

# Positive temperature versions of two theorems on first-passage percolation

Sasha Sodin\*

October 19, 2019

## Abstract

The estimates on the fluctuations of first-passage percolation due to Talagrand and Benjamini–Kalai–Schramm are transcribed into the positive-temperature setting of random Schrödinger operators.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $H = -\frac{1}{2d}\Delta + V$  be a random Schrödinger operator on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  with non-negative potential  $V \geq 0$ :

$$(H\psi)(x) = (1 + V(x))\psi(x) - \frac{1}{2d} \sum_{y \sim x} \psi(y) , \quad \psi \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d) .$$

Assume that the entries of  $V$  are independent, identically distributed, and satisfy

$$\mathbb{P}\{V(x) > 0\} > 0 . \tag{1}$$

The inverse  $G = H^{-1}$  of  $H$  defines a random metric

$$\rho(x, y) = \log \frac{\sqrt{G(x, x)G(y, y)}}{G(x, y)} \tag{2}$$

---

\*Department of Mathematics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA. E-mail: asodin@princeton.edu

on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  (see Lemma 2.4 below for the verification of the triangle inequality). We are interested in the behaviour of  $\rho(x, y)$  for large  $\|x - y\|$  (here and forth  $\|\cdot\|$  stands for the  $\ell_1$  norm); to simplify the notation, set  $\rho(x) = \rho(0, x)$ .

Zerner proved [16, Theorem A], using Kingman's subadditive ergodic theorem [10], that if  $V$  satisfies (1) and

$$\mathbb{E} \log^d(1 + V(x)) < \infty . \quad (3)$$

then

$$\rho(x) = \|x\|_V(1 + o(1)) , \quad \|x\| \rightarrow \infty , \quad (4)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_V$  is a deterministic norm on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  determined by the distribution of  $V$ . As to the fluctuations of  $\rho(x)$ , Zerner showed [16, Theorem C] that (1), (3), and

$$\text{if } d = 2, \text{ then } \mathbb{P}\{V(x) = 0\} = 0$$

imply the bound

$$\text{Var } \rho(x) \leq C_V \|x\| . \quad (5)$$

In dimension  $d = 1$ , the bound (5) is sharp; moreover,  $\rho$  obeys a central limit theorem

$$\frac{\rho(x) - \mathbb{E}\rho(x)}{\sigma_V |x|^{1/2}} \xrightarrow[|x| \rightarrow \infty]{D} N(0, 1) ,$$

which follows from the results of Furstenberg and Kesten [8]. In higher dimension, the fluctuations of  $\rho$  are expected to be smaller: the exponent

$$\chi_d = \limsup_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{1}{2} \log \text{Var } \rho(x)}{\log \|x\|}$$

is expected to be equal to  $1/3$  in dimension  $d = 2$ , and to be even smaller in higher dimension.

These conjectures are closely related to the corresponding conjectures for first-passage percolation. In fact,  $\rho$  is a positive-temperature counterpart of the (site) first-passage percolation metric corresponding to  $\omega = \log(1 + V)$ ; we refer to Zerner [16, Section 3] for a more elaborate discussion of this connection.

The rigorous understanding of fluctuations in dimension  $d \geq 2$  is for now confined to a handful of integrable models (see Corwin [7] for a review); extending it beyond this class remains a major open problem. We refer to the works of Chatterjee [6] and Auffinger–Damron [1, 2] for some recent results.

Here we carry out a much more modest task: verifying that the bounds on the fluctuations in (bond) first-passage percolation due to Talagrand [15] and Benjamini–Kalai–Schramm [4] are also valid for the random matrix (2). Zerner’s bound (5) is a positive-temperature counterpart of Kesten’s estimate [9]. Kesten showed that the (bond) first-passage percolation  $\rho_{\text{FPP}}$  satisfies

$$\text{Var } \rho_{\text{FPP}}(x) \leq C\|x\| ;$$

furthermore, if the underlying random variables have exponential tails, then so does  $(\rho_{\text{FPP}}(x) - \mathbb{E}\rho_{\text{FPP}}(x))/\sqrt{\|x\|}$ . Talagrand improved the tail bound to

$$\mathbb{P}\{|\rho_{\text{FPP}}(x) - \mathbb{E}\rho_{\text{FPP}}(x)| \geq t\} \leq C \exp\left\{-\frac{t^2}{C\|x\|}\right\}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq \|x\|.$$

Benjamini, Kalai, and Schramm [4] proved, in dimension  $d \geq 2$ , the sublinear bound

$$\text{Var } \rho_{\text{FPP}}(x) \leq C\|x\|/\log(\|x\| + 2),$$

for the special case of Bernoulli-distributed potential. Benaïm and Rossignol [3] extended this bound to a wider class of distributions (“nearly gamma” in the terminology of [3]), and complemented it with an exponential tail estimate. Extensions of the Benjamini–Kalai–Schramm bound to other models have been found by van der Berg and Kiss [5], and by Matic and Nolen [12].

Theorem 1 below is a positive temperature analogue of Talagrand’s bound (with a slightly stronger conclusion under a slightly stronger assumption – mainly, to use a more elementary concentration inequality from [13, 15] instead of a more involved one from [15]), and Theorem 2 – of the Benjamini–Kalai–Schramm bound. The strategy of the proof is very close to the original arguments; the modification mainly enters in a couple of deterministic estimates. Set  $\mu(x) = \mathbb{E}\rho(x)$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose the entries of  $V$  are independent, identically distributed, and bounded from below by  $\epsilon > 0$ . Also assume that the entries of  $V$  are bounded from above by  $0 < M < \infty$ . Then*

$$\mathbb{P}\{\rho(x) \leq \mu(x) - t\} \leq C \exp\left\{-\frac{t^2}{C(\epsilon, M)(\mu(x) + 1)}\right\}, \quad (6)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\{\rho(x) \geq \mu(x) + t\} \leq C \exp\left\{-\frac{t^2}{C(\epsilon, M)(\mu(x) + t + 1)}\right\}, \quad (7)$$

for every  $t \geq 0$ .

**Remark 1.1.** *The assumption  $\epsilon \leq V \leq M$  yields the deterministic estimate*

$$C_\epsilon^{-1}\|x\| \leq \rho(x) \leq C_M\|x\| ,$$

*which, in conjunction with (6) and (7), implies the inequality*

$$\mathbb{P} \{ |\rho(x) - \mu(x)| \geq t \} \leq C \exp \left\{ -\frac{t^2}{C(\epsilon, M)\|x\|} \right\} .$$

**Theorem 2.** *Assume that the distribution of the potential is given by*

$$\mathbb{P} \{ V(x) = a \} = \mathbb{P} \{ V(x) = b \} = 1/2$$

*for some  $0 < a < b$ , and that  $d \geq 2$ . Then*

$$\text{Var } \rho(x) \leq C_{a,b} \frac{\|x\|}{\log(\|x\| + 2)} . \quad (8)$$

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof of Theorem 1 is based on Talagrand's concentration inequality [13, 15]. We state this inequality as

**Lemma 2.1** (Talagrand). *Assume that  $\{V(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{X}\}$  are independent random variables, the distribution of every one of which is supported in  $[0, M]$ . Then, for every convex (or concave)  $L$ -Lipschitz function  $f : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .*

$$\mathbb{P} \{ f \geq \mathbb{E}f + t \} \leq C \exp \left\{ -\frac{t^2}{CM^2L^2} \right\} ,$$

*where  $C > 0$  is a constant.*

Denote  $g(x) = G(0, x)$ . To apply Lemma 2.1, we first compute the gradient of  $\log g$ , and then estimate its norm.

**Lemma 2.2.** *For any  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial V(y)} \log g(x) = -\frac{G(0, y)G(y, x)}{G(0, x)} .$$

*Proof.* Let  $P_y = \delta_y \delta_y^*$  be the projector on the  $y$ -th coordinate. Set  $H_h = H + hP_y$ ,  $G_h = H_h^{-1}$ . By the resolvent identity

$$G_h = G - hGP_y G_h ,$$

hence

$$\left. \frac{d}{dh} \right|_{h=0} G_h = -GP_y G$$

and

$$\left. \frac{d}{dh} \right|_{h=0} G_h(0, x) = -G(0, y)G(y, x) .$$

□

Our next goal is to prove

**Proposition 2.3.** *Suppose  $V \geq \epsilon > 0$ . Then*

$$\sum_y \left[ \frac{G(0, y)G(y, x)}{G(0, x)} \right]^2 \leq A_\epsilon(\rho(x) + 1) , \quad (9)$$

where  $A_\epsilon$  depends only on  $\epsilon$ .

The proof consists of two ingredients. The first one, equivalent to the triangle inequality for  $\rho$ , yields an upper bound on every term in (9).

**Lemma 2.4.** *For any  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,*

$$\frac{G(0, y)G(y, x)}{G(0, x)} \leq G(y, y) \leq C_\epsilon .$$

*Proof.* Let  $H_y$  be the operator obtained by erasing the edges that connect  $y$  to its neighbours, and let  $G_y = H_y^{-1}$ . By the resolvent identity,

$$G(0, x) = G_y(0, x) + \frac{1}{2d} \sum_{y' \sim y} G_y(0, y')G(y, x) .$$

In particular,

$$G(0, y) = \frac{1}{2d} \sum_{y' \sim y} G_y(0, y')G(y, y) .$$

Therefore

$$G(0, x) = G_y(0, x) + \frac{G(0, y)G(y, x)}{G(y, y)} .$$

□

The second ingredient is

**Lemma 2.5.** *For any  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,*

$$\sum_y \frac{G(0, y)G(y, x)}{G(0, x)} \leq C_\epsilon(\rho(x) + 1) .$$

The proof of Lemma 2.5 requires two more lemmata. Denote

$$g_2(x) = G^2(0, x) = \sum_y G(0, y)G(y, x) , \quad u(x) = \frac{g_2(x)}{g(x)} .$$

**Lemma 2.6.** *For any  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,*

$$\sum_{y \sim x} \frac{g(y)}{2d(1 + V(x))g(x)} = 1 - \frac{\delta(x)}{(1 + V(0))g(0)} \quad (10)$$

and

$$u(x) = \sum_{y \sim x} u(y) \frac{g(y)}{2d(1 + V(x))g(x)} + \frac{1}{1 + V(x)} . \quad (11)$$

*Proof.* The first formula follows from the relation  $Hg = \delta$ , and the second one – from the relation  $Hg_2 = g$ .  $\square$

Set  $\tilde{\rho}(x) = \log \frac{G(0,0)}{G(0,x)}$ .

**Lemma 2.7.** *For any  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}(x) &\geq \sum_{y \sim x} \tilde{\rho}(y) \frac{g(y)}{2d(1 + V(x))g(x)} \\ &\quad + \log(1 + V(x)) + \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{(1 + V(0))g(0)} \right) \delta(x) . \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* For  $x \neq 0$ , (10) and the concavity of logarithm yield

$$\sum_{y \sim x} \frac{g(y)}{2d(1 + V(x))g(x)} \log \frac{2d(1 + V(x))g(x)}{g(y)} \leq \log(2d) .$$

Using (10) once again, we obtain

$$-\tilde{\rho}(x) + \sum_{y \sim x} \tilde{\rho}(y) \frac{g(y)}{2d(1 + V(x))g(x)} + \log(1 + V(x)) \leq 0 .$$

The argument is similar for  $x = 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 2.5.* Let  $A \geq \log^{-1}(1 + \epsilon)$ . Then from Lemmata 2.6 and 2.7 the function  $u_A = u - A\tilde{\rho}$  satisfies

$$u_A(x) \leq \sum_{y \sim x} u_A(y) \frac{g(y)}{2d(1 + V(x))g(x)} - A \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{(1 + V(0))g(0)} \right) \delta(x) .$$

By a finite-volume approximation argument,

$$\max u_A(x) = u_A(0) \leq -\frac{A}{1 - \frac{1}{(1+V(0))g(0)}} \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{(1 + V(0))g(0)} \right) \leq A'_\epsilon ,$$

whence

$$u(x) \leq A'_\epsilon + A\tilde{\rho}(x) \leq C_\epsilon(1 + \rho(x)) .$$

□

*Proof of Proposition 2.3.* By Lemma 2.4 ,

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \sum_y \left[ \frac{G(0, y)G(y, x)}{G(0, x)} \right]^2 \\ &\leq \max_y G(y, y) \sum_y \frac{G(0, y)G(y, x)}{G(0, x)} = \max_y G(y, y) u(x) . \end{aligned}$$

The inequality  $V \geq \epsilon$  implies  $G(y, y) \leq A''_\epsilon$ , and Lemma 2.5 implies

$$u(x) \leq C_\epsilon(\rho(x) + 1) .$$

□

Next, we need

**Lemma 2.8.** *For any  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $\log g(x)$ ,  $\log \frac{G(0, x)}{G(0, 0)}$ , and  $\log \frac{G(0, x)}{G(x, x)}$  are convex functions of the potential. Consequently,*

$$\rho(x) = -\frac{1}{2} \left[ \log \frac{G(0, x)}{G(0, 0)} + \log \frac{G(0, x)}{G(x, x)} \right]$$

*is a concave function of the potential.*

*Proof.* The first statement follows from the random walk expansion:

$$g(x) = \sum \frac{1}{1+V(x_0)} \frac{1}{2d} \frac{1}{1+V(x_1)} \frac{1}{2d} \cdots \frac{1}{2d} \frac{1}{1+V(x_k)} ,$$

where the sum is over all paths  $w : x_0 = 0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_k = x$ . Indeed, for every  $w$

$$T_w = \log \frac{1}{1+V(x_0)} \frac{1}{2d} \frac{1}{1+V(x_1)} \frac{1}{2d} \cdots \frac{1}{2d} \frac{1}{1+V(x_k)}$$

is a convex function of  $V$ , hence also  $\log g(x) = \log \sum_w e^{T_w}$  is convex.

To prove the second statement, observe that

$$G(0, x) = \frac{1}{2d} G(0, 0) \sum_{y \sim 0} G_0(y, x) ,$$

where  $G_0$  is obtained by deleting the edges adjacent to 0. Therefore

$$\log \frac{G(0, x)}{G(0, 0)} = -\log(2d) + \log \sum_{y \sim 0} G_0(y, x) ;$$

for every  $y$ ,  $\log G_0(y, x)$  is a convex function of  $V$ , hence so is  $\log \frac{G(0, x)}{G(0, 0)}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Denote  $\rho_0(x) = \min(\rho(x), \mu(x))$ . Then by Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 2.3

$$\|\nabla_V \rho_0(x)\|_2^2 \leq A_\epsilon(\mu(x) + 1) ,$$

$A_\epsilon$  depends only on  $\epsilon$ . By Lemma 2.8,  $\rho_0$  is concave, therefore by Lemma 2.1

$$\mathbb{P} \{ \rho(x) \leq \mu(x) - t \} \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{t^2}{CM^2 A_\epsilon(\mu(x) + 1)} \right\} .$$

Similarly, set  $\rho_t(x) = \min(\rho(x), \mu(x) + t)$ . Then

$$\|\nabla_V \rho_t(x)\|_2^2 \leq A_\epsilon(\mu(x) + t + 1) ,$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \{ \rho(x) \geq \mu(x) + t \} &= \mathbb{P} \{ \rho_t(x) \geq \mu(x) + t \} \\ &\leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{t^2}{CM^2 A_\epsilon(\mu(x) + t + 1)} \right\} . \end{aligned}$$

$\square$



### 3 Proof of Theorem 2

The proof follows the strategy of Benjamini, Kalai, and Schramm [4]. Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\|x\| \geq 2$ ; set  $m = \lfloor \|x\|^{1/4} \rfloor + 1$ .

Let

$$F = -\frac{1}{\#B} \sum_{z \in B} \log G(z, x+z) ,$$

where

$$B = B(0, m) = \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \|z\| \leq m\}$$

is the ball of radius  $m$  about the origin. According to Lemma 2.4,

$$G(0, x) \geq \frac{G(z, x+z)G(0, z)G(x, x+z)}{G(z, z)G(x+z, x+z)} ,$$

therefore  $\rho(x) \leq F + C_{a,b}m$ ; similarly,  $\rho(x) \geq F - C_{a,b}m$ . It is therefore sufficient to show that

$$\text{Var } F \leq C_{a,b} \frac{\|x\|}{\log \|x\|} .$$

We use another inequality due to Talagrand [14] (see Ledoux [11] for a semigroup derivation). Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a (finite or countable) set. Let  $\sigma_x^+ : \{a, b\}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \{a, b\}^{\mathcal{X}}$  be the map setting the  $x$ -th coordinate to  $b$ , and  $\sigma_x^- : \{a, b\}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \{a, b\}^{\mathcal{X}}$  the map setting the  $x$ -th coordinate to  $a$ . Denote

$$\partial_x f = f \circ \sigma_x^+ - f \circ \sigma_x^- .$$

**Lemma 3.1** (Talagrand). *For any function  $f$  on  $\{a, b\}^{\mathcal{X}}$ ,*

$$\text{Var } f \leq C_{a,b} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{\mathbb{E}|\partial_x f|^2}{1 + \log \frac{\mathbb{E}|\partial_x f|^2}{(\mathbb{E}|\partial_x f|)^2}} . \quad (12)$$

Let us estimate the right-hand side for  $f = F$ ,  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{Z}^d$ . Denote

$$\sigma_x^t = t\sigma_x^+ + (1-t)\sigma_x^- ;$$

then

$$\partial_x F = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial F}{\partial V(x)} \circ \sigma_x^t dt .$$

According to Lemma 2.2,

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial V(y)} = \frac{1}{\#B} \sum_{z \in B} \frac{G(z, y)G(y, x + z)}{G(z, x + z)} .$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial F}{\partial V(y)} \circ \sigma_y^t &= \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{\#B} \sum_{z \in B} \frac{G(z, y)G(y, x + z)}{G(z, x + z)} \circ \sigma_y^t \\ &= \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{\#B} \sum_{z \in B} \frac{G(0, y - z)G(y - z, x)}{G(0, x)} \circ \sigma_{y-z}^t \\ &= \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{\#B} \sum_{v \in y+B} \frac{G(0, v)G(v, x)}{G(0, x)} \circ \sigma_v^t . \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.2.** *For any  $Q \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$  and any  $x', x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,*

$$\sum_{v \in Q} \frac{G(x', v)G(v, x)}{G(x', x)} \leq C_a(\text{diam}_\rho Q + 1) \leq C_{a,b}(\text{diam } Q + 1) . \quad (13)$$

Let us first conclude the proof of Theorem 2 and then prove the lemma. Set  $\delta = m^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , and let

$$A = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \mathbb{E} (\partial_y F)^2 \leq \delta \mathbb{E} \partial_y F \right\} .$$

Then the contribution of coordinates in  $A$  to the right-hand side of (12) is at most  $C\delta\|x\|$  by Lemma 2.5. For  $y$  in the complement of  $A$ , Lemma 3.2 yields

$$\mathbb{E} \partial_y F \leq \frac{Cm}{\#B} ,$$

hence

$$\mathbb{E} (\partial_y F)^2 \geq \delta \mathbb{E} \partial_y F \geq \frac{\delta \#B}{Cm} (\mathbb{E} \partial_y F)^2 ,$$

and

$$\log \frac{\mathbb{E} (\partial_y F)^2}{(\mathbb{E} \partial_y F)^2} \geq \log \frac{\delta}{Cm} \geq \log(\|x\|/C')$$

by the inequality  $\#B \geq Cm^2$  (which holds with  $d$ -independent  $C$ ). The contribution of the complement of  $A$  to (12) is therefore at most  $C' \frac{\|x\|}{\log \|x\|}$ . Thus finally

$$\text{Var} F \leq \frac{C'' \|x\|}{\log \|x\|} .$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 3.2.* For  $Q \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $x', x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , set

$$u_Q(x', x) = \frac{(G \mathbb{1}_Q G)(x', x)}{G(x', x)} = \frac{\sum_{q \in Q} G(x', q) G(q, x)}{G(x', x)}.$$

Similarly to Lemma 2.6,

$$u_Q(x', x) = \sum_{y \sim x} u_Q(x', y) \frac{G(x', y)}{2d(1 + V(x))G(x', x)} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_Q(x)}{1 + V(x)}.$$

By a finite-volume approximation argument, it is sufficient to prove the estimate (13) in a finite box. Then  $\max_x u_Q(x', x)$  is attained for some  $x_{\max} \in Q$ . By symmetry,  $\max_{x', x} u_Q(x', x)$  is attained when both  $x'$  and  $x$  are in  $Q$ . On the other hand, for  $x', x \in Q$

$$u_Q(x', x) \leq u_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(x', x) \leq C(1 + \log \frac{1}{G(x', x)}) \leq C'(1 + \text{diam}_\rho Q)$$

by Lemma 2.5. □

**Remark 3.3.** *To extend Theorem 2 to the generality of the work of Benaïm and Rossignol [3], one may use the modified Poincaré inequality of [3] instead of Talagrand's inequality (12).*

**Acknowledgment.** I am grateful to Thomas Spencer for helpful conversations, and to Itai Benjamini, Michael Damron, Alexander Elgart, and Gil Kalai for their comments on a preliminary version of this note.

## References

- [1] A. Auffinger, M. Damron, A simplified proof of the relation between scaling exponents in rst-passage percolation, arXiv:1109.0523
- [2] A. Auffinger, M. Damron, The scaling relation  $\chi = 2\xi - 1$  for directed polymers in a random environment, arXiv:1211.0992
- [3] M. Benaïm, R. Rossignol, Exponential concentration for first passage percolation through modified Poincaré inequalities, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. 44 (2008), no. 3, 544–573.

- [4] I. Benjamini, G. Kalai, O. Schramm, First passage percolation has sub-linear distance variance, *Ann. Probab.* 31 (2003), no. 4, 1970–1978.
- [5] J. van den Berg, D. Kiss, Sublinearity of the travel-time variance for dependent first-passage percolation, *Ann. Probab.* 40 (2012), no. 2, 743–764.
- [6] S. Chatterjee, The universal relation between scaling exponents in first-passage percolation, *arXiv:1105.4566*
- [7] I. Corwin, The Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation and universality class, *Random Matrices Theory Appl.* 1 (2012), no. 1, 1130001, 76 pp.
- [8] H. Furstenberg, H. Kesten, Products of random matrices, *Ann. Math. Statist.* 31, 1960, 457–469.
- [9] H. Kesten, On the speed of convergence in first-passage percolation, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 3 (1993), no. 2, 296–338.
- [10] J. F. C. Kingman, Subadditive ergodic theory. *Ann. Probability* 1 (1973), 883–909.
- [11] M. Ledoux, Deviation inequalities on largest eigenvalues, *Geometric aspects of functional analysis*, 167–219, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, 1910, Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- [12] I. Matic, J. Nolen, A sublinear variance bound for solutions of a random Hamilton-Jacobi equation, *Journal of Statistical Physics* 149 (2012), no. 2, pp. 342–361
- [13] M. Talagrand, An isoperimetric theorem on the cube and the Kintchine–Kahane inequalities, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 104 (1988), no. 3, 905–909.
- [14] M. Talagrand, On Russo’s approximate zero-one law, *Ann. Probab.* 22 (1994), no. 3, 1576–1587.
- [15] M. Talagrand, Concentration of measure and isoperimetric inequalities in product spaces, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* No. 81 (1995), 73–205.
- [16] M. P. W. Zerner, Directional decay of the Green’s function for a random nonnegative potential on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 8 (1998), no. 1, 246–280.