

A lower bound for point-to-point connection probabilities in critical percolation

J. van den Berg^{†*} and H. Don[§]

[†]CWI and VU University Amsterdam ; email: J.van.den.Berg@cwi.nl

[§]Radboud University Nijmegen; email: h.don@math.ru.nl

December 24, 2019

Abstract

Consider critical site percolation on \mathbb{Z}^d with $d \geq 2$. We prove a lower bound of order n^{-d^2} for point-to-point connection probabilities, where n is the distance between the points.

Most of the work in our proof concerns a ‘construction’ which finally reduces the problem to a topological one. This is then solved by applying a topological fact, Lemma 2.11 below, which follows from Brouwer’s fixed point theorem.

Our bound improves the lower bound with exponent $2d(d-1)$, used by Cerf in 2015 [1] to obtain an *upper* bound for the so-called two-arm probabilities. Apart from being of interest in itself, our result gives a small improvement of the bound on the two-arm exponent found by Cerf.

Key words and phrases: Critical percolation, connection probabilities.

AMS 2000 subject classifications. Primary 60K35; secondary 82B43.

*During part of this project JvdB was affiliated as visiting professor at NYU Abu Dhabi

1 Introduction and statement of the main results

Consider site percolation on \mathbb{Z}^d with $d \geq 2$. Let $p_c = p_c(d)$ denote the critical probability. We use the notation $\Lambda(n)$ for the box $[-n, n]^d$. Our main result is the following, Theorem 1.1 below. Although the result is, essentially, only relevant for dimensions 3 - 6, we formulate it for all $d \geq 2$ because the proof works for all these values of d ‘simultaneously’.

Theorem 1.1. *There is a constant $c > 0$, which depends only on the dimension d , such that for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, x \neq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow x \text{ in } \Lambda(4\|x\|)) \geq \frac{c}{\|x\|^{d^2}}. \quad (1)$$

Here $\|x\| := \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |x_i|$, and $\{0 \leftrightarrow x \text{ in } \Lambda(4\|x\|)\}$ is the event that there is an open path from 0 to x which lies in $\Lambda(4\|x\|)$.

Let us first explain why this result is, essentially, only relevant for dimensions 3 - 6: For ‘nice’ two-dimensional lattices (including the square lattice) a much better exponent (2/3 or even smaller) than the exponent 4 from (1) is known. For these lattices it is believed (and known for site percolation on the triangular lattice from [7]) that for every $C > 1$, $\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow x \text{ in } \Lambda(C\|x\|)) \approx \|x\|^{-5/24}$.

Further, it has been proved for dimensions $d \geq 11$ and is strongly believed for $d \geq 7$, that the ‘unrestricted’ event in (1) (i.e. without the restriction “in $\Lambda(4\|x\|)$ ”) has probability of order $\|x\|^{-(d-2)}$, see [5] and [6]. Moreover, it seems to be believed that for such d a suitably restricted form of this event (with a suitable constant instead of the factor 4 in the l.h.s. of (1)) also has probability of order $\|x\|^{-(d-2)}$.

The methods used for the above mentioned results for $d = 2$ don’t work for $d \in \{3, \dots, 6\}$, and presumably this also holds for the methods used for $d \geq 11$. To our knowledge, for dimension $d \in \{3, \dots, 6\}$ no version of Theorem 1.1 with exponent $\leq d^2$ exists in the literature, even if we drop the restriction “in $\Lambda(4\|x\|)$ ”. In fact, we don’t know if the probabilities for the events with and without the restriction are really of different order. We stated our result for the case with restriction because it is stronger, and because of its applicability for other purposes, see the Remarks below.

Theorem 1.1 has the following implication:

Corollary 1.2. *There is a constant $c' > 0$, which depends only on the dimension d , such that for all $n \geq 1$, and all $x, y \in \Lambda(n)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(x \leftrightarrow y \text{ in } \Lambda(9n)) \geq \frac{c'}{n^{d^2}}. \quad (2)$$

Indeed, this follows readily from Theorem 1.1 by observing that, for all $x, y \in \Lambda(n)$, we have that $\|y - x\| \leq 2n$ and that $\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(x \leftrightarrow y \text{ in } \Lambda(9n)) \geq \mathbb{P}_{p_c}(x \leftrightarrow y \text{ in } x + \Lambda(8n))$, which by translation invariance is equal to $\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow y - x \text{ in } \Lambda(8n))$.

Corollary 1.2 clearly improves (apart from the factor 9 in the l.h.s. of (2), see Remark (ii) below) the following result by Cerf, which is one of the motivations for our work:

Lemma 1.3. (Cerf, Lemma 6.1 in [1])

There is a constant $\tilde{c} > 0$, which depends only on the dimension d , such that for all $n \geq 1$, and all $x, y \in \Lambda(n)$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(x \leftrightarrow y \text{ in } \Lambda(2n)) \geq \frac{\tilde{c}}{n^{2d(d-1)}}. \quad (3)$$

Remarks:

(i) Lemma 1.3 above was used in a clever way by Cerf in [1] to obtain new *upper* bounds for two-arm probabilities. Cerf's work on two-arm probabilities is, in turn, mainly motivated by the famous conjecture that, for any dimension ≥ 2 , there is no infinite open cluster at p_c . This conjecture, one of the main open problems in percolation theory, has only been proved for dimension two and for high dimensions.

(ii) The precise factor 2 in the expression $\Lambda(2n)$ in (3) is not essential for Cerf's applications mentioned in Remark (i): a bigger constant, which may even depend on the dimension, would work as well (with tiny, straightforward modifications of Cerf's arguments). This is why we have not seriously tried to reduce the factor 9 in the expression $\Lambda(9n)$ in Corollary 1.2.

(iii) What *does* matter for Cerf's applications is an improvement of the power $2d(d-1)$ in the r.h.s. of (3). By a simple adaptation of a step in Cerf's proof of Lemma 1.3, the exponent $2d(d-1)$ can be replaced by $(2d-1)(d-1)$. Our Corollary 1.2 states that it can be replaced by d^2 . So, for instance, for $d = 3$ the exponents given by Cerf, by the small adaptation of Cerf's argument mentioned above, and by our Corollary 1.2, are 12, 10 and

9 respectively; and for $d = 4$ they are 24, 21 and 16 respectively. Following step by step the computations in Sections 7-9 in Cerf's paper, shows that our improvement of Lemma 1.3 also provides a small improvement of Cerf's lower bound for the two-arm exponent.

1.1 Main ideas in the proof of Theorem 1.1

We first present, somewhat informally, Cerf's proof of Lemma 1.3 (and the proof of the small adaptation mentioned in Remark (iii) above).

To focus on the main idea we ignore here the restriction "in $\Lambda(2n)$ " in Lemma 1.3. The key ingredient is a result, Corollary 2.3 below, which goes back to work by Hammersley. Applied to the special case where Γ is a box centered at 0, and using symmetry, this result gives that there is a $C = C(d)$ such that for every n there is a 'special' site v^n on the boundary of $\Lambda(n)$ with $v_1^n = n$ and such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow v^n) \geq \frac{C}{n^{d-1}}.$$

Now let x be a vertex. By symmetry we may assume that its coordinates x_i , $i = 1, \dots, d$, are non-negative. For simplicity we also assume that they are even. Let $x(i)$ be the vertex of which the i th coordinate is equal to x_i and all other coordinates are 0.

We have by translation invariance and FKG that $\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow x)$ is larger than or equal to

$$\prod_{i=1}^d \mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow x(i)).$$

Using symmetry, the i th factor in this product is equal to $\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow (x_i, 0, 0, \dots, 0))$, and hence, by FKG (and again by symmetry), at least

$$(\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow v^{x_i/2}))^2,$$

which as we saw is $\geq C^2 \cdot \|x\|^{-2(d-1)}$. Hence the product of the d factors is at least of order $\|x\|^{-2d(d-1)}$. This gives essentially (apart from some relatively straightforward issues) Lemma 1.3.

The small adaptation mentioned before comes from an observation concerning the first step of the argument above: Note that $\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow x)$ is also larger than or equal to

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow v^{x_1}) \mathbb{P}_{p_c}(v^{x_1} \leftrightarrow x).$$

The first factor is at least $C \cdot \|x\|^{-(d-1)}$. And the second factor can be written as $\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow v^{x^1} - x)$ to which we can apply Cerf's argument mentioned above. However, since $v^{x^1} - x$ has first coordinate 0, and hence has at most $d-1$ non-zero coordinates, that argument gives a lower bound of order $\|x\|^{-2(d-1)(d-1)}$. Hence, the product of the two factors is at least of order $\|x\|^{-(2d-1)(d-1)}$ in agreement with Remark (iii).

So, roughly speaking, the explanation of Lemma 1.3 is that x can be written as the sum of $2d$ (and in fact, as the above adaptation showed, $2d-1$) special points, where each special point 'costs' a factor of order $\|x\|^{-(d-1)}$.

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 (and thus of Corollary 1.2) also uses the idea of certain special points, which will be called 'good' points. Our notion of good points is weaker than that of the special points mentioned above, in the sense that they 'cost' a factor of order $\|x\|^{-d}$. However, we will prove that, roughly speaking, each point is the sum of 'just' d good points, which together with the previous statement gives the exponent d^2 in Theorem 1.1. To prove this we first show, again using Corollary 2.3 (but now with general Γ , not only boxes) the existence of suitable paths of good points and then turn the problem into a topological issue. This is then finally solved by applying the 'topological fact' Lemma 2.11.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

2.1 Reformulation of Theorem 1.1

Before we start, we reformulate Theorem 1.1 as follows:

Proposition 2.1. *There is a constant $c > 0$, which depends only on the dimension d , such that for all $n \geq 1$, and all $x \in \Lambda(n)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow x \text{ in } \Lambda(4n)) \geq \frac{c}{n^{d^2}}. \quad (4)$$

This proposition is trivially equivalent to Theorem 1.1. This reformulation is less 'compact' than that of Theorem 1.1 but has the advantage that it is more natural with respect to the approach in our proof (where, as we will see, we first fix an n and then distinguish between 'good' and other points in $\Lambda(n)$).

2.2 Preliminaries

First we introduce some notation and definitions: For two vertices v, w , the notation $v \sim w$ means that v and w are neighbours, i.e. that $\|v - w\|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^d |v_i - w_i| = 1$.

If V and W are sets of vertices, a *path* from V to W is a sequence of vertices $v(1), \dots, v(k)$ with $v(1) \in V$, $v(k) \in W$ and $\|v(i+1) - v(i)\|_1 \leq 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k-1$. (Note that we allow consecutive vertices to be equal; this is done for convenience later in this paper.)

If W is a set of vertices, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^{\text{out}} W &= \{v \in W^c : \exists w \in W \text{ s.t. } w \sim v\}, \quad \text{and} \\ \partial^{\text{in}} W &= \{w \in W : \exists v \in W^c \text{ s.t. } w \sim v\}. \end{aligned}$$

We will use a result, Lemma 2.2 below, which goes back to work by Hammersley in the late fifties. Hammersley only proved the special case (used by Cerf) where Γ is of the form $\Lambda(k)$. The proof of the general case (which we use) is very similar, it is given in Section 2 of [2].

Lemma 2.2. (*Hammersley [4], Duminil-Copin and Tassion [2].*) *Let Γ be a finite, connected set of vertices containing 0. Then*

$$\sum_{x \in \partial^{\text{out}} \Gamma} \mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow x \text{ 'in' } \Gamma) \geq 1, \tag{5}$$

where $\{0 \leftrightarrow x \text{ 'in' } \Gamma\}$ is the event that there is an open path from 0 to x of which all vertices, except x itself, are in Γ .

Clearly, this lemma has the following consequence.

Corollary 2.3. *For every finite, connected set of vertices Γ containing 0, there is an $x \in \partial^{\text{out}} \Gamma$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_c}(0 \leftrightarrow x \text{ 'in' } \Gamma) \geq \frac{1}{|\partial^{\text{out}} \Gamma|}. \tag{6}$$

2.3 The set of ‘good’ vertices and its properties

Since, throughout the proof, the percolation parameter p is equal to p_c , we simply write \mathbb{P} instead of \mathbb{P}_{p_c} .

Let $n \geq 1$ be fixed, and consider the box $\Lambda(n)$.

Definition 2.4. *A vertex $v \in \Lambda(n)$ is called good if $v = 0$ or*

$$\mathbb{P}(0 \leftrightarrow v \text{ in } \Lambda(n)) \geq \frac{1}{|\Lambda(n)|}.$$

The set of all good vertices is denoted by G .

Lemma 2.5. *The set G has the following properties:*

- (a) *G is invariant under the automorphisms of $\Lambda(n)$.*
- (b) *For each $i = 1, \dots, d$, there is a path $\pi^{(i)} \subset G \cap [0, n]^d$ which starts in 0 and ends in $[0, n]^{i-1} \times \{n\} \times [0, n]^{d-i}$.*

Proof of Lemma 2.5.

Part (a) is obvious.

As to part (b), we define, inductively, a finite sequence $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_2 \subset \dots$ of subsets of $\Lambda(n)$ as follows: $\Gamma_1 := \{0\}$. If $j \geq 1$ and Γ_j is given, then, if $\Gamma_j \cap \partial^{\text{in}}\Lambda(n)$ is nonempty we stop the procedure. If it is empty, we can find, by Corollary 2.3, a vertex $x \in \partial^{\text{out}}\Gamma_j \cap \Lambda(n)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(0 \leftrightarrow x \text{ in } \Lambda(n)) \geq \mathbb{P}(0 \leftrightarrow x \text{ ‘in’ } \Gamma_j) \geq \frac{1}{|\partial^{\text{out}}\Gamma_j|} \geq \frac{1}{|\Lambda(n)|}.$$

In that case we take $\Gamma_{j+1} := \Gamma_j \cup \{x\}$.

Let Γ denote the final set obtained at the end of the procedure (i.e. Γ is the union of the Γ_j ’s obtained by the procedure). It is immediate from the procedure that all the vertices of Γ are good, and that there is a path $\pi = (x(1) = 0, x(2), \dots, x(m))$ in Γ from 0 to $\partial^{\text{in}}\Lambda(n)$. Clearly, (where, for $y = (y_1, \dots, y_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we use the notation $|y|$ for $(|y_1|, \dots, |y_d|)$), $(|x(1)|, |x(2)|, \dots, |x(m)|)$ is a path in $[0, n]^d$, which starts in 0 and of which the endpoint is in $[0, n]^{i-1} \times \{n\} \times [0, n]^{d-i}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Moreover, by part (a) of the lemma, each vertex of this path belongs to G . Hence, the property in part (b) of the lemma holds for some $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Using again part (a), the property follows for *each* $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. \square

Lemma 2.6. *For each $i = 1, \dots, d$ there is a path $\tilde{\pi}^{(i)}$ of good points in the box $[0, n]^{i-1} \times [-n, n] \times [0, n]^{d-i}$, starting at a point of which the i th coordinate is $-n$ and ending at a point of which the i th coordinate is n . (So $\tilde{\pi}^{(i)}$ traverses the box ‘in the long direction’).*

Proof of Lemma 2.6.

Fix an $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. For each vertex $v = (v_1, \dots, v_d)$, let the vertex $\tilde{v} = (\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_d)$ be defined by:

$$\tilde{v}_j = \begin{cases} v_j, & j \neq i \\ -v_j, & j = i \end{cases}$$

Note that, by Lemma 2.5(a), $v \in G$ iff $\tilde{v} \in G$.

Let $\pi^{(i)}$ be the path in the statement of Lemma 2.5(b), and write this path as $(v(1), v(2), \dots, v(k))$. Then, clearly, $(\tilde{v}(k), \tilde{v}(k-1), \dots, \tilde{v}(2), \tilde{v}(1), v(1), v(2), \dots, v(k))$ is a path with the desired property. \square

Now, for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$, we associate the path $\tilde{\pi}^{(i)}$ of Lemma 2.6 with a continuous curve $c^{(i)}$, simply by following the path along the edges of the graph at constant speed, chosen such that the total travel time along the path is 1. By Lemma 2.6 we immediately have the following:

Lemma 2.7. *For each $i = 1, \dots, d$, the function $c^{(i)} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is continuous and has the following properties:*

- (i) $\forall s \in [0, 1] \exists t \in [0, 1]$ s.t. $c^{(i)}(t) \in G$ and $\|c^{(i)}(t) - c^{(i)}(s)\|_1 \leq 1/2$.
- (ii) For all $s \in [0, 1]$, $-n = (c^{(i)}(0))_i \leq (c^{(i)}(s))_i \leq (c^{(i)}(1))_i = n$.
- (iii) $(c^{(i)}(s))_j \in [0, n]$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$ and $j \neq i$.

2.4 Topological approach

We use the curves $c^{(i)}, i = 1, \dots, d$, introduced in the previous subsection, to define a (as it turns out, useful) function $g : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. First we define for each $t = (t_1, \dots, t_d) \in [0, 1]^d$ the matrix $C(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ by

$$C(t) = \begin{bmatrix} c^{(1)}(t_1) & c^{(2)}(t_2) & \dots & c^{(d)}(t_d) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

Next, we introduce functions $h_d : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined recursively for $d \geq 1$ by

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(x) &= |x| && \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ h_d(x) &= |h_{d-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}) - x_d| && \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, d \geq 2. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

By induction it easily follows that for all $d \geq 1$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist weights $a_j \in \{-1, 1\}$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$ such that

$$0 \leq h_d(x) = \sum_{j=1}^d a_j x_j \leq \|x\| \quad \text{and} \quad \forall k \leq d : \left| \sum_{j=1}^k a_j x_j \right| \leq \|x\|. \quad (9)$$

Now we define $g : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ by describing the d coordinates of $g(t)$.

Definition 2.8. For $t \in [0, 1]^d$, let $C = C(t)$. For all $1 \leq i \leq d$, we define

$$(g(t))_i = C_{i,i} + h_{d-1}(C_{i,1}, \dots, C_{i,i-1}, C_{i,i+1}, \dots, C_{i,d}).$$

Lemma 2.9. The function $g : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ has the following properties:

- (a) g is continuous;
- (b) $(g(t))_i \leq 0$ if $t_i = 0$ and $(g(t))_i \geq n$ if $t_i = 1$;
- (c) For each $x \in g([0, 1]^d)$, there exist $z^{(1)}, \dots, z^{(d)} \in G$ such that

- (i) $\sum_{j=1}^k z^{(j)} \in \Lambda(2n + \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$ for $k = 1, \dots, d$;
- (ii) $\left\| x - \sum_{j=1}^d z^{(j)} \right\|_1 \leq \frac{d}{2}$.

Proof of Lemma 2.9.

Part (a) follows because g is a composition of continuous functions. Note that $C_{i,j}(t) = (c^{(j)}(t_j))_i$ so that $|C_{i,j}(t)| \leq n$ for all i, j by Lemma 2.7(ii) and (iii). By (9), this implies that

$$0 \leq h_{d-1}(C_{i,1}, \dots, C_{i,i-1}, C_{i,i+1}, \dots, C_{i,d}) \leq n.$$

Together with Lemma 2.7(ii), this proves part (b).

By definition of g and by (9), for each $t \in [0, 1]^d$ there exist weights $a_{ij}(t) \in \{-1, 1\}$ such that

$$g(t) = \tilde{C}(t)\mathbf{1} = \sum_{j=1}^d \tilde{c}^{(j)}(t_j), \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ denotes $(1, \dots, 1)$ and $\tilde{C}(t)$ is the matrix with elements $\tilde{C}_{i,j}(t) = a_{ij}(t)C_{i,j}(t)$ and columns $\tilde{c}^{(j)}(t_j)$. For all i , the partial sums of (10) satisfy

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{c}^{(j)}(t_j) \right)_i = \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^k a_{ij} C_{i,j} & \text{if } k < i, \\ C_{ii} + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^k a_{ij} C_{i,j} & \text{if } k \geq i. \end{cases}$$

Applying (9) gives that all partial sums are in $\Lambda(2n)$ for all t .

Since Lemma 2.7(i) applies to the columns of $C(t)$, it also applies to the columns of $\tilde{C}(t)$ by Lemma 2.5(a). Consequently, there exist $s = (s_1, \dots, s_d) \in [0, 1]^d$ such that $z^{(j)} := \tilde{c}^{(j)}(s_j) \in G$ for all j and such that for all $k \leq d$

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{c}^{(j)}(t_j) - \sum_{j=1}^k z^{(j)} \right\|_1 \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \|\tilde{c}^{(j)}(t_j) - z^{(j)}\|_1 \leq \frac{k}{2} \leq \frac{d}{2},$$

completing the proof of part (c). \square

Lemma 2.10. *There exists a constant $\tilde{c} > 0$ (which depends on d only) such that the inequality in Proposition 2.1 holds for all lattice points $x \in g([0, 1]^d) \cap \Lambda(n)$.*

Proof of Lemma 2.10.

Let x be a lattice point in $g([0, 1]^d) \cap \Lambda(n)$. If $n \leq d/2$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(0 \leftrightarrow x \text{ in } \Lambda(4n)) \geq p_c^{\|x\|_1} \geq p_c^{d^2/2}.$$

So we can assume that $3n + d/2 < 4n$. Choose $z^{(1)}, \dots, z^{(d)}$ as in Lemma 2.9(c). We get that the event $\{0 \leftrightarrow x \text{ in } \Lambda(4n)\}$ occurs if each of the events

$$\left\{ 0 \overset{\text{in } \Lambda(n)}{\longleftrightarrow} z^{(1)} \right\},$$

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^{d-1} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k z^{(i)} \longleftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} z^{(i)} \text{ in } \sum_{i=1}^k z^{(i)} + \Lambda(n) \right\}, \text{ and}$$

$$\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^d z^{(i)} \leftrightarrow x \text{ in } \sum_{i=1}^d z^{(i)} + \Lambda(d) \right\}$$

occurs. Hence, by FKG and using that each $z^{(i)}$ is good,

$$\mathbb{P}(0 \leftrightarrow x \text{ in } \Lambda(4n)) \geq \left(\frac{1}{(2n+1)^d} \right)^d p_c^{d/2} \geq \frac{p_c^{d/2}}{3^{d^2}} \cdot \frac{1}{n^{d^2}}.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.10. \square

2.5 Completion of the proof of Theorem 1.1

By Lemma 2.10 it is clear that the result of Proposition 2.1, and hence Theorem 1.1, follows if

$$g([0, 1]^d) \supset [0, n]^d. \quad (11)$$

Indeed, if $g([0, 1]^d) \supset [0, n]^d$, then, by Lemma 2.10, the bound (1) holds for all vertices in $[0, n]^d$, and hence, by symmetry (part (a) of Lemma 2.5), also for all vertices in $\Lambda(n)$.

Finally, (11) follows by applying the following ‘topological fact’, Lemma 2.11, to the function $\frac{g(\cdot)}{n}$, and by noting that Lemma 2.9 (a) and (b) guarantees that this function satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.11. We don’t know if this lemma is, more or less explicitly, in the literature. We are grateful to Lex Schrijver for providing his proof.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $f : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function with the following properties.*

$$\text{For all } i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \text{ and all } x \in [0, 1]^d \text{ with } x_i = 0, (f(x))_i \leq 0, \quad (12)$$

$$\text{For all } i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \text{ and all } x \in [0, 1]^d \text{ with } x_i = 1, (f(x))_i \geq 1, \quad (13)$$

Then $f([0, 1]^d) \supset [0, 1]^d$.

Proof of Lemma 2.11. [Lex Schrijver, private communication]

Since $f([0, 1]^d)$ is compact, it is sufficient to prove that $f([0, 1]^d) \supset (0, 1)^d$. Further, w.l.o.g. we may assume that $f([0, 1]^d) \subset [0, 1]^d$ and that the inequalities at the end of (12) and (13) are *equalities*. To see this, replace f by the function \tilde{f} defined by

$$(\tilde{f}(x))_i = \begin{cases} 1, & (f(x))_i \geq 1 \\ 0, & (f(x))_i \leq 0 \\ (f(x))_i, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and note that $\tilde{f}([0, 1]^d) \cap (0, 1)^d = f([0, 1]^d) \cap (0, 1)^d$.

So, from now on, we assume that $f : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow [0, 1]^d$ is continuous and has the property that:

For all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and all $x \in [0, 1]^d$ with $x_i = 0$, $(f(x))_i = 0$, and for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and all $x \in [0, 1]^d$ with $x_i = 1$, $(f(x))_i = 1$. Note that this implies in particular that, for all $x \in \partial[0, 1]^d$, $f(x) \in \partial[0, 1]^d$ and

$$f(x) \neq \mathbf{1} - x. \tag{14}$$

Now suppose there is an $a \in (0, 1)^d$ which is not in $f([0, 1]^d)$. We will see that this leads to a contradiction. Fix such an a and let π be the projection from a on $\partial[0, 1]^d$. (More precisely, for every $x \neq a$, $\pi(x)$ is the unique intersection of the half-line $\{a + \lambda(x - a) : \lambda > 0\}$ with $\partial[0, 1]^d$). Finally, let $\psi(x) := \mathbf{1} - x$.

Now consider the function $\psi \circ \pi \circ f : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \partial[0, 1]^d$. Note that it is well-defined (by the special property of a) and continuous. Hence, by Brouwer's fixed-point theorem, it has a fixed point, which we denote by b . It is clear that $b \in \partial[0, 1]^d$. So we have

$$b = (\psi \circ \pi \circ f)(b) = \psi(f(b)),$$

and hence $\psi(b) = f(b)$. However, this last equality violates (14), so we have indeed obtained a contradiction. \square

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Lex Schrijver for his proof of Lemma 2.11. We also thank Steffen Sagave and Ben Moonen for their help with a topological question which came up during an earlier, somewhat different attempt to prove Theorem 1.1. We thank Wouter Cames van Batenburg for very stimulating discussions, and Remco van der Hofstad for interesting information concerning two-point probabilities in high dimensions.

References

- [1] R. Cerf, A lower bound on the two-arms exponent for critical percolation on the lattice, *Ann. Probab.* **43**, 2458-2480 (2015).
- [2] H. Duminil-Copin and V. Tassion, A new proof of the sharpness of the phase transition for Bernoulli percolation on \mathbb{Z}^d , *Enseignement Mathématique* **62** (1-2), 199-206 (2016).
- [3] G.R. Grimmett. *Percolation*, second edition, Springer (1999).

- [4] J.M. Hammersley, Percolation processes: Lower bounds for the critical probability, *Ann. Math. Statist.* **28**, 790-795 (1957).
- [5] T. Hara, Decay of correlations in nearest-neighbor self-avoiding walk, percolation, lattice trees and animals, *Ann. Probab.* **36**, 530-593 (2008).
- [6] M. Heydenreich and R. van der Hofstad, *Progress in high-dimensional percolation and random graphs*, Lecture notes for the CRM-PIMS Summer School in Probability 2015, CRM Short Courses Series with Springer (2017).
- [7] G.F. Lawler, O. Schramm and W. Werner, One-arm exponent for critical 2D percolation, *Electr. J. Probab.* **7**, Paper 2 (2002).