

# HEAT-KERNEL ESTIMATES FOR RANDOM WALK AMONG RANDOM CONDUCTANCES WITH HEAVY TAIL

OMAR BOUKHADRA\*

*Centre de Mathématiques et Informatique (CMI),  
Université de Provence;  
Département de Mathématiques, Université de Constantine*

**ABSTRACT.** We study models of discrete-time, symmetric,  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -valued random walks in random environments, driven by a field of i.i.d. random nearest-neighbor conductances  $\omega_{xy} \in [0, 1]$ , with polynomial tail near 0 with exponent  $\gamma > 0$ . We first prove for all  $d \geq 5$  that the return probability shows an anomalous decay (non-Gaussian) that approaches (up to sub-polynomial terms) a random constant times  $n^{-2}$  when we push the power  $\gamma$  to zero. In contrast, we prove that the heat-kernel decay is as close as we want, in a logarithmic sense, to the standard decay  $n^{-d/2}$  for large values of the parameter  $\gamma$ .

**keywords :** Random walk, Random environments, Markov chains, Random conductances, Percolation.

**MSC :** 60G50; 60J10; 60K37.

## 1. Introduction and results

The main purpose of this work is the derivation of heat-kernel bounds for random walks  $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  among polynomial lower tail random conductances with exponent  $\gamma > 0$ , on  $\mathbb{Z}^d, d > 4$ . We show that the heat-kernel exhibits opposite behaviors, anomalous and standard, for small and large values of  $\gamma$ .

Random walks in reversible random environments are driven by the transition matrix

$$P_\omega(x, y) = \frac{\omega_{xy}}{\pi_\omega(x)}. \quad (1.1)$$

where  $(\omega_{xy})$  is a family of random (non-negative) conductances subject to the symmetry condition  $\omega_{xy} = \omega_{yx}$ . The sum  $\pi_\omega(x) = \sum_y \omega_{xy}$  defines an invariant, reversible measure for the corresponding discrete-time Markov chain. In most situations  $\omega_{xy}$  are non-zero only for nearest neighbors on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  and are sampled from a shift-invariant, ergodic or even i.i.d. measure  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

---

©2009 by Omar Boukhadra. Provided for non-commercial research and education use. Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.

\*E-mail address : omar.boukhadra@cmi.univ-mrs.fr.

One general class of results is available for such random walks under the additional assumptions of uniform ellipticity,

$$\exists \alpha > 0 : \quad \mathbb{Q}(\alpha < \omega_b < 1/\alpha) = 1$$

and the boundedness of the jump distribution,

$$\exists R < \infty : |x| \geq R \Rightarrow P_\omega(0, x) = 0, \quad \mathbb{Q} - a.s.$$

One has then the standard local-CLT like decay of the heat-kernel ( $c_1, c_2$  are absolute constants), as proved by Delmotte [Del99]:

$$P_\omega^n(x, y) \leq \frac{c_1}{n^{d/2}} \exp \left\{ -c_2 \frac{|x - y|^2}{n} \right\}. \quad (1.2)$$

Once the assumption of uniform ellipticity is relaxed, matters get more complicated. The most-intensely studied example is the simple random walk on the infinite cluster of supercritical bond percolation on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $d \geq 2$ . This corresponds to  $\omega_{xy} \in \{0, 1\}$  i.i.d. with  $\mathbb{Q}(\omega_b = 1) > p_c(d)$  where  $p_c(d)$  is the percolation threshold (cf. [Grim99]). Here an annealed invariance principle has been obtained by De Masi, Ferrari, Goldstein and Wick [DFGW85]–[DFGW89] in the late 1980s. More recently, Mathieu and Rémy [MR04] proved the on-diagonal (i.e.,  $x = y$ ) version of the heat-kernel upper bound (1.2)—a slightly weaker version of which was also obtained by Hecklen and Hoffman [HH05]—and, soon afterwards, Barlow [Ba04] proved the full upper and lower bounds on  $P_\omega^n(x, y)$  of the form (1.2). (Both these results hold for  $n$  exceeding some random time defined relative to the environment in the vicinity of  $x$  and  $y$ .) Heat-kernel upper bounds were then used in the proofs of quenched invariance principles by Sidoravicius and Sznitman [SSz04] for  $d \geq 4$ , and for all  $d \geq 2$  by Berger and Biskup [BB07] and Mathieu and Piatnitski [MPia07].

We consider in our case a family of symmetric, irreducible, nearest-neighbor Markov chains on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $d \geq 5$ , driven by a field of i.i.d. bounded random conductances  $\omega_{xy} \in [0, 1]$  and subject to the symmetry condition  $\omega_{xy} = \omega_{yx}$ . These are constructed as follows. Let  $\Omega$  be the set of functions  $\omega : \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\omega_{xy} > 0$  iff  $x \sim y$ , and  $\omega_{xy} = \omega_{yx}$  ( $x \sim y$  means that  $x$  and  $y$  are nearest neighbors). We call elements of  $\Omega$  environments.

We choose the family  $\{\omega_b, b = (x, y), x \sim y, b \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d\}$  i.i.d according to a law  $\mathbb{Q}$  on  $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_b &\leq 1 && \text{for all } b; \\ \mathbb{Q}(\omega_b \leq a) &\sim a^\gamma && \text{when } a \downarrow 0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

where  $\gamma > 0$  is a parameter. Therefore, the conductances are  $\mathbb{Q}$ -a.s. positive.

In a recent paper, Fontes and Mathieu [FM06] studied continuous-time random walks on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  which are defined by generators  $\mathcal{L}_\omega$  of the form

$$(\mathcal{L}_\omega f)(x) = \sum_{y \sim x} \omega_{xy} [f(y) - f(x)],$$

with conductances given by

$$\omega_{xy} = \omega(x) \wedge \omega(y)$$

for i.i.d. random variables  $\omega(x) > 0$  satisfying (1.3). For these cases, it was found that the annealed heat-kernel,  $\int d\mathbb{Q}(\omega) P_0^\omega(X_t = 0)$ , exhibits an *anomalous decay*, for  $\gamma < d/2$ . Explicitly, from [FM06], Theorem 4.3, we have

$$\int d\mathbb{Q}(\omega) P_0^\omega(X_t = 0) = t^{-(\gamma \wedge \frac{d}{2}) + o(1)}, \quad t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1.4)$$

In addition, in a more recent paper, Berger, Biskup, Hoffman and Kozma [BBHK08], provided universal upper bounds on the quenched heat-kernel by considering the nearest-neighbor simple random walk on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $d \geq 2$ , driven by a field of i.i.d. bounded random conductances  $\omega_{xy} \in [0, 1]$ . The conductance law is i.i.d. subject to the condition that the probability of  $\omega_{xy} > 0$  exceeds the threshold  $p_c(d)$  for bond percolation on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . For environments in which the origin is connected to infinity by bonds with positive conductances, they studied the decay of the  $2n$ -step return probability  $P_\omega^{2n}(0, 0)$ . They have proved that  $P_\omega^{2n}(0, 0)$  is bounded by a random constant times  $n^{-d/2}$  in  $d = 2, 3$ , while it is  $o(n^{-2})$  in  $d \geq 5$  and  $O(n^{-2} \log n)$  in  $d = 4$ . More precisely, from [BBHK08], Theorem 2.1, we have for almost every  $\omega \in \{0 \in \mathcal{C}_\infty\}$  ( $\mathcal{C}_\infty$  represents the set of sites that have a path to infinity along bonds with positive conductances), and for all  $n \geq 1$ .

$$P_\omega^n(0, 0) \leq C(\omega) \begin{cases} n^{-d/2}, & d = 2, 3, \\ n^{-2} \log n, & d = 4, \\ n^{-2}, & d \geq 5, \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

where  $C(\omega)$  is a random positive variable.

On the other hand, to show that those general upper bounds (cf. (1.5)) in  $d \geq 5$  represent a real phenomenon, they produced examples with anomalous heat-kernel decay approaching  $1/n^2$ , for i.i.d. laws  $\mathbb{Q}$  on bounded nearest-neighbor conductances with *lower tail much heavier than polynomial* and with  $\mathbb{Q}(\omega_b > 0) > p_c(d)$ . We quote Theorem 2.2 from [BBHK08] :

**Theorem 1.1** (1) *Let  $d \geq 5$  and  $\kappa > 1/d$ . There exists an i.i.d. law  $\mathbb{Q}$  on bounded, nearest-neighbor conductances with  $\mathbb{Q}(\omega_b > 0) > p_c(d)$  and a random*

variable  $C = C(\omega)$  such that for almost every  $\omega \in \{0 \in \mathcal{C}_\infty\}$ ,

$$P_\omega^{2n}(0,0) \geq C(\omega) \frac{e^{-(\log n)^\kappa}}{n^2}, \quad n \geq 1. \quad (1.6)$$

(2) Let  $d \geq 5$ . For every increasing sequence  $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ ,  $\lambda_n \rightarrow \infty$ , there exists an i.i.d. law  $\mathbb{Q}$  on bounded, nearest-neighbor conductances with  $\mathbb{Q}(\omega_b > 0) > p_c(d)$  and an a.s. positive random variable  $C = C(\omega)$  such that for almost every  $\omega \in \{0 \in \mathcal{C}_\infty\}$ ,

$$P_\omega^n(0,0) \geq \frac{C(\omega)}{\lambda_n n^2} \quad (1.7)$$

along a subsequence that does not depend on  $\omega$ .

The distributions that they use in part (1) of Theorem 1.1 have a tail near zero of the general form

$$\mathbb{Q}(\omega_{xy} < s) \approx |\log(s)|^{-\theta} \quad (1.8)$$

with  $\theta > 0$ .

Berger, Biskup, Hoffman and Kozma [BBHK08] called attention to the fact that the construction of an estimate of the anomalous heat-kernel decay for random walk among polynomial lower tail random conductances on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , seems to require subtle control of heat-kernel *lower* bounds which go beyond the estimates that can be easily pulled out from the literature. In the present paper, we give a response to this question and show that every distribution with an appropriate power-law decay near zero, can serve as such example, and that when we push the power to zero. The lower bound obtained for the return probability approaches (up to sub-polynomial terms) the upper bound supplied by [BBHK08] and that for all  $d \geq 5$ .

Here is our first main result whose proof is given in section 2 :

**Theorem 1.2** *Let  $d \geq 5$ . There exists a positive constant  $\delta(\gamma)$  depending only on  $d$  and  $\gamma$  such that  $\mathbb{Q}$ -a.s., there exists  $C = C(\omega) < \infty$  and for all  $n \geq 1$*

$$P_\omega^{2n}(0,0) \geq \frac{C}{n^{2+\delta(\gamma)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(\gamma) \xrightarrow{\gamma \rightarrow 0} 0. \quad (1.9)$$

**Remark 1.3** (1) The proof tells us in fact, with (1.5), that for  $d \geq 5$  we have almost surely

$$\begin{aligned} -2[1 + d(2d-1)\gamma] &\leq \liminf_n \frac{\log P_\omega^{2n}(0,0)}{\log n} \\ &\leq \limsup_n \frac{\log P_\omega^{2n}(0,0)}{\log n} \leq -2. \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

- (2) As we were reminded by M. Biskup and T.M. Prescott, the invariance principle (CLT) (cf Theorem 2.1. in [BP07] and Theorem 1.3 in [M08]) automatically implies the “usual” lower bound on the heat-kernel under weaker conditions on the conductances. Indeed, the Markov property and reversibility of  $X$  yield

$$P_0^\omega(X_{2n} = 0) \geq \frac{\pi_\omega(0)}{2d} \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{C}_\infty \\ |x| \leq \sqrt{n}}} P_0^\omega(X_n = x)^2.$$

Cauchy-Schwarz then gives

$$P_0^\omega(X_{2n} = 0) \geq P_0^\omega(|X_n| \leq \sqrt{n})^2 \frac{\pi_\omega(0)/2d}{|\mathcal{C}_\infty \cap [-\sqrt{n}, +\sqrt{n}]^d|}.$$

Now the invariance principle implies that  $P_0^\omega(|X_n| \leq \sqrt{n})^2$  has a positive limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and the Spatial Ergodic Theorem shows that  $|\mathcal{C}_\infty \cap [-\sqrt{n}, +\sqrt{n}]^d|$  grows proportionally to  $n^{d/2}$ . Hence we get

$$P_0^\omega(X_{2n} = 0) \geq \frac{C(\omega)}{n^{d/2}}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

with  $C(\omega) > 0$  a.s. on the set  $\{0 \in \mathcal{C}_\infty\}$ . Note that, in  $d = 2, 3$ , this complements nicely the “universal” upper bounds derived in [BBHK08]. In  $d = 4$ , the decay is at most  $n^{-2} \log n$  and at least  $n^{-2}$ .

The result of Fontes and Mathieu (1.4) (cf. [FM06], Theorem 4.3) encourages us to believe that the quenched heat-kernel has a standard decay when  $\gamma \geq d/2$ , but the construction seems to require subtle control of heat-kernel upper bounds. In the second result of this paper whose proof is given in section 3, we prove, for all  $d \geq 5$ , that the heat-kernel decay is as close as we want, in a logarithmic sense, to the standard decay  $n^{-d/2}$  for large values of the parameter  $\gamma$ . For the cases where  $d = 2, 3$ , we have a standard decay of the quenched return probability under weaker conditions on the conductances (see Remark 1.3).

**Theorem 1.4** *Let  $d \geq 5$ . There exists a positive constant  $\delta(\gamma)$  depending only on  $d$  and  $\gamma$  such that  $\mathbb{Q}$ -a.s.,*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{\log P_\omega^n(0, x)}{\log n} \leq -\frac{d}{2} + \delta(\gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(\gamma) \xrightarrow{\gamma \rightarrow +\infty} 0. \quad (1.11)$$

In what follows,, we refer to  $P_x^\omega(\cdot)$  as the *quenched* law of the random walk  $X = (X_n)_{n \geq 0}$  on  $((\mathbb{Z}^d)^\mathbb{N}, \mathcal{G})$  with transitions given in (1.1) in the environment  $\omega$ , where  $\mathcal{G}$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by cylinder functions, and let  $\mathbb{P} := \mathbb{Q} \otimes P_0^\omega$  be

the so-called *annealed* semi-direct product measure law defined by

$$\mathbb{P}(F \times G) = \int_F \mathbb{Q}(d\omega) P_0^\omega(G), \quad F \in \mathcal{F}, G \in \mathcal{G}.$$

where  $\mathcal{F}$  denote the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\Omega$  (which is the same as the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by cylinder functions).

## 2. Anomalous heat-kernel decay

In this section we provide the proof of Theorem 1.2.

We consider a family of bounded nearest-neighbor conductances  $(\omega_b) \in \Omega = [0, 1]^{\mathbb{B}^d}$  where  $b$  ranges over the set  $\mathbb{B}^d$  of unordered pairs of nearest neighbors in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . The law  $\mathbb{Q}$  of the  $\omega$ 's will be i.i.d. subject to the conditions given in (1.3).

We prove this lower bound by following a different approach of the one adopted by Berger, Biskup, Hoffman and Kozma [BBHK08] to prove (1.6–1.7). In fact, they prove that in a box of side length  $\ell_n$  there exists a configuration where a strong bond with conductance of order 1, is separated from other sites by bonds of strength  $1/n$ , and (at least) one of these “weak” bonds is connected to the origin by a “strong” path not leaving the box. Then the probability that the walk is back to the origin at time  $n$  is bounded below by the probability that the walk goes directly towards the above pattern (this costs  $e^{O(\ell_n)}$  of probability) then crosses the weak bond (which costs  $1/n$ ), spends time  $n - 2\ell_n$  on the strong bond (which costs only  $O(1)$  of probability), then crosses a weak bond again (another factor of  $1/n$ ) and then heads towards the origin to get there on time (another  $e^{O(\ell_n)}$  term). The cost of this strategy is  $O(1)e^{O(\ell_n)}n^{-2}$  so if  $\ell_n = o(\log n)$  then we get leading order  $n^{-2}$ .

Our method for proving Theorem 1.2 is, in fact, simple - we note that due to the reversibility of the walk and with a good use of Cauchy-Schwartz, one does not need to condition on the exact path of the walk, but rather show that the walker has a relatively large probability of staying within a small box around the origin. Our objective will consist in showing that for almost every  $\omega$ , the probability that the random walk when started at the origin is at time  $n$  inside the box  $B_{n^\delta} = [-3n^\delta, 3n^\delta]^d$ , is greater than  $c/n$  (where  $c$  is a constant and  $\delta = \delta(\gamma) \downarrow 0$ ). Hence we will get  $P_\omega^{2n}(0, 0)/\pi(0) \geq c/n^{2+\delta d}$  by virtue of the following inequality which, for almost every environment  $\omega$ , derives from the reversibility of  $X$ , Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (1.3) :

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{P_\omega^{2n}(0,0)}{\pi_\omega(0)} &\geq \sum_{y \in B_{n^\delta}} \frac{P_\omega^n(0,y)^2}{\pi_\omega(y)} \\
&\geq \left( \sum_{y \in B_{n^\delta}} P_\omega^n(0,y) \right)^2 \frac{1}{\pi_\omega(B_{n^\delta})} \\
&\geq \frac{P_0^\omega(X_n \in B_{n^\delta})^2}{\#B_{n^\delta}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

In order to do this, our strategy is to show that the random walk meets a *trap*, with positive probability, before getting out from  $[-3n^\delta, 3n^\delta]^d$ , where, by definition, a trap is an edge of conductance of order 1 that can be reached only by crossing an edge of order  $1/n$ . The random walk, being imprisoned in the trap inside the box  $[-3n^\delta, 3n^\delta]^d$ , will not get out from this box before time  $n$  with positive probability. Then the Markov property yields  $P_0^\omega(X_n \in [-3n^\delta, 3n^\delta]^d) \geq c/n$ . Thus, we will be brought to follow the walk until it finds a specific configuration in the environment.

First, we will need to prove one lemma. Let  $B_N = [-3N, 3N]^d$  be the box centered at the origin and of radius  $3N$  and define  $\partial B_N$  to be its inner boundary, that is, the set of vertices in  $B_N$  which are adjacent to some vertex not in  $B_N$ . We have  $\#B_N \leq (7N)^d$ . Let  $H_0 = 0$  and define  $H_N$ ,  $N \geq 1$ , to be the hitting time of  $\partial B_N$ , i.e.

$$H_N = \inf\{n \geq 0 : X_n \in \partial B_N\}.$$

The box  $B_N$  being finite for  $N$  fixed, we have then  $H_N < \infty$  a.s.,  $\forall N \geq 1$ .

Let  $\hat{e}_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , denote the canonical unit vectors in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , and let  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , with  $x := (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ . Define  $i_0 := \max\{i : |x_i| \geq |x_j|, \forall j \neq i\}$  and let  $\epsilon(x) : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$  be the function such that

$$\epsilon(x) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } x_{i_0} \geq 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } x_{i_0} < 0 \end{cases}$$

Now, let  $\alpha, \xi$  be positive constants such that  $\mathbb{Q}(\omega_b \geq \xi) > 0$ . Define  $\mathcal{A}_N(x)$  to be the event that the configuration near  $x$ ,  $y = x + \epsilon(x)\hat{e}_{i_0}$  and  $z = x + 2\epsilon(x)\hat{e}_{i_0}$  is as follows:

- (1)  $\frac{1}{2}N^{-\alpha} < \omega_{xy} \leq N^{-\alpha}$ .
- (2)  $\omega_{yz} \geq \xi$ .
- (3) every other bond emanating out of  $y$  or  $z$  has  $\omega_b \leq N^{-\alpha}$ .

The event  $\mathcal{A}_N(x)$  so constructed involves a collection of  $4d - 1$  bonds that will be denoted by  $\mathcal{C}(x)$ , i.e.

$$\mathcal{C}(x) := \{[x, y], [y, z], [y, y^i], [z, z^i], [z, z_0^i]; y = x + \epsilon(x)\hat{e}_{i_0}, z = x + 2\epsilon(x)\hat{e}_{i_0}, \\ y^i = y \pm \hat{e}_i, z^i = z \pm \hat{e}_i, \forall i \neq i_0, z_0^i = z + \epsilon(x)\hat{e}_{i_0}\}$$

Let us note that if  $x \in \partial B_N$ , for some  $N \geq 1$ , the collection  $\mathcal{C}(x)$  is outside the box  $B_N$  and if  $y \in \partial B_K$ , for  $K \neq N$ , we have  $\mathcal{C}(x) \cap \mathcal{C}(y) = \emptyset$ .

If the bonds of the collection  $\mathcal{C}(x)$  satisfy the conditions of the event  $\mathcal{A}_N(x)$ , we agree to call it a *trap* that we will denote by  $\mathfrak{P}_N$ .

The lemma says then that :

**Lemma 2.1** *The family  $\{\mathcal{A}_N^k = \mathcal{A}_N(X_{H_k})\}_{k=0}^{N-1}$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -independent for each  $N$ .*

*Proof.* The occurrence of the event  $\mathcal{A}_N(X_{H_k})$  means that the random walk  $X$  has met a trap  $\mathfrak{P}_N$  situated outside of the box  $B_k$  when it has hit for the first time the boundary of the box  $B_k$ .

Let  $q_N$  be the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -probability of having the configuration of the trap  $\mathfrak{P}_N$ . We have  $q_N = \mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{A}_N(x)) = \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{A}_N(X_{H_k})]$ ,  $\forall x \in \partial B_k$  and  $\forall k \leq N - 1$ . Indeed, by virtue of the i.i.d. character of the conductances and the Markov property, when the random walk hits the boundary of  $B_k$  for the first time at some element  $x$ , the probability that the collection  $\mathcal{C}(x)$  constitutes a trap, i.e., satisfies the conditions of the event  $\mathcal{A}_N(x)$ , depends only on the edges of the collection  $\mathcal{C}(x)$ , which have not been visited before.

Let  $k_1 < k_2 \leq N - 1$  and  $x \in \partial B_{k_2}$ , we have then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[ \mathcal{A}_N^{k_1}, X_{H_{k_2}} = x, \mathcal{A}_N^{k_2} \right] &= \mathbb{P} \left[ \left\{ \mathcal{A}_N^{k_1}, X_{H_{k_2}} = x \right\} \cap \mathcal{A}_N(x) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left[ \mathcal{A}_N^{k_1}, X_{H_{k_2}} = x \right] \mathbb{P} \left[ \mathcal{A}_N(x) \right] \\ &= q_N \mathbb{P} \left[ \mathcal{A}_N^{k_1}, X_{H_{k_2}} = x \right], \end{aligned}$$

since the events  $\{\mathcal{A}_N^{k_1}, X_{H_{k_2}} = x\}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_N(x)$  depend respectively on the conductances of the bonds of  $B_{k_2}$  and the conductances of the bonds of the collection  $\mathcal{C}(x)$  which is situated outside the box  $B_{k_2}$  when  $x \in \partial B_{k_2}$ .

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[ \mathcal{A}_N^{k_1} \mathcal{A}_N^{k_2} \right] &= \sum_{x \in \partial B_{k_2}} \mathbb{P} \left[ \mathcal{A}_N^{k_1}, X_{H_{k_2}} = x, \mathcal{A}_N^{k_2} \right] \\ &= q_N \sum_{x \in \partial B_{k_2}} \mathbb{P} \left[ \mathcal{A}_N^{k_1}, X_{H_{k_2}} = x \right] \\ &= q_N \mathbb{P} \left[ \mathcal{A}_N^{k_1} \right] = q_N^2. \end{aligned}$$



With some adaptations, this reasoning remains true in the case of more than two events  $\mathcal{A}_N^k$ .  $\square$

We come now to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Let  $d \geq 5$  and  $\gamma > 0$ . Set  $\alpha = \frac{1-\epsilon}{(4d-2)\gamma}$  for arbitrary positive constant  $\epsilon < 1$  (the constant  $\alpha$  is the same used in the definition of the event  $\mathcal{A}_N(x)$ ). As seen before (cf. (2.1)), for almost every environment  $\omega$ , the reversibility of  $X$ , Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (1.3) give

$$\frac{P_\omega^{2n}(0,0)}{\pi_\omega(0)} \geq \frac{P_0^\omega(X_n \in B_{n^{1/\alpha}})^2}{\#B_{n^{1/\alpha}}}, \quad (2.2)$$

By the assumption (1.3) on the conductances and the definition of the event  $\mathcal{A}_N(x)$ , the probability of having the configuration of the trap  $\mathfrak{P}_N$  is greater than  $cN^{-(1-\epsilon)}$  (where  $c$  is a constant that we use henceforth as a generic constant). Indeed, when  $N$  is large enough, we have

$$q_N = \mathbb{Q} \left( \frac{1}{2}N^{-\alpha} < \omega_{xy} \leq N^{-\alpha} \right) \mathbb{Q}(\omega_{yz} \geq \xi) [\mathbb{Q}(\omega_b \leq N^{-\alpha})]^{4d-3} \geq \frac{c}{N^{1-\epsilon}}.$$

Consider now the following event

$$\Lambda_N := \bigcup_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{A}_N^k.$$

The event  $\Lambda_N$  so defined may be interpreted as follows : *at least, one among the  $N$  disjoint collections  $\mathcal{C}(X_{H_k})$ ,  $k \leq N-1$ , constitutes a trap  $\mathfrak{P}_N$ .* The events  $\mathcal{A}_N^k$  being independent by lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\Lambda_N^c] &\leq (1 - cN^{\epsilon-1})^N \\ &\leq \exp \{ N \log (1 - cN^{\epsilon-1}) \} \\ &\leq \exp \{ -cN^\epsilon \}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

Chebychev inequality and (2.3) then give

$$\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{Q} \{ \omega : P_0^\omega(\Lambda_N^c) \geq 1/2 \} \leq 2 \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[\Lambda_N^c] < +\infty. \quad (2.4)$$

It results by Borel-Cantelli lemma that for almost every  $\omega$ , there exists  $N_0 \geq 1$  such that for each  $N \geq N_0$ , the event  $\mathcal{A}_N(x)$  occurs inside the box  $B_N$  with positive probability (greater than 1/2) on the path of  $X$ , for some  $x \in B_{N-1}$ . For almost every  $\omega$ , one may say that  $X$  meets with positive probability a trap  $\mathfrak{P}_N$  at some site  $x \in B_{N-1}$  before getting outside of  $B_N$ .

Suppose that  $N \geq N_0$  and let  $n$  be such that  $N^\alpha \leq n < (N+1)^\alpha$ . Define

$$D_N := \begin{cases} \inf\{k \leq N-1 : \mathcal{A}_N^k \text{ occurs}\} & \text{if } \Lambda_N \text{ occurs} \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

to be the rank of the first among the  $N$  collections  $\mathcal{C}(X_{H_k})$ ,  $k \leq N-1$ , that constitutes a trap  $\mathfrak{P}_N$ . If  $D_N = k$ , the random variable  $D_N$  so defined depends only on the steps of  $X$  up to time  $H_k$ . Thus, if  $D_N = k$ , we have  $X_{H_k} \in B_{N-1}$  and  $\mathcal{C}(X_{H_k})$  constitutes a trap  $\mathfrak{P}_N$ . So, if we set  $X_{H_k} = x$ , the bond  $[x, y]$  (of the trap  $\mathfrak{P}_N$ ) will have then a conductance of order  $N^{-\alpha}$ . In this case, the probability for the random walk, when started at  $X_{H_k} = x$ , to cross the bond  $[x, y]$  is by the property (1) of the definition of the event  $\mathcal{A}_N(x)$  above greater than

$$\frac{(1/2)N^{-\alpha}}{\pi_\omega(x)} \geq \frac{1/2}{2dN^\alpha} = \frac{1}{4dN^\alpha}. \quad (2.5)$$

Here we use the fact that  $\pi_\omega(x) \leq 2d$  by virtue of (1.3). This implies by the Markov property and by (2.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} & P_0^\omega(X_n \in B_N | D_N \leq N-1) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{x \in B_k} \frac{P_0^\omega(X_n \in B_N, D_N = k, X_{H_k} = x)}{P_0^\omega(D_N \leq N-1)} \\ &\geq \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{x \in B_k} \frac{P_0^\omega(H_N \geq n, D_N = k, X_{H_k} = x)}{P_0^\omega(D_N \leq N-1)} \\ &\geq \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{x \in B_k} \frac{P_0^\omega(D_N = k, X_{H_k} = x)}{P_0^\omega(D_N \leq N-1)} P_x^\omega(H_N \geq n) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{x \in B_k} \frac{P_0^\omega(D_N = k, X_{H_k} = x)}{P_0^\omega(D_N \leq N-1)} P_y^\omega(H_N \geq n) P_x^\omega(X_1 = y) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4dN^\alpha} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{x \in B_k} \frac{P_0^\omega(D_N = k, X_{H_k} = x)}{P_0^\omega(D_N \leq N-1)} P_y^\omega(H_N \geq n) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4dn} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{x \in B_k} \frac{P_0^\omega(D_N = k, X_{H_k} = x)}{P_0^\omega(D_N \leq N-1)} P_y^\omega(H_N \geq n). \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

If the trap  $\mathfrak{P}_N$  retains enough the random walk  $X$ , we will have  $H_N \geq n$ , when it starts at  $y$  (always the same  $y = x + \epsilon(x)\hat{e}_{i_0}$  of the collection  $\mathcal{C}(x)$ ). Let

$$E_N := \bigcup_{j=0}^{n-1} \{X_j \text{ steps outside of the trap } \mathfrak{P}_N\}$$

and we say “ $X_j$  steps outside of the trap  $\mathfrak{P}_N$ ”, when  $X_{j+1}$  is on a site of the border of the trap  $\mathfrak{P}_N$ , i.e.  $X_{j+1} = y \pm \hat{e}_i, \forall i \neq i_0$ , or  $X_{j+1} = x$  (resp.  $X_{j+1} = z \pm \hat{e}_i, \forall i \neq i_0$ , or  $X_{j+1} = z + \epsilon(z)\hat{e}_{i_0}$ ) if  $X_j = y$  (resp. if  $X_j = z$ ).

The complement of  $E_N$  is in fact the event that  $X$  does not leave the trap during its first  $n$  jumps, i.e.  $X$  jumps  $n$  times, starting at  $y$ , in turn on  $z$  and  $y$ , which, according to the configuration of the trap, costs for each jump a probability greater than

$$\frac{\xi}{\xi + (2d - 1)N^{-\alpha}}.$$

Then, we have by the Markov property

$$P_y^\omega(H_N \geq n) \geq P_y^\omega(E_N^c) \geq \left( \frac{\xi}{\xi + (2d - 1)N^{-\alpha}} \right)^n,$$

and since by the choice of  $N^\alpha \leq n < (N + 1)^\alpha$

$$\left( \frac{\xi}{\xi + (2d - 1)N^{-\alpha}} \right)^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} e^{-(2d-1)/\xi},$$

it follows for all  $N$  large enough that

$$P_y^\omega(H_N \geq n) \geq \frac{e^{-(2d-1)/\xi}}{2}. \quad (2.7)$$

So, putting this in (2.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_0^\omega(X_n \in B_N | D_N \leq N - 1) &\geq \frac{e^{-(2d-1)/\xi}}{8dn} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{x \in B_{N-1}} \frac{P_0^\omega(D_N = k, X_{H_k} = x)}{P_0^\omega(D_N \leq N - 1)} \\ &\geq \frac{e^{-(2d-1)/\xi}}{8dn}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, according to (2.4), we have  $P_0^\omega(D_N \leq N - 1) \geq 1/2$ . Then we deduce

$$P_0^\omega(X_n \in B_N) \geq P_0^\omega(X_n \in B_N | D_N \leq N - 1) P_0^\omega(D_N \leq N - 1) \geq \frac{e^{-(2d-1)/\xi}}{16dn}.$$

A fortiori, we have

$$P_0^\omega(X_n \in B_{n^{1/\alpha}}) \geq P_0^\omega(X_n \in B_N) \geq \frac{e^{-(2d-1)/\xi}}{16dn}.$$

Thus, for all  $N \geq N_0$ , by replacing the last inequality in (2.2), we obtain

$$P_\omega^{2n}(0, 0) \geq \frac{\pi(0) \left( e^{-(2d-1)/\xi} / 16d \right)^2 7^{-d}}{n^{2+\delta(\gamma)}}.$$

where  $\delta(\gamma) := d(4d - 2)\gamma / (1 - \epsilon)$ . When we let  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we get (1.10).  $\square$

### 3. Standard heat-kernel decay

We give here the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Let us first give some definitions and fix some notations besides those seen before.

Consider a Markov chain on a countable state-space  $V$  with transition probability denoted by  $\mathbf{P}(x, y)$  and invariant measure denoted by  $\pi$ . Define  $\mathbf{Q}(x, y) = \pi(x)\mathbf{P}(x, y)$  and for each  $S_1, S_2 \subset V$ , let

$$\mathbf{Q}(S_1, S_2) = \sum_{x \in S_1} \sum_{y \in S_2} \mathbf{Q}(x, y). \quad (3.1)$$

For each  $S \subset V$  with  $\pi(S) \in (0, \infty)$  we define

$$\Phi_S = \frac{\mathbf{Q}(S, S^c)}{\pi(S)} \quad (3.2)$$

and use it to define the isoperimetric profile

$$\Phi(r) = \inf \{ \Phi_S : \pi(S) \leq r \}. \quad (3.3)$$

(Here  $\pi(S)$  is the measure of  $S$ .) It is easy to check that we may restrict the infimum to sets  $S$  that are connected in the graph structure induced on  $V$  by  $\mathbf{P}$ .

To prove Theorem 1.4, we combine basically two facts. On the one hand, we use Theorem 2 of Morris and Peres [MorPer05] that we summarize here : Suppose that  $\mathbf{P}(x, x) \geq \sigma$  for some  $\sigma \in (0, 1/2]$  and all  $x \in V$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $x, y \in V$ . Then

$$\mathbf{P}^n(x, y) \leq \epsilon \pi(y) \quad (3.4)$$

for all  $n$  such that

$$n \geq 1 + \frac{(1 - \sigma)^2}{\sigma^2} \int_{4[\pi(x) \wedge \pi(y)]}^{4/\epsilon} \frac{4}{u\Phi(u)^2} du. \quad (3.5)$$

Let  $B_{N+1} = [-(N+1), N+1]^d$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{N+1}$  denote the set of nearest-neighbor bonds of  $B_{N+1}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{B}_{N+1} = \{b = (x, y) : x, y \in B_{N+1}, x \sim y\}$ . Call  $\mathbb{Z}_e^d$  the set of even points of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , i.e., the points  $x := (x_1, \dots, x_d)$  such that  $|\sum_{i=1}^d x_i| = 2k$ , with  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  ( $0 \in \mathbb{N}$ ), and equip it with the graph structure defined by : two points  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_e^d \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$  are neighbors when they are separated in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  by two steps, i.e.

$$\sum_{i=1}^d |x_i - y_i| = 2.$$

We operate the following modification on the environment  $\omega$  by defining  $\tilde{\omega}_b = 1$  on every bond  $b \notin \mathcal{B}_{N+1}$  and  $\tilde{\omega}_b = \omega_b$  otherwise. Then, we will adapt the machinery above to the following setting

$$V = \mathbb{Z}_e^d, \quad \mathbf{P} = P_{\tilde{\omega}}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \pi = \pi_{\tilde{\omega}}, \quad (3.6)$$

with the objects in (3.1–3.3) denoted by  $\mathbf{Q}_{\tilde{\omega}}$ ,  $\Phi_S^{(\tilde{\omega})}$  and  $\Phi_{\tilde{\omega}}(r)$ . So, the random walk associated with  $P_{\tilde{\omega}}^2$  moves on the even points.

On the other hand, we need to know the following standard fact that gives a lower bound of the conductances of the box  $B_N$ . For a proof, see [FM06], Lemma 3.6.

**Lemma 3.1** *Under assumption (1.3),*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\log \inf_{b \in \mathcal{B}_N} \omega_b}{\log N} = -\frac{d}{\gamma}, \quad \mathbb{Q} - a.s. \quad (3.7)$$

Thus, for arbitrary  $\mu > 0$ , we can write  $\mathbb{Q}$ -a.s., for all  $N$  large enough

$$\inf_{b \in \mathcal{B}_{N+1}} \omega_b \geq N^{-(\frac{d}{\gamma} + \mu)}. \quad (3.8)$$

Our next step involves extraction of appropriate bounds on surface and volume terms.

**Lemma 3.2** *Let  $d \geq 2$  and set  $\alpha(N) := N^{-(\frac{d}{\gamma} + \mu)}$ , for arbitrary  $\mu > 0$ . Then, for a.e.  $\omega$ , there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that the following holds: For  $N$  large enough and any finite connected  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}_e^d$ , we have*

$$\mathbf{Q}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\Lambda, \mathbb{Z}_e^d \setminus \Lambda) \geq c\alpha(N)^2 \pi_{\tilde{\omega}}(\Lambda)^{\frac{d-1}{d}}. \quad (3.9)$$

The proof of lemma 3.2 will be a consequence of the following well-known fact of isoperimetric inequalities on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  (see [Woe00], Chapter I, § 4). For any connected  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ , let  $\partial\Lambda$  denote the set of edges between  $\Lambda$  and  $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \Lambda$ . Then, there exists a constant  $\kappa$  such that

$$|\partial\Lambda| \geq \kappa |\Lambda|^{\frac{d-1}{d}} \quad (3.10)$$

for every finite connected  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ . This remains true for  $\mathbb{Z}_e^d$ .

*Proof of lemma 3.2.* For some arbitrary  $\mu > 0$ , set  $\alpha := \alpha(N) = N^{-(\frac{d}{\gamma} + \mu)}$  and let  $N \gg 1$ . For any finite connected  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}_e^d$ , we claim that

$$\mathbf{Q}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\Lambda, \mathbb{Z}_e^d \setminus \Lambda) \geq \frac{\alpha^2}{2d} |\partial\Lambda| \quad (3.11)$$

and

$$\pi_{\tilde{\omega}}(\Lambda) \leq 2d |\Lambda|. \quad (3.12)$$

Then, Lemma 3.1 gives a.s.  $\inf_{b \in \mathcal{B}_N} \omega(b) > \alpha$  and by virtue of (3.10), we have  $|\partial\Lambda| \geq \kappa |\Lambda|^{\frac{d-1}{d}}$ , then (3.9) will follow from (3.11–3.12).

It remains to prove (3.11–3.12). The bound (3.12) is implied by  $\pi_{\tilde{\omega}}(x) \leq 2d$ . For (3.11), since  $P_{\tilde{\omega}}^2$  represents two steps of a random walk, we get a lower bound on  $\mathbf{Q}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\Lambda, \mathbb{Z}_e^d \setminus \Lambda)$  by picking a site  $x \in \Lambda$  which has a neighbor  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  that has a

neighbor  $z \in \mathbb{Z}_e^d$  on the outer boundary of  $\Lambda$ . By Lemma 3.1, if  $x$  or  $z \in B_{N+1}$ , the relevant contribution is bounded by

$$\pi_{\tilde{\omega}}(x)P_{\tilde{\omega}}^2(x, z) \geq \pi_{\tilde{\omega}}(x) \frac{\tilde{\omega}_{xy}}{\pi_{\tilde{\omega}}(x)} \frac{\tilde{\omega}_{yz}}{\pi_{\tilde{\omega}}(y)} \geq \frac{\alpha^2}{2d}. \quad (3.13)$$

For the case where  $x, z \notin \mathbb{Z}_e^d \cap B_{N+1}$ , clearly the left-hand side of (3.13) is bounded by  $1/(2d) > \alpha^2/(2d)$ . Once  $\Lambda$  has at least two elements, we can do this for  $(y, z)$  ranging over all bonds in  $\partial\Lambda$ , so summing over  $(y, z)$  we get (3.11).  $\square$

Now we get what we need to estimate the decay of  $P_{\tilde{\omega}}^{2n}(0, 0)$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Let  $d \geq 5$ ,  $\gamma > 8d$  and choose  $\mu > 0$  such that

$$\mu < \frac{1}{8} - \frac{d}{\gamma}.$$

Let  $n = \lfloor N/2 \rfloor$ ,  $N \gg 1$ , and consider the random walk on  $\tilde{\omega}$ .

We will derive a bound on  $\Phi_{\Lambda}^{(\tilde{\omega})}$  for connected  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}_e^d$ . Henceforth  $c$  denotes a generic constant. Observe that (3.9) implies

$$\Phi_{\Lambda}^{(\tilde{\omega})} \geq c\alpha^2 \pi_{\tilde{\omega}}(\Lambda)^{-1/d}. \quad (3.14)$$

Then, we conclude that

$$\Phi_{\tilde{\omega}}(r) \geq c\alpha^2 r^{-1/d} \quad (3.15)$$

The relevant integral is thus bounded by

$$\frac{(1-\sigma)^2}{\sigma^2} \int_{4[\pi(0) \wedge \pi(x)]}^{4/\epsilon} \frac{4}{u\Phi_{\tilde{\omega}}(u)^2} du \leq c\alpha^{-4} \sigma^{-2} \epsilon^{-2/d} \quad (3.16)$$

for some constant  $c > 0$ . Setting  $\epsilon$  proportional to  $n^{\frac{4d^2}{\gamma} + 4\mu d - \frac{d}{2}}$ , and noting  $\sigma \geq \alpha^2/(2d)$ , the right-hand side is less than  $n$  and by setting  $\delta(\gamma) = 4d^2/\gamma$ , we will get

$$P_{\tilde{\omega}}^{2n}(0, x) \leq \frac{c}{n^{\frac{d}{2} - \delta(\gamma) - 4\mu d}}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}_e^d. \quad (3.17)$$

As the random walk will not leave the box  $B_N$  by time  $2n$ , we can replace  $\tilde{\omega}$  by  $\omega$  in (3.17), and since  $P_{\omega}^{2n}(0, x) = 0$  for each  $x \notin B_N$ , then after letting  $\mu \rightarrow 0$ , we get

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{\log P_{\omega}^{2n}(0, x)}{\log n} \leq -\frac{d}{2} + \delta(\gamma).$$

This proves the claim for even  $n$ ; for odd  $n$  we just concatenate this with a single step of the random walk.  $\square$

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I express my gratitude to my father Youcef Bey. I wish to thank my Ph.D. advisor, Pierre Mathieu for suggesting and discussions on this problem, and Abdelatif

Bencherif-Madani for his support. I also would like to thank the referees for their careful reading and comments that led to an improvement of the paper.

## REFERENCES

- [Ba04] BARLOW, M.T. (2004). *Random walks on supercritical percolation clusters*. Ann. Probab., Vol. **32**, no. 4, 3024–3084.
- [BB07] BERGER, N. AND BISKUP, M. (2007). *Quenched invariance principle for simple random walk on percolation clusters*. Probab. Theory Rel. Fields, Vol. **137**, no. 1-2, 83–120.
- [BBHK08] BERGER, N., BISKUP, M., HOFFMAN, C. E. AND KOZMA, G. (2008). *Anomalous heat-kernel decay for random walk among bounded random conductances*. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Statist., Vol. **44**, no. 2, 374–392.
- [BP07] BISKUP, M. AND PRESCOTT, T.M. (2007). *Functional CLT For Random Walk Among Bounded Random Conductances*. Electron. J. Probab., Vol. **12**, no. 49, 1323–1348.
- [Del99] DELMOTTE, T. (1999). *Parabolic Harnack inequality and estimates of Markov chains on graphs*. Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana, Vol. **15**, no. 1, 181–232.
- [DFGW85] DE MASI, A., FERRARI, P.A., GOLDSTEIN, S. AND WICK, W.D. (1985). *Invariance principle for reversible Markov processes with application to diffusion in the percolation regime*. In :Particle Systems, Random Media and Large Deviations (Brunswick, Maine), pp. 71–85, Contemp. Math., Vol. **41**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI.
- [DFGW89] DE MASI, A., FERRARI, P.A., GOLDSTEIN, S. AND WICK, W.D. (1989). *An invariance principle for reversible Markov processes. Applications to random motions in random environments*. Journal of Statistical Physics, Vol. **55**, no. 3-4, 787–855.
- [FM06] FONTES, L.R.G. AND MATHIEU, P. (2006). *On symmetric random walks with random conductances on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$* . Probab. Theory Rel. Fields, Vol. **134**, no. 4, 565–602.
- [Grim99] GRIMMETT, G.R. (1999). *Percolation* (Second edition), Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 321. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [HH05] HEICKLEN, D., AND HOFFMAN, C. (2005). *Return probabilities of a simple random walk on percolation clusters*. Electron. J. Probab., Vol. **10**, no. 8, 250–302 (electronic).
- [M08] MATHIEU, P. (2008). *Quenched invariance principles for random walks with random conductances..* Journal of Statistical Physics, Vol. **130**, no. 5, 1025–1046.
- [MorPer05] MORRIS, B. AND PERES, Y. (2005). *Evolving sets, mixing and heat kernel bounds*. Probab. Theory Rel. Fields, Vol. **133**, no. 2, 245–266.
- [MPia07] MATHIEU, P. AND PIATNITSKI, A.L. (2007). *Quenched invariance principles for random walks on percolation clusters*. Proceedings A of the Royal Society, Vol. **463**, 2287–2307.
- [MR04] MATHIEU, P. AND REMY, E. (2004). *Isoperimetry and heat kernel decay on percolation clusters*. Ann. Probab. Vol. **32**, no. 1A, 100–128.
- [SSz04] SIDORAVICIUS, V. AND SZNITMAN, A.-S. (2004). *Quenched invariance principles for walks on clusters of percolation or among random conductances*. Probab. Theory Rel. Fields, Vol. **129**, no. 2, 219–244.
- [Woe00] WOESS, W. (2000). *Random walks on infinite graphs and groups*. Cambridge tracts in Mathematics (138), Cambridge university press.

CMI, 39 RUE F. JOLIOT-CURIE 13453 MARSEILLE CEDEX 13, FRANCE.

DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES, UNIVERSITÉ DE CONSTANTINE, BP 325, ROUTE AIN EL BEY, 25017, CONSTANTINE, ALGÉRIE.