

# SPREAD-OUT PERCOLATION ON TRANSITIVE GRAPHS OF POLYNOMIAL GROWTH

PANAGIOTIS SPANOS AND MATTHEW TOINTON

ABSTRACT. Let  $G$  be a vertex-transitive graph of superlinear polynomial growth. Given  $r > 0$ , let  $G_r$  be the graph on the same vertex set as  $G$ , with two vertices joined by an edge if and only if they are at graph distance at most  $r$  apart in  $G$ . We show that the critical probability  $p_c(G_r)$  for Bernoulli bond percolation on  $G_r$  satisfies  $p_c(G_r) \sim 1/\deg(G_r)$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . This extends work of Penrose and Bollobás–Janson–Riordan, who considered the case  $G = \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

Our result provides an important ingredient in parallel work of Georgakopoulos in which he introduces a new notion of dimension in groups. It also verifies a special case of a conjecture of Easo and Hutchcroft.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries on nilpotent groups	7
3. Convergence to Haar measure	10
4. Background on inhomogeneous random graphs	16
5. The case of torsion-free nilpotent groups	17
6. Transitive graphs	27
References	34

## 1. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that the *critical percolation probability*  $p_c(G)$  of a graph  $G$  satisfies

$$(1.1) \quad p_c(G) \geq \frac{1}{\deg(G) - 1},$$

where  $\deg(G)$  denotes the maximum degree of a vertex of  $G$ . Among *transitive* graphs, exact equality is achieved if and only if  $G$  is a tree (see Proposition 6.12). However, there are various natural families of transitive graphs with degrees tending to infinity that are very far from being trees and nonetheless achieve equality *asymptotically* in the sense that

$$(1.2) \quad p_c(G) = \frac{1 + o(1)}{\deg(G)},$$

where the error term  $o(1)$  tends to zero as the degree tends to infinity. For example, Kesten [29] showed that (1.2) holds for the hypercubic lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  as  $d \rightarrow \infty$  (see also [2, §4]). Penrose [37,

---

The first author acknowledges the support of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): W1230. This work was also partially supported by a Small Grant from the Heilbronn Institute for Mathematical Research and by the German Research Foundation (DFG): SPP2265.

Theorem 1] showed that it holds for the ‘spread-out’ lattice, first considered in this context by Hara and Slade [23], in which  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  are joined by an edge if and only if  $\|x - y\| \leq r$ , with  $d > 1$  fixed and  $\|\cdot\|$  some norm on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ .

In this paper we extend Penrose’s result in a natural way to all transitive graphs of polynomial growth. The class of transitive graphs of polynomial growth includes all Cayley graphs on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , and more generally all Cayley graphs on nilpotent groups, but also includes graphs that are not realizable as Cayley graphs. The study of probability in general, and percolation in particular, on transitive graphs of polynomial growth is well established (see e.g. [1, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19, 25, 26, 27]).

We define spread-out percolation on a transitive graph  $G = (V, E)$  in a similar way to Penrose, but with the graph distance  $d_G$  in place of the norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . Precisely, for each  $r > 0$  we consider the graph  $G_r$  with vertex set  $V$ , and with  $u, v \in V$  joined by an edge if and only if  $d_G(u, v) \leq r$ . Given  $r \geq 0$  and  $v \in V$ , write  $\beta_G(r) = \#\{u \in V : d_G(u, v) \leq r\}$ , the number of vertices in a ball of radius  $r$  in  $G$ . We say  $G$  has *polynomial growth* if there exist  $C, d > 0$  such that  $\beta_G(r) \leq Cr^d$  for all  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , and *superlinear growth* if  $\beta_G(r)/r \rightarrow \infty$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $G$  be a transitive graph with superlinear polynomial growth. Then*

$$(1.3) \quad p_c(G_r) = \frac{1 + o(1)}{\beta_G(r)}$$

as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ .

The assumption of superlinear growth here is necessary, since  $p_c(G_r) = 1$  for all  $r$  if  $G$  does not have superlinear growth. Note that  $\deg(G_r) = \beta_G(r) - 1$ , so that (1.3) is equivalent to (1.2) for the family  $(G_r)_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

Part of our motivation for this work was in connection with a new notion of dimension in groups (and more general metric spaces) called the *percolation dimension*, introduced in parallel work by Georgakopoulos [18]. This notion is designed to behave similarly to the growth rate, but to assign a more ‘realistic’ value of dimension in the case of graphs with dead ends, which can allow graphs that are ‘low dimensional’ in one sense to nonetheless exhibit very fast growth. The percolation dimension has a number of desirable properties, such as being monotone decreasing with respect to subgroups and quotients. In groups of polynomial growth, it also agrees with the degree of growth, and it is this last property where our work comes in: the fact that the percolation dimension is bounded below by the degree of polynomial growth for such groups is an immediate corollary of Theorem 1.1.

Aside from its connection to Georgakopoulos’s work, Theorem 1.1 also provides evidence in favour of a conjecture of Easo and Hutchcroft. They show that transitive graphs do not satisfy (1.2) in general by constructing a family  $(G_n)$  of transitive graphs with  $\deg(G_n) \rightarrow \infty$  such that  $p_c(G_n) > 3/\deg(G_n)$  for large enough  $n$  [17, Figure 5], but conjecture that there should nonetheless exist a universal constant  $C$  such that if  $G$  is an infinite, connected, transitive, simple graph with superlinear growth then  $p_c(G) \leq C/\deg(G)$  [17, Conjecture 7.3]. Theorem 1.1 implies that for any given transitive graph  $G$  of polynomial growth the family  $(G_r)_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies this conjecture.

**1.1. About the proof.** Our proof of Theorem 1.1 uses a rather striking array of deep machinery from different areas of mathematics. We give a detailed overview of the proof shortly, including precise references, but let us first give an overview of where we draw this machinery from and how we combine it. We use celebrated theorems of Trofimov and Gromov showing that an arbitrary transitive graph  $G$  of polynomial growth can be approximated in a certain precise sense by a Cayley graph of a torsion-free nilpotent group  $\Gamma$ . Spread-out percolation at scale  $r$  on  $\Gamma$  is not obviously

comparable to spread-out percolation at scale  $r$  on  $G$ , but by using some highly refined estimates of Tessera on the size of spheres in graphs of polynomial growth, and adapting an argument of Benjamini and Schramm for comparing percolation on a graph to on a quotient, we are nonetheless able to reduce Theorem 1.1 to the special case in which  $G$  is indeed a Cayley graph of  $\Gamma$ .

In order to prove this special case of Theorem 1.1, we seek to embed  $\Gamma$  in a manifold  $M$ , in a direct generalisation of how  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  embeds in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and then adapt a proof of Penrose's result due to Bollobás, Janson and Riordan. One natural candidate for  $M$  is given by work of Malcev, who showed that every torsion-free nilpotent group embeds as a lattice in a simply connected nilpotent Lie group, called the *Malcev closure*; however, the Malcev closure does not in general admit a natural rescaling, meaning that a crucial renormalisation argument of Bollobás, Janson and Riordan has no hope of working. Another candidate for  $M$  is the *asymptotic cone* of  $\Gamma$ , defined by Gromov as a certain limit of rescaled versions of  $\Gamma$ ; however, whilst this does admit natural rescalings,  $\Gamma$  is not in general a *subgroup* of the asymptotic cone, merely a *subset*, which at first sight again ruins the Bollobás–Janson–Riordan argument. To overcome this, it is necessary to consider a manifold  $M$  with two *different* group structures – one that makes it into the Malcev closure of  $\Gamma$ , and one that makes it into the asymptotic cone – and run different parts of the argument using these different group structures. Of crucial importance is that we are able to find a certain subgroup of  $\Gamma$  that is a subgroup of  $M$  with respect to both group structures simultaneously, and which can act as the bridge between the different parts of the argument.

Let us now give a more detailed overview. For ease of comparison, let us restate Theorem 1.1 in a slightly different form, more along the lines of Penrose's work and the work of Bollobás, Janson and Riordan we mentioned briefly above. Given a transitive graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a parameter  $\lambda \geq 0$ , for each  $r$  such that  $\beta_G(r) \geq \lambda$  we define a random graph  $G_{r,\lambda}$  with vertex set  $V$  by connecting vertices  $u, v \in V$  by an edge with probability  $\lambda/\beta_G(r)$  if  $d_G(u, v) \leq r$  and with probability 0 otherwise, with the events that different edges are present independent. Equivalently,  $G_{r,\lambda}$  is  $G_r$  with a Bernoulli- $(\lambda/\beta_G(r))$  edge configuration. We will often call  $r$  the *scale* and  $\lambda$  the *degree parameter* of this model, although the expected degree of a vertex of  $G_{r,\lambda}$  is actually  $\frac{\beta_G(r)-1}{\beta_G(r)}\lambda$ , not  $\lambda$ . In light of (1.1), Theorem 1.1 is then easily seen to be equivalent to the following result.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $G$  be a transitive graph with superlinear polynomial growth. For any fixed degree parameter  $\lambda > 1$ , there exists  $R > 0$  such that if  $r \geq R$  then  $G_{r,\lambda}$  has an infinite component with probability 1.*

In proving Theorem 1.2, we make use of a theorem of Trofimov [41] showing that an arbitrary transitive graph of polynomial growth can be approximated by a Cayley graph in a certain precise sense. As such, a significant proportion of our proof of Theorem 1.2 takes place in the class of Cayley graphs, so it will be convenient to introduce some notation specialized to that setting. Given a group  $\Gamma$  with a finite symmetric generating set  $S$ , we define the *word length*  $\|g\|_S$  of an element  $g \in \Gamma$  to be the minimal integer  $n \geq 0$  such that  $g = s_1 \cdots s_n$  for some  $s_i \in S$ . The *word metric*  $d_S$  on  $\Gamma$  is then defined by  $d_S(g, h) = \|g^{-1}h\|_S$ . The *Cayley graph*  $G(\Gamma, S)$  has vertex set  $\Gamma$  and edge set  $\{(g, h) \in G \times G : g \in hS, g \neq h\}$ . Note that the graph distance between two vertices  $g, h$  of  $G(\Gamma, S)$  is then exactly  $d_S(g, h)$ . Given  $g \in \Gamma$  and  $r \geq 0$ , write  $B_{\|\cdot\|_S}(g, r) = \{h \in \Gamma : d_S(g, h) \leq r\}$ , the ball of radius  $r$  centred at  $g$  in  $G(\Gamma, S)$ .

Given a parameter  $\lambda \geq 0$ , for each  $r$  such that  $\#B_{\|\cdot\|_S}(\text{id}, r) \geq \lambda$  we define a random graph  $G_{r,\lambda}^{(S)}(\Gamma)$  with vertex set  $\Gamma$  by connecting elements  $g, h$  by an edge with probability  $\lambda/\#B_{\|\cdot\|_S}(\text{id}, r)$

if  $d_S(g, h) \leq r$  and with probability 0 otherwise, with the events that different edges are present independent.

If  $G$  is a transitive graph of polynomial growth then the Cayley graph approximating  $G$  given by Trofimov's theorem also has polynomial growth. A celebrated theorem of Gromov [20] then implies that the group underlying this Cayley graph is *virtually nilpotent*, i.e. has a nilpotent subgroup of finite index. It is a standard fact (proven in Lemma 6.5 below) that we may assume this nilpotent subgroup to be torsion-free, and it turns out that a significant step on the way to proving Theorem 1.2 is to prove the theorem in the special case of a Cayley graph of this torsion-free nilpotent group, as follows.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a torsion-free nilpotent group that is not isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}$ , and let  $S$  be a finite symmetric generating set. For any fixed degree parameter  $\lambda > 1$ , there exists  $R > 0$  such that if  $r \geq R$  then  $G_{r,\lambda}^{(S)}(\Gamma)$  has an infinite component with probability 1.*

It follows from Gromov's theorem (or an earlier result of Justin [28]) that the condition  $\Gamma \not\cong \mathbb{Z}$  appearing in Theorem 1.3 is equivalent in the class of torsion-free nilpotent groups to the condition that the growth is superlinear, so Theorem 1.3 really is a special case of Theorem 1.2.

Our approach to proving Theorem 1.3 centres on an adaptation of an alternative proof of Penrose's result given by Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [8] using their earlier work on inhomogeneous random graphs [7]. Recall that we fix some norm  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and then for each  $r > 0$  we consider a graph with vertex set  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  joined by an edge if and only if  $\|x - y\| \leq r$ . Let us call the resulting graph  $X_r$ . Given  $\lambda \geq 0$ , and writing  $\beta_r = \#\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : 0 < \|x\| \leq r\}$ , we then define a random subgraph  $X_{r,\lambda}$  of  $X_r$  to be  $X_r$  with a Bernoulli- $(\lambda/\beta_r)$  edge configuration. Penrose's result states that for all  $\lambda > 1$  the graph  $X_{r,\lambda}$  has an infinite connected component with high probability as  $r \rightarrow 1$ .

One can equivalently consider the graph  $Z_r$  with vertex set  $\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $x, y \in \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}^d$  joined by an edge if and only if  $\|x - y\| \leq 1$ , which is clearly isomorphic to  $X_r$ , and a random subgraph  $Z_{r,\lambda}$  defined to be  $Z_r$  with a Bernoulli- $(\lambda/\beta_r)$  edge configuration. On the one hand, this restatement of the problem is entirely trivial, but on the other it is also rather suggestive of what turns out to be Bollobás, Janson and Riordan's approach. A key point is that as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , and the lattices  $\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}^d$  become correspondingly finer, these lattices can be used to estimate the measure of any sufficiently 'nice' subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ : writing  $\mu$  for Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we have  $\#(\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}^d \cap A)/r^d \rightarrow \mu(A)$  for any measurable subset  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\mu(\partial A) = 0$ . It turns out that this is exactly the condition that is required to apply Bollobás, Janson and Riordan's earlier results to certain induced subgraphs of  $Z_r$ . In particular, a special case of these results then implies that if  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is a box of the form  $B = \prod_{i=1}^d [a_i, b_i]$ ,  $B_r$  is the subgraph of  $Z_r$  induced by the vertices  $\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}^d \cap B$ , and we define a random graph  $B_{r,\lambda}$  to be  $B_r$  with a Bernoulli- $(\lambda/\beta_r)$  edge configuration, then with high probability as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  for fixed  $B$  the largest connected component of  $B_{r,\lambda}$  has size  $\Omega(\#(\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}^d \cap B))$ , and the second largest component has size  $o(\#(\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}^d \cap B))$ .

For simplicity, let us sketch how this can be used to derive Penrose's result in the case  $d = 2$ ; the cases  $d > 2$  are similar, just more notationally cumbersome. We apply these results with boxes  $B(m, n) = [m, m+1] \times [n, n+1]$ , which we will call 'square boxes';  $H(m, n) = [m, m+2] \times [n, n+1]$ , which we will call 'horizontal boxes'; and  $V(m, n) = [m, m+1] \times [n, n+2]$ , which we will call 'vertical boxes'. For large enough  $r$ . The idea is then to tessellate  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with the square boxes  $B(m, n)$ ,  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and compare Bernoulli- $(\lambda/\beta_r)$  percolation on  $Z_r$  to a percolation model on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  in which the edge connecting  $(m, n)$  to  $(m+1, n)$  is open if and only if  $B(m, n)_{r,\lambda}$  and  $B(m+1, n)_{r,\lambda}$  each contain

a component of linear size  $and H(m, n)_{r, \lambda}$  contains at most one component of linear size; and the edge connecting  $(m, n)$  to  $(m, n+1)$  is open if and only if  $B(m, n)_{r, \lambda}$  and  $B(m+1, n)_{r, \lambda}$  each contain a component of linear size  $and V(m, n)_{r, \lambda}$  contains at most one component of linear size. Note that the vertical edges are all identically distributed, as are the horizontal edges. Note also that the edges are not independent, but that the model is *2-independent*, meaning that each edge is independent from those edges that are at graph distance at least 2.

To see how these two percolation models can be compared, note that in the event that two open edges of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  are incident at  $(m, n)$ , say the edges to  $(m+\delta_1, n+\delta_2)$  and  $(m+\varepsilon_1, n+\varepsilon_2)$ , the component of linear size in  $B(m, n)_{r, \lambda}$  must be connected to the components of linear size in  $B(m+\delta_1, n+\delta_2)_{r, \lambda}$  and  $B(m+\varepsilon_1, n+\varepsilon_2)_{r, \lambda}$ . In particular, this means that if  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  has an infinite component then so does  $Z_{r, \lambda}$ . On the other hand, Bollobás, Janson and Riordan's results imply that the probability of an edge of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  being open in this percolation model converges to 1 as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , and a famous result of Liggett, Schonmann and Stacey [30] about  $K$ -independent percolation measures then implies that  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  has an infinite component with probability 1 for large enough  $r$ .

In order to adapt this argument to the nilpotent setting of Theorem 1.3, we first need an analogue of the embedding of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  into  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . A natural candidate is given by a classical result of Malcev [32], who proved that  $\Gamma$  embeds as a lattice in a nilpotent Lie group  $G$ , called the *Malcev closure* of  $\Gamma$ . However, the Malcev closure does not in general admit any natural rescaling function, so there is no natural analogue of the lattices  $\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}^d$  considered by Bollobás, Janson and Riordan. Another candidate is the *asymptotic cone*  $G_\infty$  of  $\Gamma$ , defined by Gromov [20], which is a Lie group that is a *Gromov–Hausdorff limit* (see [21]) of the sequence of metric spaces  $(\Gamma, d_S/n)$ . Pansu [36] described  $G_\infty$  and endowed it with a metric  $d_{CC}$  now called the *Pansu limit metric*. This structure captures the asymptotic properties of  $\Gamma$ , and unlike the Malcev closure admits a rescaling function  $\delta_r : G_\infty \rightarrow G_\infty$  for each  $r > 0$ , called a *dilation*. However,  $\Gamma$  is not necessarily a subgroup of  $G_\infty$ , so this does not quite work either.

To overcome these issues we adapt an idea of Breuillard and Le Donne [11], who treat  $G$  and  $G_\infty$  as one manifold with two different group structures, with operations  $*$  and  $*_\infty$  respectively, and treat  $\Gamma$  as a discrete set in this manifold. We then define a new random graph  $G^{r, \lambda}$  with vertex set  $\Gamma$ , and vertices  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  joined by an edge with some suitable probability  $p = p(r, \lambda)$  if  $d_{CC}(id, \gamma_2^{-1} * \gamma_1) \leq r$ , and probability 0 otherwise. We then consider the intersection of this graph with some suitable region  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $G$ , whose role is analogous to that of the square boxes from the Bollobás–Janson–Riordan argument.

However, where Bollobás, Janson and Riordan are able to tessellate  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with isometric copies of the box  $B(0, 0)$  indexed by the elements of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , there is no analogous tessellation of  $G$  by isometric copies of  $\mathcal{S}$  indexed by elements of  $\Gamma$ . One key reason for this is that the metric  $d_{CC}$  is not  $*$ -invariant. We overcome this by finding a subgroup  $H$  of  $\Gamma$  isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  that is also a subgroup of  $G_\infty$ . This still leaves another issue, however, which is that the translates of  $\mathcal{S}$  by elements of  $H$  do not fit together as nicely as the boxes  $B(m, n)$  in the Bollobás–Janson–Riordan argument, in that the different translates overlap one another. To ensure that this does not ruin the argument, we must define the region  $\mathcal{S}$  carefully so that these overlaps are bounded, meaning that we can use them to define a  $K$ -dependent percolation on  $H$  for some fixed  $K$ .

Once we have Theorem 1.3, we then use Trofimov's theorem to extend to Theorem 1.1. More precisely, Trofimov's theorem says that there is a quotient  $G'$  of  $G$  that admits a free action by a finitely generated torsion-free nilpotent group  $\Gamma$ , and our aim is to compare spread-out percolation

on  $G$  to spread-out percolation on a Cayley graph of  $\Gamma$  defined with respect to a certain natural generating set.

Whilst this is a conceptually obvious thing to try, there are some further technical obstacles to overcome. One challenge is that, although a famous result of Benjamini and Schramm [4, Theorem 1] allows us to compare Bernoulli- $p$  percolation on  $G$  to Bernoulli- $p$  percolation on  $G'$ , this is of limited use in our context, since spread-out percolation with parameter  $\lambda$  at scale  $r$  corresponds to very different values of  $p$  in Bernoulli percolation on  $G'$  or on  $G$ . There is a similar issue in comparing spread-out percolation on  $G'$  to spread-out percolation on  $\Gamma$ .

It turns out that we can adapt Benjamini and Schramm's argument to overcome this issue, but at the expense of comparing spread-out percolation at scale  $r$  on  $G$  to spread-out percolation at some other scale  $r'$  on  $G'$ . We then need to compare spread-out percolation at different scales on  $G'$ , for which we use a quantitative version of a result of Tessera [39, Theorem 4] comparing the sizes of balls of different radii in transitive graphs of polynomial growth.

*Remark.* The results of Penrose and Bollobás, Janson and Riordan are actually rather more general than what we have described, in that instead of considering the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  one can consider an arbitrary symmetric probability distribution  $\phi$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and put an edge between  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  with probability

$$\frac{\lambda\phi(x-y)}{\sum_{z \in \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \phi(z)}.$$

The version we stated above is of course the special case of this in which  $\phi$  is the characteristic function of the closed unit ball of the norm.

In light of the issues just discussed concerning the embedding of  $\Gamma$  into its Malcev closure, there does not appear to be a natural analogue of this generalization in the setting of Theorem 1.3. There certainly does not appear to be any such natural analogue in the setting of Theorem 1.1.

**1.2. Convergence to Haar measure.** A particular ingredient we need in order for our proof of Theorem 1.3 to work is an analogue of the fact that  $\#(\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}^d \cap A)/r^d \rightarrow \mu(A)$  for any measurable subset  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\mu(\partial A) = 0$ , which recall was crucial in allowing Bollobás, Janson and Riordan to apply their work on inhomogeneous random graphs to Penrose's result. This leads us to prove a purely deterministic theorem about the Haar measure on the Malcev closure  $G$  of the torsion-tree nilpotent group  $\Gamma$  that could be of independent interest, so we introduce it briefly here.

For the statement, we need to recall a result of Pansu [36] asserting that there exists a non-negative integer  $d_\Gamma$  – the *degree of polynomial growth* – and a constant  $c_S > 0$  – the *coefficient of polynomial growth* – such that  $\#B_{\|\cdot\|_S}(\text{id}, n) = c_S n^{d_\Gamma} + o(n^{d_\Gamma})$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  (see Proposition 2.2 below for a more precise estimate of the error term due to Breuillard and Le Donne). We also endow  $G$  with the Haar measure  $\mathcal{H}$  normalized to have volume 1 on the unit ball with respect to the Pansu limit metric. A subset  $A \subset G$  is called an  $\mathcal{H}$ -*continuity set* if it is  $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable and  $\mathcal{H}(\partial A) = 0$ .

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $S$  be a finite symmetric generating set for  $\Gamma$ , and suppose  $A \subset G$  is a bounded  $\mathcal{H}$ -continuity set. Then*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap A)}{c_S r^{d_\Gamma}} = \mathcal{H}(A),$$

where  $c_S$  is the coefficient of polynomial growth.

A measure theoretic way to interpret Theorem 1.4 is the following. Define on  $G$  the discrete measure  $\nu_r$  that has mass  $1/c_S r^{d_\Gamma}$  on the elements of  $\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma)$ , and suppose  $A$  is a bounded  $\mathcal{H}$ -continuity subset of  $G$ . Then  $\nu_r(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(A)$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . This means that if we restrict to a bounded subset  $\nu_r$  converges weakly to  $\mathcal{H}$  (see [6]).

**1.3. Organization of the paper.** In Section 2, we provide a description of the constructions on nilpotent groups, and known results about the metrics and the asymptotics of those groups. In Section 3 we prove asymptotic properties of a torsion-free nilpotent group, including the proof of Theorem 1.4. In Section 4 we provide a brief summary of the results we need on percolation and from Bollobás, Janson and Riordan's work on inhomogeneous random graphs. In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.3, and in Section 6 we deduce our main result, Theorem 1.2.

**Acknowledgements.** We thank Agelos Georgakopoulos for introducing us to the works of Penrose and Bollobás–Janson–Riordan, and for pointing out their potential connection to his work on percolation dimension. We also thank Anders Karlsson for helpful suggestions, Yago Moreno Alonso for corrections to a draft, and Wolfgang Woess for useful discussions. PS thanks Emmanuel Breuillard for hosting him at the University of Cambridge, and the School of Mathematics at the University of Bristol for their hospitality during two visits.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES ON NILPOTENT GROUPS

**2.1. Lattices in nilpotent Lie groups.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a group. If  $\Gamma^{(s)} \neq \Gamma^{(s+1)} = 1$ , then  $\Gamma$  is called  $s$ -step nilpotent. If moreover  $\Gamma$  is finitely generated, the quotients  $\Gamma^{(i)}/\Gamma^{(i+1)}$  are Abelian groups, we denote  $d_i$  their rank. The constant  $d_\Gamma$  given by the Bass-Guivarc'h formula  $d_\Gamma = \sum_i d_i$  is the growth degree of the group (see [22]), i.e. if  $S$  is a finite, symmetric set of generators containing the identity, then there are  $a, b, c > 0$  such that  $ar^{d_\Gamma} < \#|S^r| < br^{d_\Gamma}$  for every  $r > c$ .

Let  $\Gamma$  be a finitely generated, torsion free, nilpotent group, there exists a connected, simply connected, nilpotent Lie group  $G$  such that  $\Gamma$  is isomorphic to a lattice in  $G$ , we call  $G$  the Malcev closure of  $\Gamma$  (see [38, 32]). A discrete subgroup  $\Gamma < G$  is called a lattice in  $G$  if  $G/\Gamma$  carries a finite invariant measure, in this case that  $G$  is nilpotent,  $\Gamma$  being a lattice is equivalent to  $G/\Gamma$  being compact (see [38]). From now on all nilpotent Lie groups will be assumed connected and simply connected.

Let  $G$  be a nilpotent Lie group. We denote by  $\mathfrak{g}$  the Lie algebra of  $G$ . The descending central series of  $\mathfrak{g}$  is defined as  $\mathfrak{g}^{(i+1)} = [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}^{(i)}] = \mathbb{R}\text{-span}\{[X, Y] : X \in \mathfrak{g}, Y \in \mathfrak{g}^{(i)}\}$ , since  $\mathfrak{g}^{(i)}$  is the Lie algebra of  $G^{(i)}$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, s$  (see [24]), then  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a nilpotent Lie algebra. There exists a basis  $\{X_1, \dots, X_d\}$  for  $\mathfrak{g}$  such that  $\mathfrak{h}_n = \mathbb{R}\text{-span}\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is an ideal of  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}_{n_i} = \mathfrak{g}^{(i)}$ , for every  $i = 1, \dots, s$ , this base is a strong Malcev basis for the descending central series (see [14]).

The exponential map  $\exp : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow G$  is defined globally and it is an analytic diffeomorphism, moreover the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula (BCH formula, in abbreviation)

$$\exp X * \exp Y = \exp\left(X + Y + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y] + \frac{1}{12}[X, [X, Y]] - \frac{1}{12}[Y, [X, Y]] \dots\right)$$

holds for every  $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$  (see [14]), by  $*$  we denote the group product in  $G$ . We denote  $\log := \exp^{-1}$  and  $X \bullet Y := \log(\exp X * \exp Y)$  for every  $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ .

There are two coordinate systems that Malcev endowed  $G$  with, the first one is the exponential coordinates,  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow G$ , defined as  $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \exp(x_1 X_1 + \dots + x_d X_d)$  for  $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , also called canonical coordinates of the first kind. The second one is  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow G$ , defined as

$\Psi(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \exp(x_1 X_1) * \dots * \exp(x_d X_d)$  called strong Malcev coordinates or canonical coordinates of second kind.

We will identify  $\mathfrak{g}$  with  $\mathbb{R}^d$  through the linear isomorphism  $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \mapsto x_1 X_1 + \dots + x_d X_d$ , we will abuse notation and write elements of  $\mathfrak{g}$  as vectors  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ , then the exponential coordinates will be written as  $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \exp X$ . There is always a Malcev basis for the descending central series such that  $\Gamma = \{\Psi(\vec{v}) : \vec{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$  (see [34]), this base is called strong Malcev basis for the descending central series strongly based on  $\Gamma$ .

Both  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  push forward the Lebesgue measure from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to a Haar measure on  $G$  (see [14]), moreover the following relation holds; if  $\mu$  is the pushforward from  $\Phi$  and  $\nu$  is the pushforward from  $\Psi$  then

$$\nu = |\det \mathbb{J}_{(\Psi^{-1} \circ \Phi)}(0)| \mu.$$

**2.2. Carnot groups.** We will describe the structure of a Carnot group, a lot of the material of this section is based on a survey on Carnot groups [16]. Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a Lie algebra, we say that  $\mathfrak{g}$  admits a stratification, if as a vector space it can be decomposed as  $\mathfrak{g} = V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_s$ , for  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that  $V_s \neq \{0\}$ ,  $[V_1, V_j] = V_{j+1}$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq s-1$  and  $[V_1, V_s] = \{0\}$ . The vector subspaces  $V_j \subset \mathfrak{g}$  are called strata of the stratification. If there is associated a fixed stratification for  $\mathfrak{g}$  then the Lie algebra is called stratified. By definition a stratified Lie algebra is nilpotent of nilpotency step  $s$ . The first stratum  $V_1$  determines the stratification and different stratifications are linearly isomorphic. Let  $G$  be a connected simply connected Lie group, we say that  $G$  is stratified (admits stratification) if the associated Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  is stratified (admits stratification correspondingly).

A Carnot group is a stratified Lie group enhanced with a subFinsler structure with distribution induced by the first stratum of the associated stratification. We will provide the definition of a subFinsler space, but in order to keep the notions as simple as possible, we will continue in the setting of a connected, simply connected Lie group. Though the general definition of a subFinsler manifold does not require for the manifold to have a Lie group structure.

Let  $V \subset \mathfrak{g}$  be a linear subspace and fix  $\|\cdot\|$  a norm on it, then  $V$  determines a distribution  $\Delta$ , meaning a subbundle, of the tangent bundle of  $G$ . For every  $g \in G$  we obtain  $\Delta_g := (L_g)^* V$ , where  $L_g$  is the left translation on  $G$  and  $F^*$  is the pull back operator of a diffeomorphism  $F$ . The norm on  $V$  induces a norm on  $\Delta_g$ ,  $\|X_g\| = \|(L_g)^* X_e\| := \|X_e\|$ , for every  $X_g \in \Delta_g$  and  $g \in G$ . If the distribution  $\Delta$  is bracket generating, meaning that the Lie algebra generated, with respect to the Lie bracket, by the vector fields  $\Gamma(\Delta)$  is the whole algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ , then we call  $(G, \Delta, \|\cdot\|)$  subFinsler manifold. If the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  is induced from an inner product, then it is called subRiemannian manifold.

The bracket generating distribution  $\Delta$  is called horizontal and an absolutely continuous curve  $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow G$  is also called horizontal or admissible if its derivative  $\dot{\gamma}(t) \in \Delta_{\gamma(t)}$  for almost all  $t \in [a, b]$ . Every such a curve can be associated with a length  $\text{Length}_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma) = \int_a^b \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\| dt$ , since  $\|\dot{\gamma}(t)\|$  is defined almost for every  $t$ . A subFinsler manifold is endowed with a distance function, for every two points  $g_1, g_2 \in G$  the distance is defined as  $d_{CC}(g_1, g_2) = \inf\{\text{Length}_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma) : \gamma \text{ admissible curve from } g_1 \text{ to } g_2\}$ . It is called Carnot-Carathéodory distance or subFinsler distance.

From Chow's Theorem (see [35]) the Carnot-Carathéodory metric is finite, induces the manifold topology and it is geodesic, i.e. that for every  $g_1, g_2 \in G$  there is an admissible  $\gamma$  from  $g_1$  to  $g_2$  such that  $d_{CC}(\gamma(t_1), \gamma(t_2)) = |t_1 - t_2|$  for every  $t_1, t_2 \in [a, b]$ . If  $\gamma$  is an admissible curve, then  $g\dot{\gamma}(t) \in \Delta_{g\gamma(t)}$  and  $\text{Length}_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma) = \text{Length}_{\|\cdot\|}(g\gamma)$  since  $\|g\dot{\gamma}\| = \|\dot{\gamma}\|$  by definition,  $d_{CC}(gg_1, gg_2) = d_{CC}(g_1, g_2)$ .

Let  $G$  be a Carnot group with Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ , it can be proved that  $\mathfrak{g}^{(k)} = V_k \oplus \dots \oplus V_s$  for every  $k = 1, \dots, s$ , where  $V_i$  are the strata of the associated stratification. Indeed one needs to observe that  $[V_i, V_j] \subset V_{i+j}$  for every  $i, j = 1, \dots, s$ , setting  $V_k = \{0\}$  for  $k > s$ .

*Remark.* Every nilpotent Lie algebra could be associated with a graded Lie algebra but the linear isomorphism defined above does not necessarily extend to a Lie algebra isomorphism, it does extend only when the group is stratified.

Dilations. For every  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  we set  $\delta_\lambda^{\mathfrak{g}} = \lambda^i X$  for every  $X \in V_i$  and  $i = 1, \dots, s$ . This map extends linearly to a map  $\delta_\lambda^{\mathfrak{g}} : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$  called algebra dilation. If  $\lambda \neq 0$ , then  $\delta_\lambda$  is an automorphism of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Since  $G$  is connected and simply connected, every  $\phi$  Lie algebra automorphism induces a unique  $F$  Lie group automorphism, such that  $dF = \phi$  and  $\exp \circ dF = F \circ \exp$ . For every  $\lambda \neq 0$  the induced from the dilations automorphisms  $\delta_\lambda^G : G \rightarrow G$  are called intrinsic dilations and they satisfy  $\exp \circ \delta_\lambda^G = \delta_\lambda^{\mathfrak{g}} \circ \exp$ . Dilations could be equivalently defined as  $\delta_\lambda^G(g) := \exp \circ \delta_\lambda^{\mathfrak{g}} \circ \exp^{-1}(g)$  for every  $g \in G$ . Some authors use the notation  $\log := \exp^{-1} : G \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ , moreover for simplicity we will write  $\delta_\lambda$  in both cases.

Let  $G$  be a Carnot group and  $\delta_\lambda$  the group dilations, then for any  $X \in V_1$  we have defined  $\delta_\lambda(X) = \lambda X \in V_1$ , this means that  $\|\delta_\lambda(X)\| = \lambda \|X\|$ . Hence for any admissible curve  $\gamma$  that connects  $g_1$  with  $g_2$  in  $G$ , we obtain that  $\delta_\lambda \circ \gamma$  connects  $\delta_\lambda(g_1)$  with  $\delta_\lambda(g_2)$  and  $\frac{d}{dt}(\delta_\lambda^G \circ \gamma)(t) = d\delta_\lambda^G \circ \dot{\gamma}(t) = \delta_\lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}(\dot{\gamma}(t)) = \lambda \dot{\gamma}(t) \in V_1$ . Therefore  $\delta_\lambda \circ \gamma$  is admissible and  $\text{Length}_{\|\cdot\|}(\delta_\lambda \circ \gamma) = \lambda \text{Length}_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma)$ , this implies that  $d_{CC}(\delta_\lambda(g_1), \delta_\lambda(g_2)) = \lambda d_{CC}(g_1, g_2)$  and  $B_{CC}(g, r) = \delta_r(B_{CC}(g, 1))$ . Lastly from the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula (2.1) and the linearity of  $\delta_\lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}$ , we obtain that  $\delta_\lambda(g_1)\delta_\lambda(g_2) = \delta_\lambda(g_1g_2)$ , for every  $g_1, g_2 \in G$ . We will denote  $B_\infty := B_{CC}(\text{id}, 1)$ .

**2.3. Graded algebra.** We will provide a description of the graded algebra, we adapt material from [11] in our setting. If  $G$  is a connected, simply connected nilpotent Lie group, even when it is not stratifiable, there is a stratified Lie algebra arising from its Lie algebra. Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be the Lie algebra of  $G$  and  $\mathfrak{g}^{(n)} = [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}^{(n-1)}]$  its descending series. The direct sum  $\mathfrak{g}_\infty := \bigoplus_{i=1}^s \mathfrak{g}^{(i)} / \mathfrak{g}^{(i+1)}$  endowed with a Lie bracket  $[\cdot, \cdot]_\infty : \mathfrak{g}_\infty \times \mathfrak{g}_\infty \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_\infty$  obtained from the following relations; let  $[X]_i \in \mathfrak{g}^{(i)} / \mathfrak{g}^{(i+1)}$  and  $[Y]_j \in \mathfrak{g}^{(j)} / \mathfrak{g}^{(j+1)}$ , then  $[[X]_i, [Y]_j]_\infty = [[X, Y]]_{i+j} \in \mathfrak{g}^{(i+j)} / \mathfrak{g}^{(i+j+1)}$ , is a stratified Lie algebra called the graded algebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The relations are well defined and determine uniquely a stratified Lie structure on  $\mathfrak{g}_\infty$ . If the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  is not stratifiable then obviously  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_\infty$  are different Lie structures. The stratified Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}_\infty$  has an associated connected, simply connected nilpotent Lie group  $G_\infty$  called the graded group of  $\mathfrak{g}$ .

Let  $\{X_1, \dots, X_d\}$  be a strong Malcev basis for the descending series  $\mathfrak{g} \supset \mathfrak{g}^{(2)} \supset \dots \supset \mathfrak{g}^{(s)}$ . For every  $j = 1, \dots, s$   $\mathfrak{g}^{(j)} = \mathfrak{g}^{(j+1)} \oplus \langle X_{m_{s-j}+1}, \dots, X_{m_{s-j+1}} \rangle$ . Set  $V_j := \langle X_{m_{s-j}+1}, \dots, X_{m_{s-j+1}} \rangle$ , as a vector space, the projection  $p_{j+1} : \mathfrak{g}^{(j)} = \mathfrak{g}^{(j)} / \mathfrak{g}^{(j+1)}$  is restricted to a linear isomorphism  $L_j : V_j \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^{(j)} / \mathfrak{g}^{(j+1)}$ , which consecutively extends to  $L$  a linear isomorphism  $L : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_\infty$ .

The exponential map  $\exp : \mathfrak{g}_\infty \rightarrow G_\infty$  is a diffeomorphism and so it is the linear map  $L^{-1} : \mathfrak{g}_\infty \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ , thus the composition  $G_\infty \xrightarrow{\log} \mathfrak{g}_\infty \xrightarrow{L^{-1}} \mathfrak{g} \xrightarrow{\exp} G$  is a diffeomorphism. This map is not necessarily group homomorphism and if the group  $G$  is not stratifiable then it is certainly not. Through this map though we can endow  $G$  with a new product rule from  $G_\infty$ , we denote it by  $*_\infty$ ,  $\mathfrak{g}$  correspondingly receive a new Lie bracket  $[\cdot, \cdot]_\infty$  and a new product  $\bullet_\infty$ . We denote the induced canonical coordinates of second kind by  $\Psi_\infty : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow G$ .

Let  $\Gamma$  be a discrete, torsion free, nilpotent group and  $G$  its Malcev closure. When we follow this procedure for the stratification of  $G$ , we choose  $\{X_1, \dots, X_d\}$  to be a strong Malcev basis that is

strongly based on  $\Gamma$ . To clarify things  $\Gamma$  is a subgroup of  $(G, *)$  but  $\Gamma$  is not in general a subgroup of  $(G, *_\infty)$ ;  $\Psi(\mathbb{Z}^d) = \Gamma$  but  $\Psi_\infty(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  is not even necessarily a group.

**Pansu limit metric.** We will present a description of the Pansu limit metric [36], thus of the asymptotic cone. Let  $S$  be a symmetric set of generators for  $\Gamma$ . From the BCH formula (2.1), the following map  $\pi : G \xrightarrow{\log} \mathfrak{g} \xrightarrow{pr} \mathfrak{g}/[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] \rightarrow V_1$  is an homomorphism,  $\pi(g_1 * g_2) = \pi(g_1) + \pi(g_2)$ . Then  $\pi(\Gamma)$  is a lattice in  $V_1$  and  $\pi(S)$  generates it. We can endow  $\mathfrak{g}/[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$  with a norm  $\|\cdot\|_Q$  such that the unit ball  $Q$  of the norm is the convex hull of  $\pi(S)$ .

Since  $G$  endowed with  $*_\infty$  is a stratified Lie group with the first stratum of its Lie algebra being  $\mathfrak{g}/[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ , the triple  $(G, V_1, \|\cdot\|_Q)$  induces  $d_{CC}$ , a Carnot-Carathéodory metric on  $G$ , called the Pansu limit metric and  $G_\infty$  is a Carnot group. We just mention that  $G_\infty$  endowed with this metric is the asymptotic cone of  $\Gamma$  with respect to the word metric arising from  $S$ . This metric is well comparable to the word metric in the sense that [36] for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  that  $\|\gamma\|_S \rightarrow \infty$  the limit  $\frac{\|\gamma\|_S}{d_{CC}(e, \gamma)} \rightarrow 1$ .

Since the graded algebra  $\mathfrak{g}_\infty$  is stratified, we can define dilations on it and through the diffeomorphism pull back the dilations on  $G$ . For every  $\lambda > 0$  the dilations  $\delta_\lambda^{\mathfrak{g}} : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$  satisfy the relations  $\delta_\lambda(X) = \lambda^j X$  for  $X \in V_j$ , specifically  $\delta_\lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}(X_{i_j}) = \lambda^j X_{i_j}$  for every  $i_j = m_{s-j+1}, \dots, m_{s-j+1}$ , then  $\delta_\lambda^G := \exp \circ \delta_\lambda \circ \log$ . Dilations do not behave well with the original group structure or the original Lie bracket, but this is natural because they are pulled back from  $G_\infty$ .

From a refinement of Pansu's construction, Breuillard and Le Donne [11] proved that:

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a torsion free, finitely generated, nilpotent group and  $S$  a finite symmetric set of generators for  $\Gamma$ . If  $\|\gamma\|_S \rightarrow \infty$ , then*

$$(2.1) \quad |d_{CC}(\text{id}, \gamma) - \|\gamma\|_S| = O(d_{CC}(\text{id}, \gamma)^{\alpha_s})$$

where  $\alpha_s = 1 - \frac{2}{3s}$  and  $s$  is the nilpotency step.

They used this bound to provide estimates for the size of the ball:

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a torsion free, finitely generated, nilpotent group and  $S$  a finite symmetric set of generators for  $\Gamma$ . Then*

$$(2.2) \quad \#(B_{\|\cdot\|_S}(\text{id}, n)) = c_S n^{d_\Gamma} + O(n^{\beta_s})$$

where  $\beta_s = d_\Gamma - \frac{2}{3s}$  and  $c_S$  is a constant that depends on the set of generators.

### 3. CONVERGENCE TO HAAR MEASURE

In this section we prove Theorem 1.4. We begin by defining a non-uniform rescaling process in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that it will be pushed-forward to the dilations through the Malcev coordinates.

Let  $\mu$  be the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . For every  $\lambda > 0$  set  $\delta_\lambda : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be the function  $(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \vec{x}_n) \mapsto (\lambda \vec{x}_1, \lambda^2 \vec{x}_2, \dots, \lambda^n \vec{x}_n)$ , we view  $\mathbb{R}^d$  as  $V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_n$  and write  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  as  $(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n)$  with  $\vec{x}_i \in V_i$ . We define  $d_i = \dim V_i$  and  $d' = \sum_{i=1}^n i d_i$ , then  $d = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i$ . Recall that  $A$  is a  $\mu$ -continuity set if the boundary has measure  $\mu(\partial A) = 0$  and the boundary  $\partial A$  is defined as the elements in the closure of  $A$  that do not belong in the interior of  $A$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *For every  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  bounded  $\mu$ -continuity set,*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\delta_{1/r}(\mathbb{Z}^d) \cap A)}{r^{d'}} = \mu(A).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$ , we can find a  $U_1$  open set such that  $\mu(U_1) \leq \epsilon$  and  $\partial A \subset U_1$ , since  $\mu(\partial A) = 0$ . Also from completeness of the Lebesgue measure there exists a compact set  $K \subset \text{int}(A)$  with  $\mu(A) \leq \mu(K) + \epsilon$ . There are  $U_2$  and  $U_3$  such that  $K \subsetneq U_2$ ,  $(\text{int}(A))^c \subsetneq U_3$  and  $U_2 \cap U_3 = \emptyset$ , this is from the  $T_4$  property.

Let  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , write  $x = (x_1^{(1)}, \dots, x_{d_{n-1}}^{(n-1)}, x_1^{(n)}, \dots, x_{d_n}^{(n)})$ , where  $\vec{x}_i = (x_1^{(i)}, \dots, x_{d_i}^{(i)})$  and set  $C_x^k := [x_1^{(1)}, x_1^{(1)} + 2^{-k}] \times \dots \times [x_j^{(i)}, x_j^{(i)} + 2^{-ik}] \times \dots \times [x_{d_n}^{(n)}, x_{d_n}^{(n)} + 2^{-nk}]$  and  $D_x^k := (x_1^{(1)} - 2^{-k}, x_1^{(1)} + 2^{-k}) \times \dots \times (x_{d_n}^{(n)} - 2^{-nk}, x_{d_n}^{(n)} + 2^{-nk})$ . For every element  $u \in U_2$  there exists  $B_E(u, r) \subset U_2$  (the Euclidean ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ). From the density of dyadic numbers we can find a  $k > 0$  and  $x \in \delta_{2^{-k}}(\mathbb{Z})$  such that  $u \in D_x^k \subset B_E(u, r)$ .

We cover  $U_2$  with  $D_x^k \subset U_2$  then  $K$  is also covered, which is compact, therefore it has a finite cover  $\cup D_x^k$ , without loss of generality we can assume that  $k$  is the same for all  $x$ . Every  $D_x^k \subset U_3^c$  since  $D_x^k \subset U_2$  and therefore  $\overline{D_x^k} \subset U_3^c$ . We can write  $\overline{D_x^k}$  as a union of  $C_y^k$  that have foreign interiors. Note that  $x \in \delta_{2^{-k}}(\mathbb{Z}) \cap A$  and  $\mu(C_x^k) = 2^{-d'k}$ . Therefore we obtain the inequality

$$\mu(A) - \epsilon \leq \mu(K) \leq \mu(\cup C_x^k) \leq \frac{\#(\delta_{2^{-k}}(\mathbb{Z}) \cap A)}{2^{-d'k}}.$$

We want to make this inequality valid for all  $r > 0$ , not only for powers of 2. Set the cardinality of the cover as  $N_1 := \#(\delta_{2^{-k}}(\mathbb{Z}) \cap (\cup C_x^k))$ , for every  $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and  $x \in \delta_{r^{-1}}(\mathbb{Z})$  we define the sets  $E_x^r := [x_1^{(1)}, x_1^{(1)} + r^{-1}] \times \dots \times [x_{d_n}^{(n)}, x_{d_n}^{(n)} + r^{-n}]$ . We can focus on the case of  $r > 2^k$ . Every  $C_x^k$  contains at least  $\lfloor \frac{r}{2^k} \rfloor^{d_1} \lfloor (\frac{r}{2^k})^2 \rfloor^{d_2} \dots \lfloor (\frac{r}{2^k})^n \rfloor^{d_n}$  sets  $E_y^r$ , for  $y \in \delta_{r^{-1}}(\mathbb{Z})$  and at most  $(\lfloor \frac{r}{2^k} \rfloor + 2)^{d_1} (\lfloor \frac{r}{2^k} \rfloor^2 + 2)^{d_2} \dots (\lfloor \frac{r}{2^k} \rfloor^n + 2)^{d_n}$ .

Since  $E_y^r$  have foreign interiors, if we consider the union of  $E_y^r$  that are contained in  $C_x^k$  then  $\mu(C_x^k) - \mu(\cup E_y^r) = \mu(C_x^k \setminus (\cup E_y^r)) < g(r)$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} g(r) &:= \sum_{i=1}^n d_i (2^{-k} + 2r^{-1})^{d_1} \dots (2^{-nk} + 2r^{-n})^{d_n} \frac{2r^{-d_i}}{(2^{-ik} + 2r^{-i})} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n d_i \frac{2r^{-d_i}}{(2^{-ik} + 2r^{-i})} \prod_{j=1}^n (2^{-jk} + 2r^{-j})^{d_j} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $g(r) \rightarrow 0$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  therefore for large  $r > 0$  we have  $N_1 g(r) < \epsilon$ . Thus  $\mu(\cup C_x^k) - \mu(\cup (\cup E_y^r)) \leq N_1 g(r) < \epsilon$ . This creates a lower bound for the quantity:

$$\mu(A) - 2\epsilon \leq \mu(\cup C_x^k) - \epsilon \leq \mu(\cup (\cup E_y^r)) \leq \frac{\delta_{1/r}(\mathbb{Z}) \cap A}{r^{d'}}$$

For the upper bound, we cover  $U_1 \cup \text{int}A$  with  $D_x^k, \overline{A} \subset U_1 \cup \text{int}A, \overline{A}$  is closed and bounded, thus compact, so it also has a finite subcover of  $D_x^k$ . We once more assume without loss of generality that  $k > 0$  is the same for all of those  $D_x^k$ . We subdivide  $\overline{D_x^k}$  to  $C_y^k$  with foreign interiors. Obviously  $A \subset \overline{A} \subset \cup D_x^k$  and  $\mu(C_y^k) = \frac{1}{2^{d'k}}$ , thus we obtain:

$$\frac{\#(\delta_{2^{-k}}(\mathbb{Z}) \cap A)}{2^{d'k}} \leq \mu(\cup C_y^k) = \mu(\cup D_x^k) \leq \mu(A \cup U_1) \leq \mu(A) + \epsilon$$

Once more we want the bound to be valid for all  $r > 0$ . We denote by  $N_2 := \#(\delta_{2^{-k}}(\mathbb{Z}) \cap (\cup C_y^k))$  the cardinality of the cover. Like previously we will cover it with  $E_x^r$ . We take the union of all  $E_x^r$  for which there exist  $C_y^k$  in the cover such that  $E_x^r \cap C_y^k \neq \emptyset$ . Once more we can observe that  $\mu(\cup E_x^r) - \mu(C_y^k) < g(r)$ . Thus  $\mu(\cup(\cup E_x^r)) - \mu(\cup C_y^k) \leq N_2 g(r)$ . If  $r > 2^k$  large enough then  $N_2 g(r) < \epsilon$  and we have obtained the upper bound:

$$\frac{\#(\delta_{1/r}(\mathbb{Z}) \cap A)}{r^{d'}} \leq \mu(\cup(\cup E_x^r)) \leq \mu(\cup C_y^k) + \epsilon \leq \mu(U_1 \cup A) + \epsilon \leq \mu(A) + 2\epsilon$$

Therefore  $\mu(A) - 2\epsilon \leq \frac{\#(\delta_{1/r}(\mathbb{Z}) \cap A)}{r^{d'}} \leq \mu(A) + 2\epsilon$  and this completes the proof.  $\square$

Let  $\Gamma < G$  be a lattice in a nilpotent Lie group,  $\mathfrak{g}$  its Lie algebra and  $\mathfrak{g}_\infty = \bigoplus_{i=1}^s V_i$  the graded algebra. Let  $S$  be a finite generating set for  $\Gamma$  and  $d_{CC}$  the Pansu limit metric on  $G$  induced by  $S$ . We will state a series of lemmas that will provide information on how the lattice is rescaled through the dilation inside the stratified group and then we will prove Theorem 1.4. Even though the Haar measure obviously depends on the group structure in this case from both structures arise the same measure up to a scalar multiple.

We endow  $G$  with a strong Malcev basis strongly based on  $\Gamma$ , recall that  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow G$  are the strong Malcev coordinates for  $(G, *)$ , defined as  $\Psi(t_1, \dots, t_d) = \exp(t_1 X_1) * \dots * \exp(t_d X_d)$ , and  $\Psi_\infty : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow G$  are the strong Malcev coordinates for  $(G, *_\infty)$ , defined as  $\Psi_\infty(t_1, \dots, t_d) = \exp(t_1 X_1) *_\infty \dots *_\infty \exp(t_d X_d)$ . The Malcev basis is strongly based on  $\Gamma$  with respect to the  $(G, *)$  structure, i.e.  $\Psi(\mathbb{Z}^d) = \Gamma$ , but  $\Psi_\infty(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  isn't necessary even a group. The exponential coordinates are common for the two group structures,  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow G$  defined as  $\Phi(t_1, \dots, t_d) = \exp(t_1 X_1 + \dots + t_d X_d)$  and push-forward the Lebesgue measure from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $G$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\nu$  be a Haar measure on  $(G, *_\infty)$ . Then there is a constant  $c > 0$  such that for every  $A \subset G$  bounded  $\nu$ -continuity set*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\delta_{1/r}(\Psi_\infty(\mathbb{Z}^d)) \cap A)}{r^{d_\Gamma}} = c\nu(A).$$

*Proof.* From Lemma 3.1, for  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  a bounded Lebesgue  $\mu$ -continuity set, we obtain that  $\#|\delta_{1/r}(\mathbb{Z}^d) \cap B|/r^{d_\Gamma} \rightarrow \mu(B)$ . We know that  $\Psi_\infty$  pushes-forward the Lebesgue measure to a Haar measure on  $(G, *_\infty)$ . By definition of the dilations we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \#(\delta_{1/r}(\Psi_\infty(\mathbb{Z}^d)) \cap A) &= \#(\Psi_\infty(\delta_{1/r}(\mathbb{Z}^d)) \cap \Psi_\infty(\Phi^{-1}(A))) = \\ &= \#(\Psi_\infty(\delta_{1/r}(\mathbb{Z}^d) \cap \Psi_\infty^{-1}(A))) = \\ &= \#(\delta_{1/r}(\mathbb{Z}^d) \cap \Psi_\infty^{-1}(A)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\frac{1}{r^{d_\Gamma}} \#|\delta_{1/r}(\Psi_\infty(\mathbb{Z}^d)) \cap A| \rightarrow \mu(\Psi_\infty^{-1}(A))$ , which is a Haar measure on  $(G, *_\infty)$ . It is known that the Haar measure is unique up to a constant.  $\square$

Breuillard and Le Donne [11] observe that dilations satisfy  $[X, Y]_\infty = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \delta_\lambda^{-1}[\delta_\lambda X, \delta_\lambda Y]$  and deduce a new form for the BCH formula. We need some notation before we express the BCH formula. We denote with  $s_i$  the number for which  $X_i \in V_{s_i}$ , let  $\vec{s} = (s, s_{d-1}, \dots, 1)$  and  $\vec{s}\alpha = \sum s_i \alpha_i$ , we write  $\vec{v}^\alpha = v_1^{\alpha_1} \dots v_d^{\alpha_d}$ , for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$  and  $(v)_i = v_i$  for  $v = (v_1, \dots, v_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Recall

that  $X \bullet Y := \log(\exp X * \exp Y)$  for every  $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ . For  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_d), Y = (y_1, \dots, y_d) \in \mathfrak{g}$  the BCH formula is expressed as:

$$(3.1) \quad (X \bullet Y)_i = x_i + y_i + \sum_{I_i} C_{\alpha, \beta} X^\alpha Y^\beta + \sum_{J_i} D_{\alpha, \beta} X^\alpha Y^\beta$$

$$(3.2) \quad (X \bullet_\infty Y)_i = x_i + y_i + \sum_{I_i} C_{\alpha, \beta} X^\alpha Y^\beta$$

where  $I_i = \{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \vec{s}\alpha \geq 1, \vec{s}\beta \geq 1 \text{ and } \vec{s}\alpha + \vec{s}\beta = s_i\}$ ,  $J_i = \{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \vec{s}\alpha \geq 1, \vec{s}\beta \geq 1 \text{ and } \vec{s}\alpha + \vec{s}\beta < s_i\}$  and  $C_{\alpha, \beta}, D_{\alpha, \beta}$  are unique constants depending on the Lie structure.

We will enrich this result. We call weighted degree of a monomial  $x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d}$  to be  $\sum_i \alpha_i s_i$ . Additionally, if we write  $x^{(i)} := (0, \dots, x_i, \dots, 0)$  for  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , then the Malcev coordinates can be written as  $\Psi(x) = \exp(x^{(1)}) \bullet \dots \bullet x^{(d)}$  and  $\Psi_\infty(x) = \exp(x^{(1)}) \bullet_\infty \dots \bullet_\infty x^{(d)}$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *There are unique constants  $C_\alpha, D_\alpha$  for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} (\log(\Psi(x)))_i &= x_i + \sum_{K_i} C_\alpha x_{i+1}^{\alpha_{i+1}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d} + \sum_{L_i} D_\alpha x_{i+1}^{\alpha_{i+1}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d} \\ (\log(\Psi_\infty(x)))_i &= x_i + \sum_{K_i} C_\alpha x_{i+1}^{\alpha_{i+1}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d} \end{aligned}$$

for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $K_i = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d : \vec{s}\alpha = s_i \text{ and } a_j = 0 \text{ for } j \leq i\}$  and  $L_i = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d : \vec{s}\alpha < s_i \text{ and } a_j = 0 \text{ for } j \leq i\}$ .

*Proof.* We will calculate the product and the constants recursively, applying the BCH formula (3.1) on  $x^{(d-k)}$  and  $v_k := x^{(d-k+1)} \bullet \dots \bullet x^{(d)}$ . For  $x^{(d-1)}$  and  $x^{(d)}$  the formula is written as

$$(x^{(d-1)} \bullet x^{(d)})_i = \begin{cases} x_d, & \text{if } i = d \\ x_{d-1}, & \text{if } i = d-1 \\ \sum_{I_i} C_{\alpha, \beta} x_{d-1}^{\alpha_{d-1}} x_d^{\beta_d} + \sum_{J_i} D_{\alpha, \beta} x_{d-1}^{\alpha_{d-1}} x_d^{\beta_d} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We set  $C_{\alpha'}^{(1)} := C_{\alpha, \beta}$  for  $\alpha = (0, \dots, \alpha_{d-1}, 0), \beta = (0, \dots, \beta_d)$  and  $\alpha' = (0, \dots, \alpha_{d-1}, \beta_d)$ , correspondingly we set  $D_{\alpha'}^{(1)} := D_{\alpha, \beta}$ , we set the rest to be equal 0. We calculate recursively, assume that for every  $k$  the following relation holds;

$$(v_k)_i = \begin{cases} x_i + \sum_{K_i} C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{i+1}^{\alpha_{i+1}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d} + \sum_{L_i} D_\alpha^{(k)} x_{i+1}^{\alpha_{i+1}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d}, & \text{if } i \geq d-k \\ \sum_{K_i} C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{d-k}^{\alpha_{d-k}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d} + \sum_{L_i} D_\alpha^{(k)} x_{d-k}^{\alpha_{d-k}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and that  $C_\alpha^{(n)}, D_\alpha^{(n)}$  are defined such that  $C_\alpha^{(n)} = D_\alpha^{(n)} = 0$ , for  $j < k$  that  $\alpha_j \neq 0$ . We will calculate  $v_{k+1}$ , apply the BCH formula (3.1) on  $v_{k+1} = x^{(d-k-1)} \bullet v_k$ , where  $v_k$  is provided by the previous relation.

$$(v_{k+1})_i = \begin{cases} x_i + \sum_{K_i} C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{i+1}^{\alpha_{i+1}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d} + \sum_{L_i} D_\alpha^{(k)} x_{i+1}^{\alpha_{i+1}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d}, & \text{if } i \geq d-k-1 \\ (v_k)_i + \sum_{I_i} C_{\alpha, \beta} x_{d-k-1}^{\alpha_{d-k-1}} v_k^\beta + \sum_{J_i} D_{\alpha, \beta} x_{d-k-1}^{\alpha_{d-k-1}} v_k^\beta & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For  $i \geq d-k-1$  we set  $C_\alpha^{(k+1)} := C_\alpha^{(k)}$  and  $D_\alpha^{(k+1)} := D_\alpha^{(k)}$ , for the rest we substitute the  $v_k^\beta$  with the sum and obtain the new constants.

We repeat the procedure for  $\Psi_\infty(x)$ . We set  $u_k := x^{(d-k)} \bullet_\infty \dots x^{(d)}$ , and repeatedly apply the BCH formula (3.2). First we apply the BCH formula (3.2) on  $x^{(d-1)}$  and  $x^{(d)}$ .

$$(x^{(d-1)} \bullet_\infty x^{(d)})_i = \begin{cases} x_d, & \text{if } i = d \\ x_{d-1}, & \text{if } i = d-1 \\ \sum_{I_i} C_{\alpha,\beta} x_{d-1}^{\alpha_{d-1}} x_d^{\beta_d} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We assume that for  $k$  the following relation holds;

$$(u_k)_i = \begin{cases} x_i + \sum_{K_i} C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{i+1}^{\alpha_{i+1}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d}, & \text{if } i \geq d-k \\ \sum_{K_i} C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{d-k}^{\alpha_{d-k}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We will calculate  $(u_{k+1}) = x^{(d-k-1)} \bullet_\infty u_k$  by applying the BCH formula (3.2) on  $x^{(d-k-1)}$  and  $u_k$ , where  $u_k$  is provided by the previous relation.

$$(u_{k+1})_i = \begin{cases} x_i + \sum_{K_i} C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{i+1}^{\alpha_{i+1}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d}, & \text{if } i \geq d-k-1 \\ (u_k)_i + \sum_{I_i} C_{\alpha,\beta} x_{d-k-1}^{\alpha_{d-k-1}} u_k^\beta & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For  $i \geq d-k-1$  we set  $C_\alpha^{(k+1)} := C_\alpha^{(k)}$ . For the rest we substitute the  $u_k^\beta$  with the sum and obtain the new constants.

The inductive step induces the same constants  $C_\alpha^{(k+1)}$  for both procedures on  $\Psi(x)$  and  $\Psi_\infty(x)$ . The important case is when  $i < d-k-1$ . We split the terms of  $(v_{k+1})_i$  into two parts; the first part will be a sum of monomials of weighted degree exactly  $s_i$ , and the second will be a sum of polynomials of weighted degree smaller than  $s_i$ . Obviously for  $(v_k)_i = \sum_{K_i} C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{d-k}^{\alpha_{d-k}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d} + \sum_{L_i} D_\alpha^{(k)} x_{d-k}^{\alpha_{d-k}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d}$  the separation is clear since for each  $\alpha \in K_i$  the weighted degree of  $C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{d-k}^{\alpha_{d-k}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d}$  equals  $\sum s_j \alpha_j = s_i$  for the  $C_\alpha^{(k)} \neq 0$ , while the weighted degree of  $D_\alpha^{(k)} x_{d-k}^{\alpha_{d-k}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d}$  is smaller than  $s_i$ .

For the second term we write  $v_k^\beta = \prod_j (v_k)_j^{\beta_j} = \prod_{j=1}^{d-k-1} (v_k)_j^{\beta_j} \prod_{j=d-k}^d (v_k)_j^{\beta_j}$ . We observe that every  $(v_k)_j^{\beta_j}$  has a polynomial of weighted degree smaller than  $s_j \beta_j$  plus polynomials for which each monomial has weighted degree exactly  $s_j \beta_j$ . The polynomials that attain weighted degree  $s_j \beta_j$  are  $x_j + \sum_{K_j} C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{j+1}^{\alpha_{j+1}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d}$ , for  $j \leq d-k$  and  $\sum_{K_j} C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{d-k}^{\alpha_{d-k}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d}$ , for  $j < d-k$ . Thus in the product the monomials that attain the maximum weighted degree  $s_i$  arise from the product

$$P_\beta(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{d-k-1} (x_j + \sum_{K_j} C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{j+1}^{\alpha_{j+1}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d})^{\beta_j} \prod_{j=d-k}^d (C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{d-k}^{\alpha_{d-k}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d})^{\beta_j}.$$

Therefore, the  $C_\alpha^{(k+1)}$  are defined to satisfy

$$\sum_{K_i} C_\alpha^{(k+1)} x_{d-k-1}^{\alpha_{d-k-1}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d} = \sum_{K_i} C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{d-k}^{\alpha_{d-k}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d} + \sum_{I_i} C_{\alpha,\beta} x_{d-k-1}^{\alpha_{d-k-1}} P_\beta(x).$$

Lastly we observe that the new constants for  $(u_{k+1})_i$ , for  $i < d-k-1$ , are defined in each step in order to satisfy the relation

$$\sum_{K_i} C_\alpha^{(k+1)} x_{d-k-1}^{\alpha_{d-k-1}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d} = \sum_{K_i} C_\alpha^{(k)} x_{d-k}^{\alpha_{d-k}} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d} + \sum_{I_i} C_{\alpha,\beta} x_{d-k-1}^{\alpha_{d-k-1}} P_\beta(x).$$

This is the exact same relation as before, so the constants are the same.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.4.** *There exist polynomials  $Q_i(x)$  such that*

$$(x^{(1)} \bullet \dots \bullet x^{(d)})_i = (x^{(1)} \bullet_\infty \dots \bullet_\infty x^{(d)})_i + Q_i(x_1, \dots, x_d)$$

and the weighted degree of  $Q_i$  is smaller than  $s_i$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, d$ .

The last corollary is useful if we treat  $\mathfrak{g}$  as a vector space and work with the  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  norm. Let  $g, h \in G$ , then  $\|\log g - \log h\|_\infty = \sup\{ |(\log g)_i - (\log h)_i| : i = 1, \dots, d \}$ . Let  $A \subset G$ , we will denote with  $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon(A) = \{g \in G : \text{dist}(\log(g), \log(A)) < \epsilon\}$ , where  $\text{dist}(x, A) = \inf\{\|x - y\|_\infty : y \in A\}$  for  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$  and  $A \subset G$ .

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $\nu$  be a Haar measure on  $(G, *_\infty)$ . Then there is a constant  $c > 0$  such that*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r^d} \#(\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap A) = c\nu(A),$$

for every bounded  $\nu$ -continuity set  $A \subset G$ .

*Proof.* We will use the previous Lemma 3.3 and Corollary 3.4 to compare  $\Psi(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  and  $\Psi_\infty(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ . Since  $\Gamma$  is strongly based on the Malcev base,  $\Psi(\mathbb{Z}^d) = \Gamma$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . We can limit ourselves in  $K$  a closed, bounded, connected subset of  $G$  that contains  $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon(A)$ , since  $A$  is bounded.

Let  $\Psi_\infty(x) \in \Psi_\infty(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  such that  $\delta_{1/r}(\Psi_\infty(x)) \in K$ , then

$$\delta_{1/r}(\Psi_\infty(x)) = \exp(x_1 r^{-s} X_1) *_\infty \dots *_\infty \exp(x_d r^{-1} X_d),$$

where  $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $K$  is compact there are  $M_i$  such that  $|x_i r^{-s_i}| < M_i$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Denote  $t_i := x_i r^{-s_i}$ . By Lemma 3.3 for  $\Psi_\infty$ , we can write

$$(\log(\delta_{1/r}(\Psi_\infty(x))))_i = \sum_{K_i} C_\alpha t_i^{\alpha_i} \dots t_d^{\alpha_d}$$

since  $\log(\delta_{1/r}(\Psi_\infty(x))) = \delta_{1/r}(\log(\Psi_\infty(x)))$ . By Lemma 3.3, we can write

$$(\log(\Psi(x)))_i = \sum_{K_i} C_\alpha r^{s_i} t_i^{\alpha_i} \dots t_d^{\alpha_d} + \sum_{J_i} D_\alpha r^{\bar{s}\alpha} t_i^{\alpha_i} \dots t_d^{\alpha_d}$$

and since  $\log(\delta_{1/r}(\Psi(x))) = \delta_{1/r}(\log(\Psi(x)))$ , we obtain

$$(\log(\delta_{1/r}(\Psi(x))))_i = (\log(\delta_{1/r}(\Psi_\infty(x))))_i + \frac{1}{r} \sum_{J_i} D_\alpha \frac{1}{r^{s_i - \bar{s}\alpha + 1}} t_i^{\alpha_i} \dots t_d^{\alpha_d}.$$

Let  $\epsilon_n > 0$  be a sequence such that  $\epsilon_n$  converges to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The sum  $\sum_{J_i} D_\alpha t_i^{\alpha_i} \dots t_d^{\alpha_d} \leq \sum_{J_i} |D_\alpha| M_i^{\alpha_i} \dots M_d^{\alpha_d}$ . For every  $\epsilon_n > 0$  there exists a  $r_n > 0$  large enough such that  $\frac{1}{r} \sum_{J_i} |D_\alpha| M_i^{\alpha_i} \dots M_d^{\alpha_d} < \epsilon_n$  for every  $r > r_n$ . We conclude that  $\|\log(\delta_{1/r}(\Psi_\infty(x))) - \log(\delta_{1/r}(\Psi(x)))\|_\infty < \epsilon_n$ . Recall that  $\Psi(\mathbb{Z}^d) = \Gamma$  and that  $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon(A) = \{g \in G : \text{dist}(\log(g), \log(A)) < \epsilon\}$ . Hence

$$\#(\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap A) \leq \#(\delta_{1/r}(\Psi_\infty(\mathbb{Z}^d)) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\epsilon_n}(A))$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \#(\delta_{1/r}(\Psi_\infty(\mathbb{Z}^d)) \cap A) &\leq \#(\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\epsilon_n}(A)) \\ &\leq \#(\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap A) + \#(\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\epsilon_n}(\partial A)) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.2 we obtain that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r^{d_\Gamma}} \#(\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap A) \leq c\nu(\mathcal{N}_{\epsilon_n}(A))$  and  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r^{d_\Gamma}} \#(\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap A) \geq c\nu(A) - \nu(\mathcal{N}_{\epsilon_n}(\partial A))$ .

The topology induced by the norm  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  is the same as the manifolds, thus  $\cap \mathcal{N}_{\epsilon_n}(A) = \bar{A}$  and  $\cap \mathcal{N}_{\epsilon_n}(\partial A) = \partial A$ . From assumptions  $A$  is  $\nu$ -continuity therefore  $\nu(\partial A) = 0$ , and thus  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(\mathcal{N}_{\epsilon_n}(A)) = \nu(\cap \mathcal{N}_{\epsilon_n}(A)) = \nu(\bar{A}) = \nu(A)$  and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(\mathcal{N}_{2\epsilon_n}(\partial A)) = \mathcal{H}(\cap \mathcal{N}_{2\epsilon_n}(A)) = \nu(\partial A) = 0.$$

The inequalities above were proven for every  $n$ , thus taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we can conclude the desired limit.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* From the previous Proposition 3.5 we know that the limit  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \#(\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap A) / c_S r^{d_\Gamma} = c_S^{-1} c\nu(A)$ , where  $c_S^{-1} c\nu$  is a Haar measure on  $(G, *_\infty)$ . We write  $\mathcal{H} := c_S^{-1} c\nu$ .

Moreover the push-forward of the Lebesgue measure through the exponential coordinates  $\Phi$  is the Haar measure on  $(G, *)$ , the same applies for  $(G, *_\infty)$ , but  $(G, *_\infty)$  has the same exponential coordinates by definition, therefore a Haar measure of  $(G, *)$  is Haar measure of  $(G, *_\infty)$ . The Haar measure is unique up to a constant, thus  $\mathcal{H}$  is the Haar measure for  $(G, *)$ .

To complete the proof we need to prove that the  $\mathcal{H}(B_\infty) = 1$ . The constant  $c_S$  is chosen to be the leading coefficient of the asymptotic growth function in Proposition 2.2. Since  $\#|\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap B_{CC}(\text{id}, 1)| = \#|\Gamma \cap B_{CC}(\text{id}, r)|$  combined with Proposition 2.1, we obtain that  $\#|B_{\|\cdot\|_S}(\text{id}, n - n^{1-\alpha_S})| \leq \#|\Gamma \cap B_{CC}(\text{id}, r)| \leq \#B_{\|\cdot\|_S}(\text{id}, n + n^{1-\alpha_S})$ . Therefore

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap B_\infty)}{c_S r^{d_\Gamma}} = 1.$$

Thus  $\mathcal{H}(B_\infty) = 1$ .  $\square$

*Remark.* In [11] the constant  $c_S$  is defined, in the torsion-free case, as the volume of the unit ball  $B_{CC}(\text{id}, 1)$  with respect to the Haar measure that induces a measure that has volume 1 on the quotient  $G/\Gamma$ . In the previous construction we also obtain a Haar measure,  $\mu(\Psi^{-1}(\cdot))$ , with volume 1 on the quotient. This is another way to prove that the constants are equal. Let  $\nu$  the induced measure on  $G/\Gamma$  and observe that  $p \circ \Phi|_{[0,1]^d} : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow G \rightarrow G/\Gamma$  is a bijection. Thus  $\nu^*(G/\Gamma) = \mu([0, 1]^d) = 1$ .

#### 4. BACKGROUND ON INHOMOGENEOUS RANDOM GRAPHS

**4.1. Percolation.** We now mention a celebrated result on percolation on graphs by Liggett–Schonmann–Stacey [30], which will be crucial for the proof of the main theorem. Given  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , a percolation measure on a graph  $G$  is called  $n$ -independent if for any two sets  $E_1, E_2$  of edges at graph distance at least  $n$  the value on each edge of  $E_1$  is independent of each value of the edges in  $E_2$ . The following proposition is a special case of their result. We consider the infinite integer lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *For every  $K > 0$  there exists a  $p_K < 1$  with the property that for any  $K$ -independent bond percolation on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  that the probability for an edge to be open is bigger than  $p_K$ , there is an infinite connected component of open edges in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  almost surely.*

**4.2. Inhomogeneous random graphs.** The rest of this section is introduction to terminology and a short description of results on inhomogeneous random graphs derived from [7]. The notions are adapted to our context, thus they will be stated less generally to avoid unnecessary complexity. The reason we state the following results is because we are going to study the spread-out percolation locally and treat it as an inhomogeneous random graph.

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a separable metric space endowed with  $\mu$  a Borel measure such that  $0 < \mu(\mathcal{S}) < \infty$ . For every  $\rho \in (0, \infty)$ , let  $V_\rho$  be a collection of points in  $\mathcal{S}$ . The triple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mu, (V_\rho)_{\rho>0})$  is called a *generalized vertex space* if  $\lim_\rho \#(V_\rho \cap A)/\rho = \mu(A)$  for every  $\mu$ -continuity set  $A$ , where a set  $A \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  is called  $\mu$ -continuity if it is measurable and  $\mu(\partial A) = 0$ . The boundary  $\partial A$  is defined as the elements in the closure of  $A$  that do not belong in the interior of  $A$ .

We call a symmetric, non-negative, measurable function  $\kappa : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a *kernel*. A kernel  $\kappa$  is called *irreducible* if, for every set  $A \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ , we have that that  $\kappa \equiv 0$  almost everywhere on  $A \times (\mathcal{S} \setminus A)$  implies either  $\mu(A) = 0$  or  $\mu(\mathcal{S} \setminus A) = 0$ .

**Definition 4.1.** We form the inhomogeneous random graph  $G(\rho, \kappa)$ , this is the random graph with vertex set  $V_\rho$ , for each two vertices  $x, y \in V_\rho$  we connect them independently with probability  $\min\{\frac{\kappa(x, y)}{\rho}, 1\}$ .

For every graph  $G$  we denote by  $e(G)$  the number of edges in the graph and by  $C_i(G)$  the number of edges in the  $i$ th largest connected component of the graph. If there is no such a component then  $C_i(G) = 0$ .

A sequence of kernels  $(\kappa_\rho)$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  is called graphical on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mu, (V_\rho)_\rho)$  with limit  $\kappa$  if  $x_\rho \rightarrow x$  and  $y_\rho \rightarrow y$  implies  $\kappa_\rho(x_\rho, y_\rho) \rightarrow \kappa(x, y)$  for almost every  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$  and  $\frac{1}{\rho} \mathbb{E}[e(G(\rho, \kappa_\rho))] \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathcal{S}^2} \kappa(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy)$ , where  $\kappa$  is a kernel on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mu, (V_\rho)_\rho)$ , continuous almost everywhere and  $\kappa \in L^1$ .

For every kernel  $\kappa$  on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mu)$  an integral operator  $T_\kappa$  is defined, for every  $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  measurable function in  $L^2(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}, \mu \times \mu)$  set  $T_\kappa f(x) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \kappa(x, y) f(y) \mu(dy)$ . Correspondingly its norm is defined as  $\|T_\kappa\| = \sup\{\|T_\kappa f\|_2 : f \geq 0 \text{ measurable, } \|f\|_2 \leq 1\}$ .

**Proposition 4.2** ([7, Theorem 3.1]). *Let  $(\kappa_\rho)$  be a graphical sequence of irreducible kernels on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mu, (V_\rho))$  with limit  $\kappa$ , such that  $\|T_\kappa\| > 1$ , then there exists an  $\alpha(\kappa) > 0$  such that  $C_1(G(\rho, \kappa_\rho))/\rho$  converges in probability to  $\alpha(\kappa)$ .*

**Proposition 4.3** ([7, Theorem 3.6]). *Let  $(\kappa_\rho)$  be a graphical sequence of irreducible kernels on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mu, (V_\rho))$  with irreducible limit  $\kappa$ , then  $C_2(G(\rho, \kappa_\rho)) = o_\rho(\rho)$ , i.e. that  $C_2(G(\rho, \kappa_\rho))/\rho$  converges in probability to 0.*

## 5. THE CASE OF TORSION-FREE NILPOTENT GROUPS

We now prove Theorem 1.3. In order to study the spread-out percolation in the group, we proceed by defining a similar random graph but qualitatively different and compare those two.

Let  $\Gamma < G$  be a lattice in a nilpotent Lie group that it is not isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be the Lie algebra of  $G$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_\infty = \bigoplus_{i=1}^s V_i$  the graded algebra. Let  $S$  be a finite generating set for  $\Gamma$  and  $d_{CC}$  the Pansu limit metric on  $G$  induced by  $S$ .

For every degree parameter  $\lambda > 0$  and distance parameter  $r > 0$  we form  $G^{r, \lambda} := G^{r, \lambda}(G, \Gamma, S)$ , the random graph that has for vertex set  $\Gamma$ , for each pair of vertices  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$  at distance  $d_{CC}(\text{id}, \gamma_2^{-1} * \gamma_1) \leq r$  we connect them independently by an edge with probability  $\frac{\lambda}{c_S r^{d_\Gamma}}$ .

Recall that we denote as  $B_\infty := B_{CC}(\text{id}, 1)$ , then  $B_{CC}(\text{id}, r) = \delta_r(B_\infty)$  for  $r > 0$ . Note that  $G^{r,\lambda}$ , likewise  $G_{r,\lambda}$ , depends on the set of generators  $S$ , because  $B_\infty$  is the unit ball with respect to the Pansu limit metric  $d_{CC}$ , which is induced by  $S$ . This graph has the advantage though that the distribution, based on which it is defined, has nice asymptotic properties. We can express the probability that we connect any pair of vertices  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$  as  $\min\{1, \frac{\lambda}{c_S r^{d_\Gamma}} \mathbb{1}_{\delta_r(B_\infty)}(\gamma_2^{-1} * \gamma_1)\}$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** *For every  $\lambda > 1$  there exists  $R > 0$  such that if  $r > R$ , then  $G^{r,\lambda}$  has an infinite component with probability 1.*

Before we move on to studying  $G^{r,\lambda}$  and proving this theorem, we will show how it implies Theorem 1.3.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* For a degree parameter  $\lambda' \in (1, \lambda)$  and a suitable choice of distance parameter  $r' > 0$ , we will show that the probability two vertices in  $G^{r,\lambda'}$  are connected by an edge is dominated by the probability that the same vertices are connected with an edge in  $G_{r',\lambda}(\Gamma)$ . Combined with the previous theorem, the validation of this statement completes the proof.

Crucial for the comparison of the two random graphs are the results on comparison of metrics on  $\Gamma$  and the bound for the growth function of  $B_{\|\cdot\|_S}$ . From (2.1) there is a function  $f(r) = O(r^\alpha)$ , where  $\alpha < 1$ , such that  $\delta_r(B_\infty) \cap \Gamma \subset B_{\|\cdot\|_S}(\text{id}, r + f(r))$  for every  $r > 0$ . From (2.2), there is a function  $g(r) = O(r^\beta)$ , where  $\beta < d_\Gamma$  such that  $\#(B_{\|\cdot\|_S}(\text{id}, r)) \geq c_S r^{d_\Gamma} + g(r)$ . Combining those two we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \#(B_{\|\cdot\|_S}(\text{id}, r + f(r))) &\leq c_S (r + f(r))^{d_\Gamma} + g(r + f(r)) \\ &\leq c_S r^{d_\Gamma} + h(r) \end{aligned}$$

where  $h(r) = o(r^{d_\Gamma})$ .

There exists an  $r_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  large enough such that for every  $r > r_1$

$$\frac{\lambda'}{c_S r^{d_\Gamma}} \mathbb{1}_{\delta_r(B_\infty)} \leq \frac{\lambda}{\#B_{\|\cdot\|_S}(\text{id}, r + f(r))} \mathbb{1}_{B_{\|\cdot\|_S}(\text{id}, r + f(r))}$$

Therefore the probability that two vertices in  $G^{r,\lambda'}(\Gamma)$  are connected by an edge is dominated by the probability those exact two vertices are connected by an edge in  $G_{r+f(r),\lambda}(\Gamma)$ . From Theorem 5.1, there exists an  $r_2$  such that for any  $r > r_2$  the graph  $G^{r,\lambda'}(\Gamma)$  has an infinite component almost surely. We conclude that for  $r > \max\{r_1 + f(r_1), r_2 + f(r_2)\}$  the  $G_{r,\lambda}(\Gamma)$  has an infinite connected component almost surely.  $\square$

For the proof of Theorem 5.1 we will study the graph  $G^{r,\lambda}$  locally by shrinking the graph through dilations and focusing on the finite part that belongs in a fixed region  $\mathcal{S} \subset G$ , to be specified later. The random graph  $\delta_{1/r}(G^{r,\lambda}) \cap \mathcal{S}$  has the same distribution as the graph that has for vertices  $\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}$  and each pair of vertices  $g, h \in \delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}$  is connected independently by an edge with probability  $\min\{1, \frac{\lambda}{c_S r^{d_\Gamma}} \mathbb{1}_{B_\infty}(\delta_{1/r}(\delta_r(h^{-1}) * \delta_r(g)))\}$ . Expressing the graph in this form is more complicated but it allows us to treat it as an inhomogeneous random graph  $G(\rho, \kappa_\rho)$  as in Definition 4.1 in the set up of the next proposition.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a bounded, open, connected subset of  $G$ . We set  $\rho := c_S r^{d_\Gamma}$  and we consider the sequence of vertex sets  $V_\rho := \delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}$ . We define  $\kappa : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as  $\kappa := \lambda \mathbb{1}_{B_\infty}(h^{-1} *_\infty g)$  and  $\kappa_\rho : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as  $\kappa_\rho(g, h) := \lambda \mathbb{1}_{B_\infty}(\delta_{1/r}(\delta_r(h^{-1}) * \delta_r(g)))$ . Then the triple*

$(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{H}, (V_\rho)_\rho)$  is a generalized vertex space,  $\kappa$  is an irreducible kernel and  $(\kappa_\rho)_{\rho>0}$  is a sequence of kernels graphical on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{H}, (V_\rho)_\rho)$  with limit  $\kappa$ .

We will need some lemmas for the proof of Proposition 5.2, their proofs are technical, thus they will be given in the end of this section. We define  $F_r := \delta_{1/r} \circ \Psi \circ \delta_r$ .

**Lemma 5.3.** *For every  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  the sequence  $F_r(x) \rightarrow \Psi_\infty(x)$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover the convergence is uniform on bounded sets.*

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a bounded, closed, connected subset of  $G$ . For every  $\eta > 0$  there is an  $r_0 > 0$  such that for  $r > r_0$*

$$\Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{N}_\eta(\partial\mathcal{S})) \subseteq F_r^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{N}_\eta(\mathcal{S})).$$

*Moreover there exists a  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $F_r^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \subset B$  for every  $r > 0$ .*

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $\rho = c_S r^{d_T}$  and  $(g_n), (h_n)$  two sequences in  $G$  such that  $g_n \rightarrow g$  and  $h_n \rightarrow h$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then  $\delta_{1/r}(\delta_r(g_\rho) * \delta_r(h_\rho)) \rightarrow g *_\infty h$ , as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof of Proposition 5.2.* We begin by observing that the triple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{H}, (V_\rho)_\rho)$  is indeed a generalized vertex space, it is an immediate corollary of Theorem 1.4 since  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}) < \infty$ . Now we need to prove a series of properties for  $\kappa$  and  $\kappa_\rho$ .

Firstly,  $\kappa_\rho$  and  $\kappa$  are kernels. Indeed, they are positive functions. The fact that they are symmetric arises from the inverse element in the group structure, which coincides in the two different group structures. This can be derived from the BCH formula (2.1) for the Lie brackets. Since the groups are Lie groups the inverse element as a function is continuous. Both of them are positive functions, thus they are indeed kernels.

Moreover,  $\kappa$  is continuous a.e. and  $\kappa \in L^1(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$ . This is a consequence of  $\mathcal{H}(\partial B_\infty) = 0$ , which is valid because  $\partial B_\infty \subset B_{CC}(\text{id}, 1 + \epsilon) \setminus B_{CC}(\text{id}, 1 - \epsilon)$  and  $\mathcal{H}(B_{CC}(\text{id}, r)) = r^{d_T}$ . Thus  $\kappa$  is almost everywhere continuous. Additionally,  $\|\kappa\|_1 = \iint_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}} \kappa(x, y) \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}(d(x, y)) \leq \lambda \iint_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}(d(x, y)) \leq \lambda \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})^2 \leq \infty$  as required.

Next,  $\kappa$  is an irreducible kernel. Let  $A \subset \mathcal{S}$  such that  $0 < \mathcal{H}(A) < \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$ . Then there exists  $g \in G$  such that  $B_{CC}(g, \frac{1}{2}) \cap A$  and  $B_{CC}(g, \frac{1}{2}) \cap A^c$  both have positive measures, because  $\mathcal{S}$  is connected and open. Indeed, there are two balls  $B_1, B_2$  such that  $B_1 \cap A$  and  $B_2 \cap A^c$  have positive measures, we connect their centers with a line and cover it with open balls, since it is a compact set, it has a finite subcover. Thus we have a finite number of balls intersecting each other, if there is no ball intersecting both  $A$  and  $A^c$  in a set of positive measure then there are two balls with non empty intersection such that one intersects  $A$  in a set of positive measure and the other intersects  $A^c$  in a set of positive measure, yet their intersection has positive measure, which is a contradiction. We obtain  $\kappa(g_1, g_2) \neq 0$  for every  $(g_1, g_2) \in B_{CC}(g, \frac{1}{2}) \cap A \times B_{CC}(g, \frac{1}{2}) \cap A^c$ , since  $g_2^{-1} *_\infty g_1 \in B_\infty$  for any  $g_1, g_2 \in B_{CC}(g, \frac{1}{2})$ , which concludes that  $\kappa$  is irreducible.

We move on to prove that  $\kappa_\rho$  is a graphical sequence with limit  $\kappa$ . Thus, we need to prove that if  $g_\rho \rightarrow g$  and  $h_\rho \rightarrow h$ , as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$  then  $\kappa_\rho(g_\rho, h_\rho) \rightarrow \kappa(g, h)$ , as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ , almost everywhere in  $G \times G$ . Let  $g_\rho, h_\rho \in G$  such that  $g_\rho \rightarrow g$  and  $h_\rho \rightarrow h$ . It is enough to prove that  $\kappa_\rho(g_\rho, h_\rho^{-1}) \rightarrow \kappa(g, h^{-1})$  because the inverse element as a function is continuous in the Lie group. Lemma 5.5 tells us that  $\delta_{1/r}(\delta_r(g_\rho) * \delta_r(h_\rho)) \rightarrow g *_\infty h$ .

We recall that  $\kappa$  is defined as  $\lambda \mathbb{1}_{B_\infty}(h^{-1} *_\infty g)$ . Thus the kernel is discontinuous on points of the boundary,  $h^{-1} *_\infty g \in \partial B_\infty$ . We define  $U := \{(x, y) \in G \times G : y^{-1} *_\infty x \in \partial B_\infty\}$ ,  $U$  is a closed set. We treat  $\mathfrak{g}$  as  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and consider the  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  norm on it, correspondingly for  $X \in \mathfrak{g}$  and

$A \subset \mathfrak{g}$  the  $\text{dist}(X, A) = \inf\{\|X - Y\| : Y \in A\}$ . For any  $(g, h) \in U^c$  there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\text{dist}(\log(h^{-1} *_{\infty} g), \log(\partial B_{\infty})) > \epsilon$ , because the boundary  $\partial B_{\infty}$  is a closed set. Since the sequence  $\delta_{1/r}(\delta_r(h_{\rho}^{-1}) * \delta_r(g_{\rho}))$  converges to  $h^{-1} *_{\infty} g$ , therefore there exists an  $R > 0$  such that for every  $r > R$  the  $\|\log(\delta_{1/r}(\delta_r(h_{\rho}^{-1}) * \delta_r(g_{\rho}))) - \log(h^{-1} *_{\infty} g)\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon$ . Thus  $\kappa_{\rho}(g_{\rho}, h_{\rho}) = \kappa(g, h)$  for every  $r > R$ .

To complete the proof of this convergence we need to prove that the kernel is discontinuous on a set of measure 0, i.e.  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}(U) = 0$ , but  $U_x = \{y \in G : y^{-1} *_{\infty} x \in \partial B_{\infty}\} = x *_{\infty} \partial B_{\infty}$  and  $\mathcal{H}(x *_{\infty} \partial B_{\infty}) = 0$ , because the boundary of  $B_{\infty}$  has measure 0. We conclude that almost everywhere if  $g_{\rho} \rightarrow g$  and  $h_{\rho} \rightarrow h$ , then  $\kappa_{\rho}(g_{\rho}, h_{\rho}) \rightarrow \kappa(g, h)$ . This concludes the proof that  $\kappa_{\rho}$  is a graphical sequence with limit  $\kappa$ .

The last property we need to prove is that  $\frac{1}{\rho} \mathbb{E}[e(G(\rho, \kappa_{\rho}))] \rightarrow \iint_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}} \kappa(x, y) \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}(d(x, y))$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ ,

where  $G(\rho, \kappa_{\rho})$  is the inhomogeneous random graph arising by the kernel  $\kappa_{\rho}$  on the generalized vertex space  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{H}, (V_{\rho})_{\rho})$ . We want to calculate the limit, therefore we can restrict to  $\rho > \lambda$  and substitute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\rho} \mathbb{E}[e(G(\kappa_{\rho}, \rho))] &= \frac{1}{2\rho} \sum_{x, y \in V_{\rho}} \min\left\{\frac{\kappa_{\rho}(x, y)}{\rho}, 1\right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\rho} \sum_{x, y \in V_{\rho}} \frac{\kappa_{\rho}(x, y)}{\rho} \end{aligned}$$

The sum is over elements of  $V_{\rho}$  which is a dynamical set, it varies as  $\rho$  grows and this causes problems in calculations, what we expound below is done in order to slide over this problem with the help of the previous lemmas. We substitute in the sum  $v = F_r^{-1}(x)$  and  $u = F_r^{-1}(y)$  and the sum is written as

$$\sum_{x, y \in V_{\rho}} \frac{1}{\rho^2} \kappa_{\rho}(x, y) = \sum_{v, u \in F_r^{-1}(V_{\rho})} \frac{1}{\rho^2} \kappa_{\rho}(F_r(v), F_r(u)).$$

Recall that  $V_{\rho} = \delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\Psi^{-1}(\Gamma) = \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $\delta_{1/r}(\delta_r(x)) = x$ , simply substitutions lead to the equality:

$$\begin{aligned} F_r^{-1}(V_{\rho}) &= F_r^{-1}(\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma)) \cap F_r^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \\ &= \delta_{1/r}(\Psi^{-1}(\delta_r(\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma)))) \cap F_r^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \\ &= \delta_{1/r}(\mathbb{Z}^d) \cap F_r^{-1}(\mathcal{S}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.4 allows us to sandwich  $F_r^{-1}(\mathcal{S})$ , and hence sandwich  $F_r^{-1}(V_{\rho})$  by  $C_r^{\eta} := \Psi_{\infty}^{-1}(\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{N}_{\eta}(\partial \mathcal{S})) \cap \delta_{1/r}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  and  $D_r^{\eta} := \Psi_{\infty}^{-1}(\mathcal{N}_{\eta}(\mathcal{S})) \cap \delta_{1/r}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  so that  $C_r^{\eta} \subset F_r^{-1}(V_{\rho}) \subset D_r^{\eta}$ . Lastly we set as  $A_r := \Psi_{\infty}^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \cap \delta_{1/r}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  and bound the following difference;

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{v, u \in A_r} \frac{\kappa_{\rho}(F_r(v), F_r(u))}{(c_S r^{d_{\Gamma}})^2} - \sum_{v, u \in F_r^{-1}(V_{\rho})} \frac{\kappa_{\rho}(F_r(v), F_r(u))}{(c_S r^{d_{\Gamma}})^2} \right| &\leq \sum_{v, u \in D_r^{\eta} \setminus C_r^{\eta}} \frac{\kappa_{\rho}(F_r(v), F_r(u))}{(c_S r^{d_{\Gamma}})^2} \\ &\leq \sum_{v, u \in D_r^{\eta} \setminus C_r^{\eta}} \frac{\lambda}{(c_S r^{d_{\Gamma}})^2}. \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 1.4 though we obtain that the right part of the inequality

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{v, u \in D_r^\eta \setminus C_r^\eta} \frac{\lambda}{(c_S r^{d_\Gamma})^2} = \lambda \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{N}_\eta(\partial \mathcal{S}))^2$$

for every  $\eta > 0$ , but  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{N}_\eta(\partial \mathcal{S})) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\partial \mathcal{S}) = 0$  as  $\eta \rightarrow 0$ . We deduce the proof to the calculation of the following limit;

$$(5.1) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{v, u \in \mathcal{A}_r} \kappa_\rho(F_r(v), F_r(u)) \frac{1}{(c_S r^{d_\Gamma})^2} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{v, u \in F_r^{-1}(V_\rho)} \frac{\kappa_\rho(F_r(v), F_r(u))}{(c_S r^{d_\Gamma})^2}.$$

From Lemma 5.3, the sequence  $F_r(v)$  converges to  $\Psi_\infty(v)$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly on  $\Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S})$ . In combination with the previous property of the sequence of kernels, that if  $g_\rho \rightarrow g$  and  $h_\rho \rightarrow h$ , then  $\kappa_\rho(g_\rho, h_\rho) \rightarrow \kappa(g, h)$ . We obtain that  $\kappa_\rho(F_r(v), F_r(u)) \rightarrow \kappa(\Psi_\infty(v), \Psi_\infty(u))$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  almost everywhere.

Now that we established  $\mathcal{A}_r$  a fixed domain to work on and  $\kappa_\rho(F_r(v), F_r(u))$  converges pointwise, we will obtain the desired limit from Lebesgue's theorem. Essentially we create a partition of  $\Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \times \Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S})$ . We define  $P_{(w,z)}^{(r)} = E_w^r \times E_z^r$  for every  $z, w \in \delta_{1/r}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ , where  $E_z^r = [z_1, z_1 + r^{-s}] \times \dots \times [z_d, z_d + r^{-1}]$  as in Lemma 3.1. We define the step functions  $f_r(v, u) := \kappa_\rho(F_r(w), F_r(z))$  for every  $(v, u) \in P_{(w,z)}^{(r)}$ .

We will show that  $f_r(v, u) \rightarrow \kappa(\Psi_\infty(v), \Psi_\infty(u))$  pointwise, as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , almost everywhere. Recall that convergence is not guaranteed for  $(x, y) \in U$ , where we have defined  $U$  as  $\{(x, y) \in G \times G : y^{-1} *_\infty x \in \partial B_\infty\}$  a set of measure 0. Let  $(v, u) \in \Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \times \Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S})$  such that  $(\Psi_\infty(v), \Psi_\infty(u)) \in U^c$ , this means that  $\Psi_\infty(u)^{-1} *_\infty \Psi_\infty(v) \in \text{int}(B_\infty) \cup \text{int}(B_\infty^c)$ . Let  $g := \Psi_\infty(u)^{-1} *_\infty \Psi_\infty(v)$ , there exists an open ball  $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon(g)$  with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  in  $G$  such that  $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon(g) \subset \text{int}(B_\infty) \cup \text{int}(B_\infty^c)$ . For this  $\epsilon > 0$  we will find  $r_0 > 0$  such that for every  $r > r_0$  the following holds; if  $(v, u) \in P_{(w,z)}^{(r)}$ , then every  $(x, y) \in P_{(w,z)}^{(r)}$  has the property  $\Psi_\infty(y)^{-1} *_\infty \Psi_\infty(x) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon(g)$ . Indeed,  $\Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S})$  is a bounded set. The coordinates of  $\log(\Psi_\infty(y)^{-1} *_\infty \Psi_\infty(x))$  are given by polynomials. Since  $(x, y) \in P_{(z,w)}$  and  $(v, u) \in P_{(z,w)}$ , then  $(x)_i - (v)_i < r^{-s_i}$  and  $(y)_i - (u)_i < r^{-s_i}$ . Therefore if  $r_0 = \epsilon^{-1}$ , then for  $r > r_0$  and  $(x, y) \in P_{(z,w)}$ ,  $\|\log(\Psi_\infty(y)^{-1} *_\infty \Psi_\infty(x)) - \log(\Psi_\infty(u)^{-1} *_\infty \Psi_\infty(v))\|_\infty < \epsilon$ .

We conclude that we have shown  $f_r(v, u) \rightarrow \kappa(\Psi_\infty(v), \Psi_\infty(u))$  pointwise almost everywhere, thus

$$(5.2) \quad \iint_{\Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \times \Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S})} f_r(v, u) \mu \otimes \mu(d(v, u)) \rightarrow \iint_{\Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \times \Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S})} \kappa(\Psi_\infty(v), \Psi_\infty(u)) \mu \otimes \mu(d(v, u)).$$

The first integral evaluates as

$$\begin{aligned}
\iint_{\Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \times \Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S})} f_r(v, u) \mu \otimes \mu(d(v, u)) &= \sum_{w, z \in A_{\mathcal{P}(w, z)}} \iint f_r(v, u) \mu \otimes \mu(d(v, u)) \\
&= \sum_{w, z \in A_{\mathcal{P}(w, z)}} \iint \kappa_\rho(F_r(w), F_r(z)) \mu \otimes \mu(d(v, u)) \\
&= \sum_{w, z \in A_r} \kappa_\rho(F_r(w), F_r(z)) \mu \otimes \mu(P_{(w, z)}) \\
(5.3) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \sum_{w, z \in A_r} \kappa_\rho(F_r(w), F_r(z)) \frac{1}{(r^{d_\Gamma})^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $\mathcal{H}(\cdot) = \frac{\mu(\Psi_\infty^{-1}(\cdot))}{c_{\mathcal{S}}}$  and combine (5.1), (5.2) and (5.3) to obtain the desired limit.  $\square$

For every choice of  $\mathcal{S}$  an inhomogeneous random graph  $G(\rho, \kappa_\rho)$  is formed as in Definition 4.1. This random graph will have the same distribution as  $\delta_{1/r}(G^{r, \lambda}) \cap \mathcal{S}$ . Therefore our approach to studying  $G^{r, \lambda}$  will be as follows; we will find a specific region  $\mathcal{S}$ . We will use the tools from the previous construction to describe the graph inside the region  $\mathcal{S}$ . We will define an action of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  that acts freely on  $\mathcal{S}$  and covers a part of  $G$ . Inside that part we will find the infinite component.

*Proof of Theorem 5.1.* We consider the random graph  $G'(\Gamma)$ , that has vertex set  $\delta_{1/r}(\Gamma)$  and for two vertices  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \delta_{1/r}(\Gamma)$  we connect them with probability  $\min\{1, \frac{1}{c_r^{d_\Gamma}} \mathbb{1}_{B_\infty}(\delta_{1/r}(\delta_r(\gamma_2))^{-1} * \delta_r(\gamma_1))\}$ . It is obvious that this graph  $G'(\Gamma)$  has the exact same distribution as  $G^{r, \lambda}$  rescaled through  $\delta_{1/r}$ . This is due to the fact that the indicator function can be written as  $\mathbb{1}_{\delta_r(B_\infty)}(x) = \mathbb{1}_{B_\infty}(\delta_{1/r}(x))$  and that for both group structures the inverse element function is the same,  $\delta_r(x^{-1}) = \delta_r(x)^{-1}$ .

We begin with the observation that if  $g = \exp(\lambda_1 X_1) \in Z(G)$ , then  $g * h = g *_\infty h$ , for any  $h \in G$ . Indeed if  $Y = (y_1, \dots, y_d) \in \mathfrak{g}$  such that  $\exp Y = h$  then the BCH formula (3.1) and (3.2) calculates the coordinates of  $\log(g * h)$  and  $\log(g *_\infty h)$  correspondingly,

$$(\log(g * h))_1 = y_1 + \lambda \text{ and } (\log(g *_\infty h))_1 = y_1 + \lambda$$

and

$$(\log(g * h))_j = y_j + 0 \text{ and } (\log(g *_\infty h))_j = y_j + 0, \quad \text{for every } j > 1,$$

so that  $g * h = g *_\infty h$ . The same applies for  $g = \exp(\lambda X_2)$ , i.e.  $g * h = g *_\infty h$  for any  $h \in G$ . Indeed, we can assume without loss of generality that  $X_2 \notin \mathfrak{g}^{(s)}$ , otherwise it is the same case as the previous one,  $X_1$ . Let  $Y = (y_1, \dots, y_d) \in \mathfrak{g}$  such that  $\exp(Y) = h$ , then the BCH formula (3.1) and (3.2) applied for  $*$  and  $*_\infty$  correspondingly on the first, second and  $j$ -th coordinates, provides us with

$$\begin{aligned}
(\log(g * h))_1 &= y_1 + \sum_{I_1} C_{\alpha, \beta} (\lambda X_2)^{\alpha} Y^{\beta} + \sum_{J_1} D_{\alpha, \beta} (\lambda X_2)^{\alpha} Y^{\beta}, \\
(\log(g *_\infty h))_1 &= y_1 + \sum_{I_1} C_{\alpha, \beta} (\lambda X_2)^{\alpha} Y^{\beta}, \\
(\log(g * h))_2 &= y_2 + \lambda \text{ and } (\log(g *_\infty h))_2 = y_2 + \lambda,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$(\log(g * h))_j = y_j + 0 \text{ and } (\log(g *_{\infty} h))_j = y_j + 0 \text{ for } j > 2.$$

But  $J_1$  is empty because  $X^\alpha \neq 0$  only when  $\alpha_2 \neq 0$ , for which we have assumed that  $s_2 = s - 1$ . Since  $X_2 \in \mathfrak{g}^{(s-1)}$  the  $\vec{s} \cdot \alpha + \vec{s} \cdot \beta = s$ . Consequently  $(\log(g * h))_j = (\log(g *_{\infty} h))_j$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, s$ .

For every  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  we set  $h_1 := \exp(2N^s X_1)$  and  $h_2 := \exp(2N^{s_2} X_2)$ . The discrete group  $H_N := \langle h_1, h_2 \rangle$  generated by those two, is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . We define an action on  $G$ : for every  $(n, m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  and  $g \in G$  we set  $(n, m) *_{\infty} g = h_1^n h_2^m * g$ . From the previous exposition we know that  $h_1^n h_2^m * g = h_1^n h_2^m *_{\infty} g$ , so this action we have created is independent of the choice of group structure.

We define  $\text{Box}(N) := \{(t_1, \dots, t_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : |t_i| < N^{s_i}\} = \delta_N(\text{Box}(1))$  and we set  $\mathcal{S}_0 = \mathcal{S}_0^{(N)} := \exp(\text{Box}(N))$ , where  $N > 0$  will be fixed later. For every  $(n, m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ , we denote  $\mathcal{S}_{(n, m)} := (n, m) *_{\infty} \mathcal{S}_0$ . Let  $a_1, a_2$  be the usual generators of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ ,  $(1, 0)$  and  $(0, 1)$  correspondingly. We denote as  $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}_0 \cup \mathcal{S}_{a_1}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2 = \mathcal{S}_0 \cup \mathcal{S}_{a_2}$ . For any edge  $e = \{(n, m), (n, m) + a_i\}$  of the Cayley graph  $G(\mathbb{Z}^2, \{a_1, a_2\})$ , we denote  $\mathcal{S}_e = (n, m) *_{\infty} \mathcal{S}_i$ .

In the upcoming analysis of the random graph it will be important to know how many of the sets  $\mathcal{S}_e$  for different edges  $e$  overlap. Our aim is to bound the distance of two elements  $v, u \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  for which  $\mathcal{S}_v$  and  $\mathcal{S}_u$  have non-trivial intersection. By obtaining such a bound, it is ensured that whenever two elements are further away, the random graphs contained in the corresponding boxes are independent. The bound that we will obtain will be independent from  $N$  the size of the box.

*Remark.* We aim to create a matching with a bond percolation on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . An edge  $e$  will be open if  $\mathcal{S}_e$  will contain a unique linear size connected component. This percolation will be  $k$ -independent, this  $k$  though will depend on the number of overlaps of translations of  $\mathcal{S}_e$ . This is the reason why we want to bound this number independently from  $N$ . An additional reason we want to bound it is the following: we will prove that as  $N$  grows the probability for  $\mathcal{S}_e$  to contain a unique linear component also grows, we want it to be larger than the constant given by Proposition 4.1, therefore  $N$  and  $k$  must be independent.

There exists a  $K > 0$  independent of  $N$  such that for every  $v, u \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  at graph distance larger than  $K$  the sets  $v *_{\infty} \mathcal{S}_i \cap u *_{\infty} \mathcal{S}_j = \emptyset$ , for any  $i, j = 0, 1, 2$ .

Without any loss of generality we study the case  $v = (0, 0)$ , since every other case is a translation. Let  $(n, m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  and  $g \in (n, m) *_{\infty} \mathcal{S}_0$  then  $g = h_1^n *_{\infty} h_2^m *_{\infty} x$  for an  $x \in \mathcal{S}_0$ . We distinguish two cases.

- If  $|m| \geq 2$ , then

$$|(\log(g))_2| = |m2N^{s_2} + (\log(x))_2| \geq 4N^{s_2} - |(\log(x))_2| \geq 3N^{s_2},$$

whence  $g \notin \mathcal{S}_0$ .

- If  $|m| < 2$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} |(\log(g))_1| &= |n2N^s + (\log(x))_1 + \sum_{i \in I_1} C_{\alpha, \beta} m 2N^{s_2}(x)_i| \\ &\geq n2N^s - N^s - \sum_{i \in I_1} |C_{\alpha, \beta}| 2N^s, \end{aligned}$$

so that if  $n > 1 + \sum |C_{\alpha, \beta}|$  then  $|(\log g)_1| > N^s$ , hence  $g \notin \mathcal{S}_0$ .

Therefore, if  $v$  is at graph distance larger than  $K := 2 + \sum |C_{\alpha, \beta}|$  from the  $(0, 0)$  then  $\mathcal{S}_0 \cap \mathcal{S}_v = \emptyset$ .

We proceed by studying the graph inside  $\mathcal{S}_i$  by defining a new finite random graph in there. As already mentioned, the way to study the graph locally will be through the construction of Definition 4.1. We will define three graphs. Set  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_i$ , for  $i = 0, 1, 2$ ,  $V_\rho = \delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_i$ ,  $\kappa^{(i)} = \lambda \mathbf{1}_{B_\infty}(h^{-1} *_\infty g)$  and  $\kappa_\rho^{(i)} = \lambda \mathbf{1}_{B_\infty}(\delta_{1/r}(\delta_r(h^{-1}) * \delta_r(g)))$ . From Proposition 5.2, we obtain inhomogeneous random graphs  $G(\rho, \kappa_\rho^{(i)})$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2$ . We connect each  $g, h \in \delta_{1/r}(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_i$  with probability  $\lambda \mathbf{1}_{B_\infty}(\delta_{1/r}(\delta_r(h^{-1}) * \delta_r(g)))$ , giving exactly the distribution of  $G'(\Gamma)$  restricted in  $\mathcal{S}_i$ . Thus, studying  $G(p, \kappa_\rho^{(i)})$  is equivalent to studying  $G'(\Gamma)$  locally.

We will bound below the norm of the integral operator  $T_{\kappa^{(i)}}$  for every  $i = 0, 1, 2$  in order to apply Proposition 4.2 and Proposition 4.3. For any function  $f : \mathcal{S}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the operator is  $T_{\kappa^{(i)}}f(g) = \lambda \int_{\mathcal{S}_i} \mathbf{1}_{B_\infty}(h^{-1} * g) f(h) \mathcal{H}(dh)$ . Let  $f \equiv 1$  then:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_2^2 &= \int_{\mathcal{S}_i} f^2 d\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i) \\ \|T_{\kappa^{(i)}}f\|_2^2 &= \int_{\mathcal{S}_i} \left( \lambda \int_{\mathcal{S}_i} \mathbf{1}_{B_\infty}(h^{-1} *_\infty g) \mathcal{H}(dh) \right)^2 \mathcal{H}(dg) = \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{S}_i} \lambda^2 \mathcal{H}(g *_\infty B_\infty \cap \mathcal{S}_i)^2 \mathcal{H}(dg) \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\|T_{\kappa^{(i)}}\|^2 \geq \frac{\|T_{\kappa^{(i)}}f\|_2^2}{\|f\|_2^2} = \lambda^2 \frac{\int_{\mathcal{S}_i} \mathcal{H}(g *_\infty B_\infty \cap \mathcal{S}_i)^2 \mathcal{H}(dg)}{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i)}.$$

For  $g \in \mathcal{S}_i$  with  $d_{CC}(g, \partial\mathcal{S}_i) \geq 1$ , it is true that  $g *_\infty B_\infty \subset \mathcal{S}_i$ , therefore  $\mathcal{H}(g *_\infty B_\infty \cap \mathcal{S}_i) = \mathcal{H}(g *_\infty B_\infty) = 1$ . We split  $\mathcal{S}_i$  into  $U_i := \{g \in \mathcal{S}_i : d_{CC}(g, \partial\mathcal{S}_i) \leq 1\}$  and its complement and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{\kappa^{(i)}}\|^2 &\geq \lambda^2 \left( \frac{\int_{U_i} \mathcal{H}(g *_\infty B_\infty \cap \mathcal{S}_i)^2 \mathcal{H}(dg)}{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i)} + \frac{\int_{\mathcal{S}_i \setminus U_i} 1 \mathcal{H}(dg)}{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i)} \right) \\ &\geq \lambda^2 \frac{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i \setminus U_i)}{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i)} \end{aligned}$$

The sets  $\mathcal{S}_i$  depend on the choice of  $N$ , we need to find an  $N_0 > 0$  such that for any  $N \geq N_0$  the operator norm  $\|T_{\kappa^{(i)}}\| > 1$  for all  $i = 0, 1, 2$ . Since  $\lambda > 1$ , it is sufficient to prove that the ratio  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i \setminus U_i)/\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i)$  converges to 1, as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Rather than calculating  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i \setminus U_i)$  directly, we will find a subset  $A$  of  $\mathcal{S}_i \setminus U_i$  such that  $\mathcal{H}(A)/\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i) \rightarrow 1$ ; this clearly suffices. For  $\mathcal{S}_0$  this set will be  $\mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)}$  the image of  $\text{Box}(N-L)$  to  $G$  through the exponential. For some fixed  $L$  depending on the group  $G$ , we will show that  $\mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)} \subset \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus U$  for large  $N$ .

In order to prove that  $\mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus U_0$ , it is sufficient to prove that if an element  $g \in G$  is at distance  $d_{CC}(g, \mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)}) \leq 1$ , then  $g$  is contained in  $\text{int}(\mathcal{S}_0)$ . For any such element  $g$  there exists  $x \in \mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)}$  such that  $g \in B_{CC}(x, 1)$ , hence  $g \in x *_\infty B_\infty$ . Thus there exists a  $y \in B_\infty$  for which  $g = x *_\infty y$ . Let  $\log(x) =: X = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$  and  $\log(y) =: Y = (y_1, \dots, y_d)$ . Since  $B_\infty$  is bounded, we know that  $x_i < C^{s_i}$  for a constant  $C > 0$ , fixed uniformly for all elements in  $B_\infty$ , and  $y_i < (N-L)^{s_i}$ .

From the BCH formula (3.2) we obtain

$$(X \bullet_{\infty} Y)_i = x_i + y_i + \sum_{I_i} C_{\alpha,\beta} X^{\alpha} Y^{\beta} \leq (N-L)^{s_i} + C^{s_i} + \sum_{I_i} C_{\alpha,\beta} (N-L)^{\alpha} C^{\beta}.$$

We observe that  $\sum_{I_i} c_{\alpha,\beta} (N-L)^{\alpha} C^{\beta}$  is a polynomial of  $N$  with degree  $s_i - 1$  and the maximum degree is attained for  $\vec{\beta} = 1$ . If  $L$  is chosen such that  $L > \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{I_i} |C_{\alpha,\beta}| C$  then there is  $N_0$  large enough such that for every  $N > N_0$

$$LN^{s_i-1} > \sum_{j=2}^{s_i} \binom{s_i}{j} L^j N^{s_i-j} (-1)^j + C^{s_i} + \sum_{I_i} c_{\alpha,\beta} (N-L)^{\alpha} C^{\beta}$$

we add  $N^{s_i}$  and abstract  $LN^{s_i-1}$  in both sides and obtain

$$N^{s_i} > (N-L)^{s_i} + C^{s_i} + \sum_{I_i} c_{\alpha,\beta} (N-L)^{\alpha} C^{\beta}$$

for every  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Thus  $x *_{\infty} y \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S}_0)$ .

Now we will show that the ratio of  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)})/\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_0)$  tends to 1 as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . The Haar measure  $\mathcal{H}$  is defined as the push-forward of the Lebesgue measure  $\mu$  through  $\Psi_{\infty}$  divided by  $c_S$ . It is possible to change coordinate system from canonical coordinates of second kind to exponential. Theorem 2.1 provides a relation for the corresponding measures:  $\mathcal{H}(\cdot) = |\det \mathbf{J}_{(\Psi_{\infty}^{-1} \circ \text{exp})}(0)| \mu(\text{exp}^{-1}(\cdot))$ . The ratio is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)})}{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_0^{(N)})} &= \frac{|\det \mathbf{J}_{(\Psi_{\infty}^{-1} \circ \text{exp})}(0)| \mu(\text{exp}^{-1}(\text{exp}(\text{Box}(N-L))))}{|\det \mathbf{J}_{(\Psi_{\infty}^{-1} \circ \text{exp})}(0)| \mu(\text{exp}^{-1}(\text{exp}(\text{Box}(N))))} \\ &= \left( \frac{\mu(\text{Box}(N-L))}{\mu(\text{Box}(N))} \right)^{d_{\Gamma}} \\ &= \left( \frac{N-L}{N} \right)^{d_{\Gamma}} \rightarrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof for  $\mathcal{S}_0$ .

To pass the property to  $\mathcal{S}_i$  it is enough to take the translations of  $\mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)}$  through  $a_i$ , the generators of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . The action of  $a_i$  preserves the distance  $d_{CC}$ , thus  $a_i *_{N} \mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)} \subset \mathcal{S}_i \setminus U_i$ . We proved that the measure of  $(\mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)})^c \cap \mathcal{S}_0$  over  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i)$  tends to 0. Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is the Haar measure the same applies for the translation  $(a_i *_{N} \mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)})^c \cap \mathcal{S}_{a_i}$ , hence the measure of the union of those two sets over  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i)$  converges to 0. Therefore, the measure of the complementary set in  $\mathcal{S}_i$  over  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i)$  converges to 1 and

$$\left( \left( (\mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)})^c \cap \mathcal{S}_0 \right) \cup \left( (a_i *_{N} \mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)})^c \cap \mathcal{S}_{a_i} \right) \right)^c \subset \mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)} \cup a_i *_{N} \mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)}.$$

Therefore we obtain the limit

$$\frac{\mathcal{H} \left( \mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)} \cup a_i *_{N} \mathcal{S}_0^{(N-L)} \right)}{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}_i)} \rightarrow 1$$

This concludes the proof for  $\mathcal{S}_i$ .

The distribution of  $G(\rho, \kappa_\rho)$  is the same as  $G'(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_i$ . The assumptions of Theorem 4.2 are satisfied for  $(\mathcal{S}_0, \kappa_\rho^{(0)}, (V_\rho^0)_{\rho>0})$ , whence there is a constant  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $\frac{1}{\rho} C_1(G(\rho, \kappa_\rho^{(0)})) \xrightarrow{p} \alpha$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover the assumptions of Theorem 4.3 are satisfied for  $(\mathcal{S}_i, \kappa_\rho^{(i)}, (V_\rho^i)_{\rho>0})$  for both  $i = 1, 2$ , hence  $C_2(G(\rho, \kappa_\rho^{(i)})) = o_p(\rho)$ , which means that for every  $\epsilon > 0$  the probability  $\mathbb{P}(C_2(G(\rho, \kappa_\rho^{(i)})) \geq \epsilon \rho) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ .

For every  $(n, m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ , the  $G'(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_{(n,m)}$  has the same distribution as a random graph as  $(n, m) *_{\mathcal{N}} G_\rho^{(0)}$ . Thus  $\mathbb{P}(C_1(G'(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_{(n,m)}) \geq (\alpha - \epsilon)\rho) \rightarrow 1$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ . Similarly for the edges, given  $e = \{(n, m), (n, m) + a_i\}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , the graph  $G'(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_e$  has the same distribution as  $(n, m) *_{\mathcal{N}} (G'(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_i)$ . Therefore, for every  $\epsilon > 0$  we have  $\mathbb{P}(C_2(G'(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_e) \geq \epsilon \rho) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ .

Now we have all the tools to establish a matching between our model and a bond percolation on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . Let  $e = \{(n, m), (n, m) + a_i\}$  be an edge of the lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , and define  $X(e)$  to be the event that  $C_1(G'(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_{(n,m)})$  and  $C_1(G'(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_{(n,m)+a_i})$  are both larger than  $\alpha\rho$  while  $C_2(G'(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_e) < \alpha\rho$ . The previous analysis proves exactly that  $\mathbb{P}(X(e)) \rightarrow 1$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  and that the convergence is uniform on edges. Let  $p_K$  be the constant of Proposition 4.1, and choose  $r > 0$  large enough such that  $\mathbb{P}(X(e)) \geq p_K$  for every edge  $e$  of  $G(\mathbb{Z}^2, \{a_1, a_2\})$ .

This event will provide us with the coupling between the spread-out percolation on  $G$  and a  $K$ -independent Bernoulli percolation on  $G(\mathbb{Z}^2, \{a_1, a_2\})$ . We declare an edge  $e$  of  $G(\mathbb{Z}^2, \{a_1, a_2\})$  open if  $X(e)$  holds. Since for every two edges  $e, f$  at distance larger than  $K$  the graphs  $G'(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_e$  and  $G'(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_f$  have independent distributions, the events  $X(e)$  and  $X(f)$  are independent. As a consequence, the bond percolation defined is  $K$ -independent, and for any edge  $e$  the probability that  $e$  is open is larger than  $p_K$ . Since  $p_K$  is chosen based on Proposition 4.1, with probability 1 there exists an infinite sequence  $v_1, v_2, \dots \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  such that  $v_i$  is adjacent to  $v_{i+1}$  and  $X(\{v_i, v_{i+1}\})$  holds for every  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ .

For each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  the graph  $G'(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_{v_i}$  contains at least one connected component of size larger than  $\alpha\rho$ ; let  $\mathcal{C}_i$  be such a component. Since  $X(\{v_i, v_{i+1}\})$  is true,  $\mathcal{S}_{\{v_i, v_{i+1}\}}$  contains at most one connected component of size bigger than  $\alpha\rho$ , consequently  $\mathcal{C}_i \cup \mathcal{C}_{i+1}$  must be a connected set. This statement holds for every  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , thus  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_i$  is a connected, infinite set. We conclude that, with probability 1, there is an infinite cluster in  $G'(\Gamma)$ . As mentioned above this graph has the same distribution as  $G^{r,\lambda}(\Gamma)$  rescaled by  $\delta_{1/r}$ , thus  $G^{r,\lambda}(\Gamma)$  also contains an infinite connected component with probability 1.  $\square$

Now we provide the proofs of the lemmas.

*Proof of Lemma 5.4.* Let  $x \in F_r^{-1}(\mathcal{S})$ , from the previous Lemma 5.3 there is  $r_1 > 0$  such that for  $r > r_1$ ,  $F_r(x)$  is  $\eta \|\cdot\|_\infty$ -close to  $\Psi_\infty(x)$ , hence  $\Psi_\infty(x) \in \mathcal{N}_\eta(\mathcal{S})$ , thus  $x \in \Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{N}_\eta(\mathcal{S}))$  which proves one part of the desired relation.

Let  $x \in \Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{N}_\eta(\partial\mathcal{S}))$ , similarly from the Lemma 5.3 there is  $r_2 > 0$  such that for every  $r > r_2$   $F_r(x)$  is  $\eta \|\cdot\|_\infty$ -close to  $\Psi_\infty(x)$ , hence  $F_r(x) \in \mathcal{N}_\eta(\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{N}_\eta(\partial\mathcal{S})) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ .

The first  $r_1$  sets are bounded from its union, as a finite union of bounded sets and the rest of the sequence is contained in  $\Psi_\infty^{-1}(\mathcal{N}_\eta(\mathcal{S}))$ , which is a bounded set. Therefore there is a bounded set  $B \subset \mathfrak{g}$  such that  $F_r^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq B$  for every  $r > 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 5.3.* First we remark that  $\delta_{1/r}(\Psi_\infty(\delta_r(x))) = \Psi_\infty(x)$ , combined with Lemma 3.3 we obtain that  $(\log F_r(x))_i = (\Psi_\infty(x))_i + r^{-s_i} Q_i(r^{s_{i+1}} x_{i+1}, \dots, r^{s_d} x_d)$ , but  $r^{-s_i} Q_i(r^{s_{i+1}} x_{i+1}, \dots, r^{s_d} x_d) < r^{-1} Q_i(x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d)$  since  $Q_i$  has weighted degree strictly smaller

than  $s_i$ . The number  $Q_i(x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d)$  is fixed as  $r$  grows to infinity, thus  $r^{-s_i}Q_i(r^{s_{i+1}}x_{i+1}, \dots, r^{s_d}x_d) \rightarrow 0$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ .

If we restrict to a bounded subset  $\mathcal{S} \subset G$  then there are  $M_i > 0$  such that  $Q_i(x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d) < \sum_{L_i} |D_\alpha| M_{i+1}^{\alpha_{i+1}} \dots M_d^{\alpha_d} = M$ . Thus  $|(\log F_r(x))_i - (\Psi_\infty(x))_i| < r^{-1}M$  for every  $x \in \mathcal{S}$  and the convergence is uniform with respect to the topology induced by  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ , but as already mentioned it coincides with the topology of the manifold.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 5.5.* There are  $X_\rho, Y_\rho \in \mathfrak{g}$  such that  $\exp X_\rho = g_\rho$  and  $\exp Y_\rho = h_\rho$ , where  $X_\rho = (x_1^{(\rho)}, \dots, x_d^{(\rho)})$  and  $Y_\rho = (y_1^{(\rho)}, \dots, y_d^{(\rho)})$ . Since  $\log$  is homeomorphism,  $x_j^{(\rho)} \rightarrow x_j$  and  $y_j^{(\rho)} \rightarrow y_j$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, d$ .

Let  $Z_\rho = (z_1^{(\rho)}, z_2^{(\rho)}, \dots, z_d^{(\rho)})$ ,  $W_\rho = (w_1^{(\rho)}, \dots, w_d^{(\rho)})$  and  $W = (w_1, \dots, w_d)$  be the elements in  $\mathfrak{g}$  defined by the relations:

$$Z_\rho := \log(\delta_r(g_\rho) * \delta_r(h_\rho))$$

$$W_\rho := \log(g_\rho *_\infty h_\rho)$$

$$W := \log(g *_\infty h).$$

Since  $*_\infty$  and  $\log$  are continuous  $g_\rho *_\infty h_\rho$  converges to  $g *_\infty h$ , hence  $w_j^{(\rho)} \rightarrow w_j$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, d$ . Moreover  $\delta_{1/r}(\delta_r(g_\rho) * \delta_r(h_\rho)) = \delta_{1/r}(\exp(Z_\rho)) = \exp(\delta_{1/r}(Z_\rho))$  and  $\delta_{1/r}(Z_\rho) = (r^{-s}z_1, \dots, r^{-1}z_d)$ . From BCH formula (3.1) on  $\delta_r(X_\rho)$  and  $\delta_r(Y_\rho)$  and the BCH formula (3.2) on  $X_\rho$  and  $Y_\rho$  we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} z_j^{(\rho)} &= r^{s_j}x_j^{(\rho)} + r^{s_j}y_j^{(\rho)} + \sum_{I_j} C_{\alpha,\beta} r^\alpha X_\rho^\alpha r^\beta Y_\rho^\beta + \sum_{J_j} D_{\alpha,\beta} r^\alpha X_\rho^\alpha r^\beta Y_\rho^\beta \\ &= r^{s_j}w_j^{(\rho)} + \sum_{J_j} D_{\alpha,\beta} r^{\alpha+\beta} X_\rho^\alpha Y_\rho^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $r^{-s_j}z_j^{(\rho)} - w_j^{(\rho)} \rightarrow 0$ , because  $\sum_{J_j} D_{\alpha,\beta} r^{\alpha+\beta-s_j} X_\rho^\alpha Y_\rho^\beta \rightarrow 0$ . We conclude that  $\delta_{1/r}(Z_\rho) \rightarrow W$ , as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ , recall that  $\rho = c_S r^{d_\Gamma}$ . Since  $\exp$  is a homeomorphism  $\exp(\delta_{1/r}Z_\rho) \rightarrow \exp W$ , but  $\exp(\delta_{1/r}(Z_\rho))$  is exactly  $\delta_{1/r}(\delta(g_\rho) * \delta_r(h_\rho))$ .  $\square$

## 6. TRANSITIVE GRAPHS

As we mentioned in the introduction, in proving Theorem 1.2, we make use of a theorem of Trofimov [41] stating that an arbitrary transitive graph of polynomial growth can be approximated by a Cayley graph in a certain precise sense. There are various ways of formulating this result, but for us the most convenient will be the version appearing in work of Tessera and the second author [40, Theorem 2.1], which essentially follows from an argument of Woess [42]. Before we state this theorem, we present some background. This is mostly reproduced from [40], where the reader can find full proofs; much of that is in turn based on [42].

If  $G$  is a transitive graph and  $H < \text{Aut}(G)$  is a subgroup then we define  $G/H$  to be the quotient graph with vertices  $\{H(x) : x \in G\}$ , and  $H(x) \sim H(y)$  in  $G/H$  if and only if there exist  $x_0 \in H(x)$  and  $y_0 \in H(y)$  such that  $x_0 \sim y_0$  in  $G$ . If  $\Gamma < \text{Aut}(G)$  is a transitive subgroup that normalizes  $H$  then the quotient graph  $G/H$  is invariant under the action of  $\Gamma$  on  $G$ , and the action of  $\Gamma$  on  $G$  descends to an action of  $\Gamma$  on  $G/H$ . We write  $\Gamma_{G/H}$  for the image of  $\Gamma$  in  $\text{Aut}(G/H)$  induced by this action; thus  $\Gamma_{G/H}$  is the quotient of  $\Gamma$  by the normal subgroup  $\{g \in \Gamma : gH(x) = H(x) \text{ for every } x \in G\}$ .

The automorphism group  $\text{Aut}(G)$  is a metrizable topological group under the topology of pointwise convergence, in which vertex stabilizers are compact. Given a subgroup  $\Gamma < \text{Aut}(G)$  and a vertex  $x \in G$ , we write  $\Gamma_x$  for the stabilizer of  $x$ . The vertex stabilizers  $\Gamma_x$  are all isometric to one another, and in particular have the same diameter and cardinality;  $\Gamma$  is discrete if and only if this cardinality is finite.

A subset  $U \subset \text{Aut}(G)$  is precompact if and only if all its orbits are finite, if and only if at least one orbit is finite. In particular, if  $H < \text{Aut}(G)$  is a compact subgroup normalized by a transitive subgroup  $\Gamma < \text{Aut}(G)$  then the fibres of the projection  $G \rightarrow G/H$  are finite.

If  $\Gamma$  acts transitively on  $G$  then, given a fixed vertex  $o \in G$ , the set  $S = \{g \in \Gamma : d(g(o), o) \leq 1\}$  is a compact symmetric generating set for  $\Gamma$ . The fact that  $S$  contains the identity has the notationally convenient effect of ensuring that for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the ball of radius  $n$  in  $G(\Gamma, S)$  is exactly the  $n$ -fold product set  $S^n = \{s_1 \cdots s_n : s_i \in S\}$ . Moreover, given  $g, h \in \Gamma$  and a non-negative integer  $n$ , we have  $d(g(o), h(o)) \leq n$  if and only if there exists  $s \in S^n$  such that  $g = hs$ , and given a (left-invariant) Haar measure  $\mu$  on  $\Gamma$  and a vertex  $x \in G$ , we have

$$(6.1) \quad \beta_G(n) = \frac{\mu(S^n)}{\mu(\Gamma_x)}.$$

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $G$  be a transitive graph, let  $H \triangleleft \Gamma < \text{Aut}(G)$ , and write  $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_{G/H}$  for the quotient homomorphism. Let  $o \in G$ . Then  $(\Gamma_{G/H})_{H(o)} = \pi(\Gamma_o)$ .*

*Proof.* This is claimed in [40, Lemma 3.5], but it does not quite appear to follow immediately from the preceding conclusion, which immediately implies only that  $\pi(g) \in (\Gamma_{G/H})_{H(o)}$  if and only if there exists  $h \in H$  such that  $hg \in \Gamma_o$ . However, [40, Lemma 3.6] then implies that this occurs if and only if there exists  $h \in \ker \pi$  such that  $hg \in \Gamma_o$ , as required.  $\square$

We will actually need the following slight refinement of [40, Theorem 2.1], in which the conclusion that the action of the finite-index nilpotent subgroup on the quotient graph is free replaces the weaker condition that  $\Gamma_{G/H}$  acts with finite vertex stabilizers.

**Theorem 6.2.** *Let  $G$  be a connected, locally finite transitive graph of polynomial growth, and let  $o \in G$ . Let  $\Gamma < \text{Aut}(G)$  be a transitive subgroup. Then there is a compact normal subgroup  $H \triangleleft \Gamma$  such that  $\Gamma_{G/H}$  contains a normal torsion-free nilpotent subgroup of finite index that acts freely on  $G/H$ .*

*Remark 6.3.* By following the same argument and keeping track of all the quantitative aspects, one can also deduce that the finite-index nilpotent subgroup acts freely on the quotient graph in Tessera and the second author's finitary version of Trofimov's theorem [40, Theorem 2.3].

To obtain the additional conclusion that the finite-index normal nilpotent subgroup acts freely on  $G/H$ , we use the following lemma.

**Proposition 6.4.** *Let  $G$  be a connected, locally finite transitive graph of polynomial growth, and let  $o \in G$ . Let  $\Gamma < \text{Aut}(G)$  be a transitive subgroup acting on  $G$  with finite vertex stabilizers, and containing a normal nilpotent subgroup  $N$  with finite index. Then there exists a finite normal subgroup  $H \triangleleft \Gamma$  such that the image of  $N$  in  $\Gamma_{G/H}$  acts freely on  $G/H$ .*

*Proof.* If  $N_o = \{\text{id}\}$  then  $N$  acts freely on  $G$ , since if  $n(v) = v$  for some  $n \in N$  and  $v \in G$  then by transitivity there exists  $g \in \Gamma$  such that  $g(v) = o$ , so that  $gng^{-1}(o) = o$  and hence  $n = \text{id}$  by normality of  $N$ . We may therefore assume that  $N_o$  contains at least one non-identity element. In particular, we may also assume that  $|\Gamma_o| > 1$  and proceed by induction on  $|\Gamma_o|$ .

Consider  $N_o^\Gamma$ , the normal closure in  $\Gamma$  of the stabilizer  $N_o$ . Let  $S$  be the symmetric generating set  $\{g \in \Gamma : d_G(g(o), o) \leq 1\}$ , which is a finite symmetric generating set for  $\Gamma$ . Since  $S$  is finite,  $S^2$  is an *approximate group*, which simply means that  $S^2$  is symmetric and contains the identity and that there is a finite set  $X$  such that  $S^2 \subset XS$ . We may therefore apply [40, Proposition 6.5] to conclude that  $N_o^\Gamma$  is finite.

Write  $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_{G/N_o^\Gamma}$  for the quotient homomorphism, noting that  $(\Gamma_{G/N_o^\Gamma})_{N_o^\Gamma(o)} = \pi(\Gamma_o)$  by Lemma 6.1, and hence  $|(\Gamma_{G/N_o^\Gamma})_{N_o^\Gamma(o)}| < |G_o|$  because  $N_o$  contains a non-trivial element. The proposition therefore follows from applying the induction hypothesis to the group  $\Gamma_{G/N_o^\Gamma}$  acting on the graph  $G/N_o^\Gamma$ .  $\square$

The conclusion that the finite-index normal nilpotent subgroup is torsion-free is automatic by the following standard lemma.

**Lemma 6.5.** *Suppose  $\Gamma$  is a finitely generated group and  $N$  is a nilpotent subgroup of finite index. Then  $N$  contains a torsion-free subgroup of finite index that is normal in  $\Gamma$ .*

*Proof.* A subgroup of finite index in a finitely generated group is finitely generated, and every finitely generated nilpotent group embeds as a finite index subgroup in  $A \times B$  for some finite group  $A$  and some torsion-free group  $B$  (see [3, Theorem 2.1]), so  $N$  contains a further finite-index subgroup  $H$  that is torsion free. It is easy to check that the subgroup  $\bigcap_{g \in \Gamma/H} gHg^{-1}$  is a well-defined finite-index normal subgroup of  $\Gamma$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 6.2.* It is stated in [40, Theorem 2.1] that there is a compact normal subgroup  $H_0 \triangleleft \Gamma$  such that  $\Gamma_{G/H_0}$  is virtually nilpotent and acts on  $G/H_0$  with finite vertex stabilizers. Lemma 6.5 implies that  $\Gamma$  contains a normal nilpotent subgroup  $N$  of finite index. Proposition 6.4 therefore implies that there exists a normal subgroup  $H \triangleleft \Gamma$  containing  $H_0$  such that  $[H : H_0] < \infty$ , so that  $H$  is compact, and such that the image of  $N$  in  $\Gamma_{G/H}$  acts freely on  $G/H$ . The image of  $N$  is a nilpotent subgroup with finite index in  $\Gamma_{G/H}$ , so by Lemma 6.5 it contains a torsion-free nilpotent subgroup with finite index that is normal in  $\Gamma_{G/H}$ .  $\square$

Our aim in applying Theorem 6.2 is to compare spread-out percolation on  $G$  to spread-out percolation on  $G/H$ , and spread-out percolation on  $G/H$  to spread-out percolation on  $\Gamma_{G/H}$ . We start by comparing spread-out percolation on  $G$  to spread-out percolation on  $G/H$ .

Benjamini and Schramm [4, Theorem 1] famously showed that for each  $v \in G$  and  $p \in [0, 1]$  the image under  $\pi$  of the cluster of  $v$  in Bernoulli- $p$  percolation on  $G$  stochastically dominates the cluster of  $\pi(v)$  in Bernoulli- $p$  percolation on  $G/H$ . However, this is of limited use in our context, since spread-out percolation with parameter  $\lambda$  at scale  $r$  corresponds to very different values of  $p$  in Bernoulli percolation on  $G/H$  or on  $G$ . Fortunately, however, a similar argument to Benjamini and Schramm's yields the following result. Here and from now on, we write  $\mathbb{P}_p^G$  for the law of Bernoulli- $p$  bond percolation on  $G$ . Given a vertex  $v$  of  $G$  we write  $K_v$  for the cluster containing  $v$ , and given another vertex  $u$  we write  $u \leftrightarrow v$  for the event that  $u$  and  $v$  belong to the same open cluster.

**Proposition 6.6.** *Let  $G$  be a locally finite graph, let  $H < \text{Aut}(G)$ , and let  $\pi : G \rightarrow G/H$  be the quotient map. Let  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , and suppose that each orbit of  $H$  has size  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and diameter at most  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then for each  $v \in G$  and  $p \in [0, 1]$ , the image under  $\pi$  of the cluster of  $v$  in Bernoulli- $p$  percolation on  $G_{r+\ell}$  stochastically dominates the cluster of  $\pi(v)$  in Bernoulli- $(1 - (1-p)^k)$  percolation on  $(G/H)_r$ . That is,*

$$\mathbb{P}_p^{G_{r+\ell}} \left( \pi(K_v) \in A \right) \geq \mathbb{P}_{1-(1-p)^k}^{(G/H)_r} \left( K_{\pi(v)} \in A \right)$$

for every increasing measurable set  $A \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{G/H}$ .

*Proof.* We describe a procedure for coupling Bernoulli- $(1 - (1 - p)^k)$  bond percolation on  $(G/H)_r$  to Bernoulli- $p$  bond percolation on  $G_{r+\ell}$ , and exploring the cluster of  $\pi(v)$  in  $(G/H)_r^{1-(1-p)^k}$  and the cluster of  $v$  in  $G_{r+\ell}^{(p)}$ . We define random sequences  $C_0, C_1, C_2, \dots$  of subsets of  $G/H$  and  $B_0, B_1, B_2, \dots$  of sets of edges in  $(G/H)_r$ , and, for each  $x \in \bigcup_i C_i$ , a vertex  $u_x$  of  $G$  belonging to the orbit  $x$ . These sets and elements will depend on the random graph  $G_{r+\ell}^{(p)}$ , and will be defined such that  $\bigcup_i C_i$  is the cluster of  $\pi(v)$  in the coupled  $(G/H)_r^{1-(1-p)^k}$ , and such that for each  $x \in \bigcup_i C_i$  we have  $u_x \leftrightarrow v$  in  $G_{r+\ell}^{(p)}$ , proving the proposition.

Start with  $C_0 = \{\pi(v)\}$  and  $B_0 = \emptyset$ , and set  $u_{\pi(v)} = v$ . Then, once  $C_n$  and  $B_n$  are defined, if  $B_n$  contains the whole edge boundary  $\partial C_n$  of  $C_n$  in  $(G/H)_r$  then we stop. If  $\partial C_n \not\subseteq B_n$ , let  $x \in C_n$  and  $y \in (G/H) \setminus C_n$  be such that  $(x, y) \in \partial C_n \setminus B_n$ , with  $x$  chosen to be at minimum possible distance from  $\pi(v)$ . Now note that for each vertex  $z$  of  $G$  belonging to the  $H$ -orbit  $y$  we have  $d(u_x, z) \leq r + \ell$ , so that the graph  $G_{r+\ell}$  contains the edge  $(u_x, z)$ . If all  $k$  of these edges are closed in  $G_{r+\ell}^{(p)}$ , we declare  $(x, y)$  to be closed in  $(G/H)_r$ , and set  $C_{n+1} = C_n$  and  $B_{n+1} = B_n \cup \{(x, y)\}$ . If at least one of these edges is open, however, then we declare  $(x, y)$  to be open in  $(G/H)_r$ , set  $B_{n+1} = B_n$  and  $C'_{n+1} = C'_n \cup \{y\}$ , and choose  $u_y \in y$  arbitrarily so that  $(u_x, u_y)$  is open.

Note that each edge of  $(G/H)_r$  that we explore in this way has probability  $1 - (1 - p)^k$  of being open, and that decisions about distinct edges are independent. If we now declare edges of  $(G/H)_r$  we did not explore to be open independently with probability  $1 - (1 - p)^k$ , we recover Bernoulli- $(1 - (1 - p)^k)$  bond percolation on  $(G/H)_r$ , with  $K_{\pi(v)} = \bigcup_i C_i$  as required (note that by choosing  $x$  to have the smallest possible distance from  $\pi(v)$  we ensured that  $\bigcup_i C_i$  contained every vertex of  $K_{\pi(v)}$ ).  $\square$

Next, we want to compare spread-out percolation on  $G/H$  to spread-out percolation on  $\Gamma_{G/H}$ . For this, we use the following proposition, the proof of which is somewhat similar to that of Proposition 6.6.

**Proposition 6.7.** *Let  $G$  be a connected transitive graph with distinguished vertex  $o$ , and suppose  $\Gamma < \text{Aut}(G)$  acts transitively on  $G$  and contains a subgroup  $H < \Gamma$  that acts freely on  $G$  with exactly  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  distinct orbits. Let  $S = \{g \in \Gamma : d(o, g(o)) \leq 1\}$ , let  $X \subset S^k$  be a minimal set containing the identity and satisfying  $G = HX(o)$ , and let  $\eta : G \rightarrow H$  and  $\xi : G \rightarrow X$  be the unique maps such that  $v = \eta(v)\xi(v)(o)$  for all  $v \in G$ . Then for each  $p \in [0, 1]$ ,  $m, r \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h \in H$ , the image under  $\eta$  of the cluster of  $h(o)$  in Bernoulli- $p$  bond percolation on  $G_{rm+2k}$  stochastically dominates the cluster of  $h$  in Bernoulli- $(1 - (1 - p)^k)$  bond percolation on  $G(H, (H \cap S^m)^r)$ . That is,*

$$\mathbb{P}_p^{G_{rm+2k}} \left( \eta(K_{h(o)}) \in A \right) \geq \mathbb{P}_{1-(1-p)^k}^{G(H, (H \cap S^m)^r)} \left( K_h \in A \right)$$

for every increasing measurable set  $A \subseteq \{0, 1\}^H$ .

*Proof.* We describe a procedure for coupling Bernoulli- $(1 - (1 - p)^k)$  bond percolation on  $G(H, (H \cap S^m)^r)$  to Bernoulli- $p$  bond percolation on  $G_{rm+2k}$ , and exploring the cluster of  $h$  in  $G^{1-(1-p)^k}(H, (H \cap S^m)^r)$  and the cluster of  $h(o)$  in  $G_{rm+2k}^{(p)}$ . We define random sequences  $C_0, C_1, C_2, \dots$  of subsets of  $H$  and  $B_0, B_1, B_2, \dots$  of sets of edges in  $G(H, (H \cap S^m)^r)$ , and, for each  $u \in \bigcup_i C_i$ , an element  $x_u \in X$ . These sets and elements will depend on the random graph  $G_{rm+2k}^{(p)}$ , and will be defined

such that  $\bigcup_i C_i$  is the cluster of  $h$  in the coupled  $G^{(1-(1-p)^k)}(H, (H \cap S^m)^r)$ , and such that for each  $u \in \bigcup_i C_i$  we have  $ux_u(o) \leftrightarrow h(o)$  in  $G_{rm+2k}^{(p)}$ , proving the proposition.

Start with  $C_0 = \{h\}$  and  $B_0 = \emptyset$ , and set  $x_h = \text{id}$ . Then, once  $C_n$  and  $B_n$  are defined, if  $B_n$  contains the whole edge boundary  $\partial C_n$  of  $C_n$  in  $G(H, (H \cap S^m)^r)$  then we stop. If  $\partial C_n \not\subset B_n$ , let  $u \in C_n$  and  $s \in (H \cap S^m)^r$  be such that  $(u, us) \in \partial C_n \setminus B_n$ , with  $u$  chosen to be at minimum possible distance from  $h$ . Now note that for each  $y \in X$  we have  $d_G(ux_u(o), usy(o)) \leq rm + 2k$ , so that the graph  $G_{rm+2k}$  contains the edge  $(ux_u(o), usy(o))$ . If all  $k$  of these edges are closed in  $G_{rm+2k}^{(p)}$ , we declare  $(u, us)$  to be closed in  $G(H, (H \cap S^m)^r)$ , and set  $C_{n+1} = C_n$  and  $B_{n+1} = B_n \cup \{(u, us)\}$ . If at least one of these edges is open, however, then we declare  $(u, us)$  to be open in  $G(H, (H \cap S^m)^r)$ , set  $B_{n+1} = B_n$  and  $C_{n+1} = C_n \cup \{us\}$ , and choose  $x_{us} \in X$  arbitrarily so that  $(ux_u(o), usx_{us}(o))$  is open.

Note that each edge of  $G(H, (H \cap S^m)^r)$  that we explore in this way has probability  $1 - (1-p)^k$  of being open, and that decisions about distinct edges are independent. If we now declare edges of  $G(H, (H \cap S^m)^r)$  we did not explore to be open independently with probability  $1 - (1-p)^k$ , we recover Bernoulli- $(1 - (1-p)^k)$  bond percolation on  $G(H, (H \cap S^m)^r)$ , with  $K_h = \bigcup_i C_i$  as required.  $\square$

The assumption in Proposition 6.7 that  $X \subset S^k$  does not render the proposition vacuous, thanks to the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.8.** *Let  $G$  be a connected transitive graph with distinguished vertex  $o$ , and suppose  $\Gamma < \text{Aut}(G)$  acts transitively on  $G$  and contains a subgroup  $H < \Gamma$  that acts on  $G$  with at least  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  distinct orbits. Let  $S = \{g \in \Gamma : d(o, g(o)) \leq 1\}$ . Then  $S^{k-1}(o)$  has non-empty intersection with at least  $k$  distinct  $H$ -orbits.*

*Proof.* The case  $k = 1$  is trivial, so we may assume that  $k \geq 2$  and, by induction, that  $S^{k-2}(o)$  has non-empty intersection with at least  $k - 1$  distinct  $H$ -orbits. Writing  $U$  for the union of those orbits of  $H$  having non-empty intersection with  $S^{k-2}(o)$ , we may also assume that  $U \neq G$ , so that there exists a vertex  $u \in U$  with a neighbour  $v \in G \setminus U$ . By definition, there exists  $h \in H$  such that  $h(u) \in S^{k-2}(o)$ , and hence  $h(v) \in S^{k-1}(o)$ , so that  $S^{k-1}(o)$  meets at least one more  $H$ -orbit than  $S^{k-2}(o)$  does.  $\square$

In order to use Proposition 6.7 to compare spread-out percolation on  $G/H$  to spread-out percolation on the torsion-free nilpotent subgroup of  $\Gamma_{G/H}$ , we need to be able to compare the sizes of balls in the two spaces. For this, we use the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.9.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a group with finite symmetric generator set  $S$  containing the identity, let  $H \leq \Gamma$  be a finite-index subgroup, and let  $X \subset S^k$  be a set of right-coset representatives for  $H$  in  $\Gamma$ . Let  $m > 2k$ . Then for every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $S^{r(m-2k)} \subset (H \cap S^m)^r X$ . In particular,  $H \cap S^m$  generates  $H$  and  $|S^{r(m-2k)}| \leq [G : H] |(H \cap S^m)^r|$ .*

*Proof.* The fact that  $X$  is a set of coset representatives implies that  $S^{m-k} \subset HX$ . Since  $X \subset S^k$  this in fact implies that

$$(6.2) \quad S^{m-k} \subset (H \cap S^m)X,$$

and proves the case  $r = 1$  a fortiori. For  $r > 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^{r(m-2k)} &= \mathcal{S}^{(r-1)(m-2k)} \mathcal{S}^{m-2k} \\ &\subset (H \cap \mathcal{S}^m)^{r-1} X \mathcal{S}^{m-2k} && \text{(by induction)} \\ &\subset (H \cap \mathcal{S}^m)^{r-1} \mathcal{S}^{m-k} \\ &\subset (H \cap \mathcal{S}^m)^r X && \text{(by (6.2)),} \end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

We also need to compare balls of slightly different radii in  $G$  and in  $G/H$ , for which we use the following result of Tessera, which actually holds in the more general setting of measured metric spaces with *property (M)* (see [39] for definitions and details).

**Proposition 6.10** (Tessera [39, Theorem 4]<sup>1</sup>). *Given  $K > 1$  there exist  $C = C(K) \geq 1$  and  $\delta = \delta(K) > 0$  such that if  $G$  is a locally finite transitive graph and  $|\beta_G(2n)| \leq K|\beta_G(n)|$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  then*

$$|B(x, n+1) \setminus B(x, n)| \leq Cn^{-\delta} \beta_G(n)$$

for all  $x \in G$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

It will be convenient to record the following particular consequence of Proposition 6.10.

**Lemma 6.11.** *Let  $k, t, K \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then there exists  $M = M(k, t, K, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that if  $G$  is a locally finite transitive graph satisfying  $|\beta_G(2n)| \leq K|\beta_G(n)|$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  then  $|\beta_G(r(m-t))| \geq (1-\varepsilon)|\beta_G((r+1)m+k)|$  for all integers  $m, r \geq M$ .*

*Proof.* Applying Proposition 6.10 with  $G_r$  in place of  $G$ , provided  $m$  is large enough in terms of  $t, K$  and  $\varepsilon$  we have  $\beta_G(r(m-t)) \geq (1-\varepsilon)^{1/3} \beta_G(rm)$ . Applying Proposition 6.10 with  $G_m$  now in place of  $G$ , provided  $r$  is large enough in terms of  $K$  and  $\varepsilon$  we have  $\beta_G(rm) \geq (1-\varepsilon)^{1/3} \beta_G((r+1)m)$ . Finally, provided  $r$  is large enough in terms of  $t, K$  and  $\varepsilon$ , Proposition 6.10 implies that  $\beta_G((r+1)m) \geq (1-\varepsilon)^{1/3} \beta_G((r+1)m+k)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Let  $H \triangleleft \Gamma$  be the compact subgroup given by Theorem 6.2, let  $N \triangleleft \Gamma_{G/H}$  be the normal torsion-free nilpotent subgroup of finite index in  $\Gamma_{G/H}$  acting freely on  $G/H$  given by the same theorem. Since  $H$  is compact, its orbits are finite, so that  $G/H$  also has superlinear growth. Since  $\Gamma_{G/H}$  acts with finite vertex stabilizers, the set  $S = \{g \in \Gamma/H : d(H(o), g(H(o))) \leq 1\}$  is a finite symmetric generating set, and  $\Gamma_{G/H}$  is a finitely generated group of superlinear polynomial growth by (6.1). Note therefore that  $N$  is not cyclic, since otherwise  $N$  and hence  $\Gamma_{G/H}$  would have linear growth.

Write  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  for the number of distinct orbits of the action of  $N$  on  $G/H$ , and let  $X \subset S^k$  be a minimal set containing the identity and satisfying  $G/H = NX(H(o))$ , noting that such a set exists by Lemma 6.8. Let  $Y$  be a set of right-coset representatives for  $N$  in  $\Gamma/H$  such that  $X \subset Y$  and such that for each  $Y(H(o)) = X(H(o))$  (such a set exists because, given a right coset  $Ng$  of  $N$  in  $\Gamma$ , we have  $g(H(o)) = nx(H(o))$  for some  $n \in N$  and  $x \in X$ , so that  $Ng = N(n^{-1}g)$  and  $n^{-1}g(H(o)) = x(H(o))$ ). Fix  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that  $Y \subset S^t$ .

Fix  $\lambda > 1$  and  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $m > 2t$ , and let  $q = \lambda^{3/4}/|B(H(o), (n+1)m+2k)|$ . Provided  $m$  and  $n$  are large enough, Lemma 6.11 implies that  $\beta_{G/H}(n(m-2t)) \geq \lambda^{-1/4} \beta_{G/H}((n+1)m+2k)$ ,

<sup>1</sup>The statement of [39, Theorem 4] does not include the fact that  $C$  and  $\delta$  depend only on  $K$ , but this follows from the proof.

and hence that  $q \geq \lambda^{1/2}/\beta_{G/H}(n(m-2t))$ . It follows from Lemma 6.9 that  $B(H(o), n(m-2t)) = S^{n(m-2t)}(H(o)) \subset (N \cap S^m)^n Y(H(o)) = (N \cap S^m)^n X(H(o))$ , hence  $\beta_{G/H}(n(m-2t)) \leq k|(N \cap S^m)^n|$ , and hence

$$q \geq \frac{\lambda^{1/2}}{k|(N \cap S^m)^n|}.$$

Provided  $n$  is large enough, we also have  $1 - (1-q)^k \geq \lambda^{-1/4}kq$ , and hence therefore

$$1 - (1-q)^k \geq \frac{\lambda^{1/4}}{|(N \cap S^m)^n|}.$$

Provided  $n$  is large enough, Lemma 6.9 and Theorem 1.3 then imply that

$$\mathbb{P}_{1-(1-q)^k}(G(N, (N \cap S^m)^n) \text{ contains an infinite cluster}) = 1,$$

and then Proposition 6.7 implies that

$$\mathbb{P}_q((G/H)_{nm+2k} \text{ contains an infinite cluster}) = 1.$$

Since  $(G/H)_{nm+2k}$  is a subgraph of  $(G/H)_r$  for all  $r \geq nm+2k$ , this then implies that  $(G/H)_{r, \lambda^{3/4}}$  has an infinite component with probability 1 for every integer  $r \in [nm+2k, (n+1)m+2k]$ . Leaving  $m$  fixed but large enough, and allowing  $n$  to vary over all large enough integers, this proves that  $(G/H)_{r, \lambda^{3/4}}$  has an infinite component with probability 1 for every integer  $r \geq m+2k$ .

Now write  $\ell$  for the diameter of the orbits of  $H$ , fix an integer  $r > \ell$ , and set  $p = \lambda/\beta_G(r)$ . For large enough  $r$  we have  $1 - (1-p)^{|H(o)|} \geq \lambda^{-1/8}|H(o)|p$ , hence

$$1 - (1-p)^{|H(o)|} \geq \frac{\lambda^{7/8}|H(o)|}{\beta_G(r)} \geq \frac{\lambda^{7/8}}{\beta_{G/H}(r)}.$$

Moreover, Proposition 6.10 implies that for large enough  $r$  we have  $\beta_{G/H}(r) \leq \lambda^{1/8}\beta_{G/H}(r-\ell)$ , and hence  $1 - (1-p)^{|H(o)|} \geq \lambda^{3/4}/\beta_{G/H}(r-\ell)$ . Provided  $r$  is large enough, the previous paragraph then implies that  $\mathbb{P}_{1-(1-p)^{|H(o)|}}((G/H)_{r-\ell} \text{ contains an infinite cluster}) = 1$ , and then Proposition 6.6 implies that  $\mathbb{P}_p(G_r \text{ contains an infinite cluster}) = 1$ , as required.  $\square$

We close this section and the paper by returning to one of the first assertions we made in the introduction: that equality holds in (1.1) for  $G$  transitive if and only if  $G$  is a tree. This is well known in folklore, but we have been unable to find an explicit reference, so we record a proof here for completeness. One can also prove this more elementarily, but we opt for brevity.

**Proposition 6.12.** *Suppose  $G = (V, E)$  is a connected transitive graph of degree  $d \geq 2$ . Then  $p_c(G) \geq 1/(d-1)$ , with equality if and only if  $G$  is a tree.*

*Proof.* Equality in the case of a tree is well known (see e.g. [31, Theorem 1.8]). To see that strict inequality holds for transitive graphs that are not trees, we use a result of Martineau and Severo [33, Theorem 0.1], a special case of which states that if  $G_0 = (V_0, E_0)$  is a transitive graph with  $p_c(G) < 1$  and  $H$  is a non-trivial group acting freely on  $V_0$  by automorphisms then  $p_c(G_0/H) > p_c(G_0)$ . Now simply note that the universal cover of  $G$  (indeed any  $d$ -regular graph) is the  $d$ -regular tree  $T_d$ , and that  $G$  is then the quotient of  $T_d$  by the group of deck transformations, which acts freely.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. K. Alexopoulos. Random walks on discrete groups of polynomial volume growth. *The Annals of Probability*, 30(2):723 – 801, 2002.
- [2] N. Alon, I. Benjamini, and A. Stacey. Percolation on finite graphs and isoperimetric inequalities. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(3A):1727–1745, 2004.
- [3] G. Baumslag. Lecture notes on nilpotent groups. In *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*, pages 1–73, 1971.
- [4] I. Benjamini and O. Schramm. Percolation beyond  $\mathbf{Z}^d$ , many questions and a few answers. *Electron. Comm. Probab.*, 1:71–82, 1996.
- [5] I. Benjamini and R. Tessera. First passage percolation on nilpotent Cayley graphs and beyond. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 20(none):1 – 20, 2015.
- [6] P. Billingsley. *Weak Convergence in Metric Spaces*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 1999.
- [7] B. Bollobás, S. Janson, and O. Riordan. The phase transition in inhomogeneous random graphs. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 31(1):3–122, aug 2007.
- [8] B. Bollobás, S. Janson, and O. Riordan. Spread-out percolation in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 31(2):239–246, 2007.
- [9] E. Breuillard. Local limit theorems and equidistribution of random walks on the Heisenberg group. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 15(1):35–82, 2005.
- [10] E. Breuillard. Equidistribution of dense subgroups on nilpotent Lie groups. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 30(1):131–150, 2010.
- [11] E. Breuillard and E. Le Donne. On the rate of convergence to the asymptotic cone for nilpotent groups and subFinsler geometry. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(48):19220–19226, 2013.
- [12] D. Contreras, S. Martineau, and V. Tassion. Supercritical percolation on graphs of polynomial growth. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06326*, 2021.
- [13] D. Contreras, S. Martineau, and V. Tassion. Locality of percolation for graphs with polynomial growth. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 28:1–9, 2023.
- [14] L. J. Corwin and F. P. Greenleaf. *Representations of nilpotent Lie groups and their applications. Part I*, volume 18 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990. Basic theory and examples.
- [15] P. Diaconis and B. Hough. Random walk on unipotent matrix groups. *Annales scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure*, 54(3):587–625, 2021.
- [16] E. L. Donne. A primer on Carnot groups: Homogenous groups, Carnot–Carathéodory spaces, and regularity of their isometries. *Analysis and Geometry in Metric Spaces*, 5(1):116–137, 2017.
- [17] P. Easo and T. Hutchcroft. The critical percolation probability is local. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10983*, 2023.
- [18] A. Georgakopoulos. A notion of dimension based on probability on groups, 2024+.
- [19] C. Gorski. Strict monotonicity for first passage percolation on graphs of polynomial growth and quasi-trees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.13922*, 2022.
- [20] M. Gromov. Groups of polynomial growth and expanding maps. *Publications Mathématiques de l'Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques*, 53(1):53–78, Dec 1981.
- [21] M. Gromov. *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*, volume 152 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1999.
- [22] Y. Guivarc’h. Croissance polynomiale et périodes des fonctions harmoniques. *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, 101:333–379, 1973.
- [23] T. Hara and G. Slade. Mean-field critical behaviour for percolation in high dimensions. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 128:333–391, 1990.
- [24] G. Hochschild. *The structure of Lie groups*. Holden-Day, Inc., San Francisco-London-Amsterdam,, 1965.
- [25] S. Ishiwata. A central limit theorem on a covering graph with a transformation group of polynomial growth. *Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan*, 55(3):837 – 853, 2003.
- [26] S. Ishiwata, H. Kawabi, and R. Namba. Central limit theorems for non-symmetric random walks on nilpotent covering graphs: Part I. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 25:1–46, 2020.
- [27] S. Ishiwata, H. Kawabi, and R. Namba. Central Limit Theorems for Non-Symmetric Random Walks on Nilpotent Covering Graphs: Part II. *Potential Analysis*, 55(1):127–166, Jun 2021.
- [28] J. Justin. Groupes et semi-groupes à croissance linéaire. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 273:212–214, 1971.

- [29] H. Kesten. Asymptotics in high dimensions for percolation. In *Disorder in physical systems*, pages 219–240. 1990.
- [30] T. M. Liggett, R. H. Schonmann, and A. Stacey. Domination by product measures. *The Annals of Probability*, 25(1):71–95, 1997.
- [31] R. Lyons and Y. Peres. *Probability on Trees and Networks*, volume 42 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2016. Available at <https://rdlyons.pages.iu.edu/>.
- [32] A. I. Malcev. Nilpotent torsion-free groups. *Izvestiya Akademii Nauk SSSR. Seriya Matematicheskaya*, 13:201 – 212, 1949.
- [33] S. Martineau and F. Severo. Strict monotonicity of percolation thresholds under covering maps. *The Annals of Probability*, 47(6):4116–4136, 2019.
- [34] Y. Matsushima. On the Discrete Subgroups and Homogeneous Spaces of Nilpotent Lie Groups. *Nagoya Mathematical Journal*, 2:95–110, 1951.
- [35] R. Montgomery. *A tour of subriemannian geometries, their geodesics and applications*, volume 91 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.
- [36] P. Pansu. Croissance des boules et des géodésiques fermées dans les nilvariétés. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 3(3):415–445, 1983.
- [37] M. D. Penrose. On the spread-out limit for bond and continuum percolation. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 3(1):253–276, 1993.
- [38] M. S. Raghunathan. *Discrete subgroups of Lie groups*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1972.
- [39] R. Tessera. Volume of spheres in doubling metric measured spaces and in groups of polynomial growth. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 135:47–64, 2007.
- [40] R. Tessera and M. Tointon. A finitary structure theorem for vertex-transitive graphs of polynomial growth. *Combinatorica*, 41:263–298, 2021.
- [41] V. I. Trofimov. Graphs with polynomial growth. *Math. USSR-Sb.*, 51:405–417, 1985.
- [42] W. Woess. Topological groups and infinite graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 95:373–384, 1991.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, RUHR UNIVERSITY BOCHUM, GERMANY  
Email address: [panagiotis.spanos@ruhr-uni-bochum.de](mailto:panagiotis.spanos@ruhr-uni-bochum.de)

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, UNITED KINGDOM  
Email address: [m.tointon@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:m.tointon@bristol.ac.uk)