

Unpublished manuscript

Diagrammatic bounds on the lace-expansion coefficients for oriented percolation

Akira Sakai*

July 25, 2007

In this note, we provide a complete proof of [2, Proposition 3.3]. For notational convenience, we use bold letters to denote vertices in $\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}$, e.g., $\mathbf{o} \equiv (o, 0)$ and $\mathbf{x}$; if necessary, we denote the spatial and temporal components of a given vertex $\mathbf{v}$ by $\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}$ and $\tau_{\mathbf{v}}$ respectively: $\mathbf{v} = (\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}, \tau_{\mathbf{v}})$. To identify the starting and terminal points, we write, e.g., $\varphi_p(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}_p(\mathbf{v} \rightarrow \mathbf{x})$ and abbreviate it to $\varphi_p(\mathbf{x})$ if $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{o}$; in particular, $\varphi_p(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{x}) = \varphi_p(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v})$ if the model is translation-invariant. Let $\text{piv}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x})$ denote the (random) set of pivotal bonds for $\{\mathbf{v} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\}$.

1 Bounds in terms of two-point functions

In this section, we prove bounds on $\pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\Pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$, for fixed $\mathbf{x}$, in terms of two-point functions. To prove these bounds, we do not have to assume translation-invariance.

Recall that the lace-expansion coefficients $\pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\Pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$ for $N \geq 1$ are defined in terms of the event

$$\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_N}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{o} \rightrightarrows \underline{b}_1\} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^N E(b_i, \underline{b}_{i+1}; \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{b_i}(\bar{b}_{i-1})), \quad (1.1)$$

where $\vec{b}_N = (b_1, \dots, b_N)$ is an ordered set of bonds and

$$E(b, \mathbf{x}; \mathcal{C}) = \{b \rightarrow \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}\} \cap \{\nexists b' \in \text{piv}(\bar{b}, \mathbf{x}) \text{ satisfying } \underline{b}' \in \mathcal{C}\}, \quad (1.2)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^b(\mathbf{v}) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} : \mathbf{v} \rightarrow \mathbf{x} \text{ without using } b\}. \quad (1.3)$$

Lemma 1.

$$\pi_p^{(0)}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \mathbb{P}_p(\mathbf{o} \rightrightarrows \mathbf{x}) \leq \delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{o}} + (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{x})^2, \quad (1.4)$$

and, for $N \geq 1$,

$$\pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \sum_{\vec{b}_N} \mathbb{P}_p(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_N}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})) \leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{N+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N+1} \\ (\mathbf{u}_{N+1} = \mathbf{v}_{N+1} = \mathbf{x})}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{v}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{v}_1) \prod_{i=1}^N \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}), \quad (1.5)$$

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Bath, UK.

where

$$\Xi_p(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') = (\xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') + \xi_p^\times(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}')) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}'; \mathbf{v}') / 2^{\delta_{\mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}'}}, \quad (1.6)$$

$$\begin{cases} \xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') = (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{u}') (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{v}'), \\ \xi_p^\times(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') = (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{v}') (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}'). \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

Proof. Since (1.4) is already proved in [2, (3.18)], it remains to show (1.5). By definition, we can easily see that

$$E(b, \mathbf{x}; \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^b(\mathbf{y})) \subset \{\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\} \circ \{b \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\}, \quad (1.8)$$

where $E_1 \circ E_2$ is the event that E_1 and E_2 occur bond-disjointly (i.e., E_1 occurs on some bond set B and E_2 occurs on B^c). Similarly,

$$\{\mathbf{o} \Rightarrow \mathbf{v}\} \cap \{\mathbf{o} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\} \subset \bigcup_{\mathbf{u}} \{ \{\mathbf{o} \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}\} \circ \{\mathbf{o} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}\} \circ \{\mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\} \}, \quad (1.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} E(b, \mathbf{v}; \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^b(\mathbf{y})) \cap \{\bar{b} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\} \subset & \bigcup_{\mathbf{u}: \tau_{\mathbf{u}} > \tau_{\underline{b}}} \{ \{ \{\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}\} \circ \{b \rightarrow \mathbf{v}\} \circ \{\mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\} \} \\ & \cup \{ \{\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}\} \circ \{b \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}\} \circ \{\mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\} \} \}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

To prove (1.5), we use (1.8)–(1.10) and the BK inequality and pay attention to which event depends on which time interval. For example, by (1.8),

$$\tilde{E}_{\bar{b}_N}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \subset \tilde{E}_{\bar{b}_{N-1}}^{(N-1)}(\underline{b}_N) \cap \{\bar{b}_{N-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\} \circ \{b_N \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\}. \quad (1.11)$$

Since $\tilde{E}_{\bar{b}_{N-1}}^{(N-1)}(\underline{b}_N)$ depends only on bonds before time $\tau_{\underline{b}_N}$, we can use the BK inequality to obtain

$$\sum_{b_N} \mathbb{P}_p(\tilde{E}_{\bar{b}_N}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{v}_N} \mathbb{P}_p(\tilde{E}_{\bar{b}_{N-1}}^{(N-1)}(\mathbf{v}_N) \cap \{\bar{b}_{N-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\}) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_N; \mathbf{x}). \quad (1.12)$$

Then, by (1.10) and the BK inequality and using the Markov property, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{b_{N-1}} \mathbb{P}_p(\tilde{E}_{\bar{b}_{N-1}}^{(N-1)}(\mathbf{v}_N) \cap \{\bar{b}_{N-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\}) \\ & \leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v}_{N-1}, \mathbf{u}_N \\ (\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{N-1}} < \tau_{\mathbf{u}_N})}} \left(\mathbb{P}_p(\tilde{E}_{\bar{b}_{N-2}}^{(N-2)}(\mathbf{v}_{N-1}) \cap \{\bar{b}_{N-2} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_N\}) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_{N-1}; \mathbf{v}_N) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mathbb{P}_p(\tilde{E}_{\bar{b}_{N-2}}^{(N-2)}(\mathbf{v}_{N-1}) \cap \{\bar{b}_{N-2} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_N\}) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_{N-1}; \mathbf{u}_N) \right) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_N; \mathbf{v}_N) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_N; \mathbf{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (1.13)$$

Since $\tau_{\mathbf{u}_N} \leq \tau_{\mathbf{v}_N} < \tau_{\mathbf{x}}$ (due to $(q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_N; \mathbf{x})$ in (1.12) and $\varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_N; \mathbf{v}_N)$ in (1.13)), we can replace the last term in (1.13) by $(q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}_N; \mathbf{x})$, using the trivial inequality

$$\varphi_p(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{x}) \leq (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{x}) \quad (\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{x}). \quad (1.14)$$

Summarizing these bounds, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{b_{N-1}, b_N} \mathbb{P}_p(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_N}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})) &\leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v}_{N-1}, \mathbf{u}_N, \mathbf{v}_N \\ (\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{N-1}} < \tau_{\mathbf{u}_N})}} \left(\mathbb{P}_p\left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_{N-2}}^{(N-2)}(\mathbf{v}_{N-1}) \cap \{\bar{b}_{N-2} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_N\}\right) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_{N-1}; \mathbf{v}_N) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{P}_p\left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_{N-2}}^{(N-2)}(\mathbf{v}_{N-1}) \cap \{\bar{b}_{N-2} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_N\}\right) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_{N-1}; \mathbf{u}_N) \right) \\
&\quad \times \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_N; \mathbf{v}_N) \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_N, \mathbf{v}_N; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}). \tag{1.15}
\end{aligned}$$

Using (1.13)–(1.14) again, but with different variables, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{b_{N-2}, b_{N-1}, b_N} \mathbb{P}_p(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_N}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})) &\leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_{N-1}, \mathbf{u}_N \\ \mathbf{v}_{N-2}, \mathbf{v}_{N-1}, \mathbf{v}_N \\ (\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{N-2}} < \tau_{\mathbf{u}_{N-1}})}} \left(\mathbb{P}_p\left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_{N-3}}^{(N-3)}(\mathbf{v}_{N-2}) \cap \{\bar{b}_{N-3} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_{N-1}\}\right) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_{N-2}; \mathbf{v}_{N-1}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{P}_p\left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_{N-3}}^{(N-3)}(\mathbf{v}_{N-2}) \cap \{\bar{b}_{N-3} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_{N-1}\}\right) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_{N-2}; \mathbf{u}_{N-1}) \right) \\
&\quad \times \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_{N-1}; \mathbf{v}_{N-1}) \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_{N-1}, \mathbf{v}_{N-1}; \mathbf{u}_N, \mathbf{v}_N) \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_N, \mathbf{v}_N; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}). \tag{1.16}
\end{aligned}$$

We repeat this procedure until we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\vec{b}_N} \mathbb{P}_p(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_N}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})) &\leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N \\ (\tau_{\mathbf{v}_1} < \tau_{\mathbf{u}_2})}} \left(\mathbb{P}_p\left(\{\mathbf{o} \Rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1\} \cap \{\mathbf{o} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_2\}\right) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_1; \mathbf{v}_2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{P}_p\left(\{\mathbf{o} \Rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1\} \cap \{\mathbf{o} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_2\}\right) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_1; \mathbf{u}_2) \right) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_2; \mathbf{v}_2) \\
&\quad \times \prod_{i=2}^{N-1} \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_N, \mathbf{v}_N; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}). \tag{1.17}
\end{aligned}$$

By (1.9) and the BK inequality and using the Markov property and (1.14) under the restriction $\tau_{\mathbf{v}_1} < \tau_{\mathbf{u}_2}$, we obtain (1.5). ■

Lemma 2. For $N \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) &\equiv \sum_{\vec{b}_N} \sum_{b=1}^N \mathbb{P}_p\left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_N}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \cap \{b = b_j \text{ or } b \in \text{piv}(\bar{b}_j, \bar{b}_{j+1})\}\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{N+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N+1} \\ (\mathbf{u}_{N+1} = \mathbf{v}_{N+1} = \mathbf{x})}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{v}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{v}_1) \sum_{j=1}^N \prod_{i \neq j} \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \\
&\quad \times \left(\Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) + \Theta_p(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) + \Theta'_p(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \right), \tag{1.18}
\end{aligned}$$

where the empty product $\prod_{i \neq j} \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1})$ for the case of $N = 1$ is 1 by convention, and

$$\Theta_p(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') = (\theta_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') + \theta_p^\times(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}')) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}'; \mathbf{v}') / 2^{\delta_{\mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}'}}, \quad (1.19)$$

$$\begin{cases} \theta_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') = (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{u}') (q_p * \varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{v}'), \\ \theta_p^\times(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') = (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{v}') (q_p * \varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}'), \end{cases} \quad (1.20)$$

$$\Theta'_p(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') = (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{v}') (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}') (\varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}'; \mathbf{v}'). \quad (1.21)$$

Proof. Since

$$\sum_{\vec{b}_N, b} \mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_N}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \cap \{b = b_j \text{ or } b \in \text{piv}(\bar{b}_j, \underline{b}_{j+1})\} \right) = \pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{\vec{b}_N, b} \mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_N}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \cap \{b \in \text{piv}(\bar{b}_j, \underline{b}_{j+1})\} \right), \quad (1.22)$$

it suffices to investigate the sum on the right-hand side. To do so, we use the following relations that are similar to (1.8) and (1.10):

$$E(b', \mathbf{x}; \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{b'}(\mathbf{y})) \cap \{b \in \text{piv}(\bar{b}', \mathbf{x})\} \subset \{\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\} \circ \{b' \rightarrow b \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\}, \quad (1.23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} E(b', \mathbf{v}; \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{b'}(\mathbf{y})) \cap \{b \in \text{piv}(\bar{b}', \mathbf{v})\} \cap \{\bar{b}' \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\} &\subset \bigcup_{\mathbf{u}: \tau_{\mathbf{u}} > \tau_{\bar{b}'}} \left\{ \{\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}\} \circ \{b' \rightarrow b \rightarrow \mathbf{v}\} \circ \{\mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\} \right\} \\ &\cup \left\{ \{\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}\} \circ \{b' \rightarrow b \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}\} \circ \{\mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\} \right\} \\ &\cup \left\{ \{\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}\} \circ \{b' \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \rightarrow b \rightarrow \mathbf{v}\} \circ \{\mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.24)$$

First we let $j = N$. By (1.23) and using the BK inequality and the Markov property, we obtain

$$\sum_{b_N, b} \mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_N}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \cap \{b \in \text{piv}(\bar{b}_N, \mathbf{x})\} \right) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{v}_N} \mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_{N-1}}^{(N-1)}(\mathbf{v}_N) \cap \{\bar{b}_{N-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}\} \right) (q_p * \varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_N; \mathbf{x}), \quad (1.25)$$

which is equivalent to (1.12), except for the last term $(q_p * \varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_N; \mathbf{x})$. Therefore, by following the same line as in (1.13)–(1.17), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\vec{b}_N, b} \mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_N}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \cap \{b \in \text{piv}(\bar{b}_N, \mathbf{x})\} \right) &\leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{v}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{v}_1) \prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \\ &\quad \times \Theta_p(\mathbf{u}_N, \mathbf{v}_N; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (1.26)$$

Applying (1.5) to $\pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$ in (1.22) and using $\Theta'_p(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') = 0$ for $\mathbf{u}' = \mathbf{v}'$ (since $(\varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}'; \mathbf{v}')$ in (1.21) is zero if $\mathbf{u}' = \mathbf{v}'$), we obtain the term for $j = N$ in (1.18).

Next we let $j < N$. Following the same line as in (1.12)–(1.16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\vec{b}_N, b} \mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_N}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \cap \{b \in \text{piv}(\bar{b}_j, \underline{b}_{j+1})\} \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_{j+2}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N \\ \mathbf{v}_{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N \\ (\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{j+1}} < \tau_{\mathbf{u}_{j+2}})}} \sum_{\vec{b}_j, b} \left(\mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_j}^{(j)}(\mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \cap \{b \in \text{piv}(\bar{b}_j, \mathbf{v}_{j+1})\} \cap \{\bar{b}_j \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_{j+2}\} \right) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_{j+1}; \mathbf{v}_{j+2}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_j}^{(j)}(\mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \cap \{b \in \text{piv}(\bar{b}_j, \mathbf{v}_{j+1})\} \cap \{\bar{b}_j \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_{j+2}\} \right) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_{j+1}; \mathbf{u}_{j+2}) \right) \\
& \quad \times \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_{j+2}; \mathbf{v}_{j+2}) \prod_{i=j+2}^{N-1} \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_N, \mathbf{v}_N; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}). \tag{1.27}
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by (1.24) and using the BK inequality and the Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{b_j, b} \mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_j}^{(j)}(\mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \cap \{b \in \text{piv}(\bar{b}_j, \mathbf{v}_{j+1})\} \cap \{\bar{b}_j \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_{j+2}\} \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{u}_{j+1} \\ (\tau_{\mathbf{v}_j} < \tau_{\mathbf{u}_{j+1}})}} \left(\left(\mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_{j-1}}^{(j-1)}(\mathbf{v}_j) \cap \{\bar{b}_{j-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_{j+1}\} \right) (q_p * \varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_{j-1}}^{(j-1)}(\mathbf{v}_j) \cap \{\bar{b}_{j-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_{j+1}\} \right) (q_p * \varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}) \right) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_{j+1}; \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_{j-1}}^{(j-1)}(\mathbf{v}_j) \cap \{\bar{b}_{j-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_{j+1}\} \right) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}) (\varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}_{j+1}; \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \right) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_{j+1}; \mathbf{u}_{j+2}), \tag{1.28}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last term can be replaced by $(q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}_{j+1}; \mathbf{u}_{j+2})$, because $\tau_{\mathbf{u}_{j+1}} \leq \tau_{\mathbf{v}_{j+1}} < \tau_{\mathbf{u}_{j+2}}$ (due to the restriction in (1.27) and the factors $\varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_{j+1}; \mathbf{v}_{j+1})$ and $(\varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}_{j+1}; \mathbf{v}_{j+1})$ in (1.28)). Using (1.28) as well as that with $\mathbf{u}_{j+2}$ replaced by $\mathbf{v}_{j+2}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.27) & \leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N \\ \mathbf{v}_j, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N \\ (\tau_{\mathbf{v}_j} < \tau_{\mathbf{u}_{j+1}})}} \sum_{\vec{b}_{j-1}} \left(\left(\mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_{j-1}}^{(j-1)}(\mathbf{v}_j) \cap \{\bar{b}_{j-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_{j+1}\} \right) (q_p * \varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_{j-1}}^{(j-1)}(\mathbf{v}_j) \cap \{\bar{b}_{j-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_{j+1}\} \right) (q_p * \varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}) \right) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_{j+1}; \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_{j-1}}^{(j-1)}(\mathbf{v}_j) \cap \{\bar{b}_{j-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_{j+1}\} \right) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}) (\varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}_{j+1}; \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \right) \\
& \quad \times \prod_{i=j+1}^{N-1} \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_N, \mathbf{v}_N; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}). \tag{1.29}
\end{aligned}$$

Repeatedly using (1.13)–(1.14) with different variables, we finally arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.29) &\leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_j, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{N+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_{j-1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N+1} \\ (\mathbf{u}_{N+1} = \mathbf{v}_{N+1} = \mathbf{x}) \\ (\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{j-1}} < \tau_{\mathbf{u}_j})}} \sum_{\vec{b}_{j-2}} \left(\mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_{j-2}}^{(j-2)}(\mathbf{v}_{j-1}) \cap \{\bar{b}_{j-2} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_j\} \right) (q_p * \varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_{j-1}; \mathbf{v}_j) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{P}_p \left(\tilde{E}_{\vec{b}_{j-2}}^{(j-2)}(\mathbf{v}_{j-1}) \cap \{\bar{b}_{j-2} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_j\} \right) (q_p * \varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}_{j-1}; \mathbf{u}_j) \right) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_j; \mathbf{v}_j) \\
&\quad \times \left(\Theta_p(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) + \Theta'_p(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \right) \prod_{i=j+1}^N \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{N+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N+1} \\ (\mathbf{u}_{N+1} = \mathbf{v}_{N+1} = \mathbf{x})}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{v}_1) \prod_{i \neq j} \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \\
&\quad \times \left(\Theta_p(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) + \Theta'_p(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \right). \tag{1.30}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the bound (1.5) on $\pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$ in (1.22), we obtain the term for $j < N$ in (1.18).

The proof of (1.18) is completed by summing the above bounds over $j = 1, \dots, N$. $\blacksquare$

2 Proof of [2, Proposition 3.3]

In this section, we prove [2, Proposition 3.3] using Lemmas 1–2 and assuming translation-invariance.

Let $\varphi_p^{(m)}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{x}) = \varphi_p(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{x}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}} - \tau_{\mathbf{v}}}$. Recall that the weighted bubble $W_p^{(m)}(k)$ and the triangles $T_p^{(m)}$ and $\tilde{T}_p$ are defined as

$$W_p^{(m)}(k) = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{v}} (1 - \cos(k \cdot \sigma_{\mathbf{v}})) \times \begin{cases} (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}) (mq_p * \varphi_p^{(m)})(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}) & (m < 1), \\ (mq_p * \varphi_p^{(m)})(\mathbf{v}) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}) & (m \geq 1), \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

$$T_p^{(m)} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{v}} (q_p * \varphi_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}) (mq_p * \varphi_p^{(m)})(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}), \tag{2.2}$$

$$\tilde{T}_p = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{v}} (q_p * \varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}), \tag{2.3}$$

and that the square $S_p^{(m)}$ and the H-shaped diagram H_p are defined as (cf., [2, Figure 2])

$$S_p^{(m)} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{v}} (q_p * \varphi_p * \varphi_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}) (mq_p * \varphi_p^{(m)})(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}), \tag{2.4}$$

$$H_p = \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}} (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}) (\varphi_p * q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{v}) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{w}) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{w}). \tag{2.5}$$

[2, Proposition 3.3] is an immediate consequence of the following lemma:

Lemma 3. (i) For $N \geq 0$ and $\ell = 0, 1, 2$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{N}} \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^{\ell} \pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq (N+1)^{\ell} (1 + 2T_p^{(m)}) (2T_p^{(m)})^{(N-1) \vee 0} \times \begin{cases} T_p^{(m)} & (\ell \leq 1), \\ S_p^{(m)} & (\ell = 2), \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}_+} (1 - \cos(k \cdot \sigma_{\mathbf{x}})) \pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq 3(N+1)^2 (1 + 2T_p^{(m)}) (2T_p^{(m)})^{(N-1) \vee 0} W_p^{(m)}(k). \quad (2.7)$$

(ii) For $N \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}_+} \Pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \leq N(1 + 2T_p^{(1)}) \left((T_p^{(1)} + \tilde{T}_p) (2T_p^{(1)})^{N-1} + H_p (2T_p^{(1)})^{(N-2) \vee 0} \right). \quad (2.8)$$

Proof of Lemma 3(i). First we prove (2.6)–(2.7) for $N = 0$. By (1.4), we readily obtain

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{N}} \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^{\ell} \pi_p^{(0)}(\mathbf{x}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^{\ell} (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{x}) (mq_p * \varphi_p^{(m)})(\mathbf{x}) \leq \begin{cases} T_p^{(m)} & (\ell \leq 1), \\ S_p^{(m)} & (\ell = 2), \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

where we have used (cf., [3, (5.17)])

$$\tau_{\mathbf{x}} (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{t=1}^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{x}) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} \sum_{\mathbf{v}: \tau_{\mathbf{v}}=t} (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}) \varphi_p(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{x}) = (q_p * \varphi_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{x}), \quad (2.10)$$

$$\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{(2.10)}{\leq} \tau_{\mathbf{x}} (q_p * \varphi_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{(2.10)}{\leq} (q_p * \varphi_p * \varphi_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{x}). \quad (2.11)$$

We note that we have multiplied one of the two diagram lines (i.e., $(q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{x})$) by $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^{\ell}$ and the other by $m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}}$. If we multiply either $(q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{x})$ or $(mq_p * \varphi_p^{(m)})(\mathbf{x})$ (depending on whether $m < 1$ or $m \geq 1$) by $1 - \cos(k \cdot \sigma_{\mathbf{x}})$ instead of $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^{\ell}$, we obtain

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}} (1 - \cos(k \cdot \sigma_{\mathbf{x}})) \pi_p^{(0)}(\mathbf{x}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq W_p^{(m)}(k), \quad (2.12)$$

as required.

Next we prove (2.6) for $N \geq 1$ and $\ell = 0$. We note that, as in the $N = 0$ case above, there are two “external” diagram lines from $\mathbf{o}$ to $\mathbf{x}$ in each of the 2^{N-1} bounding diagrams in (1.5). Each line looks like

$$\varphi_p(\mathbf{y}_1) \prod_{i=1}^{N-1} (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{y}_i; \mathbf{y}_{i+1}) (q_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{y}_N; \mathbf{x}), \quad (2.13)$$

where each $\mathbf{y}_i$ is either $\mathbf{u}_i$ or $\mathbf{v}_i$ in (1.5); denote the line with $\mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{v}_1$ by $\omega_{\mathbf{v}_1} \equiv (\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x})$ and the other by $\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1} \equiv (\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x})$. Multiplying $\omega_{\mathbf{v}_1}$ by $m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}}$ and using

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & 2 \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \Xi_p(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} \\ & \sum_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} (\xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{u}}} + \xi_p^{\times}(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{v}}}) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{v}) \\ & \sum_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} (\xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{o}; \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{v}}} + \xi_p^{\times}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{o}; \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{u}}}) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{v}) \end{aligned} \right\} \leq 2T_p^{(m)} \quad (\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}), \quad (2.14)$$

and

$$\sum_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{v}) \varphi_p(\mathbf{v}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{v}}} \leq 1 + \sum_{\mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{o}} (\varphi_p * \varphi_p)(\mathbf{v}) (mq_p * \varphi_p^{(m)})(\mathbf{v}) \leq 1 + 2T_p^{(m)}, \quad (2.15)$$

we obtain

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}} \pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq (1 + 2T_p^{(m)})(2T_p^{(m)})^{N-1} T_p^{(m)} \quad (N \geq 1), \quad (2.16)$$

as required.

Before proceeding the proof, we define (cf., (1.6))

$$\tilde{\Xi}_p(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') = \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{v}) (\xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') + \xi_p^{\times}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}')) / 2^{\delta_{\mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}'}} , \quad (2.17)$$

which satisfies similar bounds to (2.14), due to translation-invariance. We note that, by using (2.17), the bound in (1.5) can be reorganized as

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{N+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N+1} \\ (\mathbf{u}_{N+1} = \mathbf{v}_{N+1} = \mathbf{x})}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{v}_1) \prod_{i=1}^N \tilde{\Xi}_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}), \quad (2.18)$$

or, for $j = 1, \dots, N$, as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{N+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N+1} \\ (\mathbf{u}_{N+1} = \mathbf{v}_{N+1} = \mathbf{x})}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{v}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{v}_1) \left(\prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \right) \\ & \times \left(\xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) + \xi_p^{\times}(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \right) \left(\prod_{i=j+1}^N \tilde{\Xi}_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

Now we prove (2.6) for $N \geq 1$ and $\ell = 1, 2$. To do so, we multiply $\omega_{\mathbf{v}_1}$ by $m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}}$ as before, and multiply $\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1} = (\mathbf{o}, \omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}^{(1)}, \dots, \omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}^{(N+1)})$, where $\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}^{(1)} = \mathbf{u}_1$, $\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}^{(i)} \in \{\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i\}$ for $i = 2, \dots, N$ and $\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}^{(N+1)} = \mathbf{x}$, by $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^{\ell}$, using the decomposition

$$\tau_{\mathbf{x}} = \tau_{\mathbf{u}_1} + \sum_{j=1}^N (\tau_{\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}^{(j+1)}} - \tau_{\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}^{(j)}}). \quad (2.20)$$

Consider, e.g., the bounding diagram with $\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}^{(i)} = \mathbf{u}_i$ for all $i = 2, \dots, N$; we denote this diagram by $U(\mathbf{x})$ for convenience. Then, by (2.18) and (2.10)–(2.11), the contribution from $\tau_{\mathbf{u}_1}^{\ell}$ is bounded as

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{N+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N+1} \\ (\mathbf{u}_{N+1} = \mathbf{v}_{N+1})}} \tau_{\mathbf{u}_1}^{\ell} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p^{(m)}(\mathbf{v}_1) \prod_{i=1}^N \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i) \xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{i+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{v}_i}} \leq (T_p^{(m)})^N \times \begin{cases} T_p^{(m)} & (\ell = 1), \\ S_p^{(m)} & (\ell = 2), \end{cases} \quad (2.21)$$

and, by (2.19) and (2.10)–(2.11) and using (2.15), the contribution from each $(\tau_{\mathbf{u}_{j+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{u}_j})^\ell$ is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{N+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N+1} \\ (\mathbf{u}_{N+1} = \mathbf{v}_{N+1})}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{v}_1) \varphi_p^{(m)}(\mathbf{v}_1) \left(\prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{i+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{v}_i}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}; \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \right) \\
& \quad \times (\tau_{\mathbf{u}_{j+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{u}_j})^\ell \xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{j+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{v}_j}} \\
& \quad \times \left(\prod_{i=j+1}^N \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_i; \mathbf{v}_i) \xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{i+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{v}_i}} \right) \\
& \leq (1 + 2T_p^{(m)})(T_p^{(m)})^{N-1} \times \begin{cases} T_p^{(m)} & (\ell = 1), \\ S_p^{(m)} & (\ell = 2). \end{cases} \tag{2.22}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for $\ell = 1$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}} \tau_{\mathbf{x}} U(\mathbf{x}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq N(1 + 2T_p^{(m)})(T_p^{(m)})^N + (T_p^{(m)})^{N+1} \leq (N+1)(1 + 2T_p^{(m)})(T_p^{(m)})^N. \tag{2.23}$$

The other $2^{N-1} - 1$ bounding diagrams obey the same bound. This completes the proof of (2.6) for $\ell \leq 1$.

The cross terms for $\ell = 2$ can also be bounded similarly. For example, the contribution from $(\tau_{\mathbf{u}_{j'+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{u}_{j'}})(\tau_{\mathbf{u}_{j+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{u}_j})$ with $j' < j$ is bounded, by using (2.19) (cf., (2.22)), by

$$\begin{aligned}
& (T_p^{(m)})^{N-j'} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{j'+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{j'+1}}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{v}_1) \varphi_p^{(m)}(\mathbf{v}_1) \prod_{i=1}^{j'-1} \xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{i+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{v}_i}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}; \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \\
& \quad \times (\tau_{\mathbf{u}_{j'+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{u}_{j'}}) \xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}_{j'}, \mathbf{v}_{j'}; \mathbf{u}_{j'+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j'+1}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{j'+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{v}_{j'}}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_{j'+1}; \mathbf{v}_{j'+1}) \\
& \leq (1 + 2T_p^{(m)})(T_p^{(m)})^{N-1} S_p^{(m)}. \tag{2.24}
\end{aligned}$$

There are $N(N-1) - 1$ more cross terms that obey the same bound. There are $2N$ cross terms remaining, each of which is bounded by $(T_p^{(m)})^N S_p^{(m)}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mathbf{x}} \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 U(\mathbf{x}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} & \leq N^2(1 + 2T_p^{(m)})(T_p^{(m)})^{N-1} S_p^{(m)} + (2N+1)(T_p^{(m)})^N S_p^{(m)} \\
& \leq (N+1)^2(1 + 2T_p^{(m)})(T_p^{(m)})^{N-1} S_p^{(m)}. \tag{2.25}
\end{aligned}$$

The other $2^{N-1} - 1$ bounding diagrams than $U(\mathbf{x})$ obey the same bound. This completes the proof of (2.6).

Finally we prove (2.7) for $N \geq 1$. If $m < 1$, then we multiply $\omega_{\mathbf{v}_1}$ by $m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}}$ as before, and multiply $\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}$ by $1 - \cos(k \cdot \sigma_{\mathbf{x}})$ and use the decomposition (cf., [4, (4.50)])

$$1 - \cos(k \cdot \sigma_{\mathbf{x}}) \leq (2N+3) \left(1 - \cos(k \cdot \sigma_{\mathbf{u}_1}) + \sum_{j=1}^N \left(1 - \cos(k \cdot (\sigma_{\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}^{(j+1)}} - \sigma_{\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}^{(j)}})) \right) \right). \tag{2.26}$$

For example, consider the bounding diagram $U(\mathbf{x})$ again, where $\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}^{(i)} = \mathbf{u}_i$ for all $i = 2, \dots, N$. Similarly to (2.21)–(2.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{N+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N+1} \\ (\mathbf{u}_{N+1} = \mathbf{v}_{N+1})}} (1 - \cos(k \cdot \sigma_{\mathbf{u}_1})) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p^{(m)}(\mathbf{v}_1) \prod_{i=1}^N \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i) \xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{i+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{v}_i}} \\ \leq W_p^{(m)}(k) (T_p^{(m)})^N, \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{N+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N+1} \\ (\mathbf{u}_{N+1} = \mathbf{v}_{N+1})}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{v}_1) \varphi_p^{(m)}(\mathbf{v}_1) \left(\prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{i+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{v}_i}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}; \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \right) \\ \times \left(1 - \cos(k \cdot (\sigma_{\mathbf{u}_{j+1}} - \sigma_{\mathbf{u}_j})) \right) \xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{j+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{v}_j}} \\ \times \left(\prod_{i=j+1}^N \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_i; \mathbf{v}_i) \xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{v}_{i+1}} - \tau_{\mathbf{v}_i}} \right) \\ \leq (1 + 2T_p^{(m)}) (T_p^{(m)})^{N-1} W_p^{(m)}(k). \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} (1 - \cos(k \cdot \sigma_{\mathbf{x}})) U(\mathbf{x}) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} &\leq (2N + 3) \left((T_p^{(m)})^N W_p^{(m)}(k) + N(1 + 2T_p^{(m)}) (T_p^{(m)})^{N-1} W_p^{(m)}(k) \right) \\ &\leq 3(N + 1)^2 (1 + 2T_p^{(m)}) (T_p^{(m)})^{N-1} W_p^{(m)}(k). \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

The other $2^{N-1} - 1$ bounding diagrams than $U(\mathbf{x})$ obey the same bound.

If $m \geq 1$, then we multiply $\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}$ by $(1 - \cos(k \cdot \sigma_{\mathbf{x}})) m^{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}}$ and use the decomposition (2.26). The rest is the same. This completes the proof of (2.7) for $N \geq 1$. $\blacksquare$

Proof of Lemma 3(ii). First we recall (1.18). Since we have the bound (2.16) on the contribution from $\Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1})$, it thus remains to investigate the contributions from $\Theta_p(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1})$ and $\Theta'_p(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1})$. However, since (cf., (2.19))

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{N+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N+1} \\ (\mathbf{u}_{N+1} = \mathbf{v}_{N+1})}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{v}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{v}_1) \left(\prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \right) \left(\prod_{i=j+1}^N \tilde{\Xi}_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \right) \\ \times \left(\theta_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) + \theta_p^{\times}(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \right) \leq (1 + 2T_p^{(1)}) (2T_p^{(1)})^{N-1} \tilde{T}_p, \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

and, for $j < N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{N+1} \\ \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N+1} \\ (\mathbf{u}_{N+1} = \mathbf{v}_{N+1})}} \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{v}_1) \varphi_p(\mathbf{v}_1) \left(\prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \Xi_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \right) \left(\prod_{i=j+2}^N \tilde{\Xi}_p(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i; \mathbf{u}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \right) \\ \times \Theta'_p(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j; \mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}) \left(\xi_p^{||}(\mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}; \mathbf{u}_{j+2}, \mathbf{v}_{j+2}) + \xi_p^{\times}(\mathbf{u}_{j+1}, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}; \mathbf{u}_{j+2}, \mathbf{v}_{j+2}) \right) \\ \leq (1 + 2T_p^{(1)}) (2T_p^{(1)})^{N-2} H_p, \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \Pi_p^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) &\leq (1 + 2T_p^{(1)}) \left(N(T_p^{(1)} + \tilde{T}_p)(2T_p^{(1)})^{N-1} + (N-1)H_p(2T_p^{(1)})^{N-2} \right) \\ &\leq N(1 + 2T_p^{(1)}) \left((T_p^{(1)} + \tilde{T}_p)(2T_p^{(1)})^{N-1} + H_p(2T_p^{(1)})^{(N-2) \vee 0} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 3(ii). ■

References

- [1] J. van den Berg and H. Kesten. Inequalities with applications to percolation and reliability. *J. Appl. Probab.* **22** (1985): 556–569.
- [2] L.-C. Chen and A. Sakai. Critical behavior and the limit distribution for long-range oriented percolation. I. *Preprint* (2007).
- [3] A. Sakai. Mean-field critical behavior for the contact process. *J. Stat. Phys.* **104** (2001): 111–143.
- [4] G. Slade. The lace expansion and its applications. *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1879** (2006).