

COARSE EMBEDDABILITY, L^1 -COMPRESSION AND PERCOLATIONS ON GENERAL GRAPHS

By CHIRANJIB MUKHERJEE¹ and KONSTANTIN RECKE²
Universität Münster

6 June, 2024

Abstract: We show that a locally finite, connected graph has a coarse embedding into a Hilbert space if and only if there exist bond percolations with arbitrarily large marginals and two-point function vanishing at infinity. We further show that the decay is stretched exponential with stretching exponent $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ if and only if the L^1 -compression exponent of the graph is at least α , leading to a probabilistic characterization of this exponent. These results are new even in the particular setting of Cayley graphs of finitely generated groups. The proofs build on a new probabilistic method introduced recently by the authors to study group-invariant percolation on Cayley graphs [24, 25], which is now extended to the general, non-symmetric situation of graphs to study their coarse embeddability and compression exponents.

1. MAIN RESULTS

1.1 Background. Consider a locally finite, connected, infinite graph $G = (V, E)$. The incentive to understand the *large scale geometry* of G leads to two important notions of measuring to which extent its geometry is comparable to that of a Hilbert space, resp. to that of an L^1 -space:

- A map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between metric spaces is a **coarse embedding**, if there exist non-decreasing maps $\rho_1, \rho_2: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $\rho_1(t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\rho_1(d_X(u, v)) \leq d_Y(f(u), f(v)) \leq \rho_2(d_X(u, v)) \quad (1.1)$$

for all $u, v \in X$. We are interested in the existence of a coarse embedding from $X = G$ into the target space $Y = H$ for some Hilbert space H .

- The **L^1 -compression exponent** $\alpha_1^*(X)$ of a metric space X is the supremum over all those $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ such that there exists a measure space (Y, ν) and a Lipschitz function $f: X \rightarrow L_1(\nu)$ satisfying

$$\|f(u) - f(v)\|_1 \geq c d_X(u, v)^\alpha \quad (1.2)$$

for every $u, v \in X$ and a uniform constant $c > 0$, see [16, 27]. We are interested in $\alpha_1^*(G)$, which provides an elegant measurement of the non-bi-Lipschitz embeddability of the graph into L^1 -spaces.

In this paper, by using percolation on G , we find the first probabilistic characterizations of coarse embeddability into a Hilbert space and of the L^1 -compression exponent. More precisely, we characterize these properties by the existence of random subgraphs obtained by randomly deleting or retaining

¹Universität Münster, Einsteinstrasse 62, Münster 48149, Germany, chiranjib.mukherjee@uni-muenster.de

²Universität Münster, Einsteinstrasse 62, Münster 48149, Germany konstantin.recke@uni-muenster.de

AMS Subject Classification: 82B43, 51F99, 20F65.

Keywords: Percolation, Graphs, Coarse embeddability, Compression.

edges (resp. vertices) – that is by considering *bond (resp. site) percolations* – which simultaneously satisfy two competing properties:

- (1) containing every individual edge (resp. site) with high probability, *and*
- (2) exhibiting decay of connection probabilities (i.e. decay of the two-point function), the decay rate being quantified explicitly.

To precisely state our results, recall that a **general bond percolation** on a graph $G = (V, E)$ is the distribution of a random subgraph obtained by keeping or deleting edges. We say that a general bond percolation \mathbf{P} has **marginals larger than** $p \in [0, 1]$, if

$$\inf_{e \in E} \mathbf{P}[e \in E] \geq p. \quad (1.3)$$

The **two-point function**

$$\tau: V \times V \rightarrow [0, 1], \tau(u, v) := \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] \quad (1.4)$$

will be our main object of interest. Its decay or non-decay at infinity measures the *connectivity* of the percolation under consideration. Note the competitive relationship between having large marginals (i.e. larger than some p which is close to 1) and simultaneously exhibiting two-point function decay. This leads to the natural problem of determining under which conditions, and for which kinds of models, two-point function decay may hold in the presence of large marginals.

In the setting of Cayley graphs of groups, several important geometric properties have recently been shown to admit characterizations [24, 25] through the existence or non-existence of *invariant* percolations (i.e. invariant under the natural action of the group on its Cayley graph) with large marginals and two-point function decay. More precisely, the *Haagerup property* and *Kazhdan's property (T)* have been characterized through percolation by the present authors [25] – we refer to Appendix A for details. For now, let us record that these results assert that on highly symmetric graphs, connectivity of invariant percolations is closely related to geometric properties of the symmetry group. We will provide a surprising extension of the method developed by the authors in [25] to obtain results in the – in a sense completely orthogonal – situation of coarse embeddability and compression exponents of *non-symmetric* graphs, see Theorem 1 and Theorem 3 for precise statements. Their consequences (Corollary 2 and Corollary 4) are new also in the particular setting of Cayley graphs of finitely generated groups.

Let us conclude this section, by highlighting the two main difficulties one needs to overcome to obtain the present results. First, one would expect a statement about the behavior of all percolation models – and in particular a statement about their two-point function decay – to be essentially vacant in the sense that it does not bear significant information about interesting geometric features of the graph. Secondly, if one were to set about understanding embeddings into Hilbert spaces or L^1 -spaces through percolations, the natural attempt would be to construct percolation models capturing the geometry *intrinsically*, i.e. by removing the boundaries of certain sets randomly. This approach, which works very well for amenability due to the existence of Følner sets, can not be implemented for obtaining embedding properties, cf. Remark 4. As we will see, the way to address these difficulties is to use a novel machinery relating *measure definite kernels* and percolations via monotone couplings of Poisson point processes (in a non-invariant setting), which turns out to be especially robust in the present setting of locally finite, connected graphs, which we emphasize is as general as one could hope for.

1.2 Results about general infinite graphs. As described above, we study two-point function decay of general bond percolations on general infinite graphs. These of course form a rather wild set and it is a priori far from clear whether the corresponding two-point function decay encodes *significant information at all* (this is elaborated in Remark 1). Our first main result (see Theorem 3.1) shows

that it does: recall that a map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between metric spaces is a **coarse embedding**, if there exist non-decreasing maps $\rho_1, \rho_2: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $\rho_1(t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\rho_1(d_X(u, v)) \leq d_Y(f(u), f(v)) \leq \rho_2(d_X(u, v))$$

for all $u, v \in X$.

Theorem 1 (Percolation and coarse embeddability into a Hilbert space for graphs). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a locally finite, connected graph. Then G admits a coarse embedding into a Hilbert space if and only if for every $p < 1$, there exists a general bond percolation \mathbf{P} with $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega] > p$ for every $e \in E$ and such that the two-point function vanishes at infinity, i.e.*

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] : u, v \in V, d(u, v) > r \right\} = 0. \quad (1.5)$$

In particular, we obtain the following consequence in the invariant setting. Here a finitely generated group **embeds coarsely into a Hilbert space**, if there exists a coarse embedding into a Hilbert space in the sense of (1.1) for the group equipped with some word metric.

Corollary 2 (Percolation and coarse embeddability into a Hilbert space for groups). *Let Γ be a finitely generated group. Then Γ embeds coarsely into a Hilbert space if and only if some, equivalently every, Cayley graph $G = (V, E)$ has the property that for every $p < 1$, there exists a general bond percolation \mathbf{P} with $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega] > p$ for every $e \in E$ and such that the two-point function vanishes at infinity.*

A few remarks are in order to put Theorem 1 and Corollary 2 into context.

Remark 1 (Invariance vs. non-invariance) We emphasize that there is no assumption of invariance in Theorem 1, which is quite exceptional. To quote from a beautiful survey by Häggström and Jonasson [18], the assumption of group-invariance is "extremely natural" and "almost universally employed" in percolation theory, and "to work with arbitrary probability measures on $\{0, 1\}^E$ would, however, be to take things a bit too far, as not much of interest can be said in such a general setting". This intuition is underscored by a plethora of results in the invariant setting, see [22, 28] (see also Remark 3 for the only exception the authors are aware of). From this point of view, it is quite surprising that two-point function decay of general percolations characterizes coarse embeddability into a Hilbert space, i.e. the natural notion of *looking like a Hilbert space on large scales*. This is particularly noteworthy in Corollary 2 because there is a canonical group action available. It turns out that the same statement with Γ -invariant bond percolations characterizes the Haagerup property of Γ (see Theorem A.1) and this relationship between the Haagerup property and coarse embeddability recovers similar observations made in coarse geometry, see e.g. [9, 32]. ■

Remark 2 (Probabilistic interpretation of coarse embeddability) To the best of the authors' knowledge, Theorem 1 is the first probabilistic characterization of coarse embeddability into a Hilbert space. Its geometric meaning may be understood by thinking of the graph as a network and considering the task of designing a strategy of randomly removing edges in order to disconnect the graph. Consider the strategy successful if vertices, which are far apart, are disconnected with high probability, i.e. with probability tending to one as the distance tends to infinity. As a constraint, associate a cost to the removal of edges so that it is only allowed to remove each edge with probability at most $1 - p$. Theorem 1 shows that there exists a successful strategy at arbitrarily small costs if and only if the graph looks like a Hilbert space on large scales. ■

Remark 3 (Connection with Property A) For a *bounded degree* graph, coarse embeddability into a Hilbert space follows from Yu's property A, introduced in [33]. Following [32], we say that $G = (V, E)$ has **property A** if for all $R, \varepsilon > 0$, there exists a family $\{A_v\}_{v \in V}$ of non-empty finite subsets of $V \times \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(u, v) \leq R$ implies $|A_u \Delta A_v| / |A_u \cap A_v| < \varepsilon$, and such that there exists $S \geq 0$ such

that $(u, n) \in A_v$ implies $d(v, u) \leq S$. It has been shown in a series of works (e.g. [15, Section 2]) that a connected graph $G = (V, E)$ with bounded degrees has property A if and only if it is *strongly hyperfinite*, i.e. for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $K \geq 1$ and a probability measure ν on the set of K -separators (i.e. subsets $A \subset V$ such that all components of the induced graph on $V \setminus A$ are of size at most K) such that for every $v \in V$, the measure of the set of K -separators containing v is at most ε . By considering edges in the complement of a random K -separator, we may state an equivalent condition in the present paper's terminology as follows: for every $p < 1$, there exists $K \geq 1$ and a general bond percolation \mathbf{P} with $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega] > p$ for every $e \in E$ and such that all clusters are of size at most K (this condition may equivalently be replaced by requiring the two-point function to be supported on finite tubes of diameter K , i.e. $\mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] = 0$ whenever $d(u, v) > K$). Although Theorem 1 resembles this in spirit, the methods used for property A are quite different from the present paper and also do not seem to apply in our setting – in particular, Theorem 1 does not assume bounded degrees. ■

Remark 4 (Amenability) To elaborate on the previous point, property A (hyperfiniteness) is similar to amenability in the sense that it is characterized intrinsically by the existence of sets with small boundaries, which is not the case for coarse embeddability into a Hilbert space. Amenability for quasi-transitive graphs is a fundamental property, which has been characterized through the existence of group-invariant percolations with large marginals and only finite clusters in the seminal work of Benjamini, Lyons, Peres, and Schramm [6], see also [24] for a closely related characterization emphasizing the role of the two-point function. These results rely on a powerful tool in percolation known as the *mass-transport principle* [6]. We do not use the mass-transport principle to prove Theorem 1 and point out that this principle does not hold at the present level of generality. ■

Let us now turn to the main result concerning *compression exponents*, which provide a way of measuring non-bi-Lipschitz embeddability introduced by Guentner and Kaminker [16]: recall that the L^1 -**compression exponent** $\alpha_1^*(X)$ of a metric space X is the supremum over those $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ such that there exists a Lipschitz function $f: X \rightarrow L_1$ satisfying

$$\|f(u) - f(v)\| \geq cd_X(u, v)^\alpha$$

for every $u, v \in X$ and a uniform constant $c > 0$, cf. [16, 27]. Our second main result characterizes α_1^* of general graphs as well as finitely generated groups through percolation (see Theorem 3.2).

Theorem 3 (Percolation and the L^1 -compression exponent for graphs). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a locally finite, connected graph. Then $\alpha_1^*(G)$ is the supremum over those $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ for which there exists $C > 0$ such that for every $p < 1$, there exists a general bond percolation \mathbf{P} with $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega] > p$ for every $e \in E$ and which satisfies the stretched exponential decay*

$$e^{-\beta d(u, v)} \leq \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] \leq e^{-\gamma d(u, v)^\alpha} \quad (1.6)$$

for every $u, v \in V$ and some $\beta, \gamma > 0$ with $\beta/\gamma \leq C$.

In fact, we provide a general result for arbitrary compression functions, i.e. lower bounds in (1.2) which are of the form $c\rho(d(u, v))$ for choices of ρ possibly different from $\rho(t) = t^\alpha$ (see Theorem 3.3). As an important corollary, we characterize the L^1 -compression exponent of a finitely generated group, which is defined as in (1.2) for the group equipped with some word metric, cf. [27].

Corollary 4 (Percolation and the L^1 -compression exponent for groups). *Let Γ be a finitely generated group and let $G = (V, E)$ be some Cayley graph. Then $\alpha_1^*(\Gamma)$ is the supremum over those $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ for which there exists $C > 0$ such that for every $p < 1$, there exists a general bond percolation \mathbf{P} with $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega] > p$ for every $e \in E$ and which satisfies the stretched exponential decay*

$$e^{-\beta d(u, v)} \leq \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] \leq e^{-\gamma d(u, v)^\alpha}$$

for every $u, v \in V$ and some $\beta, \gamma > 0$ with $\beta/\gamma \leq C$.

Let us conclude with two remarks, which provide the necessary context.

Remark 5 (Comparison with equivariant compression) In contrast to the invariant situation considered in [25] (see Theorem A.3), Theorem 3 shows that the L^1 -compression exponent is *characterized* by the existence of bond percolations with large marginals and sufficiently strong control of the two-point function decay. This significant strengthening is enabled by a clearer understanding of the kernel-theoretic technicalities which show up in the proof, see Section 2.3 and Remark 9. ■

Remark 6 (Probabilistic interpretation of the L^1 -compression exponent) To the best of the authors' knowledge, Theorem 3 is the first probabilistic characterization of the L^1 -compression exponent of locally finite, connected graphs as well as finitely generated groups. It may clearly be interpreted as a probabilistic *robustness* property of the graph similarly to Remark 2: more precisely, it shows that a graph does not admit an embedding into an L^1 -space with good compression if and only if any strategy of disconnecting the graph fails to deliver stretched exponential decay in the sense of (1.6) for marginals above some non-trivial threshold. Let us also point out that there exist powerful interactions between the theory of compression exponents and random walks, see e.g. [8, 26, 27] and the references there – our results open a path towards establishing further links with percolation. ■

This concludes our investigation of the connections between two-point function decay of percolations and geometric properties of general graphs. Let us also include two brief comments:

- First, the preceding two results perhaps suggest (to a reader familiar with [25]) that a non-invariant version of Kazhdan's property (T) can also be formulated – we show in Proposition 3.4 that this is not the case. Indeed, there it is shown that every locally finite, connected, infinite graph admits percolations (satisfying the FKG-Inequality) with large marginals and two-point function decay *in some direction*.
- Second, our results motivate the investigation of versions of these properties for finite graphs and their local weak limits. Indeed, in percolation theory as well as in coarse geometry, there is a second class of typically non-symmetric graphs of major interest. These are finite graphs and in particular sequences of finite graphs with size tending to infinity, see e.g. [4, 14] and [3]. These are especially relevant due to their connection with the notion of *local weak convergence* introduced by Benjamini and Schramm [7], see also [2]. The general question about the interplay between percolation and the geometry of such graphs as well as the specific questions investigated in this paper have interesting analogues for finite graphs and their local weak limits.

In this context, expanders are well-known examples with poor embedding properties into Hilbert and L^1 -spaces. In a recent breakthrough development, Salez has shown using probabilistic arguments that these have negative *Ollivier-Ricci curvature* [31]. Understanding the relationship between, on the one hand, expansion and Ollivier-Ricci curvature, and, on the other hand, finite and random analogues of the properties considered in this paper could thus lead to a natural refinement of the results of Salez in [31].

We plan to address these questions in future work. See also Section 4 for further directions.

1.3 Organization. The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces terminology and notation regarding graphs (see Section 2.1) and percolation (see Section 2.2), and provides the necessary tools from the theory of kernels (see Section 2.3) and a measure-theoretic construction (see Section 2.4). Section 3 contains the construction relating kernels and percolations (see Section 3.1 for

the definition and properties of the constructed percolations) as well as the proofs of our main results (see Section 3.2). In Section 4, we provide a brief outlook and some questions raised by our results.

2. PRELIMINARIES

This section introduces the key notions from graph theory, percolation and the theory of kernels needed in the sequel. For more extensive treatments of these topics, we refer to [5, 9, 22, 28, 32] (see also [25] for a more detailed discussion of the invariant setting and [21] for a different probabilistic treatment of kernels). This section also contains a review of the main measure-theoretic construction needed in the sequel, see Section 2.4.

2.1 Graph theoretic terminology. Consider a graph $G = (V, E)$ with vertex set V and symmetric edge set $E \subset V \times V$. An edge between two vertices u and v is denoted by $[u, v]$. In this case, we say that u and v are **adjacent** or **neighbors** and write $u \sim v$. The **degree** $\deg(v) = \deg_G(v)$ of a vertex v is the number of vertices adjacent to v . If H is a subgraph of G , $\deg_H(v)$ denotes the number of adjacent vertices in H . The graph is **locally finite**, if every vertex has finite degree. It has **bounded degree** if $\sup_{v \in V} \deg(v) < \infty$. The graph is **connected**, if every two vertices are joined by a path of edges. For a connected graph, the **graph distance** between $u, v \in V$ is defined to be the length of a shortest path connecting u and v and is denoted by $d(u, v)$.

2.2 Percolation. A **general bond percolation** on a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a probability measure on subsets of E , i.e. on $\{0, 1\}^E$ equipped with the Borel σ -algebra. The percolation configuration is typically denoted by ω and we identify ω with the corresponding induced subgraph without further mention. A **cluster** of ω is a connected component of ω and we write $C(v) = C_\omega(v)$ for the cluster containing $v \in V$. We write $\deg_\omega(v)$ for the degree of $v \in V$ as a vertex in ω . The **two-point function**

$$\tau: V \times V \rightarrow [0, 1], \tau(u, v) := \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v], \quad (2.1)$$

is the probability that u and v are in the same cluster of the percolation configuration. If $\Gamma \subset \text{Aut}(G)$ is a subgroup, we say that \mathbf{P} is **Γ -invariant** if it is invariant under the induced action of Γ on $\{0, 1\}^E$. The most prominent (invariant) model is **Bernoulli bond percolation** \mathbb{P}_p with parameter $p \in [0, 1]$, in which each edge is deleted independently with probability $1 - p$. Bernoulli percolation is well-known to satisfy the FKG-Inequality, which we now introduce in general.

An event $A \in \mathcal{B}(\{0, 1\}^E)$ is **increasing**, if $\omega \in A$ and $\omega \leq \omega'$ implies $\omega' \in A$. We say that \mathbf{P} satisfies the **FKG-Inequality** (or has **positive associations**), if for any two increasing events A and B

$$\mathbf{P}(A \cap B) \geq \mathbf{P}(A) \mathbf{P}(B). \quad (2.2)$$

Similarly, a measurable function $f: \{0, 1\}^E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is **increasing** if $\omega \leq \omega'$ implies $f(\omega) \leq f(\omega')$. By a standard monotone class argument, Inequality (2.2) is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{E}[f(\omega)g(\omega)] \geq \mathbf{E}[f(\omega)]\mathbf{E}[g(\omega)] \quad (2.3)$$

for every two increasing $f, g \in L^2(\mathbf{P})$.

2.3 General theory of kernels. Let X be a set. Recall the following definitions:

- A map $k: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a **positive definite kernel** if the matrix $[k(x, y)]_{x, y \in F}$ is positive for every finite subset $F \subset X$, i.e.

$$\sum_{i, j=1}^n \bar{a}_i a_j k(x_i, x_j) \geq 0 \quad (2.4)$$

for every $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{C}$. It is **normalized** if $k(x, x) = 1$ for every $x \in X$.

- A map $k: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a

- ◊ **conditionally negative definite kernel** if $k(x, x) = 0$ and $k(x, y) = k(y, x)$ for every $x, y \in V$ and

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n a_i a_j k(x_i, x_j) \leq 0 \quad (2.5)$$

for every $x_1, \dots, x_n \in V$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = 0$.

- ◊ **measure definite kernel**, if there exists a measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ and a map $S: X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, $x \mapsto S_x$, such that

$$k(x, y) = \mu(S_x \Delta S_y) \quad (2.6)$$

for every $x, y \in X$.

- ◊ **L^1 -kernel**, if there exists a measurable space (Y, ν) and a map $f: X \rightarrow L^1(Y, \nu)$ such that

$$k(x, y) = \|f(x) - f(y)\| \quad (2.7)$$

for every $x, y \in X$.

The reason for grouping the four concepts as above, is that positive definiteness should be seen as opposite to the other three, which in turn are related as follows: clearly every measure definite kernel is an L^1 -kernel. In fact, the two concepts agree by the following classical argument, see for instance [12, Proposition 2.6], which we include for the convenience of the reader.

Proposition 2.1 (Measure definite and L^1 -kernels coincide). *Let X be a countable set and let $k: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be an L^1 -kernel. Then k is measure definite.*

Proof. The class of measure definite kernels is a convex cone closed under pointwise convergence, see Proposition 2.2 below. The convex cone of L^1 -kernels, on the other hand, is generated by **cut-metrics**, i.e. pull-backs of the $\{0, 1\}$ -valued metric on two elements, see for instance [13, Section 4.2]. Since every cut-metric is measure-definite, the claim follows. \square

We single out the following standard fact about measure definite kernels used in the above proof due to its importance.

Proposition 2.2 (Pointwise limits of measure definite kernels, cf. [29, Proposition 1.3]). *Let X be a countable set. The class of measure definite kernels on X is closed under pointwise convergence.*

A sketch of proof of the above proposition is provided below Lemma 2.5.

Every measure definite kernel is conditionally negative definite, but not conversely [29, Proposition 1.1 ff.]. Conditionally negative definite kernels have some particularly useful features: most importantly, $k: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is conditionally negative definite if and only if it is of the form

$$k(x, y) = \|f(x) - f(y)\|_H^2 \quad (2.8)$$

for a Hilbert space H and a map $f: X \rightarrow H$, see e.g. [5, Theorem C.2.3]. This is equivalent, by a well-known result of Schoenberg, to

$$k_\lambda: X \times X \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad k_\lambda(x, y) := e^{-\lambda k(x, y)} \quad (2.9)$$

defining a positive definite kernel for every $\lambda \geq 0$, see e.g. [5, Theorem C.3.2].

Another important example of positive definite kernels, which explains the connection with percolation, is provided by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3 (Two-point functions are positive definite). *Let \mathbf{P} be a general bond percolation on a graph $G = (V, E)$. Then the two-point function defines a normalized, positive definite kernel on $V \times V$.*

Proof. This observation is due to Aizenman and Newman [1]. We include the short proof for the convenience of the reader: First note that τ is normalized as $\tau(v, v) = \mathbf{P}[v \leftrightarrow v] = 1$ for every $v \in V$. Now let $v_1, \dots, v_n \in V$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{C}$. Let ω denote a random variable with law \mathbf{P} and denote by \mathcal{C} the set of clusters in ω . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \bar{a}_i a_j \tau(v_i, v_j) &= \sum_{i,j} \bar{a}_i a_j \mathbf{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{v_i \leftrightarrow v_j\}}] = \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i,j} \bar{a}_i a_j \mathbb{1}_{\{v_i \leftrightarrow v_j\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{\{v_i, v_j\} \subset C} \bar{a}_i a_j \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \left| \sum_{v_i \in C} a_i \right|^2 \right] \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence τ defines a positive definite kernel. \square

In the setting of Lemma 2.3, positive definiteness together with a standard result [5, Proposition C.2.4(iii)] imply that

$$\begin{aligned} k: V \times V &\rightarrow [0, 1], \quad k(u, v) = \mathbf{P}[u \not\leftrightarrow v] = 1 - \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] \\ &= \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow u] - \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] \end{aligned}$$

is a conditionally negative definite kernel. In fact, this definition actually provides examples of measure definite kernels by the next lemma.

Lemma 2.4 (Measure definite kernels and two-point functions). *Let \mathbf{P} be a general bond percolation on a graph $G = (V, E)$. Then $\mathbf{P}[u \not\leftrightarrow v]$ defines a measure definite kernel on $V \times V$.*

Proof. This result, observed and used by the authors in the invariant setup in [25], is central for the present work and relies on the following remarkable characterization of measure definite kernels in [10, Corollary 6.17]: Let X be a set and let $k: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a map such that $k(x, x) = 0$ and $k(x, y) = k(y, x)$ for every $x, y \in X$. Then k is measure definite if and only if the following two conditions hold:

- (a) k satisfies the triangle inequality, i.e. $k(x, z) \leq k(x, y) + k(y, z)$ for all $x, y, z \in X$.
- (b) for every finite subset $F \subset X$, we have that

$$k|_{F \times F} = \sum_{S \subset F} \lambda_S \delta_S, \tag{2.10}$$

with $\lambda_S \geq 0$ and

$$\delta_S(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k(x, y) > 0 \text{ and } |S \cap \{x, y\}| = 1, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \tag{2.11}$$

With this characterization in mind, we now consider the kernel

$$k: V \times V \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad k(u, v) := \mathbf{P}[u \not\leftrightarrow v].$$

Clearly $k(u, u) = 0$ and $k(u, v) = k(v, u)$ for every $u, v \in V$. To prove measure definiteness, it thus suffices to verify conditions (a) and (b) stated above. Condition (a) is straightforward to check: for

every $u, w, v \in V$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
k(u, v) &= \mathbf{P}[u \not\leftrightarrow v] \\
&\leq \mathbf{P}[(\{u \leftrightarrow w\} \cap \{w \leftrightarrow v\})^c] \\
&= \mathbf{P}[\{u \not\leftrightarrow w\} \cup \{w \not\leftrightarrow v\}] \\
&\leq \mathbf{P}[u \not\leftrightarrow w] + \mathbf{P}[w \not\leftrightarrow v] \\
&= k(u, w) + k(w, v).
\end{aligned}$$

To verify condition (b), consider an arbitrary finite subset $F = \{v_1, \dots, v_N\} \subset V$. Let ω denote the configuration of \mathbf{P} and, for $v \in V$, let $C(v)$ denote the ω -cluster of v viewed as a subset of V . We now define random subsets C_1, \dots, C_N of F as follows: set $C_1 := C(v_1) \cap F$ and, iteratively for $i \in \{2, \dots, N\}$,

$$C_i := \begin{cases} C(v_i) \cap F & \text{if } v_i \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} C_j, \\ \emptyset & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

We obtain random, pairwise disjoint subsets C_1, \dots, C_N of F which are either empty or are the restriction of one of the clusters of ω to the set F . Let μ_i denote the law of C_i viewed as a probability measure on $\{0, 1\}^F$. For $v \in F$, define

$$S_v = \{\xi \in \{0, 1\}^F : \xi(v) = 1\}. \quad (2.12)$$

By definition we have that a pair of vertices $u, v \in F$ is not connected in ω if and only if there exists a unique $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that C_i contains u and does not contain v , namely the C_i which coincides with the restriction of $C(u)$ to F . It follows that for every $u, v \in F$,

$$\begin{aligned}
k(u, v) &= \mathbf{P}\left[u \in C_i \text{ and } v \notin C_i \text{ for a unique } i \in \{1, \dots, N\}\right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{P}[u \in C_i, v \notin C_i] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i(S_u \setminus S_v).
\end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

By symmetry, we also have that

$$k(u, v) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i(S_v \setminus S_u) \quad (2.14)$$

for every $u, v \in F$. Summing up (2.13) and (2.14), we obtain that

$$k(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i(S_u \Delta S_v) \quad (2.15)$$

for every $u, v \in F$. But for every $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, the kernel

$$k_i: F \times F \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad k_i(u, v) := \mu_i(S_u \Delta S_v) \quad (2.16)$$

is clearly measure definite kernel. By condition (b) stated above, it may therefore be written in the form (2.10). Since $k|_{F \times F}$ itself is a non-negative linear combination of the kernels k_i by (2.15), it follows that $k|_{F \times F}$ is also of the form (2.10). Hence k satisfies condition (b), which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

2.4 Wall structures on general graphs. The ideas behind the measure theoretic construction described in this section go back to Robertson and Steger [29] and were further developed and applied in [11, 10, 12]. For conciseness, we only recall the concepts strictly needed and refer to these works for details, background and related results.

Let X be a countable set and denote by

$$\Omega_X := \{0, 1\}^X \setminus \{(0, 0, \dots), (1, 1, \dots)\} \quad (2.17)$$

the set of non-trivial subsets of X . We equip Ω_X with the σ -algebra \mathcal{B}_X of Borel sets. For $x \in X$, we define

$$S_x := \{c \in \Omega_X : c(x) = 1\} \in \mathcal{B}_X \quad (2.18)$$

to be the set of non-trivial subsets of X containing x . We observe that $S(x)\Delta S(y)$ consists of all nontrivial subsets of Ω_X which **separate** x and y in the sense that they contain exactly one of the two. Such sets may be interpreted as *walls* between x and y and this interpretation leads to the concept of *space with measured walls* [11], see also [12]. For the purposes of this paper (i.e. proving our two main results), it suffices to recall the following two technical lemmas. The first result shows that the space $(\Omega_X, \mathcal{B}_X)$ is a universal measurable space for measure definite kernels, resp. L^1 -kernels.

Lemma 2.5 (Wall structures associated to measure definite and L^1 -kernels). *Let X be a countable set and let $k: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a measure definite kernel or an L^1 -kernel. Then there exists a regular Borel measure μ_k on $(\Omega_X, \mathcal{B}_X)$ such that*

$$k(x, y) = \mu_k(S_x \Delta S_y) \quad (2.19)$$

for every $x, y \in X$.

Sketch of proof. We may assume that k is measure definite by Proposition 2.1. Thus, there exists a measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \nu)$ and a map $T: X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}, x \mapsto T_x$ such that $k(x, y) = \nu(T_x \Delta T_y)$ for every $x, y \in X$. Without loss of generality, Ω does not contain any points belonging to all, resp. none, of the sets T_x . Define a map

$$\phi: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_X, \phi(\omega)(x) := \mathbb{1}_{T_x}(\omega).$$

Since ϕ is measurable, the push-forward of ν under this map is a well-defined measure μ on (Ω, X, \mathcal{B}) . Then

$$\mu(S_x \Delta S_y) = \nu(\phi^{-1}(S_x \Delta S_y)) = \nu(T_x \Delta T_y)$$

and we obtain a measure μ on $(\Omega_X, \mathcal{B}_X)$ implementing the measure definite kernel k . The fact that μ is regular may be concluded from the two properties that open subsets of Ω_X are σ -compact and that $\mu(K) < \infty$ for compact subsets $K \subset \Omega$. We refer to [29, Proposition 1.2] for details. \square

Sketch of proof of Proposition 2.2. For the convenience of the reader, we include a brief sketch of the proof and refer to [29, Proposition 1.3] for details. By Lemma 2.5, it suffices to prove that if k is the pointwise limit of a sequence (k_n) of measure definite kernels of the form $k_n(x, y) = \mu_n(S_x \Delta S_y)$, where each μ_n is a regular Borel measure on $(\Omega_X, \mathcal{B}_X)$, then k is measure definite. By pointwise convergence, $\sup_n \mu_n(S_x \Delta S_y) < \infty$ for every $x, y \in X$. By compactness and the fact that X is countable, we may assume that $\mu_n|_{S_x \Delta S_y}$ converges weakly for every $x, y \in X$. Using this observation, it is not difficult to conclude that Ω_X decomposes into a countable disjoint union of sets T_i such that $\mu_n|_{T_i}$ converges weakly to $\mu^{(i)}$ for each $i \geq 1$ and such that every $S_x \Delta S_y$ is contained in the union of at most finitely many of the sets T_i . Defining $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu^{(i)}$, the fact that $S_x \Delta S_y$ is contained in at most finitely many

of the sets T_i implies that

$$\mu(S_x \Delta S_y) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu^{(i)}(T_i \cap (S_x \Delta S_y)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_n(T_i \cap (S_x \Delta S_y)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(S_x \Delta S_y) = k(x, y),$$

i.e. the kernel k is indeed measure definite. \square

Lemma 2.6 (Wall structures associated to negative definite kernels). *Let X be a countable set and let $k: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a conditionally negative definite kernel. Then there exists a regular Borel measure μ_k on $(\Omega_X, \mathcal{B}_X)$ such that*

$$\sqrt{k(x, y)} = \mu_k(S_x \Delta S_y) \quad (2.20)$$

for every $x, y \in X$.

Sketch of proof. We include a brief sketch of the proof and refer to [29, Proposition 1.4] for details. By taking limits along increasing unions of a sequence of finite sets (see [29, Proposition 1.3 and 1.4] for this part of the argument), it suffices to prove the lemma for finite X . In the finite case, recall from (2.8) that we can represent

$$k(x, y) = \|f(x) - f(y)\|_H^2$$

for a map $f: X \rightarrow H$ into a, without loss of generality real, Hilbert space H . Replacing H by the linear subspace generated by $\{f(x): x \in X\}$ if necessary, we may assume that H is finite dimensional. The homogeneous space Ω of all half-spaces of H carries a natural measure μ which is invariant under (the unimodular group of) rigid motions of H and can be normalized such that

$$\mu(\{E \in \Omega: \xi \in E, \eta \notin E\}) = \|\xi - \eta\|_H$$

for every $\xi, \eta \in H$. Defining $T_x := \{E \in \Omega: f(x) \in E\}$, we obtain that

$$\sqrt{k(x, y)} = \|f(x) - f(y)\| = \mu(S_x \setminus S_y) = \mu(S_y \setminus S_x),$$

and thus k is indeed measure definite and thus of the desired form by Lemma 2.5. \square

We refer to $(\Omega_X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu_k)$ as the **canonical wall structure** associated to the conditionally negative definite kernel k . In the case that X is the vertex set of a graph $G = (V, E)$, we write

$$W_e := S_x \Delta S_y \quad \text{if } e = [x, y] \in E, \quad (2.21)$$

for the set of walls separating the endpoints of the edge. Note that Lemma 2.6 in particular implies that the square root of a conditionally negative definite kernel is measure definite.

3. COARSE EMBEDDABILITY AND L^1 -COMPRESSION EXPONENT OF GRAPHS

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1 and Theorem 3 (and therefore Corollary 2 and Corollary 4), stated again below.

Theorem 3.1 (Percolation and coarse embeddability into a Hilbert space for graphs). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a locally finite, connected graph. Then G admits a coarse embedding into a Hilbert space if and only if for every $p < 1$, there exists a general bond percolation \mathbf{P} with $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega] > p$ for every $e \in E$ and such that the two-point function vanishes at infinity, i.e.*

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v]: u, v \in V, d(u, v) > r \right\} = 0.$$

Theorem 3.2 (Percolation and the L^1 -compression exponent for graphs). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a locally finite, connected graph. Then $\alpha_1^*(G)$ is the supremum over those $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ for which there exists $C > 0$ such that for every $p < 1$, there exists a general bond percolation \mathbf{P} with $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega] > p$ for every $e \in E$ and which satisfies the stretched exponential decay*

$$e^{-\beta d(u,v)} \leq \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] \leq e^{-\gamma d(u,v)^\alpha}$$

for every $u, v \in V$ and some $\beta, \gamma > 0$ with $\beta/\gamma \leq C$.

In fact, we actually prove the following general quantitative result,

Theorem 3.3 (Characterization of L^1 -compression functions). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a locally finite, connected graph and let $\rho: [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be a function with $\{\rho = 0\} = \{0\}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a Lipschitz function $f: V \rightarrow L^1$ satisfying*

$$\|f(u) - f(v)\| \geq c\rho(d(u,v))$$

for every $u, v \in V$ and a uniform constant $c > 0$.

- (ii) *There exists $C > 0$ such that for every $p < 1$, there exists a general bond percolation \mathbf{P} with $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega] > p$ for every $e \in E$ and with*

$$e^{-\beta d(u,v)} \leq \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] \leq e^{-\gamma \rho(d(u,v))}$$

for every $u, v \in V$ and some $\beta, \gamma > 0$ with $\beta/\gamma \leq C$.

We also show that the percolation condition characterizing property (T) given in Theorem A.2 trivializes when applied to general percolations.

Proposition 3.4 (Connectivity decay and positive associations on infinite graphs). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a locally finite, connected, infinite graph. Then for every $p < 1$, there exists a general bond percolation \mathbf{P} with $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega]$ for every $e \in E$, which satisfies the FKG-Inequality and has connectivity decay, i.e.*

$$\inf_{u,v \in V} \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

Remark 7 (Triviality of non-invariant property (T)) Proposition 3.4 shows that the percolation condition characterizing property (T) in Theorem A.2 trivializes when applied to general percolations in the sense that no locally finite, infinite, connected graph exists which satisfies that condition. In fact, it even shows that the condition can not be satisfied when only percolations with positive correlations are considered. ■

3.1 A one-parameter family of percolations. To every wall structure on a graph, we associate in this section a 1-parameter family of percolations with parameter $t > 0$. Here the parameter is the intensity of a Poisson process on the wall structure and intuitively corresponds to large marginals when t is small and small marginals when t is large.

Proposition 3.5 (Percolations from negative definite kernels). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a locally finite, connected graph and let $k: V \times V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a conditionally negative definite kernel. Then for every $t > 0$, there exists a general bond percolation \mathbf{P}_t which satisfies the FKG-Inequality and the following:*

- (i) for every $[u, v] = e \in E$,

$$\mathbf{P}_t[e \in E] = \exp(-t\sqrt{k(u,v)}). \quad (3.2)$$

(ii) for every $u, v \in V$,

$$\mathbf{P}_t[u \leftrightarrow v] \leq \exp(-t\sqrt{k(u, v)}). \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover, there exists a monotonically decreasing coupling of the family $(\mathbf{P}_t)_{t>0}$.

Proof. Let $(\Omega_V, \mathcal{B}_V, \mu_k)$ be the canonical wall-structure associated to k . Let η be a Poisson process on $\Omega_V \times [0, \infty)$ with intensity measure $\mu_k \otimes ds$, where ds denotes Lebesgue measure – i.e. η is a random counting measure on $\Omega_V \times [0, \infty)$ such that

(i) for every measurable $B \subset \Omega_V \times [0, \infty)$,

$$\mathbf{P}[\eta(B) = i] = e^{-(\mu_k \otimes ds)(B)} \frac{(\mu_k \otimes ds)(B)^i}{i!} \quad (3.4)$$

for every $i \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$.

(ii) for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every collection of pairwise disjoint, measurable $B_1, \dots, B_n \subset \Omega_V \times [0, \infty)$, the random variables $\eta(B_1), \dots, \eta(B_n)$ are independent.

For $t \in [0, \infty)$, define the configuration ω_t of a bond percolation on G as follows: for each edge $[u, v] = e$, let $e \in \omega_t$ if and only if

$$\eta(S_e \times [0, t]) = 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Let \mathbf{P}_t denote the law of ω_t . Observing that $\omega_t \subset \omega_s$ for $s < t$, we see that the family $(\mathbf{P}_t)_{t>0}$ has the desired monotone coupling. The FKG-Inequality for the Poisson process, see [20, Theorem 20.4], implies that \mathbf{P}_t satisfies the FKG-Inequality (note that every increasing event for ω_t is a decreasing event for η). Moreover,

$$\mathbf{P}_t[e \in E] = \mathbb{P}[\eta(S_e \times [0, t]) = 0] = \exp(-t\sqrt{k(u, v)}),$$

which shows (i). Finally, let $u, v \in V$ and suppose that

$$\eta((S_u \Delta S_v) \times [0, t]) > 0.$$

Then there exists $(c, s) \in \text{supp}(\eta)$ which satisfies $c(u) \neq c(v)$ and $s < t$. Now consider any path joining u to v in G and label the appearing edges e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n . Write $e_i = [u_i, v_i]$ and $u = u_0$. Then we may choose $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ minimal such that $c(e_i) \neq c(e_{i+1})$. In particular, $(c, s) \in (S_{u_i} \Delta S_{u_{i+1}}) \times [0, t)$ and hence

$$\eta(S_{e_i} \times [0, t]) > 0.$$

It follows that this path is not contained in ω_t . Since the path was arbitrary, we obtain that

$$\left\{ \eta((S_u \Delta S_v) \times [0, t]) > 0 \right\} \subset \left\{ u \overset{\omega_t}{\leftrightarrow} v \right\}^c,$$

and hence

$$\mathbf{P}_t[u \leftrightarrow v] \leq \mathbb{P}[\eta((S_u \Delta S_v) \times [0, t]) = 0] = \exp(-t\sqrt{k(u, v)}),$$

which proves (ii) and thus completes the proof. \square

The same arguments as in the above proof of Proposition 3.5 yield the following.

Corollary 3.6 (Percolations from measure definite and L^1 -kernels). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a locally finite, connected graph and let $k: V \times V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a measure definite kernel or an L^1 -kernel. Then for every $t > 0$, there exists a general bond percolation \mathbf{P}_t which satisfies the FKG-Inequality and the following:*

(i) for every $[u, v] = e \in E$,

$$\mathbf{P}_t[e \in \omega] = \exp(-tk(u, v)). \quad (3.6)$$

(ii) for every $u, v \in V$,

$$\mathbf{P}_t[u \leftrightarrow v] \leq \exp(-tk(u, v)). \quad (3.7)$$

Moreover, there exists a monotonically decreasing coupling of the family $(\mathbf{P}_t)_{t>0}$.

3.2 Proofs of the main results. With the percolation construction established, we now proceed to the proofs of the main results of this section, ordered increasingly according to the required technicalities.

Proof of Proposition 3.4: Let $G = (V, E)$ be a locally finite, connected, infinite graph. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$A_n := \{n, n+1, \dots\} \subset \mathbb{N} \quad (3.8)$$

and observe that $|A_n \Delta A_m| = \max\{n, m\} - \min\{n, m\}$. Fix a root $o \in V$ and define for each other vertex v

$$|v| := d(o, v) \quad \text{and} \quad S_v := A_{|v|}. \quad (3.9)$$

It follows that

$$k: V \times V \rightarrow [0, \infty), \quad k(u, v) := |S_u \Delta S_v| \quad (3.10)$$

is a symmetric, normalized and unbounded measure definite kernel with

$$\sup \{k(u, v) : d(u, v) \leq R\} \leq R. \quad (3.11)$$

Let $(\mathbf{P}_t)_{t>0}$ be a family of percolations as shown to exist in Proposition 3.5. For every $p > 1$, (3.11) and (3.2) guarantee that \mathbf{P}_t has marginals at least p for t sufficiently close to 0. Moreover, \mathbf{P}_t satisfies the FKG-Inequality. Finally, (3.3) and unboundedness of k imply that

$$\inf_{u, v \in V} \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] \leq \exp\left(-t \sup_{u, v \in V} \sqrt{k(u, v)}\right) = 0,$$

i.e. connectivity decay. □

Remark 8 (Connectivity decay vs. vanishing connectivity) The kernel k in the above proof is unbounded, but not proper as $k(u, v) = 0$ whenever $d(o, u) = d(o, v)$. Thus the two-point function constructed in the above proof does not necessarily vanish at infinity (of course G also need not coarsely embed into a Hilbert space). In a similar direction, let us mention that one could easily define proper measure definite kernels on G , even with linear growth, e.g. by considering the induced distance of a spanning tree. The problem with such a kernel, however, is that it does not necessarily satisfy a uniform upper bound of the form $\sup \{k(u, v) : d(u, v) \leq r\} < \infty$ and hence would not yield large marginals for small intensities. ■

To prove Theorem 3.1, we first recall the kernel-theoretic characterization of coarse embeddability into a Hilbert space.

Theorem 3.7 (Coarse embeddability through kernels, cf. [32, Theorem 3.2.8]). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a locally finite, connected graph. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) G admits a coarse embedding into a Hilbert space;

- (ii) *there exists a conditionally negative definite kernel $k: V \times V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ together with maps $\rho_1, \rho_2: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $\rho_1(t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and*

$$\rho_1(d(u, v)) \leq k(u, v) \leq \rho_2(d(u, v)) \quad (3.12)$$

for every $u, v \in V$;

- (iii) *for every $R, \varepsilon > 0$, there exists a normalized, positive definite kernel $k: V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which tends to zero off tubes, i.e.*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{k(u, v) : d(u, v) \geq r\} = 0, \quad (3.13)$$

and has (R, ε) -variation, i.e. $d(u, v) \leq R$ implies $|1 - k(u, v)| < \varepsilon$.

Sketch of proof. For the convenience of the reader, we include a sketch of one possible line of argument to prove Theorem 3.7.

The equivalence between (i) and (ii) can easily be deduced from the fact, mentioned already in (2.8), that $k: V \times V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a conditionally negative definite kernel if and only if $k(u, v) = \|f(u) - f(v)\|_H^2$ for a Hilbert space H and map $f: V \rightarrow H$.

The implication from (ii) to (iii) follows from Schoenberg's theorem, stated in (2.9), which asserts that if $k: V \times V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a conditionally negative definite kernel, then $e^{-\lambda k}$ is a positive definite kernel for every $\lambda \geq 0$.

Finally, the fact that (iii) implies (ii) may be seen by the following construction: suppose (iii) holds and find for every $n \geq 1$ some $R_n \geq \max\{n, R_{n-1}\}$ and a normalized, positive definite kernel k_n such that $d(u, v) \leq n$ implies $|k_n(u, v) - 1| < 2^{-n}$ and such that $d(u, v) > R_n$ implies $k_n(u, v) < 1/2$. It can then be checked that $k(u, v) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 1 - k_n(u, v)$ defines a conditionally negative definite kernel with $k(u, v) \leq 2d(u, v) + 1$ and $k(u, v) \geq 2^{-1}Q(d(u, v))$, where $Q(t) := \min\{n \geq 1 : t \leq R_n\}$. We refer to either [32] or [30, Theorem 11.16] for details. \square

With this preparation, we now proceed to the proofs of our two main results.

Proof of Theorem 3.1: Suppose that for every $p < 1$, there exists a general bond percolation \mathbf{P} with $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega] > p$ for every $e \in E$ and such that the two-point function tends to zero off tubes. Choose a sequence (\mathbf{P}_n) of general bond percolations such that $\mathbf{P}_n[e \in \omega] > 1 - 1/n$ for every $e \in E$ and such that the corresponding two-point function

$$\tau_n: V \times V \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad \tau_n(u, v) = \mathbf{P}_n[u \leftrightarrow v]$$

tends to zero off tubes. By Lemma 2.3, τ_n is a normalized, positive definite kernel. Let $R, \varepsilon > 0$. We now verify that τ_n has (R, ε) -variation for n large enough: if γ is any path in G of length at most R , then it follows that

$$\mathbf{P}_n[\gamma \subset \omega] \geq 1 - R \left(1 - \inf_{e \in E} \mathbf{P}_n[e \in \omega]\right) \geq 1 - R/n$$

and thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \{\tau_n(u, v) : d(u, v) \leq R\} = 1.$$

By Theorem 3.7 "(iii) \Rightarrow (i)", G admits a coarse embedding into a Hilbert space.

Conversely, suppose that G admits a coarse embedding into a Hilbert space. By Theorem 3.7 "(i) \Rightarrow (ii)", there exists a conditionally negative definite kernel $k: V \times V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and maps $\rho_1, \rho_2: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $\rho_1(t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\rho_1(d(u, v)) \leq k(u, v) \leq \rho_2(d(u, v)) \quad (3.14)$$

for every $u, v \in V$. By Proposition 3.5, there exists for every $t > 0$ a general bond percolation \mathbf{P}_t with

$$\mathbf{P}_t[e \in E] = \exp(-t\sqrt{k(u, v)}) \quad (3.15)$$

for every $[u, v] = e \in E$ and with

$$\mathbf{P}_t[u \leftrightarrow v] \leq \exp(-t\sqrt{k(u, v)}) \quad (3.16)$$

for every $u, v \in V$. Using (3.15) and the upper bound in (3.14), we see that

$$\inf_{e \in E} \mathbf{P}_t[e \in E] = \exp\left(-t \sup_{e=[u, v] \in E} \sqrt{k(u, v)}\right) \geq e^{-t\sqrt{\rho_2(1)}} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.17)$$

and it follows that \mathbf{P}_t has marginals at least p for t sufficiently small. Moreover, for any $t > 0$, (3.16) and the lower bound in (3.14) imply that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] : u, v \in V, d(u, v) > r \right\} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} e^{-t\sqrt{\rho_1(r)}} = 0, \quad (3.18)$$

i.e. the two-point function of \mathbf{P}_t vanishes at infinity. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2: Let $f: V \rightarrow L^1$ be a Lipschitz function, say with Lipschitz constant L , such that

$$\|f(u) - f(v)\|_1 \geq cd(u, v)^\alpha \quad (3.19)$$

for every $u, v \in V$ and some uniform constant $c > 0$. Corollary 3.6 applied with the L^1 -kernel

$$k: V \times V \rightarrow [0, \infty), k(u, v) := \|f(u) - f(v)\|$$

yields the existence of a family $(\mathbf{P}_t)_{t>0}$ of general bond percolations with

$$\mathbf{P}_t[e \in E] = \exp(-tk(u, v)) \leq \exp(-tLd(u, v))$$

for every $[u, v] = e \in E$ and

$$\mathbf{P}_t[u \leftrightarrow v] \leq \exp(-tk(u, v)) \geq \exp(-tcd(u, v)^\alpha)$$

for every $u, v \in V$. Setting

$$\beta_t := tL \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_t := tc,$$

it immediately follows that the two-point function of \mathbf{P}_t has stretched exponential decay in the sense that

$$e^{-\beta_t d(u, v)} \leq \mathbf{P}_t[u \leftrightarrow v] \leq e^{-\gamma_t d(u, v)^\alpha}$$

for every $t > 0$ with

$$\sup_{t>0} \frac{\beta_t}{\gamma_t} = \frac{L}{c} =: C < \infty.$$

Moreover, the lower bound on the distortion in (3.19), together with the same argument used in (3.17) above, implies that \mathbf{P}_t has marginals at least p for t sufficiently small.

Conversely, suppose there exists a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence (\mathbf{P}_n) of general bond percolations, such that \mathbf{P}_n satisfies $\mathbf{P}_n[e \in \omega] > 1 - 1/n$ for every $e \in E$ and the stretched exponential two-point function decay

$$e^{-\beta_n d(u, v)} \leq \mathbf{P}_n[u \leftrightarrow v] \leq e^{-\gamma_n d(u, v)^\alpha} \quad (3.20)$$

for every $u, v \in V$ and some $\beta_n, \gamma_n > 0$ with $\beta_n/\gamma_n \leq C$. Note that since the marginals tend to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we must have $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$ and thus also $\beta_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Set

$$k_n: V \times V \rightarrow [0, \infty), k_n(u, v) := \frac{\mathbf{P}_n[u \not\leftrightarrow v]}{\gamma_n}. \quad (3.21)$$

By Lemma 2.4 and the obvious fact that scalar multiplication preserves measure definiteness, each k_n defines a measure definite kernel. Moreover, the lower bound in (3.20) and the fact that $\beta_n \rightarrow 0$ imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n(u, v) &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 - \mathbf{P}_n[u \leftrightarrow v]}{\gamma_n} \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 - e^{-\beta_n d(u, v)}}{\gamma_n} \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_n}{\gamma_n} \frac{1 - e^{-\beta_n d(u, v)}}{\beta_n} \\ &\leq Cd(u, v) \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

for every $u, v \in V$. By countability, we may go over to a subsequence such that

$$k: V \times V \rightarrow [0, \infty), \quad k(u, v) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n(u, v) \tag{3.23}$$

exists. As a pointwise limit of measure definite kernels, k is measure definite, see Proposition 2.2. By (3.22), it is Lipschitz with constant C . On the other hand, the upper bound in (3.20) and the fact that $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$ imply that

$$k(u, v) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n(u, v) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 - e^{-\gamma_n d(u, v)^\alpha}}{\gamma_n} = d(u, v)^\alpha \tag{3.24}$$

for every $u, v \in V$. Finally, Proposition 2.1 implies that k is an L^1 -kernel. Combining this fact with (3.22) and (3.24) shows that $\alpha_1^*(G) \geq \alpha$. \square

Remark 9 (Difference to the equivariant case) The construction in Proposition 3.5 differs from the construction in the proof of [25, Theorem 3.6] in applying to general conditionally negative definite kernels on graphs and in directly providing the monotone coupling using an auxiliary Poisson process on a larger space. The difference between the equivariant and the non-equivariant compression exponents manifests itself in the proof of "(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)" of Theorem 3 compared to that of Theorem A.3 which was given in [25]. While the percolations can be used in both situations to produce a measure definite kernel with growth at least d^α , this is sufficient to conclude $\alpha_1^* \geq \alpha$ only in the non-equivariant case. In the equivariant case, although the constructed kernel inherits invariance from the invariant percolations, it is not known that there actually is an associated isometric action implementing the kernel in the sense of (A.2) – this is the same problem as the "missing application" which was raised in [12, Proposition 2.8 & Remark 2.9]. In general, this property is only known for kernels which are the *square-root* of a conditionally negative definite kernel, where it is due to Robertson and Steger [29, Proof of Theorem 2.1] (see also [10, Theorem 6.25] for a generalization). Due to having to take the square root, it is only possible to conclude $\alpha_1^\# \geq \alpha/2$ in [25] – note however, that the kernel the square-root is taken of is already measured definite, which is much stronger than the required conditional negative definiteness. \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 3.3: This follows exactly as in the above proof of Theorem 3.2 with a general function ρ replacing the function $\rho(t) = t^\alpha$. \square

4. CLOSING REMARKS

- (A) As mentioned in Remark 6, there exist powerful interactions between the theory of compression exponents and random walks, see e.g. [8, 26, 27] and the references therein. It would be very interesting to establish links with percolation through Theorem 3 and Theorem A.3, or to find novel combinations of the methods.
- (B) It would be interesting to formulate a non-invariant version of property (T), e.g. by introducing a weak form of invariance. For Cayley graphs, one possibility could be to consider *uniformly quasi-invariant* percolations, i.e. general percolations \mathbf{P} such that all shifts admit densities uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbf{P})$. The condition in Corollary 2 with uniformly quasi-invariant percolations would imply that the corresponding group has the *weak Haagerup property* introduced in [19] (this follows from [25] together with [17, Proposition 3.1]), but we do not know whether the converse holds.
- (C) The previous remark seems to be closely related to the challenge of finding a coarse version of property (T) posed by Roe [30, Section 11.4, Question (b)] (of course, a non-trivial version). Note that Proposition 3.4 fails for finite graphs. Thus the natural attempt of finding a coarse version of property (T) by considering the percolation-theoretic condition in Theorem A.2 for general, instead of invariant, bond percolations is another instance of a plausible definition of "coarse property (T)" trivializing to "being bounded", cf. [30, Section 11.4.3].
- (D) As alluded to in Remark 9 and pointed out at the end of Appendix A, the question whether the *equivariant L^1 -compression exponent* is characterized through invariant percolations remains open. More precisely, it is not known in general that (ii) implies (i) in Theorem A.3. This implication would follow from the "missing implication" in [12, Proposition 2.8].

APPENDIX A. DISCUSSION OF THE INVARIANT SETTING

This section contains a brief description of the results obtained by the authors prior to this work in the invariant setting. The reader interested only in the non-symmetric situation may skip this section.

The main inspiration for the present work are the results described below, which were recently obtained in the setting of Cayley graphs [25] and which deal with geometric properties of groups, namely the *Haagerup property*, *property (T)* and the *equivariant L^1 -compression exponent*.

Recall that given a finitely generated group Γ and a finite, symmetric generating set S , the **Cayley graph** of Γ with respect to S is the graph $G = (V, E)$ with vertex set $V = \Gamma$ and edges between all pairs of vertices which can be obtained from one another by right multiplication with some $s \in S$. A Γ -**invariant bond percolation** is a general bond percolation, which is invariant under the left-multiplication action of Γ . Also recall the following notions:

- The group Γ has the **Haagerup property**, if there exists an affine isometric action of Γ on a Hilbert space H which is metrically proper, i.e.

$$|\{g \in \Gamma: gB \cap B \neq \emptyset\}| < \infty \tag{A.1}$$

for every bounded $B \subset H$.

- The group Γ has **property (T)**, if every affine isometric action of Γ on a Hilbert space H has a fixed point.
- The **equivariant L^1 -compression exponent** $\alpha_1^\#(\Gamma)$ is the supremum over those $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, such that there exists a measure space (Y, ν) and an affine isometric action of Γ on $L^1(Y, \nu)$ together with a Γ -equivariant map $f: \Gamma \rightarrow L^1(Y, \nu)$ such that

$$\|f(g) - f(h)\| \geq cd(g, h)^\alpha \tag{A.2}$$

for every $g, h \in \Gamma$ and a uniform constant $c > 0$, where d is some word metric on Γ .

We refer to [5, 9, 16] for more information, including common equivalent definitions. We chose to state these particular definitions because they require minimal background. Two important remarks are that Γ has both the Haagerup property and property (T) if and only if it is finite, and that the Haagerup property implies that Γ admits a coarse embedding into a Hilbert space.

We are now in a position to recall the interplay with invariant percolation, which inspired the present work. We point out that large marginals were equivalently expressed in [25] by requiring large expected degree, i.e. by requiring $\mathbf{E}[\deg_\omega(v)] > \alpha \deg(v)$ for every $v \in V$ and some $\alpha < 1$ close to 1.

Theorem A.1 (Characterization of the Haagerup property, cf. [25]). *Let Γ be a finitely generated group. Then Γ has the Haagerup property if and only if some, equivalently every, Cayley graph $G = (V, E)$ has the property that for every $p < 1$, there exists a Γ -invariant bond percolation \mathbf{P} with $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega] \geq p$ for every $e \in E$ and such that the two-point function vanishes at infinity, i.e.*

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] : u, v \in V, d(u, v) > r \right\} = 0.$$

The Haagerup property is thus characterized by the existence of invariant percolations with large marginals and two-point function decay.

Theorem A.2 (Characterization of Kazhdan's property (T), cf. [25]). *Let Γ be a finitely generated group. Then Γ has property (T) if and only if some, equivalently every, Cayley graph $G = (V, E)$ has the property that there exists $p^* < 1$ such that every Γ -invariant bond percolation \mathbf{P} with $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega] > p^*$ for every $e \in E$ exhibits long-range order, i.e.*

$$\inf_{u, v \in V} \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] > 0. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Thus, whether Γ has property (T) is characterized by the *existence of a threshold* $p^* < 1$ on each of its Cayley graphs such that every invariant bond percolation with marginals above p^* *not only* has infinite clusters w.p.p. (which follows from non-amenability of property (T) groups and the characterization of amenability through percolation in [6]), but in fact has a cluster which has a uniformly positive probability of reaching *any given vertex*. The direct implication in Theorem A.2 is due to Lyons and Schramm [23].

Theorem A.3 (Description of the equivariant L^1 -compression exponent, cf. [25]). *Let Γ be a finitely generated group and let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then each of the following conditions implies the next:*

- (i) *The equivariant L^1 -compression exponent $\alpha_1^\#(\Gamma)$ is at least α .*
- (ii) *Some, equivalently every, Cayley graph $G = (V, E)$ has the property that there exists $C > 0$ such that for every $p < 1$, there exists a Γ -invariant bond percolation \mathbf{P} with $\mathbf{P}[e \in \omega] > p$ for every $e \in E$ and which satisfies the stretched exponential decay*

$$e^{-\beta d(u, v)} \leq \mathbf{P}[u \leftrightarrow v] \leq e^{-\gamma d(u, v)^\alpha}$$

for all $u, v \in V$ and some $\beta, \gamma > 0$ with $\beta/\gamma \leq C$.

- (iii) *The equivariant L^1 -compression exponent $\alpha_1^\#(\Gamma)$ is at least $\alpha/2$.*

Moreover, (i) and (ii) are equivalent for amenable Γ .

The question whether (ii) implies (i) in Theorem A.3 has appeared in [25] and remains open for non-amenable groups (see Remark 9 and Section 4). The non-equivariant analogue of this question has an affirmative answer by Corollary 4.

Acknowledgement: The research of both authors is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) under Germany's Excellence Strategy EXC 2044-390685587, Mathematics Münster: Dynamics-Geometry-Structure.

REFERENCES

1. AIZENMAN, M. and NEWMAN, C. M. (1984). Tree graph inequalities and critical behavior in percolation models. *J. Statist. Phys.* **36** 107-143.
2. ALDOUS, D. and LYONS, R. (2007). Processes on unimodular random networks. *Electron. J. Probab.* **12** 1454-1508.
3. ALEKSEEV, V. and FINN-SELL, M. (2019). Sofic boundaries of groups and coarse geometry of sofic approximations. *Groups Geom. Dyn.* **13** 191-234.
4. ALON, N., BENJAMINI, I., STACEY, A. (2004). Percolation on finite graphs and isoperimetric inequalities. *Ann. Probab.* **32** 1727-1745.
5. BEKKA, B., DE LA HARPE, P., VALETTE, A. (2008). Kazhdan's property (T). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
6. BENJAMINI, I., LYONS, R., PERES, Y., SCHRAMM, O. (1999). Group-invariant percolation on graphs. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **9** 29-66.
7. BENJAMINI, I. and SCHRAMM, O. (2001). Recurrence of distributional limits of finite planar graphs. *Electron. J. Probab.* **6** 1-13.
8. BRIEUSSEL, J. and ZHENG, T. (2021). Speed of random walks, isoperimetry and compression of finitely generated groups. *Ann. of Math.* **193** 1-105.
9. BROWN, N. P. and OZAWA, N. (2008). C^* -Algebras and finite dimensional approximations. In: *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, Vol. **88**, AMS, Providence, Rhode Island.
10. CHATTERJI, I., DRUTU, C., HAGLUND, F. (2010). Kazhdan and Haagerup properties from the median viewpoint. *Adv. Math.* **225**(2) 882-921.
11. CHERIX, P.-A., MARTIN, F., VALETTE, A. (2004). Spaces with measured walls, the Haagerup property and property (T). *Ergod. Theory Dynam. Sys.* **24** 1895-1908.
12. DE CORNULIER, Y., STALDER, Y., VALETTE, A. (2012). Proper actions of wreath products and generalizations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **364**(6) 3159-3184.
13. DEZA, M. and LAURENT, M. (1997). *Geometry of Cuts and Metrics*. Springer, Berlin, 1997.
14. EASO, P. and HUTCHCROFT, T. (2024). The critical percolation probability is local. *arXiv-preprint*: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.10983>.
15. ELEK, G. (2021). Uniform hyperfiniteness. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **374** 5095-5111.
16. GUENTNER, E. and KAMINKER, J. (2004). Exactness and uniform embeddability of discrete groups. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **70** 703-718.
17. HAAGERUP, U. and KNUDBY, S. (2015). The weak Haagerup property II: Examples. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2015**(16) 6941-6967.
18. HÄGGSTRÖM, O. and JONASSON, J. (2006). Uniqueness and non-uniqueness in percolation theory. *Prob. Surv.* **3** 289-344.
19. KNUDBY, S. (2014). Semigroups of Herz-Schur multipliers. *J. Funct. Anal.* **266** 1565-1610.
20. LAST, G. and PENROSE, M. (2017). Lectures on the Poisson Process. In: *Institute of Mathematical Statistics Textbooks*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
21. LYONS, R. (2013). Distance covariance in metric spaces. *Ann. Probab.* **41** 3284-3305.
22. LYONS, R. and PERES, Y. (2016). *Probability on Trees and Networks*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

23. LYONS, R. and SCHRAMM, O. (1999). Indistinguishability of percolation clusters. *Ann. Prob.* **27** 1809-1836.
24. MUKHERJEE, C. and RECKE, K. (2022). Schur multipliers of C^* -algebras, group-invariant compactification and applications to amenability and percolation. *J. Funct. Anal.* **287**, to appear. *arxiv-preprint*: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.11411>.
25. MUKHERJEE, C. and RECKE, K. (2023). Haagerup property and group-invariant percolation. *arxiv-preprint*: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.17429>.
26. NAOR, A. and PERES, Y. (2008). Embeddings of discrete groups and the speed of random walks. *Intern. Math. Res. Notices*, rnn076.
27. NAOR, A. and PERES, Y. (2011). L_p compression, traveling salesmen, and stable walks. *Duke Math. J.* **157** 53-108.
28. PETE, G. (2022). Probability and Geometry on Groups. Available at: <http://math.bme.hu/~gabor/PGG.pdf>.
29. ROBERTSON, G. and STEGER, T. (1998). Negative definite kernels and a dynamical characterization of property (T) for countable groups. *Ergod. Theory Dynam. Sys.* **18** 247-253.
30. ROE, J. (2003). Lectures on coarse geometry. In: *University Lecture Series*, Vol. **31**, AMS, Providence, Rhode Island.
31. SALEZ, J. (2022). Sparse expanders have negative curvature. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **32** 1486-1513.
32. WILLETT, R. (2009). Some notes on property A. In: *Limits of graphs in group theory and computer science*, EPFL Press, Lausanne.
33. YU, G. (2000). The coarse Baum–Connes conjecture for spaces which admit a uniform embedding into Hilbert space. *Invent. Math.* **139** 201-240.