

Factor of iid's through stochastic domination

Ádám Timár

Abstract

We develop a method to prove that certain percolation processes on amenable random rooted graphs are factors of iid (fiid), given that the process is a monotone limit of random finite subgraphs that satisfy a certain independent stochastic domination property. Among the consequences are the previously open claims that the Uniform Spanning Forest (USF) is a factor of iid for recurrent graphs, it is a finite-valued finitary fiid on amenable graphs, and that the critical Ising model on \mathbb{Z}^d is a finite-valued finitary fiid, using the known uniqueness of the Gibbs measure.

1 Introduction

For a given graph G , consider an iid labelling of its vertices by uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables. A factor of iid process on G is a new labelling of the graph where the label of each vertex can be encoded from the iid labels in its neighborhood, and the same coding rule is used for every vertex. We will give a formal definition later. For example, the Ising model on \mathbb{Z}^d with all-plus boundary conditions is always a factor of iid [1], but with wired boundary conditions it is a factor of iid only if there is a unique Gibbs measure. See the Introduction of [5] for a list of factor of iid models and references. Among the benefits of factor of iid constructions are that they go through when taking local limits of graphs, hence they are well suited for sofic approximation. From the algorithmic point of view, factor of iid constructions can be viewed as simple models of computing with parallel processors, a natural distributed algorithm. As we will see, a hierarchical categorization of random processes has been introduced, based on whether they are factors of iid with further restrictions (the coding using a fixed bounded neighborhood, using a random but bounded neighborhood...).

For a while it has been folklore that the Wired Uniform Spanning Forest of a transient graph can be attained as a factor of iid, using the the cycle-popping procedure to generate it, which is also underlying “Wilson’s algorithm rooted at infinity” ([6], [15]). A proof of full detail and references can be found in [5]. However, the cycle popping algorithm would not stabilize in a limit when the graph is recurrent, and the question of whether the uniform spanning forest on an infinite recurrent G is a factor of iid remained open. See Question 6.1 in [5]. Other examples where the study of USF on recurrent graphs have shown to be more difficult than on transient ones include the question of their one-endedness, where this was the last unresolved case one until recently [9].

Partially supported by Icelandic Research Fund grant number 239736-051 and the ERC Consolidator Grant 772466 “NOISE”.

Note that on a recurrent, or more generally, an invariantly amenable graph, the free and the wired Uniform Spanning Forest are the same. To indicate this equality, but keep in mind that we are dealing with infinite graphs, we will denote it by USF for such graphs, even though the USF always has a unique component on recurrent graphs.

Theorem 1. Let G be a unimodular random graph that is almost surely recurrent. Then the USF of G is a factor of iid.

The theorem is a part of Corollary 5. The full proof is given in Section 3.

We mention that the question whether the Free Uniform Spanning Forest is a factor of iid in full generality is open. It is of special importance, because of its connections to the fixed-price conjecture. See [13] for details.

A special class of fiid processes is formed by those where the factor labelling of a vertex can be determined without any error from a large enough neighborhood of that vertex, where the size of the necessary neighborhood possibly depends on the iid labels in it, similarly to how stopping times are defined. Such fiid processes are called finitary factor of iid or ffiid. A further restriction is when the iid labels are not Lebesgue $[0,1]$, but rather we have a constant number of random bits on every vertex. A finitary factor from such an iid labelling is called a finite-valued finitary factor of iid.

Theorem 2. (1) The USF on \mathbb{Z}^d is a finite-valued finitary fiid.
(2) The Ising model on \mathbb{Z}^d when there is a unique Gibbs measure is a finite-valued finitary fiid.

Part (1) is completely new, while part (2) was shown for supercritical temperature by van den Berg and Steif [7], and remained open for critical temperature (see Remark 1.4 in [17]). We believe that this theorem is true for any invariantly amenable URG G instead of \mathbb{Z}^d , but we did not pursue this direction. What is missing for such an argument is a *finite-valued* finitary fiid version of Lemma 11.

Section 2 contains the standard definitions that we will rely on. In Section 3 we present our definition of a “compatible monotone limit”, show that certain models satisfy it, and prove how it implies the existence of fiid codings. In Section 4 we extend the construction to obtain finitary fiid codings, which will further be extended in Section 5 to finite-valued finitary fiid.

2 Definitions

Denote the set of locally finite graphs with a distinguished root vertex and up to rooted isomorphisms by \mathcal{G}_* . Let \mathcal{G}_{**} be the set of locally finite graphs with a distinguished ordered pair of vertices, up to isomorphisms preserving the ordered pair. A *unimodular random graph (URG)* is a probability measure μ on \mathcal{G}_* satisfying

$$\int \sum_{x \in V(G)} f(G, o, x) d\mu((G, o)) = \int \sum_{x \in V(G)} f(G, x, o) d\mu((G, o)) \quad (1)$$

for every Borel $f : \mathcal{G}_{**} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$. This latter equation is usually referred to as the Mass Transport Principle. See [4] or [8] for more on URG's. By a slight abuse of terminology we will often refer to the random graph (G, o) as a URG, and also, in general we will sometimes refer to probability

measures on graphs as random graphs. Also, we may hide the root in our notation and call G a URG.

One can decorate the vertices and edges of a URG with some marking (elements of some metric space X , often finite), and then it is possible to represent a percolation (i.e., random subgraph), coloring, collection of subgraphs etc. of a URG by a marked version of the URG. We say that a percolation or other decoration of the URG G is *invariant*, if this marked graph also satisfies (1) in the extended space of marked graphs. When the URG is supported on some fixed quasi-transitive unimodular graph G (such as a Cayley graph) with a random marking, then this definition of invariance is equivalent to the usual invariance under the automorphisms of G .

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a unimodular quasi-transitive graph, and denote by 2^G the set of its subgraphs. We will consider random subgraphs that are either edge sets or vertex sets of G ; by a *random subgraph* or *percolation*, we will always refer to one of these cases. If $(X_v)_{v \in V}$ is a collection of iid Lebesgue $[0,1]$ random labels on the vertices and μ is a random subgraph of G , say that μ is a *factor of iid (fid)*, if there is a *coding* map (also called an *fid rule*) ϕ from $[0,1]^V$ to 2^G that is measurable and equivariant with the automorphisms of G , and such that the push-forward of the iid Lebesgue labels by ϕ is μ . A more hands-on way to put this definition is that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is an R such that by looking at the X_v in the R -neighborhood of o we can tell whether o and the edges incident to it should be in the random subgraph given by μ , up to an error less than ϵ , and in telling so we only need information in this R -ball up to rooted isomorphisms. This latter definition can be applied to any unimodular random graph without the assumption of quasi-transitivity. If one can almost surely stop at an R such that the status of o and its edges can be determined without any error, and that only information in the R -ball is used to determine that we stop, then we call μ a *finitary factor of iid*. Finally, if instead of Lebesgue $[0,1]$ we label every vertex by k iid Bernoulli $(1/2)$ random variables (“random bits”) for some uniform finite k , then the existence of a finitary fid coding means that μ is a *finite valued finitary fid (fv fid)*.

A unimodular random graph is *invariantly amenable* if there exists an increasing sequence of induced subgraphs Γ_n of G ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) whose union is G , and such that all component of every Γ_n is finite. We call such a sequence a *hyperfinite exhaustion*. See [4] for proofs of why this is equivalent to alternative common definitions. As proved in Lemma 2.3 of [19], if G is invariantly amenable, then one is also able to construct the above Γ_n as a factor of iid. The proof also implies the following.

Lemma 3. If G is an invariantly amenable unimodular random graph, then there exists a sequence of induced subgraphs Γ_n such that every component of Γ_n is finite, $\Gamma_n \subset \Gamma_{n+1}$, $G = \cup \Gamma_n$, and Γ_n is a finitary factor of iid for every n .

If H is a subgraph of K , and μ is a probability measure on 2^K , then $\mu|_H$ is the probability measure corresponding to the random graph given by μ restricted to H . If H_1, \dots, H_k are pairwise disjoint graphs and μ_i is a random subgraph of H_i , then denote by $\otimes \mu_i$ the union of the random graphs sampled independently by the μ_i over $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

From now on $G = (G, o)$ will always denote an invariantly amenable unimodular random graph (URG). For convenience, we will assume that the iid labels are coming from a suitable product set $\Xi = \Xi_0 \times \Xi_1 \times \dots$ with some product probability measure on it.

3 Monotone weak limits as factor of iid

Definition 1. Let μ be a random subgraph of G . Say that μ is a *compatible monotone decreasing limit* if for every finite connected graph H one can define a random subgraph μ_H , depending only on the isomorphism class of H , in such a way that

1. whenever G_n is a finite exhaustion of G , μ_{G_n} weakly converges to μ_G , and
2. if H_1, \dots, H_k are pairwise disjoint connected subgraphs of the finite connected H , then $\otimes \mu_{H_i}$ stochastically dominates $\mu_H|_{\cup H_i}$.

We define a *compatible monotone increasing limit* similarly, with the direction of stochastic domination changed in (2). A *compatible monotone limit* is a compatible monotone decreasing or monotone increasing limit.

Example 3.1. The Free Uniform Spanning Forest (FUSF) of a URG is an example of a compatible monotone decreasing limit. This is clear when $k = 1$ in the above definition, from the standard proof of the existence of these forests, using monotone couplings based on Rayleigh's monotonicity law. For $k > 1$, one can add paths between the H_i to connect them in a tree-like way, and apply the previous argument to this connected subgraph of H .

Example 3.2. The WUSF is a compatible monotone increasing limit on any graph. For this, we will use a technical modification of Definition 1, namely, we require 2. to hold only when the minimal distance between the H_i is at least 2 and $H \setminus \cup H_i$ is connected. (This more general definition could be used in each of our applications without any complication; we preferred to stick to the more natural one in Definition 1, because in most cases it is sufficient.) Denote by $(\cup H_i)^w$ the graph where we replace every edge of G with a single endpoint x in some H_i by an edge $\{x, w\}$, where w is an extra vertex added to $\cup H_i$, and define H_i^w to be H_i with a wired boundary. Then, with notation as in Definition 1,

$$\text{UST}(H^w)|_{\cup H_i} \succeq \text{UST}((\cup H_i)^w)|_{\cup H_i} = \otimes \text{UST}(H_i^w),$$

where the stochastic domination follows because H^w can be obtained from $(\cup H_i)^w$ by contracting edges outside of $\cup H_i$.

Example 3.3. Consider the Ising model with the all-plus boundary condition, and the random subgraph given by vertices with plus spin. This is a compatible monotone decreasing limit, as follows from the fact that on a fixed finite graph the Ising model with any boundary condition is stochastically dominated by that with the plus boundary condition. Likewise, the Ising model with minus boundary conditions is a compatible monotone increasing limit.

Example 3.4. Similarly to the previous example, Fortuin-Kasteleyn random cluster models of parameter $q \geq 1$ with free (respectively: wired) boundary condition are compatible monotone decreasing (respectively: increasing) limits.

Theorem 4. Let G be an invariantly amenable URG. Suppose that the random subgraph μ_G is a monotone weak limit. Then μ_G is a factor of iid.

Proof. We prove the claim for a compatible monotone decreasing limit. The monotone increasing case would work the same way.

Consider a factor of iid sequence of subgraphs Γ_n of G ($n = 1, 2 \dots$) such that $\Gamma_n \subset \Gamma_{n+1}$, their union is G , and every component of any Γ_n is finite. Such a sequence exists by Lemma 2.3 of [19] (Lemma 3). Use the labels from Ξ_0 to define this.

For every finite H fix some measurable map ϕ_1 from Ξ_1^H to the subgraph of H , in such a way that the iid measure on the labels from Ξ_1 is mapped into the measure μ_H , as in Definition 1. For each component H of Γ_1 assign the random ω_H using ϕ_1 on H , and let ω_{Γ_1} be the union of these disjoint subgraphs ω_H over the H . Suppose that $\omega_{\Gamma_{n-1}}$ has been defined, it is a random subgraph of Γ_{n-1} . For every finite graph H and H_1, \dots, H_k pairwise disjoint subsets of H , define a monotone coupling between ω_H and $\cup \omega_{H_i}$. Such a coupling exists by (2) and Strassen's theorem. So we can randomly remove some of the edges of $\cup \omega_{H_i}$, and add some edges of $H \setminus \cup E(H_i)$, and get a subgraph of distribution ω_H in H . Now for every finite H , conditional on $\cup \omega_{H_i}$, fix some rule of removing and adding the edges as some function from Ξ_n^H (we can call ϕ_n the function describing this rule). This rule should be the same for isomorphic collections (H, H_1, \dots, H_k) . Apply this rule to each of the components of Γ_n , to define ω_{Γ_n} as a factor of iid.

Every edge can change status at most twice during this procedure: the first change may happen if it becomes part of ω_{Γ_n} for some n , and the second one may happen if it gets removed in some later stage (and then it stays like that). Hence the weak limit ω_G of ω_{Γ_n} is a factor of iid. \square

Corollary 5. The USF of an invariantly amenable URG is a factor of iid. In particular, this holds when the URG is almost surely recurrent.

The last claim was not known, see Question 6.1 by Angel, Ray and Spinka in [5].

Remark 6. The construction in the proof is Γ_n -local, by which we mean that conditioned on Γ_n , for every component K of Γ_n we defined $\omega_{\Gamma_n}|_K$ independently from the others, and using only the iid labels in K .

4 Finitary fiid's for amenable graphs

Theorem 7. Let G be an invariantly amenable URG, and suppose that there is a unique Gibbs measure for the Ising model. Then it is a finitary factor of iid.

Remark 8. This was proved for the subcritical case by van den Berg and Steif in [7] (and strengthened in [17] where finite expected coding volume is proved), even with a choice of a finite-valued ffiid (as in Theorem 2). They also showed, based on the method of [16], that in the phase of multiple Gibbs measures there is no finitary coding. From [20], [2] and [3] we know that the Ising model on \mathbb{Z}^d has a unique Gibbs measure at critical temperature, so our theorem covers that case as well. Compare it to the result in [7] that any factor of iid coding of the critical Ising model necessarily has infinite expected coding volume (meaning that if $R \in [0, \infty]$ is the smallest radius needed for coding, then R^d has infinite expectation).

Proof. Consider the finitary fiid hyperfinite exhaustion Γ_n as in Lemma 3. Let \mathcal{P}_n be the set of connected components of Γ_n .

For a given finite subgraph $H \subset G$ consider the Ising model on H with all-plus boundary conditions (respectively: all-minus boundary conditions), and define the vertices that got a positive spin to be ω_H^+ (respectively: ω_H^-). Then, for $H \subset K$ finite subgraphs, we have

$$\omega_H^+ \succeq \omega_K^+|_H \succeq \omega_K^-|_H \succeq \omega_H^-,$$

so similarly to the proof of Theorem 4, if a monotonous coupling $\cup_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} \omega_H^+$ and $\cup_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} \omega_H^-$ have been constructed (so that $\cup_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} \omega_H^+ \supset \cup_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} \omega_H^-$), then one can remove vertices from $\cup_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} \omega_H^+$ to get $\cup_{K \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1}} \omega_K^+$ and add vertices to $\cup_{H \in \mathcal{P}_n} \omega_H^-$ to get $\cup_{K \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1}} \omega_K^-$ in a way that $\cup_{K \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1}} \omega_K^+ \subset \cup_{K \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1}} \omega_K^-$, and do this for each K following some fixed fiid rule being the same for isomorphic tuples $(K, \{H \subset K, H \in \mathcal{P}_n\})$. By step n the construction is finitary, because \mathcal{P}_n is finitary and we only have to use information from within the element H of \mathcal{P}_n that contains o to be able to tell the status of o in ω_H^+ and in ω_H^- . At some finite n , $\omega_H^+(o) = \omega_H^-(o)$, and from this point on it will remain unchanged. \square

Theorem 9. Let G be an invariantly amenable URG. Then the USF is a finitary factor of iid.

Proof. [1st proof] This proof only works for the case when G is not two-ended almost surely. It is known that then all the components of the WUSF are one-ended. Namely, it was shown in [4] that every tree of the WUSF of a transient URG is almost surely one-ended when the URG has the bounded degrees, then in [12] the bounded degree assumption got removed, and finally the claim was shown in [9] for all recurrent URG's that are not two-ended (that is, one-ended). See this latter for a detailed history and further references.

In the proof of Theorem 4, if an edge e is not in the FUSF $=: \omega_G$ then it is not in ω_{Γ_n} for all $n \geq N$, where N is either the first time when $e \in \Gamma_N$ and $e \notin \omega_{\Gamma_N}$, or N is the time when e is removed from ω_{Γ_N} , i.e., $e \in \omega_{\Gamma_{N-1}} \setminus \omega_{\Gamma_N}$. So one can tell if e is in ω_G from looking at the neighborhood that contains its component in Γ_N .

Now suppose that $e \in \omega_G$. By assumption, the component C of e has one end. Consider the finite component C_0 of $C \setminus \{e\}$, and observe that none of the finitely many edges of $\partial C_0 \setminus \{e\}$ is in ω_{Γ_n} if n is large enough. But once we know the status of these edges, we also know that e has to be in ω_G , because otherwise one of its endpoints would be in a finite component, which is not possible. So from a large enough neighborhood we can tell with certainty that $e \in \omega_G$, by the previous paragraph.

[2nd proof] For invariantly amenable URG's the free and the wired uniform spanning forests are the same [6]. Using that the WUSF is a compatible monotone increasing limit, the FUSF is a compatible monotone decreasing limit, and that the wired is dominated by the free, we can apply a similar sandwiching argument as in the proof of Theorem 7, to get that the factor is finitary. Unlike the previous proof, this one does not use any prior knowledge about the number of ends. \square

Remark 10. Similarly to Remark 6, the constructions in Theorem 7 and the second proof of Theorem 9 are Γ_n -local.

5 Finite-valued finitary factor of iid's

In this section we are going to prove Theorem 2. Our argument would give finite-valued fiid construction for any compatible monotone limit where the fiid construction of Theorem 4 can be

implemented in a finitary way, like in the case of the USF and the Ising in Theorems 7, 9.

Lemma 11. For $G = \mathbb{Z}^d$ there exists a hyperfinite exhaustion as in Lemma 3 such that the sequence $(\Gamma_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is a finite-valued finitary fiid.

Proof. Consider the construction from Theorem 1.3 in [18]. \square

We believe that the lemma is true for any invariantly amenable URG, but we did not go after this direction.

Denote by $\text{dist}(\mu, \nu)$ the total variation distance between μ and ν .

Proposition 12. Suppose $\epsilon > 0$, \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} are finite sets with $|\mathcal{N}| \geq |\mathcal{M}|/\epsilon$. Let ν be the uniform probability measure on \mathcal{N} and μ be an arbitrary probability measure on \mathcal{M} . Then there is a map $\phi : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that $\text{dist}(\mu, \nu \circ \phi^{-1}) < \epsilon$. If furthermore we assume that, for some given finite set H , $\mathcal{M} = 2^H$ is the set of all subsets of H , then ϕ can be chosen such that $\nu \circ \phi^{-1}$ stochastically dominates μ .

Proof. Let $M = |\mathcal{M}|$, $N = |\mathcal{N}|$. Without loss of generality we may assume $\mathcal{M} = \{1, \dots, M\}$. To every element $m \in \mathcal{M}$, we will map $\lfloor N\mu(m) \rfloor$ vertices of \mathcal{N} , these vertices chosen to be different for the different m . The remaining elements of \mathcal{N} can be mapped to arbitrary points. For any $\mathcal{M}' \subset \mathcal{M}$ we have

$$\nu \circ \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{M}') \geq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}'} \lfloor N\mu(m) \rfloor \geq \frac{1}{N}(-|\mathcal{M}'| + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}'} N\mu(m)) \geq \mu(\mathcal{M}') - \epsilon.$$

Since \mathcal{M}' was arbitrary, this proves the claim.

For the second assertion, instead of arbitrarily mapping the “remaining elements” of \mathcal{N} , map them all to $H \in \mathcal{M}$. \square

The following alternative form of the previous proposition will be handy for us. By a “bit” we just mean a Bernoulli(1/2) random variable, and when talking about several bits, we always assume that they are independent.

Proposition 13. Let H be a finite set, $\delta > 0$, $\epsilon > 0$, and μ be a probability measure on the subsets of size at most $\delta|H|$ of H . Then one can sample from some probability measure μ' with the property that $\mu' \succeq \mu$ and $\text{dist}(\mu, \mu') < \epsilon$, using at most $\log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + |H|\delta \log \frac{\epsilon}{\delta}$ bits.

Proof. By Proposition 12, it is enough to prove that

$$2^\alpha \geq \binom{|H|}{\delta|H|} \frac{1}{\epsilon},$$

where $\alpha = \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + |H|\delta \log \frac{\epsilon}{\delta}$. We have $\binom{|H|}{\delta|H|} \epsilon^{-1} \leq (\frac{\epsilon}{\delta})^{\delta|H|} \epsilon^{-1}$, and its base 2 logarithm is at most $\log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \delta|H| \log \frac{\epsilon}{\delta}$, proving the claim. \square

The next lemma creates a link between finite-valued fiid's and fiid's where the expected number of bits used at o is finite. (For this latter, we assume that we started with an infinite list of iid bits available at every vertex.)

Lemma 14. Let (G, o) be a URG. Suppose that $G = \omega_0 \supset \omega_1 \supset \omega_2 \supset \dots$ is a sequence of subgraphs with $\cap \omega_n = \omega$, and suppose that ω_{n+1} can be constructed from ω_n using a finitary fiid rule that

uses at most c bits of every vertex. Suppose further that the expected total number of bits used from o for the construction of the $(\omega_i)_{i=0}^\infty$ is $m < \infty$. Then ω is a finite-valued fiid.

Proof. We may assume that $c < m/4$. Call the fiid rule in the lemma the *initial fiid rule*. We will start with $10m$ bits at every vertex, and redefine the initial fiid rule, in such a way that the new rule is using these bits (instead of the list of infinitely many at each vertex), but constructs the same factors graphs. As $n = 0, 1, \dots$, do the following. Fix the first bit of every vertex to get a labelled copy G_0 of G that has no symmetries almost surely. Suppose now that ω_n has been constructed. Look at the number of bits that were not used by step n at each vertex. Let U_n^- be the set of vertices where this number is at most c , and let U_n^+ be the set of vertices where it is at least $2c$. Then $\mathbf{P}(o \in U_n^-) \leq \mathbf{P}(o \in U_n^+)$, so there exists a (stable) matching m that injectively maps every point of U_n^- to some point of U_n^+ . This matching can be constructed deterministically and in a finitary way (see [11] and more generally [14]) without using any extra bits, as long as ties can be broken. We can use some local rule and G_0 for this. Once we have the matching, construct ω_{n+1} from ω_n as given by the initial fiid rule, using bits as follows. For each point that is outside of $U_n^- \cup U_n^+$, use its first unused bits. For each point $x \in U_n^-$, use the first unused bits of $m(x)$. Finally, for every point in U_n^+ , use the second c of its unused bits (because the first c may be used by the vertex matched to it). By construction, every vertex has at least c unused bits at its disposal, so we can construct ω_{n+1} . We obtained that the whole sequence (ω_n) can be constructed using the $10m$ starting bits per vertex. Up to step n our construction is finitary. It remains to show that the limit is also finitary. The initial fiid rule uses finitely many bits at o almost surely. To obtain these bits using the matchings, we use a finitary process. There may be other vertices who are using bits from o because they got matched to it, but there are at most m/c of them, so finding them is again a matter of finitely many finitary processes. We conclude that the new fiid process that we defined is finitary. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Assume that infinitely many iid bits are given at every vertex. We will construct μ as a finitary fiid using a finite expected number of bits from o . Then the claim will follow from Lemma 14. Consider Γ_n as in the assumptions, let \mathcal{P}_n be the set of connected components of Γ_n , and $\mathcal{P}_n(o)$ be the element of \mathcal{P}_n that contains o .

First we prove (2).

By the construction in Theorem 7 (see Remark 10) we have a finitary fiid sequence $\omega_n \searrow \omega$ that is \mathcal{P}_n -local. Define $\omega_0 := V(G)$. We will construct a sequence (ω'_n) such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\omega_n |_{\mathcal{P}_n(o)} = \omega'_n |_{\mathcal{P}_n(o)}) > 1 - 4^{-n}. \quad (2)$$

Then it will be clear that $\omega'_n \rightarrow \omega$. Define $\omega'_0 = \omega_0$. Suppose that ω'_n has been defined and it satisfies (2). For $n = 0, 1, \dots$ we will try to sample the elements of $\omega'_n \setminus \omega_{n+1}$ in a finitary fiid way, so that removing them from ω'_n we get ω_{n+1} . Because of the small possibility of error coming from Proposition 13, we will not be able to sample $\omega'_n \setminus \omega_{n+1}$ precisely, but instead we will sample a set whose removal from ω'_n gives us a set *close to* ω_{n+1} , and this latter is what we will call ω'_{n+1} . The construction will be such that the expected total number of bits per vertex used in all the steps is finite. Step 0 is trivial.

By taking a subsequence if necessary, we may assume

$$\mathbf{P}(o \in \omega_n \setminus \omega) = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{P}_n(o) \cap (\omega_n \setminus \omega)|}{|\mathcal{P}_n(o)|}\right) \leq 4^{-n} \quad (3)$$

for every n . Note that the first equality here is always true by a standard mass transport argument (let every vertex in $\omega_n \setminus \omega$ send mass $1/k$ to each of the k vertices in its \mathcal{P}_n -component...). Similarly, using the induction hypothesis and (2), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{P}_n(o) \cap (\omega'_n \setminus \omega_n)|}{|\mathcal{P}_n(o)|}\right) \leq 4^{-n}, \quad (4)$$

and thus with (3):

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{P}_n(o) \cap (\omega'_n \setminus \omega)|}{|\mathcal{P}_n(o)|}\right) \leq 2 \cdot 4^{-n}. \quad (5)$$

For every component $K \in \mathcal{P}_n$, set $\epsilon = 4^{-n-1}$ and apply Proposition 13 to sample $K \cap (\omega'_n \setminus \omega_{n+1})$. Define $K \cap \omega'_{n+1}$ to be $K \cap \omega'_n$ minus this sampled set. Then (2) will be satisfied by our choice of ϵ . The expected number of bits per vertex needed for the sample can be bounded from above by considering two cases. If $\frac{|K \cap (\omega'_n \setminus \omega)|}{|K|} \leq 2^{-n}$, then we need at most $c2^{-n}n$ bits on average per vertex. The other case is when the inequality goes the other way, in which case one needs at most $\frac{c}{|H|} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \leq 2n \frac{c}{|H|}$ bits on average per vertex but

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{P}_n(o) \cap (\omega'_n \setminus \omega)|}{|\mathcal{P}_n(o)|} > 2^{-n}\right) < 2^{-n}$$

using (5) and Chebyshev's inequality. Putting together the two cases, we have that the expected number of bits that one has to use from o at the n 'th step is at most $c2^{-n}n + 2^{-n+1}nc$. These are summable over the n , so the expected total number of bits per vertex is finite.

The proof would go through for (1) almost verbatim, replacing the reference to Theorem 7 by Theorem 9. The only difference is that in (1) we have edge-percolation, hence instead of the event $o \in \omega$ we would have to take $e \in \omega$ with e a uniform random edge on o . \square

Acknowledgments: I thank Russ Lyons for his comments on the manuscript and Gábor Pete for discussions.

References

- [1] S. Adams (1992) Følner independence and the amenable Ising model *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* **12**(4), 633-657.
- [2] M. Aizenman, H. Duminil-Copin, and V. Sidoravicius (2015) Random currents and continuity of Ising model's spontaneous magnetization, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* no. 2, 719-742.
- [3] M. Aizenman and R. Fernández (1986) On the critical behavior of the magnetization in high-dimensional Ising models, *J. Statist. Phys.* **44**, 393-454.

- [4] D. Aldous, R. Lyons (2007) Processes on unimodular random networks *Electron. J. Probab.* **12**, 1454-1508.
- [5] O. Angel, G. Ray and Y. Spinka (2021) Uniform even subgraphs and graphical representations of Ising as factors of i.i.d. (preprint)
- [6] I. Benjamini, R. Lyons, Y., Peres and O. Schramm (2001) Uniform spanning forests, *Annals of Probability* **29**, 1-65.
- [7] J. van den Berg and J. E. Steif (1999) On the existence and nonexistence of finitary codings for a class of random fields *Annals of Probability* **27**, 1501-1522.
- [8] N. Curien (2018) Random graphs - the local convergence point of view. Notes <https://www.imo.universite-paris-saclay.fr/~nicolas.curien/cours/cours-RG.pdf>
- [9] D. van Engelenburg and T. Hutchcroft (2023) The number of ends in the uniform spanning tree for recurrent unimodular random graphs, [arXiv:2301.03875](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.03875)
- [10] O. Häggström, J. Jonasson, and R. Lyons (2002) Coupling and Bernoullicity in random cluster and Potts models, *Bernoulli*, 275–294.
- [11] C. Hoffman, A. E. Holroyd and Y. Peres (2006) A stable marriage of Poisson and Lebesgue *Ann. Probab.* **34**, 1241–1272.
- [12] T. Hutchcroft (2020) Continuity of the Ising phase transition on nonamenable groups, [arXiv:2007.15625](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.15625)
- [13] T. Hutchcroft and G. Pete (2020) Kazhdan groups have cost 1, *Inventiones mathematicae* **221**, 873-891.
- [14] A. Khezeli (2018) Shift-coupling of random rooted graphs and networks, in *Unimodularity in randomly generated graphs*, 719, 175-211.
- [15] R. Lyons and A. Thom (2016) Invariant coupling of determinantal measures on sofic groups, *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* **36**, 574-607.
- [16] K. Marton and P. Shields (1994) The positive-divergence and blowing-up properties, *Israel J. Math.* **86** 331–348.
- [17] Y. Spinka (2020) Finitary coding for the sub-critical Ising model with finite expected coding volume, *Electron. J. Probab.* **25**, 1-27.
- [18] Á. Timár (2009) Invariant matchings of exponential tail on coin flips in \mathbb{Z}^d (preprint) [arXiv:0909.1090](https://arxiv.org/abs/0909.1090)
- [19] Á. Timár (2019) One-ended spanning trees in amenable unimodular graphs, *Electronic Communications in Probability* **24**, paper no. 72, 12 pp.
- [20] C. N. Yang (1952) The spontaneous magnetization of a two-dimensional Ising model, *Phys. Rev.* **85**, 808–816.

Ádám Timár

Division of Mathematics, The Science Institute, University of Iceland

Dunhaga 3 IS-107 Reykjavik, Iceland

and

Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics

Reáltanoda u. 13-15, Budapest 1053 Hungary

`madaramit[at]gmail.com`