.

In order to show (i), we need to show that given $L_i^{*(n)} \neq 0$ and given the σ -field $\mathcal{F}_{n,i}$ generated by $L_k^{*(n)}$ ($k \neq i$) and $L_k^{*(m)}$ ($m < n, k \geq 1$), the p.g.f. of $L_i^{*(n)}$ is f^* . Indeed, on the event $L_i^{*(n)} \neq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[s^{L_i^{*(n)}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,i}] &= \mathbf{E}[s^{L_i^{*(n)}} \mid L_i^{*(n)} \neq 0] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[s^{L^*} \mathbf{1}_{\{L^* \neq 0\}}] / \bar{q} = \mathbf{E}[s^{L^*} (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1}_{\{L^* = 0\}})] / \bar{q} \\ &= \{\mathbf{E}[1^{L-L^*} s^{L^*}] - \mathbf{P}[L^* = 0]\} / \bar{q} \\ &= [f(q1 + \bar{q}s) - q] / \bar{q} = f^*(s) \end{aligned}$$

by (iii).

Similarly, (ii) comes from the fact that on the event of extinction,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[s^{L_i^{*(n)}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,i}] &= \mathbf{E}[s^{L_i^{*(n)}} \mid L_i^{*(n)} = 0] = \mathbf{E}[s^L \mathbf{1}_{\{L^* = 0\}}] / q \\ &= \mathbf{E}[s^{L-L^*} 0^{L^*}] / q = f(qs + \bar{q}0) / q = \tilde{f}(s) \end{aligned}$$

since $0^x = \mathbf{1}_{\{x=0\}}$.

Finally, (iv) follows once we show that the function claimed to be the p.g.f. of U_σ is the same as the p.g.f. of $L - L^*$ given $L^* = d_\sigma$. Once again, by (iii), we have that for some constants c and c' ,

$$\mathbf{E}[s^{L-L^*} \mid L^* = d] = c \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right)^d f(qs + \bar{q}t) \Big|_{t=0} = c'(D^d f)(qs).$$

Substitution of $s = 1$ yields $c' = 1/(D^d f)(q)$. ◀

REMARK. Part (iii), which led to all the other parts of the proposition, is an instance of the following general calculation. Suppose that we are given a nonnegative random number X of particles with X having p.g.f. F . One interpretation of F is that if we color each particle red with probability r , then the probability that all particles are colored red is $F(r)$. Now suppose that we first categorize each particle independently as small or big, with the probability of a particle being categorized small being q . Then independently color each small particle red with probability s and color each big particle red with probability t . Since the chance that a given particle is colored red is then $qs + \bar{q}t$, we have (by our interpretation) that the probability that all particles are colored red is $F(qs + \bar{q}t)$. On the other hand, if Y is the number of big particles, then by conditioning on Y , we see that this is also equal to the joint p.g.f. of $X - Y$ and Y .

§10.6. Notes.

Ideas related to size-biased Galton-Watson trees occur in Hawkes (1981) and in Joffe and Waugh (1982). The generation sizes of size-biased Galton-Watson trees are known as a Q-process in the case $m \leq 1$; see Athreya and Ney (1972), pp. 56–60.

The proof that the law of Z_1 given $Z_n > 0$ stochastically increases in n that appears at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 10.7 is due to Matthias Birkner (personal communication, 2000).

§10.7. Additional Exercises.

10.12. Show that if $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, p)$, then $\widehat{X} \sim 1 + \text{Bin}(n - 1, p)$, while if $X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$, then $\widehat{X} \sim 1 + \text{Pois}(\lambda)$.

10.13. Let X be a multiparameter binomial random variable, i.e., there are independent events A_1, \dots, A_n such that $X = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{A_i}$. Let I be a random variable independent of A_i such that $I = i$ with probability $\mathbf{P}[A_i] / \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{P}[A_j]$. Show that $\widehat{X} \sim 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{A_i} \mathbf{1}_{\{I \neq i\}}$.

10.14. Let X, X_1, \dots, X_k be i.i.d. nonnegative random variables for some $k \geq 0$ and let \widehat{X} be an independent random variable with the size-biased distribution of X . Show that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\frac{k+1}{\widehat{X} + X_1 + \dots + X_k} \right] = \frac{1}{\mathbf{E}[X]}.$$

10.15. Show that if $X \geq 0$, then X is stochastically dominated by \widehat{X} . Deduce the arithmetic mean-quadratic mean inequality, that $\mathbf{E}[X]^2 \leq \mathbf{E}[X^2]$, and determine when equality occurs. Deduce the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality from this.

10.16. In the notation of Lemma 10.2, show that $\langle (X_n, \mathcal{F}_n) \rangle$ is a martingale with respect to ν . Deduce that if μ is a probability measure, then $\langle (X_n, \mathcal{F}_n) \rangle$ is a submartingale with respect to μ .

10.17. The simplest proof of the Kesten-Stigum theorem along traditional lines is due to Tanny (1988). Complete the following outline of this proof. A branching process in varying environments (BPVE) is one in which the offspring distribution depends on the generation. Namely, if $\langle L_i^{(n)}; n, i \geq 1 \rangle$ are independent random variables with values in \mathbb{N} such that for each n , the variables $L_i^{(n)}$ are identically distributed, then set $Z_0 := 1$ and, inductively, $Z_{n+1} := \sum_{i=1}^{Z_n} L_i^{(n+1)}$. Let $m_n := \mathbf{E}[L_i^{(n)}]$ and $M_n := \prod_{k=1}^n m_k$. Show that $M_n = \mathbf{E}[Z_n]$ and that Z_n/M_n is a martingale. Its limit is denoted W .

Given a Galton-Watson branching process $\langle Z_n \rangle$ and a number $A > 0$, define a BPVE $\langle Z_n(A) \rangle$ by letting $\langle L_i^{(n)}(A) \rangle$ have the distribution of $L \mathbf{1}_{\{L < Am^n\}}$. Use the fact that $W < \infty$ a.s. to show that for any $\epsilon > 0$, one can choose A sufficiently large that $\mathbf{P}[\forall n \quad Z_n = Z_n(A)] > 1 - \epsilon$. Show that when $Z_n = Z_n(A)$ for all n , we have

$$W = W(A) \prod_{n \geq 1} (1 - \mathbf{E}[L; L \geq m^n]/m).$$

Show that this product is 0 iff $\mathbf{E}[L \log^+ L] = \infty$. Conclude that if $\mathbf{E}[L \log^+ L] = \infty$, then $W = 0$ a.s.

For the converse, define a BPVE $\langle Z_n(B) \rangle$ by letting $\langle L_i^{(n)}(B) \rangle$ have the distribution of $L\mathbf{1}_{\{L < Bm^{3n/4}\}}$. Choose B large enough so that $\mathbf{E}[Z_n(B)] > 0$ for all n . Show that $Z_n(B)/M_n(B)$ is bounded in L^2 , whence its limit $W(B)$ has expectation 1. From $Z_n \geq Z_n(B)$, conclude that $\mathbf{E}[W] \geq \lim M_n(B)/m^n$. Show that by appropriate choice of B , if $\mathbf{E}[L \log^+ L] < \infty$, then this last limit can be made arbitrarily close to 1.

10.18. Let $G_n := \sup\{|u|; T_n \subseteq T^u\}$ be the generation of the most recent common ancestor of all individuals in generation n . Show that if $m = 1$ and $\text{Var}(L) < \infty$, then the conditional distribution of G_n/n given $Z_n > 0$ tends to the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$.

A traditional proof of Theorem 10.7 observes that $\mathbf{P}[Z_n > 0] = 1 - f^{(n)}(0)$ and analyzes the rate at which the iterates of f tend to 1. The following exercises outline such a proof.

10.19. Show that if $m = 1$, then $\lim_{s \uparrow 1} f''(s) = \sigma^2$.

10.20. Suppose that $m = 1$, $p_1 \neq 1$, and $\sigma < \infty$.

(a) Define $\delta(s) := [1 - f(s)]^{-1} - [1 - s]^{-1}$. Show that $\lim_{s \uparrow 1} \delta(s) = \sigma^2/2$.

(b) Let $s_n \in [0, 1)$ be such that $n(1 - s_n) \rightarrow \alpha \in [0, \infty]$. Show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n[1 - f^{(n)}(s_n)] = \frac{1}{\sigma^2/2 + \alpha^{-1}}.$$

10.21. Use Exercise 10.20 and Laplace transforms to prove Theorem 10.7 in the case that $\sigma < \infty$.

10.22. Let X and Y be real-valued random variables. Say that X is **stochastically more variable than** Y if $\mathbf{E}[h(X)] \geq \mathbf{E}[h(Y)]$ for all nonnegative increasing convex functions $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Show that this is equivalent to $\int_a^\infty \mathbf{P}[X > t] dt \geq \int_a^\infty \mathbf{P}[Y > t] dt$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

10.23. Suppose that X_i are nonnegative independent identically distributed random variables, that Y_i are nonnegative independent identically distributed random variables, and that X_i is stochastically more variable than Y_i for each $i \geq 1$.

(a) Show that $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ is stochastically more variable than $\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ for each $n \geq 1$.

(b) Let M and N be nonnegative integer-valued random variables independent of all X_i and Y_i . Suppose that M is stochastically more variable than N . Show that $\sum_{i=1}^M X_i$ is stochastically more variable than $\sum_{i=1}^N X_i$, which, in turn, is stochastically more variable than $\sum_{i=1}^N Y_i$.

10.24. Suppose that $L^{(1)}$ is a stochastically more variable offspring distribution than $L^{(2)}$ and that $Z_n^{(i)}$ are the corresponding generation sizes of Galton-Watson processes beginning with 1 individual each.

(a) Show that $Z_n^{(1)}$ is stochastically more variable than $Z_n^{(2)}$ for each n .

(b) Show that $\mathbf{P}[Z_n^{(1)} = 0] \geq \mathbf{P}[Z_n^{(2)} = 0]$ for each n .

(c) Show that the conditional distribution of $Z_n^{(1)}$ given $Z_n^{(1)} > 0$ is stochastically more variable than the conditional distribution of $Z_n^{(2)}$ given $Z_n^{(2)} > 0$ for each n .

(d) Show that the following is an example where $L^{(1)}$ is a stochastically more variable offspring distribution than $L^{(2)}$. Write $p_k^{(i)}$ for $\mathbf{P}[L^{(i)} = k]$. Suppose that $p_0^{(1)} > 0$, that $a := \min\{k \geq 1; p_k^{(1)} > 0\}$, that $p_k^{(2)} = 0$ for $k > K$, that $p_k^{(2)} = p_k^{(1)}$ for $a < k \leq K$, and that $\mathbf{E}[L^{(1)}] = \mathbf{E}[L^{(2)}]$.

Chapter 11

Speed of Random Walks

The last sections are independent of the first two.

§11.1. The Varopoulos-Carne Bounds.

Recall from Section 5.2 that the transition operator

$$(Pf)(u) := \sum_v p(u, v)f(v)$$

is a bounded self-adjoint operator on $\ell^2(\mathbf{V}, \pi)$.

Carne (1985) gave the following generalization and improvement of a fundamental result of Varopoulos (1985b), which we have improved a bit more.

THEOREM 11.1. *For any reversible random walk, we have*

$$p_n(u, v) \leq 2\sqrt{\pi_v/\pi_u} \|P\|_\pi^n e^{-|u-v|^2/(2n)}.$$

The exponential part is sharp, as we can see from the case of simple random walk.

To prove Theorem 11.1, we need some standard facts from analysis. These are detailed in the following exercises.

▷ **EXERCISE 11.1.**

Let T be a bounded self-adjoint operator on a Hilbert space and Q be a polynomial with real coefficients. Show that

$$\|Q(T)\| \leq \max_{|x| \leq \|T\|} |Q(x)|.$$

▷ **EXERCISE 11.2.**

Show that for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, there are unique polynomials Q_k of degree $|k|$ such that $Q_k(\cos \theta) = \cos k\theta$. Show that $|Q_k(x)| \leq 1$ whenever $|x| \leq 1$. These polynomials are called the **Chebyshev polynomials**.

Let $q_n(k)$ denote the probability that simple random walk on \mathbb{Z} starting at 0 is at k after n steps.

▷ EXERCISE 11.3.

Show the standard estimate

$$\sum_{|k| \geq d} q_n(k) \leq 2e^{-d^2/(2n)}.$$

The following formula is a modification of that proved by Carne (1985).

LEMMA 11.2. *Let Q_k be the Chebyshev polynomials. For any reversible random walk, we have*

$$P^n = \|P\|_\pi^n \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} q_n(k) Q_k(P/\|P\|_\pi). \tag{11.1}$$

Furthermore, $\|Q_k(P/\|P\|_\pi)\|_\pi \leq 1$ for all k .

Proof. Let w be such that $z = (w + w^{-1})/2$. Then

$$Q_k(z) = Q_k((w + w^{-1})/2) = (w^k + w^{-k})/2$$

since it holds for all z of modulus 1. By the binomial theorem,

$$z^n = [(w + w^{-1})/2]^n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} q_n(k) w^k = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} q_n(k) (w^k + w^{-k})/2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} q_n(k) Q_k(z).$$

Since this is an identity between polynomials, we may apply it to $z := P/\|P\|_\pi$ to get (11.1). The final estimate derives from Exercise 11.1 (for $T := P/\|P\|_\pi$) and Exercise 11.2. ◀

Proof of Theorem 11.1. Fix $u, v \in V$ and write $d := |u - v|$. Set $e_u := \mathbf{1}_{\{u\}}/\sqrt{\pi(u)}$. Then

$$p_n(u, v) = \sqrt{\pi(v)/\pi(u)} (e_u, P^n e_v)_\pi. \tag{11.2}$$

When we substitute (11.1) for P^n here, we may exploit the fact that $(Q_k(P/\|P\|_\pi) e_v, e_u)_\pi = 0$ for $|k| < d$ since Q_k has degree $|k|$ and $p_i(u, v) = 0$ for $i < d$. Furthermore, we may use the bound $|(Q_k(P/\|P\|_\pi) e_v, e_u)_\pi| \leq \|Q_k(P/\|P\|_\pi)\|_\pi \|e_v\|_\pi \|e_u\|_\pi \leq 1$. We obtain

$$p_n(u, v) \leq \sqrt{\pi(v)/\pi(u)} \|P\|_\pi^n \sum_{|k| \geq d} q_n(k).$$

Now use Exercise 11.3 to complete the proof. ◀

§11.2. Branching Number of a Graph.

For a connected locally finite graph G , choose some vertex $o \in G$ and define the **branching number** $\text{br } G$ of G as the supremum of those $\lambda \geq 1$ such that there is a positive flow from o to infinity when the edges have capacities $\lambda^{-|e|}$, where distance is measured from o . By the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem, this is the same as

$$\text{br } G = \inf \left\{ \lambda \geq 1; \inf \left\{ \sum_{e \in \Pi} \lambda^{-|e|}; \Pi \text{ separates } o \text{ from } \infty \right\} = 0 \right\}.$$

▷ EXERCISE 11.4.

Show that $\text{br } G$ does not depend on the choice of vertex o .

▷ EXERCISE 11.5.

Show that if G' is a subgraph of G , then $\text{br } G' \leq \text{br } G$.

Recall that $\lambda_c(G)$ is the critical value of λ separating transience from recurrence for RW_λ on G .

▷ EXERCISE 11.6.

Show that $\lambda_c(G) \leq \text{br } G$.

Recall that we call a subtree T of G rooted at o **geodesic** if for every vertex $v \in T$, the distance from v to o is the same in T as in G . Note that for such trees, $\text{br } T \leq \text{br } G$ since any cutset of G restricts to one in T . It follows from Section 2.9 that when G is a Cayley graph of a finitely generated group, there is a geodesic spanning tree T of G with $\text{br } T$ equal to the growth rate of G , whence we may conclude that $\text{br } G$ also equals the growth rate of G . Hence, we also have $\text{br } G = \lambda_c(G)$. This also holds for many planar graphs:

THEOREM 11.3. (LYONS, 1996) *Let G be an infinite connected planar graph of bounded degree that can be embedded in the plane in such a way that only finitely many vertices are embedded in any bounded region. Assume that G has a geodesic spanning tree with no leaves. Then $\lambda_c(G) = \text{br } G$.*

LEMMA 11.4. *If G is an infinite connected planar graph of bounded degree that can be embedded in the plane in such a way that only finitely many vertices are embedded in any bounded region. Suppose that T is a geodesic spanning tree of G with no leaves. Then $\text{br } T = \text{br } G$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that for $\lambda > \text{br } T$, we have $\lambda \geq \text{br } G$. Given a cutset Π of T , we shall define a cutset Π^* of G whose corresponding cutset sum is not much larger than

that of Π . Embed G in the plane in the manner assumed possible. We may assume then that o is at the origin of the plane and that all vertices in T_n are on the circle of radius n in the plane. Now every vertex $v \in T$ has a descendant subtree $T^v \subseteq T$. For $n \geq |v|$, this subtree cuts off an arc of the circle; in the clockwise order of $T^v \cap T_n$, there is a least element \underline{v}_n and a greatest element \bar{v}_n . Each edge in Π has two endpoints; collect the ones farther from o in a set W . Define Π^* to be the collection of edges incident to the set of vertices

$$W^* := \{\underline{v}_n, \bar{v}_n; v \in W, n \geq |v|\} .$$

We claim that Π^* is a cutset of G . For if $o = x_1, x_2, \dots$ is a path in G with an infinite number of distinct vertices, let x_k be the first vertex belonging to T^v for some $v \in W$. Planarity implies that $x_k \in W^*$, whence the path intersects Π^* , as desired.

Now let c be the maximum degree of vertices in G . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in \Pi^*} \lambda^{-|e|} &\leq c \sum_{v \in W^*} \lambda^{-|v|+1} \leq c \sum_{v \in W} \sum_{n \geq |v|} 2\lambda^{-n+1} \\ &= \frac{2c\lambda}{\lambda-1} \sum_{v \in W} \lambda^{-|v|+1} = \frac{2c\lambda}{\lambda-1} \sum_{e \in \Pi} \lambda^{-|e|} . \end{aligned}$$

Now the desired conclusion is evident. ◀

Proof of Theorem 11.3. We need only show that $\lambda_c(G) \geq \text{br } G$. Let $\lambda < \text{br } G$ and let T be a geodesic spanning tree of G . By the lemma, $\lambda < \text{br } T$, whence by Theorem 2.19, RW_λ is transient on T . Therefore, RW_λ is also transient on G . ◀

PROPOSITION 11.5. (PERES) *If G is a connected locally finite graph with bounded degree on which simple random walk has positive speed, then $\text{br } G > 1$. More precisely, if $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |X_n|/n \geq s$ with positive probability, then $\text{br } G \geq e^{s/2}$.*

Note that this bound is not as good as the one obtained for trees, Proposition 4.11.

Proof. Given $0 < s' < s'' < s$, there is some L such that

$$q := \mathbf{P}[\forall n \geq L \quad |X_n| > s''n] > 0. \tag{11.3}$$

As in the proof of Proposition 4.11, define the general percolation on G by keeping those edges $e(v)$ such that $|v| \leq s''L$ or $\exists n < |v|/s'' \quad X_n = v$. According to (11.3), the component of the root in this percolation is infinite with probability at least q . On the other hand, if $|v| > s''L$, then by Theorem 11.1,

$$\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow v] = \mathbf{P}[\exists n < |v|/s'' \quad X_n = v] \leq \sum_{n=1}^{|v|/s''} p_n(o, v)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{|v|/s''} 2\sqrt{\pi_v/\pi_o} e^{-|v|^2/(2n)} \leq 2\frac{|v|}{s''} \sqrt{\frac{\pi_v}{\pi_o}} e^{-s''|v|/2} \\ &< Ce^{-s'|v|/2} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant C . In light of Proposition 4.8, this means that for any cutset Π , we have

$$q < \sum_{e(v) \in \Pi} Ce^{-s'|v|/2}.$$

Therefore, $\text{br } G \geq e^{s'/2}$. Since this holds for all $s' < s$, the result follows. ◀

▷ EXERCISE 11.7.

Show that the hypothesis of bounded degree in Proposition 11.5 is necessary.

Many questions about RW_λ are unsolved on trees: ...

§11.3. Stationary Measures on Trees.

We consider here simple random walk on random trees, where the tree is chosen according to some probability measure that gives us a Markov chain which is stationary in an appropriate sense. In order to achieve a stationary Markov chain, we need to change our point of view from a random walk on a fixed (though random) tree to a random walk on the space of isomorphism classes of trees.

The formalism is as follows. Let \mathcal{T} be the space of trees in Exercise 10.5 with some vertex designated as the root. Call two rooted trees **isomorphic** if there is a bijection of their vertex sets preserving adjacency and mapping one root to the other. For $T \in \mathcal{T}$, let $/T/$ denote the set of trees that are isomorphic to T . Let $\widehat{\mathcal{T}} := \{/T/; T \in \mathcal{T}\}$. For a tree T , let $\text{MoveRoot}(T, x)$ denote the tree which has the same vertex and edge sets as T but has a new root, x , for some vertex $x \in T$.

Write $\deg T$ for $\deg(\text{root}(T))$. Consider the Markov chain that moves from a tree T to the tree $\text{MoveRoot}(T, x)$ for a random neighbor x of the root of T . For fixed T , this chain is isomorphic to simple random walk on T . Write the transition probabilities as

$$p(T, T') = \begin{cases} 1/\deg T & \text{if } \exists x \in T \text{ } |x| = 1 \text{ and } T' = \text{MoveRoot}(T, x); \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now we are really interested in the Markov chain induced by this chain on isomorphism classes of trees, so define $\text{MoveRoot}(/T/, x) := / \text{MoveRoot}(T, x) /$ for $x \in T$ and

$$p(/T/, /T'/) := |\{x \in T; |x| = 1, /T'/ = \text{MoveRoot}(/T/, x)\}| / \deg T.$$

Let P^* be the corresponding operator on measures on \widehat{T} . We call a Borel measure μ on \widehat{T} **stationary** (for simple random walk) if $P^*\mu = \mu$. We will also call a Borel measure μ on \mathcal{T} stationary if the induced measure $/\mu/$ on \widehat{T} is. Note that in such a case, $\deg X_k$ is a stationary sequence, where $\langle X_k \rangle$ denotes simple random walk on T . To make explicit the fact that μ is stationary for simple random walk, we will write that μ is SRW-stationary.

▷ EXERCISE 11.8.

Let $G = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$ be a finite connected graph with E (undirected) edges. For $v \in \mathbf{V}$, let T_v be the universal cover of G based at v (see Section 2.8). Define

$$\mu(/T/) := \frac{1}{2E} \sum \{\deg v; v \in \mathbf{V}, /T_v/ = /T/\}.$$

Show that μ is a stationary probability on \widehat{T} .

For a tree T , write T^\diamond for the **bi-infinitary part** of T consisting of the vertices and edges of T that belong to some bi-infinite self-avoiding path. As long as T has at least two boundary points, its bi-infinitary part is non-empty. Let the vertex of T^\diamond closest to $\text{root}(T)$ be the root of T^\diamond . The parts of T that are not in its bi-infinitary part are finite trees that we call **shrubs**. Since simple random walk on a shrub is recurrent, simple random walk on T visits T^\diamond infinitely often and, in fact, takes infinitely many steps on T^\diamond . If we observe $\langle X_k \rangle$ only when it makes a transition along an edge of T^\diamond , then we see simple random walk on T^\diamond (by the strong Markov property). In particular, if we begin simple random walk on \mathcal{T} with an initial stationary probability measure μ , then $X_k \in T^\diamond$ eventually a.s., whence $\text{root}(T) \in T^\diamond$ with positive probability. Thus, we may induce the Markov chain on the set of states $\{T; \text{root}(T) \in T^\diamond\}$ and obtain a new probability measure μ^\diamond that is stationary for simple random walk.

Let $\text{SRW} \times \mu$ denote the probability measure on paths in trees given by choosing a tree according to μ and then independently running simple random walk on the tree starting at its root.

THEOREM 11.6. *If μ is an ergodic SRW-stationary probability measure on the space of trees \mathcal{T} such that μ -a.e. tree is infinite, then the speed (rate of escape) of simple random walk is $\text{SRW} \times \mu$ -a.s.*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X_n|}{n} = \sum_{k \geq 1} \mu(\deg T = k) \frac{k-2}{k} \geq 0. \tag{11.4}$$

The speed is positive iff μ -a.e. tree has at least 3 boundary points, in which case μ -a.e. tree has uncountably many boundary points and branching number > 1 .

Proof. The speed is the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} |X_n| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (|X_{k+1}| - |X_k|).$$

Now the strong law of large numbers for martingale differences (Feller (1971), p. 243) gives

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (|X_{k+1}| - |X_k|) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{E}[|X_{k+1}| - |X_k| \mid \langle X_i; i \leq k \rangle] \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (11.5)$$

Provided $X_k \neq o$, the k th term here equals

$$\frac{\deg X_k - 2}{\deg X_k}. \quad (11.6)$$

Since T is a.s. infinite, $X_k = o$ for only a set of k of density 0, whence the speed equals

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{\deg X_k - 2}{\deg X_k}.$$

Since this is the limit of averages of an ergodic stationary sequence, the ergodic theorem tells us that it converges a.s. to the mean of an element of the sequence,

$$\int \frac{\deg T - 2}{\deg T} d\mu(T), \quad (11.7)$$

which is the same as (11.4).

Now the speed is of course 0 if the trees have at most 2 ends. In the opposite case, $\mu^\diamond(\deg T \geq 3) > 0$ since otherwise the walk would be restricted to \mathbb{Z} . Since $\deg T \geq 2$ μ^\diamond -a.s., it follows from (11.7) that the speed is positive μ^\diamond -a.s.

Moreover, the speed is positive μ -a.s. since it is positive μ^\diamond -a.s. and the time spent in shrubs is finite since this is the return time to the bi-infinite part [EXPLAIN].

The fact that μ -a.e. tree has infinitely many boundary points is a consequence of the transience, and the stronger fact that the branching number is > 1 follows from Proposition 4.11. ◀

▷ EXERCISE 11.9.

Show that the speed of simple random walk on the universal cover of a finite connected graph G with V vertices, E (undirected) edges, and at least two cycles is $1 - V/E$.

Sometimes, it is easier to find a stationary measure for delayed simple random walk, rather than for simple random walk. Here, we define **delayed simple random walk** on a graph with maximum degree at most D to have the transition probabilities

$$p(u, v) := \begin{cases} 1/D & \text{if } u \sim v, \\ 1 - \deg u/D & \text{if } u = v, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(The choice of D will be left implicit, but will be clear from context.) Thus, any uniform measure on the vertices is an (infinite) stationary measure for delayed simple random walk.

LEMMA 11.7. *If μ is a DSRW-stationary probability measure on \mathcal{T} , then the degree-biased μ' is a SRW-stationary probability measure on \mathcal{T} ; more precisely, $\mu' \ll \mu$ with*

$$\frac{d\mu'}{d\mu}(T) := \frac{\deg T}{\int \deg t d\mu(t)}.$$

If μ is ergodic, then so is μ' .

Proof. ... ◀

Hence, we may apply Theorem 11.6.

▷ EXERCISE 11.10.

Show that if μ is an ergodic DSRW-stationary probability measure on the space of trees \mathcal{T} such that μ -a.e. tree has at least 3 boundary points and maximum degree at most D , then the rate of escape of simple random walk (not delayed) is $\text{SRW} \times \mu$ -a.s.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X_n|}{n} = \frac{\int \deg T d\mu(T) - 2}{\int \deg T d\mu(T)}.$$

We now consider Cayley graphs. Recall that an edge $[u, v]$ is present in the graph iff there is a generator a such that $ua = v$. (Cayley graphs defined by multiplication on the left instead of on the right are isomorphic by inversion.) Thus, for any g in the group, multiplication by g on the left is an automorphism of G . Given a percolation on a Cayley graph $G = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$, i.e., a Borel probability measure \mathcal{P} on the subsets of \mathbf{E} , write $\omega \subseteq \mathbf{E}$ for the random subset given by the percolation. The action of multiplication by g induces a map

$$g\omega := \{[gu, gv]; [u, v] \in \omega\}.$$

Thus, g acts on \mathcal{P} ; we call \mathcal{P} **translation-invariant** if $g\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}$ for all $g \in \mathbf{V}$. If $\{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_D\}$ denotes the generating set for G , assumed to be closed under inverses, then clearly \mathcal{P} is translation-invariant iff $g_i\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}$ for $i = 1, \dots, D$. Call the percolation a **random forest** if each component is a tree, for example, the random spanning forests of various kinds studied in Chapter 8. In particular, FUSF, WUSF, FMSF, and WMSF are all translation-invariant random forests by Exercise 9.2.

EXAMPLE 11.8. Let G be the usual Cayley graph of \mathbb{Z} . Consider the 3 possible spanning forests that have only trees with 3 vertices. If these 3 are equally likely, then we get a translation-invariant random forest of G . This is easily seen not to be SRW-stationary.

Let μ denote the law of the component of the identity, o , of a translation-invariant random forest \mathcal{P} . Then μ is stationary for a random walk $\langle X_n \rangle$ starting at $X_0 = o$ iff $X_1\mu = \mu$. The following is essentially due to Häggström (1997).

LEMMA 11.9. *If μ is the component law of a translation-invariant random forest on a Cayley graph, then μ is stationary for delayed simple random walk. In fact, μ is globally reversible.*

Proof. Let T_g denote the component of g , so $\mu(A) = \mathbf{P}[T_o \in A]$. We need to show that for Borel $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{T}$,

$$\mathbf{P}[T_o \in A, T_{X_1} \in B] = \mathbf{P}[T_o \in B, T_{X_1} \in A].$$

We will show more generally that for Borel $A, B \subseteq \{0, 1\}^E$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}[A, X_1B] = \mathbf{P}[B, X_1A].$$

Now we may write the first event as a disjoint union

$$A \cap X_1B = \bigcup_{i=1}^D (A \cap B \cap \{X_1 = o\} \cap \{\deg o = i\}) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^D (A \cap g_iB \cap \{X_1 = g_i\})$$

whence

$$\mathbf{P}[A, X_1B] = \sum_{i=1}^D \mathbf{P}[A, B, \deg o = i](D-i)/D + \sum_{i=1}^D \mathbf{P}[A, g_iB, (o, g_i) \in \omega]/D.$$

By translation invariance, the last term here equals

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^D \mathbf{P}[g_i^{-1}(A \cap g_iB \cap \{(o, g_i) \in \omega\})]/D &= \sum_{i=1}^D \mathbf{P}[g_i^{-1}A, B, (g_i^{-1}, o) \in \omega]/D \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^D \mathbf{P}[B, g_iA, (o, g_i) \in \omega]/D \end{aligned}$$

since inversion is a permutation of $\{g_1, \dots, g_D\}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}[A, X_1B] &= \sum_{i=1}^D \mathbf{P}[A, B, \deg o = i](D-i)/D + \sum_{i=1}^D \mathbf{P}[B, g_iA, (o, g_i) \in \omega]/D \\ &= \mathbf{P}[B, X_1A], \end{aligned}$$

as desired. ◀

The following corollary generalizes results of Häggström (1997). It shows how the obvious property of Cayley graphs having 1, 2 or uncountably many ends generalizes to translation-invariant random forests. Here, an **end** is an equivalence class of infinite nonself-intersecting paths in G , with two paths being equivalent if for all finite $A \subset G$, the paths are eventually in the same connected component of $G \setminus A$. (Part of this was proved in Corollary 7.16.)

COROLLARY 11.10. *If μ is the component law of a translation-invariant random forest on a Cayley graph, then simple random walk on the infinite trees with at least 3 boundary points has positive speed a.s. Hence, these trees have $\text{br} > 1$. In particular, there are a.s. no trees with a finite number of boundary points ≥ 3 .*

Proof. We have seen that $/\mu/$ is DSRW-stationary on $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$. If $A \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ denotes the set of tree classes with at least 3 boundary points, then A is invariant under the random walk, so $/\mu/$ conditioned to A is also DSRW-stationary. From Lemma 11.7, we also get a SRW-stationary probability measure on A , to which we may apply Theorem 11.6. ◀

Since a tree with branching number > 1 also has exponential growth, it follows that if G is a group of subexponential growth, then every tree in a translation-invariant random forest has at most 2 ends a.s. Actually, this holds for all amenable groups:

COROLLARY 11.11. *If G is an amenable group, then every tree in a translation-invariant random forest has at most 2 ends a.s.*

Proof. By reasoning exactly parallel to Exercise 9.5, the expected degree of every vertex in the forest is two. Therefore, the speed of delayed simple random walk is 0 a.s., whence the number of ends cannot be at least 3 with positive probability. ◀

In fact, this result holds still more generally:

THEOREM 11.12. *If G is an amenable group, then every component in a translation-invariant percolation has at most 2 ends a.s.*

This is due to Burton and Keane (1989) in the case where $G = \mathbb{Z}^d$. It was proved by a somewhat different method in Exercise 7.30. It follows from Corollary 11.11 and the following lemma:

LEMMA 11.13. *Let G be a Cayley graph. Let $\omega \in \Omega$ be a translation-invariant percolation on G . Then there is a translation-invariant percolation process ω' such that $\omega' \subset \omega$ and that enjoys the following properties: For $x \in \mathbb{V}$, let $K(x)$, $K'(x)$ denote the component of x in ω , ω' , resp. Then*

- (i) ω' is a forest a.s.;
- (ii) $\forall x \in \mathbf{V} \ |K'(x)| = |K(x)|$ a.s.; and
- (iii) $\forall x \in \mathbf{V}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, if $K(x)$ has at least k ends with positive probability, then $K'(x)$ also has at least k ends with positive probability.

▷ EXERCISE 11.11.

Prove Lemma 11.13.

Theorem 11.12 also has a direct proof:

Proof. Let $G_n = (\mathbf{V}_n, \mathbf{E}_n)$ be an exhaustion of G by finite subgraphs witnessing the amenability of G . Suppose that there is a translation-invariant percolation with some component having at least 3 ends with positive probability. Call a connected subset of a component an **encounter set** if its removal leaves at least 3 infinite components. By assumption, there is some finite K such that for every vertex v , the probability that v belongs to an encounter set of size K is some positive number α . Then the expected number of vertices in G_n that belong to some encounter set of size K is $\alpha|\mathbf{V}_n|$. By Chebyshev's inequality, it follows that for some $\epsilon > 0$ and all large n , with positive probability, there are at least $\epsilon|\mathbf{V}_n|$ pairwise-disjoint encounter sets of size K contained within G_n . We claim that the number of boundary points of G_n is then at least $\epsilon|\mathbf{V}_n| + 2$, which contradicts the fact that G_n witnesses the amenability of G . Indeed, if there were N pairwise-disjoint encounter sets inside G_n , then contract each such encounter set to a single vertex. Then the claim follows from Lemma 11.14 below. ◀

LEMMA 11.14. *Given a finite graph G with a subset B of its vertices (thought of as boundary vertices), call a vertex v in a subgraph H an encounter point for B if its removal from H leaves at least 3 components intersecting B . If a subgraph H of G has N encounter points for B , then $|H \cap B| \geq N + 2$.*

Proof. We use induction on N . It clearly holds for $N = 1$. If it holds for fewer than N encounter points, then to prove it for H with N encounter points, choose one encounter point $v \in H$. If $H \setminus v$ has $r \geq 3$ components, then choose neighbors v_1, \dots, v_r of v in different components of $H \setminus v$. Apply the induction hypothesis to the graph G with boundary $B \cup \{v, v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ and subgraph $H \setminus v$. Each component of the subgraph $H \setminus v$ has fewer than N encounter points; let the number of encounter points be $N_1, \dots, N_r \geq 0$. Then $\sum N_i = N - 1$ and $|(H \setminus v) \cap (B \cup \{v, v_1, v_2, v_3\})| \geq \sum (N_i + 2) = N - 1 + 2r$. Therefore $|H \cap B| \geq N - 1 + 2r - 3 \geq N + 2$ since $r \geq 3$. ◀

▷ EXERCISE 11.12.

Use Theorem 11.12 as follows to prove the theorem of Burton and Keane (1989) (slightly generalized) that on the Cayley graph of any amenable group, there is at most one infinite component in any translation-invariant percolation with the property that for any $e \in \mathbf{E}$, we have $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega \mid \omega \setminus e] > 0$ a.s. on the event that the endpoints of e are not connected in $\omega \setminus e$. (Of course, this condition is satisfied by Bernoulli percolation.)

- (a) Prove that the number of infinite components is a.s. constant.
- (b) Prove that the number of infinite components is a.s. 0, 1 or ∞ .
- (c) Prove that if the number of infinite components is a.s. infinite, then with positive probability, there are components with at least 3 ends.

▷ EXERCISE 11.13.

Prove that for a translation-invariant random forest on a Cayley graph, there are a.s. no isolated boundary points in trees with an infinite boundary.

§11.4. Galton-Watson Trees.

When we run random walks on Galton-Watson trees T , their asymptotic properties reveal information about the structure of T beyond the growth rate and branching number. This is the theme of the present section and of Chapter 14.

We know by Theorem 2.19 and Corollary 4.10 that simple random walk on a Galton-Watson tree T is almost surely transient. Equivalently, by Theorem 2.3, the effective conductance of T from the root to infinity is a.s. finite when each edge has unit conductance. See Figure 11.1 for the distribution of the effective conductance when an individual has 1 or 2 children with equal probability and Section 14.6 for further discussion of this graph.

Transience means only that the distance of a random walker from the root of T tends to infinity a.s. Is the rate of escape positive? Can we calculate the rate? Such a rate would clearly be related to the proportion of the time the walk spends at vertices of degree $k + 1$ for each k , since at such a vertex, the expected change in the distance to the root is $(k - 1)/(k + 1)$. Now recall from Exercise 2.1 that the stationary distribution for simple random walk on a finite graph G is proportional to the degrees of the vertices. On Galton-Watson trees, however, the asymptotic proportion of time spent at vertices of degree $k + 1$ will turn out to be p_k , the ordinary probability that an individual has k children. *Unlike the situation for finite graphs, there is therefore no biasing in favor of vertices of large*

degree. As we demonstrate in Theorem 11.17, this means that the speed is a.s.

$$l := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p_k \frac{k-1}{k+1}.$$

In particular, the speed is positive.

By Jensen's inequality, unless $Z_1 = m$ a.s., $l < (m-1)/(m+1)$. Notice that the latter is the speed on the deterministic tree of the same growth rate when m is an integer. Since random walk on a random spherically symmetric tree is essentially the same as a special case of random walk in a random environment (RWRE) on the nonnegative integers, we may compare this slowing down to the fact that randomness also slows down random walk for the general RWRE on the integers (Solomon, 1975). All the results in this section are from the paper Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres (1995b).




Figure 11.1. The apparent density of the conductance for $p_1 = p_2 = 1/2$.

Ergodic theory is crucial to our work in this section as it will be in Chapter 14. Since a fixed Galton-Watson tree has no homogeneity, the space on which we may use ergodic theory has to be the space of all trees. Briefly, our plan is to identify a stationary measure for simple random walk on the space of trees. The resulting Markov process may be viewed as a Kakutani tower over a sequence of i.i.d. random variables obtained from regeneration points. This yields ergodicity for the Markov process and allows computation of the speed of simple random walk. We remark that Kesten (1986) has analyzed simple random walk

on a *critical* Galton-Watson tree conditioned on nonextinction, where the rate of escape is subdiffusive.

In order to construct a stationary Markov chain on the space of trees, we will use unlabelled but rooted trees. The family tree of a Galton-Watson process is rooted at the initial individual. Note that since our trees are unlabelled, the chance, say, that the family tree has two children of the root, one having one child and the other having three, is

$$2p_2p_1p_3. \tag{11.8}$$

Since various measures on the space of trees will need to be considered, we use **GW** to denote the standard measure on (family) trees given by a Galton-Watson process. We use **E** to refer only to the law of Z_1 in order to avoid confusion. We assume throughout this section, unless stated otherwise, that $p_k < 1$ for all k and that $p_0 = 0$.

In order to analyze the speed of simple random walk, we need to find a stationary measure for the environment process, i.e., the tree as seen from the current vertex. This will be a fundamental tool as well for our analysis of harmonic measure. Now the root of a Galton-Watson tree is different from the other vertices since it has stochastically one fewer neighbor. To remedy this defect, we consider augmented Galton-Watson measure, **AGW**. This measure is defined just like **GW** except that the number of children of the root (only) has the law of $Z_1 + 1$; i.e., the root has $k + 1$ children with probability p_k and these children all have independent standard Galton-Watson descendant trees.

THEOREM 11.15. *The Markov chain with transition probabilities \mathbf{p}_{SRW} and initial distribution **AGW** is stationary.*

Proof. The measure **AGW** is stationary since when the walk takes a step to a neighbor of the root, it goes to a vertex with one neighbor (where it just came from) plus a **GW**-tree; and the neighbor it came from also has attached another **GW**-tree. This is the same as **AGW**. ◀

REMARK. It is clear that the chain is locally reversible, i.e., that it is reversible on every communicating class. This, however, does not imply (global) reversibility. We will have no need for global reversibility, only for local reversibility (which is, indeed, a consequence of global reversibility). A proof of global reversibility may be found in Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres (1995b); this proof may also serve to convince the skeptic who finds insufficient the above reasoning for stationarity.

It now follows from Theorem 11.6 that simple random walk has positive speed with positive **AGW**-probability; we want to establish this a.s., so we will show ergodicity. This will also give us our formula for the speed.

We will find it convenient to work with random walks indexed by \mathbb{Z} rather than by \mathbb{N} . We will denote such a bi-infinite path $\dots, x_{-1}, x_0, x_1, \dots$ by \vec{x} . Similarly, a path of vertices x_0, x_1, \dots in T will be denoted \vec{x} and a path \dots, x_{-1}, x_0 will be denoted \bar{x} . We will regard a ray as either a path \vec{x} or \bar{x} that starts at the root and doesn't backtrack. The path of simple random walk has the property that a.s., it **converges** to a ray in the sense that there is a unique ray with which it shares infinitely many vertices. If a path \vec{x} converges to a ray ξ in this sense, then we will write $x_{+\infty} = \xi$. Similarly for a limit $x_{-\infty}$ of a path \bar{x} . The space of convergent paths \vec{x} in T will be denoted \vec{T} ; likewise, \bar{T} denotes the convergent paths \bar{x} and \overleftrightarrow{T} denotes the paths \vec{x} for which both \vec{x} and \bar{x} converge and have distinct limits.

Now since we actually want to work with a Markov chain on the space of trees rather than on a random tree, we will use the path space (actually, path bundle over the space of trees)

$$\text{PathsInTrees} := \left\{ (\vec{x}, T); \vec{x} \in \vec{T}, x_0 = \text{root}(T) \right\}.$$

Let S be the shift map:

$$(S\vec{x})_n := x_{n+1},$$

$$S(\vec{x}, T) := (S\vec{x}, \text{MoveRoot}(T, x_1)).$$

Extend simple random walk to all integer times by letting \bar{x} be an independent copy of \vec{x} . Let $\text{SRW} \times \text{AGW}$ denote the measure on PathsInTrees associated to this stationary Markov chain, although this is not a product measure.

▷ EXERCISE 11.14.

Show that this chain is indeed stationary.

When a random walk traverses an edge for the first and last time simultaneously, we say it **regenerates** since it will now remain in a previously unexplored tree. Thus, we define the set of **regeneration points**

$$\text{Regen} := \left\{ (\vec{x}, T) \in \text{PathsInTrees}; \forall n < 0 \ x_n \neq x_0, \ \forall n > 0 \ x_n \neq x_{-1} \right\}.$$

PROPOSITION 11.16. *For $\text{SRW} \times \text{AGW}$ -a.e. (\vec{x}, T) , there are infinitely many $n \geq 0$ for which $S^n(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{Regen}$. In other words, $(\text{PathsInTrees}, \text{SRW} \times \text{AGW}, S)$ is a tower over Regen.*

The subject of towers in ergodic theory is usually not covered in probability courses, so we review the relevant definitions and facts here. A **measure-preserving system**

(X, \mathcal{F}, μ, S) is a measure space (X, \mathcal{F}, μ) together with a measurable map S from X to itself such that for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mu(S^{-1}A) = \mu(A)$. Fix $A \in \mathcal{F}$ with $0 < \mu(A) < \infty$. We denote the **induced measure** on A by $\mu_A(C) := \mu(C)/\mu(A)$ for $C \subseteq A$. We also write $\mu(C | A)$ for $\mu_A(C)$ since it is a conditional measure. Define the **return time** to A by $n_A(x) := \inf\{n \geq 1; S^n x \in A\}$ for $x \in A$ and, if $n_A(x) < \infty$, the **return map** $S_A(x) := S^{n_A(x)}(x)$. The Poincaré recurrence theorem (Petersen (1983), p. 34) states that if $\mu(X) < \infty$, then $n_A(x) < \infty$ for a.e. $x \in A$. In this case, $(A, \mathcal{F} \cap A, \mu_A, S_A)$ is a measure-preserving system (Petersen (1983), p. 39), called the **induced system**. If $\mu(X \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} S^{-n}A) = 0$, then (X, \mathcal{F}, μ, S) is called a **(Kakutani) tower** over $(A, \mathcal{F} \cap A, \mu_A, S_A)$ with **height** function n_A . Conversely, given a measure-preserving system $(A, \mathcal{G}, \nu, \tilde{S})$ and a measurable function $n_A : A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$, we may construct a tower (X, \mathcal{F}, μ, S) over A with height function n_A by setting

$$\begin{aligned} X &:= \{(x, k) \in A \times \mathbb{N}^+; k \leq n_A(x)\}, \\ \mathcal{F} &:= \{B \subseteq X; \forall k \{x \in A; (x, k) \in B\} \in \mathcal{G}\}, \\ \mu(B) &:= \sum_{k \geq 1} \nu\{x \in A; (x, k) \in B\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$S(x, k) := \begin{cases} (x, k+1) & \text{if } k < n_A(x), \\ (\tilde{S}x, 1) & \text{if } k = n_A(x). \end{cases}$$

In this case, $x \in A$ is called the **base point** of $(x, k) \in X$. See Figure 11.2. If $\int n_A d\nu < \infty$, then we normally work with the probability measure $\mu_1 := \mu / \int n_A d\nu$ instead of μ . If $\mu(X) < \infty$, then by the Poincaré recurrence theorem, the following are equivalent:

- (X, \mathcal{F}, μ, S) is a tower over A ;
- for μ -a.e. $x \in X$ there is an $n \geq 0$ such that $S^n x \in A$.
- for μ -a.e. $x \in X$ there are infinitely many $n \geq 0$ such that $S^n x \in A$.

In this case, the Kac lemma (Petersen (1983), p. 46) gives that the mean return time to A is $\int_A n_A d\mu_A = \mu(X)/\mu(A)$. If X is a tower over A , then the system (X, \mathcal{F}, μ, S) is ergodic iff $(A, \mathcal{F} \cap A, \mu_A, S_A)$ is ergodic (Petersen (1983), p. 56).

Proof of Proposition 11.16. Define the set of **fresh points**

$$\text{Fresh} := \{(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{PathsInTrees}; \forall n < 0 \ x_n \neq x_0\}.$$

Note that by a.s. transience of simple random walk and the fact that harmonic measure is not concentrated on just one point, there are a.s. infinitely many $n \geq 0$ such $S^n(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{Fresh}$. Let \mathcal{F}_n be the σ -field generated by the subtree formed from the vertices $\{\dots, x_{-1}, x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ and their neighbors (or, equivalently, the σ -field generated by




Figure 11.2. A schematic of a tower over A , showing part of an orbit of x .

$\{\dots, x_{-1}, x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ and their degrees). Then by a.s. transience, $(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})(\text{Regen} \mid \text{Fresh}) > 0$ and, in fact, $(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})(\text{Regen} \mid \text{Fresh}, \mathcal{F}_{-1}) = (\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})(\text{Regen} \mid \text{Fresh})$. Let R be the event that there is at least one $k \geq 0$ for which $S^k(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{Regen}$. Then $(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})(R \mid \mathcal{F}_n)$ is at least the probability that the walk comes to a fresh vertex after time n , which is 1, times the conditional probability that at that time, the walk regenerates, which is a constant, $(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})(\text{Regen} \mid \text{Fresh})$. On the other hand, by the martingale convergence theorem, $(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})(R \mid \mathcal{F}_n) \rightarrow \mathbf{1}_R$ a.s., whence the limit must be $\mathbf{1}$. That is, R occurs a.s., which completes the proof that PathsInTrees is a tower over Regen . \blacktriangleleft

Given a tree T and a vertex x in T , the subtree T^x rooted at x denotes the subgraph of T formed from those edges and vertices that become disconnected from the root of T when x is removed. This may be considered as the descendant tree of x . The sequence of fresh trees $T \setminus T^{x_{-1}}$ seen at regeneration points (\vec{x}, T) is clearly stationary, but not i.i.d. However, the part of a tree between regeneration points, together with the path taken through this part of the tree, is independent of the rest of the tree and of the rest of the walk. We call this part a **slab**. To define this notion precisely, we use the return time n_{Regen} . For $(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{Regen}$, the associated **slab** (including the path taken through the slab) is

$$\text{Slab}(\vec{x}, T) := (\langle x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1} \rangle, T \setminus (T^{x_{-1}} \cup T^{x_n})) ,$$

where $n := n_{\text{Regen}}(\vec{x}, T)$. Thus, the random variables $\text{Slab}(S_{\text{Regen}}^k(\vec{x}, T))$ are i.i.d.

Since the random variables $\text{Slab}(S_{\text{Regen}}^k(\vec{x}, T))$ generate the σ -field of $(\text{Regen}, (\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})_{\text{Regen}}, S_{\text{Regen}})$, the system $(\text{Regen}, (\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})_{\text{Regen}}, S_{\text{Regen}})$ is ergodic, hence so is the system $(\text{PathsInTrees}, \text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW}, S)$.

THEOREM 11.17. *The speed (rate of escape) of simple random walk is $\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW}$ -a.s.*

$$l := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x_n|}{n} = \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{Z_1 - 1}{Z_1 + 1} \right]. \quad (11.9)$$

This is immediate now.

▷ **EXERCISE 11.15.**

Show that the same formula (11.9) holds for the speed of simple random walk on \mathbf{GW} -a.e. tree.

Now we consider the case when $p_0 > 0$. As usual, let q be the probability of extinction of the Galton-Watson process. Let Nonextinction be the event of nonextinction of an \mathbf{AGW} tree. Since \mathbf{AGW} is still invariant and Nonextinction is an invariant subset of trees, $\mathbf{AGW}_{\text{Nonextinction}}$ is SRW -invariant. The $\mathbf{AGW}_{\text{Nonextinction}}$ -distribution of the degree of the root is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{AGW}(\text{deg } x_0 = k + 1 \mid \text{Nonextinction}) &= \frac{\mathbf{AGW}(\text{Nonextinction} \mid \text{deg } x_0 = k + 1)}{\mathbf{AGW}(\text{Nonextinction})} p_k \\ &= p_k \frac{1 - q^{k+1}}{1 - q^2}. \end{aligned}$$

▷ **EXERCISE 11.16.**

Prove this formula.

The proof of Theorem 11.17 on speed is valid when one conditions on nonextinction in the appropriate places. It gives the following formula:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x_n|}{n} = \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{Z_1 - 1}{Z_1 + 1} \mid \text{Nonextinction} \right] = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{k - 1}{k + 1} p_k \frac{1 - q^{k+1}}{1 - q^2}.$$

For example, the speed when $p_1 = p_2 = 1/2$ is $1/6$, while for the offspring distribution of the same unconditional mean $p_0 = p_3 = 1/2$, the speed given nonextinction is only $(7 - 3\sqrt{5})/8 = 0.036^+$.

▷ EXERCISE 11.17.

Define $T_\Delta := [\Delta \bullet - T]$, where Δ is a single vertex not in T , to be thought of as representing the past. Let $\gamma(T)$ be the probability that simple random walk started at Δ never returns to Δ :

$$\gamma(T) := \text{SRW}_{T_\Delta}(\forall n > 0 \quad x_n \neq \Delta).$$

This is also equal to $\text{SRW}_{[T \bullet - \Delta]}(\forall n > 0 \quad x_n \neq \Delta)$. Let $\mathcal{C}(T)$ denote the effective conductance of T from its root to infinity when each edge has unit conductance. Show that

$$\gamma(T) = \frac{\mathcal{C}(T)}{1 + \mathcal{C}(T)} = \mathcal{C}(T_\Delta).$$

The notation γ is intended to remind us of the word “conductance”.

§11.5. Biased Random Walks on Galton-Watson Trees.

Maybe prove positive speed for $\lambda > 1$ except for proving that slabs are i.i.d.

Prove $\lambda \leq f'(q)$ implies zero speed.

Chen’s inequality/ies.

§11.6. Notes.

In Section 11.4 we gave a short proof that simple random walk on infinite Galton-Watson trees is a.s. transient. This result was first proved by Grimmett and Kesten (1983), Lemma 2.

Entropy and harmonic functions on groups. G_1 and questions on other groups.

Local and global reversibility.

§11.7. Additional Exercises.

11.18. Since simple random walk on a graph is a reversible Markov chain, the Markov chain on \widehat{T} induced by simple random walk is “locally reversible” in being reversible on each communicating class of states. A stationary measure μ is not necessarily “globally reversible”, however; i.e., it is not necessarily the case that for Borel sets $A, B \subseteq \widehat{T}$,

$$\int_A p(T, B) d\mu(T) = \int_B p(T, A) d\mu(T).$$

Give such an example. On the other hand, prove that every globally reversible μ is stationary.

11.19. For $(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{PathsInTrees}$, write $N(\vec{x}, T) := |\{n; x_n = x_0\}|$ for the number of visits to the root of T . For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $D_k(\vec{x}, T) := \{j \in \mathbb{N}; \deg x_j = k + 1\}$.

(a) Show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2n + 1} |D_k(\vec{x}, T) \cap [-n, n]| = p_k \quad \text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW}\text{-a.s.}$$

This means that the proportion of time that simple random walk spends at vertices of degree $k + 1$ is p_k .

(b) For $i \geq 0$, let γ_i be i.i.d. random variables with the distribution of the **GW**-law of $\gamma(T)$, where $\gamma(T)$ is defined in Exercise 11.17. Let

$$\Gamma_k := \int (k + 1) / (\gamma_0 + \dots + \gamma_k) d\mathbf{GW}.$$

Show that

$$\int N(\vec{x}, T) d\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW}((\vec{x}, T) \mid \deg x_0 = k + 1) = 2\Gamma_k - 1$$

and that Γ_k is decreasing in k . What is $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_k$?

(c) The result in (a) says that there is no biasing of visits to a vertex according to its degree, just as Theorem 11.15 says. Yet the result in (b) indicates that there is indeed a biasing. How can these results be compatible?

(d) What is

$$\int N(\vec{x}, T) d\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW}((\vec{x}, T) \mid \deg x_0 = k + 1, \text{Fresh})?$$

11.20. Show that a labelled tree chosen according to **GW** a.s. has no graph-automorphisms except for the identity map.

Chapter 12

Hausdorff Dimension

§12.1. Basics.

How do we capture the intrinsic dimension of a geometric object (such as a curve, a surface, or a body)? Assume that the object is bounded. One approach is via scaling: in its dimension, its measure would change by a factor r^d , where r is the linear scale change and d is the dimension. But this requires knowing the dimension d and requires moving outside the object itself. Another approach is to cover the object by small sets, leaving the object itself unchanged. If E is a bounded set in euclidean space, let $N(E, \epsilon)$ be the number of balls of diameter at most ϵ required to cover E . Then when E is d -dimensional, $N(E, \epsilon) \approx C/\epsilon^d$. To get at d , then, look at $\log N(E, \epsilon)/\log(1/\epsilon)$ and take some kind of limit as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. This gives the **upper** and **lower Minkowski dimensions**:

$$\dim^{\text{M}} E := \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log N(E, \epsilon)}{\log(1/\epsilon)},$$

$$\dim_{\text{M}} E := \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log N(E, \epsilon)}{\log(1/\epsilon)}.$$

The lower Minkowski dimension is often called simply the Minkowski dimension. Note that we could use cubes instead of balls, or even b -adic cubes

$$[a_1 b^{-n}, (a_1 + 1)b^{-n}] \times [a_2 b^{-n}, (a_2 + 1)b^{-n}] \times \cdots \times [a_d b^{-n}, (a_d + 1)b^{-n}] \quad (a_i \in \mathbb{Z}, n \in \mathbb{N}),$$

and not change these dimensions. For future reference, we call n the **order** of a b -adic cube if the sides of the cube have length b^{-n} .

These definitions make sense in any metric space E . Thus they are intrinsic. It is clear that the Minkowski dimension of a singleton is 0.

EXAMPLE 12.1. Let E be the standard middle-thirds Cantor set,

$$E := \left\{ \sum_{n \geq 1} x_n 3^{-n}; x_n \in \{0, 2\} \right\}.$$

To calculate the Minkowski dimensions of E , it is convenient to use triadic intervals, of course. We have that $N(E, 3^{-n}) = 2^n$, so for $\epsilon = 3^{-n}$, we have

$$\frac{\log N(E, \epsilon)}{\log(1/\epsilon)} = \frac{\log 2}{\log 3}.$$

Thus, the upper and lower Minkowski dimensions are both $\log 2 / \log 3$.

EXAMPLE 12.2. Let $E := \{1/n; n \geq 1\}$. Given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, let k be such that $1/k^2 \approx \epsilon$. Then it takes about $1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$ intervals of length ϵ to cover $E \cap [0, 1/k]$ and about $1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$ more to cover the k points in $E \cap [1/k, 1]$. It can be shown that, indeed, $N(E, \epsilon) \approx 2/\sqrt{\epsilon}$, so that $\dim_M E = 1/2$.

This example shows that a countable union of sets of Minkowski dimension 0 may have positive Minkowski dimension, even when the union consists entirely of isolated points. For this reason, Minkowski dimensions are not entirely suitable.

So we consider yet another approach. In what dimension should we measure the *size* of E ? Note that a surface has infinite 1-dimensional measure but zero 3-dimensional measure. How do we measure size in an arbitrary dimension? Define **Hausdorff α -dimensional (outer) measure** by

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha(E) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\text{diam } E_i)^\alpha; E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i, \forall i \text{ diam } E_i < \epsilon \right\}.$$

(The limit as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ here exists because the infimum is taken over smaller sets as ϵ decreases.) Note that, up to a bounded factor, the restriction of \mathcal{H}_d to Borel sets in \mathbb{R}^d is d -dimensional Lebesgue measure, \mathcal{L}_d .

▷ EXERCISE 12.1.

Show that for any $E \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a real number α_0 such that $\alpha < \alpha_0 \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\alpha(E) = +\infty$ and $\alpha > \alpha_0 \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\alpha(E) = 0$.

The number α_0 of the preceding exercise is called the **Hausdorff dimension** of E , denoted $\dim_H E$ or simply $\dim E$. We can also write

$$\dim E = \inf \left\{ \alpha; \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\text{diam } E_i)^\alpha; E \subseteq \bigcup_i E_i \right\} = 0 \right\}.$$

Again, these definitions make sense in any metric space (in some circumstances, you may need to recall that the infimum of the empty set is $+\infty$). In \mathbb{R}^d , we could restrict ourselves

to covers by open sets, spheres or b -adic cubes; this would change \mathcal{H}_α by at most a bounded factor, and so would leave the dimension unchanged. Also, $\dim E \leq \dim_{\text{M}} E$ for any E : if $E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{N(E,\epsilon)} E_i$ with $\text{diam } E_i \leq \epsilon$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N(E,\epsilon)} (\text{diam } E_i)^\alpha \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N(E,\epsilon)} \epsilon^\alpha = N(E,\epsilon) \epsilon^\alpha.$$

Thus, if $\alpha > \dim_{\text{M}} E$, we get $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(E) = 0$.

EXAMPLE 12.3. Let E be the standard middle-thirds Cantor set again. For an upper bound on its Hausdorff dimension, we use the Minkowski dimension, $\log 2 / \log 3$. For a lower bound, let μ be the Cantor-Lebesgue measure, i.e., the law of $\sum_{n \geq 1} X_n 3^{-n}$ when X_n are i.i.d. with $\mathbf{P}[X_n = 0] = \mathbf{P}[X_n = 2] = 1/2$. Let E_i be triadic intervals whose union covers E . Now every triadic interval either is disjoint from E or is one of those entering in the construction of E . When E_i is one of the latter, we have

$$(\text{diam } E_i)^{\log 2 / \log 3} = \mu(E_i),$$

whence we get that

$$\sum_i (\text{diam } E_i)^{\log 2 / \log 3} \geq \sum_i \mu(E_i) \geq \mu(E) = 1.$$

(Except for wasteful covers, these inequalities are equalities.) This shows that $\dim E \geq \log 2 / \log 3$. Therefore, the Hausdorff dimension is in fact equal to the Minkowski dimension in this case.

EXAMPLE 12.4. If $E := \{1/n; n \geq 1\}$, then $\dim E = 0$: For any $\alpha, \epsilon > 0$, we may cover E by the sets $E_i := [1/i, 1/i + (\epsilon/2^i)^{1/\alpha}]$, showing that $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(E) < \epsilon$.

EXAMPLE 12.5. Let E be the Cantor middle-thirds set. The set $E \times E$ is called the planar Cantor set. We have $\dim E = \dim^{\text{M}} E = \log 4 / \log 3$. To prove this, note that it requires 4^n triadic squares of order n to cover E , whence $\dim^{\text{M}} E = \log 4 / \log 3$. On the other hand, if μ is the Cantor-Lebesgue measure, then $\mu \times \mu$ is supported by $E \times E$. If E_i are triadic squares covering $E \times E$, then as in Example 12.3,

$$\sum_i (\text{diam } E_i)^{\log 4 / \log 3} \geq \sum_i (\mu \times \mu)(E_i) \geq (\mu \times \mu)(E \times E) = 1.$$

Hence $\dim E \times E \geq \log 4 / \log 3$.

▷ EXERCISE 12.2.

The Sierpinski carpet is the set

$$E := \left\{ \left(\sum_n x_n 3^{-n}, \sum_n y_n 3^{-n} \right) ; x_n, y_n \in \{0, 1, 2\}, \forall n \ x_n \neq 1 \text{ or } y_n \neq 1 \right\}.$$

That is, the unit square is divided into its nine triadic subsquares of order 1 and (the interior of) the middle one is removed. This process is repeated on each of the remaining 8 squares, and so on. Show that $\dim E = \dim^M E = \log 8 / \log 3$.

▷ EXERCISE 12.3.

The Sierpinski gasket is the set obtained by partitioning a triangle into four congruent pieces and removing (the interior of) the middle one, then repeating this process *ad infinitum* on the remaining pieces, as in Figures 12.1 and 12.2. Show that its Hausdorff dimension is $\log 3 / \log 2$.




Figure 12.1. The first three stages of the construction of the Sierpinski gasket.

▷ EXERCISE 12.4.

Show that for any sets E_n , $\dim(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n) = \sup \dim E_n$.

▷ EXERCISE 12.5.

Show that if $E_1 \supseteq E_2 \supseteq \dots$, then $\dim \bigcap E_n \leq \lim \dim E_n$.

One can extend the notion of Hausdorff measures to other **gauge functions** $h : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ in place of $h(t) := t^\alpha$. We require merely that h be continuous and increasing and that $h(0^+) = 0$. This allows for finer examination of the size of E in cases when $\mathcal{H}_{\dim E}(E) \in \{0, \infty\}$.




Figure 12.2. The Sierpinski gasket, drawn by O. Schramm.

§12.2. Coding by Trees.

Recall from Section 1.9 how, following Furstenberg (1970), we associate trees to closed sets in $[0, 1]$ (later in this section, we will consider much more general associations to bounded sets in \mathbb{R}^d). Namely, for $E \subseteq [0, 1]$ and for any integer $b \geq 2$, consider the system of b -adic subintervals of $[0, 1]$. Those whose intersection with E is non-empty will form the vertices of the associated tree. Two such intervals are connected by an edge iff one contains the other and their orders differ by one. The root of this tree is $[0, 1]$ (provided $E \neq \emptyset$). We denote the tree by $T_{[b]}(E)$ and call it the **b -adic coding of E** .

EXAMPLE: For the Cantor middle-thirds set and for the base $b = 3$, the associated tree is the binary tree. Note that if, instead of always taking out the middle third in the construction of the set, we took out the last third, we would still get the binary tree as its 3-adic coding.

If $T_{[b]}(E)$ the b -adic coding of E , then we claim that

$$\text{br } T_{[b]}(E) = b^{\dim E}, \quad (12.1)$$

$$\underline{\text{gr}} T_{[b]}(E) = b^{\dim_M E}, \quad (12.2)$$

$$\overline{\text{gr}} T_{[b]}(E) = b^{\dim^M E}. \quad (12.3)$$




Figure 12.3. In this case $b = 4$.

For note that a cover of E by b -adic intervals is essentially the same as a cutset of $T_{[b]}(E)$. If the interval I_v corresponds to (actually, is) the vertex $v \in T_{[b]}(E)$, then $\text{diam } I_v = b^{-|v|}$. Thus,

$$\dim E = \inf \left\{ \alpha ; \inf_{\Pi} \sum_{e \in \Pi} b^{-\alpha|e|} = 0 \right\} .$$

Comparing this with the formula (2.18) for the branching number gives (12.1).

▷ EXERCISE 12.6.

Deduce (12.2) and (12.3) in the same way.

This helps us to see that the tree coding a set determines the dimension of the set, that the placement of particular digits in the coding doesn't influence the dimension. We may also say that $b^{\dim E}$ is an average number of b -adic subintervals intersecting E of order 1 more than a given b -adic interval intersecting E .

EXAMPLE 12.6. We may easily rederive the Hausdorff and Minkowski dimensions of the Cantor middle-thirds set, E . Since $T_{[3]}(E)$ is a binary tree, it has branching number and growth 2. From (12.1) and (12.2), it follows that the Hausdorff and Minkowski dimensions are both $\log 2 / \log 3$.

▷ EXERCISE 12.7.

Reinterpret Theorems 2.19 and 4.16 as theorems on random walks on b -adic intervals intersecting E and on random b -adic possible coverings of E .

For any tree T , define a metric on its boundary ∂T by $d(\xi, \eta) := e^{-|\xi \wedge \eta|}$ ($\xi \neq \eta$), where $\xi \wedge \eta$ is defined to be the vertex common to both ξ and η that is furthest from 0 if

$\xi \neq \eta$ and $\xi \wedge \eta := \xi$ if $\xi = \eta$. With this metric, we can consider $\dim E$ for $E \subseteq \partial T$. The covers to consider here are by sets of the form

$$I_v := \{\xi \in \partial T; v \in \xi\} \tag{12.4}$$

since any subset of ∂T is contained in such a special set of the same diameter. (Namely, if $E \subseteq \partial T$ and $v := \bigwedge_{\xi \in E} \xi$, in the obvious extension of the \wedge notation, then $E \subseteq I_v$ and $\text{diam } E = \text{diam } I_v$.)

▷ EXERCISE 12.8.

What is $\text{diam } I_v$?

In particular, for the subset $\partial' T$, we have

$$\dim \partial' T = \log \text{br } T$$

as in Section 1.7, so that

$$\dim \partial T_{[b]}(E) = (\dim E) \log b.$$

There is a more general way than b -adic coding to relate trees to certain types of sets. Denote the interior of a set I by $\text{int } I$. Suppose that for each vertex $v \in T$, there is a compact set $\emptyset \neq I_v \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with the following properties:

$$I_v = \overline{\text{int } I_v}, \tag{12.5}$$

$$u \rightarrow v \implies I_v \subseteq I_u, \tag{12.6}$$

$$\bar{u} = \bar{v} \text{ and } u \neq v \implies \text{int } I_u \cap \text{int } I_v = \emptyset, \tag{12.7}$$

$$\forall \xi \in \partial T \quad \lim_{v \in \xi} \text{diam } I_v = 0, \tag{12.8}$$

$$C_1 := \inf_{v \neq o} \frac{\text{diam } I_v}{\text{diam } I_{\bar{v}}} > 0, \tag{12.9}$$

$$C_2 := \inf_v \frac{\mathcal{L}_d(\text{int } I_v)}{(\text{diam } I_v)^d} > 0. \tag{12.10}$$

For example, if the sets I_v are b -adic cubes of order $|v|$, this is just a multidimensional version of the previous coding. For the Sierpinski gasket (Exercise 12.3), more natural sets I_v are equilateral triangles. Similarly, for the von Koch snowflake (Figure 12.4), natural sets to use are again equilateral triangles (see Figure 12.5).




Figure 12.4. The first three stages of the construction of the von Koch snowflake.




Figure 12.5. The sets I_v for the top side of the von Koch snowflake.

▷ EXERCISE 12.9.

Prove that under the conditions (12.5)–(12.10),

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{|v|=n} \text{diam } I_v = 0.$$

We may associate the following set to T and I_\bullet :

$$I_T := \bigcup_{\xi \in \partial T} \bigcap_{v \in \xi} I_v.$$

If T is locally finite (as it must be when C_1 and C_2 are positive), then we also have

$$I_T = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \bigcup_{|v|=n} I_v.$$

▷ EXERCISE 12.10.

Prove this equality (if T is locally finite).

For example, $I_{T_{[b]}(E)} = E$.

The sets $\{I_v\}_{v \in T}$ are actually the only ones we need consider in determining $\dim I_T$ or even, up to a bounded factor, $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(I_T)$:

THEOREM 12.7. *If (12.5)–(12.10) hold, then*

$$\dim I_T = \inf \left\{ \alpha; \inf_{\Pi} \sum_{e(v) \in \Pi} (\text{diam} I_v)^\alpha = 0 \right\}.$$

In fact, for $\alpha > 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha(I_T) \leq \liminf_{d(0, \Pi) \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{e(v) \in \Pi} (\text{diam} I_v)^\alpha \leq C \mathcal{H}_\alpha(I_T), \tag{12.11}$$

where

$$C := \frac{4^d}{C_2 C_1^d}.$$

COROLLARY 12.8. *If the sets I_v are b -adic cubes of order $|v|$ in \mathbb{R}^d , then*

$$\dim I_T = \dim \partial T / \log b.$$

When this corollary is applied to $T = T_{[b]}(E)$, we obtain (12.1) again. To prove Theorem 12.7, we need a little geometric fact:

LEMMA 12.9. *Let E and O_i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) be subsets of \mathbb{R}^d such that O_i are open and disjoint, $\overline{O_i} \cap E \neq \emptyset$, $\text{diam} O_i \leq \text{diam} E$, and $\mathcal{L}_d(O_i) \geq C(\text{diam} E)^d$. Then $n \leq 4^d/C$.*

Proof. Fix $x_0 \in E$ and let B be the closed ball centered at x with radius $2 \cdot \text{diam} E$. Then $\overline{O_i} \subseteq B$, whence

$$(4 \text{diam} E)^d \geq \mathcal{L}_d(B) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_d(O_i) \geq nC(\text{diam} E)^d. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

▷ **EXERCISE 12.11.**

Prove the left-hand inequality of (12.11).

Proof of Theorem 12.7. For the right-hand inequality of (12.11), consider a cover by sets of positive diameter

$$I_T \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i.$$

For each i , put

$$\Pi_i := \{e(v); \text{diam } I_v \leq \text{diam } E_i < \text{diam } I_{\frac{v}{2}}\}.$$

This is a cutset, so

$$I_T \cap E_i \subseteq I_T \subseteq \bigcup_{e(v) \in \Pi_i} I_v.$$

Also, for $e(v) \in \Pi_i$, we have $\mathcal{L}_d(\text{int } I_v) \geq C_2(\text{diam } I_v)^d \geq C_2 C_1^d (\text{diam } I_{\frac{v}{2}})^d > C_2 C_1^d (\text{diam } E_i)^d$, whence by Lemma 12.9,

$$V_i := \{e(v) \in \Pi_i; I_v \cap E_i \neq \emptyset\}$$

has at most $C = 4^d / (C_2 C_1^d)$ elements. Now

$$I_T \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(E_i \cap \bigcup_{e(v) \in V_i} I_v \right) \subseteq \bigcup_i \bigcup_{e(v) \in V_i} I_v$$

and the cutset $\Pi := \bigcup V_i$ satisfies

$$\sum_{e(v) \in \Pi} (\text{diam } I_v)^\alpha \leq \sum_{i, e(v) \in V_i} (\text{diam } I_v)^\alpha \leq \sum_{i, e(v) \in V_i} (\text{diam } E_i)^\alpha \leq c \sum_i (\text{diam } E_i)^\alpha. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

▷ EXERCISE 12.12.

- (a) Suppose that μ is a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d such that the measure of every b -adic cube of order n is at most $Cb^{-n\alpha}$ for some constants C and α . Show that there is a constant C' such that the measure of every ball of radius r is at most $C'r^\alpha$.
- (b) The **Frostman exponent** of a probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d is

$$\text{Frost}\mu := \sup\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}; \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d, r > 0} \mu(B_r(x)) / r^\alpha < \infty\},$$

where $B_r(x)$ is the ball of radius r centered at x . Show that the Hausdorff dimension of every compact set is the supremum of the Frostman exponents of the probability measures it supports.

§12.3. Galton-Watson Fractals.

We may combine Theorem 12.7 with Falconer’s Theorem 4.21 on Galton-Watson networks to determine the dimension of random fractals. Thus, suppose that the sets I_v are randomly assigned to a Galton-Watson tree in such a way that the regularity conditions

$$\begin{aligned} I_v &= \overline{\text{int } I_v}, \\ u \rightarrow v &\implies I_v \subseteq I_u, \\ \tilde{u} = \tilde{v} \text{ and } u \neq v &\implies \text{int } I_u \cap \text{int } I_v = \emptyset, \\ \inf_v \mathcal{L}_d(\text{int } I_v)/(\text{diam } I_v)^d &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

are satisfied a.s. and their normalized diameters $c(e(v)) := \text{diam } I_v / \text{diam } I_0$ are the capacities of a Galton-Watson network with generating random variable $\mathcal{L} := (L, A_1, \dots, A_L)$, $0 < A_i < 1$ a.s. (You might want to glance at the examples following the proof of the theorem at this point.)

THEOREM 12.10. (FALCONER (1986), MAULDIN AND WILLIAMS (1986)) *Almost surely on nonextinction,*

$$\dim I_{T'} = \min \left\{ \alpha; \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^L A_i^\alpha \right] \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Proof. Since $I_o \supseteq \bigcup_{|v|=1} I_v$ and $\{\text{int } I_v\}_{|v|=1}$ are disjoint, $\mathcal{L}_d(I_o) \geq \sum \mathcal{L}_d(\text{int } I_v)$, whence $(\text{diam } I_o)^d \geq \mathcal{L}_d(I_o) \geq C_2 \sum (\text{diam } I_v)^d = C_2 (\text{diam } I_o)^d \sum_{|v|=1} A_v^d$, whence $\mathbf{E}[\sum_1^L A_i^d] \leq 1/C_2$. By the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, $\alpha \mapsto \mathbf{E}[\sum_1^L A_i^\alpha]$ is continuous on $[d, \infty]$ and has limit 0 at ∞ , so there is some α such that $\mathbf{E}[\sum_1^L A_i^\alpha] \leq 1$. Since $\alpha \mapsto \mathbf{E}[\sum_1^L A_i^\alpha]$ is continuous from the right on $[0, \infty)$ by the monotone convergence theorem, it follows that the minimum written exists.

Assume first that $\exists \epsilon > 0 \forall i \ \epsilon \leq A_i \leq 1 - \epsilon$ a.s. Then the last regularity conditions, (12.8) and (12.9), are satisfied a.s.: $\forall \xi \in \partial' T \ \lim_{v \in \xi} \text{diam } I_v = 0$,

$$\inf_{v \neq o} \frac{\text{diam } I_v}{\text{diam } I_v^-} = \inf_{v \neq o} A_v \geq \epsilon.$$

Hence Theorem 12.7 assures us that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim I_{T'} &= \inf \left\{ \alpha; \inf_{\Pi} \sum_{e(v) \in \Pi} (\text{diam } I_v)^\alpha = 0 \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \alpha; \inf_{\Pi} \sum_{e \in \Pi} c(e)^\alpha = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now the capacities $\langle c(e)^\alpha \rangle$ come from a Galton-Watson network with $\mathcal{L}^{(\alpha)} := (L, A_1^\alpha, \dots, A_L^\alpha)$, whence Falconer's Theorem 4.21 says that

$$\inf_{\Pi} \sum_{e \in \Pi} c(e)^\alpha = 0 \text{ a.s. if } \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_1^L A_i^\alpha \right] \leq 1$$

while

$$\inf_{\Pi} \sum_{e \in \Pi} c(e)^\alpha > 0 \text{ a.s. if } \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_1^L A_i^\alpha \right] > 1.$$

This gives the result.

For the general case, note that $\mathbf{E}[\sum_1^L A_i^\alpha] \leq 1 \Rightarrow \inf_{\Pi} \sum c(e)^\alpha = 0 \text{ a.s.} \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\alpha(I_{T'}) = 0 \text{ a.s.}$ For the other direction, consider the Galton-Watson subnetwork $T_{(\epsilon)}$ consisting of those branches with $\epsilon \leq A_i \leq 1 - \epsilon$. Thus $I_{T'_{(\epsilon)}} \subseteq I_{T'}$. From the above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_1^L A_i^\alpha \mathbf{1}_{\epsilon \leq A_i \leq 1 - \epsilon} \right] > 1 &\implies \mathcal{H}_\alpha(I_{T'_{(\epsilon)}}) > 0 \text{ a.s. on nonextinction of } T_{(\epsilon)} \\ &\implies \mathcal{H}_\alpha(I_{T'}) > 0 \text{ a.s. on nonextinction of } T_{(\epsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{P}[T'_{(\epsilon)} \neq \emptyset] \rightarrow \mathbf{P}[T' \neq \emptyset]$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ by Exercise 4.12 and

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\sum_1^L A_i^\alpha \right] = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_1^L A_i^\alpha \mathbf{1}_{\epsilon \leq A_i \leq 1 - \epsilon} \right]$$

by the monotone convergence theorem, it follows that $\mathbf{E}[\sum A_i^\alpha] > 1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\alpha(I_{T'}) > 0 \text{ a.s. on } T' \neq \emptyset.$ ◀

REMARK. By Falconer's theorem, $\mathcal{H}_{\dim I_{T'}}(I_{T'}) = 0 \text{ a.s.}$

EXAMPLE 12.11. Divide $[0, 1]$ into 3 equal parts and keep each independently with probability p . Repeat this with the remaining intervals *ad infinitum*. The Galton-Watson network comes from the random variable $\mathcal{L} = (L, A_1, \dots, A_L)$, where L is a $\text{Bin}(3, p)$ -random variable, so that $\mathbf{E}[s^L] = (\bar{p} + ps)^3$, and $A_i \equiv 1/3$. Thus extinction is a.s. iff $p \leq 1/3$, while for $p > 1/3$, the probability of extinction q satisfies $(\bar{p} + pq)^3 = q$ and a.s. on nonextinction,

$$\begin{aligned} \dim I_{T'} &= \min \left\{ \alpha; \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_1^L A_i^\alpha \right] \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \min \{ \alpha; (1/3)^\alpha 3p \leq 1 \} \\ &= 1 + \log p / \log 3. \end{aligned}$$

EXAMPLE 12.12. Remove from $[0, 1]$ a central portion leaving two intervals of random length $A_1 = A_2 \in (0, 1/2)$. Repeat on the remaining intervals *ad infinitum*. Here $L \equiv 2$. There is no extinction and a.s. $\dim I_T$ is the root of

$$1 = \mathbf{E}[A_1^\alpha + A_2^\alpha] = 2\mathbf{E}[A_1^\alpha].$$

For example, if A_1 is uniform on $[0, 1/2]$, then

$$\mathbf{E}[A_1^\alpha] = 2 \int_0^{1/2} t^\alpha dt = \frac{1}{2^\alpha(\alpha + 1)},$$

whence $\dim I_T \approx 0.457$.

EXAMPLE 12.13. Suppose M and N are random integers with $M \geq 2$ and $0 \leq N \leq M^2$. Divide the unit square into M^2 equal squares and keep N of them (in some manner). Repeat on the remaining squares *ad infinitum*. The probability of extinction of the associated Galton-Watson network is a root of $\mathbf{E}[s^N] = s$ and a.s. on nonextinction,

$$\dim I_{T'} = \min\{\alpha; \mathbf{E}[N/M^{2\alpha}] \leq 1\}.$$

By selecting the squares appropriately, one can have infinite connectivity of $I_{T'}$.

EXAMPLE 12.14. Here, we consider the zero set E of Brownian motion B_t on \mathbb{R} . That is, $E := \{t; B_t = 0\}$. To find $\dim E$, we may restrict to an interval $[0, t_0]$ where $B_{t_0} = 0$. Of course, t_0 is random. By scale invariance of B_t and of Hausdorff dimension, the time t_0 makes no difference. So let's condition on $B_1 = 0$. This is known as **Brownian bridge**. Calculation of finite-dimensional marginals shows B_t given $B_1 = 0$ to have the same law as $B_t^0 := B_t - tB_1$. One way to construct E is as follows. From $[0, 1]$, remove the interval (τ_1, τ_2) , where $\tau_1 := \max\{t < \frac{1}{2}; B_t^0 = 0\}$ and $\tau_2 := \min\{t > \frac{1}{2}; B_t^0 = 0\}$. Independence and scaling shows that E is obtained as the iteration of this process. That is, $E = I_T$, where T is the binary tree and $A_1 := \tau_1$ and $A_2 := 1 - \tau_2$ are the lengths of the surviving intervals. One can show that the joint density of A_1 and A_2 is

$$\mathbf{P}[A_1 \in da_1, A_2 \in da_2] = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{a_1 a_2 (1 - a_1 - a_2)^3}} da_1 da_2 \quad (a_1, a_2 \in [0, 1/2]).$$

Straightforward calculus then shows that $\mathbf{E}[A_1^{1/2} + A_2^{1/2}] = 1$, so $\dim E = 1/2$ a.s. This result is due to Taylor (1955), but this method is due to Graf, Mauldin, and Williams (1988).

More examples of the use of Theorem 12.10 can be found in Mauldin and Williams (1986).

§12.4. Hölder Exponent.

Let T be an infinite locally finite tree and μ be a Borel probability measure on ∂T . Even if there is no proper closed subset of ∂T of μ -measure 1, there may still be “much smaller” subsets of ∂T that carry μ . That is, there may be sets $E \subseteq \partial T$ with $\dim E < \dim \partial T$ and $\mu(E) = 1$. This suggests defining the **dimension** of μ as

$$\dim \mu := \min\{\dim E; \mu(E) = 1\}.$$

▷ EXERCISE 12.13.

Show that this minimum exists.

▷ EXERCISE 12.14.

Let T be an infinite locally finite tree. Show that there is a one-to-one correspondence between unit flows θ from o to ∂T and Borel probability measures μ on ∂T satisfying

$$\theta(v) = \mu(\{\xi; v \in \xi\}).$$

The dimension of a measure is most often computed by calculating pointwise information, rather than by using the definition, and then using the following theorem of Billingsley (1965). For a ray $\xi = \langle \xi_1, \xi_2, \dots \rangle \in \partial T$, identify μ with the unit flow corresponding to μ as in Exercise 12.14 and define the **Hölder exponent** of μ at ξ to be

$$\text{Hö}(\mu)(\xi) := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{\mu(\xi_n)}.$$

For example, if T is the m -ary tree, $\theta(v) := m^{-|v|}$, and μ is the probability measure corresponding to the unit flow θ , then the Hölder exponent of μ is everywhere $\log m$.

THEOREM 12.15. *For any Borel probability measure μ on the boundary of a tree,*

$$\dim \mu = \mu\text{-ess sup } \text{Hö}(\mu).$$

Proof. Let $d := \mu\text{-ess sup } \text{Hö}(\mu)$. We first exhibit a carrier of μ whose dimension is at most d . Then we show that every carrier of μ has dimension at least d .

Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha > d$, let

$$\begin{aligned} E(k, \alpha) &:= \{\xi \in \partial T; \exists n \geq k \quad (1/n) \log(1/\mu(\xi_n)) \leq \alpha\} \\ &= \{\xi \in \partial T; \exists n \geq k \quad e^{-n\alpha} \leq \mu(\xi_n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then clearly $\bigcap_{\alpha} \bigcap_k E(k, \alpha)$ is a carrier of μ . To show that it has Hausdorff dimension at most d , it suffices, by Exercise 12.5, to show that $\dim \bigcap_k E(k, \alpha) \leq \alpha$. Clearly $E(k, \alpha)$ is

open, so is a countable union of disjoint sets of the form (12.4), call them I_{v_i} , with all $|v_i| \geq k$ and

$$(\text{diam } I_{v_i})^\alpha \leq e^{-|v_i|^\alpha} \leq \mu(I_{v_i}).$$

Since

$$\sum_i (\text{diam } I_{v_i})^\alpha \leq \sum_i \mu(I_{v_i}) \leq 1$$

and the sets I_{v_i} also cover $\cap_k E(k, \alpha)$, it follows that $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\cap_k E(k, \alpha)) \leq 1$. This implies our desired inequality $\dim \cap_k E(k, \alpha) \leq \alpha$.

For the other direction, suppose that F is a carrier of μ . For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha < d$, let

$$F(k, \alpha) := \{\xi \in F; \forall n \geq k \quad (1/n) \log(1/\mu(\xi_n)) \geq \alpha\}.$$

Then $\mu(F(k, \alpha)) > 0$ for sufficiently large k . Fix such a k . To show that $\dim F \geq d$, it suffices to show that $\dim F(k, \alpha) \geq \alpha$. Indeed, reasoning similar to that in the preceding paragraph shows that $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(F(k, \alpha)) \geq \mu(F(k, \alpha))$, which completes the proof. ◀

As an example of the calculation of Hölder exponent, consider the harmonic measure of **simple forward random walk**, which is the random walk that starts at the root and chooses randomly (uniformly) among the children of the present vertex as the next vertex. The corresponding harmonic measure on ∂T is called **visibility measure**, denoted VIS_T , and corresponds to the **equally-splitting flow**. Suppose now that T is a Galton-Watson tree starting, as usual, with one particle and having Z_1 children. Identifying measure and flow, we have that VIS_T is a flow on the random tree T . Let **GW** denote the distribution of Galton-Watson trees. The probability measure that corresponds to choosing a Galton-Watson tree T at random followed by a ray of ∂T chosen according to VIS_T will be denoted $\text{VIS} \times \text{GW}$. Formally, this is

$$(\text{VIS} \times \text{GW})(F) := \iint \mathbf{1}_F(\xi, T) d\text{VIS}_T(\xi) d\text{GW}(T).$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{\text{VIS}_T(\xi_n)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \log \frac{\text{VIS}_T(\xi_k)}{\text{VIS}_T(\xi_{k+1})}$$

and the random variables $\text{VIS}_T(\xi_{k-1})/\text{VIS}_T(\xi_k)$ are $\text{VIS} \times \text{GW}$ -i.i.d. with the same distribution as Z_1 , the strong law of large numbers gives

$$\text{Hö}(\text{VIS}_T)(\xi) = \mathbf{E}[\log Z_1] \quad \text{VIS} \times \text{GW-a.s. } (\xi, T).$$

Thus $\dim \text{VIS}_T = \mathbf{E}[\log Z_1]$ for GW -a.e. tree T . Jensen's inequality (or the arithmetic mean-geometric mean inequality) shows that this dimension is less than $\log m$ except in the deterministic case $Z_1 = m$ a.s.

§12.5. Derived Trees.

This section is based on some unpublished ideas of Furstenberg. Most of the time, for the sake of compactness, we need to restrict our trees to have uniformly bounded degree. Thus, fix an integer r and let \mathbf{T} be the r -ary tree, which we identify with $\{0, 1, \dots, r-1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^+}$; we will consider only subtrees of \mathbf{T} rooted at the root of \mathbf{T} and that have no leaves. Recall that for a tree T and vertex $v \in T$, we denote by T^v the subtree of T formed from the descendants of v . We view T^v as a rooted subtree of \mathbf{T} with v identified with the root of \mathbf{T} . Given a unit flow θ on T and a vertex $v \in T$, the conditional flow through v is defined to be the unit flow

$$\theta^v(x) := \theta(x)/\theta(v) \quad \text{for } x \geq v$$

on T^v . The class of subtrees of \mathbf{T} is given the natural topology as in Exercise 10.5. This class is compact. For a subtree T , let $\mathcal{D}(T)$ denote the closure of the set of its descendant trees, $\{T^v; v \in T\}$. We call these trees the **derived trees** of T . Thus, $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{T}) = \{\mathbf{T}\}$.

▷ EXERCISE 12.15.

Show that if $T^* \in \mathcal{D}(T)$, then $\mathcal{D}(T^*) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(T)$.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} T_n^v &:= \{x \in T^v; |x| \leq |v| + n\}, \\ M_n(v) &:= |\partial T_n^v| = |\{x \in T^v; |x| = |v| + n\}|, \\ \dim \sup \partial T &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{v \in T} \frac{1}{n} \log M_n(v), \\ \dim \inf \partial T &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{v \in T} \frac{1}{n} \log M_n(v). \end{aligned}$$

▷ EXERCISE 12.16.

Show that these limits exist.

Clearly,

$$\dim \partial T \leq \dim_{\text{M}} \partial T = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M_n \leq \dim \sup \partial T. \tag{12.12}$$

Also, if $\alpha < \dim \inf \partial T$, then there is some n such that

$$\min_{v \in T} \frac{1}{n} \log M_n(v) > \alpha,$$

i.e., $M_n(v) \geq \lceil e^{\alpha n} \rceil$ for all $v \in T$. Thus, in the notation of Exercise 2.74, $T^{[n]}$ contains a $\lceil e^{\alpha n} \rceil$ -ary subtree. Therefore $\dim \partial T^{[n]} \geq \log \lceil e^{\alpha n} \rceil \geq \alpha n$, whence $\dim \partial T \geq \alpha$. Thus, we obtain

$$\dim \partial T \geq \dim \inf \partial T. \tag{12.13}$$

Since for any $T^* \in \mathcal{D}(T)$, $v \in T^*$, and $n \geq 0$, there is some $w \in T$ such that $T_n^w = (T^*)^v_n$, we have $\dim \inf \partial T \leq \dim \inf \partial T^*$ and $\dim \sup \partial T^* \leq \dim \sup \partial T$. Combining these inequalities with (12.12) and (12.13) as applied to T^* , we arrive at

PROPOSITION 12.16. *For any $T^* \in \mathcal{D}(T)$, we have*

$$\dim \inf \partial T \leq \dim \partial T^* \leq \dim \sup \partial T .$$

▷ EXERCISE 12.17.

Show that if T is subperiodic, then $\dim \partial T = \dim \sup \partial T$.

Proposition 12.16 is sharp in a strong sense, as shown by the following theorem of Furstenberg.

THEOREM 12.17. *If T is a tree of uniformly bounded degree, then there exist $T^* \in \mathcal{D}(T)$ and a unit flow θ^* on T^* such that*

$$\dim \partial T^* = \dim \sup \partial T , \tag{12.14}$$

$$\forall x \in T^* \quad \frac{1}{|x|} \log \frac{1}{\theta^*(x)} \geq \dim \sup \partial T , \tag{12.15}$$

and for θ^* -a.e. $\xi \in \partial T^*$

$$\text{Hö}(\theta^*)(\xi) = \dim \sup \partial T . \tag{12.16}$$

Similarly, there exist $T^{**} \in \mathcal{D}(T)$ and a unit flow θ^{**} on T^{**} such that

$$\dim \partial T^{**} = \dim \inf \partial T \tag{12.17}$$

and

$$\forall x \in T^{**} \quad \frac{1}{|x|} \log \frac{1}{\theta^{**}(x)} \leq \dim \inf \partial T . \tag{12.18}$$

Proof. (Ledrappier and Peres) We concentrate first on (12.15). We claim that for any positive integer L and any $\alpha < \dim \sup \partial T$, there is some vertex $v \in T$ and some unit flow θ on T_L^v (from v to ∂T_L^v) such that

$$\forall x \in T_L^v \quad \frac{1}{|x| - |v|} \log \frac{1}{\theta(x)} \geq \alpha .$$

Suppose for a contradiction that this is not the case for some L and α . Choose v and n so that n is a multiple of L and

$$M_n(v)^{1/n} > e^{\alpha r^{L/n}} .$$

(Recall that r is the degree of the root of \mathbf{T} .) Let θ be the flow on T_n^v such that

$$\forall x \in \partial T_n^v \quad \theta(x) = 1/M_n(v).$$

Then θ restricts to a flow on T_L^v , whence, by our assumption, $\exists x_1 \in T_L^v \quad \theta(x) > e^{-(|x_1|-|v|)\alpha}$. By similar reasoning, define a finite sequence $\langle x_k \rangle$ inductively as follows. Provided $|x_k| - |v| \leq n - L$, choose $x_{k+1} \in T_L^{x_k}$ such that $\theta^{x_k}(x_{k+1}) > e^{-(|x_{k+1}|-|x_k|)\alpha}$. Let the last index thereby achieved on $\langle x_k \rangle$ be K . Then, using $x_0 := v$, we have

$$\theta(x_K) = \prod_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta^{x_k}(x_{k+1}) > e^{-(|x_K|-|v|)\alpha} \geq e^{-n\alpha} > \frac{r^L}{M_n(v)}.$$

On the other hand, since $|v| + n - |x_K| < L$, we have

$$\theta(x_K) = \frac{|\partial T_{|v|+n-|x_K|}^{x_K}|}{M_n(v)} < \frac{r^L}{M_n(v)}.$$

As these two inequalities contradict each other, our claim is established.

For $j \geq 1$, there is thus some unit flow θ_j on some $T_j^{v_j}$ such that

$$\forall x \in T_j^{v_j} \quad \frac{1}{|x| - |v_j|} \log \frac{1}{\theta_j(x)} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{j}\right) \dim \sup \partial T. \quad (12.19)$$

Identifying $T_j^{v_j}$ with a rooted subtree of \mathbf{T} identifies θ_j with a unit flow on \mathbf{T} . These flows have an edgewise limit point θ^* . Those edges where $\theta^* > 0$ form a tree $T^* \in \mathcal{D}(T)$. Because of (12.19), we obtain (12.15). By definition of Hölder exponent, this means that $\text{Hö}(\theta^*) \geq \dim \sup \partial T$. On the other hand, Theorem 12.15 gives $\text{Hö}(\theta^*) \leq \dim \sup \partial T^* \leq \dim \sup \partial T$, whence (12.14) and (12.16) follow.

The proof of (12.18) is parallel to that of (12.15) and we omit it. To deduce (12.17), let

$$M_n^{**} := |\{x \in T^{**}; |x| = n\}|$$

and $\alpha := \dim \inf \partial T$. By (12.18), we have

$$1 = \theta^{**}(0) = \sum_{|v|=n} \theta^{**}(v) \geq \sum_{|v|=n} e^{-\alpha n} = M_n^{**} e^{-\alpha n},$$

so that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_n^{**} \leq \alpha.$$

Therefore, $\dim \partial T^{**} \leq \alpha$. ◀

The first part of Theorem 12.17 allows us to give another proof of Furstenberg’s important Theorem 2.22: If T is subperiodic, then every $T^* \in \mathcal{D}(T)$ is isomorphic to a subtree of a descendant subtree T^v . In particular,

$$\dim \partial T^* \leq \dim \partial T.$$

On the other hand, if $T^* \in \mathcal{D}(T)$ satisfies (12.14), then

$$\dim \partial T \geq \dim \partial T^* = \dim \sup \partial T \geq \dim^M \partial T \geq \dim \partial T.$$

Therefore, $\dim \partial T = \dim^M \partial T$, as desired.

§12.6. Additional Exercises.

12.18. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ be open and non-empty and $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be Lipschitz. Show that $\dim(\text{graph}(f)) = 2$.

12.19. Let T be a Galton-Watson tree with offspring random variable L having mean $m > 1$. Show that the Hausdorff measure of ∂T in dimension $\log m$ is 0 a.s. except when L is constant.

12.20. Let $m > 1$. Show that for $\gamma < 1$,

$$\max \left\{ \dim I_{T'} ; \|L\|_\infty < \infty, \mathbf{E}[L] = m, \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_1^L A_i \right] = \gamma \right\} = \left(1 - \frac{\log \gamma}{\log m} \right)^{-1} < 1$$

while for $\gamma > 1$,

$$\min \left\{ \dim I_{T'} ; \|L\|_\infty < \infty, \mathbf{E}[L] = m, \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_1^L A_i \right] = \gamma \right\} = \left(1 - \frac{\log \gamma}{\log m} \right)^{-1} > 1,$$

with equality in each case iff $\forall i \ A_i = \gamma/m$ a.s. What if $\gamma = 1$?

12.21. To create (the top side of) a random von Koch curve, begin with the unit interval. Replace the middle portion of random length $\in (0, 1/3)$ by the other two sides of an equilateral triangle, as in Figure 12.6. Repeat this proportionally on all the remaining 4 pieces, etc. Of course, here, the associated Galton-Watson network has no extinction. Show that if the length is uniform on $[0, 1/3]$, then $\dim I_T \approx 1.144$ a.s.




Figure 12.6.

12.22. Create a random Cantor set in $[0, 1]$ by removing a middle interval between two points chosen independently uniformly on $[0, 1]$. Repeat indefinitely proportionally on the remaining intervals. Show that $\dim I_T = (\sqrt{17} - 3)/2$ a.s.

12.23. Given a probability vector $\langle p_i; 1 \leq i \leq k \rangle$, the capacities of the Galton-Watson network generated by $(k, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k)$ define a unit flow θ , which corresponds to a probability measure μ on the boundary. Show that

$$\dim \mu = \sum_i p_i \log \frac{1}{p_i}.$$

12.24. Let $p(\bullet, \bullet)$ be the transition probabilities of a finite-state irreducible Markov chain. Let $\pi(\bullet)$ be the stationary probability distribution. The directed graph G associated to this chain has for vertices the states and for edges all (u, v) for which $p(u, v) > 0$. Let T be the directed cover of G (see Section 2.8). Define the unit flow

$$\theta(\langle v_1, \dots, v_{n+1} \rangle) := \pi(v_1) \prod_{i=1}^n p(v_i, v_{i+1}).$$

Let μ be the corresponding probability measure on ∂T . Show that

$$\dim \mu = \sum_u \pi(u) \sum_v p(u, v) \log \frac{1}{p(u, v)}.$$

12.25. Let $p_k > 0$ ($1 \leq k \leq r$) satisfy $\sum_{k=1}^r p_k = 1$. Let **GW** be the corresponding Galton-Watson measure on trees. Show that for **GW**-a.e. T , $\mathcal{D}(T)$ is equal to the set of *all* subtrees of **T**.

12.26. Let $p_k > 0$ ($1 \leq k \leq r$) satisfy $\sum_{k=1}^r p_k = 1$. Let **GW** be the corresponding Galton-Watson measure on trees. Show that for **GW**-a.e. T , $\dim \sup \partial T = \sup\{k; p_k > 0\}$ and $\dim \inf \partial T = \inf\{k; p_k > 0\}$.

Chapter 13

Capacity

The notion of capacity will lead to important reformulations of our theorems concerning random walk and percolation on trees. As one consequence, we will be able to deduce a classical relationship of Hausdorff dimension and capacity in euclidean space.

§13.1. Definitions.

We call a function Ψ on T such that $\Psi \geq 0$ and $x \rightarrow y \Rightarrow \Psi(x) \leq \Psi(y)$ a **gauge**. For a gauge Ψ , define $\Psi(\xi) := \lim_{x \in \xi} \Psi(x)$ and define the **kernel** $K := \partial T \times \partial T \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by

$$K(\xi, \eta) := \begin{cases} \Psi(\xi \wedge \eta) & \text{if } \xi \neq \eta, \\ \Psi(\xi) & \text{if } \xi = \eta. \end{cases}$$

A common gauge is $\Psi(x) := \lambda^{|x|}$ or $\Psi(x) := \lambda^{|x|}/(\lambda - 1)$ for $\lambda > 1$. Using $c(e(x)) := \lambda^{1-|x|}(\lambda - 1)$ or $c(e(x)) := \lambda^{1-|x|}$, we see that these gauges are special cases of the following assignment of a gauge to conductances:

$$\Psi(x) := \Psi(o) + \sum_{o < u \leq x} c(e(u))^{-1}. \quad (13.1)$$

Furthermore, given a gauge Ψ , we can implicitly define conductances by (13.1).

Given a Borel probability μ on ∂T , its **potential** is the function

$$V_\mu(\xi) := \int_{\partial T} K(\xi, \eta) d\mu(\eta)$$

and its **energy** is the number

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) := \int_{\partial T \times \partial T} K d(\mu \times \mu) = \int_{\partial T} V_\mu(\xi) d\mu(\xi).$$

The **capacity** of $E \subseteq \partial T$ is

$$\text{cap } E := \left[\inf \{ \mathcal{E}(\mu) ; \mu \text{ a probability and } \mu(\partial T \setminus E) = 0 \} \right]^{-1}.$$

Recall from Exercise 12.14 that Borel probabilities μ on ∂T are in 1-1 correspondence with unit flows θ on T via

$$\theta(e(x)) = \theta(x) = \mu(\{\xi; x \in \xi\}).$$

We may express V_μ and $\mathcal{E}(\mu)$ in terms of θ as follows. Set

$$\Phi(x) := \Psi(x) - \Psi(\tilde{x}), \quad x \neq o.$$

(Recall that \tilde{x} is the parent of x .) Thus, $\Phi(x)$ is the resistance of $e(x)$ when (13.1) holds.

PROPOSITION 13.1. (LYONS, 1990) *We have*

$$\forall \xi \in \partial T \quad V_\mu(\xi) = \Psi(o) + \sum_{o < x \in \xi} \Phi(x)\theta(x)$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) = \Psi(o) + \sum_{o \neq x \in T} \Phi(x)\theta(x)^2.$$

Proof. By linearity, we may assume that $\Psi(o) = 0$. Then $\Psi(x) = \sum_{o < u \leq x} \Phi(u)$ and $\Psi(\xi) = \sum_{o < x \in \xi} \Phi(x)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} V_\mu(\xi) &= \int_{\partial T} K(\xi, \eta) d\mu(\eta) = \int_{\partial T} \Psi(\xi \wedge \eta) d\mu(\eta) = \int_{\partial T} \sum_{o < x \leq \xi \wedge \eta} \Phi(x) d\mu(\eta) \\ &= \int_{\partial T} \sum_{o < x \in \xi} \Phi(x) \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \eta\}} d\mu(\eta) = \sum_{o < x \in \xi} \Phi(x) \int_{\partial T} \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \eta\}} d\mu(\eta) = \sum_{o < x \in \xi} \Phi(x)\theta(x). \end{aligned}$$

Now integrate to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\mu) &= \int_{\partial T} V_\mu d\mu = \int_{\partial T} \sum_{o < x \in \xi} \Phi(x)\theta(x) d\mu(\xi) \\ &= \sum_{o \neq x \in T} \Phi(x)\theta(x)\mu(\{\xi; x \in \xi\}). \end{aligned} \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

When conductances determine Ψ through (13.1) and the equation $\Psi(o) := 0$, we have $\Phi(x) = c(e(x))^{-1}$ and thus $\mathcal{E}(\mu) = \mathcal{E}(\theta)$, as we defined energy of flows in Section 2.4. In particular, $\mathcal{E}(\mu)$ is minimum when $\mathcal{E}(\theta)$ is and, hence, $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$ has a unique minimum corresponding to unit current flow when $C_{\text{eff}} > 0$. If i denotes unit current flow and μ_i the corresponding measure on ∂T , then μ_i gives the distribution of current outflow on

∂T . Probabilistically, this is **harmonic measure** for the random walk, i.e., the “hitting” distribution on ∂T : by Proposition 2.11, given an edge $e(x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i(\{\xi; x \in \xi\}) &= i(e(x)) \\ &= \mathbf{E}[\text{number of transitions from } \bar{x} \text{ to } x \\ &\quad - \text{number of transitions from } x \text{ to } \bar{x}] \\ &= \mathbf{P}[\text{random walk eventually stays in } T^x]. \end{aligned}$$

We may reformulate Theorem 2.10 and Proposition 2.11 as follows for trees:

THEOREM 13.2. *Given conductances on a tree T , the associated random walk is transient iff the capacity of ∂T is positive in the associated gauge. The unit flow corresponds to the harmonic measure on ∂T , which minimizes the energy.*

In this context, Theorem 2.19 becomes

$$\dim \partial T = \inf\{\lambda > 1; \text{cap } \partial T = 0 \text{ in the gauge } \Psi(u) = \lambda^{|u|}\}.$$

Although $\dim \partial T$ has a similar definition via Hausdorff measures, it is capacity, not Hausdorff measure, in the critical gauge that determines the type of critical random walk, $\text{RW}_{\text{br } T}$.

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\mu_i}(\xi) &= \sum_{o < u \in \xi} i(e(u))/c(e(u)) = \sum_{o < u \in \xi} [V(\bar{u}) - V(u)] = V(o) - \lim_{u \in \xi} V(u) \\ &= \mathcal{E}(i) - \lim_{u \in \xi} V(u) = \mathcal{E}(\mu_i) - \lim_{u \in \xi} V(u) = (\text{cap } \partial T)^{-1} - \lim_{u \in \xi} V(u). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\forall \xi \quad V_{\mu_i}(\xi) \leq (\text{cap } \partial T)^{-1}$. One can show that $V_{\mu_i}(\xi) = (\text{cap } \partial T)^{-1}$, i.e., $\lim_{u \in \xi} V(u) = 0$, except for a set of ξ of capacity 0 (Lyons, 1990). This further justifies thinking of the electrical network T as grounded at ∞ .

§13.2. Percolation on Trees.

Let p_x be survival probabilities for independent percolation, as in Section 4.3. Consider the gauge

$$\Psi(x) := \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow x]^{-1} = \prod_{o < u \leq x} p_u^{-1}.$$

Note that

$$\Psi(o) = 1.$$

If we define conductances by

$$c(e(u)) := \Psi(u)^{-1} - \Psi(\hat{u})^{-1},$$

then $\Psi(x)$ is one plus the resistance between o and x . Thus, (4.12) holds. Because $\Psi(o) = 1$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu_i) = 1 + \mathcal{E}(i) = 1 + \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)^{-1},$$

whence

$$\text{cap } \partial T = \mathcal{E}(\mu_i)^{-1} = \frac{\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)}{1 + \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \infty)}.$$

We may therefore rewrite Theorem 4.19 as

$$\text{cap } \partial T \leq \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \partial T] \leq 2 \text{ cap } \partial T. \tag{13.2}$$

These inequalities are easily generalized to subsets of ∂T :

THEOREM 13.3. (LYONS, 1992) *For Borel $E \subseteq \partial T$, we have*

$$\text{cap } E \leq \mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow E] \leq 2 \text{ cap } E.$$

Proof. If E is closed, let $T_{(E)} := \{u; \exists \xi \in E \ u \in \xi\}$. Then $T_{(E)}$ is a subtree of T with $\partial T_{(E)} = E$. Hence the result follows from (13.2). The general case follows from the theory of Choquet capacities, which we omit (see Lyons (1992)). ◀

▷ EXERCISE 13.1.

Show that if $p_x \equiv p \in (0, 1)$ and T is spherically symmetric, then

$$\text{cap } \partial T = \left(1 + (1 - p) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^n |T_n|} \right)^{-1}.$$

Thus, $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \partial T] > 0$ iff $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^n |T_n|} < \infty$.

If we specialize to trees coding closed sets, as in Section 1.9 and Section 12.2, and take $p_u \equiv p$, the result that $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow \partial T] > 0$ iff $\text{cap } \partial T > 0$ is due to Fan (1989, 1990).

§13.3. Euclidean Space.

Like Hausdorff dimension in euclidean space, capacity in euclidean space is also related to trees. We treat first the case of \mathbb{R}^1 .

Consider a closed set $E \subseteq [0, 1]$ and a kernel

$$K(x, y) := f\left(\frac{1}{|x - y|}\right),$$

where $f \geq 0$ and f is increasing. Here, f is called the **gauge** function. We denote the capacity of E with respect to f by $\text{cap}_f(E)$.

▷ EXERCISE 13.2.

Suppose that f and g are two gauge functions such that $f/c_1 - c_2 \leq g \leq c_1 f + c_2$ for some constants c_1 and c_2 . Show that for all E , $\text{cap}_f(E) > 0$ iff $\text{cap}_g(E) > 0$.

The gauge functions $f(z) = z^\alpha$ ($\alpha > 0$) or $f(z) = \log z$ are so frequently used that the corresponding capacities have their own notation, *viz*, cap_α and cap_0 . For any set E , there is a critical α_0 such that $\text{cap}_\alpha(E) > 0$ for $\alpha < \alpha_0$ and $\text{cap}_\alpha(E) = 0$ for $\alpha > \alpha_0$. In fact, $\alpha_0 = \dim E$. This result is due to Frostman (1935); we will deduce it from our work on trees. We will also show the following result.

THEOREM 13.4. (BENJAMINI AND PERES, 1992) *Critical homesick random walk on $T_{[b]}(E)$ has the same type for all b ; it is transient iff $\text{cap}_{\dim E}(E) > 0$.*

(Actually, Benjamini and Peres stated this only for simple random walk and $\text{cap}_0 E$. That case bears a curious relation to a result of Kakutani (1944): $\text{cap}_0 E > 0$ iff Brownian motion in \mathbb{R}^2 hits E a.s.)

PROPOSITION 13.5. (BENJAMINI AND PERES, 1992) *Let $r_n > 0$ satisfy $\sum r_n = \infty$. Give $T_{[b]}(E)$ the conductances $c(e(u)) := r_{|u|}^{-1}$ and suppose that f is increasing and satisfies*

$$f(b^{n+1}) = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} r_k.$$

If $\nu \in \text{Prob}(E)$ and $\mu \in \text{Prob}(\partial T_{[b]}(E))$ are continuous and satisfy $\theta(e(u)) = \nu(I_u)$, where θ is the flow corresponding to μ , then

$$b^{-1} \mathcal{E}_c(\theta) \leq \mathcal{E}_f(\nu) \leq 3 \mathcal{E}_c(\theta).$$

Hence $(T_{[b]}(E), c)$ is transient iff $\text{cap}_f(E) > 0$.

Proof of Theorem 13.4. Critical random walk uses the conductances $c(e(u)) = \lambda_c^{-|u|}$, where $\lambda_c = \text{br } T_{[b]}(E) = b^{\dim E}$. Hence, set $r_n := b^{n \dim E}$ in Proposition 13.5. According to the

proposition, RW_{λ_c} is transient iff $\text{cap}_f E > 0$. Since there are constants c_1 and c_2 such that $f(z)/c_1 - c_2 \leq z^{\dim E} \leq c_1 f(z) + c_2$ when $\dim E > 0$ and $f(z)/c_1 - c_2 \leq \log z \leq c_1 f(z) + c_2$ when $\dim E = 0$, we have $\text{cap}_f E > 0$ iff $\text{cap}_{\dim E}(E) > 0$ by Exercise 13.2. ◀

COROLLARY 13.6. (FROSTMAN, 1935) $\dim E = \inf\{\alpha; \text{cap}_\alpha(E) = 0\}$.

▷ EXERCISE 13.3.

Prove this; the proof is very similar to that for the theorem.

Proof of Proposition 13.5. If $t \geq b^N$, then $f(t) \geq f(b^N)$, whence

$$f(t) \geq \sum_{n \geq 2} [f(b^n) - f(b^{n-1})] \mathbf{1}_{\{b^n \leq t\}} = \sum_{n \geq 2} r_{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{b^n \leq t\}},$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\nu) &= \iint f\left(\frac{1}{|x-y|}\right) d\nu(x) d\nu(y) \geq \iint \sum_{n \geq 2} r_{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x-y| \leq b^{-n}\}} d\nu(x) d\nu(y) \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 2} r_{n-1} (\nu \times \nu)\{|x-y| \leq b^{-n}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now $\{|x-y| \leq b^{-n}\} \supseteq \bigcup_{k=0}^{b^n-1} I_k^n \times I_k^n$, where $I_k^n := [\frac{k}{b^n}, \frac{k+1}{b^n}]$, whence by the arithmetic-quadratic mean inequality (or the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\nu) &\geq \sum_{n \geq 2} r_{n-1} \sum_k (\nu I_k^n)^2 = \sum_{n \geq 2} r_{n-1} \sum_{|u|=n} \theta(u)^2 = \sum_{n \geq 2} r_{n-1} \sum_{|u|=n-1} \sum_{u \rightarrow x} \theta(x)^2 \\ &\geq \sum_{n \geq 2} r_{n-1} \sum_{|u|=n-1} \frac{1}{b} \left(\sum_{u \rightarrow x} \theta(x) \right)^2 = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{n \geq 2} r_{n-1} \sum_{|u|=n-1} \theta(u)^2 = \frac{1}{b} \mathcal{E}(\theta). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $f(t) \leq f(b^{N+1})$ when $t < b^{N+1}$, i.e.,

$$f(t) \leq \sum_{n \geq 1} [f(b^{n+1}) - f(b^n)] \mathbf{1}_{\{b^n \leq t\}} = \sum_{n \geq 1} r_n \mathbf{1}_{\{b^n \leq t\}}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\nu) &= \iint f\left(\frac{1}{|x-y|}\right) d\nu(x) d\nu(y) \leq \iint \sum_{n \geq 1} r_n \mathbf{1}_{\{|x-y| \leq b^{-n}\}} d\nu(x) d\nu(y) \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 1} r_n (\nu \times \nu)\{|x-y| \leq b^{-n}\}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 13.1.

Now

$$\{|x - y| \leq b^{-n}\} \subseteq \bigcup_{k=0}^{b^n - 1} (I_k^n \times (I_k^n \cup I_{k-1}^n \cup I_{k+1}^n)). \tag{13.3}$$

(See Figure 13.1.) This gives the bound

$$(\nu \times \nu)\{|x - y| \leq b^{-n}\} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{b^n - 1} (\nu I_k^n)(\nu I_k^n + \nu I_{k-1}^n + \nu I_{k+1}^n).$$

The cross terms are estimated by the following inequality:

$$AB \leq \frac{A^2 + B^2}{2}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (\nu \times \nu)\{|x - y| \leq b^{-n}\} &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{b^n - 1} (\nu I_k^n)^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{b^n - 1} (\nu I_k^n)^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{b^n - 1} \frac{(\nu I_{k-1}^n)^2 + (\nu I_{k+1}^n)^2}{2} \\ &\leq 3 \sum_{|u|=n} (\nu I_u)^2 = 3 \sum_{|u|=n} \theta(u)^2, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\mathcal{E}(\nu) \leq 3 \sum_{n \geq 1} r_n \sum_{|u|=n} \theta(u)^2 = 3\mathcal{E}(\theta). \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Open Question. Let E be the Cantor middle-thirds set, μ_b harmonic measure of simple random walk on $T_{[b]}(E)$, and ν_b the corresponding measure on E . Thus ν_3 is Cantor-Lebesgue measure. Is $\nu_2 \perp \nu_3$?

The situation in higher dimensional euclidean space is very similar. Denote the euclidean distance between x and y by $|x - y|$. Consider a closed set $E \subseteq [0, 1]^d$ and a kernel $K(x, y) := f(\frac{1}{|x-y|})$, where $f \geq 0$ and f is increasing. Again, f is called the **gauge** function and we denote the capacity of E with respect to f by $\text{cap}_f(E)$. The tree $T_{[b]}(E)$ is now formed from the b -adic cubes in $[0, 1]^d$.

PROPOSITION 13.7. (BENJAMINI AND PERES, 1992) *Let $r_n > 0$ satisfy $\sum r_n = \infty$. Give $T_{[b]}(E)$ the conductances $c(e(u)) := r_{|u|}^{-1}$ and suppose that f is increasing and satisfies*

$$f(b^{n+1}) = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} r_k .$$

If $\nu \in \text{Prob}(E)$ and $\mu \in \text{Prob}(\partial T_{[b]}(E))$ are continuous and satisfy $\theta(e(u)) = \nu(I_u)$, where θ is the flow corresponding to μ , then

$$b^{-d} \mathcal{E}_c(\theta) \leq \mathcal{E}_f(\nu) \leq 3^d \mathcal{E}_c(\theta) .$$

▷ EXERCISE 13.4.

Prove Proposition 13.7.

§13.4. Generalized Diameters and Average Meeting Height on Trees.

There are amusing alternative definitions of capacity that we present in some generality and then specialize to trees. Suppose that X is a compact Hausdorff* space and $K : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is continuous and symmetric. Let $\text{Prob}(X)$ denote the set of Borel probability measures on X . For $\mu \in \text{Prob}(X)$, set

$$\begin{aligned} V_\mu(x) &:= \int_X K(x, y) d\mu(y), & \mathcal{E}(\mu) &:= \int_{X \times X} K d(\mu \times \mu), \\ \mathcal{E}(X) &:= \inf\{\mathcal{E}(\mu); \mu \in \text{Prob}(X)\}, & \text{cap}(X) &:= \mathcal{E}(X)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and define the **Chebyshev constants**

$$M_n(X) := \max_{x_1, \dots, x_n \in X} \min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n K(x, x_k),$$

and the **generalized diameters**

$$D_n(X) := \min_{x_1, \dots, x_n \in X} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} K(x_j, x_k).$$

[To see where generalized diameters get their name, consider the case $n = 2$ and $K(x, y) = 1/d(x, y)$ for a metric space. The original kernel, however, was $\log 1/d(x, y)$.]

* We shall have need only of metric spaces, but the proofs are no simpler than for Hausdorff spaces.

THEOREM 13.8. *In the preceding notation, we have:*

- (a) $\mathcal{E}(X) = \inf\{\|V_\mu\|_{L^\infty(\mu)}; \mu \in \text{Prob}(X)\}$. If $\mathcal{E}(X) < \infty$, then $\exists \mu \in \text{Prob}(X)$ $V_\mu = \mathcal{E}(X)$ μ -a.e.
- (b) (Fekete-Szegö) $D_n(X) \uparrow \mathcal{E}(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf\{M_n(\hat{X}); \hat{X} \subseteq X \text{ is compact}\}$. Also, $\mathcal{E}(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n(\hat{X})$ for any compact $\hat{X} \subseteq X$ such that $\exists \mu \in \text{Prob}(\hat{X}) \forall x \in \hat{X} V_\mu(x) \leq \mathcal{E}(X)$.

See the notes at the end of this chapter for a proof.

We have seen that in case X is the boundary of a tree T and $K(\xi, \eta) = \Psi(\xi \wedge \eta)$ as in Section 13.1, there is a measure, *viz.*, harmonic measure, such that $V_\mu \leq \mathcal{E}(\partial T)$ everywhere. Hence

$$\mathcal{E}(\partial T) = \lim D_n(\partial T) = \lim M_n(\partial T).$$

We transfer this from the boundary to the interior of T to obtain the following theorem.

THEOREM 13.9. (BENJAMINI AND PERES, 1992) *If $\forall \xi \in \partial T \sum_{x \in \xi} c(e(x))^{-1} = \infty$ and T is locally finite, then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \partial T) > 0$;
- (ii) $\exists A < \infty \forall n \geq 1 \exists$ distinct $x_1, \dots, x_n \in T$ such that

$$\binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow x_j \wedge x_k)^{-1} \leq A;$$

- (iii) $\exists A < \infty \forall n \geq 1 \forall x_1, \dots, x_n \in T \exists u \in T \forall k u \not\leq x_k$ and

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow u \wedge x_k)^{-1} \leq A.$$

REMARK. For simple random walk, i.e., $c \equiv 1$, we have $\mathcal{C}(o \rightarrow x \wedge u)^{-1} = |x \wedge u|$. Thus, the quantities in (ii) and (iii) are average meeting heights.

For example, consider simple random walk on the unary tree. This is recurrent, whence the three conditions in Theorem 13.9 are false. Indeed, it is not hard to see that given n distinct vertices, the average in (ii) is at least $(n+1)/2$, while even for $n=1$, there is no bound on the quantity in (iii).

For a more interesting example, consider simple random walk on the binary tree, T . Now the three conditions are true. To illustrate (ii), suppose that n is a power of 2. Choose x_1, \dots, x_n to be the n th level of T , T_n . Then the quantity in (ii) is approximately equal to 1. To see that (iii) holds with $A=1$, suppose that $H := \langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$ is given. Choose a child u_1 of the root of T such that T^{u_1} contains at most half of H . Then choose a child u_2

of u_1 such that T^{u_2} contains at most half of $H \cap T^{u_1}$. Continue in this way until we reach a vertex u_k with $H \cap T^{u_k} = \emptyset$. Let $u := u_k$. Since $u \wedge x = o$ for $x \in H \setminus T^{u_1}$, these vertices x contribute 0 to the left-hand side of (iii). Similarly, the vertices in $H \setminus T^{u_2}$ contribute at most $1/4$ to the left-hand side of (iii), and so on.

REMARK. The proof will show that the smallest possible A in (ii), as well as in (iii), is $\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \partial T)^{-1}$.

Proof of Theorem 13.9. Assume (i). Use $K(\xi, t) := \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \xi \wedge \eta)^{-1}$. Then $D_n(\partial T) \leq \mathcal{E}(\partial T)$, so $\exists \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n \in \partial T$ such that

$$\binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{j < k} \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \xi_j \wedge \xi_k)^{-1} \leq \mathcal{E}(\partial T).$$

From the hypothesis that $\forall \xi \in \partial T \ \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \xi)^{-1} = \infty$, the ξ_k are distinct. Hence $\exists x_k \in \xi_k$ distinct such that $x_j \wedge x_k = \xi_j \wedge \xi_k$, namely, pick $x_k \in \xi_k$ such that $|x_k| > \max_{i \neq j} |\xi_i \wedge \xi_j|$. This gives (ii) with $A = \mathcal{E}(\partial T)$.

For the remainder of the proof of the theorem, we will need new trees T^* and T^{**} , created by adding a ray to each leaf or vertex of T , respectively, with all new edges having conductance 1. Since $\partial T^* \setminus \partial T$ and $\partial T^{**} \setminus \partial T$ are countable and $K(\xi, \xi) \equiv \infty$, we have $\text{cap}(\partial T^*) = \text{cap}(\partial T^{**}) = \text{cap}(\partial T)$.

Assume (i) again. Given $x_1, \dots, x_n \in T$, let $\xi_k \in \partial T^*$ such that $x_k \in \xi_k$. Since $M_n(\partial T^*) \leq \mathcal{E}(\partial T^*) = \mathcal{E}(\partial T)$, there exists $\eta \in \partial T^*$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \eta \wedge \xi_k)^{-1} \leq \mathcal{E}(\partial T).$$

Then $\forall k \ \eta \neq \xi_k$, so $\exists u \in \eta \cap T$ such that $\forall k \ u \wedge x_k \leq \eta \wedge \xi_k$ and $u \not\leq x_k$. This gives (iii).

Now assume (iii). Given $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n \in \partial T^*$, choose $x_k \in \xi_k \cap T$ so that in case $\xi_k \in \partial T^* \setminus \partial T$, then $x_k \in \partial T \setminus \partial T$, while if not, then $|x_k|$ is so large that $\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow x_k)^{-1} > nA$. Let u be as asserted in (iii). Then $\forall k \ u \not\leq x_k$. Choose $\eta \in \partial T^*$ such that $u \in \eta$. Then $\forall k \ \eta \wedge \xi_k = u \wedge x_k$, so

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \eta \wedge \xi_k)^{-1} \leq A.$$

Therefore $\mathcal{E}(\partial T^*) \leq A$, so $\text{cap}(\partial T) > 0$.

Finally, assume (ii). Given n , let x_1, \dots, x_n be as in (ii). Choose $\xi_k \in \partial T^{**} \setminus \partial T$ such that $x_k \in \xi_k$. Then $\forall j < k \ \xi_j \wedge \xi_k = x_j \wedge x_k$, whence

$$\binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{j < k} \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \xi_j \wedge \xi_k)^{-1} \leq A.$$

Therefore $\mathcal{E}(\partial T^{**}) \leq A$, so $\text{cap}(\partial T) > 0$. ◀

§13.5. Notes.

Here we prove Theorem 13.8.

Proof of Theorem 13.8. (a) Since $\mathcal{E}(\mu) = \|V_\mu\|_{L^1(\mu)} \leq \|V_\mu\|_{L^\infty(\mu)}$, we have $\mathcal{E}(X) \leq \inf_\mu \|V_\mu\|_{L^\infty(\mu)}$. On the other hand, suppose that $\mathcal{E}(X) < \infty$ (since otherwise certainly $\mathcal{E}(X) \geq \inf_\mu \|V_\mu\|_{L^\infty(\mu)}$) and let $\mu_n \in \text{Prob}(X)$ be such that $\mathcal{E}(\mu_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(X)$. Let μ be a weak* limit point of $\{\mu_n\}$ and let $\langle \mu_{n_\alpha} \rangle$ be a subnet** of $\langle \mu_n \rangle$ such that $\mu_{n_\alpha} \xrightarrow{w^*} \mu$. Then $\mu_{n_\alpha} \times \mu_{n_\alpha} \xrightarrow{w^*} \mu \times \mu$. (Proof: $C(X) \otimes C(X)$ is (uniformly) dense in $C(X \times X)$ by the Stone-Weierstrass theorem. On $C(X) \otimes C(X)$, the convergence is obvious.) We have $\forall t \in \mathbb{R} \quad K \wedge t \in C(X \times X)$, whence

$$\int K \wedge t d\mu \times \mu = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \int K \wedge t d\mu_{n_\alpha} \times \mu_{n_\alpha} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\mu_n) = \mathcal{E}(X),$$

whence $\mathcal{E}(\mu) = \sup_t \int K \wedge t d\mu \times \mu \leq \mathcal{E}(X)$, whence $\mathcal{E}(\mu) = \mathcal{E}(X)$. We claim that $V_\mu \geq \mathcal{E}(X)$ μ -a.e.; this gives $V_\mu = \mathcal{E}(X)$ μ -a.e. since $\mathcal{E}(X) = \mathcal{E}(\mu) = \int V_\mu d\mu$. Suppose there were a set $F \subseteq X$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $\mu F > 0$ and $V_\mu \upharpoonright F \leq \mathcal{E}(X) - \delta$. Then move a little more of μ 's mass to F : Let $\nu := \mathbf{1}_F \mu / \mu F$ and $\eta > 0$. We have $\mathcal{E}(\nu) < \infty$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}((1-\eta)\mu + \eta\nu) &= (1-\eta)^2 \mathcal{E}(\mu) + \eta^2 \mathcal{E}(\nu) + 2(1-\eta)\eta \int V_\mu d\nu \\ &\leq (1-\eta)^2 \mathcal{E}(X) + \eta^2 \mathcal{E}(\nu) + 2(1-\eta)\eta(\mathcal{E}(X) - \delta) \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}(X) - 2\eta\delta + O(\eta^2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mathcal{E}((1-\eta)\mu + \eta\nu) < \mathcal{E}(X)$ for sufficiently small η , a contradiction.

(b) Regard $D_{n+1}(X)$ as an average of averages over all n -subsets of $\{x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$; each n -subset average is $\geq D_n(X)$, whence so is $D_{n+1}(X)$.

Claim: $D_{n+1}(X) \leq M_n(X)$. Let $D_{n+1}(X) = \binom{n+1}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq n+1} K(x_j, x_k)$. For each j , write this as $f_j(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{n+1}) + n^{-1}(n+1)^{-1} \sum_{k \neq j} K(x_j, x_k)$. Only the second term depends on x_j , hence x_j is such that

$$\sum_{k \neq j} K(x_j, x_k) = \min_{x \in X} \sum_{k \neq j} K(x, x_k) \leq nM_n(X).$$

Therefore

$$D_{n+1}(X) = \frac{1}{n(n+1)} \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \sum_{k \neq j} K(x_j, x_k) \leq \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} M_n(X) = M_n(X).$$

Therefore for any compact $\hat{X} \subseteq X$, we have $D_{n+1}(X) \leq D_{n+1}(\hat{X}) \leq M_n(\hat{X})$, whence $D_{n+1}(X) \leq \inf_{\hat{X}} M_n(\hat{X})$.

Claim: $\inf_{\hat{X}} M_n(\hat{X}) \leq \mathcal{E}(X)$ and if $V_\mu \leq \mathcal{E}(X)$ on \hat{X} with $\mu\hat{X} = 1$, then $M_n(\hat{X}) \leq \mathcal{E}(X)$. We may assume $\mathcal{E}(X) < \infty$. From part (a), $\exists \mu \in \text{Prob}(X) \quad V_\mu = \mathcal{E}(X)$ μ -a.e. Since V_μ is lower

** Take a subsequence if X is a metric space.

semicontinuous by Fatou's lemma, the set \hat{X}_0 where $V_\mu \leq \mathcal{E}(X)$ is compact and $\mu\hat{X}_0 = 1$. For any $\hat{X} \subseteq \hat{X}_0$ with $\mu\hat{X} = 1$ and any $x_k \in \hat{X}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \hat{X}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n K(x, x_k) &\leq \int_{\hat{X}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n K(x, x_k) d\mu(x) = \int_X \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n K(x, x_k) d\mu(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n V_\mu(x_k) \leq \mathcal{E}(X), \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $M_n(\hat{X}) \leq \mathcal{E}(X)$.

Claim: $\mathcal{E}(X) \leq \lim D_n(X)$. Let $D_n(X) = \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} K(x_j, x_k)$ and $\mu_n := \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \delta(x_j)$. Let μ be a weak* limit point of $\{\mu_n\}$. We have for $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int K \wedge t d(\mu_n \times \mu_n) \leq \frac{n-1}{n} D_n(X) + \frac{t}{n},$$

whence

$$\int K \wedge t d(\mu \times \mu) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_n(X),$$

whence

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_n(X).$$

Putting the claims together, we see that

$$D_{n+1}(X) \leq \inf_{\hat{X}} M_n(\hat{X}) \leq \mathcal{E}(X) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_n(X),$$

from which the theorem follows. ◀

REMARK. We have also seen that when $\mathcal{E}(X) < \infty$, a minimizing measure (called equilibrium measure) on X can be obtained as a weak* limit point of minimizing “sets” for $D_n(X)$.

§13.6. Additional Exercises.

13.5. Show that $\text{cap } E \geq \text{cap}(\partial T) \cdot \mu_i(E)$, where μ_i is the unit current flow, whence if random walk can hit E , so can percolation. Find T and $E \subseteq \partial T$ so that $\mu_i(E) = 0$ yet $\mathbf{P}[o \leftrightarrow E] > 0$ (so $\text{cap } E > 0$).

13.6. Use a method similar to the proof of Theorem 4.19 to prove the following theorem of Benjamini, Pemantle, and Peres (1995). Let $\langle X_n \rangle$ be a transient Markov chain on a countable state space with initial distribution π and transition probabilities $p(x, y)$. Define the Green function $G(x, y) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} p^{(n)}(x, y)$ and the Martin kernel $K(x, y) := G(x, y) / \sum_z \pi(z) G(z, y)$. Note that K may not be symmetric. Then with capacity defined using the kernel K , we have for any set S of states,

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{cap}(S) \leq \mathbf{P}[\exists n \geq 0; X_n \in S] \leq \text{cap}(S).$$

See Benjamini, Pemantle, and Peres (1995) for various applications.

13.7. Show that if μ is a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d satisfying $\mu(B_r(x)) \leq Cr^\alpha$ for some constants C and α and if $\beta < \alpha$, then the energy of μ in the gauge z^β is finite. By using this and previous exercises, give another proof of Corollary 13.6.

13.8. Remove the hypothesis from Theorem 13.9 that T be locally finite.

13.9. Give an example of a kernel on a space X such that $\mathcal{E}(X) < \infty$ yet for all $\mu \in \text{Prob}(X)$, there is some $x \in X$ with $V_\mu(x) = \infty$.

13.10. Give $\text{Prob}(X)$ the weak* topology. Show that $\mu \mapsto \mathcal{E}(\mu)$ is lower semicontinuous.

Chapter 14

Harmonic Measure on Galton-Watson Trees

This chapter is based on Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres (1995a, 1996a). Unless otherwise attributed, all results here are from those papers, especially the former.

§14.1. Introduction.

There are two “first-order” aspects of the asymptotic behavior of a transient random walk that generally bear study: its rate of escape and its “direction” of escape. In Section 11.4, the former was studied for simple random walk on Galton-Watson trees. The latter, with “direction” interpreted as harmonic measure, will be studied in this chapter. We will see that the random irregularities that recur in a nondegenerate Galton-Watson tree T direct or confine the random walk to an exponentially smaller subtree of T . One aspect of this, and the key tool in its proof, is the dimension of harmonic measure. Now, since $\text{br} T = m$ a.s., the boundary ∂T has Hausdorff dimension $\log m$ a.s.

▷ EXERCISE 14.1.

Show that the Hausdorff dimension of harmonic measure is a.s. constant.

The main result of this chapter is that the Hausdorff dimension of harmonic measure is strictly less than that of the full boundary:

THEOREM 14.1. *The Hausdorff dimension of harmonic measure on the boundary of a nondegenerate Galton-Watson tree T is a.s. a constant $d < \log m = \dim(\partial T)$, i.e., there is a Borel subset of ∂T of full harmonic measure and dimension d .*

This result is established in a sharper form in Theorem 14.15.

With some further work, Theorem 14.1 yields the following restriction on the range of random walk.

COROLLARY 14.2. *Fix a nondegenerate offspring distribution with mean m . Let d be as in Theorem 14.1. For any $\epsilon > 0$ and for almost every Galton-Watson tree T , there is a*

rooted subtree Γ of T of growth

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\Gamma_n|^{\frac{1}{n}} = e^d < m$$

such that with probability $1 - \epsilon$, the sample path of simple random walk on T is contained in Γ . (Here, $|\Gamma_n|$ is the cardinality of the n th level of Γ .)

See Corollary 14.16 for a restatement and proof.

This corollary gives a partial explanation for the “low” speed of simple random walk on a Galton-Watson tree: the walk is confined to a smaller subtree.

The setting and results of Section 11.4 will be fundamental to our work here. Certain Markov chains on the space of trees (inspired by Furstenberg (1970)) are discussed in Section 14.2 and used in Section 14.3 to compute the dimension of the limit uniform measure, extending a theorem of Hawkes (1981). A general condition for dimension drop is given in Section 14.4 and applied to harmonic measure in Section 14.5, where Theorem 14.1 and Corollary 14.2 are proved. In Section 14.6, we analyze the electrical conductance of a Galton-Watson tree using a functional equation for its distribution. This yields a numerical scheme for approximating the dimension of harmonic measure.

§14.2. Markov Chains on the Space of Trees.

These chains are inspired by Furstenberg (1970). Given a flow θ on a tree T and a vertex $x \in T$ with $\theta(x) > 0$, we write θ^x for the (conditional) flow on T^x given by

$$\theta^x(y) := \theta(y)/\theta(x) \quad (y \in T^x).$$

We call a Borel function $\Theta : \{\text{trees}\} \rightarrow \{\text{flows on trees}\}$ a **(consistent) flow rule** if $\Theta(T)$ is a flow on T such that

$$x \in T, |x| = 1, \Theta(T)(x) > 0 \implies \Theta(T)^x = \Theta(T^x).$$

A flow rule may also be thought of as a Borel function that assigns to a k -tuple $(T^{(1)}, \dots, T^{(k)})$ of trees a k -tuple of nonnegative numbers adding to one representing the probabilities of choosing the corresponding trees $T^{(i)}$ in $\bigvee_{i=1}^k T^{(i)}$, which is the tree formed by joining the roots of $T^{(i)}$ by single edges to a new vertex, the new vertex being the root of the new tree. It follows from the definition that for all $x \in T$, not only those at distance 1 from the root, $\Theta(T)(x) > 0 \implies \Theta(T)^x = \Theta(T^x)$. We will usually write Θ_T for $\Theta(T)$.

▷ EXERCISE 14.2.

Define formally the space of flows on trees with a natural metric. Define “consistent flow rule” on a space of flows on $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_0$.

The principal object of interest in this chapter, harmonic measure, comes from a flow rule, **HARM**. Another natural example is harmonic measure, \mathbf{HARM}^λ , for homesick random walk RW_λ ; this was treated by Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres (1996a). Visibility measure, encountered in Section 12.4, gives a flow rule **VIS**. A final example, **UNIF**, will be studied in Section 14.3.

PROPOSITION 14.3. *If Θ and Θ' are two flow rules such that for \mathbf{GW} -a.e. tree T and all vertices $|x| = 1$, $\Theta_T(x) + \Theta'_T(x) > 0$, then $\mathbf{GW}(\Theta_T = \Theta'_T) \in \{0, 1\}$.*

Proof. By the hypothesis, if $\Theta_T = \Theta'_T$ and $|x| = 1$, then $\Theta_{T^x} = \Theta'_{T^x}$. Thus, the result follows from Proposition 4.6. ◀

Given a flow rule Θ , there is an associated Markov chain on the space of trees given by the transition probabilities

$$\forall T \forall x \in T \ |x| = 1 \implies \mathbf{p}_\Theta(T, T^x) = \Theta_T(x).$$

We say that a (possibly infinite) measure μ on the space of trees is **Θ -stationary** if it is \mathbf{p}_Θ -stationary, i.e.,

$$\mu \mathbf{p}_\Theta = \mu,$$

or, in other words, for any Borel set A of trees,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(A) &= (\mu \mathbf{p}_\Theta)(A) = \int \sum_{T' \in A} \mathbf{p}_\Theta(T, T') d\mu(T) \\ &= \int \sum_{\substack{|x|=1 \\ T^x \in A}} \mathbf{p}_\Theta(T, T^x) d\mu(T) \\ &= \int \sum_{\substack{|x|=1 \\ T^x \in A}} \Theta_T(x) d\mu(T). \end{aligned}$$

If we denote the vertices along a ray ξ by ξ_0, ξ_1, \dots , then the path of such a Markov chain is a sequence $\langle T^{\xi_n} \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$ for some tree T and some ray $\xi \in \partial T$. Clearly, we may identify the space of such paths with the ray bundle

$$\text{RaysInTrees} := \{(\xi, T) ; \xi \in \partial T\}.$$

For the corresponding path measure on RaysInTrees , write

$$(\Theta \times \mu)(F) := \int \int \mathbf{1}_F(\xi, T) d\Theta_T(\xi) d\mu(T),$$

although this is not a product measure.

The ergodic theory of Markov chains on general state spaces is rarely discussed, so we review it here. Our development is based on Kifer (1986), pp. 19–22; for another approach, see Rosenblatt (1971), especially pp. 96–97. Let \mathcal{X} be a measurable state space and \mathbf{p} be a transition probability function on \mathcal{X} (i.e., $\mathbf{p}(x, A)$ is measurable in x for each measurable set A and is a probability measure for each fixed x). This gives the usual operator P on bounded* measurable functions f , where

$$(Pf)(x) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(y) P(x, dy),$$

and its adjoint P^* on probability measures, where

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} f dP^*\nu := \int_{\mathcal{X}} Pf d\nu.$$

Let μ be a stationary probability measure, i.e., $P^*\mu = \mu$, and let \mathcal{I} be the σ -field of **invariant** sets, i.e., those measurable sets A such that

$$\mathbf{p}(x, A) = \mathbf{1}_A(x) \quad \mu\text{-a.s.}$$

A bounded measurable function f is called **harmonic** if $Pf = f$ μ -a.s. Let $(\mathcal{X}^\infty, \mathbf{p} \times \mu)$ be the space of (one-sided) sequences of states with the measure induced by choosing the initial state according to μ and making transitions via \mathbf{p} . That is, if $\langle X_n; n \geq 0 \rangle$ is the Markov chain on \mathcal{X} , then $\mathbf{p} \times \mu$ is its law.

LEMMA 14.4. *If f is a bounded measurable function on \mathcal{X} , then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) f is harmonic;
- (ii) f is \mathcal{I} -measurable;
- (iii) $f(X_0) = f(X_1)$ $\mathbf{p} \times \mu$ -a.s.

The idea is that when there is a finite stationary measure, then, as in the case of a Markov chain with a denumerable number of states, there really aren't any nontrivial bounded harmonic functions.

* Everything we will say about bounded functions applies equally to nonnegative functions.

▷ EXERCISE 14.3.

Show that Lemma 14.4 may not be true if μ is an infinite stationary measure.

Proof of Lemma 14.4. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Since P is a positive operator,

$$P(f \wedge \alpha) \leq (Pf) \wedge \alpha = f \wedge \alpha.$$

Also

$$\int P(f \wedge \alpha) d\mu = \int f \wedge \alpha dP^* \mu = \int f \wedge \alpha d\mu,$$

whence $f \wedge \alpha$ is harmonic. Therefore, for μ -a.e. $x \in \{f \geq \alpha\}$, we have $\mathbf{p}(x, \{f \geq \alpha\}) = 1$. Likewise, $\mathbf{p}(x, \{f \leq \beta\}) = 1$ for every β , whence $\{f \geq \alpha\} \in \mathcal{I}$. Thus, f is \mathcal{I} -measurable.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): For any interval I , we have $\mathbf{p}(x, \{f \in I\}) = \mathbf{1}_{\{\{f \in I\}\}}(x)$ μ -a.s. Thus, if $f(X_0) \in I$, then $f(X_1) \in I$ a.s.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): This is obvious. ◀

We now show that functions on \mathcal{X}^∞ that are (a.s.) shift-invariant depend only on their first coordinate:

PROPOSITION 14.5. *A bounded measurable function h on \mathcal{X}^∞ is shift invariant iff there exists a bounded \mathcal{I} -measurable function f on \mathcal{X} such that $h(X_0, X_1, \dots) = f(X_0)$ $\mathbf{p} \times \mu$ -a.s. Indeed, f can be determined from h by $f(X_0) = \mathbf{E}_{X_0}[h(X_0, X_1, \dots)]$.*

Proof. If h has the form given in terms of f , then the lemma shows that h is shift invariant. Conversely, given h , define f (μ -a.e.) as indicated. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(X_0) &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[h(X_0, X_1, \dots) \mid X_0, X_1] \mid X_0] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[h(X_1, X_2, \dots) \mid X_0, X_1] \mid X_0] \quad \text{by shift invariance} \\ &= \mathbf{E}[f(X_1) \mid X_0] \quad \text{by the Markov property and the definition of } f \\ &= (Pf)(X_0) \quad \text{by definition of } P. \end{aligned}$$

That is, f is harmonic, so is \mathcal{I} -measurable. Now similar reasoning, together with the martingale convergence theorem, gives

$$\begin{aligned} h(X_0, X_1, \dots) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[h(X_0, X_1, \dots) \mid X_0, \dots, X_n] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[h(X_n, X_{n+1}, \dots) \mid X_0, \dots, X_n] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(X_n) = f(X_0) \end{aligned}$$

by the lemma. ◀

As an immediate corollary, we get a criterion for ergodicity:

COROLLARY 14.6. $\mathbf{p} \times \mu$ is ergodic for the shift iff \mathcal{I} is trivial.

In our setting, this says that $\Theta \times \mu$ is ergodic (for the shift map) iff every Θ -invariant set of trees has μ -measure 0 or 1, where a Borel set A of trees is called **Θ -invariant** if

$$\mathbf{p}_\Theta(T, A) = \mathbf{1}_A(T) \quad \mu\text{-a.s.}$$

Moreover, even without ergodicity, shift-invariant functions on RaysInTrees correspond to Θ -invariant functions; in particular, they depend (a.s.) only on their second coordinate.

We call two measures **equivalent** if they are mutually absolutely continuous.

PROPOSITION 14.7. *Let Θ be a flow rule such that for \mathbf{GW} -a.e. tree T and for all $|x| = 1$, $\Theta_T(x) > 0$. Then the Markov chain with transition probabilities \mathbf{p}_Θ and initial distribution \mathbf{GW} is ergodic, though not necessarily stationary. Hence, if a (possibly infinite) Θ -stationary measure μ exists that is absolutely continuous with respect to \mathbf{GW} , then μ is equivalent to \mathbf{GW} and the associated Markov chain is ergodic.*

Proof. Let A be a Borel set of trees that is Θ -invariant. It follows from our assumption that for \mathbf{GW} -a.e. T ,

$$T \in A \iff T^x \in A \quad \text{for every } |x| = 1.$$

Thus, the result follows from Proposition 4.6. ◀

Open Question. If a flow rule has a stationary measure equivalent to \mathbf{GW} , must the associated Markov chain be ergodic?

Given a Θ -stationary probability measure μ on the space of trees, we follow Furstenberg (1970) and define the **entropy** of the associated stationary Markov chain as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ent}_\Theta(\mu) &:= \int \sum_{|x|=1} \mathbf{p}_\Theta(T, T^x) \log \frac{1}{\mathbf{p}_\Theta(T, T^x)} d\mu(T) \\ &= \int \sum_{|x|=1} \Theta_T(x) \log \frac{1}{\Theta_T(x)} d\mu(T) \\ &= \int \int \log \frac{1}{\Theta_T(\xi_1)} d\Theta_T(\xi) d\mu(T) \\ &= \int \log \frac{1}{\Theta_T(\xi_1)} d(\Theta \times \mu)(\xi, T). \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$g_\Theta(\xi, T) := \log \frac{1}{\Theta_T(\xi_1)}$$

and let S be the shift on RaysInTrees . The ergodic theorem tells us that the Hölder exponent (Section 12.4) is actually a limit a.s.:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hö}(\Theta_T)(\xi) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{\Theta_T(\xi_n)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \log \frac{\Theta_T(\xi_k)}{\Theta_T(\xi_{k+1})} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \log \frac{1}{\Theta(T)^{\xi_k}(\xi_{k+1})} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} S^k g_\Theta(\xi, T) \end{aligned}$$

exists $\Theta \times \mu$ -a.s.; and it satisfies

$$\int \text{Hö}(\Theta_T)(\xi) d(\Theta \times \mu)(\xi, T) = \text{Ent}_\Theta(\mu).$$

If the Markov chain is ergodic, then

$$\text{Hö}(\Theta_T)(\xi) = \text{Ent}_\Theta(\mu) \quad \Theta \times \mu\text{-a.s.} \tag{14.1}$$

This is our principal tool for calculating Hausdorff dimension. Note that even if the Markov chain is not ergodic, the Hölder exponent $\text{Hö}(\Theta_T)(\xi)$ is constant Θ_T -a.s. for μ -a.e. T : since $(\xi, T) \mapsto \text{Hö}(\Theta_T)(\xi)$ is a shift-invariant function, it depends only on T (a.s.) (Proposition 14.5).

§14.3. The Hölder Exponent of Limit Uniform Measure.

By the Seneta-Heyde theorem, if Z_n and Z'_n are two i.i.d. Galton-Watson processes without extinction, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Z_n/Z'_n$ exists a.s. This allows us to define (a.s.) a measure UNIF_T on the boundary of a Galton-Watson tree by

$$\text{UNIF}_T(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|T^x \cap T_n|}{Z_n},$$

where T_n denotes the vertices of the n th generation of T . We call this measure **limit uniform** since, before the limit is taken, it is uniform on T_n . We may write this measure another way: Let c_n be constants such that $c_{n+1}/c_n \rightarrow m$ and

$$\tilde{W}(T) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Z_n/c_n$$

exists and is finite non-zero a.s. Then we have

$$\text{UNIF}_T(x) = \frac{\tilde{W}(T^x)}{m^{|x|} \tilde{W}(T)}. \tag{14.2}$$

Note that

$$\tilde{W}(T) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{|x|=1} \tilde{W}(T^x). \quad (14.3)$$

According to the Kesten-Stigum theorem, when $\mathbf{E}[Z_1 \log Z_1] < \infty$, we may take c_n to be m^n and so W may be used in place of \tilde{W} in (14.2) and (14.3). A theorem of Athreya (1971) gives that

$$\int \tilde{W}(T) d\mathbf{GW}(T) < \infty \iff \mathbf{E}[Z_1 \log Z_1] < \infty. \quad (14.4)$$

As we mentioned in the introduction, $\dim(\partial T) = \log m$ a.s. Now Hawkes (1981) showed that the Hölder exponent of UNIF_T is $\log m$ a.s. provided $\mathbf{E}[Z_1(\log Z_1)^2] < \infty$. One could anticipate Hawkes's result that UNIF_T has full Hausdorff dimension, $\log m$, since limit uniform measure “spreads out” the most possible (at least under some moment condition on Z_1). Furthermore, one might guess that no other measure which comes from a consistent flow rule can have full dimension. We will show that this is indeed true provided that the flow rule has a finite stationary measure for the associated Markov chain that is absolutely continuous with respect to \mathbf{GW} . We will then show that such is the case for harmonic measure of simple random walk. Incidentally, this method will allow us to give a simpler proof of Hawkes's theorem as well as to extend its validity to the case where $\mathbf{E}[Z_1 \log Z_1] < \infty$. The value of $\dim \text{UNIF}_T$ is unknown when $\mathbf{E}[Z_1 \log Z_1] = \infty$.

In this section, we prove and extend the theorem of Hawkes (1981) on the Hölder exponent of limit uniform measure and study further the associated Markov chain. We begin by showing that a (possibly infinite) UNIF -stationary measure on trees is $\tilde{W}(T) d\mathbf{GW}(T)$. This was also observed by Hawkes (1981), p. 378. It can be seen intuitively as follows: start a Markov chain with transition probabilities \mathbf{p}_{UNIF} from the initial distribution \mathbf{GW} . If the path followed through T is ξ , then the n th state of the Markov chain is T^{ξ_n} . It is clear that $\tilde{W}(T^{\xi_n})$ is sampled from Z_n independent copies of \tilde{W} biased according to size. Since $Z_n \rightarrow \infty$, the law of $\tilde{W}(T^{\xi_n})$ tends weakly to that of size-biased \tilde{W} . Actually, this only makes sense when \tilde{W} has finite mean, i.e., when $\mathbf{E}[Z_1 \log Z_1] < \infty$ by Athreya's theorem (14.4). In this case, this intuitive argument is easily turned into a rigorous proof. Related ideas occur in Joffe and Waugh (1982). However, we present the following direct verification of stationarity that is valid even in the case when \tilde{W} has infinite mean.

PROPOSITION 14.8. *The Markov chain with transition probabilities \mathbf{p}_{UNIF} and initial distribution $\tilde{W} \cdot \mathbf{GW}$ is stationary and ergodic.*

Proof. Apply the definition of stationarity with $\Theta_T(x) = \tilde{W}(T^x)/(m\tilde{W}(T))$: for any Borel

set A of trees, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 ((\tilde{W} \cdot \mathbf{GW})_{\mathbf{P}_{\text{UNIF}}})(A) &= \int \sum_{\substack{|x|=1 \\ T^x \in A}} \frac{\tilde{W}(T^x)}{m\tilde{W}(T)} \cdot \tilde{W}(T) d\mathbf{GW}(T) \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p_k \frac{1}{m} \int_{T^{(1)}} \cdots \int_{T^{(k)}} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{T^{(i)} \in A} \tilde{W}(T^{(i)}) \prod_{j=1}^k d\mathbf{GW}(T^{(j)}) \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p_k \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{T^{(1)}} \cdots \int_{T^{(k)}} \mathbf{1}_{T^{(i)} \in A} \tilde{W}(T^{(i)}) \prod_{j=1}^k d\mathbf{GW}(T^{(j)}) \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p_k \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_A \tilde{W} d\mathbf{GW} = \int_A \tilde{W} d\mathbf{GW} \\
 &= (\tilde{W} \cdot \mathbf{GW})(A),
 \end{aligned}$$

as desired. Since $\tilde{W} > 0$ \mathbf{GW} -a.s., ergodicity is guaranteed by Proposition 14.7. \blacktriangleleft

▷ EXERCISE 14.4.

This chain is closely connected to the size-biased Galton-Watson trees of Section 10.1. Show that in case $\mathbf{E}[Z_1 \log Z_1] < \infty$, the distribution of a UNIF_T -path is $\widehat{\mathbf{GW}}_*$.

In order to calculate the Hölder exponent of limit uniform measure, we will use the following well-known lemma of ergodic theory:

LEMMA 14.9. *If S is a measure-preserving transformation on a probability space, g is finite and measurable, and $g - Sg$ is bounded below by an integrable function, then $g - Sg$ is integrable with integral zero.*

Proof. The ergodic theorem implies the a.s. convergence of

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} S^k(g - Sg)(x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} (g - S^n g)(x).$$

Since the distribution of $S^n g$ is the same as that of g , taking this limit in probability gives 0. Hence we have a.s. convergence to 0 and $g - Sg$ is integrable with integral 0. \blacktriangleleft

THEOREM 14.10. *If $\mathbf{E}[Z_1 \log Z_1] < \infty$, then the Hölder exponent at ξ of limit uniform measure UNIF_T is equal to $\log m$ for UNIF_T -a.e. ray $\xi \in \partial T$ and \mathbf{GW} -a.e. tree T . In particular, $\dim \text{UNIF}_T = \log m$ for \mathbf{GW} -a.e. T .*

Proof. The hypothesis and Proposition 14.8 ensure that $W\mathbf{GW}$ is a stationary probability distribution. Let S be the shift on the ray bundle RaysInTrees with the invariant measure

$\text{UNIF} \times \text{WG}\mathbf{W}$. Define $g(\xi, T) := \log W(T)$ for a Galton-Watson tree T and $\xi \in \partial T$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (g - Sg)(\xi, T) &= \log W(T) - \log W(T^{\xi_1}) = \log \frac{mW(T)}{W(T^{\xi_1})} - \log m \\ &= \log \frac{1}{\text{UNIF}_T(\xi_1)} - \log m. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $g - Sg \geq -\log m$, whence the lemma implies that $g - Sg$ has integral zero.

Now, for $\text{UNIF} \times \text{WG}\mathbf{W}$ -a.e. (ξ, T) (hence for $\text{UNIF} \times \mathbf{GW}$ -a.e. (ξ, T)), we have that

$$\text{Hö}(\text{UNIF}_T)(\xi) = \text{Ent}_{\text{UNIF}}(\text{WG}\mathbf{W})$$

by ergodicity. By definition and the preceding calculation, this in turn is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ent}_{\text{UNIF}}(\text{WG}\mathbf{W}) &= \iint \log \frac{1}{\text{UNIF}_T(\xi_1)} d\text{UNIF}_T(\xi) W(T) d\mathbf{GW}(T) \\ &= \log m + \iint (g - Sg) d\text{UNIF}_T(\xi) W(T) d\mathbf{GW}(T) \\ &= \log m. \end{aligned} \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Open Question. What is $\dim \text{UNIF}_T$ when $\mathbf{E}[Z_1 \log Z_1] = \infty$?

§14.4. Dimension Drop for Other Flow Rules.

It was conjectured in Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres (1995b) that any flow rule other than limit uniform gives measures of dimension less than $\log m$ \mathbf{GW} -a.s. In this section, we prove (following Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres (1995b)) that this is the case when the flow rule has a finite stationary measure equivalent to \mathbf{GW} . Our theorem is valid even when $\mathbf{E}[Z_1 \log Z_1] = \infty$. Shannon's inequality will be the tool we use to compare the dimension of measures arising from flow rules to the dimension of the whole boundary: the inequality states that

$$a_i, b_i \in [0, 1], \quad \sum a_i = \sum b_i = 1 \quad \implies \quad \sum a_i \log \frac{1}{a_i} \leq \sum a_i \log \frac{1}{b_i},$$

with equality iff $a_i \equiv b_i$.

▷ EXERCISE 14.5.

Prove Shannon's inequality.

THEOREM 14.11. *If Θ is a flow rule such that $\Theta_T \neq \text{UNIF}_T$ for \mathbf{GW} -a.e. T and there is a finite Θ -stationary measure μ absolutely continuous with respect to \mathbf{GW} , then for μ -a.e. T , we have $\text{Hö}(\Theta_T) < \log m$ Θ_T -a.s. and $\dim(\Theta_T) < \log m$.*

Proof. Recall that the Hölder exponent of Θ_T is constant Θ_T -a.s. for μ -a.e. T and equal to the Hausdorff dimension of Θ_T . Thus, it suffices to show that the set of trees

$$A := \{T; \dim \Theta_T = \log m\} = \{T; \text{Hö}(\Theta_T) = \log m \ \Theta_T\text{-a.s.}\}$$

has μ -measure 0. Suppose that $\mu(A) > 0$. Now since $\mu \ll \mathbf{GW}$, the limit uniform measure UNIF_T is defined and satisfies (14.2) for μ_A -a.e. T . Let $g(\xi, T) := \log \tilde{W}(T)$. As in the proof of Theorem 14.10, $g - Sg \geq -\log m$. Since the entropy is the mean Hölder exponent, we have by Shannon's inequality and Lemma 14.9,

$$\begin{aligned} \log m &= \text{Ent}_{\Theta}(\mu_A) = \int \sum_{|x|=1} \Theta_T(x) \log \frac{1}{\Theta_T(x)} d\mu_A(T) \\ &< \int \sum_{|x|=1} \Theta_T(x) \log \frac{1}{\text{UNIF}_T(x)} d\mu_A(T) \\ &= \int \log \frac{1}{\text{UNIF}_T(\xi_1)} d\Theta_T(\xi) d\mu_A(T) \\ &= \log m + \int (g - Sg) d\Theta_T(\xi) d\mu_A(T) \\ &= \log m. \end{aligned}$$

This contradiction shows that $\mu(A) = 0$, as desired. ◀

In order to apply this theorem to harmonic measure, we need to find a stationary measure for the harmonic flow rule with the above properties. We do not know a general condition for a flow rule to have such a stationary measure.

§14.5. Harmonic-Stationary Measure.

Consider the set of “last exit points”

$$\text{Exit} := \{(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{PathsInTrees}; x_{-1} \in x_{-\infty}, \forall n > 0 \ x_n \neq x_{-1}\}.$$

This is precisely the event that the path has just exited, for the last time, a horoball centered at $x_{-\infty}$. Since regeneration points are exit points, the set Exit has positive measure and for a.e. (\vec{x}, T) , there is an $n > 0$ such that $S^n(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{Exit}$. (This also follows directly merely from the almost sure transience of simple random walk.) Inducing on this set will yield the measure we need to apply Theorem 14.11:

THEOREM 14.12. *There is a unique ergodic HARM-stationary measure μ_{HARM} equivalent to **GW**.*

Proof. The key point is that for $(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{Exit}$, the path of vertices $\langle x'_k \rangle$ in the tree T given by the second components of the sequence $\langle S_{\text{Exit}}^k(\vec{x}, T) \rangle_{k \geq 0}$ is a sample from $\text{HARM}_{T \setminus T^{x-1}}$. (Recall that T is rooted at x_0 .) Note that the Markov property of this factor of the induced system is a consequence of the fact that HARM is a consistent flow rule.

Now since $\mathbf{AGW}_{\text{Exit}} \ll \mathbf{AGW}$, we have that the $(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})_{\text{Exit}}$ -law of $T \setminus T^{x-1}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to **GW**. From Proposition 14.7, it follows that the $(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})_{\text{Exit}}$ -law of $T \setminus T^{x-1}$ is equivalent to **GW**. [This can also be seen directly: for \mathbf{AGW} -a.e. T , the SRW_T -probability that $(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{Exit}$ is positive, whence the $(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})_{\text{Exit}}$ -law of T is equivalent to \mathbf{AGW} . This gives that the $(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})_{\text{Exit}}$ -law of $T \setminus T^{x-1}$ is equivalent to **GW**.]

Therefore, the above natural factor of the induced measure-preserving system

$$(\text{Exit}, (\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})_{\text{Exit}}, S_{\text{Exit}})$$

obtained by mapping $(\vec{x}, T) \mapsto \langle \Gamma(k) \setminus \Gamma(k)^{x'_{k-1}} \rangle$, where $\Gamma(k) := \text{MoveRoot}(T, x'_k)$, is a HARM-stationary Markov chain on trees with a stationary measure μ_{HARM} equivalent to **GW**.

The fact that $\text{HARM} \times \mu_{\text{HARM}}$ is ergodic follows from our general result on ergodicity, Proposition 14.7. Ergodicity implies that μ_{HARM} is the unique HARM-stationary measure absolutely continuous with respect to **GW**. ◀

Since increases in distance from the root can be considered to come only at exit points, it is natural that the speed is also the probability of being at an exit point:

PROPOSITION 14.13. *The measure of the exit set is the speed: $(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})(\text{Exit}) = \mathbf{E}[(Z_1 - 1)/(Z_1 + 1)]$.*

▷ **EXERCISE 14.6.**

Prove Proposition 14.13.

The next proposition is intuitively obvious, but crucial.

PROPOSITION 14.14. *For **GW**-a.e. T , $\text{HARM}_T \neq \text{UNIF}_T$.*

Proof. We use the notation and conclusion of Exercise 11.17. In view of the zero-one law, Proposition 14.3, we need merely show that we do not have $\text{HARM}_T = \text{UNIF}_T$ a.s. Now,

for any tree T and any $x \in T$ with $|x| = 1$, we have

$$\text{HARM}_T(x) = \frac{\gamma(T^x)}{\sum_{|y|=1} \gamma(T^y)}$$

while

$$\text{UNIF}_T(x) = \frac{\tilde{W}(T^x)}{\sum_{y=1} \tilde{W}(T^y)}.$$

Therefore, if $\text{HARM}_T = \text{UNIF}_T$, the vector

$$\left\langle \frac{\gamma(T^x)}{\tilde{W}(T^x)} \right\rangle_{|x|=1} \tag{14.5}$$

is a multiple of the constant vector $\mathbf{1}$. For Galton-Watson trees, the components of this vector are i.i.d. with the same law as that of $\gamma(T)/\tilde{W}(T)$. The only way (14.5) can be a (random) multiple of $\mathbf{1}$, then, is for $\gamma(T)/\tilde{W}(T)$ to be a constant **GW**-a.s. But $\gamma < 1$ and, since Z_1 is not constant, \tilde{W} is obviously unbounded, so this is impossible. ◀

Taking stock of our preceding results, we obtain our main theorem:

THEOREM 14.15. *The dimension of harmonic measure is **GW**-a.s. less than $\log m$. The Hölder exponent exists a.s. and is constant.*

Proof. The hypotheses of Theorem 14.11 are verified in Theorem 14.12 and Proposition 14.14. The constancy of the Hölder exponent follows from (14.1). ◀

Note that no moment assumptions (other than $m < \infty$) were used.

Open Question. (Ledrappier) We saw in Section 12.4 that the dimension of visibility measure is a.s. $\mathbf{E}[\log Z_1]$. In the direction of comparison opposite to that of Theorem 14.1, is this a lower bound for $\dim \text{HARM}_T$?

▷ **EXERCISE 14.7.**

Suppose that $p_0 > 0$. Show that given nonextinction, the dimension of harmonic measure is a.s. less than $\log m$.

We now demonstrate how the drop in dimension of harmonic measure implies the confinement of simple random walk to a much smaller subtree. Given a tree T and positive integer n , recall that T_n denotes the set of the vertices of T at distance n from the root and $|T_n|$ is the cardinality of T_n .

COROLLARY 14.16. For **GW**-almost all trees T and for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a subtree $T(\epsilon) \subseteq T$ such that

$$\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{GW} \left\{ x_n \in T(\epsilon) \text{ for all } n \geq 0 \right\} \geq 1 - \epsilon \quad (14.6)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |T(\epsilon)_n| \rightarrow d, \quad (14.7)$$

where $d < \log m$ is the dimension of HARM_T . Furthermore, any subtree $T(\epsilon)$ satisfying (14.6) must have growth

$$\liminf \frac{1}{n} \log |T(\epsilon)_n| \geq d. \quad (14.8)$$

Proof. Let $n_k := 1 + \max\{n; |x_n| = k\}$ be the k -th exit epoch and $D(x, k)$ be the set of descendants y of x with $|y| \leq |x| + k$. We will use three sample path properties of simple random walk on a fixed tree:

$$\mathbf{Speed} : l := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x_n|}{n} > 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (14.9)$$

$$\mathbf{H\"older\ exponent} : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \frac{1}{\text{HARM}_T(x_{n_k})} = d \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (14.10)$$

$$\mathbf{Neighborhood\ size} : \forall \delta > 0 \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |D(x_n, \delta|x_n|)|}{|x_n|} \leq \delta \log m \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (14.11)$$

(In fact, the limit in (14.11) exists and equals the right-hand side, but this is not needed.) In order to see that (14.11) holds for **GW**-a.e. tree, denote by y_k the k -th fresh point visited by simple random walk. Then (14.11) can be written as

$$\forall \delta > 0 \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |y_k|^{-1} \log |D(y_k, \delta|y_k|)| \leq \delta \log m$$

and since $|y_k|/k$ has a positive a.s. limit, this is equivalent to

$$\forall \delta^* > 0 \quad \limsup_k k^{-1} \log |D(y_k, \delta^* k)| \leq \delta^* \log m. \quad (14.12)$$

Now the random variables $|D(y_k, \delta^* k)|$ are identically distributed, though not independent. Indeed, the descendant subtree of y_k has the law of **GW**. Since the expected number of descendants of y_k at generation $|y_k| + j$ is m^j for every j , we have by Markov's inequality that

$$(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{GW}) \left\{ |D(y_k, \delta^* k)| \geq m^{\delta^* k} \right\} \leq m^{-\delta^* k} \sum_{j=0}^{\delta^* k} m^j.$$

If $\delta' > \delta^*$, then the right-hand side decays exponentially in k , so by the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we get (14.12), hence (14.11).

Now (14.10) alone implies (14.8) (Exercise 14.8).

Applying Egorov's theorem to the two almost sure asymptotics (14.9) and (14.10), we see that for each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a set of paths A_ϵ with $\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{GW}(A_\epsilon) > 1 - \epsilon$ and such that the convergence in (14.9) and (14.10) is uniform on A_ϵ . Thus, we can choose $\langle \delta_n \rangle$ decreasing to 0 such that on A_ϵ , for all k and all n ,

$$\text{HARM}_T(x_{n_k}) > e^{-k(d+\delta_k)} \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{|x_n|}{nl} - 1 \right| < \delta_n. \quad (14.13)$$

Now since δ_n is eventually less than any fixed δ , (14.11) implies that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |x_n|^{-1} \log |D(x_n, 3\delta_{|x_n|}|x_n|)| = 0 \text{ a.s.},$$

so applying Egorov's theorem once more and replacing A_ϵ by a subset thereof (which we continue to denote A_ϵ), we may assume that there exists a sequence $\langle \eta_n \rangle$ decreasing to 0 such that

$$|D(x_n, 3\delta_{|x_n|}|x_n|)| \leq e^{|x_n|\eta_n} \quad \text{for all } n \quad (14.14)$$

on A_ϵ .

Define $F_0^{(\epsilon)}$ to consist of all vertices $v \in T$ such that either $\delta_{|v|} \geq 1/3$ or both

$$\text{HARM}_T(v) \geq e^{-|v|(d+\delta_{|v|})} \quad \text{and} \quad |D(v, 3\delta_{|v|}|v|)| \leq e^{|v|\eta_{|v|}}. \quad (14.15)$$

Finally, let

$$F^{(\epsilon)} = \bigcup_{v \in F_0^{(\epsilon)}} D(v, 3\delta_{|v|}|v|)$$

and denote by $T(\epsilon)$ the component of the root in $F^{(\epsilon)}$. Since the number of vertices $v \in T_n$ satisfying $\text{HARM}_T(v) \geq e^{-|v|(d+\delta_{|v|})}$ is at most $e^{n(d+\delta_n)}$, the bounds (14.15) yield for sufficiently large n

$$|T(\epsilon)_n| \leq \sum_{\substack{v \in F_0^{(\epsilon)} \\ n-3\delta_{|v|}|v| \leq |v| \leq n}} |D(v, 3\delta_{|v|}|v|)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^n e^{k(d+\delta_k)} e^{k\eta_k} = e^{n(d+\alpha_n)},$$

where $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = 0$. Hence

$$\limsup \frac{1}{n} \log |T(\epsilon)_n| \leq d.$$

In combination with the lower bound (14.8), this gives (14.7).

It remains to establish that the walk stays inside $F^{(\epsilon)}$ forever on the event A_ϵ , since that will imply that the walk is confined to $T(\epsilon)$ on this event. The points visited at exit epochs n_k are in $F_0^{(\epsilon)}$ by the first part of (14.13) and (14.14). Fix a path $\{x_j\}$ in A_ϵ and a time n , and suppose that the last exit epoch before n is n_k , so that $n_k \leq n < n_{k+1}$. Denote by $N := n_{k+1} - 1$ the time preceding the next exit epoch, and observe that $x_N = x_{n_k}$. If $\delta_n \geq 1/3$, then x_n is in $F_0^{(\epsilon)}$ since $\delta_{|x_n|} \geq \delta_n$, so consider the case that $\delta_n < 1/3$. By the second part of (14.13), we have

$$\frac{|x_n|}{nl} < 1 + \delta_n \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|x_N|}{nN} \geq \frac{|x_n|}{Nl} > 1 - \delta_N \geq 1 - \delta_n.$$

Dividing these inequalities, we find that

$$|x_n| \leq \frac{1 + \delta_n}{1 - \delta_n} |x_N| \leq (1 + 3\delta_n) |x_N|.$$

It follows that x_n is in $D(x_{n_k}, 3\delta_{|x_{n_k}|} |x_{n_k}|)$. Since $x_{n_k} \in F_0^{(\epsilon)}$, we arrive at our desired conclusion that $x_n \in F^{(\epsilon)}$. ◀

▷ EXERCISE 14.8.

Prove (14.8).

Open Question. It was shown in Theorem 11.17 that the speed of simple random walk on a Galton-Watson tree with mean m is strictly smaller than the speed of simple random walk on a deterministic tree where each vertex has m children ($m \in \mathbb{N}$). Since we have also shown that simple random walk is essentially confined to a smaller subtree of growth e^d , it is natural to ask whether its speed is, in fact, smaller than $(e^d - 1)/(e^d + 1)$.

§14.6. Calculations.

Our primary aim in this section is to compute the dimension of harmonic measure, d , numerically. Recall the notation of Exercise 11.17. Note that

$$\sum_{|x|=1} \gamma(T^x) = \mathcal{C}(T) = \frac{\gamma(T)}{1 - \gamma(T)},$$

whence for $|x| = 1$,

$$\text{HARM}_T(x) = \frac{\gamma(T^x)}{\sum_{|y|=1} \gamma(T^y)} = \gamma(T^x)(1 - \gamma(T))/\gamma(T). \tag{14.16}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d &= \text{Ent}_{\text{HARM}}(\mu_{\text{HARM}}) = \int \log \frac{1}{\text{HARM}_T(\xi_1)} d\text{HARM} \times \mu_{\text{HARM}}(\xi, T) \\ &= \int \log \frac{\gamma(T)}{\gamma(T^{\xi_1})(1 - \gamma(T))} d\text{HARM} \times \mu_{\text{HARM}}(\xi, T) \\ &= \int \log \frac{1}{1 - \gamma(T)} d\mu_{\text{HARM}}(T) = \int \log(1 + \mathcal{C}(T)) d\mu_{\text{HARM}}(T) \end{aligned}$$

by stationarity.

In order to compute such an integral, the following expression for the Radon-Nikodým derivative of the **HARM**-stationary Galton-Watson measure μ_{HARM} with respect to **GW** is useful; it has not appeared in print before, though it was alluded to in Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres (1995b). Denote by $\mathcal{R}(T)$ the effective resistance of T from its root to infinity.

PROPOSITION 14.17. *The Radon-Nikodým derivative of μ_{HARM} with respect to **GW** is*

$$\frac{d\mu_{\text{HARM}}}{d\mathbf{GW}}(T) = \frac{1}{l} \int_{T'} \frac{1}{1 + \mathcal{R}(T) + \mathcal{R}(T')} d\mathbf{GW}(T'). \quad (14.17)$$

Proof. Since the $\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW}$ -law of $T \setminus T^{x-1}$ is **GW**, we have

$$d\mathbf{GW}(\Gamma) = (\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})[T \setminus T^{x-1} = \Gamma]$$

and

$$d\mu_{\text{HARM}}(\Gamma) = (\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})[T \setminus T^{x-1} = \Gamma \mid \text{Exit}].$$

Thus, using Proposition 14.13, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mu_{\text{HARM}}}{d\mathbf{GW}}(\Gamma) &= \frac{(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})[T \setminus T^{x-1} = \Gamma \mid \text{Exit}]}{(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})[T \setminus T^{x-1} = \Gamma]} \\ &= \frac{1}{l} (\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})[\text{Exit} \mid T \setminus T^{x-1} = \Gamma]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that on **Exit**, we have $x_{-1} = (x_{-\infty})_1$. Thus,

$$\frac{d\mu_{\text{HARM}}}{d\mathbf{GW}}(\Gamma) = \frac{1}{l} (\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW})[\vec{x} \subset \Gamma \text{ and } x_{-\infty} \notin \partial\Gamma \mid T \setminus T^{x-1} = \Gamma]. \quad (14.18)$$

Recall that under SRW_T , \vec{x} and \vec{x} are independent simple random walks starting at $\text{root}(T)$. Also, the $(\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW} \mid T \setminus T^{x-1} = \Gamma)$ -law of T^{x-1} is **GW**, whence the

(SRW \times **AGW** | $T \setminus T^{x-1} = \Gamma$)-law of T is $[\Gamma \bullet \mathbf{GW}]$. [EXPLAIN NOTATION.] Since the conditioning in (14.18) forces $x_{-1} \notin \Gamma$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mu_{\text{HARM}}}{d\mathbf{GW}}(\Gamma) &= \frac{1}{l} \gamma(\Gamma) \int \text{HARM}_{[T' \bullet \Gamma]}(\partial T') d\mathbf{GW}(T') \\ &= \frac{\gamma(\Gamma)}{l} \int \frac{\mathcal{C}(T')}{\gamma(\Gamma) + \mathcal{C}(T')} d\mathbf{GW}(T') \\ &= \frac{1}{l} \int \frac{1}{\gamma(\Gamma)^{-1} + \mathcal{C}(T')^{-1}} d\mathbf{GW}(T') \\ &= \frac{1}{l} \int \frac{1}{1 + \mathcal{R}(\Gamma) + \mathcal{R}(T')} d\mathbf{GW}(T'). \end{aligned}$$

Of course, it follows that

$$l = \iint \frac{1}{1 + \mathcal{R}(T) + \mathcal{R}(T')} d\mathbf{GW}(T) d\mathbf{GW}(T');$$

the right-hand side may be thought of as the $[\mathbf{GW} \bullet \mathbf{GW}]$ -expected effective conductance from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$, where the boundary of one of the **GW** trees is $-\infty$ and the boundary of the other is $+\infty$.

The next computational step is to find the **GW**-law of $\mathcal{R}(T)$, or, equivalently, of $\gamma(T)$. Since

$$\gamma(T) = \frac{\mathcal{C}(T)}{1 + \mathcal{C}(T)} = \frac{\sum_{|x|=1} \gamma(T^x)}{1 + \sum_{|x|=1} \gamma(T^x)}, \tag{14.19}$$

we have for $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$\gamma(T) \leq s \iff \sum_{|x|=1} \gamma(T^x) \leq \frac{s}{s-1}.$$

Since $\gamma(T^x)$ are i.i.d. under **GW** with the same law as γ , the **GW**-c.d.f. F_γ of γ satisfies

$$F(s) = \begin{cases} \sum_k p_k F^{*k} \left(\frac{s}{1-s} \right) & \text{if } s \in (0, 1); \\ 0 & \text{if } s \leq 0; \\ 1 & \text{if } s \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{14.20}$$

THEOREM 14.18. *The functional equation (14.20) has exactly two solutions, F_γ and the Heaviside function $\mathbf{1}_{[0, \infty)}$. Define the operator on c.d.f.'s*

$$\mathcal{K}: F \mapsto \sum_k p_k F^{*k} \left(\frac{s}{1-s} \right) \quad (s \in (0, 1)).$$

For any initial c.d.f. F with $F(0) = 0$ and $F(1) = 1$ other than the Heaviside function, we have weak convergence under iteration to F_γ :

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{K}^n(F) = F_\gamma.$$

For a proof, see Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres (1997).

Theorem 14.18 provides a method of calculating F_γ . It is not known that F_γ has a density, but calculations support a conjecture that it does. Some graphs of what seems to be the **GW**-density of $\gamma(T)$ for certain progeny distributions appear in Figures 14.1–14.3. These graphs reflect the stochastic self-similarity of the Galton-Watson trees. Consider, for example, Figure 14.1. Roughly speaking, the peaks represent the number of generations with no branching. For example, note that the full binary tree has conductance 1, whence its γ value is $1/2$. Thus, the tree with one child of the root followed by the full binary tree has conductance $1/2$ and γ value $1/3$. The wide peak at the right of Figure 14.1 is thus due entirely to those trees that begin with two children of the root. The peak to its left, roughly lying over 0.29, is due, at first approximation, to an unspecified number of generations without branching, while the n th peak to the left of it is due to n generations without branching (and an unspecified continuation). Of course, the next level of approximation deals with further resolution of the peaks; for example, the central peak over 0.29 is actually the sum of two nearby peaks.

Numerical calculations (still for the case $p_1 = p_2 = 1/2$) give the mean of $\gamma(T)$ to be about 0.297, the mean of $\mathcal{C}(T)$ to be about 0.44, and the mean of $\mathcal{R}(T)$ to be about 2.76. This last can be compared with the mean energy of the equally-splitting flow VIS_T , which is exactly 3:

▷ EXERCISE 14.9.

Show that the mean energy of VIS_T is $(1 - \mathbf{E}[1/Z_1])^{-1} - 1$.

In terms of F_γ , we have

$$d = - \int \log(1 - \gamma(T)) d\mu_{\text{HARM}}(T) = -\frac{1}{l} \int_{s=0}^1 \int_{t=0}^1 \frac{\log(1-s)}{s^{-1} + t^{-1} - 1} dF_\gamma(t) dF_\gamma(s).$$

Using this equation for $p_1 = p_2 = 1/2$, we have calculated that the dimension of harmonic measure is about 0.38, i.e., about $\log 1.47$, which should be compared with the dimensions of visibility measure, $\log \sqrt{2}$, and of limit uniform measure, $\log 1.5$. One can also calculate that the mean number of children of the vertices visited by a HARM_T path, which is the same as the μ_{HARM} -mean degree of the root, is about 1.58. This is about halfway between the average seen by the entire walk (and by simple forward walk), namely, exactly 1.5, and the average seen by a UNIF_T path, $5/3$. This last calculation comes from Exercise 14.4 that a UNIF_T -path has the law of $\widehat{\text{GW}}_*$; from Section 10.1, we know that this implies that the number of children of a vertex on a UNIF_T -path has the law of the size-biased variable \widehat{Z}_1 .




Figure 14.1. The apparent GW-density of $\gamma(T)$ for $f(s) = (s + s^2)/2$.




Figure 14.2. The apparent GW-density of $\gamma(T)$ for $f(s) = (s^2 + s^3)/2$.




Figure 14.3. The apparent **GW**-density of $\gamma(T)$ for $f(s) = (s + s^2 + s^3)/3$.

§14.7. Additional Exercises.

14.10. Show that the hypothesis of Proposition 14.3 is needed. You may want to use two flow rules that both follow a 2-ray when it exists (see Exercise 14.11) but do different things otherwise.

14.11. Give an example of a flow rule Θ with a Θ -stationary measure that is absolutely continuous with respect to **GW** but whose associated Markov chain is *not* ergodic as follows. Call a ray $\xi \in \partial T$ an *n*-ray if every vertex in the ray has exactly *n* children and write $T \in A_n$ if ∂T contains an *n*-ray. Note that A_n are pairwise disjoint. Consider the Galton-Watson process with $p_3 := p_4 := 1/2$. Show that $\mathbf{GW}(A_n) > 0$ for $n = 3, 4$. Define Θ_T to choose equally among all children of the root on $(A_3 \cup A_4)^c$ and to choose equally among all children of the root belonging to an *n*-ray when $T \in A_n$. Show that \mathbf{GW}_{A_n} is Θ -stationary for both $n = 3, 4$, whence the Θ -stationary measure $(\mathbf{GW}_{A_3} + \mathbf{GW}_{A_4})/2$ gives a non-ergodic Markov chain.

The following sequence of exercises, 14.12–14.20, treats the ideas of Furstenberg (1970) that inspired those of Section 14.2. They will not be used in the sequel. We adopt the setting and notation of Section 12.5.

14.12. Let \mathcal{U} be the space of unit flows on \mathbf{T} . Give \mathcal{U} a natural compact topology.

14.13. A Markov chain on \mathcal{U} is called **canonical** if it has transition probabilities $p(\theta, \theta^v) = \theta(v)$ for $|v| = 1$. Any Borel probability measure μ on \mathcal{U} can be used as an initial distribution to define a canonical Markov chain on \mathcal{U} , denoted $\text{Markov}(\mu)$. Regard $\text{Markov}(\mu)$ as a Borel probability measure on path space \mathcal{U}^∞ (which has the product topology). Show that the set of canonical Markov chains on \mathcal{U} is weak*-compact and convex.

14.14. Let S be the left shift on \mathcal{U}^∞ . For a probability measure μ on \mathcal{U} , let $\text{Stat}(\mu)$ be the set of weak*-limit points of

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} S^n \text{Markov}(\mu).$$

Show that $\text{Stat}(\mu)$ is nonempty and consists of stationary canonical Markov chains.

14.15. Let f be a continuous function on \mathcal{U}^∞ , μ be a probability measure on \mathcal{U} , and $\nu \in \text{Stat}(\mu)$. Show that $\int f d\nu$ is a limit point of the numbers

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int \sum_{|v|=n} \theta(v) \int f(\theta^v, \theta^{v_1}, \theta^{v_2}, \dots) d\theta^v(v_1, v_2, \dots) d\mu(\theta),$$

where we identify \mathcal{U} with the set of Borel probability measures on $\partial\mathbf{T}$.

14.16. For any probability measure μ on \mathcal{U} , define its **entropy** as $\text{Ent}(\mu) := \int F(\theta) d\mu(\theta)$, where

$$F(\theta) := \sum_{|v|=1} \theta(v) \log \frac{1}{\theta(v)}.$$

Define this also to be the entropy of the associated Markov chain $\text{Markov}(\mu)$. Show that $\text{Ent}(\mu) = \int H d\text{Markov}(\mu)$, where

$$H(\theta, \theta^{v_1}, \theta^{v_2}, \dots) := \log \frac{1}{\theta(v_1)}.$$

Show that if $\nu \in \text{Stat}(\mu)$, then $\int H d\nu$ is a limit point of the numbers

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int \sum_{|v|=n} \theta(v) \log \frac{1}{\theta(v)} d\mu(\theta).$$

14.17. Suppose that the initial distribution is concentrated at a single unit flow θ_0 , so that $\mu = \delta_{\theta_0}$. Show that if for all v with $\theta(v) \neq 0$, we have

$$\alpha \leq \frac{1}{|v|} \log \frac{1}{\theta_0(v)} \leq \beta,$$

then for all $\nu \in \text{Stat}(\mu)$, we have $\alpha \leq \text{Ent}(\nu) \leq \beta$.

14.18. Show that if ν is a stationary canonical Markov chain with initial distribution μ , then its entropy is

$$\text{Ent}(\nu) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{1}{N} \sum_{|v|=N} \theta(v) \log \frac{1}{\theta(v)} d\mu(\theta).$$

14.19. Show that if ν is a stationary canonical Markov chain, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{\theta(v_n)}$$

exists for almost every trajectory $\langle \theta^{v_1}, \theta^{v_2}, \dots \rangle$ and has expectation $\text{Ent}(\nu)$. If the Markov chain is ergodic, then this limit is $\text{Ent}(\nu)$ a.s.

14.20. Show that if T is a tree of uniformly bounded degree, then there is a stationary canonical Markov chain ν such that for almost every trajectory $\langle \theta, \theta^{v_1}, \theta^{v_2}, \dots \rangle$, the flow θ is carried by a derived tree of T and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{\theta(v_n)} = \text{Ent}(\nu) = \dim \sup \partial T.$$

Show similarly that there is a stationary canonical Markov chain ρ such that for almost every trajectory $\langle \theta, \theta^{v_1}, \theta^{v_2}, \dots \rangle$, the flow θ is carried by a derived tree of T and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{\theta(v_n)} = \text{Ent}(\rho) \leq \dim \inf \partial T.$$

14.21. Show that under the assumptions of Theorem 11.6, harmonic measure of simple random walk has positive Hausdorff dimension. This gives another proof that μ -a.e. tree has branching number > 1 .

14.22. Give another proof of ergodicity of $(\text{PathsInTrees}, \text{SRW} \times \text{AGW}, S)$ that uses Theorem 14.12 instead of regeneration points.

14.23. Define loop-erased simple random walk as the limit x_∞ of a simple random walk path \vec{x} . Show that the (expected) probability that the path of a loop-erased simple random walk from the root of T does not intersect the path of an independent (not loop-erased) simple random walk from the root of T is the speed $\mathbf{E}[(Z_1 - 1)/(Z_1 + 1)]$. Hence by Proposition 9.14, the chance that the root of T does not belong to the same tree as a uniformly chosen neighbor in the uniform wired spanning forest on T is the speed $\mathbf{E}[(Z_1 - 1)/(Z_1 + 1)]$.

Comments on Exercises

CHAPTER 1

- 1.1.** Let $\lambda > \text{gr } T$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |T_n| \lambda^{-n} = 0$. The total amount of water that can flow from o to infinity is bounded by $|T_n| \lambda^{-n}$.

CHAPTER 2

- 2.1.** (c) Use part (a).
- 2.8.** By symmetry, all vertices at a given distance from o have the same voltage. Therefore, they can be identified without changing any voltages (or currents). This yields the graph \mathbb{N} with multiple edges and loops. We may remove the loops. We see that the parallel edges between $n - 1$ and n are equivalent to a single edge whose conductance is C_n . These new edges are in series.
- 2.10.** The complete bipartite graph $K_{4,4}$.
- 2.11.** Use superposition and the symmetry of the transfer impedance matrix. For another solution, see Tetali (1991).
- 2.13.** Since $\{\chi^e; e \in E_{1/2}\}$ form a basis of $\ell^2_-(E)$ and the norms of θ_n are bounded, it follows that θ_n tend weakly to θ . Hence the norm of θ is at most $\liminf_n \mathcal{E}(\theta_n)$. Furthermore, as $d^* \theta_n(x)$ is the inner product of θ_n with the star at x , it converges to $d^* \theta$.
- 2.15.** (This is due to Lyons (1983).) Let U_1, U_2 be independent uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables. Take a path in W_f that stays fairly close to the points $(n, U_1 n, U_2 f(n))$ ($n \geq 1$).
- 2.17.** Let $Z := \{e^+; e \in \Pi\}$ and let G be the subtree of T induced by those vertices that Π separates from ∞ . Then the restriction of θ to G is a flow from o to Z , whence the result is a consequence of Lemma 2.8.
- 2.18.** Consider spherically symmetric trees.
- 2.25.** (a) Let $\beta > \inf a_n/n$ and let m be such that $a_m/m < \beta$. Write $a_0 := 0$. For any n , write $n = qm + r$ with $0 \leq r \leq m - 1$; then we have

$$a_n = a_{qm+r} \leq a_m + \cdots + a_m + a_r = qa_m + a_r,$$

whence

$$\frac{a_n}{n} \leq \frac{qa_m + a_r}{qm + r} < \frac{a_m}{m} + \frac{a_r}{n} < \beta + \frac{a_r}{n},$$

whence

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n}{n} \leq \beta.$$

- (b) Modify the proof so that if an infinite a_r appears, then it is replaced by a_{m+r} instead.
 (c) Observe that $\langle \log |T_n| \rangle$ is subadditive.

2.26. Given an N -superperiodic tree T , for $k = 0, \dots, N$, consider a stalk of length k followed by a copy of T . The union of these $N + 1$ trees, with their roots identified, is a 0-superperiodic tree with the same growth rate and branching number as T .

2.28. Suppose that w_x is broken arbitrarily as the concatenation of two words w_1 and w_2 . Let x_i be the product of the generators in w_i ($i = 1, 2$). Then $x = x_1 x_2$. If for some i , we had $w_{x_i} \neq w_i$, then we could substitute the word w_{x_i} for w_i and find another word w whose product was x yet would be either shorter than w_x or come earlier lexicographically than w_x . Either of these circumstances would contradict the definition of w_x as minimal, whence $w_i = w_{x_i}$ for both i .

This fact for $i = 1$ shows that T is a tree; for $i = 2$, it shows that T is subperiodic.

2.29. Use Exercise 2.1.

2.30. Express the equations for i_c by Exercise 2.2. Cramer's rule gives that i_c is a rational function of c .

2.31. The corresponding conductances are $c^h(x, y) := c(x, y)h(x)h(y)$.

2.32. *Solution 1.* Let u be the first vertex among $\{x, y\}$ that is visited by a random walk starting from a . Before being absorbed on Z , the walk is as likely to make loops at u in one direction as in the other by reversibility. This leaves at most one net traversal of the edge between x and y .

Solution 2. Let, say, $v(x) \geq v(y)$. Let $\Pi := \{[u, w] ; v(u) \geq v(x), v(w) \leq v(x)\}$. Then Π is a cutset separating a from Z (see Section 2.5), whence $\sum_{[u, w] \in \Pi} i(u, w) = 1$. Since $i(u, w) \geq 0$ for all $[u, w] \in \Pi$ and since $[x, y] \in \Pi$, it follows that $i(x, y) \leq 1$.

2.33. Use Proposition 2.2.

2.34. This is due to Tetali (1991).

2.35. Use the stationary distribution from Exercise 2.1.

2.36. Use Exercise 2.1. Calculate the expectation in question by considering the frequency of transitions from x to y in a bi-infinite sequence of states of the Markov chain.

2.37. (This is due to Chandra, Raghavan, Ruzzo, Smolensky, and Tiwari (1996/97).) Use Exercise 2.36.

2.38. This is well known and does not depend on reversibility. One proof is to apply the martingale convergence theorem to $\langle f(X_n) \rangle$, where f is harmonic.

2.39. Use Fubini's theorem.

2.40. (b) From part (a), we have

$$\mathbf{P}_a[\tau_Z < \tau_a^+] \mu(x) = \pi(x) \sum_{\mathcal{P}} \prod_{e \in \mathcal{P}} c(e) / \prod_{w \in \mathcal{P}} \pi(w) = \pi(x) \nu(x) / \pi(a),$$

where the sum is over paths \mathcal{P} from a to x that visit a and x just once and do not visit $Z \setminus \{x\}$.

2.42. The answers for the first question are 29/63, 29/35, 17/20.

2.46. The expression given by Thomson's Principle can also be regarded as an extremal width.

(a) Use that the minimum occurs iff F is harmonic at each $x \notin A \cup Z$. Or, let i be the unit current flow from A to Z and use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in E_{1/2}} dF(e)^2 c(e) \mathcal{R}(A \leftrightarrow Z) &= \sum_{e \in E_{1/2}} dF(e)^2 c(e) \sum_{e \in E_{1/2}} i(e)^2 r(e) \\ &\geq \left(\sum_{e \in E_{1/2}} i(e) dF(e) \right)^2 = \left(\sum_{x \in V} d^* i(x) F(x) \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\sum_{x \in A} d^* i(x) F(x) \right)^2 = 1. \end{aligned}$$

See Griffeath and Liggett (1982), Theorem 2.1 for essentially the same statement.

(b) Note that the minimum is achieved exactly for the lengths $\ell(e) = |dv(e)|$, where v is the voltage from a unit potential applied between A and Z .

2.48. Use Exercise 2.46 and the fact that the minimum of linear functions is concave.

2.49. Use Exercise 2.46.

2.52. (This is due to Tetali (1991).) Use Exercise 2.34.

2.53. Use that $\partial i / \partial r(e)$ is a flow with strength 0.

2.54. Use Exercise 2.53 and Exercise 2.49.

2.57. (a) Cycles at a are equally likely to be traversed in either direction. Thus, cycles contribute nothing to $\mathbf{E}[S_e - S_{\bar{e}}]$.

2.58. Make G transient by adding a sequence of edges of ever greater conductance from z to " ∞ ".

2.59. By Proposition 2.11, $v(X_n) = P_{X_n}[\exists k \geq n X_k = a]$. Now the intersection of the events $\{\exists k \geq n X_k = a\}$ is the event that a is visited infinitely often, which has probability 0. Since these events are also decreasing, their limiting probability is 0. That is, $E[v(X_n)] \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand, $\langle v(X_n) \rangle$ is a nonnegative supermartingale, whence it converges a.s. and $E[\lim v(X_n)] = \lim E[v(X_n)] = 0$.

2.60. Use Exercise 2.46.

2.61. Replace each vertex x by two vertices x' and x'' with an edge from x' to x'' of capacity $c(x)$. All edges that led into x now lead into x' , while all edges that led out of x now lead out of x'' . Apply the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem for directed networks (with edge capacities).

2.63. Use Exercise 2.61(a).

2.65. The tree of Example 1.2 will do. Order the cutsets according to the (first) edge on the “main” ray that they contain. Let A_n be the size of the n th cutset. Let $T(k)$ be the tree coming off the vertex at level k of the main ray; thus, $T(k)$ begins with two children of its root for $k \geq 1$. Show that $T(k)$ contains k levels of a binary tree. Let $B_{n,k} := \Pi_n \cap T(k)$. Thus, $A_n \geq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} |B_{n,k}|$. Reduce the problem to the case where all vertices in $B_{n,k}$ are at level at most $3k$ for $n \leq 2k$. Use (2.15) to show that $\sum_{n=k+1}^{2k} |B_{n,k}|^{-1} < 2$ for each k . Deduce that $\sum_n A_n^{-1} < \infty$ by using the Arithmetic-Harmonic Mean Inequality.

Alternatively, use Exercise 2.66.

2.66. This is due to Yoram Gat (1997, personal communication). Write $A := \{\Pi_n; n \geq 1\}$ and $S(A) := \sum_n |\Pi_n|^{-1}$. We may clearly assume that each Π_n is minimal. Suppose that there is some edge $e \notin \bigcup_n \Pi_n$. Then there is some Π_k that does not separate the root from e . Let Π'_k be the cutset obtained from Π_k by replacing all the descendants of e in Π_k by e . Then $|\Pi'_k| \leq |\Pi_k|$. Let $A' := \{\Pi_n; n \neq k\} \cup \{\Pi'_k\}$. Then A' is also a sequence of disjoint cutsets and $S(A') \geq S(A)$.

If we order the edges of T in any fashion that makes $|e|$ nondecreasing and apply the above procedure recursively to all edges not in the current collection of cutsets, we obtain a sequence A_i of collections of disjoint cutsets with $S(A_i)$ nondecreasing in i . Let $A_\infty := \liminf A_i$. Then A_∞ is also a sequence of disjoint cutsets, and $S(A_\infty) \geq S(A)$. Furthermore, each edge of T appears in some element of A_∞ .

Call two cutsets **comparable** if one separates the root from the other. Suppose that there are two cutsets of A_∞ that are not comparable, Π_n and Π_m . Then we may create two new cutsets Π'_n and Π'_m , that are comparable and whose union contains the same edges as $\Pi_n \cup \Pi_m$. Since $|\Pi'_n| + |\Pi'_m| = |\Pi_n| + |\Pi_m|$ and $\min\{|\Pi'_n|, |\Pi'_m|\} \leq \min\{|\Pi_n|, |\Pi_m|\}$, it follows that $|\Pi'_n|^{-1} + |\Pi'_m|^{-1} \geq |\Pi_n|^{-1} + |\Pi_m|^{-1}$. By replacing Π_n and Π_m in A_∞ by Π'_n and Π'_m and repeating this procedure as long as there are at least two cutsets in the collection that are not comparable, we obtain in the limit a collection A'_∞ of disjoint pairwise comparable cutsets containing each edge of T and such that $S(A'_\infty) \geq S(A)$. But the only collection of disjoint pairwise comparable cutsets containing each edge of T is $A'_\infty = \{T_n; n \geq 1\}$.

2.67. This is due to I. Benjamini (personal communication, 1996).

(a) Given cutsets, consider the new network where the edges of the cutsets are divided in two by an extra vertex for each edge, each half getting half the resistance.

(b) Reverse time.

(c) Note that A_n are independent.

2.71. (This is due to Peres.)

2.72. Let G be the subtree of T induced by those vertices that Π separates from ∞ . If G were infinite, then we could find a path $o = x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots$ of vertices in G such that each x_{i+1} is a child of x_i by choosing x_{i+1} to be a child of x_i with an infinite number of descendants in G . This would produce a path from o to ∞ that did not intersect Π , which contradicts our

assumption. Hence G is finite. Let Π' be the set of edges joining a vertex of G to a vertex of $T \setminus G$ that has an infinite number of descendants.

- 2.73.** If T is transient, then the voltage function, normalized to take the value 1 at the root o and vanish at infinity, works as F . Conversely, given F , use the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem to find a nonzero flow θ from the root, with $\theta(e) \leq dF(e)c(e)$ for all e . Thus $\sum_{e \in \xi} \theta(e)/c(e) \leq F(o)$ for every path ξ from o . For each path ξ connecting o to x , multiply this inequality by $\theta(e(x))$ and sum over $x \in T_n$. This implies that θ has finite energy.
- 2.76.** This an immediate consequence of the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem. In the form of Exercise 12.12, it is due to Frostman (1935).
- 2.77.** Let $x \in T$ with $|x| > k$. Let u be the ancestor of x which has $|u| = |x| - k$. Then the embedding of T^u into T embeds T^x into T^w for some $w \in T_k$.
- 2.79.** Consider the directed graph on $0, 1, \dots, k$ with edges $\langle i, j \rangle$ for $i \leq j$.
- 2.81.** This seems to be new. Let β be an irrational number. For real x, y and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, set $f_k(x, y) := (\mathbf{1}_{[0, 1/2]}(\lfloor x + k\beta \rfloor), \mathbf{1}_{[0, 1/2]}(\lfloor y + k\beta \rfloor))$ and let $F_n(x, y)$ be the sequence $\langle f_k(x, y); 0 \leq k < n \rangle$. Let T be the tree of all finite sequences of the form $F_n(x, y)$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, together with the null sequence, which is the root of T . Join $F_n(x, y)$ to $F_{n+1}(x, y)$ by an edge. Then $|T_n| = 4n^2$. Let λ_2 be Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]^2$ and for vertices $w \in T$, set $\theta(w) := \lambda_2\{(x, y); F_{|w|}(x, y) = w\}$. Now choose β not well-approximable by rationals, e.g., $\sqrt{5}$. Then θ is approximately uniform on T_n , whence has finite measure for unit conductances. That is, simple random walk is transient.
- 2.82.** Given (x_1, \dots, x_n) and (y_1, \dots, y_m) that correspond to vertices in T , the sequence obtained by concatenating them with N zeros in between also corresponds to a vertex in T . Thus T is N -superperiodic and $\text{br}T = \text{gr}T$. To rule out $(N - 1)$ -superperiodicity, use rational approximations to α . If $\alpha > 1/2$ or $\alpha = 1/2$, then $\text{gr}T = 2$ by the SLLN or the Ballot Theorem respectively. If $\alpha < 1/2$, then Cramer's theorem on large deviations, or Stirling's formula, imply that $\text{gr}T$ is the binary entropy of α .

CHAPTER 3

- 3.2.** It suffices to do the case $H = \bigcup H_n$. Let $K_1 := H_1$ and define K_n for $n > 1$ by $H_n = H_{n-1} \oplus K_n$. Then

$$H = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n := \left\{ \sum x_n; x_n \in K_n, \sum \|x_n\|^2 < \infty \right\}.$$

This makes the result obvious.

- 3.3.** Follow the proof of Proposition 3.1, but use the stars more than the cycles.
- 3.5.** The free effective resistance between a and z equals $r(e)i_{\mathbb{F}}^e(e)/[1 - i_{\mathbb{F}}^e(e)]$.
- 3.6.** (a) If $x \in V$, then $\nabla \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}$ is the star at x .
 (d) Use Exercise 2.60.
 (g) Find ∇g first by using the fact that $P_{\nabla \mathbb{D}_0} = P_{\star}$ and the fact that $i_x - i_w = i_{\mathbb{W}}^{\langle x, w \rangle}$ if $\langle x, w \rangle$ is an oriented edge.

(h) Use part (g).

3.7. (Thomassen, 1989) Fix vertices $a_i \in V_i$. Use Theorem 3.6 with

$$W_n := \{(x_1, x_2); |x_1 - a_1| \vee |x_2 - a_2| = n\}.$$

We remark that the product with $V := V_1 \times V_2$ and $E := \{(x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)\}; (x_1, y_1) \in E_1 \text{ and } (x_2, y_2) \in E_2\}$ is called the **categorical product**. These terms are not universally used; other terms include “sum” for what we called the cartesian product and “product” for the categorical product.

3.8. The set of $g \geq f$ in \mathbf{D}_0 is closed and convex. Use Exercise 3.6(h).

3.12. Use Theorem 2.15.

3.13. (b) Use Exercise 2.45 and Proposition 2.11.

3.14. (a) Since $\{\chi^e; e \in E_{1/2}\}$ is a basis for $\ell^2_-(E)$ and $P_{\nabla\mathbf{HD}} = P_{\diamond}^\perp - P_{\star}$, the linear span of $\{i_F^e - i_W^e\}$ is dense in $\nabla\mathbf{HD}$.

3.15. Define the random walk

$$Y_n := \begin{cases} X_n & \text{if } n \leq \tau_{G \setminus H}, \\ X_{\tau_{G \setminus H}} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It follows from a slight extension of the ideas leading to (3.7) that for $f \in \mathbf{D}$ harmonic at all vertices in H , the sequence $\langle f(Y_n) \rangle$ is an L^2 martingale, whence $f(X_0) = \mathbf{E}[\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(Y_n)]$. This is 0 if f is supported on H .

3.16. Consider linearly independent elements of $\mathbf{D}/(\mathbb{R} + \mathbf{D}_0)$.

3.17. If $e \in E$ with $v(e^-) < \alpha < v(e^+)$ and we subdivide e by a vertex x , giving the two resulting edges resistances

$$r(e^-, x) = r(e) \frac{\alpha - v(e^-)}{v(e^+) - v(e^-)}$$

and

$$r(x, e^+) = r(e) \frac{v(e^+) - \alpha}{v(e^+) - v(e^-)},$$

and if the corresponding random walk on the graph with e subdivided is observed only when a new vertex of G is reached, then we see the original random walk on G and $v(x)$, the probability of never visiting o , is α .

For each $k = 2, 3, \dots$ in turn, subdivide each edge e where $v(e^-) < 1 - 1/k < v(e^+)$ as just described with a new vertex x having $v(x) = 1 - 1/k$. Let G' be the network that includes all these vertices. Let Π_k be the set of all vertices $x \in G'$ with $v(x) = 1 - 1/k$ and let τ_k be the first time the random walk on G' visits Π_k . This stopping time is finite since $v(X_n) \rightarrow 1$ by Exercise 2.59. The limit distribution of $J(X_n)$ on the circle is the same for G as for G' and is the limit of $J(X_{\tau_k})$ since $J(X_n)$ converges a.s.

Let G'_k be the subnetwork of G' determined by all vertices x with $v(x) \leq 1 - 1/k$. Because all vertices of Π_k are at the same potential in G' , identifying them to a single vertex will not change the current flow in G'_k . Thus, the current flow along an edge e in G'_k incident to a vertex in Π_k is proportional to the chance that e is the edge taken when Π_k is first visited. This means that the chance that $J(X_{\tau_k})$ is an arc $J(x)$ is exactly the length of $J(x)$ if $x \in \Pi_k$. Hence the limit distribution of $J(X_{\tau_k})$ is Lebesgue measure.

CHAPTER 4

- 4.1. Various theorems will work. The monotone convergence theorem works even when $m = \infty$.
- 4.2. We will soon see (Corollary 4.10) that also $\text{br } T = m$ a.s. given nonextinction.
- 4.3. Show that for each n , the event that the diameter of the component is at least n is measurable.
- 4.4. One way is to let $\langle G_n \rangle$ be an exhaustion of G by finite subgraphs containing x . If

$$\mathbf{P}_p[\exists \text{ infinite-diameter component of } G(\omega)] > 0,$$

then for some n , we have $\mathbf{P}_p[\exists u \in G_n \ u \leftrightarrow \infty] > 0$. This latter event is independent of the event that all the edges of G_n are present. The intersection of these two events contains the event that $x \leftrightarrow \infty$.

- 4.5. Let $p \geq p_c(G)$ and $p' \in [0, 1]$. The law of $G_{pp'}(\omega)$ given $G_p(\omega)$ is precisely that of percolation on $G_p(\omega)$ with survival parameter p' . Therefore, we want to show that if $p' < p_c(G)/p$, i.e., if $pp' < p_c(G)$, then $G_{pp'}(\omega)$ a.s. has no infinite components, while if $pp' > p_c(G)$, then $G_{pp'}(\omega)$ a.s. has an infinite component. But this follows from the definition of $p_c(G)$.
- 4.6. Let d_u denote the number of children of a vertex u in a tree. Use the strong law of large numbers for bounded martingale differences to compare the speed to

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \leq n} \frac{d_{X_k} - 1}{d_{X_k} + 1}.$$

Show that the frequency of visits to vertices with at least 2 children is at least $1/N$.

- 4.8. Use Theorem 4.16. This result is due originally to Grimmett and Kesten (1983), Lemma 2.
- 4.12. Let f_n and f be the corresponding p.g.f.'s. Then $f_n(s) \rightarrow f(s)$ for each $s \in [0, 1]$.
- 4.17. (a) By symmetry, we have on the event A that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{L_i^{(n+1)}}{\sum_{j=1}^{Z_n} L_j^{(n+1)} + \sum_{j=1}^{Z'_n} L'_j{}^{(n+1)}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] &= \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{L'_i{}^{(n+1)}}{\sum_{j=1}^{Z_n} L'_j{}^{(n+1)} + \sum_{j=1}^{Z'_n} L_j^{(n+1)}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{Z_n + Z'_n}. \end{aligned}$$

(b) By part (a), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[Y_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] &= \frac{Z_n}{Z_n + Z'_n} \mathbf{P}[A \mid \mathcal{F}_n] + Y_n \mathbf{P}[\neg A \mid \mathcal{F}_n] \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{Z_n}{Z_n + Z'_n} \mathbf{1}_A \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] + \mathbf{E}[Y_n \mathbf{1}_{\neg A} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[Y_n \mathbf{1}_A + Y_n \mathbf{1}_{\neg A} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = Y_n. \end{aligned}$$

Since $0 \leq Y_n \leq 1$, the martingale converges to $Y \in [0, 1]$.

(c) Assume that $1 < m < \infty$. We have

$$\mathbf{E}[Y \mid Z_0, Z'_0] = Y_0 = Z_0/(Z_0 + Z'_0). \tag{4.1}$$

Now $\langle Z'_{k+n} \rangle_{n \geq 0}$ is also a Galton-Watson process, so

$$Y^{(k)} := \lim_n \frac{Z_n}{Z_n + Z'_{k+n}}$$

exists a.s. too with

$$\mathbf{E}[Y^{(k)} \mid Z_0, Z'_k] = Z_0/(Z_0 + Z'_k)$$

by (4.1). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}[Y = 1, Z_n \not\rightarrow 0, Z'_n \not\rightarrow 0] &= \mathbf{P}\left[\frac{Z'_n}{Z_n} \rightarrow 0, Z_n \not\rightarrow 0, Z'_n \not\rightarrow 0\right] \\ &= \mathbf{P}\left[\frac{Z'_{n+k}}{Z_n} \rightarrow 0, Z_n \not\rightarrow 0, Z'_n \not\rightarrow 0\right] \\ &= \mathbf{P}[Y^{(k)} = 1, Z_n \not\rightarrow 0, Z'_n \not\rightarrow 0] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}[Y^{(k)} \mathbf{1}_{\{Z'_k > 0\}}] = \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{Z_0}{Z_0 + Z'_k} \mathbf{1}_{\{Z'_k > 0\}}\right] \\ &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is due to the fact that, by the weak law of large numbers and Proposition 4.1, $Z'_{n+k}/Z'_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} m^k$. Hence $\mathbf{P}[Y = 1, Z_n \not\rightarrow 0, Z'_n \not\rightarrow 0] = 0$. By symmetry, $\mathbf{P}[Y = 0, Z_n \not\rightarrow 0, Z'_n \not\rightarrow 0] = 0$ too.

4.19. Take $c_n := Z'_n$ for almost any particular realization of $\langle Z'_n \rangle$ with $Z'_n \not\rightarrow 0$. Part (iii) of the Seneta-Heyde theorem, the fact that $c_{n+1}/c_n \rightarrow m$, follows from $Z_{n+1}/Z_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} m$. That is, if $Z_n/c_n \rightarrow V$ a.s., $0 < V < \infty$ a.s. on nonextinction, then

$$\frac{Z_{n+1}}{Z_n} \cdot \frac{c_n}{c_{n+1}} \rightarrow \frac{V}{V} = 1 \tag{4.2}$$

a.s. on nonextinction. Since $Z_{n+1}/Z_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} m$, it follows that $c_n/c_{n+1} \rightarrow 1/m$.

4.20. This follows either from (4.2) in the solution to Exercise 4.19 or from the Seneta-Heyde theorem.

4.22. We have $1 - \theta_n(p) = (1 - p\theta_n(p))^n$.

4.24. The bilinear form $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mapsto \mathbf{E}[X(\mu_1)X(\mu_2)]$ gives the seminorm $\mathcal{E}(\bullet)^{1/2}$, whence the seminorm satisfies the parallelogram law, which is the desired identity.

4.25. Use Exercise 4.24.

4.30. $\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \partial T(n))/(1 + \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \partial T(n))) = 2/(n + 2)$ while Theorem 10.7 gives $\mathbf{P}_{1/2}[o \leftrightarrow \partial T_n] \sim 4/n$, so the inequalities with “2” in them are better for large n .

4.31. $\mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \partial T)/(1 + \mathcal{C}(o \leftrightarrow \partial T)) = (2p - 1)/p$ and $\mathbf{P}_p[o \leftrightarrow \partial T] = (2p - 1)/p^2$.

4.32. For related results, see Adams and Lyons (1991) and Pemantle and Peres (1996).

4.33. This is due to Lyons (1992).

CHAPTER 5

5.1. In fact, for every finite connected subset K of \mathbb{T}_{b+1} , we have $|\partial_E K| = (b-1)|K| + 2$.

5.2. Let the transition probabilities be $p(x, y)$. Then the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \|Pf\|_2^2 &= \sum_{x \in V} \pi(x) (Pf)(x)^2 = \sum_{x \in V} \pi(x) \left[\sum_{y \in V} p(x, y) f(y) \right]^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{x \in V} \pi(x) \sum_{y \in V} p(x, y) f(y)^2 = \sum_{y \in V} f(y)^2 \sum_{x \in V} \pi(x) p(x, y) \\ &= \sum_{y \in V} f(y)^2 \pi(y) = \|f\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

5.3. The first equality depends only on the fact that P is self-adjoint. Suppose that $|(Pf, f)| \leq C(f, f)$ for all f . Then for all f, g , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(Pf, g)| &= \left| \frac{(P(f+g), f+g) - (P(f-g), f-g)}{4} \right| \\ &\leq C[(f+g, f+g) + (f-g, f-g)]/4 = C[(f, f) + (g, g)]/2. \end{aligned}$$

Put $g = Pf$ to get $(Pf, Pf) \leq C(f, f)$. This shows that $\|P\| = \sup\{|(Pf, f)|/(f, f); f \in \mathbf{D}_{00} \setminus \{0\}\}$.

5.4. The fact that the Markov chain is irreducible implies that the right-most quantity does not depend on the choice of x, y . Furthermore, it is clear that the middle term is at least $\rho(G)$. To see that the middle term is at most $\|P\|_\pi$, use $p_n(x, z) = (\mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}, P^n \mathbf{1}_{\{z\}})_\pi / \pi(x)$ to deduce that $p_n(x, z) \leq \sqrt{\pi(z)/\pi(x)} \|P^n\|_\pi$. Finally, to show that $\|P\|_\pi \leq \rho(G)$, suppose that $f \in \mathbf{D}_{00}$ with $\|f\|_\pi = 1$. Write $f = \sum_x f(x) \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}$. Then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|P^n f\|_\pi^{1/n} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sum_{x, y} f(x) f(y) p_{2n}(x, y) \right]^{1/2n} \leq \rho(G).$$

On the other hand, $\|Pf\|_\pi^n \leq \|P^n f\|_\pi$ by the spectral theorem and the power-mean inequality (i.e., convexity of $t \mapsto t^n$ for $t > 0$). [In order to use only the spectral theorem from linear algebra, one may use the same reduction as in the solution to Exercise 11.1.] Hence $\|P\|_\pi \leq \rho(G)$.

5.6. Use the fact that $\iota_E(\mathbb{T}_{b+1}) = (b-1)/(b+1)$ to get an upper bound on $\rho(\mathbb{T}_{b+1})$. To get a lower bound, calculate $\|Pf\|$ for $f := \sum_{n=1}^N b^{-n/2} \mathbf{1}_{S_n}$, where N is arbitrary and S_n is the sphere of radius n .

5.7. For finite networks and the corresponding definition of isoperimetric constant (see Exercise 5.22), the situation is quite different; see Chung and Tetali (1998).

5.9. (This was the original proof of Theorem 5.2 in BLPS (1999).) Let θ be an antisymmetric function on \mathbf{E} with $|\theta(e)| \leq c(e)$ for all edges e and $d^* \theta(x) = \iota_E(G) D(x)$ for all vertices x .

We may assume that θ is acyclic, i.e., that there is no cycle of oriented edges on each of which $\theta > 0$. (Otherwise, we modify θ by subtracting appropriate cycles.) Let $K \subset V$ be finite and nonempty. Suppose for a contradiction that $|\partial_E K|_c/|K|_D = \nu_E(G)$. The proof of Theorem 5.1 shows that for all $e \in \partial_E K$, we have $\theta(e) = c(e)$ if e is oriented to point out of K ; in particular, $\theta(e) > 0$. Let $(x_1, x_0) \in \partial_E K$ with $x_1 \in K$ and $x_0 \notin K$ and let g be an automorphism of G that carries x_0 to x_1 . Write x_2 for the image of x_1 and gK for the image of K . Since we also have $|\partial_E gK|_c/|gK|_D = \nu_E(G)$ and $(x_2, x_1) \in \partial_E gK$, it follows that $\theta(x_2, x_1) > 0$. We may similarly find x_3 such that $\theta(x_3, x_2) > 0$ and so on, until we arrive at some x_k that equals some previous x_j or is outside K . Both lead to a contradiction, the former contradicting the acyclicity of θ and the latter the fact that on all edges leading out of K , we have $\theta > 0$.

5.10. (Due to R. Lyons.) Use the method of solution of Exercise 5.9.

5.12. (Due to R. Lyons.)

5.13. (This was the original proof of Theorem 5.4 in BLPS (1999).) Let θ be an antisymmetric function on E with $\text{flow}_+(\theta, x) \leq 1$ and $d^*\theta(x) = \nu_V(G)$ for all vertices x . Let $K \subset V$ be finite and nonempty. Suppose for a contradiction that $|\partial_V K|/|K| = \nu_V(G)$. The proof of Theorem 5.3 shows that for all $x \in \partial_V K$, we have $\text{flow}_+(\theta, x) = 1$ and $\text{flow}_+(-\theta, v) = \nu_V(G) + 1$; in particular, there is some e leading to x with $\theta(e) \geq 1/d$ and some e leading away from x with $\theta(e) \geq (\nu_V(G) + 1)/d \geq 1/d$, where d is the degree in G . Since G is transitive, the same is true for all $x \in V$. Therefore, we may find either a cycle or a bi-infinite path with all edges e having the property that $\theta(e) \geq 1/d$. We may then subtract $1/d$ from these edges, yielding another function θ' that satisfies $\text{flow}_+(\theta', v) \leq 1$ and $d^*\theta'(x) = \nu_V(G)$ for all vertices x . But then $\text{flow}_+(\theta', x) < 1$ for some x , a contradiction.

5.14. (Due to R. Lyons.)

5.16. This is Exercise 6.17 $\frac{1}{2}$ in Gromov (1999). Consider the graph G_k formed by adding all edges $[x, y]$ with $\text{dist}_G(x, y) \leq k$.

5.20. This is due to Kesten (1959a, 1959b).

5.22. This is due to Chung and Tetali (1998).

5.24. We use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Exercise 5.4:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_x[X_n \in A] &= (\mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}, P^n \mathbf{1}_A)_\pi / \pi(x) \leq \sqrt{|x|_\pi} \|P^n \mathbf{1}_A\|_\pi / \pi(x) \\ &\leq \|P\|_\pi^n \sqrt{|A|_\pi / \pi(x)} = \rho(G)^n \sqrt{|A|_\pi / \pi(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

5.25. We may apply Exercise 5.24 to bound $\mathbf{P}[|X_n| \leq 2\alpha n]$ for $\alpha < -\log \rho(G) / \log \overline{\text{gr}} G$. (This appears as Lemma 4.2 in Virág (2000a).)

5.27. This is from Häggström, Jonasson, and Lyons (2002).

5.28. (Due to Y. Peres and published in Häggström, Jonasson, and Lyons (2002).) The amenable case is trivial, so assume that G is nonamenable. According to the reasoning of the first paragraph of the proof of Theorem 5.9 and (5.15), we have

$$|(\widehat{K})'|/|E((\widehat{K})')| + |K|/|E^*(K)| \leq |(\widehat{K})'|/|E((\widehat{K})')| + |\widehat{K}|/|E^*(\widehat{K})| \leq 1 + 1/|E((\widehat{K})')|. \quad (5.3)$$

Write

$$\kappa_n := |\partial_E K_n|/|K_n| - \iota'_E(G)$$

and

$$\lambda_n := |\partial_E L_n|/|L_n| - \iota'_E(G^\dagger).$$

Also write $d := d_G$, $d^\dagger := d_{G^\dagger}$, $\iota := \iota'_E(G)$, and $\iota^\dagger := \iota'_E(G^\dagger)$. We may rewrite (5.3) as

$$\frac{2}{d^\dagger - |\partial_E L_n|/|L_n|} + \frac{2}{d + |\partial_E K_n|/|K_n|} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{|E(L_n)|},$$

or, again, as

$$\frac{2}{d^\dagger - \iota^\dagger - \lambda_n} + \frac{2}{d + \iota + \kappa_n} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{|E(L_n)|} = \frac{2}{d^\dagger - \iota^\dagger} + \frac{2}{d + \iota} + \frac{1}{|E(L_n)|},$$

whence

$$\frac{2\lambda_n}{(d^\dagger - \iota^\dagger)(d^\dagger - \iota^\dagger - \lambda_n)} + \frac{2\kappa_n}{(d + \iota)(d + \iota + \kappa_n)} \leq \frac{1}{|E(L_n)|}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} 2\lambda_n &\leq \frac{(d^\dagger - \iota^\dagger)(d^\dagger - \iota^\dagger - \lambda_n)}{(d + \iota)(d + \iota + \kappa_n)}(2\kappa_n) + \frac{(d^\dagger - \iota^\dagger)(d^\dagger - \iota^\dagger - \lambda_n)}{|E(L_n)|} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{d^\dagger - \iota^\dagger}{d + \iota}\right)^2 2\kappa_n + \frac{(d^\dagger - \iota^\dagger)^2}{|E(L_n)|}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$2\kappa_{n+1} \leq \left(\frac{d - \iota}{d^\dagger + \iota^\dagger}\right)^2 2\lambda_n + \frac{(d - \iota)^2}{|E(K_{n+1})|}.$$

Putting these together, we obtain

$$2\kappa_{n+1} \leq a(2\kappa_n) + b_n,$$

where

$$a := \left(\frac{(d - \iota)(d^\dagger - \iota^\dagger)}{(d + \iota)(d^\dagger + \iota^\dagger)}\right)^2$$

and

$$b_n := \left(\frac{(d - \iota)(d^\dagger - \iota^\dagger)}{d^\dagger + \iota^\dagger}\right)^2 \frac{1}{|E(L_n)|} + \frac{(d - \iota)^2}{|E(K_{n+1})|}.$$

Therefore

$$2\kappa_n \leq 2\kappa_0 a^{n-1} + \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} a^j b_{n-j}.$$

Since $a < 1$ and $b_n \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $\kappa_n \rightarrow 0$. Hence $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ too.

CHAPTER 6

- 6.1.** Prove this by induction, removing one leaf of $K \cap T$ at a time.
- 6.2.** Divide A into two pieces depending on the value of $\omega(e)$.
- 6.5.** Let $A := \{y \leftrightarrow \infty\}$ and $B := \{x \leftrightarrow y\}$.
- 6.6.** The transitive case is due to Lyons (1995).
- 6.10.** (a) If not, take a limit point of pairs of paths as the radius of S tends to infinity.
 (b) Use Menger's theorem (Exercise 2.63) and part (a) repeatedly.
- 6.11.** Let us first suppose that $\mathbf{P}_o[X_k = o]$ is strictly positive for all large k . Note that for any k and n , we have $\mathbf{P}_o[X_n = o] \geq \mathbf{P}_o[X_k = o]\mathbf{P}_o[X_{n-k} = o]$. Thus by Fekete's Lemma (Exercise 2.25), we have $\rho(G) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_o[X_n = o]^{1/n}$ and $\mathbf{P}_o[X_n = o] \leq \rho(G)^n$ for all n .
 On the other hand, if $\mathbf{P}_o[X_k = o] = 0$ for odd k , it is still true that $\mathbf{P}_o[X_k = o]$ is strictly positive for all even k , whence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_o[X_{2n} = o]^{1/2n}$ exists and equals $\rho(G)$.
- 6.12.** Use Exercise 5.8.
- 6.13.** (These generators were introduced by Revelle (2001).) It is the same as the graph of Example 6.2 would be if the trees in that example were chosen both to be 3-regular.
- 6.16.** Use Exercise 6.12.
- 6.18.** Use Theorem 6.19.
- 6.19.** See Grimmett (1999), pp. 18–19.
- 6.20.** It is not known whether the hypothesis holds for every Cayley graph of at least quadratic growth.
- 6.22.** (This fact is folklore, but was published for the first time by Peres and Steif (1998).) If there is an infinite cluster with positive probability, then by Kolmogorov's 0-1 law, there is an infinite cluster a.s. Let A be the set of vertices x of T for which $\omega \cap T^x$ contains an infinite cluster a.s. Then A is a subtree of T and clearly cannot have a finite boundary. Furthermore, since A is countable, for a.e. ω , each $x \in A$ has the property that $\omega \cap T^x$ contains an infinite cluster. Also, a.s. for all $x \in A$, $\omega \cap T^x \neq T^x \cap A$. Therefore, a.e. ω has the property

$$\forall x \in A \quad \omega \cap T^x \text{ contains an infinite cluster different from } T^x \cap A. \quad (6.4)$$

For any ω with this property, for all $x \in A$, there is some $y \in T^x \cap A \setminus \omega$. Therefore, such an ω contains infinitely many infinite clusters. Since a.e. ω does have property (6.4), it follows that ω contains infinitely many infinite clusters a.s.

- 6.25.** (This is from Kesten (1982).) Let $a_{n,\ell}$ denote the number of connected subgraphs (V', E') of G such that $o \in V'$, $|V'| = n$, and $|\partial_V V'| = \ell$. Note that for such a subgraph, $\ell \leq (d-1)|V'| = (d-1)n$ provided $n \geq 2$. Let $p := 1/d$ and consider Bernoulli(p) site percolation on G . Writing the fact that 1 is at least the probability that the cluster of o is finite, we obtain

$$1 \geq \sum_{n,\ell} a_{n,\ell} p^n (1-p)^\ell \geq \sum_{n \geq 2} a_n p^n (1-p)^{(d-1)n}.$$

Therefore $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n^{1/n} \leq 1/[p(1-p)^{d-1}]$. Putting in the chosen value of p gives the result.

- 6.26.** (From Häggström, Jonasson, and Lyons (2002).) Let $b_{n,\ell}$ denote the number of connected subgraphs (V', E') of G such that $o \in V'$, $|E'| = n$, and $|\{[x, y]; x \in V', y \notin V'\} \setminus E'| = \ell$. Note that for such a subgraph,

$$\ell \leq d|V'| - 2n \leq d(n+1) - 2n = (d-2)n + d. \tag{6.5}$$

Let $p := 1/(d-1)$ and consider Bernoulli(p) bond percolation on G . Writing the fact that 1 is at least the probability that the cluster of o is finite and using (6.5), we obtain

$$1 \geq \sum_{n,\ell} b_{n,\ell} p^n (1-p)^\ell \geq \sum_n b_n p^n (1-p)^{(d-2)n+d}.$$

Therefore $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n^{1/n} \leq 1/[p(1-p)^{d-2}]$. Putting in the chosen value of p gives the result.

- 6.27.** Since the graph has bounded degree, it contains a bi-infinite geodesic passing through o iff it contains geodesics of length $2k$ for each k with o in the middle. By transitivity, it suffices to find a geodesic of length $2k$ anywhere. But this is trivial.

- 6.28.** (This is from Babson and Benjamini (1999).) We give the solution for bond percolation. Let d be the degree of vertices and $2t$ be an upper bound for the length of cycles in a set spanning all cycles. If $K(o)$ is finite, then $\partial_E K(o)$ is a cutset separating o from ∞ . Let $\Pi \subseteq \partial_E K(o)$ be a minimal cutset. All edges in Π are closed, which is an event of probability $(1-p)^{|\Pi|}$. We claim that the number of minimal cutsets separating o from ∞ and with n edges is at most CnD^n for some constants C and D that do not depend on n , which implies that $p_c(G) < 1$ as in the proof of Theorem 6.15. Fix any bi-infinite geodesic $\langle x_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ with $x_0 = o$ (see Exercise 6.27). Let Π be any minimal cutset separating o from ∞ with n edges. Since Π separates o from ∞ , there are some $j, l \geq 0$ such that $[x_{-j-1}, x_{-j}], [x_l, x_{l+1}] \in \Pi$. Since Π is connected in G_E^t and $\langle x_k \rangle$ is a geodesic, it follows that $j+l < nt$. By Exercise 6.25, the number of connected subgraphs of G_E^t that have n vertices and that include the edge $[x_l, x_{l+1}]$ is at most cD^n , where c is some constant and D is the degree of G_E^t . Since there are no more than nt choices for l , the bound we want follows with $C := ct$.

- 6.29.** (This is due to Häggström, Peres, and Schonmann (1999), where a direct proof can be found.) Follow the method of proof of Lemma 6.29.

- 6.32.** This is due to Benjamini and Schramm (1996b).

CHAPTER 7

- 7.3.** Fix $u, v \in V$. Let $f(x, y)$ be the indicator that $y \in \Gamma_{u,xv}$.
- 7.4.** Use Exercise 7.3.
- 7.5.** For any x , consider the elements of $S(x)$ that fix x_1, \dots, x_n .
- 7.10.** Use the same proof as of Theorem 7.13, but only put mass on vertices in ω .
- 7.11.** (This is from BLPS (1999).) Note that if K is a finite tree, then $\alpha_K < 2$.
- 7.12.** (This is from BLPS (1999).) Use the method of proof of the first part of Theorem 7.17.
- 7.14.** Fixing x and y , define $f_n(p)$ to be the \mathbf{P}_p -probability that there is an open path between x and y that has length at most n . Then f_n is a polynomial, hence continuous, and increases to τ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, f_n is an increasing function. This implies the claim.
- 7.15.** If G is quasi-transitive, let G' be a transitive representation of G . Given a configuration ω on G , define the configuration ω' on G' by letting $\omega'([x, y]) = 1$ iff there is a path of open edges in ω that joins x and y . Use Theorem 7.18.
- 7.16.** If there were two faces with an infinite number of sides, then a ball that intersects both of them would contain a finite number of vertices whose removal would leave more than one infinite component. If there were only one face with an infinite number of sides, then let x_n ($n \in \mathbb{Z}$) be the vertices on that face. Quasi-transitivity would imply that there is a maximum distance M of any vertex to $A := \{x_n\}$. Since the graph has one end, for all large n , there is a path from x_{-n} to x_n that avoids the M -neighborhood of x_0 . Since this path stays within distance M of A , there are two vertices $x_{-r(n)}, x_{s(n)}$ ($r(n), s(n) > 0$) within distance M of the path and within distance $2M + 1$ of each other. If $\sup_n r(n)s(n) = \infty$, then there would be points (either $x_{-r(n)}$ or $x_{s(n)}$) the removal of whose $(2M + 1)$ -neighborhood would leave an arbitrarily large finite component (one containing x_0). This would contradict the quasi-transitivity. Hence all paths from x_{-n} to x_n intersect some fixed neighborhood of x_0 . But this contradicts having just one end.
- 7.17.** Deduce it from the transitive case by using a version of insertion tolerance that preserves the topology on the union of the sets of ends of all infinite clusters.
- 7.21.** (This is adapted from BLPS (1999).)
- 7.22.** (This is due to Salvatori (1992).)
- 7.23.** (From BLPS (1999).) Because of Proposition 7.11 and Exercise 7.21, we know that Γ is unimodular. Fix i and let r be the distance from o_1 to o_i . Let n_i be the number of vertices in Γo_i at distance r from o_1 and let n_1 be the number of vertices in Γo_1 at distance r from o_i . Begin with mass n_i at each vertex $x \in \Gamma o_1$ and redistribute it equally among those vertices in Γo_i at distance r from x . When n is large, $|K_n|$ dominates the number of vertices at distance r from $\partial_\vee K_n$. Hence, the total mass transported from vertices in $\Gamma o_1 \cap K_n$ is asymptotically proportional to the total mass transported into vertices in $\Gamma o_i \cap K_n$; that is,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_1 |\Gamma o_i \cap K_n|}{n_i |\Gamma o_1 \cap K_n|} = 1. \tag{7.6}$$

By the Mass-Transport Principle, we also have

$$n_i \mu_{o_i} = n_1 \mu_{o_1}. \quad (7.7)$$

Since (7.6) and (7.7) hold for all i , their conjunction imply the desired result.

- 7.24.** Use Exercise 7.20.
- 7.25.** This was noted by Häggström (private communication, 1997). The same sharpening was shown another way in BLPS (1999) by using Theorem 5.2.
- 7.27.** This is from BLPS (1999).
- 7.29.** This is from BLPS (1999).
- 7.30.** (This is noted in BLPS (1999).) Combine Lemma 7.30 with the argument in the proof of Theorem 6.6.
- 7.31.** (This is from BLPS (1999).) Combine Lemma 7.30 with Theorem 7.15. See also Corollary 7.16.
- 7.32.** This is from BLPS (1999).
- 7.33.** (This is from BLPS (1999).) Let $\mathbb{Z}_3 := \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ be the group of order 3 and let T be the 3-regular tree with a distinguished end, ξ . On T , let every vertex be connected to precisely one of its offspring (as measured from ξ), each with probability $1/2$. Then every component is a ray. Let ω_1 be the preimage of this configuration under the coordinate projection $T \times \mathbb{Z}_3 \rightarrow T$. For every vertex x in T that has distance 5 from the root of the ray containing x , add to ω_1 two edges at random in the \mathbb{Z}_3 direction, in order to connect the 3 preimages of x in $T \times \mathbb{Z}_3$. The resulting configuration is a stationary spanning forest with 3 ends per tree and expected degree $(1/2)1 + (1/2)2 + 2^{-(5+1)}((2/3)1 + (1/3)2)$.
- 7.34.** (This is from BLPS (1999).) Use the notation of the solution to Exercise 7.33. For every vertex x that is a root of a ray in T , add to ω_1 two edges at random in the \mathbb{Z}_3 direction to connect the 3 preimages of x , and for every edge e in a ray in T that has distance 5 from the root of the ray, delete two of its preimages at random.

CHAPTER 8

- 8.1.** For the random walk version, this is proved in Sections 6.5 and 7.3 of Lawler (1991).
- 8.3.** Use balls.
- 8.4.** (Compare Theorem 3.2 in Thomassen (1990).) The number of components of T when restricted to G_n is at most $|V_n|$. A tree with k vertices has $k - 1$ edges. The statement on expectation follows from the bounded convergence theorem.
- 8.6.** Use also Rayleigh's monotonicity law.
- 8.8.** For the first part, compare coefficients of x_i . The second part is Cor. 4.4 in Burton and Pemantle (1993).

8.10. (This is also due to Feder and Mihail (1992).) We follow the proof of Theorem 8.5. We induct on the number of edges of G . Given A and B as specified, there is an edge e on which A depends (and so B ignores) such that A is positively correlated with e (since A is negatively correlated with those edges that A ignores). Thus, $\mathbf{P}[A \mid e \in T] \geq \mathbf{P}[A \mid e \notin T]$. Now

$$\mathbf{P}[A \mid B] = \mathbf{P}[e \in T \mid B]\mathbf{P}[A \mid B, e \in T] + \mathbf{P}[e \notin T \mid B]\mathbf{P}[A \mid B, e \notin T]. \tag{8.8}$$

The induction hypothesis implies that (8.8) is at most

$$\mathbf{P}[e \in T \mid B]\mathbf{P}[A \mid e \in T] + \mathbf{P}[e \notin T \mid B]\mathbf{P}[A \mid e \notin T]. \tag{8.9}$$

By Theorem 8.5, we have that $\mathbf{P}[e \in T \mid B] \leq \mathbf{P}[e \in T]$ and we have chosen e so that $\mathbf{P}[A \mid e \in T] \geq \mathbf{P}[A \mid e \notin T]$. Therefore, (8.9) is at most

$$\mathbf{P}[e \in T]\mathbf{P}[A \mid e \in T] + \mathbf{P}[e \notin T]\mathbf{P}[A \mid e \notin T] = \mathbf{P}[A].$$

8.13. You need to use $H(1, 1)$ to find $Y(e, f) = 1/2 - 1/\pi$ for e the edge from $(0, 0)$ to $(1, 0)$ and f the edge from $(0, 0)$ to $(0, 1)$. From this, the values of $Y(e, g)$ for the other edges g incident to the origin follow. Use the transfer current theorem directly to find $\mathbf{P}[\deg_T(0, 0) = 4]$. Other probabilities can be computed by Exercise 8.8 or by computing $\mathbf{P}[\deg_T(0, 0) \geq 3]$ and using the fact that the expected degree is 2 (Exercise 8.4). See Burton and Pemantle (1993), p. 1346, for some of the details.

It is not needed for the solution to this problem, but here are some values of H .

4	$80 - \frac{736}{3\pi}$	$-49 + \frac{160}{\pi}$	$12 - \frac{472}{15\pi}$	$-1 + \frac{48}{5\pi}$	$\frac{704}{105\pi}$
3	$17 - \frac{48}{\pi}$	$-8 + \frac{92}{3\pi}$	$1 + \frac{8}{3\pi}$	$\frac{92}{15\pi}$	$-1 + \frac{48}{5\pi}$
2	$4 - \frac{8}{\pi}$	$-1 + \frac{8}{\pi}$	$\frac{16}{3\pi}$	$1 + \frac{8}{3\pi}$	$12 - \frac{472}{15\pi}$
1	1	$\frac{4}{\pi}$	$-1 + \frac{8}{\pi}$	$-8 + \frac{92}{3\pi}$	$-49 + \frac{160}{\pi}$
0	0	1	$4 - \frac{8}{\pi}$	$17 - \frac{48}{\pi}$	$80 - \frac{736}{3\pi}$
(x_1, x_2)	0	1	2	3	4

Such a table was first constructed by McCrea and Whipple (1940). It is used for studying harmonic measure there and in Spitzer (1976), Section 15. See these references for proofs that

$$\lim_{|x_1|+|x_2| \rightarrow \infty} \left[H(x_1, x_2) - \frac{2}{\pi} \log \sqrt{|x_1|^2 + |x_2|^2} \right] = \frac{2\gamma + \log 8}{\pi},$$

where γ is Euler's constant. In fact, the convergence is extremely rapid. Using the preceding table, we can calculate the transfer currents, which we give in two tables. We show $Y(e, f)$

for e the edge from $(0, 0)$ to $(1, 0)$ and f varying. The first table is for the horizontal edges f , labelled with the left-hand endpoint of f :

4	$-\frac{129}{2} + \frac{608}{3\pi}$	$\frac{95}{2} - \frac{746}{5\pi}$	$-\frac{37}{2} + \frac{872}{15\pi}$	$\frac{7}{2} - \frac{1154}{105\pi}$	0
3	$-\frac{25}{2} + \frac{118}{3\pi}$	$\frac{17}{2} - \frac{80}{3\pi}$	$-\frac{5}{2} + \frac{118}{15\pi}$	0	$-\frac{7}{2} + \frac{1154}{105\pi}$
2	$-\frac{5}{2} + \frac{8}{\pi}$	$\frac{3}{2} - \frac{14}{3\pi}$	0	$\frac{5}{2} - \frac{118}{15\pi}$	$\frac{37}{2} - \frac{872}{15\pi}$
1	$-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{\pi}$	0	$-\frac{3}{2} + \frac{14}{3\pi}$	$-\frac{17}{2} + \frac{80}{3\pi}$	$-\frac{95}{2} + \frac{746}{5\pi}$
0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{\pi}$	$\frac{5}{2} - \frac{8}{\pi}$	$\frac{25}{2} - \frac{118}{3\pi}$	$\frac{129}{2} - \frac{608}{3\pi}$
(x_1, x_2)	0	1	2	3	4

The second table is for the vertical edges f , labelled with the lower endpoint of f :

4	$-138 + \frac{6503}{15\pi}$	$79 - \frac{1241}{5\pi}$	$-25 + \frac{1649}{21\pi}$	$4 - \frac{1321}{105\pi}$
3	$-26 + \frac{245}{3\pi}$	$13 - \frac{613}{15\pi}$	$-3 + \frac{47}{5\pi}$	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{167}{105\pi}$
2	$-5 + \frac{47}{3\pi}$	$2 - \frac{19}{3\pi}$	$-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{23}{15\pi}$	$-3 + \frac{47}{5\pi}$
1	$-1 + \frac{3}{\pi}$	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{5}{3\pi}$	$2 - \frac{19}{3\pi}$	$13 - \frac{613}{15\pi}$
0	$-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\pi}$	$-1 + \frac{3}{\pi}$	$-5 + \frac{47}{3\pi}$	$-26 + \frac{245}{3\pi}$
(x_1, x_2)	1	2	3	4

Symmetries of the plane give some other values from these.

- 8.14. (From Propp and Wilson (1998).) Let T be a tree rooted at some vertex x . Choose any directed path $x = u_0, u_1, \dots, u_l = x$ from x back to x that visits every vertex. For $1 \leq i < l$, let \mathcal{P}_i be the path u_0, u_1, \dots, u_i followed by the path in T from u_i to x . In the trajectory $\mathcal{P}_{l-1}, \mathcal{P}_{l-2}, \dots, \mathcal{P}_1$, the last time any vertex $u \neq x$ is visited, it is followed by its parent in T . Therefore, if the chain on spanning trees begins at any spanning tree, following this trajectory (which has positive probability of happening) will lead to T . (This also shows aperiodicity.)

8.16. We have

$$\tilde{p}(T, B(T, e)) = \frac{\pi(B(T, e))}{\pi(T)} p(B(T, e), T) = \frac{\alpha(B(T, e))}{\alpha(T)} p(g) = p(e).$$

8.17. There are too many spanning trees.

8.19. (From Propp and Wilson (1998).) We sum over the number of transitions out of x that are needed. We may find this by popping cycles at x . The number of such is the number of visits to x starting at x before visiting r . This is $\pi(x)(\mathbf{E}_x[\tau_r] + \mathbf{E}_r[\tau_x])$, as can be seen by considering the frequency of appropriate events in a bi-infinite path of the Markov chain. In the reversible case, we can also use the formulas in Section 2.2 to get

$$\sum_{x \text{ a state}} \sum_{x=e^-} c(e) \mathcal{R}(x \leftrightarrow r),$$

which is the same as what is to be shown.

8.21. Consider cosets.

8.22. This is due to Foster (1948).

8.23. (a) Add a (new) edge e from a to z of unit conductance. Then spanning trees of $G \cup \{e\}$ containing e are in 1-1 correspondence preserving β with spanning trees of $G/\{a, z\}$. Thus, the right-hand side of (8.13) is $(1 - \mathbf{P}[e \in T])/\mathbf{P}[e \in T]$ in $G \cup \{e\}$. Now apply Corollary 8.4.

(b) Note that any cycles in a random walk from a to z have equal likelihood of traversing e as \check{e} .

8.24. Use Wilson's algorithm with a given rung in place and a random walk started far away. This problem was originally analyzed by Häggström (1994), who used the theory of subshifts of finite type.

8.26. Use the fact that $i - i' - [i(f) - i'(f)]\chi^f$ is a flow between the endpoints of f .

8.27. Calculate the chance that all the edges incident to a given vertex are present.

8.29. This is a special case of what is proved in Feder and Mihail (1992). An earlier and more straightforward proof of a different generalization is given by Joag-Dev and Proschan (1983), paragraph 3.1(c).

8.30. Use the result of Exercise 8.29.

CHAPTER 9

- 9.4.** The simplest case assumes that G is locally finite and that when the finite subset $A \subset E$ is removed, all the components are transient. In this case, show that there is a finite subset B of endpoints of the edges of A such that $\text{FSF}(\exists x, y \in B x \leftrightarrow y) = 1 > \text{WSF}(\exists x, y \in B x \leftrightarrow y)$. Here, $x \leftrightarrow y$ means that x and y are in the same component (tree).
- 9.5. (b)** This holds for any probability measure on spanning forests with infinite trees by the bounded convergence theorem.
- 9.6.** Use Theorem 9.3.
- 9.8.** Use Exercise 9.12.
- 9.9.** (This is due to Medolla and Soardi (1995).) Use Corollary 9.5.
- 9.12.** This is due to Häggström (1998).
- 9.13.** The free uniform spanning forest has one tree a.s. since this joining edge is present in every finite approximation. But the wired uniform spanning forest has two a.s.; use Proposition 9.1.
- 9.14.** Join \mathbb{Z} and \mathbb{Z}^3 by an edge.
- 9.16.** (This is from BLPS (2001), Proposition 14.1.)
- 9.17.** (This is Corollary 4.7 of Benjamini, Lyons, and Schramm (1999).)
- 9.19.** Each spanning tree has all but two edges of G . Condition on the values of these two missing edges to calculate the chance that they are the missing edges. It turns out that there are 3 trees with probability $4/45$, 6 with probability $7/72$, and 2 with probability $3/40$. There are 3 edge conductances equal to $9\sqrt{3}/(2\sqrt{7})$, two equal to $16/\sqrt{21}$, and one equal to $5\sqrt{7}/(2\sqrt{3})$.
- 9.20.** There are 4 trees of probability $1/15$ and 12 of probability $11/180$.
- 9.23.** The chance is
- $$\int \frac{1-x^2}{1-x^2+x^3} dx = 0.72301^+.$$
- This is just slightly less than the chance for the uniform spanning tree.
- 9.24.** Use Exercise 9.5.
- 9.25.** This is due to Häggström (1998)).
- 9.28.** This analogue of Theorem 8.7 is due to R. Pemantle after seeing Theorem 8.7. It is easier to prove.

CHAPTER 10

10.4. For any $\lambda > 0$, we have $\mathbf{P}[\widehat{X}_n < \lambda] = \mathbf{E}[X_n; X_n < \lambda] / \mathbf{E}[X_n] \leq \lambda \mathbf{P}[X_n > 0] / \mathbf{E}[X_n] \rightarrow 0$.

10.5. Compare Neveu (1986).

10.6. (Compare Neveu (1986).) Let Ω be the probability space on which the random variables $L_i^{(n)}$ are defined. Then \mathbf{GW} is the law of the random variable $T : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ defined by

$$T := \{ \langle i_1, \dots, i_n \rangle; n \geq 0, i_j \in \mathbb{Z}^+ (1 \leq j \leq n), i_{j+1} \leq L_{I(i_1, \dots, i_j)}^{j+1} (1 \leq j \leq n-1) \},$$

where $I(i_1, \dots, i_j)$ is the index appropriate to the individual $\langle i_1, \dots, i_j \rangle$. Actually, any injection I from the set of finite sequences to \mathbb{Z}^+ will do, rather than the one implicit in the definition of a Galton-Watson process, i.e., (4.1). For example, if $\langle P_n \rangle$ denotes the sequence of prime numbers, then we may use $I(i_1, \dots, i_j) := \prod_{l=1}^j P_{i_l}$.

10.9. Use Laplace transforms.

10.11. (This is due independently to J. Geiger and G. Alsmeyer (private communications, 2000).) We need to show that for any x , we have $\mathbf{P}[A > x \mid A \geq B] \leq \mathbf{P}[A > x \mid A \geq C]$. Let F be the c.d.f. of A . For any fixed x , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}[A > x \mid A \geq B] &= \frac{\mathbf{P}[A > x, A \geq B]}{\mathbf{P}[A \geq B]} = \frac{\int_{y>x} \mathbf{P}[B \leq y] dF(y)}{\int_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbf{P}[B \leq y] dF(y)} \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\int_{y \leq x} \mathbf{P}[B \leq y] dF(y)}{\int_{y > x} \mathbf{P}[B \leq y] dF(y)} \right)^{-1} \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\int_{y \leq x} \mathbf{P}[C \leq y] \frac{\mathbf{P}[B \leq x]}{\mathbf{P}[C \leq x]} dF(y)}{\int_{y > x} \mathbf{P}[C \leq y] \frac{\mathbf{P}[B \leq x]}{\mathbf{P}[C \leq x]} dF(y)} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\int_{y \leq x} \mathbf{P}[C \leq y] dF(y)}{\int_{y > x} \mathbf{P}[C \leq y] dF(y)} \right)^{-1} = \mathbf{P}[A > x \mid A \geq C]. \end{aligned}$$

To show that the hypothesis holds for geometric random variables, we must show that for all $k \geq 1$, the function $p \mapsto (1 - p^{k+1}) / (1 - p^k)$ is decreasing in p . Taking the logarithmic derivative of this function and rearranging terms, we obtain that this is equivalent to $p \leq (k + p^{k+1}) / (k + 1)$, which is a consequence of the arithmetic mean-geometric mean inequality.

10.15. To deduce the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, apply the arithmetic mean-quadratic mean inequality to the probability measure $(Y^2 / \mathbf{E}[Y^2])\mathbf{P}$ and the random variable X/Y .

10.18. This is due to Zubkov (1975). In the notation of the proof of Theorem 10.7, show that $i\mathbf{P}[X'_i > 0] \rightarrow 1$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. See Geiger (1999) for details.

10.20. (a) By l'Hôpital's rule, Exercise 4.1, and Exercise 10.19, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{s \uparrow 1} \delta(s) &= \lim_{s \uparrow 1} \frac{f(s) - s}{(1-s)[1-f(s)]} = \lim_{s \uparrow 1} \frac{f'(s) - 1}{f(s) - 1 - f'(s)(1-s)} \\ &= \lim_{s \uparrow 1} \frac{f''(s)}{2f'(s) - f''(s)(1-s)} = \sigma^2 / 2. \end{aligned}$$

(b) We have

$$[1 - f^{(n)}(s)]^{-1} - (1 - s)^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \delta \left(f^{(k)}(s) \right) .$$

Since $f^{(k)}(s_n) \rightarrow 1$ uniformly in n as $k \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that

$$\frac{[1 - f^{(n)}(s_n)]^{-1} - (1 - s_n)^{-1}}{n} \rightarrow \sigma^2/2$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Applying the hypothesis that $n(1 - s_n) \rightarrow \alpha$ gives the result.

10.21. (i) Take $s_n := 0$ in Exercise 10.20 to get $n[1 - f^{(n)}(0)] \rightarrow 2/\sigma^2$.

(ii) By the continuity theorem for Laplace transform (Feller (1971), p. 431), it suffices to show that the Laplace transform of the law of Z_n/n conditional on $Z_n > 0$ converges to the Laplace transform of the exponential law with mean $\sigma^2/2$, i.e., to $x \mapsto (1 + x\sigma^2/2)^{-1}$. Now the Laplace transform at x of the law of Z_n/n conditional on $Z_n > 0$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[e^{-xZ_n/n} \mid Z_n > 0] &= \mathbf{E}[e^{-xZ_n/n} \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_n > 0\}}] / \mathbf{P}[Z_n > 0] = \frac{\mathbf{E}[e^{-xZ_n/n}] - \mathbf{E}[e^{-xZ_n/n} \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_n=0\}}]}{1 - f^{(n)}(0)} \\ &= \frac{f^{(n)}(e^{-x/n}) - f^{(n)}(0)}{1 - f^{(n)}(0)} = 1 - \frac{n[1 - f^{(n)}(e^{-x/n})]}{n[1 - f^{(n)}(0)]} . \end{aligned}$$

Application of Exercise 10.20 with $s_n := e^{-x/n}$, together with part (i), gives the result.

10.22. Set $h_a(t) := (t - a)^+$. For one direction, just note that h_a is a nonnegative increasing convex function. For the other, given h , let g give a line of support of h at the point $(\mathbf{E}Y, \mathbf{E}h(Y))$. Then $\mathbf{E}h(Y) = g(\mathbf{E}Y) = \mathbf{E}g(Y) \leq \mathbf{E}g^+(Y) \leq \mathbf{E}g^+(X) \leq \mathbf{E}h(X)$.

10.23. (a) Condition on X_i and Y_i for $i < n$.

(b) Show that $n \mapsto \mathbf{E}[h(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i)]$ is an increasing convex function when h is. See Ross (1996), p. 444 for details.

10.24. (a) Use Exercise 10.23.

(b) Use (a) and Exercise 10.22. See Ross (1996), p. 446.

CHAPTER 11

11.1. This is an immediate consequence of the spectral theorem. If the reader is unfamiliar with the spectral theorem for bounded self-adjoint operators on Hilbert space, then he may reduce to the spectral theorem from linear algebra on finite-dimensional spaces as follows. Let H_n be finite-dimensional subspaces increasing to the entire Hilbert space. Let A_n be the orthogonal projection onto H_n . Then A_n converges to the identity operator in the strong operator topology, i.e., $A_n f$ converges to f in norm for every f . Since A_n has norm 1, it follows easily that $A_n T A_n$ converges to T in the strong operator topology. Furthermore, $A_n T A_n$ is really a self-adjoint operator of norm at most $\|T\|$ on H_n . Since $Q(A_n T A_n)$ converges to $Q(T)$ in the strong operator topology and thus $\|Q(A_n T A_n)\| \rightarrow \|Q(T)\|$, the result can be applied to $A_n T A_n$ and then deduced for T . (Even the spectral theorem on finite-dimensional spaces

can be avoided by more work. For example, one can use the numerical range and the spectral mapping theorem for polynomials.)

- 11.2.** We may take $k \geq 1$. Given any complex number z , there is a number w such that $z = (w + w^{-1})/2$. Since $(w^k + w^{-k})/2 - (2z)^k/2$ is a Laurent polynomial of degree $k - 1$ and is unchanged when w is mapped to w^{-1} , induction on k shows that there is a unique polynomial Q_k such that

$$Q_k(z) = Q_k((w + w^{-1})/2) = (w^k + w^{-k})/2. \tag{11.10}$$

In case $z = e^{i\theta}$, we get

$$Q_k(\cos \theta) = \cos k\theta. \tag{11.11}$$

Furthermore, any polynomial satisfying (11.11) satisfies (11.10) for infinitely many z , whence for all z . Thus, Q_k are unique. Finally, any $x \in [-1, 1]$ is of the form $\cos \theta$, so the inequality is immediate.

- 11.3.** Let $\langle Y_n \rangle$ be simple random walk on \mathbb{Z} starting at 0. The sum in question is twice

$$\mathbf{P}[Y_n \geq d] = \mathbf{P}[e^{\alpha Y_n} \geq e^{\alpha d}] \leq e^{-\alpha d} \mathbf{E}[e^{\alpha Y_n}] = e^{-\alpha d} (\cosh \alpha)^n$$

for any $\alpha > 0$ by Markov's inequality. Now use $\cosh \alpha \leq e^{\alpha^2/2}$ and substitute $\alpha := d/n$.

- 11.5.** Distances in G' are no smaller than in G .
- 11.6.** Use the Nash-Williams criterion.
- 11.7.** Think about simulating large conductances via multiple edges.
- 11.9.** Use Exercise 11.8. This appears in Lyons, Pemantle, and Peres (1996b).
- 11.11.** Use the free minimal spanning forest of ω . The first two properties are clear. To see the third, assume that $K(x)$ has at least k ends with positive probability. Choose any ball A about x so that $K(x) \setminus A$ has at least k infinite components with positive probability. Then with positive probability, $K(x) \setminus A$ has at least k infinite components, all edges in A are assigned values less than $1/2$, and all edges in $\partial_E A$ are assigned values greater than $1/2$. In such a case, ω' contains a spanning tree of $A \cap \omega$ that is part of a tree in ω' with at least k ends.
- 11.12. (a)** Use ergodicity.
- 11.13.** (This generalizes Häggström (1997).) If there are ≥ 3 isolated boundary points in some tree, then replace this tree by the tree spanned by the isolated points. The new tree has countable boundary and still gives a translation-invariant random forest, so contradicts Corollary 11.10. If there is exactly one isolated boundary point, go from it to the first vertex encountered of degree ≥ 3 and choose 2 rays by visibility measure from there; if there are exactly 2 isolated boundary points, choose one of them at random and then do the same as when there is only one isolated boundary point. In either case, we obtain a translation-invariant random forest with a tree containing exactly 3 boundary points, again contradicting Corollary 11.10.
- 11.14.** Use (local) reversibility of simple random walk.

11.15. To prove this intuitively clear fact, note that the **AGW**-law of $T \setminus T^{x-1}$ is **GW** since x_{-1} is uniformly chosen from the neighbors of the root of T . Let A be the event that the walk remains in $T \setminus T^{x-1}$:

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= \{(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{PathsInTrees}; \forall n > 0 \ x_n \in T \setminus T^{x-1}\} \\ &= \{(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{PathsInTrees}; \vec{x} \subset T \setminus T^{x-1}\} \end{aligned}$$

and B_k be the event that the walk returns to the root of T exactly k times:

$$B_k := \{(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{PathsInTrees}; |\{i \geq 1; x_i = x_0\}| = k\} .$$

Then the $(\text{SRW} \times \text{AGW} \mid A, B_k)$ -law of $(\vec{x}, T \setminus T^{x-1})$ is equal to the $(\text{SRW} \times \text{GW} \mid B_k)$ -law of (\vec{x}, T) , whence the $(\text{SRW} \times \text{AGW} \mid A)$ -law of $(\vec{x}, T \setminus T^{x-1})$ is equivalent to the $(\text{SRW} \times \text{GW})$ -law of (\vec{x}, T) . By Theorem 11.17, this implies that the speed of the latter is almost surely $\mathbf{E}[(Z_1 - 1)/(Z_1 + 1)]$.

11.16. For the numerator, calculate the probability of extinction by calculating the probability that each child of the root has only finitely many descendants; while for the denominator, calculate the probability of extinction by regarding **AGW** as $[\text{GW} \bullet \text{GW}]$, so that extinction occurs when each of the two **GW** trees is finite.

11.17. Compare the remark following Corollary 4.20.

11.18. Consider spherically symmetric trees.

11.19. These observations are due to Lyons and Peres.

(a) This is an immediate consequence of the ergodic theorem.

(b) In each direction of time, the number of visits to the root is a geometric random variable. To establish that Γ_k decreases with k , first prove the elementary inequality

$$a_i > 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq k+1) \quad \implies \quad \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \frac{k}{\sum_{j \neq i} a_j} \geq \frac{k+1}{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i} .$$

We have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_k = 1/\int \gamma d\mathbf{GW}$.

(c) Let

$$N_k(\vec{x}, T) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j \in D_k(\vec{x}, T), |j| \leq n} N(\vec{x}, T)}{|D_k(\vec{x}, T) \cap [-n, n]|}$$

when the limit exists; this is the average number of visits to vertices of degree $k+1$. By the ergodic theorem and part (b), $N_k(\vec{x}, T) = \Gamma_k$ **AGW**-a.s. Let $D'_k(\vec{x}, T) := \{j \in \mathbb{N}; \deg x_j = k+1, S^j(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{Fresh}\}$. Then

$$N_k(\vec{x}, T) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j \in D'_k(\vec{x}, T), |j| \leq n} N(\vec{x}, T)^2}{|D'_k(\vec{x}, T) \cap [-n, n]|}$$

when the limit exists. Thus, N_k measures the second moment of the number of visits to fresh vertices, not the first, which indeed does not depend on k (see part (d)). The fact that this

decreases with k is consistent with the idea that the variance of the number of visits to a fresh vertex decreases in k since a larger degree gives behavior closer to the mean.

(d) It is $1/\int \gamma d\mathbf{GW}$. We give two proofs.

First proof. It cannot depend on k since the chance of being at a vertex of degree $k+1$ given that the walk is at a fresh vertex is p_k , which is the same as the proportion of time spent at vertices of degree k . Since it doesn't depend on k , we can simply calculate the expected number of visits to a fresh vertex. Since the number of visits is geometric, its mean is the reciprocal of the non-return probability.

Second proof. A fresh epoch is an epoch of last visit for the reversed process. For $\text{SRW} \times \mathbf{AGW}$, if $x_n \neq x_0$ for $n > 0$, then the descendant tree T^{x_1} has an escape probability $\hat{\gamma}$ with the size-biased distribution of the \mathbf{GW} -law of $\gamma(T)$. By reversibility, then, so does the tree $T^{x_{-1}}$ when $(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{Fresh}$. Assume now that $(\vec{x}, T) \in \text{Fresh}$ and $\deg x_0 = k+1$. Let y_1, \dots, y_k be the neighbors of x_0 other than x_{-1} . Then $\gamma(T^{y_i})$ are i.i.d. with the distribution of the \mathbf{GW} -law of $\gamma(T)$ and $\hat{\gamma}, \gamma(T^{y_1}), \dots, \gamma(T^{y_k})$ are independent. Hence the expected number of visits to x_0 is $\mathbf{E}[(k+1)/(\hat{\gamma} + \gamma(T^{y_1}) + \dots + \gamma(T^{y_k}))]$. Now use Exercise 10.14.

CHAPTER 12

- 12.1. Show that if $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_2}(E) > 0$, then $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_1}(E) = +\infty$. (In fact, $\alpha_0 \leq d$.)
- 12.5. Since $\bigcap E_n \subseteq E_m$, we have $\dim \bigcap E_n \leq \dim E_m$ for each m .
- 12.8. It is usually, but not always, $e^{-|v|}$.
- 12.12. This is due to Frostman (1935).
 - (a) Take the largest b -adic cube containing the center of the ball. A bounded number of b -adic cubes of the same size cover the ball.
 - (b) Use the result of Exercise 2.76.
- 12.13. Take $E_n \subseteq \partial T$ with $\dim E_n$ decreasing to the infimum. Set $E := \bigcap E_n$.
- 12.16. Use Exercise 2.25 on subadditivity. We get that $\dim \sup \partial T = \inf_n \max_v \frac{1}{n} \log M_n(v)$ and $\dim \inf \partial T = \sup_n \min_v \frac{1}{n} \log M_n(v)$.
- 12.17. Use Furstenberg's theorem (Theorem 2.22).
- 12.19. Use Theorem 4.21. (The statement of this exercise was proved in increasing generality by Hawkes (1981), Graf (1987), and Falconer (1987), Lemma 4.4(b).)
- 12.20. Let α be the minimum appearing in Theorem 12.10. If $\gamma < 1$, then $\alpha < 1$ and so two applications of Hölder's inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned}
 1 &= \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_1^L A_i^\alpha \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_1^L A_i^\alpha 1^{1-\alpha} \right] \leq \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\sum_1^L A_i \right)^\alpha \left(\sum_1^L 1 \right)^{1-\alpha} \right] \\
 &\leq \left(\mathbf{E} \left[\sum_1^L A_i \right] \right)^\alpha \mathbf{E} [L]^{1-\alpha} = \gamma^\alpha m^{1-\alpha}.
 \end{aligned}$$

If $\gamma > 1$, then $\alpha > 1$ and the inequalities are reversed. Of course, if $\gamma = 1$, then $\alpha = 1$ always.

12.22. This is due to Mauldin and Williams (1986).

12.23. Use the law of large numbers.

12.24. Use the law of large numbers for Markov chains.

CHAPTER 13

13.1. Use convexity of the energy (from, say, (2.13)) to deduce that energy is minimized by the spherically symmetric flow.

13.3. Bound the potential of μ at each point x by integrating over $B_{2^{-n}}(x) \setminus B_{2^{-n-1}}(x)$, $n \geq 1$.

13.4. The only significant change is the replacement of (13.3). Notice that if $|x - y| \leq b^{-n}$ and x is in a certain b -adic cube, then y must be in either the same b -adic cube or a neighboring one.

13.9. Let $X := \{0, 1\}$ and $K(x, y) := \infty \mathbf{1}_{\{x \neq y\}}$.

CHAPTER 14

14.1. Use Proposition 4.6.

14.5. Use concavity of log.

14.6. See the third proof of the Kac lemma in Petersen (1983), pp. 47–48.

14.7. Given nonextinction, the subtree of a Galton-Watson tree consisting of those individuals with an infinite line of descent has the law of another Galton-Watson process still with mean m (Section 10.5). Theorem 14.15 applies to this subtree, while harmonic measure on the whole tree is equal to harmonic measure on the subtree.

14.9. For a flow θ on T , define

$$\mathcal{E}_n(\theta) := \sum_{1 \leq |x| \leq n} \theta(x)^2,$$

so that its energy for unit conductances is $\mathcal{E}(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n(\theta)$. Set $a_n := \int \mathcal{E}_n(\text{VIS}_T) d\mathbf{GW}(T)$. We have $a_0 = 0$ and

$$a_{n+1} = \int \left\{ \sum_{|x|=1} \frac{1}{Z_1^2} (1 + \mathcal{E}_n(\text{VIS}_{T^x})) \right\} d\mathbf{GW}(T).$$

Conditioning on Z_1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n+1} &= \sum_{k \geq 1} p_k \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{i=1}^k \int (1 + \mathcal{E}_n(\text{VIS}_{T^{(i)}})) d\mathbf{GW}(T^{(i)}) \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} p_k \frac{1}{k^2} k (1 + a_n) = \mathbf{E}[1/Z_1] (1 + a_n). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\int \mathcal{E}(\text{VIS}_T) d\mathbf{GW}(T) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}[1/Z_1]^k = \frac{\mathbf{E}[1/Z_1]}{1 - \mathbf{E}[1/Z_1]}.$$

- 14.19.** This exercise is relevant to the proof of Lemma 6 in Furstenberg (1970), which is incorrect. If the definition of dimension of a measure as given in Section 12.4 is used instead of Furstenberg's definition, thus implicitly revising his Lemma 6, then the present exercise together with Billingsley's Theorem 12.15 give a proof of this revision.
- 14.23.** $S^{-1}(\text{Exit})$ has the same measure as Exit and for $(\vec{x}, T) \in S^{-1}(\text{Exit})$, the ray $x_{-\infty}$ is a path of a loop-erased simple random walk while \vec{x} is a disjoint path of simple random walk.

Bibliography

- ADAMS, S.
(1990) Trees and amenable equivalence relations. *Ergodic Theory Dynamical Systems* **10**, 1–14.
- ADAMS, S. and LYONS, R.
(1991) Amenability, Kazhdan’s property and percolation for trees, groups and equivalence relations. *Israel J. Math.* **75**, 341–370.
- AIZENMAN, M. and BARSKY, D.J.
(1987) Sharpness of the phase transition in percolation models. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **108**, 489–526.
- AIZENMAN, M., BURCHARD, A., NEWMAN, C.M., and WILSON, D.B.
(1999) Scaling limits for minimal and random spanning trees in two dimensions. *Random Structures Algorithms* **15**, 319–367. Statistical physics methods in discrete probability, combinatorics, and theoretical computer science (Princeton, NJ, 1997).
- AIZENMAN, M., KESTEN, H., and NEWMAN, C.M.
(1987) Uniqueness of the infinite cluster and continuity of connectivity functions for short and long range percolation. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **111**, 505–531.
- ALDOUS, D.J.
(1990) The random walk construction of uniform spanning trees and uniform labelled trees. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **3**, 450–465.
- ALON, N.
(1986) Eigenvalues and expanders. *Combinatorica* **6**, 83–96. Theory of computing (Singer Island, Fla., 1984).
- ANCONA, A.
(1988) Positive harmonic functions and hyperbolicity. In Král, J., Lukeš, J., Netuka, I., and Veselý, J., editors, *Potential Theory—Surveys and Problems (Prague, 1987)*, pages 1–23, Berlin. Springer.
- ANCONA, A., LYONS, R., and PERES, Y.
(1999) Crossing estimates and convergence of Dirichlet functions along random walk and diffusion paths. *Ann. Probab.* **27**, 970–989.
- ASMUSSEN, S. and HERING, H.
(1983) *Branching Processes*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, Mass.
- ATHREYA, K.B.
(1971) A note on a functional equation arising in Galton-Watson branching processes. *J. Appl. Probability* **8**, 589–598.

- ATHREYA, K.B. and NEY, P.E.
 (1972) *Branching Processes*. Springer-Verlag, New York. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 196.
- BABSON, E. and BENJAMINI, I.
 (1999) Cut sets and normed cohomology with applications to percolation. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **127**, 589–597.
- BARSKY, D.J., GRIMMETT, G.R., and NEWMAN, C.M.
 (1991) Percolation in half-spaces: equality of critical densities and continuity of the percolation probability. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **90**, 111–148.
- BEKKA, M.E.B. and VALETTE, A.
 (1997) Group cohomology, harmonic functions and the first L^2 -Betti number. *Potential Anal.* **6**, 313–326.
- BENJAMINI, I., KESTEN, H., PERES, Y., and SCHRAMM, O.
 (2001) Geometry of the uniform spanning forest: transitions in dimensions 4, 8, 12, *Ann. Math.* To appear.
- BENJAMINI, I., LYONS, R., PERES, Y., and SCHRAMM, O.
 (1999a) Critical percolation on any nonamenable group has no infinite clusters. *Ann. Probab.* **27**, 1347–1356.
 (1999b) Group-invariant percolation on graphs. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **9**, 29–66.
 (2001) Uniform spanning forests. *Ann. Probab.* **29**, 1–65.
- BENJAMINI, I., LYONS, R., and SCHRAMM, O.
 (1999) Percolation perturbations in potential theory and random walks. In Picardello, M. and Woess, W., editors, *Random Walks and Discrete Potential Theory*, Sympos. Math., pages 56–84, Cambridge. Cambridge Univ. Press. Papers from the workshop held in Cortona, 1997.
- BENJAMINI, I., PEMANTLE, R., and PERES, Y.
 (1995) Martin capacity for Markov chains. *Ann. Probab.* **23**, 1332–1346.
 (1998) Unpredictable paths and percolation. *Ann. Probab.* **26**, 1198–1211.
- BENJAMINI, I. and PERES, Y.
 (1992) Random walks on a tree and capacity in the interval. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **28**, 557–592.
- BENJAMINI, I. and SCHRAMM, O.
 (1996a) Harmonic functions on planar and almost planar graphs and manifolds, via circle packings. *Invent. Math.* **126**, 565–587.
 (1996b) Percolation beyond \mathbf{Z}^d , many questions and a few answers. *Electron. Comm. Probab.* **1**, no. 8, 71–82 (electronic).
 (1996c) Random walks and harmonic functions on infinite planar graphs using square tilings. *Ann. Probab.* **24**, 1219–1238.
 (1997) Every graph with a positive Cheeger constant contains a tree with a positive Cheeger constant. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **7**, 403–419.
 (1998) Conformal invariance of Voronoi percolation. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **197**, 75–107.
 (2001) Percolation in the hyperbolic plane. *Jour. Amer. Math. Soc.* **14**, 487–507.

- VAN DEN BERG, J. and KEANE, M.
 (1984) On the continuity of the percolation probability function. In Beals, R., Beck, A., Bellow, A., and Hajian, A., editors, *Conference in Modern Analysis and Probability (New Haven, Conn., 1982)*, pages 61–65. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI.
- VAN DEN BERG, J. and MEESTER, R.W.J.
 (1991) Stability properties of a flow process in graphs. *Random Structures Algorithms* **2**, 335–341.
- BIGGS, N.L., MOHAR, B., and SHAWE-TAYLOR, J.
 (1988) The spectral radius of infinite graphs. *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **20**, 116–120.
- BILLINGSLEY, P.
 (1965) *Ergodic Theory and Information*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York.
- BLACKWELL, D.
 (1955) On transient Markov processes with a countable number of states and stationary transition probabilities. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **26**, 654–658.
- BRODER, A.
 (1989) Generating random spanning trees. In *30th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (Research Triangle Park, North Carolina)*, pages 442–447, New York. IEEE.
- BROOKS, R.L., SMITH, C.A.B., STONE, A.H., and TUTTE, W.T.
 (1940) The dissection of rectangles into squares. *Duke Math. J.* **7**, 312–340.
- BURTON, R.M. and KEANE, M.
 (1989) Density and uniqueness in percolation. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **121**, 501–505.
- BURTON, R.M. and PEMANTLE, R.
 (1993) Local characteristics, entropy and limit theorems for spanning trees and domino tilings via transfer-impedances. *Ann. Probab.* **21**, 1329–1371.
- CARNE, T.K.
 (1985) A transmutation formula for Markov chains. *Bull. Sci. Math. (2)* **109**, 399–405.
- CAYLEY, A.
 (1889) A theorem on trees. *Quart. J. Math.* **23**, 376–378.
- CHABOUD, T. and KENYON, C.
 (1996) Planar Cayley graphs with regular dual. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* **6**, 553–561.
- CHANDRA, A.K., RAGHAVAN, P., RUZZO, W.L., SMOLENSKY, R., and TIWARI, P.
 (1996/97) The electrical resistance of a graph captures its commute and cover times. *Comput. Complexity* **6**, 312–340.
- CHAYES, J.T., CHAYES, L., and NEWMAN, C.M.
 (1985) The stochastic geometry of invasion percolation. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **101**, 383–407.
- CHEEGER, J.
 (1970) A lower bound for the smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian. In Gunning, R.C., editor, *Problems in Analysis*, pages 195–199, Princeton, N. J. Princeton Univ. Press. A symposium in honor of Salomon Bochner, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., 1–3 April 1969.

- CHOQUET, G. and DENY, J.
 (1960) Sur l'équation de convolution $\mu = \mu * \sigma$. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **250**, 799–801.
- CHUNG, F.R.K. and TETALI, P.
 (1998) Isoperimetric inequalities for Cartesian products of graphs. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **7**, 141–148.
- COLBOURN, C.J., PROVAN, J.S., and VERTIGAN, D.
 (1995) A new approach to solving three combinatorial enumeration problems on planar graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.* **60**, 119–129. ARIDAM VI and VII (New Brunswick, NJ, 1991/1992).
- DIESTEL, R. and LEADER, I.
 (2001) A conjecture concerning a limit of non-Cayley graphs. *J. Algebraic Combin.* **14**, 17–25.
- DODZIUK, J.
 (1979) L^2 harmonic forms on rotationally symmetric Riemannian manifolds. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **77**, 395–400.
 (1984) Difference equations, isoperimetric inequality and transience of certain random walks. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **284**, 787–794.
- DODZIUK, J. and KENDALL, W.S.
 (1986) Combinatorial Laplacians and isoperimetric inequality. In Elworthy, K.D., editor, *From Local Times to Global Geometry, Control and Physics*, pages 68–74. Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow. Papers from the Warwick symposium on stochastic differential equations and applications, held at the University of Warwick, Coventry, 1984/85.
- DOOB, J.L.
 (1984) *Classical Potential Theory and Its Probabilistic Counterpart*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- DOYLE, P.
 (1988) Electric currents in infinite networks (preliminary version). Unpublished manuscript.
- DOYLE, P.G. and SNELL, J.L.
 (1984) *Random Walks and Electric Networks*. Mathematical Association of America, Washington, DC.
- DUPLANTIER, B.
 (1992) Loop-erased self-avoiding walks in 2D. *Physica A* **191**, 516–522.
- DURRETT, R.
 (1986) Reversible diffusion processes. In Chao, J.A. and Woyczyński, W.A., editors, *Probability Theory and Harmonic Analysis*, pages 67–89. Dekker, New York. Papers from the conference held in Cleveland, Ohio, May 10–12, 1983.
 (1996) *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Duxbury Press, Belmont, CA, second edition.
- DYNKIN, E.B. and MALJUTOV, M.B.
 (1961) Random walk on groups with a finite number of generators. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **137**, 1042–1045. English translation: *Soviet Math. Dokl.* (1961) **2**, 399–402.

- FALCONER, K.J.
 (1986) Random fractals. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **100**, 559–582.
 (1987) Cut-set sums and tree processes. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **101**, 337–346.
- FAN, A.H.
 (1989) *Décompositions de Mesures et Recouvrements Aléatoires*. Ph.D. thesis, Université de Paris-Sud, Département de Mathématique, Orsay.
 (1990) Sur quelques processus de naissance et de mort. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **310**, 441–444.
- FEDER, T. and MIHAIL, M.
 (1992) Balanced matroids. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 26–38, New York. Association for Computing Machinery (ACM). Held in Victoria, BC, Canada.
- FELLER, W.
 (1971) *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications. Vol. II*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, second edition.
- FØLNER, E.
 (1955) On groups with full Banach mean value. *Math. Scand.* **3**, 243–254.
- FORD, JR., L.R. and FULKERSON, D.R.
 (1962) *Flows in Networks*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- FORTUIN, C.M., KASTELEYN, P.W., and GINIBRE, J.
 (1971) Correlation inequalities on some partially ordered sets. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **22**, 89–103.
- FOSTER, R.M.
 (1948) The average impedance of an electrical network. In *Reissner Anniversary Volume, Contributions to Applied Mechanics*, pages 333–340. J. W. Edwards, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Edited by the Staff of the Department of Aeronautical Engineering and Applied Mechanics of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.
- FROSTMAN, O.
 (1935) Potentiel d'équilibre et capacité des ensembles avec quelques applications à la théorie des fonctions. *Meddel. Lunds Univ. Mat. Sem.* **3**, 1–118.
- FUKUSHIMA, M.
 (1980) *Dirichlet Forms and Markov Processes*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam.
 (1985) Energy forms and diffusion processes. In Streit, L., editor, *Mathematics + Physics. Vol. 1*, pages 65–97. World Sci. Publishing, Singapore. Lectures on recent results.
- FURSTENBERG, H.
 (1967) Disjointness in ergodic theory, minimal sets, and a problem in Diophantine approximation. *Math. Systems Theory* **1**, 1–49.
 (1970) Intersections of Cantor sets and transversality of semigroups. In Gunning, R.C., editor, *Problems in Analysis*, pages 41–59. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J. A symposium in honor of Salomon Bochner, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., 1–3 April 1969.

- (1981) *Recurrence in Ergodic Theory and Combinatorial Number Theory*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. M. B. Porter Lectures.
- GABORIAU, D.
 (1998) Mercuriale de groupes et de relations. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **326**, 219–222.
 (2000) Coût des relations d'équivalence et des groupes. *Invent. Math.* **139**, 41–98.
 (2002) Invariants l^2 de relations d'équivalence et de groupes. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 93–150.
- GANDOLFI, A., KEANE, M.S., and NEWMAN, C.M.
 (1992) Uniqueness of the infinite component in a random graph with applications to percolation and spin glasses. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **92**, 511–527.
- GEIGER, J.
 (1999) Elementary new proofs of classical limit theorems for Galton-Watson processes. *J. Appl. Probab.* **36**, 301–309.
- GERL, P.
 (1988) Random walks on graphs with a strong isoperimetric property. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **1**, 171–187.
- GOLDMAN, J.R. and KAUFFMAN, L.H.
 (1993) Knots, tangles, and electrical networks. *Adv. in Appl. Math.* **14**, 267–306.
- GRAF, S.
 (1987) Statistically self-similar fractals. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **74**, 357–392.
- GRAF, S., MAULDIN, R.D., and WILLIAMS, S.C.
 (1988) The exact Hausdorff dimension in random recursive constructions. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **71**, x+121.
- GREY, D.R.
 (1980) A new look at convergence of branching processes. *Ann. Probab.* **8**, 377–380.
- GRIFFEATH, D. and LIGGETT, T.M.
 (1982) Critical phenomena for Spitzer's reversible nearest particle systems. *Ann. Probab.* **10**, 881–895.
- GRIGORCHUK, R.I.
 (1983) On the Milnor problem of group growth. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **271**, 30–33.
- GRIGOR'YAN, A.A.
 (1985) The existence of positive fundamental solutions of the Laplace equation on Riemannian manifolds. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)* **128(170)**, 354–363, 446. English translation: *Math. USSR-Sb.* **56** (1987), no. 2, 349–358.
- GRIMMETT, G.
 (1997) Percolation and disordered systems. In *Lectures on Probability Theory and Statistics*, pages 153–300. Springer, Berlin. Lectures from the 26th Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, August 19–September 4, 1996, Edited by P. Bernard.
 (1999) *Percolation*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition.
- GRIMMETT, G. and KESTEN, H.
 (1983) Random electrical networks on complete graphs II: Proofs. Unpublished manuscript, available at <http://www.arxiv.org/abs/math.PR/0107068>.

- GRIMMETT, G.R., KESTEN, H., and ZHANG, Y.
 (1993) Random walk on the infinite cluster of the percolation model. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **96**, 33–44.
- GRIMMETT, G.R. and MARSTRAND, J.M.
 (1990) The supercritical phase of percolation is well behaved. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A* **430**, 439–457.
- GRIMMETT, G.R. and NEWMAN, C.M.
 (1990) Percolation in $\infty+1$ dimensions. In Grimmett, G.R. and Welsh, D.J.A., editors, *Disorder in Physical Systems*, pages 167–190. Oxford Univ. Press, New York. A volume in honour of John M. Hammersley on the occasion of his 70th birthday.
- GRIMMETT, G.R. and STACEY, A.M.
 (1998) Critical probabilities for site and bond percolation models. *Ann. Probab.* **26**, 1788–1812.
- GROMOV, M.
 (1981) Groups of polynomial growth and expanding maps. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, 53–73.
 (1999) *Metric Structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian Spaces*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA. Based on the 1981 French original [MR 85e:53051], With appendices by M. Katz, P. Pansu and S. Semmes, Translated from the French by Sean Michael Bates.
- HÄGGSTRÖM, O.
 (1994) *Aspects of Spatial Random Processes*. Ph.D. thesis, Göteborg, Sweden.
 (1995) Random-cluster measures and uniform spanning trees. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **59**, 267–275.
 (1997) Infinite clusters in dependent automorphism invariant percolation on trees. *Ann. Probab.* **25**, 1423–1436.
 (1998) Uniform and minimal essential spanning forests on trees. *Random Structures Algorithms* **12**, 27–50.
- HÄGGSTRÖM, O., JONASSON, J., and LYONS, R.
 (2002) Explicit isoperimetric constants and phase transitions in the random-cluster model. *Ann. Probab.* **30**, 443–473.
- HÄGGSTRÖM, O. and PERES, Y.
 (1999) Monotonicity of uniqueness for percolation on Cayley graphs: all infinite clusters are born simultaneously. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **113**, 273–285.
- HÄGGSTRÖM, O., PERES, Y., and SCHONMANN, R.H.
 (1999) Percolation on transitive graphs as a coalescent process: Relentless merging followed by simultaneous uniqueness. In Bramson, M. and Durrett, R., editors, *Perplexing Problems in Probability*, pages 69–90, Boston. Birkhäuser. Festschrift in honor of Harry Kesten.
- HAMMERSLEY, J.M.
 (1961) The number of polygons on a lattice. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **57**, 516–523.
- HARA, T. and SLADE, G.
 (1990) Mean-field critical behaviour for percolation in high dimensions. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **128**, 333–391.

- (1994) Mean-field behaviour and the lace expansion. In Grimmett, G., editor, *Probability and Phase Transition*, pages 87–122. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht. Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute on Probability Theory of Spatial Disorder and Phase Transition held at the University of Cambridge, Cambridge, July 4–16, 1993.
- HARRIS, T.E.
 (1960) A lower bound for the critical probability in a certain percolation process. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **56**, 13–20.
- HAWKES, J.
 (1970/71) Some dimension theorems for the sample functions of stable processes. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **20**, 733–738.
 (1981) Trees generated by a simple branching process. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* **24**, 373–384.
- HEATHCOTE, C.R.
 (1966) Corrections and comments on the paper “A branching process allowing immigration”. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **28**, 213–217.
- HEATHCOTE, C.R., SENETA, E., and VERE-JONES, D.
 (1967) A refinement of two theorems in the theory of branching processes. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* **12**, 341–346.
- HEYDE, C.C.
 (1970) Extension of a result of Seneta for the super-critical Galton-Watson process. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **41**, 739–742.
- HEYDE, C.C. and SENETA, E.
 (1977) *I. J. Bienaymé. Statistical Theory Anticipated*. Springer-Verlag, New York. Studies in the History of Mathematics and Physical Sciences, No. 3.
- HIGUCHI, Y. and SHIRAI, T.
 (2000) Isoperimetric constants of (d, f) -regular planar graphs. Preprint.
- HOLOPAINEN, I. and SOARDI, P.M.
 (1997) p -harmonic functions on graphs and manifolds. *Manuscripta Math.* **94**, 95–110.
- ICHIHARA, K.
 (1978) Some global properties of symmetric diffusion processes. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **14**, 441–486.
- IMRICH, W.
 (1975) On Whitney’s theorem on the unique embeddability of 3-connected planar graphs. In Fiedler, M., editor, *Recent Advances in Graph Theory (Proc. Second Czechoslovak Sympos., Prague, 1974)*, pages 303–306. (Loose errata). Academia, Prague.
- JOAG-DEV, K. and PROSCHAN, F.
 (1983) Negative association of random variables, with applications. *Ann. Statist.* **11**, 286–295.
- JOFFE, A. and WAUGH, W.A.O’N.
 (1982) Exact distributions of kin numbers in a Galton-Watson process. *J. Appl. Probab.* **19**, 767–775.

- KAHN, J.
 (2004) Inequality of two critical probabilities for percolation. In preparation.
- KAIMANOVICH, V.A.
 (1992) Dirichlet norms, capacities and generalized isoperimetric inequalities for Markov operators. *Potential Anal.* **1**, 61–82.
- KAKUTANI, S.
 (1944) Two-dimensional Brownian motion and harmonic functions. *Proc. Imp. Acad. Tokyo* **20**, 706–714.
- KANAI, M.
 (1985) Rough isometries, and combinatorial approximations of geometries of noncompact Riemannian manifolds. *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **37**, 391–413.
 (1986) Rough isometries and the parabolicity of Riemannian manifolds. *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **38**, 227–238.
- KARGAPOLOV, M.I. and MERZLJAKOV, J.I.
 (1979) *Fundamentals of the Theory of Groups*. Springer-Verlag, New York. Translated from the second Russian edition by Robert G. Burns.
- KASTELEYN, P.
 (1961) The statistics of dimers on a lattice I. The number of dimer arrangements on a quadratic lattice. *Physica* **27**, 1209–1225.
- KENYON, R.
 (1997) Local statistics of lattice dimers. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **33**, 591–618.
 (1998) Tilings and discrete Dirichlet problems. *Israel J. Math.* **105**, 61–84.
 (2000a) Conformal invariance of domino tiling. *Ann. Probab.* **28**, 759–795.
 (2000b) Long-range properties of spanning trees. *J. Math. Phys.* **41**, 1338–1363. Probabilistic techniques in equilibrium and nonequilibrium statistical physics.
- KENYON, R.W., PROPP, J.G., and WILSON, D.B.
 (2000) Trees and matchings. *Electron. J. Combin.* **7**, Research Paper 25, 34 pp. (electronic).
- KESTEN, H.
 (1959a) Full Banach mean values on countable groups. *Math. Scand.* **7**, 146–156.
 (1959b) Symmetric random walks on groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **92**, 336–354.
 (1980) The critical probability of bond percolation on the square lattice equals $\frac{1}{2}$. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **74**, 41–59.
 (1982) *Percolation Theory for Mathematicians*. Birkhäuser Boston, Mass.
 (1986) Subdiffusive behavior of random walk on a random cluster. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **22**, 425–487.
- KESTEN, H., NEY, P., and SPITZER, F.
 (1966) The Galton-Watson process with mean one and finite variance. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* **11**, 579–611.
- KESTEN, H. and STIGUM, B.P.
 (1966) A limit theorem for multidimensional Galton-Watson processes. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **37**, 1211–1223.

KIFER, Y.

(1986) *Ergodic Theory of Random Transformations*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA.

KIRCHHOFF, G.

(1847) Ueber die Auflösung der Gleichungen, auf welche man bei der Untersuchung der linearen Vertheilung galvanischer Ströme geführt wird. *Ann. Phys. und Chem.* **72**, 497–508.

KOLMOGOROV, A.

(1938) On the solution of a problem in biology. *Izv. NII Matem. Mekh. Tomskogo Univ.* **2**, 7–12.

KURATOWSKI, K.

(1966) *Topology. Vol. I*. Academic Press, New York. New edition, revised and augmented. Translated from the French by J. Jaworowski.

LALLEY, S.P.

(1998) Percolation on Fuchsian groups. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **34**, 151–177.

LANGLANDS, R., POULIOT, P., and SAINT-AUBIN, Y.

(1994) Conformal invariance in two-dimensional percolation. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* **30**, 1–61.

LAWLER, G., SCHRAMM, O., and WERNER, W.

(2004) Conformal invariance of planar loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees. *Ann. Probab.* To appear.

LAWLER, G.F.

(1988) Loop-erased self-avoiding random walk in two and three dimensions. *J. Statist. Phys.* **50**, 91–108.

(1991) *Intersections of Random Walks*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA.

LAWRENCENKO, S., PLUMMER, M.D., and ZHA, X.

(2002) Isoperimetric constants of infinite plane graphs. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **28**, 313–330.

LIGGETT, T.M., SCHONMANN, R.H., and STACEY, A.M.

(1997) Domination by product measures. *Ann. Probab.* **25**, 71–95.

LYONS, R.

(1989) The Ising model and percolation on trees and tree-like graphs. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **125**, 337–353.

(1990) Random walks and percolation on trees. *Ann. Probab.* **18**, 931–958.

(1992) Random walks, capacity and percolation on trees. *Ann. Probab.* **20**, 2043–2088.

(1995) Random walks and the growth of groups. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **320**, 1361–1366.

(1996) Diffusions and random shadows in negatively curved manifolds. *J. Funct. Anal.* **138**, 426–448.

(2000) Phase transitions on nonamenable graphs. *J. Math. Phys.* **41**, 1099–1126. Probabilistic techniques in equilibrium and nonequilibrium statistical physics.

- LYONS, R., PEMANTLE, R., and PERES, Y.
 (1995a) Conceptual proofs of $L \log L$ criteria for mean behavior of branching processes. *Ann. Probab.* **23**, 1125–1138.
 (1995b) Ergodic theory on Galton-Watson trees: speed of random walk and dimension of harmonic measure. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **15**, 593–619.
 (1996a) Biased random walks on Galton-Watson trees. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **106**, 249–264.
 (1996b) Random walks on the lamplighter group. *Ann. Probab.* **24**, 1993–2006.
 (1997) Unsolved problems concerning random walks on trees. In Athreya, K.B. and Jagers, P., editors, *Classical and Modern Branching Processes*, pages 223–237. Springer, New York. Papers from the IMA Workshop held at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, June 13–17, 1994.
- LYONS, R. and SCHRAMM, O.
 (1999) Indistinguishability of percolation clusters. *Ann. Probab.* **27**, 1809–1836.
- LYONS, T.
 (1983) A simple criterion for transience of a reversible Markov chain. *Ann. Probab.* **11**, 393–402.
- MADRAS, N. and SLADE, G.
 (1993) *The Self-Avoiding Walk*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA.
- MAJUMDAR, S.N.
 (1992) Exact fractal dimension of the loop-erased self-avoiding random walk in two dimensions. *Phys. Rev. Letters* **68**, 2329–2331.
- MASSEY, W.S.
 (1991) *A Basic Course in Algebraic Topology*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- MAULDIN, R.D. and WILLIAMS, S.C.
 (1986) Random recursive constructions: asymptotic geometric and topological properties. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **295**, 325–346.
- MCCREA, W.H. and WHIPPLE, F.J.W.
 (1940) Random paths in two and three dimensions. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh* **60**, 281–298.
- MEDOLLA, G. and SOARDI, P.M.
 (1995) Extension of Foster’s averaging formula to infinite networks with moderate growth. *Math. Z.* **219**, 171–185.
- MINC, H.
 (1988) *Nonnegative Matrices*. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- MOHAR, B.
 (1988) Isoperimetric inequalities, growth, and the spectrum of graphs. *Linear Algebra Appl.* **103**, 119–131.
- MONTROLL, E.
 (1964) Lattice statistics. In Beckenbach, E., editor, *Applied Combinatorial Mathematics*, pages 96–143. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney. University of California Engineering and Physical Sciences Extension Series.

MOON, J.W.

(1967) Various proofs of Cayley's formula for counting trees. In Harary, F. and Beineke, L., editors, *A seminar on Graph Theory*, pages 70–78. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

MORRIS, B.

(2003) The components of the wired spanning forest are recurrent. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **125**, 259–265.

MUCHNIK, R. and PAK, I.

(2001) Percolation on Grigorchuk groups. *Comm. Algebra* **29**, 661–671.

NASH-WILLIAMS, C.ST.J.A.

(1959) Random walk and electric currents in networks. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **55**, 181–194.

NEVEU, J.

(1986) Arbres et processus de Galton-Watson. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **22**, 199–207.

NEWMAN, C.M. and SCHULMAN, L.S.

(1981) Infinite clusters in percolation models. *J. Statist. Phys.* **26**, 613–628.

PAK, I. and SMIRNOVA-NAGNIBEDA, T.

(2000) On non-uniqueness of percolation on nonamenable Cayley graphs. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **330**, 495–500.

PAKES, A.G. and KHATTREE, R.

(1992) Length-biasing, characterizations of laws and the moment problem. *Austral. J. Statist.* **34**, 307–322.

PATERSON, A.L.T.

(1988) *Amenability*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI.

PEMANTLE, R.

(1991) Choosing a spanning tree for the integer lattice uniformly. *Ann. Probab.* **19**, 1559–1574.

PEMANTLE, R. and PERES, Y.

(1996) On which graphs are all random walks in random environments transient? In *Random Discrete Structures (Minneapolis, MN, 1993)*, pages 207–211. Springer, New York.

PERES, Y.

(1996) Intersection-equivalence of Brownian paths and certain branching processes. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **177**, 417–434.

(2000) Percolation on nonamenable products at the uniqueness threshold. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **36**, 395–406.

PERES, Y. and STEIF, J.E.

(1998) The number of infinite clusters in dynamical percolation. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **111**, 141–165.

PETERSEN, K.

(1983) *Ergodic Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

PITMAN, J.

(1993) *Probability*. Springer, New York.

PROPP, J.G.

- (1997) Continuum spanning trees. Unpublished manuscript available at <http://math.wisc.edu/~propp/continuum.ps>.

PROPP, J.G. and WILSON, D.B.

- (1998) How to get a perfectly random sample from a generic Markov chain and generate a random spanning tree of a directed graph. *J. Algorithms* **27**, 170–217. 7th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (Atlanta, GA, 1996).

REDMOND, C. and YUKICH, J.E.

- (1994) Limit theorems and rates of convergence for Euclidean functionals. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **4**, 1057–1073.

REVELLE, D.

- (2001) Biased random walk on lamplighter groups and graphs. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **14**, 379–391.

ROSENBLATT, M.

- (1971) *Markov Processes. Structure and Asymptotic Behavior*. Springer-Verlag, New York. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 184.

ROSS, S.M.

- (1996) *Stochastic Processes*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, second edition.

SALVATORI, M.

- (1992) On the norms of group-invariant transition operators on graphs. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **5**, 563–576.

SCHONMANN, R.H.

- (1999a) Percolation in $\infty + 1$ dimensions at the uniqueness threshold. In Bramson, M. and Durrett, R., editors, *Perplexing Problems in Probability*, pages 53–67. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA. Festschrift in honor of Harry Kesten.
- (1999b) Stability of infinite clusters in supercritical percolation. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **113**, 287–300.
- (2001) Multiplicity of phase transitions and mean-field criticality on highly non-amenable graphs. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **219**, 271–322.

SCHRAMM, O.

- (1997) Personal communication.
- (2000) Scaling limits of loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees. *Israel J. Math.* **118**, 221–288.

SENETA, E.

- (1968) On recent theorems concerning the supercritical Galton-Watson process. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **39**, 2098–2102.
- (1970) On the supercritical Galton-Watson process with immigration. *Math. Biosci.* **7**, 9–14.

SHEPP, L.A.

- (1972) Covering the circle with random arcs. *Israel J. Math.* **11**, 328–345.

SMIRNOV, S.

- (2001) Critical percolation in the plane: conformal invariance, Cardy’s formula, scaling limits. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **333**, 239–244.

- SOARDI, P.M.
 (1993) Rough isometries and Dirichlet finite harmonic functions on graphs. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **119**, 1239–1248.
- SOARDI, P.M. and WOESS, W.
 (1990) Amenability, unimodularity, and the spectral radius of random walks on infinite graphs. *Math. Z.* **205**, 471–486.
- SOLOMON, F.
 (1975) Random walks in a random environment. *Ann. Probability* **3**, 1–31.
- SPITZER, F.
 (1976) *Principles of Random Walk*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 34.
- STRASSEN, V.
 (1965) The existence of probability measures with given marginals. *Ann. Math. Statist* **36**, 423–439.
- TANNY, D.
 (1988) A necessary and sufficient condition for a branching process in a random environment to grow like the product of its means. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **28**, 123–139.
- TAYLOR, S.J.
 (1955) The α -dimensional measure of the graph and set of zeros of a Brownian path. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **51**, 265–274.
- TEMPERLEY, H.N.V.
 (1974) Enumeration of graphs on a large periodic lattice. In McDonough, T.P. and Mavron, V.C., editors, *Combinatorics (Proc. British Combinatorial Conf., Univ. Coll. Wales, Aberystwyth, 1973)*, pages 155–159, London. Cambridge Univ. Press. London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., No. 13.
- TETALI, P.
 (1991) Random walks and the effective resistance of networks. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **4**, 101–109.
- THOMASSEN, C.
 (1989) Transient random walks, harmonic functions, and electrical currents in infinite electrical networks. Technical Report Mat-Report n. 1989-07, The Technical Univ. of Denmark.
 (1990) Resistances and currents in infinite electrical networks. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **49**, 87–102.
- TÓTH, B. and WERNER, W.
 (1998) The true self-repelling motion. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **111**, 375–452.
- TROFIMOV, V.I.
 (1985) Groups of automorphisms of graphs as topological groups. *Mat. Zametki* **38**, 378–385, 476. English translation: *Math. Notes* **38** (1985), no. 3-4, 717–720.
- TRUEMPER, K.
 (1989) On the delta-wye reduction for planar graphs. *J. Graph Theory* **13**, 141–148.
- VAROPOULOS, N.TH.
 (1985a) Isoperimetric inequalities and Markov chains. *J. Funct. Anal.* **63**, 215–239.

- (1985b) Long range estimates for Markov chains. *Bull. Sci. Math. (2)* **109**, 225–252.
- VIRÁG, B.
 (2000a) Anchored expansion and random walk. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **10**, 1588–1605.
 (2000b) On the speed of random walks on graphs. *Ann. Probab.* **28**, 379–394.
- WHITNEY, H.
 (1954) Congruent graphs and the connectivity of graphs. *Amer. J. Math.* **76**, 150–168.
- WILSON, D.B.
 (1996) Generating random spanning trees more quickly than the cover time. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, pages 296–303, New York. ACM. Held in Philadelphia, PA, May 22–24, 1996.
 (1997) Determinant algorithms for random planar structures. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (New Orleans, LA, 1997)*, pages 258–267, New York. ACM. Held in New Orleans, LA, January 5–7, 1997.
- WILSON, J.S.
 (2004) On exponential growth and uniformly exponential growth for groups. *Invent. Math.* **155**, 287–303.
- WOESS, W.
 (1991) Topological groups and infinite graphs. *Discrete Math.* **95**, 373–384. Directions in infinite graph theory and combinatorics (Cambridge, 1989).
- WOLF, J.A.
 (1968) Growth of finitely generated solvable groups and curvature of Riemannian manifolds. *J. Differential Geometry* **2**, 421–446.
- YAGLOM, A.M.
 (1947) Certain limit theorems of the theory of branching random processes. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.)* **56**, 795–798.
- YUKICH, J.E.
 (1996a) Ergodic theorems for some classical problems in combinatorial optimization. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **6**, 1006–1023.
 (1996b) Worst case asymptotics for some classical optimization problems. *Combinatorica* **16**, 575–586.
- ZUBKOV, A.M.
 (1975) Limit distributions of the distance to the nearest common ancestor. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* **20**, 614–623. English translation: *Theor. Probab. Appl.* **20**, 602–612.

Glossary of Notation

p_k	The probability of k children in a Galton-Watson process.
f	The probability generating function of $\langle p_k \rangle$.
m	The mean number of children in a Galton-Watson process.
Z_n	The number of individuals of the n th generation in a Galton-Watson process.
E	Expectation with respect to the law of Z_1 .
W	The limit of the martingale Z_n/m^n in a Galton-Watson process.
$W(T)$	This is W when the tree T needs to be specified.
$\tilde{W}, \tilde{W}(T)$	The limit of Z_n/c_n from the Seneta-Heyde theorem.
GW	The measure on (rooted unlabelled) trees given by a Galton-Watson process.
AGW	The measure on (rooted unlabelled) trees given by an augmented Galton-Watson process.
$\vec{x}, \bar{x}, \vec{x}$	Paths indexed by \mathbb{N} , $-\mathbb{N}$, and \mathbb{Z} , respectively.
$\vec{T}, \bar{T}, \vec{T}$	The sets of convergent paths on a tree T indexed as indicated. For $\vec{x} \in \vec{T}$, it is also required that $x_\infty \neq x_{-\infty}$.
$x_\infty, x_{-\infty}$	The limit points of convergent paths. These are in ∂T .
∂T	The boundary of a tree T , i.e., the rays from its root.
$[x, \xi]$	The ray from a vertex x to a boundary point $\xi \in \partial T$.
$\deg x$	The degree of a vertex x .
$ x $	The distance of a vertex x to the root.
$ x - y $	The distance between two vertices x, y in a tree.
T_n	The set of vertices of T at distance n from the root.
$x \rightarrow y$	The vertex y is a child of the vertex x .
$x \wedge y$	The common ancestor to x and y furthest from the root.
T^x	The subtree of T consisting of x and its descendants.
$\text{MoveRoot}(T, x)$	The tree T but rooted at x .

$\bigvee T_i$	The tree formed by joining the trees T_i at their roots to a new vertex, which is the new root.
$[T_1 \bullet T_2]$	The tree rooted at the root of T_1 formed by joining T_1 and T_2 by an edge between their roots.
Δ	A single vertex.
T_Δ	The join $[\Delta \bullet T]$.
$\mathcal{C}(T), \mathcal{R}(T)$	The effective conductance and resistance of a tree T from its root to its boundary when each edge has unit conductance.
$\gamma(T)$	The probability that simple random walk on T_Δ never returns to Δ . It equals $\mathcal{C}(T)/(1 + \mathcal{C}(T))$.
$\mathcal{E}(\theta)$	The energy of a flow θ .
$\mu_A, \mu(\cdot A)$	The measure μ conditioned on the event A .
S	A measure-preserving map, usually the left shift.
n_A	The return time to a set A in a dynamical system.
S_A , as in $S_{\text{Regen}}, S_{\text{Exit}}$	The return map on a set A in a dynamical system.
PathsInTrees	The bi-infinite path bundle over the space of trees.
RaysInTrees	The ray bundle over the space of trees.
Regen	The regeneration points in PathsInTrees .
Exit	The exit points in PathsInTrees .
SRW_T	The path measure for simple random walk on T .
VIS_T, VIS	Visibility measure on ∂T , a.k.a. the equally-splitting flow on T , and its associated flow rule.
$\text{UNIF}_T, \text{UNIF}$	Limit uniform measure on ∂T and its associated flow rule.
$\text{HARM}_T, \text{HARM}$	Harmonic measure of simple random walk on T and its associated flow rule.
μ_{HARM}	The harmonic-stationary measure on trees equivalent to GW .
$\Theta \times \mu$	The space-time measure of a Θ -stationary Markov chain with stationary measure μ .
$\text{SRW} \times \text{AGW}$	The measure on PathsInTrees gotten by running simple random walk on an augmented Galton-Watson tree.
$\text{VIS} \times \text{GW}$	The measure on RaysInTrees gotten by running simple forward random walk on a Galton-Watson tree.
$\text{HARM} \times \mu_{\text{HARM}}$	The space-time measure of the harmonic-stationary Markov chain.
$\text{Ent}_\Theta(\mu)$	The entropy of a Θ -stationary Markov chain on the space of trees with stationary measure μ .

- l The speed of simple random walk.
 d The dimension of harmonic measure.

Ich bin dein Baum

by Friedrich Rückert

Ich bin dein Baum: o Gärtner, dessen Treue
 Mich hält in Liebespflēg' und süßer Zucht,
 Komm, daß ich in den Schoß dir dankbar streue
 Die reife dir allein gewachsne Frucht.

Ich bin dein Gärtner, o du Baum der Treue!
 Auf andres Glück fühl' ich nicht Eifersucht:
 Die holden Äste find' ich stets aufs neue
 Geschmückt mit Frucht, wo ich gepflückt die Frucht.

I am your tree, O gardener, whose care
 Holds me in sweet restraint and loving ban.
 Come, let me find your lap and scatter there
 The ripened fruit, grown for no other man.

I am your gardener, then, O faithful tree!
 I covet no one else's bliss instead;
 Your lovely limbs in perpetuity
 Yield fruit, however lately harvested.

Transl. by Walter Arndt