

# Hyperuniform and rigid stable matchings

M.A. Klatt\*, G. Last† and D. Yogeshwaran‡

January 29, 2020

## Abstract

We study a stable partial matching  $\tau$  of the  $d$ -dimensional lattice with a stationary determinantal point process  $\Psi$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with intensity  $\alpha > 1$ . For instance,  $\Psi$  might be a Poisson process. The matched points from  $\Psi$  form a stationary and ergodic (under lattice shifts) point process  $\Psi^\tau$  with intensity 1 that very much resembles  $\Psi$  for  $\alpha$  close to 1. On the other hand  $\Psi^\tau$  is hyperuniform and number rigid, quite in contrast to a Poisson process. We deduce these properties by proving more general results for a stationary point process  $\Psi$ , whose so-called matching flower (a stopping set determining the matching partner of a lattice point) has a certain subexponential tail behaviour. For hyperuniformity, we also additionally need to assume some mixing condition on  $\Psi$ . Further, if  $\Psi$  is a Poisson process then  $\Psi^\tau$  has an exponentially decreasing truncated pair correlation function.

**Keywords:** stable matching, Poisson process, determinantal process, hyperuniformity, number rigidity, pair correlation function

**AMS MSC 2010:** 60G55, 60G57, 60D05

## 1 Introduction

With respect to the degree of order and disorder, the completely independent Poisson point process (ideal gas) is the exact opposite of a (standard) lattice with a perfect short- and long-range order. Here we match these two extremes in the stable sense of Gale and Shapley [9] and Holroyd, Pemantle, Peres and Schramm [18], where lattice and Poisson points prefer to be close to each other. Assuming the intensity of the Poisson process to be larger than one, the matched Poisson points form a point process (a stable thinning) that inherits properties from both the lattice and the Poisson process. In fact, if the Poisson intensity approaches unity, the thinning becomes almost indistinguishable from a Poisson process in any finite observation window, while its large-scale density fluctuations remain anomalously suppressed similar to the lattice; see the supplementary video<sup>§</sup>. In

---

\*michael.klatt@kit.edu, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Institute for Stochastics, 76131 Karlsruhe, Germany.

†guenter.last@kit.edu, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Institute for Stochastics, 76131 Karlsruhe, Germany.

‡d.yogesh@isibang.ac.in, Theoretical Statistics and Mathematics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Bangalore, India.

<sup>§</sup><https://arxiv.org/src/1810.00265v1/anc/KLY-2018-Supplementary-Video.mp4>




Figure 1: Samples of 1D hyperuniform stable matchings: a stationarized lattice  $\Phi$  (blue crosses) is matched to a Poisson point process  $\Psi$  with intensity  $\alpha > 1$  (gray points) resulting in the hyperuniform point process  $\Psi^\tau$  (green points). The matching is visualized by (green) lines. Three samples are depicted, each at a different intensity  $\alpha$ .

this article, we study such properties of stable partial matchings between the lattice and a stationary point process. We shall now give more details.

Let  $\Psi$  be an ergodic simple point process on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with finite intensity  $\alpha > 1$ . Throughout we identify a *point process* with its *support*, where we refer to [27] for notation and terminology from point process theory. Let  $U$  be a  $[0, 1)^d$ -valued random variable, independent of  $\Psi$  and let  $\Phi := \mathbb{Z}^d + U$  be a *randomized lattice*, where  $B + x := \{y + x : y \in B\}$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Further, if  $U$  is uniform in  $[0, 1)^d$ , we call the randomized lattice  $\Phi$  a *stationarized lattice*. A *matching* between  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  is a mapping  $\tau \equiv \tau(\Phi, \Psi, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\infty\}$  such that almost surely  $\tau(\Phi) \subset \Psi$ ,  $\tau(\Psi) \subset \Phi \cup \{\infty\}$ , and  $\tau(x) = p$  if and only if  $\tau(p) = x$  for  $p \in \Phi$  and  $x \in \Psi$ . Since  $\alpha > 1$ , as a rule we will have  $\tau(x) = \infty$  for infinitely many  $x \in \Psi$ . Following [18], we call a matching *stable* if there is no pair  $(p, x) \in \Phi \times \Psi$  such that

$$|p - x| < \min\{|p - \tau(p)|, |x - \tau(x)|\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $|x - \infty| = \infty$  for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . (Such a pair is called *unstable*.) In the absence of *infinite descending chains* the *mutual nearest neighbour matching* shows that a stable matching exists and is almost surely uniquely determined; see [18] and Section 3. In this paper we study the point process  $\Psi^\tau := \{\tau(p) : p \in \Phi\} = \{x \in \Psi : \tau(x) \neq \infty\}$ ; a stable thinning of  $\Psi$ . Figures 1 and 2 show realizations of  $\Psi^\tau$  when  $\Psi$  is a stationary Poisson point process in 1D and 2D, respectively.

It is not hard to see that  $\Psi^\tau$  is stationary and ergodic under translations from  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Moreover, if  $U$  has the uniform distribution, then  $\Psi^\tau$  is stationary and ergodic (under all translations) and has intensity 1. It might be helpful to interpret  $\Psi^\tau$  as the output process of a spatial *queueing system*, where  $\Phi$  represents the locations (arrival times) of customers and  $\Psi$  the potential departure times. In fact, a one-sided version of the stable matching can be interpreted as a queueing system with deterministic arrival times, one




Figure 2: Samples of 2D hyperuniform stable matchings: a stationarized lattice  $\Phi$  (blue crosses) is matched to a Poisson point process  $\Psi$  with intensity  $\alpha > 1$  (gray points) resulting in the hyperuniform point process  $\Psi^\tau$  (green points). The matching is visualized by (green) lines. Three samples are depicted, each at a different intensity  $\alpha$ .

server with infinite waiting capacity and a *last in, first out* service discipline. The output process of a closely related system (with a first in, first out service discipline) was studied in [14, 8]; see also Section 9.

In this paper, we show that the stable thinning  $\Psi^\tau$  has several remarkable properties. As mentioned before, when  $\Psi$  is the stationary Poisson point process,  $\Psi^\tau$  approaches the lattice and the Poisson point process with unit intensity at the two extreme limits  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ , respectively. On the other hand, we prove that if  $\Psi$  is a stationary determinantal point process with a suitably fast decaying kernel,  $\Psi^\tau$  is *hyperuniform* (or *superhomogeneous*), that is, density fluctuations on large scales are anomalously suppressed; see [39, 38]. This also includes the stationary Poisson point process. More precisely, hyperuniformity means that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Var } \Psi^\tau(rW)}{\lambda_d(rW)} = 0, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $\lambda_d$  denotes Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $W$  is an arbitrary convex and compact set with  $\lambda_d(W) > 0$ . In general, this notion depends on the observation window  $W$ , see [23]. In our paper, however, we consider the stronger notion of hyperuniformity defined above. We also show that  $\Psi^\tau$  is *number rigid* when  $\Psi$  is a stationary determinantal point process. This means that for each bounded Borel set  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  the random number  $\Psi^\tau(B)$  is almost surely determined by  $\Psi^\tau \cap B^c$ , the restriction of  $\Psi^\tau$  to the complement of  $B$ ; see [10, 11] for a definition and discussion of this concept. Despite these unique properties on large scales, the *truncated (or total) pair correlation function* of  $\Psi^\tau$  is exponentially decaying (if  $U$  is deterministic) when  $\Psi$  is the stationary Poisson point process. In one and two dimensions, there is a close relationship between hyperuniformity and number rigidity; see [12]. To reiterate why hyperuniformity and number rigidity of  $\Psi^\tau$  is interesting, note that the original point process  $\Psi$  in many of the above cases (for example, the stationary Poisson point process) does not need to be hyperuniform or number rigid. Further, our results supply a large class of examples of hyperuniform and number rigid point processes in all dimensions. There are few examples of number rigid point processes in higher

dimensions ( $d \geq 3$ ). The ones we are aware of are small i.i.d. Gaussian perturbations of a lattice [34], stationary point processes satisfying DLR (Dobrushin-Landford-Ruelle) equations with appropriate interacting potentials [7] and the hierarchical Coulomb gas in  $d = 3$  [5]. We wish to also point out that first rigidity and hyperuniformity reveal something intrinsically interesting about the point process, and second these properties are also useful to understand percolation models on point processes (see page 5 of [13]).

The paper is organized as follows. We define the matching algorithm in Section 2 and strongly supported by [18] we show that the stable partial matching between two locally finite point sets is well defined and unique in the absence of infinite descending chains. In Section 3, we discuss a few basic properties of stable partial matchings  $\tau$  for a general stationary and ergodic point process  $\Psi$  with intensity  $\alpha \geq 1$ . The point process  $\Phi$  is assumed to be stationary with intensity 1 or a randomized lattice. Theorems 3.1 and 3.4 show that the matching  $\tau$  and hence the thinned process  $\Psi^\tau$  are well-defined for a huge class of point processes. In Section 4, we introduce and study the *matching flower*, one of our key technical tools. It is a *stopping set* that determines the matching partner of a given point. Starting from Section 5, we assume that  $\Phi$  is a (possibly randomized) lattice. In Section 5, we consider the tail properties of the matching distance  $\|\tau(0)\|$  of the origin 0 from its matching partner and also that of the size of the matching flower. When  $\Psi$  is a stationary determinantal point process (which includes the Poisson process) with intensity  $\alpha > 1$ , the first main result of our paper (Theorem 5.1) shows that the distance  $\|\tau(0)\|$  has an exponentially decaying tail; a crucial fact for all of our later results on determinantal processes. Our proof is inspired by ideas from [18]. The assumption of a determinantal point process allows us to use the concentration inequality in [32] for suitable Lipschitz functionals. Then, we show in Theorem 5.5 that the size of the matching flower for a stationary point process (satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 3.4) has a sub-exponentially decaying tail provided the matching distance  $\|\tau(0)\|$  has a sub-exponentially decaying tail. Combining Theorems 5.1 and 5.5, we deduce sub-exponentially decaying tail for the size of the matching flower of stationary determinantal point process with intensity  $\alpha > 1$  in Corollary 5.8. We also study the tail behaviour of the matching distance seen from an extra point added to  $\Psi$ . In case of the Poisson point process, we study the tail behaviour of the matching distance and the size of the matching flower of a typical point (Theorem 5.9 and Proposition 5.10). In Section 6, we first prove a general criterion for hyperuniformity (Theorem 6.1), which is satisfied for  $\Psi^\tau$ , whenever  $\Phi$  is a deterministic lattice and  $\Psi$  is determinantal with a ‘fast decaying’ kernel and intensity  $\alpha > 1$ . The general criteria involve sub-exponentially decaying tail for the size of the matching flower and suitable decay of mixing coefficients of the point process  $\Psi$ . Here, we use mixing properties of determinantal point processes. In Section 7, we prove number rigidity of  $\Psi^\tau$  assuming only sub-exponentially decaying tail for the size of the matching flower. In Section 8, we assume that  $\Phi$  is a deterministic lattice and that  $\Psi$  is a stationary Poisson process and prove that the truncated pair correlation function is exponentially decaying. In Section 9, we consider a one-sided stable matching on the line, a simpler version of the two-sided case. This can be interpreted as a queueing system with a Last-In-First-Out rule and where the input and departure processes are both considered to be  $\mathbb{Z}$ -stationary point processes. Under weak assumptions, we show that the asymptotic variance profile of the output process is the same as that of the input process. In other words, the output process is hyperuniform or non-hyperuniform

or hyperfluctuating, whenever the input is. In Section 10, extensive simulations of a matching on the torus (in 1D, 2D, and 3D) between the lattice and determinantal and Poisson point processes confirm the hyperuniformity of  $\Psi^\tau$  and study how local and global structural characteristics change with varying intensity  $\alpha$ . Our code is freely available as an R-package via [24]. We conclude the paper by presenting some conjectures and some further directions of research. The appendix contains some basic material on point processes.

In a sense, the Poisson point process is a degenerate case of a determinantal point process. Nevertheless, we consider the Poisson point process to be a determinantal point process for ease of stating our results and proofs. The facts about determinantal point processes that we use in our paper are provided in the appendix (Section 12), see Theorems 12.1 and 12.2 as well as (12.1).

Our results on hyperuniformity and number rigidity are stated under general conditions on mixing of the point process  $\Psi$  (satisfied by determinantal point processes with fast-decaying kernels) and sub-exponentially decaying tail bound on the size of the matching flower. As pointed out above, the proof of the latter uses the concentration properties of a determinantal process. Though exponential decay of pair correlation function is proven only for  $\Psi$  being a Poisson point process, we believe that this can also be extended to suitably mixing point process  $\Psi$  and again assuming that the size of the matching flower has a sub-exponentially decaying tail.

## 2 Stable matchings

We let  $\mathbf{N}$  denote the space of all locally finite subsets  $\varphi \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  equipped with the  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{N}$  generated by the mappings  $\varphi \mapsto \varphi(B) := \text{card}(\varphi \cap B)$ ,  $B \in \mathcal{B}^d$ . Here  $\mathcal{B}^d$  denotes the Borel  $\sigma$ -field in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We will identify  $\varphi \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  with the associated counting measure.

Let  $d(x, A) := \inf\{\|y - x\| : y \in A\}$  denote the distance between a point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and a set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $\inf \emptyset := \infty$  and where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the Euclidean norm. Let  $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . We call  $p \in \varphi$  *nearest neighbour* of  $x$  in  $\varphi$  if  $\|x - p\| \leq \|x - q\|$  for all  $q \in \varphi$ . The lexicographically smallest among the nearest neighbours of  $x$  is denoted by  $N^-(\varphi, x)$  and the largest by  $N^+(\varphi, x)$ . For completeness we define  $N(\varphi, x) := \infty$  if  $\varphi = \emptyset$ .

Given  $\varphi, \psi \in \mathbf{N}$  we now define a *mutual nearest neighbor matching* from  $\varphi$  to  $\psi$ , closely following [18]. For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we define  $\tau_1(\varphi, \psi, x) := y$  if  $N^-(\psi, x) = y$  and  $N^+(\varphi, y) = x$  or  $N^+(\varphi, x) = y$  and  $N^-(\psi, y) = x$ . Otherwise we put  $\tau_1(\varphi, \psi, x) := \infty$ . For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we inductively define a mapping  $\tau_{n+1}(\varphi, \psi, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  by  $\tau_{n+1}(\varphi, \psi, x) := \tau_1(\varphi_n, \psi_n, x)$ , where

$$\varphi_n := \{x \in \varphi : \tau_n(\varphi, \psi, x) \notin \psi\}, \quad \psi_n := \{x \in \psi : \tau_n(\varphi, \psi, x) \notin \varphi\}.$$

For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we define  $\tau(\varphi, \psi, x) := \tau_n(\varphi, \psi, x)$  if  $x \in (\varphi_n \setminus \varphi_{n+1}) \cup (\psi_n \setminus \psi_{n+1})$  for some  $n \geq 0$ , where  $\varphi_0 := \varphi$  and  $\psi_0 := \psi$ . Define the sets of unmatched points

$$\varphi_\infty := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi_n, \quad \psi_\infty := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi_n.$$

For  $x \in \varphi_\infty \cup \psi_\infty$ , we set  $\tau(\varphi, \psi, x) := \infty$ . For completeness we define  $\tau(\varphi, \psi, x) := x$  in all other cases, that is for  $x \notin \varphi \cup \psi$ . We refer to the above iterative procedure for




Figure 3: The iterated mutually closest matching algorithm: match mutually nearest neighbors (left), then repeat considering only the remaining points (center and right).

defining the matching as *mutual nearest neighbour matching* as above or more simply as *matching algorithm*. See Figure 3 for an illustration of the algorithm for point processes on the line.

Note that  $\tau$  is a measurable mapping on  $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{N} \times \mathbb{R}^d$  with the *covariance property*

$$\tau(\varphi + z, \psi + z, x + z) = \tau(\varphi, \psi, x) + z, \quad \varphi, \psi \in \mathbf{N}, x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (2.1)$$

Given points  $p \in \varphi$  and  $x, y \in \psi$ ,  $p$  *prefers*  $x$  to  $y$  if either  $\|x - p\| < \|y - p\|$  or  $\|x - p\| = \|y - p\|$  and  $x$  is lexicographically strictly smaller than  $y$ . Correspondingly for  $x \in \psi$  and  $p, q \in \varphi$ ,  $x$  *prefers*  $p$  to  $q$  if either  $\|p - x\| < \|q - x\|$  or  $\|p - x\| = \|q - x\|$  and  $p$  is lexicographically greater than  $q$ .

We now refine the notion of stable matchings as discussed in the introduction. A (partial) matching is in general defined by a measurable mapping  $\tau' : \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{N} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\infty\}$  such that  $\tau'(\varphi, \psi, q) \in \psi \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $\tau'(\varphi, \psi, x) \in \varphi \cup \{\infty\}$ , and  $\tau'(\varphi, \psi, q) = x$  if and only if  $\tau'(\varphi, \psi, x) = q$  for  $q \in \varphi$  and  $x \in \psi$ . It is called partial because not all points in  $\varphi \cup \psi$  need to be matched, i.e., some of them are mapped to  $\infty$ . Given  $\varphi, \psi \in \mathbf{N}$ , we call a pair  $(p, x) \in \varphi \times \psi$  *unstable* in  $(\varphi, \psi)$  if  $x$  prefers  $p$  to  $\tau'(\varphi, \psi, x)$  and  $p$  prefers  $x$  to  $\tau'(\varphi, \psi, p)$ . If there is no unstable pair in  $(\varphi, \psi)$ , then we call  $\tau'$  a *stable matching* from  $\varphi$  to  $\psi$ . Moreover if  $\tau'$  is a stable matching from  $\varphi$  to  $\psi$  for all  $(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{N}$ , then we simply call it *stable*.

**Proposition 2.1.** *The mutual nearest neighbor matching  $\tau$  is stable.*

*Proof:* Assume that there is an unstable pair  $(p, x) \in \varphi \times \psi$ . By definition of  $\tau$  there exists an  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  such that  $p \in \varphi_n$  and  $x \in \psi_n$  as well as  $N^-(\psi_n, p) = \tau(\varphi, \psi, p) \neq x$  or  $N^+(\varphi_n, x) = \tau(\varphi, \psi, x) \neq p$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

We call  $(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{N}$  *non-equidistant* if there do not exist  $p, q \in \varphi$  and  $x, y \in \psi$  with  $\{p, x\} \neq \{q, y\}$  and  $\|p - x\| = \|q - y\|$ . Note that the mutual nearest neighbor matching is well defined and stable independent of this property, but if  $(\varphi, \psi)$  is *non-equidistant*, then  $\tau(\varphi, \psi, \cdot) = \tau(\psi, \varphi, \cdot)$  due to the symmetry of the Euclidean norm.

Let  $\varphi, \psi \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $n \geq 2$ . A sequence  $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  of points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is called a *descending chain* in  $(\varphi, \psi)$  if  $z_i \in \varphi$  for odd  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $z_i \in \psi$  for even  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $z_i$  prefers  $z_{i+1}$  to  $z_{i-1}$  for each  $i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$ . Note that any pair  $(z_1, z_2) \in \varphi \times \psi$  is a descending chain. An infinite sequence  $(z_1, z_2, \dots)$  of points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is called an *infinite descending chain* if for every  $n \geq 2$ ,  $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  is a descending chain. The following result can be proved as Lemma 15 in [18].

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $\varphi, \psi \in \mathbf{N}$ , and suppose that there is no infinite descending chain in  $(\varphi, \psi)$ . Then  $\varphi_\infty = \emptyset$  or  $\psi_\infty = \emptyset$ , and there is a unique stable partial matching from  $\varphi$  to  $\psi$ , which is produced by the mutual nearest neighbor matching.*

*Remark 2.3.* In  $d = 1$ , there is no infinite descending chain in  $(\mathbb{Z}, \psi)$  for any  $\psi \in \mathbf{N}$ . Otherwise there would be an infinite descending chain in  $\mathbb{Z}$ . The corresponding statement does not hold for any  $d > 1$ .

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let  $\varphi, \psi \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , then  $\tau(\varphi \setminus \varphi_\infty, \psi \setminus \psi_\infty, x) = \tau(\varphi, \psi, x)$ .*

*Proof:* If  $x \in \varphi_\infty \cup \psi_\infty$  (or  $x \notin \varphi \cup \psi$ ), then  $\tau(\varphi \setminus \varphi_\infty, \psi \setminus \psi_\infty, x) = \tau(\varphi, \psi, x) = \infty$ . Otherwise  $x$  prefers  $\tau(\varphi, \psi, x)$  to each point in  $\varphi_\infty \cup \psi_\infty$ , which by the definition of the algorithm concludes the proof.  $\square$

For later use we define the *the matching status* of a point as the (measurable) function  $M: \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{N} \times \mathbb{R}^d$  given by

$$M(\varphi, \psi, x) := \mathbf{1}\{\tau(\varphi, \psi, x) \in \varphi \cup \psi\}, \quad (\varphi, \psi, x) \in \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{N} \times \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (2.2)$$

### 3 Matching of point processes

A (simple) *point process* on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (see e.g. [22, 27]) is a random element  $\Psi$  of  $\mathbf{N}$  defined on some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . Such a point process is *stationary* if  $\Psi$  and  $\Psi + x$  have the same distribution for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . In that case we define the *intensity*  $\alpha$  of  $\Psi$  by  $\alpha := \mathbb{E}[\Psi([0, 1]^d)]$  and we have that  $\mathbb{E}[\Psi(B)] = \alpha \lambda_d(B)$  for any Borel set  $B$ . Some more point process notions such as the correlation functions are defined in the appendix, see Section 12.

In this section we consider point processes  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Later in the paper we shall assume that  $\Psi$  is determinantal (in particular Poisson) and that  $\Phi$  is a (randomized) lattice. Let  $\tau$  be the stable matching introduced in the preceding section and define

$$\Phi^\tau := \{p \in \Phi : \tau(\Phi, \Psi, p) \neq \infty\}, \quad \Psi^\tau := \{x \in \Psi : \tau(\Phi, \Psi, x) \neq \infty\}.$$

If  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are stationary (resp. ergodic) then it follows from the covariance property (2.1) that  $\Phi^\tau$  and  $\Psi^\tau$  are stationary (resp. ergodic) as well.

Next we show that for jointly stationary and ergodic point processes, in the process with the lesser intensity all points are matched (almost surely).

**Theorem 3.1.** *Assume that  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are jointly stationary and ergodic with intensities 1 and  $\alpha \geq 1$ , respectively. Assume also that  $(\Phi, \Psi)$  does almost surely not contain an infinite descending chain. Then  $\mathbb{P}(\Phi^\tau = \Phi) = 1$ . If  $\alpha = 1$ , then also  $\mathbb{P}(\Psi^\tau = \Psi) = 1$ .*

*Proof:* The proof is similar to the one of Proposition 9 in [18]. First, it is not hard to show that  $\Phi^\tau$  and  $\Psi^\tau$  have the same intensity, that is

$$\mathbb{E}\Phi^\tau([0, 1]^d) = \mathbb{E}\Psi^\tau([0, 1]^d). \quad (3.1)$$

Note that  $\{\Phi^\tau \neq \Phi\} = \{\Phi_\infty \neq \emptyset\}$  and the same holds true for  $\Psi$  as well. By the covariance property (2.1), the events  $\{\Phi^\tau = \Phi, \Psi^\tau = \Psi\}$ ,  $\{\Phi^\tau = \Phi, \Psi^\tau \neq \Psi\}$  and  $\{\Phi^\tau \neq \Phi, \Psi^\tau = \Psi\}$  are invariant under joint translations of  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$ . By Lemma 2.2 and ergodicity, exactly one of these events has probability one. The case  $\mathbb{P}(\Phi^\tau \neq \Phi, \Psi^\tau = \Psi) = 1$  contradicts (3.1), so that only the other two cases remain. This proves the first assertion. If  $\alpha = 1$ , then  $\mathbb{P}(\Phi^\tau = \Phi, \Psi^\tau \neq \Psi) = 1$  also contradicts (3.1), proving the second assertion.  $\square$

From now on, we assume that  $\Phi = \mathbb{Z}^d + U$  is a randomized lattice where  $U$  is  $[0, 1)^d$ -valued random variable. The point process  $\Phi$  as well  $\Phi^\tau$  and  $\Psi^\tau$  are  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -stationary, that is distributionally invariant under shifts from  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . However,  $\Phi$  is generally not stationary unless  $U$  is uniformly distributed on  $[0, 1)^d$ . Given  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we often write  $\Phi_u := \mathbb{Z}^d + u$  and  $\Psi_u^\tau := \{x \in \Psi : \tau(\Phi_u, \Psi, x) \neq \infty\}$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** *Assume that  $\Psi$  is a stationary point process with intensity  $\alpha \geq 1$ . Assume also that  $\Psi$  is ergodic under translations from  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Let  $\Phi := \mathbb{Z}^d + U$ , where  $U$  is a  $[0, 1)^d$ -valued random variable, independent of  $\Psi$ . Then assuming that  $(\Phi, \Psi)$  does almost surely not contain an infinite descending chain, the assertions of Theorem 3.1 hold.*

*Proof:* Assume first that  $U$  is uniformly distributed, so that  $\Phi$  is stationary. Let  $A \subset \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  be measurable and invariant under (diagonal) translations. Then

$$\mathbb{P}((\Phi, \Psi) \in A) = \mathbb{P}((\mathbb{Z}^d + U, \Psi) \in A) = \mathbb{P}((\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi - U) \in A) = \mathbb{P}((\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi) \in A),$$

where we have used the assumed independence and stationarity of  $\Psi$ . Since the event  $\{(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi) \in A\}$  is invariant under (diagonal) translations of  $\Psi$  by elements of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , we obtain that  $\mathbb{P}((\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi) \in A) \in \{0, 1\}$  and hence the joint ergodicity of  $(\Phi, \Psi)$ . Moreover,  $(\Phi, \Psi)$  does almost surely not contain an infinite descending chain, so that Theorem 3.1 applies.

Let  $u \in [0, 1)^d$ . By the covariance property (2.1), we have  $\Phi_u^\tau := (\Phi_u)^\tau \stackrel{d}{=} \Phi_0^\tau + u$  and  $\Psi_u^\tau \stackrel{d}{=} \Psi_0^\tau + u$ . Hence  $\mathbb{P}(\Phi_u^\tau = \Phi_u)$  does not depend on  $u$ . By the first step of the proof we have  $\int_{[0, 1)^d} \mathbb{P}(\Phi_u^\tau = \Phi_u) du = 1$ , and therefore  $\mathbb{P}(\Phi_u^\tau = \Phi_u) = 1$  for all  $u \in [0, 1)^d$ . If  $\alpha = 1$ , then  $\int_{[0, 1)^d} \mathbb{P}(\Psi_u^\tau = \Psi_u) du = 1$ , and therefore  $\mathbb{P}(\Psi_u^\tau = \Psi_u) = 1$  for all  $u \in [0, 1)^d$ . This implies the assertion for general  $U$ .  $\square$

*Remark 3.3.* It is easy to see that a *mixing* point process  $\Psi$  has the ergodicity property assumed in Theorem 3.2. Our main example, the stationary determinantal point processes are *mixing*; see Theorem 7 in [37] and also Theorem 12.2 in the appendix for more quantitative bounds.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Assume that  $\Phi$  is a randomized lattice,  $\Psi$  is a stationary point process, and that for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the  $n$ -th correlation function of  $\Psi$  exists and is bounded by  $n^{\theta n} c^n$  for some  $c > 0$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1)$ . Then  $(\Phi, \Psi)$  does almost surely not contain an infinite descending chain.*

*Proof:* The proof is a direct consequence of the following lemma, which will also be needed later.  $\square$

We denote by  $\kappa_d$  the volume of the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .



**Lemma 3.5.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 3.4 be satisfied. Let  $q_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $b > 0$ . Let  $A_{n,b}$  be the event that there is a descending chain  $(q_0 + U, x_1, q_1, \dots, x_n, q_n)$  in  $(\Phi, \Psi)$  such that  $\|x_1 - q_0 - U\| \leq b$ . Then  $\mathbb{P}(A_{n,b}) \leq a_n/n!$ , where  $a_n := n^\theta c \kappa_d^2 (b^2 + 2b\sqrt{d})^d$ .*

*Proof:* To simplify the notation, we first assume that  $U \equiv 0$ . By stationarity, we can further assume that  $q_0 = 0$ . The indicator function of  $A_{n,b}$  is bounded by

$$\sum_{x_1, \dots, x_n \in \Psi}^{\neq} \sum_{q_1, \dots, q_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1}\{b \geq \|x_1\| \geq \|q_1 - x_1\| \geq \dots \geq \|x_n - q_{n-1}\| \geq \|q_n - x_n\|\}.$$

Taking expectations and using our assumptions on  $\Psi$  gives

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{n,b}) \leq n^{\theta n} c^n \int \sum_{q_1, \dots, q_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1}\{b \geq \|x_1\| \geq \|q_1 - x_1\| \geq \dots \geq \|x_n - q_{n-1}\| \geq \|q_n - x_n\|\} d(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

Letting  $W := [0, 1)^d$  this can be written as

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{n,b}) \leq n^{\theta n} c^n \int_{W^n} \sum_{p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{q_1, \dots, q_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1}\{b \geq \|p_1 + u_1\| \geq \|q_1 - p_1 - u_1\| \geq \dots \geq \|p_n + u_n - q_{n-1}\| \geq \|q_n - p_n - u_n\|\} d(u_1, \dots, u_n).$$

By a change of variables the right-hand side equals

$$n^{\theta n} c^n \int_{W^n} \sum_{p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{q_1, \dots, q_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1}\{b \geq \|p_1 + u_1\| \geq \|q_1 - u_1\| \geq \dots \geq \|p_n + u_n\| \geq \|q_n - u_n\|\} d(u_1, \dots, u_n).$$

Since  $\|q_j\| \leq \|q_j - u_j\| + \sqrt{d}$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , this can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} n^{\theta n} c^n (\kappa_d (b + 2\sqrt{d})^d)^n \int_{W^n} \sum_{p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1}\{b \geq \|p_1 + u_1\| \geq \dots \geq \|p_n + u_n\|\} d(u_1, \dots, u_n) \\ = n^{\theta n} c^n (\kappa_d (b + 2\sqrt{d})^d)^n \int \mathbf{1}\{b \geq \|y_1\| \geq \dots \geq \|y_n\|\} d(y_1, \dots, y_n) \\ = \frac{n^{\theta n} c^n (\kappa_d (b + 2\sqrt{d})^d)^n (\kappa_d b^d)^n}{n!}. \end{aligned}$$

In the general case, we can assume that  $q_0 = U$ . We then need to replace  $x_1$  by  $x_1 - u$ , and  $q_j$  by  $q_j + u$  and integrate  $u$  with respect to the distribution of  $U$ . The details are left to the reader.  $\square$

Note that, we have actually proved a bound on the expected number of descending chains. The following lemma can be proved as the previous one.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 3.4 be satisfied. Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $b > 0$ . Let  $A_{n,b}$  be the event that there is a descending chain  $(x, q_1, x_1, \dots, q_n, x_n)$  in  $(\Psi \cup \{x\}, \Phi)$  such that  $\|q_1 - x\| \leq b$ . Then the assertion of Lemma 3.5 holds.*




Figure 4: The construction of a matching flower, (0) starts with the matching  $\tau$  between  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  and  $\Psi$ . (1) A ball grows at  $q$  until it touches the matching partner  $\tau(\mathbb{Z}^2, \Psi, q)$  in  $\Psi$ . (2) Two new balls touching  $q$  are centered at  $\tau(\mathbb{Z}^2, \Psi, q)$  and  $x$  (which is preferred by  $q$ ). (3) New balls grow around the lattice points inside the balls at  $\tau(\mathbb{Z}^2, \Psi, q)$  and  $x$ . (4) To points of  $\Psi$  inside these balls, new balls are assigned that touch their lattice neighbors. Since no new lattice points are accessed, the algorithm terminates. The matching flower  $F(\mathbb{Z}^2, \Psi, q)$  is the union of all balls from (1)–(4).

Due to (12.1), we have that stationary determinantal point processes satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.4 and hence we have the following corollary via Theorem 3.2.

**Corollary 3.7.** *Assume that  $\Phi$  is a randomized lattice and that  $\Psi$  is a stationary determinantal point process (in particular Poisson). Then  $(\Phi, \Psi)$  does almost surely not contain an infinite descending chain and thus the assertions of Theorem 3.1 hold.*

*Remark 3.8.* There are many more examples of point processes satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 3.4 including  $\alpha$ -determinantal point processes with ‘fast decaying’ kernels for  $\alpha = -1/m, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , rarefied Gibbsian point processes, many Cox point processes etc. See (1.12) and Sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 in [3] for these examples and also see Sections 4 and 7 in [6].

*Remark 3.9.* Note that the absence of infinite descending chains in Theorem 3.4 is independent of the intensity  $\alpha$  of  $\Psi$  and that there is almost surely no infinite descending chain in  $(\Psi, \Phi)$  as well as in  $(\Phi, \Psi)$ . Even for an unmatched point, all descending chains are almost surely finite (but there are infinitely many).

## 4 Matching flower

Here we define the *matching flower*  $F(\Phi, \Psi, z)$  of a point  $z \in \Phi \cup \Psi$ , which is a random set that determines the matching partner of  $z$ . Importantly, it is a stopping set. We can define this flower by searching the matching partner of  $z$  through iterating over all potential matching partners, competitors and their matching neighbors.

Figure 4 illustrates an intuitive algorithm to construct the matching flower for the example of a lattice point  $q \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . First a ball is centered at  $q$  that touches its matching partner  $\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, q)$ . The second step determines which points in  $\Psi$  are preferred or equal to  $\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, q)$  (by  $q$ ), which have to be inside the ball from the first step or touch it, then to each of these points a new ball is assigned that touches  $q$ . The third step determines which lattice points are preferred or equal to  $q$  (by these points in  $\Psi$ ), then to each one of them a ball is assigned that touches the corresponding point in  $\Psi$ . Finally, the second and third steps are iterated (considering each new lattice point instead of  $q$ ) until no new

points can be found in any of the balls. An alternative representation of the matching flower is via an ordered *graph of preference*. We do not formally define it but refer to Fig. 5 for an illustration.

If there are no infinite descending chains in  $(\Phi, \Psi)$  and if there is a matching partner  $\tau(\Phi, \Psi, z) \neq \infty$  of  $z$ , then the matching flower  $F(\Phi, \Psi, z)$  is bounded. This is because  $\Psi$  and  $\Phi$  are locally finite and thus there are only finitely many chains whose second element is closer to  $z$  than  $\tau(\Phi, \Psi, z)$ . Because of the absence of infinite descending chains, the iterative search for nearest neighbors terminates in a pair of mutually nearest neighbors after a finite number of steps. Note that  $F(\Phi, \Psi, q)$  does not only determine the matching status and partner of  $q \in \Phi$  but does so for all points of  $\Phi$  that are in the matching flower.

For a rigorous mathematical analysis, we need a more explicit definition of the matching flower and we do so now by defining the matching flower on two locally finite sets. Let  $\varphi, \psi \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $z \in \varphi \cup \psi$ . If  $\tau(\varphi, \psi, z) = \infty$  we set  $F(\varphi, \psi, z) := \mathbb{R}^d$ . Assume now that  $\tau(\varphi, \psi, z) \neq \infty$ . We call a descending chain  $c = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$  in  $(\varphi, \psi)$  a *competing chain* in  $(\varphi, \psi)$  for  $z$  if  $z_1 = z$  and  $z_2$  is equal or preferred to  $\tau(\varphi, \psi, z_1)$ . In this case, we define

$$F_c := B(z_1, \|z_1 - z_2\|) \cup \bigcup_{i=2}^n B(z_i, \|z_i - z_{i-1}\|),$$

where  $B(z, r)$  denotes a ball with center  $z$  and radius  $r$ . Then the matching flower of  $z$  (w.r.t.  $(\varphi, \psi)$ ) is defined by  $F(\varphi, \psi, z) := \bigcup F_c$ , where the union is over all competing chains  $c$  for  $z$ . This definition is similar to (2.1) in [26]. Just for completeness we define  $F(\psi, \varphi, z) := \{z\}$  for  $z \notin \varphi \cup \psi$ .

*Remark 4.1.* If  $(\varphi, \psi)$  is non-equidistant, then  $F(\varphi, \psi, \cdot) = F(\psi, \varphi, \cdot)$ .

For  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$ , we define  $\varphi^z := \varphi \cup \{z\}$ . Although the definition of the matching flower involves the global matching, the mapping  $(\varphi, \psi) \mapsto F(\varphi^z, \psi, z)$  has the following useful *stopping set* property. For a set  $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  we abbreviate  $\varphi_W := \varphi \cap W$  and  $\varphi_W^z := (\varphi^z)_W$ . For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  the *k-th nearest neighbour* of  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  in  $\varphi$  is defined as the point  $N_k(\varphi, z)$  such that the number of points in  $\varphi$  that  $z$  prefers to  $N_k(\varphi, z)$  is exactly equal to  $k - 1$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $z \in W$  and let  $(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{N}$ . Then  $F(\varphi^z, \psi, z) \subset W$  iff  $F(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W, z) \subset W$ . In this case  $\tau(\varphi^z, \psi, z) = \tau(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W, z)$ . The corresponding statement also holds for  $\psi^z$ .*

*Proof:* We can assume that  $z \notin \psi$ . (Otherwise the assertion is trivial.)

Assume that  $F(\varphi^z, \psi, z) \subset W$  and  $\tau(\varphi^z, \psi, z) \neq \infty$ . Then there exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\tau(\varphi^z, \psi, z) = N_k(\psi, z)$ . Let  $c$  be a descending chain in  $(\varphi^z, \psi)$  starting in  $z_1 = z$  and  $q_1 \in \{N_1(\psi, z), \dots, N_k(\psi, z)\}$ . Since  $F(\varphi^z, \psi, z) \subset W$  we obtain that  $c$  is also a descending chain in  $(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W)$ . This shows that  $N_j(\psi, z) = N_j(\psi_W, z)$  for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Moreover, applying the matching algorithm from Section 2 to both  $(\varphi^z, \psi)$  and  $(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W)$  yields that  $\tau(\varphi^z, \psi, z) = \tau(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W, z)$ . But then any competing chain in  $(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W)$  for  $z$  is also a competing chain in  $(\varphi^z, \psi)$  for  $z$ . It follows that  $F(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W, z) \subset W$ .

Assume that  $F(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W, z) \subset W$  and  $\tau(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W, z) \neq \infty$ . Thus there exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\tau(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W, z) = N_k(\psi_W, z)$ . Since  $B(z, \|N_k(\psi_W, z) - z\|) \subset W$ , we obtain that  $N_j(\psi_W, z) = N_j(\psi, z)$  for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Let  $c = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$  be a descending chain




Figure 5: A matching flower  $F(\mathbb{Z}^2, \Psi, q_0)$  for a lattice point  $q_0$  (left) and its ordered graph of preference (right), with preferences ordered from top to bottom and from right to left (children are preferred to parent points). In general, the graph does not have to be a tree.

in  $(\varphi^z, \psi)$  with  $z_1 = z$  and  $z_2 \in \{N_1(\psi, z), \dots, N_k(\psi, z)\}$ . Since the pair  $(z_1, z_2)$  is a descending chain in  $(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W)$  and  $F(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W, z) \subset W$  we obtain that  $B(z_2, \|z_2 - z_1\|) \subset W$ . Since  $\|z_3 - z_2\| \leq \|z_2 - z_1\|$  we obtain that  $z_3 \in W$ , so that  $(z_1, z_2, z_3)$  is a descending chain in  $(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W)$ . It follows inductively that  $c$  is a descending chain in  $(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W)$ . Applying the matching algorithm from Section 2 to both  $(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W)$  and  $(\varphi^z, \psi)$  shows that  $\tau(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W, z) = \tau(\varphi^z, \psi, z)$  and in turn  $F(\varphi^z, \psi, z) \subset W$ .

In case  $\tau(\varphi^z, \psi, z) = \infty$  or  $\tau(\varphi_W^z, \psi_W, z) = \infty$ , then by the definition of the matching flower  $W = \mathbb{R}^d$  and hence the claim follows trivially.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.3.** *Suppose that  $\Phi$  is a randomized lattice and that  $\Psi$  is a stationary determinantal point process (in particular Poisson). Let  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then the following implication holds almost surely: if  $\tau(\Phi, \Psi, z) \neq \infty$  then  $F(\Phi, \Psi, z)$  is bounded.*

*Proof:* Assume that  $\tau(\Phi, \Psi, z) \neq \infty$ . Then  $F(\Phi, \Psi, z)$  is bounded iff there are only finitely many competing chains for  $z$ . Since there are only finitely many choices for the second point of such a competing chain, the only way to have infinitely many of them is via an infinite descending chain. However, by Corollary 3.7 such chains do almost surely not exist.  $\square$

## 5 Tail bounds for the matching distance and flower

From now on,  $\Psi$  shall always be a stationary point process with intensity  $\alpha \geq 1$ . Here we shall prove tail bounds for the distance to the matching partner of a lattice point and the matching flower of a lattice point when  $\Psi$  is a determinantal point process (see Section 12 for definitions) and we show the same for points of  $\Psi$  as well when  $\Psi$  is a Poisson point process.

### 5.1 Lattice points matched to determinantal point processes

If  $\Psi$  is determinantal and  $\alpha > 1$ , we derive an exponential tail bound for the length of the random vector  $\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)$ , that is for the distance of the origin from its matching partner, when matching the lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  to  $\Psi$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** *Assume that  $\Psi$  is determinantal (in particular Poisson) with intensity  $\alpha > 1$ . Then there exists  $c_1 > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(\|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)\| > r) \leq c_1 e^{-c_1^{-1} r^d}$  for all  $r \geq 0$ .*

Our proof of Theorem 5.1 was inspired by that of Theorem 21 in [17]. First we need to establish a few auxiliary results. We write  $\mu_0$  for the counting measure supported by  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , that is we let  $\mu_0(B) := \text{card}(\mathbb{Z}^d \cap B)$  for each Borel set  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . In the following lemma, we use the *intrinsic volumes*  $V_0(K), \dots, V_d(K)$  of a compact convex subset  $K$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ; see e.g. Appendix A.3 in [27]. In the following proof and also later we denote by  $B_r$  the ball with radius  $r \geq 0$  centered at the origin. We shall frequently use the following version of a classical fact; see [41]. For the reader's convenience, we give a short proof.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $K$  be a compact convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . There exist constants  $c_0, \dots, c_{d-1}$  (which only depend on the dimension), such that*

$$|\lambda_d(K) - \mu_0(K)| \leq c_0 V_0(K) + \dots + c_{d-1} V_{d-1}(K).$$

*Proof:* The proof is based on basic convex geometry. Let  $W := [0, 1]^d$  and define  $I := \{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d : (W + q) \cap K \neq \emptyset\}$ . Then

$$\mu_0(K) \leq \text{card } I \leq \lambda_d(K + B_{\sqrt{d}}), \quad (5.1)$$

where  $K + L := \{x + y : x \in K, y \in L\}$  is the *Minkowski sum* of  $K$  and a set  $L \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . By the *Steiner formula* (see e.g. Appendix A.3 in [27])

$$\lambda_d(K + B_{\sqrt{d}}) = \lambda_d(K) + \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} d^{(d-j)/2} \kappa_{d-j} V_j(K), \quad (5.2)$$

where  $\kappa_j$  is the volume of the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^j$ . This gives one of the desired inequalities.

Let  $J_1 := \{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d : (W + q) \subset K^0\}$  and  $J_2 := \{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d : (W + q) \cap \partial K \neq \emptyset\}$ , where  $K^0$  and  $\partial K$  denote the *interior* and the *boundary* of  $K$  respectively. Then

$$\lambda_d(K) \leq \text{card } J_1 + \text{card } J_2 \leq \mu_0(K) + \text{card } J_2.$$

For  $r > 0$  let  $\partial_r K := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : d(x, \partial K) \leq r\}$ . Since  $\cup_{q \in J_2} (W + q) \subset \partial_{\sqrt{d}} K$ , we have that

$$\text{card } J_2 \leq \lambda_d(\partial_{\sqrt{d}} K) \leq 2(\lambda_d(K + B_{\sqrt{d}}) - \lambda_d(K)),$$

where the last inequality comes from (3.19) in [20]. Applying Steiner's formula again, concludes the proof.  $\square$

Unless stated otherwise, we now assume that  $\Psi$  satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 5.1. Further we abbreviate  $\tau(x) := \tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, x)$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $r > 0$  and assume that  $\mu_0(\{p \in B_{2r} : \tau(p) \in B_r\}) < \Psi(B_r)$ . Then  $\|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)\| \leq r$ .*

*Proof:* By assumption there must exist an  $x \in \Psi \cap B_r$  such that  $\tau(x) \notin B_{2r}$ . Assume now on the contrary, that  $\|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)\| = \|\tau(0)\| > r$ . But then the pair  $(0, x)$  would not be stable, a contradiction.  $\square$

For a (possibly half-open) cube  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $q \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap B$ , we say that  $B$  is *decisive for  $q$*  if the matching flower  $F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, q)$  is a subset of  $B$ . In this case we have  $\tau(q) \in B$ . Moreover, the event that  $B$  is decisive for  $q$  does only depend on  $\Psi \cap B$ . Given  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we write  $Q(m) := (-m, m]^d$ .

**Lemma 5.4.** *For each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_0(\{p \in Q(m) : Q(m) \text{ is not decisive for } p\}) \leq \varepsilon(2m)^d.$$

*Proof:* We combine the proof of Corollary 17 in [17] with the properties of the matching flower. Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . The distribution of the random set

$$U_n := \{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d : Q(n) + q \text{ is not decisive for } q\}$$

is invariant under shifts from  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . By Proposition 4.3, the matching flower is almost surely finite. Therefore we may choose an integer  $n$  so large such that

$$\mathbb{P}(Q(n) \text{ is not decisive for } 0) \leq \varepsilon/2.$$

Therefore we obtain for each  $m \geq n$

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_0(U_n \cap Q(m)) = \sum_{q \in Q(m)} \mathbb{P}(Q(n) + q \text{ is not decisive for } q) \leq (2m)^d \varepsilon/2.$$

Since  $Q(n) + q \subset Q(m)$  for  $q \in Q(m - n)$  and the event  $\{Q(m) \text{ is not decisive for } q\}$  is decreasing in  $m$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\mu_0(\{q \in Q(m) : Q(m) \text{ is not decisive for } q\}) \\ & \leq \mu_0(Q(m) \setminus Q(m - n)) + \sum_{q \in Q(m - n)} \mathbb{P}(Q(n) + q \text{ is not decisive for } q) \\ & \leq (2m)^d - (2(m - n))^d + (2m)^d \varepsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

For sufficiently large  $m$  the last expression becomes smaller than  $(2m)^d \varepsilon$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.1:* We let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be such that  $\varepsilon(2^{d+1} + 2) < \alpha - 1$  and so, we also have that  $\alpha - \varepsilon > 1$ . Choose  $m$  as in Lemma 5.4. For  $q \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  we define  $Q_q := Q(m) + 2mq$  and the random variable

$$Y_q := \mu_0(\{p \in Q_q : Q_q \text{ is not decisive for } p\}).$$

Next we take  $r > 0$  and define

$$\begin{aligned} I_r &:= \{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d : Q_q \subset B_{2r} \setminus B_r\}, \\ S_r &:= (B_{2r} \setminus B_r) \setminus \bigcup_{q \in I_r} Q_q. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $r$  sufficiently large, we can assume that

$$\mu_0(S_r) \leq \varepsilon \mu_0(B_r). \quad (5.3)$$

The above inequality can be derived as follows. For  $r$  sufficiently large, we have that

$$S_r \subset (B_{2r} \setminus B_{2r-2m\sqrt{d}}) \cup (B_{r+2m\sqrt{d}} \setminus B_r).$$

Hence, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_0(S_r) &\leq \lambda_d(S_r + B_{\sqrt{d}}) \leq \lambda_d(B_{2r+\sqrt{d}}) - \lambda_d(B_{2r-3m\sqrt{d}}) + \lambda_d(B_{r+3m\sqrt{d}}) - \lambda_d(B_{r-\sqrt{d}}) \\ &\leq Cr^{d-1} \leq \varepsilon^{1/2}\lambda_d(B_r) \leq \varepsilon\mu_0(B_r),\end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  is a constant, the first inequality is similar to (5.1), the second is from the above-mentioned inclusion for  $S_r$ , the third inequality is due to Steiner's formula (5.2) and the fact that  $V_j(B_r) = O(r^j)$  for all  $j$ . The last inequality is from Lemma 5.2 and the above bound on growth rate of the  $V_j$ .

Next we note that

$$\mu_0(\{q \in B_{2r} : \tau(q) \in B_r\}) \leq \mu_0(B_r) + \mu_0(S_r) + \mu_0\left(\left\{p \in \bigcup_{q \in I_r} Q_q : \tau(p) \in B_r\right\}\right).$$

If  $p \in Q_q \subset B_{2r} \setminus B_r$  and  $\tau(p) \in B_r$ , then  $Q_q$  is not decisive for  $p$ . Therefore

$$\mu_0(\{q \in B_{2r} : \tau(q) \in B_r\}) \leq \mu_0(B_r) + \mu_0(S_r) + Z_r, \quad (5.4)$$

where

$$Z_r := \sum_{q \in I_r} Y_q.$$

Consider the events

$$\begin{aligned}C_r &:= \{\Psi(B_r) > (\alpha - \varepsilon)\mu_0(B_r)\}, \\ D_r &:= \{Z_r < 2^{d+1}\varepsilon\mu_0(B_r)\}.\end{aligned}$$

If the event  $D_r$  occurs, then we obtain from (5.4), (5.3) and the definition of  $\varepsilon$  that

$$\mu_0(\{q \in B_{2r} : \tau(q) \in B_r\}) \leq (1 + \varepsilon + 2^{d+1}\varepsilon)\mu_0(B_r) < (\alpha - \varepsilon)\mu_0(B_r).$$

If  $C_r \cap D_r$  occurs, we therefore have

$$\mu_0(\{q \in B_{2r} : \tau(q) \in B_r\}) < \Psi(B_r).$$

Lemma 5.3 shows that  $\|\tau(0)\| \leq r$ .

To conclude the proof it now suffices to bound the probabilities of the complements  $\Omega \setminus C_r$  and  $\Omega \setminus D_r$ . Observing that  $\Psi(B_r)$  is a 1-Lipschitz functional, we can use Theorem 12.1 to derive that

$$\mathbb{P}(\Psi(B_r) \leq (\alpha - \varepsilon)\lambda_d(B_r)) \leq 5 \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2\lambda_d(B_r)}{4(\varepsilon + 2\alpha)}\right).$$

Since by Lemma 5.2  $\mu_0(B_r)/\lambda_d(B_r) \rightarrow 1$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  this gives the desired inequality for  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega \setminus C_r)$ . To treat the complement of  $D_r$  we apply Lemma 5.4. This gives

$$\mathbb{E}Z_r \leq \varepsilon(2m)^d\mu_0(I_r) \leq \varepsilon\mu_0(B_{2r}).$$

By Lemma 5.2 and the properties of intrinsic volumes

$$\mu_0(B_{2r}) \leq 2^d \lambda_d(B_r) + \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} c_j 2^j r^j V_j(B_1),$$

so that

$$\mathbb{E}Z_r \leq 3\varepsilon 2^{d-1} \lambda_d(B_r)$$

for all sufficiently large  $r$ . Note that  $Z_r$  is a function of  $\Psi \cap A$  where  $A = \cup_{q \in I_r} Q_q$ . Since the  $Y_q$  are bounded by  $(2m)^d$  and the  $Q_q$  are disjoint, we have that  $Z_r$  is  $(2m)^d$ -Lipschitz. Also note that  $\lambda_d(A) = (2m)^d \mu_0(I_r)$ . So we can again apply the concentration inequality in Theorem 12.1 to derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Omega \setminus D_r) &\leq \mathbb{P}(Z_r \geq \mathbb{E}Z_r + \varepsilon 2^{d-1} \lambda_d(B_r)) \\ &\leq 5 \exp\left(-\frac{(\varepsilon 2^{d-1} \lambda_d(B_r))^2}{4(2m)^d (\varepsilon 2^{d-1} \lambda_d(B_r) + 2(2m)^{2d} \alpha \mu_0(I_r))}\right) \\ &\leq 5 \exp\left(-\frac{(\varepsilon \lambda_d(B_r))^2}{8m^d (\varepsilon \lambda_d(B_r) + 2^{d+2} m^{2d} \alpha \mu_0(I_r))}\right) \end{aligned}$$

which in view of Lemma 5.2 gives the desired result.  $\square$

We now return to a general stationary point process  $\Psi$  with intensity  $\alpha \geq 1$ .

**Theorem 5.5.** *Assume for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  that the  $n$ -th correlation function of  $\Psi$  exists and is bounded by  $n^{\theta n} c^n$  for some  $c > 0$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1)$ . Assume that there exists  $c_1 > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(\|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)\| > r) \leq c_1 e^{-c_1^{-1} r^\delta}$  for all  $r \geq 0$  and some  $\delta > 0$ . Then there exists  $c_2 > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0) \not\subset B_r) \leq c_2 e^{-c_2^{-1} r^\beta}, \quad r > 0, \quad (5.5)$$

where  $\beta := \min\{(1 - \theta)\delta, 2d\}/(2d + 1 - \theta)$ .

*Proof:* The proof follows closely that of Lemma 2.4 in [26]. Let  $r \geq 1$ . We take  $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$  and a large  $K \geq 4$  both to be fixed later. Let  $m$  be the largest integer smaller than  $Kr^{1-\varepsilon}$  and let  $E$  be the event that there exists a descending chain  $(0, z_1, \dots, z_m)$  in  $(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi)$  such that  $\|z_1\| \leq K^{-1}r^\varepsilon$ . We assert that

$$\{F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0) \not\subset B_r\} \subset \{KY > r^\varepsilon\} \cup E, \quad (5.6)$$

where  $Y := \|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)\|$ . To see this we assume that  $KY \leq r^\varepsilon$  and that  $E$  does not hold. Take a descending chain  $(0, z_1, \dots, z_k)$  in  $(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi)$  such that  $\|z_1\| \leq Y$ . Since  $Y \leq K^{-1}r^\varepsilon$  we have  $k \leq m - 1$  and hence  $\|z_k\| \leq (m - 1)Y \leq (Kr^{1-\varepsilon} - 1)Y$ . Therefore, by the definition of the matching flower, each point in  $F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)$  has norm at most  $Kr^{1-\varepsilon}Y \leq r$ , proving (5.6).

Next we bound  $\mathbb{P}(E)$ . There is a unique  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $m \in \{2n, 2n + 1\}$ . By Lemma 3.5 we have that  $\mathbb{P}(E) \leq a_n^n/n!$ , where

$$a_n = n^\theta c \kappa_d^2 (K^{-2} r^{2\varepsilon} + 2K^{-1} r^\varepsilon \sqrt{d})^d.$$



Since  $n! \geq n^n e^{-n}$  (by the exponential series), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(E) &\leq (n^{\theta-1} c e \kappa_d^2 (K^{-2} r^{2\varepsilon} + 2K^{-1} r^\varepsilon \sqrt{d})^d)^n \\ &\leq (n^{\theta-1} c e \kappa_d^2 K^{-d} (1 + 2\sqrt{d})^d r^{2\varepsilon d})^n, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to  $K \geq 1$  and  $r \geq 1$ . Note that

$$n \geq (m-1)/2 \geq (Kr^{1-\varepsilon} - 2)/2 \geq Kr^{1-\varepsilon}/4,$$

where the third inequality comes from  $K \geq 4$  and  $r \geq 1$ . Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}(E) \leq (4^{1-\theta} c e \kappa_d^2 K^{\theta-1} K^{-d} r^{(1-\varepsilon)(\theta-1)} (1 + 2\sqrt{d})^d r^{2\varepsilon d})^n.$$

We now set  $\varepsilon := (1-\theta)/(2d+1-\theta)$ , so that  $(1-\varepsilon)(\theta-1) + 2\varepsilon d = 0$ . Further we choose  $K$  so large that

$$4^{1-\theta} c e \kappa_d^2 (1 + 2\sqrt{d})^d K^{\theta-1} K^{-d} \leq e^{-1}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(E) \leq \exp[-n] \leq \exp[-Kr^{1-\varepsilon}/4] = \exp\left[-(K/4)r^{2d/(2d+1-\theta)}\right]. \quad (5.7)$$

On the other hand we obtain from our assumptions that

$$\mathbb{P}(KY > r^\varepsilon) \leq c_1 \exp\left[-c_1^{-1} K^{-\delta} r^{\varepsilon\delta}\right] = c_1 \exp\left[-c_1^{-1} K^{-\delta} r^{(1-\theta)\delta/(2d+1-\theta)}\right].$$

Using this and inequality (5.7) in (5.6) yields the asserted inequality.  $\square$

Next we consider the distance to the matching partner of an extra point added to  $\Psi$ . For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , recall that  $\Psi^x = \Psi \cup \{x\}$ .

**Theorem 5.6.** *Assume that there exists  $c_1 > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(\|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)\| > r) \leq c_1 e^{-c_1^{-1} r^\delta}$  for all  $r \geq 0$  and some  $\delta > 0$ . Then there exists  $c_3 > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(r < \|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi^x, x) - x\| < \infty) \leq c_3 e^{-c_3^{-1} r^\delta}, \quad r > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (5.8)$$

*Proof:* Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $r > 0$ . Suppose that for all  $q \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus B(x, r)$  we have that  $\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, q) \neq x$ . Then the matching partner of  $x$  (if any) in the matching of  $\Psi^x$  with  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  must be in  $B(x, r)$ . Therefore either  $\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi^x, x) = \infty$  or  $\|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi^x, x) - x\| \leq r$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(r < \|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi^x, x) - x\| < \infty) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\text{there exists } q \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus B(x, r) \text{ with } \tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, q) = x) \\ &\leq \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus B(x, r)} \mathbb{P}(\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, q) = x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain from stationarity and our assumption that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(r < \|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi^x, x) - x\| < \infty) &\leq \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus B(x, r)} \mathbb{P}(\|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, q) - q\| > \|q - x\|/2) \\ &= \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus B(x, r)} \mathbb{P}(\|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)\| > \|q - x\|/2) \\ &\leq \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus B(x, r)} c_1 e^{-c_1^{-1} \|q - x\|^\delta} \end{aligned}$$

for some  $c'_1 > 0$ . In view of the monotonicity of the exponential function there exists  $b'_1 > 0$  such that the above right-hand side can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} b'_1 \int \mathbf{1}\{\|y - x\| > r\} e^{-c'_1 \|y - x\|^\delta} dy &= b'_1 \int \mathbf{1}\{\|y\| > r\} e^{-c'_1 \|y\|^\delta} dy \\ &= d\kappa_d b'_1 \int_r^\infty u^{d-1} e^{-c'_1 u^\delta} du \\ &= d\kappa_d b'_1 \delta^{-1} \int_{r^\delta}^\infty v^{(d-\delta)/\delta} e^{-c'_1 v} dv, \end{aligned}$$

where the second identity is achieved by using polar coordinates. This yields the assertion.  $\square$

*Remark 5.7.* Apart from the constants  $c_1$  and  $c_3$ , the tail bounds in Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.6 are optimal. But we do not expect the tail bounds for the matching flower in Theorem 5.5 to be optimal.

For the case of determinantal point processes, using Corollary 3.7 and Theorem 5.1 in Theorems 5.5 and 5.6, we get the following corollary.

**Corollary 5.8.** *Assume that  $\Psi$  is a determinantal point process (in particular Poisson) with intensity  $\alpha > 1$ . Then there exists  $c_2 > 0, c_3 > 0$  such that (5.5) and (5.8) hold with  $\beta = d/(2d + 1)$  and  $\delta = d$  respectively.*

## 5.2 Matched points in a Poisson point process

In this subsection, we assume that  $\Psi$  is a stationary Poisson point process. Then we can derive further tail bounds as the distribution of  $\Psi^x$  is that of the Palm distribution of the Poisson point process. Recall the definition  $\Phi := \mathbb{Z}^d + U$  of the randomized lattice, where  $U$  is  $[0, 1)^d$ -valued random variable.

**Theorem 5.9.** *Assume that  $U$  is uniformly distributed. Then there exists  $c_4 > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(r < \|\tau(\Phi, \Psi^x, x) - x\| < \infty) \leq c_4 e^{-c_4^{-1} r^d}, \quad r > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

*Proof:* By stationarity and translation covariance of  $\tau$ , it suffices to prove the result for  $x = 0$ . Let  $r > 0$ . The result follows from Theorem 5.1, once we have shown that

$$\alpha \mathbb{P}(r < \|\tau(\Phi, \Psi^0, 0)\| < \infty) = \mathbb{P}(r < \|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)\|).$$

Even though this can be derived from general results in [28], we prefer to give a direct argument. Let  $g: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a measurable function and let  $W := [0, 1)^d$ . By stationarity, independence of  $\Psi$  and  $\Phi$  and the Mecke equation (Theorem 4.1 in [27]) we

have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \alpha \mathbb{E} \mathbf{1}\{\tau(\Phi, \Psi^0, 0) \neq \infty\} g(\tau(\Phi, \Psi^0, 0)) \\
&= \alpha \mathbb{E} \int_W \mathbf{1}\{\tau(\Phi - x, (\Psi - x) \cup \{0\}, 0) \neq \infty\} g(\tau(\Phi - x, (\Psi - x) \cup \{0\}, 0)) dx \\
&= \alpha \mathbb{E} \int_W \mathbf{1}\{\tau(\Phi, \Psi^x, x) \neq \infty\} g(\tau(\Phi, \Psi^x, x) - x) dx \\
&= \mathbb{E} \sum_{x \in \Psi \cap W} \mathbf{1}\{\tau(\Phi, \Psi, x) \neq \infty\} g(\tau(\Phi, \Psi, x) - x) = \mathbb{E} \sum_{x \in \Psi^\tau \cap W} g(\tau(\Phi, \Psi, x) - x).
\end{aligned}$$

Since all points of  $\Phi$  are almost surely matched, the above equals

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \sum_{p \in \Phi} \mathbf{1}\{\tau(\Phi, \Psi, p) \in W\} g(p - \tau(\Phi, \Psi, p)) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \sum_{p \in \Phi} \mathbf{1}\{\tau(\Phi - p, \Psi - p, 0) + p \in W\} g(-\tau(\Phi - p, \Psi - p, 0)) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \sum_{p \in \Phi} \mathbf{1}\{\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0) + p \in W\} g(-\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used independence of  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  and stationarity of  $\Psi$ . By Campbell's formula for  $\Phi$  (Proposition 2.7 in [27]) this comes to

$$\mathbb{E} \int \mathbf{1}\{\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0) + x \in W\} g(-\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)) dx.$$

Since  $W$  has unit volume, we finally obtain that

$$\alpha \mathbb{E} \mathbf{1}\{\tau(\Phi, \Psi^0, 0) \neq \infty\} g(\tau(\Phi, \Psi^0, 0)) = \mathbb{E} g(-\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)) \tag{5.9}$$

and in particular the desired result.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.10.** *Assume that  $U$  is uniformly distributed. Then there exists  $c_5 > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(M(\Phi, \Psi^x, x) = 1, F(\Phi, \Psi^x, x) \not\subset B(x, r)) \leq c_5 e^{-c_5^{-1} r^{\beta'}}, \quad r > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where  $\beta' := d/(2d + 1)$  and the matching status  $M$  was defined in (2.2).

*Proof:* Given Theorem 5.9, the proof is basically the same as that of Theorem 5.5 with  $\theta = 0, \delta = d$ . We define  $Y := \|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi^x, x) - x\|$  and replace the set inclusion (5.6) by

$$\{M(\Phi, \Psi^x, x) = 1, F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi^x, x) \not\subset B(x, r)\} \subset \{M(\Phi, \Psi^x, x) = 1, KY > r^\varepsilon\} \cup E.$$

To bound  $\mathbb{P}(E)$  we apply Lemma 3.6 instead of Lemma 3.5.  $\square$

## 6 Hyperuniformity

Again we assume that  $\Psi$  is a stationary point process with intensity  $\alpha \geq 1$  and that  $\Phi = \mathbb{Z}^d$ . Recall the definition of hyperuniformity in (1.2), the definition of the  $\alpha_{p,q}$ -mixing coefficients in Section 12 and that  $\Psi_0^\tau$  denotes the set of matched points in  $\Psi$  when  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  is matched with  $\Psi$ . We abbreviate  $F(q) := F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, q)$ ,  $q \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $\Psi$  be a stationary point process with intensity  $\alpha \geq 1$ . Assume that for some  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$  we have that*

$$\sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|w\|^{\gamma d} \alpha_{\|w\|^{\gamma d}, \|w\|^{\gamma d}}(\|w\|) < \infty \text{ and } \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(F(0) \not\subset B(0, \|w\|^\gamma)) < \infty.$$

*Then the point process  $\Psi_0^\tau$  is hyperuniform.*

Before presenting the proof, we give two simple corollaries. If  $\Psi$  has unit intensity, then using Theorem 3.2, we have that  $\Psi_0^\tau = \Psi$  and thus we have the following sufficient condition for hyperuniformity.

**Corollary 6.2.** *Let  $\Psi$  be a unit intensity stationary point process satisfying the assumptions in Theorem 6.1. Then  $\Psi$  is hyperuniform.*

**Theorem 6.3.** *Let  $\Psi$  be a determinantal point process (in particular Poisson) with intensity  $\alpha > 1$  with kernel  $K$  and define  $\omega(s) := \sup_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|x-y\| \geq s} |K(x, y)|$ ,  $s > 0$ . Assume that there exists  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$  such that  $\sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|w\|^\gamma \omega(\|w\|)^2 < \infty$ . Then  $\Psi_0^\tau$  is hyperuniform.*

*Proof.* The proof follows from combining Corollary 5.8 and Theorems 6.1 and 12.2.  $\square$

Many determinantal point processes satisfy the above decay condition on the kernel including Poisson (an extreme case of determinantal point process) and the Ginibre point process (see [19]).

*Proof of Theorem 6.1.* As before, we write  $\tau(x) := \tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, x)$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $Y_x := \tau(x) - x$ .

For each Borel set  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\Psi_0^\tau(B) = \mathbb{E} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1}\{\tau(p) \in B\} = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(p + Y_p \in B).$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\Psi_0^\tau(B)^2 &= \mathbb{E}\Psi_0^\tau(B) + \mathbb{E} \sum_{p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^d}^{\neq} \mathbf{1}\{\tau(p) \in B, \tau(q) \in B\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\Psi_0^\tau(B) + \sum_{p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^d}^{\neq} \mathbb{P}(p + Y_p \in B, q + Y_q \in B). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[\Psi_0^\tau(B)] &= \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(p + Y_p \in B) - \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(p + Y_p \in B)^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^d}^{\neq} (\mathbb{P}(p + Y_p \in B, q + Y_q \in B) - \mathbb{P}(p + Y_p \in B)\mathbb{P}(q + Y_q \in B)). \end{aligned}$$

The series convergence will be justified below.

Take a convex compact set  $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  containing the origin 0 in its interior. Let  $r > 0$  and set  $W_r := rW$ . By stationarity,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(p + Y_p \in W_r) &= \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(p + Y_0 \in W_r) \\ &= \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \mathbb{E} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1}\{p + Y_0 \in W_r\} \\ &= \int \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \mu_0(W_r - y) \mathbb{P}(Y_0 \in dy). \end{aligned}$$

As  $r \rightarrow \infty$  the above integrand tends to 1 uniformly in  $y$  by Lemma 5.2, so that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(p + Y_p \in W_r) = 1.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(p + Y_p \in W_r)^2 &= \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \iint \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1}\{p + y \in W_r, p + z \in W_r\} \mathbb{P}(Y_0 \in dy) \mathbb{P}(Y_0 \in dz) \\ &= \iint \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \mu_0((W_r - y) \cap (W_r - z)) \mathbb{P}(Y_0 \in dy) \mathbb{P}(Y_0 \in dz). \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

Since by Lemma 5.2 and standard properties of the intrinsic volumes

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{|\mu_0((W_r - y) \cap (W_r - z)) - \lambda_d((W_r - y) \cap (W_r - z))|}{\lambda_d(W_r)} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} c_i \frac{V_i((W_r - y) \cap (W_r - z))}{\lambda_d(W_r)} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} c_i \frac{V_i(W_r)}{\lambda_d(W_r)} = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} c_i \frac{V_i(W)}{\lambda_d(W)} r^{i-d}, \end{aligned}$$

the right hand side of (6.1) tends to 1 as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^2 &:= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \mathbb{V}ar \Psi_0^r(W_r) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_{p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^d}^{\neq} (\mathbb{P}(p + Y_0 \in W_r, q + Y_{q-p} \in W_r) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{P}(p + Y_0 \in W_r) \mathbb{P}(q + Y_0 \in W_r)), \end{aligned}$$

where we have again used stationarity and where the existence of the limit will be justified below. This can be rewritten as

$$\sigma^2 = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} a(r, p, w), \quad (6.2)$$

where

$$a(r, p, w) := \mathbb{P}(p + Y_0 \in W_r, p + w + Y_w \in W_r) - \mathbb{P}(p + Y_0 \in W_r) \mathbb{P}(p + w + Y_0 \in W_r).$$

Let  $w \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(p + Y_0 \in W_r, p + w + Y_w \in W_r) \\ &= \int \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1}\{p + y \in W_r, p + w + z \in W_r\} \mathbb{P}((Y_0, Y_w) \in d(y, z)) \\ &= \int \mu_0((W_r - y) \cap (W_r - w - z)) \mathbb{P}((Y_0, Y_w) \in d(y, z)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain similarly as above

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(p + Y_p \in W_r, p + w + Y_{p+w} \in W_r) = 1.$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(p + Y_0 \in W_r) \mathbb{P}(p + w + Y_0 \in W_r) \\ &= \iint \mu_0((W_r - y) \cap (W_r - w - z)) \mathbb{P}(Y_0 \in dy) \mathbb{P}(Y_0 \in dz), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(p + Y_0 \in W_r) \mathbb{P}(p + w + Y_0 \in W_r) = 1.$$

We next show that

$$\lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |a(r, p, w)| \leq b(w), \quad w \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}, r > 0, \quad (6.3)$$

where the numbers  $b(w) \geq 0$ ,  $w \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ , do not depend on  $r$  and satisfy  $\sum_w b(w) < \infty$ . Then we can apply dominated convergence to (6.2) to conclude that  $\sigma^2 = 0$ .

Let  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$  be as assumed in the theorem. By the stopping set properties of the flowers and from the definition of the  $\alpha_{p,q}$ -mixing coefficients in Section 12, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{P}(F(0) \subset B(0, \|w\|^\gamma/3), p + Y_0 \in W_r, F(w) \subset B(w, \|w\|^\gamma/3), p + w + Y_w \in W_r) \\ & \quad - \mathbb{P}(F(0) \subset B(0, \|w\|^\gamma/3), p + Y_0 \in W_r) \mathbb{P}(F(w) \subset B(w, \|w\|^\gamma/3), p + w + Y_w \in W_r)| \\ & \leq \alpha_{\|w\|^\gamma d, \|w\|^\gamma d}(\|w\|/3), \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

and again from the stopping set property of the matching flower, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \{F(0) \subset B(0, \|w\|^\gamma/3), p + Y_0 \in W_r\} & \subset \{Y_0 \in B(0, \|w\|^\gamma/3), p + Y_0 \in W_r\} \\ & \subset \{p \in W_r + B(0, \|w\|^\gamma/3)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Defining

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{a}(r, p, w) \\ & := \mathbb{P}(F(0) \subset B(0, \|w\|^\gamma/3), p + Y_0 \in W_r, F(w) \subset B(w, \|w\|^\gamma/3), p + w + Y_w \in W_r) \\ & \quad - \mathbb{P}(F(0) \subset B(0, \|w\|^\gamma/3), p + Y_0 \in W_r) \mathbb{P}(F(w) \subset B(w, \|w\|^\gamma/3), p + w + Y_w \in W_r) \end{aligned}$$

we have that  $\tilde{a}(r, p, w) = 0$  for  $p \notin W_r + B(0, \|w\|^\gamma/3)$  as both the terms are 0. Thus, we can derive from (6.4) that

$$\sum_p |\tilde{a}(r, p, w)| \leq \alpha_{\|w\|^\gamma, \|w\|^\gamma} (\|w\|/3) \lambda_d(W_r + B(0, \|w\|^\gamma/3)).$$

Hence, we have that

$$\lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_p |\tilde{a}(r, p, w)| \leq C' \|w\|^{\gamma d} \alpha_{\|w\|^\gamma, \|w\|^\gamma} (\|w\|/3). \quad (6.5)$$

Now, we bound the remaining terms in  $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |a(r, p, w)|$ . We have (up to boundary effects)

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(F(0) \not\subset B(0, \|w\|^\gamma/3), p + Y_0 \in W_r, p + w + Y_w \in W_r) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \mathbf{1}\{F(0) \not\subset B(0, \|w\|^\gamma/3)\} \lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1}\{p + Y_0 \in W_r\} \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(F(0) \not\subset B(0, \|w\|^\gamma/3)) =: c(w). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we obtain that

$$\lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(F(w) \not\subset B(w, \|w\|^\gamma/3), p + Y_0 \in W_r, p + w + Y_w \in W_r) \leq c(w).$$

By the additivity of a probability measure and (6.5), we now obtain

$$\lambda_d(W_r)^{-1} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |a(r, p, w)| \leq 4c(w) + C' \|w\|^{\gamma d} \alpha_{\|w\|^\gamma, \|w\|^\gamma} (\|w\|/3), \quad w \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\},$$

and the proof is complete as both terms on the above right-hand side are summable by our assumptions.  $\square$

## 7 Number rigidity

We assume here again  $\Phi = \mathbb{Z}^d$ . Recall that a point process  $\Psi'$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is called *number rigid* if for each closed ball  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  centred at the origin, the random number  $\Psi'(A)$  of  $\Psi'$ -points in  $A$  is almost surely determined by  $\Psi' \cap A^c$ . In this case the latter property holds for all bounded Borel sets  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . We now give a condition for number rigidity of the point processes of matched points. Recall the definition  $F(q) := F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, q)$ ,  $q \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

**Theorem 7.1.** *Assume that  $\Psi$  is a stationary point process with intensity  $\alpha \geq 1$  such that  $\sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(F(0) \not\subset B(0, \|w\|)) < \infty$ . Then  $\Psi_0^\tau$  is a number rigid point process.*

Before moving onto the proof, we state an important consequence of the theorem.

**Theorem 7.2.** *Assume that  $\Psi$  is a stationary determinantal point process (in particular Poisson) with intensity  $\alpha > 1$ . Then the matched point process  $\Psi_0^\tau$  is number rigid.*




Figure 6: Undecided matching:  $\Psi_0^\tau$  is only observed outside of  $A = [a, b]$ . There are points (blue and green) for which the iterated mutually closest matching is independent of  $\Psi_0^\tau \cap A$ . The potential matching partners of the other points (marked in orange) are undecided.

*Proof.* It follows from combining Corollary 5.8 and Theorem 7.1.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 7.1.* Write  $\Psi_0 := \Psi_0^\tau$ . Let  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a closed ball with radius  $r$  centred at the origin. We wish to show that  $\Psi_0(A)$  is almost surely determined by  $\Psi_0 \cap A^c$ . For this we use a modified version of the mutual nearest neighbour matching of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  with  $\Psi_0 \cap A^c$ , using the concept of *undecided* points. We call the set of undecided points of  $\Psi_0$  as  $\Psi_0^{UD}$  and that of  $\Phi$  as  $\Phi^{UD}$ . The following points are undecided : (i) all points in  $\mathbb{Z}^d \cap A$ , (ii) all points in  $\mathbb{Z}^d \cap A^c$  or in  $\Psi_0 \cap A^c$  who need to consider points inside  $A$  for deciding their potential matching partner. More precisely, we can write this as

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_0^{UD} &= \{x \in \Psi_0 \cap A^c : F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi_0 \cap A^c, x) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}, \\ \Phi^{UD} &= (\mathbb{Z}^d \cap A) \cup \{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap A^c : F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi_0 \cap A^c, q) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}. \end{aligned}$$

We have illustrated the notion of undecided points in Fig. 6. For  $z \in (\mathbb{Z}^d \cup \Psi_0) \cap A^c$ , by the stopping set property of the matching flower (Lemma 4.2), we have that  $F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi_0, z) \subset A^c$  iff  $F(\mathbb{Z}^d \cap A^c, \Psi_0 \cap A^c, z) \subset A^c$ . Thus, we have that  $\Phi^{UD}, \Psi_0^{UD}$  are determined by  $(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi_0 \cap A^c)$ . Further, by Proposition 2.4 the points in  $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \Phi^{UD}$  are matched to points in  $\Psi_0 \setminus \Psi_0^{UD}$  and vice-versa.

Let us now define  $Z_1 := \text{card}(\Phi^{UD} \cap A^c)$ ,  $Z_2 := \text{card}(\Phi^{UD} \cap A)$ ,  $Z_3 := \text{card} \Psi_0^{UD}$ . Since  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  is completely matched to  $\Psi_0$ , we have that  $Z_3 \leq Z_1 + Z_2$ . Now if we show that  $Z_1 < \infty$  a.s., then we have by the above inequality that  $Z_3 < \infty$  a.s. and again as a consequence of the complete matching of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  to  $\Psi_0$ , we derive that  $\Psi_0(A) = Z_1 + Z_2 - Z_3$  a.s. Thus, we have that  $\Psi_0(A)$  is a.s. determined by  $(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi_0 \cap A^c)$ , i.e.,  $\Psi_0$  is a number rigid point process. So our proof is now complete if we show that  $Z_1 < \infty$  a.s..

By the stopping set property of the matching flower (Lemma 4.2) as mentioned above, we have that

$$\Phi^{UD} \cap A^c = \{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap A^c : F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi_0, q) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}.$$



Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}Z_1 &= \mathbb{E} \text{card}(\Phi^{UD} \cap A^c) = \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \|q\| > r} \mathbb{P}(F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi_0, q) \cap A \neq \emptyset) \\
&= \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \|q\| > r} \mathbb{P}((F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi_0, 0) + q) \cap A \neq \emptyset) \\
&= \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \|q\| > r} \mathbb{P}(F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi_0, 0) \cap B(-q, r) \neq \emptyset) \\
&\leq \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \|q\| > r} \mathbb{P}(F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi_0, 0) \not\subset B(0, \|q\| - r)),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that the balls  $B(-q, r)$  and  $B(0, \|q\| - r)$  have disjoint interiors. Proposition 2.4 shows that  $\tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi_0, 0) = \tau(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)$ . Therefore any competing chain in  $(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi_0)$  for 0 is also a competing chain in  $(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi)$  for 0 so that we have  $F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi_0, 0) \subset F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0)$ . Hence we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}Z_1 \leq \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \|q\| > r} \mathbb{P}(F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi, 0) \not\subset B(0, \|q\| - r)).$$

Now by our assumption the last sum is finite and this yields that  $Z_1 < \infty$  a.s. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 8 Pair correlation function in the Poisson case

In this section, we assume that  $\Psi$  is a Poisson process with intensity  $\alpha > 1$ .

For  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$ , we write  $\varphi^{x,y} := \varphi \cup \{x, y\}$ . Recall the definition of matching status in (2.2) and the definitions of the intensity function and the second order correlation function of a point process from the appendix.

**Proposition 8.1.** *The function*

$$\rho_1(x) := \alpha \mathbb{E}M(\Psi^x, \mathbb{Z}^d, x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

*is an intensity function of  $\Psi^\tau$ , while*

$$\rho_2(x, y) := \alpha^2 \mathbb{E}M(\Psi^{x,y}, \mathbb{Z}^d, x)M(\Psi^{x,y}, \mathbb{Z}^d, y), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

*is a second order correlation function of  $\Psi_0^\tau$ .*

*Proof:* The first equation is a quick consequence of the Mecke equation (Theorem 4.1 in [27]) while the second follows from the bivariate Mecke equation, that is the case  $m = 2$  of Theorem 4.4 in [27].  $\square$

The next result shows that the *truncated second order correlation function* decays exponentially fast.

**Proposition 8.2.** *There exist  $a_1 > 0$  such that*

$$|\rho_2(x, y) - \rho_1(x)\rho_1(y)| \leq a_1 e^{-a_1^{-1}\|x-y\|^{\beta'}}, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  are as in Proposition 8.1 and  $\beta' = d/(2d+1)$ .

*Proof:* Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . By the stopping set property of the matching flower and complete independence of  $\Psi$ , the events  $\{F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi^x, x) \subset B(x, \|y-x\|/3)\}$  and  $\{F(\Psi^y, \mathbb{Z}^d, y) \subset B(y, \|y-x\|/3)\}$  are independent. Moreover, on the first event we have that  $M(\Psi^{x,y}, \mathbb{Z}^d, x) = M(\Psi^x, \mathbb{Z}^d, x)$ . A similar statement applies to the second event. Therefore it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}M(\Psi^{x,y}, \mathbb{Z}^d, x)M(\Psi^{x,y}, \mathbb{Z}^d, y) - \mathbb{E}M(\Psi^x, \mathbb{Z}^d, x)\mathbb{E}M(\Psi^y, \mathbb{Z}^d, y)| \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{P}(M(\Psi^x, \mathbb{Z}^d, x) = 1, F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi^x, x) \not\subset B(x, \|y-x\|/3)) \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{P}(M(\Psi^y, \mathbb{Z}^d, y) = 1, F(\Psi^y, \mathbb{Z}^d, y) \not\subset B(y, \|y-x\|/3)). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that

$$\mathbb{P}(M(\Psi^x, \mathbb{Z}^d, x) = 1, F(\mathbb{Z}^d, \Psi^x, x) \not\subset B(x, r)) \leq b'_1 e^{-b'_2 r^{\beta'}}, \quad r > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (8.1)$$

for some constants  $b'_1, b'_2 > 0$ . This would imply the assertion.

To check (8.1), we need to derive the equivalent of Proposition 5.10 for non-randomized lattices. However, instead of using Theorem 5.9, we use Corollary 5.8 and follow the proof of Theorem 5.5. Since  $\theta = 0$  for the Poisson point process,  $\varepsilon = 1/(2d+1)$ . But since decay rate provided by Corollary 5.8 is same as that of Theorem 5.1, we obtain the exponent  $\beta' = \varepsilon d$ .  $\square$

*Remark 8.3.* Let  $W$  be an arbitrary convex and compact set with  $\lambda_d(W) > 0$  and  $0 \in W$ . From hyperuniformity (Theorem 6.3), exponential decay of truncated second order correlation function (Proposition 8.2) and using Proposition 2 of [30], we have that  $\text{Var} \Psi_0^\tau(rW) = O(r^{d-1})$  (that is,  $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{-(d-1)} \text{Var} \Psi_0^\tau(rW) < \infty$ ) and further using Lemma 1.6 of [31] for  $d = 2$ , we have that  $\text{Var} \Psi_0^\tau(rW) = \Theta(r)$  (that is,  $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{-1} \text{Var} \Psi_0^\tau(rW) < \infty$  and  $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} r / \text{Var} \Psi_0^\tau(rW) < \infty$ ). These are so-called class I hyperuniform systems; see [38].

## 9 One-sided matching on the line

In this section, we shall consider the one-sided matching on the line. The main motivation for such a consideration is to generalize our hyperuniformity results for stable partial matchings. Our set-up is to consider a partial matching of a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -stationary point process  $\Phi$  with a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -stationary point process  $\Psi$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ . As in general dimensions, we say that a point process  $\Phi$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  is  $\mathbb{Z}$ -stationary if  $\Phi + z$  has the same distribution as  $\Phi$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . The main difference with the previous sections shall be that the matching will be one-sided, i.e., every  $\Phi$  point will be matched to its right. Every  $\Phi$  point is matched with the first ‘available’  $\Psi$  point on its right. In other words, the  $\Phi$  points search for their ‘partners’ to their right and the  $\Psi$  points search for their ‘partners’ to their left. One can describe a mutual nearest-neighbour matching algorithm as for stable matching

(see Section 2) but with  $\Phi$  points searching only to their right and  $\Psi$  points searching only to their left. The matched process  $\Psi_0 := \Psi_0^\tau \subset \Psi$  can be interpreted as *the output process* of a queueing system with arrivals at  $\Phi$  and potential departures at  $\Psi$  with LIFO (Last-In-First-Out) rule. Under certain additional assumptions, we shall now show that  $\Psi_0$  is hyperuniform iff  $\Phi$  is. Departure processes of queueing systems under various service rules and i.i.d. inter-arrival times have been studied extensively in queueing theory and in particular, hyperuniformity of  $\Psi_0$  has been proven in the case of  $\Phi = \mathbb{Z}_+$  (i.e., periodic arrivals) (see [8, 40]). From a more point process perspective, this point process has been investigated in [14]. Here, we interpret the departure process as arising from a partial matching and hence naturally extend to general arrival and potential departure processes.

We use the notation as before for describing the matching. For  $p \in \Phi$ , let  $\tau(\Phi, \Psi, p) \in \Psi$  denote the matched point of  $\Psi$  and for  $x \in \Psi$ ,  $\tau(\Phi, \Psi, x) \in \Phi$  denotes the matched point of  $\Phi$  if it exists, else we set  $\tau(\Phi, \Psi, x) = \infty$ . By our assumption on one-sided matching, we have that  $Y_p := \tau(\Phi, \Psi, p) - p \geq 0$  for all  $p \in \Phi$ . By stationarity of  $\Psi$  and  $\Phi$ , we have that the random field  $\{Y_p\}_{p \in \Phi}$  and the point process  $\Psi_0$  are  $\mathbb{Z}$ -stationary. For  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we define  $L(t)$  as the number of un-matched points of  $\Phi$  up to  $t$ , i.e.,

$$L(t) := \sum_{p \in \Phi, p < t} \mathbf{1}\{p + Y_p \geq t\} = \sum_{p \in \Phi - t, p - t < 0} \mathbf{1}\{p - t + Y_p \geq 0\} \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{p \in \Phi, p < 0} \mathbf{1}\{p + Y_p \geq 0\},$$

where the last equality follows from  $\mathbb{Z}$ -stationarity of  $\Psi$  and  $\{Y_p\}_{p \in \Phi}$ . Thus, we see that  $\{L(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is also a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -stationary random field. Now, we have our main theorem on one-sided matchings.

**Theorem 9.1.** *Let  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  be  $\mathbb{Z}$ -ergodic point processes on  $\mathbb{R}$  with intensities 1 and  $\alpha (\geq 1)$  respectively. Consider the one-sided matching of  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  as described above. Also, assume that  $\text{Var}(L(0)) < \infty$ . Then, we have the following :*

1. *If  $\lim_{t \in \mathbb{N}, t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\Phi([-t, t])) = \infty$  then we have that*

$$\lim_{t \in \mathbb{N}, t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Var}(\Psi_0([-t, t]))}{\text{Var}(\Phi([-t, t]))} = 1.$$

2. *If  $\text{Var}(\Phi([-t, t]))$  is bounded then so is  $\text{Var}(\Psi_0([-t, t]))$ .*

In other words, we have that  $\Psi_0$  is hyperuniform iff  $\Phi$  is hyperuniform under appropriate assumptions. Though it is surprising that there is no explicit requirement on tail bounds for the  $Y_p$ , the finite variance condition shall impose the same. Suppose that  $\Phi = \mathbb{Z}$  and then by stationarity of the  $Y_p$ , we have that

$$\mathbb{E}(L(0)) = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}, p < 0} \mathbb{P}(Y_p \geq -p) = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}, p < 0} \mathbb{P}(Y_0 \geq -p) = E(Y_0).$$

Thus  $E(Y_0) < \infty$  is a necessary condition for  $\text{Var}(L(0))$  to be finite. After the proof, we shall also give a sufficient condition for the finiteness of the variance when  $\Phi = \mathbb{Z}$ .

*Proof.* The proof idea is similar to that of [40, Theorem 1.1]. We shall derive suitable bounds on  $\text{Var}(\Psi_0([-t, t]))$  from which both the statements will follow trivially. We shall assume that always  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . From the representation of  $L(t)$ , we have that

$$\Psi_0[-t, t) = \sum_{p \in \Phi} \mathbf{1}\{-t \leq p + Y_p < t\} = L(-t) - L(t) + \Phi([-t, t)), \quad t \in \mathbb{N}$$

and so we obtain that

$$\mathbb{V}\text{ar}(\Psi_0([-t, t])) = \mathbb{V}\text{ar}(L(-t) - L(t)) + 2\text{Cov}(L(-t) - L(t), \Phi([-t, t])) + \mathbb{V}\text{ar}(\Phi([-t, t]))$$

Now again by  $\mathbb{Z}$ -stationarity of  $L(\cdot)$  and Cauchy-Schwarz, we derive that

$$\mathbb{V}\text{ar}(L(-t) - L(t)) = 2\mathbb{V}\text{ar}(L(0)) - 2\text{Cov}(L(0), L(2t)) \leq 4\mathbb{V}\text{ar}(L(0)),$$

and

$$2|\text{Cov}(L(-t) - L(t), \Phi([-t, t]))| \leq 4\sqrt{\mathbb{V}\text{ar}(\Phi([-t, t])\mathbb{V}\text{ar}(L(0)))}.$$

Thus, both the statements in 1.) and 2.) follow from the finiteness of  $\mathbb{V}\text{ar}(L(0))$  and our respective assumptions on  $\mathbb{V}\text{ar}(\Phi([-t, t]))$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 9.2.** *Let  $\Phi = \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\Psi$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -stationary point process on  $\mathbb{R}$  with intensity  $\alpha \geq 1$  such that  $\sum_{p>0, p \in \mathbb{Z}} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(\Psi([0, p]) < p)} < \infty$ . Then we have that  $\mathbb{E}(L(0)^2) < \infty$ .*

The condition on  $\Psi$  is satisfied by stationary determinantal point processes (including Poisson) with intensity  $\alpha > 1$  (see Theorem 12.1). Many other stationary point processes called as *weak sub-Poisson point processes* and with intensity  $\alpha > 1$  also satisfy the condition in Theorem 9.2 (see Proposition 2.3 in [4]). Determinantal point processes are examples of the so-called weak sub-Poisson point processes.

*Proof.* By the representation of  $L(0)$ , stationarity of the  $Y_p$  and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}(L(0)^2) \leq \left( \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}, p < 0} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(Y_0 \geq -p)} \right)^2.$$

The proof is now complete by noting that for  $p \in \mathbb{Z}, p > 0$ ,  $\{Y_0 > p\} = \{\Psi([0, p]) < p\}$  due to the definition of the one-sided matching.  $\square$

## 10 Simulated matching on a torus

The simulation procedure of the mutual nearest neighbor matching closely follows the description of the algorithm in Section 1. Given two point patterns, the algorithm iteratively matches mutual nearest neighbors and removes them from the list of unmatched points. When in one of the point patterns no unmatched points remain, the algorithm terminates. The only difference to the infinite model discussed above is that the finite, simulated samples are matched on a torus (that is, with periodic boundary conditions). Our implementation uses periodic copies of points and an efficient nearest neighbor search to match big data sets.

For this study, we implemented the mutual nearest neighbor algorithm in R [36] using the RANN library [1]. Our R-package for matching point patterns on the torus in arbitrary dimension is freely available via the GitHub repository [24]. Moreover, all data of this simulation study is published in the Zenodo repository [25]. The random numbers for the simulation of random point patterns are generated by the MT19937 generator known as “Mersenne Twister”.




Figure 7: Hyperuniform and rigid stable matchings  $\Psi^\tau$ : the samples show matchings of a lattice on a 2D torus to two Poisson point processes with different intensities. Note the different degree of local order (highlighted by the magnifying glasses).

Samples of a stationarized lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  in a finite observation window  $[0, L]^d$  (considered as a flat torus) are matched to realizations of Poisson and determinantal point processes in 1D, 2D, and 3D with varying intensities. Figure 7 shows 2D samples of the thinned process  $\Psi^\tau$  at intensities either close to or far away from unity.

A sample of a Poisson point process with intensity  $\alpha$  is simulated by randomly placing independent and uniformly distributed points inside an observation window, where the number of points is sampled from a Poisson distribution with mean value  $\alpha L^d$ . We simulate samples of determinantal point processes using the R-function `dppPowerExp` of the `spatstat` library [2]. It simulates a power exponential spectral model defined in [29]. The model parameter of our simulations are a shape parameter of 10 and a scale parameter of  $(1 - 10^{-4})$  times the maximally allowed value. The corresponding determinantal point process is not hyperuniform.

In 3D, both processes were simulated at intensities  $\alpha = 1+10^{-2}$ ,  $1+1$ , and  $1+10$ , where for the determinantal point process  $L = 10, 8$ , and  $5$ , respectively (which corresponds to about 1000 points per sample), and for the Poisson point process  $L = 22$  at each intensity (which corresponds to about 10,000 to 100,000 points per sample). For each process and intensity, we simulated 100 samples.

Figure 8 shows (in the top) for both the Poisson and the determinantal point process the empirical complementary cumulative distribution function (ECCDF)  $\widehat{T}$  of the distance  $\|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^3, \Psi, q)\|$  of a lattice point  $q$  to its matching partner (based on all lattice points and their matching partners in all samples). It is an empirical estimate of the tail distribution  $\mathbb{P}(\|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^3, \Psi, q)\| > r)$  for  $r > 0$ . The exponential tails in the semi-logarithmic plots are in agreement with Theorem 5.1 and Remark 5.7, where the constant  $c_1$  depends on the process  $\Psi$  and in particular on its intensity  $\alpha$ . As expected,  $c_1$  decreases with decreasing  $\alpha$ .

Next, we analyze some two-point statistics of the process of matched points  $\Psi^\tau$ . The long-range behavior of the process can be well studied using the Fourier transform of the truncated pair-correlation function. The so-called *structure factor* is defined as the function

$$S(k) := 1 + \int_{[0, L]^d} (\rho_2(x, 0) - 1) e^{-i\langle k, x \rangle} dx, \quad k \in (2\pi/L)\mathbb{N}_0^d, \quad (10.1)$$




Figure 8: Stable matchings of the lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^3$  to Poisson and determinantal point processes on the torus at different intensities  $\alpha$  (left, center, right): empirical complementary cumulative distribution function (ECCDF)  $\hat{T}$  of the distance  $\|\tau(\mathbb{Z}^3, \Psi, q)\|$  of a lattice point  $q$  to its matching partner (top) and scattering intensity  $\mathcal{S}(k)$  for the thinned process  $\Psi^\tau$  (bottom). In the depicted samples of the determinantal point process, green (light) balls represent matched points and red (dark) balls represent unmatched points.

for a point process with unit intensity, where  $\langle k, x \rangle$  is the scalar product of  $k$  and  $x$ . The norm of the *wave vector*  $k$  is called the *wavenumber*  $\|k\|$ . If the point process is stationary and if  $\rho_2(x, 0) - 1$  is (absolutely) integrable, then the condition (1.2) for hyperuniformity is equivalent to [39, 23]

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} S(k) = 0. \quad (10.2)$$

In that case, hyperuniformity can be detected in simulations by extrapolating  $S(k)$ . However, in the case of a stationarized lattice, the pair-correlation function of  $\Psi^\tau$  does not necessarily exist. So, instead of the structure factor, we compute a different two-point statistics. The empirical *scattering intensity* function

$$\mathcal{S}(k) := \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N e^{-i\langle k, X_j \rangle} \right|^2 \quad (10.3)$$

is defined for a sample of  $N$  points at positions  $X_j$ . The name indicates that this quantity is directly observable in X-ray or light-scattering experiments (under suitable assumptions) [15]. In statistical physics, the scattering intensity function is commonly used to estimate the structure factor since  $\mathbb{E}\mathcal{S}(k)$  (suitably compensated) converges in the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  to  $S(k)$  [15, 38].

Figure 8 shows (in the bottom) the scattering intensities  $\mathcal{S}(k)$  for the matched points in samples of the Poisson or the determinantal point processes in 3D at different intensities




Figure 9: High precision analysis of the scattering intensity  $\mathcal{S}(k)$  for stable matchings in 1D (left) and 2D (right) on the torus between a stationarized lattice and a Poisson point process with intensity close (left) or far away (right) from unity: The (gray) dots in the log-log plots show the single values of  $\mathcal{S}(k)$  for allowed values of  $\|k\|$  (for all ten samples), which range over at least seven orders of magnitude. Moreover, the (red) marks with error bars depict averages over bins of wavenumbers. The dashed lines indicate a power law behavior  $\|k\|^2$  with proportionality constants  $\mathcal{O}(10^6)$  (left) and  $\mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$  (right). The vertical lines (right) indicate the positions of reciprocal lattice vectors for the square lattice.

$\alpha$ . The average values and error bars of  $\mathcal{S}(k)$  correspond not only to an average over the 100 samples per curve but also to a binning of all allowed wave numbers, which only excludes those wave vectors that correspond to reciprocal lattice vectors of the cubic lattice. For the latter, the corresponding wavenumbers are indicated by dashed vertical lines and the average values of  $\mathcal{S}(k)$  are depicted by solid vertical lines. In the infinite system limit, we expect these values to diverge (indicating the underlying long-range order of the lattice). With increasing intensity these so-called Bragg peaks are clearly visible for both the matched Poisson and determinantal point process. For  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ , the scattering intensities become similar to those of the unmatched point processes  $\Psi$ . In the case of a matched Poisson process, a suppression of density fluctuations can only be seen at large length scales, that is, small wavenumbers  $\|k\|$ .

For such low intensities, huge system sizes are necessary to numerically confirm the hyperuniformity. Therefore, we have simulated large samples of the Poisson point process in 1D with  $L = 10^6$  at  $\alpha = 1.01$ . We have also simulated samples in 2D with  $L = 300$  at  $\alpha = 11$ . This corresponds to about  $10^6$  points per sample, where we have simulated ten samples at each intensity.

With mean values of the scattering intensity ranging over up to ten orders of magnitude, Fig. 9 strongly indicates hyperuniformity of  $\Psi^\tau$  for the matching of a Poisson point process  $\Psi$  to a stationarized lattice on the torus. For  $\alpha = 1 + 10^{-2}$ , the process  $\Psi^\tau$  is at most wavenumbers indistinguishable from a Poisson process. The hyperuniformity can only be detected due to the huge system size of a million points, where wavenumbers  $k < 10^{-3}$  are accessible. For  $\alpha = 1 + 10^2$ , the system is obviously hyperuniform. The scattering consists of a diffuse part and peaks at the positions of the reciprocal lattice vectors of the square lattice. The scattering intensity is consistent with  $\mathcal{S}(k) \sim \|k\|^2$  for




Figure 10: Number variance of matched points in 2D stable matchings between a stationarized lattice and a Poisson point process with intensity  $\alpha = 1 + 10^{-2}$  on the flat torus. The number variance is estimated for spherical observation windows  $B_R$  with varying radii  $R$ . Samples of observation windows are shown on the left and right hand side. They correspond to small ( $R = 10$ ) or large ( $R = 250$ ) radii. To highlight different scaling regimes, we use a double logarithmic plot. Up to about  $R = 10$ , the scaling of the number variance is approximately proportional to  $R^2$ . So, in this regime, the system appears to be non-hyperuniform. The hyperuniform, linear scaling regime can only be observed for radii  $R > 100$ .

$\|k\| \rightarrow 0$ , which corresponds to a class I hyperuniform system [38] in agreement with Remark 8.3.

Finally, we directly estimate the *number variance*  $\text{Var} \Psi^\tau(B_R)$  of the number of matched points in a spherical observation window  $B_R$  with radius  $R$ . Figure 10 shows the number variance for a matching between a stationarized lattice and a Poisson point process with an intensity  $\alpha = 1 + 10^{-2}$  on the flat torus. To detect hyperuniformity, we again have to analyze large system sizes. So, we simulate ten samples in 2D each containing a million lattice points (i.e., the linear system size is  $L = 1000$ ). We then match in each sample the lattice with the Poisson points. To estimate the number variance, a million spherical observation windows are randomly placed into each sample (considered as a flat torus). For each throw, we compute the numbers of matched Poisson points within various distances  $R$  from the window center. For a each radius  $R$ , the sample variance of this number is our estimator of the number variance  $\text{Var} \Psi^\tau(B_R)$ . Its statistical error, estimated by the standard deviation of the sample variance, is smaller than the point size in Fig. 10.

## 11 Conclusions and Outlook

We have studied partial stable matchings between the integer lattice and a stationary point process of higher intensity. In one dimension, we have considered partial one-sided stable matchings between more general stationary point processes. Although our notion of stability is with respect to the Euclidean distance, our techniques should work for stability with respect to more general distances and also for more general lattices. Though



matchings between point processes have been studied before, the main focus has been on existence of a complete matching between two point processes of equal intensity and on deriving (under suitable assumptions) tail bounds on the matching distance. Our partial matchings produce a new class of point processes that exhibit interesting phenomena such as hyperuniformity and number rigidity. These concepts originate in statistical physics and material science whereas the notion of stable matching arose in combinatorial optimization. Moreover, the matching can be interpreted as a spatial queueing system. Even in 1D, it might be interesting to further study the matching from the point of view of queueing.

Our new class of point processes provides insights into the interplay of global and local structure in hyperuniform point processes. For any finite observation window, we can define a point process that is within this window virtually indistinguishable from a Poisson (or determinantal) point process. Nevertheless, the model is rigorously hyperuniform, where the suppression of density fluctuations occurs at arbitrarily large length scales. Due to the available efficient algorithms for the nearest neighbor search, our stable matching offers a straightforward and efficient simulation of huge correlated, hyperuniform point patterns with a tunable degree of local order, see Figs. 7 and 9 and the supplementary video.

Our results can be further pursued and possibly extended in several directions. First of all, we believe that hyperuniformity and rigidity remain true if  $\Phi$  is a stationary lattice and  $W$  the unit ball (which is confirmed by our simulations). In fact it is tempting to conjecture that  $\Psi^\tau$  is hyperuniform, whenever  $\Phi$  is a hyperuniform point process. Even beyond that  $\Psi^\tau$  might inherit any asymptotic number variance from  $\Phi$ . An intriguing example is if  $\Phi$  is anti-hyperuniform or hyperfluctuating, that is, if  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var } \Psi^\tau(rW) / \lambda_d(rW) = \infty$  like for a Poisson hyperplane intersection process [16]. As evidence, we have shown the above in the special case of one dimension for one-sided matchings in Section 9. It is of interest to study whether these point processes exhibit further rigidity (see [13] for more about notions of rigidity). Simply put our simulations suggest that the matched point process “inherits” local properties from  $\Psi$  and global properties from  $\Phi$  if the intensity of  $\Psi$  is larger than that of  $\Phi$ .

Further, our proofs of hyperuniformity and number rigidity relied crucially upon exponential tail bounds for the typical matching distance. In light of this, one can ask what do exponential tail bounds for the typical matching distance between two i.i.d. copies of the same point process imply about the point process.

## 12 Appendix: Some point process results

We shall briefly introduce here some basic point process notions and state some general results of use for us. For  $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $k \in \mathbf{N}$ , we define the *kth factorial measure* of  $\varphi$  as

$$\varphi^{(k)} := \{(x_1, \dots, x_k) : x_i \in \varphi, x_i \neq x_j, \forall i \neq j\}.$$

As with  $\varphi$ , we often view  $\varphi^{(k)}$  as a measure on  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^k$  as follows :

$$\varphi^{(k)}(\cdot) := \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in \varphi}^{\neq} \delta_{(x_1, \dots, x_k)}(\cdot),$$

where  $\sum^{\neq}$  denotes that the summation is taken over pairwise distinct entries and an empty sum is defined to be 0. For a point process  $\Psi$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define the  $k$ th factorial moment measure as  $\alpha^{(k)}(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}(\Psi^{(k)}(\cdot))$ . If the measure  $\alpha^{(k)}$  has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure, i.e., for all  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\alpha^{(k)}(dx_1 \dots dx_k) = \rho_k(x_1, \dots, x_k)dx_1 \dots dx_k$ , then  $\rho_k$  is said to be the  $k$ -point correlation function of  $\Psi$ .

Given a point process  $\Psi$ , we can define the following mixing coefficient

$$\alpha_{p,q}(s) := \sup \{ |\text{Cov}(f(\Psi \cap A), g(\Psi \cap B))| : f, g \in \{0, 1\}, \lambda_d(A) \leq p, \lambda_d(B) \leq q, d(A, B) \geq s \},$$

where  $d(A, B) := \inf_{x \in A, y \in B} \|x - y\|$ .

Let  $K : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a measurable function. We call such a  $K$  kernel. We assume that the kernel  $K$  is Hermitian, non-negative definite, locally square-integrable and the associated integral operator is locally trace-class with eigenvalues in  $[0, 1]$ . A point process  $\Psi$  is said to be a *determinantal point process with kernel  $K$*  if for all  $k \geq 1$  and  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have that

$$\rho_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \det((K(x_i, x_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}).$$

The above conditions on the kernel  $K$  guarantee the existence and uniqueness of the determinantal point process with kernel  $K$  (see Theorem 4.5.5 in [19].) Further if  $\Psi$  is stationary,  $K(x, x)$  is a constant and is the intensity of the process  $\Psi$ . As a simple consequence of Hadamard's inequality, we derive the following useful inequality :

$$\rho_k(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq K(0, 0)^n. \quad (12.1)$$

Though the  $k$ -point correlation functions of the stationary Poisson point process satisfy the condition of being determinantal with the kernel  $K(x, y) = \mathbf{1}\{|x - y| = 0\}$ , the associated integral operator is degenerate. Therefore, the Poisson point process is, strictly speaking, excluded from our framework for determinantal point processes. However, the stationary Poisson point process has all properties that we use of determinantal point processes (such as (12.1), Theorems 12.1 and 12.2). Hence, we include it as an example of determinantal point processes.

We now state an important concentration inequality for determinantal point processes as well as a bound for the  $\alpha_{p,q}$  mixing coefficient. The next two results can be found as Theorem 3.6 in [32] and Corollary 4.2 in [35] respectively.

**Theorem 12.1.** *Let  $\Psi$  be a stationary determinantal point process (in particular Poisson) with kernel  $K$  and intensity  $\alpha = K(0, 0)$  and  $f : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $c$ -Lipschitz functional (i.e.,  $|f(\varphi + \delta_x) - f(\varphi)| \leq c$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \varphi \in \mathbf{N}$ ). Then for any  $a > 0$  and bounded set  $A$ , we have that*

$$\mathbb{P}(|f(\Psi \cap A) - \mathbb{E}(f(\Psi \cap A))| \geq a) \leq 5 \exp\left(-\frac{a^2}{4c(a + 2\alpha\lambda_d(A)c)}\right).$$

**Theorem 12.2.** *Let  $\Psi$  be a stationary determinantal point process (in particular Poisson) with kernel  $K$  and define  $\omega(s) := \sup_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|x - y\| \geq s} |K(x, y)|$ ,  $s > 0$ . Then we have that for all  $s > 0$ ,*

$$\alpha_{p,q}(s) \leq pq\omega(s)^2$$

It can be shown that if for all  $p, q > 0$ ,  $\alpha_{p,q}(s) \rightarrow 0$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\Psi$  is mixing. For example, see Section 3 in [21].

## Acknowledgments

This work was in part supported by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) through Grants No. HU1874/3-2 and No. LA965/6-2 awarded as part of the DFG-Forschergruppe FOR 1548 “Geometry and Physics of Spatial Random Systems.” DY’s work was supported by INSPIRE Faculty Award from DST and CPDA from the Indian Statistical Institute. This project was initiated during DY’s visit to the Institute of Stochastics, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology and DY wishes to thank the institute for hosting him. DY would like to thank Raphaël Lachièze-Rey for his comments on an earlier draft and Subhroshekhar Ghosh and Manjunath Krishnapur for discussions on higher-dimensional examples of rigid point processes. The authors are thankful to the two anonymous referees for their comments leading to an improved presentation.

## References

- [1] S. Arya, D. Mount, S.E. Kemp, and G. Jefferis (2017). RANN: Fast Nearest Neighbour Search (Wraps ANN Library) Using L2 Metric. R package version 2.5.1.
- [2] A. Baddeley and R. Turner (2005). Spatstat: an R package for analyzing spatial point patterns. *J. Stat. Software* **12**, 1–42.
- [3] B. Błaszczyszyn, D. Yogeshwaran, and J.E. Yukich (2019). Limit theory for geometric statistics of point processes having fast decay of correlations. *Ann. Probab.* **47**(2), 835–895.
- [4] B. Błaszczyszyn and D. Yogeshwaran (2015). Clustering comparison of point processes, with applications to random geometric models. In *Stochastic Geometry, Spatial Statistics and Random Fields* (pp. 31–71). Springer, Cham.
- [5] S. Chatterjee (2019). Rigidity of the three-dimensional hierarchical Coulomb gas. *Prob. Th. Rel. Fields* **175**(3-4), 1123–1176.
- [6] D.J. Daley and G. Last (2005). Descending chains, the lilypond model, and mutual-nearest-neighbour matching. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **37**(3), 604–628.
- [7] D. Dereudre, A. Hardy, T. Leblé, and M. Maïda (2018). DLR equations and rigidity for the Sine-beta process. *arXiv:1809.03989*.
- [8] A. Al Hanbali, M. Mandjes, Y. Nazarathy, and W. Whitt (2011). The asymptotic variance of departures in critically loaded queues. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **43**, 243–263.
- [9] D. Gale and L. Shapley (1962). College admissions and stability of marriage. *Amer. Math. Monthly* **60**, 9–15
- [10] S. Ghosh and J.L. Lebowitz (2017). Fluctuations, large deviations and rigidity in hyperuniform systems: A brief survey. *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.* **48**, 609–631.
- [11] S. Ghosh and Y. Peres (2017). Rigidity and tolerance in point processes: Gaussian zeros and Ginibre eigenvalues. *Duke Math. J.* **166**, 1789–1858.

- [12] S. Ghosh and J.L. Lebowitz (2017). Number rigidity in superhomogeneous random point fields. *J. Stat. Phys.* **166**, 1016–1027.
- [13] S. Ghosh and M. Krishnapur (2015). Rigidity hierarchy in random point fields: random polynomials and determinantal processes. *arXiv:1510.08814*.
- [14] S. Goldstein, J.L. Lebowitz, and E. Speer (2006). Large deviations for a point process of bounded variability. *Markov Process. Related Fields* **12**, 235–256.
- [15] J.-P. Hansen and I.R. McDonald (2013). *Theory of Simple Liquids: With Applications to Soft Matter*. Fourth Edition, Academic Press, Amsterdam.
- [16] L. Heinrich, H. Schmidt, and V. Schmidt (2006) Central limit theorems for Poisson hyperplane tessellations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **16**, 919–950.
- [17] C. Hoffman, A.E. Holroyd, and Y. Peres (2009). Tail bounds for the stable marriage of Poisson and Lebesgue. *Canad. J. Math.* **61**, 1279–1299.
- [18] A.E. Holroyd, R. Pemantle, Y. Peres, and O. Schramm (2009). Poisson matching. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré B* **45**, 266–287.
- [19] J.B. Hough, M. Krishnapur, Y. Peres, and B. Virag (2009). *Zeros of Gaussian analytic functions and determinantal point processes*. Vol. **51**, Amer. Math. Soc.
- [20] D. Hug, G. Last, and M. Schulte (2016). Second order properties and central limit theorems for geometric functionals of Boolean models. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **26**, 73–135.
- [21] G. Ivanoff (1982). Central limit theorems for point processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **12**(2), 171–186.
- [22] O. Kallenberg (2002). *Foundations of Modern Probability*. Second Edition, Springer, New York.
- [23] J. Kim and S. Torquato (2017). Effect of Window Shape on the Detection of Hyperuniformity via the Local Number Variance. *J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp.*, **2017**(1), 013402.
- [24] M.A. Klatt (2018) `matchingpp`—An R Package for the Stable Matching of Point Patterns. GitHub repository <http://github.com/michael-klatt/matchingpp>.
- [25] M.A. Klatt (2020). Supplementary dataset: Hyperuniform and rigid stable matchings. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3575193>.
- [26] G. Last and M.D. Penrose (2013). Percolation and limit theory for the Poisson lilypond model. *Random Structures Algorithms* **42**, 226–249.
- [27] G. Last and M. Penrose (2017). *Lectures on the Poisson Process*. Cambridge University Press.
- [28] G. Last and H. Thorisson (2009). Invariant transports of stationary random measures and mass-stationarity. *Ann. Probab.* **37**, 790–813.

- [29] F. Lavancier, J. Møller, and E. Rubak (2015). Determinantal point process models and statistical inference *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.* **77**, 853–977.
- [30] P. A. Martin and T. Yalcin (1980). The charge fluctuations in classical Coulomb systems. *J. Stat. Phys.* 22(4), 435–463.
- [31] F. Nazarov and M. Sodin (2012). Correlation functions for random complex zeroes: strong clustering and local universality. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 310(1), 75–98.
- [32] R. Pemantle and Y. Peres (2014). Concentration of Lipschitz functionals of determinantal and other strong Rayleigh measures. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **23**(1), 140–160.
- [33] M. Penrose (2003). *Random Geometric Graphs*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [34] Y. Peres and A. Sly (2014). Rigidity and tolerance for perturbed lattices. *arXiv:1409.4490*.
- [35] A. Poinas, B. Delyon, and F. Lavancier (2019). Mixing properties and central limit theorem for associated point processes. *Bernoulli*, **25**(3), 1724–1754.
- [36] R Development Core Team (2011). *R: a Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- [37] A. Soshnikov (2000). Determinantal random point fields. *Russian Math. Surveys* **55**, 923–975.
- [38] S. Torquato (2018). Hyperuniform states of matter. *Phys. Rep.* **745**, 1–95.
- [39] S. Torquato and F.H. Stillinger (2003). Local density fluctuations, hyperuniformity, and order metrics. *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 041–113.
- [40] W. Whitt (1984). Approximations for departure processes and queues in series. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* **31**(4), 499–521.
- [41] J.M. Wills (1973). Zur Gitterpunktanzahl konvexer Mengen. *Elem. Math.* **28**, 57–63.