

The Search Efficiency of Intermittent Lévy walks Optimally Scales with Target Size*

Brieuc Guinard and Amos Korman

IRIF, CNRS and University of Paris, France

Abstract

We address the general question of what is the best strategy to employ when searching for targets of unpredictable sizes. Motivated by biological scenarios, we focus on generalized random walk strategies, in which step-lengths follow a given distribution, while their direction is randomly uniform. To capture common biological scenarios in which motion degrades detection, we further restrict attention to *intermittent* settings, which means that the searcher can detect a target only while being “immobile”, that is, in-between moving steps. We prove that in a finite two-dimensional torus, an intermittent Lévy walk whose step-lengths are distributed according to an inverse-square power-law is a near-optimal strategy for finding sparse targets of any size and shape. Specifically, in a square torus of area n , and assuming that the detection radius is normalized to 1, the strategy finds any connected set of diameter D in $\tilde{O}(n/D)$ expected time, whereas $\Omega(n/D)$ is an unconditional lower bound on the expected time, that holds even when assuming that the shape and size of the target are known. Furthermore, this particular Lévy process stands in stark contrast to many other basic intermittent processes, including all other Lévy walks, which we prove to be extremely inefficient for wide ranges of target scales. Our results thus provide strong theoretical support for the optimality and robustness of intermittent Lévy walks under general conditions.

*This work has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No 648032).

1 Introduction

Lévy walks are random walks whose step lengths are distributed according to $p(\ell) \sim 1/\ell^\mu$, for some fixed $1 < \mu \leq 3$. These patterns are super-diffusive, characterised by frequent short move-steps and more rare long re-locations, see review in [36]. In the last two decades, empirical evidence has been accumulating for Lévy-like movement patterns in a myriad of biological systems, ranging from immune cells [13], swarming bacteria [2], snails [30], bees [29, 35], deer [11], marine predators [14, 32], albatrosses [15, 33, 34], to even humans [7, 28, 31]. In many of these cases, movement has been characterised by the Lévy pattern with exponent $\mu = 2$, hereafter termed *Cauchy walk* [10, 13, 14, 18, 29]. The universality of Lévy patterns gave rise to one of the most central questions in the field of optimal foraging: under which circumstances is it advantageous for a forager to adopt a Lévy movement pattern? In their highly influential work [34], Viswanathan et al. showed that when food resources are scarce and revisitable, the Cauchy walk consumes more food than other forms of Lévy walks. Despite its susceptibility to model assumptions [16, 27], the result in [34] has so far been the main theoretical argument for the optimality of such walks.

A crucial assumption used by Viswanathan et al. [34] is that the searcher can reliably detect targets throughout its movement. In many biological scenarios, however, motion strongly degrades detection and hence, stabilizing the sensory field often requires the animal to slow down significantly [4, 19, 25]. Aiming to capture this detection constraint, the model of *intermittent search* [6] assumes that targets cannot be detected during the ballistic relocation movements [5, 3, 23, 24, 21, 26]. Generalizing the family of Lévy walks within the intermittent framework, henceforth, we consider an *intermittent random walk* as a Markov chain of randomly oriented steps, whose lengths are chosen independently according to a given distribution, allowing detection of targets only at the last point of a step (see Fig. 1(a)).

A natural question is therefore to identify under which conditions is it advantageous to have an intermittent random walk strategy whose ballistic step-lengths follow a Lévy distribution. For the one-dimensional case, Lomholt et al. [21] showed that the detection time of the intermittent Cauchy walk strategy is significantly smaller than that of any 2-scales search strategy, which incorporates two step lengths. This result is consistent with a recent result showing that the search efficiency in one-dimension can improve polynomially by adding more step-lengths to the support of the random walk distribution [12]. The situation, however, is very different for two-dimensional topologies. Indeed, in the two-dimensional discrete $\sqrt{n} \times \sqrt{n}$ grid, the hitting time of the simple random walk is already quasi-linear in n [20], leaving a small gap for improvement.

The current study proposes a different criteria to evaluate the performances of search strategies, focusing on their robustness with respect to target size. Specifically, we evaluate a strategy by its ability to quickly locate a target that may appear in a variety of sizes and shapes. This measure is motivated by the fact that in multiple contexts, including ones for which Lévy patterns have been reported, targets may significantly vary in size. To name a few examples, this occurs when marine predators search for patches of fish [32], bees search for assemblages of flowers [35], swarming bacteria search for food concentrations [2], immune cells search for bacterial infections [13], or even when the eye scans the visual field [8].

In principle, as larger targets often entail higher rewards, an animal could benefit from optimizing the search with respect to such targets. However, tuning the intermittent search for larger targets may potentially cause inefficiency with respect to finding smaller, possibly more abundant,

targets. For example, in the non-intermittent setting in two-dimensional terrains, the ballistic strategy seems to find targets extremely fast [34]. However, as we shall show, in the intermittent setting, while this strategy is efficient at finding very large targets it is highly inefficient at finding small targets. Conversely, an intermittent walk with very small steps is close to a Brownian motion, and is hence very slow at going far away, and thus, as we shall show, inefficient at finding large targets. Overall, when targets appear in unpredictable sizes, it is unclear which intermittent strategy is best to employ.

1.1 Model

We consider an idealized model in which a searcher aims to quickly find a single target in a finite two-dimensional terrain with periodical boundary conditions. This is modelled as a two-dimensional square torus $\mathbb{T}_n = \sqrt{n} \times \sqrt{n}$ whose area is parametrized by n . The searcher starts the search at a point of the torus, denoted x_0 , chosen uniformly at random (u.a.r), and then moves according to some strategy. We consider a general family of random walk processes, composed of discrete randomly oriented ballistic steps. In these strategies, the length of a step ℓ is chosen according to a specified distribution p , while its direction is chosen uniformly at random. We are mainly interested in two families of random walk processes:

- A *Lévy walk* Z^μ on \mathbb{R}^2 , or X^μ on \mathbb{T}_n , for a given $\mu \in (1, 3]$ and maximal step $\ell_{max} > 1$ (possibly $\ell_{max} = \infty$), is the random walk process whose step-lengths are distributed according to

$$p(\ell) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } \ell \leq 1 \\ a\ell^{-\mu} & \text{if } \ell \in (1, \ell_{max}) \\ 0 & \text{if } \ell \geq \ell_{max} \end{cases} \quad , \quad (1)$$

where $a = (1 + \int_1^{\ell_{max}} \ell^{-\mu} d\ell)^{-1}$ is the normalization factor. When considering a Lévy process on the torus, we shall take $\ell_{max} = \sqrt{n}/2$. Note that as μ grows from 1 to 3, the behaviour changes from being almost ballistic to being diffusive-like [34]. When $\mu = 2$, we refer to the process as a *Cauchy walk*. The Cauchy walk on the torus is denoted X^{cauchy} .

- A *2-scales search*. The process takes a step of length $L > 1$ with probability q , and otherwise, with probability $1 - q$, it takes a step of length 1. This process approximates the typical model considered in the intermittent search literature, in which the process alternates between diffusive phases and ballistic ones [6].

For all processes, speed is assumed to be constant. Specifically, doing a step of length ℓ necessitates ℓ time units.

A *target* S is a connected subset of the torus. An *intermittent* searcher can detect a target only in-between steps. That is, the target S is *detected* if, at the end of a ballistic step, it is located within distance 1 — the sensing range — from the current location of the searcher. See Fig 1(a). Detecting S is therefore equivalent to visiting a point of the “extended set” $B(S)$, containing all points at distance at most 1 from S . The *detection time* of a process X with respect to S , denoted $t_{detect}^X(n, S)$, is the expected time until X detects S for the first time. Expectation is taken with




Figure 1: (a) Intermittent Lévy walk. The target S is marked in dark blue. The extended target $B(S) \supset S$ is marked in both light and dark blue. The Lévy searcher starts at the yellow point, and moves in discrete steps. A red circle signifies the area inspected at the end of a step - the ball $B(x)$ of radius 1 around the location x . The target S is detected on the 12th step of the process. (b) Illustration of the lower bound proof of Eq. (3). Consider a target S (colored blue) of diameter D (of any given shape). Color roughly $n/(3D+2)^2$ discs gray, so that each has radius $D+1$ and is located at a distance of D from its neighboring discs. Furthermore, align this structure so that the extended target $B(S)$ is located in one of the discs. Since the initial location of the searcher is uniform in the torus, with probability $\frac{1}{2}$, at least half of the discs need to be visited before detecting S . The time required to visit a new disc is at least the smallest distance between two discs, i.e., D . The detection time is therefore at least roughly $D \cdot n/(3D+2)^2 \approx n/D$.

respect to the randomness of X and the random initial location $X(0)$, which we recall, is chosen u.a.r.

As we show, it turns out that the important parameter governing the detection time is not the area of S , but rather its diameter D , namely, the maximal distance between any two points of S . Since the detection radius is 1, finding targets of smaller diameter takes roughly the same time, hence, in what follows we assume that $D \geq 1$. We define $t_{detect}^X(n, D)$ as the worst detection time, taken over the ensemble \mathcal{D} of all connected targets of diameter D , that is,

$$t_{detect}^X(n, D) := \sup_{S \in \mathcal{D}} \{t_{detect}^X(n, S)\}. \quad (2)$$

Competitive analysis. To evaluate efficiency with respect to a certain diameter D , we compare $t_{detect}^X(n, D)$ to $\text{opt}(n, D)$, namely, the best achievable detection time of a connected target whose diameter is D , regardless of its shape. Importantly, when computing this optimal value, we impose no restriction on the search strategy (except having constant speed), allowing it to detect while moving (i.e., be non-intermittent), use infinite memory, and, furthermore, be tuned to the shape and the diameter of the target. The following tight bound holds (see proof in Section 3.1, and a sketch of the lower bound in Fig 1(b)) for every $D \in [1, \sqrt{n}/2]$:

$$\text{opt}(n, D) = \Theta(n/D). \quad (3)$$

In order to quantify the sensitivity of a strategy to target scales, we consider the worst ratio between the detection time and the optimal detection time, taken over all diameters D . That is,

strategy X is called $\phi(n)$ -scale-sensitive if

$$\phi(n) = \sup_{D \in [1, \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}]} \{(D/n) \cdot t_{detect}^X(n, D)\}. \quad (4)$$

Note that the smaller $\phi(n)$ is the closer X is to the theoretically optimal bound simultaneously for all possible targets of diameter D , of any shape, and for every D .

To demonstrate the definition of scale-sensitivity, let us consider the intermittent process in which all step lengths are deterministically chosen to be some integer ℓ . Note that the case $\ell = 1$ corresponds to the simple random walk, and that taking $\ell = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$ may be viewed as a ballistic strategy. Consider first that the target is a disc of large diameter, say $D = \sqrt{n}/2$. Since the searcher starts at a random point, with constant probability, the target is located at a distance of at least $\sqrt{n}/2$ from the initial location of the searcher. In this case, merely traversing this distance by the random walk process requires expected $\Omega(n/\ell^2)$ steps and hence consumes $\Omega(n/\ell)$ time on expectation. This implies that the scale-sensitivity is $\Omega(\sqrt{n}/\ell)$. Consider next a target of diameter 1. In order to find it, the process requires $\Omega(n\ell)$ time, since $\Omega(n)$ expected number of steps are necessary, and each step takes ℓ time. Altogether, these arguments imply that the scale-sensitivity is at least $\Omega(\max\{\ell, \sqrt{n}/\ell\}) = \Omega(n^{1/4})$.

1.2 Our results

Lower bounds. In Section 3 we establish several lower bounds on the scale-sensitivities of basic intermittent strategies. We first prove that the scale-sensitivities of all intermittent Lévy walks other than Cauchy (i.e., the cases $\mu \neq 2$) are polynomial in n .

Theorem 1. *The scale-sensitivity of X^μ is*
$$\begin{cases} \Omega(n^{\varepsilon/2}) & \text{if } \mu = 2 \pm \varepsilon, \text{ where } 0 < \varepsilon < 1 \\ \Omega(\log n) & \text{if } \mu = 2 \\ \Omega\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log n}\right) & \text{if } \mu = 3 \end{cases}.$$

For the cases where $1 < \mu < 2$ the proof follows from the fact that the average step length is already polynomial in n , which means that the process is slow at finding small targets. For $2 < \mu \leq 3$, the lower bounds stem from the fact that such processes take long time to reach faraway locations. Hence, in comparison to the optimal strategy, these strategies are slow at finding large faraway targets.

We next prove that the scale-sensitivity of the 2-scale intermittent process is also polynomial in n (no attempt has been made to maximize the constant exponent in the lower bound).

Theorem 2. *The scale-sensitivity of any 2-scales intermittent search is $\Omega(n^{1/8})$.*

The scale-sensitivity of the Cauchy walk is poly-logarithmic. In Section 4 we establish our main result: An upper bound of $O(\log^3 n)$ on the scale-sensitivity of the Cauchy process on the torus. For this purpose, we first study the Cauchy process $Z = Z^2$ on the infinite plane \mathbb{R}^2 , that starts at the origin. Roughly speaking, we show that the location of this process at step m is more or less uniform in the ball of radius m around the origin. More precisely, we first establish the following lower bound on the p.d.f. of Z .




Figure 2: Detection time performances of Lévy walks on a 100×100 torus. On the left, the scale-sensitivity is plotted for a range of Lévy walks (parameterized by μ). On the right, a heat map is plotted where the darker colors signify the ratio between the expected detection time of a disc of diameter D and the optimal reference, taken as n/D .

Lemma 3. *For any constant $\alpha > 0$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for any integer $m \in [1, \alpha l_{max}]$, and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, with $\|x\| \leq m$,*

$$p^{Z(m)}(x) \geq \frac{c}{m^2}.$$

We then complement this lower bound with an upper bound on the probability to detect x .

Lemma 4. *For any constant $\alpha > 0$, there exists a constant $c' > 0$ such that, for any integer $m \in [2, \alpha l_{max}]$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have*

$$\Pr(Z(m) \in B(x)) \leq \frac{c' \log^2 m}{m^2}.$$

We next study the intermittent Cauchy process X^{cauchy} on the torus \mathbb{T}_n , and use the lower and upper bounds in Lemmas 3 and 4 to establish an upper bound on its detection time.

Theorem 5. *Consider the Cauchy walk X^{cauchy} on the torus \mathbb{T}_n . The maximal detection time of X^{cauchy} with respect to a target of diameter D is*

$$t_{\text{detect}}^{X^{\text{cauchy}}}(n, D) = O\left(\frac{n \log^3 n}{D}\right). \quad (5)$$

Consequently, the scale-sensitivity of X^{cauchy} is $O(\log^3 n)$.

Theorems 1 and 5 imply that the gap between the scale-sensitivity of the intermittent Cauchy process and scale-sensitivities of the other intermittent Lévy processes grows exponentially with the size of the torus. Based on simulations, Figure 2 demonstrates that this gap is evident even when the size of the torus is relatively small.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 More definitions

We consider a mobile agent that searches a target over an Euclidean domain Ω , which is either the infinite line \mathbb{R} , the infinite plane \mathbb{R}^2 , or the finite torus \mathbb{T}_n identified as the set $[-\sqrt{n}/2, \sqrt{n}/2]^2$ in \mathbb{R}^2 . For $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega$, we consider the standard norm $\|x\| = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}$.

The searcher moves according to some random process V on Ω . Recall that the *probability density function* (p.d.f.) for V is an integrable function p^V such that, for any interval (in \mathbb{R}) or square (in \mathbb{R}^2 or \mathbb{T}_n) A of Ω , we have

$$\Pr(V \in A) = \int_A p^V(x) dx.$$

If it exists, it is unique in the sense that if two functions have this property, then they are equal almost everywhere.

Definition 6. A *random walk process* on Ω is a process Z such that the initial position $Z(0)$ is given by some distribution (see below) and for every integer $m \geq 0$,

$$Z(m+1) = Z(m) + V(m+1),$$

where $(V(m))_{m \geq 1}$ are the independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) steps. The lengths of $\ell = \|V(m)\|$ of the steps are chosen according to some distribution $p(\ell)$, and the angle of each step is chosen uniformly at random. When $\Omega \in \{\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}\}$, unless stated otherwise, the initial position is the origin, i.e., $Z(0) = 0$. Conversely, when $\Omega = \mathbb{T}_n$, the initial position is taken to be uniform in the torus. In general, when the initial position is some $x \neq 0$, we often denote the process as Z^x to emphasise this fact. For technicality reasons, we impose that the process does not always stay in place, that is, the probability to move is greater than 0.

Recall from Section 1.1 the definition of the specific random walk processes — the Lévy (and Cauchy) walk with parameter μ and maximal step ℓ_{max} , and the 2-Scales search process. For an integer m , denote by $T(m)$ the random time taken by the walk up to step m , i.e.,

$$T(m) = \sum_{s=1}^m \|V(s)\|.$$

Denote by τ the average time (i.e., the average length) taken by a step, that is,

$$\tau = \mathbb{E}(\|V(m)\|).$$

Note that since $(V(m))_{m \geq 1}$ are i.i.d, the definition of τ is independent of the step m .

2.2 Expectations and variances of step-lengths

Claim 7. Consider the Lévy walk X^μ with maximal step length ℓ_{max} . The average length of a step (and hence the average time to take a step) is

$$\tau = \begin{cases} \Theta(\ell_{max}^{2-\mu}) & \text{if } \mu \in (1, 2) \\ \Theta(\log \ell_{max}) & \text{if } \mu = 2 \\ \Theta(1) & \text{if } \mu \in (2, 3] \end{cases}, \quad (6)$$

and the variance σ^2 and second moment M of a step-length are

$$\sigma^2 = \Theta(M) = \begin{cases} \Theta(\ell_{max}^{3-\mu}) & \text{if } \mu \in (1, 3) \\ \Theta(\log \ell_{max}) & \text{if } \mu = 3 \end{cases}. \quad (7)$$

Proof. Given the definition of p^μ , the expected step-length is

$$\tau = \int_0^1 a \ell d\ell + \int_1^{\ell_{max}} a \ell^{1-\mu} d\ell.$$

The first term is $\frac{a}{2}$, a constant, the second term is $\Theta(\ell_{max}^{2-\mu})$ if $\mu \neq 2$, and $\Theta(\log \ell_{max})$ if $\mu = 2$. The second moment M is computed likewise:

$$M = \int_0^{\ell_{max}} \ell^2 p^\mu(\ell) d\ell = \int_0^1 a \ell^2 d\ell + \int_1^{\ell_{max}} a \ell^{2-\mu} d\ell.$$

We have $\int_0^1 a \ell^2 d\ell = \frac{a}{3}$ for the first term, and for the second term

$$\int_1^{\ell_{max}} \ell^{2-\mu} d\ell = \begin{cases} \Theta(\ell_{max}^{3-\mu}) & \text{if } \mu < 3 \\ \Theta(\log(\ell_{max})) & \text{if } \mu = 3 \end{cases}.$$

Now remark that $\tau^2 = o(M)$, so that $\sigma^2 = \Theta(M)$. □

2.3 On the connection between time and number of steps

To ease the notation, we drop the dependency on n in several notations when it clear from the context. Let us denote by $m_{detect}^X(S)$ the random number of steps before X detects S for the first time (i.e., since the searcher has a perception radius 1, $m_{detect}^X(S)$ is the first m such that $X(m) \in B(S)$). By definition, the expected time before detecting S is $t_{detect}^X(S) = \mathbb{E}(T(m_{detect}^X(S)))$. We next argue that this time equals the average number of steps needed to hit S , multiplied by the average time τ needed for one step.

Claim 8. *For any intermittent random walk X on \mathbb{T}_n , and any set $S \subseteq \mathbb{T}_n$,*

$$t_{detect}^X(S) = \mathbb{E}(m_{detect}^X(S)) \cdot \tau,$$

where $\tau = \mathbb{E}(\|V(1)\|)$ is the expected step-length.

Claim 8 reminds of Wald's identity with respect to the lengths $(\|V(s)\|)_s$. However, Wald's identity cannot be applied directly because $m_{detect}^X(S)$ is not a stopping step¹ for the sequence $(\|V(s)\|)_s$. Instead, we prove the claim by the Martingale Stopping Theorem (that can also be used to prove Wald's identity).

Proof. To prove the claim, note that we can suppose that $\tau < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}(m_{detect}^X(S)) < \infty$. Indeed, if $\tau = \infty$, then even one step takes an infinite expected time. Moreover, since $p(0) < 1$ by definition, there exist $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ such that the probability that a length of a step is at least ε is at least δ . If

¹The usual terminology is *stopping time*, but we employ the term "step" here so as to emphasis that the variable counts steps.

$\mathbb{E}(m_{detect}^X(S)) = \infty$, then, after m steps, where m is large, there are roughly δm steps of length at least ε . Hence, if there is an infinite number of steps, then with probability 1 there is an infinite number of steps, each of which taking time at least ε . In both cases, we have $t_{detect}^X(S) = \infty$, and the equality is verified. In what follows we therefore assume that both $\tau < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}(m_{detect}^X(S)) < \infty$.

We start the proof by defining:

$$W(m) := \sum_{s \leq m} (\|V(s)\| - \tau).$$

The claim is proven by showing first that $(W(m))_m$ is a martingale with respect to $(X(m))_m$. Then, as $m_{detect}^X(S)$ is a stopping step for $(X(m))_m$ (i.e., the event $\{m_{detect}^X(S) = m\}$ depends only on $X(s)$, for $s \leq m$), we can apply the Martingale Stopping Theorem which gives $\sum_{s \leq m_{detect}^X(S)} (\|V_s\| - \tau) = 0$. In more details, recall, e.g., from [22][Definition 12.1], that a sequence of random variables $(W(m))_m$ is a *martingale* with respect to the sequence $(X(m))_m$ if, for all $m \geq 0$, the following conditions hold:

- $W(m)$ is a function of $X(0), X(1), \dots, X(m)$,
- $\mathbb{E}(|W(m)|) < \infty$,
- $\mathbb{E}(W(m+1) \mid X(0), \dots, X(m)) = W(m)$.

We first claim that $W(m) = \sum_{s \leq m} (V_s - \mathbb{E}(V_1))$ is a martingale with respect to $X(0), X(1), \dots$. Indeed, since $V(s) = X(s) - X(s-1)$, the first condition holds. Since $\mathbb{E}(|W(m)|) \leq \sum_{s \leq m} \mathbb{E}(|V_s - \tau|) \leq 2\tau m < \infty$, the second condition holds. Finally, since $W(m+1) = W(m) + \|V(m+1)\| - \tau$, we have $\mathbb{E}(W(m+1) \mid X(0), \dots, X(m)) = W(m) + \mathbb{E}(\|V(m+1)\|) - \tau = W(m)$, and hence the third condition holds as well.

Next, recall the Martingale Stopping Theorem (e.g., [22][Theorem 12.2]) which implies that $\mathbb{E}(W(M)) = \mathbb{E}(W(0))$, whenever the following three conditions hold:

- $W(0), W(1), \dots$ is a martingale with respect to $X(0), X(1), \dots$,
- M is a stopping step for $X(0), X(1), \dots$ such that $\mathbb{E}(M) < \infty$, and
- there is a constant c such that $\mathbb{E}(|W(m+1) - W(m)| \mid X(0), \dots, X(m)) < c$.

Let us prove that the conditions of the Martingale Stopping theorem hold. We have already seen that the first condition holds. Secondly, we have $\mathbb{E}(m_{detect}^X(S)) < \infty$ by hypothesis. Finally, we need to prove that $\mathbb{E}(|W(m+1) - W(m)| \mid X(0), \dots, X(m)) < c$ for some c independent of m . Since $W(m+1) - W(m) = \|V(m+1)\| - \tau$, we have $\mathbb{E}(|W(m+1) - W(m)| \mid X(0), \dots, X(m)) = \mathbb{E}(|\|V(m+1)\| - \tau|) \leq 2\tau$. Therefore, the conditions hold and the theorem gives:

$$\mathbb{E}(W(m_{detect}(S))) = \mathbb{E}(W(0)) = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \mathbb{E}(W(m_{detect}^X(S))) = \mathbb{E}\left(-m_{detect}^X(S)\tau + \sum_{s \leq m_{detect}^X(S)} \|V(s)\|\right) \\
&= -\mathbb{E}(m_{detect}^X(S))\tau + \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{s \leq m_{detect}^X(S)} \|V_s\|\right) \\
&= -\mathbb{E}(m_{detect}^X(S))\tau + t_{detect}^X(S),
\end{aligned}$$

which establishes Claim 8. □

2.4 Monotonicity

A function f on \mathbb{R}^2 is called *radial* if there is a function \tilde{f} on \mathbb{R}^+ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $f(x) = \tilde{f}(\|x\|)$. In this case we say that f is non-increasing if \tilde{f} is. The goal of this section is to prove the following.

Claim 9. *Let X and Y be two independent random variables with values in \mathbb{R}^2 , admitting probability density functions respectively f and g . Let h be the probability density functions of $X + Y$. If f and g are both radial and non-increasing functions then so is h .*

We shall soon prove the claim, but first, let us give a corollary, assuming the claim is true.

Corollary 10 (Monotonicity). *Let Z be a random walk process on \mathbb{R}^2 , starting at $Z(0) = 0$, with step-length distribution p . If p is non-increasing, then for any $m \geq 1$ the distribution $p^{Z(m)}$ of $Z(m)$ is radial and non-increasing. In particular, for any x, x' points in \mathbb{R}^2 with $\|x\| \leq \|x'\|$, we have $p^{Z(m)}(x') \leq p^{Z(m)}(x)$. Furthermore, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and any $m \geq 1$, $p^{Z(m)}(x) \leq \frac{1}{\pi\|x\|^2}$.*

Proof. The fact that $p^{Z(m)}$ is radial and non-increasing follows from Claim 9 by induction. Indeed, the step-length vectors $V(1), V(2), \dots$ are independent and, by hypothesis, admit a radial, non-increasing p.d.f. Hence so does $Z(m) = V(1) + V(2) + \dots + V(m)$. The upper bound on $p^{Z(m)}(x)$ follows easily. Indeed, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, consider the ball B of radius $\|x\|$ and centered at 0. We have $\int_B p_m^Z(y) dy \leq 1$, and by the monotonicity, $\int_B p_m^Z(y) dy \geq p_m^Z(x)|B| = p_m^Z(x) \cdot \pi \|x\|^2$. □

Proof of Claim 9. Let $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, denote by $rot_\theta(x)$ the point obtained by rotating x around the center 0 with an angle of θ . Then, by a change of variable, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
h(rot_\theta(x)) &= \int_{y \in \mathbb{R}^2} f(rot_\theta(x) - y)g(y)dy \\
&= \int_{y \in \mathbb{R}^2} f(rot_\theta(x) - rot_\theta(y))g(rot_\theta(y))dy \\
&= \int_{y \in \mathbb{R}^2} f(x - y)g(y)dy = h(x),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used in the last equality the radially of f and g . This establishes the fact that h is radial. Next, we prove, in a manner inspired by [1], that $h(x)$ is non-increasing with $\|x\|$. Since h is radial,

we can restrict the study to points of the non-negative y -axis. Let us fix $x = (0, x_2) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, and $x' = (0, x'_2) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ with $x'_2 \geq x_2$. Our goal is to show that $h(x) \geq h(x')$.

Let $\gamma = \frac{x'_2 - x_2}{2}$. Note that $f(0, x_2 + y) \geq f(0, x'_2 - y)$ for every $y \in (-\infty, \gamma]$. Define, for $y = (y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the function $H_{x, y_1}(y_2) = f(x - y)g(y)$. When y_1 is clear from the context, we shall write $H_x(y_2)$ instead of $H_{x, y_1}(y_2)$ for simplicity of notation. Now write, beginning with the change of variable $y_2 \mapsto -y_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &= \int_{y_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{y_2 \in \mathbb{R}} H_x(-y_2) dy_1 dy_2 = \int_{y_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{y_2 \in \mathbb{R}} H_x(-y_2 - \gamma) dy_1 dy_2 \\ &= \int_{y_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{y_2 \geq 0} H_x(-y_2 - \gamma) dy_2 + \int_{y_2 \leq 0} H_x(-y_2 - \gamma) dy_2 \right) dy_1 \\ &= \int_{y_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{y_2 \geq 0} H_x(-y_2 - \gamma) + H_x(y_2 - \gamma) dy_2 dy_1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h(x') &= \int_{y_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{y_2 \in \mathbb{R}} H_{x'}(y_2) dy_1 dy_2 \\ &= \int_{y_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{y_2 \geq \gamma} H_{x'}(y_2) + \int_{y_2 \leq \gamma} H_{x'}(y_2) dy_1 dy_2 \\ &= \int_{y_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{y_2 \geq 0} H_{x'}(y_2 + \gamma) dy_2 + \int_{y_2 \leq 0} H_{x'}(y_2 + \gamma) dy_2 \right) dy_1 \\ &= \int_{y_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{y_2 \geq 0} H_{x'}(y_2 + \gamma) + H_{x'}(-y_2 + \gamma) dy_2 \right) dy_1 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have that $h(x) - h(x')$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{y_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{y_2 \geq 0} f(-y_1, x_2 + y_2 + \gamma)g(y_1, -y_2 - \gamma) + f(-y_1, x_2 - y_2 + \gamma)g(y_1, y_2 - \gamma) \\ &\quad - f(-y_1, x'_2 - y_2 - \gamma)g(y_1, y_2 + \gamma) - f(-y_1, x'_2 + y_2 - \gamma)g(y_1, \gamma - y_2) dy_1 dy_2 \end{aligned}$$

Since g is radial, we have $g(y_1, -y_2 - \gamma) = g(y_1, y_2 + \gamma)$ and $g(y_1, \gamma - y_2) = g(y_1, y_2 - \gamma)$. Furthermore, using that $x_2 + \gamma = x'_2 - \gamma$, we obtain that $h(x) - h(x')$ is equal to:

$$\int_{y_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{y_2 \geq 0} (f(-y_1, x_2 + y_2 + \gamma) - f(-y_1, x_2 - y_2 + \gamma)) (g(y_1, y_2 + \gamma) - g(y_1, y_2 - \gamma)) dy_1 dy_2$$

In this summation, since $x_2 \geq 0$, $\gamma \geq 0$ and $y_2 \geq 0$, we have $|x_2 + y_2 + \gamma| \geq |x_2 - y_2 + \gamma|$ and $|y_2 + \gamma| \geq |y_2 - \gamma|$. Since f and g are non-increasing functions of the distance to 0, both factors of the integrand are non-negative, hence the integrand is non-negative and $h(x) - h(x') \geq 0$. \square

2.5 Projections of 2-dimensional Lévy walks are also Lévy

Consider a Lévy walk Z^μ with parameter μ on \mathbb{R}^2 , that has maximal step length ℓ_{max} (including the case $\ell_{max} = \infty$). The goal of this section is to prove that its projection on each of the axes is also a Lévy walk with parameter μ . Without loss of generality, we may consider only the projection Z_1^μ on the x -axis. Hence, we aim to prove the following.

Theorem 11. *The projection Z_1^μ of Z^μ is a Lévy walk on \mathbb{R} with parameter μ , in the sense that the p.d.f. of the step-lengths of X_1^μ is $p(\ell) \sim 1/\ell^\mu$, for $\ell \in [1, \frac{\ell_{max}}{2}]$. Furthermore, the variance of X_1^μ is*

$$\sigma^2 = \begin{cases} \Theta(\ell_{max}^{3-\mu}) & \text{if } \mu \in (1, 3) \\ \Theta(\log \ell_{max}) & \text{if } \mu = 3 \end{cases}.$$

Proof. It is clear that Z_1^μ is also a random walk that moves incrementally, with the increments between $Z_1^\mu(m)$ and $Z_1^\mu(m+1)$ being the projection $Z_1(m+1)$ of the chosen 2-dimensional vector $V(m+1) = Z^\mu(m+1) - Z^\mu(m)$. These projections are i.i.d. variables as the vectors $(V(m))_m$ are i.i.d. variables, and their signs are \pm with equal probability. Hence, all that needs to be verified is that $l_1 := |V_1(1)|$ has a Lévy distribution with parameter μ .

Let V be one step-length drawn according to a Lévy distribution p^μ . Recall that

$$p^\mu(\ell) = \begin{cases} a_\mu & \text{if } \ell \leq 1 \\ a_\mu \ell^{-\mu} & \text{if } \ell \in [1, \ell_{max}) \\ 0 & \text{if } \ell \geq \ell_{max} \end{cases},$$

where a_μ is the normalization factor, with $a_\mu = \frac{1}{1 + \int_1^{\ell_{max}} \ell^{-\mu} d\ell} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1-\mu}{1-\ell_{max}^{1-\mu}}} \in [1 - \frac{1}{\mu}]$. Hence the distribution of $V = (V_1, V_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is

$$p^V(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\|x\|} p^\mu(\|x\|) = \begin{cases} \frac{a_\mu}{2\pi} \|x\|^{-1} & \text{if } \|x\| \leq 1 \\ \frac{a_\mu}{2\pi} \|x\|^{-\mu-1} & \text{if } \|x\| \in [1, \ell_{max}) \\ 0 & \text{if } \|x\| \geq \ell_{max} \end{cases}. \quad (8)$$

For $x_1 \in (0, \ell_{max})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p^{l_1}(x_1) &= 2 \int_0^{\sqrt{\ell_{max}^2 - x_1^2}} p^V(x_1, x_2) dx_2 \\ &= \frac{2a_\mu}{2\pi} \int_0^{\sqrt{\ell_{max}^2 - x_1^2}} \mathbf{1}_{\|x\| < 1} \frac{1}{\|x\|} + \mathbf{1}_{\|x\| \geq 1} \frac{1}{\|x\|^{1+\mu}} dx_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $x = (x_1, x_2)$. If $|x_1| \geq 1$, then $\|x\| \geq 1$ for any $x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} p^{l_1}(x_1) &= \frac{a_\mu}{\pi} \int_0^{\sqrt{\ell_{max}^2 - x_1^2}} \frac{1}{(x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{\frac{1+\mu}{2}}} dx_2 \\ &= \frac{a_\mu}{\pi} \frac{1}{x_1^\mu} I(x_1), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$I(x_1) := \int_0^{\sqrt{\frac{\ell_{max}^2}{x_1^2} - 1}} \frac{1}{(1+y^2)^{\frac{1+\mu}{2}}} dy.$$

For any $x_1 \in (1, \ell_{max})$, we have $I(x_1) \leq \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{(1+y^2)^{\frac{1+\mu}{2}}} dy = O(1)$ since $\frac{1}{(1+y^2)^{\frac{1+\mu}{2}}} = \Theta(y^{-\mu})$, for large y , and this function of y is integrable as $\mu > 1$. Furthermore, if $|x_1| \leq \ell_{max}/2$, we have

$I(x_1) \geq \int_0^1 \frac{1}{(1+y^2)^{\frac{1+\mu}{2}}} dy$ which is a positive constant. Hence, if $|x_1| \in (1, \ell_{max}/2)$, we have

$$p^{l_1}(x_1) = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{x_1^\mu}\right), \quad (9)$$

and for $\ell_{max}/2 \leq x_1 \leq \ell_{max}$, we have

$$p^{l_1}(x_1) = O\left(\frac{1}{x_1^\mu}\right). \quad (10)$$

Hence, the projection of the Lévy walk on the axes are Lévy-like, in the sense that their step-lengths distributions generally follow a power-law of same exponent μ . The expected length, second moment and variance of one projected step are computed as in Claim 7. Indeed write, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\int_0^{\ell_{max}} x_1^i p^{l_1}(x_1) dx_1 = \Theta\left(\int_0^1 x_1^i p^{l_1}(x_1) dx_1 + \int_1^{\ell_{max}/2} x_1^{i-\mu} dx_1 + \int_{\ell_{max}/2}^{\ell_{max}} x_1^i p^{l_1}(x_1) dx_1\right).$$

We have $\int_0^1 x_1^i p^{l_1}(x_1) dx_1 \leq 1$. Also, it is easy to verify from Eq. (9) and (10) that the third term is dominated by the second term, which in turn, is $\Theta(\int_1^{\ell_{max}} x_1^{i-\mu} dx_1)$. Hence, the expected length, second moment and variance of one projected step are of the same order as those of the non-projected steps given by Claim 7, which concludes the proof of Theorem 11. \square

3 Lower bounds

3.1 General Lower Bounds

We begin with a general proposition that holds for any search process X on the torus whose speed is constant (i.e. it takes ℓ units of time to do a ballistic step of length ℓ). We next define a quantity, termed T_D , which will be used to lower bound the time needed to detect an extended target $B(S)$ at distance D or more. Formally, we distinguish three cases, according to the given process X .

- If X is an intermittent random walk, we let T_D be the expected time needed before the end point of a step is at a distance at least D from the initial location.
- If X is a random walk but non-intermittent (i.e., can detect while moving) then T_D is defined as the expected time until X is at a distance of at least D from the initial location (note that this may happen in the middle of a step).
- In all other cases, we simply define $T_D = D$.

Note that since for any process (whose speed is constant) it takes at least time D to reach a distance D , we always have $T_D \geq D$.

Claim 12. *Let X be any search process on the torus. Consider any target S of diameter $D < \sqrt{n}/6 - 1$. The expected number of steps required to detect S is $\Omega(n/D^2)$, and the expected time to detect S is $\Omega(n \frac{T_D}{D^2})$.*

Proof. Consider a target S of diameter D and of an arbitrary shape. Let us first construct an $s \times s$ grid, where $s = \lfloor \sqrt{n}/(3D + 2) \rfloor$. Note that since $D < \sqrt{n}/6 - 1$, we have $s \geq 2$. To make the grid symmetric, we let the distance between two neighboring points be precisely \sqrt{n}/s . We next align the grid so that one of its nodes u^* is in S , and construct a disc of radius $D + 1$ around each node. Note that the distance between any two discs is at least D . See Fig 1(b). Furthermore, note that the disc U^* corresponding to u^* fully contains the extended target $B(S)$. Because the initial location of the searcher $X(0)$ is uniform in the torus, from the perspective of the searcher, each of the discs has an equal probability to be U^* . It follows that with probability $1/2$, at least half of the discs are visited, before the searcher visits U^* . This implies that the expected time to detect S is at least

$$\Omega\left(\mathbb{E}(t_1) + \dots + \mathbb{E}(t_{\lfloor \frac{M}{2} \rfloor})\right),$$

where t_i is the time duration from the i 'th visited disc to the $i + 1$ 'st visited disc, in the event \mathcal{A} that at least $\lfloor \frac{M}{2} \rfloor$ discs are visited before detecting S . Since different discs are separated by a distance of at least D , each $\mathbb{E}(t_i)$ is lower bounded by the expected time until going to distance D or more, i.e. $\mathbb{E}(t_i) \geq T_D$. This proves that the expected time to detect S is $\Omega(M \cdot T_D) = \Omega(n \frac{T_D}{D^2})$. This completes the proof of Claim 12. \square

Corollary 13. *For every $1 \leq D \leq \sqrt{n}/2$, the best possible detection time is $\Theta(n/D)$, when we allow the strategy to be non-intermittent, unrestricted in terms of its internal computational power and navigation abilities, and fully tuned to the diameter. In other words, $\text{opt}(n, D) = \Theta(n/D)$. Moreover, the scale-sensitivity of X is $\Omega(\sup_{D \in [1, \frac{\sqrt{n}}{6}]} T_D/D)$.*

Proof. The fact that $\text{opt}(n, D) = \Omega(n/D)$ for every $D < \sqrt{n}/6 - 1$ follows immediately from Claim 12 and the fact that $T_D \geq D$. For $\sqrt{n}/6 - 1 < D \leq \sqrt{n}/2$ the $\Omega(n/D) = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$ bound follows simply because with constant probability, the target is at distance $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ from the initial location of the searcher.

In order to see why $\text{opt}(n, D) = O(n/D)$, let us tile the torus with horizontal and vertical lines partitioning the torus into squares of size $D/2 \times D/2$ each. In the case that \sqrt{n} is not a multiple of $D/2$, we might have few of these squares smaller than $D/2 \times D/2$. It is clear that this can be constructed while maintaining that the number of horizontal and vertical lines is $O(\sqrt{n}/D)$. For any connected target S of diameter D , the set $B(S)$ must intersect at least one of these lines. Now consider a deterministic strategy that repeatedly walks over this tiling exhaustively, without doing much repetition in each exhaustive search. E.g., by first walking on the horizontal lines exhaustively (with occasional steps to move between horizontal lines) and then walking on the vertical lines exhaustively. It is easy to see that such a strategy exists and requires at most $O(\sqrt{n}/D \cdot \sqrt{n}) = O(n/D)$ time to pass over all the lines, and hence to detect the target. This establishes the required upper bound.

The claim regarding the scale-sensitivity now follows by Claim 12 and the definition in Eq. 4. This completes the proof of Corollary 13. \square

Claim 12, applied with $D = 1$, also yields the following corollary, by remarking that for intermittent random walk processes, T_1 , namely, the expected time until the end point of a step is at a distance of at least 1 is at least the expected time for one step τ , i.e., $T_1 \geq \tau$.

Corollary 14. *The scale-sensitivity of an intermittent random walk strategy X is $\Omega(\tau)$.*

Claim 15. Consider an intermittent random walk process on the torus \mathbb{T}_n . If L is the maximal length in the support of the step-length distribution, then the expected time needed to go to a distance $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ is $\Omega(\frac{n}{L})$. Consequently the scale-sensitivity of the walk is $\Omega(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{L})$.

Proof. Intuitively, if the goal of the walk is to go far, then all steps of length $\ell < L$ should be replaced by steps of length L . In this case, the walk becomes a simple (one step-length) random walk, of length L . The expected number of steps N needed for it to go to a distance of \sqrt{n} is the same as the expected number of steps needed for the simple random walk (i.e., with step-length $\ell = 1$), reach a distance of \sqrt{n}/L . Hence, $N = \Theta(\frac{n}{L^2})$. Since each step costs L time, the expected time to go to distance \sqrt{n} is then $\Omega(\frac{n}{L})$. We next prove the claim formally.

Since the time it takes for a random walk process on \mathbb{T}_n to go to distance $d = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$ is at least that of the same process on \mathbb{R} , we may study a random walk $X = (X_1, X_2)$ on \mathbb{R} , of maximal step-length L . Then, X_1 also has maximal length L . Denote by μ_1 and σ_1 the mean and standard deviation of the step-length distribution p_1 of X_1 . We have:

$$\sigma_1^2 = \int_0^L p_1(\ell)\ell^2 d\ell \leq \int_0^L p_1(\ell)\ell \cdot L d\ell = L\mu_1. \quad (11)$$

In [9], it is proved that the (maximal) distance $d_{max}(m)$ reached by any such random walk strategy on \mathbb{R} during m steps verifies $\mathbb{E}(d_{max}(m)) = \Theta(\sqrt{m}\sigma_1)$. We, on the other hand, are interested in m_d , the (random) number of steps needed to reach distance at least d . Note that for $m \geq m_d$, we have $d_{max}(m) \geq d_{max}(m_d) \geq d$. Therefore, by Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}(d_{2\mathbb{E}(m_d)}) \geq \mathbb{E}(d_{2\mathbb{E}(m_d)} \mid m_d < 2\mathbb{E}(m_d)) \cdot \Pr(m_d < 2\mathbb{E}(m_d)) \geq d \cdot \frac{1}{2}. \quad (12)$$

Now using the result of [9], we have $\mathbb{E}(d_{2\mathbb{E}(m_d)}) = \Theta(\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(m_d)}\sigma_1)$ and hence, by Eq. (12),

$$\mathbb{E}(m_d) = \Omega\left(\frac{d^2}{\sigma_1^2}\right).$$

We are interested in $\mathbb{E}(T(m_d))$, the expected time needed to reach distance d . Claim 8 states the intuitive equality $\mathbb{E}(T(m_d)) = \mathbb{E}(m_d) \cdot \tau$, i.e., the hitting time is the expected number of steps, multiplied by the average time of a step. Note that Claim 8 is stated with respect to the hitting step of a given set. Hence, we can apply it with respect to m_d , since m_d is the hitting step of the set of nodes at distance d or more. We thus obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(T(m_d)) = \Omega\left(\frac{d^2}{\sigma_1^2} \cdot \mu_1\right) = \Omega(d^2/L) = \Omega(n/L),$$

where the second equality comes from Eq. (11).

Finally, regarding the scale-sensitivity claim, consider a target of diameter $D = c\sqrt{n}$, where c is a sufficiently small constant. With constant probability, on the projection of the first coordinate, the distance between $X_1(0)$ and the (projected) target is $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$. Conditioning on this event, in order to detect the target, the process X_1 needs to reach this distance. Thus, X needs an expected time $\Omega(\frac{n}{L})$ before detecting the target. On the other hand, an optimal process on \mathbb{T}_n finds such a target in roughly $\frac{n}{D} = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$ time. Hence, the scale-sensitivity of a random walk of maximal length L is at least $\Omega(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{L})$. \square

3.2 Lower Bounds for Lévy Walks

Theorem 1 (restated). *The scale-sensitivity of X^μ is*

$$\begin{cases} \Omega(n^{\varepsilon/2}) & \text{if } \mu = 2 \pm \varepsilon, \text{ where } 0 < \varepsilon < 1 \\ \Omega(\log n) & \text{if } \mu = 2 \\ \Omega\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log n}\right) & \text{if } \mu = 3 \end{cases}.$$

Proof. Consider first the case $1 < \mu < 2$. By Corollary 14, the scale-sensitivity is $\Omega(\tau)$ where τ is the expected step length, and is given by Claim 7, using that $\ell_{max} = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$:

$$\tau = \Theta(n^{1-\frac{\mu}{2}}).$$

Hence, the scale-sensitivity of the Lévy walk of parameter $1 < \mu < 2$ is $\Omega(n^{1-\frac{\mu}{2}})$. Writing $\mu = 2 - \varepsilon$ for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we get that the scale-sensitivity is $\Omega(n^{\varepsilon/2})$, as stated in the first item of the theorem.

For $\mu = 2$, corresponding to the Cauchy process, the argument is the same, plugging the value $\tau = \Theta(\log n)$ from Claim 7.

It remains to prove the theorem for the case $2 < \mu \leq 3$. To analyse this case, we first establish the following.

Claim 16. *Let X^μ be a Lévy walk process on the torus \mathbb{T}_n , for $\mu \in (2, 3]$. The expected time required to reach a distance of $d = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$ from the starting point is $\Omega(n^{\frac{\mu-1}{2}})$ for $\mu \in (2, 3)$ and $\Omega(\frac{n}{\log n})$ for $\mu = 3$.*

Assuming Claim 16, we use Claim 12, applied with $D = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$, to obtain that the scale-sensitivity of X^μ is at least:

$$\Omega\left(\frac{T}{\sqrt{n}}\right) = \begin{cases} \Omega(n^{\frac{\mu}{2}-1}) & \text{if } \mu \in (2, 3) \\ \Omega\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log n}\right) & \text{if } \mu = 3 \end{cases},$$

as stated in the second and third items of the theorem. It therefore remains to prove Claim 16.

Let m_d denote the random number of *steps* before the process reaches a distance of at least d . As mentioned in the proof of Claim 15, Claim 8 implies that $\mathbb{E}(T(m_d)) = \mathbb{E}(m_d) \cdot \tau$ where τ is the expected length of a jump.

Let Z^μ be the process on \mathbb{R}^2 , with $Z(0) = X(0) = (0, 0)$ and evolving with the same steps as X^μ . Since the distance from the origin in \mathbb{R}^2 is always at least that of the process on \mathbb{T}_n , the number of steps needed to go to distance d in \mathbb{T}_n is at least as high as in \mathbb{R}^2 . Hence, we may analyze the process Z^μ instead of X^μ .

Define $d_{max}(m)$ as the maximal distance (from the initial point) that the process reached from step 0 up to step m , i.e.,

$$d_{max}(m) = \max_{s \leq m} \|Z^\mu(0) - Z^\mu(s)\|.$$

As stated in Theorem 11, the projection of Z^μ on each coordinate is also a Lévy walk process with the same parameter μ , and admits a standard deviation σ' . Let $d_{i,max}(m)$ be the maximal distance reached by the projection on coordinate $i = 1, 2$. Since the steps are independent, the standard deviation of $Z_i(s)$, for $s \leq m$, is $\sqrt{s}\sigma' \leq \sqrt{m}\sigma'$.

By Kolmogorov's inequality, we have for any $\lambda > 0$, $\Pr(d_{i,max}(m) \geq \lambda\sqrt{m}\sigma') \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2}$. Furthermore, since $d_{max}(m) \leq \sqrt{2} \max\{d_{1,max}(m), d_{2,max}(m)\}$, we have by a union bound argument, for

any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\Pr(d_{max}(m) \geq \lambda\sqrt{m}\sigma') \leq \Pr\left(d_{1,max}(m) \geq \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{m}\sigma'\right) + \Pr\left(d_{2,max}(m) \geq \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{m}\sigma'\right) \leq \frac{4}{\lambda^2}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(d_{max}(m)) &= \int_{s=0}^{\infty} \Pr(d_{max}(m) \geq s) ds \leq \sum_{\lambda=0}^{\infty} \int_{\lambda'=0}^{\sqrt{m}\sigma'} \Pr(d_{max}(m) \geq \lambda\sqrt{m}\sigma' + \lambda') d\lambda' \\ &\leq (\sqrt{m}\sigma' + 1) \left(\sum_{\lambda \geq 0} \Pr(d_{max}(m) \geq \lambda\sqrt{m}\sigma') \right) = O(\sqrt{m}\sigma'). \end{aligned}$$

As given by Theorem 11 (with $\ell_{max} = \sqrt{n}/2$), the variance σ'^2 of the projected law is:

$$\sigma'^2 = \Theta(\sigma^2) = \begin{cases} \Theta(n^{\frac{3-\mu}{2}}) & \text{if } \mu \in (2, 3) \\ \Theta(\log n) & \text{if } \mu = 3 \end{cases}. \quad (13)$$

Next, the expectation of m_d can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}(m_d) = \sum_{m \geq 0} \Pr(m_d > m),$$

and, as $m_d > m$ if and only if $d_{max}(m) < d$, denoting by M the set containing all integers m such that $d \geq 2\mathbb{E}(d_{max}(m))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(m_d) &= \sum_{m \geq 0} \Pr(m_d > m) \geq \sum_{m \geq 0} \Pr(d_{max}(m) < d) \\ &\geq \sum_{m \in M} \Pr(d_{max}(m) < 2\mathbb{E}(d_{max}(m))) \\ &\geq \sum_{m \in M} \frac{1}{2} = \Omega(|M|), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Markov's inequality in the fourth transition. We next argue that

$$|M| = \Omega\left(\frac{d^2}{\sigma'^2}\right). \quad (14)$$

Indeed, let $c > 0$ be some constant such that $\mathbb{E}(d_{max}(m)) \leq c\sqrt{m}\sigma'$. Now take any $m \leq \frac{1}{(2c)^2} \frac{d^2}{\sigma'^2}$. Then $d \geq 2c\sqrt{m}\sigma' \geq 2\mathbb{E}(d_{max}(m))$, and so $m \in M$. This establishes Eq. (14), implying that

$$\mathbb{E}(m_d) = \Omega\left(\frac{d^2}{\sigma'^2}\right).$$

Plugging in the value of σ'^2 from Eq (13) establishes the proof of Claim 16, and thus concludes the proof of Theorem 1. \square

3.3 A Lower Bound for 2-Scales Intermittent Search

Our next goal is to prove the following lower bound.

Theorem 2 (restated). *The scale-sensitivity of any 2-scales intermittent search is $\Omega(n^{1/8})$.*

Proof. Let X be a 2-steps process with large step L , for some $L > 1$. In order to prove the theorem, we begin with the following claim.

Claim 17. *Assume that the probability to do a step of length L is $q \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. For every $d \in [1, q^{-1/2}]$, it takes time $\Omega(d^2)$ to go to distance $\Omega(d)$, i.e., $T_d = \Omega(d^2)$.*

Proof of Claim 17. In order to prove the claim, let \mathcal{A} be the event that the first $\lfloor \frac{1}{q} \rfloor$ steps are of length 1. This happens with probability $(1 - q)^{\lfloor \frac{1}{q} \rfloor} \geq (1 - q)^{\frac{1}{q}} = e^{\frac{1}{q} \log(1-q)} \geq \frac{1}{4}$ as the function $\frac{1}{q} \log(1 - q)$ decreases with $q \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Conditionally on \mathcal{A} , the process is a simple random walk, at least until the $\lfloor \frac{1}{q} \rfloor + 1$ 'st step. Hence, for every $d \in [1, q^{-1/2}]$, the expected time to go to distance d , conditioning on \mathcal{A} , is $\Omega(d^2)$. Since \mathcal{A} happens with constant probability, we find that the expected time to go to distance d (without conditioning on \mathcal{A}) is also $\Omega(d^2)$. This completes the proof of Claim 17. \square

Combining Corollary 13 and Claim 17, we find that the scale-sensitivity of X is

$$\Omega \left(\sup_{d \leq \min\{\sqrt{n}/6, \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}}\}} d^2/d \right) = \Omega \left(\min \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{n}}{6}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \right\} \right).$$

If the minimum of these two terms is $\frac{\sqrt{n}}{6}$, then we have proved Theorem 2. Let us therefore continue by supposing that this lower bound is $\Omega(1/\sqrt{q})$. Note that this is valid also if $q \geq \frac{1}{2}$ as the bound is, in this case, simply $\Omega(1)$. Furthermore, since the expected time taken by one jump is $1 - q + qL \geq qL$, we have by Corollary 14 that the scale-sensitivity is at least qL .

Hence the scale-sensitivity of X is at least $\max\{1/\sqrt{q}, qL\}$. This is minimized when both terms are equal, i.e., when $q^{3/2} = \frac{1}{L}$ which implies that the scale-sensitivity is at least $L^{1/3}$.

Finally, combining this result with Claim 15, we get that the scale-sensitivity is at least

$$\max \left\{ L^{1/3}, \frac{\sqrt{n}}{L} \right\}.$$

Minimizing this, we find that the scale-sensitivity of X is $\Omega(n^{1/8})$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2. \square

4 Scale-sensitivity of the intermittent Cauchy Walk

We take $n > 4$ for technical reasons, and let $\ell_{max} = \sqrt{n}/2$. Recall from Theorem 1 that the scale-sensitivity of the Cauchy walk X^{cauchy} on the torus is $\Omega(\log n)$. The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem which states that this lower bound is nearly matched.

Theorem 18. *Consider the Cauchy walk process X^{cauchy} on the torus \mathbb{T}_n . The hitting time of X^{cauchy} with respect to a target of diameter D is*

$$t_{\text{detect}}^{X^{\text{cauchy}}}(n, D) = O \left(\frac{n \log^3 n}{D} \right).$$

Consequently, the scale-sensitivity of X^{cauchy} is $O(\log^3 n)$.

Theorem 18 concerns the Cauchy walk on the two-dimensional torus. As the one-dimensional Cauchy walk is fairly well understood [21, 36], it is tempting to analyze the two-dimensional walk by projecting it on the two axes and using the properties of the one-dimensional walk on these projections. However, this approach needs to somehow handle the fact that these projections are not independent of each other. As we could not find an easy way to overcome this dependence issue, we prove Theorem 18 following a different line of arguments, that directly examine the two-dimensional process.

When proving Theorem 18, we shall in fact show a stronger claim: That, regardless of where the process starts, X^{cauchy} detects any given set S of diameter D is expected time $t_{\text{detect}}^{X^{\text{cauchy}}}(n, S) = O((n \log^3 n)/D)$. In order to show this, we can assume without loss of generality that the process starts at the origin, i.e., that $X^{\text{cauchy}}(0) = 0$.

Claim 8 implies that in order to find the detecting time $t_{\text{detect}}^{X^{\text{cauchy}}}(S)$ of S , it is sufficient to identify the expected number of steps until detecting S , as

$$t_{\text{detect}}^{X^{\text{cauchy}}}(S) = \mathbb{E}(m_{\text{detect}}^{X^{\text{cauchy}}}(S)) \cdot \tau = \Theta(\mathbb{E}(m_{\text{detect}}^{X^{\text{cauchy}}}(S)) \cdot \log n).$$

Now let Z be the process on \mathbb{R}^2 that evolves with the same steps $V(s)$ as X^{cauchy} , i.e. $Z(m) = \sum_{s=1}^m V(s)$. Note that the projection of Z on the torus $[-\sqrt{n}/2, \sqrt{n}/2]^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is X^{cauchy} , as all steps $V(s)$ have maximal length $\sqrt{n}/2$, and hence, are not modified under the projection.

The next lemma establishes a connection between $\mathbb{E}(m_{\text{detect}}^{X^{\text{cauchy}}}(S))$ and the process Z on \mathbb{R}^2 . Given a set S , recall that $B(S)$ is the set of points at distance at most 1 from S , and that $Z(m)$ detects S if and only if $Z(m) \in B(S)$.

Lemma 19. *Consider a random walk process Z on \mathbb{R}^2 and its projection X on the torus \mathbb{T}_n . Let \mathcal{D} be the set of connected subsets $S \subset \mathbb{T}_n$ of diameter D . For any m_0 ,*

$$\mathbb{E}(m_{\text{detect}}^X(n, D)) = O \left(m_0 \cdot \sup_{S \in \mathcal{D}} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{m=0}^{m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(S) \mid Z(0) \in B(S))}{\sum_{m=m_0}^{2m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(S))} \right\} \right). \quad (15)$$

We provide a formal proof of Lemma 19 in Section 4.1. The proof is based on the technique in [1], relying on the identity $\Pr(N \geq 1) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(N)}{\mathbb{E}(N \mid N \geq 1)}$, that holds for any non-negative random variable N .

Lemma 19 allows to deduce Theorem 18 from pointwise bounds on the Cauchy process Z on \mathbb{R}^2 , defined by Eq. (1). The next lemma provides a lower bound on the p.d.f $p^{Z(m)}$, of the process at step m .

Lemma 3 (restated). *For any constant $\alpha > 0$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for any integer $m \in [1, \alpha \ell_{\max}]$, and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, with $\|x\| \leq m$,*

$$p^{Z(m)}(x) \geq \frac{c}{m^2}.$$

From Lemma 3, we immediately deduce that the probability that $Z(m)$ detects a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is $\Omega(\int_{y \in B(x)} cm^{-2} dy) = \Omega(cm^{-2})$, where $B(x) = B(\{x\})$. This lower bound is complemented by the following upper bound.

Lemma 4 (restated). *For any constant $\alpha > 0$, there exists a constant $c' > 0$ such that, for any integer $m \in [2, \alpha \ell_{\max}]$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have*

$$\Pr(Z(m) \in B(x)) \leq \frac{c' \log^2 m}{m^2}.$$

Lemmas 3 and 4 are formally proved in Section 4.2. Let us give here a sketch of the proofs. Using the monotonicity property, the lower bound stated in Lemma 3 follows once we prove that with at least some constant probability, the process at step m belongs to the ring $\{x \mid \|x\| \in [m, cm]\}$ for some constant $c > 1$. This is because the area of this ring is roughly m^2 , and each point in it is farther from 0 than x , and hence, by monotonicity, less likely to be visited at step m . In order to establish the lower bound on the probability to be in the ring at step m , we first prove that with some constant probability, at some step before m , the walk goes to a distance at least $2m$.

Next, conditioning on that event, we prove that with a constant probability, the walk does not get much farther away, stays at a distance of at least m . To prove the latter claim, we use Chebyshev's inequality. It implies, for a one-dimensional process, that the distance traveled in m steps is governed by \sqrt{m} times the standard deviation of the step-length process. Here the standard deviation is too large (roughly \sqrt{n}), however, we can reduce it by conditioning on the event that none of the m step-lengths are significantly larger than m , which occurs with a constant probability. Finally, we prove that by taking a sufficiently large constant c , it can be guaranteed that with a large constant probability, the walk at step m is at most at distance cm . Making sure that all these constant probability events happen simultaneously, we then establish the desired constant lower bound on the probability to be in the aforementioned ring at step m .

For the proof of the upper bound in Lemma 4, we first show that because of the monotonicity property, it is sufficient to prove that the probability to detect 0 at step m is small, i.e., that

$$\Pr(Z(m) \in B(0)) = O\left(\frac{\log^2 m}{m^2}\right).$$

Intuitively, to establish this, we first argue that with high probability in m , at some step before step m , the process has gone to a distance $d = \Omega\left(\frac{m}{\log m}\right)$. By Corollary 10, the probability density function at any point in $B(0)$ would then be at most $O\left(\frac{1}{d^2}\right)$, which is the desired bound.

Proof of Theorem 18, assuming the aforementioned Lemmas. Given the connected set S of diameter $D \geq 1$, we first construct a subset S' , containing $\Theta(D)$ isolated points of S that stretch over distance of roughly D , as follows. Take two points $u = (u_1, u_2)$ and $v = (v_1, v_2)$ in S that are at distance D from each other, so that $\max\{|u_1 - v_1|, |u_2 - v_2|\} \geq D/2$. Let us assume, without loss of generality, that $v_1 - u_1 \geq D/2$. Since S is connected, for every $z \in [u_1, v_1]$, there exists $\phi(z)$ such that $(z, \phi(z)) \in S$. Let $d = \lceil v_1 - u_1 \rceil = \Theta(D)$. For integer $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor d \rfloor\}$, define

$$s(i) = (u_1 + i, \phi(u_1 + i)),$$

and let $S' = \{s(i) \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor d \rfloor\}$. Note that $|S'| = \Theta(D)$. Since $S' \subseteq S$, an upper bound on the detecting time of S' is an upper bound on the detecting time of S . It is therefore sufficient to restrict attention to S' and upper bound its detecting time. For that purpose we need to bound the time until visiting a point in $B(S')$, the set of points of distance at most 1 from S' . Note that the area of $B(S')$ is $|B(S')| = \Omega(D)$. We also remark, that although $B(S')$ may not be connected,

it may help the reader to imagine $B(S')$ as a horizontal cylinder of length $\Theta(D)$ and radius 1, i.e., to consider that $\phi(u_1 + i)$ does not depend on i . Indeed, we will not require any condition on the y -coordinates of the $s(i)$'s.

In order to upper bound $\mathbb{E}(m_{detect}^{X^{cauchy}}(B(S')))$ we shall apply Lemma 19 with $m_0 = \sqrt{n}$. Note that $2m_0 \leq \alpha \ell_{max}$ for $\alpha = 4$. We shall furthermore lower bound the denominator in the r.h.s of Eq. (19) and upper bound the numerator. Both these terms concern the Cauchy process Z with cut off ℓ_{max} on \mathbb{R}^2 .

Let us begin with the lower bound. With this setting of m_0 , any $x \in B(S') \subseteq B(\mathbb{T}_n) \subseteq [-\sqrt{n}/2 - 1, \sqrt{n}/2 + 1]^2$ trivially satisfies $\|x\| \leq m$, for any $m \geq m_0 + 1$, and we can apply Lemma 3 to get a lower bound on the denominator in the r.h.s of Eq. (19):

$$\sum_{m=m_0+1}^{2m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(S')) = \sum_{m=m_0+1}^{2m_0} \int_{x \in B(S')} p_m^Z(x) dx \geq \sum_{m=m_0+1}^{2m_0} \frac{c}{m^2} |B(S')| = \Omega\left(\frac{D}{\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

Next, we provide an upper bound to the numerator of the r.h.s of Eq. (19) which is the number of returns to S' conditioning on the fact that $Z(0) = z$, for some $z \in B(S')$. Let us denote this process by Z^z (note that $Z = Z^0$). Then,

$$\sum_{m=0}^{m_0} \Pr(Z^z(m) \in B(S')) \leq 2 + \sum_{m=2}^{m_0} \Pr(Z^z(m) \in B(S')). \quad (16)$$

Clearly, the probability density function $p^{Z^z(m)}$ of $Z^z(m)$ is obtained by a translation from $p^{Z(m)}$. Thus, by Corollary 10, we have for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$:

$$p^{Z^z(m)}(y) \leq \frac{1}{\|y - z\|^2}.$$

In particular, for y such that $\|y - z\| \geq 2$,

$$\Pr(Z^z(m) \in B(y)) \leq \frac{1}{(\|y - z\| - 1)^2}, \quad (17)$$

since every $w \in B(y)$ satisfies $\|w - z\| \geq \|y - z\| - 1 \geq 0$.

Next, as $z \in B(S')$, consider an index $i_z \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ for which $z \in B(s(i_z))$. Let $r_m = \frac{m}{\sqrt{c \log m}}$ with c being the constant c' mentioned in Lemma 4. To exploit Eq. (17), we define

$$I = \{i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\} \mid |s(i)_1 - s(i_z)_1| = |i - i_z| \leq r_m + 2\},$$

and $I^c = \{0, \dots, d-1\} \setminus I$. We proceed with the following decomposition:

$$\Pr(Z^z(m) \in B(S')) \leq \sum_{i \in I} \Pr(Z^z(m) \in B(s(i))) + \sum_{i \in I^c} \Pr(Z^z(m) \in B(s(i))). \quad (18)$$

By construction, $|I| \leq 2(r_m + 2) + 1$. Hence, using Lemma 4, the first sum in the r.h.s of Eq. (18) is at most:

$$\sum_{i \in I} \Pr(Z^z(m) \in B(s(i))) \leq \frac{|I|}{r_m^2} = O\left(\frac{1}{r_m}\right).$$

Next, we aim to upper bound the sum on I^c . By the triangle inequality, for any $i \in I^c$, we have $\|s(i) - z\| \geq \|s(i) - s(i_z)\| - 1 \geq |i - i_z| - 1 > 1$. Hence, by Eq. (17), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in I^c} \Pr(Z^z(m) \in B(s(i))) &\leq \sum_{i \in I^c} \frac{1}{(\|s(i) - z\| - 1)^2} \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in I^c} \frac{1}{(|i - i_z| - 2)^2} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}, |k| \geq \lceil r_m \rceil} \frac{1}{k^2} = O\left(\frac{1}{r_m}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used in the last line that $i \in I^c \subset \{i_z + k \mid k \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } |k| > r_m + 2\}$. Thus, we get by Eq. (18):

$$\Pr(Z^z(m) \in B(S')) = O\left(\frac{1}{r_m}\right),$$

which stands for any $z \in B(S')$. Plugging this in Eq. (16), together with the definition $r_m = \frac{m}{\sqrt{c \log m}}$, and the fact that $m_0 = O(\sqrt{n})$, we get:

$$\sum_{m=0}^{m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(S') \mid Z(0) \in B(S')) = 2 + O\left(\sum_{m=2}^{m_0} \frac{\log m}{m}\right) = O(\log^2 n).$$

Altogether, the fraction in Eq. (19) satisfies:

$$\frac{\sum_{m=0}^{m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(S') \mid Z(0) \in B(S'))}{\sum_{m=m_0}^{2m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(S'))} = O\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{D} \cdot \log^2 n\right).$$

Together with the fact that $m_0 = O(\sqrt{n})$, Lemma 19 implies that $\mathbb{E}(m_{detect}^X(n, D)) = O\left(\frac{n}{D} \log^2 n\right)$. Finally, using Claim 8 and the fact that $\tau = \Theta(\log n)$, we have

$$t_{detect}^X(S) = O\left(\frac{n \log^3 n}{D}\right),$$

and since this is true for any connected set $S \subseteq \mathbb{T}_n$ of diameter D , we obtain $t_{detect}^X(n, D) = O\left(\frac{n \log^3 n}{D}\right)$, as desired. \square

4.1 Proof of Lemma 19

Lemma 19 (restated). *Consider a random walk process Z on \mathbb{R}^2 and its projection X on the torus \mathbb{T}_n . Let \mathcal{D} be the set of connected subsets $S \subset \mathbb{T}_n$ of diameter D . For any m_0 ,*

$$\mathbb{E}(m_{detect}^X(n, D)) = O\left(m_0 \cdot \sup_{S \in \mathcal{D}} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{m=0}^{m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(S) \mid Z(0) \in B(S))}{\sum_{m=m_0}^{2m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(S))} \right\}\right). \quad (19)$$

Proof. We begin with the following claim that shows that if the probability to hit S by step m is at least p for any starting point, then the expected detecting step is at most m/p . The claim will then be used to prove the lemma by showing that the inverse of the supremum in Eq. (19) is a lower bound for $\Pr(m_{detect}^X(S) \leq 2m_0)$.

Claim 20. Fix an integer $m > 0$ and a real number $q > 0$ and a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{T}_n$. Denote by X^x the process X starting at $X(0) = x$. If, for any $x \in \mathbb{T}_n$, we have $\Pr(m_{detect}^{X^x}(S) \leq m) \geq q$ then $\mathbb{E}(m_{detect}^X(S)) \leq mq^{-1}$.

Proof of Claim 20. The proof of the claim is simple. Given a set S , define a Bernoulli variable χ as follows. Consider m steps of the process and define χ to be “success” if and only if the process hits S within these m steps. Note that χ has probability at least q to be “success” regardless of where the process starts, by hypothesis. Hence, the expected number of trials until χ succeeds is at most $1/q$. This translates to $\mathbb{E}(m_{detect}^X(S)) \leq mq^{-1}$, and establishes Claim 20. \square

To conclude the proof of Lemma 19, relying on Claim 20, it is sufficient to prove that, for any $S \subset \mathbb{T}_n$,

$$\Pr(m_{detect}^X(S) \leq 2m_0) \geq \frac{\sum_{m=m_0}^{2m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(S))}{\sum_{m=0}^{m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(S) \mid Z(0) \in B(S))}. \quad (20)$$

Indeed if this is true for any $S \subset \mathbb{T}_n$, then the infimum of the right-hand side of Eq. (20) is a lower bound for $\Pr(m_{detect}^{X^x}(S) \leq 2m_0)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{T}_n$, since this is also equal to $\Pr(m_{detect}^{X^x}(S^{-x}) \leq 2m_0)$, where S^{-x} is the translation by $-x$ of S .

For this, we rely on the following identity (see also [17]). If N is a non-negative random variable then:

$$\Pr(N \geq 1) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(N)}{\mathbb{E}(N \mid N \geq 1)}. \quad (21)$$

We employ this identity for the random variable $N_S(m_0, 2m_0)$ which is the number of times Z visits $B(S)$ between steps m_0 and $2m_0$ included. Note that this quantity is positive if and only if $B(S)$ is visited during this interval by Z . Moreover, since $S \subset \mathbb{T}_n$ and X is the projection of Z on the torus, then $Z(m) \in B(S)$ implies that also $X(m) \in B(S)$. Therefore,

$$\Pr(m_{detect}^X(S) \leq 2m_0) \geq \Pr(N_S(m_0, 2m_0) \geq 1). \quad (22)$$

Note that $N_S(m_0, 2m_0) = \sum_{m=m_0}^{2m_0} \mathbf{1}_{Z(m) \in B(S)}$, so that

$$\mathbb{E}(N_S(m_0, 2m_0)) = \sum_{m=m_0}^{2m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(S)). \quad (23)$$

Note also that the denominator in Eq. (21) applied to $N_S(m_0, 2m_0)$ verifies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(N_S(m_0, 2m_0) \mid N_S(m_0, 2m_0) \geq 1) &= \mathbb{E}(N_S(m_0, 2m_0) \mid Z(m) \in B(S) \text{ for some } m \in [m_0, 2m_0]) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}(N_S(m_0, 2m_0) \mid Z(m_0) \in B(S)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}(N_S(0, m_0) \mid Z(0) \in B(S)), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality comes from the fact that visiting $B(S)$ earlier (i.e., for $m = m_0$ instead of $m > m_0$) can only increase the number of returns to $B(S)$, and the second inequality is a consequence of the Markov property. Finally, write, as above,

$$\mathbb{E}(N_S(0, m_0) \mid Z(0) \in B(S)) = \sum_{m=0}^{m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in S \mid Z(0) \in B(S)). \quad (24)$$

Therefore, when applied to $N_S(m_0, 2m_0)$, Eq. (21), combined with Eqs. (22), (23) and (24), implies that

$$\Pr_0(m_{detect}^X(S) \leq 2m_0) \geq \frac{\sum_{m=m_0}^{2m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(S))}{\sum_{m=0}^{m_0} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(S) \mid Z(0) \in B(S))}.$$

This establishes Eq. (20), and thus completes the proof of Lemma 19. \square

4.2 Proofs of Lemmas 3 and 4

In this section we aim to prove the following lower and upper bounds, stated in Lemmas 3 and 4, respectively. The proof of Lemma 3 is given in Section 4.2.2, and the proof of Lemma 4 is given in Section 4.2.3. Before presenting these proofs, let us first establish lower and upper bounds on the distance traveled by the walk at step m .

4.2.1 Superdiffusive properties of the Cauchy walk on \mathbb{R}^2

We first remark that the probability to choose a length in a given interval is easily computed from Eq. (1).

Observation 21. *The probability to do a step of length at most $\ell > 0$ is $a\ell$ if $\ell \leq 1$ and $a(2 - \frac{1}{\ell})$ if $\ell > 1$. For integers $\ell_{max} \geq \ell_2 \geq \ell_1 \geq 1$, the probability to choose a length in $[\ell_1, \ell_2]$ is $a(\frac{1}{\ell_1} - \frac{1}{\ell_2})$.*

The next claim quantifies the probability that the Cauchy process goes to a distance of at least d after m steps. In particular, it shows that in step m , the process is at a distance of $\Omega(m)$ with constant probability, and that it is at a distance of $\Omega(m/\log m)$ with high probability in m .

Claim 22. *For any integer $m \geq 2$ and any real $d \in [1, \frac{\ell_{max}}{3}]$ we have,*

$$\Pr(\exists s \leq m \text{ s.t. } \|Z(s)\| \geq d) \geq 1 - e^{-cm/d},$$

for some constant $c > 0$. In particular this lower bound is at least

- $1 - O(m^{-2})$ if $d = c' \frac{m}{\log m}$ with $c' > 0$ a small enough constant,
- $\Omega(1)$ if $d = c'm$ for any constant $c' > 0$ with $c'm \leq \ell_{max}/3$.

Proof. By Observation 21, the probability that a given step has a length at least $2d$ is $a(\frac{1}{2d} - \frac{1}{\ell_{max}}) \geq \frac{a}{6d}$. Since the steps are independent, the probability of the event \mathcal{A} that at least one of the steps $1, \dots, m$ has a length at least $2d$ is

$$\Pr(\mathcal{A}) \geq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{a}{6d}\right)^m.$$

Writing $(1 - a/6d)^m = e^{m \log(1 - \frac{a}{6d})} \leq e^{-cm/d}$, for some constant $c > 0$, we get

$$\Pr(\mathcal{A}) \geq 1 - e^{-cm/d}.$$

To conclude, it suffices to show that \mathcal{A} implies that there exists a step $s \leq m$ for which $\|Z(s)\| \geq d$. Indeed, suppose that \mathcal{A} occurs and let $s \leq m$ be the first step of length $2d$ or more. Then,

- Either $\|Z(s-1)\| \geq d$, in which case we are done.
- Or $\|Z(s-1)\| < d$. In this case, as $Z(s) = Z(s-1) + V(s)$, we have $\|Z(s)\| \geq \|V(s)\| - \|Z(s-1)\| > 2d - d = d$.

This concludes the proof of Claim 22. \square

Claim 22 asserts that, with some probability, the walk goes far from 0. Conversely, the next claim says that with some constant probability, the walk does not get too far.

Claim 23. • For any constant $c > 0$, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that, for any two integers $1 \leq s \leq m$, we have $\Pr(\|Z(s)\| \leq cm) \geq \delta$.

- For any constant $0 < \delta < 1$, there exists a (large enough) constant $c > 0$ such that, for any two integers $1 \leq s \leq m$, we have $\Pr(\|Z(s)\| \leq cm) \geq \delta$.

Proof. Fix an integer $m \geq 1$ and let c'' be a constant, to be chosen later. Let \mathcal{A} denote the event that each of the first m steps has length at most $\ell = c''m$. We have, for any integer $s \leq m$, and any constant $c > 0$,

$$\Pr(\|Z(s)\| \leq cm) \geq \Pr(\mathcal{A}) \cdot \Pr(\|Z(s)\| \leq cm \mid \mathcal{A}). \quad (25)$$

We shall study separately each term in the r.h.s of Eq. (25), and establish the following:

- For the first item of Claim 23, we shall take $c'' > 0$ so that both factors are constants (hence their multiplication is at least some constant δ),
- For the second item of Claim 23, where the bound δ is given, we will show that both terms can be made at least $\sqrt{\delta}$ by choosing c and c'' appropriately.

Proceeding with the first term in the r.h.s of Eq. (25), by Observation 21, we have:

$$\Pr(\mathcal{A}) = \begin{cases} (ac''m)^m & \text{if } c''m \leq 1 \\ (2a)^m (1 - \frac{1}{2c''m})^m & \text{if } c''m \in [1, \ell_{max}] \\ 1 & \text{if } c''m \geq \ell_{max} \end{cases} .$$

For $1 \leq m \leq \frac{1}{c''}$, we have $(ac''m)^m \geq (ac''m)^{\frac{1}{c''}}$ as $ac''m \leq c''m \leq 1$, and $(ac''m)^{\frac{1}{c''}} \geq (ac'')^{\frac{1}{c''}}$ as $m \geq 1$. For the second item, note that the function $(1 - \frac{\alpha}{x})^x = e^{x \log(1 - \frac{\alpha}{x})}$ is increasing in $x \geq \alpha$ and thus, for $x \geq 2\alpha$, we have $(1 - \frac{\alpha}{x})^x \geq 2^{-2\alpha}$. Applying this with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2c''}$, we have, $(1 - \frac{1}{2c''m})^m \geq 2^{-\frac{1}{c''}}$, for $m \geq \frac{1}{c''}$. Overall, using $2a \geq 1$, we get

$$\Pr(\mathcal{A}) \geq \begin{cases} (\frac{c''}{2})^{\frac{1}{c''}} & \text{if } c''m \leq 1 \\ 2^{-\frac{1}{c''}} & \text{if } c''m \in [1, \ell_{max}] \\ 1 & \text{if } c''m \geq \ell_{max} \end{cases} .$$

Hence,

- $\Pr(\mathcal{A}) = \Omega(1)$ for any given $c'' > 0$.

- Furthermore, with respect to the second item of Claim 23 where $0 < \delta < 1$ is given, we can choose c'' large enough (in particular, we take $c'' \geq 1$ so that $c''m \geq 1$), to ensure that $\Pr(\mathcal{A}) \geq 2^{-\frac{1}{c''}} \geq \sqrt{\delta}$.

We are now ready to lower bound the second factor in Eq. (25), namely, $\Pr(\|Z(s)\| \leq cm \mid \mathcal{A})$. We begin with a notation: If X is a random variable, let us write $X^{\mathcal{A}}$ for the random variable X conditioned on the occurrence of \mathcal{A} . Our first goal is to prove that

$$\Pr(\|Z^{\mathcal{A}}(s)\| \leq cm) \geq 1 - \frac{8s\mathbb{E}(\|V^{\mathcal{B}}\|^2)}{c^2m^2}, \quad (26)$$

where $V^{\mathcal{B}} = (V_1^{\mathcal{B}}, V_2^{\mathcal{B}})$ is one step-vector of the walk on \mathbb{R}^2 , conditioned on the event \mathcal{B} that it is at most $c''m$. Eq. (26) will be established by applying Chebyshev's inequality on each of the projections on the axes and using a union bound argument. Specifically, decomposing the walk Z on the two axes, by writing $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$, we first use an union bound to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\|Z^{\mathcal{A}}(s)\| > cm) &\leq \Pr(\exists i = 1, 2 \text{ s.t. } |Z_i^{\mathcal{A}}(s)| > cm/2) \\ &\leq \Pr(|Z_1^{\mathcal{A}}(s)| > cm/2) + \Pr(|Z_2^{\mathcal{A}}(s)| > cm/2) \\ &\leq 2\Pr(|Z_1^{\mathcal{A}}(s)| > cm/2), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the symmetry to deduce that Z_1 and Z_2 share the same distribution. Hence,

$$\Pr(\|Z^{\mathcal{A}}(s)\| \leq cm) \geq 1 - 2\Pr(|Z_1^{\mathcal{A}}(s)| > cm/2).$$

Next, we aim to lower bound the r.h.s. Relying on the fact that the expectation of $Z_1^{\mathcal{A}}(s)$ is 0 for any s , by Chebyshev's inequality, we have:

$$\Pr(|Z_1^{\mathcal{A}}(s)| > cm/2) \leq \frac{4\text{Var}(Z_1^{\mathcal{A}}(s))}{c^2m^2}.$$

Since $Z_1^{\mathcal{A}}(s)$ is the sum of s independent steps that follow the same law as $V_1^{\mathcal{B}}$, we have:

$$\text{Var}(Z_1^{\mathcal{A}}(s)) = s\text{Var}(V_1^{\mathcal{B}}).$$

As the expectation of $V_1^{\mathcal{B}}$ is zero, we have $\text{Var}(V_1^{\mathcal{B}}) = \mathbb{E}((V_1^{\mathcal{B}})^2)$. Furthermore, since $|V_1^{\mathcal{B}}| \leq \|V^{\mathcal{B}}\|$, we obtain:

$$\text{Var}(Z_1^{\mathcal{A}}(s)) \leq s\mathbb{E}(\|V^{\mathcal{B}}\|^2),$$

which concludes the proof of Eq. (26). Next, let us estimate $\mathbb{E}(\|V^{\mathcal{B}}\|^2)$. If, on the one hand, $c''m \leq 1$, then, when conditioning on \mathcal{A} , the length of a step is chosen uniformly at random in $[0, c''m]$. Thus, its second moment is

$$\mathbb{E}(\|V^{\mathcal{B}}\|^2) = \int_0^{c''m} \ell^2 \frac{d\ell}{c''m} = \frac{(c''m)^2}{3}. \quad (27)$$

On the other hand, if $c''m \geq 1$, then $V^{\mathcal{B}}$ is a Cauchy walk with cut off $\ell_{max} = c''m$. Hence, its second moment is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\|V^{\mathcal{B}}\|^2) &= a' \int_0^1 \ell^2 d\ell + a' \int_1^{c''m} \ell^2 \ell^{-2} d\ell \\ &\leq a' \int_0^{c''m} 1 d\ell = a'c''m \leq c''m. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Overall, by Eqs. (26), (27) and (28) we find that, for $s \leq m$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\|Z^{\mathcal{A}}(s)\| \leq cm) &\geq \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{8sc''^2}{3c^2} & \text{if } c''m \leq 1 \\ 1 - \frac{8sc''}{c^2m} & \text{if } c''m \geq 1 \end{cases} \\ &\geq \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{8c''}{3c^2} & \text{if } c''m \leq 1 \\ 1 - \frac{8c''}{c^2} & \text{if } c''m \geq 1 \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

We then conclude the proof of Claim 23 by observing the following.

- For the first item of Claim 23, we have proved that $\Pr(\mathcal{A}) = \Omega(1)$ for any constant $c'' > 0$. Hence, we may now choose c'' small enough so that $\Pr(\|Z^{\mathcal{A}}(s)\| \leq cm) = \Omega(1)$.
- For the second item of Claim 23, we have already chosen c'' to be large (in order to have $\Pr(\mathcal{A}) \geq \sqrt{\delta}$), but we are free to choose c large enough so that $\Pr(\|Z^{\mathcal{A}}(s)\| \leq cm) \geq \sqrt{\delta}$.

□

4.2.2 Proof of Lemma 3 (lower bound)

In this section we prove the following:

Lemma 3 (restated). *For any constant $\alpha > 0$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for any integer $m \in [1, \alpha \ell_{max}]$, and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, with $\|x\| \leq m$,*

$$p^{Z(m)}(x) \geq \frac{c}{m^2}.$$

Proof. First note that for $m = 1$, the lemma holds by the definition of the Lévy process. Let us therefore consider an integer $m \geq 2$.

By the monotonicity property (Corollary 10), it is enough to prove that there is some constant $c' > 1$ such that,

$$\Pr(m \leq \|Z(m)\| \leq c'm) = \Omega(1). \quad (29)$$

Indeed, if this holds, then, since the area of the ring $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ s.t. } m \leq \|y\| \leq c'm\}$ is $\Theta(m^2)$, then we would have that for at least one point u in this ring, $p^{Z(m)}(u) = \Omega(m^{-2})$. Then, by monotonicity, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\|x\| \leq m$, we would have $p^{Z(m)}(x) \geq p^{Z(m)}(u) = \Omega(m^{-2})$ which is the desired lower bound.

We thus proceed to prove Eq. (29). For this, let us define, for a given $m \in [2, \alpha \ell_{max}]$, the event

$$\mathcal{A}_{far} = \exists s \leq m \text{ s.t. } \|Z(s)\| \geq 2m.$$

We next prove the following claim.

Claim 24. $\Pr(\mathcal{A}_{far}) = \Omega(1)$, where the constant in lower bound does not depend on m .

Proof of Claim 24. By Claim 22, we immediately get that the claim holds for any $m \in [2, \ell_{max}/6]$. We next show that the claim holds also for $m \in [\ell_{max}/6, \alpha \ell_{max}]$. Intuitively, we prove this using a constant number of iterations. Each iteration consists of at most $m' = \alpha' \ell_{max}$ steps, with α' a small constant, during which we are guaranteed to go a distance of $\ell_{max}/3$ with constant probability.

Because the direction is chosen uniformly at random, at the cost of reducing this probability by a constant factor, we can further impose that the x -coordinate increases by a factor of, say, $\ell_{max}/5$. As these iterations are independent, and since α is a constant, we can guarantee that up to step $m = \alpha\ell_{max}$, the process goes away to a distance of at least $2\alpha\ell_{max}$ with constant probability.

Formally, first notice that we can take $\alpha > 1$ without loss of generality. Note now that since $m \in [\ell_{max}/6, \alpha\ell_{max}]$, the second item in Claim 22 implies that:

$$\Pr\left(\exists s \leq \frac{m}{10\alpha} \text{ s.t. } \|Z(s)\| \geq \frac{\ell_{max}}{3}\right) \geq c'_\alpha,$$

for some constant $c'_\alpha > 0$. As a consequence, since the direction of $Z(s)$ is distributed uniformly at random, we have:

$$\Pr\left(\exists s \leq \frac{m}{10\alpha}, Z_1(s) \geq \frac{\ell_{max}}{4}\right) \geq c_\alpha, \quad (30)$$

for some constant $c_\alpha > 0$. When this occurs, let $s_1 \leq \frac{m}{10\alpha}$ be such that $Z_1(s_1) \geq \frac{\ell_{max}}{4}$. By the Markov property, starting from step s_1 , we can then apply again (30) to show that with probability c_α , there is a $s_2 \leq s_1 + \frac{m}{10\alpha} \leq 2\frac{m}{10\alpha}$ such that $Z_1(s_2) \geq Z_1(s_1) + \frac{\ell_{max}}{4} \geq 2\frac{\ell_{max}}{4}$. Overall, this happens with probability c_α^2 . Repeating this $\lceil 9\alpha \rceil$ times, we finally get:

$$\Pr\left(\exists s \leq \lceil 9\alpha \rceil \frac{m}{10\alpha}, Z_1(s) \geq \lceil 9\alpha \rceil \frac{\ell_{max}}{4}\right) \geq c_\alpha^{\lceil 9\alpha \rceil},$$

which is a positive constant. Because $\alpha > 1$, this implies $\Pr(\exists s \leq m, Z_1(s) \geq 2\alpha\ell_{max}) = \Omega(1)$. As $2\alpha\ell_{max} \geq 2m$ and $\|Z\|(s) \geq |Z_1(s)|$, this, in turn, implies $\Pr(\mathcal{A}_{far}) = \Omega(1)$, completing the proof of Claim 24. \square

Next, conditioning on \mathcal{A}_{far} , we write:

$$\Pr(\|Z(m)\| \geq m \mid \mathcal{A}_{far}) \geq \min_{s \leq m} \Pr(\|Z(m)\| \geq m \mid \|Z(s)\| \geq 2m) \quad (31)$$

$$\geq \min_{s \leq m} \Pr(\|Z(m-s)\| \leq m), \quad (32)$$

where we used the Markov property, and the spatial homogeneity of the process, in the latter inequality. In words, in the r.h.s. of Inequality (31), we examine the probability to be at a high distance (i.e., m), knowing that the process was even further (at some point x at distance at least $2m$). In Inequality (32) we bound this by the probability of staying within distance m .

By the first item of Claim 23, the r.h.s of Inequality (32) is at least some positive constant (again, independent of m). Overall, for any $m \geq 2$, we have:

$$\Pr(\|Z(m)\| \geq m) \geq \Pr(\|Z(m)\| \geq m \mid \mathcal{A}_{far}) \cdot \Pr(\mathcal{A}_{far}) \geq \gamma,$$

for some constant $\gamma > 0$ (independent of m). Next, using the second item of Claim 23, with $\delta = 1 - \frac{\gamma}{2}$, we get that there exists a large enough constant $c' > 0$ (again, independent of m), such that:

$$\Pr(\|Z(m)\| \leq c'm) \geq \delta. \quad (33)$$

Hence, using a union bound argument, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(m \leq \|Z(m)\| \leq c'm) &\geq \Pr(\|Z(m)\| \geq m) + \Pr(\|Z(m)\| \leq c'm) - 1 \\ &\geq \gamma + \delta - 1 = \frac{\gamma}{2} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes Eq. (29) and thus concludes the proof of Lemma 3. \square

4.2.3 Proof of Lemma 4 (upper bound)

This section is dedicated to the proof of Lemma 4:

Lemma 4 (restated). *For any constant $\alpha > 0$, there exists a constant $c' > 0$ such that, for any integer $m \in [2, \alpha \ell_{max}]$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have*

$$\Pr(Z(m) \in B(x)) \leq \frac{c' \log^2 m}{m^2}.$$

Proof. Let $\alpha > 0$ and $m \in [2, \alpha \ell_{max}]$. Due to the monotonicity property stated in Corollary 10, it is sufficient to prove this result for $x = 0$. Indeed, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the sets $B(0) \setminus B(x)$ and $B(x) \setminus B(0)$ have the same area A , and

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(x) \setminus B(0)) &\leq A \max_{y \in B(x) \setminus B(0)} \{p^{\|Z(m)\|}(y)\} \\ &\leq A \min_{y \in B(0) \setminus B(x)} \{p^{\|Z(m)\|}(y)\} \\ &\leq \Pr(Z(m) \in B(0) \setminus B(x)), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to the monotonicity property and the fact that any point in $B(x) \setminus B(0)$ is at distance more than 1 from the origin, and hence, farther from 0 than any point in $B(0) \setminus B(x)$. This shows that $\Pr(Z(m) \in B(x)) \leq \Pr(Z(m) \in B(0))$, hence it is sufficient to prove the required upper bound for $x = 0$.

Intuitively, to establish this, we say that with high probability, there is some step $s \leq m$ for which $Z(s)$ is “distant” (at least $cm/\log m$). Conditioning on this, the probability to be located in $B(0)$ at step m is found out to be small, due to the monotonicity of the process (Corollary 10). Formally, consider a (small) positive constant c , and let \mathcal{A} be the event that there is some $s \leq m$ for which $\|Z(s)\| \geq cm/\log m$.

Consider $B(0)$ the ball of radius 1 with center 0. Write

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(Z(m) \in B(0)) &= \Pr(Z(m) \in B(0) \cap \mathcal{A}) + \Pr(Z(m) \in B(0) \cap \neg \mathcal{A}) \\ &\leq \Pr(Z(m) \in B(0) \mid \mathcal{A}) + \Pr(\neg \mathcal{A}), \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

By the first item of Claim 22, taking c to be sufficiently small, we have

$$\Pr(\neg \mathcal{A}) = O(m^{-2}).$$

In order to express the remaining term of Eq. (34), we will denote in the following equation Z^x the Cauchy process on \mathbb{R}^2 with cut off ℓ_{max} starting with $Z(0) = x$. Since our process was defined to start at 0, we have $Z = Z^0$. Remark that the law of Z^x is obtained by a translation of that of Z^0 .

With this notation in mind, we have, using the Markov property for the second inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(Z^0(m) \in B(0) \mid \mathcal{A}) &\leq \max_{s \leq m} \Pr(Z^0(m) \in B(0) \mid \|Z^0(s)\| \geq cm/\log m) \\
&\leq \max_{s \leq m} \sup_{\|x\| \geq cm/\log m} \Pr(Z^x(m-s) \in B(0)) \\
&= \max_{s \leq m} \sup_{\|x\| \geq cm/\log m} \Pr(Z^x(s) \in B(0)) \\
&= \max_{s \leq m} \sup_{\|x\| \geq cm/\log m} \Pr(Z^0(s) \in B(-x)) \\
&= \max_{s \leq m} \sup_{\|x\| \geq cm/\log m} \Pr(Z(s) \in B(x))
\end{aligned}$$

Use now Corollary 10 that gives $p^{Z(m)}(x) \leq \frac{1}{\pi\|x\|^2}$. Hence, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|x\| > 1$, we have

$$\Pr(Z(m) \in B(x)) = \int_{B(x)} p^{Z(m)}(y) dy \leq \int_{B(x)} \frac{1}{\pi(\|x\| - 1)^2} dy = \frac{1}{(\|x\| - 1)^2}.$$

Let $m(c)$ be the largest integer $m > 0$ such that $cm/\log m \leq 2$. For $m > m(c)$, we have

$$\Pr(Z(s) \in B(x)) \leq \max_{s \leq m} \frac{1}{(cm \log m - 1)^2} = \frac{1}{(cm \log m - 1)^2}$$

Overall, we find that, for $m > m(c)$

$$\Pr(Z(m) \in B(0)) \leq \frac{1}{(cm/\log m - 1)^2} + \frac{c'}{m^2},$$

which we can bound by $\frac{c_2 \log^2 m}{m^2}$ for some constant $c_2 > 0$. Since $m(c)$ is a constant, there is some other constant $c_3 > 0$ for which, for any $m \in [2, m(c)]$, we have $\Pr(Z(m) \in B(0)) \leq \frac{c_3 \log^2 m}{m^2}$. We then obtain, for any $m \geq 2$,

$$\Pr(Z(m) \in B(0)) \leq \frac{\max\{c_2, c_3\} \log^2 m}{m^2},$$

which concludes the proof of Lemma 4. □

5 Discussion

We suggest to evaluate strategies according to the measure of scale-sensitivity, which aims to capture search efficiency that holds with respect to a large range of target sizes. This measure is motivated by the fact that in multiple foraging contexts, including ones for which Lévy patterns have been reported, targets appear in varying sizes. Importantly, small scale-sensitivity means, in particular, that areas of all scales are visited quickly and regularly. This has significance also in other tasks than foraging, for example, during eye scanpaths, for which intermittent patterns are of interest and Lévy walk movement has been suggested [8].

As implied by Eq. (3), all connected targets of a given diameter share a common lower bound for their detection time. Conversely, Theorem 5 implies that such targets are found by roughly this time by the Cauchy strategy. Thus the right parameter to consider is indeed the diameter of the

target and not, e.g., its area. We find this rather surprising, as, in contrast to the non-intermittent searcher, crossing the target’s boundary by an intermittent searcher does not suffice for detection. Hence, for example, a ball-shaped target appears to be, at least at a first glance, significantly more susceptible for detection than its one dimensional perimeter. A consequence of this insight is that a large prey aiming to hide from an efficient searcher would benefit by organizing itself in a bulging shape that minimizes its diameter.

To conclude, we prove here that the detection time of the intermittent Cauchy walk is extremely close to the detection time of the best possible strategy, even when allowing the latter to perfectly detect while moving, and to completely be tuned to the shape of the target. Perhaps the most impressive feature of the Cauchy walk is that it manages to do so for all target shapes and sizes, without the need for any *a priori* information about the target. Indeed, its scale-sensitivity is at most poly-logarithmic in the size of the domain, while other basic intermittent strategies have polynomial scale-sensitivity. This exponential separation provides a strong support for the efficiency and robustness of intermittent Cauchy walks under general conditions.

Acknowledgment. The authors are thankful to Ofer Feinerman for helpful discussions, and to Robin Vacus for commenting on the presentation.

References

- [1] Micah Adler, Harald Rcke, Naveen Sivadasan, Christian Sohler, and Berthold Vcking. Randomized pursuit-evasion in graphs. *Automata, Languages and Programming : 29th International Colloquium, ICALP 2002, Springer, 901-912 (2002)*, 01 2002.
- [2] Gil Ariel, Amit Rabani, Sivan Benisty, Jonathan D Partridge, Rasika M Harshey, and Avraham Be’Er. Swarming bacteria migrate by lévy walk. *Nature communications*, 6:8396, 2015.
- [3] Frederic Bartumeus and Simon A Levin. Fractal reorientation clocks: Linking animal behavior to statistical patterns of search. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(49):19072–19077, 2008.
- [4] William J Bell. *Searching behaviour: the behavioural ecology of finding resources*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [5] O Bénichou, C Loverdo, M Moreau, and R Voituriez. Two-dimensional intermittent search processes: An alternative to lévy flight strategies. *Physical Review E*, 74(2):020102, 2006.
- [6] Olivier Bénichou, C Loverdo, M Moreau, and R Voituriez. Intermittent search strategies. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 83(1), 2011.
- [7] Denis Boyer et al. Scale-free foraging by primates emerges from their interaction with a complex environment. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 273(1595), 2006. [arXiv:http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/273/1595/1743.full.pdf](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/273/1595/1743.full.pdf).
- [8] Dirk Brockmann and Theo Geisel. The ecology of gaze shifts. *Neurocomputing*, 32:643–650, 2000.

- [9] A. Comtet and S. N. Majumdar. Precise asymptotics for a random walker’s maximum. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 6:06013, June 2005. [arXiv:cond-mat/0506195](https://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0506195), doi:10.1088/1742-5468/2005/06/P06013.
- [10] Monique de Jager, Franz J Weissing, Peter MJ Herman, Bart A Nolet, and Johan van de Koppel. Lévy walks evolve through interaction between movement and environmental complexity. *Science*, 332(6037):1551–1553, 2011.
- [11] Stefano Focardi, Paolo Montanaro, and Elena Pecchioli. Adaptive lévy walks in foraging fallow deer. *PLoS One*, 4(8):e6587, 2009.
- [12] Briec Guinard and Amos Korman. Tight bounds for the cover times of random walks with heterogeneous step lengths. In *37th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2020, March 10-13, 2020, Montpellier, France*, pages 28:1–28:14, 2020. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2020.28>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2020.28.
- [13] Tajie H Harris, Edward J Banigan, David A Christian, Christoph Konradt, Elia D Tait Wojno, Kazumi Norose, Emma H Wilson, Beena John, Wolfgang Weninger, Andrew D Luster, et al. Generalized lévy walks and the role of chemokines in migration of effector cd8+ t cells. *Nature*, 486(7404):545–548, 2012.
- [14] N. E. Humphries, N. Queiroz, J. R. M. Dyer, N. G. Pade, M. K. Musyl, K. M. Schaefer, D. W. Fuller, J. M. Brunnschweiler, T. K. Doyle, J. D. R. Houghton, G. C. Hays, C. S. Jones, L. R. Noble, V. J. Wearmouth, E. J. Southall, and D. W. Sims. Environmental context explains Lévy and Brownian movement patterns of marine predators. *Nature*, 465:1066–1069, June 2010. doi:10.1038/nature09116.
- [15] Nicolas E Humphries, Henri Weimerskirch, Nuno Queiroz, Emily J Southall, and David W Sims. Foraging success of biological lévy flights recorded in situ. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(19):7169–7174, 2012.
- [16] Alex James, Michael J Plank, and Andrew M Edwards. Assessing lévy walks as models of animal foraging. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 8(62):1233–1247, 2011.
- [17] Varun Kanade, Frederik Mallmann-Trenn, and Thomas Sauerwald. On coalescence time in graphs-when is coalescing as fast as meeting? *CoRR*, abs/1611.02460, 2016. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1611.02460>.
- [18] Ekaterina Korobkova, Thierry Emonet, Jose MG Vilar, Thomas S Shimizu, and Philippe Cluzel. From molecular noise to behavioural variability in a single bacterium. *Nature*, 428(6982):574, 2004.
- [19] Donald L Kramer and Robert L McLaughlin. The behavioral ecology of intermittent locomotion. *American Zoologist*, 41(2):137–153, 2001.
- [20] David A Levin and Yuval Peres. *Markov chains and mixing times*, volume 107. American Mathematical Soc., 2017.

- [21] Michael A. Lomholt et al. Lévy strategies in intermittent search processes are advantageous. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(32), 2008. URL: <http://www.pnas.org/content/105/32/11055.abstract>, arXiv:<http://www.pnas.org/content/105/32/11055.full.pdf>, doi:10.1073/pnas.0803117105.
- [22] M. Mitzenmacher and E. Upfal. *Probability and Computing: Randomized Algorithms and Probabilistic Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [23] G. Oshanin et al. Intermittent random walks for an optimal search strategy: one-dimensional case. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, 19(6), 2007. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/0953-8984/19/i=6/a=065142>.
- [24] Gleb Oshanin, Katja Lindenberg, Horacio S Wio, and Sergei Burlatsky. Efficient search by optimized intermittent random walks. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 42(43), 2009. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/1751-8121/42/i=43/a=434008>.
- [25] W John O'Brien, Howard I Browman, and Barbara I Evans. Search strategies of foraging animals. *American Scientist*, 78(2):152–160, 1990.
- [26] Vladimir V Palyulin, Aleksei V Chechkin, and Ralf Metzler. Lévy flights do not always optimize random blind search for sparse targets. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(8):2931–2936, 2014.
- [27] MJ Plank and A James. Optimal foraging: Lévy pattern or process? *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 5(26):1077–1086, 2008.
- [28] D. A. Raichlen, B. M. Wood, A. D. Gordon, A. Z. P. Mabulla, F. W. Marlowe, and H. Pontzer. Evidence of Lévy walk foraging patterns in human hunter-gatherers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, 111:728–733, January 2014. doi:10.1073/pnas.1318616111.
- [29] Andrew M Reynolds, Alan D Smith, Randolph Menzel, Uwe Greggers, Donald R Reynolds, and Joseph R Riley. Displaced honey bees perform optimal scale-free search flights. *Ecology*, 88(8):1955–1961, 2007.
- [30] Andy Reynolds, Giacomo Santini, Guido Chelazzi, and Stefano Focardi. The weierstrassian movement patterns of snails. *Royal Society Open Science*, 4(6):160941, 2017. URL: <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/abs/10.1098/rsos.160941>, arXiv:<https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rsos.160941>, doi:10.1098/rsos.160941.
- [31] I. Rhee, M. Shin, S. Hong, K. Lee, and S. Chong. On the lévy-walk nature of human mobility. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2008*.
- [32] D. W. Sims, E. J. Southall, N. E. Humphries, G. C. Hays, C. J. A. Bradshaw, J. W. Pitchford, A. James, M. Z. Ahmed, A. S. Brierley, M. A. Hindell, D. Morritt, M. K. Musyl, D. Righton, E. L. C. Shepard, V. J. Wearmouth, R. P. Wilson, M. J. Witt, and J. D. Metcalfe. Scaling laws of marine predator search behaviour. *Nature*, 451:1098–1102, February 2008. doi:10.1038/nature06518.

- [33] G. M. Viswanathan et al. Lévy flight search patterns of wandering albatrosses. *Nature*, 381(6581), 1996.
- [34] G. M. Viswanathan et al. Optimizing the success of random searches. *Nature*, 401(6756), 1999.
- [35] Stephan Wolf, Elizabeth Nicholls, Andrew M Reynolds, Patricia Wells, Ka S Lim, Robert J Paxton, and Juliet L Osborne. Optimal search patterns in honeybee orientation flights are robust against emerging infectious diseases. *Scientific reports*, 6:32612, 2016.
- [36] V Zaburdaev, S Denisov, and J Klafter. Lévy walks. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 87(2):483, 2015.