

EVOLUTION AND LIMITING CONFIGURATION OF A LONG-RANGE SCHELLING-TYPE SPIN SYSTEM*

BY HAMED OMIDVAR AND MASSIMO FRANCESCHETTI

University of California, San Diego

We consider a long-range interacting particle system in which binary particles – whose initial states are chosen uniformly at random – are located at the nodes of a flat torus $(\mathbb{Z}/h\mathbb{Z})^2$. Each node of the torus is connected to all the nodes located in an l_∞ -ball of radius w in the toroidal space centered at itself and we assume that h is exponentially larger than w^2 . Based on the states of the neighboring particles and on the value of a common intolerance threshold τ , every particle is labeled “stable,” or “unstable.” Every unstable particle that can become stable by flipping its state is labeled “p-stable.” Finally, unstable particles that remained p-stable for a random, independent and identically distributed waiting time, flip their state and become stable. When the waiting times have an exponential distribution and $\tau \leq 1/2$, this model is equivalent to a Schelling model of self-organized segregation in an open system, a zero-temperature Ising model with Glauber dynamics, or an Asynchronous Cellular Automaton (ACA) with extended Moore neighborhoods.

We first prove a shape theorem for the spreading of the “affected” nodes of a given state – namely nodes on which a particle of a given state would be p-stable. As $w \rightarrow \infty$, this spreading starts with high probability (w.h.p.) from any l_∞ -ball in the torus having radius $w/2$ and containing only affected nodes, and continues for a time that is at least exponential in the cardinality of the neighborhood of interaction $N = (2w + 1)^2$. Second, we show that when the process reaches a limiting configuration and no more state changes occur, for all $\tau \in (\tau^*, 1 - \tau^*) \setminus \{1/2\}$ where $\tau^* \approx 0.488$, w.h.p. any particle is contained in a large “monochromatic ball” of cardinality exponential in N . When particles are placed on the infinite lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 rather than on a flat torus, for the values of τ mentioned above, after a sufficiently long evolution time, w.h.p. any particle is contained in a large monochromatic ball of cardinality exponential in N .

*An extended abstract of an earlier version of this paper containing a subset of the results and with most proofs omitted appears in the proceedings of ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC '18). This work was partially supported by Army Research Office (ARO), award number W911NF-15-1-0253.

MSC 2010 subject classifications: Primary 60K35, 82C22, 82C43, 82B43

Keywords and phrases: Interacting Particle System (IPS), Agent-Based Model, Asynchronous Cellular Automaton, Zero-Temperature Ising Model, Unperturbed Schelling Segregation, Distributed Algorithm, Self-Organized Segregation, Percolation Theory, First Passage Percolation, Exponential Segregation

1. Introduction.

1.1. *Background.* Consider a flat torus $(\mathbb{Z}/h\mathbb{Z})^2$. Connect each node of the torus to all the nodes located in an l_∞ -ball of radius w in the toroidal space centered at itself, and assume that h is exponentially larger than w^2 . This gives a Cayley graph $G_w = C((\mathbb{Z}/h\mathbb{Z})^2, \{-w, -w+1, \dots, w\}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\})$. Put a particle at each node of the graph such that its initial binary state is an element of the set $\{\theta, \bar{\theta}\}$ that is chosen independently and uniformly at random. The “neighborhood” of a node, or particle, is defined as the set containing the node itself and all of its adjacent nodes in G_w . All particles have a common intolerance threshold $0 < \tau < 1$, indicating the minimum fraction of particles in their same state that must be in their neighborhood to label them “stable.” A particle that is not stable is labeled “unstable.” Furthermore, a particle that is not stable, but can become stable by flipping its state, is labeled “p-stable.” Every time a particle becomes p-stable, it is assigned an independent and identical clock. When the clock rings, the particle’s state is flipped if the particle has remained p-stable for the entire clock duration. This flipping action indicates that the particle has moved out of the system and a new particle has occupied its location. This change is then immediately detected by the neighbors who update their labels accordingly. We are interested in the limiting configuration of this process when both h and w tend to infinity, and h is exponentially larger than w^2 . Hence, we consider the behavior of the system when $\log h = \omega(w^2)$ as $w \rightarrow \infty$. This is of course equivalent to looking at the behavior for $h \rightarrow \infty$ when $w^2 = o(\log h)$, while also requiring $w \rightarrow \infty$. This choice ensures that the rate of growth of the number of particles inside any neighborhood is exponentially smaller than the rate of growth of the number of particles over the entire torus. As a consequence, interactions occur over an unbounded range, but are also sufficiently “local” to ensure that a limiting configuration can be studied.

In social sciences and economics, this model has been extensively studied using Poisson clocks and is known as the Schelling model in an “open” system [35, 36]. In computation theory, mathematics, physics, complexity theory, theoretical biology and material sciences, it is known as a two-dimensional, two-state Asynchronous Cellular Automaton (ACA) with extended Moore neighborhoods and exponential waiting times [11]. Related models appeared in epidemiology [20, 12], economics [23], engineering and computer sciences [28, 14]. Mathematically, all of them fall in the general area of interacting particle systems [29, 30]. For an intolerance value of $1/2$, the model corresponds to the Ising model with zero temperature, which exhibits spontaneous magnetization as spins align along the direction of the




FIG 1. *Self-organization arising over time for a value of the intolerance $\tau = 0.42$ on a 1000×1000 flat torus and neighborhood size 441. Green and blue indicate areas of “stable” particles in states θ and $\bar{\theta}$, respectively. White and yellow indicate areas of “unstable” particles in states θ and $\bar{\theta}$ respectively. Initial configuration (a), transient configurations (b)-(c), final configuration (d). When the process terminates all particles are stable and large monochromatic areas can be observed.*

local field [38, 10].

The dynamics of these processes can be roughly divided into two classes. *Glauber dynamics* assume unstable particles to simply flip their state if this makes them stable. In contrast, *Kawasaki dynamics* assume that pairs of unstable particles swap their locations if this will make both of them stable. While Glauber dynamics correspond to an “open” system where the number of particles of each state can change over time, the Kawasaki dynamics correspond to a “closed” system where the number of particles of each state is fixed. In this paper, we consider Glauber dynamics. Other variants are possible, including having unstable particles swap (or flip) regardless of whether this makes them stable or not, or to assume that particles have a small probability of acting differently than what the general rule prescribes, have multiple intolerance levels, multiple states, different distributions, and time-varying intolerance [41, 42, 43, 44, 32, 31, 7, 37, 4, 5].

A common effect observed by simulating several variants of the model is that in the limiting configuration large monochromatic areas containing particles with the same state are formed, for a wide range of the intolerance threshold τ . This corresponds to observing spontaneous self-organization resulting from local interactions. See Figure 1 for a simulation of this behavior.

1.2. Prior work. Although simulation results have been available for a long time, rigorous results for the limiting behavior of the model appeared only recently, even for the one-dimensional case and assuming Poisson clocks. Brandt et al. [8] considered a ring graph for the Kawasaki model of evolution. In this setting, they showed that for an intolerance level $\tau = 1/2$,




FIG 2. For $\tau \in (\tau_*, 1 - \tau_*) \setminus \{1/2\}$, where $\tau_* \approx 0.433$, we prove a shape theorem for the spread of the “affected” nodes during the process dynamics (gray plus black region) and then show that in the final configuration, for all $\tau \in (\tau^*, 1 - \tau^*) \setminus \{1/2\}$ where $\tau^* \approx 0.488$, with probability tending to one as $w \rightarrow \infty$ (w.h.p.), any particle is contained in a large “monochromatic ball” of size exponential in $N = (2w + 1)^2$ (gray region).

the expected size of the largest monochromatic ball containing an arbitrary particle in the final configuration is polynomial in the size of the neighborhood. Barmpalias et al. [3] showed that there exists a value of $\tau^* \approx 0.35$, such that for all $\tau < \tau^*$ the initial configuration remains almost static with high probability (w.h.p.), while for all $\tau^* < \tau < 1/2$ the size of the largest monochromatic ball in the final configuration is exponential in the size of the neighborhood w.h.p. On the other hand, for all $\tau > 1/2$ the system evolves w.h.p. towards a state with only two monochromatic components. For the Glauber model the behavior is similar and consists of a transition from a static configuration to a configuration with exponential monochromatic balls occurring at $\tau \approx 0.35$, a special point $\tau = 1/2$ with monochromatic balls of polynomial expected size, then again exponential monochromatic balls until $\tau \approx 0.65$, and finally a static configuration for larger values of τ . Holden and Sheffield [21] have considered the case $\tau = 1/2$ and studied the dynamical scaling limit as the size of the neighborhood tends to infinity and the lattice is correspondingly re-scaled.

In the two-dimensional model, the case $\tau = 1/2$ is open. Immorlica et al. [22] have shown for the Glauber dynamics the existence of a value $\tau^* < 1/2$, such that for all $\tau^* < \tau < 1/2$ the expected size of the largest monochromatic ball is exponential in the size of the neighborhood. This shows that exponential monochromatic balls are expected in the small interval $\tau \in (1/2 - \epsilon, 1/2)$. Barmpalias et al. [6] considered a model in which particles in different states have different intolerance parameters, i.e., τ_1 and τ_2 . For the special case of $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau$, they have shown that when $\tau > 3/4$, or $\tau < 1/4$, the initial configuration remains almost static w.h.p.

In a previous work by the authors [34], the intolerance interval that leads to the formation of large monochromatic balls has been enlarged from $\epsilon > 0$ to ≈ 0.134 , namely when $0.433 < \tau < 1/2$ (and for $1/2 < \tau < 0.567$), the expected size of the largest monochromatic ball is exponential in the size of the neighborhood of interaction. In addition, “almost monochromatic balls”

have been considered, namely balls where the ratio of the number of particles in one state and the number of particles in the other state quickly vanishes as the size of the neighborhood grows, and it has been shown that for $0.344 < \tau \leq 0.433$ (and for $0.567 \leq \tau < 0.656$) the expected size of the largest almost monochromatic ball is exponential in the size of the neighborhood.

1.3. Contribution. The first contribution of this paper is the development of a shape theorem for the spread of “affected” nodes of a given state θ during the process dynamics – namely nodes on which θ -particles would be p-stable. Letting w be the l_∞ radius of the neighborhood of interaction on the torus, and $N = (2w + 1)^2$ its cardinality, we show that conditional on the existence of an l_∞ ball in the torus having radius $w/2$ centered at the origin and containing only θ -affected nodes, the spreading of these affected nodes starts with high probability from such a ball, and continues for a time that is at least exponential in N . This is the first result that precisely describes the transient dynamics of the spreading process. Key to this result is that we consider the spreading of θ -affected nodes rather than the spreading of unstable particles. These nodes have the potential of having a particle located on them being p-stable. While unstable particles may keep switching between being stable and unstable during the process dynamics, the behavior of θ -affected nodes is somewhat more static; once they become affected they remain so for a long time interval. Another key property is that in the initial configuration, θ -affected nodes are rare: they do not occur with high probability in an exponentially large region around the origin. It follows that all the θ -affected nodes that are found within this region after an exponentially long evolution time must have spread from the original affected region of radius $w/2$ centered at the origin.

Our second contribution is determining the limiting size of the largest monochromatic ball, for a given interval of τ . A weakness of all previous results for the two dimensional case is that they obtain lower bounds on the expected size of the largest monochromatic ball containing a given particle, but they do not show that in the final configuration any particle ends up in an exponentially large monochromatic ball with high probability. A possibility that is consistent with the results in the literature (but inconsistent with the simulation results) is that only an exponentially small fraction of the nodes are contained in a large monochromatic ball at the end of the process, but that those neighborhoods are so large that the expected size of largest monochromatic ball containing any node is exponentially large. For this reason, current results leave a large gap in our qualitative understanding of the two-dimensional process. We close this gap by showing that when

the process stops, for all $\tau \in (\tau^*, 1 - \tau^*) \setminus \{1/2\}$ where $\tau^* \approx 0.488$, w.h.p. any particle is contained in a large monochromatic ball of size exponential in $N = (2w + 1)^2$. When particles are placed on the infinite lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 rather than on a flat torus, for the values of τ mentioned above, after a sufficiently long evolution time, w.h.p. any particle is contained in a large monochromatic ball of size exponential in N . These results are summarized in Figure 2.

1.4. *Additional related work.* For the case of a neighborhood of interaction of constant radius w over an infinite lattice, Fontes et al. [16] have shown the existence of a critical probability $1/2 < p^* < 1$ for the initial Bernoulli distribution of the particle states such that for $\tau = 1/2$ and $p > p^*$ the Glauber model on the d -dimensional grid converges to a state where only particles in one state are present. This shows that complete monochromaticity occurs w.h.p. for $\tau = 1/2$ and $p \in (1 - \epsilon, 1)$. Morris [33] has shown that p^* converges to $1/2$ as $d \rightarrow \infty$. Caputo and Martinelli [9] have shown the same result for d -regular trees, while Kanoria and Montanari [24] derived it for d -regular trees in a synchronous setting where flips occur simultaneously, and obtained lower bounds on $p^*(d)$ for small values of d . The case $d = 1$ was first investigated by Erdős and Ney [15], and Arratia [2] has proven that $p^*(1) = 1$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we introduce the model, state our results, and give a summary of the proof construction. In section 3 we provide a few preliminary results along with some results from previous works. In section 4 we develop the concentration bound for the spreading time of the affected nodes. In section 5 we use this concentration bound to obtain a shape theorem for the spread of affected nodes. In section 6 we prove a size theorem for the limiting configuration.

2. Model and Main Results.

2.1. *Notational Conventions.* For a node, vertex, or vector $v = (v(1), \dots, v(d))$ we shall use the l_∞ norm denoted by

$$\|v\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |v(i)|.$$

Also, $\lfloor a \rfloor$ ($\lceil a \rceil$) is the largest (smallest) integer $\leq a$ ($\geq a$), $a \wedge b = \min(a, b)$, $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$.

2.2. The Model.

Definition 1 (Initial Configuration). Consider the Cayley graph

$$G_w = C(\mathbb{T}^2, \{-w, -w+1, \dots, w\}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}),$$

where $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}/h\mathbb{Z}$, $\log h = \omega(w^2)$, and w is assumed to be an integer. We define the initial configuration by placing a binary particle at each node of G_w and choosing the state of each particle independently at random to be θ or $\bar{\theta}$ according to a Bernoulli distribution of parameter $p = 1/2$. By the state of a node we mean the state of the particle located at that node and by particle u we mean the particle located at node u .

Definition 2 (Neighborhood of a Node). For any $u \in \mathbb{T}^2$, we define a neighborhood of radius ρ , or ρ -neighborhood of node u as the set of all nodes in an l_∞ -ball of radius ρ in the flat torus \mathbb{T}^2 centered at u as

$$\mathcal{N}_\rho(u) := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{T}^2 : \|v - u\|_\infty \leq \rho \right\}.$$

When $\rho = w$ we drop the subscript and refer to the *the neighborhood of u* as $\mathcal{N}(u)$. This also corresponds to a ball of unit radius in the graph metric centered at u . The *size* of a neighborhood is defined as its cardinality. We indicate the size of $\mathcal{N}(u)$ with $N = (2w+1)^2$.

Remark 1. The choice $\log h = \omega(w^2)$ ensures that while the size of $\mathcal{N}(u)$ is not uniformly bounded as $w \rightarrow \infty$, it is exponentially small compared to the number of particles in the entire torus. This ensures that interactions among particles occur over an unbounded range and are also sufficiently “local” to enable to study the limiting properties of the model. On the other hand, the choice of the l_∞ norm is to comply with the original definition of a neighborhood in the Schelling model, but results can be easily extended to other norms.

Definition 3 (Intolerance Parameter). We define the *intolerance parameter* as the rational number $\tau = \lceil \tilde{\tau} N \rceil / N$, where $\tilde{\tau} \in [0, 1]$ and $N = (2w+1)^2$ is the size of the neighborhood of a node.

Definition 4 (Stable, Unstable, and P-stable Particles). Let $s_t(u)$ denote the state of a particle at node u at time t and let

$$r_t(u) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(u)} 1_{\{s_t(u)=s_t(v)\}},$$

where $1_{\{\cdot\}}$ is the indicator function. A particle at node u at time t is *stable* if and only if $r_t(u) \geq \tau$. A particle that is not stable is called *unstable*.

An unstable particle that can become stable by flipping its state is called *p-stable*.

Definition 5 (Flipping Times). Every time a particle is labeled p-stable, a new independent random variable with distribution F , denoted as its *flipping time*, is assigned to it. We assume that F satisfies the following properties:

$$(2.1) \quad F(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \leq 0,$$

$$(2.2) \quad F \text{ is not concentrated on one point,}$$

$$(2.3) \quad \exists \gamma > 0, \text{ such that } \int e^{\gamma x} F(dx) < \infty.$$

The particle then waits for the amount of its last flipping time, and then flips its state, if and only if the particle has remained p-stable since the assignment of this flipping time.

Remark 2. Two observations are in order. First, for $\tau < 1/2$, a particle that is unstable is also p-stable, however, this is not the case for $\tau > 1/2$. Second, when F is exponential, the process dynamics are equivalent to a discrete-time model where at each discrete time step one p-stable particle is chosen uniformly at random and its state is flipped.

Definition 6 (Affected Nodes). A node in G_w is called *θ -affected* whenever a θ -particle located there would be p-stable. By an affected node we mean a θ -affected node.

Definition 7 (Final Configuration). We define a *final configuration* of the system as a configuration of particles where there are no p-stable particles.

Remark 3. By defining a Lyapunov function to be the sum over all nodes u of the number of particles in the same state as the particle at node u that are present in its neighborhood, it is easy to argue that with probability one the process indeed reaches a final configuration, see [3].

Definition 8 (Monochromatic Ball). At any point in time, the *monochromatic balls* of a particle at node u are the l_∞ -balls with largest radii that contain only particles in a single state and that also contain u . We choose one of these monochromatic balls arbitrarily and call it *the monochromatic ball* of node u .

Definition 9 (Size of Monochromatic Ball). The size of the monochromatic ball of node u at time t is

$$M_t(u) := \sup_{\rho \in \mathbb{N}, v \in \mathbb{T}^2} \left| \left\{ \mathcal{N}_\rho(v) : u \in \mathcal{N}_\rho(v) \text{ and } \forall i \in \mathcal{N}_\rho(v), s_t(i) = s_t(u) \right\} \right|.$$

The size of the monochromatic ball of a particle at node u in the final configuration is denoted by $M(u)$. We also use M_t and M to denote $M_t(0)$ and $M(0)$ respectively.

Throughout the paper we say that an event occurs *with high probability* (w.h.p.) if its probability approaches one as w tends to infinity. In all of our results, the rate of convergence of events that occur w.h.p. is always $1 - o(w^{-2})$. We also say that an event occurs almost surely (a.s.) if the event occurs *with probability equal to one* (w.p.1).

2.3. Main Results. Our first result shows that conditional on having all the nodes in a small neighborhood of the origin being affected, this small neighborhood w.h.p ignites a cascading process leading to more and more affected nodes, and this process creates a set of affected nodes whose shape during an exponentially large interval of time resembles a ball in a given metric. To state these results rigorously, we define the set of affected nodes within radius ρ of the origin at time t as follows:

Definition 10. For any $\rho, t > 0$, we define

$$A_{F,\rho}(0, t) := \{v \in \mathcal{N}_\rho(0) : v \text{ is affected at time } t\}.$$

We then consider the set $A_{F,\rho}(0, t)$ for any $t = t(w) \in [2^{c_1 N}, 2^{c_2 N}]$ and $\rho = \rho(w) = 2^{c_2 N+1}$, where $N = (2w+1)^2$, $0 < c_1 < c_2 < 0.5(1 - H(\tau))$, and $H(\tau) = -\tau \log_2(\tau) - (1 - \tau) \log_2(1 - \tau)$ is the *binary entropy function*. We also let $\tau_* \approx 0.433$ be the solution of

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{3}{4} \left(1 - H \left(\frac{4}{3} \tau_* \right) \right) - (1 - H(\tau_*)) = 0.$$

Given these choices, we condition on having all the nodes in $\mathcal{N}_{w/2}(0)$ being affected at time zero, and consider any $\tau \in (\tau_*, 1/2) \cup (1/2, 1 - \tau_*)$. The following theorem shows that in this case w.h.p. there exists a norm $l_*(t)$ on \mathbb{R}^2 such that, denoting by $B_{l_*}(0, t)$ the ball of radius t in norm l_* and centered at the origin, we have that at time t all the nodes in $A_{F,\rho}(0, t)$ are contained in $B_{l_*}(0, t + o(t))$, and the nodes in $B_{l_*}(0, t - o(t))$ are all affected, i.e.,




FIG 3. *W.h.p. there exists a norm l_* on the plane, such that, at time t all the affected nodes in $A_{F,\rho}(0, t)$ are contained in $B_{l_*}(0, t + o(t))$, and all the nodes in $B_{l_*}(0, t - o(t))$ are affected.*

they belong to $A_{F,\rho}(0, t)$. The corresponding geometric picture is illustrated in Figure 3. This shows the existence of two concentric exponentially large balls centered at the origin, such that for $t(w)$ in the given interval all the nodes in the affected set are contained within the outer ball, and all the nodes inside the inner ball are affected.

Theorem 1 (Shape Theorem —Transient). *For all $\tau \in (\tau_*, 1/2) \cup (1/2, 1 - \tau_*)$, $t(w) \in [2^{c_1 N}, 2^{c_2 N}]$, and $\rho(w) = 2^{c_2 N + 1}$, where c_1, c_2 , and N are as defined above, and conditional on having all the nodes in $\mathcal{N}_{w/2}(0)$ being affected at time $t = 0$, w.h.p. there exists a norm $l_*(t)$ on \mathbb{R}^2 , and a constant $c > 0$, such that at time t we have*

(2.5)

$$B_{l_*}(0, t - N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t) \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 \subset A_{F,\rho}(0, t) \subset B_{l_*}(0, t + N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t).$$

Remark 4. In Theorem 1 without loss of generality we have assumed that the linear time scale is chosen such that the re-scaled limit shape of the set $A_{F,\rho}(0, t)$ is a unit l_* -ball. The lower and upper bounds $2^{c_1 N} \leq t \leq 2^{c_2 N}$ in this theorem reflect the following trade-off: on the one side the time scale t is chosen large enough so that after time t the set of affected nodes roughly resembles a ball. On the other side, the time scale, and therefore the size of the ball, is chosen small enough to ensure that the region of space where the spreading process occurs is initially sufficiently clear of any θ or $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes and the process can proceed without interference.

Since as $w \rightarrow \infty$ we also have that $t \rightarrow \infty$, it can be of interest to investigate the limiting behavior of the norm $l^*(t)$. Although numerical simulations suggest that l_* may converge to the Euclidean norm, this question remains open. Finally, we also mention that similar shape theorems have been proven in the literature for percolation models and other contact processes [26, 27, 1, 13, 40], but none of them applies to our model.

To state our second result, we let $\tau^* \approx 0.488$ be the solution of

$$(2.6) \quad 5(1 + e(\tau))^2 - 6 = 0,$$

where

$$(2.7) \quad e(\tau) = \frac{3(\tau - 0.5) + \sqrt{9(\tau - 0.5)^2 - 7(\tau - 0.5)(3\tau + 0.5)}}{2(3\tau + 0.5)}.$$

Theorem 2 (Size Theorem —Final Configuration). *For all $\tau \in (\tau^*, 1 - \tau^*) \setminus \{1/2\}$, let*

$$a(\tau) = (1 - H(\tau)) \left(2 - (1 + e(\tau))^2 \right),$$

and

$$b(\tau) = (1 + e(\tau))^2 (1 - H(\tau)).$$

For all $\epsilon > 0$, w.h.p. we have

$$(2.8) \quad 2^{(a(\tau) - \epsilon)N} \leq M \leq 2^{(b(\tau) + \epsilon)N}.$$

The numerical values for $a(\tau)$ and $b(\tau)$ derived in the proof of the above theorem are plotted in Figure 4.

Remark 5. For $\tau \in (\tau^*, 1 - \tau^*) \setminus \{1/2\}$, as the intolerance gets farther from one half in both directions, larger monochromatic balls are formed w.h.p. An intuitive explanation for this behavior is that as τ decreases farther from $1/2$, agents become more tolerant and configurations that can start a cascading process become less likely, and hence located farther from each other. The cascading process can then evolve without interference from other cascading processes for a longer amount of time, and lead to the formation of larger monochromatic balls. On the other hand, as τ increases farther from $1/2$ agents become less tolerant. Since unstable agents will flip their state only if this makes them stable, configurations that can start a cascading process become less likely and located farther from each other in this case as well. By the same argument as above, once the cascading process is ignited, it leads to larger monochromatic balls.

2.4. The Infinite Lattice Case. We can consider similar dynamics occurring on the infinite lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 instead of the finite torus \mathbb{T}^2 . Using Theorem B3 of [30, p. 3] it is easy to verify that the process on \mathbb{Z}^2 exists, and is unique, and is a Feller Markov process on $\{\theta, \bar{\theta}\}^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$. The following corollary follows from the proof of Theorem 2.




FIG 4. Exponent multipliers $a(\tau)$ and $b(\tau)$ for the lower bound and upper bounds on the size of the largest monochromatic balls.

COROLLARY 1 (Size Theorem —Infinite Lattice). For all $\epsilon > 0$, $\tau \in (\tau^*, 1 - \tau^*) \setminus \{1/2\}$, let $t^* = 2^{(a(\tau)+\epsilon)N}$. For all $t \geq t^*$, w.h.p. we have

$$(2.9) \quad 2^{(a(\tau)-\epsilon)N} \leq M_t \leq 2^{(b(\tau)+\epsilon)N}.$$

2.5. Proof Outline.

Shape Theorem. To prove the shape theorem, we consider a variation of our process on G_w . We describe the spreading of the affected nodes around the origin for this new process and then use a coupling argument to show that the same spreading also occurs in the original process. To describe the spreading in the new process, we adapt a strategy developed by Tessera [40] for first passage percolation (FPP). However, while Tessera's result relies on Talagrand's concentration inequality [39, Proposition 8.3] for the spreading time in FPP, our shape theorem is based on a concentration bound that we develop independently for the spread of affected nodes in our new process, by extending some results of Kesten's [26, 27]. This bound is a key step in our proof.

We show that the set of affected nodes at time t in the new process is close to the set of nodes whose expected time of becoming affected is at most t , and that there exists a norm l_* such that the latter set is also close to an l_* -ball of radius t . The former statement is proved using the concentration bound (our Theorem 4), and the latter statement is proved




FIG 5. The gradual spread of affected nodes from the expandable region towards the origin in time increments of size $\rho'/4$.

showing that the expected time of the spread from one point to another in G_w is asymptotically close to the length of a corresponding “optimal geometric path” (again using Theorem 4).

To derive the bound on the spreading time of the affected nodes, we represent the difference between the random spreading time and the mean spreading time between any two nodes as a sum of martingale differences and, after estimating the sum of squares of these differences, apply a martingale inequality developed by Kesten (re-stated as Theorem 5 of this paper). Along the way, to bound the martingale differences, we use a modified result from [26] to compare our process with two FPP processes on \mathbb{Z}^2 .

Size Theorem. The main idea of the proof in this case is to show that w.h.p. while the spread of the θ -affected nodes reaches the origin, the $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes are still at distances at least exponential in N from the origin. Once the origin is reached, the p-stable particles around it will w.h.p. lead to the formation of an exponentially large “firewall” (i.e., an annulus of particles in the same state) that is indestructible by other spreading processes. The interior of this firewall will then become monochromatic, so that in the final configuration there will be w.h.p. an exponentially large monochromatic ball around the origin.

To elaborate on this main idea, we define an *expandable region*, that is composed of a local configuration of particles and a possible set of flips inside it, that can lead to at least one new affected node outside of it. We consider the expandable region closest to the origin in the l_* norm, and denote its type by θ . We denote its l_* -distance to the origin by X , and consider an l_* -ball of radius X at the origin. We then argue that, since there




FIG 6. A firewall formed around the origin.

are no expandable regions in this ball, any spreading of affected nodes of any type inside this ball dies out quickly, while the expandable region starts a spreading of θ -affected nodes towards the origin w.h.p. We then find an upper bound $X \leq \rho$, where $\rho = \rho(\tau, N)$, that holds w.h.p., and choose $\rho' = \rho'(\tau, N)$ such that w.h.p. there is no $\bar{\theta}$ -expandable region inside the annulus $B_{l_*}(0, X + \rho') \setminus B_{l_*}(0, X)$. We consider the extremal case $X = \rho$ and study the “race” between the possible spreads of the $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes from outside $B_{l_*}(0, \rho + \rho')$ and the spread of the expandable region at distance ρ towards the origin, see Figure 5.

We consider the gradual spreading of the expandable region in time intervals of $\rho'/4$ towards the origin. Using the shape theorem, we argue that w.h.p. the origin will eventually be contained in a neighborhood such that all of its nodes are θ -affected. We then show that the origin is quickly surrounded by an exponentially large *firewall* while any spreading of affected nodes started from outside $B_{l_*}(0, \rho + \rho')$ is still at large distances from it. This firewall is an indestructible monochromatic annulus which isolates the origin from the outside flips, see Figure 6. It will thus protect the cascading process which w.h.p. leads to the formation of a monochromatic ball of size exponential in N containing the origin. This shows that the lower bound occurs w.h.p. To see that the upper bound also occurs w.h.p. we note that in a large enough exponential size neighborhood around the origin, w.h.p. the origin will be surrounded by exponentially large monochromatic balls of particles in both states protected by firewalls.

In our proofs throughout the paper, we focus on the case where $\tau < 1/2$. The results for $\tau > 1/2$ follow by a simple argument provided in Section 6.1.

3. Preliminary and Previous Results. We begin with the following elementary lemma giving lower and upper bounds for the probability of a node being affected.

Lemma 1. *Let p_u be the probability of being θ -affected for an arbitrary node in the initial configuration. There exist positive constants c_l and c_u*

which depend only on τ such that

$$c_l \frac{2^{-[1-H(\tau')]N}}{\sqrt{N}} \leq p_u \leq c_u \frac{2^{-[1-H(\tau')]N}}{\sqrt{N}},$$

where $\tau' = \frac{\tau N - 2}{N - 1}$, and H is the binary entropy function.

PROOF. We have

$$(3.1) \quad p_u = \frac{1}{2^{N-1}} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau N - 2} \binom{N-1}{k},$$

where the two unit reduction is to account for the strict inequality and the particle at the node itself at the center of the neighborhood. Let $\tau' = \frac{\tau N - 2}{N - 1}$. After some algebra, we have

$$\binom{N-1}{\tau'(N-1)} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\tau'(N-1)} \binom{N-1}{k} \leq \frac{1 - \tau'}{1 - 2\tau'} \binom{N-1}{\tau'(N-1)},$$

and using Stirling's formula, there exist constants $c, c' \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$c \frac{2^{H(\tau')(N-1)}}{\sqrt{(N-1)\tau'(1-\tau')}} \leq \binom{N-1}{\tau'(N-1)} \leq c' \frac{2^{H(\tau')(N-1)}}{\sqrt{(N-1)\tau'(1-\tau')}}.$$

The result follows by combining the above inequalities. ■

The following lemma is a consequence of Lemma 1.

Lemma 2. *Let $\rho = 2^{cN}$ where $0 < c < [1 - H(\tau')]/2$. In the initial configuration, the following event occurs w.h.p.*

$$A = \{ \nexists \theta\text{-affected nodes in } \mathcal{N}_\rho \}.$$

Definition 11 (m -block). We define an m -block to be an $m/2$ -neighborhood. A *monochromatic block* is a block whose particles are all in the same state. When m is not specified, by a *block* we mean a w -block.

Definition 12 (Region of Expansion). We call a *region of expansion* of type θ any neighborhood whose configuration is such that if we change all the θ -particles in a w -block anywhere inside it to $\bar{\theta}$, then all the θ -particles on its outer boundary (i.e., the set of particles in the set composed by the $(w+2)$ -block co-centered with the w -block and excluding the w -block itself) are p -stable.




FIG 7. Part of the lattice partitioned into m -blocks. Green and gray indicate good and bad blocks respectively.

The next lemma is a restatement of Lemma 8 in [34].

Lemma 3 ([34]). *Let $\tau \in (\tau_*, 1/2)$ and let \mathcal{N}_r be any neighborhood with radius $r \leq 2^{cN}$ where $c \in (0, 0.5[1 - H(\tau')])$ in the initial configuration. Then, \mathcal{N}_r is a region of expansion w.h.p.*

Remark 6. Equation (2.4), which provides the value of τ_* , is derived in the proof of the above lemma.

Let \mathcal{M} denote an arbitrary m -block with $m \geq w$ and

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}} := \bigcup_{v \in \mathbb{T}^2} \left\{ \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}_{w/2}(v) \right\}.$$

Also, let W_I be the random variable representing the number of particles in state $\bar{\theta}$ in $I \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}$, and N_I be the total number of particles in $I \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Definition 13 (Good Block). For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, \mathcal{M} is called a *good m -block* of type θ , if and only if for all $I \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}$ we have $W_I - N_I/2 < N^{1/2+\epsilon}$. Otherwise \mathcal{M} is called a *bad m -block* (see Figure 7).

By the following lemma (which is a restatement of Lemma 11 in [34]), an N -block is a good block w.h.p. Since for sufficiently large N the number of particles in different states inside a good block is “balanced”, a node whose entire neighborhood is contained in a good block cannot be a θ -affected node.

Lemma 4 ([34]). *Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$. There exists a constant $c > 0$, such that, in the initial configuration, for all $I \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}$ we have*

$$W_I - N_I/2 < N^{1/2+\epsilon}$$

with probability at least

$$1 - e^{-cN^{2\epsilon}}.$$

We now want to review a result from percolation theory. Without loss of generality, we assume G_w is defined on \mathbb{Z}^2 rather than on the finite torus \mathbb{T}^2 . Let us re-normalize (i.e., partition and rescale) G_w into m -blocks starting from the m -block centered at the origin (see Figure 7) and define the graph $G'_w := (\mathcal{V}', \mathcal{E}')$ where \mathcal{V}' is the set of all m -blocks and \mathcal{E}' is the set of all pairs of m -blocks that are horizontally, vertically, or diagonally adjacent. We define a path in G'_w as an ordered set of nodes in this graph such that each pair of consecutive nodes are neighbors of each other in G'_w and no node appears more than once in the set. Let $S(k)$ be the cluster of radius k in G'_w with center at the origin, i.e., $S(k)$ is the set of all m -blocks on G'_w for which $\Delta(0, x) \leq k$, where Δ denotes the length (i.e., cardinality) of the shortest path on G'_w , 0 denotes the node at the origin in G'_w , and x denotes an arbitrary node in G'_w . Let $\partial S(k)$ denote the surface of $S(k)$, i.e., the set of all the nodes in G'_w such that $\Delta(0, x) = k$. Let A_k be the event that there exists a path of bad m -blocks joining the origin to some vertex in $\partial S(k)$. Let the *radius* of a bad cluster (i.e., cluster of bad m -blocks) be defined as

$$\sup\{\Delta(0, x) : x \in \text{bad cluster}\}.$$

Let p denote the probability that an arbitrary m -block in the initial configuration in the above setting is a bad m -block. It is noted that an m -block is a bad m -block independently of the others. Let $0 < p_c < 1$ denote the critical probability in the above percolation setting. The following result is Theorem 5.4 in [18].

Theorem 3. *(Exponential tail decay of the radius of a bad cluster.) If $p < p_c$, then there exists $\psi(p) > 0$ such that*

$$P_p(A_k) < e^{-k\psi(p)}, \quad \text{for all } k.$$

Definition 14 (Firewall). A *firewall* of radius r and center u is a monochromatic annulus

$$A_r(u) = \left\{ y : r - \sqrt{2}w \leq \|u - y\|_2 \leq r \right\},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the Euclidean distance and $r \geq 3w$.

Consider a disc of radius r , centered at a particle such that all the particles inside the disc are in the same state. Lemma 6 in [22] shows that if $r > w^3$, $\tau \in (\tau^*, 1/2)$, and w is sufficiently large, then all the particles inside the disc will remain a.s. stable regardless of the configuration of the particles outside the disc. Here we state a similar lemma but for a firewall, without proof.

Lemma 5 ([22]). *Let $A_r(u)$ be the set of particles contained in an annulus of outer radius $r \geq w^3$ and of width $\sqrt{2}w$ centered at u . For all $\tau \in (\tau^*, 1/2)$ and for a sufficiently large constant w , if $A_r(u)$ is monochromatic at time t , then it will a.s. remain monochromatic at all times $t' > t$.*

By Lemma 5, once formed a firewall of sufficiently large radius remains static, and since its width is $\sqrt{2}w$ the particles inside the inner circle are not going to be affected by the configurations outside the firewall.

We now review some of the definitions from [34]. In that paper, the goal is to identify a configuration that can trigger a cascading process leading to the formation of monochromatic balls w.h.p.

Definition 15 (Radical Region). For any $\epsilon, \epsilon' \in (0, 1/2)$ let

$$\hat{\tau} = \tau(1 - 1/(\tau N^{1/2-\epsilon})),$$

and define a *radical region* to be a neighborhood of radius $(1 + \epsilon')w$ containing less than $\hat{\tau}(1 + \epsilon')^2 N$ particles in state θ .

Definition 16 (P-stable Region). For any $\epsilon, \epsilon' \in (0, 1/2)$, we define a *p-stable region* to be a neighborhood of radius $\epsilon'w$, containing at least $\lfloor \tau \epsilon'^2 N - N^{1/2+\epsilon} \rfloor$ p-stable particles in state θ .

The following is Lemma 4 in [34].

Lemma 6 ([34]). *A radical region $\mathcal{N}_{(1+\epsilon')w}$ in the initial configuration contains a p-stable region $\mathcal{N}_{\epsilon'w}$ at its center w.h.p.*

Now consider a geometric configuration where a radical region, and neighborhoods $\mathcal{N}_{\epsilon'w}$, $\mathcal{N}_{w/2}$ and \mathcal{N}_ρ with $\rho > 3w$, are all co-centered. Let

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{T}(\rho) = \inf\{t : \exists v \in \mathcal{N}_\rho, v \text{ is a } \bar{\theta}\text{-affected node at time } t\}.$$




FIG 8. The function $e(\tau)$ gives the infimum of ϵ' to potentially trigger a cascading process.

Definition 17 (Expandable Radical Region). A radical region is called an *expandable* radical region (of type θ) if there is a possible sequence of at most $(w + 1)^2$ flips inside it that can make the neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_{w/2}$ at its center monochromatic with particles in state $\bar{\theta}$.

The next lemma, which is a restatement of Lemma 5 in [34], shows that a radical region in this configuration is an expandable radical region of type θ w.h.p., provided that ϵ' is large enough and there is no $\bar{\theta}$ -affected node in \mathcal{N}_ρ . The main idea is that the $\bar{\theta}$ particles in the p-stable region at the center of the radical region can trigger a process that leads to monochromatic balls of radius w .

Lemma 7 ([34]). *For all $\epsilon' > e(\tau)$ there exists w.h.p. a sequence of at most $(w + 1)^2$ possible flips in a radical region $\mathcal{N}_{(1+\epsilon')w}$ such that if they happen before $\mathcal{T}(\rho)$, then all the particles inside $\mathcal{N}_{w/2}$ will have the same state.*

The function $e(\tau)$ is plotted in Figure 8. The following lemma, which is Lemma 20 in [34], gives a lower bound and an upper bound for the proba-

bility that an arbitrary neighborhood of the size of a radical region is indeed a radical region in the initial configuration.

Lemma 8 ([34]). *Let ϵ' and ϵ be positive constants. In the initial configuration an arbitrary neighborhood with radius $(1 + \epsilon')w$ is a radical region with probability $p_{\epsilon'}$, where*

$$2^{-[1-H(\tau'')](1+\epsilon')^2N-o(N)} \leq p_{\epsilon'} \leq 2^{-[1-H(\tau'')](1+\epsilon')^2N+o(N)},$$

and $\tau'' = (\lfloor \hat{\tau}(1 + \epsilon')^2N \rfloor - 1)/(1 + \epsilon')^2N$, $\hat{\tau} = (1 - 1/(\tau N^{1/2-\epsilon}))\tau$, and H is the binary entropy function.

4. The Concentration Bound. The concentration bound developed in this section is a main step required for proving our main results and it resembles the one developed in the context of FPP [27].

4.1. First Passage Percolation. FPP was originally developed by Hammersley and Welsh [19] in 1965 and then further developed especially by Kesten in 1986 [25, 26, 27]. It is a mathematical model to describe the flow of a fluid through a random medium. A non-negative random variable t_i , defined as the passage time of an edge e_i , is placed at each nearest-neighbor edge of the grid defined on \mathbb{Z}^d . The collection $\{t_i\}$ is assumed to be independent, identically distributed with a common distribution F . The random variable t_i is interpreted as the time or the cost needed to traverse edge e_i . The basic problem is to asymptotically describe the set of nodes that have been visited by a given time, when a fluid starts traversing the edges from the node at the origin. FPP on the nodes of the lattice can also be defined along the same lines, when passage times are assigned to nodes instead of edges.

The beauty of Kesten's approach in developing a concentration bound for FPP, is that he uses a martingale representation for the difference between the spreading time and its mean that is independent of the underlying geometrical structure of the process. We exploit such a property in our proof.

4.2. Modified Model. In this section, we work with a modified version of the model introduced in Section 2. We prove some results for this new model, and then use them to prove Theorem 1 by coupling the modified model with our original model.

The modified model differs from the original one by the following assumption:

- We consider G_w to be constructed on an infinite integer lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 . In this model, particles are only located on a neighborhood \mathcal{N}_v with radius $\exp(\exp(N))$ centered at the origin and there are no particles on the nodes located outside this neighborhood.
- The initial configuration of the particles are chosen uniformly at random from those where \mathcal{N}_v is a region of expansion and there are no θ nor $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes on \mathcal{N}_v .
- Each particle can make a flip only once and a single flipping time is assigned to every particle.
- We label some nodes as *affected**. An *affected** node is a node where a θ -particle placed on it will make a flip after its flipping time, regardless of this particle being p-stable or not. An *affected* block* is a w -block such that all the nodes on it are *affected**.
- By *placing* an *affected** block at a location we mean labeling the particles located in this block as *affected**. We can place an *affected** block at the origin or at any node.

4.3. *Additional Definitions for the Modified Model.* We now define notions of paths and passage times similar to FPP.

Definition 18 (Path and First Passage Time for the Modified Model). Let t_i be the flipping time of the particle located at v_i . Let $\mathbf{0}^*$ denote an *affected** block placed at the origin, and u an arbitrary node on G_w . Let a path r be a set of particles v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k such that they become p-stable in a sequence, i.e., v_j becomes p-stable after v_{j-1} , and

$$T(r) = \sum_{i=1}^k t_i.$$

Then, we define the *first passage time* for the modified model from the origin to u as

$$a_{0,u} := T(\mathbf{0}^*, u) := \inf_{r \in \mathcal{P}} \{T(r)\},$$

where \mathcal{P} is the set of possible sequences of flips when we place an *affected** block at the origin that will lead to an *affected* node at u . When we assume that in the initial configuration the entire \mathcal{N}_v is a region of expansion and there are no *affected* nodes of any type on \mathcal{N}_v , \mathcal{P} will be non-empty. Clearly, the notion of first passage time can be extended to any pair of nodes on a neighborhood \mathcal{N}'_v with radius $\exp(\exp(N)) - w$ centered at the origin denoted by $a_{x,u}$, in which case, we assume that the *affected** block is placed

at x instead of the origin. We note that with the given conditions on the initial configuration and the placement of an affected* block on x there always exists a set of flips leading to a an affected node at any location.

4.4. The Concentration Bound.

Theorem 4. *Let $c > 0$ be a constant and let u be any node on G_w whose l_∞ -distance from the origin is at least 2^{cN} and at most $\exp(\exp(N)) - w$. There exists a constant $c' > 0$ (independent of N) such that, for N sufficiently large, for all $\lambda \leq \|u\|$, we have*

$$(4.1) \quad P \{ |a_{0,u} - \mathbb{E}[a_{0,u}]| \geq \lambda \} \leq e^{-c'\lambda/\sqrt{\|u\| \log \|u\|}}.$$

4.5. Proof Outline. To prove the concentration bound, we represent the difference between $a_{0,u}$ and $\mathbb{E}[a_{0,u}]$ as a sum of martingale differences. The principal step to bound this sum is to first obtain a bound for the sum of the squares of these differences and apply a martingale inequality developed by Kesten [27] (re-stated as Theorem 5 of this paper). This boils down to finding upper bounds for two probabilities. The first one is the probability of the existence of a self-avoiding path with at least a given number of steps and with at most a given passage time (see (4.27) and (4.28)), the second one is the probability that the first passage time is larger than a certain quantity. To bound these terms, we introduce two intermediate FPPs that, when coupled with our modified model, provide upper bounds for each one of these probabilities. We decorate the variables pertaining to these two processes by prime and double prime respectively, throughout this section.

4.6. First intermediate FPP process. First consider the following process. Put a θ particle on each node of \mathbb{Z}^2 . Initially all the particles in this process, regardless of their neighborhood configuration, are labeled as stable, except for the particles located in a w -neighborhood centered at the origin, which are labeled as p-stable. Each particle is assigned a single flipping time t_i , that is the same (single) flipping time of the particle in our modified process. Once a particle v_i flips, it is labeled as stable permanently, and all the θ -particles in the w -neighborhoods that are horizontally, vertically, or diagonally adjacent to the w -neighborhood where the flip has occurred, are labeled as p-stable. We then define a path as a sequence of v_i 's such that the particles located on them can flip in this order. By coupling, it should be clear that if there is a self-avoiding path with its first node located in a block centered at the origin with at least a given number of steps and at most a given passage time in our modified process, then there is such a

path also in the process that we have just described. Next, we perform an additional coupling of this process (and hence of our modified process) with a d -dimensional FPP process.

Consider a d -dimensional lattice \mathbb{Z}^d , where $d = \log_2 N + 2$ is assumed to be an integer. Each node of \mathbb{Z}^d is represented by a vector of integer coordinates $v = (v_1, \dots, v_d)$. We construct a mapping $\mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ as follows. We partition \mathbb{Z}^2 into w -neighborhoods starting from the w -neighborhood centered at the origin and consider the re-normalized lattice Z' where each node of Z' corresponds to a w -neighborhood of the partition. We identify each node of Z' by the first two coordinates (v_1, v_2) of \mathbb{Z}^d . For every $(v_1, v_2) \in Z'$ we then assign the N nodes of \mathbb{Z}^2 of the corresponding w -neighborhood, to points of \mathbb{Z}^d by letting the remaining $d - 2$ coordinates be in $\{0, 1\}^{(d-2)}$. We consider a site FPP process on \mathbb{Z}^d where the passage times for each image node on \mathbb{Z}^d from \mathbb{Z}^2 are chosen to be equal to the flipping times in our modified process. The passage times for rest of the nodes, i.e. $\mathbb{Z}^{(d-2)} \setminus \{0, 1\}^{(d-2)}$, are chosen to be i.i.d with distribution F . We call this our *first intermediate FPP*. By coupling, it should be clear that if there is a self-avoiding path from the origin with at least a given number of steps and at most a given passage time in our modified process, then there is such a path also in the process described in the beginning of this section, and therefore in the first intermediate FPP process. It follows that we can bound the probability of occurrence of such an event in our modified process by the probability of occurrence of the corresponding event in the first intermediate FPP.

Definition 19 (Path and First Passage Time for the First Intermediate FPP). Let a path r' be a set of nodes in the first intermediate FPP setting such that the sequence v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k of passages with passage times t_1, \dots, t_k is possible. Let

$$T'(r') = \sum_{i=1}^k t_i.$$

Let \mathcal{N} be a neighborhood. We define the *first passage time* from the origin to \mathcal{N} in the first intermediate FPP process as

$$T'(\mathbf{0}, \mathcal{N}) := \inf_{r' \in \mathcal{P}'} \{T'(r')\},$$

where \mathcal{P}' is the set of possible sequences of passages starting from the origin and ending in \mathcal{N} . Finally, we write ξ_i for the i 'th coordinate vector and define the passage time from 0 to $n\xi_1$ as

$$a'_{0,n} := T'(\mathbf{0}^*, n\xi_1).$$

Due to the coupling described above, we have the following lemma which is used in the proof of the concentration bound.

Lemma 9. *Let $c, c' > 0$ be constants. We have*

$$\begin{aligned} & P\{\exists \text{ self-avoiding path } r \text{ starting at } 0 \text{ of at least } \lceil cn \rceil \text{ steps} \\ & \quad \text{and with } T(r) < c'n\} \\ & \leq P\{\exists \text{ self-avoiding path } r' \text{ starting at } 0 \text{ of at least } \lceil cn \rceil \text{ steps} \\ & \quad \text{and with } T'(r') < c'n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we recall a proposition from [26] (Proposition 5.8 in this reference). Let $0 < p_c < 1$ be the critical probability of standard site percolation on the lattice.

Proposition 1 (Kesten [26]). *If*

$$F(0) = P\{t(v) = 0\} < p_c,$$

then there exist constants $0 < B, C, D < \infty$, depending on d and F only, such that

$$\begin{aligned} & P\{\exists \text{ self-avoiding path } r' \text{ from the origin which contains at least } n \\ & \quad \text{edges and has } T'(r') < Bn\} \\ & \leq Ce^{-Dn}. \end{aligned}$$

We now slightly modify the above proposition to account for $d = \log_2 N + 2$. This proposition is used in the proof of Theorem 4. The proof follows easily from the proof of the original statement and is omitted.

Proposition 2 (Kesten – modified). *Let $c > 0$ be a constant, $n \geq 2^{cN}$, and $d = \log_2 N + 2$ be an integer. If (2.1) holds then for sufficiently large N , there exist constants $0 < B, C, D < \infty, 1 \leq E < \infty$, depending on F only, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & P\{\exists \text{ self-avoiding path } r' \text{ from the origin which contains at least } n \\ & \quad \text{vertices and has } T'(r') < Bn\} \\ & \leq Ce^{-Dn/(\log n)^E}. \end{aligned}$$

4.7. *Second intermediate FPP process.* Consider the integer lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 and re-normalize it by partitioning the lattice into w -blocks such that we have a w -block centered at the origin and these blocks form a new lattice L' . We assume that each node of L' is connected to its horizontal and vertical neighbors. Consider a first passage percolation process on this lattice that is coupled with our modified process by assigning the same random flipping times t_i 's of our modified process to the nodes of \mathbb{Z}^2 . We define the passage time of each node on L' as the sum of all the t_i 's of the particles of its corresponding block of nodes in \mathbb{Z}^2 . We point out that, in our modified process, when we assume that the entire graph is a region of expansion, once we have a monochromatic block, it can make a neighboring block monochromatic by flipping its particles one by one such that the time of this event is no larger than the sum of the flipping times of all the particles in this block. This fact implies that our second intermediate FPP provides an upper bound on the passage time from one node to the other on the modified process. These statements are made rigorous in the following.

Definition 20 (Path and First Passage Time for the Second Intermediate FPP). Let a path r'' be a set of nodes v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k in \mathbb{Z}^2 with flipping times t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k such that they correspond to a possible passage in the second intermediate FPP process on L' as described above. Let

$$T''(r'') = \sum_{i=1}^k t_i.$$

Let \mathcal{N} be a neighborhood. We define the *first passage time* from the origin to \mathcal{N} as

$$T''(\mathbf{0}, \mathcal{N}) := \inf_{r'' \in \mathcal{P}''} \{T''(r'')\},$$

where \mathcal{P}'' is the set of possible sequences of passages starting from the origin and ending in \mathcal{N} . Finally, we write ξ_i for the i 'th coordinate vector and define the passage time from 0 to $n\xi_1$ as

$$a''_{0,n} := T''(\mathbf{0}^*, n\xi_1).$$

Due to the coupling described above, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 10. *For any $a, y > 0$, we have*

$$P\{a_{0,n} \geq ayn\} \leq P\{a''_{0,n} \geq ayn\}.$$

4.8. The Bound.

The following theorem is a restatement of Theorem 3 in [27] which plays a critical role in the proof of our concentration bound.

Theorem 5 (Kesten [27]). *Let $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}_{0 \leq k \leq V}$ be an increasing family of σ -fields of measurable sets and let $\{U_k\}_{0 \leq k \leq V}$ be a family of positive random variables that are \mathcal{F}_V -measurable. (We do not assume that U_k is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable.) Let $\{Z_k\}_{0 \leq k \leq V}$ be a martingale with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}_{0 \leq k \leq V}$. (We allow $V = \infty$, in which case $\mathcal{F}_V = \vee_0^\infty \mathcal{F}_k$ and we merely assume that $\{Z_k\}_{0 \leq k < \infty}$ is a martingale.) Assume that the increments $\Delta_k := Z_k - Z_{k-1}$ satisfy*

$$(4.2) \quad |\Delta_k| \leq c \text{ for some constant } c,$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad E\{\Delta_k^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\} \leq E\{U_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\}.$$

Assume further that for some constants $0 < C_1, C_2 < \infty$ and x_0 with

$$(4.4) \quad x_0 \geq e^2 c^2,$$

we have

$$(4.5) \quad P\left\{\sum_{k=1}^V U_k > x\right\} \leq C_1 e^{-C_2 x} \text{ when } x \geq x_0.$$

Then, in the case where $V = \infty$, $Z_V = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z_k$ exists w.p.1. Moreover, irrespective of the value of V , there exist universal constants $0 < C_3, C_4 < \infty$ that do not depend on V, C_1, C_2, c and x_0 , nor on the distribution of $\{Z_k\}$ and $\{U_k\}$, such that

$$(4.6) \quad P\{Z_V - Z_0 \geq x\} \leq C_3 \left(1 + C_1 + \frac{C_1}{C_2 x_0}\right) \times \exp\left(-C_4 \frac{x}{x_0^{1/2} + C_2^{-1/3} x^{1/3}}\right).$$

In particular, for $x \leq C_2 x_0^{3/2}$,

$$(4.7) \quad P\{Z_V - Z_0 \geq x\} \leq C_3 \left(1 + C_1 + \frac{C_1}{C_2 x_0}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{C_4 x}{2\sqrt{x_0}}\right).$$

With a bit of abuse of notation, let

$$a_{0,n} := T(\mathbf{0}^*, n\xi_1).$$

We order the vertices of G_w in some arbitrary way, v_1, v_2, \dots which remains fixed throughout. We work with a slightly simpler probability space which does not take into account the initial configuration of the particles $\{\theta, \bar{\theta}\}^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$, nor the possibility of having multiple flipping times for each particle. This probability space is

$$\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \dots, \quad \mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty),$$

and a generic point of Ω is denoted by $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$. In the configuration ω , the flipping time of v_i is

$$t(v_i) = t(v_i, \omega) = \omega_i.$$

When it is necessary to indicate the dependence on ω we write $a_{0,k}(\omega)$ instead of $a_{0,k}$, $T(r, \omega)$ instead of $T(r)$, etc. We shall use the following σ -fields of subsets of Ω :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_0 &= \text{the trivial } \sigma\text{-field} = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_k &= \sigma\text{-field generated by } \omega_1, \dots, \omega_k, \quad k \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

The martingale representation of $a_{0,n} - \mathbb{E}[a_{0,n}]$ is

$$(4.8) \quad a_{0,n} - \mathbb{E}[a_{0,n}] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\mathbb{E}\{a_{0,n} | \mathcal{F}_k\} - \mathbb{E}\{a_{0,n} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\}).$$

This representation is valid because $Z_0 := 0$ and

$$(4.9) \quad Z_l := \sum_{k=1}^l (\mathbb{E}\{a_{0,n} | \mathcal{F}_k\} - \mathbb{E}\{a_{0,n} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\})$$

$$(4.10) \quad = \mathbb{E}\{a_{0,n} | \mathcal{F}_l\} - \mathbb{E}[a_{0,n}], \quad l \geq 1,$$

defines an $\{\mathcal{F}_l\}$ -martingale that converges w.p.1 to $a_{0,n} - \mathbb{E}[a_{0,n}]$. The increments of $\{Z_l\}$ are denoted by

$$(4.11) \quad \Delta_k = \Delta_{k,n}(\omega) = \mathbb{E}\{a_{0,n} | \mathcal{F}_k\} - \mathbb{E}\{a_{0,n} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\}.$$

The principal step is to estimate

$$\mathbb{E}\{\Delta_k^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\}.$$

To this end, we write

$$a_{0,n}(\omega) = f(t(v_1, \omega), t(v_2, \omega), \dots) = f(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$$

for some Borel function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Also, the following notation is useful. If $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$ and $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$ are points of Ω , then

$$[\omega, \sigma]_k = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k, \sigma_{k+1}, \dots)$$

is the point that agrees with ω and σ on the first k coordinates and the coordinates after k , respectively. ν_{k+1} will be the product measure

$$\nu_{k+1} = \prod_{k+1}^{\infty} F_i$$

on the obvious σ -field in

$$\Omega_{k+1} = R_{k+1} \times R_{k+2} \times \dots$$

when each $R_i = \mathbb{R}_+$ and $F_i = F$. We can think of Ω as $R_1 \times \dots \times R_k \times \Omega_{k+1}$ and if g is a function from $\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then if we fix $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, g(\sigma)$ can be viewed as a function of $\sigma_{k+1}, \sigma_{k+2}, \dots$; that is, as a function on Ω_{k+1} . Correspondingly,

$$\int_{\Omega_{k+1}} \nu_{k+1}(d\sigma) g(\sigma) := \int \prod_{k+1}^{\infty} F(d\sigma_i) g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \sigma_{k+1}, \dots)$$

is the integral over all coordinates σ_i , with $i \geq k+1$, and is a function of $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$. By the independence of the $t(v_i, \omega) = \omega_i$, $i \geq 1$, we have

$$(4.12) \quad \mathbb{E}\{a_{0,n} | \mathcal{F}_k\}(\omega) = \int_{\Omega_{k+1}} \nu_{k+1}(d\sigma) f([\omega, \sigma]_k).$$

This is a function of $t(v_i, \omega) = \omega_i$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, only. It also equals

$$(4.13) \quad \int_{\Omega_k} \nu_k(d\sigma) f([\omega, \sigma]_k),$$

because $[\omega, \sigma]_k$ does not involve σ_k and the integration over σ_k has no effect. Using (4.13) for $\mathbb{E}\{a_{0,n} | \mathcal{F}_k\}$ and (4.12) with k replaced by $(k-1)$ for $\mathbb{E}\{a_{0,n} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\}$, we find

$$(4.14) \quad \Delta_k = \int_{\Omega_k} \nu_k(d\sigma) \{f[\omega, \sigma]_k - f([\omega, \sigma]_{k-1})\}.$$

Our task now is to estimate

$$g_k(\omega, \sigma) := |f([\omega, \sigma]_k) - f([\omega, \sigma]_{k-1})|.$$

Note that

$$(4.15) \quad t(v_i, [\omega, \sigma]_k) = t(v_i, [\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}) = \begin{cases} t(v_i, \omega), & \text{if } i \leq k-1, \\ t(v_i, \sigma), & \text{if } i \geq k+1. \end{cases}$$

Only for $i = k$ do we obtain different values for the flipping time of v_i in the two configurations $[\omega, \sigma]_k$ and $[\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}$:

$$t(v_k, [\omega, \sigma]_k) = t(v_k, \omega), \quad t(v_k, [\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}) = t(v_k, \sigma).$$

We claim that this implies

$$(4.16) \quad g_k(\omega, \sigma) \leq |t(v_k, \omega) - t(v_k, \sigma)|.$$

Indeed, for any path r ,

$$(4.17) \quad |T(r, [\omega, \sigma]_k) - T(r, [\omega, \sigma]_{k-1})| \leq \sum_{v \in r} |t(v, [\omega, \sigma]_k) - t(v, [\omega, \sigma]_{k-1})| \\ \leq |t(v_k, \omega) - t(v_k, \sigma)|.$$

Therefore, the same estimate holds for

$$|a_{0,n}([\omega, \sigma]_k) - a_{0,n}([\omega, \sigma]_{k-1})| = |\inf_r T(r, [\omega, \sigma]_k) - \inf_r T(r, [\omega, \sigma]_{k-1})|.$$

This proves (4.16). Let $\pi_n(\omega)$ be the optimal path from 0 to $n\xi_1$ in the configuration ω ; that is, $\pi_n(\omega)$ is a path from 0 to $n\xi_1$ with

$$(4.18) \quad a_{0,n}(\omega) = T(\pi_n(\omega), \omega).$$

In our modified process, such a path always exists. There could, however, be several paths with this property. To define $\pi_n(\omega)$ uniquely in case of ties, we order all paths from 0 to $n\xi_1$ in some arbitrary way, and take for $\pi_n(\omega)$ the first path in this ordering that satisfies (4.18). We write $v \in \pi$ to denote that v is a vertex in the path π . Then, if

$$(4.19) \quad v_k \notin \pi_n([\omega, \sigma]_k),$$

(4.15) and (4.17) show that

$$T(\pi_n([\omega, \sigma]_k), [\omega, \sigma]_k) = T(\pi_n([\omega, \sigma]_k), [\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}).$$

Thus, under (4.19),

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{0,n}([\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}) &= \inf\{T(r, [\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}) : r \text{ a path from } 0 \text{ to } n\xi_1\} \\
&\leq T(\pi_n([\omega, \sigma]_k), [\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}) \\
&= T(\pi_n([\omega, \sigma]_k), [\omega, \sigma]_k) \\
&= a_{0,n}([\omega, \sigma]_k).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if

$$(4.20) \quad v_k \notin \pi_n([\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}),$$

then

$$a_{0,n}([\omega, \sigma]_k) \leq a_{0,n}([\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}).$$

It follows that $g_k(\omega, \sigma) = 0$ if (4.19) and (4.20) both hold, and by virtue of (4.16),

$$(4.21) \quad g_k(\omega, \sigma) \leq |t(v_k, \omega) - t(v_k, \sigma)| \times 1_{\{v_k \in \pi_n([\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}) \text{ or } v_k \in \pi_n([\omega, \sigma]_k)\}}.$$

This is then an estimate for g_k . Let $1_k(\omega, \sigma)$ denote the indicator function in the right-hand side of the above inequality. Now using Schwarz's inequality and (4.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.22) \quad \mathbb{E} [\Delta_k^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{\Omega_k} \nu_k(d\sigma) g_k(\omega, \sigma) \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{\Omega_k} \nu_k(d\sigma) |t(v_k, \omega) - t(v_k, \sigma)| 1_k(\omega, \sigma) \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\Omega_k} \nu_k(d\sigma) |t(v_k, \omega) - t(v_k, \sigma)|^2 1_k(\omega, \sigma) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \int_{\Omega_k} \nu_k(d\sigma) 1_k(\omega, \sigma) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\Omega_k} \nu_k(d\sigma) |t(v_k, \omega) - t(v_k, \sigma)|^2 1_k(\omega, \sigma) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\int_{\Omega_k} \nu_k(d\sigma) |t(v_k, \omega) - t(v_k, \sigma)|^2 1_k(\omega, \sigma),$$

is a function of $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k$ only; the σ -variables all have been integrated out. Similar to (4.12) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.23) \quad & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\Omega_k} \nu_k(d\sigma) |t(v_k, \omega) - t(v_k, \sigma)|^2 1_k(\omega, \sigma) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \\
 &= \int F(d\omega_k) \int_{\Omega_k} \nu_k(d\sigma) |t(v_k, \omega) - t(v_k, \sigma)|^2 \times 1_k(\omega, \sigma) \\
 &= \int F(d\omega_k) \int F(d\sigma_k) \int_{\Omega_{k+1}} \nu_{k+1}(d\sigma) |t(v_k, \omega) - t(v_k, \sigma)|^2 \times 1_k(\omega, \sigma).
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that ν_k can be written as the product measure $F \times \nu_{k+1}$ on $R_k \times \Omega_{k+1} = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega_{k+1}$. Let us write

$$J_k(\omega) = 1_{\{v_k \in \pi_n(\omega)\}}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.24) \quad & 1_k(\omega, \sigma) = J_k([\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}) \vee J_k([\omega, \sigma]_k) \\
 &= J_k(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}, \sigma_k, \sigma_{k+1}, \dots) \vee J_k(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}, \omega_k, \sigma_{k+1}, \dots).
 \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $t(v_k, \omega) = \omega_k$, $t(v_k, \sigma) = \sigma_k$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & |t(v_k, \omega) - t(v_k, \sigma)|^2 1_k(\omega, \sigma) \\
 & \leq |\omega_k - \sigma_k|^2 \left\{ J_k(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}, \sigma_k, \sigma_{k+1}, \dots) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \vee J_k(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}, \omega_k, \sigma_{k+1}, \dots) \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Clearly the right-hand side is symmetric in ω_k and σ_k for fixed

$$\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}, \sigma_{k+1}, \sigma_{k+2}, \dots,$$

(in fact, this is true also for the left-hand-side). It is also clear that on $\{\sigma_k \leq \omega_k\}$ or on $\{t(v_k, \sigma) \leq t(v_k, \omega)\}$ we have

$$(4.25) \quad |t(v_k, \omega) - t(v_k, \sigma)| \leq t(v_k, \omega),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.26) \quad & J_k(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}, \sigma_k, \sigma_{k+1}, \dots) \vee J_k(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}, \omega_k, \sigma_{k+1}, \dots) \\
 &= J_k(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}, \sigma_k, \sigma_{k+1}, \dots) = J_k([\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}).
 \end{aligned}$$

(4.26) simply says that if v_k belongs to the optimal path in configuration $[\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}$ or in configuration $[\omega, \sigma]_k$, then it will belong to the optimal path

in the configuration that gives the lower value to $t(v_k)$. Substituting (4.23)-(4.26) into (4.22) we find

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.27) \quad & \mathbb{E}[\Delta_k^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \\
 & \leq 2 \int_{\Omega_{k+1}} \nu_{k+1}(d\sigma) \int \int_{\sigma_k \leq \omega_k} F(d\omega_k) F(d\sigma_k) t^2(v_k, \omega) J_k([\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}) \\
 & \leq 2 \int F(d\omega_k) t^2(v_k, \omega) \int F(d\sigma_k) \int_{\Omega_{k+1}} \nu_{k+1}(d\sigma) J_k([\omega, \sigma]_{k-1}) \\
 & = \left(2 \int x^2 dF(x) \right) P\{v_k \in \pi_n(\omega) | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $|\pi|$ denote the number of vertices in π . For any $a > 0$, $y > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.28) \quad & P\{|\pi_n| \geq yn\} \leq P\{a_{0,n} \geq ayn\} \\
 & + P\{\exists \text{ self-avoiding path } r \text{ starting at } 0 \\
 & \text{ of at least } yn \text{ steps and with } T(r) < ayn\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now we want to use our intermediate FPP processes to bound the probabilities on the right hand side of (4.28). Let us decorate the variables corresponding to our first and second intermediate FPP processes by a prime and a double prime respectively. We are going to find upper bounds for the right hand side terms of (4.28) using these intermediate processes. Let r''_n be the optimal path between the origin and $n\xi_1$ in our second intermediate process. Using Lemma 10 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.29) \quad & P\{a_{0,n} \geq ayn\} \leq P\{a''_{0,n} \geq ayn\} = P\{T''(r''_n) \geq ayn\} \leq P\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{w'n} t_i \geq ayn\right\},
 \end{aligned}$$

where $w' = O(w)$ adjusts the number of particles for the renormalized graph (our second intermediate process). Using Lemma 9, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.30) \quad & P\{\exists \text{ self-avoiding path } r \text{ starting at } 0 \text{ of at least } yn \text{ steps} \\
 & \text{ and with } T(r) < ayn\} \\
 & \leq P\{\exists \text{ self-avoiding path } r' \text{ starting at } 0 \text{ of at least } yn \text{ steps} \\
 & \text{ and with } T'(r') < ayn\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For a suitable a , using Proposition 2, and for sufficiently large N , we have

$$\begin{aligned} P\{\exists \text{ self-avoiding path } r' \text{ starting at } 0 \text{ of at least } yn \text{ steps} \\ \text{and with } T'(r') < ayn\} \\ \leq C_2 \exp(-C_3 yn / (\log n)^{C_4}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$(4.31) \quad P\{|\pi_n| \geq yn\} \leq P\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{w'n} t_i \geq ayn\right\} + C_2 \exp(-C_3 yn / (\log n)^{C_4}).$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 4. We show that

$$(4.32) \quad P\{|a_{0,n} - \mathbb{E}[a_{0,n}]\| \geq x\} \leq C_3 e^{-C_4 x / \sqrt{n \log n}} \text{ for } x \leq n,$$

when $n \geq 2^{cN}$ for some constant $c > 0$ and N sufficiently large. Since our proof does not rely on any special properties for the directions along the coordinate axes, we can conclude that for any arbitrary direction one can obtain a similar result. In particular (4.1) holds.

We want to use Theorem 5, for which we need a truncation argument. Let n be fixed. Define

$$(4.33) \quad \hat{t}(v_i) = t(v_i) \wedge \frac{4d}{\gamma} \log n,$$

with γ as in (2.3). Passage times and related quantities, when defined in terms of the \hat{t} instead of the t , will be denoted by the symbols decorated with a caret. For example, if $r = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}(r) &= \sum_{i=1}^k \hat{t}(v_i); \\ \hat{a}_{0,n} &= \inf\{\hat{T}(r) : r \text{ a path from } 0 \text{ to } n\xi\}, \\ \hat{\pi}_n &= \text{optimal path for } \hat{a}_{0,n}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 11. *If (2.1) and (2.3) hold, then there exist constants $1/2 < C_1 < \infty$, $0 < C_i < \infty$ for $i > 1$, such that*

$$(4.34) \quad P\{\hat{\pi}_n \not\subseteq [-n(\log n)^{C_1}, n(\log n)^{C_1}]^d\} \leq 3e^{-C_2 n},$$

$$(4.35) \quad P\{|a_{0,n} - \hat{a}_{0,n}| \geq x\} \leq 3e^{-C_2 n} + C_3 e^{-(\gamma/2)x}, \quad x \geq 0,$$

and

$$(4.36) \quad |\mathbb{E}[a_{0,n}] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{a}_{0,n}]| \leq C_4.$$

PROOF. The probability in the left-hand side of (4.34) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.37) \quad & P\{|\hat{\pi}_n| \geq n(\log n)^{C_1}\} \leq P\{\hat{a}_{0,n} \geq an(\log n)^{C_1}\} \\
 & + P\{\exists \text{ self-avoiding path } r \text{ starting at } 0 \\
 & \text{ of at least } n(\log n)^{C_1} \text{ steps and with } \hat{T}(r) < an(\log n)^{C_1}\} \\
 & \leq P\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{w'n} t_i \geq an(\log n)^{C_1}\right\} + C_5 \exp(-C_6 n(\log n)^{C_1}/(\log n)^{C_7}),
 \end{aligned}$$

similar to (4.31). Note that the last inequality is true for some constants C_5, C_6 that are independent of n , although the distribution of \hat{t} does depend on n . This follows because for any constant C and for large enough n , we have $\hat{t}(v) \geq t(v) \wedge C$. Thus also $\hat{T}(t) \geq \sum_{v \in r} \{t(v) \wedge C\}$, and it suffices to apply Proposition 2 and choose C_1 to be equal to C_7 .

Now we use (2.3) for the following standard large deviation estimate:

$$(4.38) \quad P\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{w'n} t_i \geq an(\log n)^{C_1}\right\} \leq e^{-\gamma an(\log n)^{C_1}} \left(E[e^{\gamma t_1}]\right)^{w'n}.$$

Now, using the fact that $n \geq 2^{cN}$, for sufficiently large N , and $C_1 > 1/2$, the above expression is bounded above by $\exp(-n)$. Now, the inequality in (4.34) follows. To prove (4.35) and (4.36) we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.39) \quad & 0 \leq a_{0,n} - \hat{a}_{0,n} \leq T(\hat{\pi}_n) - \hat{T}(\hat{\pi}_n) \\
 & = \sum_{v \in \hat{\pi}_n} \{t(v) - \hat{t}(v)\} \leq \sum_{v \in \hat{\pi}_n} t(v) 1_{\{t(v) > \frac{4d}{\gamma} \log n\}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

If $\hat{\pi}_n \subseteq [-n(\log n)^{C_1}, n(\log n)^{C_1}]^d$, then the last term of (4.39) is at most

$$\sum_{v \in [-n(\log n)^{C_1}, n(\log n)^{C_1}]^d} t(v) 1_{\{t(v) > \frac{4d}{\gamma} \log n\}}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.40) \quad & P\{|a_{0,n} - \hat{a}_{0,n}| \geq x\} \leq P\{\hat{\pi}_n \not\subseteq [-n(\log n)^{C_1}, n(\log n)^{C_1}]^d\} \\
 & + P\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{M'} t_i 1_{\{t_i > \frac{4d}{\gamma} \log n\}} \geq x\right\},
 \end{aligned}$$

where

(4.41)

$$M' = \text{number of nodes in } [-C_1 n \log n, C_1 n \log n]^d \sim d(2C_1 n \log n)^d.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.42) \quad & P \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{M'} t_i 1_{\{t_i > \frac{4d}{\gamma} \log n\}} \geq x \right\} \\
 & \leq e^{-(\gamma/2)x} \left[1 + \int_{y \geq 4(d/\gamma) \log n} (e^{(\gamma/2)y} - 1) F(dy) \right]^{M'} \\
 & \leq e^{-(\gamma/2)x} \left[1 + e^{-2d \log n} \int e^{\gamma y} F(dy) \right]^{M'} \\
 & \leq \exp \left\{ -(\gamma/2)x + M' n^{-2d} \int e^{\gamma y} F(dy) \right\} \\
 & \leq C_3 e^{-(\gamma/2)x},
 \end{aligned}$$

we now have that (4.35) follows from (4.40), (4.34) and (4.42); and (4.36) follows from (4.35) and by the additional estimates,

$$0 \leq \hat{a}_{0,n} \leq a_{0,n}.$$

We also have that there exists y_0 such that for all $y \geq y_0$,

(4.43)

$$\begin{aligned}
 P\{|a_{0,n} - \hat{a}_{0,n}| \geq yn \log n\} & \leq P\{a_{0,n} \geq yn \log n\} \leq P\{a_{0,n}'' \geq yn \log n\} \\
 & \leq e^{-\gamma yn \log n} \left[\int e^{\gamma x} F(dx) \right]^{wn} \leq e^{-(\gamma/2)yn \log n},
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that replacing the t_i 's belonging to the optimal path with an arbitrary set of flipping times can only increase the probability of this event. ■

Now we can prove (4.1). By Lemma 11 we have for $x\sqrt{n} \geq 2C_4$,

$$\begin{aligned} P\{|a_{0,n} - \mathbb{E}[a_{0,n}]| \geq x\sqrt{n}\} &\leq P\left\{|a_{0,n} - \hat{a}_{0,n}| \geq \frac{x}{4}\sqrt{n}\right\} \\ &\quad + P\left\{|\hat{a}_{0,n} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{a}_{0,n}]| \geq \frac{x}{4}\sqrt{n}\right\} \\ &\leq 3\exp(-C_2n) + C_3 \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma}{8}x\sqrt{n}\right) \\ &\quad + P\left\{|\hat{a}_{0,n} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{a}_{0,n}]| \geq \frac{x}{4}\sqrt{n}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The first term in the right hand side is at most $3\exp(-C_2x)$ for $x \leq n$. Hence if we prove the following, the proof of (4.1) is complete.

$$(4.44) \quad P\left\{|\hat{a}_{0,n} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{a}_{0,n}]| \geq \frac{x}{4}\sqrt{n}\right\} \leq C_7 \exp(-C_8x/\sqrt{\log n}) \quad \text{for } x \leq n.$$

The remaining part of the proof deduces (4.44) from Theorem 5. As in (4.8)-(4.11),

$$\hat{a}_{0,n} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{a}_{0,n}] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \hat{\Delta}_k$$

with

$$\hat{\Delta}_k = \mathbb{E}[\hat{a}_{0,n} | \mathcal{F}_k] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{a}_{0,n} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}].$$

Moreover,

$$Z_0 = 0, \quad Z_l = \sum_{k=1}^l \hat{\Delta}_k, \quad l \geq 1,$$

defines a martingale. We shall now verify the hypotheses of Theorem 5 for this martingale. Note that replacing $t(v_i)$, $a_{0,n}$ and Δ_k by $\hat{t}(v_i)$, $\hat{a}_{0,n}$ and $\hat{\Delta}_k$ merely amounts to changing the distribution F to

$$\hat{F}(x) = F(x) \vee 1_{\{x \geq \frac{4d}{\gamma} \log n\}}.$$

Therefore, by (4.16), (4.14) and the definition (4.33) of \hat{t} , we have

$$|\hat{\Delta}_k| \leq 2 \max(\text{supp } \hat{F}) \leq \frac{8d}{\gamma} \log n.$$

This corresponds to (4.2) by letting

$$c = \frac{8d}{\gamma} \log n.$$

Furthermore, by (4.27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\Delta}_k^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] &\leq \left(2 \int x^2 \hat{F}(dx) \right) P\{v_k \in \hat{\pi}_n(\omega) | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\} \\ &\leq \left(2 \int x^2 F(dx) \right) P\{v_k \in \hat{\pi}_n(\omega) | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (4.3) holds with

$$U_k = D \hat{J}_k,$$

where

$$D = 2 \int x^2 F(dx), \quad \hat{J}_k(w) = 1_{\{v_k \in \hat{\pi}_n(\omega)\}}.$$

We next let $C > 0$ as in Proposition 2 and

$$(4.45) \quad x_0 = n \log n \frac{2D}{\gamma C} \log \left\{ \int e^{\gamma u} F(du) \right\}.$$

Clearly this satisfies (4.4) for sufficiently large n . Finally, we verify (4.5). We have

$$\begin{aligned} (4.46) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} U_k &= D \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 1_{\{v_k \in \hat{\pi}_n(\omega)\}} \\ &= D |\hat{\pi}_n(\omega)| = D \times \text{length of } \hat{\pi}_n(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, as in (4.37) and (4.38), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (4.47) \quad P\{|\hat{\pi}_n(\omega)| \geq y\} &\leq P\{\hat{a}_{0,n} \geq Cy\} \\ &\quad + P\{\exists \text{ self-avoiding path } r \text{ starting at } 0 \\ &\quad \text{of at least } y \text{ steps and with } \hat{T}(r) < Cy\} \\ &\leq e^{-\gamma Cy} \left[\int e^{\gamma u} F(du) \right]^{wn} + C_9 \exp(-C_{10}y/(\log n)^{C_{11}}). \end{aligned}$$

For $y \geq x_0/D$ and x_0 as in (4.45), the right-hand side of (4.47) is at most

$$e^{-(\gamma/2)Cy} + C_9 e^{-C_{10}y/(\log n)^{C_{11}}}.$$

Therefore, (4.5) holds with $C_1 = (1 + C_9)$ and

$$C_2 = \frac{\gamma C}{2D} \wedge \frac{C_{10}}{D(\log n)^{C_{11}}}.$$

Thus, by (4.7) (applied to $\hat{a}_{0,n}$ and to $-\hat{a}_{0,n}$), for $n \geq 2^{cN}$, $x \leq n$ when N is sufficiently large, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P \{ |\hat{a}_{0,n} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{a}_{0,n}]| \geq x \} &\leq 2C_3(1 + C_1)\left(1 + \frac{C_1}{C_2 x_0}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{C_4}{2} \frac{x}{\sqrt{x_0}}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-C_{12} \frac{x}{\sqrt{n \log n}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which proves (4.1) for our process on G_w . ■

5. Proof of the Shape Theorem.

Throughout this section, we continue working with the modified model introduced in Section 4. The coupling used to obtain the final result for the original model occurs in the last steps of the proof.

Notational Conventions. Given a subset A of \mathbb{R}^2 , and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote $tA = \{ta \mid a \in A\}$, and $AB = \{a + b \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$. So in particular $A^n = \{a_1 + \dots + a_n \mid a_i \in A\}$.

We introduce the following definition from Tessera [40] with some modifications.

Definition 21 (Strong Asymptotic Geodesicity (SAG) for $\mathbb{E}[a]$). Let $Q : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be an increasing function such that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} Q(\alpha) = \infty.$$

Let $c'_1 \in (0, c_1)$ be a constant and let $\bar{A}(0, r) = \{x \mid \mathbb{E}[a_{0,x}] \leq r\}$ and $[\bar{A}]_t$ denote the t -neighborhood of the subset \bar{A} with respect to $\mathbb{E}[a]$. $\mathbb{E}[a]$ is called *SAG*(Q) when for all integers $m \geq 1$, and for all $x, y \in G_w$ such that $\mathbb{E}[a_{x,y}]/m \geq 2^{c'_1 N}$, there exists a sequence $x = x_0, \dots, x_m = y$ in G_w satisfying, for all $0 \leq i \leq m-1$,

$$(5.1) \quad \alpha \left(1 - \frac{1}{Q(\alpha)}\right) \leq \mathbb{E}[a_{x_i, x_{i+1}}] \leq \alpha \left(1 + \frac{1}{Q(\alpha)}\right),$$

where $\alpha = \mathbb{E}[a_{x,y}]/m$; and for all $r \geq 2^{c'_1 N}$, we have

$$(5.2) \quad \bar{A} \left(0, \left(1 + \frac{1}{Q(r)}\right) r\right) \subset [\bar{A}(0, r)]_{\frac{6r}{Q(r)}}.$$

Proposition 3. *Let $t \geq 2^{c_1 N}$ and*

$$A'_F(0, t) = \{x \mid a_{0,x} \leq t\}.$$

There exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for $N \geq N_0$, there exists a norm l_ on \mathbb{R}^2 , and $c > 0$, such that almost surely,*

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} B_{l_*}(0, t - N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t) \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 &\subset A'_F(0, t) \\ &\subset B_{l_*}(0, t + N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of this proposition, as outlined in Section 2, consists of two main parts. We now start by preparing the stage for the first part of the proof.

Let \bar{d}_1 and \bar{d}_2 be the metrics defined by the expected value of first passage times in the first and second intermediate FPPs when we choose the nodes to be on G_w defined on \mathbb{Z}^2 . Let x, y denote two arbitrary nodes on G_w . Since in the modified model we are assuming that G_w is a region of expansion and there are no affected nodes of any type on G_w , it is easy to see that there exists $c, c' > 0$ such that for sufficiently large N we can write

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} d_{l_2}(x, y)/N^c &\leq \bar{d}_1(0, \xi_1 \|x - y\|_1 / N^{c'}) \leq \mathbb{E}[a_{x,y}] \\ &\leq \bar{d}_2(0, \xi_1 \|x - y\|_1 / N^{c'}) \leq N^c d_{l_2}(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4 (Tessera – modified). *Let $2^{c_1 N} \leq r_w \leq 2^{c_2 N}$ be a sequence and \mathcal{N}_{r_w} be a sequence of neighborhoods with radii r_w centered at the origin. There exists $C > 0$ and $w_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ (hence $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$) such that for $w \geq w_0$ (hence $N \geq N_0$), almost surely,*

$$(5.5) \quad \sup_{x,y \in \mathcal{N}_{r_w}} |a_{x,y} - \mathbb{E}[a_{x,y}]| \leq C r_w^{1/2} \log^{3/2} r_w.$$

To prove this proposition, we first need the following lemma whose proof follows the same lines as the one of Lemma 11 and is omitted. Let $c \in [c_1, c_2]$, $c'_2 > c_2$ be constants. Let A_1 be the event that for every pair of nodes in \mathcal{N}_{r_w} , the first passage time is at most $2^{c'_2 N}$. To see that this event occurs w.h.p., let $x, y \in \mathcal{N}_{r_w}$, we first note that

$$P(a_{x,y} > 2^{c'_2 N}) \leq P(a''_{x,y} > 2^{c'_2 N}),$$

where a'' is the first passage time of the second intermediate FPP. Now it is easy to see that standard concentration bounds imply that there exists a constant C' such that the last term in the above inequality is at most $\exp(-C' 2^{c'_2 N})$. It follows that event A_1 occurs w.h.p.

Lemma 12. *Let \mathcal{N}_{r_w} be a neighborhood with radius r_w centered at the origin. If (2.1) and (2.3) hold, then conditional on A_1 , there exist constants $0 < C_1, C_2 < \infty$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{N}_{r_w}$*

$$(5.6) \quad P\{\pi_{x,y} \not\subseteq \mathcal{N}'_{r_w(\log r_w)^{C_1}}\} \leq e^{-C_2 r_w},$$

where $\pi_{x,y}$ denotes the optimal path between x, y and $\mathcal{N}'_{r_w(\log r_w)^{C_1}}$ denotes a neighborhood with radius $r_w(\log r_w)^{C_1}$ centered at the origin.

The proof of the above lemma is similar to that of Lemma 11 and is omitted.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4. Let A_2 denote the event that the optimal path of every pair of nodes in \mathcal{N}_{r_w} are contained in $\mathcal{N}'_{r_w(\log r_w)^{C_1}}$. Using Lemma 12 this event occurs w.h.p.

Let C_3 be a constant to be determined later. Let w be sufficiently large so that $P(A_1)$ is greater than $1/2$. Let $E = c/4$ and let w be large enough such that for $\|x - y\| \geq 2^{EN}$, (4.1) holds. Using (4.1) for these nodes and standard concentration bounds for nodes such that $\|x - y\| < 2^{EN}$ it is easy to see that for all x, y in \mathcal{N}_{r_w} , there exists a constant C_4 , such that for sufficiently large N ,

$$P\left(|a_{x,y} - \mathbb{E}[a_{x,y}]|^2 \geq C_3 r_w \log^3 r_w\right) \leq 2 \exp(-c' C_3 \log r_w).$$

where c' is the constant in (4.1). Now letting $C_3 = 6/c'$, we have that for large enough w , all x, y such that $\|x - y\| < r_w$,

$$P\left(|a_{x,y} - \mathbb{E}[a_{x,y}]|^2 \geq C_3 r_w \log^3 r_w\right) \leq 2r_w^{-6}.$$

Hence for w large enough we have

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\sup_{x,y \in B(0,r_w)} |a_{x,y} - \mathbb{E}[a_{x,y}]|^2 \geq C_3 r_w \log^3 r_w\right) &\leq 2r_w^{-6} |\mathcal{N}_{r_w}|^2 \\ &\leq 16r_w^{-2} \leq 16w^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows from the fact that $\sum_{w=1}^{\infty} w^{-2} < \infty$. ■

Now let $t \geq 2^{c_1 N}$. It follows from Proposition 4 that there exists C' , such that almost surely for sufficiently large N , we have

$$(5.7) \quad \bar{A}(0, t - C' t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t) \subset A'_F(0, t) \subset \bar{A}(0, t + C' t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t).$$

We now focus on the second part of the proof of Proposition 3.

Theorem 6. *Let $t \geq 2^{c_1 N}$. There exists $c > 0$ and N_0 such that, for every $N > N_0$, there exists a norm l_* such that, almost surely,*

$$(5.8) \quad B_{l_*}(0, t - N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t) \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 \subset \bar{A}(0, t) \subset B_{l_*}(0, t + N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t).$$

The proof of the above theorem follows from the following results. We first need the following lemma.

Lemma 13. *Consider an arbitrary $10w$ -neighborhood denoted by \mathcal{N} in the initial configuration of the modified model. Now assume that, due to placing an affected* block outside of \mathcal{N} , at some time $t^* > 0$ there is a θ -affected node u at the center of \mathcal{N} . Then, at time t^* , w.h.p. there exists a sequence of flips of θ -particles in \mathcal{N} that if they happen, there will be a θ -affected w -block inside \mathcal{N} .*

To prove the above lemma we first need the following definition.

Definition 22 (Balance Property). Let $\mathcal{R}_{a,b}(v) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ denote a rectangle of sides a and b centered at $v \in G_w$. Let \mathcal{I} be the collection of sets of particles in the possible intersections of the two rectangles $\mathcal{R}_{0.5, w^{1/4}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{w^{1/4}, 0.5}$ with the neighborhood \mathcal{N} on G_w in the initial configuration. More precisely,

$$\mathcal{I} := \bigcup_{v \in G_w} \left\{ \mathcal{R}_{0.5, w^{1/4}}(v) \cap \mathcal{N} \right\} \cup \bigcup_{v \in G_w} \left\{ \mathcal{R}_{w^{1/4}, 0.5}(v) \cap \mathcal{N} \right\}.$$

Also, let W_I be the random variable representing the number of particles in state $\bar{\theta}$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$, and N_I be the total number of particles in $I \in \mathcal{I}$. We say a neighborhood has the *balance property* if and only if, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, and for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$ we have $W_I - N_I/2 < w^{1/8+\epsilon}$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 13. Let A be the event that the balance property holds for \mathcal{N} in the initial configuration. With a similar argument as in Lemma 4, it is easy to see that A occurs w.h.p.

Now assume that the balance property holds for \mathcal{N} in the initial configuration. Consider a w -block (henceforth referred to as a block) inside \mathcal{N} such that the affected node at the center of \mathcal{N} at time t^* is located in the lower-left corner of this block. We then partition G_w into blocks starting from this block (see Figure 7). Now since node u is an affected node, the balance property in the initial configuration implies that there has been

$$N' = (1/2 - \tau)N + o(N)$$

flips in the four blocks that comprise most of the neighborhood of u (except for at most $O(w)$ particles). This in turn implies that there has been N' p-stable particles in these blocks that have flipped so that node u has become affected. Let B denote the event of the existence of the sequence of flips mentioned in the statement of this lemma.

Now consider the first p-stable particle in one of these four blocks located at some node v . In order for this particle to become p-stable, there should have been N' flips of p-stable particles in the rest of its neighborhood which – except for $O(w)$ nodes – consists of at most three blocks. Next, consider the first particle that has become p-stable in one of these three blocks (located at some node v'). With a similar argument as above, there has been N' flips of p-stable particles in the rest of the neighborhood of this particle which again consists of at most three blocks to make this particle p-stable. Let B_1 denote the event of having equal number of flips in these three blocks that consist the neighborhood of v' – except for $O(w)$ nodes – and that also the l_∞ distance between each pair of the nodes with one node in one block and the other in another block is maximum and that also the l_∞ distance between each of these nodes where a flip occurs and the node v' is also maximum.

Now, using Bayes' theorem and the FKG inequality, we can see that it suffices to show that event B conditional on B_1 occurs w.h.p. To see this, we first argue that the block with the largest number of p-stable particles in at most the three blocks comprising close to $3/4$ of the neighborhood of node v – except for $O(w)$ nodes – where flips could have happened has had at least

$$(1/3)N' + o(N')$$

p-stable particles. Let B_2 denote the event that the number of p-stable particles that have led to the instability of particle at v' is equal in at most the three blocks consisting close to $3/4$ of its neighborhood – except for $O(w)$ nodes – and that also the l_∞ distance between each pair of the nodes with one node in one block and the other in another block is maximum and that also the l_∞ distance between each of these nodes where a flip occurs and the node v' is also maximum. Now it is easy to see that event B has a smaller probability when event B_2 occurs as well. It is now easy to check (using similar elementary arguments as in the proof of Lemma 5 in [34]) that the flips of particles leading to node v' becoming affected and the flips of particles leading to node v becoming affected will lead to the formation of a block of affected nodes centered at node v' . Combined with the fact that the balance property holds for \mathcal{N} w.h.p., the proof is complete. ■

Proposition 5. *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for sufficiently large N , $\mathbb{E}[a]$ is SAG(Q) where*

$$(5.9) \quad Q(\alpha) = \frac{\alpha^{1/2}}{N^c \log^{3/2} \alpha}.$$

PROOF. Let $r_w = 2^{c'_1 N}$ where c'_1 is the constant in the definition of SAG, and let $c''_2 > c'_2 > c_2$ be constants. Let \mathcal{N}_ρ be a neighborhood with radius $\rho = 2^{c'_2 N}$. Let events A_1, A_2 be as defined in the proof of Proposition 4. Let A_3 be the event that the first flipping time of all the particles inside \mathcal{N}_ρ is less than N^2 . Let t_x denote the first flipping time of particle at node $x \in \mathcal{N}_\rho$. Standard concentration bounds imply that for sufficiently large N there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$P(t_x > N^2) \leq \exp(-cN^2).$$

It follows that event A_3 occurs w.h.p.

Let us define a *very good block* as a $10w$ -block that satisfies the balance property and a *very bad block* as a $10w$ -block that does not satisfy this property. Let us divide the lattice into $10w$ -blocks starting from the block centered at the origin. Since each of these blocks is a very good block w.h.p., it follows from Theorem 3 that in \mathcal{N}_ρ there are no clusters of very bad blocks with radius larger than N^2 in the initial configuration w.h.p. Let us denote this event by A_4 . Conditional on this event, using Lemma 13, we can conclude that when a node becomes affected after a time $O(N^3)$ there is an affected block in a neighborhood of radius N^3 w.h.p.

Now we can conclude that the intersection of the above events occurs w.h.p. In particular, w.h.p.,

$$(5.10) \quad \sup_{x,y \in \mathcal{N}_{r_w}} |a_{x,y} - \mathbb{E}[a_{x,y}]| \leq Cr_w^{1/2} \log^{3/2} r_w,$$

and the optimal path between any two nodes inside \mathcal{N}_{r_w} is contained in \mathcal{N}_ρ , and the first flipping time of all the particles inside \mathcal{N}_ρ is less than N^2 .

Consider an optimal path γ between x, y where $x, y \in \mathcal{N}_{r_w}$. It follows that the maximum flipping time over all the particles on γ is at most N^2 w.h.p. Therefore w.h.p. one can find a node z in γ such that we have

$$|\lambda a_{x,y} - a_{x,z}| \leq N^2,$$

and

$$|(1 - \lambda)a_{x,y} - (a_{x,y} - a_{x,z})| \leq N^2.$$

Now let us denote $a_{x,y} - a_{x,z}$ by $a_{z,y}^*$. We now show that w.h.p.

$$(5.11) \quad a_{z,y}^* \leq a_{z,y} + N^5.$$

To see this, we note that the event of $a_{z,y}$ being smaller than some value and the event of having an affected block centered at z are both increasing in the change of a θ -particle to a $\bar{\theta}$ -particle so using the FKG inequality these events are positively correlated. Now we note that since z has become affected after $a_{x,z}$, standard concentration bounds imply that after at most N^5 time, w.h.p. this node will be inside an affected block and hence we can conclude that (5.11) holds w.h.p.

Next we show that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $a_{z,y}^* \geq a_{z,y} - N^c r_w^{1/2} \log^{3/2} r_w$ w.h.p. To see this, first we note that due to (5.10) and (5.4) we can conclude that there exists $c' > 0$ such that there are no affected nodes of any type in $\mathcal{N}_\rho \setminus [A(x, a_{x,y})]_{N^{c'} r_w^{1/2} \log^{3/2} r_w}$, where $[A]_t$ denotes the l_∞ neighborhood of A . Consider a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(z)$ with radius $N^{c'} r_w^{1/2} \log^{3/2} r_w$ centered at z . We want to argue that w.h.p. the formation of the optimal path from x to y from the time $a_{x,z}$ only involves the spread of affected nodes from $\mathcal{N}(z)$. To see this, assume that the spread of affected nodes started from a node z' contained in $A'(0, a_{x,z}) \setminus \mathcal{N}(z)$ has also participated in the formation of the optimal path. This implies that w.h.p. there had been a sequence of possible flips leading to a p-stable particle that was needed for the formation of the optimal path before the spread of affected nodes from $\mathcal{N}(z)$ had reached this particle. However, this implies that w.h.p. the node z is not on the optimal path from x to y which is a contradiction. Hence we can conclude that there exists $c > 0$ such that $a_{z,y}^* \geq a_{z,y} - N^c r_w^{1/2} \log^{3/2} r_w$ w.h.p.

Now we can conclude that there exists a constant $C'' > 0$ such that w.h.p.,

$$|\lambda a_{x,y} - a_{x,z}| \leq N^2,$$

and

$$|(1 - \lambda)a_{x,y} - a_{z,y}| \leq N^{C''} r_w^{1/2} \log^{3/2} r_w.$$

Combined with (5.10) we can conclude that, w.h.p. there exists a constant $D > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{N}_\rho$ there exists a node z for which we have

$$|\lambda \mathbb{E}[a_{x,y}] - \mathbb{E}[a_{x,z}]| \leq N^D r_w^{1/2} \log^{3/2} r_w,$$

and

$$|(1 - \lambda)\mathbb{E}[a_{x,y}] - \mathbb{E}[a_{z,y}]| \leq N^D r_w^{1/2} \log^{3/2} r_w.$$

The result now follows from Propositions 3.1 and 4.1 in Sections 3 and 4 in [40]. \blacksquare

Now, in order to use the above definition to conclude the shape theorem we need the following result which is a modified version of Proposition 1.8 in [40].

Proposition 6 (Tessera – modified). *If $\mathbb{E}[a]$ is SAG(Q) with*

$$Q(\alpha) = \frac{\alpha^{1/2}}{N^c \log^{3/2} \alpha},$$

then there exists a norm l_ on \mathbb{R}^2 and $C > 0$ such that for all $t \geq 2^{c_1 N}$, when N is sufficiently large we have*

$$B_{l_*} \left(0, t - N^C t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t \right) \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 \subset \bar{A}(0, t) \subset B_{l_*} \left(0, t + N^C t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t \right).$$

PROOF. The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 1.8 in [40], except for the fact that we need to prove a statement similar to Lemma 5.1 in [40] for our setting (since we do not have triangular inequality for $\mathbb{E}[a]$). We want to show that, there exists a constant $c'' > 0$ such that for all $W \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $r/W \geq 2^{c'_1 N}$ where c'_1 is the constant in the definition of SAG, and for N sufficiently large we have,

$$d_H \left(\frac{1}{r} \bar{A}(0, r/W)^W, \frac{1}{r} \bar{A}(0, r) \right) \leq \frac{N^{c''}}{Q(r/W)},$$

where d_H denotes the Hausdorff distance with respect to the l_2 norm. We note that due to (5.1) we can write

$$\bar{A}(0, (1 - \epsilon)r/W)^W \subset \bar{A}(0, r) \subset \bar{A}(0, (1 + \epsilon)r/W)^W,$$

where

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{Q(r/W)}$$

Since there exists a $c'' > 0$ such that $\|x - y\| \leq N^{c''} \mathbb{E}[a_{x,y}]$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{N}$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{A}(0, (1 + \epsilon)r/W)^W &\subset (\bar{A}(0, (1 - \epsilon)r/W)_{12\epsilon r/W})^W \\ &\subset (\bar{A}(0, (1 - \epsilon)r/W)) B_{l_2}(0, 12N^{c''} \epsilon r/W)^W \\ &= (\bar{A}(0, (1 - \epsilon)r/W))^W B_{l_2}(0, 12N^{c''} \epsilon r) \end{aligned}$$

where the notation $[\bar{A}(0, r/W)]_{12\epsilon r/W}$ stands for the $12\epsilon r/W$ -neighborhood of $\bar{A}(0, r/W)$. The rest of the proof follows from the first part of the proof of Proposition 1.8 in [40] presented in Section 5.3. \blacksquare

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3. The proof follows combining Propositions 4, 5, and 6. Using Proposition 4, we can conclude that there exists $C' > 0$ such that for sufficiently large N , almost surely we have

$$\bar{A}(0, t - C't^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t) \subset A'_F(0, t) \subset \bar{A}(0, t + C't^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t).$$

Using Proposition 5 we can conclude that $\mathbb{E}[a]$ is $\text{SAG}(\alpha^{1/2}/N^c \log^{3/2} \alpha)$. Finally, the proof follows from Proposition 6 with $Q(t) = t^{1/2}/N^c \log^{3/2} t$ when N is sufficiently large. \blacksquare

Lemma 14. *Let $c_2 < c'_2 < c''_2 \in (c_2, 0.5(1 - H(\tau)))$ be constants and let $u \in G_w$, and $\mathcal{N}_\rho(u)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\rho'}(u)$ be two neighborhoods with radii $\rho = 2^{c'_2 N}$ and $\rho' = 2^{c''_2 N}$. Let*

$$A = \{ \nexists \text{ } \theta\text{-affected node in } \mathcal{N}_{\rho'}(u) \text{ in the initial configuration} \}.$$

There exists a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}^+$, such that conditional on event A and for sufficiently large N , we have

$$P(\mathcal{T}(\rho) > \rho) > 1 - e^{-\sqrt{\rho'}/N^c},$$

where $\mathcal{T}(\rho)$ is defined in (3.2).

PROOF. Let x, y be two nodes on $\mathcal{N}_\rho(0)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\rho'}(0)$ respectively such that they have the largest l_∞ distance from the origin (i.e., they are on the boundaries of these neighborhoods). Let a' denote the first passage time between two nodes located on \mathbb{Z}^2 , similar to (5.4) there exists a constant $c' > 0$ such that for sufficiently large N we can write

$$P(a_{x,y} \leq \rho) \leq P\left(a'_{0, \xi_1(\rho - \rho')/N^{c'}} \leq \rho\right).$$

Now due to (5.4) there exists a constant $c'' > 0$ such that we can write

$$P(a_{x,y} \leq \rho) \leq P\left(a'_{0, \xi_1(\rho - \rho')/N^{c'}} - \mathbb{E}\left[a'_{0, \xi_1(\rho - \rho')/N^{c'}}\right] \leq \rho - \frac{\rho' - \rho}{N^{c''}}\right).$$

Now using the fact that there are less than $64\rho'^2$ pairs of nodes on the boundaries of $\mathcal{N}_\rho(u)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\rho'}(u)$ we can use the Talagrand concentration

bound [39, Proposition 8.3] to conclude that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for sufficiently large N we have

$$P(\mathcal{T}(\rho) \leq \rho) \leq \exp(-\sqrt{\rho}/N^c).$$

■

We are now ready to consider the original mode introduced in this paper and provide the proof of Theorem 1.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1 (SHAPE THEOREM). Let \mathcal{N}_N and \mathcal{N}_{2N} be two neighborhoods with radii N and $2N$ respectively that are centered at the origin. Let A be the event of having a θ -affected block at the origin in the original model. Let A_1 be the event that all the blocks in $\mathcal{N}_{2N} \setminus \mathcal{N}_N$ are good. Using Lemma 4, A_1 occurs w.h.p. Let $c'_2, c''_2 \in (c_2, 0.5(1 - H(\tau)))$ be constants such that $c''_2 > c'_2$ and let $\mathcal{N}_{\rho'}(0)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\rho''}(0)$ be neighborhoods with radii $\rho' = 2^{c'_2 N}$ and $\rho'' = 2^{c''_2 N}$ respectively. Let A_2 be the event that there are no affected nodes of any type in $\mathcal{N}_{\rho''} \setminus \mathcal{N}_{2N}$. By Lemma 2, A_2 occurs w.h.p. Let A_3 be the event that $\mathcal{N}_{\rho''}$ is a region of expansion. Using Lemma 3, the fact that events A and A_3 are increasing events in the change of a θ -particle to a $\bar{\theta}$ -particle, and the FKG inequality, we can conclude that event A_3 occurs w.h.p. Let A_4 be the event that there are no affected nodes of any type inside $\mathcal{N}_{\rho'}$ that is due to the spread of any type of affected node outside of $\mathcal{N}_{\rho''}$ at any time $t \leq \rho'$. Using Lemma 14, A_4 occurs w.h.p.

Additionally, let A_5 and A'_5 be the events that the sum of the first flipping times of the particles in \mathcal{N}_{2N} in the original process and in the modified process will be less than \sqrt{t} respectively. Standard bounds imply that A_5 and A'_5 occur w.h.p. Now, conditional on A, A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 we can consider the following coupling between the original model and the modified model. We assume that all the particles in the initial configuration that are located in $\mathcal{N}_{\rho''} \setminus \mathcal{N}_{2N}$ in both models have the same states, and that the first flipping time of each particle in the original model is the same as the flipping time of its corresponding particle in the modified model. Using this coupling we can conclude that there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(A_{F,\rho}(0, t) \subset B_{l_*}(0, t + N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t) \mid A, A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4\right) \\ & \geq P\left(A'_{F,\rho}(0, t + \sqrt{t}) \subset B_{l_*}(0, t + N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t) \mid A'_5\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(B_{l_*}(0, t - N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t) \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 \subset A_{F,\rho}(0, t) \mid A, A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5\right) \\ & \geq P\left(B_{l_*}(0, t - N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t) \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 \subset A'_F(0, t - \sqrt{t})\right). \end{aligned}$$




FIG 9. *Expandable region.* \mathcal{X}_1 is called a θ -expandable region whenever there exists a set of flips of θ -particles inside \mathcal{X}_1 leading to a θ -affected node in \mathcal{X}_2 .

Since events $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5, A'_5$ occur w.h.p., and according to Proposition 3, event $B_{l_*}(0, t - N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t) \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 \subset A'_{F,\rho}(0, t \pm \sqrt{t}) \subset B_{l_*}(0, t + N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t)$ occurs w.h.p., hence we can conclude that, in the original model, conditional on A , w.h.p. we have

$$B_{l_*}(0, t - N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t) \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 \subset A_{F,\rho}(0, t) \subset B_{l_*}(0, t + N^c t^{1/2} \log^{3/2} t).$$

■

6. Proof of the Size Theorem. Without loss of generality, we assume that the set of nodes of G_w is a subset of the nodes on \mathbb{Z}^2 and we work with the obvious probability space. We first define the *expandable region*; to do so we need the following lemma.

Lemma 15. *Let c be an arbitrary positive constant. W.h.p. there are no clusters of bad blocks with radius greater than N^3 in a neighborhood with radius $\rho = O(2^{cN})$ in the initial configuration.*

PROOF. Let p , be the probability of having a bad block, and let $k = N^3$. By Theorem 3, it follows that w.h.p. there is no cluster of bad blocks containing a bad block with l_1 -distance from its center greater than N^3 in a neighborhood with exponential radius in N . ■

Now divide G_w into N -blocks and consider the union of particles inside a cluster of bad N -blocks and the set of particles outside the cluster whose l_∞ distance to at least one node in the cluster is less than or equal to $N/4$. We denote this set by \mathcal{X}_1 . Note that for sufficiently large N , the probability of having a bad N -block is below the critical probability of percolation, and each N -block is a bad N -block independently of the others, hence by

Lemma 15, w.h.p. there is no cluster of bad N -blocks with radius larger than N^3 in a neighborhood with exponential size in N on G_w . Also, consider the set of all the particles outside \mathcal{X}_1 whose l_∞ distance to at least one particle in \mathcal{X}_1 is less than or equal to $N/4$ and denote it by \mathcal{X}_2 .

Definition 23 (Expandable Region). \mathcal{X}_1 is called a θ -expandable region whenever there exists a set of flips of θ -particles inside \mathcal{X}_1 leading to a θ -affected node in \mathcal{X}_2 (see Figure 9). It is noted that if \mathcal{X}_1 is not an expandable region, the possible spread of θ -affected nodes started in it will die out before reaching \mathcal{X}_2 . The center of an expandable region is the node at the center of the smallest neighborhood that contains the expandable region.

We now want to argue about the distance of the closest expandable region to the origin. The following lemma shows how far the closest expandable region to the origin can be. We show this by establishing a relationship between radical regions and expandable regions. The following lemma exploits the fact that the closest radical region to the origin is also an expandable region w.h.p. (note that an expandable radical region is defined differently from an expandable region.)

Lemma 16. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $\epsilon' > e(\tau)$. W.h.p. the l_* -distance of the origin from the node at the center of the closest expandable region in the initial configuration is at most*

$$\rho = 2^{0.5(1-H(\tau)+\epsilon)(1+\epsilon')^2 N}.$$

PROOF. Consider a neighborhood with radius $2^{0.5(1-H(\tau)+\epsilon/2)(1+\epsilon')^2 N}$ centered at the origin. Using Lemma 8, w.h.p. there exists a radical region in this neighborhood. Using Lemma 7 a radical region is expandable w.h.p. Using Lemma 15, w.h.p. there is no cluster of bad blocks with radius larger than N^3 in a neighborhood with radius ρ centered at the origin in the initial configuration. Now consider a neighborhood with radius $3N^3$ centered at the center of the radical region. Since the event of having an expandable radical region at the center of this neighborhood and the event of this region begin a region of expansion are both increasing events in the change of a θ -particle to a $\bar{\theta}$ -particle, by an application of FKG inequality [17] and using Lemma 3 this neighborhood is a region of expansion w.h.p. and this completes the proof. ■

The following lemma shows that in the initial configuration w.h.p. there

is no part of an expandable region in an annulus around the origin whose width is ρ' .

Lemma 17. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $\epsilon' > e(\tau)$. W.h.p. there is no node that belongs to an expandable region in*

$$B_{l_*}(0, \rho + \rho') \setminus B_{l_*}(0, \rho),$$

for

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= 2^{0.5(1-H(\tau)+\epsilon/2)(1+\epsilon')^2N}, \\ \rho' &= 2^{(1-H(\tau)-\epsilon)(1-0.5(1+\epsilon')^2)N+o(N)}. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. By Lemma 15, w.h.p. there is no cluster of bad blocks with radius larger than N^3 in a neighborhood with radius $2(\rho + \rho')$ centered at the origin in the initial configuration. Also, for large N we have,

$$\text{Number of nodes in } B_{l_*}(0, \rho + \rho' + 2N^3) \setminus B_{l_*}(0, \rho) \leq 8\rho\rho'.$$

Also, if we have

$$\text{Number of nodes in } B_{l_*}(0, \rho + \rho' + 2N^3) \setminus B_{l_*}(0, \rho) = 2^{(1-H(\tau)-\epsilon)N+o(N)},$$

then w.h.p. there will be no location inside $B_{l_*}(0, \rho + \rho' + 2N^3) \setminus B_{l_*}(0, \rho)$ for which a particle would be p-stable. Here we have used the fact that $(H(\tau) - H(\tau'')) = o(1)$, and the fact that having a p-stable particle is a necessary condition for having an expandable region. ■

The following lemma shows that w.h.p. an expandable region can lead to the formation of a θ -affected w -block.

Lemma 18. *W.h.p. there exists a sequence of possible flips in $\mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_2$ that can lead to a θ -affected w -block centered in \mathcal{X}_1 .*

PROOF. Since \mathcal{X}_1 is an expandable region, there exists a sequence of flips leading to a new affected node inside a good $N/4$ -block. By coupling with our modified model and using Lemma 13 we can conclude that, w.h.p. there exists a sequence of possible flips in the $N/4$ -block that can lead to a monochromatic w -block in it. Now with an application of Lemma 3 and using the fact that the event of having $\mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_2$ inside a N^3 -block and the event of having that block being a region of expansion are positively correlated, we can conclude that the latter event occurs w.h.p. and this completes the proof. ■

We are now ready to begin the proof of Theorem 2.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. We first show that the size of the largest monochromatic ball is at least exponential in N w.h.p. Let $\epsilon' > e(\tau)$ with $e(\tau)$ as defined in (2.7), and $\epsilon'' > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} a(\tau) - \epsilon &\leq (1 - H(\tau) - \epsilon'') \left(2 - (1 + \epsilon')^2\right), \\ b(\tau) + \epsilon &\geq (1 + \epsilon')^2 (1 - H(\tau) + \epsilon''). \end{aligned}$$

Let $t^* = 2^{(a(\tau) + \epsilon)N}$. We wish to show that for all $t \geq t^*$,

$$M_n \geq 2^{(a(\tau) - \epsilon)N} \text{ w.h.p.}$$

By Lemma 15, w.h.p. there is no cluster of bad blocks with radius larger than N^3 in a neighborhood with radius 2^N centered at the origin in the initial configuration (event A_0).

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= 2^{0.5(1-H(\tau)+\epsilon'')/2(1+\epsilon')^2N}, \\ \rho' &= 2^{(1-H(\tau)-\epsilon'')(1-0.5(1+\epsilon')^2)N+2\log_2 N}, \\ \rho'' &= 2^{(1-H(\tau)+\epsilon'')((1+\epsilon')^2-1)N}, \end{aligned}$$

We let N be sufficiently large so that there exists a norm l_* and $C > 0$ such that (5.3) in Proposition 3 is satisfied for $t = \rho'^{1/3}$. We also assume that N is sufficiently large, such that $\rho'/N > w^3$, $LL' < \rho'/4 - \rho'^{1/3} - (N^4 + N)\rho'' - N$ where

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \left\lceil \frac{\rho}{\rho'/4 - 2N^C \sqrt{\rho'} \log^{3/2} \rho' - N} \right\rceil, \\ L' &= \left\lceil 2N^C \sqrt{\rho'} \log^{3/2} \rho' + N \right\rceil. \end{aligned}$$

Let the closest expandable region to the origin in the l_* norm be a θ -expandable region and let $\mathcal{N}_{\rho'/4}$ be a neighborhood at the origin with radius $\rho'/4$, now let

$$\mathcal{T}(\rho'/4) = \inf \left\{ t \mid \exists \text{ a } \bar{\theta}\text{-affected node in } \mathcal{N}_{\rho'/4} \right\},$$

$A = \left\{ \text{The origin is contained in a firewall of radius } \rho'/N \text{ before } \mathcal{T}(\rho'/4) \right\}$.

We now want to show

$$(6.1) \quad A \text{ occurs w.h.p.}$$




FIG 10. *W.h.p. the closest expandable region to the origin will not be farther than ρ with respect to the l_* -norm.*

To show this, we condition A on a few events that we show they occur w.h.p. and argue that since event A conditional on these events also occurs w.h.p., A occurs w.h.p.

Let X denote the l_* -distance from the origin to the closest node in an expandable region and let

$$A_1 = \{X \leq \rho, \text{ at } t = 0\},$$

$$A_2 = \{\nexists \text{ a } \bar{\theta}\text{-expandable region in } B_{l_*}(0, X + \rho') \setminus B_{l_*}(0, X) \text{ at } t = 0\}.$$

Consider an l_* -ball of radius ρ . According to Lemma 16, w.h.p. there is an expandable region in this ball (see Figure 10). This implies

A_1 occurs w.h.p.

Using the fact that the existence of a θ -expandable region in $B_{l_*}(0, X + \rho') \setminus B_{l_*}(0, \rho)$ can only increase the probability of event A_2 (since they are both increasing events in the change of a θ -particle to a $\bar{\theta}$ -particle, by an application of FKG inequality [17] for the initial configuration they are positively correlated), and the fact that conditional on event A_1 , event A_2 would have the smallest probability when $X = \rho$, we let

$$A'_2 = \{\nexists \text{ a } \bar{\theta}\text{-expandable region in } B_{l_*}(0, \rho + \rho') \setminus B_{l_*}(0, \rho) \text{ at } n = 0\},$$

and by an application of FKG inequality [17] for the initial configuration we have

$$P(A_2) \geq P(A_2 \mid A_1) P(A_1) \geq P(A_2 \mid X = \rho) P(A_1) \geq P(A'_2) P(A_1).$$




FIG 11. The gradual spreads of affected nodes from the expandable region towards the origin in time intervals of $\rho'/4$. After each time interval, all the nodes inside the corresponding l_* -ball of radius $\rho'/4 - o(\rho')$ are going to be affected.

Using Lemma 17, event A'_2 occurs w.h.p., hence we have

$$A_2 \text{ occurs w.h.p.}$$

Now consider the line segment from the center of the closest expandable region to the origin. Let \mathcal{N} denote the set of particles such that their l_* -distances from at least one point on the line segment is less than or equal to $2N^{c'}\rho'$ where c' is the constant in Lemma 12. Let

$$A_3 = \{ \nexists \text{ a } \bar{\theta}\text{-affected node in } \mathcal{N} \text{ and it is a region of expansion at } t = 0 \}.$$

Since event A_3 has the smallest probability when $X = \rho$, with an application of Lemma 1 and Lemma 3, we can conclude that

$$A_3 \text{ occurs w.h.p.}$$

We are now going to consider the gradual spread of the affected nodes from the expandable region towards the origin in $\rho'/4$ time intervals (see Figure 5).

To consider the growth of the θ -affected nodes we first notice that using Lemma 18, w.h.p. there exists a sequence of less than N^4 flips that can create a θ -affected w -block centered at the center of the expandable region. Let us denote this event by A_4 . Hence we have

$$A_4 \text{ occurs w.h.p.}$$

Let T_N denote the time it takes until N^4 flips occur one by one. Let $A'_5 = \{T_N < \rho^{1/3}\}$. Standard concentration bounds imply that there exist $c > 0$

such that this event occurs with probability at least $1 - \exp(-c\rho'^{1/3})$. Let A_5 denote the event that the time that it takes until we have a θ -affected block at the center of the expandable region is less than $\rho'^{1/3}$. We have

$$P(A_5) \geq P(A'_5) \geq 1 - \exp(-c\rho'^{1/3}).$$

Hence we have

A_5 occurs w.h.p.

Let A_6 denote the event of having less than ρ'' affected nodes in the l_* -ball of radius ρ . Standard concentration bounds imply that this event also occurs w.h.p., hence we have

A_6 occurs w.h.p.

Now we want to consider the spread of possible $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes from outside of $B_{l_*}(0, \rho + \rho')$ towards the origin. Since there are at most ρ'' affected nodes in this ball w.h.p., if we remove all the annuli from this ball that contain an affected node along with their clusters of bad blocks and also a margin of good blocks around these clusters we would have a ball of radius at least $\rho - (N^4 + N)\rho''$. Furthermore, we argue that since the event of having larger growths of $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes in a given time interval and the event of having this ball being a region of expansion of type $\bar{\theta}$ are both increasing in the change of a $\bar{\theta}$ -particle to a θ -particle, by assuming that this ball is a region of expansion of type $\bar{\theta}$ we would only get an upper bound for the speed of the spread of $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes. Hence, from this point forward, to consider the spread of $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes towards the origin we consider this ball and assume it is a region of expansion and does not contain any affected nodes.

Let A_7 denote the event that the growths of the $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes in a time interval of $\rho'^{1/3}$ – that conditional on A_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ is at most needed for the formation of the θ -affected w -blocks in the first gradual growth – is less than $\rho'^{1/3} + N^C \rho'^{1/6} \log^{3/2} \rho'$ in the l_* norm in all directions in the annulus around the origin. To show that this event occurs w.h.p. we consider the l_* -ball of radius $\rho - (N^4 + N)\rho''$ described above. By coupling with our modified model, it follows from the proof of Proposition 3 and Theorem 1 that the growths of all the $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes in this ball will be less than $\rho'^{1/3} + N^C \rho'^{1/6} \log^{3/2} \rho'$ hence we can conclude that

A_7 occurs w.h.p.


Now let A_8 denote the event that the origin is contained in a w -block of θ -affected nodes before there are any $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes in an l_* -ball with radius $\rho'/2$ around the origin. To show that this event occurs w.h.p. we consider L time intervals of size $\rho'/4$ and argue that first of all in every one of these time intervals the growth of θ -affected nodes from the closest θ -affected w -block towards the origin (first started from the expandable region) is at least $\rho'/4 - N^C(\rho')^{1/2} \log^{3/2} \rho'$. To see this, consider a line segment of length ρ and let \mathcal{N}' denote the set of particles such that their l_* -distances from at least one point on the line segment is less than or equal to $N^{c'} \rho'$ where c' is the constant in Lemma 12. We argue that not having θ -affected nodes in \mathcal{N}' and having smaller growths in a given time interval in this neighborhood are both increasing events in the change of a $\bar{\theta}$ -particle to a θ -particle hence using the FKG inequality they are positively correlated. Let us consider a neighborhood with the shape of \mathcal{N}' that does not contain any affected nodes and is a region of expansion. By coupling with our modified model, it follows from the proof of Proposition 3 and Theorem 1 that all the growths of an affected block in this neighborhood will be at least $\rho'/4 - N^C(\rho')^{1/2} \log^{3/2} \rho'$. It follows that all the gradual growths of θ -affected nodes started by the expandable region towards the origin will be at least $\rho'/4 - N^C(\rho')^{1/2} \log^{3/2} \rho'$.

Second of all we need to show that the possible growths of $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes started from outside of $B_{l_*}(0, \rho + \rho' - w)$ are not going to interfere with any of these growths and will not reach the $B_{l_*}(0, \rho'/2)$ before having the origin contained in a θ -affected w -block (see Figure 11). To show this, since we are conditioning on events A_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, 7$, and since $LL' < \rho'/4 - \rho^{1/3} - (N^4 + N)\rho'' - N$ it suffices to show that the growths of $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes started from outside a $B_{l_*}(0, \rho - \rho^{1/3} - N^c \rho'' - N)$ which does not contain any affected nodes and is assumed to be a region of expansion in every time interval of size $\rho'/4$ is at most $\rho'/4 + N^C(\rho')^{1/2} \log^{3/2} \rho'$, which guarantees that not only these growths will not interfere with the growths of θ -affected nodes but also they will not reach $B_{l_*}(0, \rho'/2)$ before having the origin contained in a θ -affected w -block. By coupling with our modified model, it follows from the proof of Proposition 3 and Theorem 1 that this event also occurs w.h.p. Hence we can conclude that

A_8 occurs w.h.p.

This also implies that by the time the origin is contained in a θ -affected w -block, the $\bar{\theta}$ -affected nodes are still in l_* -distance of more than $\rho'/2$ from the origin w.h.p.

Now let r be proportional to ρ'/N . Let us denote the event that the

FIG 12. *Formation of a firewall around the origin.*

time it takes until a number of affected nodes equal to the number of all the particles in a firewall with radius r centered at the origin and a line of width $2\sqrt{N}$ from the origin to the firewall make a flip one by one being smaller than $\rho'/4$ by A'_9 (see Figure 12). Standard concentration bounds imply A'_9 occurs w.h.p.

Let A_{10} denote the event that this firewall is formed in a time interval smaller than $\rho'/4$. We have $P(A_{10}) \leq P(A'_9)$ and since A'_9 occurs w.h.p. we have

$$A_{10} \text{ occurs w.h.p.}$$

With a similar argument for event A_8 , w.h.p. the growth of all the possible $\bar{\theta}$ affected nodes will be less than $\rho'/3$ for this interval (event A_{11}). Hence, we have

$$A_{11} \text{ occurs w.h.p.}$$

Finally we can write

$$P(A) \geq P\left(A \mid A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{11}\right) P(A_0 \cap A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_{11}),$$

hence, we have that

$$A \text{ occurs w.h.p.}$$

Now, using Lemma 3 w.h.p. the interior of the firewall is a region of expansion in the initial configuration and since w.h.p. only θ -affected nodes have reached this region by the time of the formation of the firewall, it is still a region of expansion for the state $\bar{\theta}$. Now, since the sum of the time for the gradual growths, formation of the firewall, and the time that it takes until the interior of the firewall becomes monochromatic (by a standard concentration bound) is less than t^* w.h.p., for all $t \geq t^*$ it will be monochromatic w.h.p. and this proves the lower bound.

Next, we show the corresponding upper bound. Consider four neighborhoods with radius $N(\rho + \rho')$ such that each of them share the origin as a

different corner node. Divide the union of these neighborhoods into neighborhoods of radius $\rho + \rho'$ in an arbitrary way and consider the nodes at the center of each of these neighborhoods. Now using the above result we have that for $t \geq t^*$, w.h.p., all these central nodes will have a monochromatic balls of size at least $2^{a(\tau) - \epsilon N}$. Also it is easy to see that for $t \geq t^*$, w.h.p. all the four neighborhoods defined above will have particles with exponentially large monochromatic balls of both states. This implies that for all $t \geq t^*$ the size of the monochromatic balls of the origin is at most $4N^2(\rho + \rho')^2$. ■

6.1. *Extension to $\tau > 1/2$.* As mentioned before, while for $\tau < 1/2$ unstable particles are also p-stable, for $\tau > 1/2$ this is not the case. Let $\bar{\tau} = 1 - \tau + 2/N$. A p-stable particle of type θ is a particle for which $W < \bar{\tau}N$ where W is the number of θ particles in its neighborhood. The reason for adding the term $2/N$ in the definition is to account for the strict inequality that is needed for being p-stable and the flip of the particle at the center of the neighborhood which adds one particle of its type to the neighborhood. All our results can be easily extended for $\tau > 1/2$ using $\bar{\tau}$ defined above. For example, a radical region in this case is a neighborhood \mathcal{N}_S of radius $S = (1 + \epsilon')w$ such that $W_S < \bar{\tau}'(1 + \epsilon')^2N$, where $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ and

$$\bar{\tau}' = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\bar{\tau}N^{1/2-\epsilon}}\right) \bar{\tau}.$$

By replacing τ with $\bar{\tau}$, it can be checked that all proofs extend to the interval $1/2 < \tau < 1 - \tau_*$ for the shape theorem and the interval $1/2 < \tau < 1 - \tau^*$ for the size theorem.

7. Conclusions and Future Directions. We provide two key theorems for a spin system located on a flat torus or on \mathbb{Z}^2 . While most of the previous theoretical developments for this process focus on its final configuration behavior, our shape theorem provides a first-order characterization of the geometry of “affected nodes” at any time during the evolution phase. Our second theorem provides the first result for the size of the largest monochromatic ball of any node in the final configuration, for a given interval of the intolerance parameter. Along the way, we also provided a tight concentration bound for the spreading time of the affected nodes. We expect that the interval of τ leading to exponential monochromatic balls can be further improved using more complex geometric constructions and exploiting the new tools we provide here, namely the concentration bound and the shape theorem. Also, we only discuss the existence of an l_* norm for the shape theorem while simulations suggests an euclidean norm and this remains to be proven.

Another direction of further study could be the investigation of how the parameter of the initial distribution of the agents influences the formation of monochromatic balls, since it is only known that a single monochromatic ball occurs w.h.p. for $\tau = 1/2$ and $p \in (1 - \epsilon, 1)$, while our results are limited to the case $p = 1/2$. Finally, we point out that for $\tau = 1/2$ the behavior of the model is unknown.

Acknowledgment. The authors would like to thank Prof. Jason Schweinsberg of the Mathematics Department of University of California at San Diego for providing invaluable feedback and suggestions on earlier drafts of the paper.

References.

- [1] ALVES, O., MACHADO, F. P., POPOV, S. Y. et al. (2002). The shape theorem for the frog model. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **12** 533–546.
- [2] ARRATIA, R. (1983). Site Recurrence for Annihilating Random Walks on \mathbb{Z}_d . *Ann. Probab.* **11** 706–713.
- [3] BARMALIAS, G., ELWES, R. and LEWIS-PYE, A. (2014). Digital morphogenesis via Schelling segregation. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on* 156–165. IEEE.
- [4] BARMALIAS, G., ELWES, R. and LEWIS-PYE, A. (2015a). Minority population in the one-dimensional Schelling model of segregation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.02497*.
- [5] BARMALIAS, G., ELWES, R. and LEWIS-PYE, A. (2015b). Tipping points in 1-dimensional Schelling models with switching agents. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **158** 806–852.
- [6] BARMALIAS, G., ELWES, R. and LEWIS-PYE, A. (2016). Unperturbed Schelling Segregation in Two or Three Dimensions. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **164** 1460–1487.
- [7] BHAKTA, P., MIRACLE, S. and RANDALL, D. (2014). Clustering and mixing times for segregation models on \mathbb{Z}^d . In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms* 327–340. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [8] BRANDT, C., IMMORLICA, N., KAMATH, G. and KLEINBERG, R. (2012). An analysis of one-dimensional Schelling segregation. In *Proceedings of the forty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing* 789–804. ACM.
- [9] CAPUTO, P. and MARTINELLI, F. (2006). Phase ordering after a deep quench: the stochastic Ising and hard core gas models on a tree. *Probability theory and related fields* **136** 37–80.
- [10] CASTELLANO, C., FORTUNATO, S. and LORETO, V. (2009). Statistical physics of social dynamics. *Reviews of modern physics* **81** 591.
- [11] CHOPARD, B. and DROZ, M. (1998). *Cellular automata*. Springer.
- [12] DRAIEF, M. and MASSOULI, L. (2010). *Epidemics and rumours in complex networks*. Cambridge University Press.
- [13] DREWITZ, A., RÁTH, B. and SAPOZHNIKOV, A. (2014). On chemical distances and shape theorems in percolation models with long-range correlations. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **55** 083307.
- [14] EASLEY, D. and KLEINBERG, J. (2010). *Networks, crowds, and markets: Reasoning about a highly connected world*. Cambridge University Press.

- [15] ERDOS, P. and NEY, P. (1974). Some problems on random intervals and annihilating particles. *The Annals of Probability* **2** 828–839.
- [16] FONTES, L. R., SCHONMANN, R. and SIDORAVICIUS, V. (2002). Stretched exponential fixation in stochastic Ising models at zero temperature. *Communications in mathematical physics* **228** 495–518.
- [17] FORTUIN, C. M., KASTELEYN, P. W. and GINIBRE, J. (1971). Correlation inequalities on some partially ordered sets. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **22** 89–103.
- [18] GRIMMETT, G. (1999). Percolation, second ed. *Springer* **321**.
- [19] HAMMERSLEY, J. M. and WELSH, D. J. (1965). First-passage percolation, subadditive processes, stochastic networks, and generalized renewal theory. In *Bernoulli 1713, Bayes 1763, Laplace 1813* 61–110. Springer.
- [20] HETHCOTE, H. W. (2000). The mathematics of infectious diseases. *SIAM review* **42** 599–653.
- [21] HOLDEN, N. and SHEFFIELD, S. (2018). Scaling limits of the Schelling model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03346*.
- [22] IMMORLICA, N., KLEINBERG, R., LUCIER, B. and ZADOMIGHADDAM, M. (2017). Exponential Segregation in a Two-dimensional Schelling Model with Tolerant Individuals. 984–993.
- [23] JACKSON, M. O. and WATTS, A. (2002). On the formation of interaction networks in social coordination games. *Games and Economic Behavior* **41** 265–291.
- [24] KANORIA, Y., MONTANARI, A. et al. (2011). Majority dynamics on trees and the dynamic cavity method. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **21** 1694–1748.
- [25] KESTEN, H. (1980). The critical probability of bond percolation on the square lattice equals $1/2$. *Communications in mathematical physics* **74** 41–59.
- [26] KESTEN, H. (1986). Aspects of first passage percolation. *École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint Flour XIV-1984* 125–264.
- [27] KESTEN, H. (1993). On the Speed of Convergence in First-Passage Percolation. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **3** 296–338.
- [28] KLEINBERG, J. (2007). Cascading behavior in networks: Algorithmic and economic issues. *Algorithmic game theory* **24** 613–632.
- [29] LIGGETT, T. (2012). *Interacting particle systems* **276**. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [30] LIGGETT, T. M. (2013). *Stochastic interacting systems: contact, voter and exclusion processes* **324**. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [31] MEYER-ORTMANN, H. (2003). Immigration, integration and ghetto formation. *International Journal of Modern Physics C* **14** 311–320.
- [32] MOBIUS, M. M. and ROSENBLAT, T. (2000). The formation of ghettos as a local interaction phenomenon. *Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University*.
- [33] MORRIS, R. (2011). Zero-temperature Glauber dynamics on \mathbb{Z}^d . *Probability theory and related fields* **149** 417–434.
- [34] OMIÐVAR, H. and FRANCESCHETTI, M. (2018). Self-organized Segregation on the Grid. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **170** 748–783.
- [35] SCHELLING, T. C. (1969). Models of Segregation. *The American Economic Review* **59** 488–493.
- [36] SCHELLING, T. C. (1971). Dynamic models of segregation. *Journal of mathematical sociology* **1** 143–186.
- [37] SCHULZE, C. (2005). Potts-like model for ghetto formation in multi-cultural societies. *International Journal of Modern Physics C* **16** 351–355.
- [38] STAUFFER, D. and SOLOMON, S. (2007). Ising, Schelling and self-organising segregation. *The European Physical Journal B-Condensed Matter and Complex Systems* **57**

- 473–479.
- [39] TALAGRAND, M. (1995). Concentration of measure and isoperimetric inequalities in product spaces. *Publications Mathématiques de l’IHES* **81** 73–205.
 - [40] TESSERA, R. (2017). Speed of convergence in first passage percolation and geodesicity of the average distance. *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré*.
 - [41] YOUNG, H. P. (2001). *Individual strategy and social structure: An evolutionary theory of institutions*. Princeton University Press.
 - [42] ZHANG, J. (2004a). A dynamic model of residential segregation. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* **28** 147–170.
 - [43] ZHANG, J. (2004b). Residential segregation in an all-integrationist world. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **54** 533–550.
 - [44] ZHANG, J. (2011). Tipping and Residential Segregation: A Unified Schelling Model*. *Journal of Regional Science* **51** 167–193.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT,
9500 GILMAN DRIVE, LA JOLLA, CA 92093
E-MAIL: homidvar@ucsd.edu
mfrances@ucsd.edu