

Continuity of the critical value for long-range percolation

Johannes Bäuml^{*}

December 8, 2023

Abstract. We show that for long-range percolation with polynomially decaying connection probabilities in dimension $d \geq 2$, the critical value depends continuously on the precise specifications of the model. Among other things, we use this result to show transience of the infinite super-critical long-range percolation cluster in dimension $d \geq 3$ and to prove a shape theorem for super-critical long-range percolation in the strong decay regime.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Main results	3
1.2	Varying short edges only	6
1.3	Notation	7
2	The proof of Theorem 1.1	8
3	Applications of Theorem 1.1	14
3.1	Locality of long-range percolation	14
3.2	Continuity of the percolation probability outside criticality	16
3.3	Existence of big clusters	17
3.4	Transience of random walks	19
4	A shape theorem for the long-range percolation metric	20
4.1	Proof of Theorem 1.8	20
4.2	Proofs of the Propositions	22
5	Varying short edges only	27
5.1	Strict inequality of critical points	27
5.2	The proof of Theorem 1.9	30
6	No locality for one-dimensional long-range percolation	31
7	References	32

^{*}DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES.

E-Mail: jbaeumler@math.ucla.edu

MSC Class: 82B43, 60K35, 05C12, 05C81

Keywords: Long-range percolation, locality, random walk, transience, shape theorem

1 Introduction

Consider Bernoulli bond percolation on \mathbb{Z}^d , where we include an edge between the vertices $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with probability $1 - e^{-\beta J(x-y)}$, independent of all other edges. The function $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a **symmetric** kernel, where symmetric means that $J(x) = J(-x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and that for all vectors $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ the value of $J(x)$ is invariant under flipping the sign of one or more coordinates and under permutations of the coordinates of x . We denote the resulting probability measure by $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}$ or \mathbb{P}_β and its expectation by $\mathbb{E}_{\beta, J}$ or \mathbb{E}_β . Edges that are included are also referred to as open. We do not allow the case $x = y$ here, i.e., we do not consider self-loops. So in particular the value $J(\mathbf{0})$ does not influence the percolation configuration and we can also consider J as a function from $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ to $[0, \infty)$. From this construction, we directly get that the resulting measure is translation invariant. As the kernel J has all symmetries of the integer lattice, so does the measure \mathbb{P}_β . We are interested in the case where the kernel is **integrable**, meaning that $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} J(0, x) < \infty$. The integrability condition guarantees that the resulting open subgraph is almost surely locally finite under the measure \mathbb{P}_β . Further, we require that the kernel J is **irreducible**, meaning that for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ there exist $\mathbf{0} = a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n = x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $J(a_{i-1} - a_i) > 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. This procedure creates certain clusters, which are the connected components in the resulting random graph. Write K_x for the cluster containing the vertex $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. A major question in percolation theory is the emergence of infinite clusters, for which we define the critical parameter β_c by

$$\beta_c = \beta_c(J) = \inf \{ \beta \geq 0 : \mathbb{P}_\beta(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = \infty) > 0 \}.$$

A comparison with a Galton-Watson tree shows that there are no infinite clusters for $\beta < (\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} J(x))^{-1}$, which implies $\beta_c > 0$. In dimension $d \geq 2$ it is well known that $\beta_c < \infty$, as long as $J \neq 0$. For dimension $d = 1$, Newman and Schulman showed that $\beta_c < \infty$ as long as J does not decay faster than quadratic [41, 45]. For (long-range) percolation there is also the question whether there can exist two or more infinite open clusters simultaneously. It was first proven by Aizenman, Kesten, and Newman [2] that the number of infinite open clusters is almost surely either 0 or 1. Later, Burton and Keane [15] gave a different proof of this fact by using the amenability of \mathbb{Z}^d . This proof also works for long-range percolation. Indeed, the integrability of the kernel J implies that

$$\sum_{x: \|x\| \leq n} \sum_{y: \|y\| > n} \mathbb{P}_\beta(x \sim y) = o(n^d)$$

which implies uniqueness of the infinite component, cf. [15].

Long-range percolation is mostly studied in the case where $J(x) \simeq \|x\|^{-d-\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 0$, where we write $J(x) \simeq \|x\|^{-d-\alpha}$ if the ratio between the two quantities satisfies $\varepsilon < \frac{J(x)}{\|x\|^{-d-\alpha}} < \varepsilon^{-1}$ for a small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $\|x\|$ large enough. The condition that $\alpha > 0$ guarantees the integrability of the kernel J . In general, it is expected that for $\alpha > d$ the resulting graph looks similar to nearest-neighbor percolation, is very well connected for $\alpha < d$, and shows a self-similar behavior for $\alpha = d$. See [5, 6, 9, 11–13] for results pointing in this direction.

In this paper, we are interested in several different properties of the *supercritical* percolation cluster, i.e., in the case $\beta > \beta_c$, and in which way the parameter β_c depends on the kernel J - in particular, if the critical parameter β_c is continuous when viewed as a function from kernels to $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{+\infty\}$. One very important case of kernels J is the case where J has finite range, i.e., if $J(x) = 0$ for all but finitely many $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Following

pioneering work of Grimmett and Marstrand [30], who showed continuity of the critical parameter in certain finite-range cases, different properties of the resulting finite-range percolation graph in the supercritical phase were later proven, including results on graph distances [4, 21, 42, 43] and return properties of random walks [31]. Further progress on the continuity of β_c was made by Meester and Steif for long-range percolation with exponentially decaying tail [38]. The continuity of the critical parameter β_c was also studied for long-range percolation with polynomial decay. In the case where $J(x) \simeq \|x\|^{-d-\alpha}$ for $\alpha < d$, Berger proved (a version of) continuity of the parameter β_c [10]. Using this result, many other properties of the resulting long-range percolation graph were understood for $\alpha < d$, see [9, 12–14]. In this paper, we study the supercritical phase for $\alpha \geq d$. We will mostly work on the case where the kernel J satisfies

$$J(x) \leq C\|x\|^{-2d} \text{ and } J(x) = \|x\|^{-s+o(1)} \quad (1)$$

for some constants $C < \infty$ and $s \geq 2d$, and all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. Note that for $J(x) \simeq \|x\|^{-d-\alpha}$ for some $\alpha \geq d$ these assumptions are satisfied.

1.1 Main results

In this section, we describe our main results. The first result deals with the convergence of the critical value β_c in dimension $d \geq 2$ if one considers the special situation where one erases all edges from some length onward.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $d \geq 2$ and let $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be an irreducible and symmetric kernel such that $J(x) = \mathcal{O}(\|x\|^{-2d})$. Let $\beta > \beta_c(J)$. Then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ so that the kernel \tilde{J} defined by*

$$\tilde{J}(x) = \begin{cases} J(x) & \text{if } \|x\| \leq N \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

satisfies $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, \tilde{J}}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = \infty) > 0$.

The proof of this Theorem follows a standard ‘‘Grimmett-Marstrand-approach’’ that relies on the symmetries and properties of the integer lattice. We will use the assumption $J(x) = \mathcal{O}(\|x\|^{-2d})$ only at one point in the proof, which is in Lemma 2.4. The other steps to obtain Lemma 2.4 and to see how Lemma 2.4 implies Theorem 1.1 follow using similar arguments as the results of Grimmett and Marstrand [30], which were also repeated by Meester and Steif [38]. The class of kernels that still percolate after removing all long enough edges is very important for this paper. As we will refer to it quite often in the rest of the paper, we give such kernels a name with the following definition.

Definition 1.2. *We call a kernel $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ **resilient** if for all $\beta > \beta_c(J)$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ so that the kernel \tilde{J} defined by*

$$\tilde{J}(x) = \begin{cases} J(x) & \text{if } \|x\| \leq N \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

satisfies $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, \tilde{J}}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = \infty) > 0$.

So phrased in this language, Theorem 1.1 together with the results of Berger [10, Theorem 1.8] show the following.

Remark 1.3. *Let $d \geq 2$ and let $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be an irreducible and symmetric kernel satisfying $J(x) = \mathcal{O}(\|x\|^{-2d})$ or $J(x) \simeq \|x\|^{-s}$ for some $s \in (d, 2d)$. Then J is resilient.*

Note that a kernel $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ can only be resilient for $d \geq 2$, as a finite-range model can never percolate in dimension $d = 1$. Resilience of kernels was previously established by Berger for long-range percolation with kernel $J(x) \simeq \|x\|^{-s}$ for some $s \in (d, 2d)$ [10] and by Meester and Steif for long-range percolation with exponential decay of the connection probability [38]. Furthermore, several works establish resilience for different kernels J with $\sum_x J(x) = \infty$ [27, 28, 39, 44], i.e., for the case where $\beta_c(J) = 0$. The general case, i.e., assuming irreducibility and $\sum_x J(x) = \infty$ only, is still open. For dependent percolation models, resilience of the kernel was shown by Mönch for inhomogeneous long-range percolation in the weak decay regime [40] and by Dembin and Tassion for Boolean percolation [20].

Resilience of kernels (and thus Theorem 1.1) already has several interesting implications and corollaries. The first one deals with the locality of the long-range percolation graph in dimension $d \geq 2$. We say that J_n converges to J in L_1 (of \mathbb{Z}^d) if $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |J_n(x) - J(x)|$ converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $d \geq 2$, and let $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a symmetric, irreducible and resilient kernel. Let $(J_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of kernels converging to J in L_1 of \mathbb{Z}^d . Then*

$$\beta_c(J_n) \rightarrow \beta_c(J)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, this holds for symmetric J satisfying $J(x) \simeq \|x\|^{-s}$ for some $s > d$. Further, let $d \geq 1$, let $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a kernel, and let $(J_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of kernels converging to J in L_1 from above. Then

$$\beta_c(J_n) \rightarrow \beta_c(J).$$

Note that Theorem 1.1 is a special case of Theorem 1.4 and is also used in its proof. Theorem 1.4 shows a locality-type result for long-range percolation that requires that the graph is fixed and only the kernel J varies with n . A more general version of locality also allows the graphs to change and considers the critical parameter depending on the graph. Locality for short-range percolation graphs was previously established for slabs of \mathbb{Z}^d by Grimmett and Marstrand [30], for graphs of polynomial growth by Contreras, Martineau, and Tassion [19], and by Easo and Hutchcroft for general transitive graphs [26]. Using locality for (long-range) percolation, one can deduce that the percolation probability $\theta(\beta, J)$ is continuous outside of the critical points, i.e., at points (β, J) for which $\beta \neq \beta_c(J)$.

Corollary 1.5. *Let $d \geq 2$, let J be an irreducible and resilient kernel, and let $\beta \neq \beta_c(J)$. Let $(J_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of kernels converging to J in L_1 , and assume that $\beta_n \rightarrow \beta$. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta(\beta_n, J_n) = \theta(\beta, J).$$

One thing that we will do quite often in this paper is to exploit known results for finite-range percolation and use the resilience of kernels to show corresponding results for long-range percolation. We start this by showing the existence of giant clusters for long-range percolation in the supercritical regime. The corresponding result for finite-range percolation was shown by Deuschel and Pisztora in [21].

Theorem 1.6. *Let $d \geq 2$, let $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be an irreducible, symmetric, and resilient kernel, and let $\beta > \beta_c(J)$. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N$*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(|K_{\max}(B_n(\mathbf{0}))| \geq (\theta(\beta, J) - \varepsilon)|B_n(\mathbf{0})|) \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Further, we use the result of Theorem 1.1 to show transience of the simple random walk on the supercritical long-range percolation cluster in dimension $d \geq 3$. This solves a conjecture by Heydenreich, Hulshof, and Jorritsma [34] and Sönmez and Rouselle [46].

Theorem 1.7. *Let $d \geq 3$, let J be an irreducible and resilient kernel, and let $\beta > \beta_c(J)$. Then the unique infinite component is almost surely a transient graph. In particular, if J is a symmetric kernel such that*

$$J(x) \simeq \|x\|^{-s} \quad (2)$$

for some $s > d$, then infinite percolation cluster is almost surely transient for $\beta > \beta_c(J)$.

Note that the restriction to $d \geq 3$ is necessary, as for $d \in \{1, 2\}$ and kernels J satisfying condition (2) with $s \geq 2d$, the simple random walk on the long-range percolation cluster is recurrent, as proven in [7, 10].

The next property of the supercritical long-range percolation graph that we consider is the distance growth. For two points $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we write $D(x, y)$ for the chemical distance (also called graph distance or hop-count distance) between x and y , which is the length of the shortest open path between x and y . For decay exponent $s > 2d$, Berger established a lower bound on the chemical distances [11] by showing that

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{D(\mathbf{0}, x)}{\|x\|} > 0 \text{ almost surely.} \quad (3)$$

Furthermore, he conjectured that an analogous upper bound holds in the supercritical regime [11, Conjecture 3]. We verify this conjecture by giving an upper bound on the chemical distances. Furthermore, we prove a shape theorem for the ball in the long-range percolation metric. For the shape theorem, we need to define distances on \mathbb{R}^d instead of \mathbb{Z}^d , so we identify a point $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with the set $x + [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^d$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we write x^d for the corresponding point in the integer lattice. If $\sum_x J(x) < \infty$, the long-range percolation graph has holes for $\beta > \beta_c(J)$, in the sense that there are infinitely many connected components, and only one of them is infinite. In particular, the graph is not connected. To circumvent this issue, for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we define \hat{x} as the point $y \in \mathcal{C}_\infty$ such that $\|x - y\|$ is minimal. If there are several such points y , we pick the smallest one in the usual lexicographic ordering (any deterministic rule would work here, but we decide with no particular reason for this one). For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we define $\hat{x} := \hat{x}^d$. The uniqueness of the infinite open cluster now implies that in the supercritical regime one has almost surely $D(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) < \infty$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We also define the metric on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\hat{D} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty), \quad \hat{D}(x, y) = D(\hat{x}, \hat{y}).$$

So in particular $\hat{D}(x, y) = D(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{C}_\infty$. We define the balls in this metric by

$$\hat{B}_t(x) = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \hat{D}(z, x) \leq t \right\}.$$

Theorem 1.8. *Let $d \geq 2$, $s > 2d$, and let $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a symmetric and irreducible kernel satisfying $J(x) = \mathcal{O}(\|x\|^{-s})$. Let $\beta > \beta_c(J)$. Then there exists a deterministic function $\mu : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\hat{D}(\mathbf{0}, nx)}{n} = \mu(x) \quad \text{almost surely and in } L_1. \quad (4)$$

The function μ is a norm on \mathbb{R}^d , so in particular $\mu(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. The convergence is uniform in the sense that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d: \|x\| \geq n} \left| \frac{\hat{D}(\mathbf{0}, x) - \mu(x)}{\|x\|} \right| = 0 \text{ almost surely.} \quad (5)$$

Define the 1-ball in the μ -metric by $\mathcal{B}_\mu = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mu(z) \leq 1\}$. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists almost surely some $t_0 < \infty$ such that

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\mathcal{B}_\mu \subset \frac{\hat{B}_t(\mathbf{0})}{t} \subset (1 + \varepsilon)\mathcal{B}_\mu \quad (6)$$

for all $t \geq t_0$.

Note that the restriction to $s > 2d$ in the above theorem is necessary, as the chemical distances grow sublinearly for $s \leq 2d$ [6, 12]. Thus there can be no non-trivial shape theorem as described above.

1.2 Varying short edges only

In the previous literature, also a different model of long-range percolation was considered. Let $f : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a **symmetric** function, i.e., $f(-x) = f(x)$ and f is invariant under sign-changes and permutations of the coordinates of x . We define the edge $e = \{x, y\}$ to be open with probability $f(x - y)$ if $\|x - y\| > 1$, and with probability $p \in [0, 1]$ if $\|x - y\| = 1$. We assume that all edges are independent of each other and write $\mathbb{P}_{p,f}$ for the resulting probability measure. Typically, we consider the function f as fixed and vary the parameter p . The difference to the previous setup is that here, we vary the probability that short-range edges are open, whereas, in the previous setup, all probabilities $\mathbb{P}_{\beta,J}(\{x, y\} \text{ open})$ changed when varying β , as long as $J(x - y) \in (0, \infty)$. As the measure $\mathbb{P}_{p,f}$ is monotone in p , we can define the critical value

$$p_c(f) = \inf \{p \in [0, 1] : \mathbb{P}_{p,f}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = \infty) > 0\}.$$

Note that $p_c(f) \geq 0$, where equality can hold, even if the function f is integrable. Furthermore, for every function f one has $p_c(f) \leq p_c^d \leq 1$, where p_c^d is the critical value for nearest-neighbor percolation on \mathbb{Z}^d ; also note that $p_c^d < 1$ for $d \geq 2$. For $d = 1$, and for functions f for which $\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)\|x\|^2 > 1$, Newman and Schulman proved that $p_c(f) < 1$ [41], whereas the condition $f(x) \leq (1 + o(1))\|x\|^{-2}$ implies that $p_c(f) = 1$ in dimension 1 [1]. The setup of varying the short-range probabilities in long-range percolation was often considered in previous literature [1, 38, 41], particularly in the work about continuity of the critical point for long-range percolation with exponential decay by Meester and Steif. One natural question is now whether the results that we stated above also hold for a supercritical long-range percolation measure $\mathbb{P}_{p,f}$. The answer is yes, under a certain regularity condition.

Theorem 1.9. *Let $f : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a symmetric function so that*

$$f(x) \simeq \|x\|^{-s} \quad (7)$$

for some $s > d$. Then in the supercritical regime ($p > p_c(f)$), the same results as stated in Theorems 1.1, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7, and Corollary 1.5 hold for the measure $\mathbb{P}_{p,f}$. If $s > 2d$, then also the shape theorem as stated in Theorem 1.8 holds.

Our main tool for proving the results of Theorem 1.9 is a strict inequality of critical points for different kernels.

Proposition 1.10. *Let J be an integrable and symmetric kernel so that there exists constants $0 < a < A < \infty$ such that*

$$0 < aJ(x + e_i) \leq J(x) \leq AJ(x + e_i) \quad (8)$$

for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\|x\|$ large enough. Define the kernel \bar{J} by

$$\bar{J}(x) = \begin{cases} J(x) + 1 & \text{if } \|x\| = 1 \\ J(x) & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

Then $\beta_c(\bar{J}) < \beta_c(J)$.

To prove this result, we use the well-known technique of enhancements developed by Aizenman and Grimmett [3]. Finally, we give a counterexample to the statement of Theorem 1.4 in dimension $d = 1$, even under the assumption that the approximating sequence has a non-trivial percolation threshold.

Theorem 1.11. *Let $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow [0, 1)$ be a symmetric and integrable function with $p_c(f) < 1$. Then there exists a sequence of functions $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ which converges to f in L_1 such that $p_c(f_n) < 1$ for all n , but $p_c(f_n) \not\rightarrow p_c(f)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Note that this statement is trivial when one removes the assumption that $p_c(f_n) < 1$ for all n , as one can always pick a sequence of compactly supported functions $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ that converges to f in L_1 , but in dimension $d = 1$ every compactly supported function f_n already satisfies $p_c(f_n) = 1$.

1.3 Notation

When we write $\|x\|$ we always mean the 2-norm. We write $B_m(x)$ for the ball of radius m around x in the ∞ -norm, i.e., $B_m(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \|x - y\|_\infty \leq m\}$. We write $\mathbf{0}$ for the origin of \mathbb{Z}^d and define the annulus $S_n^{(1+\delta)n} = B_{(1+\delta)n}(\mathbf{0}) \setminus B_n(\mathbf{0})$.

We use the notation $x \leftrightarrow y$ if there exists an open path from x to y and for a set $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ we write $x \xrightarrow{A} y$ if there exists a path from x to y that is entirely within the set A . For $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we write $K_x = \{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d : x \leftrightarrow y\}$ for the open cluster containing x . For a set $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ we define $K_x(A) = \{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d : x \xrightarrow{A} y\}$ as the open set containing x within A . For a set $R \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ we define

$$K_R = \bigcup_{x \in R} K_x \quad \text{and} \quad K_R(A) = \bigcup_{x \in R} K_x(A).$$

We say that a set $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ is an **(open) m -pad** if $A = B_m(x)$ for some $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and if $y \xrightarrow{A} z$ for all $y, z \in A$. For a kernel $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and two (disjoint) sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ we define

$$J(A, B) = \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{y \in B} J(x - y).$$

In particular, this implies that for all $\beta \geq 0$ and all disjoint sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(A \approx B) = \prod_{x \in A} \prod_{y \in B} e^{-\beta J(x-y)} = e^{-\beta \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{y \in B} J(x-y)} = e^{-\beta J(A, B)}.$$

In many of our proofs, we will use *sprinkling*. Let E be the edge set of the complete graph upon \mathbb{Z}^d , i.e., $E = \{\{x, y\} : x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d, x \neq y\}$. For an edge $e = \{x, y\} \in E$, we also write $J(e) := J(x - y)$. We consider the percolation configuration as an element $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^E$ and we regard an edge $e \in E$ as open if $\omega(e) = 1$. To define sprinkling formally, we construct two sequences of environments $(\omega_\beta)_{\beta \geq 0}, (\omega'_\beta)_{\beta \geq 0}$ as follows. Let $(U_e)_{e \in E}, (U'_e)_{e \in E}$ be independent random variables that are uniformly distributed on the interval $[0, 1]$. For all $e \in E$ and all $\beta \geq 0$, we define $\omega_\beta, \omega'_\beta \in \{0, 1\}^E$ by

$$\omega_\beta(e) = \mathbb{1}\{U_e \leq 1 - \exp(-\beta J(e))\} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega'_\beta(e) = \mathbb{1}\{U'_e \leq 1 - \exp(-\beta J(e))\}.$$

From the definition it directly follows that $\mathbb{P}(\omega_\beta(e) = 1) = 1 - \exp(-\beta J(e)) = \mathbb{P}_\beta(e \text{ is open})$ and the same result also holds for ω'_β . Furthermore, this coupling is monotone in the sense that if $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta$, then $\omega_\alpha \leq \omega_\beta$. For $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$, define $\omega = \omega_\beta \vee \omega'_\alpha \in \{0, 1\}^E$ by

$$\omega(e) = \omega_\beta(e) \vee \omega'_\alpha(e) = \max\{\omega_\beta(e), \omega'_\alpha(e)\}$$

for all $e \in E$. Then, by independence of ω_β and ω'_α ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\omega(e) = 0) &= \mathbb{P}(\omega_\beta(e) = 0, \omega'_\alpha(e) = 0) = \mathbb{P}(\omega_\beta(e) = 0) \mathbb{P}(\omega'_\alpha(e) = 0) = e^{-\alpha J(e)} e^{-\beta J(e)} \\ &= e^{-(\alpha+\beta)J(e)} = \mathbb{P}(\omega_{\alpha+\beta}(e) = 0) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

which implies that $\omega = \omega_\beta \vee \omega'_\alpha$ has the same distribution as $\omega_{\alpha+\beta}$. We will often consider this setup where we have a first percolation configuration ω_β and then sprinkle with the additional edges in ω'_α to obtain the new configuration $\omega = \omega_\beta \vee \omega'_\alpha$.

2 The proof of Theorem 1.1

We only show the proofs where the properties of the long-range percolation graph are essential. Throughout this section, we assume that J is a symmetric and irreducible kernel satisfying the assumption of Theorem 1.1 ($J(x) = \mathcal{O}(\|x\|^{-2d})$). We use this main assumption only at one point, namely in Lemma 2.4. All the other arguments follow similar arguments as used by Grimmett and Marstrand [30], respectively Meester and Steif [38].

Lemma 2.1. *Let $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be an irreducible and symmetric kernel. Then for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, $\beta > 0$, and $x \in \{0, \dots, m\}^d =: A_m$*

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta(\mathbf{0} \xleftrightarrow{A_m} x) > 0.$$

Proof. As the kernel J is irreducible, we can find N large enough so that the kernel \tilde{J} defined by $\tilde{J}(v) = J(v) \mathbb{1}_{\{\|v\| \leq N\}}$ is still irreducible. By definition, the kernel \tilde{J} is also symmetric. Define $x_m := (\lfloor m/2 \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor m/2 \rfloor) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. By symmetry of the kernel \tilde{J} , there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough and $x \in A_m$ one has

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, \tilde{J}}(B_k(x_m) \xleftrightarrow{A_m} x) > 0.$$

Indeed, this is possible as one can go from x towards the direction of x_m , and with positive probability there thus exists an open path between x and $B_k(x_m)$. Further, by the irreducibility of the kernel J , there is $K \geq k$ such that for all $y \in B_k(x_m)$

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(y \xleftrightarrow{B_K(x_m)} x_m \right) > 0.$$

Let m be large enough so that $B_K(x_m) \subset A_m$ (and thus also $B_k(x_m) \subset A_m$). Then for each $x \in A_m$, there exists with positive probability a path from x to some $u \in B_k(x_m)$, and this path is entirely within A_m . Further, with positive probability, there is a path from u to x_m that is entirely within $B_K(x_m) \subset A_m$. So both paths have a positive probability of being open. Concatenating the two paths and using the FKG-inequality [32, Section 2.2] gives a path between x and x_m that is open with positive probability. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\beta > \beta_c$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\mathbb{P}_\beta(B_m(\mathbf{0}) \leftrightarrow \infty) > 1 - \varepsilon$. Then for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N$ and all sets $B_m(\mathbf{0}) \subset R \subset B_n(\mathbf{0})$*

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta(J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) > L) > 1 - 2\varepsilon$$

where the set $K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) = \bigcup_{x \in R} K_x(B_n(\mathbf{0}))$ is the set of points that can be reached from R within $B_n(\mathbf{0})$.

Proof. Note that for all sets $R \supset B_m(\mathbf{0})$ we have that $K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \supset K_{B_m(\mathbf{0})}(B_n(\mathbf{0}))$, so it suffices to show the claim for $R = B_m(\mathbf{0})$. We set $R = B_m(\mathbf{0})$ for the rest of the proof. For the proof itself, we use a contraposition. So assume that there are infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta(J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) > L) \leq 1 - 2\varepsilon$$

or equivalently

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta(J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) \leq L) \geq 2\varepsilon.$$

Then we also get by Fatou's Lemma that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\beta(J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) \leq L \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N}) \\ & \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\beta(J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) \leq L) \geq 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Together with $\mathbb{P}_\beta(R \leftrightarrow \infty) > 1 - \varepsilon$ this implies that

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta(R \leftrightarrow \infty \text{ and } J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) \leq L \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N}) \geq \varepsilon$$

which is a contradiction, as this probability needs to be 0, see for example [38, Lemma 2.6]. \square

Definition 2.3. *For $\delta > 0$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the set*

$$P_{m,n}^\delta = \{x \in B_{(1+\delta)n}(\mathbf{0}) \setminus B_n(\mathbf{0}) : x \text{ is in an open } m\text{-pad } A \subset B_{(1+\delta)n}(\mathbf{0}) \setminus B_n(\mathbf{0})\}$$

as the union of all open m -pads within $B_{(1+\delta)n}(\mathbf{0}) \setminus B_n(\mathbf{0})$.

The next lemma is the key lemma that uses the assumption on the kernel J that $J(x) = \mathcal{O}(\|x\|^{-2d})$. A similar version was proven by Meester and Steif [38, Lemma A].

Lemma 2.4. *Let J be an irreducible kernel so that $J(x) = \mathcal{O}(\|x\|^{-2d})$ and let $\beta > \beta_c(J)$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\mathbb{P}_\beta(B_m(\mathbf{0}) \leftrightarrow \infty) > 1 - \varepsilon$. Then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N$ and all sets $B_m(\mathbf{0}) \subset R \subset B_n(\mathbf{0})$*

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \sim P_{m,n}^\delta) > 1 - 3\varepsilon.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 2.2, it suffices to prove this result for $R = B_m(\mathbf{0})$. The important observation here is that

$$\begin{aligned} J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), S_n^{(1+\delta)n}) &= J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) - J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), B_{(1+\delta)n}(\mathbf{0})^C) \\ &\geq J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) - J(B_n(\mathbf{0}), B_{(1+\delta)n}(\mathbf{0})^C) \end{aligned}$$

and the quantity $J(B_n(\mathbf{0}), B_{(1+\delta)n}(\mathbf{0})^C) = \sum_{x \in B_n(\mathbf{0})} \sum_{y \notin B_n(\mathbf{0})} J(x-y)$ is uniformly bounded over all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, as $J(x-y) = \mathcal{O}(\|x-y\|^{-2d})$. Note that this is the essential step (and the only time in the proof of Theorem 1.1) where we use the requirement that $J(x) = \mathcal{O}(\|x\|^{-2d})$. So the quantity $J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), S_n^{(1+\delta)n})$ can be arbitrarily large for suitable choice of L . In particular, for L large enough we have that

$$\text{if } J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) > L, \text{ then } J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), S_n^{(1+\delta)n}) > \frac{L}{2}.$$

and thus, by Lemma 2.2, we get that for all large enough $L > 0$ one has for all large enough n that

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), S_n^{(1+\delta)n}) > \frac{L}{2} \right) \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon.$$

Next, we argue that there exists $L < \infty$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \sim P_{m,n}^\delta \mid J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), S_n^{(1+\delta)n}) > \frac{L}{2} \right) > 1 - \varepsilon \quad (10)$$

which then implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \sim P_{m,n}^\delta \right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \sim P_{m,n}^\delta \mid J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), S_n^{(1+\delta)n}) > \frac{L}{2} \right) \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), S_n^{(1+\delta)n}) > \frac{L}{2} \right) \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon)(1 - 2\varepsilon) \geq 1 - 3\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

So we are left to show that (10) holds for L large enough. Note that $J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), S_n^{(1+\delta)n})$ is proportional to the (expected) number of points $x \in S_n^{(1+\delta)n}$ that are connected to $K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0}))$ by an open edge. Using that different edges between $S_n^{(1+\delta)n}$ and $K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0}))$ are independent, we see that for every $M < \infty$ there exists $L < \infty$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\left| \left\{ x \in S_n^{(1+\delta)n} : x \sim K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \right\} \right| \geq M \mid J(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})), S_n^{(1+\delta)n}) > \frac{L}{2} \right) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (11)$$

Each $x \in S_n^{(1+\delta)n}$ has a strictly positive probability of being contained in $P_{m,n}^\delta$. For points $x, y \in S_n^{(1+\delta)n}$ with $\|x-y\|_\infty \geq 5m$ it is independent whether they are elements of $P_{m,n}^\delta$. Using this independence one sees that (11) implies (10) for M large enough. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\beta > \beta_c$, and $\varepsilon, \delta, K > 0$. Then there exists $m, N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N$ there exists $y = y(n) \in \partial B_n(\mathbf{0}) = \{x : \|x\|_\infty = n\}$ such that for all sets $B_m(\mathbf{0}) \subseteq R \subseteq B_n(\mathbf{0})$*

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \sim P_{m,n}^{\delta,y} \right) > 1 - \varepsilon \quad (12)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(J(R, W_y^n) > K \right) > 1 - \varepsilon, \quad (13)$$




Figure 1: An illustration of the statement of Lemma 2.5: The inner blue square (R) is connected by an open path (the black edges) to an open m -pad (the outer blue square) in $S_n^{(1+\delta)n} \cap B_{\delta n}(y)$ (the green hatched area).

where the sets $P_{m,n}^{\delta,y}$ and W_y^n are defined by

$$P_{m,n}^{\delta,y} = \left\{ x \in P_{m,n}^\delta : x \text{ is contained in an } m\text{-pad } A \subset S_n^{(1+\delta)n} \text{ such that } A \subset B_{\delta n}(y) \right\}$$

and

$$W_y^n = P_{m,n}^{\delta,y} \cup \bigcup_{x \in B_n(\mathbf{0}) : x \sim P_{m,n}^{\delta,y}} K_x(B_n(\mathbf{0}) \setminus R).$$

See Figure 1 for a picture of this setup.

Proof. We start with the proof of (12). As in the preceding lemmas, it suffices to show the claim for $R = B_m(\mathbf{0})$. For fixed $\delta > 0$ we can choose a family of sets $(\mathcal{Y}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mathcal{Y}_n \subset \partial B_n(\mathbf{0})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $Y := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\mathcal{Y}_n| < \infty$, and such that for all $m < \frac{\delta}{3}n$, if $A \subset S_n^{(1+\delta)n}$ is an open m -pad, then $A \subset S_n^{(1+\delta)n} \cap B_{\delta n}(y)$ for some $y \in \mathcal{Y}_n$. These properties of \mathcal{Y}_n imply that

$$\bigcup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \left\{ K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \sim P_{m,n}^{\delta,y} \right\} = \left\{ K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \sim P_{m,n}^\delta \right\}.$$

The set \mathcal{Y}_n can be constructed by taking points $y \in \partial B_n(\mathbf{0})$ that have an Euclidean distance of order δn . As all the events $\left\{ K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \sim P_{m,n}^{\delta,y} \right\}$ are increasing, we get by the FKG-inequality [32, Section 2.2] (respectively the “square-root-trick”) that there needs to exist a $y \in \mathcal{Y}_n$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \sim P_{m,n}^{\delta,y} \right) \geq 1 - \left(1 - \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \sim P_{m,n}^\delta \right) \right)^{1/Y}$$

By Lemma 2.4, the expression on the right-hand side of this inequality quantity can be arbitrarily close to 1 for suitable choice of m, N and all $n \geq N$, as $Y < \infty$. Thus also the expression on the left-hand side of this inequality $\left(\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \sim P_{m,n}^{\delta,y}\right)\right)$ will be arbitrarily close to 1 for an appropriate choice of m, N and all $n \geq N$. In particular, for fixed $\varepsilon, \delta, K > 0$ there exist $m, N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N$ there exists $y \in \partial B_n(\mathbf{0})$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \approx P_{m,n}^{\delta,y}\right) \leq e^{-\beta K} \varepsilon. \quad (14)$$

As $e^{-\beta K} < 1$, this directly implies (12). Next, let us go to the proof of (13). Conditioned on the event $\{J(R, W_y^n) \leq K\}$, there is a probability of at least $e^{-\beta K}$ that all edges between R and W_y^n are closed. However, if all edges between R and W_y^n are closed, then $K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \approx P_{m,n}^{\delta,y}$, and thus we get that

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(K_R(B_n(\mathbf{0})) \approx P_{m,n}^{\delta,y}\right) \geq \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(J(R, W_y^n) \leq K\right) e^{-\beta K},$$

which directly implies that $\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(J(R, W_y^n) \leq K\right) \leq \varepsilon$, by (14). \square

In the previous proofs, we did not use the assumption that $\beta > \beta_c$. Instead, we only used that $\theta(\beta) = \mathbb{P}_\beta(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = \infty) > 0$ (which is conjectured to be equivalent to $\beta > \beta_c$ in dimension $d \geq 2$). However, in the next few lemmas, we will use that $\beta > \beta_c$, as the proofs of these results will require sprinkling as introduced in section 1.3.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\beta > \beta_c$. For all $\varepsilon', \delta > 0$, and there exist $m, N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all even $n \geq N$*

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(B_m(\mathbf{0}) \overset{B_{(1+\delta)n}(\mathbf{0})}{\longleftrightarrow} F_m^\delta(ne_i)\right) > 1 - \varepsilon' \quad (15)$$

where $F_m^\delta(ne_i)$ is the set

$$F_m^\delta(ne_i) = \left\{x \in B_\delta(ne_i) : x \text{ is contained in an open } m\text{-pad } \tilde{A} \subset B_\delta(ne_i)\right\}.$$

Further, let $\varepsilon', \delta, K > 0$. Then there exists $m, N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all even $n \geq N$ and all sets $B_m(\mathbf{0}) \subseteq R \subseteq B_{n+\delta n}(\mathbf{0}) \setminus B_{\delta n}(ne_i)$

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(J(R, \tilde{W}) > K\right) > 1 - \varepsilon' \quad (16)$$

where the set \tilde{W} is defined by

$$\tilde{W} = P_{m,n}^{\delta,ne_i} \cup \bigcup_{x \in P_{m,n}^{\delta,ne_i}} K_x(B_{(1+\delta)n}(\mathbf{0}) \setminus R).$$

Proof. By the symmetry of the kernel J it suffices to prove the result for $e_i = e_1$. We define

$$\tilde{\beta} = \frac{\beta + \beta_c}{2}, \eta = \frac{\beta - \beta_c}{2}, \text{ and } \varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon'}{3}$$

and take K large enough so that $1 - e^{-\eta K} > 1 - \varepsilon$. Let $m, N \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that for all $k \geq N$ there exists $y \in \partial B_k(\mathbf{0})$ such that for all sets $B_m(\mathbf{0}) \subseteq R \subseteq B_n(\mathbf{0})$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\beta}} \left(K_R(B_k(\mathbf{0})) \sim P_{m,k}^{\delta,y}\right) > 1 - \varepsilon \text{ and } \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(J(R, W_y^k) > K\right) > 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (17)$$




Figure 2: Connecting m -pads (the blue boxes) in the proof of Lemma 2.6. We first find a path from $B_m(\mathbf{0})$ (the blue box on the left side) to $A = B_m(z)$ (the middle blue box). From A , we find a path to an m -pad $\tilde{A} \subset F_m^\delta(ne_1)$ (in the picture, \tilde{A} is the blue box on the right side). Combining these two paths gives a path from $B_m(\mathbf{0})$ to $F_m^\delta(ne_1)$.

Such m, N , and $y = y(k)$ exist by the results of Lemma 2.6. In the following, we work with the two percolation configurations $\omega_{\tilde{\beta}}$ and ω'_η . Note that their union $\omega_{\tilde{\beta}} \vee \omega'_\eta$ is distributed like ω_β . Unless otherwise specified, all connection events of the form $x \sim v$ or $A \leftrightarrow B$ will always refer to connections in the environment $\omega_{\tilde{\beta}}$.

By the symmetry of the kernel J we can assume that the point $y \in \partial B_k(\mathbf{0})$ chosen in (17) satisfies $y_1 = \langle y, e_1 \rangle = k$. So in particular we get that $B_m(\mathbf{0}) \stackrel{B_{(1+\delta)k}(\mathbf{0})}{\longleftrightarrow} A$ for some open m -pad $A \subset S_k^{(1+\delta)k} \cap B_{\delta k}(y)$ with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$. Assume that such a set A exists. Let $z \in A$ be such that $B_m(z) = A$. Define the set

$$\tilde{R} = K_A(B_{(1+\delta)k}(\mathbf{0})) = \left\{ x \in B_{(1+\delta)k}(\mathbf{0}) : x \stackrel{B_{(1+\delta)k}(\mathbf{0})}{\longleftrightarrow} A \right\}$$

as the open set containing A within $B_{(1+\delta)k}(\mathbf{0})$ in the environment $\omega_{\tilde{\beta}}$. Define $\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ by $\tilde{y}_1 = y_1$ and $\tilde{y}_i = -y_i$ for $i \geq 2$. Furthermore, we define the sets

$$P = \left\{ x \in z + S_k^{(1+\delta)k} : x \text{ is contained in an } m\text{-pad that is a subset of } z + \left(B_{\delta k}(\tilde{y}) \cap S_k^{(1+\delta)k} \right) \right\}$$

and

$$W = P \cup \bigcup_{x \in B_k(z) : x \sim P} K_x(B_k(z) \setminus \tilde{R}).$$

The set \tilde{R} can be constructed by only revealing the information whether edges with at least one end in \tilde{R} are open. Contrary to that, the set W only depends on edges with both ends outside of \tilde{R} . Also note that the set W is defined as the set $W_{\tilde{y}}^k$ in Lemma 2.5,

up to a translation. Using the translation invariance of the model and Lemma 2.5, we get that $J(\tilde{R}, W) > K$ with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$. Assuming that $J(\tilde{R}, W) > K$, there exists an ω'_η -open edge between \tilde{R} and W with probability at least $1 - \exp(-\eta K) > 1 - \varepsilon$. If there exists such an open edge between \tilde{R} and B in the environment ω'_η , then there exists an open path in the environment $\omega_{\tilde{\beta}} \vee \omega'_\eta$ from $B_m(\mathbf{0})$ to P and this open path is entirely in the set $B_{(1+\delta)k}(\mathbf{0}) \cup B_{(1+\delta)k}(z) \subset B_{(2+2\delta)k}(\mathbf{0})$. The three relevant events for this ($B_m(\mathbf{0}) \leftrightarrow A$ for some m -pad $A \subset P_{m,k}^{\delta,y}$, $J(\tilde{R}, W) > K$, and the existence of an open edge between W and \tilde{R} in the environment ω'_η) all have a conditional probability of at least $(1 - \varepsilon)$. Thus, all three of the events occur simultaneously with probability at least $(1 - \varepsilon)^3 \geq 1 - 3\varepsilon$.

Let $B_m(\tilde{z}) = \tilde{A} \subset P$ be an open m -pad. We know that

$$\begin{aligned} A &= B_m(z) \subset S_k^{(1+\delta)k} \cap B_{\delta k}(y), \\ \tilde{A} &= B_m(\tilde{z}) \subset z + S_k^{(1+\delta)k} \cap B_{\delta k}(\tilde{y}). \end{aligned}$$

As $y + \tilde{y} = 2ke_1$ and $\|z - y\|_\infty \leq \delta k$, we thus get that

$$\tilde{A} \subset z + B_{\delta k}(\tilde{y}) = z - y + y + B_{\delta k}(\tilde{y}) = z - y + B_{\delta k}(2ke_1) \subset B_{2\delta k}(2ke_1),$$

which also implies that $\tilde{A} \subset B_{(1+\delta)2k}(\mathbf{0})$, and thus $\tilde{A} \subset F_m^\delta(2ke_1)$. See Figure 2 for the relative positions of $A, \tilde{A}, y, \tilde{y}$, and z . So in total, we see that

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(B_m(\mathbf{0}) \overset{B_{(1+\delta)2k}(\mathbf{0})}{\longleftrightarrow} F_m^\delta(2ke_1) \right) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^3 \geq 1 - 3\varepsilon = 1 - \varepsilon'$$

which finishes the proof of (15) for $n = 2k$. The proof of (16) works the same way as the proof of (13) and we omit it. \square

From here on, a renormalization with a mixed site-bond percolation model shows that there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ so that the kernel \tilde{J} defined by $\tilde{J}(x) = J(x)\mathbb{1}_{\|x\| \leq N}$ satisfies $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, \tilde{J}}(|K_\mathbf{0}| = \infty) > 0$. The precise details of this renormalization and the comparison with a supercritical model of site-bond percolation were carried out in [30, 38].

3 Applications of Theorem 1.1

We apply Theorem 1.1 to prove Theorems 1.4, 1.7, and 1.8, and Corollary 1.5. In the proofs of these results, we will often use that the corresponding results are known for supercritical finite-range percolation. Theorem 1.1 then allows us to deduce the corresponding results also for supercritical long-range percolation.

3.1 Locality of long-range percolation

We start with the proof of Theorem 1.4. Note that Theorem 1.1 also provides a locality result of the type $\beta_c(J_n) \rightarrow \beta_c(J)$ if one defines the kernels J_n by

$$J_n(x) = \begin{cases} J(x) & \text{if } \|x\| \leq n \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $J_n \rightarrow J$ in L_1 on \mathbb{Z}^d . In order to show the result, we will show that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_c(J_n) \geq \beta_c(J) \text{ and} \quad (18)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_c(J_n) \leq \beta_c(J). \quad (19)$$

We need to show both inequalities for the case where J_n converges to a resilient kernel J , and for the case where J_n converges to a general kernel from above.

We start with the proof of (18); here we do not make a distinction whether the kernel J is resilient or not. Let $\beta < \beta_c(J)$. By the proof of sharpness of the phase transition by Duminil-Copin and Tassion [22, 23], there exists a finite set $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\mathbf{0} \in S \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and

$$\phi_{\beta, J}(S) := \sum_{x \in S} \sum_{y \notin S} \left(1 - e^{-\beta J(x-y)}\right) \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(\mathbf{0} \xleftrightarrow{S} x\right) < 1. \quad (20)$$

As $J_n \rightarrow J$ in L_1 of \mathbb{Z}^d , we also get that

$$\phi_{\beta, J_n}(S) = \sum_{x \in S} \sum_{y \notin S} \left(1 - e^{-\beta J_n(x-y)}\right) \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J_n} \left(\mathbf{0} \xleftrightarrow{S} x\right) < 1$$

for all large enough n , which implies that $\beta_c(J_n) \geq \beta$ for all large enough n . As $\beta < \beta_c(J)$ was arbitrary, this finishes the proof of (18).

We still need to show that (19) holds. We start with the case where J is a general kernel and J_n converges to J from above. If $J_n \geq J$, then $\beta_c(J_n) \leq \beta_c(J)$, which implies that (19) holds for this case.

Next, let J be a resilient kernel and let $(J_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of kernels such that J_n converges to J in L_1 , not necessarily from above. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Take $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that the kernel \tilde{J} defined by

$$\tilde{J}(x) = \begin{cases} J(x) & \text{if } \|x\| \leq N \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

satisfies $\beta_c(\tilde{J}) < \beta_c(J) + \varepsilon$. Such $N \in \mathbb{N}$ exists as J is a resilient kernel. Define the kernel \tilde{J}_n by

$$\tilde{J}_n(x) = \begin{cases} J_n(x) & \text{if } \|x\| \leq N \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

Then $\tilde{J}_n \rightarrow \tilde{J}$ pointwise. As both \tilde{J}_n and \tilde{J} have uniform (in n) finite range, $\beta_c(\tilde{J}_n)$ converges to $\beta_c(\tilde{J})$ and thus

$$\beta_c(J_n) \leq \beta_c(\tilde{J}_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_c(\tilde{J}) < \beta_c(J) + \varepsilon$$

which implies that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_c(J_n) \leq \beta_c(J) + \varepsilon$. As $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary this finishes the proof. \square

Remark 3.1. Note that the proof of (18) used the L_1 -convergence of the kernel J_n , but did not use any other property of the limiting kernel J . Contrary to that, the proof of (19) used pointwise convergence of the kernels only, but also required resilience of the kernel J , or that the approximating sequence converges from above.

3.2 Continuity of the percolation probability outside criticality

Next, we go to the proof of Corollary 1.5. Note that the restriction to $\beta \neq \beta_c(J)$ in the statement is essential. Indeed, proving the result of Corollary 1.5 for $\beta = \beta_c(J)$ would imply continuity of the percolation phase transition, which is an important open problem even for finite-range percolation in intermediate dimensions. A similar statement to that of Corollary 1.5 for long-range percolation with exponentially decaying connection probabilities was already proven by Meester and Steif in [38, Theorem 1.4] and we follow a similar strategy of the proof as they did.

Proof of Corollary 1.5. In order to show the corollary, we need to show that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta(\beta_n, J_n) \leq \theta(\beta, J) \quad \text{and} \quad (21)$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta(\beta_n, J_n) \geq \theta(\beta, J). \quad (22)$$

We start with the proof of (21). Let $\varepsilon > 0$. As the number of finite subsets of \mathbb{Z}^d is countable, there exists a finite collection of different finite sets $(A_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\}}$ such that $\mathbf{0} \in A_i \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(K_{\mathbf{0}} \in \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(K_{\mathbf{0}} = A_i) \geq 1 - \theta(\beta, J) - \varepsilon.$$

As A_i is a finite set, $\beta_n \rightarrow \beta$, and $J_n \rightarrow J$ in L_1 , we get that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{P}_{\beta_n, J_n}(K_{\mathbf{0}} = A_i) = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(K_{\mathbf{0}} = A_i) \geq 1 - \theta(\beta, J) - \varepsilon,$$

so in particular

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{P}_{\beta_n, J_n}(K_{\mathbf{0}} = A_i) \geq 1 - \theta(\beta, J) - 2\varepsilon$$

for all n large enough and thus also

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta_n, J_n}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = \infty) \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{P}_{\beta_n, J_n}(K_{\mathbf{0}} = A_i) \leq \theta(\beta, J) + 2\varepsilon$$

for all n large enough, which finishes the proof of (21), as $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary.

Next, let us prove (22). Let us first assume that $\beta < \beta_c(J)$. As $\beta_n \rightarrow \beta$ and $\beta_c(J_n) \rightarrow \beta_c(J)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ (by Theorem 1.4), we have that $\beta_n < \beta_c(J_n)$ for all n large enough. So in particular

$$\theta(\beta_n, J_n) = 0 = \theta(\beta, J)$$

for all large enough $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Next, let us turn to the case $\beta > \beta_c(J)$. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, define the kernel I_N by $I_N(x) = J(x) \mathbb{1}_{\{\|x\| \leq N\}}$. As J is a resilient kernel by assumption, we know from Theorem 1.4 that $\beta_c(I_N) \rightarrow \beta_c(J)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, so in particular we can pick $M \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that $\beta > \beta_c(I_M)$. We couple the measures $(\mathbb{P}_{\beta, I_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ for different values of $k \in \mathbb{N}$ using the Harris coupling (see e.g. [33]), and we write $\mathcal{C}_{\infty}(\omega_{\leq M})$ for the (almost surely unique) infinite cluster sampled by \mathbb{P}_{β, I_M} . We write $\mathbf{0} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\infty}(\omega_{\leq M})$ if the origin is connected to the infinite finite-range percolation cluster and we write $\mathbf{0} \xleftrightarrow{\leq N} \mathcal{C}_{\infty}(\omega_{\leq M})$ if

the origin is connected to $\mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq M})$ using only edges $\{x, y\}$ with $\|x - y\| \leq N$. Using this coupling, one can see that for all $N \geq M$

$$\theta(\beta, J) - \theta(\beta, I_N) = \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \mathbf{0} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq M}) \right\} \cap \left\{ \mathbf{0} \xleftrightarrow{\leq N} \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq M}) \right\}^c \right)$$

which converges to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$ by the uniqueness of the infinite open cluster. So for each $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that

$$\theta(\beta, I_N) \geq \theta(\beta, J) - \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \beta > \beta_c(I_N)$$

As the function $\tilde{\beta} \mapsto \theta(\tilde{\beta}, I_N)$ is continuous in $\tilde{\beta}$ for all $\tilde{\beta} \neq \beta_c(I_N)$, we can pick $\delta > 0$ small enough so that

$$\theta(\beta - \delta, I_N) \geq \theta(\beta, J) - 2\varepsilon.$$

As $\beta_n \rightarrow \beta$ and $J_n \rightarrow J$ in L_1 (and thus also pointwise) this implies that $\beta_n J_n(x) \geq (\beta - \delta) I_N(x)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ (Note that I_N has finite range only). As different edges are independent, the pointwise bound already implies the corresponding dominance for the percolation measures, i.e., $\mathbb{P}_{\beta_n, J_n} \succeq \mathbb{P}_{(\beta - \delta), I_N}$ for all large enough n . For such sufficiently large n , we get by the stochastic domination that

$$\theta(\beta_n, J_n) \geq \theta(\beta - \delta, I_N) \geq \theta(\beta, J) - 2\varepsilon,$$

which finishes the proof as $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary. \square

Remark 3.2. Note that the proof of (21) did not use any previous results and holds without any further assumptions on the kernel J . Contrary to that, the proof of inequality (22) heavily uses the resilience of the kernel J and it can be easily seen that inequality (22) does not hold in dimension $d = 1$. However, the proof of (22) does not use the L_1 -convergence of J_n to J , but requires pointwise convergence only.

3.3 Existence of big clusters

For the proof of Theorem 1.6, we need the following claim for finite-range percolation. It says that with high probability all points x, y in the infinite cluster of a box are connected in a slightly bigger box.

Claim 3.3. Let $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be an irreducible and symmetric kernel with finite range, and let $\beta > \beta_c(J)$. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(\forall x, y \in \mathcal{C}_\infty \cap B_{n - \sqrt{n}}(\mathbf{0}) : x \xleftrightarrow{B_n(\mathbf{0})} y \right) = 1.$$

We will prove this result later; let us first see how it implies Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6 given Claim 3.3. By Theorem 1.1 we know that we can pick $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that the kernel \tilde{J} defined by $\tilde{J}(x) = J(x) \mathbb{1}_{\|x\| \leq N}$ satisfies $\beta > \beta_c(\tilde{J})$. So in particular there almost surely exists an infinite open cluster using only short edges. Define this cluster as

$$K = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : x \leftrightarrow \infty \text{ using only open edges } e \text{ with } |e| \leq N \right\}.$$

The set K is a random set and a subset of the infinite cluster \mathcal{C}_∞ whose distribution is invariant under translations. For a point $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, define the random variable Z_y as the distance to the set K :

$$Z_y = \inf \left\{ m \geq 0 : \text{There exist } y_0, y_1, \dots, y_k \subset B_m(y) \text{ s.t.} \right. \\ \left. \{y_i, y_{i+1}\} \text{ open for } i = 0, \dots, k-1, y_0 = y, \text{ and } y_k \in K \right\}.$$

So in particular $Z_y = 0$ if and only if $y \in K$, and $Z_y < \infty$ if and only if $y \in \mathcal{C}_\infty$ almost surely, by uniqueness of the infinite cluster. The probability of the event $\{\infty > Z_0 > \sqrt{n}\}$ converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. So in particular, by stationarity,

$$|B_n(\mathbf{0})|^{-1} \sum_{y \in B_n(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty} \mathbb{1}_{Z_y > \sqrt{n}}$$

converges to 0 in expectation, and thus also in probability, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Assume that

$$|\{x \in B_{n-3\sqrt{n}}(\mathbf{0}) : x \in \mathcal{C}_\infty\}| \geq (\theta(\beta, J) - \varepsilon)|B_{n-3\sqrt{n}}(\mathbf{0})|, \quad (23)$$

$$|B_n(\mathbf{0})|^{-1} \sum_{y \in B_n(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty} \mathbb{1}_{Z_y > \sqrt{n}} \leq \varepsilon, \text{ and that} \quad (24)$$

$$B_{n-\sqrt{n}}(\mathbf{0}) \cap K \text{ is connected within } B_n(\mathbf{0}). \quad (25)$$

All these three events hold with high probability in n . The event (23) holds with high probability because of ergodicity, the event (24) holds with high probability as the sum converges to 0 in probability, and the third event (25) holds with high probability by Claim 3.3. Thus all three events hold simultaneously with high probability. If the event in (25) holds, then for all $x, y \in B_{n-3\sqrt{n}}(\mathbf{0})$ with $Z_x, Z_y \leq \sqrt{n}$ there exists a path between them that stays entirely within $B_n(\mathbf{0})$. So if all three events (23), (24), and (25) hold simultaneously, then

$$|K_{\max}(B_n(\mathbf{0}))| \geq (\theta(\beta, J) - \varepsilon)|B_{n-3\sqrt{n}}(\mathbf{0})| - \varepsilon|B_n(\mathbf{0})| \geq (\theta(\beta, J) - 3\varepsilon)|B_n(\mathbf{0})|$$

where the last inequality holds for n large enough. This shows Theorem 1.6. \square

Finally, we prove Claim 3.3. Before going to the proof, we need to introduce two results. The first one is due to Cerf and Th  ret [16, Theorem 6], following earlier work of Antal and Pisztora [4]. They proved the result for nearest-neighbor percolation, but the same proof works for finite-range percolation.

Theorem 3.4 (Cerf-Th  ret [16]). *Let $d \geq 2$, let $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a symmetric and irreducible kernel with finite range, and let $\beta > \beta_c(J)$. Then there exist positive constants A_1, A_2, A_3 such that*

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \forall l \geq A_3 \|x - y\|, \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(x \leftrightarrow y, D(x, y) \geq l) \leq A_1 e^{-A_2 l} \quad (26)$$

One other result that we will use for the proof of Claim 3.3 is that it is exponentially unlikely for a box $B_n(\mathbf{0})$ to not intersect the infinite cluster. We will use that for all symmetric finite-range kernels J and all $\beta > \beta_c(J)$ there exist $C < \infty$ and $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(B_n(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty = \emptyset) \leq C e^{-n^\eta} \quad (27)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This follows from the results of Durrett and Schonmann in dimension $d = 2$ [25] and from the results of Chayes, Chayes, and Newman in dimension $d \geq 3$ [17]. Note that (27) directly implies the following result: If J is a symmetric and resilient kernel, and $\beta > \beta_c(J)$, then there exists N such that the kernel \tilde{J} defined by $\tilde{J}(x) = J(x)\mathbb{1}_{\|x\| \leq N}$ satisfies $\beta > \beta_c(\tilde{J})$. Thus we get that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(B_n(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty = \emptyset) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\beta, \tilde{J}}(B_n(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty = \emptyset) \leq Ce^{-n^\eta} \quad (28)$$

for some $C < \infty, \eta > 0$, and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. With this, we go to the proof of Claim 3.3.

Proof of Claim 3.3. Define the event \mathcal{G}_n by

$$\mathcal{G}_n = \bigcap_{x \in B_n(\mathbf{0})} \{B_{n^{1/4}}(x) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty \neq \emptyset\} \cap \bigcap_{x, y \in B_n(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty} \left\{ D(x, y) \leq A_3(\|x - y\| \vee n^{1/4}) \right\}.$$

Note that the condition $x, y \in \mathcal{C}_\infty$ implies that $x \leftrightarrow y$ by uniqueness of the infinite open cluster. So using (26) and (27) and a union bound over all possible values of $x, y \in B_n(\mathbf{0})$ one sees that $\mathbb{P}_\beta(\mathcal{G}_n) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n}$ for all large enough n . We finish the proof by showing that the event \mathcal{G}_n implies that $x \xleftrightarrow{B_n(\mathbf{0})} y$ for all $x, y \in B_{n-\sqrt{n}}(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty$. Let $x, y \in B_{n-\sqrt{n}}(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty$. Then we can pick $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k \in B_{n-\sqrt{n}}(\mathbf{0})$ such that $\|a_i - a_{i-1}\| \leq n^{1/4}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $x \in B_{n^{1/4}}(a_0), y \in B_{n^{1/4}}(a_k)$. By the definition of the event \mathcal{G}_n , for all $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ there exists $x_i \in B_{n^{1/4}}(a_i) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty$. The Euclidean distance between x_i and x_{i-1} is bounded by

$$\|x_i - x_{i-1}\| \leq \|a_i - x_i\| + \|a_i - a_{i-1}\| + \|a_{i-1} - x_{i-1}\| \leq 3dn^{1/4}$$

and thus the graph distance between x_i and x_{i-1} is bounded by $A_3 3dn^{1/4}$, by the definition of \mathcal{G}_n . The same holds for the graph distance between x and x_0 and the graph distance between x_k and y . As J is a kernel with finite range and $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k \in B_{n-\sqrt{n}}(\mathbf{0})$, the shortest path between x_i and x_{i-1} stays inside the box $B_n(\mathbf{0})$ for large enough n , and the same holds for the shortest path between x_0 and x , respectively between x_k and y . Thus we get that

$$x \xleftrightarrow{B_n(\mathbf{0})} x_0 \xleftrightarrow{B_n(\mathbf{0})} x_1 \xleftrightarrow{B_n(\mathbf{0})} \dots \xleftrightarrow{B_n(\mathbf{0})} x_k \xleftrightarrow{B_n(\mathbf{0})} y$$

which shows that $x \xleftrightarrow{B_n(\mathbf{0})} y$. As $x, y \in B_{n-\sqrt{n}} \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty$ were arbitrary, this finishes the proof. \square

3.4 Transience of random walks

Next, we prove transience of the simple random walk on supercritical long-range percolation clusters in dimension $d \geq 3$. Our main tool here is transience of the simple random walk on finite-range percolation clusters in dimension $d \geq 3$. This was shown by Grimmett, Kesten, and Zhang for nearest-neighbor percolation [31]. The proof for finite-range percolation works analogous and we will not pursue this here.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Let $\beta > \beta_c(J)$ and let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough such that the kernel \tilde{J} defined by

$$\tilde{J}(x) = \begin{cases} J(x) & \text{if } \|x\| \leq N \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

satisfies $\beta > \beta_c(\tilde{J})$. Such an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ exists, as the kernel J was assumed to be resilient. As \tilde{J} is a kernel with finite range, this implies that the infinite cluster constructed with the measure $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, \tilde{J}}$ is almost surely transient [31]. We can sample the percolation configuration

under the measure $\mathbb{P}_{\beta,J}$ by first sampling the percolation configuration under the measure $\mathbb{P}_{\beta,\tilde{J}}$ and then including the edges $e = \{x, y\}$ with $\|x - y\| > N$ with the corresponding probabilities. The infinite cluster sampled by $\mathbb{P}_{\beta,\tilde{J}}$ is almost surely a transient graph. Then, we add additional edges to this graph. By Rayleigh's monotonicity principle, this implies that the infinite cluster sampled by the percolation configuration $\mathbb{P}_{\beta,J}$ is almost surely transient. \square

4 A shape theorem for the long-range percolation metric

The last property of the long-range percolation cluster that we consider is the growth of chemical distances. The study of chemical distances and shape theorems is a classical question in percolation, and shape theorems for various settings were previously established [16, 29, 36]. Also, one of our main tools is Theorem 3.4 by Cerf and Th  ret discussed above. Using this result, it is straightforward to show that the chemical distance between two *typical* points $x, y \in \mathcal{C}_\infty$ in the long-range percolation model is of the same order as the Euclidean distance. However, there might be points x that are several steps away from the infinite finite-range cluster. To circumvent such problems, we introduce the following two results.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $d \geq 2$, let $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a symmetric and irreducible kernel satisfying $J(x) = \mathcal{O}(\|x\|^{-s})$ for some $s > 2d$, and let $\beta > \beta_c(J)$. Then there exists $\kappa > 0$ and $C' < \infty$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\exists x, y \in \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega) \cap B_n(\mathbf{0}) : D(x, y) > C'n \right) \leq n^{-\kappa}$$

for all large enough $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $d \geq 2$, let $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a symmetric and irreducible kernel satisfying $J(x) = \mathcal{O}(\|x\|^{-s})$ for some $s > 2d$, and let $\beta > \beta_c(J)$. Let $\zeta = \frac{1}{6d}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\exists x, y \in B_{n\zeta}(\mathbf{0}) : n < D(x, y) < \infty \right) \leq n^{-1.1}$$

for all large enough n .

We postpone the proofs of these results to section 4.2. First, we discuss how these two propositions imply Theorem 1.8.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 1.8

The proof of Theorem 1.8 given the two propositions follows from classical techniques, as demonstrated in [16, 29]. The moment properties that follow from the exponential decay results (Theorem 3.4) in the finite-range setting are weaker for long-range percolation, but Proposition 4.2 still provides strong enough estimates on the moments.

Proof of (4) given Propositions 4.1 and 4.2. Let $\zeta = \frac{1}{6d}$. We start by showing that

$$\mathbb{E}_\beta \left[\hat{D}(\mathbf{0}, x) \right] < \infty \tag{29}$$

for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. If $\hat{D}(\mathbf{0}, x) > n$, then either there are $u, v \in B_{n\zeta}(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty$ with $D(u, v) > n$, or (at least) one of $\hat{\mathbf{0}}, \hat{x}$ is not in $B_{n\zeta}(\mathbf{0})$. The probability that there are $u, v \in B_{n\zeta}(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty$ with $D(u, v) > n$ is small, by Proposition 4.2. If n is large enough, say that $B_{n\zeta/2}(x) \subset B_{n\zeta}(\mathbf{0})$,

then also the events $\hat{x} \notin B_{n\zeta}(x), \hat{\mathbf{0}} \notin B_{n\zeta}(\mathbf{0})$ are very unlikely, by (28). In particular, we get that for n large enough

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\hat{D}(\mathbf{0}, x) > n \right) &\leq \mathbb{P}_\beta (\exists u, v \in B_{n\zeta}(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty : D(u, v) > n) + 2\mathbb{P}_\beta (\mathcal{C}_\infty \cap B_{n\zeta/2}(\mathbf{0}) = \emptyset) \\ &\leq n^{-1.1} + C \exp \left(-n^{\frac{\zeta\eta}{2}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for some $C < \infty$ and $\eta > 0$. Summing this over all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ shows that the expectation in (29) is indeed finite. This directly implies that for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the expectation of $\hat{D}(\mathbf{0}, z)$ is also finite. With this, we can construct the norm μ . We do this very briefly and follow the same arguments as presented by Cerf and Theret [16]. \hat{D} is a metric on \mathbb{Z}^d , and thus $\hat{D}(x, z) \leq \hat{D}(x, y) + \hat{D}(y, z)$ for all $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. As the percolation process is stationary and ergodic, we can use Kingman's subadditive ergodic theorem [37]. For $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we define

$$\mu(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\hat{D}(\mathbf{0}, nx)}{n}$$

where the limit exists almost surely and in L_1 . Similarly, for $x \in \mathbb{Q}^d$, let N be such that $Nx \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Then we define

$$\mu(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\hat{D}(\mathbf{0}, nNx)}{nN}.$$

The function μ is a semi-norm on \mathbb{Q}^d and the limit above does not depend on the choice of N . As $\mu(x) \leq \|x\|_\infty (\mu(e_1) + \dots + \mu(e_d))$, the function μ is Lipschitz-continuous on \mathbb{Q}^d and thus we can extend it to \mathbb{R}^d . It directly follows from the asymptotic lower-bound on the chemical distance (3) that $\mu(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, so μ is a norm on \mathbb{R}^d . \square

Next, we show the following result for long-range percolation, which was, for finite-range percolation previously proven in [16, Lemma 1]. The proof for long-range percolation uses Propositions 4.1 and 4.2. Because of the polynomial decay in the statements of the propositions (compared to stretched exponential decay for analogous statements for finite-range percolation), we need slightly different tools compared to the proof for finite-range percolation.

Lemma 4.3. *Let J be a kernel satisfying $J(x) = \mathcal{O}(\|x\|^{-s})$ for some $s > 2d$, and let $\beta > \beta_c(J)$. Then there exists a constant C such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists almost surely $R > 0$ such that for all $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$*

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \|u\|_\infty \geq R \\ \|u - v\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon \|u\|_\infty \end{array} \right\} \implies \hat{D}(u, v) \leq C\varepsilon \|u\|_\infty.$$

Proof of Lemma 4.3 given Propositions 4.1 and 4.2. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{T}_k \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be a deterministic set so that

$$\mathcal{T}_k \subset B_{2^k}(\mathbf{0}) \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{T}_k} B_{\varepsilon 2^k}(x) \supseteq B_{2^k}(\mathbf{0}).$$

Further, assume that

$$T := \sup_k |\mathcal{T}_k| < \infty,$$

which is possible by the properties of \mathcal{T}_k . Indeed, the set \mathcal{T}_k needs to have a cardinality of order ε^{-d} . Define the event \mathcal{E}_k by

$$\mathcal{E}_k = \bigcap_{x \in B_{2^k}(\mathbf{0})} \left\{ B_{\sqrt{2^k}}(x) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty \neq \emptyset \right\} \cap \bigcap_{x \in \mathcal{T}_k} \left\{ D(u, v) \leq C' 4\varepsilon 2^k \quad \forall u, v \in \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega) \cap B_{4\varepsilon 2^k}(x) \right\}$$

where C' is the constant from Proposition 4.1. Using the result of Proposition 4.1 and inequality (28), it directly follows from a union bound that

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta(\mathcal{E}_k^C) \leq (2^k + 1)^d \exp\left(-2^{\frac{kn}{2}}\right) + T(4\varepsilon 2^k)^{-\kappa} \leq T' 2^{-k\kappa}$$

for some constant $T' < \infty$. So in particular we get that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_\beta(\mathcal{E}_k^C) < \infty$ and thus the event \mathcal{E}_k^C only occurs for finitely many k almost surely. Say that the event \mathcal{E}_k holds for all $k \geq K$. Now let $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\|u\|_\infty > 2^K$ and $\|u - v\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon \|u\|_\infty$. Say that $\|u\|_\infty \in (2^k, 2^{k+1}]$. Then there exists $x \in \mathcal{T}_k$ with $u \in B_{\varepsilon 2^k}(x)$. Further, as $\|u - v\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon \|u\|_\infty \leq 2\varepsilon 2^k$, and $\|u - \hat{u}\| \leq \sqrt{2^k}$, $\|v - \hat{v}\| \leq \sqrt{2^k}$, we get that $\hat{u}, \hat{v} \in B_{4\varepsilon 2^k}(x)$ for k large enough. So in particular we get that

$$\hat{D}(u, v) = D(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \leq C' 4\varepsilon 2^k \leq C' 4\varepsilon \|u\|_\infty.$$

This finishes the proof as $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\|u\|_\infty > 2^K$ and $\|u - v\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon \|u\|_\infty$ were arbitrary. \square

Given Lemma 4.3, the proof of the remaining items of Theorem 1.8 does not make any use of the long-range percolation properties of the graphs and is completely analogous to finite-range percolation. It was carried out in full detail in the proof of [16, Lemma 2] and [16, Theorem 3], and we do not repeat their proof here.

4.2 Proofs of the Propositions

Before proving Proposition 4.1, we first need to introduce and prove several intermediate claims.

Notation 4.4. For $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we write $B_k(x, \omega) := \{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d : D(x, y) \leq k\}$ for the ball of radius k around x in the percolation metric. For an environment $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^E$, we define $\omega_{\leq N}$ by

$$\omega_{\leq N}(e) = \begin{cases} \omega(e) & \text{if } |e| \leq N \\ 0 & \text{if } |e| > N \end{cases}.$$

We write $\Delta(\omega_{\leq N})$ for the set of connected sets in the environment $\omega_{\leq N}$. Note that we do not require that elements of $\Delta(\omega_{\leq N})$ are maximally connected. We define the spheres in the percolation metric $(S_k(x, \omega))_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ by

$$S_k(x, \omega) = \{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d : D(x, y) = k\} = B_k(x, \omega) \setminus B_{k-1}(x, \omega).$$

For $u \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $V_u^K := Ku + \{0, \dots, K-1\}^d$ as the box with side length K and base point Ku .

Note that by local finiteness of the graph, we have that almost surely $|K_x| = \infty$ if and only if $|S_j(x)| \geq 1$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. One other result that we use is the existence of giant components in finite boxes. Let J be a symmetric and irreducible kernel with finite range and let $\beta > \beta_c(J)$. Then there exists a linear size cluster in the box. In particular, there exists some $\rho > 0$ such that for all K large enough and all $x \in V_0^K$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(|K_x(V_0^K)| \geq K) \geq \rho. \quad (30)$$

This result follows directly from [8, 30].

Claim 4.5. *Let J be a symmetric and irreducible kernel, and let $\beta > \beta_c(J)$. For $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we define the event $L_k(x)$*

$$L_k(x) := \left\{ |S_k(x, \omega)| \geq 1 \text{ and there is no } Z \in \Delta(\omega_{\leq N}) \text{ s.t. } Z \subset B_k(x, \omega) \text{ and } |Z| \geq k^{\frac{1}{4d}} \right\}. \quad (31)$$

Phrased differently, $L_k(x)$ is the event that K_x has ‘depth’ at least k , but $B_k(x, \omega)$ does not contain a finite-range cluster Z with a size of at least $k^{\frac{1}{4d}}$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(L_k(x)) \leq e^{-\sqrt{k}} \quad (32)$$

for all k large enough.

Proof. If $|S_k(x, \omega)| \geq 1$, then $S_0(x, \omega) \cup \dots \cup S_{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor}(x, \omega)$ has size at least $k/2$ and thus $S_0(x, \omega) \cup \dots \cup S_{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor}(x, \omega)$ intersects at least $k^{\frac{3}{5}}$ many sets of the form V_u^K with $K = \lceil k^{\frac{1}{4d}} \rceil$ and $u \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. This holds as $|S_0(x, \omega) \cup \dots \cup S_{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor}(x, \omega)| \geq k/2$ and each set V_u^K contains $K^d = \lceil k^{\frac{1}{4d}} \rceil^d$ many elements, and $k^{\frac{3}{5}} \lceil k^{\frac{1}{4d}} \rceil^d < \frac{k}{2}$ for large enough k . For each of the sets of the form V_u^K that intersects $S_0(x, \omega) \cup \dots \cup S_{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor}(x, \omega)$ there is a strictly positive (in k) probability ρ that $S_0(x, \omega) \cup \dots \cup S_{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor}(x, \omega)$ is connected to an open cluster $Z \in \Delta(\omega_{\leq N})$ that is of size at least K and entirely contained in the block V_u^K . More formally, for each block V_u^K we define the event

$$D_u^k(x) := \left\{ \text{There is } Z \in \Delta(\omega_{\leq N}) \text{ with } Z \subset V_u^K, Z \cap \bigcup_{i=0}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} S_i(x, \omega) \neq \emptyset, \text{ and } |Z| \geq k^{\frac{1}{4d}} \right\}.$$

Then there is a constant $\rho > 0$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u \in \mathbb{Z}^d$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(D_u^k(x) \mid V_u^K \cap \bigcup_{i=0}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} S_i(x, \omega) \neq \emptyset \right) \geq \rho$$

by (30). As different blocks are independent, there is a chance of at least ρ of building such an open cluster Z in each block V_u^K with $V_u^K \cap \bigcup_{i=0}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} S_i(x, \omega) \neq \emptyset$. Thus we get that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(\nexists u \in \mathbb{Z}^d : D_u^k(x) \text{ occurs} \mid |S_k(x, \omega)| \geq 1 \right) \leq (1 - \rho)^{k^{\frac{3}{5}}} \leq e^{-\sqrt{k}}$$

for all k large enough. However, if there exists $u \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $Z \in \Delta(\omega_{\leq N})$ with $Z \subset V_u^K$, $Z \cap \bigcup_{i=0}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} S_i(x, \omega) \neq \emptyset$, then parts of the connected set Z are also of size at least $k^{\frac{1}{4d}}$ and completely contained within $S_0(x, \omega) \cup \dots \cup S_k(x, \omega) = B_k(x, \omega)$. \square

Finally, we are able to go to the proof of Proposition 4.1. One important property of the supercritical finite-range percolation cluster that we will use is the upper bound on the probability of a large finite cluster. Let I_N be a symmetric kernel with finite range. Then for all $\beta > \beta_c(I_N)$ there exists a constant $c_\beta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, I_N} \left(n \leq |K_{\mathbf{0}}| < \infty \right) \leq \exp \left(-c_\beta n^{\frac{1}{d}} \right). \quad (33)$$

This result goes back to Kesten and Zhang [35], improving an earlier result of Chayes, Chayes, and Newman [17]. See also the discussion in Grimmett’s book [32, (8.64)] for a proof, and a result of Contreras, Martineau, and Tassion for an improvement of this result to general groups of polynomial growth [18].

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Let $\eta \in (0, 1)$ so that $d + \eta(d - s) < 0$, which is possible since $s > 2d$. We will first argue that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{ \exists x \in \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega) \cap B_n(\mathbf{0}) : D(x, \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N}) \cap B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})) > n \} \\ & \subset \left\{ \exists u \in B_{2n}(\mathbf{0}), y \in \mathbb{Z}^d : u \sim y, \|u - y\| \geq n^\eta \right\} \cup \left\{ \exists u \in B_n(\mathbf{0}) : L_{\lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor}(u) \text{ holds} \right\} \\ & \cup \left\{ \exists u \in B_{2n}(\mathbf{0}) : \lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor^{\frac{1}{4d}} \leq |K_u(\omega_{\leq N})| < \infty \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For the general structure of the argument, we want to show that $\mathcal{A}_1 \subset \mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_3 \cup \mathcal{A}_4$, with $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_4$ the events listed above. We will show that if $\omega \in \mathcal{A}_1$, $\omega \notin \mathcal{A}_2$, and $\omega \notin \mathcal{A}_3$, then $\omega \in \mathcal{A}_4$. So assume that $\omega \in \mathcal{A}_1$. Then there exists $x \in \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega) \cap B_n(\mathbf{0})$ so that x is connected to $B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})^C$ but $D(x, \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N}) \cap B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})) > n$. If there is no edge of length at least n^η with an endpoint in $B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})$, then $B_{n^{1-\eta}}(x, \omega) \subset B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})$. If $L_{\lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor}(x)$ does not occur, then $B_{\lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor}(x, \omega)$ contains a set $Z \in \Delta(\omega_{\leq N})$ with $|Z| \geq \lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor^{\frac{1}{4d}}$. As $B_{n^{1-\eta}}(x, \omega) \subset B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})$, we can pick $u \in Z \cap B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})$.

Then $Z \subset K_u(\omega_{\leq N})$, so in particular $|K_u(\omega_{\leq N})| \geq \lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor^{\frac{1}{4d}}$. Since

$$D(x, \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N}) \cap B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})) > n \text{ but } D(x, Z) \leq n^{1-\eta},$$

we also get that $K_u(\omega_{\leq N}) \not\subset \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N})$, i.e., $K_u(\omega_{\leq N})$ is finite. So in particular, there exists a point $u \in B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})$ with $\lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor^{\frac{1}{4d}} \leq |K_u(\omega_{\leq N})| < \infty$. This shows that the inclusion holds. By a union bound, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(\exists x \in \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega) \cap B_n(\mathbf{0}) : D(x, \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N}) \cap B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})) > n) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(\exists u \in B_{2n}(\mathbf{0}), y \in \mathbb{Z}^d : u \sim y, \|u - y\| \geq n^\eta) + \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(\exists u \in B_n(\mathbf{0}) : L_{\lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor}(u) \text{ holds}) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(\exists u \in B_{2n}(\mathbf{0}) : \lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor^{\frac{1}{4d}} \leq |K_u(\omega_{\leq N})| < \infty) \end{aligned}$$

and we are only left to show that each of the three summands is polynomially small in n . For the first summand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(\exists u \in B_{2n}(\mathbf{0}), y \in \mathbb{Z}^d : u \sim y, \|u - y\| \geq n^\eta) \leq (4n + 1)^d \sum_{y: \|y\| \geq n^\eta} \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(0 \sim y) \\ & \leq C' n^d \sum_{y: \|y\| \geq n^\eta} \|y\|^{-s} \leq C'' n^d (n^\eta)^{d-s} \leq C'' n^{d+\eta(d-s)} \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $C', C'' < \infty$ that depend on d, β , and J . The last expression is polynomially small in n by our assumption on η . The remaining two terms can be upper bounded using a union bound over the possible values of u :

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(\exists u \in B_n(\mathbf{0}) : L_{\lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor}(u) \text{ holds}) \leq (2n + 1)^d \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(L_{\lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor}(\mathbf{0})) \\ & \stackrel{(32)}{\leq} (2n + 1)^d \exp\left(-\sqrt{\lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor}\right), \text{ and} \\ & \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(\exists u \in B_{2n}(\mathbf{0}) : \lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor^{\frac{1}{4d}} \leq |K_u(\omega_{\leq N})| < \infty) \leq (4n + 1)^d \mathbb{P}_{\beta, I_N}\left(\lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor^{\frac{1}{4d}} \leq |K_{\mathbf{0}}| < \infty\right) \\ & \stackrel{(33)}{\leq} (4n + 1)^d \exp\left(-c_\beta \left(\lfloor n^{1-\eta} \rfloor^{\frac{1}{4d}}\right)^{\frac{1}{d}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Both quantities in the above expressions are (sub)polynomially small in n and thus we see that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(\exists x \in \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega) \cap B_n(\mathbf{0}) : D(x, \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N}) \cap B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})) > n) \leq n^{-\bar{\kappa}} \quad (34)$$

for some $\bar{\kappa} > 0$ and all n large enough. If $u, v \in B_n(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega)$ are such that $D(u, v) > (C + 2)n$, then either $D(u, \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N}) \cap B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})) > n$, $D(v, \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N}) \cap B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})) > n$, or there are $x, y \in \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N}) \cap B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})$ with $D(x, y; \omega_{\leq N}) > Cn$. Thus we get that for some C large enough

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(\exists u, v \in \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega) \cap B_n(\mathbf{0}) : D(u, v) > (C + 2)n \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(\exists x \in \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega) \cap B_n(\mathbf{0}) : D(x, \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N}) \cap B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})) > n \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(\exists x, y \in \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N}) \cap B_{2n}(\mathbf{0}) : D(x, y; \omega_{\leq N}) > Cn \right) \\ & \stackrel{(34)}{\leq} n^{-\bar{\kappa}} + \sum_{x, y \in B_{2n}(\mathbf{0})} \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\infty > D(x, y; \omega_{\leq N}) > Cn \right) \stackrel{(26)}{\leq} n^{-\kappa} \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds for some $\kappa > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough. \square

Finally, we go to the proof of Proposition 4.2.

Proof of Proposition 4.2. Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the kernel J_N defined by $J_N(x) = J(x)\mathbb{1}_{\|x\| \leq N}$ satisfies $\beta > \beta_c(J_N)$. Such a $N \in \mathbb{N}$ exists by Theorem 1.1. Let $x, y \in B_{n^\zeta}(\mathbf{0})$ be arbitrary. First, explore the two clusters $K_x(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})$ and $K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})$. We will now argue that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(n < D(x, y) < \infty, |K_x(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| \leq n^\zeta \text{ or } |K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| \leq n^\zeta \right) \leq n^{\zeta-1.5} \quad (35)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(n < D(x, y) < \infty, |K_x(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| > n^\zeta, |K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| > n^\zeta \right) \leq n^{\zeta-1.5} \quad (36)$$

for all large enough $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that the two probabilities in (35) and (36) add up to $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(n < D(x, y) < \infty)$. Together with a union bound, equations (35),(36) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(\exists x, y \in B_{n^\zeta}(\mathbf{0}) : n < D(x, y) < \infty) \leq \sum_{x, y \in B_{n^\zeta}(\mathbf{0})} \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J}(n < D(x, y) < \infty) \\ & \leq \sum_{x, y \in B_{n^\zeta}(\mathbf{0})} n^{\zeta-1.5} \leq Cn^{3\zeta-1.5} = Cn^{\frac{1}{2d}-1.5} \leq n^{-1.1} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C < \infty$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough. Thus we are left to show that (35) and (36) hold. We start with (35). If $x \in K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})$ and $|K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| \leq n^\zeta$, there is nothing to show as the chemical distance between x and y can be at most n^ζ in this case. Using this observation and the symmetry between x and y we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(n < D(x, y) < \infty, |K_x(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| \leq n^\zeta \text{ or } |K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| \leq n^\zeta \right) \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(n < D(x, y) < \infty, |K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| \leq n^\zeta \right) \\ & = 2\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(n < D(x, y) < \infty, |K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| \leq n^\zeta, x \notin K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}) \right) \quad (37) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 2\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(D(x, y) < \infty, |K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| \leq n^\zeta, x \notin K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}) \right). \quad (38)$$

If $D(x, y) < \infty$, but $x \notin K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})$, there needs to exist at least one open edge $\{u, v\}$ with $\|u - v\| > n^{3/4}$ and $u \in K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}), v \notin K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})$. As these edges are independent from the configuration $K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})$ we get that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, J} \left(D(x, y) < \infty, |K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| \leq n^\zeta, x \notin K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}) \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{P}_{\beta,J} \left(|K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| \leq n^\zeta, \omega(\{u,v\}) = 1 \text{ for some } u \in K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}) \text{ and } v \notin B_{n^{3/4}}(u) \right) \\
&\leq n^\zeta \mathbb{P}_{\beta,J}(\omega(\{\mathbf{0},v\}) = 1 \text{ for some } v \notin B_{n^{3/4}}(\mathbf{0})) \leq n^\zeta \sum_{v \notin B_{n^{3/4}}(\mathbf{0})} \mathbb{P}_{\beta,J}(\mathbf{0} \sim v) \\
&\leq n^\zeta \sum_{v \notin B_{n^{3/4}}(\mathbf{0})} C_1 \|v\|^{-s} \leq C_2 n^\zeta n^{\frac{3}{4}(d-s)} \leq \frac{1}{2} n^{\zeta-1.5}
\end{aligned}$$

for some constants C_1, C_2 and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough. In the last inequality, we used that $d - s < -d \leq -2$. Plugging this into (38) finishes the proof of (35).

Next, we prove (36). As in Notation 4.4, we define sets $(S_j(x, \omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}))_{j=0}^{\lfloor n^\zeta \rfloor}$ by $S_0(x, \omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}) = \{x\}$ and

$$S_{j+1}(x, \omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}) = B_{j+1}(x, \omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}) \setminus B_j(x, \omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}).$$

Analogously, we define the sets $(S_j(y, \omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}))_{j=0}^{\lfloor n^\zeta \rfloor}$. We only explore these spheres for $\lfloor n^\zeta \rfloor$ many steps to ensure that all these sets are contained in $B_{n^{0.9}}(\mathbf{0})$, where the exponent 0.9 is arbitrary and any other exponent close enough to 1 would also work. Note that

$$|K_x(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| > n^\zeta \text{ if and only if } \left| \bigcup_{i=0}^{\lfloor n^\zeta \rfloor} S_i(x, \omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}) \right| > n^\zeta.$$

Define the event

$$\tilde{L}(x) := \left\{ \left| \bigcup_{i=0}^{\lfloor n^\zeta \rfloor} S_i(x, \omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}) \right| > n^\zeta, \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N}) \cap \bigcup_{i=0}^{\lfloor n^\zeta \rfloor} S_i(x, \omega_{\leq n^{3/4}}) = \emptyset \right\}. \quad (39)$$

Whenever the set $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\lfloor n^\zeta \rfloor} S_i(x, \omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})$ has a size of at least $n^\zeta = n^{1/(6d)}$, it needs to intersect at least $n^{\zeta/2}$ many boxes of the form V_u^K with $K = \lfloor n^{\frac{1}{12d^2}} \rfloor$. This holds as

$$n^{\zeta/2} |V_u^K| \leq n^{\frac{1}{12d}} \left(\lfloor n^{\frac{1}{12d^2}} \rfloor \right)^d \leq n^{\frac{1}{6d}} = n^\zeta.$$

Whenever the cluster $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\lfloor n^\zeta \rfloor} S_i(x, \omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})$ touches a box of the form V_u^K , there is a strictly positive chance that the cluster $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\lfloor n^\zeta \rfloor} S_i(x, \omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})$ actually touches a set $Z \subset V_u^K$ that is connected in the environment $\omega_{\leq N}$ and that has a size at least K , cf. (30). From here on, a similar argument as the one presented in the proof of Claim 4.5 shows that there exists some $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta,J}(\tilde{L}(x)) \leq \exp(-n^\gamma) \quad (40)$$

for all large enough n . Similarly, we also get that $\mathbb{P}_{\beta,J}(\tilde{L}(y)) \leq \exp(-n^\gamma)$, where the event $\tilde{L}(y)$ is defined as in (39), with x replaced by y . If both events $\tilde{L}(x)$ and $\tilde{L}(y)$ do not hold, then both x and y are connected by an open path of length at most n^ζ to points u_x , respectively u_y , such that $u_x, u_y \in \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N})$. Furthermore, we can choose the points u_x, u_y such that $u_x, u_y \in B_{n^{0.9}}(\mathbf{0})$. This holds, as the paths have a length of at most $n^\zeta \leq n^{0.1}$, and the edges in the path have a length of at most $n^{3/4}$. Thus we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_{\beta,J} \left(n < D(x, y) < \infty, |K_x(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| > n^\zeta, |K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| > n^\zeta \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_{\beta,J} \left(n < D(x, y), |K_x(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| > n^\zeta, |K_y(\omega_{\leq n^{3/4}})| > n^\zeta \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{P}_{\beta,J} \left(\tilde{L}(x) \cup \tilde{L}(y) \cup \left\{ \exists u_x, u_y \in B_{n^{0.9}}(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty(\omega_{\leq N}) : D(u_x, u_y) > n - 2n^\zeta \right\} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(40)}{\leq} 2 \exp(-n^\gamma) + \sum_{u_x, u_y \in B_{n^{0.9}}(\mathbf{0})} \mathbb{P}_{\beta,J} \left(\infty > D(u_x, u_y) > n - 2n^\zeta \right) \\
&\stackrel{(26)}{\leq} 2 \exp(-n^\gamma) + (2n^{0.9} + 1)^d C e^{-cn}
\end{aligned}$$

for some constants $c > 0$ and $C < \infty$, where the last two inequalities hold for all large enough n . So in particular this implies that (36) holds. \square

5 Varying short edges only

5.1 Strict inequality of critical points

In this section, we prove Proposition 1.10. In order to prove the strict inequality of critical points, we use the technique of enhancements developed by Aizenman and Grimmett [3]. The main item to prove here is the differential inequality (41). For an integrable and translation-invariant kernel J and $\beta, s \geq 0$, we define the combined measure $\mathbb{P}_{\beta,s,J}$ as the measure of independent bond percolation where an edge $\{x, y\}$ is open with probability

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta,s,J}(\{x, y\} \text{ open}) = p(\beta, s, \{x, y\}) = \begin{cases} 1 - \exp(-\beta J(\{x, y\}) - s) & \text{if } \|x - y\| = 1 \\ 1 - \exp(-\beta J(\{x, y\})) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Proposition 5.1. *For every kernel J satisfying condition (8), there exists a continuous function $g : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\beta, s > 0$ and all $n \geq N$*

$$\frac{d}{d\beta} \mathbb{P}_{\beta,s,J}(\mathbf{0} \leftrightarrow B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) \leq g(\beta, s) \frac{d}{ds} \mathbb{P}_{\beta,s,J}(\mathbf{0} \leftrightarrow B_n(\mathbf{0})^C). \quad (41)$$

Assuming this proposition, we can directly prove Proposition 1.10.

Proof of Proposition 1.10 assuming Proposition 5.1. Let J be a kernel and assume that $0 < \beta_c(J) < \infty$. Let $K \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough so that $\frac{1}{K} < \frac{\beta_c(J)}{4}$. Let M be a large enough constant so that $g(\beta, s) \leq M$ for all $\beta \in [\frac{1}{2}\beta_c(J), 2\beta_c(J)]$ and $s \in [\frac{1}{K}, \beta_c(J)]$. For abbreviation, we write $\beta_c = \beta_c(J)$ in the rest of the proof. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 0.1)$ be small enough so that

$$2\varepsilon M < \frac{\beta_c}{4} \text{ and } \varepsilon < \frac{\beta_c}{4}.$$

For $r \in [0, 2\varepsilon]$ define

$$\beta(r) := \beta_c + \varepsilon - r \text{ and } s(r) := \frac{1}{K} + rM.$$

So in particular

$$(\beta(r), s(r)) \in \left[\frac{\beta_c}{2}, \beta_c \right] \times \left[\frac{1}{K}, \frac{1}{K} + 2\varepsilon M \right] \text{ for all } r \in [0, 2\varepsilon],$$

and thus $g(\beta(r), s(r)) \leq M$ for all $r \in [0, 2\varepsilon]$. Differentiating yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{P}_{\beta(r), s(r), J}(\mathbf{0} \leftrightarrow B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) \\
&= -\frac{d}{d\beta(r)} \mathbb{P}_{\beta(r), s(r), J}(\mathbf{0} \leftrightarrow B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) + M \frac{d}{ds(r)} \mathbb{P}_{\beta(r), s(r), J}(\mathbf{0} \leftrightarrow B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

for n large enough. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\beta_c - \varepsilon, \frac{1}{K} + 2\varepsilon M, J}(\mathbf{0} \leftrightarrow B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) &= \mathbb{P}_{\beta(2\varepsilon), s(2\varepsilon), J}(\mathbf{0} \leftrightarrow B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\beta(0), s(0), J}(\mathbf{0} \leftrightarrow B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{\beta_c + \varepsilon, \frac{1}{K}, J}(\mathbf{0} \leftrightarrow B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\beta_c + \varepsilon, 0, J}(\mathbf{0} \leftrightarrow B_n(\mathbf{0})^C) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

for n large enough. Finally, we will prove that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta_c - \varepsilon, \frac{1}{K} + 2\varepsilon M, J} \lesssim \mathbb{P}_{\beta_c - \varepsilon, \bar{J}} \quad (42)$$

which implies that $\beta_c(\bar{J}) \leq \beta_c - \varepsilon < \beta_c(J)$. In order to show (42), we just need to show that for each edge the marginal probability of being open under the measure $\mathbb{P}_{\beta_c - \varepsilon, \bar{J}}$ is at least the marginal probability of being open under the measure $\mathbb{P}_{\beta_c - \varepsilon, \frac{1}{K} + 2\varepsilon M, J}$. This is clear for the non-nearest-neighbor edges, as they have the same probability of being open under both measures. For nearest-neighbor edges e , we need to show that

$$(\beta_c - \varepsilon)J(e) + \frac{1}{K} + 2\varepsilon M \leq (\beta_c - \varepsilon)\bar{J}(e),$$

which is true, as

$$\begin{aligned} (\beta_c - \varepsilon)J(e) + \frac{1}{K} + 2\varepsilon M \leq (\beta_c - \varepsilon)\bar{J}(e) &\Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{K} + 2\varepsilon M \leq \beta_c - \varepsilon \\ &\Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{K} + 2\varepsilon M + \varepsilon \leq \beta_c \end{aligned}$$

and the last line follows from the assumptions on K and ε , as $\frac{1}{K}, 2\varepsilon M, \varepsilon \leq \frac{\beta_c}{4}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.1. For an edge e , we write $p(\beta, s, e)$ for the probability that this edge is open under the measure $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}$. We write E_n for the set of edges with at least one endpoint in $B_n(\mathbf{0})$, and we write E_n^s for the edges $\{x, y\} \in E_n$ with $\|x - y\| = 1$, i.e., the *short* edges. We define the event $A_n = \{\mathbf{0} \leftrightarrow B_n(\mathbf{0})^C\}$. Using Russo's formula, respectively a straight-forward modification for long-range percolation, and applying it for the two derivatives in (41), we need to show that there exists a continuous function g such that for n large enough

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in E_n} \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(e \text{ is pivotal for the event } A_n) \frac{d}{d\beta} p(\beta, s, e) \\ \leq g(\beta, s) \sum_{e \in E_n^s} \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(e \text{ is pivotal for the event } A_n) \frac{d}{ds} p(\beta, s, e). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

From the definition of $p(\beta, s, e)$, we see that $\frac{d}{d\beta} p(\beta, s, e)$ is of order $J(e)$, whereas $\frac{d}{ds} p(\beta, s, e)$ is 0 for $e \notin E_n^s$ and of constant order for $e \in E_n^s$. Thus inequality (43) holds, provided we can show that there exists a continuous function $\bar{g} : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ so that

$$\sum_{e \in E_n} J(e) \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(e \text{ is pivotal for } A_n) \leq \bar{g}(\beta, s) \sum_{e \in E_n^s} \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(e \text{ is pivotal for } A_n). \quad (44)$$

So we need to study the probability that edges are pivotal for the event A_n for both short and long edges. We write $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ if all coordinates of x are non-negative. For fixed $\beta > 0$, the probability that an edge e is open is proportional to $J(e)$. Thus there exist constants

$C_1, C_2 < \infty$ depending on the kernel J and, in a continuous way, on the parameters β and s so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{e \in E_n} J(e) \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(e \text{ is pivotal for } A_n) &\leq C_1 \sum_{e \in E_n} \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(e \text{ is open and pivotal for } A_n) \\
&\leq 2C_1 \sum_{x \in B_n(\mathbf{0})} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{x\}} \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(\{x, y\} \text{ is open and pivotal for } A_n) \\
&\leq C_2 \sum_{x \in B_n(\mathbf{0}) : x \geq \mathbf{0}} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{x\}} \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(\{x, y\} \text{ is open and pivotal for } A_n). \tag{45}
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows by symmetry of the model and the symmetry of the event A_n . We only restrict to $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ as we want $x - e_1$ to be well-defined inside the box $B_n(\mathbf{0})$ in the following.

For long enough edges $\{x, y\}$, the probability $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(\{x, y\} \text{ open})$ is of the same order as the probability $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(\{x - e_1, y\} \text{ open})$, by condition (8). So for long enough edges $\{x, y\}$ we can ‘reroute’ the edge $\{x, y\}$ to start at $x - e_1$ instead of x . The probability of the corresponding new event only differs by a constant multiplicative factor. For short edges, we can replace the open edge $\{x, y\}$ with two edges $\{x - e_1, u\}$ and $\{u, y\}$ for some $u \in B_n(\mathbf{0})$ with $\|u - x\| = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $J(\{x - e_1, u\}), J(\{u, y\}) > 0$. Using such local modifications, we see that there exists a constant C_3 (that does not depend on n) such that for n large enough and for all $x \in B_n(\mathbf{0})$ with $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{x\}} \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(\{x, y\} \text{ is open and pivotal for } A_n) \\
&\leq C_3 \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{x\}} \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(\{x, x - e_1\} \text{ and } \{x - e_1, y\} \text{ are both open and pivotal for } A_n). \tag{46}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we argue that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{x\}} \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(\{x, x - e_1\} \text{ and } \{x - e_1, y\} \text{ are open and pivotal for } A_n) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(\{x, x - e_1\} \text{ is open and pivotal for } A_n). \tag{47}
\end{aligned}$$

To show inequality (47), first note that the events of the form

$$\left\{ \{x, x - e_1\} \text{ and } \{x - e_1, y\} \text{ are open and pivotal for } A_n \right\}$$

are disjoint for distinct $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{x\}$. This holds, as there can never be three open edges with $x - e_1$ as an endpoint that are pivotal for a connection event like A_n . Thus we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{x\}} \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J}(\{x, x - e_1\} \text{ and } \{x - e_1, y\} \text{ are both open and pivotal for } A_n) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J} \left(\bigcup_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{x\}} \left\{ \{x, x - e_1\} \text{ and } \{x - e_1, y\} \text{ are both open and pivotal for } A_n \right\} \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_{\beta, s, J} \left(\bigcup_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{x\}} \left\{ \{x, x - e_1\} \text{ open and pivotal for } A_n, \{x - e_1, y\} \text{ open} \right\} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathbb{P}_{\beta,s,J}(\{x, x - e_1\} \text{ open and pivotal for } A_n).$$

The last equality holds because if $\{x, x - e_1\}$ is pivotal for A_n , then $x - e_1$ needs to be connected to at least one different vertex $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{x\}$. This shows (47). Inserting inequalities (46) and (47) into (45), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{e \in E_n} J(e) \mathbb{P}_{\beta,s,J}(e \text{ is pivotal for } A_n) \\ & \stackrel{(45)}{\leq} C_2 \sum_{x \in B_n(\mathbf{0}): x \geq \mathbf{0}} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{x\}} \mathbb{P}_{\beta,s,J}(\{x, y\} \text{ is open and pivotal for } A_n) \\ & \stackrel{(46),(47)}{\leq} C_2 C_3 \sum_{x \in B_n(\mathbf{0}): x \geq \mathbf{0}} \mathbb{P}_{\beta,s,J}(\{x, x - e_1\} \text{ is open and pivotal for } A_n) \\ & \leq C_2 C_3 \sum_{e \in E_n^s} \mathbb{P}_{\beta,s,J}(e \text{ is pivotal for } A_n) \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof of (44) and thus the proof of Proposition 1.10. \square

5.2 The proof of Theorem 1.9

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.9, which states that the results of the previous sections also hold for the model in which only the probability of the nearest-neighbor edges is changed. Our main tool for this is the strict inequality of critical points, Proposition 1.10.

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Let $f : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, 1)$ and let $p > p_c(f)$. Define $\bar{p} = \frac{p+p_c(f)}{2} \in (p_c(f), p)$. Choose $\beta > 0$ so that

$$e^{-\beta} = \frac{1-p}{1-\bar{p}} \quad (48)$$

which is possible since $1 - \bar{p} > 1 - p$. Define a kernel $J : \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by

$$1 - e^{-\beta J(x)} = \begin{cases} \bar{p} & \text{if } \|x\| = 1 \\ f(x) & \text{if } \|x\| > 1 \end{cases}.$$

Thus we get that the two measures $\mathbb{P}_{\beta,J}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\bar{p},f}$ agree. As there is an infinite open cluster under the measure $\mathbb{P}_{\bar{p},f}$, this directly implies that $\beta \geq \beta_c(J)$. Define the kernel \bar{J} by

$$\bar{J}(x) = \begin{cases} J(x) + 1 & \text{if } \|x\| = 1 \\ J(x) & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

By construction we have for all edges $\{x, y\}$ with $\|x - y\| > 1$ that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta,\bar{J}}(\{x, y\} \text{ closed}) = \mathbb{P}_{\beta,J}(\{x, y\} \text{ closed}) = \mathbb{P}_{\bar{p},f}(\{x, y\} \text{ closed}).$$

For nearest-neighbor edges $\{x, y\}$ with $\|x - y\| = 1$ we have by the definition of β (48) that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta,\bar{J}}(\{x, y\} \text{ closed}) = e^{-\beta \bar{J}(x-y)} = e^{-\beta J(x-y)} e^{-\beta} = (1-\bar{p}) \frac{1-p}{1-\bar{p}} = \mathbb{P}_{p,f}(\{x, y\} \text{ closed})$$

and thus the two measures $\mathbb{P}_{p,f}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\beta,\bar{J}}$ agree. As $f(x) \simeq \|x\|^{-s}$ for some $s > d$ by assumption (7), this directly implies that condition (8) is satisfied. Thus we can apply Proposition 1.10 for the kernel J , and in particular, we get that

$$\beta \geq \beta_c(J) > \beta_c(\bar{J}).$$

So the measure $\mathbb{P}_{p,f}$ equals the measure $\mathbb{P}_{\beta,\overline{\mathcal{J}}}$, which is a measure for supercritical long-range percolation on \mathbb{Z}^d . From here one can easily verify that the different results stated in Theorem 1.9 hold. \square

6 No locality for one-dimensional long-range percolation

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.11. Our main tool for this proof is the existence and the discontinuity of the phase transition in one-dimensional long-range percolation with $\frac{1}{\|x-y\|^2}$ interaction, as proven by Aizenman, Newman, and Schulman [1, 41]. See also [24] for a new proof of these results. In particular, we will use the following results:

Theorem 6.1 (Theorem 1.2 of [41] and Proposition 1.1 of [1]). *Let $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow [0, 1)$ be a symmetric function so that $\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)x^2 > 1$. Then $p_c(f) < 1$. Assume that $\beta = \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)x^2 < \infty$, and let $\theta(p, f) = \mathbb{P}_{p,f}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = \infty)$. Then*

$$\theta(p, f)^2 \beta \in \{0\} \cup [1, +\infty).$$

In particular, as $p \mapsto \theta(p, f)$ is continuous from the right, one has that $\theta(p_c(f), f)^2 \beta \geq 1$.

Before going to the proof of Theorem 1.11, we introduce and prove the following claim.

Lemma 6.2. *Assume that $p_n \rightarrow p$ and $f_n \rightarrow f$ in L_1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$*

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_n, f_n}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = N) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{p, f}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = N) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ and} \quad (49)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_n, f_n}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| \leq N) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{p, f}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| \leq N) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (50)$$

Proof. The convergence in (50) follows from (49) and additivity. So we only need to show (49). Let \mathcal{C}_N be the set of subsets of \mathbb{Z}^d of size N that contain the origin. For a set $K \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ define $\|K\|_{\infty} := \max\{\|x\|_{\infty} : x \in K\}$. As $(p_n, f_n) \rightarrow (p, f)$ in L_1 , for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we can choose $M \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that

$$\mathbb{P}_{p, f}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = N \text{ and } \|K_{\mathbf{0}}\|_{\infty} > M) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \text{ and}$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_n, f_n}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = N \text{ and } \|K_{\mathbf{0}}\|_{\infty} > M) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ large enough.}$$

Furthermore, for all finite subsets $K \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, the probability $\mathbb{P}_{p_n, f_n}(K_{\mathbf{0}} = K)$ converges to $\mathbb{P}_{p, f}(K_{\mathbf{0}} = K)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Write \mathcal{C}_N^M for all (finitely many) subsets K of \mathbb{Z}^d containing the origin with $|K| = N, \|K\|_{\infty} \leq M$. Thus we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{p_n, f_n}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = N) - \mathbb{P}_{p, f}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = N) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{C}_N^M} (\mathbb{P}_{p_n, f_n}(K_{\mathbf{0}} = K) - \mathbb{P}_{p, f}(K_{\mathbf{0}} = K)) \\ & + \mathbb{P}_{p_n, f_n}(K_{\mathbf{0}} \in \mathcal{C}_N \setminus \mathcal{C}_N^M) - \mathbb{P}_{p, f}(K_{\mathbf{0}} \in \mathcal{C}_N \setminus \mathcal{C}_N^M) \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \end{aligned}$$

for n large enough. As ε was arbitrary, this finishes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.11. Let $\theta = \mathbb{P}_{p_c(f), f}(|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = \infty)$. Define $\gamma = \left(\frac{2}{1+\theta}\right)^2$ and note that $\gamma > 1$. For $n \geq 3$, define $f_n : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow [0, 1)$ by

$$f_n(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } |x| \leq n \\ \frac{\gamma}{x^2} & \text{if } |x| > n \end{cases}.$$

Then f_n converges to f in L_1 and $p_c(f_n) < 1$ for all n , by Theorem 6.1. Also, by Theorem 6.1 we know that

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_c(f_n), f_n} (|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = \infty)^2 \gamma = \mathbb{P}_{p_c(f_n), f_n} (|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = \infty)^2 \left(\frac{2}{1 + \theta} \right)^2 \geq 1,$$

so in particular $\mathbb{P}_{p_c(f_n), f_n} (|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = \infty) \geq \frac{1 + \theta}{2}$. By the definition of $\theta = \mathbb{P}_{p_c(f), f} (|K_{\mathbf{0}}| = \infty)$, we can choose M large enough so that

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_c(f), f} (|K_{\mathbf{0}}| > M) \leq \frac{1 + 3\theta}{4}. \quad (51)$$

On the other hand, we know that

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_c(f_n), f_n} (|K_{\mathbf{0}}| > M) \geq \frac{1 + \theta}{2} = \frac{1 + 3\theta}{4} + \frac{1 - \theta}{4}. \quad (52)$$

Assume that $p_c(f_n)$ converges to $p_c(f)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathbb{P}_{p_c(f_n), f_n} (|K_{\mathbf{0}}| > M)$ also converges to $\mathbb{P}_{p_c(f), f} (|K_{\mathbf{0}}| > M)$ by Lemma 6.2. This contradicts (51) and (52) and thus $p_c(f_n)$ does not converge to $p_c(f)$. \square

Remark 6.3. *Similarly, one can also show that for all kernels $J : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $\beta_c(J) < \infty$ there exists a sequence of kernels $J_n : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that J_n converges to J in L_1 , but $\beta_c(J_n)$ does not converge to $\beta_c(J)$.*

7 References

- [1] Michael Aizenman and Charles M. Newman. Discontinuity of the percolation density in one-dimensional $1/|x - y|^2$ percolation models. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 107(4) (1986) 611–647.
- [2] Michael Aizenman, Harry Kesten, and Charles M Newman. Uniqueness of the infinite cluster and continuity of connectivity functions for short and long range percolation. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 111(4):505–531, 1987.
- [3] Michael Aizenman and Geoffrey Grimmett. Strict monotonicity for critical points in percolation and ferromagnetic models. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 63:817–835, 1991.
- [4] Peter Antal and Agoston Pisztora. On the chemical distance for supercritical bernoulli percolation. *The Annals of Probability*, 24(2):1036–1048, 1996.
- [5] Johannes Bäumlner. Behavior of the distance exponent for $1/\|x - y\|^{2d}$ long-range percolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.04793*, 2022.
- [6] Johannes Bäumlner. Distances in $1/\|x - y\|^{2d}$ percolation models for all dimensions. *Commun. Math. Phys.* (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-023-04861-z>.
- [7] Johannes Bäumlner. Recurrence and transience of symmetric random walks with long-range jumps. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 28:1–24, 2023.
- [8] David J. Barsky, Geoffrey R. Grimmett, and Charles M. Newman. Percolation in half-spaces: equality of critical densities and continuity of the percolation probability. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 90(1):111–148, 1991.
- [9] Itai Benjamini and Noam Berger. The diameter of long-range percolation clusters on finite cycles. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 19(2):102–111, 2001.
- [10] Noam Berger. Transience, recurrence and critical behavior for long-range percolation. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 226(3):531–558, 2002.

- [11] Noam Berger. A lower bound for the chemical distance in sparse long-range percolation models. *arXiv preprint math/0409021*, 2004.
- [12] Marek Biskup. On the scaling of the chemical distance in long-range percolation models. *The Annals of Probability*, 32(4):2938–2977, 2004.
- [13] Marek Biskup. Graph diameter in long-range percolation. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 39(2):210–227, 2011.
- [14] Marek Biskup and Jeffrey Lin. Sharp asymptotic for the chemical distance in long-range percolation. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 55(3):560–583, 2019.
- [15] Robert M. Burton and Michael Keane. Density and uniqueness in percolation. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 121:501–505, 1989.
- [16] Raphaël Cerf and Marie Thérét. Weak shape theorem in first passage percolation with infinite passage times. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 52(3):1351 – 1381, 2016.
- [17] Jennifer T. Chayes, Lincoln Chayes, and Charles M Newman. Bernoulli percolation above threshold: an invasion percolation analysis. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 1272–1287, 1987.
- [18] Daniel Contreras, Sébastien Martineau, and Vincent Tassion. Supercritical percolation on graphs of polynomial growth. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06326*, 2021.
- [19] Daniel Contreras, Sébastien Martineau, and Vincent Tassion. Locality of percolation for graphs with polynomial growth. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 28:1–9, 2023.
- [20] Barbara Dembin and Vincent Tassion. Almost sharp sharpness for poisson boolean percolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.00999*, 2022.
- [21] Jean-Dominique Deuschel and Agoston Pisztora. Surface order large deviations for high-density percolation. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 104(4):467–482, 1996.
- [22] Hugo Duminil-Copin and Vincent Tassion. A new proof of the sharpness of the phase transition for bernoulli percolation and the ising model. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 343(2) (2016) 725–745.
- [23] Hugo Duminil-Copin and Vincent Tassion. A new proof of the sharpness of the phase transition for bernoulli percolation on \mathbb{Z}^d . *L’Enseignement mathématique*, 62(1) (2017) 199–206.
- [24] Hugo Duminil-Copin, Christophe Garban, and Vincent Tassion. Long-range models in 1d revisited. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.04642*, 2020.
- [25] Richard Durrett and Roberto H. Schonmann. Large deviations for the contact process and two dimensional percolation. *Probability theory and related fields*, 77(4):583–603, 1988.
- [26] Philip Easo and Tom Hutchcroft. The critical percolation probability is local. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10983*, 2023.
- [27] Sacha Friedli, Bernardo N. B. de Lima, and Vlasdas Sidoravicius. On Long Range Percolation with Heavy Tails. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 9:175 – 177, 2004.
- [28] Sacha Friedli and Bernardo N. B. De Lima. On the truncation of systems with non-summable interactions. *Journal of statistical physics*, 122(6):1215–1236, 2006.
- [29] Olivier Garet and Régine Marchand. Asymptotic shape for the chemical distance and first-passage percolation on the infinite bernoulli cluster. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 8:169–199, 2004.
- [30] Geoffrey R. Grimmett and John M. Marstrand. The supercritical phase of percolation is well behaved. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 430(1879):439–457, 1990.
- [31] Geoffrey R. Grimmett, Harry Kesten, and Yu Zhang. Random walk on the infinite cluster of the percolation model. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 96:33–44, 1993.

- [32] Geoffrey R. Grimmett. Percolation, volume 321 of. *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*, 1999.
- [33] Markus Heydenreich and Remco Van der Hofstad. *Progress in high-dimensional percolation and random graphs*. Springer, 2017.
- [34] Markus Heydenreich, Tim Hulshof, and Joost Jorritsma. Structures in supercritical scale-free percolation. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 27(4):2569 – 2604, 2017.
- [35] Harry Kesten and Yu Zhang. The probability of a large finite cluster in supercritical bernoulli percolation. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 537–555, 1990.
- [36] Harry Kesten. First-passage percolation. *From classical to modern probability: CIMPA Summer School 2001*, pages 93–143, 2003.
- [37] John Kingman. Subadditive ergodic theory. *The Annals of Probability*, 1(6):883–899, 1973.
- [38] Ronald Meester and Jeffrey E. Steif. On the continuity of the critical value for long range percolation in the exponential case. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 180(2):483–504, 1996.
- [39] Mikhail Menshikov, Vidas Sidoravicius, and Marina Vachkovskaia. A note on two-dimensional truncated long-range percolation. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 33(4):912–929, 2001.
- [40] Christian Mönch. Inhomogeneous long-range percolation in the weak decay regime. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.02027*, 2023.
- [41] Charles M. Newman and Lawrence S. Schulman. One dimensional $1/|j - i|^s$ percolation models: The existence of a transition for $s \leq 2$. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 104(4):547–571, 1986.
- [42] Mathew D. Penrose and Agoston Pisztora. Large deviations for discrete and continuous percolation. *Advances in applied probability*, 28(1):29–52, 1996.
- [43] Agoston Pisztora. Surface order large deviations for ising, potts and percolation models. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 104(4):427–466, 1996.
- [44] Vidas Sidoravicius, Donatas Surgailis, and Maria E. Vares. On the truncated anisotropic long-range percolation on \mathbb{Z}^2 . *Stochastic processes and their applications*, 81(2):337–349, 1999.
- [45] Lawrence S. Schulman. Long range percolation in one dimension. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 16(17):L639, 1983.
- [46] Ercan Sönmez and Arnaud Rousselle. Random walk on the random connection model. *Indagationes Mathematicae*, 33(5):1049–1060, 2022.