

Using random graphs to sample repulsive Gibbs point processes with arbitrary-range potentials

Tobias Friedrich* Andreas Göbel* Maximilian Katzmann†
 Martin S. Krejca‡ Marcus Pappik*

*Hasso Plattner Institute, University of Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany
 {tobias.friedrich, andreas.goebel, marcus.pappik}@hpi.de

† Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany
 maximilian.katzmann@kit.edu

‡ Sorbonne University, CNRS, LIP6, Paris, France
 martin.krejca@lip6.fr

Abstract

Gibbs point processes are frequently used in statistical physics to model gasses and liquids of interacting particles. The main computational tasks related to such models are sampling from the point process and computing its partition function, which is the normalizing constant of its distribution. In this paper, we study computational aspects of Gibbs point processes that are defined by a fugacity parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a repulsive symmetric pair potential ϕ on a bounded measurable region \mathbb{V} of a complete separable metric space, equipped with a locally finite reference volume measure ν . We introduce a new approach for approximately sampling from such point processes and for obtaining a randomized approximation of their partition functions. Under mild assumptions, such as a uniform sampler for \mathbb{V} , our algorithms have running time polynomial in the volume $\nu(\mathbb{V})$ of the region for all fugacities $\lambda < \epsilon/C_\phi$, where C_ϕ denotes the temperedness constant of the potential. In contrast to previous rigorous approximation results for comparable fugacity regimes, which were restricted to finite-range potentials, our approach applies to arbitrary repulsive potentials.

Our algorithmic approach is based on mapping repulsive Gibbs point processes to hard-core models on a natural family of geometric random graphs. Previous attempts to discretize Gibbs point processes based on hard-core models used deterministically constructed graphs, which limited the results to not only hard-constraint potentials but also to box-shaped regions $\mathbb{V} = [0, \ell]^d$ in d -dimensional Euclidean space. We overcome both limitations by randomization of the considered graph. Specifically, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, we define a distribution $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ on graphs of size n such that the partition function of a hard-core model on a random graph from this distribution concentrates around the partition function of a Gibbs point process with potential ϕ on the region \mathbb{V} for $n \in \Theta(\nu(\mathbb{V})^2)$. We show this concentration result by deriving a corollary of the Efron–Stein inequality, which allows proving concentration for a function of independent random inputs, given that the output of this function only exhibits small relative changes when one of its inputs is altered. A randomized approximation for the partition function of a Gibbs point process follows from approximating the hard-core partition function of a random graph from $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$. Furthermore, we obtain an efficient sampler for the Gibbs point process by utilizing an approximate sampler for the hard-core model on a random graph from $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$. By deriving the density of our sampler with respect to a Poisson point process via the Rényi–Mönch theorem, we show that it is close to the density of the original Gibbs point process.

1 Introduction

Gibbs point processes are an important tool for modeling a variety of phenomena that can be described as distributions of random spatial events [BGM+06; MW07]. Especially in statistical physics, such point processes are frequently used as stochastic models for gasses or liquids of interacting particles [Rue99]. A popular way to study such particle mixtures and their dynamics is to simulate them, for example, in order to compute their associated statistics. This requires an efficient procedure to generate point configurations from the model, that is, sampling from the Gibbs point process in question. To this end, efficient sampling from Gibbs point processes has been studied for several decades leading, for example, to the development of the Monte Carlo method [MRR+53]. Since then, a variety of exact and approximate sampling algorithms for such point processes have been proposed in the literature, and their efficiency for different models and parameters have been studied extensively both with rigorous running time guarantees [FGK+21a; GJ21; Møl89; MP21] and without [Gar00; HVM99].

To better portray this line of research, we start by briefly introducing the notion of a Gibbs point process. Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space with Borel algebra $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$, and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$ that assigns finite volume to bounded measurable sets. In this work, we study Gibbs point processes $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ on bounded measurable regions $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ that are parameterized by a *fugacity* parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a repulsive (non-negative), symmetric, measurable *potential function* $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$. Such a process $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ is defined by a density with respect to a Poisson point process Q_{λ} with intensity λ on \mathbb{X} . For every finite point configuration $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{V}^k$, this density is proportional to $e^{-H(x_1, \dots, x_k)}$, where H is the *Hamiltonian*

$$H(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{\{i, j\} \in \binom{[k]}{2}} \phi(x_i, x_j).$$

More precisely, the density can be expressed explicitly as

$$\frac{dP_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}}{dQ_{\lambda}}(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\forall i \in [k]: x_i \in \mathbb{V}} \cdot e^{-H(x_1, \dots, x_k)} e^{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}}{\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)},$$

where the normalizing constant $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ is the *partition function*

$$\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) = 1 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \int_{\mathbb{V}^k} e^{-H(x_1, \dots, x_k)} \nu^k(d\mathbf{x}).$$

The main algorithmic tasks related to such Gibbs point processes are to sample point configurations from the distribution $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ and to compute $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$.

In this article, we focus on the approximation versions of these computational tasks. Formally, the problem of ε -*approximate sampling* from $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ is defined as producing a random point configuration with a distribution that has a total variation distance of at most ε to $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$. Analogously, the problem of ε -*approximating* $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ is defined as computing some value $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $(1 - \varepsilon)\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) \leq x \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$. Moreover, an algorithm is called a *randomized ε -approximation* if it outputs an ε -approximation of $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ with probability larger than $\frac{1}{2}$. The choice of the constant $\frac{1}{2}$ is rather arbitrary here, as the error probability can be made smaller than every $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ by taking the median of $O(\log(\delta^{-1}))$ independent runs. Furthermore, we consider an ε -approximate sampler and a (randomized) ε -approximation algorithm

as efficient if their running time is polynomial in the volume $\nu(\mathbb{V})$ and in ε^{-1} .

Recent rigorous results establish bounds on the fugacity regime of different models, for which these algorithmic problems can be solved efficiently. Often, these bounds are stated in terms of the *temperedness constant* C_ϕ , which is defined as the essential supremum

$$C_\phi = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x_1 \in \mathbb{X}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \left| 1 - e^{-\phi(x_1, x_2)} \right| \nu(dx_2).$$

This value can be seen as measure for the strength of interactions between points.

In the algorithmic literature, \mathbb{V} is usually considered to be a box-shaped region of d -dimensional Euclidean space (i.e., $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbb{V} = [0, \ell]^d$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$). Moreover, the majority of rigorous computational results that state running time guarantees focus on the hard-sphere model. This model results from setting $\phi(x_1, x_2) = \infty$ whenever the distance $d(x_1, x_2)$ is less than some constant $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and $\phi(x_1, x_2) = 0$ otherwise. In this setting, the best known parameter regime for exact sampling was given by Guo and Jerrum [GJ21]. Using a partial rejection sampler, they achieve near linear running time in the volume $\nu(\mathbb{V})$ for all fugacities $\lambda < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}C_\phi}$. To the best of our knowledge, no results are known for the exact computation of $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ for any non-trivial model.

Broader results are known for the approximation versions of these computational problems. Friedrich, Göbel, Krejca, and Pappik [FGK+21b] proposed a randomized polynomial time approximation algorithm for the hard-sphere partition function for $\lambda < \frac{\varepsilon}{C_\phi}$. They achieve this result by discretizing the hard-sphere model, mapping the algorithmic problem to a discrete spin system on a geometric graph. Later, their result was extended to hard-constraint systems of multiple particle types, such as the continuous Widom–Rowlinson model, and improved to yield a quasi-polynomial deterministic approximation algorithm and a polynomial-time approximate sampler [FGK+21a].

Just recently, comparable fugacity bounds were obtained in the more general setting of repulsive potentials with finite range, that is, assuming there is some constant $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\phi(x_1, x_2) = 0$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{X}$ with $d(x_1, x_2) > r$. In this setting, Michelen and Perkins [MP22] showed that efficient randomized approximation and approximate sampling can be achieved for $\lambda < \frac{\varepsilon}{\Delta_\phi}$, where Δ_ϕ denotes the potential-weighted connective constant. In general, it holds that $\Delta_\phi \leq C_\phi$ and, for Euclidean space, Δ_ϕ is strictly smaller for small dimensions and converges to C_ϕ as the number of dimensions increases. Their result uses a recent improvement for the regime of analyticity of the infinite volume pressure [MP21], which they relate to the mixing time of a Markov chain with stationary measure $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$. As this Markov chain updates balls of radius $\Theta(r)$ in each step, they require the range of the potential r to be constant to efficiently run each step of the chain¹.

A restriction common to all previously mentioned rigorous algorithmic results is that they only apply to Gibbs point processes with finite-range potentials. This excludes various models of interest in statistical physics, such as the Uhlenbeck–Ford model [FU61], the Yoshida–Kamakura model [YK74], and the generalized exponential model [BSD14].

¹ In fact, their Markov chain result is based on a connection between analyticity of the pressure and strong spatial mixing, which also requires a finite-range potential.

Our contributions

We present a new approximate sampler for $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ (Theorem 1.4) and a new randomized approximation algorithm for $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ (Theorem 1.3). Both apply to arbitrary repulsive potentials and run efficiently in the volume $\nu(\mathbb{V})$ for $\lambda < \frac{\epsilon}{C_{\phi}}$. This removes the limitation to finite-range potentials found in the literature while covering almost the entire known fugacity regime for efficient computation in the finite-range setting. Our approach extends beyond Euclidean space, that is, it works for arbitrary complete, separable metric spaces (\mathbb{X}, d) and arbitrary bounded measurable regions $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, provided access to a uniform sampler for \mathbb{V} .

We obtain our algorithmic results by introducing a new method of discretization for Gibbs point processes with repulsive pair potentials. Specifically, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, we define a natural random graph model $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ on graphs of size n such that the partition function of a suitably chosen hard-core model on a random graph from $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ strongly concentrates around $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ for $n \in \Theta(\nu(\mathbb{V})^2)$ (Theorem 1.1). This greatly extends existing discretization schemes, which were limited to hard-constraint point processes, by simulating the repulsive soft-core interactions between points using the randomly drawn edges of the graph.

1.1 Discretizing repulsive Gibbs point processes

Our general algorithmic approach is to reduce the algorithmic sampling and approximation problem to the analogous problems for a hard-core model on discrete graphs, which we briefly define. For an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, let $\mathcal{I}(G) \subseteq 2^V$ denote the set of independent sets of G . For a parameter $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the *hard-core model* on G is a probability distribution $\mu_G^{(\gamma)}$ on $\mathcal{I}(G)$ that assigns each independent set $I \in \mathcal{I}(G)$ a probability proportional to $\gamma^{|I|}$. The normalizing constant of this distribution, $Z_G(\gamma) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}(G)} \gamma^{|I|}$, is called the *hard-core partition function* on G . The goal is to reduce the problem of approximate sampling from $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ to approximate sampling from $\mu_G^{(\gamma)}$ and, similarly, to reduce the problem of approximating $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ to approximating $Z_G(\gamma)$ for a suitably chosen graph G and parameter γ . The advantage of this approach is that sampling from a hard-core model and that approximating hard-core partition functions are well studied problems. Specifically, a sequence of recent papers [AJK+21; ALG21; CFY+22; CLV20; CLV21] established approximate sampling from $\mu_G^{(\gamma)}$ in $\tilde{O}(|V|)$ running time and randomized approximation of $Z_G(\gamma)$ in $\tilde{O}(|V|^2)$ running time for graphs G with maximum degree Δ for all γ strictly below the *tree threshold* $\gamma_c(\Delta) := \frac{(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}}{(\Delta-2)^{\Delta}}$.

Our reduction is inspired by the discretization schemes of [FGK+21a; FGK+21b]. These approaches are limited to the hard-sphere model in specific regions of Euclidean space. In this setting, the utilized graph G is essentially a unit disk graph based on a carefully constructed deterministic point set in \mathbb{V} . This procedure comes with two major disadvantages. First, constructing an appropriate point set that guarantees the desired approximation quality is a difficult task, and explicit ways to do so were only given for box-shaped regions of Euclidean space. Second, it is not obvious how this technique extends to general repulsive potentials ϕ . Modeling soft-core interactions using a single hard-core model likely requires far more sophisticated graph constructions depending on ϕ .

Instead of using a fixed graph for our discretization, we circumvent the above problems by investigating hard-core models on a suitably chosen family of random graphs. For a bounded measurable region $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, let $u_{\mathbb{V}}$ denote the uniform distribution on \mathbb{V} . That is, for $x \sim u_{\mathbb{V}}$, we have $\Pr[x \in A] = \frac{\nu(A)}{\nu(\mathbb{V})}$ for every measurable $A \subseteq \mathbb{V}$, and $\Pr[x \notin \mathbb{V}] = 0$. For a repulsive potential ϕ and a positive integer $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, we

consider a random graph model $\zeta_{\mathbb{V},\phi}^{(n)}$ on the set of undirected graphs with vertex set $[n]$, where $\zeta_{\mathbb{V},\phi}^{(n)}$ is defined by the following natural procedure to generate a graph:

1. For each $i \in [n]$, draw a uniform random point $x_i \sim u_{\mathbb{V}}$ independently.
2. For all $i, j \in [n]$ with $i \neq j$, connect i and j with an edge with probability $p_{\phi}(x_i, x_j) = 1 - e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)}$ independently.

A key property of the graphs from $\zeta_{\mathbb{V},\phi}^{(n)}$ is that, for a suitably chosen parameter γ , their hard-core partition functions concentrate around $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$, which is at the core of our algorithms.

► **Theorem 1.1.** Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra, and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be bounded and measurable, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and let $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a symmetric repulsive potential. For all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and $n \geq 4\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-1} \max\left\{e^6\lambda^2\nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln(4\varepsilon^{-1})^2\right\}$, it holds that, for $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V},\phi}^{(n)}$,

$$\Pr\left[\left|Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right) - \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)\right| \geq \varepsilon\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)\right] \leq \delta. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Informally, [Theorem 1.1](#) says that, for $n \in \Theta(\nu(\mathbb{V})^2)$ and $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V},\phi}^{(n)}$, the hard-core partition function $Z_G(\gamma(n))$ with $\gamma(n) = \frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}$ is strongly concentrated around the partition function of the repulsive Gibbs point process $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$. In [\[FGK+21a, Proposition 5.8\]](#), it was argued that the partition function of an unrestricted Poisson point process in a bounded measurable region \mathbb{V} of Euclidean space cannot be approximated by the hard-core partition function $Z_G(\gamma(n))$ for any graph G on n vertices if $n \in o(\nu(\mathbb{V})^2)$. As the unrestricted Poisson point process is a special case of a repulsive Gibbs point process with constant zero potential, this implies that our concentration result in [Theorem 1.1](#) is tight in terms of its asymptotic dependency on the volume $\nu(\mathbb{V})$.

We note that in the setting of hard-constraint models such as the hard-sphere model in Euclidean space, the idea of discretizing based on geometric random graphs was already studied in [\[FGK+21a\]](#) with the goal to allow for more general regions \mathbb{V} . However, due to the geometric arguments that were used in their proofs, their results relied on \mathbb{V} to exhibit a certain nice partitioning, which itself is non-trivial to check. In contrast to that, we prove our more general concentration result in a far less *ad hoc* manner. Specifically, we derive [Theorem 1.1](#) from a corollary of the Efron–Stein inequality [\[ES81\]](#). This corollary provides a convenient-to-use way for proving concentration of functions of independent random inputs, given that changing one input of the function only leads to small relative changes of its output. We proceed by discussing this approach in detail.

Proving concentration

We prove [Theorem 1.1](#) in two steps. First, we show that, for $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V},\phi}^{(n)}$ and $\gamma(n) = \frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}$, the expected hard-core partition function $\mathbb{E}[Z_G(\gamma(n))]$ converges rapidly to the partition function of the point process $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ as n grows. Once this is established, it remains to prove that the distribution of the partition functions $Z_G(\gamma(n))$ for $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V},\phi}^{(n)}$ concentrates around this expectation. To prove the latter, we derive the following corollary from the Efron–Stein inequality [\[ES81\]](#).

► **Corollary 1.2.** [Corollary of the Efron–Stein inequality] Let $\{(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mu_i)\}_{i \in [N]}$ be probability spaces with product space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu) = \bigotimes_{i \in [N]} (\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mu_i)$, and let $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an \mathcal{F} -measurable function. Assume that there are $c_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ for $i \in [N]$ such that $C := \sum_{i \in [N]} c_i^2 < 2$ and, for all $\mathbf{x} = (x_j)_{j \in [N]} \in \Omega$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_j)_{j \in [N]} \in \Omega$ that disagree only at position i , it holds that

$$|f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{y})| \leq c_i \cdot \min\{f(\mathbf{x}), f(\mathbf{y})\}.$$

Then, for all $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, it holds that

$$\Pr[|f - \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]| \geq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]] \leq \left(\frac{2}{2-C} - 1\right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Most methods for proving concentration in similar settings usually require the output of the function f to exhibit small *absolute* changes, given that one of its inputs is changed [McD89; McD98]. In contrast to that, [Corollary 1.2](#) applies if f exhibits small *relative* changes.

To apply [Corollary 1.2](#) to hard-core partition functions of random graphs from $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$, we need to express the random graph model $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ using a product of probability spaces. To this end, we model a random graph $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ based on n points $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in [n]}$, each independently drawn from $u_{\mathbb{V}}$, and $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ independent random variables $\mathbf{y} = (y_{i,j})_{1 \leq i < j \leq n}$, each uniformly distributed on the real interval $[0, 1]$. Given the random vectors \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} , we construct a graph by connecting vertices $i < j$ by an edge iff $y_{i,j} \leq p_\phi(x_i, x_j)$. Note that the resulting graph is distributed according to $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$. Thus, we express the hard-core partition function on the random graph model $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ as a function $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ for \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} as described above. The effect of changing a component of \mathbf{y} is bounded by the relative change of the hard-core partition function when adding or removing an edge. On the other hand, the effect of changing a component of \mathbf{x} , say x_i , is bounded by considering the change of the hard-core partition function when altering the neighborhood of a single vertex i . Bounding both effects and applying [Corollary 1.2](#) yields the concentration result ([Theorem 1.1](#)).

1.2 Algorithmic contributions

We first discuss our approximation algorithm for $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ and then our sampler for $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$.

Given our concentration result ([Theorem 1.1](#)), a straightforward idea for approximating $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ is to sample a graph $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ and try to approximate its hard-core partition function. A refined version of this procedure leads to the following theorem.

► **Theorem 1.3.** Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra, and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be bounded and measurable, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and let $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a symmetric repulsive potential. Assume there is a sampler for $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ with running time $t_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}(n)$. If

$$\lambda < \frac{e}{C_\phi},$$

then, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, there is a randomized ε -approximation algorithm for $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ with running time in $\tilde{O}(\nu(\mathbb{V})^4 \varepsilon^{-6}) + t_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}(\tilde{O}(\nu(\mathbb{V})^2 \varepsilon^{-2}))$. ◀

With respect to sampling from $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$, it is less obvious how [Theorem 1.1](#) can be utilized. However, under

mild assumptions, we obtain an approximate sampler, based on [Theorem 1.1](#), by the following procedure: Sample an independent $I \in \mathcal{I}(G)$ set (approximately) from $\mu_G^{(Y^{(n)})}$ and output the point configuration $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$. Given that $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ is simple, which means that drawing a point configuration that contains the same point multiple times has probability zero, a refined version of the approach sketched above leads to the following result.

► **Theorem 1.4.** Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra, and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be bounded and measurable, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and let $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a symmetric repulsive potential. Assume we can sample from the uniform distribution $u_{\mathbb{V}}$ in time $t_{\mathbb{V}}$ and, for every $x, y \in \mathbb{V}$, we can evaluate $\phi(x, y)$ in time t_{ϕ} . If the Gibbs point process $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ is simple and

$$\lambda < \frac{e}{C_{\phi}},$$

then, for every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, there exists an ε -approximate sampling algorithm for $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ with running time in $\tilde{O}(\nu(\mathbb{V})^3 \varepsilon^{-6} + \nu(\mathbb{V})^2 \varepsilon^{-3} t_{\mathbb{V}} + \nu(\mathbb{V})^4 \varepsilon^{-6} t_{\phi})$. ◀

There are two main differences in the assumptions of the approximation result ([Theorem 1.3](#)) and the sampling result ([Theorem 1.4](#)). First, the sampling result requires the point process to be simple. The reason is that, in order to bound the total variation distance between the output of our sampler and $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$, we derive a density of that output with respect to a Poisson point process. This task is greatly simplified by assuming that $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ is simple, as it allows for an easier characterization of the output distribution of our sampling based on a theorem by Rényi–Mönch (see [\[DV08, Theorem 9.2.XII\]](#)). However, assuming the point process to be simple is only a minor restriction, as it is satisfied for most applications of point processes. For example, it is trivially satisfied if the reference volume measure ν is not-atomic (i.e., assigns volume 0 to single points). This includes the most frequently studied case of Gibbs point processes in Euclidean space but also a variety of other spaces, such as Gibbs point processes in hyperbolic spaces or in Riemannian manifolds.

Second, our sampling result requires efficient sampling from the uniform distribution $u_{\mathbb{V}}$ and an efficient way to compute the potential ϕ . In contrast to that, [Theorem 1.3](#) only assumes an efficient way to sample a graph from $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$. This is due to the fact that for approximating $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$, we only need to approximate the hard-core partition function of a random graph from $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$. Our sampling procedure additionally requires the position $x_i \in \mathbb{V}$ for each vertex $i \in [n]$ along with the graph to output the point configuration, associated to a random independent set drawn from the hard-core model. Sampling from $u_{\mathbb{V}}$ and evaluating ϕ can be used to construct a random graph from $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$. Therefore, the latter assumption is weaker, and we derive the following corollary of [Theorem 1.3](#).

► **Corollary 1.5.** Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra, and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be bounded and measurable, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and let $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a symmetric repulsive potential. Assume we can sample from the uniform distribution $u_{\mathbb{V}}$ in time $t_{\mathbb{V}}$ and, for every $x, y \in \mathbb{V}$, we can evaluate $\phi(x, y)$ in time t_{ϕ} . If

$$\lambda < \frac{e}{C_{\phi}},$$

then, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, there is a randomized ε -approximation algorithm for $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ with running time in $\tilde{O}(v(\mathbb{V})^4 \varepsilon^{-6} + v(\mathbb{V})^2 \varepsilon^{-2} t_{\mathbb{V}} + v(\mathbb{V})^4 \varepsilon^{-4} t_{\phi})$. \blacktriangleleft

Last, we briefly discuss the origin of the fugacity bound $\frac{\varepsilon}{C_{\phi}}$ in our algorithmic results. Write $\gamma(n) = \frac{\lambda v(\mathbb{V})}{n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. Note that our algorithms rely on either an efficient approximation of the hard-core partition function $Z_G(\gamma(n))$ or an efficient approximate sampler for an independent set from $\mu_G^{(\gamma(n))}$ for a random graph $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$. As discussed earlier, such computational results are known for general graph of maximum degree Δ as long as the parameter γ is below the corresponding tree threshold $\gamma_c(\Delta)$. Observe that $\gamma_c(\Delta) \approx \frac{\varepsilon}{\Delta}$ for large Δ . Thus, roughly speaking, we can perform the necessary computational tasks as long as $\gamma(n) = \frac{\lambda v(\mathbb{V})}{n} < \frac{\varepsilon}{\Delta_G}$, where Δ_G is the maximum degree of the graph G that was drawn from $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$. Equivalently, this is $\lambda < \frac{\varepsilon n}{\Delta_G v(\mathbb{V})}$. The main observation is now that, for $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$, the expected degree of an arbitrary vertex of G is upper-bounded by $\frac{n C_{\phi}}{v(\mathbb{V})}$. By proving that, with sufficiently high probability, the maximum degree Δ_G is not much larger than this value, we obtain the desired bound of $\frac{\varepsilon}{C_{\phi}}$.

1.3 Concentration of antiferromagnetic partition functions

So far, we discussed how concentration of hard-core partition functions $Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda v(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)$ for random graphs $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$, stated in [Theorem 1.1](#), is obtained from [Corollary 1.2](#). However, our concentration result is more general and applies to antiferromagnetic two-state spin systems on a larger class of random graph models. As such spin systems have been studied extensively [[LLY13](#); [SS12](#); [SST14](#)], we believe this general result to be of independent interest.

To outline this more general concentration result, we start by introducing the class of spin systems to which it applies. For an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ with vertices V and edges $E \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$, we denote by Σ_G the set of all functions $\sigma : V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. To simplify notation, we assume $V = [n]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A *two-state spin system* with parameters $\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ on G is a probability distribution $\mu_G^{(\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1)}$ on Σ_G with

$$\mu_G^{(\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1)}(\sigma) = \frac{\gamma^{|\sigma|_1} \beta_0^{m_G^{(0)}(\sigma)} \beta_1^{m_G^{(1)}(\sigma)}}{Z_G(\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1)},$$

where $|\sigma|_1 = |\sigma^{-1}(1)|$ counts the number of vertices assigned to 1, $m_G^{(a)}(\sigma) = \sum_{\{i, j\} \in E} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(i)=\sigma(j)=a}$ counts the number of edges with both endpoints assigned to $a \in \{0, 1\}$, and the normalizing constant $Z_G(\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1)$ is the partition function

$$Z_G(\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_G} \gamma^{|\sigma|_1} \beta_0^{m_G^{(0)}(\sigma)} \beta_1^{m_G^{(1)}(\sigma)}.$$

A two-state spin system is *antiferromagnetic* if $\beta_0, \beta_1 \in [0, 1]$. Our concentration result applies to antiferromagnetic two-state spin systems with $\beta_0 = 1$. In this case, we omit β_0 completely, write $\beta = \beta_1 \in [0, 1]$, and denote the partition function by $Z_G(\gamma, \beta)$.

Our concentration result for partition functions $Z_G(\gamma, \beta)$ applies to the following class of random graph models. Let $\mathcal{X} = (X, \mathcal{A}, \xi)$ be a probability space, and let $p : X^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a symmetric function that is measurable with respect to the product measure $\xi^2 = \xi \times \xi$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, we denote by $\zeta_{\mathcal{X}, p}^{(n)}$ a distribution on undirected graphs with vertex set $[n]$ that is induced by the following procedure for generating a random graph:

1. Draw a tuple $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n$ according to the product distribution ξ^n .
2. For all $i, j \in [n], i \neq j$, add the edge $\{i, j\}$ independently with probability $p(x_i, x_j)$.

Observe that $\zeta_{\mathcal{X}, p}^{(n)}$ encompasses classical random graph models, such as Erdős–Rényi random graphs and geometric random graphs, as well as popular models studied in network theory, such as hyperbolic random graphs [KPK+10] and geometric inhomogeneous random graphs [BKL19].

Applying [Corollary 1.2](#) and using essentially the same arguments as in our proof sketch for [Theorem 1.1](#) yields the following result.

► **Theorem 1.6.** Let $\mathcal{X} = (X, \mathcal{A}, \xi)$ be a probability space, and let $p : X^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be symmetric and \mathcal{A}^2 -measurable. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma(n) \leq \gamma_0 n^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ for some $\gamma_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. For all $\beta \in [0, 1], \varepsilon \in (0, 1], \delta \in (0, 1], n \geq (2\gamma_0^2 \varepsilon^{-2} \delta^{-1})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ and $G \sim \zeta_{\mathcal{X}, p}^{(n)}$, it holds that

$$\Pr[|Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta) - \mathbb{E}[Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta)]| \geq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta)]] \leq \delta. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

A surprising aspect of this result is that, even though $\mathbb{E}[Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta)] \geq 1 + n\gamma(n)$ diverges for $\gamma(n) \in \omega(n^{-1})$ as n increases, [Theorem 1.6](#) still ensures that the distribution of the partition functions gets more and more concentrated as long as $\gamma(n) \in o(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$.

We derive [Theorem 1.1](#) as a special case of [Theorem 1.6](#). To see how this works, first observe that, for $\beta = 0$, $Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta)$ is the hard-core partition function of a graph G with parameter $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Moreover, by setting $\mathcal{X} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathcal{B}, u_{\mathbb{V}})$ and $p(x_1, x_2) = p_{\phi}(x_1, x_2) = 1 - e^{-\phi(x_1, x_2)}$ for every $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{V}$, we express the random graph model $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ in the framework proposed above. Last, setting $\gamma_0 = \lambda v(\mathbb{V})$ and $\gamma(n) = \gamma_0 n^{-1}$ and applying [Theorem 1.6](#) yields the desired concentration result for hard-core partition functions on $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$.

1.4 Discussion and outlook

We start by having a closer look at the assumptions that we require for our sampling and approximation algorithms to work efficiently. To this end, let us start by considering the setting where $\mathbb{V} = [0, \ell]^d \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a box of side length $\ell \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ in d -dimensional Euclidean space, equipped with the Euclidean distance and the Lebesgue measure as volume. Our sampling result in [Theorem 1.4](#) requires an efficient uniform sampler for \mathbb{V} . Note that such a uniform sampler can easily be obtained when assuming a real-valued model of computation, such as given in [BSS00]. The use of such a computational model is not only common [MP22], but the ability to output floating-point numbers with arbitrary precision is necessary to obtain any non-trivial total variation bound. In fact, we argue that, even for general complete, separable metric spaces, assuming a uniform sampler for a bounded region \mathbb{V} is not a restriction if we aim for sampling from a repulsive Gibbs point processes on \mathbb{V} . To see this, note that any efficient sampler for a Poisson point process with non-zero fugacity (which is a special case of a repulsive Gibbs point process with zero potential) can be turned into an efficient uniform sampler by sampling a non-empty point configuration and selecting one of the points uniformly at random. Thus, not only does our sampling procedure for repulsive Gibbs point processes require an efficient method for uniform sampling from \mathbb{V} , but existence of an efficient sampler for repulsive Gibbs point processes also implies the existence of such a uniform sampler. For efficient approximation of the partition function, the situation is different. As shown in [Theorem 1.3](#), we only require an efficient sampling procedure for $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$. This might be possible in some cases without access to a uniform sampler from \mathbb{V} . Especially in the setting of Euclidean space, it could

be an interesting question for future research to characterize regions \mathbb{V} and potentials ϕ that allow for efficient sampling from $\zeta_{\mathbb{V},\phi}^{(n)}$ with a discrete model of computation.

The next aspect of our results that we discuss is the fugacity regime of $\lambda < \frac{e}{C_\phi}$. In this work, we present the first algorithmic approach that allows for efficient approximation and approximate sampling in this regime for repulsive potentials with infinite range. However, in the finite-range setting, Michelen and Perkins [MP22] presented a slightly better parameter regime of $\frac{e}{\Delta_\phi}$, where Δ_ϕ denotes the potential-weighted connective constant. An obvious question is if our approach can achieve the same fugacity bound for general repulsive potentials. This could be possible by studying the implications that a bound on Δ_ϕ has for the random graph model $\zeta_{\mathbb{V},\phi}^{(n)}$, with the goal to achieve better sampling and approximation result for hard-core models on random graphs from that model. A reasonable candidate for this seems to be the (discrete) connective constant for graphs, which was previously studied in the context of efficient approximation of hard-core partition functions [SSŠ+17]. We believe that further improvements of the fugacity regime and extension to non-repulsive potentials, if possible, will require new conceptual insights.

Our results can be immediately extended to handle Gibbs point processes with non-uniform fugacity. This is, $\lambda : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a measurable function and the Gibbs point process is defined via a density with respect to a Poisson point process of intensity function λ . A simple way to model this in the framework of uniform fugacities is to define a new volume measure $\nu'(A) = \int_A \lambda(x) \nu(dx)$ and consider a process of fugacity one with respect to the new reference measure ν' . The resulting process has uniform fugacity and is equivalent to the initial process.

Another extension of our results is to include multiple types of particles. That is, the points are generated from a marked point process and the repulsive potential depends not only on the spatial positions but also on the marks of the points. A straightforward way to apply our results to this is to model the marks as a part of the underlying space \mathbb{X} . More precisely, for a model with $q \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ particle types in some space \mathbb{X} , we simply construct a new space $\mathbb{X}' = \mathbb{X} \times [q]$ and equip it with a volume measure ν' , which is the product of the original measure ν and the counting measure on $[q]$. By choosing the potential ϕ appropriately, this allows to represent multiple particle types using the setting that we consider in our paper.

Finally, it would be interesting to see if the concentration inequalities we present in this paper are tight. As discussed earlier, [Theorem 1.1](#) is indeed tight in terms of its dependency on $\nu(\mathbb{V})$. However, to obtain an upper bound on the error probability of $\delta \in (0, 1)$, [Theorem 1.1](#) requires $n \in \Theta(\delta^{-1})$. We wonder if a stronger, Chernoff-like, dependency of $n \in \text{poly}(\ln(\delta^{-1}))$ can be achieved. Similarly, it would be interesting if the more general concentration result in [Theorem 1.6](#) is tight, both in terms of the models it applies to and the parameter bound $\gamma(n) \in o(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$.

2 Preliminaries

We formally introduce the discrete antiferromagnetic spin systems we investigate, as well as Gibbs point processes.

2.1 Antiferromagnetic spin systems

For an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ with vertices V and edges $E \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$, we denote by Σ_G the set of all functions $\sigma : V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. Without loss of generality, we are going to assume the canonical vertex set $V = [n]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A *two-state spin system* with parameters $\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ on G is a probability

distribution $\mu_G^{(\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1)}$ on Σ_G with

$$\mu_G^{(\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1)}(\sigma) = \frac{\gamma^{|\sigma|_1} \beta_0^{m_G^{(0)}(\sigma)} \beta_1^{m_G^{(1)}(\sigma)}}{Z_G(\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1)},$$

where $|\sigma|_1 = |\sigma^{-1}(1)|$ counts the number of vertices assigned to 1, $m_G^{(a)}(\sigma) = \sum_{\{i,j\} \in E} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(i)=\sigma(j)=a}$ counts the number of edges with both endpoints assigned to $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and $Z_G(\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1)$ is the normalizing constant

$$Z_G(\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_G} \gamma^{|\sigma|_1} \beta_0^{m_G^{(0)}(\sigma)} \beta_1^{m_G^{(1)}(\sigma)}.$$

Note that we implicitly assume $\beta_0 \neq 0$ or $\beta_1 \neq 0$, as $\mu_G^{(\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1)}$ is not defined otherwise.

Usually, $\mu_G^{(\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1)}$ is referred to as the *Gibbs distribution* of the model and Z_G is called the *partition function*. Further, a two-state spin system is *antiferromagnetic* if $\beta_0, \beta_1 \in [0, 1]$. For our concentration result, we focus on the setting where $\beta_0 = 1$. In this case, we omit β_0 completely and write $\beta = \beta_1 \in [0, 1]$ and denote the partition function by $Z_G(\gamma, \beta)$. Of special interest within this class of antiferromagnetic two-state spin systems is the *hard-core model*, which results from setting $\beta = 0$. In this case, we might just omit the edge interactions β completely and write $\mu_G^{(\gamma)}$ and $Z_G(\gamma)$. Note that this implies that only configurations $\sigma \in \Sigma_G$ for which $\sigma^{-1}(1)$ is an independent set in G can have non-zero probability. For us, this model is especially relevant, as we show that concentration of hard-core partition functions on random graphs can be used to derive randomized approximations for the partition function of repulsive Gibbs point processes, which are introduced in the next section.

2.2 Gibbs point processes

We introduce the notion of Gibbs point processes that is used throughout this paper. For a formal treatment, it is common to model point processes as random counting measures. Note that this is different from the simplified definition that we gave in the introduction. For a more detailed overview on the theory of point processes and specifically Gibbs point processes, see [Jan18].

Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space and let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra of that space. Let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$ such that all bounded measurable sets have finite measure. Denote by \mathcal{N} the set of all locally finite counting measures on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. Formally, this is the set of all measures η on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$ with values in $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that $\nu(A) < \infty$ implies $\eta(A) < \infty$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}$. For each $A \in \mathcal{B}$, define a map $N_A : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ with $\eta \mapsto \eta(A)$ and let \mathcal{R} be the sigma algebra on \mathcal{N} that is generated by the set of those maps $\{N_A \mid A \in \mathcal{B}\}$. A *point process* on \mathbb{X} is now a measurable map from some probability space to the measurable space $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{R})$. With some abuse of terminology, we call any probability distribution on $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{R})$ a point process, as we can only use the identity as measurable mapping from η to itself. Moreover, a point process is called *simple* if $N_x(\eta) \leq 1$ with probability 1, where we write N_x for $N_{\{x\}}$.

Note that every counting measure $\eta \in \mathcal{N}$ is associated with a multiset of points in \mathbb{X} . To see this, define $X_\eta = \{x \in \mathbb{X} \mid N_x(\eta) > 0\}$. Then η can be expressed as a weighted sum of Dirac measures

$$\eta = \sum_{x \in X_\eta} N_x(\eta) \delta_x.$$

In this sense, η is associated with a multiset of points $x \in X_\eta$, each occurring with finite multiplicity $N_x(\eta)$. We may use such a *point configuration* interchangeably with its corresponding counting measure.

An important example for point processes are Poisson point processes. A *Poisson point process* with intensity $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ on (\mathbb{X}, d) is uniquely defined by the following properties

- for all bounded measurable $A \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ it holds that N_A is Poisson distributed with intensity $\kappa \nu(A)$ and
- for all $m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and disjoint measurable $A_1, \dots, A_m \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ it holds that N_{A_1}, \dots, N_{A_m} are independent.

Generally speaking, a *Gibbs point process* is a point process that is absolutely continuous with respect to a Poisson point process. For a bounded measurable $V \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ let \mathcal{N}_V denote the set of locally finite counting measures $\eta \in \mathcal{N}$ that satisfy $N_A(\eta) = 0$ for all measurable $A \subseteq \mathbb{X} \setminus V$. In this work we are interested in Gibbs point processes $P_V^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ on bounded measurable regions $V \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ that are parameterized by a *fugacity* parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and non-negative, symmetric, measurable *potential function* $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$. Formally, such a process $P_V^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ is defined by having a density with respect to a Poisson point process with intensity λ of the form

$$\frac{dP_V^{(\lambda, \phi)}}{dQ_\gamma}(\eta) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\eta \in \mathcal{N}_V} e^{-H(\eta)} e^{\lambda \nu(V)}}{\Xi_V(\lambda, \phi)}$$

where $H : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ is the *Hamiltonian* defined by

$$H(\eta) = \sum_{\{x, y\} \in \binom{X_\eta}{2}} N_x(\eta) N_y(\eta) \phi(x, y) + \sum_{x \in X_\eta} \frac{N_x(\eta)(N_x(\eta) - 1)}{2} \phi(x, x).$$

The normalizing constant $\Xi_V(\lambda, \phi)$ is usually called the (*grand-canonical*) *partition function* and can be written explicitly as

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_V(\lambda, \phi) &= 1 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \int_{V^k} e^{-H(\delta_{x_1} + \dots + \delta_{x_k})} \nu^k(d\mathbf{x}) \\ &= 1 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \int_{V^k} \prod_{\{i, j\} \in \binom{[k]}{2}} e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} \nu^k(d\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

3 A corollary of the Efron–Stein inequality

In this section, we derive [Corollary 1.2](#) from the Efron–Stein inequality. [Corollary 1.2](#) allows us to prove concentration for a function f on a product of probability spaces, given that the value of f only exhibits small relative changes when we change one of its inputs. This concentration result is central to our results.

We start by presenting the original Efron–Stein inequality. For $N \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ let $\{(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mu_i)\}_{i \in [N]}$ be a collection of probability spaces and let $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function on the product space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu) = \bigotimes_{i \in [N]} (\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mu_i)$. For each $i \in [N]$ define a function $\Delta_i^{(f)} : \Omega \times \Omega_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where, for every $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \Omega$ and $y_i \in \Omega_i$, the value $\Delta_i^{(f)}(\mathbf{x}, y_i)$ is defined as the squared difference in f that is caused by replacing x_i in \mathbf{x} with y_i . Formally, this is $\Delta_i^{(f)}(\mathbf{x}, y_i) = (f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{y}))^2$ where $\mathbf{y} = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, y_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_N)$. The Efron–Stein inequality bounds the variance of f under μ based on the local squared deviations $\Delta_i^{(f)}(\mathbf{x}, y_i)$.

► **Theorem 3.1 (Efron–Stein inequality [ES81]²).** Let $\{(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mu_i)\}_{i \in [N]}$ be probability spaces with product space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu) = \bigotimes_{i \in [N]} (\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mu_i)$. For every \mathcal{F} -measurable function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ it holds that

$$\text{Var}_\mu[f] \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \times \mu_i} \left[\Delta_i^{(f)} \right]. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Theorem 3.1 immediately gives a concentration result for f whenever $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E}_{\mu \times \mu_i} \left[\Delta_i^{(f)} \right]$ is of order of magnitude $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f]^2$ by using Chebyshev’s inequality. However, obtaining such a bound might turn out difficult, especially if $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f]$ is hard to compute explicitly. We present a sufficient condition for such a bound that is convenient to use and more in line with other methods for obtaining concentration results for functions of independent inputs, such as the method of bounded differences.

► **Corollary 1.2.** [Corollary of the Efron–Stein inequality] Let $\{(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mu_i)\}_{i \in [N]}$ be probability spaces with product space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu) = \bigotimes_{i \in [N]} (\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mu_i)$, and let $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an \mathcal{F} -measurable function. Assume that there are $c_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ for $i \in [N]$ such that $C := \sum_{i \in [N]} c_i^2 < 2$ and, for all $\mathbf{x} = (x_j)_{j \in [N]} \in \Omega$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_j)_{j \in [N]} \in \Omega$ that disagree only at position i , it holds that

$$|f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{y})| \leq c_i \cdot \min\{f(\mathbf{x}), f(\mathbf{y})\}.$$

Then, for all $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, it holds that

$$\Pr[|f - \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]| \geq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]] \leq \left(\frac{2}{2-C} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Proof. First, note that $|f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{y})| \leq c_i \min\{f(\mathbf{x}), f(\mathbf{y})\} \leq c_i f(\mathbf{x})$ implies $\mathbb{E}_{\mu \times \mu_i} \left[\Delta_i^{(f)} \right] \leq c_i^2 \mathbb{E}_\mu[f^2]$ for all $i \in [N]$. Thus, by **Theorem 3.1**, we have $\text{Var}_\mu[f] \leq \frac{C}{2} \mathbb{E}_\mu[f^2]$. Now, recall that by definition $\text{Var}_\mu[f] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[f^2] - \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]^2$, which implies $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f^2] - \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]^2 \leq \frac{C}{2} \mathbb{E}_\mu[f^2]$. Rearranging for $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f^2]$ and using the fact that $\frac{C}{2} < 1$ yields $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f^2] \leq \frac{2}{2-C} \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]^2$. Substituting this back into the definition of the variance, we obtain

$$\text{Var}_\mu[f] \leq \left(\frac{2}{2-C} - 1 \right) \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]^2,$$

which proves the first part of our claim. The second part follows immediately by applying Chebyshev’s inequality. ■

► **Remark 3.2.** Usually, we want to characterize concentration asymptotically in N . In this setting, **Corollary 1.2** tells us that, if $c_i \in O\left(N^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}\right)$ for all $i \in [N]$ and some $\alpha > 0$, then, for all $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1]$ such that $\varepsilon^2 \delta < 1$, it is sufficient to choose $N \in \Theta\left(\delta^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{\alpha}}\right)$ to ensure

$$\Pr[|f - \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]| \geq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]] \leq \delta. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

² The Efron–Stein inequality is usually stated for functions of independent real-valued random variables. However, it extends to functions on products of arbitrary probability spaces.

4 Concentration of partition functions of antiferromagnetic spin systems on random graphs

In this section, we use [Corollary 1.2](#) to derive a concentration result for the partition functions of antiferromagnetic two-state spin systems for a broad class of random graphs. We start by formalizing the random graph model that we consider.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ we denote by \mathcal{G}_n the set of all graphs on the canonical vertex set $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Note that each graph in \mathcal{G}_n is fully characterized by its edge set E . Let $\mathcal{X} = (X, \mathcal{A}, \xi)$ be a separable probability space, and let $p : X^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a symmetric function that is measurable with respect to the product measure $\xi^2 = \xi \times \xi$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ the random graph model induced by (X, \mathcal{A}, ξ) and p is described by generating a graph $G = ([n], E)$ by

- drawing a tuple $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n$ according to the product distribution ξ^n and
- adding the edge $\{i, j\}$ for all $i, j \in [n], i \neq j$ independently with probability $p(x_i, x_j)$.

Formally, this gives a probability distribution $\zeta_{\mathcal{X}, p}^{(n)}$ on \mathcal{G}_n with

$$\zeta_{\mathcal{X}, p}^{(n)}(G) = \int_{X^n} \left(\prod_{\{i, j\} \in E} p(x_i, x_j) \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{\{i, j\} \in \binom{[n]}{2} \setminus E} (1 - p(x_i, x_j)) \right) \xi^n(d\mathbf{x})$$

for all $G \in \mathcal{G}_n$, where $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in [n]}$ inside the integral.

To apply [Corollary 1.2](#) to partition functions on a random graph model $\zeta_{\mathcal{X}, p}^{(n)}$, we will need to bound how much the partition function changes when applying small modifications to the structure of a graph. More specifically, we want to get a bound on the relative change of the partition function, given that we

- add or remove a single edge, or
- add or remove a set of edges that are all incident to the same vertex.

The following two lemmas provide such bounds.

► **Lemma 4.1.** Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph and, for any $e \in E$ let $G' = (V, E \setminus \{e\})$. For all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\beta \in [0, 1]$ it holds that

$$0 \leq Z_{G'}(\gamma, \beta) - Z_G(\gamma, \beta) \leq \gamma^2 Z_G(\gamma, \beta)$$

and especially

$$|Z_{G'}(\gamma, \beta) - Z_G(\gamma, \beta)| \leq \gamma^2 \min\{Z_G(\gamma, \beta), Z_{G'}(\gamma, \beta)\}. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $V = [n]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and let $e = \{i, j\}$ for $i, j \in [n]$. Note that $\Sigma_G = \Sigma_{G'}$, as their vertex sets are identical. Further, observe that, for all $\sigma \in \Sigma_G$, it holds that $m_G^{(1)}(\sigma) \geq m_{G'}^{(1)}(\sigma)$. Thus, we have $\beta^{m_G^{(1)}(\sigma)} \leq \beta^{m_{G'}^{(1)}(\sigma)}$ and $Z_G(\gamma, \beta) \leq Z_{G'}(\gamma, \beta)$, which proves

$$0 \leq Z_{G'}(\gamma, \beta) - Z_G(\gamma, \beta).$$

We proceed by rewriting the partition function of G' as

$$Z_{G'}(\gamma, \beta) = \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Sigma_{G'}: \\ \sigma(i)=0 \text{ or } \sigma(j)=0}} \gamma^{|\sigma|_1} \beta^{m_{G'}^{(1)}(\sigma)} + \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Sigma_{G'}: \\ \sigma(i)=\sigma(j)=1}} \gamma^{|\sigma|_1} \beta^{m_{G'}^{(1)}(\sigma)}.$$

Observe that

$$\sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Sigma_{G'}: \\ \sigma(i)=0 \text{ or } \sigma(j)=0}} \gamma^{|\sigma|_1} \beta^{m_{G'}^{(1)}(\sigma)} = \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Sigma_G: \\ \sigma(i)=0 \text{ or } \sigma(j)=0}} \gamma^{|\sigma|_1} \beta^{m_G^{(1)}(\sigma)} \leq Z_G(\gamma, \beta).$$

For every $k \in [n]$, let $N_{G'}(k)$ denote the neighbors of vertex k in G' . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Sigma_{G'}: \\ \sigma(i)=\sigma(j)=1}} \gamma^{|\sigma|_1} \beta^{m_{G'}^{(1)}(\sigma)} &= \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Sigma_{G'}: \\ \sigma(i)=\sigma(j)=0}} \gamma^{|\sigma|_1+2} \beta^{m_{G'}^{(1)}(\sigma)} \beta^{\sum_{k \in N_{G'}(i)} \sigma(k)} \beta^{\sum_{k \in N_{G'}(j)} \sigma(k)} \\ &\leq \gamma^2 \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Sigma_{G'}: \\ \sigma(i)=\sigma(j)=0}} \gamma^{|\sigma|_1} \beta^{m_{G'}^{(1)}(\sigma)} \\ &= \gamma^2 \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Sigma_G: \\ \sigma(i)=\sigma(j)=0}} \gamma^{|\sigma|_1} \beta^{m_G^{(1)}(\sigma)} \\ &\leq \gamma^2 Z_G(\gamma, \beta). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $Z_{G'}(\gamma, \beta) \leq (1 + \gamma^2)Z_G(\gamma, \beta)$ and thus

$$Z_{G'}(\gamma, \beta) - Z_G(\gamma, \beta) \leq \gamma^2 Z_G(\gamma, \beta).$$

The upper bound on $|Z_{G'}(\gamma, \beta) - Z_G(\gamma, \beta)|$ follows immediately. ■

► **Lemma 4.2.** Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph and without loss of generality assume $V = [n]$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $E_H, E_{H'} \subseteq \{\{n+1, i\} \mid i \in [n]\}$, and set $H = ([n+1], E \cup E_H)$ and $H' = ([n+1], E \cup E_{H'})$. For all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\beta \in [0, 1]$ it holds that

$$|Z_H(\gamma, \beta) - Z_{H'}(\gamma, \beta)| \leq \gamma Z_G(\gamma, \beta) \leq \gamma \min\{Z_H(\gamma, \beta), Z_{H'}(\gamma, \beta)\}. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Proof. By [Lemma 4.1](#), we know that removing an edge from a graph doesn't decrease the partition function. Thus, $Z_H(\gamma, \beta)$ is maximized by choosing $E_H = \emptyset$ and minimized by choosing $E_H = \{\{n+1, i\} \mid i \in [n]\}$. Consequently, we have

$$Z_H(\gamma, \beta) \leq (1 + \gamma)Z_G(\gamma, \beta)$$

and

$$Z_H(\gamma, \beta) \geq Z_G(\gamma, \beta) + \gamma \geq Z_G(\gamma, \beta).$$

As the same holds for H' , we obtain

$$|Z_H(\gamma, \beta) - Z_{H'}(\gamma, \beta)| \leq \gamma Z_G(\gamma, \beta)$$

and the claim follows by noting that $Z_G(\gamma, \beta) \leq \min\{Z_H(\gamma, \beta), Z_{H'}(\gamma, \beta)\}$. ■

Based on [Lemmas 4.1](#) and [4.2](#), we use [Corollary 1.2](#) to prove the following statement.

► **Theorem 4.3.** Let $\mathcal{X} = (X, \mathcal{A}, \xi)$ be probability space, and let $p : X^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a symmetric and \mathcal{A}^2 -measurable. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma(n) \leq \gamma_0 n^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ for some $\gamma_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. For all $\beta \in [0, 1]$, $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $n > \gamma_0^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}$ and $G \sim \zeta_{\mathcal{X}, p}^{(n)}$ it holds that

$$\Pr[|Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta) - \mathbb{E}[Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta)]| \geq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta)]] \leq \frac{\gamma_0^2}{(n^\alpha - \gamma_0^2) \varepsilon^2}. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Proof. We aim for applying [Corollary 1.2](#) to prove our claim. To this end, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ we need to write the partition function $Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta)$ for $G \sim \zeta_{\mathcal{X}, p}^{(n)}$ as a function on a product of σ -finite probability spaces. At first, an obvious choice seems to be \mathcal{X}^n together with $\binom{n}{2}$ additional binary random variables, one for each potential edge $\{i, j\} \in \binom{[n]}{2}$. However, note that the edges might not necessarily be independent, meaning that the resulting product distribution would not resemble $\zeta_{\mathcal{X}, p}^{(n)}$. Instead, let $\mathcal{Y} = ([0, 1], \mathcal{B}([0, 1]), u)$, where $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ is the Borel algebra restricted to $[0, 1]$ and u is the uniform distribution on that interval. We consider the probability space $\mathcal{X}^n \otimes \mathcal{Y}^{\binom{n}{2}}$.

For $\mathbf{x} \in X^n$ and $\mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^{\binom{n}{2}}$ let $\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y} \in X^n \times [0, 1]^{\binom{n}{2}}$ denote the concatenation of \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} . We construct a measurable function $g : X^n \times [0, 1]^{\binom{n}{2}} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_n$ by mapping every $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y} \in X^n \times [0, 1]^{\binom{n}{2}}$ with $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in [n]} \in X^n$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_{i,j})_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \in [0, 1]^{\binom{n}{2}}$ to $g(\mathbf{z}) = ([n], E)$ such that, for all $i < j$, it holds that $\{i, j\} \in E$ if and only if $p(x_i, x_j) \geq y_{i,j}$. Simple calculations show that, for $\mathbf{z} \sim \xi^n \times u^{\binom{n}{2}}$, it holds that $g(\mathbf{z}) \sim \zeta_{\mathcal{X}, p}^{(n)}$. Now, let $f : X^n \times [0, 1]^{\binom{n}{2}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathbf{z} \mapsto Z_{g(\mathbf{z})}(\gamma(n), \beta)$. In order to apply [Corollary 1.2](#), we need to bound the relative change of $f(\mathbf{z})$ if we change one component of \mathbf{z} . Let $\mathbf{x}' = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x'_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) \in X^n$ for any $i \in [n]$. Then $g(\mathbf{x}' \circ \mathbf{y})$ can only differ from $g(\mathbf{z})$ on edges that are incident to vertex i . Thus, by [Lemma 4.2](#), it holds that

$$|f(\mathbf{z}) - f(\mathbf{x}' \circ \mathbf{y})| \leq \gamma(n) \min\{f(\mathbf{z}), f(\mathbf{x}' \circ \mathbf{y})\}.$$

Now, let $\mathbf{y}' = (y'_{i,j})_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \in [0, 1]^{\binom{n}{2}}$ such that $y'_{i,j} = y_{i,j}$ accept for one pair $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. Note that $g(\mathbf{z})$ and $g(\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y}')$ differ by at most one edge. By [Lemma 4.1](#), we have

$$|f(\mathbf{z}) - f(\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y}')| \leq \gamma(n)^2 \min\{f(\mathbf{z}), f(\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y}')\}.$$

Furthermore, note that for $\gamma_0 n^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ and $n > \gamma_0^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}$ it holds that

$$C = n\gamma(n)^2 + \binom{n}{2} \gamma(n)^4 \leq \gamma_0^2 n^{-\alpha} + \gamma_0^4 n^{-2\alpha} \leq 2\gamma_0^2 n^{-\alpha} < 2.$$

Thus, by [Corollary 1.2](#) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[|Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta) - \mathbb{E}[Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta)]| \geq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta)]] &\leq \left(\frac{2}{2-C} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{1 - \gamma_0^2 n^{-\alpha}} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{\gamma_0^2}{(n^\alpha - \gamma_0^2)\varepsilon^2},$$

which concludes the proof. ■

Theorem 1.6 follows immediately from **Theorem 4.3**.

► **Theorem 1.6.** Let $\mathcal{X} = (X, \mathcal{A}, \xi)$ be a probability space, and let $p : X^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be symmetric and \mathcal{A}^2 -measurable. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma(n) \leq \gamma_0 n^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ for some $\gamma_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. For all $\beta \in [0, 1]$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$, $n \geq (2\gamma_0^2\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-1})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ and $G \sim \zeta_{\mathcal{X}, p}^{(n)}$, it holds that

$$\Pr[|Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta) - \mathbb{E}[Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta)]| \geq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta)]] \leq \delta. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Proof. For $\varepsilon \leq 1$ and $\delta \leq 1$ it holds that $n \geq (2\gamma_0^2\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-1})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} > \gamma_0^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}$. Applying **Theorem 4.3** yields

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[|Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta) - \mathbb{E}[Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta)]| \geq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[Z_G(\gamma(n), \beta)]] &\leq \frac{1}{(2\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-1} - 1)\varepsilon^2} \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon^2\delta}{(2 - \varepsilon^2\delta)\varepsilon^2} \\ &= \frac{\delta}{2 - \varepsilon^2\delta} \\ &\leq \delta. \end{aligned} \quad \blacksquare$$

5 Application to repulsive Gibbs point processes

We use our concentration results for antiferromagnetic spin systems to relate repulsive Gibbs point processes to a hard-core model on carefully constructed classes of random graphs. To this end, let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. For every bounded and measurable $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ we define a probability space $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{V}} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{V}}, u_{\mathbb{V}})$, where $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{V}}$ denotes the restriction of \mathcal{B} to \mathbb{V} and $u_{\mathbb{V}}$ is the probability measure on $(\mathbb{V}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{V}})$ that is defined via the constant density $\frac{1}{\nu(\mathbb{V})}$ with respect to ν restricted to \mathbb{V} . For every symmetric, repulsive and measurable pair potential function $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, we now define the random graph model $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)} = \zeta_{\mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{V}}, p_{\phi}}^{(n)}$, where $p_{\phi}(x, y) = 1 - e^{-\phi(x, y)}$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{V}$. To see that this is valid according to our random graph model, note that, if (\mathbb{X}, d) is complete and separable, then $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{V}}$ is countably generated, and therefore $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{V}}$ is a separable probability space.

The following lemma relates the expected hard-core partition function on $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ with the partition function of the continuous Gibbs point process $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$.

► **Lemma 5.1.** Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be bounded and measurable, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and let $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a symmetric repulsive potential. For all $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $n \geq 2\varepsilon^{-1} \max\{e^6 \lambda^2 \nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln(2\varepsilon^{-1})^2\}$ it holds that

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) \leq \mathbb{E}_{G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}} \left[Z_G \left(\frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n} \right) \right] \leq \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi). \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Proof. We start by rewriting the hard-core partition function as

$$Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda v(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^k \frac{v(\mathbb{V})^k}{n^k} \sum_{S \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{S}{2}} \mathbb{1}_{\{i,j\} \notin E}.$$

Thus, by linearity of expectation we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}} \left[Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda v(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right) \right] &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^k \frac{v(\mathbb{V})^k}{n^k} \sum_{S \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \mathbb{E}_{G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}} \left[\prod_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{S}{2}} \mathbb{1}_{\{i,j\} \notin E} \right] \\ &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^k \frac{v(\mathbb{V})^k}{n^k} \sum_{S \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \Pr \left[\bigwedge_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{S}{2}} \{i,j\} \notin E \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, observe that for all $S \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ with $|S| = k$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\bigwedge_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{S}{2}} \{i,j\} \notin E \right] &= \int_{\mathbb{V}^n} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{S}{2}} (1 - p_\phi(x_i, x_j)) u_{\mathbb{V}}^n(\mathbf{dx}) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{V}^n} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{S}{2}} e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} u_{\mathbb{V}}^n(\mathbf{dx}) \\ &= \frac{1}{v(\mathbb{V})^n} \int_{\mathbb{V}^n} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{S}{2}} e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} v^n(\mathbf{dx}) \\ &= \frac{v(\mathbb{V})^{n-k}}{v(\mathbb{V})^n} \int_{\mathbb{V}^k} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[k]}{2}} e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} v^k(\mathbf{dx}) \\ &= \frac{1}{v(\mathbb{V})^k} \int_{\mathbb{V}^k} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[k]}{2}} e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} v^k(\mathbf{dx}). \end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}} \left[Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda v(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right) \right] &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^k \frac{1}{n^k} \sum_{S \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \int_{\mathbb{V}^k} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[k]}{2}} e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} v^k(\mathbf{dx}) \\ &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^k \frac{\binom{n}{k}}{n^k} \int_{\mathbb{V}^k} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[k]}{2}} e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} v^k(\mathbf{dx}) \\ &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{i}{n}\right) \int_{\mathbb{V}^k} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[k]}{2}} e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} v^k(\mathbf{dx}), \end{aligned}$$

from which the upper bound

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}} \left[Z_G \left(\frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n} \right) \right] \leq \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$$

follows immediately.

For the lower bound set

$$S_m = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \int_{\mathbb{V}^k} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[k]}{2}} e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} \nu^k(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{x})$$

for any $1 \leq m \leq n$. Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}} \left[Z_G \left(\frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n} \right) \right] \geq \left(1 - \frac{m}{n} \right)^m S_m.$$

Thus, for $n \geq 2\varepsilon^{-1}m^2$ Bernoulli's inequality yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}} \left[Z_G \left(\frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n} \right) \right] \geq \left(1 - \frac{m^2}{n} \right) S_m \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) S_m.$$

Furthermore, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) - S_m &= \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \int_{\mathbb{V}^k} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[k]}{2}} e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} \nu^k(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{x}) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^k \nu(\mathbb{V})^k}{k!}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from the fact that ϕ is non-negative. Next, observe that this is equal to the error of the Taylor expansion of $e^{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}$ around 0, truncated after m terms. Thus, by Lagrange's remainder formula, we obtain

$$\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) - S_m \leq \frac{e^{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}}{(m+1)!} (\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}))^{m+1}.$$

Choosing $m \geq \max\{e^3 \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}), \ln(2\varepsilon^{-1})\}$ and using the fact that $(m+1)! > \left(\frac{m+1}{e}\right)^{m+1}$ yields

$$\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) - S_m \leq \left(\frac{e^2 \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{m+1} \right)^{m+1} \leq e^{-(m+1)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

As $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) \geq 1$, we get

$$S_m \geq \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi).$$

For $n \geq 2\varepsilon^{-1}m^2 = 2\varepsilon^{-1} \max\{e^6 \lambda^2 \nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln(2\varepsilon^{-1})^2\}$ we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}} \left[Z_G \left(\frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n} \right) \right] \geq \left(1 - \frac{m}{n} \right)^m S_m \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right)^2 \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi),$$

which proves the claim. ■

► **Theorem 1.1.** Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra, and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be bounded and measurable, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and let $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a symmetric repulsive potential. For all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and $n \geq 4\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-1} \max\{e^6\lambda^2\nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln(4\varepsilon^{-1})^2\}$, it holds that, for $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$,

$$\Pr\left[\left|Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right) - \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)\right| \geq \varepsilon\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)\right] \leq \delta. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Proof. By setting $\alpha = 1$ and $\gamma_0 = \lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})$ and using the fact that

$$n \geq 4\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-1} \max\{e^6\lambda^2\nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln(4\varepsilon^{-1})^2\} \geq \left(2\gamma_0^2\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{-2}\delta^{-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$$

Theorem 1.6 yields

$$\Pr\left[\left|Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right) - \mathbb{E}\left[Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)\right]\right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)\right]\right] \leq \delta.$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 5.1 we know that for

$$n \geq 4\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-1} \max\{e^6\lambda^2\nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln(4\varepsilon^{-1})^2\} \geq 2\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{-1} \max\left\{e^6\lambda^2\nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln\left(2\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{-1}\right)^2\right\}$$

it holds that

$$\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) \leq \mathbb{E}_{G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}}\left[Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)\right] \leq \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi).$$

Thus, we have

$$\left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)\mathbb{E}\left[Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)\right] \leq \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$$

and similarly

$$\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)\mathbb{E}\left[Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)\right] \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^2\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi).$$

We obtain

$$\Pr\left[\left|Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right) - \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)\right| \geq \varepsilon\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)\right] \leq \delta,$$

which proves the claim. ■

5.1 Approximating the partition function

One of the main applications of Theorem 1.1 is that it yields a rather simple randomized procedure for approximating $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$. The rough idea is as follows:

1. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large, sample a graph G from $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$.

2. Approximate $Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)$ and use the result as an approximation for $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$.

We are especially interested in obtaining an algorithm that is asymptotically efficient in the volume $\nu(\mathbb{V})$, as this gives a natural way to parameterize the algorithmic problem. More specifically, we want to characterize the regime of the fugacity λ in terms of the potential ϕ for which we can get a randomized ε -approximation of $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ in time polynomial in $\nu(\mathbb{V})$ and $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. We characterize this fugacity regime in terms of the temperedness constant

$$C_\phi = \text{ess sup}_{x_1 \in \mathbb{X}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \left| 1 - e^{-\phi(x_1, x_2)} \right| \nu(dx_2),$$

where ess sup denotes the essential supremum (i.e., an upper bound that holds almost everywhere).

In order to ensure that the approximation algorithm runs efficiently in $\nu(\mathbb{V})$, two ingredients are important. First, we need to bound how large n needs to be chosen to ensure that $Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)$ is close to $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ with high probability. Second, we need to ensure that $Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)$ can be approximated in time polynomial in $\nu(\mathbb{V})$. Obviously, both requirements are satisfied if $n \in \text{poly}(\nu(\mathbb{V}))$ is sufficient and if $Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)$ can be approximated in time $\text{poly}(n)$. To tackle the first part, [Theorem 1.1](#) gives a useful tool. For the second part, we will use some well known results on approximating the hard-core partition function.

► **Theorem 5.2** ([\[ŠVV09, Corollary 8.4\]](#)³ and [\[AJK+21, Theorem 1\]](#)). Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph with maximum vertex degree bounded by $\Delta_G \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with

$$\gamma < \gamma_c(\Delta_G) = \frac{(\Delta_G - 1)^{\Delta_G - 1}}{(\Delta_G - 2)^{\Delta_G}}.$$

Then, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, there is a randomized ε -approximation algorithm for the hard-core partition function $Z_G(\gamma)$ with running time $\tilde{O}(|V|^2 \varepsilon^{-2})$. ◀

Thus, arguing that Z_G for $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ can be approximated in time $\text{poly}(n)$ boils down to obtaining a probabilistic upper bound on Δ_G . We use the following simple lemma.

► **Lemma 5.3.** Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be bounded and measurable, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and let $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a symmetric repulsive potential. Assume $C_\phi > 0$. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, $q \in (0, 1]$, $n \geq 3 \max\{\alpha^{-1}, \alpha^{-2}\} \ln(q^{-1}) C_\phi^{-1} \nu(\mathbb{V}) + 1$ and $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ it holds that

$$\Pr \left[\Delta_G \geq (1 + \alpha) \frac{n - 1}{\nu(\mathbb{V})} C_\phi \right] \leq qn. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Proof. By union bound, it is sufficient to argue that, for each $i \in [n]$ it holds that

$$\Pr \left[\Delta_G(i) \geq (1 + \alpha) \frac{n - 1}{\nu(\mathbb{V})} C_\phi \right] \leq q,$$

³ Štefankovič, Vempala, and Vigoda [[ŠVV09](#)] only state this result for $\gamma < \frac{2}{\Delta_G}$ as they use an older mixing time result for Glauber dynamics by Vigoda [[Vig01](#)]. Combining their approach with the more recent mixing time bound by Anari, Jain, Koehler, Pham, and Vuong [[AJK+21](#)] gives the desired bound of $\gamma < \gamma_c(\Delta_G)$.

where $\Delta_G(i)$ denotes the degree of vertex $i \in [n]$ in G . Now, observe that the random variables $\Delta_G(i)$ for $i \in [n]$ are identically distributed. Thus, we can focus on $\Delta_G(n)$ for ease of notation. By definition, it holds for $k \in [n-1] \cup \{0\}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\Delta_G(n) = k] &= \sum_{S \in \binom{[n-1]}{k}} \int_{\mathbb{V}^n} \left(\prod_{i \in S} p_\phi(x_n, x_i) \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{i \in [n-1] \setminus S} (1 - p_\phi(x_n, x_i)) \right) u_{\mathbb{V}}^n(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{V}} \sum_{S \in \binom{[n-1]}{k}} \left(\prod_{i \in S} \int_{\mathbb{V}} p_\phi(x_n, x_i) u_{\mathbb{V}}(dx_i) \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{i \in [n-1] \setminus S} \int_{\mathbb{V}} (1 - p_\phi(x_n, x_i)) u_{\mathbb{V}}(dx_i) \right) u_{\mathbb{V}}(dx_n) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{V}} \binom{n-1}{k} \left(\int_{\mathbb{V}} p_\phi(x_1, x_2) u_{\mathbb{V}}(dx_2) \right)^k \left(1 - \int_{\mathbb{V}} p_\phi(x_1, x_2) u_{\mathbb{V}}(dx_2) \right)^{n-1-k} u_{\mathbb{V}}(dx_1). \end{aligned}$$

For every $x_1 \in \mathbb{V}$, let B_{x_1} be a binomial random variable with $n-1$ trials and success probability $\int_{\mathbb{V}} p_\phi(x_1, x_2) u_{\mathbb{V}}(dx_2)$. We obtain

$$\Pr[\Delta_G(n) = k] = \int_{\mathbb{V}} \Pr[B_{x_1} = k] u_{\mathbb{V}}(dx_1),$$

which implies for all $a \in [0, n-1]$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\Delta_G(n) \geq a] &= \sum_{k=\lceil a \rceil}^{n-1} \int_{\mathbb{V}} \Pr[B_{x_1} = k] u_{\mathbb{V}}(dx_1) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{V}} \sum_{k=\lceil a \rceil}^{n-1} \Pr[B_{x_1} = k] u_{\mathbb{V}}(dx_1) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{V}} \Pr[B_{x_1} \geq a] u_{\mathbb{V}}(dx_1). \end{aligned}$$

Next, let B be a binomial random variable with $n-1$ trials and success probability $\frac{C_\phi}{v(\mathbb{V})}$. Observe that, by the definition of C_ϕ , it holds for ν -almost all $x_1 \in \mathbb{V}$ that $\int_{\mathbb{V}} p_\phi(x_1, x_2) u_{\mathbb{V}}(dx_2) \leq \frac{C_\phi}{v(\mathbb{V})}$. Thus, we have that B stochastically dominates B_{x_1} for $u_{\mathbb{V}}$ -almost all $x_1 \in \mathbb{V}$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\Pr[\Delta_G(n) \geq a] \leq \int_{\mathbb{V}} \Pr[B \geq a] u_{\mathbb{V}}(dx_1) = \Pr[B \geq a].$$

Observing that $E[B] = \frac{n-1}{v(\mathbb{V})} C_\phi$ and applying Chernoff bound yields

$$\Pr\left[\Delta_G(n) \geq (1 + \alpha) \frac{n-1}{v(\mathbb{V})} C_\phi\right] \leq e^{-\frac{\min\{\alpha, \alpha^2\} C_\phi (n-1)}{3v(\mathbb{V})}}.$$

Setting $n \geq 3 \max\{\alpha^{-1}, \alpha^{-2}\} \ln(q^{-1}) C_\phi^{-1} v(\mathbb{V}) + 1$ we have $\Pr\left[\Delta_G(n) \geq (1 + \alpha) \frac{n-1}{v(\mathbb{V})} C_\phi\right] \leq q$, which proves the claim. ■

Combining [Theorem 1.1](#), [Lemma 5.3](#), and [Theorem 5.2](#), we obtain the following algorithmic result.

► **Theorem 1.3.** Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra, and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be bounded and measurable, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and let $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a symmetric repulsive potential. Assume there is a sampler for $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ with running time $t_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}(n)$. If

$$\lambda < \frac{e}{C_\phi},$$

then, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, there is a randomized ε -approximation algorithm for $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ with running time in $\tilde{O}(\nu(\mathbb{V})^4 \varepsilon^{-6}) + t_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}(\tilde{O}(\nu(\mathbb{V})^2 \varepsilon^{-2}))$. ◀

Proof. We start by giving a more precise outline of the algorithmic idea. To this end, we define

$$N = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 324\varepsilon^{-2} \max \{ e^6 \lambda^2 \nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln(4\varepsilon^{-1})^2 \}, \\ 24 \max \left\{ \frac{1}{e^{-\lambda C_\phi}}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e^{-\lambda C_\phi})^2} \right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}) \ln \left(24 \max \left\{ \frac{1}{e^{-\lambda C_\phi}}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e^{-\lambda C_\phi})^2} \right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}) \right)^2 \end{array} \right\}.$$

We now use the following procedure to approximate $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$:

1. Choose some integer $n \geq N$.
2. Draw a graph G from $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$.
3. If $\Delta_G \geq \frac{en}{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}$, return an arbitrary value.
4. Else, use the algorithm from [Theorem 5.2](#) to $\frac{\varepsilon}{3}$ -approximate $Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)$ with an error probability of at most $\frac{1}{9}$ and return the result.

We proceed by arguing that this procedure yields an ε -approximation of $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ in time $\text{poly}(\nu(\mathbb{V})\varepsilon^{-1})$. We start by bounding the probability that the computed value is not an ε -approximation.

First, we assume that, whenever $\Delta_G \geq \frac{en}{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}$, the algorithm returns no ε -approximation in step 3. Let A be the event that this happens. Second, let B denote the event that the hard-core partition function $Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)$ the graph G that we drew in step 2 is not an $\frac{\varepsilon}{3}$ -approximation of $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$. Finally, let C denote the event we do not manage to compute an $\frac{\varepsilon}{3}$ -approximation of $Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)$ in step 4. Note that the probability that the above procedure does not output an ε -approximation for $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$ is upper bounded by

$$\Pr \left[A \cup (B \cap \bar{A}) \cup (C \cap \bar{B} \cap \bar{A}) \right] \leq \Pr[A] + \Pr[B] + \Pr[C].$$

We proceed with bounding each of these probabilities separately.

To bound $\Pr[A]$, let $z = 24 \max \left\{ \frac{1}{e^{-\lambda C_\phi}}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e^{-\lambda C_\phi})^2} \right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})$. As we are interested in asymptotic behavior in terms of $\nu(\mathbb{V})$, we may assume that $\nu(\mathbb{V})$ is sufficiently large to ensure $z \geq 5$. Note that for this, we have to exclude the case $\lambda = 0$, which trivially yields $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) = 1$. Now, observe that for $z \geq 5$ it holds that $z \ln(z)^2 \geq z \ln(z \ln(z)^2)$. Next, observe that $n \geq z \ln(z)^2$. Thus, we have $n \geq z \ln(n)$. Furthermore, by $n \geq 5 \ln(5)^2 \geq e \geq 2$, we have

$$n - 1 \geq \frac{n}{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq 12 \max\left\{\frac{1}{e - \lambda C_\phi}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e - \lambda C_\phi)^2}\right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}) \ln(n) \\
&\geq 3(\ln(9) + 1) \max\left\{\frac{1}{e - \lambda C_\phi}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e - \lambda C_\phi)^2}\right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}) \ln(n) \\
&= 3(\ln(9) \ln(n) + \ln(n)) \max\left\{\frac{1}{e - \lambda C_\phi}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e - \lambda C_\phi)^2}\right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}) \\
&\geq 3 \ln(9n) \max\left\{\frac{1}{e - \lambda C_\phi}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e - \lambda C_\phi)^2}\right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$n \geq 3 \max\left\{\frac{\lambda C_\phi}{e - \lambda C_\phi}, \left(\frac{\lambda C_\phi}{e - \lambda C_\phi}\right)^2\right\} \ln(9n) C_\phi^{-1} \nu(\mathbb{V}) + 1$$

and by [Lemma 5.3](#)

$$\Pr\left[\Delta_G \geq \frac{en}{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}\right] \leq \Pr\left[\Delta_G \geq \left(1 + \frac{e - \lambda C_\phi}{\lambda C_\phi}\right) \frac{n-1}{\nu(\mathbb{V})} C_\phi\right] \leq \frac{1}{9}.$$

To bound $\Pr[B]$, note that for $n \geq 324\epsilon^{-2} \max\{e^6 \lambda^2 \nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln(4\epsilon^{-1})^2\}$ [Theorem 1.1](#) yields

$$\Pr[B] = \Pr\left[\left|Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right) - \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)\right| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{3} \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)\right] \leq \frac{1}{9}.$$

Finally, note that, by [Theorem 5.2](#), we can obtain an $\frac{\epsilon}{3}$ -approximation of $Z_G\left(\frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)$ with error probability at most $\Pr[C] \leq \frac{1}{9}$ in time $\tilde{O}(n^2 \epsilon^{-2})$ as long as $\frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n} < \gamma_c(\Delta_G)$. As we only run the approximation for graphs G with $\Delta_G < \frac{en}{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}$ it holds that

$$\frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n} < \frac{e}{\Delta_G} < \gamma_c(\Delta_G),$$

proving that the requirement is satisfied.

We obtain that the error probability is bounded by $\frac{1}{3}$. To finish the proof, we need to argue that our algorithm has the desired running time. To this end, note that $N \in O(\nu(\mathbb{V})^2 \epsilon^{-2})$. Thus, we can also choose $n \in O(\nu(\mathbb{V})^2 \epsilon^{-2})$. By assumption, step 2 can be computed in time $t_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}(n) = t_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}(O(\nu(\mathbb{V})^2 \epsilon^{-2}))$. Furthermore, step 3 can be computed in time $\tilde{O}(n^2 \nu(\mathbb{V})^{-1}) = \tilde{O}(\nu(\mathbb{V})^3 \epsilon^{-4})$ and, by [Theorem 5.2](#), step 4 runs in time $\tilde{O}(n^2 \epsilon^{-2}) = \tilde{O}(\nu(\mathbb{V})^4 \epsilon^{-6})$ for $\frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n} < \gamma_c(\Delta_G)$. Consequently, the overall running time is in $\tilde{O}(\nu(\mathbb{V})^4 \epsilon^{-6}) + t_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}(O(\nu(\mathbb{V})^2 \epsilon^{-2}))$. \blacksquare

[Corollary 1.5](#) follows immediately from [Theorem 1.1](#) by noting that a graph from $\zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ can be sampled by drawing n points from $u_{\mathbb{V}}$ and evaluating ϕ for each pair of points.

6 Sampling from repulsive Gibbs point processes

In this section, we propose an approximate sampling algorithm for the Gibbs measure of a repulsive Gibbs point process, based in random hard-core models. More precisely, we investigate the sampling procedure given by [Algorithm 1](#)

Algorithm 1: Approximate sampling algorithm for a repulsive point process $(\mathbb{V}, \lambda, \phi)$.

Data: Instance of a repulsive Gibbs point process $(\mathbb{V}, \lambda, \phi)$, error bound $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$

Result: multiset of points in \mathbb{V}

- 1 set $n = \left\lceil \max \left\{ \frac{8 \cdot 18^2 \cdot 12}{\varepsilon^3} \max \{ e^6 \lambda^2 \nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln(\frac{4 \cdot 18}{\varepsilon}) \}, 6 \ln(\frac{4\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}) \max \left\{ \frac{1}{e - \lambda C_\phi}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e - \lambda C_\phi)^2} \right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}) \ln \left(3 \ln(\frac{4\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}) \max \left\{ \frac{1}{e - \lambda C_\phi}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e - \lambda C_\phi)^2} \right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}) \right)^2 \right\} \right\rceil$;
- 2 for each $i \in [n]$ draw $X_i \sim u_{\mathbb{V}}$ independently;
- 3 draw $E \subseteq \binom{[n]}{2}$ s.t. $\{i, j\} \in E$ with probability $p_\phi(X_i, X_j) = 1 - e^{-\phi(X_i, X_j)}$ independently;
- 4 set $G = ([n], E)$;
- 5 **if** maximum degree $\Delta_G \geq \frac{en}{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}$ **then**
- 6 | set $X = \emptyset$;
- 7 **else**
- 8 | sample $\sigma \in \Sigma_G$ $\frac{\varepsilon}{4}$ -approximately from the hard-core distribution $\mu_G^{(\gamma(n))}$ where $\gamma(n) = \frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}$;
- 9 | set $X = \{X_i \mid i \in [n] \text{ s.t. } \sigma(i) = 1\}$ (possibly multiset);
- 10 **end**
- 11 **return** X ;

Our main theorem in this section is as follows.

► **Theorem 6.1.** Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be bounded and measurable, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and let $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a symmetric repulsive potential. Assume we can sample from the uniform distribution $u_{\mathbb{V}}$ in time $t_{\mathbb{V}}$ and, for every $x, y \in \mathbb{V}$, evaluate $\phi(x, y)$ in time t_ϕ . If the Gibbs point process $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ is simple and

$$\lambda < \frac{e}{C_\phi}$$

then, for every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, [Algorithm 1](#) samples ε -approximately from $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ and has running time in $\tilde{O}(\nu(\mathbb{V})^3 \varepsilon^{-6} + \nu(\mathbb{V})^2 \varepsilon^{-3} t_{\mathbb{V}} + \nu(\mathbb{V})^4 \varepsilon^{-6} t_\phi)$. ◀

[Theorem 1.4](#) follows immediately from the theorem above. To prove [Theorem 6.1](#), we start by analyzing a simplified algorithm, given in [Algorithm 2](#).

The main difference between [Algorithm 1](#) and [Algorithm 2](#) is that the latter one does not check if the maximum degree of the sampled graph G is bounded and that it assumes access to a perfect sampler for $\mu_G^{(\gamma(n))}$. It is not clear if such a perfect sampler for the hard-core Gibbs distribution can be realized in polynomial time, especially for arbitrary vertex degrees. Therefore, [Algorithm 2](#) is not suitable for algorithmic applications. However, the main purpose of [Algorithm 2](#) is that the distribution of point multisets that it outputs are much easier to analyze. We use this, together with a coupling argument, to bound the total

Algorithm 2: Modified sampling process

Data: Instance of a repulsive Gibbs point process $(\mathbb{V}, \lambda, \phi)$, error bound $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$

Result: multiset of points in \mathbb{V}

- 1 set $n = \left\lceil \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 8 \frac{18^2 \cdot 12}{\varepsilon^3} \max \{ e^6 \lambda^2 \nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln(\frac{4 \cdot 18}{\varepsilon}) \}, \\ 6 \ln(\frac{4e}{\varepsilon}) \max \left\{ \frac{1}{e - \lambda C_\phi}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e - \lambda C_\phi)^2} \right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}) \ln \left(3 \ln(\frac{4e}{\varepsilon}) \max \left\{ \frac{1}{e - \lambda C_\phi}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e - \lambda C_\phi)^2} \right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}) \right)^2 \end{array} \right\} \right\rceil$;
 - 2 for each $i \in [n]$ draw $X_i \sim u_{\mathbb{V}}$ independently;
 - 3 draw $E \subseteq \binom{[n]}{2}$ s.t. $\{i, j\} \in E$ with probability $p_\phi(X_i, X_j) = 1 - e^{-\phi(X_i, X_j)}$ independently;
 - 4 set $G = ([n], E)$;
 - 5 sample $\tau \in \Sigma_G$ exactly from the hard-core distribution $\mu_G^{(\gamma(n))}$ where $\gamma(n) = \frac{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}{n}$;
 - 6 set $Y = \{X_i \mid i \in [n] \text{ s.t. } \tau(i) = 1\}$ (possibly multiset);
 - 7 **return** Y ;
-

variation distance between the output of [Algorithm 1](#) and $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$. Once this is done, it remains to show that [Algorithm 1](#) satisfies the running time requirements, given in [Theorem 6.1](#).

To analyze the output distribution of [Algorithm 2](#), we start by considering the resulting distribution of multisets of points (or counting measures respectively) when conditioning on the event that the hard-core partition function $Z_G(\gamma(n))$ of the drawn graph G is close to the partition function of the continuous process $\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)$. More specifically, for any given n and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, let $A_\alpha^{(n)} = \{H \in \mathcal{G}_n \mid |Z_H(\gamma(n)) - \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)| \leq \alpha \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)\}$. We derive an explicit density for the output of [Algorithm 2](#) with respect to a Poisson point process under the condition that $G \in A_\alpha^{(n)}$ for some sufficiently small α . To this end, we use the following characterization of simple point processes via so called *void probabilities*.

► **Theorem 6.2 (Rényi–Mönch, see [DV08, Theorem 9.2.XII]).** Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the associated Borel algebra. Let P and Q be simple point process on (\mathbb{X}, d) . If, for $\eta_P \sim P$ and $\eta_Q \sim Q$ and for all bounded $B \in \mathcal{B}$, it holds that

$$\Pr[\eta_P(B) = 0] = \Pr[\eta_Q(B) = 0],$$

then $P = Q$. ◀

[Theorem 6.2](#) greatly simplifies proving that a given candidate function actually is a valid density for the point process in question, as it implies that it is sufficient to check if it yields the correct void probabilities.

Before we proceed, we introduce some additional notation that is useful for stating and proving our next lemmas. For a given graph $H = (V, E)$, we denote by $\mathcal{I}(H) \subseteq 2^V$ the set of all independent sets in H . Moreover, for every spin configuration $\sigma \in \Sigma_H$, we denote by S_σ the set of all vertices $v \in V$ with $\sigma(v) = 1$. Note that, for a hard-core model on H with $\gamma > 0$, this construction gives a one-to-one correspondence between $\mathcal{I}(H)$ and the set of spin configurations $\sigma \in \Sigma_H$ with $\mu_H^{(\gamma)}(\sigma) > 0$. Therefore, it is often convenient to argue about elements in $\mathcal{I}(H)$ instead of using spin configurations.

► **Lemma 6.3.** Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be bounded and measurable, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and let $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a symmetric repulsive potential. Furthermore, for any given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, let \widehat{P}_ε be the point process produced by [Algorithm 2](#) conditioned on $G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}$, and let Q_λ denote a Poisson

point process with intensity λ . If the Gibbs point process $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ is simple, then \widehat{P}_ε has a density with respect to Q of the form

$$g_\varepsilon(\eta) = \mathbb{1}_{\eta \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{V}}} \Pr \left[G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \right]^{-1} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{\eta(\mathbb{V})-1} 1 - \frac{i}{n} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\eta(\mathbb{V}) \leq n} \\ \cdot \left(\prod_{\{x, y\} \in \binom{X_\eta}{2}} e^{-N_x(\eta)N_y(\eta)\phi(x, y)} \right) \left(\prod_{x \in X_\eta} e^{-\frac{N_x(\eta)(N_x(\eta)-1)}{2}\phi(x, x)} \right) \Psi_n^{(\eta(\mathbb{V}))}(\varphi(\eta)) e^{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})},$$

where φ maps every finite counting measure η to an arbitrary but fixed tuple $(x_1, \dots, x_{\eta(\mathbb{X})})$ such that $\eta = \sum_{i=1}^{\eta(\mathbb{X})} \delta_{x_i}$ and

$$\Psi_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\substack{H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}: \\ [k] \in \mathcal{I}(H)}} \frac{1}{Z_H(Y(n))} \int_{\mathbb{V}^{n-k}} \left(\prod_{\substack{(i, j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ \{i, j+k\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{(i, j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ \{i, j+k\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) \\ \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i, j\} \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i+k, j+k\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i, j\} \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i+k, j+k\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) u_{\mathbb{V}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{y})$$

for all $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{V}^k$. ◀

Proof. First, observe that $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$. As $n \geq 4 \frac{12^3}{\varepsilon^3} \max \left\{ e^6 \lambda^2 \nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln \left(4 \frac{12}{\varepsilon} \right)^2 \right\}$, [Theorem 1.1](#) implies that $\Pr \left[G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12} > 0$. Therefore, conditioning on the event $G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}$ is well defined.

Next, note that, for all $x \in \mathbb{V}$ it holds that

$$\Pr[\eta(\{x\}) \geq 2] \geq \frac{e^{-\phi(x, x)} \lambda^2 \nu(\{x\})^2}{\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)} \geq \frac{e^{-\phi(x, x)} \lambda^2 \nu(\{x\})^2}{e^{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}}$$

for $\eta \sim P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$. Thus, if $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ is simple (i.e., $\Pr[\eta(\{x\}) \geq 2] = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{V}$), it holds that $\lambda = 0$ or, for all $x \in \mathbb{V}$, $\nu(\{x\}) = 0$ or $\phi(x, x) = \infty$. This implies that the output of [Algorithm 2](#) is simple as well, and consequently \widehat{P}_ε is a simple point process.

Knowing that \widehat{P}_ε is simple, [Theorem 6.2](#) implies that, in order to verify that g_ε is indeed a density for \widehat{P}_ε , it suffices to prove that it yields the correct void probabilities. Formally, this means showing that for all bounded $B \in \mathcal{B}$ it holds that

$$\Pr \left[Y \cap B = \emptyset \mid G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \right] = \int_{\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\eta(B)=0} g_\varepsilon(\eta) Q_\lambda(d\eta)$$

for Y and G as in [Algorithm 2](#).

To prove this, we first write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\eta(B)=0} g_\varepsilon(\eta) Q_\lambda(d\eta) &= \int_{\mathcal{N}_\mathbb{V}} \mathbb{1}_{\eta(B)=0} g_\varepsilon(\eta) Q_\lambda(d\eta) \\ &= e^{-\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})} \cdot \left(g_\varepsilon(\mathbf{0}) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \int_{\mathbb{V}^k} \mathbb{1}_{\forall i \in [k]: x_i \notin B} g_\varepsilon \left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \delta_{x_i} \right) \nu^k(d\mathbf{x}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the constant 0 measure on \mathbb{X} . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})} g_\varepsilon(\mathbf{0}) &= \Pr \left[G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \right]^{-1} \cdot \sum_{H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}} \frac{1}{Z_H(Y(n))} \int_{\mathbb{V}^n} \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n]}{2}: \\ \{i,j\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n]}{2}: \\ \{i,j\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) u_{\mathbb{V}}^n(d\mathbf{y}) \\ &= \Pr \left[G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \right]^{-1} \cdot \sum_{H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}} \Pr[S_\tau = \emptyset \mid G = H] \Pr[G = H] \\ &= \frac{\Pr \left[S_\tau = \emptyset \wedge G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \right]}{\Pr \left[G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \right]} \\ &= \Pr \left[S_\tau = \emptyset \mid G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

for τ as in [Algorithm 2](#). We proceed by a case distinction based on k . For every $k > n$ and $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{V}^k$ we have $g_\varepsilon(\sum_{i \in [k]} \delta_{x_i}) = 0$. Therefore, we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{V}^k} \mathbb{1}_{\forall i \in [k]: x_i \notin B} g_\varepsilon \left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \delta_{x_i} \right) \nu^k(d\mathbf{x}) = 0$$

for all $k > n$. Now, consider $k \in [n]$ and observe that for all $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{V}^k$ we have

$$\Psi_n^{(k)} \left(\varphi \left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \delta_{x_i} \right) \right) = \Psi_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{x})$$

by symmetry. Moreover, it holds that

$$\frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} 1 - \frac{i}{n} \right) = \binom{n}{k} \frac{\gamma(n)^k}{\nu(\mathbb{V})^k}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$e^{-\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \int_{\mathbb{V}^k} \mathbb{1}_{\forall i \in [k]: x_i \notin B} g_\varepsilon \left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \delta_{x_i} \right) \nu^k(d\mathbf{x})$$

$$= \Pr\left[G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}\right]^{-1} \binom{n}{k} \gamma(n)^k \int_{\mathbb{V}^k} \mathbb{1}_{\forall i \in [k]: x_i \notin B} \left(\prod_{i,j \in \binom{[k]}{2}} e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} \right) \Psi_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) u_{\mathbb{V}}^k(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{x}).$$

Next, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \gamma(n)^k \int_{\mathbb{V}^k} \mathbb{1}_{\forall i \in [k]: x_i \notin B} \left(\prod_{i,j \in \binom{[k]}{2}} e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} \right) \Psi_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) u_{\mathbb{V}}^k(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}} \mathbb{1}_{[k] \in I(H)} \frac{\gamma(n)^k}{Z_H(\gamma(n))} \int_{\mathbb{V}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\forall i \in [k]: x_i \notin B} \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n]}{2}: \\ \{i,j\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n]}{2}: \\ \{i,j\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(x_i, x_j)} \right) u_{\mathbb{V}}^n(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}} \Pr[S_\tau = [k] \mid G = H] \Pr[G = H \wedge \forall i \in [k] : X_i \notin B] \end{aligned}$$

for X_1, \dots, X_n as in [Algorithm 2](#). Furthermore, because the event $S_\tau = [k]$ is independent of X_1, \dots, X_n given G , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}} \Pr[S_\tau = [k] \mid G = H] \Pr[G = H \wedge \forall i \in [k] : X_i \notin B] &= \sum_{H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}} \Pr[S_\tau = [k] \wedge G = H \wedge \forall i \in [k] : X_i \notin B] \\ &= \Pr[S_\tau = [k] \wedge G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \wedge \forall i \in [k] : X_i \notin B] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\lambda v(\mathbb{V})} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \int_{\mathbb{V}^k} \mathbb{1}_{\forall i \in [k]: x_i \notin B} g_\varepsilon \left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \delta_{x_i} \right) v^k(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{x}) &= \binom{n}{k} \frac{\Pr[S_\tau = [k] \wedge G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \wedge \forall i \in [k] : X_i \notin B]}{\Pr[G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}]} \\ &= \binom{n}{k} \Pr[S_\tau = [k] \wedge \forall i \in [k] : X_i \notin B \mid G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}] \\ &= \sum_{V' \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \Pr[S_\tau = V' \wedge \forall i \in V' : X_i \notin B \mid G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to symmetry. Combining everything yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\eta(B)=0} g_\varepsilon(\eta) Q_\lambda(\mathbf{d}\eta) &= \Pr[S_\tau = \emptyset \mid G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}] + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{V' \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \Pr[S_\tau = V' \wedge \forall i \in V' : X_i \notin B \mid G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}] \\ &= \sum_{V' \in 2^{[n]}} \Pr[S_\tau = V' \wedge \forall i \in V' : X_i \notin B \mid G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}] \\ &= \Pr[\forall i \in S_\tau : X_i \notin B \mid G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}] \end{aligned}$$

$$= \Pr \left[Y \cap B = \emptyset \mid G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \right],$$

which concludes the proof. ■

We proceed by upper and lower bounding the density $g_\varepsilon(\eta)$ in terms of the density of $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$. To this end, we use the following basic facts about the partition function of the hard-core model.

► **Observation 6.4** (see [FGK+21a]). For every undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ the following holds:

(1) For all $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$

$$Z_G(\gamma_1) \leq Z_G(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \leq e^{\gamma_2 |V|} Z_G(\gamma_1).$$

(2) For all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $S \subseteq V$

$$Z_{G-S}(\gamma) \leq Z_G(\gamma) \leq e^{\gamma |S|} Z_{G-S}(\gamma),$$

where $G - S$ denotes the subgraph of G that is induced by $V \setminus S$. ◀

Using [Observation 6.4](#) we derive the following bounds.

► **Lemma 6.5.** Consider the setting of [Lemma 6.3](#) and let f denote the density of $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ with respect to Q_λ . For n as in [Algorithm 2](#) and all $\eta \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\eta(\mathbb{V}) \leq \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon n}{12}}, \frac{\varepsilon n}{40\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})} \right\}$ it holds that

$$\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) f(\eta) \leq g_\varepsilon(\eta) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) f(\eta). \quad \leftarrow$$

Proof. First, recall that, when $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ is simple, its density with respect to Q_λ can be expressed as

$$f(\eta) = \frac{1}{\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)} \mathbb{1}_{\eta \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{V}}} \left(\prod_{\{x, y\} \in \binom{X_\eta}{2}} e^{-N_x(\eta) N_y(\eta) \phi(x, y)} \right) \left(\prod_{x \in X_\eta} e^{-\frac{N_x(\eta)(N_x(\eta)-1)}{2} \phi(x, x)} \right) e^{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}$$

for every $\eta \in \mathcal{N}$. Therefore, we have

$$g_\varepsilon(\eta) = \Pr \left[G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \right]^{-1} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{\eta(\mathbb{V})-1} 1 - \frac{i}{n} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\eta(\mathbb{V}) \leq n} \Psi_n^{(\eta(\mathbb{V}))}(\varphi(\eta)) \Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi) f(\eta).$$

As we focus on η with $\eta(\mathbb{V}) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon n}{12}} \leq n$, we omit the indicator $\mathbb{1}_{\eta(\mathbb{V}) \leq n}$ from now on.

We proceed by deriving an upper bound on $g_\varepsilon(\eta)$ for $\eta \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\eta(\mathbb{V}) \leq \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon n}{12}}, \frac{\varepsilon n}{40\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})} \right\}$. To this end, note that

$$\left(\prod_{i=0}^{\eta(\mathbb{V})-1} 1 - \frac{i}{n} \right) \leq 1.$$

Moreover, for $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$ and $n \geq 4 \frac{12^3}{\varepsilon^3} \max \left\{ e^6 \lambda^2 \nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln \left(4 \frac{12}{\varepsilon} \right)^2 \right\}$ [Theorem 1.1](#) yields $\Pr \left[G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}$.

Finally, observe that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{V}^k$ for $k \leq n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) &\leq \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}\right)\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)} \sum_{\substack{H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}: \\ [k] \in J(H)}} \int_{\mathbb{V}^{n-k}} \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ \{i,j+k\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ \{i,j+k\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) \\
&\quad \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i+k, j+k\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i+k, j+k\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) u_{\mathbb{V}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{y}) \\
&= \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}\right)\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)} \int_{\mathbb{V}^{n-k}} \sum_{\substack{H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}: \\ [k] \in J(H)}} \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ \{i,j+k\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ \{i,j+k\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) \\
&\quad \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i+k, j+k\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i+k, j+k\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) u_{\mathbb{V}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{y}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}\right)\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)} \int_{\mathbb{V}^{n-k}} 1 u_{\mathbb{V}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{y}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}\right)\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Given that $\varepsilon \leq 1$ we get

$$g_\varepsilon(\eta) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}\right)^{-2} f(\eta) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{11}\right)^2 f(\eta) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) f(\eta),$$

which proves the upper bound.

For the lower bound, note that

$$\Pr\left[G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}\right]^{-1} \geq 1$$

and for $\eta(\mathbb{V}) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon n}{12}}$

$$\left(\prod_{i=0}^{\eta(\mathbb{V})-1} 1 - \frac{i}{n}\right) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\eta(\mathbb{V})}{n}\right)^{\eta(\mathbb{V})} \geq 1 - \frac{\eta(\mathbb{V})^2}{n} \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}.$$

We proceed by lower bounding $\Psi_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{x})$. First, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) &\geq \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{12}\right)\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)} \sum_{\substack{H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}: \\ [k] \in \mathcal{I}(H)}} \int_{\mathbb{V}^{n-k}} \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ \{i,j+k\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ \{i,j+k\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) \\
&\quad \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i+k, j+k\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i+k, j+k\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) u_{\mathbb{V}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{y}) \\
&= \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{12}\right)\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)} \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}_n: \\ [k] \in \mathcal{I}(H)}} \mathbb{1}_{H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}} \int_{\mathbb{V}^{n-k}} \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ \{i,j+k\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ \{i,j+k\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) \\
&\quad \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i+k, j+k\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i+k, j+k\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) u_{\mathbb{V}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{y}).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, for each graph $H \in \mathcal{G}_n$, let $H' = ([n-k], E')$ denote the subgraph that results from $H - [k]$ after relabeling each vertex in $i \in [n] \setminus [k]$ to $i - k \in [n-k]$ (note that this relabeling is formally required for $H' \in \mathcal{G}_{n-k}$). By [Observation 6.4](#) and the fact that $\gamma(n) \leq \gamma(n-k)$ and $Z_{H'}(\gamma) = Z_{H-[k]}(\gamma)$ for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ we have

$$Z_H(\gamma(n)) \leq e^{\gamma(n)k} Z_{H'}(\gamma(n)) \leq e^{\frac{k}{n}\lambda_{\mathbb{V}}(\mathbb{V})} Z_{H'}(\gamma(n-k)).$$

On the other hand, note that

$$\gamma(n-k) = \frac{\lambda_{\mathbb{V}}(\mathbb{V})}{n-k} = \frac{n}{n(n-k)} \lambda_{\mathbb{V}}(\mathbb{V}) = \left(\frac{n-k}{n(n-k)} + \frac{k}{n(n-k)} \right) \lambda_{\mathbb{V}}(\mathbb{V}) \leq \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{k}{n} \right) \lambda_{\mathbb{V}}(\mathbb{V}) = \gamma(n) + \frac{k}{n} \lambda_{\mathbb{V}}(\mathbb{V}).$$

Therefore, [Observation 6.4](#) yields

$$Z_H(\gamma(n-k)) \leq e^{\frac{k}{n}\lambda_{\mathbb{V}}(\mathbb{V})} Z_H(\gamma(n))$$

and

$$Z_H(\gamma(n)) \geq e^{-\frac{k}{n}\lambda_{\mathbb{V}}(\mathbb{V})} Z_H(\gamma(n-k)) \geq e^{-\frac{k}{n}\lambda_{\mathbb{V}}(\mathbb{V})} Z_{H'}(\gamma(n-k)).$$

Thus, for $k \leq \frac{\varepsilon n}{40\lambda_{\mathbb{V}}(\mathbb{V})}$ we have

$$e^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{40}} Z_{H'}(\gamma(n-k)) \leq Z_H(\gamma(n)) \leq e^{\frac{\varepsilon}{40}} Z_{H'}(\gamma(n-k)).$$

As $e^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{40}} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{18}\right) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}\right)$ and $e^{\frac{\varepsilon}{40}} \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{18}\right) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{12}\right)$ for all $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, this means that $H' \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{18}}^{(n-k)}$ is a

sufficient condition for $H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}_n: \\ [k] \in \mathcal{I}(H)}} \mathbb{1}_{H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}} \int_{\mathbb{V}^{n-k}} \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ \{i,j+k\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ \{i,j+k\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) \\
& \quad \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i+k, j+k\} \in E_H}} 1 - e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i+k, j+k\} \notin E_H}} e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) u_{\mathbb{V}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{y}) \\
& \geq \sum_{H' \in \mathcal{G}_{n-k}} \mathbb{1}_{H' \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{18}}^{(n-k)}} \int_{\mathbb{V}^{n-k}} \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i,j\} \in E_{H'}}} 1 - e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i,j\} \notin E_{H'}}} e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) \\
& \quad \sum_{F \subseteq [k] \times [n-k]} \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ (i,j) \in F}} 1 - e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in [k] \times [n-k]: \\ (i,j) \notin F}} e^{-\phi(x_i, y_j)} \right) u_{\mathbb{V}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{y}) \\
& = \sum_{H' \in \mathcal{G}_{n-k}} \mathbb{1}_{H' \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{18}}^{(n-k)}} \int_{\mathbb{V}^{n-k}} \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i,j\} \in E_{H'}}} 1 - e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n-k]}{2}: \\ \{i,j\} \notin E_{H'}}} e^{-\phi(y_i, y_j)} \right) u_{\mathbb{V}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{y}) \\
& = \Pr \left[G' \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{18}}^{(n-k)} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

for $G' \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n-k)}$. Next, observe that $n \geq 1$ we have $k \leq \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon n}{12}}, \frac{\varepsilon n}{40\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})} \right\} \leq \frac{n}{2}$ and $n - k \geq \frac{n}{2}$. Therefore, for $n \geq 8 \frac{18^2 \cdot 12}{\varepsilon^3} \max \left\{ e^6 \lambda^2 \nu(\mathbb{V})^2, \ln \left(\frac{4 \cdot 18}{\varepsilon} \right)^2 \right\}$ [Theorem 1.1](#) yields $\Pr \left[G' \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{18}}^{(n-k)} \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}$ for $G' \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n-k)}$. Consequently, we have

$$\Psi_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) \geq \frac{1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}}{1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{12}} \cdot \frac{1}{\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)}$$

and

$$g_{\varepsilon}(\eta) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}\right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{12}\right)^{-1} f(\eta) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}\right)^3 f(\eta) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) f(\eta),$$

which concludes the proof. ■

We proceed by using [Lemmas 6.3](#) and [6.5](#) to bound the total variation distance between $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ and the output distribution of [Algorithm 2](#). However, as [Lemma 6.5](#) only provides information for point sets that are sufficiently small compared to n , we need a different way to deal with large point configurations. To this end, the following two results are useful. The first lemma is a domination result for the size of independent sets, drawn from a hard-core model.

► **Lemma 6.6.** Let $G \in \mathcal{G}_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. For $\sigma \sim \mu_G^{(\gamma)}$ it holds that $|S_\sigma|$ is stochastically dominated by a binomial random variable with n trials and success probability $\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}$. ◀

Proof. We use a coupling argument to prove this statement. Consider the following procedure for sampling a set $S_n \subseteq [n]$:

1. Start with $S_0 = \emptyset$.
2. For each $i \in [n]$, set $S_i = S_{i-1} \cup \{i\}$ with probability $\Pr[\sigma(i) = 1 \mid \bigwedge_{j \in [i-1]} \sigma(j) = \mathbb{1}_{j \in S_{i-1}}]$ for $\sigma \sim \mu_G^{(\gamma)}$.

Note that the resulting set S_n follows the same distribution as S_σ for $\sigma \sim \mu_G^{(\gamma)}$. Due to the definition of this process, it suffices to consider sequences $(S_i)_{i \in [n] \cup \{0\}}$ such that the event $\{\bigwedge_{j \in [i-1]} \sigma(j) = \mathbb{1}_{j \in S_{i-1}}\}$ has non-zero probability. Further, note that

$$\Pr \left[\sigma(i) = 1 \mid \bigwedge_{j \in [i-1]} \sigma(j) = \mathbb{1}_{j \in S_{i-1}} \right] \leq \frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}$$

for all $i \in [n]$. Now, we consider a modified process $(S'_i)_{i \in [n] \cup \{0\}}$ with $S'_0 = \emptyset$ and $S'_i = S'_{i-1} \cup \{i\}$ with probability $\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}$. Observe that $(S_i)_{i \in [n] \cup \{0\}}$ and $(S'_i)_{i \in [n] \cup \{0\}}$ can be coupled in such a way that $S_i \subseteq S'_i$ whenever $S_{i-1} \subseteq S'_{i-1}$ for all $i \in [n]$. As initially $S_0 = S'_0$, the same coupling yields $S_n \subseteq S'_n$. Finally, observing that $|S'_n|$ follows a binomial distribution with n trials and success probability $\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}$ concludes the proof. ■

The second lemma is the analog of [Lemma 6.6](#) for repulsive point processes. However, proving it is slightly more technically involved. We start by introducing some additional notation and terminology. For two counting measures $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathcal{N}$, we write $\eta_1 \leq \eta_2$ if $\eta_1(B) \leq \eta_2(B)$ for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$. A measurable function $h : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called *increasing* if $h(\eta_1) \leq h(\eta_2)$ for all $\eta_1 \leq \eta_2$. Moreover, for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, let Q_κ denote the Poisson point process with intensity κ and let P be a point process that has a density f_P with respect to Q_κ . A function $\zeta : \mathcal{N} \times \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called a *Papangelou intensity* for P (w.r.t. Q_κ) if, for all $\eta \in \mathcal{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{X}$, it holds that

$$f_P(\eta + \delta_x) = \zeta(\eta, x) f_P(\eta).$$

The domination lemma we are aiming for immediately follows from a result by Georgii and Küneth [\[GK97\]](#).

► **Theorem 6.7 ([\[GK97, Theorem 1.1\]](#)).** Let Q_κ be a Poisson point process of intensity $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and let P_1, P_2 be point processes that are absolutely continuous with respect to Q_κ . Assume P_1 and P_2 have Papangelou intensities ζ_1 and ζ_2 . If, for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\eta_1 \leq \eta_2$, $\zeta_1(\eta_1, x) \leq \zeta_2(\eta_2, x)$, then, for all increasing $h : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, it holds that

$$\int_{\mathcal{N}} h(\eta) P_1(d\eta) \leq \int_{\mathcal{N}} h(\eta) P_2(d\eta). \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

With that, we show the following simple domination result.

► **Lemma 6.8.** Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be bounded and measurable, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$

and let $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a symmetric repulsive potential. For $\eta \sim P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ it holds that $\eta(\mathbb{V})$ is dominated by a Poisson random variable with parameter $\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})$. \blacktriangleleft

Proof. Let Q_λ denote a Poisson point process with intensity λ . Note that a density of

$$f_1(\eta) = \frac{1}{\Xi_{\mathbb{V}}(\lambda, \phi)} \mathbb{1}_{\eta \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{V}}} \left(\prod_{\{x, y\} \in \binom{X_\eta}{2}} e^{-N_x(\eta)N_y(\eta)\phi(x, y)} \right) \left(\prod_{x \in X_\eta} e^{-\frac{N_x(\eta)(N_x(\eta)-1)}{2}\phi(x, x)} \right) e^{\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}$$

is a density for $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ with respect to Q_λ . Therefore,

$$\zeta_1(\eta, x) = \mathbb{1}_{x \in \mathbb{V}} \prod_{y \in X_\eta} e^{-N_y(\eta)\phi(x, y)}$$

is a Papangelou intensity for $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$. Moreover, let P denote the point process defined by the density $f_2(\eta) = \mathbb{1}_{\eta \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{V}}}$ and observe that $\zeta_2(\eta, x) = \mathbb{1}_{x \in \mathbb{V}}$ is a Papangelou intensity for P .

For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $h_k(\eta) = \mathbb{1}_{\eta(\mathbb{V}) \geq k}$ and observe that h_k is increasing. Further, note that, for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathcal{N}$, it holds that

$$\zeta_1(\eta_1, x) = \mathbb{1}_{x \in \mathbb{V}} \prod_{y \in X_{\eta_1}} e^{-N_y(\eta_1)\phi(x, y)} \leq \mathbb{1}_{x \in \mathbb{V}} = \zeta_2(\eta_2, x).$$

By [Theorem 6.7](#), this implies that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\int_{\mathcal{N}} h_k(\eta) P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}(d\eta) \leq \int_{\mathcal{N}} h_k(\eta) P(d\eta).$$

Consequently, for $\eta \sim P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ and $\xi \sim P$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that

$$\Pr[\eta(\mathbb{V}) \geq k] \leq \Pr[\xi(\mathbb{V}) \geq k]$$

and observing that $\xi(\mathbb{V})$ follows a Poisson distribution with parameter $\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})$ concludes the proof. \blacksquare

We now bound the total variation distance between the output of [Algorithm 2](#) and $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$.

\blacktriangleright **Lemma 6.9.** Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete, separable metric space, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ be the Borel algebra and let ν be a locally finite reference measure on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ be bounded and measurable, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and let $\phi : \mathbb{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a symmetric repulsive potential. For every given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, [Algorithm 2](#) is an $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ -approximate sampler from $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$. \blacktriangleleft

Proof. We start by bounding the total variation distance between $d_{\text{tv}}\left(P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}, \widehat{P}_\varepsilon\right)$ for \widehat{P}_ε as in [Lemma 6.3](#). The statement then follows from a coupling argument. Let Q_λ denote a Poisson point process of intensity λ . Let g_ε be the density of \widehat{P}_ε with respect to Q_λ as given in [Lemma 6.3](#) and let f denote the density of $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$ with respect to Q . Moreover, set $m = \min\left\{\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon\eta}{12}}, \frac{\varepsilon\eta}{40\lambda\nu(\mathbb{V})}\right\}$. Note that the total variation distance can

be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{tv}}\left(P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda,\phi)}, \widehat{P}_\varepsilon\right) &= \int_{\mathcal{N}} |f(\eta) - g_\varepsilon(\eta)| Q_\lambda(d\eta) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\eta(\mathbb{V}) \leq m} |f(\eta) - g_\varepsilon(\eta)| Q_\lambda(d\eta) + \int_{\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\eta(\mathbb{V}) > m} |f(\eta) - g_\varepsilon(\eta)| Q_\lambda(d\eta). \end{aligned}$$

By [Lemma 6.5](#), we get

$$\int_{\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\eta(\mathbb{V}) \leq m} |f(\eta) - g_\varepsilon(\eta)| Q_\lambda(d\eta) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \int_{\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\eta(\mathbb{V}) \leq m} f(\eta) Q_\lambda(d\eta) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

Further, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\eta(\mathbb{V}) > m} |f(\eta) - g_\varepsilon(\eta)| Q_\lambda(d\eta) &\leq \int_{\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\eta(\mathbb{V}) > m} f(\eta) Q_\lambda(d\eta) + \int_{\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\eta(\mathbb{V}) > m} g_\varepsilon(\eta) Q_\lambda(d\eta) \\ &= \Pr[\xi(\mathbb{V}) > m] + \Pr\left[|Y| > m \mid G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}\right] \end{aligned}$$

for $\xi \sim P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda,\phi)}$, and G and Y as in [Algorithm 2](#).

We proceed by bounding each of these probability separately. Note that, by our choice of n it holds that $m \geq \frac{12}{\varepsilon} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})$. By [Lemma 6.8](#), we have $\mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda,\phi)}}[\xi(\mathbb{V})] \leq \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})$. Thus, Markov's inequality yields $\Pr[\xi(\mathbb{V}) > m] \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{12}$. Moreover, note that $|Y| = |S_\tau|$ for τ as in [Algorithm 2](#). As $\tau \sim \mu_H^{(Y(n))}$ for some $H \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_n$ and [Lemma 6.6](#) applies to all such graphs, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|Y| \mid G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}\right] \leq \frac{\gamma(n)}{1 + \gamma(n)} n \leq \gamma(n) n = \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}).$$

Again, applying Markov's inequality gives $\Pr\left[|Y| > m \mid G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}\right] \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{12}$. Consequently, we have

$$d_{\text{tv}}\left(P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda,\phi)}, \widehat{P}_\varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} = \frac{5}{12} \varepsilon.$$

To finish the proof, we now relate the output of [Algorithm 2](#) with \widehat{P}_ε by using a coupling argument. To this end, note that [Algorithm 2](#) can be used to sample from \widehat{P}_ε by simply restarting the sampler whenever $G \notin A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}$. For our choice of n we know that with a probability of $\Pr\left[G \in A_{\frac{\varepsilon}{12}}^{(n)}\right] \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12}$ only a single run of [Algorithm 2](#) is required. By this coupling, the total variation distance between the output of [Algorithm 2](#) and \widehat{P}_ε is at most $\frac{\varepsilon}{12}$. Finally, applying triangle inequality shows that the total variation distance between the output of [Algorithm 2](#) and $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda,\phi)}$ is bounded by $\frac{5}{12} \varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{12} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, which concludes the proof. \blacksquare

Using [Lemma 6.9](#), we are able to prove that [Algorithm 1](#) is an ε -approximate sampler for $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda,\phi)}$. In order to argue that [Algorithm 1](#) also satisfies the running time requirements, given in [Theorem 6.1](#), we require an efficient approximate sampler from the hard-core distribution $\mu_G^{(Y(n))}$. To this end, we use the following known result.

► **Theorem 6.10** ([AJK+21, Theorem 5]). Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph with maximum vertex degree bounded by $\Delta_G \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with

$$\gamma < \gamma_c(\Delta_G) = \frac{(\Delta_G - 1)^{\Delta_G - 1}}{(\Delta_G - 2)^{\Delta_G}}.$$

Then, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, there is an ε -approximate sampler for the hard-core Gibbs distribution $\mu_G^{(\gamma)}$ with an expected running time of $O\left(|V| \ln\left(\frac{|V|}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)$. ◀

Proof of Theorem 6.1. We start by arguing that Algorithm 1 is an ε -approximate sampler for $P_{\mathbb{V}}^{(\lambda, \phi)}$. To this end, we show that the total variation distance between the output distributions of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 is bounded by $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Using the triangle inequality and Lemma 6.9 then yields the desired result. To bound the total variation distance between the Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 by $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, it suffices to construct a coupling of both algorithms such that their output coincides with a probability of at least $1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. This is, we want to find a coupling of both algorithms such that $X \neq Y$ with probability at most $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, where X and Y are as in Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2.

To construct such a coupling, we start by letting both algorithms draw the same points X_1, \dots, X_n and construct the same graph G . If $\Delta_G \geq \frac{en}{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}$, then we may just assume $X \neq Y$. Otherwise, if $\Delta_G < \frac{en}{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}$, then $\sigma = \tau$ is a sufficient condition for $X = Y$. As τ is drawn from $\mu_G^{(\gamma(n))}$ and σ is drawn from an $\frac{\varepsilon}{4}$ approximation of that distribution, they can be coupled in such a way that $\Pr[\tau \neq \sigma] \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$. Using this coupling of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, we have

$$\Pr[X \neq Y] \leq \Pr\left[\Delta_G \geq \frac{en}{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}\right] + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \cdot \Pr\left[\Delta_G < \frac{en}{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}\right] \leq \Pr\left[\Delta_G \geq \frac{en}{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}\right] + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

Therefore, it remains to prove that $\Delta_G \geq \frac{en}{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}$ with probability at most $\frac{\varepsilon}{4}$, where $G \sim \zeta_{\mathbb{V}, \phi}^{(n)}$. We follow a similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1.3. Note that, for our choice of n , there exists $z \geq 3 \ln\left(\frac{4e}{\varepsilon}\right) \max\left\{\frac{1}{e - \lambda C_\phi}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e - \lambda C_\phi)^2}\right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})$ such that $n = 2z \ln(z)^2$. Moreover, we have $n \geq e \geq 2$ and, for $\nu(\mathbb{V})$ (consequently z) sufficiently large, it holds that $2z \ln(z)^2 \geq 2z \ln(2z \ln(z)^2) = 2z \ln(n)$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} n - 1 &\geq \frac{n}{2} \\ &\geq 3 \ln\left(\frac{4e}{\varepsilon}\right) \max\left\{\frac{1}{e - \lambda C_\phi}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e - \lambda C_\phi)^2}\right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}) \ln(n) \\ &\geq 3 \ln\left(\frac{4n}{\varepsilon}\right) \max\left\{\frac{1}{e - \lambda C_\phi}, \frac{\lambda C_\phi}{(e - \lambda C_\phi)^2}\right\} \lambda \nu(\mathbb{V}) \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 5.3

$$\Pr\left[\Delta_G \geq \frac{en}{\lambda \nu(\mathbb{V})}\right] \leq \Pr\left[\Delta_G \geq \left(1 + \frac{e - \lambda C_\phi}{\lambda C_\phi}\right) \frac{n - 1}{\nu(\mathbb{V})} C_\phi\right] \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

To prove [Theorem 6.1](#), it remains to show that [Algorithm 1](#) satisfies the given running time requirements. To this end, note that, for all $\lambda < \frac{e}{C_\phi}$, it holds that $n \in \tilde{O}(v(\mathbb{V})^2 \varepsilon^{-3})$. Therefore, sampling X_1, \dots, X_n requires a running time of $\tilde{O}(nt_{\mathbb{V}}) = \tilde{O}(v(\mathbb{V})^2 \varepsilon^{-3} t_{\mathbb{V}})$. Moreover, the graph can be constructed in time $\tilde{O}(n^2 t_\phi) = \tilde{O}(v(\mathbb{V})^4 \varepsilon^{-6} t_\phi)$ and $\Delta_G \geq \frac{en}{\lambda v(\mathbb{V})}$ can be checked in time $\tilde{O}(n^2 v(\mathbb{V})^{-1}) = \tilde{O}(v(\mathbb{V})^3 \varepsilon^{-6})$. Finally, for $\Delta_G < \frac{en}{\lambda v(\mathbb{V})}$ it holds that

$$\gamma(n) \leq \frac{\lambda v(\mathbb{V})}{n} < \frac{e}{\Delta_G} < \gamma_c(\Delta_G).$$

Thus, [Theorem 6.10](#) guarantees the existence of an $\frac{\varepsilon}{8}$ -approximate sampler from $\mu_G^{(\gamma(n))}$ with an expected running time in $O(n \ln(\frac{n}{\varepsilon})) = O\left(v(\mathbb{V})^2 \varepsilon^{-3} \ln\left(\frac{v(\mathbb{V})}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)$. Note that, by Markov's inequality, the probability that this sampler takes more than $\frac{8}{\varepsilon}$ times its expected running time is bounded by $\frac{\varepsilon}{8}$. Therefore, if we run the sampler from [Theorem 6.10](#) with an error bound of $\frac{\varepsilon}{8}$ and, whenever the algorithm takes more than $\frac{8}{\varepsilon}$ times its expected running time, stop it and return an arbitrary spin configuration, this results in an $\frac{\varepsilon}{4}$ -approximate sampler with a guaranteed running time in $\tilde{O}(v(\mathbb{V})^2 \varepsilon^{-4})$. Consequently, [Algorithm 1](#) runs in time $\tilde{O}(v(\mathbb{V})^3 \varepsilon^{-6} + v(\mathbb{V})^2 \varepsilon^{-3} t_{\mathbb{V}} + v(\mathbb{V})^4 \varepsilon^{-6} t_\phi)$, which concludes the proof. ■

Acknowledgments

Andreas Göbel was funded by the project PAGES (project No. 467516565) of the German Research Foundation (DFG). This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 945298-ParisRegionFP. This research was partially funded by the HPI Research School on Data Science and Engineering.

References

- [AJK+21] Nima Anari, Vishesh Jain, Frederic Koehler, Huy Tuan Pham, and Thuy-Duong Vuong. "Entropic independence II: Optimal sampling and concentration via restricted modified log-Sobolev inequalities." In: *CoRR* abs/2111.03247 (2021). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.03247> (see pages 4, 21, 37).
- [ALG21] Nima Anari, Kuikui Liu, and Shayan Oveis Gharan. "Spectral independence in high-dimensional expanders and applications to the hardcore model." In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 0.0 (2021), FOCS20-1–FOCS20-37. DOI: [10.1137/20M1367696](https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1367696) (see page 4).
- [BGM+06] Adrian Baddeley, Pablo Gregori, Jorge Mateu, Radu Stoica, and Dietrich Stoyan. *Case Studies in Spatial Point Process Modeling*. Vol. 185. Springer, 2006. DOI: [10.1007/0-387-31144-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-31144-0) (see page 2).
- [BKL19] Karl Bringmann, Ralph Keusch, and Johannes Lengler. "Geometric inhomogeneous random graphs." In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 760 (2019), pp. 35–54. DOI: [10.1016/j.tcs.2018.08.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2018.08.014) (see page 9).
- [BSD14] Andreas K. Bacher, Thomas B. Schröder, and Jeppe C. Dyre. "Explaining why simple liquids are quasi-universal." In: *Nature Communications* 5.1 (2014), pp. 1–7. DOI: [10.1038/ncomms6424](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms6424) (see page 3).

- [BSS00] Lenore Blum, Mike Shub, and Steve Smale. “On a theory of computation and complexity over the real numbers: NP-completeness, recursive functions and universal machines.” In: *The Collected Papers of Stephen Smale: Volume 3*. World Scientific, 2000, pp. 1293–1338. DOI: [10.1142/9789812792839_0013](https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812792839_0013) (see page 9).
- [CFY+22] Xiaoyu Chen, Weiming Feng, Yitong Yin, and Xinyuan Zhang. “Rapid mixing of Glauber dynamics via spectral independence for all degrees.” In: *2021 IEEE 62nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. 2022, pp. 137–148. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS52979.2021.00022](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS52979.2021.00022) (see page 4).
- [CLV20] Zongchen Chen, Kuikui Liu, and Eric Vigoda. “Rapid mixing of Glauber dynamics up to uniqueness via contraction.” In: *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. 2020, pp. 1307–1318. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00124](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00124) (see page 4).
- [CLV21] Zongchen Chen, Kuikui Liu, and Eric Vigoda. “Optimal mixing of Glauber dynamics: Entropy factorization via high-dimensional expansion.” In: *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*. 2021, pp. 1537–1550. DOI: [10.1145/3406325.3451035](https://doi.org/10.1145/3406325.3451035) (see page 4).
- [DV08] Daryl J. Daley and David Vere-Jones. *An Introduction to the Theory of Point Processes. Volume II: General Theory and Structure*. Springer, 2008. DOI: [10.1111/j.1751-5823.2008.00054_18.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-5823.2008.00054_18.x) (see pages 7, 26).
- [ES81] Bradley Efron and Charles Stein. “The jackknife estimate of variance.” In: *The Annals of Statistics* (1981), pp. 586–596. DOI: [10.1214/aos/1176345462](https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176345462) (see pages 5, 13).
- [FGK+21a] Tobias Friedrich, Andreas Göbel, Maximilian Katzmann, Martin S. Krejca, and Marcus Pappik. “Algorithms for general hard-constraint point processes via discretization.” In: *CoRR abs/2107.08848* (2021). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.08848> (see pages 2–5, 30).
- [FGK+21b] Tobias Friedrich, Andreas Göbel, Martin Krejca, and Marcus Pappik. “A spectral independence view on hard spheres via block dynamics.” In: *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*. Vol. 198. 2021, 66:1–66:15. DOI: [10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2021.66](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2021.66) (see pages 3, 4).
- [FU61] Gavin W. Ford and George E. Uhlenbeck. *The theory of linear graphs with applications to the theory of the virial development of the properties of gases*. Tech. rep. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1961 (see page 3).
- [Gar00] Nancy L. Garcia. “Perfect simulation of spatial processes.” In: *Resenhas do Instituto de Matemática e Estatística da Universidade de São Paulo* 4.3 (2000), pp. 283–325 (see page 2).
- [GJ21] Heng Guo and Mark Jerrum. “Perfect simulation of the hard disks model by partial rejection sampling.” In: *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré D* 8.2 (2021), pp. 159–177. DOI: [10.4171/AIHPD/99](https://doi.org/10.4171/AIHPD/99) (see pages 2, 3).
- [GK97] Hans-Otto Georgii and Torsten Kühneth. “Stochastic comparison of point random fields.” In: *Journal of Applied Probability* 34.4 (1997), pp. 868–881. DOI: [10.2307/3215003](https://doi.org/10.2307/3215003) (see page 34).
- [HVM99] Olle Häggström, Marie-Colette NM Van Lieshout, and Jesper Møller. “Characterization results and Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms including exact simulation for some spatial point processes.” In: *Bernoulli* (1999), pp. 641–658. DOI: [10.2307/3318694](https://doi.org/10.2307/3318694) (see page 2).

- [Jan18] Sabine Jansen. *Gibbsian Point Processes*. 2018. URL: <https://www.math.lmu.de/~jansen/gibbspp.pdf> (visited on 04/04/2022) (see page 11).
- [KPK+10] Dmitri Krioukov, Fragkiskos Papadopoulos, Maksim Kitsak, Amin Vahdat, and Marián Boguná. “Hyperbolic geometry of complex networks.” In: *Physical Review E* 82.3 (2010), p. 036106. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevE.82.036106](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.82.036106) (see page 9).
- [LLY13] Liang Li, Pinyan Lu, and Yitong Yin. “Correlation decay up to uniqueness in spin systems.” In: *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms (SODA)*. 2013, pp. 67–84. URL: <https://dlnext.acm.org/doi/10.5555/2627817.2627822> (see page 8).
- [McD89] Colin McDiarmid. “On the method of bounded differences.” In: *Surveys in combinatorics* 141.1 (1989), pp. 148–188. DOI: [10.1017/CBO9781107359949.008](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107359949.008) (see page 6).
- [McD98] Colin McDiarmid. “Concentration.” In: *Probabilistic methods for algorithmic discrete mathematics*. Springer, 1998, pp. 195–248. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-662-12788-9_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-12788-9_6) (see page 6).
- [Møl89] Jesper Møller. “On the rate of convergence of spatial birth-and-death processes.” In: *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* 41.3 (1989), pp. 565–581. DOI: [10.1007/BF00050669](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00050669) (see page 2).
- [MP21] Marcus Michelen and Will Perkins. “Potential-weighted connective constants and uniqueness of Gibbs measures.” In: *CoRR* abs/2109.01094 (2021). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.01094> (see pages 2, 3).
- [MP22] Marcus Michelen and Will Perkins. “Strong spatial mixing for repulsive point processes.” In: *CoRR* abs/2202.08753 (2022). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.08753> (see pages 3, 9, 10).
- [MRR+53] Nicholas Metropolis, Arianna W. Rosenbluth, Marshall N. Rosenbluth, Augusta H. Teller, and Edward Teller. “Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines.” In: *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 21.6 (1953), pp. 1087–1092. DOI: [10.1063/1.1699114](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1699114) (see page 2).
- [MW07] Jesper Møller and Rasmus P Waagepetersen. “Modern statistics for spatial point processes.” In: *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 34.4 (2007), pp. 643–684. DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-9469.2007.00569.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9469.2007.00569.x) (see page 2).
- [Rue99] David Ruelle. *Statistical Mechanics: Rigorous Results*. World Scientific, 1999. ISBN: 978-9810238629 (see page 2).
- [SS12] Allan Sly and Nike Sun. “The computational hardness of counting in two-spin models on d -regular graphs.” In: *2012 IEEE 53rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. 2012, pp. 361–369. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS.2012.56](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2012.56) (see page 8).
- [SSŠ+17] Alistair Sinclair, Piyush Srivastava, Daniel Štefankovič, and Yitong Yin. “Spatial mixing and the connective constant: Optimal bounds.” In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 168.1 (2017), pp. 153–197. DOI: [10.1007/s00440-016-0708-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-016-0708-2) (see page 10).
- [SST14] Alistair Sinclair, Piyush Srivastava, and Marc Thurley. “Approximation algorithms for two-state anti-ferromagnetic spin systems on bounded degree graphs.” In: *Journal of Statistical Physics* 155.4 (2014), pp. 666–686. DOI: [10.1007/s10955-014-0947-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10955-014-0947-5) (see page 8).
- [ŠVV09] Daniel Štefankovič, Santosh Vempala, and Eric Vigoda. “Adaptive simulated annealing: A near-optimal connection between sampling and counting.” In: *Journal of the ACM* 56.3 (2009), pp. 1–36. DOI: [10.1145/1516512.1516520](https://doi.org/10.1145/1516512.1516520) (see page 21).

- [Vig01] Eric Vigoda. “A note on the Glauber dynamics for sampling independent sets.” In: *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* 8.1 (2001), pp. 1–8. DOI: [10.37236/1552](https://doi.org/10.37236/1552) (see page 21).
- [YK74] Takeshi Yoshida and Shiro Kamakura. “Liquid-Solid Transitions in Systems of Soft Repulsive Forces: Softness of Potentials and a Maximum in Melting Curves.” In: *Progress of Theoretical Physics* 52.3 (1974), pp. 822–839. DOI: [10.1143/PTP.52.822](https://doi.org/10.1143/PTP.52.822) (see page 3).