

NORMAL APPROXIMATION FOR GIBBS PROCESSES VIA DISAGREEMENT COUPLINGS

CHRISTIAN HIRSCH, MORITZ OTTO, AND ANNE MARIE SVANE

ABSTRACT. This work improves the existing central limit theorems (CLTs) for geometric functionals of Gibbs processes in three aspects. First, we derive a CLT for weakly stabilizing functionals, thereby improving on the previously used assumption of exponential stabilization. Second, we show that this CLT holds for interaction ranges up to the percolation threshold of the dominating Poisson process. This avoids imprecise branching bounds from graphical construction. Third, by constructing simultaneous couplings of several Palm processes for Gibbs functionals, we provide a quantitative CLT in terms of Kolmogorov bounds for normal approximation. An important conceptual ingredient in these advances is the extension of disagreement coupling adapted to unbounded windows and to the comparison at multiple spatial locations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Because of their ability to encode possibly highly complex interactions, Gibbs point processes are applied in a broad range of domains such as biology, ecology, materials science and telecommunication networks [1, 29]. However, even for simple models, the use of Gibbs point processes comes at massive computational costs as the simulation requires elaborate Markov chain Monte Carlo methods [1]. This issue becomes particularly pressing when devising goodness-of-fit tests on large datasets. Therefore, an attractive approach is to develop test statistics that are asymptotically normal on large windows. Then, to develop a hypothesis test only the mean and variance under the null model are needed. This explains the need for central limit theorems (CLTs) on functionals of Gibbs point processes.

The last decade was marked by vigorous research activities in the asymptotic theory of statistics that can be written as a sum of certain scores evaluated at the points of a point process with rapidly decaying correlations. Improving on the methods used in the classical setting of Poisson point processes in [24], CLTs for Gibbs point processes could be derived in [27, 32] by relying on the graphical construction of Gibbs processes [11].

However, despite these recent advances, some aspects of the limit theory for Poisson processes could so far not been transferred to Gibbs point processes:

- (1) All of [7, 27, 32] are formulated under the condition of exponential stabilization. This makes it difficult to apply [27, 32] for delicate topological functionals, such as the persistent Betti numbers.
- (2) Both [27, 32] rely on the graphical construction of Gibbs processes from [11], thereby imposing restrictive constraints on the interaction range of the Gibbs process for which a (partially quantitative) CLT can be established.
- (3) In [3], disagreement coupling is used to establish a CLT with a Gibbs particle process as input thus allowing a larger interaction range. However, the investigations are restricted to U-statistics and do not provide quantitative error bounds for normal approximation. Very recently, [7] derived a quantitative CLT with optimal convergence rates (up to logarithmic corrections) and for a very general class of β -mixing point processes. However, the convergence is quantified with respect to the Wasserstein distance and the methods do not extend easily to the Kolmogorov distance.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60K35. Secondary 60D05, 55U10.

Key words and phrases. Gibbs process, disagreement coupling, normal approximation, stabilizing functionals, martingale central limit theorem, Palm processes, Stein's method.

In our work, we will address all of the shortcomings mentioned above. The key tool for achieving the improvements will be a more refined analysis of the correlation structure of Gibbs processes using disagreement coupling. While this technique was initially suggested for studying the spatial correlation structure of lattice-Gibbs point processes [31], it has recently been successfully extended to derive Poisson approximation theorems for continuum Gibbs processes [18]. However, the construction in [18] is not adapted to the setting of unbounded domains or the coupling at several locations, which are critical for the CLT improvements derived in the present article. Therefore, a major part of our investigation is devoted to making disagreement coupling more flexible so that it can accommodate the needs from spatial limit theorems. Equipped with these conceptual advances, we improve the existing CLTs for Gibbs point processes in three aspects.

- (1) We extend the CLT for weakly stabilizing functionals from [24] to the setting of Gibbs point processes. In particular, this yields a CLT for persistent Betti numbers and total edge length of minimal spanning trees.
- (2) We prove a CLT for Gibbs point processes under the condition that the interaction range is smaller than the critical value of continuum percolation of an associated Poisson point process. This improves on the restrictive constraints coming from the branching bounds of the graphical construction in [11]. In other words, our work makes normal approximation available for point processes that were out of reach in [27].
- (3) We show how the convergence in Wasserstein distance from [7] can be upgraded to a convergence in Kolmogorov distance provided stricter conditions are imposed on the point process and the functional. To that end, we introduce simultaneous couplings of several Palm versions for Gibbs processes.

The rest of this manuscript is organized as follows. First, in Section 2, we introduce the model and main results, Theorems 3 and 4. Then, in Section 3, we discuss examples satisfying the conditions of these results. We review the definition of disagreement coupling in Section 4 and establish the properties needed for the proofs of the main results. We prove Theorems 3 and 4 in Sections 5 and 6, respectively. Finally, we provide a detailed comparison with the existing normal approximation literature in Appendix A and a technical auxiliary result in Appendix B.

2. MODEL AND MAIN RESULTS

The main results of this article, Theorems 3 and 4 below, are CLTs for stabilizing functionals on Gibbs point processes. First, we discuss in greater detail the considered classes of Gibbs point processes. For a concise introduction to Gibbs point processes, we refer the reader to [8].

2.1. Conditions on the Gibbs process. Let \mathbb{R}^d be Euclidean space equipped with the Borel σ -algebra \mathcal{B}^d . Define \mathcal{B}_0^d to be the set of bounded Borel sets. Let \mathbf{N} be the space of all locally finite subsets of \mathbb{R}^d and let \mathcal{N} denote the smallest σ -algebra on \mathbf{N} such that $\mu \mapsto \mu(B) := \#\mu \cap B$ is measurable for all $B \in \mathcal{B}_0^d$, where $\#A$ denotes the cardinality of a set A . Let $\mathbf{N}_0 \subseteq \mathbf{N}$ denote the subspace of finite subsets and for $B \in \mathcal{B}^d$, let $\mathbf{N}_B \subseteq \mathbf{N}$ denote the locally finite subsets of B . A *point process* is a measurable map from (Ω, \mathcal{F}) to $(\mathbf{N}, \mathcal{N})$ where $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is some probability space.

To define Gibbs point processes, we start from an energy functional $E : \mathbf{N}_0 \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ which satisfies:

- ▷ *Non-degeneracy:* $E(\emptyset) = 0$.
- ▷ *Hereditary:* For all $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $E(\psi) = \infty$ implies $E(\psi \cup \{x\}) = \infty$.
- ▷ *Stability:* There is a constant $C > 0$ with

$$(1) \quad \inf_{\psi \in \mathbf{N}_0} E(\psi) \geq -C\#\psi.$$

The *local energy* $J : \mathbf{N}_0 \times \mathbf{N}_0 \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is given by

$$(2) \quad J(\varphi, \psi) := E(\varphi \cup \psi) - E(\psi),$$

which encodes the energy increase when adding the point configuration φ to ψ . We will assume that J has *finite interaction range*. That is, there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that

$$J(x, \psi) = J(x, \psi \cap B_{r_0}(x))$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_0$, where

$$B_{r_0}(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : |y - x| \leq r_0\}$$

denotes the Euclidean ball with radius $r_0 > 0$ centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We write $B_{r_0} := B_{r_0}(x)$. Note that the assumption of finite interaction range allows us to define $J(\varphi, \psi)$ also for $\psi \in \mathbf{N}$.

For $B \in \mathcal{B}_0^d$, the *partition function* $Z_B: \mathbf{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is defined by

$$Z_B(\psi) := \mathbb{E}[e^{-J(\mathcal{P}_B, \psi)}], \quad \psi \in \mathbf{N},$$

where \mathcal{P}_B denotes a unit intensity Poisson process on B . Condition (1) indeed ensures that $Z_B(\psi) < \infty$ and since $J(\emptyset, \psi) = 0$ for all $\psi \in \mathbf{N}$, we also have that $Z_B(\psi) \geq e^{-|B|} > 0$.

For $B \in \mathcal{B}_0^d$ and $\psi \in \mathbf{N}$, we now define the *finite-volume Gibbs point process* $\mathcal{X}(B, \psi)$ on B with boundary conditions ψ as the point process with density

$$(3) \quad \varphi \mapsto Z_B(\psi)^{-1} e^{-J(\varphi, \psi)}$$

with respect to the unit intensity Poisson process on B . This is well-defined since $0 < Z_B(\psi) < \infty$.

The finite-volume Gibbs process is sometimes, e.g. in [18], introduced in terms of the Papangelou conditional intensity (PI) $\kappa: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbf{N}_0 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ defined by

$$\kappa(x, \psi) = e^{-J(x, \psi)}.$$

Then, $\mathcal{X}(B, \psi)$ can be characterized as the unique point process satisfying the *GNZ equation*

$$(4) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{X_i \in \mathcal{X}(B, \psi)} f(X_i, \mathcal{X}(B, \psi)) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_B f(x, \mathcal{X}(B, \psi) \cup \{x\}) \kappa(x, \mathcal{X}(B, \psi) \cup \psi) \lambda(dx) \right],$$

for each $f: B \times \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ that is measurable [12, 23].

Consider the finite volume Gibbs point process $\mathcal{X}(B, \psi)$ on $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$ with boundary conditions $\psi \in \mathbf{N}$. Then, \mathcal{X} satisfies the *DLR equations*: For $C \subseteq B$ and all $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}_{B \setminus C}$ outside a set of measure 0 with respect to $\mathcal{X}(B, \psi) \cap (B \setminus C)$,

$$(5) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}(B, \psi) \cap C \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{X}(B, \psi) \cap (B \setminus C) = \varphi) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}(C, \psi \cup \varphi) \in \cdot).$$

In words, the conditional distribution of $\mathcal{X}(B, \psi) \cap C$ given $\mathcal{X}(B, \psi) \cap (B \setminus C)$ is again a Gibbs point process, namely the Gibbs process on C with boundary conditions $\psi \cup (\mathcal{X}(B, \psi) \cap (B \setminus C))$.

The GNZ equations can be used to define Gibbs processes in unbounded domains. A point process \mathcal{X} is said to be an *infinite-volume Gibbs point process* on \mathbb{R}^d if

$$(6) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{X_i \in \mathcal{X}} f(X_i, \mathcal{X}) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int f(x, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x\}) \kappa(x, \mathcal{X}) \lambda(dx) \right],$$

for each measurable $f: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$.

While the finite-volume Gibbs process was explicitly defined in (3), the existence and in particular the uniqueness of infinite-volume Gibbs processes is generally far from trivial, see e.g. [4, 8]. We therefore make some further assumptions on κ . For $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we let $A \oplus B := \{x + y \mid x \in A, y \in B\}$ and for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we write $x + A := \{x\} \oplus A$. Moreover, we define $B_r(A) = A \oplus B_r$. Then, the Boolean model with intensity α_0 and balls of radius $r/2$ is defined as $B_{r/2}(\mathcal{P})$. Let $r_c = r_c(\alpha_0)$ denote the critical threshold of continuum percolation for a Poisson point process \mathcal{P} with intensity $\alpha_0 > 0$. That is, the infimum of all $r > 0$ such that $B_{r/2}(\mathcal{P})$ has an unbounded connected component with positive probability.

Throughout the paper, we will work under the following assumption.

$$(7) \quad \text{The PI is bounded } 0 \leq \kappa \leq \alpha_0 \text{ and has a finite interaction range } r_0 < r_c(\alpha_0).$$

Then, for any given PI κ , there exists a unique infinite-volume Gibbs point process (see [8, Thm. 5.4] or Proposition 19 below). We now give two well-known examples of Gibbs point process models satisfying the assumptions.

Example 1 (Pairwise interaction processes). In this example, the local energy is given in terms of a non-negative pair potential $v : [0, r_0] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$,

$$J(x, \psi) := -\log(\alpha_0) + \sum_{y \in \psi \cap B_{r_0}(x)} v(|x - y|).$$

The special case $\Psi = \beta \mathbb{1}_{[0, r_0]}$ where $\beta > 0$ and $\mathbb{1}_{[0, r_0]}$ is the indicator for the interval $[0, r_0]$ is known as the Strauss process. If $\beta = \infty$, one obtains the hard-sphere model.

Example 2 (Area-interaction process [2]). In this example, we use for $\alpha_0, r_0 > 0$ and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ the potential

$$J(x, \psi) := -\log(\alpha_0) + V(x, \psi) \log(\gamma),$$

where

$$V(x, \psi) := \left| B_{r_0/2}(x) \setminus \bigcup_{y \in \psi \cap B_{r_0/2}(x)} B_{r_0/2}(y) \right|.$$

In both examples, the PI κ is *translation-invariant*, i.e., $\kappa(x, \psi) = \kappa(x + y, \psi + y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_0$.

We finally mention that an infinite-volume Gibbs process also satisfies the DLR equations: It holds for all $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}_{B^c}$ outside a set of $\mathcal{X} \cap B^c$ -measure zero that

$$(8) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X} \cap B \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{X} \cap B^c = \varphi) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}(B, \varphi) \in \cdot).$$

That is, given the boundary conditions $\mathcal{X} \cap B^c$, the distribution of $\mathcal{X} \cap B$ is a finite volume Gibbs process.

We conclude by discussing the relation between Gibbs point processes satisfying Assumption (7) and those appearing in the existing literature [3, 7, 27, 32] on normal approximation for Gibbs processes. Since we do not need the precise definitions in the rest of the paper, we keep the remarks very brief at the present point. For the interested reader, we have included a more thorough discussion in Appendix A.

The class of Gibbs processes considered in [7, 27, 32] were first introduced in [27, Section 1.1]. For finite-range interactions, the entire theory relies on a restrictive interaction-range bound formulated in [27, Equation (1.4)]. As observed in [3, Remark 3], especially for low dimensions d , Assumption (7) is a substantial improvement of the bound [27, Equation (1.4)]. In other words, our work makes normal approximation available for point processes that were out of reach in [7, 27, 32]. Conversely, we note that our paper requires the interaction range to be finite, whereas [32] also allows some infinite-range Gibbs processes.

The key achievement of [7] is to provide a quantitative CLT for point processes that are not necessarily of Gibbsian type. The main assumption here is the *exponential decay of dependence (EDD)*. The authors verify this condition for the Gibbs process from [27]. In Section A, we show that the EDD property also holds under Assumption (7).

Finally, we mention that a qualitative normal approximation result was obtained in [3] under the assumption (7). However, this only applies in the case of U -statistics with finite stabilization radius.

2.2. Statement of main results and conditions on the functional. The main results of this article are two CLTs for functionals of Gibbs processes on growing domains, see Theorems 3 and 4. These results are complementary in the following sense. While Theorem 3 describes a CLT for a general class of translation-invariant Gibbs functionals without convergence rates, Theorem 4 provides a quantitative CLT for the more restricted class of Gibbs functionals that can be written as a sum of scores. Therefore, it is natural that the two results require different sets of conditions. However, loosely speaking, in both cases the conditions consist of a moment bound and stabilization condition.

We now discuss a CLT for weakly stabilizing functionals as the first main result of our paper. Let $H : \mathbf{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a functional. We say that H is *translation-invariant* if $H(\varphi) = H(\varphi + x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}_0$. Writing $Q_n := [-n/2, n/2]^d$, $n \geq 1$, we consider functionals H_n of locally finite point patterns $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$ of the form

$$H_n(\varphi) := H(\varphi \cap Q_n)$$

To prove the CLT for $H_n(\mathcal{X})$, we need to impose a moment and a stabilization condition. The moment condition requires that there are constants $c_M, p_M > 0$ such that for any $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$(9) \quad \mathbb{E}[|H_n(\mathcal{X}) - H_n(\mathcal{X} \setminus Q_{z,m})|^5] \leq c_M m^{p_M},$$

where $Q_{z,m} := z + Q_m$. The stabilization condition requires that, almost surely,

$$(10) \quad H(\mathcal{X}) - H(\mathcal{X} \setminus Q_l) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (H(\mathcal{X} \cap Q_{w_n, m_n}) - H((\mathcal{X} \cap Q_{w_n, m_n}) \setminus Q_l))$$

exists for all $l \geq 0$ and all sequences $m_n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\mathbb{R}^d = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \bigcap_{n \geq k} Q_{w_n, m_n}$. Note that the limit is necessarily independent of the sequence Q_{w_n, m_n} . This is a *weak stabilization condition* in the sense that there is no assumption on the rate of convergence in (10).

We show in Section 5.2.1, that the conditions are satisfied if the following deterministic conditions on the functional hold. The conditions will be stated in terms of the *add-one cost operator*

$$(D_x H)(\varphi) := H(\varphi \cup \{x\}) - H(\varphi)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}_0$. Then, the moment condition (9) will be satisfied if there are constants $c_{DM}, R_{DM} > 0$ such that for any finite point pattern $\varphi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(11) \quad |D_y H(\varphi)| \leq c_{DM} \exp(c_{DM} \varphi(B_{R_{DM}})),$$

see Lemma 32. The stabilization condition (10) is satisfied if for every $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$ and any sequence Q_{w_n, m_n} with $w_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $m_n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\bigcup_{k \geq 1} \bigcap_{n \geq k} Q_{w_n, m_n} = \mathbb{R}^d$, the limit

$$(12) \quad H(\varphi \cup \{0\}) - H(\varphi) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_0 H(\varphi \cap Q_{w_n, z_n})$$

exists, see Lemma 34.

Let $N(0, \sigma^2)$ denote a normal random variable with variance $\sigma^2 \geq 0$. Then our first main result is the following. The proof will follow from Theorem 30 and Lemma 32.

Theorem 3 (CLT for weakly stabilizing functionals on Gibbs processes). *Let \mathcal{X} be an infinite-volume Gibbs point process with translation-invariant PI satisfying (7). Let H be a translation-invariant functional on finite point patterns satisfying conditions (9) and (10). Then,*

$$|Q_n|^{-1} \text{Var}(H_n(\mathcal{X})) \rightarrow \sigma^2,$$

for some $\sigma^2 \geq 0$. Moreover,

$$|Q_n|^{-1/2} (H_n(\mathcal{X}) - \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X})]) \rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2).$$

While [24] gives a CLT for weakly stabilizing functionals on Poisson point processes, most CLTs for more general point process models in the literature, e.g. [5, 7, 27, 32], only apply to functionals given in terms of an exponentially stabilizing score function, and [3] even requires finite stabilization range. The weak stabilization condition (12) closely mimics the one in [24], which is, however, only required to hold almost surely in [24]. For an almost sure condition in the Gibbs setting, one would have to use (10). Condition (11) resembles the power growth condition in [5, Equation (1.18)], except that it requires a fixed radius R_{DM} .

A formula for the limiting variance σ^2 is given in Theorem 30. Positivity of σ^2 is not part of the statement in Theorem 3. In Corollary 6, we demonstrate in an example how the positivity can be checked. The argument easily generalizes to a variety of other functionals.

Our second main result is a quantitative normal approximation result in the *Kolmogorov distance*

$$d_K(X, Y) := \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(X \leq u) - \mathbb{P}(Y \leq u)|.$$

between real-valued random variables X, Y . Concerning the setup for Theorem 4, for $n \geq 1$, we consider the functional

$$(13) \quad H(\varphi) := \sum_{x \in \varphi \cap Q} g(x, \varphi), \quad \varphi \in \mathbf{N},$$

for some measurable score function $g: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. We follow the convention that $g(x, \varphi) = g(x, \varphi \cup \{x\})$ for every locally finite $\varphi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \notin \varphi$.

We first impose a bounded moment condition. More precisely, we assume that

$$(14) \quad \sup_{x_1, \dots, x_5 \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[g(x_1, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_5\})^6] =: c_m < \infty,$$

where we note that the x_1, \dots, x_5 do not need to be pairwise distinct.

Second, we require that g is *exponentially stabilizing* in the spirit of [5]. To make this precise, we assume that there is a *stabilization radius* $R(x, \varphi)$ having exponentially decaying probabilities. That is, first, for all locally finite $\varphi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \in \varphi$, we have

$$g(x, \varphi) = g(x, \varphi \cap B_{R(x, \varphi)}(x)).$$

We also assume that the event $\{R(x, \varphi) \leq r\}$ is measurable with respect to $\varphi \cap B_r(x)$. Second, we impose that

$$(15) \quad -\limsup_{r \uparrow \infty} \sup_{x_1, \dots, x_5 \in \mathbb{R}^d} r^{-1} \log \mathbb{P}(R(x_1, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_5\}) > r) =: c_{es} > 0.$$

Theorem 4 (Quantitative normal approximation of Gibbsian score sums). *Let \mathcal{X} be an infinite-volume Gibbs point process satisfying (7). Assume that (14), (15) hold. Moreover, we assume that $g(x, \varphi) = 0$ implies $g(x, \varphi') = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and locally finite $\varphi \subseteq \varphi' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. We also assume that Q is a bounded Borel set with $|Q| > 1$ and $|B_{(\log |Q|)^2}(Q)| \leq 2|Q|$. Then, $H := H(\mathcal{X})$ defined at (13) satisfies*

$$d_K\left(\frac{H - \mathbb{E}[H]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(H)}}, N(0, 1)\right) \leq c_{\text{norm}} \frac{|Q|(\log |Q|)^{2d}}{\text{Var}(H)^{3/2}},$$

where $c_{\text{norm}} = c_{\text{norm}}(d, \alpha_0, r_0, c_m, c_{es})$.

The bound on the parallel set $|B_{(\log |Q|)^2}(Q)|$ is a technical condition, which for instance can be checked for sets of the form $Q = aK$ where K is fixed convex and $a > 0$ large enough. In particular, this condition disappears in our Corollary 5. Note that Theorem 4 also applies to finite-volume Gibbs processes since the PI $\kappa(x, \varphi \cup \psi) \mathbb{1}_Q(x)$ corresponds to the Gibbs process $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$. As an application, we state two variations of Theorem 4 concerning the convergence rate when the observation window $Q = Q_n$ increases towards \mathbb{R}^d . For the first version, let \mathcal{X} be Gibbs process with PI κ satisfying (7) and let

$$H^n := H^n(\mathcal{X}) := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X} \cap Q_n} g(x, \mathcal{X}).$$

Often in applications, only $\mathcal{X} \cap Q_n$ can be observed, hence it is more natural to consider

$$H_\cap^n := H_\cap^n(\mathcal{X}) := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X} \cap Q_n} g(x, \mathcal{X} \cap Q_n)$$

and modify the assumptions (14) and (15) by

$$(16) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{x_1, \dots, x_5 \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[g(x_1, (\mathcal{X} \cap Q_n) \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_5\})^6] =: c_m < \infty,$$

$$(17) \quad -\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \limsup_{r \uparrow \infty} \sup_{x_1, \dots, x_5 \in \mathbb{R}^d} r^{-1} \log \mathbb{P}(R(x_1, (\mathcal{X} \cap Q_n) \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_5\}) > r) =: c_{es} > 0.$$

Corollary 5. *Let \mathcal{X} be an infinite-volume Gibbs point process satisfying (7). Moreover, we assume that $g(x, \varphi) = 0$ implies $g(x, \varphi') = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and locally finite $\varphi \subseteq \varphi' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$.*

(a) *Assume that (14), (15) hold. If $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |Q_n|^{-1} \text{Var}(H^n) > 0$, we have for n large enough,*

$$d_K\left(\frac{H^n - \mathbb{E}[H^n]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(H^n)}}, N(0, 1)\right) \in O\left(\frac{(\log |Q_n|)^{2d}}{\sqrt{|Q_n|}}\right).$$

(b) *Assume that (16), (17) hold. If $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |Q_n|^{-1} \text{Var}(H_\cap^n) > 0$, we have for n large enough,*

$$d_K\left(\frac{H_\cap^n - \mathbb{E}[H_\cap^n]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(H_\cap^n)}}, N(0, 1)\right) \in O\left(\frac{(\log |Q_n|)^{2d}}{\sqrt{|Q_n|}}\right).$$

Similar convergence rates were obtained in [32, Thm. 1.2], but for a smaller class of Gibbs processes. As mentioned in Section 2.1, very recently a quantitative CLT was derived in [7] under the EDD conditions in without the need for any monotonicity assumptions on the score function g . However, the convergence rates are slightly worse and given in terms of the Wasserstein distance, whereas bounds for the Kolmogorov distance are often easier to interpret. We note that also in other contexts, one frequently encounters the situation where extending Wasserstein convergence rates to Kolmogorov convergence rates requires substantial additional work [28]. In the special case of Poisson processes, better convergence rates were obtained in [20].

The weak stabilization condition (10) is weaker than the exponential stabilization condition (17) when the PI is translation-invariant. We briefly explain why. Fix $l \geq 1$. For $i \geq 2l$, we let

$$E_{i,l}^{(1)} := \left\{ \max_{x \in \mathcal{X} \cap Q_i} \max_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \max_{m \in \mathbb{N}} R(x, \mathcal{X} \cap Q_{w,m}) \leq i/2 \right\}$$

denote the event that the stabilization radius of the points in Q_i is at most $i/2$ for any of the windows $Q_{w,m}$ with $w \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $m \geq 1$. We note that for fixed x , the number of different sets of the form $B_{i/2}(x) \cap Q_{w,m}$ is finite and of order $O(i^d)$. Hence, by exponential stabilization and the GNZ formula (6), the probabilities $1 - \mathbb{P}(E_{i,l}^{(1)})$ decay to 0 exponentially in i . Hence, by the Borel-Cantelli lemma, there exists an almost surely finite random variable I_0 such that $E_{i,l}^{(1)}$ occurs for all $i \geq I_0$. We now argue that this implies the weak stabilization. Indeed, let $m_n \geq 1$ and $w_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be such that $\mathbb{R}^d = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \bigcap_{n \geq k} Q_{w_n, m_n}$. Then, $g(x, \mathcal{X} \cap Q_{w_n, m_n}) = g(x, \mathcal{X} \cap (Q_{w_n, m_n} \setminus Q_l))$ holds for every $n \geq 1$ and every $x \in (\mathcal{X} \setminus Q_{I_0}) \cap Q_{w_n, m_n}$. Therefore, whenever n is such that $Q_{w_n, m_n} \supseteq Q_{2I_0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & H(\mathcal{X} \cap Q_{w_n, m_n}) - H(\mathcal{X} \cap (Q_{w_n, m_n} \setminus Q_l)) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X} \cap Q_l} g(x, \mathcal{X} \cap B_{I_0}(x)) + \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X} \cap (Q_{I_0} \setminus Q_l)} (g(x, \mathcal{X} \cap Q_{2I_0}) - g(x, \mathcal{X} \cap (Q_{w_n, m_n} \setminus Q_l))). \end{aligned}$$

Noting that the last term stabilizes when $n \rightarrow \infty$ if the stabilization radius $R(x, \mathcal{X} \setminus Q_l)$ is finite proves the weak stabilization condition.

To prove Theorems 3 and 4, we extend to Gibbs processes the martingale approach from [24] and the Palm couplings from [6]. The proofs rely on a precise control of the decay of spatial correlations through refined forms of disagreement coupling given in Section 4 that are tailored to Theorems 3 and 4.

3. EXAMPLES

In this section, we present specific examples for Theorems 3 (persistent Betti numbers; minimal spanning tree) and 4 (total edge length in Voronoi tessellations and k -nearest neighbor graphs). In all examples, we consider Gibbs point processes where Assumption (7) holds.

3.1. Example for Theorem 3: Persistent Betti numbers. The persistent Betti numbers are invariants used in topological data analysis for summarizing the persistence diagram. They are defined for $r \leq s$, $q = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$ and a finite set $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$ by

$$\beta_q^{r,s}(\varphi) = \dim(\text{Im}(H_q(B_r(\varphi); \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_q(B_s(\varphi); \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}))),$$

where $H_q(\cdot, \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$ denotes the q th homology group with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. Homology is a fundamental quantity in algebraic topology. Loosely speaking, the rank of H_q encodes the number of q -dimensional holes of a topological space, see [10] for a thorough introduction to topological data analysis. The use of persistent Betti numbers for statistics of point patterns was first suggested in [26] under the name rank functions.

Most existing CLTs for functionals on point processes, e.g. [5, 32], assume the functional is written in terms of an exponentially stabilizing score function. This is not easily verified for $\beta_q^{r,s}$. However, some first results on consistency and asymptotic normality for Betti numbers were given when $r = s$ in [30, 33, 34]. These results were extended to general r and s in [13, 17]. All asymptotic normality results previously considered have been restricted to Poisson or Bernoulli point processes. Existing CLTs were derived by observing that weak stabilization in the sense of [24] holds for persistent Betti numbers. The same observation leads to the following corollary of Theorem 3.

Corollary 6. *Let \mathcal{X} be an infinite-volume Gibbs point process with translation-invariant PI satisfying (7). Then for all $0 \leq r \leq s$*

$$|Q_n|^{-1/2}(\beta_q^{r,s}(\mathcal{X} \cap Q_n) - \mathbb{E}\beta_q^{r,s}(\mathcal{X} \cap Q_n)) \rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2)$$

for some $\sigma^2 \geq 0$. If $\kappa > 0$, then $\sigma^2 > 0$.

We show the first statement of Corollary 6 below. The proof of the positivity of the limiting variance is deferred to the end of Section 5.2. The proof relies on the fact that $\beta_q^{r,s}$ can be computed from the Čech complex via the Nerve Theorem, see [10, Chap. III.2] for details.

Proof. The corollary follows from Theorem 3 if we can show Condition (11) and (12). Condition (12) follows directly from [13, Lem 5.3]. For Condition (11), recall that $k+1$ points in a finite point pattern φ form a k -simplex of filtration value t in the Čech complex if and only if the smallest ball containing the $k+1$ points has radius t . Thus, adding a point y to a point pattern φ changes the k -simplices in the Čech complex with filtration value less than or equal s only by adding and removing simplices with all $k+1$ vertices contained in a ball of radius $2s$ around y . By [13, Lem. 2.11], this changes $\beta_q^{r,s}$ by at most the number of added and removed q - and $(q+1)$ -simplices. This number is bounded by the total number of $(q+1)$ - and $(q+2)$ -tuples of points in $\varphi \cap B_{2s}(y)$, which is again bounded by

$$(\varphi(B_{2s}(y)) + 1)^{q+1} + (\varphi(B_{2s}(y)) + 1)^{q+2} \leq 2(\varphi(B_{2s}(y)) + 1)^{q+2}.$$

This shows Condition (11). □

3.2. Example for Theorem 3: Total edge length in minimal spanning trees. For a finite set $\varphi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, the minimal spanning tree (MST) is a tree defined on the vertex set φ . The edge set of this tree is chosen such that it minimizes the total edge length. We note that this tree is almost surely unique for any point process that satisfies (8). We let $H(\varphi)$ denote the total edge length of the MST. For Poisson point processes, the asymptotic properties of H were considered in [16] and [25, Theorem 2.3]. We discuss this example because it is one of the prototypical examples where exponential stabilization fails even in the Poisson setting. Hence, we are not able to rely on Theorem 4. To verify (9) and (10), we proceed as in [16] with only few modifications. To make the presentation self-contained we give the details below.

Moment bound. For any bounded Borel set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$, we have a trivial upper bound

$$(18) \quad H(\varphi \cap A) \leq \text{diam}(A)\varphi(A).$$

We bound the positive and negative parts of $H_n(\mathcal{X}) - H_n(\mathcal{X} \setminus Q_{z,m})$ separately. For the positive part, we first note that if $\mathcal{X} \cap Q_n \subseteq Q_{z,m}$, then by (18),

$$H_n(\mathcal{X}) - H_n(\mathcal{X} \setminus Q_{z,m}) \leq \sqrt{d}m\mathcal{X}(Q_{z,m}),$$

and by the stochastic domination (7), the fifth moment of the right-hand side is of order $O(m^{5+5d})$. Thus, we may henceforth assume that $K_{z,m} \leq m_0(n)$, where we write

$$K_{z,m} := \min \{k \geq m : \mathcal{X} \cap Q_{z,k} \not\subseteq Q_{z,m}\}$$

and

$$m_0(n) := \min \{k \geq m : Q_n \subseteq Q_{z,k}\}.$$

Now, we derive an upper bound for $H_n(\mathcal{X})$. For this, we first build a minimal spanning tree on $\mathcal{X} \cap (Q_n \setminus Q_{z,m})$, then build a spanning tree on $\mathcal{X} \cap Q_{z,m}$ and finally connect the two trees through a point in $\mathcal{X} \cap Q_{z,K_{z,m}}$ to build a spanning tree on $\mathcal{X} \cap Q_n$. Therefore,

$$(19) \quad H_n(\mathcal{X}) \leq H_n(\mathcal{X} \setminus Q_{z,m}) + \sqrt{d}K_{z,m}\mathcal{X}(Q_{z,m}).$$

As noted above, the tenth moment of $\mathcal{X}(Q_{z,m})$ is of order $O(m^{10d})$. Hence, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it suffices to show that the tenth moment of $K_{z,m}$ grows polynomially in m . To that end, we note that

$$(20) \quad \mathbb{E}[K_{z,m}^{10}] \leq \sum_{k \geq m} k^{10} \mathbb{P}(K_{z,m} = k)$$

Now, by the Poisson-likeness derived in Proposition 42, we have $\sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}(K_{z,m} = k) \leq c_1(k^d - m^d) \exp(- (k^d - m^d)/c_1)$. Hence, the right-hand side of (20) is of order $O(m^{d+10})$, as asserted.

Finally, we bound the negative part of the difference $H_n(\mathcal{X}) - H_n(\mathcal{X} \setminus Q_{z,m})$. First, if $\mathcal{X} \cap Q_n \subseteq Q_{z,m}$, then $H_n(\mathcal{X}) - H_n(\mathcal{X} \setminus Q_{z,m})$ is positive. If $\mathcal{X} \cap Q_n \subseteq Q_n \setminus Q_{z,m}$ then $H_n(\mathcal{X}) = H_n(\mathcal{X} \setminus Q_{z,m})$. Hence, we may assume that in the MST on $\mathcal{X} \cap Q_n$ there are some edges crossing $\partial Q_{z,m}$. We now bound the length of the MST on $\mathcal{X} \cap (Q_n \setminus Q_{z,m})$ where as a starting point, we consider the MST on $\mathcal{X} \cap Q_n$. Let

$$\mathcal{L}_{z,m,n} := \left\{ \text{edges in the MST of } \mathcal{X} \cap Q_n \text{ with exactly one endpoint in } \mathcal{X} \cap Q_{z,m} \right\}.$$

Then, we get a graph connecting $\mathcal{X} \cap (Q_n \setminus Q_{z,m})$ by removing all edges with at least one endpoint in $Q_{z,m}$ and connecting all points in $\mathcal{X} \cap (Q_n \setminus Q_{z,m})$ that used to be connected to $\mathcal{X} \cap Q_{z,m}$ to any fixed other such point. The length of any such new connection is bounded by $\sqrt{d}m$ plus the length of two edges from $\mathcal{L}_{z,m,n}$. Henceforth, we use that there is a deterministic upper bound $d_{\max} \geq 1$ for the possible degree of any vertex in the MST. This yields

$$(21) \quad H_n(\mathcal{X} \setminus Q_{z,m}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}) \leq \sum_{e \in \mathcal{L}_{z,m,n}} (2L_{z,m,n} + \sqrt{d}m) \leq d_{\max} \mathcal{X}(Q_{z,m})(2L_{z,m,n} + \sqrt{d}m),$$

where $L_{z,m,n} := \max_{e \in \mathcal{L}_{z,m,n}} |e|$ denotes the maximal edge length in $\mathcal{L}_{z,m,n}$. Hence, as in the case for the positive part, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{E}[L_{z,m,n}^{10}]$ is at most of polynomial order in m . To achieve this goal, we note that

$$(22) \quad \mathbb{E}[L_{z,m,n}^{10}] \leq \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell + 1) \mathbb{P}(L_{z,m,n}^{10} \geq \ell).$$

Now, under the event $\{L_{z,m,n} \geq \ell^{1/10}\}$, there exists an edge $e \in \mathcal{L}_{z,m,n}$ of length at least $\ell^{1/10}$. Since the MST is a subset of the Delaunay complex, there is a ball with diameter at least $|e|$ containing e that does not contain any points of $\mathcal{X} \cap Q_n$ in its interior. But again by the Poisson-likeness, the probability of this event can be bounded by $c_1(m + \ell^{1/10})^d \exp(-\ell^{d/10}/c_1)$ for some constant $c_1 > 0$. Therefore, the right-hand side of (22) is of order $O(m^d)$, as asserted.

Weak stabilization. To verify the weak stabilization condition, we proceed as in [16, Proposition 3]. To make this precise, we first need the notion of separating sets. More precisely, for $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$, a *separating set of width* $\delta > 0$ for a box Q_l is a finite set $S \subseteq \varphi \cap (Q_{l+\delta+18r_0} \setminus Q_{l+18r_0})$ such that any line segment from a point in ∂Q_{l+18r_0} to a point in $\partial Q_{l+\delta+18r_0}$ passes within distance $3r_0$ of some point of S . We note our definition is scaled by $9r_0$ compared to the original definition in [16], which uses 1 instead of $9r_0$ in the definition of the windows and $1/3$ instead of $3r_0$ for the distance. After appropriate rescaling, the arguments in [16] extend to our setting. We shall need the following two results from [16], which we restate in our setting.

Proposition 7 (Monotonicity in increasing windows; Proposition 3 of [16]). *Let $l \geq 1$ and $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$. Assume that $S \subseteq \varphi \cap (Q_{l+\delta+18r_0} \setminus Q_{l+18r_0})$ is a separating set of width $\delta > 2r_0$ for Q_l . Then, for any $w, w' \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $m, m' \geq 1$ with $Q_{l+\delta+18r_0} \subseteq Q_{w,m} \subseteq Q_{w',m'}$, we have*

$$H(\varphi \cap Q_{w,m}) - H(\varphi \cap (Q_{w,m} \setminus Q_l)) \leq H(\varphi \cap Q_{w',m'}) - H(\varphi \cap (Q_{w',m'} \setminus Q_l)).$$

The value of Proposition 7 becomes apparent when combined with (19) since the latter shows that almost surely the sequence $H(\mathcal{X} \cap Q_{w_n, m_n}) - H(\mathcal{X} \cap (Q_{w_n, m_n} \setminus Q_l))$ remains bounded as $n \uparrow \infty$. Hence, the almost sure convergence in (10) holds as soon as we can show that almost surely \mathcal{X} has a δ -separating set for Q_l for some $\delta > 0$.

To prove this final step, by the Borel-Cantelli lemma, it remains to show that the probability that there fails to be a δ -separating set decays at exponential speed in δ . To this end, we choose a set of points $\phi \subseteq \partial Q_{l+2r_0}$ such that every point in ∂Q_{l+2r_0} is at distance at most r_0 from a point in ϕ . This is possible with a cardinality $\#\phi \in O(l^{d-1})$. Similarly, we choose a subset ϕ' with the same property in $\partial Q_{l+\delta+2r_0}$, where now $\#\phi' \in O((l + \delta)^{d-1})$. In particular, if for every line segment between ϕ and ϕ' there is a point of S within distance $2r_0$, then for every line segment between ∂Q_{l+2r_0} and $\partial Q_{l+\delta+2r_0}$ there is a point of S within distance $3r_0$.

Finally, the Poisson-likeness from Proposition 42 shows that for fixed $P \in \partial Q_{l+2r_0}$ and $P' \in Q_{l+\delta+2r_0}$, the probability $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X} \cap B_{2r_0}([P, P']) = \emptyset)$ decays exponentially in δ , where $[P, P']$ denotes the line segment from P to P' . Since $\#\phi$ and $\#\phi'$ were of order $O(l^{d-1})$ and $O((l + \delta)^{d-1})$, a union bound concludes the proof.

3.3. Example for Theorem 4: Total edge length of Gibbs-Voronoi tessellations. For a locally finite $\varphi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ we define the *Voronoi cell* $C(x, \varphi)$ of $x \in \varphi$ as the set of all points in \mathbb{R}^2 whose Euclidean distance to x is less than or equal to its distance to all other points of φ . The system $\{C(x, \varphi)\}_{x \in \varphi}$ is called the *Voronoi tessellation*. We define $g(x, \varphi)$ as one half of the total boundary length of the cell $C(x, \varphi)$. We use the convention that $g(x, \varphi) = \infty$ if the cell $C(x, \varphi)$ is unbounded. Note that this convention is only made for completeness and does not play any practical role for the functionals considered since by stationarity, all cells $C(x, \mathcal{X})$ are bounded with probability 1. Then, the total edge length of the Voronoi tessellation induced by φ with generators in Q_n is (up to boundary effects) given by

$$H^n := \sum_{x \in \varphi \cap Q_n} g(x, \varphi).$$

As observed in Section 2.1, Gibbs processes satisfying Assumption (7) are Poisson-like. Hence, one can proceed as in [27, Section 1 and 5.2] to obtain the bounded moment condition (14) and the exponential stabilization property (15). Moreover, [32, Theorem 2.3] discusses further conditions under which the variance lower bound can be verified. For the condition $g(x, \varphi \cup \{y\}) \leq g(x, \varphi)$, we note that $C(x, \varphi \cup \{y\}) \subseteq C(x, \varphi)$ are convex subsets of \mathbb{R}^2 . Hence, it follows from Theorem 4 that H^n satisfies a CLT.

This extends [6, Theorem 4.13] to Gibbs processes satisfying (7). We also note that if we are not interested in rates, then this example follows from [5, Theorem 1.13]. Indeed, we first recall from Corollary 40 that under Assumption (7) the Gibbs process \mathcal{X} is EDD. Moreover, as mentioned in [7, Section 1], the EDD property is stronger than the fast decay of correlation formulated in [5, Equation (1.10)]. Together with the aforementioned exponential stabilization (also proved in [3]), this implies that the considered score function and point process form an admissible pair in the sense of [5, Definition 1.7]. Finally, combining this observation with the aforementioned upper moment bound and lower variance bound, we see that [5, Theorem 1.13] gives the asymptotic normality without rates.

3.4. Example for Theorem 4: Edge lengths in k -nearest neighbor graph.

3.4.1. Total edge length. We discuss the k -nearest neighbor (kNN) example from [7, Theorem 4.1]. In the kNN graph on a locally finite set $\varphi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we put an edge between $x, y \in \varphi$ if x is one of the k -nearest neighbors of y or vice versa. Then, we define $g(x, \varphi)$ as one half of the total length of all kNN edges incident to x . Again, we use the convention that $g(x, \varphi) = \infty$ if φ contains fewer than $k + 1$ points. As in Example 3.3, the quantity of interest is then given by

$$H^n := \sum_{x \in \varphi \cap Q_n} g(x, \varphi).$$

As in Example 3.3, the derivation of the bounded moment condition (14) and of the exponential stabilization property (15) from the Poisson-likeness follows the existing approaches in literature, e.g. [27, Theorem 5.2], [7, Theorem 4.1]. For examples of Gibbs point processes where the lower bound is satisfied, we refer to [32, Theorem 2.2]. Finally, we note that by the definition, $g(x, \varphi) = 0$ can never happen, thereby verifying the final condition from Theorem 4. Hence, we deduce that H^n satisfies a CLT.

3.4.2. Number of large k -nearest neighbor edges. The extension of the total edge length example from H^n to H_α^n is more delicate, since there is a positive probability that $\mathcal{X} \cap Q_n$ consists of fewer than $k + 1$ points. An example where the condition is satisfied for H_α^n is when $g(x, \varphi)$ is the indicator that the distance to the k th nearest neighbor of x in φ is at least some value $a > 0$.

4. DISAGREEMENT COUPLINGS

Disagreement coupling is a technique for constructing Gibbs point processes in bounded windows by thinning a dominating Poisson process. We present the algorithms we use in Section 4.1. The original and most important use of disagreement coupling is to control the amount of disagreement between Gibbs processes with different boundary conditions by relating them to the connected components of an associated Boolean model. Another important application in the context of normal approximation is to bound the spatial correlations of the Gibbs process. We show some spatial homogeneity and decorrelation results in Section 4.2. In Section 4.4, we show how disagreement coupling can be used to construct couplings between Gibbs processes in bounded domains and the unbounded domain with strong control over their disagreement. This is a main ingredient in the proof of Theorem 3. For the proof of Theorem 4, we need couplings between a whole family Gibbs processes obtained by local perturbations of the PI with bounds on the pairwise disagreement. Such couplings are given in Section 4.4. The result is also essential for the proof of Theorem 3, where it allows us to consider couplings in unbounded domains with locally differing boundary conditions.

The original definition of disagreement coupling in [18] applied to Gibbs processes on standard Borel spaces, thereby allowing applications to particle processes [3] and Gibbs processes with density with respect to random connection models [4]. However, since all our applications of disagreement coupling are to processes on Euclidean space, and to keep the exposition simple, we restrict to the Euclidean case.

4.1. Thinning algorithms. In this section, we review the construction from [18] of the finite-volume Gibbs process $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$ on a bounded domain Q with boundary conditions $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c}$ as a thinning of a Poisson process. In Section 4.1.1, we first review the basic version of the algorithm introduced in [18, Sec. 5]. This is the building block for more refined algorithms in Section 4.1.2. We give a general recipe for constructing thinning algorithms with more flexible properties generalizing the one suggested in [18, Sec. 6]. Moreover, we give two examples of such algorithms which are designed to have the properties, we need for the proofs of Theorems 3 and 4.

Henceforth, we let \mathcal{P}^* be a homogeneous unit-intensity Poisson point process on $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \alpha_0]$ and write \mathcal{P} for the projection of \mathcal{P}^* onto the \mathbb{R}^d coordinate, which is a Poisson process on \mathbb{R}^d with intensity α_0 . More generally, we use φ^* to denote elements of $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \alpha_0]}$ and φ denotes its projection to \mathbb{R}^d . We let φ_Q^* and φ_Q be the restriction of φ^* and φ to $Q \times [0, \alpha_0]$ and Q , respectively. We refer to the points of φ in a connected component of $B_r(\varphi)$ as a cluster.

4.1.1. Standard Poisson embedding. Consider a bounded Borel set $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and a set of boundary conditions $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c}$. In this section, we introduce the *standard thinning operator* $T_{Q, \psi} : \mathbf{N}_{Q \times [0, \alpha_0]} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}_Q$. For $\varphi^* \in \mathbf{N}_{Q \times [0, \alpha_0]}$, the set $T_{Q, \psi}(\varphi^*)$ is a thinning of φ , that is $T_{Q, \psi}(\varphi^*) \subseteq \varphi$. The $(d+1)$ st coordinate of φ^* is used to decide whether or not to keep the point in the thinning. The key property of $T_{Q, \psi}$ is that the thinning $T_{Q, \psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_Q$ of the Poisson process \mathcal{P}_Q^* has the distribution of the Gibbs process $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$. We call $T_{Q, \psi}(\mathcal{P}^*)$ the *standard Poisson embedding*, since it provides an embedding $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi) \subseteq \mathcal{P}$.

To define $T_{Q, \psi}$, we need an injective measurable map $\iota : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Such a map is guaranteed to exist since \mathbb{R}^d is a standard Borel space. We sometimes write $T_{Q, \psi, \iota}$ to emphasize that $T_{Q, \psi}$ depends on ι . The map ι defines a total ordering \leq_ι on Q . We sometimes refer to the map ι itself as an ordering. The main idea to construct $T_{Q, \psi}(\varphi^*)$ is to go through the points of φ in the order \leq_ι and decide for each whether to keep it in the thinned process. For $x \in Q$, define

$$Q_{(-\infty, x)} := \{y \in Q : y <_\iota x\} \text{ and } Q_{(x, \infty)} := \{y \in Q : y >_\iota x\}.$$

For $x \in Q$ and $\psi' \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus (Q_{(x, \infty)} \cup \{x\})) \times \mathbb{R}$, define the retention threshold

$$(23) \quad p(x, Q, \psi') := \kappa(x, \psi') \frac{Z_{Q_{(x, \infty)}}(\psi' \cup \{x\})}{Z_{Q_{(x, \infty)}}(\psi')}.$$

It is shown in [18, Lem. 4.1] that $0 \leq p(x, Q, \psi') \leq \alpha_0$.

The algorithm for constructing $T_{Q, \psi}(\varphi^*) = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ goes as follows:

- To define the first point $x_1 := x_1(\varphi^*)$ of $T_{Q,\psi}(\varphi^*)$, we consider the set

$$\{x \in Q : (x, u) \in \varphi^* \text{ and } u \leq p(x, Q, \psi)\}$$

for which u is below the retention threshold. We choose x_1 to be the smallest element in this set with respect to the \leq_ι -order. If there is no such element, then the construction terminates with $T_{Q,\psi}(\varphi^*) = \emptyset$.

- Otherwise, we proceed inductively. Suppose, we have defined the points x_1, \dots, x_k . This will be the restriction of $T_{Q,\psi}(\varphi^*)$ to $Q_{(-\infty, x_k)}$. It remains to define $T_{Q,\psi}(\varphi^*)$ on $Q_{(x_k, \infty)}$. We define $x_{k+1} = x_{k+1}(\varphi^*)$ to be the ι -smallest element of the set

$$(24) \quad \{x \in Q_{(x_k, \infty)} : (x, u) \in \varphi^* \text{ and } u \leq p(x, Q_{(x, \infty)}, \psi \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_k\})\}.$$

- The construction terminates once the set (24) is empty.

We state the key result of [18, Thm. 5.1], namely that the thinned Poisson process $T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}^*)$ has the distribution of the Gibbs process $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$, for later reference.

Proposition 8 (Correctness of the Poisson embedding [18]). *Assume that the PI satisfies $\kappa \leq \alpha_0$. Let $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded Borel and $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c}$ be finite. Furthermore, let $\mathcal{P}^* \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \alpha_0]$ be a unit-intensity Poisson point process. Then, $T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}^*) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_Q$ is distributed as the Gibbs process $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$.*

Proof. See [18, Thm. 5.1]. □

We remark for later that the standard thinning algorithm has the property that if $B \subseteq Q$ such that $\iota(x) < \iota(y)$ for all $x \in B, y \in Q \setminus B$, and $\xi = T_{Q,\psi}(\varphi^*) \cap B$, then

$$(25) \quad T_{Q,\psi}(\varphi^*) = \xi \cup T_{Q \setminus B, \psi \cup \xi}(\varphi_{Q \setminus B}^*).$$

While an injective measurable map $\iota : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is guaranteed to exist, it is not so intuitive what such a map looks like. While usually not strictly necessary, it is often convenient to replace ι by a more familiar map. Thus, let $\iota : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable map such that

$$|\iota^{-1}(r)| = 0$$

for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$. We define a partial ordering of \mathbb{R}^d by $x <_\iota y$ if $\iota(x) < \iota(y)$. If $|\iota^{-1}(r)| = 0$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, this almost surely induces a well-defined total ordering of the Poisson process and hence $T_{Q,\psi,\iota}(\mathcal{P}^*)$ becomes well defined.

Proposition 9. *Assume that $\iota : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable map such that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$(26) \quad |\iota^{-1}(r)| = 0.$$

Then, $T_{Q,\psi,\iota}(\mathcal{P}^)$ is distributed as $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$.*

The proof is deferred to the appendix. Using Proposition 9, one may order Q e.g. by the distance to the origin.

4.1.2. Disagreement couplings. The standard Poisson embedding defines a coupling between $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$ and \mathcal{P} for any choice of boundary conditions ψ . However, it does not provide much control over how $T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}^*)$ are related for different choices of ψ . For this reason, a refined thinning algorithm called *disagreement coupling* was suggested in [18]. This algorithm makes it possible to control the amount of disagreement between Gibbs processes with different boundary conditions. However, as we shall need some extra properties of the algorithms compared to [18], we first give a general recipe for constructing disagreement couplings. We then give two examples of such algorithms.

To define the algorithm, we need the notion of a *stopping set*. A stopping set S on a Borel set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ assigns to each $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}_B$ a Borel set $S(\varphi) \subseteq B$. We require that the map $(x, \varphi) \mapsto \mathbb{1}_{\{x \in S(\varphi)\}}$ is measurable. Moreover, S must have the property that $S(\varphi)$ depends only on $\varphi \cap S(\varphi)$, i.e. $S(\varphi) = S(\varphi \cap S(\varphi))$ for all $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}_B$. We write $S = S(\varphi)$ when φ is clear from the context. A key property of a stopping set is the following, see e.g. [21, Thm. A.3]: If S is a stopping set on B and \mathcal{P}' is a Poisson processes on B , then

$$(27) \quad \text{conditionally on } \mathcal{P}'_{S(\mathcal{P}')} , \mathcal{P}'_{B \setminus S(\mathcal{P}')} \text{ is distributed as a Poisson process on } B \setminus S(\mathcal{P}').$$

The disagreement coupling algorithm needs two ingredients:

- An sequence $S_0^*, S_1^*, S_2^*, \dots$ of stopping sets on $Q \times [0, \alpha_0]$ of the form $S_n^* = S_n \times [0, \alpha_0]$. The sequence should increase towards $Q \times [0, \alpha_0]$ in the sense that for any $\varphi^* \in \mathbf{N}_{Q \times [0, \alpha_0]}$,

$$S_0^*(\varphi^*) = \emptyset \subseteq S_1^*(\varphi^*) \subseteq S_2^*(\varphi^*) \subseteq \dots \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcup_n S_n^*(\varphi^*) = Q \times [0, \alpha_0].$$

- A family of injective ordering maps $\iota_n := \iota_n^{\varphi^*} : Q \setminus S_n(\varphi^*) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $n \geq 0$ and $\varphi^* \in \mathbf{N}_{Q \times [0, \alpha_0]}$ satisfying (26) such that $\iota_n^{\varphi^*}$ depends only on φ^* via $\varphi^* \cap S_n(\varphi^*)$. Moreover, we require

$$(28) \quad \iota_n(x) < \iota_n(y) \text{ for all } x \in S_{n+1} \setminus S_n, y \in Q \setminus S_{n+1}.$$

To ensure measurability, we extend ι_n to a map $\tilde{\iota}_n : Q \times \mathbf{N}_{Q \times [0, \alpha_0]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ by setting $\tilde{\iota}_n^{\varphi^*}(x) = -\infty$ if $x \in S_n(\varphi^*)$. We then require that $\tilde{\iota}_n : Q \times \mathbf{N}_{Q \times [0, \alpha_0]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$, is measurable.

Let $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c}$ be the boundary conditions. The disagreement coupling thinning operator $T_{Q, \psi}^{\text{dc}} : \mathbf{N}_{Q \times [0, \alpha_0]} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}_Q$ constructs the thinning of a point pattern φ^* inductively in n by constructing the thinned point pattern $\xi_n := \xi_n(\varphi^*)$ on the set $S_n \setminus S_{n-1}$ as follows:

1. First, apply the standard thinning algorithm T_{Q, ψ, ι_0} on Q and set $\chi_1 := \chi_1(\varphi^*) := T_{Q, \psi, \iota_1}(\varphi^*)$. Let $\xi_1 := \chi_1 \cap S_1$.
2. Assume inductively that we have constructed ξ_i on $S_i \setminus S_{i-1}$ for $i \leq n$. The thinning of φ^* on S_n is $\xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n$. We next construct the thinning on $S_{n+1} \setminus S_n$. For this, we add $\xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n$ to the boundary conditions ψ and apply the standard thinning operator on $Q \setminus S_n$ with ordering ι_n to obtain $\chi_{n+1} := \chi_{n+1}(\varphi^*) := T_{Q \setminus S_n, \psi \cup \xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n, \iota_n}(\varphi^*)$. We set $\xi_{n+1} := \chi_{n+1} \cap (S_{n+1} \setminus S_n)$.
3. Finally, we define $T_{Q, \psi}^{\text{dc}}(\varphi^*) := \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \xi_n$.

Note that the algorithm corresponds to applying the standard thinning operator, but with the fixed ordering replaced by an ordering $\tilde{\iota}$ that depends on φ^* , where $\tilde{\iota}$ equals $\iota_n^{\varphi^*}$ on $S_{n+1}(\varphi^*) \setminus S_n(\varphi^*)$.

To illustrate this abstract framework, we now present a specific example, where we want to construct a disagreement coupling such that changing the boundary conditions ψ locally in a set $B \subseteq Q^c$ does not change the Gibbs process too much. Before discussing all technical details, we first describe the general intuition. Loosely speaking, the stopping sets work their way through all the connected components of $B_{r_0/2}(\varphi)$ that intersect $B_{r_0/2}(B)$. Afterwards, they proceed through the remaining components of $B_{r_0/2}(\varphi)$ one at a time (note that each component \mathcal{C} of $B_{r_0/2}(\varphi)$ is enlarged to $B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{C})$ when defining the stopping sets). Now, we turn to the precise construction.

Example 10. [Cluster-based disagreement coupling]

Define $S_1 := B_{r_0}(B)$. This is a deterministic set consisting of all points within distance r_0 from B . Choose an ordering map $\iota_0 : Q \rightarrow [0, 1)$ such that $\iota_0(x) < \iota_0(y)$ whenever $x \in S_1$ and $Q \setminus S_1$. Suppose S_n is defined. If $B_{r_0}(\varphi \cap S_n) \setminus S_n \neq \emptyset$, we take $S_{n+1} := S_n \cup B_{r_0}(\varphi \cap S_n)$. Otherwise, let $S_{n+1} = S_n \cup Q_{(-\infty, x)}$ where x is the ι_0 -smallest point in $(Q \setminus S_n) \cap \varphi$. If no such point exists, we set $S_{n+1} = Q$. To define the ordering $\iota_n : Q \setminus S_n \rightarrow [0, 1)$, we let

$$\iota_n = \frac{1}{2} \iota_0 \mathbb{1}\{B_{r_0}(\varphi \cap S_n) \setminus S_n\} + \left(\frac{1}{2} \iota_0 + \frac{1}{2}\right) \mathbb{1}\{Q \setminus (S_n \cup B_{r_0}(\varphi \cap S_n))\},$$

which satisfies (28).

Note that The order in which the components not intersecting $B_{r_0/2}(B)$ are visited is determined by the ι_0 -smallest point in the cluster.

The advantage of this construction is that whenever $B_{r_0}(\varphi \cap S_n) = S_n$, so that we jump to a new cluster, it means that $(\varphi \cap S_n) \cup (\psi \cap B)$ has distance more than r_0 from $Q \setminus S_n$. Hence, the retention probabilities (23) used in the remainder of the algorithm are not influenced by $(\varphi \cap S_n) \cup (\psi \cap B)$. Therefore, the decision about the thinning of each cluster does not affect the thinning of the following clusters. Moreover, the boundary points in B , $\psi \cap B$, can only influence the thinning of clusters corresponding to components of $B_{r_0/2}(\varphi)$ that intersect $B_{r_0/2}(B)$. Changing $\psi \cap B$, the Gibbs processes agree on all other clusters

The following proposition shows that $T_{Q, \psi}^{\text{dc}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$ is indeed a Gibbs process. Note that if the maps ι_n are not injective, but satisfy (26), then $T_{Q, \psi}^{\text{dc}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$ is still well defined almost surely.

Proposition 11 (Correctness of disagreement coupling). *Suppose the PI is bounded by α_0 . Let $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Borel set and let $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c}$. Furthermore, let $\mathcal{P}_Q^* \subseteq Q \times [0, \alpha_0]$ be a unit-intensity Poisson point process. Then, $T_{Q,\psi}^{\text{dc}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$ has the distribution of the Gibbs process $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$. This also holds if the maps ι_n are not injective, but satisfy (26).*

The proof is similar to that of [18, Thm. 6.3], except that in [18], S_{n+1}^* was determined by $\mathcal{P}_{S_n}^*$, while we only require S_{n+1}^* to be a stopping set. This only changes the argument in (30) below.

Proof. We start by showing that $\xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n \cup \chi_{n+1} \sim \mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$ by induction in n , where \sim means that the point processes have the same distribution. For $n = 0$, $\chi_1 = T_{Q,\psi,\iota_0}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \sim \mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$ by Proposition 8. Assume for induction that it has been shown that $\xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_{n-1} \cup \chi_n \sim \mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$. Taking a bounded nonnegative function $f : \mathbf{N}_Q \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, we must show

$$(29) \quad \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n \cup \chi_{n+1})] = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi))].$$

Let ι'_{n-1} be the restriction of ι_{n-1} to $Q \setminus S_n$. Note that by (28), both the maps $\iota_n, \iota'_{n-1} : Q \setminus S_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n are completely determined by $\mathcal{P}_{S_n}^*$. Thus, conditionally on $\mathcal{P}_{S_n}^*$,

$$\chi_{n+1} = T_{Q \setminus S_n, \psi \cap \xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n, \iota_n}(\mathcal{P}_{Q \setminus S_n}^*) \sim \mathcal{X}(Q \setminus S_n, \psi \cup \xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n) \sim T_{Q \setminus S_n, \psi \cup \xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n, \iota'_{n-1}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q \setminus S_n}^*)$$

by definition of χ_{n+1} , the property (27) of the stopping set S_n , and Proposition 8. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n \cup \chi_{n+1})] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n \cup T_{Q \setminus S_n, \psi \cup \xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n, \iota'_{n-1}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q \setminus S_n}^*)) | \mathcal{P}_{S_n}^*]].$$

Moreover, given $\mathcal{P}_{S_n}^*$, (28) and (25) implies

$$(30) \quad \xi_n \cup T_{Q \setminus S_n, \psi \cup \xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n, \iota'_{n-1}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q \setminus S_n}^*) = \chi_n(\mathcal{P}_{Q \setminus S_{n-1}}^*).$$

Hence, by the induction assumption,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n \cup \chi_{n+1})] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_{n-1} \cup \chi_n) | \mathcal{P}_{S_n}^*]] = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi))].$$

This shows (29).

To complete the proof, take again a bounded nonnegative function $f : \mathbf{N}_Q \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. Since \mathcal{P}_Q^* is almost surely finite, there is almost surely a random $N \geq 1$ such that $T_{Q,\psi}^{\text{dc}}(\varphi^*) := \xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n \cup \chi_{n+1}$ for all $n \geq N$. Dominated convergence shows that

$$\mathbb{E}[f(T_{Q,\psi}^{\text{dc}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*))] = \mathbb{E}[f(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} \xi_n)] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1 \cup \dots \cup \xi_n \cup \chi_{n+1})] = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi))],$$

which proves the theorem. \square

The algorithm in Example 10 suffices for most purposes in this paper. However, it has the disadvantage that $S_{n+1} \setminus S_n$ can be very large, thereby causing issues for deriving the total variation bounds needed for the later arguments, see Theorem 25. Therefore, we now discuss a refinement where $S_{n+1} \setminus S_n$ contains at most one point from φ and $|S_{n+1} \setminus S_n| \leq |B_{r_0}|$.

This is achieved by an algorithm $T_{Q,B,\psi}^{\text{rad}}$ that we refer to as *radial coupling*. We note that the construction of this radial coupling below is rather involved. However, for most applications later, we shall not need the precise specification of the algorithm, but only its main properties. Therefore, we now state them here for easy reference.

Proposition 12. *Suppose the PI is bounded by α_0 . Let $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded Borel and $B \subseteq Q^c$. Furthermore, let \mathcal{P}^* be a unit-intensity Poisson point process on $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \alpha_0]$. Then, the radial coupling has the property that if $\psi, \psi' \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c}$ are locally finite sets differing only on B , then $T_{Q,B,\psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$ and $T_{Q,B,\psi'}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$ differ only on the components of $B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{P}_Q)$ intersecting $B_{r_0/2}(B)$. Moreover, each $S_{n+1} \setminus S_n$ contains at most one point from \mathcal{P} , and $|S_{n+1} \setminus S_n| \leq |B_{r_0}|$.*

Example 13 (Radial coupling). The idea of this algorithm is similar to the one given in Example 10 to go through the clusters of $B_{r_0/2}(\varphi)$ one at a time, but the description is more involved. We start again from a domain Q , boundary conditions $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c}$, and a set $B \subseteq Q^c$ where we want to be able to change the boundary conditions $\psi \cap B$. We choose a fixed ordering $\iota : Q \rightarrow [0, 1)$ satisfying (26) and a deterministic locally finite set $D \subseteq Q$ with the coverage property that $Q \subseteq B_{r_0}(D)$. We also fix a total ordering \preceq on D .

The stopping steps $S_{i,j}$ of the algorithm are indexed by a pair of lexicographically ordered integers (i, j) , $i = 1, \dots, I$, $j = 1, \dots, N_i$, where $I := I(\varphi^*)$ and $N_i := N_i(\varphi^*)$. The stopping set $S_{i,j}$ is given at the beginning of step (i, j) of the algorithm. In this step, we define three auxiliary subsets of Q that depend on φ^* , namely,

- (1) $v_{i,j+1} \in D \cup \varphi$, a point from which we start (i, j) th step;
- (2) $V_{i,j+1} := (Q \setminus S_{i,j}) \cap B_{r_0}(v_{i,j+1})$, a set used for defining $\iota_{i,j}$;
- (3) $Z_{i,j+1} = S_{i,j+1} \setminus S_{i,j} \subseteq V_{i,j+1}$, which is used to define the stopping set $S_{i,j+1}$.

Here and in the following, we use the convention $(i, N_i + 1) = (i + 1, 1)$ and $(i, 0) = (i - 1, N_i)$.

We initialize the algorithm by $S_{1,1} = \emptyset$. For step (i, j) , suppose $S_{i,j}$ has been defined.

- (1) We first choose $v_{i,j+1}$ either as a point in $\varphi \cap S_{i,j}$ if $B_{r_0}(\varphi \cap S_{i,j}) \cap (Q \setminus S_{i,j}) \neq \emptyset$ or, if $B_{r_0}(\varphi \cap S_{i,j}) \subseteq S_{i,j}$, as a point in D . In the latter case, we let $j = N_i$ and hence $(i, j + 1)$ equals $(i + 1, 1)$. The precise algorithm for choosing $v_{i,j+1}$ is quite involved, and will be given later.
- (2) Having chosen $v_{i,j+1}$, we set $V_{i,j+1} := B_{r_0}(v_{i,j+1}) \cap (Q \setminus S_{i,j})$. Define the ordering

$$\iota_{i,j} = \frac{1}{2}\iota \mathbb{1}_{V_{i,j+1}} + \left(\frac{1}{2}\iota + \frac{1}{2}\right)\mathbb{1}_{Q \setminus (S_{i,j} \cup V_{i,j+1})}.$$

Note that the set $V_{i,j+1}$, and hence also the map $\iota_{i,j}$, is completely determined by $\varphi \cap S_{i,j}$.

- (3) Now, $Z_{i,j+1}$ is defined as $Z_{i,j+1} := V_{i,j+1}$ if $\varphi \cap V_{i,j+1} = \emptyset$, and otherwise

$$Z_{i,j+1} := \{x \in V_{i,j+1} : \iota_{i,j}(x) \leq \inf \iota_{i,j}(\varphi \cap V_{i,j+1})\}.$$

Finally, set $S_{i,j+1} := S_{i,j} \cup Z_{i,j+1}$. Then, $\iota_{i,j}$ satisfies (28).

The algorithm terminates as soon as $S_{i,j} = Q$ for some $i \geq 1$, $j \geq 1$. We will see below, that this happens after finitely many steps.

The regions $Z_{i,j}$ form a partition of Q and satisfy $Z_{i,j} \subseteq V_{i,j} \subseteq V_i := \bigcup_{j=1}^{N_i} V_{i,j}$. Moreover, the construction is such that for each i , $V_i \cap \varphi$ is either empty or a cluster of $B_{r_0/2}(\varphi)$. Thus, the algorithm is exploring one cluster at a time just like the one in Example 10. Moreover, each $Z_{i,j}$ is constructed to contain at most one point from φ , which we call

$$x_{i,j} := \varphi \cap Z_{i,j}.$$

Note that $x_{i,j}$ may be the empty set. Thus, each cluster is explored (at most) one point at a time. Figure 1 illustrates how the algorithm proceeds.




FIGURE 1. Illustration of two steps in the exploration algorithm. The solid balls represent $B_{r_0/2}(\varphi)$, the blue region is the already explored region $S_{i,j}$, and the green region is the currently explored region $Z_{i,j}$. In the left figure, a new cluster is explored from a point $v_{i,1} \in D$ (red dot). In the right figure, the exploration is continued by using a point from φ as $v_{i,2}$ (red square).

We now give the precise construction of the points $v_{i,j}$. In the first step, we let $v_{1,1}$ be the \preceq -smallest point in D such that $B_{r_0}(v_{1,1}) \cap Q \cap B_{r_0}(B) \neq \emptyset$ if such a point exists and otherwise just the smallest point in D such that $B_{r_0}(v_{1,1}) \cap Q \neq \emptyset$.

Next, we explain how to construct $v_{i,j+1}$ from $S_{i,j}$. Let

$$k_{i,j+1} := \inf\{k \in \{1, \dots, j\} : (Q \setminus S_{i,j}) \cap B_{r_0}(x_{i,k}) \neq \emptyset\}$$

be the first index k where $B_{r_0}(x_{i,k})$ is not contained in $S_{i,j}$ (with the convention $B_{r_0}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$). If $k_{i,j+1} < \infty$, we define $v_{i,j+1} := x_{i,k_{i,j+1}}$. Otherwise, if $k_{i,j+1} = \infty$, we set $N_i := j$. In this case, $v_{i,j+1} = v_{i+1,1}$. If $(Q \setminus S_{i,j}) \cap B_{r_0}(B) \neq \emptyset$, we define $v_{i+1,1}$ as the \preceq -smallest element of D such that $B_{r_0}(v_{i+1,1}) \cap (Q \setminus S_{i,j}) \cap B_{r_0}(B) \neq \emptyset$. Else, if $B_{r_0}(B) \subseteq S_{i,j}$, define $v_{i+1,1}$ as the smallest element of D such that $B_{r_0}(v_{i+1,1}) \cap (Q \setminus S_{i,j}) \neq \emptyset$. This construction ensures that we move through the components of $B_{r_0/2}(\varphi)$ one at a time, starting with those intersecting $B_{r_0/2}(B)$ so that $\psi \cap B$ affect the thinning only on those components.

To see that the algorithm terminates after a finite number of steps (by which we mean that $\sum_{i \leq I} N_i < \infty$), note that all $v_{i,1}$ are pairwise distinct points in D . Since D is finite, $I < \infty$. Moreover, each N_i is finite, since it is bounded by two times the number of points in the corresponding cluster.

Consider the case when ι is an arbitrary injective ordering and $D := \delta\mathbb{Z}^d$, where $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small so that $Q_{2\delta} \subseteq B_{r_0}$ and hence $B_{r_0}(D) = \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\iota_\infty(x) = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq d} |x_i|$ for $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$. We order $x, y \in D$ by declaring $x < y$ if $\iota_\infty(x) < \iota_\infty(y)$ or $\iota_\infty(x) = \iota_\infty(y)$ and x is lexicographically smaller than y . We call the resulting thinning algorithm the *radial coupling* and denote the corresponding thinning operator by $T_{Q,B,\psi}^{\text{rad}}$. When $B = Q^c$, we may simply write $T_{Q,\psi}^{\text{rad}}$. The order in which the algorithm visits the clusters of $B_{r_0/2}(\varphi)$ is given by the smallest point in D within distance r_0 from a point in the cluster.

4.2. Homogeneity and decorrelation via disagreement coupling. The fact that the radial coupling works on the clusters of the Boolean model $B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{P})$ allows us to relate the Gibbs process to the percolation properties of the Boolean model. Since we assume $r_0 < r_c(\alpha_0)$, we already know that the connected components of $B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{P})$ are almost surely all finite. Moreover, we shall heavily rely on the following fundamental result from continuum percolation known as the *sharp phase transition*. For Borel sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we let $\{A \rightsquigarrow B\}$ denote the event that there exists a connected component of the Boolean model $B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{P})$ intersecting both $B_{r_0/2}(A)$ and $B_{r_0/2}(B)$. Then, for $r < r_c(\alpha_0)$, the connection probabilities $\mathbb{P}(A \rightsquigarrow B)$ decays exponentially fast in the distance between A and B .

Proposition 14 (Sharp phase transition, [9]). *Let $r_0 < r_c(\alpha_0)$. Then, there are constants $c_{\text{SPT},1}, c_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(o \rightsquigarrow \partial B_s) < c_{\text{SPT},1} \exp(-c_{\text{SPT},2}s).$$

Proof. See e.g. [9, Theorem 1.4]. □

Proposition 12 immediately has the following corollary, where $\text{dist}(A, B) = \inf\{|x - y| \mid x \in A, y \in B\}$ denotes the distance between two Borel sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$.

Corollary 15 (Disagreement probabilities). *Let $A \subseteq Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded Borel sets, $B \subseteq Q^c$ and $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c}$. Then,*

$$\sup_{\substack{\psi' \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c} \\ \psi \cap B^c = \psi' \cap B^c}} \mathbb{P}(T_{Q,B,\psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A \neq T_{Q,B,\psi'}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A) \leq \mathbb{P}(A \rightsquigarrow B) \leq c_{\text{SPT},1} |B_{r_0}(A)| \exp(-c_{\text{SPT},2} \text{dist}(A, B)).$$

Proof. It follows from Proposition 12 that $T_{Q,B,\psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$ and $T_{Q,B,\psi'}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$ agree on A when $B_{r_0/2}(B)$ is not connected to $B_{r_0/2}(A)$. Moreover,

$$(31) \quad \mathbb{P}(A \rightsquigarrow B) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{x \in \mathcal{P} \cap B_{r_0}(A)} \mathbb{1}_{\{x \rightsquigarrow B\}} \right] \leq \int_{B_{r_0}(A)} \mathbb{P}(x \rightsquigarrow B_{\text{dist}(A,B)}(x)) dx.$$

□

For the rest of this section, we highlight how the relation between Gibbs processes and the associated Boolean model provided by disagreement coupling can be used to establish homogeneity and decorrelation of Gibbs point processes satisfying (7). The homogeneity and decorrelation are captured through the total

variation distance and the α -mixing coefficient, respectively. Thus, we define the *total variation distance* between two random variables X, Y with values in a common measurable space S by

$$(32) \quad d_{\text{TV}}(X, Y) := \sup_{f: S \rightarrow [0,1]} |\mathbb{E}[f(X)] - \mathbb{E}[f(Y)]|,$$

where the supremum is taken over all measurable functions $f: S \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Moreover, we define the α -mixing coefficient of two σ -algebras \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} by

$$\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} |\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) - \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)|.$$

Corollary 16 (Exponential decay of the total variation distance). *Suppose that the PI satisfies condition (7). For any bounded Borel sets $A \subseteq Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $B \subseteq Q^c$, it holds that*

$$\sup_{\substack{\psi, \psi' \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c} \\ \psi \cap B^c = \psi' \cap B^c}} d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi) \cap A, \mathcal{X}(Q, \psi') \cap A) \leq c_{\text{SPT},1} |B_{r_0}(A)| e^{-c_{\text{SPT},2} \text{dist}(A,B)}.$$

Proof. We realize $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$ and $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi')$ by disagreement couplings $T_{Q,B,\psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$ and $T_{Q,B,\psi'}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$, respectively. Since

$$d_{\text{TV}}((\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi) \cap A, \mathcal{X}(Q, \psi') \cap A) \leq \mathbb{P}(T_{Q,B,\psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A \neq T_{Q,B,\psi'}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A),$$

the results follow from Corollary 15. \square

From Corollary 16, we can derive useful homogeneity and decorrelation bounds. We note that [3, Theorem 2] also establishes a decorrelation property via disagreement coupling, where in their case the spatial dependence is measured via the k -point correlation functions. However, we need α -mixing for our further arguments, which is why we include the short proof of Proposition 17 below. We also establish a form of local homogeneity in the sense that for large windows, the local distribution in a neighborhood of any space point does not depend too much on the position of the point in the window.

Proposition 17 (Spatial decorrelation and local homogeneity). *(i) Let $s > 0$ and $A \subseteq Q_n$ be Borel. Then*

$$\alpha(\sigma(\mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) \cap A), \sigma(\mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) \setminus B_s(A))) \leq c_{\text{SPT},1} |B_{r_0}(A)| e^{-c_{\text{SPT},2} s},$$

(ii) Let the PI be translation-invariant. Then

$$\sup_{x_0 \in Q_{n-2\sqrt{n}}} d_{\text{TV}}((\mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) - x_0) \cap Q_{\sqrt{n}}, \mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) \cap Q_{\sqrt{n}}) \leq 2c_{\text{SPT},1} \exp(-2c_{\text{SPT},2} \sqrt{n}).$$

Proof. We start with the proof of (i). Let $\mathcal{X}' := \mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) \cap A$, $\mathcal{X}'' := \mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) \setminus B_s(A)$ and $\mathcal{Y} := \mathcal{X}(B_s(A), \mathcal{X}'') \cap A$. We note that for any measurable sets of configurations B_1, B_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}' \in B_1, \mathcal{X}'' \in B_2) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}' \in B_1 \mid \mathcal{X}'') \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X}'' \in B_2\}] \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} \in B_1) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}'' \in B_2) + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}' \in B_1 \mid \mathcal{X}'') - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} \in B_1)\right) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X}'' \in B_2\}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} \in B_1) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}'' \in B_2) + \sup_{\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{Q_n \setminus B_s(A)}} d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{X}(B_s(A), \mathcal{X}'') \cap A, \mathcal{X}(B_s(A), \psi) \cap A). \end{aligned}$$

Noting that \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{X}' have the same distribution, we conclude the proof of part (i) by applying Corollary 16 with $Q = B_s(A)$ and $B = Q_n \setminus B_s(A)$.

For the proof of (ii), note that $Q_{2\sqrt{n}} \subseteq Q_n - x_0$ for every $x_0 \in Q_{n-2\sqrt{n}}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &d_{\text{TV}}((\mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) - x_0) \cap Q_{\sqrt{n}}, \mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) \cap Q_{\sqrt{n}}) \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{Q_{2\sqrt{n}}^c}} d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{X}(Q_{2\sqrt{n}}, \psi) \cap Q_{\sqrt{n}}, \mathcal{X}(Q_{2\sqrt{n}}, \emptyset) \cap Q_{\sqrt{n}}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that by stationarity, the distribution of $(\mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) - x_0) \cap Q_{2\sqrt{n}}$ is $\mathcal{X}(Q_{2\sqrt{n}}, \psi)$, when conditioned on $(\mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) - x_0) \cap Q_{2\sqrt{n}}^c = \psi$. Hence, the claim follows from Corollary 16. \square

4.3. Radial coupling for infinite-volume Gibbs processes. So far, we have only considered disagreement coupling for Gibbs processes in bounded domains. In this section, we extend disagreement coupling to the infinite-volume Gibbs process. That is, we show that the radial coupling extends to unbounded domains, constructing the infinite-volume Gibbs process as a thinning of \mathcal{P}^* . This construction yields explicit couplings between Gibbs processes in bounded and unbounded domains via thinning of a common Poisson process allowing us to quantify the disagreement between these processes. This improves on [18], where such couplings were only obtained qualitatively via weak convergence. The results allow us to show mixing, and hence ergodicity, of the infinite-volume Gibbs process, which is crucial for the proof of Theorem 3. For completeness, we also include proof that the infinite-volume Gibbs process is unique, although we remark that this result is not new, having appeared in e.g. [8], see also [3] for a proof using disagreement coupling.

The main result of this section, provided by Propositions 18 and 19 below, establishes that the radial thinning on Q_n converges almost surely to the infinite-volume Gibbs process when $n \uparrow \infty$.

Proposition 18 (Convergence of radial couplings). *Assume that the PI satisfies (7). Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{U^c}$ be locally finite. Then, as $n \uparrow \infty$, the embeddings $T_{Q_n \cap U, \psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_n}^*)$ converge almost surely to a limiting process on U*

$$(33) \quad T_{U, \psi}^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}_U^*) := \bigcup_{n_0 \geq 1} \bigcap_{n \geq n_0} T_{Q_n \cap U, \psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_n}^*)$$

such that for all bounded Borel sets $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{U, \psi}^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}_U^*) \cap A = T_{Q_m \cap U, \psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_m}^*) \cap A \text{ for all } m \geq n) \leq \mathbb{P}(A \not\rightsquigarrow Q_{n-4r_0}^c).$$

If κ is translation-invariant, the process $T^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}^*) := T_{\mathbb{R}^d, \emptyset}^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}^*)$ is a stationary and mixing limiting process. Moreover, $T_{U, \psi}^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}_U^*) + x$ has the same distribution as $T_{U+x, \psi+x}^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}_{U+x}^*)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

We stress that, although $T^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}^*)$ is stationary when κ is translation-invariant, the radial thinning is not translation-covariant in the sense that $T^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}^* + (x, 0))$ is generally not the same as $T^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}^*) + x$.

Proposition 19 (Uniqueness of infinite-volume Gibbs process). *Assume that the PI satisfies (7). The process $T^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}^*)$ is the distributionally unique infinite-volume Gibbs process with PI κ .*

The rest of this section is devoted to proving Propositions 18 and 19. The key ingredient is the following almost-sure consistency property of the disagreement coupling in increasing domains.

Lemma 20 (Consistency of the radial thinning). *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{U^c}$ be locally finite. Then, almost surely on the event $\{A \not\rightsquigarrow Q_{n-4r_0}^c\}$, we have for all $m \geq n$*

$$(34) \quad T_{Q_n \cap U, \psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_n}^*) \cap A = T_{Q_m \cap U, \psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_m}^*) \cap A.$$

Proof. Let V_1, \dots, V_K be the regions considered in the radial coupling algorithm on Q_m and assume that V_1, \dots, V_k are the ones that start from a point $v_{i,1} \notin Q_{n-2r_0}$. Then, $S_{k, N_k} = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_k$ is obtained as the union of $B_{r_0}(D \cap Q_{n-2r_0}^c) \cap (Q_m \cap U)$ and all $B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{C}_l) \cap (Q_m \cap U)$, $l = 1, \dots, L$, where \mathcal{C}_l is a component of $B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_m \cap U})$ such that $B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{C}_l)$ contains a point in $D \cap Q_{n-2r_0}^c$. Similarly, the disagreement coupling algorithm on Q_n first considers the $\tilde{V}_1, \dots, \tilde{V}_{\tilde{k}}$ that start from a point $\tilde{v}_{i,1} \notin Q_{n-2r_0}$. Then, $\tilde{S}_{\tilde{k}, N_{\tilde{k}}} = \tilde{V}_1 \cup \dots \cup \tilde{V}_{\tilde{k}}$ is obtained as the union of $B_{r_0}(D \cap Q_{n-2r_0}^c) \cap (Q_n \cap U)$ and all $B_{r_0/2}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{l}}) \cap (Q_n \cap U)$ where $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{l}}$ is a component of $B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_n \cap U})$ such that $B_{r_0/2}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{l}})$, $\tilde{l} = 1, \dots, \tilde{L}$, contains a point in $D \cap Q_{n-2r_0}^c$.

We claim that $(Q_m \cap U) \setminus S_{k, N_k} = (Q_n \cap U) \setminus \tilde{S}_{\tilde{k}, N_{\tilde{k}}}$, and hence the disagreement coupling algorithm proceeds the same from steps k and \tilde{k} , respectively. On the event $\{A \not\rightsquigarrow Q_{n-4r_0}^c\}$, $A \subseteq Q_m \setminus S_{k, N_k} = Q_n \setminus \tilde{S}_{\tilde{k}, N_{\tilde{k}}}$ and hence (34) follows.

To see that $(Q_m \cap U) \setminus S_{k, N_k} = (Q_n \cap U) \setminus \tilde{S}_{\tilde{k}, N_{\tilde{k}}}$, it is enough to show

$$(35) \quad B_{r_0}(D \cap Q_{n-2r_0}^c) \cup \bigcup_l B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{C}_l) = B_{r_0}(D \cap Q_{n-2r_0}^c) \cup \bigcup_{\tilde{l}} B_{r_0/2}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{l}}),$$

since $Q_m^c \subseteq Q_n^c \subseteq B_{r_0}(D \cap Q_{n-2r_0}^c)$ by the choice of D . Any component \tilde{C}_l is contained in one of the components C_l , which shows one inclusion. Next, consider any component C_l containing a point in $D \cap Q_{n-2r_0}^c$ within distance $r_0/2$. Then, $C_l \cap Q_n$ must be contained in a union of some of the components in $B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_n \cap U})$ that either contain a point in $D \cap Q_{n-2r_0}^c$ within distance $r_0/2$ themselves or has distance at most $r_0/2$ to ∂Q_n . In the latter case, it also contain a point in $D \cap Q_{n-2r_0}^c$ within distance $r_0/2$, as well as some sets of the form $B_{r_0/2}(x)$ with $x \in \mathcal{P}_{U \cap Q_m \setminus Q_n}$. Sets of the latter form must satisfy $B_{r_0}(x) \subseteq Q_{n-2r_0}^c \subseteq B_{r_0}(D \cap Q_{n-2r_0}^c)$ by the choice of δ in the definition of D . In total, this shows that $B_{r_0/2}(C_l)$ is contained in the right hand side of (35). \square

For the rest of this section, we say that a measurable function $f: \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is *local* if there exists $s > 0$ such that $f(\varphi) = f(\varphi \cap Q_s)$ holds for all $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$. We call Q_s a locality region of f .

Proof of Proposition 18. Since $r_0 < r_c$ is sub-critical, the almost-sure convergence in (33) follows from Lemma 20.

For the rest of this proof, we write $\mathcal{X} := T^\infty(\mathcal{P}^*)$. To prove that \mathcal{X} is stationary, we must show $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X} + x)] = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X})]$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and local $f: \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Since f is local and (33) holds, this is equivalent to $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} (\mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) + x)] - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset))]) = 0$. Now, let $x \in Q_{n-2\sqrt{n}}$, where n is so large such that $\sqrt{n} > s$, where Q_s is the locality region of f . Then,

$$|\mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) + x)] - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset))]| \leq d_{\text{TV}}((\mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) + x) \cap Q_{\sqrt{n}}, \mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset) \cap Q_{\sqrt{n}}),$$

which goes to 0 by part (ii) of Proposition 17, i.e., the spatial homogeneity.

The claim $T_{U, \psi}^\infty(\mathcal{P}_U^*) + x \sim T_{U+x, \psi+x}^\infty(\mathcal{P}_{U+x}^*)$ is shown similarly using the straightforward generalization of part (ii) of Proposition 17 to Gibbs processes with boundary conditions.

It remains to show that $\mathcal{X}(\infty)$ is mixing, i.e.,

$$\lim_{|x| \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X} + x)g(\mathcal{X})] = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X})]\mathbb{E}[g(\mathcal{X})]$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and local $f, g: \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a fixed bounded Borel set containing the locality regions of f and g . Then, setting $n(x) = |x|^2$, Lemma 20 gives that

$$\mathbb{E}[|f(\mathcal{X} + x)g(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}(Q_{n(x)}, \emptyset) + x)g(\mathcal{X}(Q_{n(x)}, \emptyset))|] \leq 2\mathbb{P}(A \cup (A + x) \leftrightarrow \partial Q_{n(x)-4r_0}).$$

for all sufficiently large $|x|$. As before, since \mathcal{P} is sub-critical, the right-hand side tends to 0 as $|x| \uparrow \infty$. Now, we need to show that

$$\lim_{|x| \uparrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X}(Q_{n(x)}, \emptyset) + x)g(\mathcal{X}(Q_{n(x)}, \emptyset))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X}(Q_{n(x)}, \emptyset))]\mathbb{E}[g(\mathcal{X}(Q_{n(x)}, \emptyset))] \right) = 0.$$

Invoking Proposition 17 (i), i.e., the spatial decorrelation, concludes the proof of the mixing property. \square

We now show the uniqueness result asserted in Proposition 19.

Proof of Proposition 19. We must show that $\mathcal{X} := T^\infty(\mathcal{P}^*)$ satisfies the GNZ equations (6) for any $f: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with support in $Q_s \times \mathbf{N}$ and such that $f(x, \varphi) = f(x, \varphi \cap Q_s)$ for some $s > 0$. The point process $T_{Q_n, \emptyset}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_n}^*)$ is a Gibbs point process $\mathcal{X}(Q_n, \emptyset)$ on Q_n with PI κ and hence it satisfies the GNZ equations (4) for f . Taking limits, we see that also $\mathcal{X}(\infty)$ satisfies the GNZ equations (6) for f and hence is an infinite-volume Gibbs point process with PI κ .

Now, let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Borel set and let \mathcal{X}' be any infinite-volume Gibbs point processes with PI κ . Then, to sample \mathcal{X}' in A , one may first generate a sample ψ from \mathcal{X}' in Q_n^c with $Q_n \supseteq A$ and then draw a sample from $\mathcal{X}' \cap Q_n$ under the boundary condition ψ . By the DLR equations (8), the conditional distribution of $\mathcal{X}' \cap Q_n$ given ψ can be represented as $T_{Q_n, \psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_n}^*)$. Hence, it suffices to show that $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{\psi, \psi' \in \mathbf{N}_{Q_n^c}} \mathbb{P}(E_n(\psi, \psi')) = 0$, where

$$E_n(\psi, \psi') := \{T_{Q_n, \psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_n}^*) \cap A \neq T_{Q_n, \psi'}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_n}^*) \cap A\}.$$

Hence, we conclude by using Corollary 15. \square

Remark 21. While the order on D , and hence the order in which we thin the components of $B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{P})$, goes from the outside towards the origin, the proof of Lemma 20 shows that the radial thinning construction of $T^\infty(\mathcal{P}^*)$ can actually be performed by moving from the origin and outwards by considering a growing sequence of windows Q_1, Q_2, \dots . After the thinning of Q_n , we keep the thinning we had on components of $B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{P})$ that do not contain a point in $D \cap Q_{n-2r_0}^c$ within distance $r_0/2$. On Q_{n+1} , we only need to run the radial thinning until all components containing a point in $D \cap Q_{n-2r_0}^c$ within distance $r_0/2$ have been considered, since the remaining components will not change. We continue this process for increasing n .

We mention the following corollary, which is immediate from the proof of Lemma 20.

Corollary 22 (Boundary conditions for radial thinning). *Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be Borel and $\psi, \psi' \subseteq U^c$ be locally finite with $Q_n \cap \psi = Q_n \cap \psi'$. Then, almost surely on the event $\{A \not\leftrightarrow Q_{n-4r_0}^c\}$,*

$$T_{U, \psi}^\infty(\mathcal{P}^*) \cap A = T_{U, \psi'}^\infty(\mathcal{P}^*) \cap A.$$

The following proposition, a version of the DLR-equations in unbounded domains, is used in the proof of Theorem 3.

Proposition 23 (DLR-equations in unbounded domains). *Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be Borel. Let $\mathcal{X} = T^\infty(\mathcal{P}^*)$ be an infinite-volume Gibbs process on \mathbb{R}^d and let $\mathcal{X}' = (\mathcal{X} \cap U^c) \cup T_{U, \mathcal{X} \cap U^c}^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_U^*)$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^*$ is an independent copy of \mathcal{P}^* . Then, \mathcal{X}' is again an infinite-volume Gibbs process on \mathbb{R}^d .*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{X}_n = T_{Q_{4n}, \emptyset}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_{4n}}^*)$. Then, by Proposition 18,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X} \cap Q_{2n} \neq \mathcal{X}_n \cap Q_{2n}) \leq \mathbb{P}(Q_{2n} \leftrightarrow Q_{4n}).$$

Moreover, by Corollary 22,

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{U, \mathcal{X}_n \cap U^c}^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_U^*) \cap Q_n \neq T_{U, \mathcal{X} \cap U^c}^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_U^*) \cap Q_n) \leq \mathbb{P}(Q_n \leftrightarrow Q_{2n-2r_0}) + \mathbb{P}(Q_{2n} \leftrightarrow Q_{4n}).$$

Finally,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(T_{U, \mathcal{X}_n \cap U^c}^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_U^*) \cap Q_n \neq T_{U \cap Q_{4n}, \mathcal{X}_n \cap U^c}^{\text{rad}}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{U \cap Q_{4n}}^*) \cap Q_n\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(Q_n \leftrightarrow Q_{4n-2r_0}).$$

By the DLR-equations (5), $\mathcal{X}'_n = (\mathcal{X}'_n \cap U^c) \cup T_{U \cap Q_{4n}, \mathcal{X}'_n \cap U^c}^{\text{rad}}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{U \cap Q_{4n}}^*)$ has the distribution of the Gibbs process $\mathcal{X}(Q_{4n}, \emptyset)$. If $f : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a bounded local function with locality region A , the above shows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\mathcal{X}'_n) = f(\mathcal{X}')$. Moreover, Proposition 18 implies that $\mathcal{X}'_n \cap A$ converges to $\mathcal{X} \cap A$ in the total variation distance. Hence, dominated convergence yields

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X}')] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X}'_n)] = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X})],$$

which finishes the proof. \square

4.4. Disagreement coupling for perturbed PIs. The goal of this section is to control the disagreement probabilities for Gibbs processes with PIs that differ locally. More precisely, let $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be Borel, $\psi, \psi' \subseteq Q^c$ be locally finite, and κ, κ' be PIs satisfying the assumption (7). Assume that κ and κ' are small perturbations of each other, i.e., there is a (usually large) set $P \subseteq Q$ such that for all $x \in P$ and $\mu \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$(36) \quad \kappa(x, \mu) = \kappa'(x, \mu).$$

In the following, let $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$ and $\mathcal{X}'(Q, \psi')$ be Gibbs processes with PI κ and κ' and boundary conditions $\psi, \psi' \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c}$, respectively. Throughout this section, we use a "prime" to denote quantities associated with κ' . We know already from Section 4.2 that the total variation distance between these processes on a set $A \subseteq P$ is small.

Corollary 24 (Total variation distance for different PIs). *Suppose that κ, κ' are PIs satisfying condition (7). Assume that $A \subseteq P \subseteq Q$ and κ, κ' satisfy (36). Let $\psi, \psi' \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c}$ and $B \subseteq Q^c$ such that $\psi \cap B^c = \psi' \cap B^c$. Then,*

$$(37) \quad d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi) \cap A \neq \mathcal{X}'(Q, \psi') \cap A) \leq \mathbb{P}(A \leftrightarrow B \cup (Q \setminus P)).$$

Proof. First, consider any realizations $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi) \setminus P = \xi$ and $\mathcal{X}'(Q, \psi') \setminus P = \xi'$. Extend this over Q' by using disagreement couplings $T_{P, B \cup (Q \setminus P), \xi \cup \psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$ and $T_{P, B \cup (Q \setminus P), \xi' \cup \psi'}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$, which have the distributions of $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi) \cap P$ and $\mathcal{X}'(Q, \psi') \cap P$ by the DLR-equation (5). Then,

$$(38) \quad \mathbb{P}(T_{P, B \cup (Q \setminus P), \xi \cup \psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A \neq T_{P, B \cup (Q \setminus P), \xi' \cup \psi'}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A) \leq \mathbb{P}(A \rightsquigarrow B \cup (Q \setminus P)).$$

Hence, (37) follows from Corollary 15 since \square

However, in the proof of Theorem 4, we will have a whole family of PIs and we would like to be able to simultaneously construct the corresponding Gibbs processes and still have control over all the pairwise disagreement probabilities rather than just the total variation distance. In particular, the set P may depend on which pair we compare, so the strategy for constructing the Gibbs processes in the proof of Corollary 24 does not work. Moreover, in proof of Theorem 3, we need to control how local changes in boundary conditions affect the radial thinning in unbounded domains. The theorem below, which is the main result of this section, allows us to control the disagreement probabilities in these settings. We remark that neither the theorem nor its proof provides precise information about how the difference between the Gibbs processes is related to the components of $B_{r_0/2}$.

Theorem 25 (Disagreement probabilities for differing PIs). *There is a constant $c_{\text{DP}} > 0$ with the following property. Let $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded Borel and $\iota : Q \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be injective. Suppose that κ, κ' are PIs satisfying condition (7) and $\psi, \psi' \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c}$ and $\psi \cap B^c = \psi' \cap B^c$ for some $B \subseteq Q^c$. Assume that $s > 0$ and $A \subseteq P \subseteq Q$ are such that $\text{dist}(A, (Q_m \setminus P) \cup B) \geq 3s$ and κ, κ' satisfy (36). Then,*

$$(39) \quad \mathbb{P}(T_{Q, \psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A \neq T_{Q, \psi'}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A) \leq c_{\text{DP}} |B_{2s}(A)| e^{-c_{\text{SPT}} 2s}.$$

As a corollary, we obtain the analogous statement for Gibbs processes in unbounded domains.

Corollary 26. *There are $c_{\text{DPP}}, c'_{\text{DPP}} > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $A \subseteq P \subseteq U$ and $B \subseteq U^c$ such that A, B , and $U \setminus P$ are bounded. Let $\psi, \psi' \in \mathbf{N}_{U^c}$ be such that $\psi \cap B^c = \psi' \cap B^c$. Suppose that the PIs κ, κ' satisfy (7) and (36). Let $s = \text{dist}(A, (U \setminus P) \cup B)$. Then,*

$$(40) \quad \mathbb{P}(T_{U, \psi}^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}_U^*) \cap A \neq T_{U, \psi'}^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}_U^*) \cap A) \leq c_{\text{DPP}} |B_{2s/3}(A)| \exp(-c_{\text{SPT}} s).$$

Moreover, for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{U, \psi}^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}_U^*) \setminus Q_n \neq T_{U, \psi'}^{\infty}(\mathcal{P}_U^*) \setminus Q_n) \leq c'_{\text{DPP}} \exp(-c_{\text{SPT}} n).$$

Before giving the proof of Theorem 25, we mention the following result, which will be a corollary of Lemma 28 below. While not sufficient for the proof of our main theorems, we think the result is of independent interest. It shows that we do not need to use disagreement coupling to bound the disagreement probabilities (38). In fact, the standard Poisson embedding has a similar property, at least if the ordering ι is such that $\iota(x) < \iota(y)$ whenever $x \in A$ and $y \in Q \setminus A$ (we will, however, not be able to make such a choice of ι in the proof of our main theorems). This is somewhat surprising, since the standard Poisson embedding was not designed to control the pairwise disagreement.

Corollary 27 (Disagreement probabilities for standard Poisson embedding). *Suppose that κ, κ' are PIs satisfying condition (7). Assume that $A \subseteq P \subseteq Q$ are such that κ, κ' satisfy (36). Let $\iota : Q \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be an injective map such that $\iota(x) < \iota(y)$ whenever $x \in A$ and $y \in Q \setminus A$. Let $\psi, \psi' \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c}$ and $B \subseteq Q^c$ such that $\psi \cap B^c = \psi' \cap B^c$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{Q, \psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A \neq T_{Q, \psi'}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A) \leq \alpha_0(2 + \alpha_0|A|)|A|\mathbb{P}(A \rightsquigarrow B \cup (Q \setminus P)).$$

The key to proving Theorem 25 and Corollary 27 is the following lemma which considers the standard Poisson embedding. In the lemma, we only need to choose the ordering ι locally, which makes the lemma applicable in the proofs of our main theorems.

Lemma 28 (Disagreement probability of first point). *Let $A \subseteq P \subseteq Q$ be bounded Borel, $\psi, \psi' \subseteq Q^c$ be locally finite, and $\iota : Q \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be injective such that $\iota(x) < \iota(y)$ whenever $x \in A$ and $y \in Q \setminus A$. Suppose that κ, κ' are PIs satisfying (7) and (36). Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\inf_{\iota}(T_{Q, \psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A) \neq \inf_{\iota}(T_{Q, \psi'}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A)) \leq (2 + \alpha_0|A|) d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi) \cap A, \mathcal{X}'(Q, \psi') \cap A),$$

where \inf_ι is denotes the smallest point with respect to the ordering \leq_ι .

Proof. In the following, we write $p(x, \psi) := p(x, Q, \psi)$.

$$q(x) := \mathbb{P}(T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap Q_{(-\infty, x)} = \emptyset) = \mathbb{P}\left(U_i > p(X_i, \psi) \text{ for all } (X_i, U_i) \in \mathcal{P}_{Q_{(-\infty, x)}}^*\right),$$

denote the probability that all points of \mathcal{P}_Q^* before x are rejected in the thinning. Similarly, we define $q'(x)$ and $q^\vee(x)$ by replacing $p(X_i, \psi)$ by $p'(X_i, \psi')$ and $p(X_i, \psi) \vee p'(X_i, \psi')$, respectively. By construction of the Poisson embedding, and the multivariate Mecke equation [19, Theorem 4.4], we obtain that the probability that the first points of $T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$ and $T'_{Q,\psi'}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$ disagree on A is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\inf_\iota(T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A) \neq \inf_\iota(T'_{Q,\psi'}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A)) = \int_A |p(x, \psi) - p'(x, \psi')| q^\vee(x) dx \\ & \leq \int_A |p(x, \psi) - p'(x, \psi')| q(x) dx \\ (41) \quad & \leq \int_A |p(x, \psi)q(x) - p'(x, \psi')q'(x)| dx + \int_A p'(x, \psi')|q'(x) - q(x)| dx. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, since $\mathbb{P}(\inf_\iota(T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A) \in B) = \int_{A \cap B} p(x, \psi)q(x)dx$, the definition of total variation distance yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A |p(x, \psi)q(x) - p'(x, \psi')q'(x)| dx & \leq 2 \sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}^d} |\mathbb{P}(\inf_\iota(T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A) \in B) - \mathbb{P}(\inf_\iota(T'_{Q,\psi'}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A) \in B)| \\ & \leq 2d_{\text{TV}}(T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A, T'_{Q,\psi'}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality can be seen by letting

$$B := \begin{cases} \{x \in A : p(x, \psi)q(x) \geq p'(x, \psi')q'(x)\}, & \text{if } \mathbb{P}(\inf_\iota T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \in A) \geq \mathbb{P}(\inf_\iota T'_{Q,\psi'}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \in A), \\ \{x \in A : p(x, \psi)q(x) < p'(x, \psi')q'(x)\}, & \text{if } \mathbb{P}(\inf_\iota T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \in A) < \mathbb{P}(\inf_\iota T'_{Q,\psi'}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \in A). \end{cases}$$

To bound the second integral in (41), we use that $p'(x, \psi') \leq \alpha_0$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A p'(x, \psi')|q'(x) - q(x)| dx & \leq \alpha_0 |A| \sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}^d} |\mathbb{P}(T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A \cap B = \emptyset) - \mathbb{P}(T'_{Q,\psi'}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A \cap B = \emptyset)| \\ & \leq \alpha_0 |A| d_{\text{TV}}(T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A, T'_{Q,\psi'}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \cap A), \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Before proving Theorem 25, we give the proof of Corollary 27, which is a slightly simpler version of the proof of Theorem 25.

Proof of Corollary 27. Let y_1, \dots, y_K be the points in \mathcal{P}_A and let $z_i = \{y_i\} \cap T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$ and $z'_i = \{y_i\} \cap T'_{Q,\psi'}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$, $i = 1, \dots, K$ denote the thinning of these points. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}^*) \cap A \neq T'_{Q,\psi'}(\mathcal{P}^*) \cap A) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{P}(z_i = z'_i, i < k, z_k \neq z'_k, k \leq K) \\ (42) \quad & = \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{z_i = z'_i, i < k\} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{z_k \neq z'_k, k \leq K\} | \mathcal{P}_{Q_{(-\infty, y_{k-1})}}^*]]. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we write $S_k := Q_{(-\infty, y_k)}$ and $S_k^* := Q_{(-\infty, y_k)} \times [0, \alpha_0]$. Note that by construction of the standard Poisson embedding,

$$T_{Q,\psi}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*) \setminus S_{k-1} = T_{Q \setminus S_{k-1}, \{z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}\} \cup \psi}(\mathcal{P}_{Q \setminus S_{k-1}}^*),$$

and the similar statement holds for $T'_{Q,\psi'}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$. Moreover, since S_{k-1}^* is a stopping set, conditionally on $\mathcal{P}_{S_{k-1}}^*$, $\mathcal{P}_{Q \setminus S_{k-1}}^*$ has the distribution of a Poisson process on $Q^* \setminus S_{k-1}^*$. Thus, we are in the situation of Lemma 28 with Q replaced by $Q \setminus S_{k-1}$ and A replaced by $A \setminus S_{k-1}$. Therefore, we may bound the conditional expectation in (42) by

$$(2 + \alpha_0 |A|) \mathbb{E}[d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{X}(Q \setminus S_{k-1}, \{z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}\} \cup \psi) \cap A, \mathcal{X}'(Q \setminus S_{k-1}, \{z'_1, \dots, z'_{k-1}\} \cup \psi') \cap A) | \mathcal{P}_{S_{k-1}}^*].$$

Moreover, on the event $\{z_i = z'_i, i < k\}$, the boundary conditions differ only on B , so the total variation distance is bounded by $\mathbb{P}(A \setminus S_{k-1} \rightsquigarrow B \cup Q \setminus (P \cup S_{k-1}))$ by Corollary 24. Since the number of terms in (42) is $K = \mathcal{P}(A)$, we obtain the bound on (42)

$$(2 + \alpha_0|A|)\mathbb{P}(A \rightsquigarrow B \cup (Q \setminus P))\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(A)] = (2 + \alpha_0|A|)\alpha_0|A|\mathbb{P}(A \rightsquigarrow B \cup (Q \setminus P)).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 25. Throughout this proof, we let $\mathcal{X} := T_{Q,\psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$ and $\mathcal{X}' := T_{Q,\psi'}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_Q^*)$. The idea is to bound the disagreement probability of $\mathcal{X} \cap A$ and $\mathcal{X}' \cap A$ by considering disagreement on the components of $B_{r_0/2}(\mathcal{P})$ that intersect A . More precisely, let V_i be as in Example 13. Let $V_{i_1}, V_{i_2}, \dots, V_{i_M}$ denote the subsequence of the sets V_i such that the starting point $v_{i_1} \in D$ is contained in $B_s(A)$. We introduce the events

$$E_s := \{A \rightsquigarrow B_s(A)^c\}^c, \quad \tilde{E}_s := \{B_s(A) \rightsquigarrow B_{2s}(A)^c\}^c, \quad \bar{E}_s := E_s \cap \tilde{E}_s.$$

Then, on the event E_s , \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}' agree on A if they agree on all the V_{i_m} . Moreover, on the event \tilde{E}_s , all V_{i_m} are contained in $B_{2s}(A)$. From (31), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(E_s^c) = \mathbb{P}(A \rightsquigarrow B_s(A)^c) \leq c_1 |B_{r_0}(A)| e^{-\text{CSPT}, 2^s}, \quad \mathbb{P}(\tilde{E}_s^c) = \mathbb{P}(B_s(A) \rightsquigarrow B_{2s}(A)^c) \leq c_1 |B_{s+r_0}(A)| e^{-\text{CSPT}, 2^s}.$$

Thus, it is enough to work under the events E_s and \tilde{E}_s .

Recall the definitions of $V_{i,j}$ and $\xi_{i,j}$ from Example 13 and let $\mathcal{X}_i := \mathcal{X} \cap V_i$, $\mathcal{X}'_i := \mathcal{X}' \cap V_i$ and $\mathcal{X}_{i,j} := \xi_{i,1} \cup \dots \cup \xi_{i,j}$, $\mathcal{X}'_{i,j} := \xi'_{i,1} \cup \dots \cup \xi'_{i,j}$ for $j \leq N_i$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\bar{E}_s, \mathcal{X} \cap A \neq \mathcal{X}' \cap A) \\ &= \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{E}_s, (\mathcal{X}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{i_{m-1}}) = (\mathcal{X}'_{i_1}, \dots, \mathcal{X}'_{i_{m-1}}), \mathcal{X}_{i_m} \neq \mathcal{X}'_{i_m}, M \geq m) \\ &= \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}\{(\mathcal{X}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{i_{m-1}}) = (\mathcal{X}'_{i_1}, \dots, \mathcal{X}'_{i_{m-1}}), M \geq m\} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{E}_s, \mathcal{X}_{i_m} \neq \mathcal{X}'_{i_m} \mid \mathcal{P}_{S_{i_{m-1}, N_{i_{m-1}}}^*}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We note here that $S_{i_{m-1}, N_{i_{m-1}}}^*$ is again a stopping set and the event $\{M \geq m\}$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{P}_{S_{i_{m-1}, N_{i_{m-1}}}^*}$.

We now claim that

$$(43) \quad \mathbb{P}(\tilde{E}_s, \mathcal{X}_{i_m} \neq \mathcal{X}'_{i_m} \mid \mathcal{P}_{S_{i_{m-1}, N_{i_{m-1}}}^*}) \leq c_1 e^{-\text{CSPT}, 2^s} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \leq N_{i_m}} |V_{i_m, j}| \mathbb{1}\{V_{i_m, j} \subseteq B_{2s}(A)\} \right],$$

for some $c_1 > 0$. We first explain how to conclude the proof of the Proposition from (43). Afterwards, we establish (43).

From (43), we get

$$(44) \quad \mathbb{P}(\bar{E}_s, \mathcal{X} \cap A \neq \mathcal{X}' \cap A) \leq c_1 e^{-\text{CSPT}, 2^s} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m \leq M} \sum_{j \leq N_{i_m}} |V_{i_m, j}| \mathbb{1}\{V_{i_m, j} \subseteq B_{2s}(A)\} \right].$$

Next, we bound the double sum in (44) by

$$(45) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{m \leq M} \sum_{j \leq N_{i_m}} |V_{i_m, j}| \mathbb{1}\{V_{i_m, j} \subseteq B_{2s}(A)\} &\leq \sum_{m \leq M} \sum_{j \leq N_{i_m}} |V_{i_m, j}| \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{P}_{V_{i_m, j}} = \emptyset, V_{i_m, j} \subseteq B_{2s}(A)\} \\ &+ \sum_{m \leq M} \sum_{j \leq N_{i_m}} |V_{i_m, j}| \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{P}_{V_{i_m, j}} \neq \emptyset, V_{i_m, j} \subseteq B_{2s}(A)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if $\mathcal{P}_{V_{i_m, j}} = \emptyset$, then $V_{i_m, j} = Z_{i_m, j}$. Since the $Z_{i_m, j}$ are disjoint and contained in $B_{2s}(A)$, the expected value of the first term on the right hand side of (45) is bounded by $|B_{2s}(A)|$. For the expected value of the second term on the right hand side of (45), note that every point in \mathcal{P} can only be contained in one of the sets $Z_{i_m, j} \subseteq V_{i_m, j}$. Thus the number of terms in the sum is bounded by $\mathcal{P}(B_{2s}(A))$. By Proposition 12, $|V_{i_m, j}| \leq |B_{r_0}|$. Hence, we conclude that the second term on the right hand side of (45) is bounded by

$$|B_{r_0}| \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(B_{2s}(A))] = |B_{r_0}| \alpha_0 |B_{2s}(A)|.$$

These estimates show that for some constant $c_2 > 0$, (44) is bounded by

$$c_1(1 + \alpha_0|B_{r_0}|)|B_{2s}(A)|e^{-c_{\text{SPT},2^s}} \leq c_2|B_{2s}(A)|e^{-c_{\text{SPT},2^s}}.$$

It remains to prove (43). To that end, note that given $\mathcal{P}_{S_{i_m-1, N_{i_m-1}}}^*$, the processes \mathcal{X}_{i_m} and \mathcal{X}'_{i_m} are restrictions of Gibbs processes on $Q \setminus S_{i_m-1, N_{i_m-1}}$ with boundary condition ψ and ψ' , respectively, to V_{i_m} (since $B_{r_0}(\mathcal{P} \cap S_{i_m-1, N_{i_m-1}}) \cap Q \subseteq S_{i_m-1, N_{i_m-1}}$). Hence, it is enough to consider the case $i_m = 1$. Here, we obtain the bound on (43)

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\{V_1 \subseteq B_{2s}(A)\} \cap \left\{\mathcal{X} \cap \bigcup_{j \leq N_1} V_{1,j} \neq \mathcal{X}' \cap \bigcup_{j \leq N_1} V_{1,j}\right\}\right) \\ & \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}_{1,j-1} = \mathcal{X}'_{1,j-1}, \xi_{1,j} \neq \xi'_{1,j}, N_1 \geq j, V_{1,j} \subseteq B_{2s}(A)) \\ (46) \quad & = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j \leq N_1} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X}_{1,j-1} = \mathcal{X}'_{1,j-1}, V_{1,j} \subseteq B_{2s}(A)\} \mathbb{P}(\xi_{1,j} \neq \xi'_{1,j} \mid \mathcal{P}_{S_{1,j-1}})\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\mathcal{X}_{1,0} = \mathcal{X}'_{1,0}\}$ is interpreted as trivially satisfied. Here, we have used that both the set $V_{1,j}$ and the event $\{N_1 \geq j\}$ are measurable with respect to $\mathcal{P}_{S_{1,j-1}}$. Since $S_{1,j-1}^*$ is a stopping set, conditionally on $\mathcal{P}_{S_{1,j-1}^*}$, we have that $\xi_{1,j}$ is the restriction of a Gibbs process

$$\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{1,j} := T_{Q \setminus S_{1,j-1}, \mathcal{X}_{1,j-1} \cup \psi}(\mathcal{P}_{Q \setminus S_{1,j-1}}^*)$$

and analogously for $\xi'_{1,j}$. Recalling that $\xi_{1,j} = \inf_{\iota_{1,j}}(\mathcal{P} \cap V_{1,j}) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{1,j}$ (with $\inf(\emptyset)$ interpreted as \emptyset), the event $\{\xi_{1,j} \neq \xi'_{1,j}\}$ is contained in the event $\{\inf_{\iota_{1,j}}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{1,j} \cap V_{1,j}) \neq \inf_{\iota_{1,j}}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}'_{1,j} \cap V_{1,j})\}$. Thus, we may apply Lemma 28 with Q replaced by $Q \setminus S_{1,j-1}$ and A replaced by $V_{1,j}$. Since $|V_{1,j}| \leq |B_{r_0}|$, Lemma 28 shows that the conditional probability in (46) is bounded by

$$(47) \quad c_3 d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{X}(Q \setminus S_{1,j-1}, \mathcal{X}_{1,j-1} \cup \psi) \cap V_{1,j}, \mathcal{X}'(Q \setminus S_{1,j-1}, \mathcal{X}'_{1,j-1} \cup \psi') \cap V_{1,j}),$$

where $c_3 := 2 + \alpha_0|B_{r_0}|$. Using here that $\psi, \psi' \subseteq Q^c \subseteq P^c$ and that we are on the event $\{\mathcal{X}_{1,j-1} = \mathcal{X}'_{1,j-1}\}$, Corollary 24 with A replaced by $V_{1,j}$ and Q replaced by $Q \setminus S_{1,j-1}$ gives the bound $\mathbb{P}(V_{1,j} \rightsquigarrow (Q \setminus P) \cup B)$ on the total variation distance in (47), which is again bounded by $c_1|B_{r_0}(V_{1,j})|e^{-c_{\text{SPT},2^s}}$, by the argument in (31) using that $s \leq \text{dist}(B_{2s}(A), P^c)$ by assumption. Letting $c_4 := c_3c_1$, we use this finding in (46) to obtain the asserted bound in (43)

$$(48) \quad \mathbb{P}(E_s, \mathcal{X} \cap V_1 \neq \mathcal{X}' \cap V_1) \leq c_4 e^{-c_{\text{SPT},2^s}} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j \geq 1} |V_{1,j}| \mathbb{1}\{N_1 \geq j, V_{1,j} \subseteq B_{2s}(A)\}\right].$$

□

Proof of Corollary 26. We may assume that $A, B, U \setminus P \subseteq Q_m$ for some m . From Proposition 18, we have a $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(T_{U,\psi}^\infty(\mathcal{P}_U^*) \cap A \neq T_{Q_{m+m'}, \cap U, \psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q_{m+m'} \cap U}^*) \cap A) & \leq \mathbb{P}(Q_m \rightsquigarrow Q_{m+m'-2r_0}^c) \\ & \leq 2c_1|Q_{m+r_0}| \exp(-c_{\text{SPT}}(m+m')). \end{aligned}$$

A similar statement holds for $T_{U,\psi'}^\infty(\mathcal{P}_U^*)$. By Theorem 25,

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{Q_{m+m'} \cap U, \psi}^\infty(\mathcal{P}_{Q_{m+m'} \cap U}^*) \cap A \neq T_{Q_{m+m'} \cap U, \psi'}^\infty(\mathcal{P}_{Q_{m+m'} \cap U}^*) \cap A) \leq c_{\text{DP}}|B_{2s/3}(A)| \exp(-c_{\text{SPT}}s).$$

Letting $m' \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain (40).

Still assuming $B, U \setminus P \subseteq Q_m$, take $n \geq m$, and $A = Q_{n+1} \setminus Q_n$. Then $s \geq n - m$ and (40) shows that there must be a $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{U,\psi}^\infty(\mathcal{P}_U^*) \cap (Q_{n+1} \setminus Q_n) \neq T_{U,\psi'}^\infty(\mathcal{P}_U^*) \cap (Q_{n+1} \setminus Q_n)) \leq c_2 \exp(-c_{\text{SPT}}n).$$

Summing these probabilities, we find that

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{U,\psi}^\infty(\mathcal{P}_U^*) \setminus Q_n \neq T_{U,\psi'}^\infty(\mathcal{P}_U^*) \setminus Q_n) \leq c_3 \exp(-c_{\text{SPT}}n),$$

which shows the claim. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 3 – CLT UNDER WEAK STABILIZATION

In this section, we prove Theorem 3, i.e., the CLT for Gibbsian functionals under weak stabilization. The main idea is to extend the martingale approach that was developed for Poisson point processes in [24, Theorem 3.1]. A martingale is obtained by conditioning on the point process in an increasing sequence of windows. The centered functional can then be expressed as a sum of martingale differences. Thus, general CLT results apply, if these differences can be controlled. Since the martingale differences are essentially obtained by locally changing the boundary conditions, they can be handled using the disagreement coupling results from Section 4.

The rest of the section is organized as follows. First, in Section 5.1, we establish a CLT under a general moment and stabilization condition. Second, in Section 5.2, we prove the main CLT for Gibbs processes under general conditions. In Section 5.2.1, we discuss when these conditions are satisfied. Finally, in Section 5.2.2, we demonstrate how to show variance positivity in the setting of Betti numbers, thereby completing the proof of Corollary 6.

5.1. CLT under general conditions. In the following, we let (a_n) be a sequence such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \infty$. Let \mathcal{Y}_{a_n} , $n \geq 1$, denote a sequence of point processes on \mathbb{R}^d . Later in this section, we always consider the specific choices $a_n = n + \sqrt{n}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_{a_n} = \mathcal{X}$. However, since it causes no additional work, we formulate the proofs in the general setting. For instance, in other applications, one might want to take $\mathcal{Y}_{a_n} = \mathcal{X}(Q_{a_n}, \psi_n)$. For $n \geq 1$, we consider functionals $H_n(\varphi)$ defined for any $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$. In the present subsection, we do not require translation-invariance of H_n and allow H_n to depend on n .

Let Z_{a_n} be the set of lattice points $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $Q_{z,1}$ intersects the window Q_{a_n} . Then, $Q_{a_n} \subseteq \bigcup_{z \in Z_{a_n}} Q_{z,1}$. Order Z_{a_n} lexicographically as z_1, \dots, z_{k_n} . Let $\mathcal{F}_{0,n}$ be the trivial σ -algebra and $\mathcal{F}_{k_n,n} = \sigma(\mathcal{Y}_{a_n})$. Moreover, define

$$\mathcal{F}_{i,n} := \sigma\left(\mathcal{Y}_{a_n} \cap \bigcup_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d, z \preceq z_i} Q_{z,1}\right)$$

for $0 < i < k_n$, where \preceq denotes lexicographical ordering on \mathbb{Z}^d .

The key observation in the martingale approach is that

$$H_n(\mathcal{Y}_{a_n}) - \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{Y}_{a_n})] = \sum_{i \leq k_n} \Delta_{i,n},$$

where

$$\Delta_{i,n} := \Delta_{z_i,n} := \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{Y}_{a_n}) | \mathcal{F}_{i,n}] - \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{Y}_{a_n}) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1,n}].$$

For each n , the $\mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{Y}_{a_n}) | \mathcal{F}_{i,n}]$ define a martingale with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{i,n}$. By orthogonality of martingale differences, the variance is given by

$$(49) \quad \text{Var}(H(\mathcal{Y}_{a_n}) - \mathbb{E}[H(\mathcal{Y}_{a_n})]) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k_n} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{i,n}^2].$$

We impose the following two conditions:

- (i) $\sup_{n \geq 1, z \in Z_{a_n}} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{z,n}^4] < \infty$.
- (ii) There exists a stationary ergodic point process \mathcal{Y} such that for every $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, there is a random variable $\Delta_z = \Delta_z(\mathcal{Y})$ such that $\Delta_{z,n} \rightarrow \Delta_z$ in probability (and hence in L^2 due to (i)). The limit is shift invariant meaning that for any $z_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\Delta_{z+z_0}(\mathcal{Y} + z_0) = \Delta_z(\mathcal{Y})$. The convergence must be uniform in the sense that

$$(50) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z \in Z_{a_n - \rho(a_n)}} \|\Delta_z - \Delta_{z,n}\|_{L^2} = 0,$$

where $\rho : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function with $\rho(x) \in o(x)$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \rho(x) = \infty$.

The proposition below and its proof is an adaption of [24, Thm. 3.1] to general point processes.

Proposition 29 (CLT for general functionals). *Let (a_n) be a sequence with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \infty$ and \mathcal{Y}_{a_n} a sequence of point processes on \mathbb{R}^d . Under Conditions (i) and (ii),*

$$(51) \quad a_n^{-d} \text{Var}(H_n(\mathcal{Y}_{a_n})) \rightarrow \sigma^2 \geq 0,$$

where $\sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_0^2]$, and

$$a_n^{-d/2} (H_n(\mathcal{Y}_{a_n}) - \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{Y}_{a_n})]) \rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2)$$

in distribution.

Proof. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n^d/k_n = 1$, Proposition 29 follows from the martingale CLT of [22] if the following three conditions are satisfied:

1. $\sup_{n \geq 1} k_n^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\max_{i \leq k_n} \Delta_{i,n}^2] < \infty$;
2. $k_n^{-1/2} \max_{i \leq k_n} |\Delta_{i,n}| \rightarrow 0$ in probability; and
3. $k_n^{-1} \sum_{i \leq k_n} \Delta_{i,n}^2 \rightarrow \sigma^2$ in L^1 .

In particular, (51) follows from (49) and 3. The first two conditions follow from Condition (i) exactly as in [24, proof of Thm. 3.1]. To make our presentation self-contained, we briefly reproduce the argument.

1. Condition (i) implies

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} k_n^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\max_i \Delta_{i,n}^2] \leq \sup_n k_n^{-1} \sum_{i \leq k_n} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{i,n}^2] < \infty.$$

2. This follows from Markov's inequality and (i) because

$$\mathbb{P}(k_n^{-1/2} \max_{i \leq k_n} |\Delta_{i,n}| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \sum_{i \leq k_n} \mathbb{P}(k_n^{-1/2} |\Delta_{i,n}| \geq \varepsilon) \leq k_n \frac{\max_{i \leq k_n} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{i,n}^4]}{k_n^2 \varepsilon^2},$$

which tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

3. We start by noting that Δ_z is in L^2 , since $\Delta_{z,n}$ converges to Δ_z in probability, and (i) implies uniform integrability.

By Assumption (ii), $\Delta_z(\mathcal{Y})_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ forms a multidimensional ergodic sequence, meaning that the sum

$$|Z_{a_n - \rho(a_n)}|^{-1} \sum_{z \in Z_{a_n - \rho(a_n)}} \Delta_z^2 \xrightarrow{L^1} \sigma^2,$$

see [14, Thm. 10.12]. Moreover, since $|Z_{a_n - \rho(a_n)}| = a_n^d + o(a_n^d) = k_n + o(k_n)$ and $\Delta_z \in L^2$,

$$(k_n^{-1} - |Z_{a_n - \rho(a_n)}|^{-1}) \sum_{z \in Z_{a_n - \rho(a_n)}} \Delta_z^2 \xrightarrow{L^1} 0, \quad \text{and} \quad k_n^{-1} \sum_{z \in Z_{a_n} \setminus Z_{a_n - \rho(a_n)}} \Delta_z^2 \xrightarrow{L^1} 0.$$

It remains to show that

$$k_n^{-1} \sum_{z \in Z_{a_n}} |\Delta_z^2 - \Delta_{z,n}^2| \xrightarrow{L^1} 0.$$

For this, note that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\Delta_z^2 - \Delta_{z,n}^2|] \leq \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_z + \Delta_{z,n})^2]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_z - \Delta_{z,n})^2]^{1/2}.$$

The first term is uniformly bounded by (i) and the fact that $\Delta_z \in L^2$. From Assumption (ii) we have that

$$k_n^{-1} \sum_{z \in Z_{a_n - \rho(a_n)}} \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_z - \Delta_{z,n})^2] \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow 0$. Finally,

$$k_n^{-1} \sum_{z \in Z_{a_n} \setminus Z_{a_n - \rho(a_n)}} \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_z - \Delta_{z,n})^2] \rightarrow 0,$$

again by (i) and the fact that $\Delta_z \in L^2$. This shows 3. □

5.2. A CLT for translation-invariant functionals of Gibbs point processes. We now return to Gibbs point processes. The present subsection is devoted to connecting the conditions (i) and (ii) stated in the general CLT in Proposition 29 with the conditions (9) and (10) from Section 2 in the Gibbs setting. We consider a functional H_n of the form

$$(52) \quad H_n(\varphi) = H(\varphi \cap Q_n)$$

where $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$ and H is a translation-invariant functional on \mathbf{N}_0 .

Throughout this section we let $\mathcal{X} = T^\infty(\mathcal{P}^*)$ denote the infinite-volume Gibbs process on \mathbb{R}^d . We define sets

$$V_z = \bigcup_{w \preceq z} Q_{w,1}, \quad U_z = \bigcup_{w \succ z} Q_{w,1},$$

where \preceq refers to the lexicographic ordering on \mathbb{Z}^d , and define $V_{z,n} := V_z \cap Q_n$ and $U_{z,n} := U_z \cap Q_n$. We refer the reader to Figure 2 for an illustration of these sets.

We aim at proving the following CLT under the conditions (i) and (10). This will be the most general version of the CLT. We discuss further in which situations the conditions are satisfied in Subsection 5.2.1. In the following, let $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and let z_- denote the point in \mathbb{Z}^d that comes just before z in the lexicographic order.

Theorem 30 (CLT for translation-invariant functionals). *Let \mathcal{X} be an infinite-volume Gibbs point process on \mathbb{R}^d with translation-invariant PI satisfying (7). Let H be a translation-invariant functional of finite point patterns such that (10) holds. Let H_n be as in (52). Suppose,*

$$(53) \quad \sup_{n \geq 1, z_i \in Z_{n+\sqrt{n}}} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X})|\mathcal{F}_{i,n}] - \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X})|\mathcal{F}_{i-1,n}])^4] < \infty.$$

Then, the limit

$$\Delta_0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X})|\mathcal{X} \cap V_0] - \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X})|\mathcal{X} \cap V_{0-}])$$

exists in L^2 . Let $\sigma^2 := \mathbb{E}[\Delta_0^2]$. Then, $|Q_n|^{-1} \text{Var}(H_n(\mathcal{X})) \rightarrow \sigma^2$ and

$$|Q_n|^{-1/2} (H_n(\mathcal{X}) - \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X})]) \rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2).$$

For the proof, we make the following constructions. Define

$$\eta_z := T^\infty(\mathcal{P}^*) \cap V_z, \quad \mathcal{X}'_z = \eta_z \cup T_{U_z, \eta_z}^{\infty, z}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{U_z}^*),$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^*$ is an independent copy of \mathcal{P}^* and $T^{\infty, z}$ denotes the radial coupling centered at z , i.e. $T^{\infty, z}(\varphi) = T^\infty(\varphi - z) + z$. Then $\mathcal{X}'_z \sim \mathcal{X}$ by Proposition 23. Note that

$$\mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X})|\eta_{z-}] = \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{z-})|\eta_{z-}] = \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{z-})|\eta_z].$$

Thus, we can write the martingale differences as

$$\Delta_{z,n} = \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z) | \eta_z] - \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{z-}) | \eta_{z-}] = \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{z-}) | \eta_z].$$

Note that \mathcal{X}'_z and \mathcal{X}'_{z-} both equal η_{z-} on V_{z-} . They are extended from η_z and η_{z-} on U_z and U_{z-} , respectively. Lemma 31 below will allow us to control the disagreement this causes in regions far from z .

Lemma 31. *Suppose that the PI satisfies (7). There exists a random variable $N_z \geq 1$ with $\mathbb{P}(N_z \geq n) \leq c'_{\text{DPP}} \exp(-c_{\text{SPTN}} n)$ such that almost surely*

$$\mathcal{X}'_z \cap (U_z \setminus Q_{z, N_z}) = \mathcal{X}'_{z-} \cap (U_{z-} \setminus Q_{z, N_z}).$$




FIGURE 2. Illustration of the sets U_z and L_z .

Proof. It is enough to consider the case $z = 0$. Note that $T_{U_0, \eta_0}^\infty(\mathcal{P}_{U_0}^*) = T_{U_{0-}, \eta_{0-}}^{\infty, \prime}(\mathcal{P}_{U_0}^*)$, where the thinning operator $T^{\infty, \prime}$ makes use of the PI

$$\kappa'(x, \mu) = \begin{cases} \kappa(x, \mu \cup (\eta_0 \setminus \eta_{0-})), & x \in U_0, \\ 0, & x \in Q_{0,1}. \end{cases}$$

By Corollary 26,

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{U_{0-}, \eta_{0-}}^\infty(\mathcal{P}_{U_{0-}}^*) \setminus Q_n \neq T_{U_{0-}, \eta_{0-}}^{\infty, \prime}(\mathcal{P}_{U_0}^*) \setminus Q_n) \leq c'_{\text{DPP}} \exp(-c_{\text{SPT}} n).$$

Letting N be the minimal n such that $T_{U_{0-}, \eta_{0-}}^\infty(\mathcal{P}_{U_{0-}}^*) \setminus Q_n \neq T_{U_{0-}, \eta_{0-}}^{\infty, \prime}(\mathcal{P}_{U_0}^*) \setminus Q_n$ shows the claim. \square

Proof of Theorem 30. We show Condition (i) and (ii) of Proposition 29 with $a_n = n + \sqrt{n}$, $\mathcal{Y}_{a_n} = \mathcal{X}$ and $\rho(a_n) = 2\sqrt{n}$. Assumption (53) immediately implies (i). It remains to show (ii). Fix $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. By Lemma 31, there is a.s. an N_z such that $\mathcal{X}'_z \setminus Q_{z, N_z} = \mathcal{X}'_{z-} \setminus Q_{z, N_z}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H(\mathcal{X}'_{z-}) &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{z-}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z \setminus Q_{z, N_z}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{z-}) + H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{z-} \setminus Q_{z, N_z}) \end{aligned}$$

exists almost surely by (10). Note that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[H(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H(\mathcal{X}'_{z-}) | \eta_z]^4] \leq M := \sup_{n \geq 1, z \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap Q_n} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{z,n}^4]$$

by the conditional Fatou's Lemma.

We now show that

$$\mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{z-}) | \eta_z] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[H(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H(\mathcal{X}'_{z-}) | \eta_z] =: \Delta_z \text{ in } L^2.$$

First, note that (10) implies that for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $l \geq 1$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a random variable $R(z, l, \varepsilon)$ such that whenever $Q_{z, R(z, l, \varepsilon)} \subseteq Q_{w, m}$,

$$|(H(\mathcal{X}) - H(\mathcal{X} \setminus Q_{z, l})) - (H(\mathcal{X} \cap Q_{w, m}) - H(\mathcal{X} \cap Q_{w, m} \setminus Q_{z, l}))| < \varepsilon.$$

Indeed, otherwise, for $z = 0$, there would be a $w_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $m_n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $Q_n \subseteq Q_{w_n, m_n}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$|(H(\mathcal{X}) - H(\mathcal{X} \setminus Q_{z, l})) - (H(\mathcal{X} \cap Q_{w_n, m_n}) - H(\mathcal{X} \cap Q_{w_n, m_n} \setminus Q_{z, l}))| \geq \varepsilon.$$

Since $\bigcup_{k \geq 1} \bigcap_{n \geq k} Q_{w_n, m_n} = \mathbb{R}^d$, this contradicts (10). The claim follows for any other z by stationarity. Clearly, the distribution of $R(z, l, \varepsilon)$ is independent of z .

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given and fix $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. For $l, n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define events

$$E_{z, l} := \{\mathcal{X}'_z \setminus Q_{z, l} = \mathcal{X}'_{z-} \setminus Q_{z, l}\}, \quad F_{z, l, n} := \{R(z, l, \varepsilon) \leq \sqrt{n} - l - 1\}$$

Choose l such that $\mathbb{P}(N_z > l) < \varepsilon$ where N_z is the random variable from Lemma 31. Then $\mathbb{P}(E_{z, l}) > 1 - \varepsilon$. Moreover, let $n \geq l$ be such that $\mathbb{P}(F_{z, n, l}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. Then, for all $m \geq n$, the conditional Jensen inequality and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathbb{E}[H_m(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_m(\mathcal{X}'_{z-}) | \eta_z] - \mathbb{E}[H(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H(\mathcal{X}'_{z-}) | \eta_z]\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbb{1}_{E_{z, l} \cap F_{z, l, n} \cap F_{z-, l, n}}((H_m(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_m(\mathcal{X}'_{z-})) - (H(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H(\mathcal{X}'_{z-})))\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + 4\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{z, m}^4 + \Delta_{z, l}^4]^{1/2} (\mathbb{P}(E_{z, l}^c) + \mathbb{P}(F_{z, l, n}^c) + \mathbb{P}(F_{z-, l, n}^c))^{1/2} \\ &\leq 4\|\mathbb{1}_{F_{z-, n, l}}(H_m(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_m(\mathcal{X}'_z \setminus Q_{z, l}) - H(\mathcal{X}'_z) + H(\mathcal{X}'_z \setminus Q_{z, l}))\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + 4\|\mathbb{1}_{F_{z-, n, l}}(H_m(\mathcal{X}'_{z-}) - H_m(\mathcal{X}'_{z-} \setminus Q_{z, l}) - H(\mathcal{X}'_{z-}) + H(\mathcal{X}'_{z-} \setminus Q_{z, l}))\|_{L^2}^2 + 4\sqrt{6}M^{1/2}\varepsilon^{1/2} \\ &\leq 8\varepsilon^2 + 4\sqrt{6}M^{1/2}\varepsilon^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

Since the distributions of N_z and $R(z, \varepsilon, l)$ are independent of z , the bound is uniform for all $z \in Q_{m-\sqrt{m}}$. Since ε was arbitrary, this shows (50). The fact that $\Delta_{z+z_0}(\mathcal{X} + z_0) = \Delta_z(\mathcal{X})$ follows immediately by construction, and \mathcal{X} was stationary and ergodic by Proposition 18. \square

5.2.1. *More on the conditions of Theorem 30.* In this section, we give some conditions under which the assumptions (10) and (53) in Proposition 30 are satisfied. The first lemma together with Theorem 30 implies Theorem 3.

Lemma 32 (Moment condition). *Let \mathcal{X} be an infinite-volume Gibbs point process with translation-invariant PI satisfying (7). Consider a translation-invariant functional H and let H_n be defined as in (52). Then, (9) implies (53).*

Proof of Lemma 32. First consider the case $z_{i-1} = z_{i-}$. Write $z = z_i$ for simplicity. We may write

$$(54) \quad H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{z_-}) = \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{A_{z,m}}(H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{z_-})),$$

where $A_{z,m}$ is the event $\{[N_z] = m\}$ with N_z as in Lemma 31. Then, on the event $A_{z,m}$, we have that $\mathcal{X}'_z \setminus Q_{z,m} = \mathcal{X}'_{z_-} \setminus Q_{z,m}$ and hence

$$\mathbb{1}_{A_{z,m}}(H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{z_-})) = \mathbb{1}_{A_{z,m}}((H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z \setminus Q_{z,m})) - (H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{z_-}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{z_-} \setminus Q_{z,m}))).$$

By (54) and the conditional Jensen inequality, it is enough to show that

$$(55) \quad \sup_{n,z} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{A_{z,m}}(H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z \setminus Q_{z,m})) \right)^4 \right] < \infty.$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{A_{z,m}}(H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z \setminus Q_{z,m})) \right)^4 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{A_{z,m}}(H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z \setminus Q_{z,m}))^4 \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{P}(A_{z,m})^{1/5} \mathbb{E} \left[(H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_z \setminus Q_{z,m}))^5 \right]^{4/5} \\ & \leq \sum_{m \geq 1} c' \exp(-c_2(m-1)/5) c_M m^{pM}, \end{aligned}$$

which is finite. Here, we used that the $A_{z,m}$ are disjoint, the Hölder inequality, the exponential tails of N_z from Lemma 31, and (9).

For the case $z_{i-1} \neq z_{i-}$, we note that this implies that z_i is at the boundary of Q_{a_n} . Hence, $V_{z_i} \setminus V_{z_{i-1}}$ is the union of $Q_{z_{i,1}}$ and a subset of $Q_{a_n}^c$. Define B_n to be the event that $Q_n \not\rightsquigarrow Q_{a_n-2-4r_0}^c$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. We now construct $\mathcal{X}''_{z_i} = T_{\tilde{U}_{z_i}, \eta_{z_i}}^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\tilde{U}_{z_i}}^*)$ and $\mathcal{X}''_{z_{i-1}} = T_{\tilde{U}_{z_{i-1}}, \eta_{z_{i-1}}}^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\tilde{U}_{z_{i-1}}}^*)$ using radial thinning centered at the origin (rather than at z_i). Then,

$$\Delta_{i,n} = \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{z_i}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{z_{i-1}}) | \eta_{z_i}].$$

On B_n , $\mathcal{X}''_{z_i} \cap Q_n = \mathcal{X}''_{z_{i-1}} \cap Q_n$ by Lemma 20. Hence, by the conditional Jensen and Hölder inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{i,n}^4] & \leq \mathbb{E}[1_{B_n^c} (H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{z_i}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{z_{i-1}}))^4] \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(B_n^c)^{1/5} (\mathbb{E}[(H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{z_i}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{z_{i-1}}))^5])^{4/5} \\ & \leq 2^4 \mathbb{P}(B_n^c)^{1/5} (\mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{z_i})^5]^{4/5} + \mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{z_{i-1}})^5]^{4/5}). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (9) with $Q_{z,m} = Q_n$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{z_i})^5] \leq c_M n^{pM}.$$

Hence, there are constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{i,n}^4] \leq C_1 n^p \exp(-C_2 \sqrt{n}),$$

which is bounded in n , thereby concluding the proof. \square

The following proposition gives a deterministic criterion for (9) to be satisfied.

Lemma 33. *Let \mathcal{X} be an infinite-volume Gibbs point process with translation-invariant PI satisfying (7). Consider a translation-invariant functional H and let H_n be defined as in (52). Then, the condition (11) implies (9).*

Proof. Note that

$$(56) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(H_n(\mathcal{X}) - H_n(\mathcal{X} \setminus Q_{z,m}))^5] &\leq c\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X} \cap Q_{z,m}} \exp(c\mathcal{X}(B_R(x)))\right)^5\right] \\ &\leq c\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{P} \cap Q_{z,m}} \exp(c\mathcal{P}(B_R(x)))\right)^5\right]. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality is obtained by adding points in $Q_n \cap \mathcal{X} \cap Q_{z,m}$ to $Q_n \cap \mathcal{X} \setminus Q_{z,m}$ one at a time and repeatedly use (11). For the second inequality, we realize \mathcal{X} as a thinning $\mathcal{X} = T^\infty(\mathcal{P})$.

Multiplying out $(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{P} \cap Q_{z,m}} \exp(c\mathcal{P}(B_R(x))))^5$, we get that (56) is a finite linear combination of terms of the form

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in (\mathcal{P} \cap Q_{z,m})^k_{\neq}} \prod_{i=1}^k \exp(s_i c\mathcal{P}(B_R(x_i)))\right] \\ &\leq \int_{Q_m^k} \alpha_0^k \mathbb{E}_{x_1, \dots, x_k} \left[\exp\left(5c\mathcal{P}\left(\bigcup_i B_R(x_i)\right)\right) \right] dx_1 \dots dx_k \\ &\leq C' m^{5d}, \end{aligned}$$

where $k \leq 5$, $s_1 + \dots + s_k = 5$ and $C' > 0$ is a constant independent of m . Here, $(\varphi)_{\neq}^k$ denotes the set of k -tuples of pairwise distinct points in the point pattern $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{x_1, \dots, x_k}$ denotes Palm expectation. Inserting this in (56) proves the claim. \square

The following proposition gives a deterministic criterion for H that ensures that (10) holds.

Lemma 34. *Condition (12) implies (10).*

Proof. Let l be given. For n sufficiently large, $Q_l \subseteq Q_{w_n, m_n}$ and hence $\varphi \cap Q_{w_n, m_n}$ is obtained from $\varphi \cap Q_{w_n, m_n} \setminus Q_l$ by adding the points of $\varphi \cap Q_l = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ one add a time. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &H(\varphi \cap Q_{w_n, m_n}) - H(\varphi \cap (Q_{w_n, m_n} \setminus Q_l)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k (H((\varphi \cap (Q_{w_n, m_n} \setminus Q_l)) \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_i\}) - H((\varphi \cap (Q_{w_n, m_n} \setminus Q_l)) \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}\})). \end{aligned}$$

For each term, the limit exists by the assumption (12) and translation invariance of H . \square

5.2.2. *Variance positivity.* We now complete the proof of Corollary 6 by showing the positivity of the limiting variance.

Proof of variance positivity in Corollary 6. In the proofs of Theorem 29 and 30, instead of using unit cubes, we could have used cubes of the form $az + Q_a$ for $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ and any $a > 0$. In the following we choose $a > 2s + 2(s \vee r_0)$. Defining $U_{z,a}$, $\eta_{z,a}$ and $\mathcal{X}'_{z,a}$ analogously to U_z , η_z and \mathcal{X}'_z , the limiting variance is $\sigma^2 = a^{-d} \mathbb{E} \Delta_{0,a}^2$, where $\Delta_{0,a}$ is the L^2 -limit of

$$\mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0-,a}) \mid \eta_{0,a}].$$

Thus, it is enough to show $\liminf_n \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0-,a}) \mid \eta_{0,a}]^2] > 0$.

For the proof, we construct an auxiliary process $\mathcal{X}''_{0,a} = \eta_{0-,a} \cup T_{\tilde{U}_{0,a}, \eta_{0-,a}}^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{U_{0,a}})$. Note that $\mathcal{X}''_{0,a}$ depends only on \mathcal{X} via $\eta_{0-,a}$ and $\mathcal{X}''_{0,a} \cap Q_a = \emptyset$. For a point process \mathcal{Y} , we define disjoint events

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \{\mathcal{Y} \cap Q_a = \emptyset\} \\ E_2 &= \{\mathcal{Y} \cap (Q_a \setminus Q_{a-2(r_0 \vee s)}) = \emptyset, \beta_q^{r,s}(\mathcal{Y} \cap Q_{a-2(r_0 \vee s)}) = 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Both events have positive probabilities when \mathcal{Y} is a Poisson process, see [13, Example 1.8]. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0-,a}) \mid \eta_{0,a}]^2 \right] \\
& \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [(H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0-,a}))(\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_1\} + \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_2\}) \mid \eta_{0,a}]^2 \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [(H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \setminus Q_a) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0-,a}))\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_1\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + (H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \setminus Q_a) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0-,a}) + 1)\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_2\} \mid \eta_{0,a}]^2 \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{0,a}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0-,a}) \mid \eta_{0,a}]^2 \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_1\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \mathbb{E} [H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{0,a}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a}) + 1 \mid \eta_{0,a}]^2 \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_2\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we used disjointness of E_1 and E_2 , measurability of $\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_1\}$ and $\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_2\}$ with respect to $\eta_{0,a}$, and the fact that on E_1 and E_2 , $\mathcal{X}'_{0,a}$ agrees with $\mathcal{X}''_{0,a}$ on \mathbb{R}^d and $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus Q_a$, respectively. Using the conditional Jensen inequality and the fact that both $\mathcal{X}''_{0,a}$ and $\mathcal{X}'_{0-,a}$ depend on $\eta_{0,a}$ only via $\eta_{0-,a}$, we obtain the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{0,a}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0-,a}) \mid \eta_{0-,a}]^2 \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_1\} \mid \eta_{0-,a}] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \mathbb{E} [H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{0,a}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0-,a}) + 1 \mid \eta_{0-,a}]^2 \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_2\} \mid \eta_{0-,a}] \right] \\
& \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\max \{ \mathbb{E} [H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{0,a}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0-,a}) \mid \eta_{0-,a}]^2, (\mathbb{E} [H_n(\mathcal{X}''_{0,a}) - H_n(\mathcal{X}'_{0-,a}) \mid \eta_{0-,a}] + 1)^2 \right] \\
& \quad \times \min_{i=1,2} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_i \mid \eta_{0-,a}) \Big] \\
& \geq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{i=1,2} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_i \mid \eta_{0-,a}) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality $a_1 b_1 + a_2 b_2 \geq (a_1 \vee a_2) \cdot (b_1 \wedge b_2)$ for $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 \geq 0$ was used to obtain the second inequality, and the third inequality used that $x^2 \vee (x+1)^2 \geq 1/4$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

For $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_1 \mid \eta_{0-,a})$, we have the deterministic lower bound

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_1 \mid \eta_{0-,a}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \in E_1 \mid \eta_{0-,a}) = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cap Q_a = \emptyset).$$

It thus remains to bound $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_2)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \in E_2) \\
& = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}'_{0,a} \cap (Q_a \setminus Q_{a-2(r_0 \vee s)}) = \emptyset) \mathbb{P}(\beta_q^{r,s}(\mathcal{X}_{0,a} \cap Q_{a-2(r_0 \vee s)}) = 1 \mid \mathcal{X}_{0,a} \cap (Q_a \setminus Q_{a-2(r_0 \vee s)}) = \emptyset) \\
& \geq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cap (Q_a \setminus Q_{a-2(r_0 \vee s)}) = \emptyset) \mathbb{P}(\beta_q^{r,s}(\mathcal{X}(Q_{a-2(r_0 \vee s)}, \emptyset)) = 1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality used the DLR equations (5). The probability $\mathbb{P}(\beta_q^{r,s}(\mathcal{X}(Q_{a-2(r_0 \vee s)}, \emptyset)) = 1)$ is non-zero because the corresponding probability for a Poisson process $\mathbb{P}(\beta_q^{r,s}(\mathcal{P} \cap Q_{a-2(r_0 \vee s)}) = 1)$ is positive and $\mathcal{X}(Q_{a-2(r_0 \vee s)}, \emptyset)$ has a positive density with respect to $\mathcal{P} \cap Q_{a-2(r_0 \vee s)}$ by the assumption $\kappa > 0$. \square

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 4 – NORMAL APPROXIMATION FOR GIBBSIAN SCORE SUMS

Before elaborating on the technical details of the proof of Theorem 4, we first give a broad overview of the main idea. We consider the general framework for a random measure Ξ on \mathbb{R}^d . In the proof of Theorem 4, this will be applied to the random measure

$$(57) \quad \Xi := \Xi[\mathcal{X}] := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X} \cap Q} g(x, \mathcal{X}) \delta_x,$$

noting that $|\Xi| := \Xi(\mathbb{R}^d) = H(\mathcal{X})$ is the score sum defined at (13).

The concept of Palm theory is of central importance for our approach. We recall that a collection of random measures $\{\Xi_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ is a *Palm version* of Ξ if it satisfies

$$(58) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x, \Xi) \Xi(dx) \right] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[f(x, \Xi_x)] \Lambda(dx)$$

for all non-negative measurable f , where $\Lambda := \mathbb{E}[\Xi]$ denotes the intensity measure. Moreover, we set $\sigma^2 := \text{Var}(|\Xi|) := \text{Var}(\Xi(\mathbb{R}^d))$. For an introduction to Palm theory and in particular for the definition of Palm processes with respect to random measures, we refer to [15, Section 6].

Assume that Ξ and its Palm version $\{\Xi_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ are defined on the same probability space and let

$$(59) \quad Y_x := |\Xi_x| - |\Xi|, \quad \Delta_x := \frac{Y_x}{\sigma} = \frac{|\Xi_x| - |\Xi|}{\sigma}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The proof of Theorem 4 relies on the following theorem from [6], which follows by an application of Stein's method.

Theorem 35 (Theorem 3.1 in [6]). *Let Ξ , $\{\Xi_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$, $\{Y_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$, and $\{\Delta_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ be as in (59). Then,*

$$d_K \left(\frac{|\Xi| - \mathbb{E}|\Xi|}{\sigma}, N(0, 1) \right) \leq 2E_1 + 5.5E_2 + 5E_3 + 10E_4 + 7E_5$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &:= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (Y_x \mathbb{1}\{|Y_x| \leq \sigma\} - \mathbb{E}[Y_x \mathbb{1}\{|Y_x| \leq \sigma\}]) \Lambda(dx) \right|, \\ E_2 &:= \frac{1}{\sigma^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[Y_x^2 \mathbb{1}\{|Y_x| \leq \sigma\}] \Lambda(dx), \\ E_3 &:= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[|Y_x| \mathbb{1}\{|Y_x| > \sigma\}] \Lambda(dx), \\ E_4 &:= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \int_{-1}^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \text{Cov}(\phi_x(t), \phi_y(t)) \Lambda(dx) \Lambda(dy) dt, \\ E_5 &:= \frac{1}{\sigma} \left(\int_{-1}^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |t| \text{Cov}(\phi_x(t), \phi_y(t)) \Lambda(dx) \Lambda(dy) dt \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where to simplify the notation, we write

$$\phi_x(t) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}\{1 \geq \Delta_x > t > 0\}, & t > 0, \\ \mathbb{1}\{-1 \leq \Delta_x < t < 0\}, & t < 0. \end{cases}$$

Typically, the most delicate expressions are the terms E_1 , E_4 , and E_5 . This is because, loosely speaking, those terms encode a bound on the deviation of the difference Y_x when averaged over space. In contrast, the terms E_2, E_3 only involve moment bounds at individual space points.

To prove of Theorem 4, we will specify the processes Ξ and $\{\Xi_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ in Theorem 35 and show that the terms E_1, \dots, E_5 can be bounded by the right-hand side asserted in Theorem 4. We write $\{\mathcal{X}_x^\Xi\}_{x \in Q}$ for a Palm version of \mathcal{X} with respect to Ξ in Q . That is, for all measurable $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$,

$$(60) \quad \mathbb{E} \int_Q f(x, \mathcal{X}) \Xi(dx) = \int_Q \mathbb{E} f(x, \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi) \Lambda(dx).$$

We note that assumption (14) ensures the σ -finiteness of Λ , and thereby the existence of a Palm version $\{\mathcal{X}_x^\Xi\}_{x \in Q}$, see [14]. Taking $f(x, \mathcal{X}) = \tilde{f}(x, \Xi[\mathcal{X}])$ in (60) shows that $\{\Xi[\mathcal{X}_x^\Xi]\}_{x \in Q}$ is a Palm version $\{\Xi_x\}_{x \in Q}$ of Ξ satisfying (58). Lemma 36 below shows that the reduced Palm process of \mathcal{X} with respect to Ξ at some point $x \in Q$ is a Gibbs process. This property is used in the proof of Theorem 4 to justify that we can construct a coupling of Ξ and its Palm version via disagreement coupling.

Lemma 36. *For a.a. $x \in Q$, the reduced process $\mathcal{X}_x^{\mathcal{X}, \Xi} := \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi \setminus \{x\}$ is a Gibbs process with PI κ_x given by*

$$\kappa_x(y, \omega) := \kappa(y, \omega \cup \{x\}) \frac{g(x, \omega \cup \{x, y\})}{g(x, \omega \cup \{x\})}$$

where $0/0 := 0$.

Note that for $\|y - x\| > R(x, \omega)$, we have that $\kappa_x(y, \omega) = \kappa(y, \omega)$. This will be the case in our application of Lemma 36 in the proof of Theorem 4.

Proof. We must verify (6) for $\mathcal{X}_x^{1, \Xi}$. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be measurable. We note that the Palm versions are only defined uniquely up to a Lebesgue measure zero set of points $x \in Q$. Therefore, it suffices to show that for all measurable $h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$,

$$(61) \quad \int_Q h(x) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{Y_i \in \mathcal{X}_x^{1, \Xi}} f(Y_i, \mathcal{X}_x^{1, \Xi}) \right] \Lambda(dx) = \int_Q h(x) \int \mathbb{E} \left[f(y, \mathcal{X}_x^{1, \Xi} \cup \{y\}) \kappa_x(y, \mathcal{X}_x^{1, \Xi}) \right] dy \Lambda(dx).$$

Here, the right-hand side is, by the definitions of $\mathcal{X}_x^{1, \Xi}$ in (60) and of $\kappa_x(y, \omega)$, given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_Q h(x) \int_Q f(y, (\mathcal{X} \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{y\}) \kappa_x(y, \mathcal{X} \setminus \{x\}) dy \Xi(dx) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{X_i \in \mathcal{X}} h(X_i) \int_Q f(y, (\mathcal{X} \setminus \{X_i\}) \cup \{y\}) \kappa(y, \mathcal{X}) g(X_i, \mathcal{X} \cup \{y\}) dy \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We use Fubini's theorem and apply (6) to the integral over y to get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{X_i \neq X_j \in \mathcal{X}} h(X_i) f(X_j, \mathcal{X} \setminus \{X_i\}) g(X_i, \mathcal{X}) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_Q h(x) \sum_{X_j \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{x\}} f(y, \mathcal{X} \setminus \{x\}) \Xi(dx) \right].$$

It follows from the definition (60) of $\mathcal{X}_x^{1, \Xi}$ that the above coincides with the left-hand side in (61). \square

The proof of Theorem 4 is based on the following coupling construction. Let

$$r := 4s := 4 \max\{r_0, c_s \log |Q|\} \quad \text{with} \quad c_s := 120 \max\{c_{\text{SP}\Gamma, 2}^{-1}, c_{\text{es}}^{-1}\},$$

where $c_{\text{SP}\Gamma, 2} > 0$ is the constant from Corollary 16 and $c_{\text{es}} > 0$ is introduced in (15). Here, the choice of the prefactor 120 guarantees that r and s are large enough such that the bounds asserted in Lemma 37 and Lemma 38 hold. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ be a Gibbs process with PI κ and let $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_x^\Xi$, $x \in Q$, be independent reduced Palm processes of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ with respect to Ξ at x , which is possible by the existence of uncountable product measures, see [14, Corollary 6.18]. We specify $Q^+ := B_{2r}(Q)$, $\Psi := \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \cap (Q^+)^c$, $\Psi_x = \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_x^\Xi \cap ((Q^+)^c \cup B_s(x))$ and $\kappa'_x(z, \varphi) := \kappa_x(z, \varphi_{B_s(x)^c} \cup (\Psi_x \cap B_s(x))) \mathbb{1}\{z \in B_s(x)^c\}$, with κ_x from Lemma 36. Hence, when conditioned on Ψ and $\{\Psi_x\}_{x \in Q}$, we can carry out the disagreement coupling of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_x^\Xi$, i.e.,

$$(62) \quad \mathcal{X} := T_{Q^+, (Q^+)^c, \Psi}^{\text{rad}, x}(\mathcal{P}_{Q^+}^*) \cup \Psi, \quad \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi := \begin{cases} T_{Q^+, (Q^+)^c, \Psi_x \cap (Q^+)^c}^{\text{rad}, x}(\mathcal{P}_{Q^+}^*) \cup \Psi_x & \text{if } R(x, \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_x^\Xi) \leq s, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_x^\Xi \cup \Psi_x & \text{if } R(x, \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_x^\Xi) > s, \end{cases}$$

where $T^{\text{rad}, x}$ denotes radial thinning with respect to κ'_x . It is important to note that despite the more complicated definition, the process \mathcal{X}_x^Ξ has also the correct distribution as a Palm process. This is because of the DLR equation, which is applied by first conditioning on Ψ_x , and then sampling the remaining Gibbs process with one of the two options depending on the value $R(x, \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_x^\Xi)$. Also note that while in the random measure Ξ we only sum over points in Q , the dependence through the score functions means that Ξ also depends on the configuration of \mathcal{X} outside Q . Therefore, we use the enlarged window $Q^+ = B_{2r}(Q)$ in the disagreement couplings in (62).

Given Ψ_x , it follows from Proposition 11 that $T^{\text{rad}, x}_{Q^+, (Q^+)^c, \Psi_x \cap (Q^+)^c}(\mathcal{P}_{Q^+}^*)$ is a Gibbs process on Q^+ with PI κ'_x and boundary condition Ψ_x . On the other hand, $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_x^\Xi \cap Q^+$ conditioned on Ψ_x is by (8) also a Gibbs process on Q^+ with PI κ'_x and boundary condition Ψ_x . Since the distribution of a Gibbs process is unique on compact domains, we conclude that conditionally on Ψ_x ,

$$T^{\text{rad}, x}_{Q^+, (Q^+)^c, \Psi_x \cap (Q^+)^c}(\mathcal{P}_{Q^+}^*) \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_x^\Xi \cap Q^+ x,$$

and similarly $T_{Q^+, (Q^+)^c, \Psi}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q^+}^*) \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \cap Q^+$ conditionally on Ψ . Therefore, $\mathcal{X}_x^\Xi \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_x^\Xi$ and similarly $\mathcal{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ by the DLR-equations (8). In particular, $\{\mathcal{X}_x^\Xi\}_{x \in Q}$ is a Palm version of \mathcal{X} with respect to Ξ on Q . It follows that $\{\Xi[\mathcal{X}_x^\Xi]\}_{x \in Q}$ is a Palm version of Ξ on Q .

The moment bound provided by the following lemma will be used in the proof of Theorem 4.

Lemma 37 (Moment bound for Y_x). *Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Borel set. Assume that the PI κ satisfies (7) and that (14) and (15) hold. For $x \in Q$ let $\Xi := \Xi[\mathcal{X}]$ and $\Xi_x := \Xi[\mathcal{X}_x^\Xi]$, where \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}_x^Ξ are given at (62). For $m \leq 4$ there is some $q_0 = q_0(d, \alpha_0, r_0, c_{\text{es}}, c_{\text{SPT}, 2}) > 0$ such that for $|Q| > q_0$ we have*

$$\int_Q \mathbb{E}[|Y_x|^m] \Lambda(dx) \leq c_Y |Q| s^{dm},$$

where $c_Y = c_Y(d, \alpha_0, r_0, m, c_m) > 0$.

Lemma 38 (Covariance bound). *Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Borel set. Assume that the PI κ satisfies (7) and that (14) and (15) hold. Let $p > 0$ and $F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be measurable. Furthermore, assume that there is some $q_0 = q_0(d, \alpha_0, r_0, c_{\text{es}}, c_{\text{SPT}, 2}, p) > 0$ such that $F(\varphi) \leq |Q|^p \#\varphi$ for $|Q| > q_0$ and $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}$. For those Q we have*

$$\iint_{Q^2 \cap \{|x-y| > 4r\}} \text{Cov}(F_x, F_y) \Lambda^2(dx, dy) \leq |Q|^{-1},$$

where $F_x := F(\mathcal{X}_{x,r})$ with $\mathcal{X}_{x,r} := \mathcal{X} \cap B_r(x)$ for any measurable $F : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$.

Remark 39. The bound in Lemma 38 is not at all sharp but sufficient for our purposes. As the proof reveals, Lemma 38 also holds if F_x or F_y is replaced by $F(\mathcal{X} \cap B_r(x))$ or $F(\mathcal{X} \cap B_r(y))$, respectively. In this case, the first step of the proof (where F_z is truncated) can be avoided.

From Lemma 37 we can now directly conclude that

$$\sigma^3(E_2 + E_3) \leq \int_Q \mathbb{E}[Y_x^2] \Lambda(dx) \leq c_Y |Q| s^{2d}.$$

For the remaining error terms, we will apply Lemma 37 and Lemma 38 to deduce that

$$(63) \quad E_1 \leq c_{E_1} s^{2d} \sigma^{-3} |Q|, \quad E_4 \leq c_{E_4} s^{2d} \sigma^{-3} |Q|, \quad E_5 \leq c_{E_5} s^{2d} \sigma^{-3} |Q|$$

for some constants $c_{E_i} = c_{E_i}(d, \alpha_0, c_m) > 0$, $i = 1, 4, 5$. This implies the assertion of Theorem 4 with the constant $c_{\text{norm}} := c_s^{2d}(c_Y + c_{E_1} + c_{E_4} + c_{E_5})$.

We now proceed with the proofs of the two lemmas and thereafter establish the bounds in (63).

Proof of Lemma 37. Set $\Xi^> := \Xi - \Xi^\leq$, $\Xi_x^> := \Xi_x - \Xi_x^\leq$ and $\mathcal{X} \Delta \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi := (\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi) \cup (\mathcal{X}_x^\Xi \setminus \mathcal{X})$, where

$$(64) \quad \Xi_x^\leq := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi \cap Q} g(y, \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi) \mathbb{1}\{R(y, \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi) \leq s\} \delta_y, \quad \Xi^\leq := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X} \cap Q} g(y, \mathcal{X}) \mathbb{1}\{R(y, \mathcal{X}) \leq s\} \delta_y.$$

Furthermore, we also put $\Xi_{x,r} := \Xi_x^\leq(B_r(x))$. We decompose Y_x as

$$(|\Xi_x^>| - |\Xi^>|) + (\Xi_x^\leq(B_r(x)) - \Xi^\leq(B_r(x))) + (\Xi_x^\leq(B_r(x)^c) - \Xi^\leq(B_r(x)^c)) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X} \Delta \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi \not\subseteq B_{3s}(x)\}.$$

From the Hölder inequality applied to both the expectation and the integral with respect to Λ , we get

$$(65) \quad \int_Q \mathbb{E}[|Y_x|^m] \Lambda(dx) \leq \sum_{\substack{(i_1, \dots, i_6): \\ i_1 + \dots + i_6 = m}} \left[\left(\int_Q \mathbb{E}[\Xi_x^\leq(B_r(x))^m] \Lambda(dx) \right)^{\frac{i_1}{m}} \left(\int_Q \mathbb{E}[\Xi^\leq(B_r(x))^m] \Lambda(dx) \right)^{\frac{i_2}{m}} \right. \\ \times \left(\int_Q \mathbb{E}[|\Xi_x^>|^m] \Lambda(dx) \right)^{\frac{i_3}{m}} \left(\int_Q \mathbb{E}[|\Xi^>|^m] \Lambda(dx) \right)^{\frac{i_4}{m}} \\ \times \left(\int_Q \mathbb{E}[|\Xi_x^\leq|^m \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X} \Delta \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi \not\subseteq B_{3s}(x)\}] \Lambda(dx) \right)^{\frac{i_5}{m}} \\ \left. \times \left(\int_Q \mathbb{E}[|\Xi^\leq|^m \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X} \Delta \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi \not\subseteq B_{3s}(x)\}] \Lambda(dx) \right)^{\frac{i_6}{m}} \right].$$

We now bound the six integrals on the right-hand side in (65) separately. For the first integral, we obtain by an expansion of the m th power and iteratively applying (6),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_Q \mathbb{E}[\Xi_x^{\leq}(B_r(x))^m] \Lambda(dx) \\
& \leq \int_Q \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{X_j \in \mathcal{X}_x^{\Xi} \cap B_r(x)} g(X_j, \mathcal{X}_x^{\Xi})\right)^m\right] \Lambda(dx) \\
& = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{X_i \in \mathcal{X} \cap Q} g(X_i, \mathcal{X}) \left(\sum_{X_j \in \mathcal{X} \cap B_r(X_i)} g(X_j, \mathcal{X})\right)^m\right] \\
& = \int_Q \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{\substack{(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}): \\ i_1 + \dots + i_{k+1} = m}} \mathbb{E}\left[\kappa(x, \mathcal{X}) g(x, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x\})^{i_{k+1}+1} \sum_{(X_1, \dots, X_k) \in (\mathcal{X} \cap B_r(x))^{\neq}} \prod_{j=1}^k g(X_j, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x\})^{i_j}\right] dx \\
(66) \quad & = \int_Q \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{\substack{(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}): \\ i_1 + \dots + i_{k+1} = m}} \int_{B_r(x)^k} \mathbb{E}\left[\kappa(\{x, \mathbf{w}\}, \mathcal{X}) g(x, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x, \mathbf{w}\})^{i_{k+1}+1} \prod_{j=1}^k g(w_j, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x, \mathbf{w}\})^{i_j}\right] d\mathbf{w} dx,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa(\{x, \mathbf{w}\}, \mathcal{X}) := \kappa(x, \mathcal{X})\kappa(w_1, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x\}) \cdots \kappa(w_k, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}\})$ for $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_k) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^k$. Using the moment condition (14), we find that the above is bounded by

$$|Q| \sum_{k \leq m} \sum_{\substack{(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}): \\ i_1 + \dots + i_{k+1} = m}} \alpha_0^{k+1} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in Q^{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[g(x_1, \mathcal{X} \cup \{\mathbf{x}\})^{k+1}] |B_r(x)|^k \leq c_1 |Q| r^{dm}$$

for some constant $c_1 = c_1(d, \alpha_0, m, c_m)$. The same bound can be established for the second integral on the right-hand side in (65).

For the third integral in (65), we find analogously to above that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_Q \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\sum_{X_j \in \mathcal{X}_x^{\Xi}} g(X_j, \mathcal{X}_x^{\Xi}) \mathbb{1}\{R(X_j, \mathcal{X}_x^{\Xi}) > s\}\right|^m\right] \Lambda(dx) \\
& \leq \int_Q \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{\substack{(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}): \\ i_1 + \dots + i_{k+1} = m}} \left\{ \int_{Q^k} \mathbb{E}\left[\kappa(\{x, \mathbf{w}\}, \mathcal{X}) g(x, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x, \mathbf{w}\})^{i_{k+1}+1} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \times \prod_{j=1}^k g(w_j, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x, \mathbf{w}\})^{i_j} \mathbb{1}\{R(w_j, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x, \mathbf{w}\}) > s\}\right] d\mathbf{w} dx \right\} \\
& \leq \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{\substack{(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}): \\ i_1 + \dots + i_{k+1} = m}} \left\{ \alpha_0^{k+1} |Q|^{k+1} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in Q^{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[g(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{X} \cup \{\mathbf{x}\})^{i_{k+1}+1} \prod_{j=1}^k g(x_j, \mathcal{X} \cup \{\mathbf{x}\})^{i_j} \mathbb{1}\{R(x_j, \mathcal{X} \cup \{\mathbf{x}\}) > s\}] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we bound every indicator in the expectation except for the one with $j = 1$ by 1. Then, we apply the Hölder inequality with $m+2$ factors (counted with multiplicities). This gives by (14) and (15) the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k \leq m} \sum_{\substack{(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}): \\ i_1 + \dots + i_{k+1} = m}} \alpha_0^{k+1} |Q|^{k+1} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in Q^{k+1}} \mathbb{P}(R(x_1, \mathcal{X} \cup \{\mathbf{x}\}) > s)^{\frac{1}{m+2}} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in Q^{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[g(x_1, \mathcal{X} \cup \{\mathbf{x}\})^{m+2}]^{\frac{m+1}{m+2}} \\
(67) \quad & \leq |Q|^{m+1} e^{-\frac{c_{\text{ES}} s}{2(m+2)}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds for $|Q|$ large enough. The integral of $\mathbb{E}[|\Xi|>|^m]$ in (65) can be bounded similarly.

For the fifth integral in (65), we find from the Hölder inequality the bound

$$(68) \quad \left(\int_Q \mathbb{E} \left[|\Xi_x|^{m+1} \right] \Lambda(dx) \right)^{\frac{m}{m+1}} \left(\int_Q \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X} \Delta \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi \not\subseteq B_{3s}(x)) \Lambda(dx) \right)^{\frac{1}{m+1}}.$$

Now, it follows from the bounded moments condition (14) analogously to the bounds of the terms in (66) that the first integral is bounded by $c_2|Q|^{m+2}$ for some $c_2 = c_2(\alpha_0, m, c_m) > 0$, whereas we bound the probability in the second integral by

$$(69) \quad \mathbb{P}(R(x, \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi) > s) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X} \Delta \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi \not\subseteq B_{3s}(x), R(x, \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi) \leq s).$$

By definition of \mathcal{X}_x^Ξ , the Λ -integral of the first probability is given by

$$(70) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{x \in Q} \mathbb{1}\{R(x, \mathcal{X}) > s\} g(x, \mathcal{X}) \right] &= \int_Q \mathbb{E}[\kappa(x, \mathcal{X}) \mathbb{1}\{R(x, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x\}) > s\} g(x, \mathcal{X})] dx \\ &\leq \alpha_0 \int_Q \mathbb{P}(R(x, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x\}) > s)^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[g(x, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x\})^2]^{1/2} dx \\ &\leq e^{-c_{\text{es}}s/4}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds for $|Q|$ large enough and we have used (7) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in the last line. To treat the second probability in (69), we apply Theorem 25. To that end, we note that for $R(x, \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi) \leq s$ we have by the stopping property of R that conditioned on $\Psi_{x,0} := \Psi_x \cap B_s(x)$,

$$\kappa'_x(y, \varphi) = \kappa_x(y, \varphi) = \kappa(y, \varphi), \quad y \in Q \setminus B_{2s}(x).$$

Hence, κ and κ'_x satisfy assumption (7) and we obtain from Theorem 25 with $B := B_s(x)$ and $A = P := Q \setminus B_{3s}(x)$ that

$$(71) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X} \Delta \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi \not\subseteq B_{3s}(x), R(x, \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi) \leq s) \leq c_{\text{DP}}|Q| \exp(-c_{\text{SPT},2}s/3),$$

where c_{DP} and $c_{\text{SPT},2}$ are the constants from Theorem 25. The sixth integral in (65) is treated analogously. \square

Proof of Lemma 38. For $z \in \{x, y\}$ we set $R_z := R(z, \mathcal{X}_z)$ and write

$$\tilde{F}_z := F(\mathcal{X}_z \cap B_r(z)) \mathbb{1}\{R_z \leq s\}.$$

Then,

$$(72) \quad \text{Cov}(F_x, F_y) = \text{Cov}(\tilde{F}_x, \tilde{F}_y) + \text{Cov}(\tilde{F}_x, F_y \mathbb{1}\{R_y > s\}) + \text{Cov}(F_x \mathbb{1}\{R_x > s\}, F_y)$$

As the steps for the second and the third covariance are similar, we only discuss the second in detail. Here, using that F is nonnegative, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives the upper bound

$$(73) \quad \mathbb{E}[F_x^2]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[F_y^2 \mathbb{1}\{R_y > s\}]^{1/2}.$$

An upper bound for the negative covariance can be derived similarly. By Jensen's inequality and (7), the Λ^2 -integral of (73) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(Q) &\left(\iint \mathbb{E}[F_x^2] \mathbb{E}[F_y^2 \mathbb{1}\{R_y > s\}] \Lambda^2(dx, dy) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \Lambda(Q) \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} F(\mathcal{X} \cap B_r(x))^2 g(x, \mathcal{X}) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} F(\mathcal{X} \cap B_r(y))^2 g(y, \mathcal{X}) \mathbb{1}\{R(y, \mathcal{X}) > s\} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We set $N_{z,r} := \#((\mathcal{X} \cup \{z\}) \cap B_r(z))$ for $z \in \{x, y\}$, $q_y := \mathbb{P}(R(y, \mathcal{X} \cup \{y\}) > s)$ and find from the GNZ equation (6), Hölder's inequality and (15) that the above is for $|Q| > q_0$ bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \alpha_0 |Q|^{2p} \Lambda(Q) \left(\iint \mathbb{E}[N_{x,r}^2 g(x, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x\})] \mathbb{E}[N_{y,r}^2 g(y, \mathcal{X} \cup \{y\})] \mathbb{1}\{R(y, \mathcal{X} \cup \{y\}) > s\} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \alpha_0 |Q|^{2p} \Lambda(Q) \left(\iint \mathbb{E}[N_{x,r}^4]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}[g(x, \mathcal{X} \cup \{x\})^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}[N_{y,r}^4]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}[g(y, \mathcal{X} \cup \{y\})^4]^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{q_y} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
(74) \quad &\leq \alpha_0 |Q|^{2p} \Lambda(Q)^2 \sup_{y \in Q} \mathbb{E}[g(y, \mathcal{X} \cup \{y\})^4]^{1/4} \sup_{y \in Q} \mathbb{E}[N_{y,r}^4]^{3/8} q_y^{1/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we use (14) and that $\sup_{y \in Q} \mathbb{E}[N_{y,r}^4] \leq c_1 r^{4d}$ and thus find that the above is bounded by $c_2 r^{3d/2} |Q|^{2(p+1)} q_y^{1/4}$, where $c_1 > 0$ and $c_2 > 0$ only depend on α_0 and c_m .

For the first covariance on the right-hand side in (72), we first work conditioned on Ψ_x and Ψ_y . Then, again, we want to apply Theorem 25 with $A := B_{2s}(z)$ and $P = B_{2r}(x)$, $B = B_s(x)$ for $z = y$ and $P = B_{2r}(y)$, $B = B_s(y)$ for $z = x$. Setting $\Psi_{z,0} := \Psi_z \cap B_s(z)$, we consider the PI

$$\kappa_{1,z}(w, \varphi) := \kappa(w, \varphi_{B_s(z)^c \cup \Psi_z}) \mathbb{1}\{w \in Q^+ \setminus B_s(z)\},$$

and the interpolation PI

$$\kappa'_1(w, \varphi) := \begin{cases} \kappa(w, \varphi_{B_s(x)^c \cup \Psi_{x,0}}) & w \in B_{2r}(x) \setminus B_s(x), \\ \kappa(w, \varphi_{B_s(y)^c \cup \Psi_{y,0}}) & w \in B_{2r}(y) \setminus B_s(y), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, as before conditioned on Ψ_x and Ψ_y , we note that on the event $\{R(z, \Psi_{z,0}) \leq s\}$, the process \mathcal{X}_z^Ξ is a Gibbs process on $Q^+ \setminus B_s(z)$ with PI $\kappa_{1,z}(w, \varphi)$ and boundary conditions $\Psi_{z,0}$. Hence, when defining

$$\mathcal{X}' := T_{Q^+, (Q^+)^c, \Psi_{x,0} \cup \Psi_{y,0}}^{\text{rad}}(\mathcal{P}_{Q^+}^*) \cup \Psi_{x,0} \cup \Psi_{y,0},$$

where κ'_1 is used in the definition of T^{rad} , Theorem 25 gives for $S_z := \{\mathcal{X}_z^\Xi \cap B_{2s}(z) = \mathcal{X}' \cap B_{2s}(z)\}$ that

$$(75) \quad \mathbb{P}(S_z^c) \leq c_{\text{DP}} |B_{4s}| e^{-c_{\text{SPT}, 2^s}}.$$

Similarly as before, we bound the first covariance on the right-hand side in (72) by

$$\text{Cov}(\tilde{F}_x \mathbb{1}_{S_x}, \tilde{F}_y \mathbb{1}_{S_y}) + \text{Cov}(\tilde{F}_x \mathbb{1}_{S_x^c}, \tilde{F}_y \mathbb{1}_{S_y}) + \text{Cov}(\tilde{F}_x, \tilde{F}_y \mathbb{1}_{S_y^c}).$$

Here, we use (75) to bound the last two covariances similarly to (74). Setting $\tilde{F}'_x := \tilde{F}(\mathcal{X}'_{x,r})$ where $\mathcal{X}'_{x,r} := \mathcal{X}' \cap B_r(x)$, the first covariance is further decomposed into

$$(76) \quad \text{Cov}(\tilde{F}'_x, \tilde{F}'_y) - \text{Cov}(\tilde{F}'_x \mathbb{1}_{S_x}, \tilde{F}'_y \mathbb{1}_{S_y^c}) - \text{Cov}(\tilde{F}'_x \mathbb{1}_{S_x^c}, \tilde{F}'_y \mathbb{1}_{S_y}) - \text{Cov}(\tilde{F}'_x \mathbb{1}_{S_x^c}, \tilde{F}'_y \mathbb{1}_{S_y^c}).$$

Note that the computations for the last three covariances are similar to the ones carried out above. Hence, we only consider the first covariance in detail. It is given by

$$(77) \quad \mathbb{E}[\text{Cov}(\tilde{F}'_x, \tilde{F}'_y \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y)] + \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_x \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y], \mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_y \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y]).$$

To bound the first term, we first note that by the tower property of conditional expectation,

$$\text{Cov}(\tilde{F}'_x, \tilde{F}'_y \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y) = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_y (\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_x \mid \Psi_x, \mathcal{X}'_{y,r}] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_x \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y]) \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y].$$

To bound the difference of the expectations in the round brackets, we apply Corollary 16 with $A := B_r(x)$ and the Gibbs process \mathcal{X}' . Using here that $\tilde{F}(\mathcal{X}'_{x,r}) \leq |Q|^p \#(\mathcal{X}'_{x,r}) \leq |Q|^p \mathcal{P}(B_r(x))$ almost surely, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_x \mid \Psi_x, \mathcal{X}'_{y,r}] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_x \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y]| \\
&\leq |Q|^p \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(B_r(x)) d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}'_{x,r} \mid \Psi_x, \mathcal{X}'_{y,r}), \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}'_{x,r} \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y))] \\
&\leq |Q|^p c_{\text{SPT}, 1} |B_{r+r_0}(x)| e^{-2c_{\text{SPT}, 2^s}} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(B_r(x))] \leq c_3 c_{\text{SPT}, 1} e^{-c_{\text{SPT}, 2^s}} r^{2d} |Q|^p.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\text{Cov}(\tilde{F}'_x, \tilde{F}'_y \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y) \leq c_4 c_{\text{SPT},1} e^{-c_{\text{SPT},2} s} r^{3d} |Q|^{2p}$ for some $c_3 = c_3(\alpha_0, r_0, d) > 0$ and $c_4 = c_4(\alpha_0, r_0, d) > 0$. We split the second term from (77) into

$$(78) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_x \mid \Psi_x], \mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_y \mid \Psi_y]) + \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_x \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_x \mid \Psi_x], \mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_y \mid \Psi_y]) \\ & + \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_x \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y], \mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_y \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_y \mid \Psi_y]). \end{aligned}$$

Due to the independence of Ψ_x and Ψ_y , the first covariance vanishes. The second and the third covariances can be treated very similarly, so we only consider the second one. Here, we use that $\tilde{F}(\mathcal{X}'_{x,r}) \leq |Q|^p \#(\mathcal{X}'_{x,r}) \leq |Q|^p \mathcal{P}(B_r(x))$ and obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_x \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}'_x \mid \Psi_x])^2]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{F}'_y)^2]^{1/2} \\ & \leq |Q|^{2p} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(B_r(x))^2 d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}'_{x,r} \mid \Psi_x, \Psi_y), \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}'_{x,r} \mid \Psi_x))]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(B_r(x))^2]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 16, the total variation distance is bounded by $c_{\text{SPT},1} |B_{r+r_0}(x)| e^{-2c_{\text{SPT},2} s}$ uniformly in Ψ_y . Therefore, we obtain the bound $c_5 c_{\text{SPT},1} |Q|^{2p} r^{4d} e^{-2c_{\text{SPT},2} s}$ for some $c_5 = c_5(\alpha_0, r_0)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. It remains to establish the bounds from (63).

E₁. First, we have that

$$(79) \quad \begin{aligned} \sigma^4 E_1^2 & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_Q (Y_x \mathbb{1}\{|Y_x| \leq \sigma\} - \mathbb{E}[Y_x \mathbb{1}\{|Y_x| \leq \sigma\}]) \Lambda(dx) \right)^2 \right] \\ & = \iint_{Q^2} \text{Cov}(Y_x \mathbb{1}\{|Y_x| \leq \sigma\}, Y_y \mathbb{1}\{|Y_y| \leq \sigma\}) \Lambda(dx) \Lambda(dy). \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show that the right-hand side is bounded by $c_Y \sigma^{-2} |Q|^{2r^{4d}}$. We write $Y_x^{\leq} := Y_x \mathbb{1}\{|Y_x| \leq \sigma\}$ and $Y_x^> := Y_x \mathbb{1}\{|Y_x| > \sigma\}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and reformulate the covariance in (79) by

$$(80) \quad \text{Cov}(Y_x, Y_y) - \text{Cov}(Y_x^{\leq}, Y_y^>) - \text{Cov}(Y_x^>, Y_y).$$

The second and third covariances can be treated similarly. Hence, we only discuss the integral over the first and the second covariance. Here, we use the Hölder inequality to bound the covariance in the second integral by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(Y_x^{\leq}, Y_y^>) & \leq \mathbb{E}[|Y_x^{\leq} - \mathbb{E}Y_x^{\leq}|^4]^{1/4} \mathbb{E} \left[\left((|Y_y^> - \mathbb{E}Y_y^>|)^{1/3} \right)^4 \right]^{3/4} \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[(|Y_x^{\leq}| + |\mathbb{E}Y_x^{\leq}|)^4]^{1/4} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(|Y_y^>|^{1/3} + |\mathbb{E}Y_y^>|^{1/3} \right)^4 \right]^{3/4}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we evaluate the fourth powers under the expectations and apply Jensen's inequality with the convex mappings $z \mapsto z^4$ and $z \mapsto z^{4/3}$ to each of the resulting terms. This yields the bound

$$\begin{aligned} (16\mathbb{E}[|Y_x^{\leq}|^4])^{1/4} (16\mathbb{E}[|Y_y^>|^{4/3}])^{3/4} & \leq 16\mathbb{E}[Y_x^4]^{1/4} \mathbb{E}[|Y_y^>|^{4/3}]^{3/4} \\ & \leq 16\mathbb{E}[Y_x^4]^{1/4} \mathbb{E}[Y_y^4]^{1/4} \mathbb{P}(Y_y^4 > \sigma^4)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, bounding the last probability by Markov's inequality, we find from Lemma 37 and from Jensen's inequality applied to the normalized Λ -integrals, that the integral over the second covariance in (80) is bounded by

$$16\sigma^{-2} \iint_{Q^2} \mathbb{E}[Y_x^4]^{1/4} \mathbb{E}[Y_y^4]^{3/4} \Lambda(dx) \Lambda(dy) \leq 16\Lambda(Q) \sigma^{-2} \int_Q \mathbb{E}[Y_x^4] \Lambda(dx) \leq 16\alpha_0 c_Y \sigma^{-2} |Q|^{2s^{4d}}.$$

It remains to bound the integral over the first covariance in (80), which we split by

$$(81) \quad \int_{Q^2} \mathbb{1}\{|x-y| \leq 4r\} \text{Cov}(Y_x, Y_y) \Lambda(dx) \Lambda(dy) + \int_Q \int_{Q \setminus B_{4r}(y)} \text{Cov}(Y_x, Y_y) \Lambda(dx) \Lambda(dy).$$

Here, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives $\text{Cov}(Y_x, Y_y) \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[Y_x^2]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[Y_y^2]} \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_x^2] + \mathbb{E}[Y_y^2]$. Hence, we can bound the first integral in (81) using Lemma 37 by

$$2|B_{4r}(y)| \int_Q \mathbb{E}[Y_x^2] \Lambda(dx) \leq 2\kappa_d 16^d c_Y |Q| s^{3d}.$$

To deal with the second integral in (81), we set $\Xi_{x,r}^{\leq} := \Xi_{x,r}^{\leq}(B_r(x))$, and split Y_x as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_x &= Y_x^{>,*} + Y_x^{\leq,\text{in}} + Y_x^{\leq,\text{out}} := \left(|\Xi_x^>| - |\Xi^>| \right) + \left(\Xi_{x,r}^{\leq} - \Xi^{\leq}(B_r(x)) \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\Xi_{x,r}^{\leq}(B_r(x)^c) - \Xi^{\leq}(B_r(x)^c) \right) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X} \Delta \mathcal{X}_x^{\Xi} \not\subseteq B_{3s}(x)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and bound the second integral in (81) by

$$(82) \quad \int_{Q^2} \left(\text{Cov}(Y_x^{>,*}, Y_y^{>,*}) + 2\text{Cov}(Y_x^{>,*}, Y_y^{\leq,\text{in}}) + 2\text{Cov}(Y_x^{>,*}, Y_y^{\leq,\text{out}}) + \text{Cov}(Y_x^{\leq,\text{out}}, Y_y^{\leq,\text{out}}) \right. \\ \left. + 2\text{Cov}(Y_x^{\leq,\text{out}}, Y_y^{\leq,\text{in}}) \right) \Lambda(dx) \Lambda(dy) + \int_Q \int_{Q \setminus B_{4r}(y)} \text{Cov}(Y_x^{\leq,\text{in}}, Y_y^{\leq,\text{in}}) \Lambda(dx) \Lambda(dy).$$

Now, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality together with the bounds (67), (68) and (71) in the proof of Lemma 37 give that the first integral is bounded by $c_Y |Q| s^{4d}$. For the covariance in the second integral, we rely on the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(Y_x^{\leq,\text{in}}, Y_y^{\leq,\text{in}}) &= \text{Cov}(\Xi_{x,r}^{\leq}, \Xi_{y,r}^{\leq}) - \text{Cov}(\Xi_{x,r}^{\leq}, \Xi^{\leq}(B_r(y))) \\ &\quad - \text{Cov}(\Xi^{\leq}(B_r(x)), \Xi_{y,r}^{\leq}) + \text{Cov}(\Xi^{\leq}(B_r(x)), \Xi^{\leq}(B_r(y))). \end{aligned}$$

Since the arguments for the other terms work analogously, we only consider the first term on the right-hand side. As a first step, we let $M := |Q|^{10}$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_{x,r}^{\leq} &= \sum_{w \in \mathcal{X}_x} \mathbb{1}\{w \in B_r(x)\} g(w, \mathcal{X}_x) \mathbb{1}\{R(w, \mathcal{X}_x) \leq s, g(w, \mathcal{X}_x) \leq M\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{X}_x} \mathbb{1}\{w \in B_r(x)\} g(w, \mathcal{X}_x) \mathbb{1}\{R(w, \mathcal{X}_x) \leq s, g(w, \mathcal{X}_x) > M\} =: \Xi_{x,r}^{\leq M} + \Xi_{x,r}^{> M}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$(83) \quad \text{Cov}(\Xi_{x,r}^{\leq}, \Xi_{y,r}^{\leq}) = \text{Cov}(\Xi_{x,r}^{\leq M}, \Xi_{y,r}^{\leq M}) + \text{Cov}(\Xi_{x,r}^{\leq M}, \Xi_{y,r}^{> M}) + \text{Cov}(\Xi_{x,r}^{> M}, \Xi_{y,r}^{\leq M}).$$

The Λ^2 -integral of the first covariance is by Lemma 38 and Remark 39 bounded by $|Q|^{-1}$ for $|Q|$ large enough. The integrated second covariance term is by the Jensen inequality bounded by

$$(84) \quad \int_{Q^2} \sqrt{\text{Var}(\Xi_{x,r}^{\leq M}) \text{Var}(\Xi_{y,r}^{> M})} \Lambda^2(dx, dy) \leq \Lambda(Q) \sqrt{\int_Q \mathbb{E}[(\Xi_{x,r}^{\leq M})^2] \Lambda(dx) \int_Q \mathbb{E}[(\Xi_{y,r}^{> M})^2] \Lambda(dy)}.$$

Here we find by a similar computation as in (66) that the first integral is bounded by $c_1 |Q| r^{2d}$ for some $c_1 = c_1(d, \alpha_0, c_m)$. For the second integral, we obtain similarly to (66) the bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_Q \mathbb{E}[(\Xi_{y,r}^{> M})^2] \Lambda(dy) \\ &\leq |Q| \sum_{k=0}^2 \sum_{\substack{(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}): \\ i_1 + \dots + i_{k+1} = 2}} \left\{ \alpha_0^{k+1} |B_r(y)|^k \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in Q^{k+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[g(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{X} \cup \{\mathbf{x}\})^{i_{k+1}} \prod_{j=1}^k g(x_j, \mathcal{X} \cup \{\mathbf{x}\})^{i_j} \mathbb{1}\{g(x_j, \mathcal{X} \cup \{\mathbf{x}\}) > M\} \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we apply the Hölder inequality and the Markov inequality to the expectations above and obtain from (14) that the second integral from (84) is bounded by $c_2 r^{2d} |Q|^{-3}$ for some $c_2 = c_2(d, \alpha_0, c_m)$. The

same bound can be established for the third covariance on the right-hand side in (83). Therefore, for some $c_3 = c_3(d, \alpha_0, c_m)$,

$$\int_Q \int_{Q \setminus B_{4r}(y)} \text{Cov}(Y_x^{\leq, \text{in}}, Y_y^{\leq, \text{in}}) \Lambda(dx) \Lambda(dy) \leq c_3 r^{2d}.$$

Since $r = 4s$ and $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}(\Xi) \leq \mathbb{E}[\Xi^2] \leq c_4 |Q|$ for some $c_4 = c_4(\alpha_0, c_m)$, this shows the first bond in (63).

E₄. We perform the outer integration in E_4 only from 0 to 1. The remaining integral from -1 to 0 is bounded analogously. We deal separately with the cases $|x - y| \leq 4r$ and $|x - y| > 4r$. First, consider the case $|x - y| \leq 4r$. By the bound $\text{Cov}(\phi_x(t), \phi_y(t)) \leq \mathbb{E}[\phi_x(t)]$, (14) and Lemma 37,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{-2} \int_0^1 \int_Q \int_{B_{4r}(x)} \text{Cov}(\phi_x(t), \phi_y(t)) \Lambda(dy) \Lambda(dx) dt &\leq \sigma^{-2} \int_0^1 \int_Q \Lambda(B_{4r}(x)) \mathbb{E}[\phi_x(t)] \Lambda(dx) dt \\ &\leq c_m (4r)^d \kappa_d \sigma^{-3} \int_Q \mathbb{E}[|Y_x|] \Lambda(dx) \leq c_5 r^{2d} \sigma^{-3} |Q| \end{aligned}$$

for some $c_5 = c_5(d, \alpha_0, c_m) > 0$.

Finally, we consider the case $|x - y| > 4r$. Writing $U_x := \{Y_x^{>, *}, Y_x^{\leq, \text{out}} = 0\}$, we decompose the covariance $\text{Cov}(\phi_x(t), \phi_y(t))$ as

$$(85) \quad \text{Cov}(\phi_x(t) \mathbb{1}\{U_x^c\}, \phi_y(t)) + \text{Cov}(\phi_x(t) \mathbb{1}\{U_x\}, \phi_y(t) \mathbb{1}\{U_y^c\}) + \text{Cov}(\phi_x(t) \mathbb{1}\{U_x\}, \phi_y(t) \mathbb{1}\{U_y\}).$$

Using that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\phi_x(t) \mathbb{1}\{U_x^c\}, \phi_y(t)) &\leq \mathbb{P}(U_x^c) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi} \mathbb{1}\{R(y, \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi) > s \text{ or } \mathcal{X} \Delta \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi \not\subseteq B_{3s}(x)\} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi} \mathbb{1}\{R(y, \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi) > s\} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{X} \Delta \mathcal{X}_x^\Xi \not\subseteq B_{3s}(x)\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

we find analogously to the bounds of the third and fifth term in (65) with $g \equiv 1$ that

$$\int_0^1 \int_Q \int_{Q \setminus B_{4r}(y)} |\text{Cov}(\phi_x(t) \mathbb{1}\{U_x^c\}, \phi_y(t))| \Lambda(dx) \Lambda(dy) dt \leq c_6 |Q| s^{2d}.$$

for some constant $c_6 = c_6(d, \alpha_0, c_m) > 0$. A similar estimate holds for the second covariance term. Finally, we use that on U_x it holds that $\Delta_x = \Delta_x^{\leq} := (|\Xi_x^{\leq}| - |\Xi_x^{\leq}|)/\sigma$, and hence

$$\phi_x(t) = \phi_x^{\leq}(t) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}\{1 \geq \Delta_x^{\leq} > t > 0\} & t > 0, \\ \mathbb{1}\{-1 \leq \Delta_x^{\leq} < t < 0\} & t < 0, \end{cases}$$

and decompose the third covariance as

$$\text{Cov}(\phi_x^{\leq}(t), \phi_y^{\leq}(t)) - \text{Cov}(\phi_x^{\leq}(t) \mathbb{1}\{U_x^c\}, \phi_y^{\leq}(t) \mathbb{1}\{U_y\}) - \text{Cov}(\phi_x^{\leq}(t), \phi_y^{\leq}(t) \mathbb{1}\{U_y^c\}).$$

Here, the first term is by Lemma 38 with $p = 0$ for $|Q|$ large enough bounded by $|Q|^{-1}$. Note that this result indeed applies since $(|\Xi_x^{\leq}| - |\Xi_x^{\leq}|)/\sigma$ is a function of $\mathcal{X}_x \cap B_r(x)$. The second and the third covariances are bounded similarly to the first and second covariances in (85). This gives the bound on E_4 that was asserted in (63).

E₅. The steps are very similar to the arguments for E_4 . We deal separately with the cases $|x - y| \leq 4r$ and $|x - y| > 4r$. First, consider the case where $|x - y| \leq 4r$. Then,

$$\left| \int_0^1 t \text{Cov}(\phi_x(t), \phi_y(t)) dt \right| \leq \int_0^1 t \mathbb{E}[\phi_x(t)] dt \leq 0.5 \sigma^{-2} \mathbb{E}[Y_x^2].$$

Therefore, by Lemma 37,

$$\sigma^2 \int_0^1 \int_Q \int_{B_{4r}(x)} t \text{Cov}(\phi_x(t), \phi_y(t)) \Lambda(dy) \Lambda(dx) dt \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_Q \Lambda(B_{4r}(x)) \mathbb{E}[Y_x^2] \Lambda(dx) \leq c_7 |Q| s^{3d}$$

for some $c_7 = c_7(d, \alpha_0, c_m)$, and an analogous calculation holds for $t \in [-1, 0]$.

Hence, it remains to consider the case where $|x - y| > 4r$. We use the same bound for $\text{Cov}(\phi_x(t), \phi_y(t))$ as in the case E_4 . Since $\sigma^2 \leq c_4|Q|$, the asserted bound on E_5 follows. \square

APPENDIX A. RELATION TO GIBBS PROCESSES OBTAINED FROM PERFECT SIMULATION

There is a substantial literature available [7, 27, 32] on limit theorems for a class of Gibbs point processes, usually denoted Ψ^* and satisfying the additional condition [27, (3.7)], obtained from a perfect simulation technique originally suggested in [11]. A precise definition of Ψ^* is given in [27]. Whenever we speak of the class Ψ^* below, it is implicitly assumed that [27, (3.7)] holds. As observed in Section 2.1, for finite-range Gibbs processes, our Assumption (7) is more general than the class Ψ^* .

The key achievement of [7] is to provide a quantitative CLT with respect to the Wasserstein distance for point processes that are not necessarily of Gibbsian type. The main assumption here is the exponential decay of dependence (EDD). In [7, Section 3.1], it is explained that the Gibbs point processes in Ψ^* are EDD. Although not stated explicitly, this means that the condition [27, Equation (1.4)] is also assumed. In Corollary 40 below, we show using disagreement couplings that also the Gibbs processes satisfying Assumption (7) satisfy the EDD, meaning that the results of [7] also apply in this case. To make this precise, for disjoint bounded Borel sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ we define the β -mixing coefficient

$$\beta_{A,B}(\mathcal{X}) := d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{X}_{A \cup B}, \mathcal{X}_A \cup \mathcal{X}'_B),$$

where \mathcal{X}'_B is an independent copy of \mathcal{X}_B . Then, the EDD says that there exists a constant $\theta_0 > 0$ with the following property. Whenever, $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ are disjoint bounded Borel sets with $\text{dist}(A, B) \geq \theta_0 \log(\text{diam}(A) \vee \text{diam}(B) \vee \theta_0)$, then

$$\beta_{A,B}(\mathcal{X}) \leq \theta_0(\text{diam}(A) \vee \text{diam}(B) \vee 1)^{\theta_0} e^{-\text{dist}(A,B)/\theta_0}.$$

Corollary 40 (Assumption (7) implies EDD). *Let κ be a PI satisfying Assumption (7). Then, the associated infinite-volume Gibbs process \mathcal{X} satisfies the EDD.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{X}^1 and \mathcal{X}^2 be two independent copies of \mathcal{X} . Let $\psi_i = \mathcal{X}^i \cap A$ for $i = 1, 2$. Define $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}^i := \psi_i \cup T_{A^c, \psi_i}^\infty(\mathcal{P}^*)$, where \mathcal{P}^* is independent of \mathcal{X}^1 and \mathcal{X}^2 . Then $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_i \sim \mathcal{X}$ by Proposition 23 and $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}^2$ is independent of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_A^1 = \mathcal{X}_A^1$. Hence

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{X}_{A \cup B}, \mathcal{X}_A \cup \mathcal{X}'_B) = d_{\text{TV}}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{A \cup B}^1, \mathcal{X}_A^1 \cup \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_B^2) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_B^1 \neq \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_B^2).$$

By Corollary 26 (with the roles of A and B switched),

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}^1 \cap B \neq \tilde{\mathcal{X}}^2 \cap B \mid \psi_1, \psi_2) \leq c_{\text{DPP}} |B_{2\text{dist}(A,B)/3}(B)| \exp(-c_{\text{SP}} \text{dist}(A, B)).$$

This is enough to show the claim since $|B_s(B)| \leq c_1(2s + \text{diam}(B))^d \leq c_2(s^d \vee \text{diam}(B)^d)$ for suitable $c_1, c_2 > 0$. This follows because $\text{diam}(B_s(B)) \leq \text{diam}(B) + 2s$. Using that $|B_s(B)| \leq |B_1(o)| \text{diam}(B_s(B))^d$ concludes the proof. \square

As mentioned above, for finite-range interactions, the class of Gibbs processes satisfying Assumption (7) is larger than Ψ^* . Conversely, our paper requires the interaction range to be finite, whereas Ψ^* also allows some infinite-range Gibbs processes. Currently, the exploration algorithm in the proof of Theorem 25 heavily relies on this finiteness property. Therefore, while an extension of our arguments to infinite ranges does not seem to be completely inaccessible, it would make the arguments dramatically more complicated so that we leave it for future work. Taking this into account, it is interesting to discuss to what extent our techniques can be extended to infinite-range Gibbs processes in Ψ^* . In particular, we consider the key Theorem 25.

Loosely speaking, the idea of the perfect simulation algorithm is that to construct a Gibbs point process in a Borel set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, it is only necessary to know a its *ancestor clan* $\mathbf{A}_B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$. Since the definition of the ancestor clan would require us to repeat the entire construction of the perfect simulation scheme, we refer the reader to [32] for details. However, we shall only use the following property: We denote by $\text{diam}(\mathbf{A}_B)$ the diameter of the projection of $\mathbf{A}_B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ to the \mathbb{R}^d component. Then, with high probability, the diameter $\text{diam}(\mathbf{A}_B)$ is not much larger than that of the set B . More precisely, [27, Equation (3.6)] shows that for all

Gibbs processes in Ψ^* satisfying the crucial assumption [27, Equation (3.7)] there exists some $c_{PS} > 0$ such that for all $r \geq 1$, we have

$$(86) \quad \mathbb{P}(\text{diam}(\mathbf{A}_B) \geq r + \text{diam}(B)) \leq c_{PS}(|B| \vee 1) \exp(-r/c_{PS}).$$

Equipped with this information, we have the following version of Theorem 25.

Corollary 41. *Consider two PIs κ, κ' from the class Ψ^* . Let $A \subseteq P \subseteq Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded Borel sets and $\psi, \psi' \in \mathbf{N}_{Q^c}$ that differ only on $B \subseteq Q^c$. Suppose κ and κ' satisfy (36). Let $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$ and $\mathcal{X}'(Q, \psi')$ be the Gibbs processes obtained from the perfect simulation technique using κ and κ' , respectively. Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi) \cap A \neq \mathcal{X}'(Q, \psi') \cap A) \leq C|B_{r_0}(A)| \exp(-\text{dist}(A, B \cup (Q \setminus P))/C).$$

Proof of Corollary 15 for perfect-simulation processes. When coupling $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi) \cap A$ and $\mathcal{X}'(Q, \psi') \cap A$ through the perfect simulation, we see that these two processes differ only if the ancestor clan \mathbf{A}_A hits the set $(B \cup (Q \setminus P)) \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Hence, the coupling characterization of the total variation distance gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi) \cap A \neq \mathcal{X}'(Q, \psi') \cap A) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{A}_A \cap (B \cup (Q \setminus P)) \times \mathbb{R}^d \neq \emptyset) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\text{diam}(\mathbf{A}_A) \geq \text{diam}(A) + \text{dist}(A, B \cup (Q \setminus P))). \end{aligned}$$

Now, for any fixed $r_0 > 0$, we have $|A| \vee 1 \leq c_1|B_{r_0}(A)|$ for some $c_1 > 0$. Hence, an application of (86) concludes the proof. \square

The results of [27, 32] also required the Gibbs process to be Poisson-like. That is, (i) \mathcal{X} is stochastically dominated by a homogeneous Poisson point process, and (ii) there exists $c_{PL}, r_1 > 0$ such that for all $r \geq r_1$ and $\varphi \in \mathbf{N}_{B_r(x)^c}$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}_{B_r(x)} = \emptyset \mid \mathcal{X}_{B_r(x)^c} = \varphi) \leq e^{-c_{PL}r^d}.$$

We show below that a Gibbs point process \mathcal{X} satisfying Assumption 7 is Poisson-like.

Proposition 42 (Assumption (7) implies Poisson-likeness). *Consider a PI κ bounded by α_0 and having $\inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \kappa(y, \emptyset) > 0$. Then, the associated infinite-volume Gibbs process \mathcal{X} is Poisson-like.*

Proof. Part (i) follows immediately from Proposition 19, so we concentrate on part (ii).

We follow the idea of [27, Lemma 3.3] and start by choosing $r_1 > r_0$. Then, for some $p > 0$

$$\sup_{\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{B_{r_1}(x)^c}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}_{B_{r_1}(x)} = \emptyset \mid \mathcal{X}_{B_{r_1}(x)^c} = \psi) \leq 1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}(B_{r_1}(x)) = 1)}{\mathbb{E}[\alpha_0^{\mathcal{P}(B_{r_1}(x))}]} \int_{B_{r_1-r_0}(x)} \kappa(y, \emptyset) dy \leq p < 1,$$

where we used $Z_{B_{r_1}(x)}(\psi) \leq \mathbb{E}[\alpha_0^{\mathcal{P}(B_{r_1}(x))}]$. For $r > r_1$, it is possible to place $\Omega(r^d)$ disjoint balls of radius r_1 inside $B_r(x)$. Call them $B_{r_1}(y_1), \dots, B_{r_1}(y_{k(r)})$. Define events $F = \{\mathcal{X}_{B_r(x)^c} = \varphi\}$ and $F_i = \{\mathcal{X}_{B_{r_1}(y_i)} = \emptyset\}$. Then, by the DLR-equations (8),

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}_{B_r(x)} = \emptyset \mid \mathcal{X}_{B_r(x)^c} = \varphi) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_i F_i \mid F\right) \leq \prod_i \mathbb{P}\left(F_i \mid F \cup \bigcup_{j < i} F_j\right) \leq p^{k(r)}.$$

The result follows because $k(r)$ is $\Omega(r^d)$. \square

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 9

Proof. [Proof of Proposition 9] We define a partial ordering \leq_ι of \mathbb{R}^d by $x <_\iota y$ if $\iota(x) < \iota(y)$ or $x = y$. If $\lambda(\iota^{-1}(r)) = 0$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, then almost surely, ι induces a total ordering on the points of \mathcal{P}^d . Moreover, the window $Q_{(x, \infty)} = \{y \in Q \mid i(x) < i(y)\}$ is again a measurable set. In fact, letting $\mu \in \mathbf{N}$ be locally finite, $(x, \mu) \mapsto \mu \cap Q_{(x, \infty)}$ is measurable and hence the thinning probabilities $p(x, \psi)$ are measurable maps. Thus, using ι for the standard Poisson embedding is well-defined.

We may assume $\iota(Q) \subseteq (0, 1]$. For each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, we construct an injective measurable map $\iota^n : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which provides almost the same ordering as ι . Let $\tilde{\iota} : Q \rightarrow (0, 1]$ be any injective measurable map. For $x \in Q$, there is a unique $m \in \{0, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$ such that $x \in \iota^{-1}(m2^{-n+1} - 2^{-n}, m2^{-n+1} + 2^{-n}]$, and we define

$\iota^n(x) = m + \phi(x) \in (m, m + 1]$. Letting $A_m = \iota^{-1}(m2^{-n+1} - 2^{-n}, m2^{-n+1} + 2^{-n}]$, we have that $x <_{\iota^n} y$ if either $x \in A_{m_1}$ and $y \in A_{m_2}$ with $m_1 < m_2$, or $x, y \in A_m$, and $\tilde{\iota}(x) < \tilde{\iota}(y)$.

For each n , the ordering induced by ι^n may be used in the Poisson embedding to obtain $\mathcal{X}^n(Q, \psi) := T_{Q, \psi, \iota^n}(\mathcal{P}_Q)$, which we know has the correct distribution $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$. We must show three things:

- (i) $\mathcal{X}^n(Q, \psi)$ converges almost surely to a point process $\mathcal{X}^\infty(Q, \psi)$.
- (ii) The limit $\mathcal{X}^\infty(Q, \psi)$ is the same point process $T_{Q, \psi, \iota}(\mathcal{P}_Q)$ we would get if we had used the ordering ι .
- (iii) The limit $\mathcal{X}^\infty(Q, \psi)$ again has the correct distribution $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$.

Let $Q_{(-\infty, x)} = \{y \in Q \mid i(y) < i(x)\}$, $Q_{(x, \infty)}^n = \{y \in Q \mid \iota^n(y) > \iota^n(x)\}$, and $Q_{(-\infty, x)}^n = \{y \in Q \mid \iota^n(y) < \iota^n(x)\}$. We claim that for any fixed $x \in Q$,

$$(87) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |Q_{(x, \infty)} \Delta Q_{(x, \infty)}^n| = 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |Q_{(-\infty, x)} \Delta Q_{(-\infty, x)}^n| = 0.$$

Note first that $Q_{(x, \infty)} \Delta Q_{(x, \infty)}^n = Q_{(-\infty, x)} \Delta Q_{(-\infty, x)}^n$. Suppose $i(x) \in (m_{n,x}2^{-n+1} - 2^{-n}, m_{n,x}2^{-n+1} + 2^{-n}]$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{(x, \infty)} \setminus Q_{(x, \infty)}^n &\subseteq \iota^{-1}(i(x), m_{n,x}2^{-n+1} + 2^{-n}] \\ Q_{(x, \infty)}^n \setminus Q_{(x, \infty)} &\subseteq \iota^{-1}(m_{n,x}2^{-n+1} - 2^{-n}, i(x)]. \end{aligned}$$

In total,

$$(88) \quad Q_{(x, \infty)}^n \Delta Q_{(x, \infty)} \subseteq \iota^{-1}((m_{n,x}2^{-n+1} - 2^{-n}, m_{n,x}2^{-n+1} + 2^{-n}]).$$

The claim now follows because the sets

$$\iota^{-1}((m_{n,x}2^{-n+1} - 2^{-n}, m_{n,x}2^{-n+1} + 2^{-n}])$$

decrease towards $\iota^{-1}(\iota(x))$, which has Lebesgue measure zero by assumption. The claim for $Q_{(-\infty, x)} \Delta Q_{(-\infty, x)}^n$ is shown similarly.

Now fix (x, ψ) with $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{Q_{(-\infty, x)}}$. By (88), there is an n_0 such that also $\psi \in \mathbf{N}_{Q_{(-\infty, x)}^n}$ for $n > n_0$. For such n , we have

$$p^n(x, \psi) := \kappa(x, \psi) \frac{\mathbb{E}[e^{-J(\mu \cap Q_{(x, \infty)}^n, \psi + \delta_x)}]}{\mathbb{E}[e^{-J(\mu \cap Q_{(x, \infty)}^n, \psi)}]} \rightarrow \kappa(x, \psi) \frac{\mathbb{E}[e^{-J(\mu \cap Q_{(x, \infty)}, \psi + \delta_x)}]}{\mathbb{E}[e^{-J(\mu \cap Q_{(x, \infty)}, \psi)}]} = p(x, \psi)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, looking at the denominator first, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{-J(\mu \cap Q_{(x, \infty)}^n, \psi)}] &= \mathbb{E}[e^{-J(\mu \cap Q_{(x, \infty)}, \psi)}] + \mathbb{E}[e^{-J(\mu \cap Q_{(x, \infty)}^n, \psi)} \mathbf{1}_{\mu \cap (Q_{(x, \infty)} \Delta Q_{(x, \infty)}^n) \neq \emptyset}] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[e^{-J(\mu \cap Q_{(x, \infty)}, \psi)} \mathbf{1}_{\mu \cap (Q_{(x, \infty)} \Delta Q_{(x, \infty)}^n) \neq \emptyset}]. \end{aligned}$$

The middle term goes to zero by an application of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, since the stability assumption ensures that $\mathbb{E}[e^{-2J(\mu \cap Q_{(x, \infty)}^n, \psi)}] < \infty$ and from (87) we have that

$$P(\mu \cap (Q_{(x, \infty)} \Delta Q_{(x, \infty)}^n) \neq \emptyset) = 1 - e^{-|Q_{(x, \infty)} \Delta Q_{(x, \infty)}^n|},$$

which goes to zero when $n \rightarrow \infty$. The last term goes to zero by the same reasoning. The numerator is treated similarly.

We now show (i). For almost all ω , ι and ι^n will define the same ordering of $\mathcal{P}_Q^d(\omega)$ whenever $n > N(\omega)$ according to (88). Moreover, since the thinning probabilities converge pointwise, for almost all ω there is an $N'(\omega) \geq N(\omega)$ such that the thinned process does not change whenever $n \geq N'(\omega)$. We define $\mathcal{X}^\infty(Q, \psi)$ to be this limiting point process and note that it is a.s. the same as one would have obtained by using the ordering ι for the thinning, which also shows (ii).

It remains to show (iii), that $\mathcal{X}^\infty(Q, \psi)$ has the correct Gibbs distribution. For this, let $f : \mathbf{N}_Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded measurable function. Then

$$|\mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X}^n(Q, \psi))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{X}^\infty(Q, \psi))]| \leq 2|f|_\infty P(\mathcal{X}^n(Q, \psi) \neq \mathcal{X}^\infty(Q, \psi)).$$

The right hand side goes to 0 and the left hand side is constant since all $\mathcal{X}^n(Q, \psi)$ have the same distribution $\mathcal{X}(Q, \psi)$, so it follows that also $\mathcal{X}^\infty(Q, \psi)$ must have the same distribution. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Baddeley, E. Rubak, and R. Turner. *Spatial Point Patterns: Methodology and Applications with R*. Chapman and Hall/CRC Press, 2015.
- [2] A. J. Baddeley and M. N. M. van Lieshout. Area-interaction point processes. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, 47(4):601–619, 1995.
- [3] V. Beneš, C. Hofer-Temmel, G. Last, and J. Večeřa. Decorrelation of a class of Gibbs particle processes and asymptotic properties of U -statistics. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 57(3):928–955, 2020.
- [4] S. Betsch and G. Last. On the uniqueness of Gibbs distributions with a non-negative and subcritical pair potential. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 2(59):706–725, 2023.
- [5] B. Błaszczyszyn, D. Yogeshwaran, and J. E. Yukich. Limit theory for geometric statistics of point processes having fast decay of correlations. *Ann. Probab.*, 47(2):835–895, 2019.
- [6] L. H. Y. Chen, A. Röllin, and A. Xia. Palm theory, random measures and Stein couplings. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 31(6):2881–2923, 2021.
- [7] T. Cong and A. Xia. Convergence rate for geometric statistics of point processes with fast decay dependence. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 28:1–35, 2023.
- [8] D. Dereudre. Introduction to the theory of Gibbs point processes. In D. Coupier, editor, *Stochastic Geometry*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2237, 2019.
- [9] H. Duminil-Copin, A. Raoufi, and V. Tassion. Subcritical phase of d -dimensional Poisson-Boolean percolation and its vacant set. *Ann. Henri Lebesgue*, 3:677–700, 2020.
- [10] H. Edelsbrunner and J. Harer. *Computational Topology*. AMS, Providence, RI, 2010.
- [11] P. A. Ferrari, R. Fernandez, and N. L. Garcia. Perfect simulation for interacting point processes, loss networks and ising models. *Stoch. Process. Appl.*, 102:63–88, 2002.
- [12] H.-O. Georgii. Canonical and grand canonical Gibbs states for continuum systems. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 48:31–51, 1976.
- [13] Y. Hiraoka, T. Shirai, and K. D. Trinh. Limit theorems for persistence diagrams. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 28(5):2740–2780, 2018.
- [14] O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of Modern Probability*. Springer, New York, second edition, 2002.
- [15] O. Kallenberg. *Random Measures, Theory and Applications*. Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [16] H. Kesten and S. Lee. The central limit theorem for weighted minimal spanning trees on random points. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 6:495–527, 1996.
- [17] J. T. N. Krebs and W. Polonik. On the asymptotic normality of persistent Betti numbers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.03280*, 2019.
- [18] G. Last and M. Otto. Disagreement coupling of Gibbs processes with an application to Poisson approximation. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 5(33):4091–4126, 2023.
- [19] G. Last and M. Penrose. *Lectures on the Poisson Process*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [20] G. Last, G. Peccati, and M. Schulte. Normal approximation on poisson spaces: Mehler’s formula, second order poincaré inequalities and stabilization. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 165:667–723, 2016.
- [21] G. Last, G. Peccati, and D. Yogeshwaran. Phase transitions and noise sensitivity on the poisson space via stopping sets and decision trees. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 63:457–511, 2023.
- [22] D. McLeish. Dependent central limit theorem and invariance principle. *Ann. Probab.*, 2:620–628, 1974.
- [23] X.X. Nguyen and H. Zessin. Integral and differential characterizations of the Gibbs process. *Math. Nachr.*, 88:105–115, 1979.
- [24] M. D. Penrose and J. E. Yukich. Central limit theorems for some graphs in computational geometry. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 11:1005–1041, 2001.
- [25] M. D. Penrose and J. E. Yukich. Weak laws of large numbers in geometric probability. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 13(1):277–303, 2003.
- [26] V. Robins and K. Turner. Principal component analysis of persistent homology rank functions with case studies of spatial point patterns, sphere packing and colloids. *Physica D*, 334:99–117, 2016.

- [27] T. Schreiber and J. E. Yukich. Limit theorems for geometric functionals of Gibbs point processes. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 49(4):1158–1182, 2013.
- [28] M. Schulte. Normal approximation of Poisson functionals in Kolmogorov distance. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 29(1):96–117, 2016.
- [29] F. Seitzl, J. Møller, and V. Beneš. Fitting three-dimensional Laguerre tessellations by hierarchical marked point process models. *Spat. Stat.*, 51, 2022.
- [30] K. D. Trinh. On central limit theorems in stochastic geometry for add-one cost stabilizing functionals. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 24:Paper No. 76, 15, 2019.
- [31] J. van den Berg and C. Maes. Disagreement percolation in the study of Markov fields. *Ann. Probab.*, 22(2):749–763, 1994.
- [32] A. Xia and J. E. Yukich. Normal approximation for statistics of Gibbsian input in geometric probability. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 47(4):934–972, 2015.
- [33] D. Yogeshwaran and Robert J. Adler. On the topology of random complexes built over stationary point processes. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 25(6):3338–3380, 2015.
- [34] D. Yogeshwaran, E. Subag, and R. J. Adler. Random geometric complexes in the thermodynamic regime. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 167(1-2):107–142, 2017.

(Christian Hirsch, Moritz Otto) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, AARHUS UNIVERSITY, NY MUNKEGADE 118, 8000 AARHUS C, DENMARK

Email address: `hirsch@math.au.dk`, `otto@math.au.dk`

(Christian Hirsch) DIGIT CENTER, AARHUS UNIVERSITY, FINLANDSGADE 22, 8200 AARHUS N, DENMARK

(Anne Marie Svane) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, AALBORG UNIVERSITY, AALBORG, 8000, DENMARK

Email address: `annemarie@math.aau.dk`