SCALING RELATIONS FOR 2D-PERCOLATION

By

HARRY KESTEN

IMA Preprint Series # 241

May 1986

INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS AND ITS APPLICATIONS

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

514 Vincent Hall

206 Church Street S.E.

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

#	Author(s)	Title	Recent IMA Preprints	(Limited number of preprints are available on request.)
#	Author(s)	Title	#	Author(s)
120	D.R.J. Callingham	Three Introductory Lectures on Differential Topology and its Applications	158	M. Bircoll and D. Mosco, Wiener Estimates for Parabolic Obstacle Problems
121	Giorgio Vergara Caffarelli	Green's Formulas for Linearized Problems with Live Loads	159	E. Scaett and W. Zame, Prices and Bargaining in Cooperative Games
122	F. Chiarenza and N. Garofalo	Unique Continuation for Nonnegative Solutions of Schrödinger Operators	160	K.A. Harris and Y. Sibuya, The n -th Roots of Solutions of Linear Ordinary Differential Equations
123	J.L. Ericksen	Constitutive Theory for some Constrained Elastic Crystals	161	Millard F. Seatty, Some Dynamical Problems in Continuum Physics
124	Minoru Murata	Positive solutions of Schrödinger Equations	162	P. Baren and D. Phillips, Large-Time Behavior of Solutions to a Scalar Conservation Law in Several Space Dimensions
125	John Maddocks and Gareth P. Parry	A Model for Twinning	163	A. Novick-Cohen, Interfacial Instabilities in Directional Solidification of Dilute Binary Alloys: The Kuramoto-Sivashinsky Equation
126	M. Kameko and M. Mosers	The Core of a Game with a Continuum of Players and Finite Coalitions: Nonemptiness with Bounded Sizes of Coalitions	164	H.F. Weinberger, On Metastable Patterns in Parabolic Systems
127	William Zame	Equilibria in Production Economies with an Infinite Dimensional Commodity Space	165	D. Arnold and R.S. Falk, Continuous Dependence on the Elastic Coefficients for a Class of Anisotropic Materials
128	Myrna Holtz Mosers	A Tiebout Theorem	166	I.J. Bakelman, The Boundary Value Problems for Non-linear Elliptic Equation and the Maximum Principle for Euler-Lagrange Equations
129	Abstracts for the Workshop on Theory and Applications of Liquid Crystals		167	Ingo Müller, Gases and Rubbers
130	Yoshikazu Giga	A Remark on A Priori Bounds for Global Solutions of Semi-linear Heat Equations	168	Ingo Müller, Pseudoplasticity in Shape Memory Alloys - an Extreme Case of Thermoplasticity
131	M. Chiari and G. Vergara-Caffarelli	The n -Membranes Problem	169	Luis Mazariños, Persistence and Smoothness of Hyperbolic Invariant Manifolds for Functional Differential Equations
132	P.L. Lions	Liouville's Theorem, Differential Games and Directional Derivatives of Viscosity Solutions of Isaacs' Equations II	170	A. Daniell and M. Vogelius, Homogenization limits of the Equations of Elasticity in Thin Domains
133	G. Capriz and P. Giovine	On Virtual Effects During Diffusion of a Dispersed Medium in a Suspension	171	H.C. Simpson and S.J. Spector, On Hadamard Stability in Finite Elasticity
134	Fall Quarter Seminar Abstracts		172	J.L. Vazquez and G. Varar, Isolated Singularities of the Solutions of the Schrödinger Equation with a Radial Potential
135	Umberto Mosco	Wiener Criterion and Potential Estimates for the Obstacle Problem	173	G. Dal Maso and U. Mosco, Wiener's Criterion and L^1 -Convergence
136	Chi-Sing Man	Dynamic Admissible States, Negative Absolute Temperature, and the Entropy Maximum Principle	174	John H. Maddocks, Stability and Folds
137	Abstracts for the Workshop on Oscillation Theory, Computation, and Methods of Compensated Compactness		175	R. Hardt and D. Kinderlehrer, Existence and Partial Regularity of Static Liquid Crystal Configurations
138	Arje Leizerowitz	Tracking Nonperiodic Trajectories with the Overtaking Criterion	176	M. Morokoff, Construction of Smooth Ergodic Cocycles for Systems with Fast Periodic Approximations
139	Arje Leizerowitz	Convex Sets in R^n as Affine Images of some Fixed Set in R^n	177	J.L. Ericksen, Local Equilibrium Configurations of Elastic Crystals
140	Arje Leizerowitz	Stochastic tracking with the Overtaking Criterion	178	Patricio Aviles, Global Behavior of Solutions of Some Elliptic Equations
141	Abstracts from the Workshop on Amorphous Polymers and Non-Newtonian Fluids		179	S.-N. Chow and R. Lauterbach, A Bifurcation Theorem for Critical Points of Variational Problems
142	Winter Quarter Seminar Abstracts		180	R. Pego, Phase Transitions: Stability and Admissibility in One Dimensional Nonlinear Viscosity
143	D.G. Aronson and J.L. Vazquez	The Porous Medium Equation as a Finite-speed Approximation to a Hamilton-Jacobi Equation	181	W. Zame, Existence, Uniqueness and Partial Regularity
144	E. Sanchez-Palencia and H. Weinberger	On the Edge Singularities of a Composite Conducting Medium	182	J. Sone, Fully Discrete Galerkin Methods for the Korteweg De Vries Equation
145	Jon C. Luke	Soliton Solutions in a Class of Fully Discrete Nonlinear Wave Equations	183	J. Maddocks and J. Keller, Mechanics of Robes
146	Chi-Sing Man and H. Cohen	A Coordinate-Free Approach to the Kinematics of Membranes	184	F. Bernis, Qualitative Properties for some nonlinear higher order Nonlinear Higher Order Parabolic Equations with Absorption
147	J.L. Lions	Asymptotic Problems in Distributed Systems	185	S. Reichstein and S. Reiter, Game Forms with Minimal Strategy Spaces
148	Reiner Lauterbach	An Example of Symmetry Breaking with Submaximal Isotropy Subgroup	186	T. Ding, An Answer to Littlewood's Problem on Boundedness
149	Abstracts from the Workshop on Metastability and Incompletely Posed Problems		187	J. Ding, An Answer to Littlewood's Problem on Boundedness
150	B. Buzer-Karakiewicz and Jerry Sone	Wave-dominated Shelves: A Model of Sand-Ridge Formation by Progressive, Infragravity Waves	188	J. Rubinstein and R. Moura, Dispersion and Convolution in Periodic Media
151	Abstracts from the Workshop on Dynamical Problems in Continuum Physics		189	K.H. Fleming and P.E. Sogge, Asymptotic Series and the Method of Vanishing Viscosity
152	V.I. Ollier	The problem of Embedding S^n into R^n with Prescribed Gauss	190	H. Beirão da Veiga, Existence and Asymptotic Behavior for Strong Solutions of Navier-Stokes Equations in the Whole Space
153	R. Batra	The force on a Lattice Defect in an Elastic Body	191	L.A. Caffarelli, J.L. Vazquez, and M.I. Molanski, Lipschitz Continuity of Solutions and Interfaces of the N -Dimensional Porous Medium Equation
154	J. Flückiger and Michael Lapidus	Eigenvalues of Elliptic Boundary Value Problems with and Indefinite Weight Function	192	R. Johnson, m -Functions and Floquet Exponents for Linear Differential System: $-A = F(U)$ in R^n
155	R. Kohn and M. Vogelius	Thin Plates with Rapidly Varying Thickness, and Their relation to Structural Optimization	193	F.V. Atkinson and L.A. Pletzer, Ground States and Dirichlet Problems for $-A = F(U)$ in R^n
156	M. Gurtin	Some Results and Conjectures in the Gradient Theory of Phase Transitions	194	G. Dal Maso, U. Mosco, The Wiener Modulus of a Radial Measure
157	A. Novick-Cohen	Energy Methods for the Cahn-Hilliard Equation	195	H. A. Levine and H.F. Weinberger, Inequalities between Dirichlet and Neuman Eigenvalues
			196	J. Rubinstein, On the Macroscopic Description of Slow Viscous Flow Past a Random Array of Spheres
			197	G. Dal Maso and U. Mosco, Wiener Criteria and Energy Decay for Relaxed Dirichlet Problems

- Recent IMA Preprints (continued)
#	Author(s)	Title	#	Author(s)	Title
198	V. Ollker and P. Weitzman,	On the Monge-Ampere Equation Arising in the
Reflect Mapping Problem	237	W.H. Fleming, S.J. Shen and H.M. Sonner,	On Existence of the Dominant Eigen-
function and its Application to the Large Deviation Properties of a
Ergodic Markov Process
199	M. Chipot, D. Kinderlehrer and L. Caffarelli,	Some Smoothness
Properties of Linear Laminae	238	R. Jansen and P.E. Soganiidis,	A Regularity Result for Viscosity Solutions
of Hamilton-Jacobi Equations in one Space Dimension
200	Y. Giga and R. Kohn,	Characterizing Blow-up Using Similarity Variables	239	B. Bociar-Karakli, J.L. Bona and B.L. Cohen,	Interaction of Shallow-Water
Waves and Bottom Topography
201	P. Cannarsa and H. M. Sener,	On the Singularities of the Viscosity
Solutions to Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman Equations	240	F. Colonius and W. Klemmann,	Infinite Time Optimal Control and Periodicity
Conservation Laws
202	Andrew Majda,	Nonlinear Geometric Optics for Hyperbolic Systems of
Conservation Laws			
203	G. Buttazzo, G. Dal Maso and U. Mosco,	A Derivation Theorem for Capacities
with Respect to a Radon Measure			
204	S. Cowin, M. Mehrabadi,	On the Identification of Material Symmetry for
Anisotropic Elastic Materials			
205	R.W.R. Darling,	Constructing Nonhomeomorphic Stochastic Flows.			
206	M. Chipot,	On the Reynolds Lubrication Equation			
207	R.V. Kohn and G.W. Milton,	On Bounding the Effective Conductivity of
Anisotropic Composites			
208	I.J. Bakieman,	Notes Concerning the Torsion of Hardening Rods and its
N-Dimensional Generalizations			
209	I.J. Bakieman,	The Boundary Value Problems for Non-Linear Elliptic Equations II.			
210	Guangfu Gong & Mingqin Qian,	On the Large Deviation Functions of Markov Chains			
211	Arle Leizarowitz,	Control Problems with Random and Progressively Known Targets			
212	R.W.R. Darling,	Ergodicity of a Measure-Valued Markov Chain Induced by
Random Transformations			
213	G. Gong, M. Qian & Zhongxin Zhao,	Killed Diffusions and its Conditioning			
214	Arle Leizarowitz,	Controlling Diffusion Processes on Infinite Horizon with
the Overtaking Criterion			
215	Millard Seafly,	The Poisson Function of Finite Elasticity			
216	David Terman,	Traveling Wave Solutions Arising From a Combustion Model			
217	Yuh-Jia Lee,	Sharp Inequalities and Regularity of Heat Semi-Group on
Infinite Dimensional Spaces			
218	D. Stroock,	Lecture Notes			
219	Claudio Canuto,	Spectral Methods and Maximum Principle			
220	Thomas O'Brien,	A Two Parameter Family of Pension Contribution Functions
and Stochastic Optimization			
221	Takeyuki Hida,	Analysis of Brownian Functionals			
222	Leonid Hurwicz,	On Informational Decentralization and Efficiency of
Resource Allocation Mechanisms			
223	E.B. Fabes and D.W. Stroock,	A New Proof of Moser's Parabolic Harnack
Inequality via the Old Ideas of Nash			
224	Minoru Murata,	Structure of Positive Solution to $(-\Delta + V)u = 0$ in R^n			
225	Paul Dupuis,	Large Deviations Analysis of Reflected Diffusions and
Constrained Stochastic Approximation Algorithms in Convex Sets			
226	F. Bernis,	Existence Results for Doubly Nonlinear Higher Order Parabolic
Equations on Unbounded Domains.			
227	S. Grey and S. Pelikan,	Large Deviations Principles for Stationary Processes
of Minimal Surfaces.			
228	R. Gulliver and S. Hildebrandt,	Boundary Configurations Spanning Continua
of Minimal Surfaces.			
229	J. Baxter, G. Dal Maso & U. Mosco,	Stopping Times and T-Convergence.			
230	Julio Boulliet,	Self-Similar Solutions, Having Jumps and Intervals of
Constancy of a Diffusion-Heat Conduction Equation			
231	R. Hardt, D. Kinderlehrer & F.-H. Lin,	A Remark About the Stability of
Smooth Equilibrium Configurations of Static Liquid Crystals.			
232	M. Chipot and M. Luskin,	The Compressible Reynolds Lubrication Equation			
233	J.H. Maddocks,	A Model for Disclinations in Nematic Liquid Crystal			
234	C. Foias, G.R. Sell and R. Temam,	Inertial Manifolds for Nonlinear
Evolutionary Equations			
235	P.L. Chow,	Expectation Functionals Associated with Some Stochastic Evolution
Equations			
236	Giuseppe Buttazzo,	Reinforcement by a Thin Layer with Oscillating Thickness			

Institute for Mathematics and its Applications,

DEPT.

\$ JOB NUMBER

MAIN SHOP ↑

Preprint list									
Front	79	81	83	inside inside back cover					
Back	80	82	84	back cover					

↖ MAIN SHOP

[illegible]

SCALING RELATIONS FOR 2D-PERCOLATION

Harry Kesten¹

Department of Mathematics
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853

ABSTRACT: We prove that the relations

$$\beta = \frac{2\nu}{\delta + 1}, \quad \gamma = 2\nu \frac{\delta - 1}{\delta + 1}, \quad \Delta = 2\nu \frac{\delta}{\delta + 1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta = \frac{4}{\delta + 1},$$

hold for the usual critical exponents for 2D percolation, provided the exponents δ and ν exist. Even without the last assumption various relations (inequalities) are obtained for the singular behavior near the critical point of the correlation length, the percolation probability, and the average cluster size. We show that in our models the above critical exponents have the same value for approach of p to the critical probability from above and from below.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is widely believed (see for instance [6], [10], [26]; also [25] for critical exponents in general) that various quantities in percolation behave like powers of $|p - p_c|$ as p approaches the critical probability p_c . To express these conjectures we use the following notation for site percolation on a periodic graph $\mathcal{G}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ (see [13], Ch. 1-3 for a precise description of the terminology). P_p denotes the probability measure according to which all sites of $\mathcal{G}$ are, independently of each other, occupied (vacant) with probability p (respectively $q := 1 - p$). E_p denotes expectation with respect to the probability measure P_p . W is the occupied cluster of a certain preselected site w_0 , which will be taken to be the origin $\underline{0}$ whenever possible.

#W = number of sites in W ,

¹ Research supported by the NSF through grants to Cornell University and to the Institute for Mathematics and its Applications, Minneapolis.

$A \rightsquigarrow B$ means that there exists an occupied path on $\mathcal{G}$ from some site in A to some site in B ,

$$\theta(p) = \text{percolation probability} = P_p\{\#W = \infty\},$$

$$p_c = \text{critical probability} = \sup \{p: \theta(p) = 0\}.$$

$$A(p) = \text{average number of clusters per site}$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} P_p\{\#W = n\} = E_p\{[\#W]^{-1}\}.$$

$$\tau(p, x, y) = P_p\{x \rightsquigarrow y\},$$

$$\chi(p) = E_p\{\#W: \#W < \infty\} = \sum_{n < \infty} n P_p\{\#W = n\},$$

$$\xi(p) = \text{correlation length}$$

$$= \left[\frac{1}{\chi(p)} \sum_y |y|^2 P_p\{w_0 \rightsquigarrow y \text{ and } \#W < \infty\} \right]^{1/2},$$

$$\text{where } |y| = \max\{|y(i)|: 1 \leq i \leq d\} \text{ when } y = y(1), \dots, y(d).$$

(This choice of distance is the most convenient one for our purposes, but the results would be the same with the Euclidean distance instead.) The correlation length is thought to be a "typical radius" of a finite cluster. It is roughly the root mean square average distance to w_0 of points in the finite cluster of w_0 , where the averaging refers to averaging over the finite cluster (see also Cor. 2 below).

We shall abbreviate P_{p_c} to P_{cr} .

Stated in this notation, the principal conjectures concerning power laws are as follows:

$$\xi(p) \approx |p - p_c|^{-\nu} \text{ for some } \nu > 0, \quad (1.1)$$

$$|\Delta''(p)| \approx |p - p_c|^{-1-\alpha} \text{ for some } -1 < \alpha < 0, \quad (1.2)$$

$$\theta(p) \approx (p - p_c)^\beta, \quad p > p_H, \text{ for some } 0 < \beta < 1, \quad (1.3)$$

$$\chi(p) \approx |p - p_c|^{-\gamma} \text{ for some } \gamma > 0, \quad (1.4)$$

$$\frac{E_p \{[\#W]^k; \#W < \infty\}}{E_p \{[\#W]^{k-1}; \#W < \infty\}} \approx |p - p_c|^{-\Delta_k}, \quad k \geq 2, \\ \text{for some } \Delta_k > 0, \quad (1.5)$$

$$P_{cr} \{n \leq \#W < \infty\} \approx n^{-1/\delta}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \\ \text{for some } \delta > 0, \quad (1.6)$$

and finally, if $\mathcal{G}$ is a d -dimensional graph

$$\tau(p_c, w_0, x) = P_{cr} \{w_0 \rightsquigarrow x\} \approx |x|^{2-d-\eta}, \quad |x| \rightarrow \infty, \\ \text{for some } \eta > 0. \quad (1.7)$$

The meaning of $A(p) \approx |p - p_c|^\zeta$ is that

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow p_c} \frac{\log A(p)}{\log |p - p_c|} = \zeta. \quad (1.8)$$

Often one distinguishes approach to p_c from the right and left and associates exponents ζ_+ and ζ_- to the limit as $p \downarrow p_c$, or $p \uparrow p_c$, respectively. In the results here the exponents always come out to be the same for the two sides, so we shall not distinguish the plus and minus versions of the exponents. (1.6) and (1.7) are meant similarly as limit relations for $(\log n)^{-1}$, or $(\log |x|)^{-1}$ respectively, times the logarithm of the left hand side.

In addition to the power laws (1.1)-(1.7), it is believed that the exponents satisfy the following so called scaling laws for low enough d :

$$\alpha = 2 - dv, \quad (1.9)$$

$$\beta = \frac{dv}{\delta + 1} , \quad (1.10)$$

$$\gamma = dv \frac{\delta - 1}{\delta + 1} , \quad (1.11)$$

$$\Delta_k = dv \frac{\delta}{\delta + 1} , \quad k \geq 1, \quad (1.12)$$

$$\eta = 2 - d \frac{\delta - 1}{\delta + 1} . \quad (1.13)$$

The values of these exponents are even supposed to be universal, i.e., dependent on d only, but not on the specific graph .

As far as we know none of the power laws has been proven for percolation, and the only scaling law which has been proven so far is (1.13) for $d = 2$ ([14]) under the assumption that η and δ make sense, i.e., that (1.6) and (1.7) hold. (Actually it suffices to assume (1.7).) A number of inequalities between the exponents have been proven (again under the assumption that the appropriate power laws hold; cf. [8], [9], [19]) but these do not imply any of the equalities (1.9)-(1.13). The above conjectures are based on a more fundamental scaling ansatz of the form

$$P_p\{\#W = n\} \sim n^{1-\tau} f(|p - p_c| n^\sigma) \quad (1.14)$$

or

$$P_p\{w_0 \rightsquigarrow x | \#W < \infty\} \sim |x|^{2-d-\eta} g\left(\frac{|x|}{\xi(p)}\right) \quad (1.15)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, respectively $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, $p \rightarrow p_c$ for some constants τ, σ, η and some decent functions f, g . g is assumed to satisfy

$$\lim_{s \downarrow 0} g(s) = g(0) > 0, \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} g(s) = 0 . \quad (1.16)$$

(1.14) and (1.15) are supposedly standard asymptotic relations - that is the ratio of the right and left hand side tends to 1 - when $p \rightarrow p_c$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$ or

$|x| \rightarrow \infty$ such that $|p - p_c|n^\sigma$ or $|x|(\xi(p))^{-1}$, respectively, converge to a constant. In particular (1.15) and (1.16) show that

$$P_p\{w_0 \rightsquigarrow x | \#W < \infty\} \text{ and } P_{c_r}\{w_0 \rightsquigarrow x | \#W < \infty\} \quad (1.17)$$

should be approximately equal when $|x|$ is small with respect to the correlation length. This may be the basis for the folklore that in some vague sense the whole percolation picture on a scale small with respect to the correlation length looks like percolation at criticality.

Throughout this paper we take $d = 2$. We shall prove (1.10)-(1.12) for a number of two-dimensional percolation models under the assumption that (1.1) and (1.6) hold. Actually we shall replace (1.6) by

$$\pi(n) = \pi(p_c, n) \approx n^{-1/\delta_r} \quad (1.18)$$

for some $\delta_r > 0$, where

$$\pi(p, n) := P_p\{w_0 \rightsquigarrow \partial S(n)\} \text{ and} \quad (1.19)$$

$$S(n) = [-n, n] \times [-n, n]. \quad (1.20)$$

It was shown in [14] that (1.18) is equivalent to (1.7) in the two-dimensional case. Either one of these power laws implies (1.6) and (1.13) with $2\delta_r = (\delta + 1)$. At this moment we are unable to prove any scaling relation involving α , but this paper shows that for two dimensional percolation all the scaling relations (1.10)-(1.13) are valid, once the appropriate power laws hold. Actually, the basis of our results is a number of useful inequalities which do not rely on the power laws (see Theorems 1-3). The most fundamental one is Theorem 1 which gives a weak form of the above mentioned folklore belief on the behavior on a scale small with respect to the correlation length.

For simplicity we restrict ourselves here to bond- or site percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ or percolation on their matching graphs (see [13], 2.2 for matching pairs of graphs). As done in [13], Sect. 2.5 and 3.1, we treat bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ as site percolation on the covering graph of $\mathbb{Z}^2$. For the remainder we take $w_0 = \underline{0}$, the origin, so that W stands for the occupied cluster of the origin. Site percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ is in a sense more interesting than bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$, because the former is not self dual. As we shall see in Sect. 4, this will call for special arguments to prove equality of the critical exponents for $p \uparrow p_c$ and $p \downarrow p_c$.

Our arguments seem to go through for site percolation on any matching pair of two-dimensional graphs which are invariant under reflection in one of the coordinate axes and under rotation around the origin by an angle $\phi \in (0, \pi)$. This includes all standard two-dimensional lattices, and in particular the triangular and honeycomb lattices. The main thing to check is that (2.15) below and the Russo-Seymour-Welsh lemma hold for such graphs. This can be done by the methods of [13], Appl. (v) on p. 66 and Ch. 6, and [21] - [23].

Despite the preceding definition of correlation length we shall work with another length, $L(p)$, defined in terms of the crossing probabilities of squares. Only later will we show that² $L(p) \asymp \xi(p)$. We note that $L(p)$ was already introduced in [5], Sect. 3, where it was shown to be equivalent (up to logarithmic factors) to the correlation length defined in yet another way. When we are dealing with site percolation on the graph $\mathcal{G}$, let $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}^*)$ be the corresponding matching pair of graphs (see [13], Sect. 2.2). We then define for $\bar{n} = (n_1, n_2)$ the "sponge crossing probabilities"

² $A(p) \asymp B(p)$ for two functions A and B means that

$$0 < \liminf_{p \rightarrow p_c} \frac{A(p)}{B(p)} \leq \limsup_{p \rightarrow p_c} \frac{A(p)}{B(p)} < \infty,$$

so that $A(p)$ and $B(p)$ are of the same order of magnitude.

$\sigma(\bar{n}; i, p) = \sigma(\bar{n}; i, p, \mathcal{G}) = P_p\{ \exists \text{ occupied crossing in the } i\text{-direction on } \mathcal{G} \text{ of } [0, n_1] \times [0, n_2] \},$

$\sigma^*(\bar{n}; i, p) = \sigma^*(\bar{n}; i, p, \mathcal{G}) = \sigma(\bar{n}; i, 1 - p, \mathcal{G}^*) = P_p\{ \exists \text{ vacant crossing in the } i\text{-direction on } \mathcal{G}^* \text{ of } [0, n_1] \times [0, n_2] \}.$

Here $i = 1$ or 2 and a crossing in the $1(2)$ direction will usually be called a horizontal (vertical) crossing. We remind the reader that a horizontal (vertical) crossing of $[0, n_1] \times [0, n_2]$ is a path with all its vertices, except for its endpoints, in the interior $(0, n_1) \times (0, n_2)$. We define

$$L(p) = L(p, \epsilon) = L(p, \epsilon, \mathcal{G}) = \begin{cases} \min\{n: \sigma((n, n); 1, p)\} \geq 1 - \epsilon & \text{if } p > p_c, \\ \min\{n: \sigma((n, n); 1, p)\} \leq \epsilon & \text{if } p < p_c. \end{cases} \quad (1.21)$$

For the graphs which we are considering there is symmetry between the horizontal and vertical direction so that $L(p)$ would not change if we used vertical crossing probabilities instead of horizontal crossing probabilities in (1.21). Furthermore, it holds for our graphs that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma((n, n); 1, p) + \sigma^*((n, n); 2, p) &\geq 1, \\ \sigma((n, n); 1, p) + \sigma^*((n - 1, n); 2, p) &\leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (1.22)$$

Therefore, $L(p, \epsilon, \mathcal{G})$ for $p < p_c = p_c(\mathcal{G})$ is essentially the same as $L(1 - p, \epsilon, \mathcal{G}^*)$ for $1 - p > 1 - p_c(\mathcal{G}) = p_c(\mathcal{G}^*)$. For the self dual case of bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ (for which $p_c = \frac{1}{2}$) we find that $L(\frac{1}{2} + \delta, \epsilon) \sim L(\frac{1}{2} - \delta, \epsilon)$, $\delta > 0$. However, it is far less obvious that even for site-percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$

$$L(p_c + \delta, \epsilon) \asymp L(p_c - \delta, \epsilon), \quad \delta \downarrow 0, \quad (1.23)$$

for fixed $\epsilon \leq$ some small ϵ_0 , defined below. This implies $v_+ = v_-$, where v_+ and v_- are the exponents in (1.1) corresponding to $p \uparrow p_c$ and $p \downarrow p_c$, respectively. This is also the reason why the other critical exponents (assuming they exist) are the same for $p \uparrow p_c$ and $p \downarrow p_c$. (1.23) will be proven in Sect. 4, (see Theorem 3.1), where it will also be shown that

$$L(p, \epsilon_1) \asymp L(p, \epsilon_2) \text{ for fixed } 0 < \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \leq \epsilon_0. \quad (1.24)$$

It should be noted that no symmetry between $p < p_c$ and $p > p_c$ is used in Sect. 2, 3. These sections only have to deal with p on one side of p_c at a time.

Here are our other principal results.

Theorem 1. There exist constants³ $0 < C_1, C_2 < \infty$ such that

$$C_1 \leq \frac{\pi(p, n)}{\pi(p_c, n)} \leq C_2 \text{ for all } n \leq L(p, \epsilon_0).$$

Theorem 2. For $p > p_c$

$$\pi(p_c, L(p, \epsilon_0)) \leq \frac{1}{C_1} \pi(p, L(p, \epsilon_0)) \leq C_3 \theta(p)$$

$$\leq C_3 \pi(p, L(p, \epsilon_0)) \leq C_4 \pi(p_c, L(p, \epsilon_0)).$$

Corollary 1. If (1.18) holds, then

$$\theta(p) \approx [L(p, \epsilon_0)]^{-1/\delta_r} = [L(p, \epsilon_0)]^{-2/(\delta+1)}.$$

If in addition (1.1) holds, then $\beta = 2\nu/(\delta + 1)$.

³ In the sequel C_i will always stand for a strictly positive finite constant whose precise value is of little importance. The value of C_i may be different at different appearances. Practically all these constants depend on ϵ_0 , to be fixed in Sect. 2.

Theorem 3. For $t > \frac{1}{3}$

$$E_p \{ [\#W]^t; \#W < \infty \} \asymp [L(p, \epsilon_0)]^{2t} [\pi(p_c, L(p, \epsilon_0))]^{t+1}, \quad (1.25)$$

and for all $t > 0$

$$\sum_y |y|^t P_p \{ \underline{0} \rightsquigarrow y \text{ and } \#W < \infty \} \asymp [L(p, \epsilon_0)]^{t+2} [\pi(p_c, L(p, \epsilon_0))]^2. \quad (1.26)$$

Corollary 2. $\xi(p) \asymp L(p, \epsilon_0)$,

$$\frac{E_p \{ [\#W]^t; \#W < \infty \}}{E_p \{ [\#W]^{t-1}; \#W < \infty \}} \asymp [\xi(p)]^2 \pi(p_c, \xi(p)), \quad t > \frac{4}{3},$$

and

$$\left[\frac{1}{\chi(p)} \sum_y |y|^t P_p \{ \underline{0} \rightsquigarrow y \text{ and } \#W < \infty \} \right]^{1/t} \asymp \xi(p), \quad t > 0.$$

If (1.1) and (1.18) hold then

$$\gamma = 2\nu \frac{\delta - 1}{\delta + 1}, \quad \Delta_k = 2\nu \frac{\delta}{\delta + 1}, \quad k > 2, \quad \nu > \frac{\delta + 1}{\delta},$$

and

$$\nu_k := \lim_{p \rightarrow p_c} \frac{-1}{\log|p - p_c|} \log \left[\frac{1}{\chi(p)} \sum_y |y|^k P_p \{ \underline{0} \rightsquigarrow y \text{ and } \#W < \infty \} \right]^{1/k} = \nu, \quad k > 1.$$

The proof of Theorem 1 is in Sect. 2. Theorems 2, 3 and Cor. 1,2 are proven in Sect. 3. The proofs in Sect. 3 reinforce the idea that $L(p)$ is the fundamental length scale; contributions to (1.25) and (1.26) from points y with $|y|$ much larger than $L(p)$ are negligible.

To close this introduction we tabulate some rigorous bounds which were already known or follow from the results here for the critical exponents. We also include in the table the exact values predicted by the theories of den Nijs [7], Nienhuis et al. [18], and Pearson [20], as well as the exact values on the

Bethe tree.

Rigorous bounds for 2D-percolation	"Exact" values of [7], [18], [20]	Bethe tree
$\alpha < 0$	$\alpha = -2/3$	$\alpha = -1$
$\beta < 1$	$\beta = 5/36$	$\beta = 1$
$\gamma \geq 8/5$	$\gamma = 43/18$	$\gamma = 1$
$\delta \geq 5$	$\delta = 91/5$	$\delta = 2$
$\nu > 1$	$\nu = 4/3$	$\nu = 1/2$

In particular none of the exponents α , β , γ , δ , ν have in dimension 2 the same value as on a Bethe tree. Sect. 5 contains some comments to this table.

Acknowledgement. The author wishes to thank M. Aizenman, J. and L. Chayes and R. Durrett for many helpful discussions on critical exponents. The author also thanks the IMA at the University of Minnesota for its hospitality and technical help in producing this paper.

2. THE BEHAVIOR OF $\pi(p,n)$

This section contains the proof of Theorem 1. The proof is based on a differential inequality. Aizenman and Newman [3] seem to have been the first to apply such a method in percolation theory; they used it to obtain the inequality $\gamma > 1$. Differential inequalities have also been used recently with great success by J. and L. Chayes [4] (to prove $\beta \leq 1$) and by Aizenman and Barsky [1] (to prove $p_T = p_H$). To obtain an estimate for a derivative one starts with Russo's formula ([22], [13], Ch. 4.2.). We shall need later a simple extension of this formula which we state here as Lemma 1 without proof. No essential change in the original proof is needed for this extension.

We remind the reader of some standard notion which we shall use and a couple of definitions. For a rectangle R

∂R = (topological) boundary of R ,

$\dot{R}$ = interior of R

I_A = indicator function of the event A .

A site v is pivotal for an event A if $I_A(\omega)$ changes its value when v is changed from occupied to vacant or vice versa. Here ω stands for the configuration of occupied and vacant sites. The event $\{v \text{ is pivotal for } A\}$ depends only on the sites other than v . A is an increasing (decreasing) event if changing any site from vacant to occupied can only increase (decrease) the value of I_A . We shall consider a family $\hat{P}_t$ of product measures, i.e., measures under which all vertices are independent, and with probability $p(v,t)$ that v is occupied. $p'(v,t)$ denotes $\frac{d}{dt} p(v,t)$.

Lemma 1. Let A and B be an increasing and decreasing event, respectively, each of which depends on finitely many sites only. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{d}{dt} \hat{P}_t \{A \cap B\} \\
 &= \sum_v p'(v,t) [\hat{P}_t \{v \text{ is pivotal for } A, \text{ but not for } B, \\
 & \quad \text{and } B \text{ occurs}\} - \hat{P}_t \{v \text{ is pivotal for } B, \\
 & \quad \text{but not for } A, \text{ and } A \text{ occurs}\}]. \tag{2.1}
 \end{aligned}$$

We apply this lemma here with B = the certain event (which is the original Russo formula) and $A = A(n) = \{\underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \partial S(n)\}$. It follows from Whitney's theorem (cf. [24], Theorem 2.1; also [13] Prop. 2.1) that a site v is pivotal for $A(n)$ if and only if all of the following hold (see Fig. 1):

$v \in S(n)$;

there exists a path r on $\mathcal{G}$ and inside $S(n)$ from $\underline{0}$ to some point on $\partial S(n)$ which passes through v , and has all its vertices other than v occupied;

Fig. 1. v is pivotal for $A(n)$

there exists a circuit C on $\mathcal{G}^*$ and inside $S(n)$ which passes through v , contains $\underline{0}$ in its interior, and has all its vertices other than v vacant. (If $v = \underline{0}$, then the third condition-requiring the existence of C - should be dropped.) Therefore, if $\underline{0} \neq v \in S(n)$ is pivotal for $A(n)$, then for any rectangle R with

$$\underline{0} \text{ lies outside } R, \quad v \text{ lies inside } R, \quad R \subset S(n)$$

the following two events must occur (see Fig. 2):

- a) $\Gamma(v, R) :=$ There exist two paths v_1 and v_3 on $\mathcal{G}$ from v to ∂R and two paths r_2^* and r_4^* on $\mathcal{G}^*$ from v to ∂R such that any two of these four paths only have the vertex v in common; all vertices of $r_1 \cup r_3$ other than v are occupied and all vertices of $r_2^* \cup r_4^*$ other than v are vacant; the paths r_1, r_3, r_2^* and r_4^* all are contained in R except for their endpoint on ∂R ; r_1 and r_3 separate r_2^* and r_4^* (i.e., $r_1 \cup r_3$ forms a crosscut of R such that $r_2^* \setminus v$ and $r_4^* \setminus v$ lie in different components of $R \setminus r_1 \cup r_3$).
- b) $\Xi(R) :=$ there exists two disjoint paths r' and r'' from $\underline{0}$ to ∂R and from ∂R to $\partial S(n)$, respectively, and except for their endpoints on ∂R , r' and r'' have only occupied vertices, all of which lie in $S(n) \setminus R$.

Fig. 2. Illustration of $I(v, R)$ and $E(R)$.

To see this one merely takes for r' and r'' the pieces of r from $\underline{0}$ to the first intersection with ∂R and from the last intersection with ∂R to $\partial S(n)$, respectively. r_1 and r_3 are pieces of r inside R connecting v to ∂R . Finally r_2^* and r_4^* are two pieces of C , which must exist because C contains $\underline{0}$ in its interior, so that C must leave R .

Since $I(v, R)$ and $E(R)$ depend only on vertices inside R and outside R , respectively, they are independent. Thus for any fixed choice for $R = R(v)$

$$\hat{P}_t\{v \text{ is pivotal for } A(n)\} \leq \hat{P}_t\{I(v, R)\} \hat{P}_t\{E(R)\}.$$

Thus, if we set

$$\hat{\pi}(t, n) = \hat{P}_t\{\underline{0} \leadsto \partial S(n)\} = \hat{P}_t\{A(n)\},$$

then we obtain from (2.1)

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \hat{\pi}(t, n) \right| \leq \sum_{v \in S(n)} |p'(t, v)| \hat{P}_t\{I(v, R)\} \hat{P}_t\{E(R)\}. \quad (2.2)$$

We now must make a specific choice of R for each v . For simplicity we take $n = 2^k$ for some large integer k (we later show that this is permissible). It will also turn out that we can restrict ourselves to families $\hat{P}_t$ with $p'(t,v) = \frac{d}{dt} p(t,v) = 0$ for all v with $|v| > 2^{k-3}$. Thus in (2.2) we only have to consider terms with $|v| \leq 2^{k-3}$. If $v = (v_1, v_2)$ and $|v_1| \leq |v_2| \leq 2^{k-3}$ and $16 \leq 2^{j+1} < v_2 \leq 2^{j+2}$, then let ℓ_1, ℓ_2 be such that

$$\ell_1 2^{j-2} < v_1 \leq (\ell_1 + 1) 2^{j-2}, \quad \ell_2 2^{j-2} < v_2 \leq (\ell_2 + 1) 2^{j-2}, \quad (2.3)$$

and take

$$R = R(v) = [(\ell_1 - 1) 2^j, (\ell_1 + 2) 2^j] \times [\ell_2 2^{j-2} - 2^j, \ell_2 2^{j-2} + 2^j]. \quad (2.4)$$

If $v_2 < 0$ then we choose $R(v)$ as the mirror image of $R((v_1, -v_2))$ with respect to the x -axis. If $|v_2| < |v_1|$ then we interchange the roles of the first and second coordinates in (2.3) and (2.4). As will become apparent, the precise choice of $R(v)$ is unimportant. What matters is that the ratio of the long and short side of R is bounded (in fact it is ≤ 2 for our choice), that $R \subset S(2^k)$, and that the distances from v to ∂R as well as from $\underline{0}$ to ∂R are of the same order as the sides of R in (2.4). Note that if $|v_1| \leq v_2 \leq 2^{j+2} \leq 2^{k-3}$ and $2^{j+1} < v_2$, then under (2.3) we must have

$$j \leq k - 5 \quad \text{and} \quad |\ell_1| \leq 17, \quad 8 \leq |\ell_2| \leq 17 \quad (2.5)$$

Therefore, our choice of R has the listed properties when $16 < |v| \leq 2^{k-3}$. For $|v| \leq 16$ take $R(v) = R_0 := [-16, 16] \times [-16, 16]$. This contains $\underline{0}$, but if v is pivotal for $A(2^k)$ there must still exist an occupied path from ∂R_0 to $\partial S(2^k)$, so that we still have (2.2) (even though $\underline{0} \in R_0$) if we define $\Xi(R_0)$ as $\{\partial R_0 \rightsquigarrow \partial S(\tau)\}$ and take $\hat{P}\{I(v, R_0)\} = 1$ for $|v| \leq 16$.

We can now outline the main steps of the proof of Theorem 1. We first show

that the probability of $A(2^k)$ is not changed by more than a bounded factor if $P\{v \text{ is occupied}\}$ is changed from p_c to p for every $v \in S(2^k) \setminus S(2^{k-3})$ (as long as $2^k \leq L(p, \epsilon_0)$).⁴ We then define $\hat{P}_t$ as the product measure corresponding to

$$p(t, v) = \begin{cases} p & \text{for } v \notin S(2^{k-3}), \\ tp + (1 - t)p_c & \text{for } v \in S(2^{k-3}). \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Thus $p'(t, v) = p - p_c$ for $v \in S(2^{k-3})$ and $= 0$ otherwise.

We next show that

$$\hat{P}_t \{ \Xi(R(v)) \} \leq C_3 \pi(t, 2^k) \quad (2.7)$$

for some constant C_3 independent of p, v, k, t . These first two steps are easy and were essentially proved in [15]. Combining these results with (2.2) yields, after dividing by $\pi(t, 2^k)$,

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \log \pi(t, 2^k) \right| = C_3 |p - p_c| \left[1 + \sum_{j=3}^{k-5} 2^{j+1} \sum_{|v| \leq 2^{j+2}} P_t \{ \Gamma(v, R(v)) \} \right]. \quad (2.8)$$

Now the occurrence of $\Gamma(v, R(v))$ means that v is connected to $\partial R(v)$ by four paths, which have only the vertex v in common. Two of these paths, r_1 and r_3 , are occupied while r_2^* and r_4^* are vacant (outside v). If the endpoints of r_1 and r_3 would lie on the left and right edge of $R(v)$ respectively, and r_2^* and r_4^* would have endpoints on the top and bottom edge of $R(v)$, respectively (see Fig. 3), then v would be pivotal for the event

⁴ This first step is a technicality. Unfortunately the form of our main estimate (Lemma 4) forces us to treat vertices "near the boundary" of $S(2^k)$ differently from vertices in the "central part" of $S(2^k)$. The latter fact will continue to plague us throughout the paper.

Figure 3

$C(R) := \{ \exists \text{ an occupied horizontal crossing on } \gamma \text{ of } R \}.$

The principal step in our proof is to show that the additional restriction on the endpoints of r_1, r_3, r_2^*, r_4^* does not lower the probability of $\Gamma(v, R)$ too much, i.e., that

$$\hat{P}_t \{ \Gamma(v, R(v)) \} \leq C_4 \hat{P}_t \{ v \text{ is pivotal for } C(R(v)) \} \quad (2.9)$$

when $v \in S(2^{k-3}), 2^k \leq L(p, \epsilon_0)$. Once we have this we can continue (2.8) with

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d}{dt} \log \pi(t, 2^k) \right| &\leq C_5 |p - p_c| \left[1 + \sum_j \sum_v \hat{P}_t \{ v \text{ is pivotal for } C(R(v)) \} \right] \\ &\leq C_5 |p - p_c| \left[1 + \sum_R \sum_{R(v)=R} P_t \{ v \text{ is pivotal for } C(R) \} \right] \\ &= C_5 \left[1 + \sum_R \left| \frac{d}{dt} \vartheta(R; 1, t) \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

with the slightly abusive notation

$$\delta(R;1,t) = \hat{P}_t \{C(R)\}.$$

Note that the equality in the last step of (2.10) is just (2.1) applied to $A = C(R)$ and $B =$ certain event. For the sake of argument take $p > p_c$. Then each $\delta(R;1,t)$ is increasing in t . Moreover $\hat{P}_1 = P_p$. Integration of (2.10) from $t = 0$ to $t = 1$ then gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \log \frac{\pi(p, 2^k)}{\pi(p_c, 2^k)} \right| &\leq C_6 + \left| \log \frac{\pi(p, 2^k)}{\pi(0, 2^k)} \right| \\ &\leq C_7 \left[1 + \sum_R |\delta(R;1,1) - \delta(R;1,0)| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Finally we note that the rectangles R which can occur as an $R(v)$ are of the form (2.4) (or rotations or reflections of these) and that $|x_1|$, and $|x_2|$ in (2.4) are at most 17. It follows that the right hand side of (2.11) is at most

$$C_8 \left[1 + \sum_{j=3}^{k-5} |\delta((3 \cdot 2^j, 2^{j+1}); 1, 1) - \delta((3 \cdot 2^j, 2^{j+1}); 1, 0)| \right]. \quad (2.12)$$

Since $L(p)$ is chosen such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \delta(S(L(p)); 1, 1) - \delta(S(L(p)); 1, 0) \\ &\leq \sigma((2L(p), 2L(p)); 1, p) - \sigma((2L(p), 2L(p)); 1, p_c) \end{aligned}$$

lies somewhere strictly between 0 and 1, it stands to reason that for 2^j small with respect to $2^k \leq L(p)$ the summand in (2.12) is also small. In fact we believe that there exists a constant $\zeta > 0$ such that

$$|\sigma((3 \cdot 2^j, 2^{j+1}); 1, p) - \sigma((3 \cdot 2^j, 2^{j+1}); 1, p_c)| \leq C_9 \left[\frac{2^j}{L(p)} \right]^\zeta. \quad (2.13)$$

If (2.13) would hold, then we would obtain from (2.11), (2.12) that

$$\left| \log \frac{\pi(p, 2^k)}{\pi(p_c, 2^k)} \right| \leq C_{10} \quad \text{for } 2^k \leq L(p), \quad (2.14)$$

which is essentially Theorem 1. We do not quite prove (2.13), but only the weaker inequality (2.58). Nevertheless this is good enough to yield (2.14), essentially by the indicated route.

Before turning to the nitty-gritty of the proof we assemble some basic tools. First, there exists some C_3 such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma((n,n);i,p_c,g) &> C_3 \quad \text{and} \\ \sigma^*((n,n);i,p_c,g) &> C_3, \quad i = 1,2, n \geq 1, \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

(see [22] or [13], Theorem 5.1). Now let $p > p_c$ again for the sake of argument. Then, since $\sigma((n,n);i,s,g)$ is increasing in s , we have from the definition of $L(p) = L(p, \epsilon_0)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} C_3 &< \sigma((n,n);i,s,g) < 1 - \epsilon_0 \\ \text{for } p_c &\leq s \leq p \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq n < L(p, \epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

By virtue of (1.22) we then also have

$$\sigma^*((n,n);i,s,g) > \epsilon_0, \quad p_c \leq s \leq p, \quad 1 \leq n < L(p, \epsilon_0).$$

These inequalities plus the Russo-Seymour-Welsh theorem ([21]-[23], [13], Theorem 6.1) imply that for each $k \geq 1$ there exists a $\delta_k = \delta_k(\epsilon_0, C_3) > 0$ such that

$$\sigma((kn,n);1,s,g) \geq \delta_k, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^*((kn,n);1,s,g) \geq \delta_k \quad (2.16)$$

for $p_c \leq s \leq p$, $n \leq L(p, \epsilon_0)$ and the same holds when the roles of the first and second coordinate are interchanged. Also, the same argument works for $p \leq s \leq p_c$. Even more, simple monotonicity arguments show that if $\hat{P}$ is any probability measure according to which the site v is occupied with probability $p(v)$ and all sites v are independent, then, if $p(v)$ lies between p_c and p for all v and $n \leq L(p, \epsilon_0)$, one has

$$\hat{P}\{\exists \text{ occupied horizontal crossing of } [0, kn] \times [0, n] \text{ on } \mathcal{G}\} \geq \delta_k, \quad (2.17)$$

$$\hat{P}\{\exists \text{ vacant horizontal crossing of } [0, kn] \times [0, n] \text{ on } \mathcal{G}^*\} \geq \delta_k, \quad (2.18)$$

and the same holds for vertical crossings of $[0, n] \times [0, kn]$. It also follows from this that

$$\begin{aligned} & P\{\exists \text{ occupied circuit on } \mathcal{G} \text{ surrounding} \\ & (n, (k-1)n)^2 \text{ in } [0, kn]^2 \setminus (n, (k-1)n)^2\} \geq \delta_k^4, \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

and similarly for vacant circuits on $\mathcal{G}^*$. By the same argument as used to prove (6) in [15] we now have

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{P}\{\underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \partial S(n)\} \text{ is decreasing in } n, \text{ but} \\ & \hat{P}\{\underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \partial S(2n)\} \geq C_4 \hat{P}\{\underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \partial S(n)\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

for a suitable $0 < C_4 < \infty$ independent of p , $\hat{P}$ and n , as long as $n \leq L(p, \epsilon_0)$ and

$$p(v) \text{ lies between } p_c \text{ and } p \text{ for all } v. \quad (2.21)$$

(We stress that $p < p_c$ is allowed here.) It is also easy to obtain from this the first two steps of our proof, namely if $\hat{P}_t$ is defined by (2.6), then

$$\left| \log \frac{\hat{\pi}(0, 2^k)}{\pi(p_c, 2^k)} \right| \leq C_5, \quad (2.22)$$

and (2.7) holds. (2.22) follows for $p > p_c$ from

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(p_c, 2^k) & \leq \hat{\pi}(0, 2^k) \leq \hat{\pi}(0, 2^{k-3}) \\ & = \pi(p_c, 2^{k-3}) \leq C_4^{-3} \pi(p_c, 2^k) \quad (\text{see (2.20)}). \end{aligned}$$

(The equality here holds because $p(0, v) = p_c$ for $v \in S(2^{k-3})$.)

For $p < p_c$ similar estimates apply. (2.7) follows by an argument similar to that for (6) in [14]. Consider the case with $\underline{0} \notin R = R(v) \subset S(2^k)$

$$\hat{P}_t\{\underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \partial S(2^k)\} \geq \hat{P}_t\{\underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \partial R \text{ and } \partial R \rightsquigarrow \partial S(2^k)\}$$

and there exists an occupied circuit in $\tilde{R} \setminus R$

and surrounding R ,

where $\tilde{R}$ is any rectangle containing R but $\underline{0} \notin \tilde{R} \subset S(2^k)$ (see Fig. 4).

Thus by the Harris-FKG inequality

Figure 4

$$\hat{P}_t\{\underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \partial S(2^k)\} \geq \hat{P}_t\{\exists (R)\}$$

$$P_t\{\exists \text{ occupied circuit in } \tilde{R} \setminus R \text{ surrounding } R\}.$$

By (2.3)-(2.5) we can choose $\tilde{R}$ such that $\underline{0} \notin \tilde{R} \subset S(2^k)$ and such that $\tilde{R} \setminus R$ has width at least 2^j , so that the last factor is uniformly bounded away from 0 by (2.19). Thus (2.7) holds.

Finally, we fix ϵ_0 . It follows from the proofs of Lemma 5.2, 5.3 in [13], or [2], Lemma 4.12 and eq. (4.60) (see also [19], Lemma 1) that there exist

$0 < C_6, C_7 < \infty$ and $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ with the following property. As soon as for some L

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma((L, 3L)); 1, p, \mathcal{G}) &\leq \varepsilon_1 \quad \text{and} \\ \sigma((3L, L)); 2, p, \mathcal{G}) &\leq \varepsilon_1, \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

then

$$P_p\{[-L, L]^2 \rightsquigarrow \partial S(kL)\} \leq C_6 \exp(-C_7 k). \quad (2.24)$$

Similarly, if (2.23) holds with σ replaced by σ^* , then

$$P_p\{\exists \text{ vacant path on } \mathcal{G}^* \text{ from } [-L, L]^2 \text{ to } \partial S(kL)\} \leq C_6 \exp(-C_7 k). \quad (2.25)$$

Finally, by the Russo-Seymour-Welsh lemma ([21], [22], [23] or [13], Ch. 6) we can choose $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \frac{1}{2} C_3$ (C_3 as in (2.15)) so small that

$\sigma((L, L-1); 1, p,) \leq \varepsilon_0$ implies (2.23), and similarly with σ replaced by σ^* .

For the remainder of the paper we fix $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ with this property. By the definition of $L(p, \varepsilon_0)$ and (1.22), we then also have (2.24) for $L = L(p, \varepsilon_0)$ if $p < p_c$, and (2.25) for $L = L(p, \varepsilon_0)$ if $p > p_c$.

We now begin our proof of a strengthened version of (2.8), first only for $v = \underline{0}$ and $R(v)$ a square centered at $\underline{0}$ (see Lemma 4). This requires further definitions. Let r be a path on $\mathcal{G}$ from $\underline{0}$ to $\partial S(2^k)$ in $S(2^k)$, for some $k \geq 2$. Assume that all vertices of r other than $\underline{0}$ are occupied. For the sake of argument assume that the endpoint of r lies on the right edge of $S(2^k)$, i.e., on $\{2^k\} \times [-2^k, 2^k]$. Let r' be the piece of r from its last intersection with the line $x = 2^{k-1} + 1$ to the right edge of $S(2^k)$ (see Fig. 5). r' is a crosscut of the strip $\mathcal{J}_R := [2^{k-1} + 1, 2^k] \times [-2^k, 2^k]$. Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(r, k)$ be the occupied component of r' on $\mathcal{G}$ in $\mathcal{J}_R$. Further, denote by $a = a(\mathcal{C})$ the lowest point of $\mathcal{C}$ on the right edge of $S(2^k)$. Note that a is not necessarily the endpoint of r (cf. Fig. 5). In fact one

Fig. 5 r' is the boldly drawn piece of r ; $\mathcal{C}$ consists of r' and the dashed parts.

easily sees that $a = (a(1), a(2))$ has to be the right endpoint of the lowest occupied horizontal crossing $\mathcal{R}$ of $\mathcal{J}_R$ in $\mathcal{C}$. Here the lowest crossing of $\mathcal{J}_R$ is defined as follows. Let $\mathring{\mathcal{J}}_R$ be the interior of $\mathcal{J}_R$. For any crosscut $\tilde{r}$ of $\mathcal{J}_R$, connecting the left edge and right edge of $\mathcal{J}_R$, $\mathring{\mathcal{J}}_R \setminus \tilde{r}$ consist of an upper and lower component, $\mathcal{J}^+ = \mathcal{J}^+(\tilde{r})$ and $\mathcal{J}^- = \mathcal{J}^-(\tilde{r})$. $\mathcal{J}^+$ and $\mathcal{J}^-$ are those components with $[2^{k-1} + 1, 2^k] \times \{2^k\}$ and $[2^{k-1} + 1, 2^k] \times \{-2^k\}$ as parts of their boundary, respectively. $\mathcal{R}$ is that crossing of $\mathcal{J}_R$ for which $\mathcal{J}^-(\mathcal{R})$ is minimal. For the precise definition and existence proof of $\mathcal{R}$ we should go over to the planar modification of $\mathcal{J}$ as in Sect. 2.3 of [13] and apply Prop. 2.3 of [13]. (See also Lemma 1 of [12]). We do not go into further detail since this would only obfuscate the argument at this moment.

We use similar definitions if r ends on the top, left or bottom edge of

$S(2^k)$. We define in these cases the component $\mathcal{C}(r, k)$ as the occupied component of the final piece of r in the strip $\mathcal{J}_T := [-2^k, 2^k] \times [2^{k-1}+1, 2^k]$, $\mathcal{J}_L := [-2^k, -2^{k-1} - 1] \times [-2^k, 2^k]$ or $\mathcal{J}_B := [-2^k, 2^k] \times [-2^k, -2^{k-1} - 1]$, respectively. $a(\mathcal{C})$ in these cases is the endpoint of the most "clockwise" crossing in $\mathcal{C}$ (i.e., the right most, highest and left most crossing, respectively). For a vacant crossing r^* we have similar definitions obtained by replacing "occupied and $\mathcal{g}$ " by "vacant and $\mathcal{g}^*$ ". The corresponding component and endpoint will be denoted by $\mathcal{C}^*(r^*, k)$ and $a^*(\mathcal{C}^*)$, respectively. We further use the notation

$$S(b, n) = [b(1) - n, b(1) + n] \times [b(2) - n, b(2) + n],$$

$$\overset{\circ}{S}(b, n) = (b(1) - n, b(1) + n) \times (b(2) - n, b(2) + n)$$

when $b = (b(1), b(2))$. $\overset{\circ}{S}(n) = \overset{\circ}{S}(0, n)$.

We now define an (n, k) -fence for r , or rather for $\mathcal{C}$. We say that r , or $\mathcal{C}$, has an (n, k) -fence if all three of the following conditions hold (see Fig. 6):

if s is any path on $\mathcal{g}$ from $\underline{0}$ to $\partial S(2^k)$ which lies in $\overset{\circ}{S}(2^k)$, except for its endpoint, and which has all its vertices other than $\underline{0}$ occupied, and corresponding component $\mathcal{C}(s, k)$, and if $\mathcal{C}(s, k) \cap \mathcal{C}(r, k) = \emptyset$, then

$$|a(\mathcal{C}(s, k)) - a(\mathcal{C}(r, k))| > 2\sqrt{n} 2^k, \quad (2.26)$$

if r^* is any path on $\mathcal{C}^*$ from $\underline{0}$ to $\partial S(2^k)$ which lies in $\overset{\circ}{S}(2^k)$, except for its endpoint, and which has all its vertices other than $\underline{0}$ vacant and corresponding component $\mathcal{C}^*(r^*, k)$, then

$$|a^*(\mathcal{C}^*) - a(\mathcal{C}(r, k))| > 2\sqrt{n} 2^k, \quad (2.27)$$

there exists an occupied vertical crossing s on $\mathcal{J}$ of the rectangle $(a(1), a(1) + \sqrt{n} 2^k] \times [a(2) - n 2^k, a(2) + n 2^k]$, which is connected to $\mathcal{C}(r, k)$ by an occupied path on $\mathcal{J}$ in $S(a, \sqrt{n} 2^k)$. (Here $a = a(\mathcal{C})$). (2.28)

((2.26) and (2.27) say that other components than $\mathcal{C}(r, k)$ cannot come too close to $a(\mathcal{C}(r, k))$.)

Figure 6. The small rectangle of the right is $(a(1), a(1) + \sqrt{n} 2^k] \times [a(2) - n 2^k, a(2) + n 2^k]$. The crossing s is connected to $\mathcal{C}$ by the dashed path.

As we shall see, the existence of an (n, k) -fence is useful because it allows, with a probability bounded away from zero, a "nice" extension of r to an occupied path from $\underline{0}$ to $\partial S(2^{k+1})$. Note that the fence is defined in terms of $\mathcal{C}$ only, and does not explicitly refer to r . We can therefore talk about an occupied component $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{J}_R$ having a fence. We can also define an (n, k) -fence for a vacant component $\mathcal{C}^*$ of $\mathcal{J}_R$ on $\mathcal{J}^*$ by interchanging occupied and vacant everywhere in the above. Of course if r^* is a path on $\mathcal{J}^*$ from $\underline{0}$ to the right edge of $S(2^k)$, with all its vertices except $\underline{0}$

vacant, then we say that r^* has an (n,k) -fence if the component $\mathcal{C}^*$ of the last piece of r^* crossing $\mathcal{J}_R$ has an (n,k) -fence. Finally we define an (n,k) -fence for a path from $\underline{0}$ to $\partial S(2^k)$ which ends on the top edge of $S(2^k)$ by replacing $\mathcal{J}_R$ by the strip $\mathcal{J}_T$, and the lowest crossing in $\mathcal{C}$ by the right most crossing. Also, in (2.28) we now require a horizontal crossing of $[a(1) - n2^k, a(1) + n2^k] \times [a(2), a(2) + \sqrt{n} 2^k]$ which is connected to $\mathcal{C}$ in $S(a, \sqrt{n} 2^k)$. Similarly for paths ending on the left or bottom edge of $S(2^k)$.

We shall now show that for small n the probability that every crossing of $\mathcal{J}_R$ has an (n,k) fence is close to 1. More specifically we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2. For each $\delta > 0$ there exists an $n = n(\delta) > 0$ such that, uniformly in $2^k \leq L(p, \epsilon_0)$ and $\hat{P}$ satisfying (2.21), we have

$\hat{P}\{\exists \text{ occupied horizontal crossing on } \mathcal{J} \text{ of}$

$\mathcal{J}_R = [2^{k-1} + 1, 2^k] \times [-2^k, 2^k]$ whose occupied component $\mathcal{C}$ in $\mathcal{J}_R$ does not have an (n,k) -fence\} $\leq \delta$. (2.29)

Remark: The same statement holds with "occupied on $\mathcal{J}$ " replaced by "vacant on $\mathcal{J}^*$."

Proof: Assume that there exists an occupied horizontal crossing on $\mathcal{J}_R$. Let $\mathcal{R}_1$ be the lowest such crossing and $\mathcal{C}_1$ its occupied component in $\mathcal{J}_R$. Let $a_1 = (a_1(1), a_1(2))$ be the endpoint of $\mathcal{R}_1$, and for fixed n consider the events

$E_j = E_j(n, k, \mathcal{R}_1) := \{\exists \text{ vertical crossings on } \mathcal{J} \text{ of the strips}$
 $[a_1(1) - n2^{k+j}, a_1(1) - n2^{k+j-1}] \times [a_1(2) - n2^{k+j}, a_1(2) + n2^{k+j}]$
 and $[a_1(1) + n2^{k+j-1}, a_1(1) + n2^{k+j}] \times [a_1(2) - n2^{k+j}, a_1(2) + n2^{k+j}]$,
 as well as horizontal crossings of $[a_1(1) - n2^{k+j}, a_1(1) + n2^{k+j}] \times$
 $[a_1(2) + n2^{k+j-1}, a_1(2) + n2^{k+j}]$ and $[a_1(1) - n2^{k+j}, a_1(1) + n2^{k+j}] \times$
 $[a_1(2) - n2^{k+j}, a_1(2) - n2^{k+j-1}]$; all sites on these crossings outside
 the closure of $\mathcal{J}^-(\mathcal{R}_1)$ are occupied\}.

Figure 7. The inner and outer square centered at a are $S(a, n^{2^{k+j-1}})$ and $S(a, n^{2^{k+j}})$, respectively. The solid parts of the four crossings in $S(a, n^{2^{k+j}}) \setminus S(a, n^{2^{k+j-1}})$ have to be occupied for E_j to occur.

Figure 7 makes it evident that if E_j occurs for some $j \geq 1$ with $2^j \leq n^{-1/2}$, then also (2.28) occurs. The events E_j are independent of each other since they depend on annuli with disjoint interiors. Also, conditionally on $\mathcal{R}_1$ (and hence with a_1 also given), the probability of E_j occurring is at least $\delta_4^4 > 0$. This follows from (2.17) and the fact that conditioning on $\mathcal{R}_1 = \tilde{r}$ gives no information about any vertices outside the closure of $\mathcal{J}^-(\tilde{r})$ (see [13], Prop. 2.3). Since there are⁵ $\lfloor (2 \log 2)^{-1} \log n \rfloor$ values of j with

⁵ $\lfloor a \rfloor$ denotes the largest integer $\leq a$.

$2^j \leq n^{-1/2}$, we see that

$$\hat{P}\{\exists \text{ lowest occupied horizontal crossing } \mathcal{R}_1 \text{ of } \mathcal{J}_R, \text{ but } (2.28) \text{ fails for its component } \mathcal{C}_1\} \leq (1 - \delta_4^4)^{-C_3 \log n}. \quad (2.30)$$

Now assume that $\mathcal{R}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq \sigma$, are given occupied horizontal crossings of $\mathcal{J}_R$, such that $\mathcal{R}_i$ is disjoint from $\mathcal{C}_j$, the occupied component of $\mathcal{R}_j$ in $\mathcal{J}_R$, for $i \neq j$. Then, for $i \neq j$, $\mathcal{C}_i$ lies in $\mathcal{J}_R \setminus \mathcal{R}_j$ and hence belongs to exactly one of $\mathcal{J}^-(\mathcal{R}_j)$ or $\mathcal{J}^+(\mathcal{R}_j)$. Assume the $\mathcal{R}_i$ are ordered such that $\mathcal{C}_i \subset \mathcal{J}^-(\mathcal{R}_j)$ for $i < j$, so that $\mathcal{R}_\sigma$ is the highest crossing among the $\mathcal{R}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq \sigma$. If there exists still another occupied crossing of $\mathcal{J}_R$ in $\mathcal{J}^+(\mathcal{R}_\sigma)$, let $\mathcal{R}_{\sigma+1}$ be the lowest such crossing. Denote its endpoint on the right edge of $\mathcal{J}_R$ by $a_{\sigma+1}$, and its occupied component in $\mathcal{J}_R$ by $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma+1}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}_i \subset \text{closure of } \mathcal{J}^-(\mathcal{R}_{\sigma+1})$ for $1 \leq i \leq \sigma$ in this case, and hence fixing $\mathcal{R}_i$ and $\mathcal{C}_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq \sigma$ and fixing $\mathcal{R}_{\sigma+1} = \tilde{r}$ still gives no information about vertices outside the closure of $\mathcal{J}^-(\tilde{r})$. We can therefore repeat the argument for (2.30) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{P}\{\exists \text{ lowest occupied crossing } \mathcal{R}_{\sigma+1} \text{ of } \mathcal{J}_R \text{ in } \mathcal{J}^+(\mathcal{R}_\sigma), \\ & \text{but (2.28) fails for its component } \mathcal{C}_{\sigma+1} | \mathcal{R}_i, \mathcal{C}_i, 1 \leq i \leq \sigma\} \\ & \leq (1 - \delta_4^4)^{-C_3 \log n}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{P}\{\exists \text{ any occupied crossing } \mathcal{R} \text{ of } \mathcal{J}_R \text{ such that (2.28)} \\ & \text{fails for its component } \mathcal{C}\} \leq \hat{P}\{\exists \text{ more than } \rho \text{ disjoint} \\ & \text{occupied horizontal crossings of } \mathcal{J}_R\} + \rho(1 - \delta_4^4)^{-C_3 \log n}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

By virtue of [28], Cor. 3.10, (or by a direct argument similar to (2.31)) the first term in the right hand side of (2.32) is at most

$$\begin{aligned}
 & [P\{\exists \text{ at least one occupied horizontal crossing of } \mathcal{J}_R\}]^p \leq \\
 & [1 - P\{\exists \text{ vacant vertical crossing on } \mathcal{g}^* \text{ of} \\
 & [2^{k-1} + 2, 2^k - 1] \times [-2^k, 2^k]\}]^p \text{ (by (1.22)) } \leq (1 - \delta_5)^p \text{ by (2.18)).}
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (2.32), and taking first p large, then n small, we see that we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \hat{P}\{\exists \text{ any occupied horizontal crossing of } \mathcal{J}_R \text{ whose} \\
 & \text{occupied component } \mathcal{C} \text{ in } \mathcal{J}_R \text{ does not satisfy (2.28)}\} \\
 & \leq \frac{1}{4} \delta.
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

We next show that a minor strengthening of the derivation of (2.33) actually yields (2.29). Let $\mathcal{R}$ be an occupied horizontal crossing of $\mathcal{J}_R$, with occupied component $\mathcal{C}$ in $\mathcal{J}_R$ and endpoint a on the right edge of $\mathcal{J}_R$. Assume that one of the events E_j occurs with $2n^{-1/2} \leq 2^{j-1} \leq n^{-1/4}$. It is easy to see (compare Fig. 7 again) that in this case there can be no vacant path r^* on $\mathcal{g}^*$, nor any occupied path s on $\mathcal{g}$ which does not intersect $\mathcal{C}$, which connects $\partial S(2^{k-1})$ to $\partial S(2^k)$ (in $S(2^k)$) and whose endpoint b lies inside $S(a, n2^{j+k-1}) \supset S(a, 2\sqrt{n} 2^k)$ on the counter-clockwise side of a on $\partial S(2^k)$. To guarantee (2.27) for $\mathcal{R}$ we must also make sure that there is no $a^*(\mathcal{C}^*)$ on the clockwise side of a in $\partial S(2^k) \cap S(a, 2\sqrt{n} 2^k)$. (2.26) is a similar requirement for $a(\mathcal{C}(s, k))$ with $\mathcal{C}(s, k)$ disjoint from $\mathcal{C}$. We restrict ourselves to (2.27). Assume that r^* is a vacant connection from $\partial S(2^{k-1})$ to $\partial S(2^k)$ with endpoint a^* . Define E_j^* as the analogue of E_j with "a and occupied" replaced by " a^* and vacant" (and possibly $\mathcal{J}_R$ by one of the other three strips $\mathcal{J}_T, \mathcal{J}_L, \mathcal{J}_B$). Then the occurrence of E_j^* for some j^* with

$$2n^{-1/2} \leq 2^{j^*-1} \leq n^{-1/4}$$

prevents a from lying in the clockwise direction of a^* and inside

$$S(a^*, n2^{j^*+k-1}) \supset S(a^*, 2\sqrt{n} 2^k).$$

Thus, in this case, a^* cannot lie in $S(a, 2\sqrt{n} 2^k)$ in the counterclockwise direction of a . It now follows that the left hand side of (2.29) is bounded by (2.33) plus

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{P}\{ \exists \text{ an occupied component } \mathcal{C} \text{ of one of the strips} \\ & \mathcal{J}_R, \mathcal{J}_T, \mathcal{J}_L \text{ or } \mathcal{J}_B \text{ for whose most clockwise} \\ & \text{connection from } \partial S(2^{k-1}) \text{ to } \partial S(2^k) \text{ no } E_j \text{ with} \\ & 2n^{-1/2} \leq 2^{j-1} \leq n^{-1/4} \text{ occurs} \} + \hat{P}\{ \exists \text{ a vacant component} \\ & \mathcal{C}^* \text{ of one of the strips } \mathcal{J}_R, \mathcal{J}_T, \mathcal{J}_L \text{ or } \mathcal{J}_B \text{ for} \\ & \text{whose most clockwise connection from } \partial S(2^{k-1}) \text{ to } \partial S(2^k) \\ & \text{no } E_j^* \text{ with } 2n^{-1/2} \leq 2^{j-1} \leq n^{-1/4} \text{ occurs} \}. \end{aligned}$$

These last probabilities can be made $\leq \delta/2$ by choosing n small, for the same reasons as given for (2.33). The lemma now follows.

It will be useful to have the following simple generalization of the Harris-FKG inequality.

Lemma 3. Let A and D be increasing events, and B and E decreasing events. Assume that A, B, D, E depend only on vertices in the finite sets $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ respectively. If

$$\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{D} = \emptyset, \quad (2.34)$$

then

$$P\{A \cap B | D \cap E\} \geq P\{A \cap B\} \quad (2.35)$$

for any measure P according to which all vertices are independently occupied or vacant.

Proof: First we prove that

$$P\{A \cap D \cap E\} \geq P\{A\} P\{D \cap E\}, \quad (2.36)$$

by conditioning on the configuration in $\mathcal{E}$. For each choice of such a configuration the Harris-FKG inequality gives

$$P\{A \cap D | E\} \geq P\{A | E\} P\{D | E\}.$$

Since A is independent of E , by (2.34), this is equivalent to (2.36).

Essentially, the same argument shows that

$$P\{A \cap B \cap D \cap E\} = P\{B \cap E | A \cap D\}$$

$$\geq P\{A \cap D\} \geq P\{B | A \cap D\} P\{E | A \cap D\}$$

$$\geq P\{A \cap D\} = P\{B\} P\{A \cap D \cap E\} \quad (\text{by (2.34)})$$

$$\geq P\{A\} P\{B\} P\{D \cap E\} \quad (\text{by (2.36)})$$

$$\geq P\{A \cap B\} P\{D \cap E\} \quad (\text{by Harris-FKG}).$$

This is equivalent to (2.35). □

We come to a fundamental estimate. Let $v \in S(2^{k-1})$. We then define the subevent $\Delta(v, S(2^k))$ of $\Gamma(v, S(2^k))$ as follows (see Fig. 8):

$\Delta(v, S(2^k)) := \Gamma(v, S(2^k))$ occurs with the four paths r_1, r_3, r_2^*, r_4^* satisfying the five additional requirements

$$r_1 \cap S(2^k) \setminus \overset{\circ}{S}(2^{k-1}) \subset \mathcal{A}(1,k) := [-2^k, -2^{k-1}] \times [-2^{k-1}, 2^{k-1}],$$

$$r_3 \cap S(2^k) \setminus \overset{\circ}{S}(2^{k-1}) \subset \mathcal{A}(3,k) := [2^{k-1}, 2^k] \times [-2^{k-1}, 2^{k-1}],$$

$$r_2^* \cap S(2^k) \setminus \overset{\circ}{S}(2^{k-1}) \subset \mathcal{B}(2,k) := [-2^{k-1}, 2^{k-1}] \times [2^{k-1}, 2^k],$$

$$r_4^* \cap S(2^k) \setminus \overset{\circ}{S}(2^{k-1}) \subset \mathcal{B}(4,k) := [-2^{k-1}, 2^{k-1}] \times [-2^k, -2^{k-1}];$$

In addition there exist occupied vertical crossings on $\mathcal{g}$ of $\mathcal{A}(i,k)$, $i = 1,3$, and vacant horizontal crossings on $\mathcal{g}^*$ of $\mathcal{B}(i,k)$, $i = 2,4$.

Figure 8. Illustration of $\Delta(v, S(2^k))$. The inner and outer square are $S(2^{k-1})$ and $S(2^k)$, respectively. The solidly drawn paths are occupied, while the dashed paths are vacant.

Lemma 4. There exists a constant C_0 such that for all $\hat{P}$ satisfying (2.21) and all $2^k \leq L(p, \varepsilon_0)$, we have

$$\hat{P}\{r(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} \leq C_0 \hat{P}\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\}. \quad (2.37)$$

Proof: Unfortunately we have to introduce yet other events. Assume that

$\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^j))$ occurs, so that there exist four paths, r_1, r_3 on $\mathcal{Y}$, and r_2^*, r_4^* on $\mathcal{Y}^*$, from $\underline{0}$ to $\partial S(2^j)$ in $S(2^j)$, with the additional properties listed before. Let r_i' be the last piece of r_i which crosses one of the strips $\mathcal{I}_R, \mathcal{I}_T, \mathcal{I}_L$ or $\mathcal{I}_B$ and $\mathcal{C}_i$ the associated component $\mathcal{C}(r_i', i)$, $i = 1, 3$. Similarly for $\mathcal{C}_2^*$ and $\mathcal{C}_4^*$. Define

$\Lambda(S(2^j), n) := \Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^j))$ occurs and the paths r_i, r_{1+i}^* and components $\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{C}_{1+i}^*$, $i = 1, 3$ can be chosen such that each one has an (n, j) -fence.

We begin by proving the existence of some constant $C_4(n)$ for which

$$\hat{P}\{\Lambda(S(2^j), n)\} \leq C_4(n) \hat{P}\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^{j+2}))\}, \quad (2.38)$$

(again uniformly in $\hat{P}$ satisfying (2.21) and $2^j \leq L(p, \varepsilon_0)$). We prove (2.38) by extending the paths r_1, r_3, r_2^*, r_4^* , when $\Lambda(S(2^j), n)$ occurs, as indicated in Fig. 9. We want to show that such an extension (for which $\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^{j+2}))$ occurs) is possible, with a conditional probability bounded away from 0. First partition the perimeter of $S(2^j)$ into approximately $8n^{-1}$ disjoint intervals of length $\leq n/2$. We can then pick four such intervals I_1, I_3, I_2^*, I_4^* such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{P}\{\Lambda(S(2^j), n) \text{ occurs with } a_i := a(\mathcal{C}_i) \in I_i \\ & \text{and } a_{1+i}^* := a(\mathcal{C}_{1+i}^*) \in I_{1+i}^*, i = 1, 3\} \\ & \geq C_5 n^4 \hat{P}\{\Lambda(S(2^j), n)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

Define in addition

$\Theta(S(2^j), n, I) := r(\underline{0}, S(2^j))$ occurs with $a_i \in I_i$ and $a_{1+i}^* \in I_{1+i}^*$ and paths r_i, r_{1+i}^* with endpoints a_i, a_{i+1} and components $\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{C}_{1+i}^*$ for which (2.26) and (2.27) hold, $i = 1, 3$.

Also write $\Lambda(S(2^j), n, I)$ for the event in braces in the left hand side of (2.39). Note that on $r(\underline{0}, S(2^j))$ the components $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_3, \mathcal{C}_2^*, \mathcal{C}_4^*$ must be pairwise disjoint because r_1, r_3 separate r_2^*, r_4^* . It is important to realize that on $\Theta(S(2^j), n, I)$, (2.26) and (2.27) for the specific $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_3, \mathcal{C}_4$ imply that there cannot exist any occupied or closed path from $\underline{0}$ to $\partial S(2^j)$ whose corresponding component $\mathcal{C}$ or $\mathcal{C}^*$ in one of the strips $\mathcal{J}_R, \mathcal{J}_T, \mathcal{J}_L, \mathcal{J}_B$ has its point $a(\mathcal{C})$ or $a^*(\mathcal{C}^*)$ in I_i , unless $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_i$. Similarly for I_{1+i}^* . In particular I_1, I_3, I_2^*, I_4^* must all be different. Furthermore, the components $\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{C}_{1+i}^*$ and their points a_i, a_{1+i}^* are uniquely determined by the configuration in $S(2^j)$, for any configuration in $\Theta(S(2^j), n, I)$ (recall that the I 's and I^* 's are fixed already). We must even have on $\Theta(S(2^j), n, I)$

$$S(a_i, \sqrt{n} 2^j) \text{ and } S(a_{1+i}^*, \sqrt{n} 2^j), \quad i = 1, 3 \text{ are all disjoint.} \quad (2.40)$$

For any configuration for which $\Theta(S(2^j), n, I)$ occurs, $\Lambda(S(2^j), n, I)$ occurs only if in addition the following events occur for $i = 1, 3$ ($2n < \sqrt{n}$ here):

$D_i := \{ \exists \text{ occupied crossing in the short direction of a } 2n2^j \text{ by } \sqrt{n} 2^j \text{ rectangle } R_i \text{ outside } S(2^j) \text{ but with } a_i \text{ in the center of its short side; this crossing is connected by an occupied path in } S(a_i, \sqrt{n} 2^j) \text{ to } \mathcal{C}_i \},$ and

$E_{1+i} := \{ \exists \text{ vacant crossing in the short direction of a } 2n2^j \text{ by } \sqrt{n} 2^j \text{ rectangle } R_{1+i}^* \text{ outside } S(2^j) \text{ but with } a_{1+i}^* \text{ in the center of its short side; this crossing is connected by a vacant path in } S(a_{1+i}^*, \sqrt{n} 2^j) \text{ to } \mathcal{C}_{1+i}^* \}.$

We shall now apply Lemma 3 to the complement of $S(2^j)$, conditionally on the configuration inside $S(2^j)$, whenever this configuration, call it ω_j , lies in $\Theta(S(2^j), n, I)$. We make the following choices for the various events. Assume without loss of generality that a_1, a_3, a_2^*, a_4^* are numbered such that they occur in the order a_1, a_2^*, a_3, a_4^* when $\partial S(2^j)$ is traversed clockwise.

$A_1 := \{ \exists \text{ occupied path } s_1 \text{ on } \mathcal{G} \text{ outside } S(2^j) \text{ starting next to the side of } R_1 \text{ containing } a_1, \text{ and ending on the left edge of } S(2^{j+2}) \text{ inside a given corridor } K_1 \text{ of width } n2^j; K_1 \cap S(2^{j+1}) \setminus S(2^j) \subset \mathcal{A}(1, j+2); \text{ in addition there exists an occupied vertical crossing of } \mathcal{A}(1, j+2) \};$

A_3 is obtained by replacing the index 1 by 3 and the left edge of $S(2^{j+2})$ by its right edge. See the definition of D_i for R_i and the definition of Δ for $\mathcal{A}(i, j+2)$. $A = A_1 \cap A_3$,

$$\mathcal{A} = K_1 \cup K_3 \cup \mathcal{A}(1, j+2) \cup \mathcal{A}(3, j+2).$$

B_2 and B_4 are defined very much like A_1 , this time requiring vacant connections from an interval around a_2^* and a_4^* through corridors K_2^* and K_4^* to the top and bottom edge of $S(2^{j+2})$, respectively. In addition we require a vacant horizontal crossing of $\mathcal{B}(2, j+2)$ for B_2 and of $\mathcal{B}(4, j+2)$ for B_4 . We take $B = B_2 \cap B_4$ and

$$\mathcal{B} = K_2^* \cup K_4^* \cup \mathcal{B}(2, j+2) \cup \mathcal{B}(4, j+2).$$

Furthermore we take $D = D_1 \cap D_3$, $E = E_3 \cap E_4$,

$$\mathcal{D} = S(a_1, \sqrt{n} 2^j) \cup S(a_3, \sqrt{n} 2^j),$$

$$\mathcal{E} = S(a_2^*, \sqrt{n} 2^j) \cup S(a_4^*, \sqrt{n} 2^j).$$

Figure 9. The inner and outer square are $S(2^j)$ and $S(2^{j+2})$ respectively. Solid (dashed) paths are occupied (vacant). The small squares around a_1 and a_2^* (the endpoints of r_1 and r_2^*) are $S(a_1, \sqrt{n} 2^j)$ and $S(a_2^*, \sqrt{n} 2^j)$, respectively. The corridors K_1 and K_2^* are hatched; they have width $n^{1/2} 2^j$.

The corridors K_1, K_2^*, K_3, K_4^* contain R_1, R_2^*, R_3 and R_4^* , respectively. Furthermore they have to be chosen disjoint from each other and such that

$$(K_1 \cup K_3) \text{ is disjoint from } \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{B}(2, j+2) \cup \mathcal{B}(4, j+2),$$

$$(K_2^* \cup K_4^*) \text{ is disjoint from } \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{A}(1, j+2) \cup \mathcal{A}(3, j+2).$$

Taking into account (2.40) it is not hard to convince oneself that this can be done in the manner indicated in Fig. 9 by making n small (so that the width

$n2^j$ of the corridors is small), and keeping the corridors inside $\overset{o}{S}(2^{j+1})$ until their last leg out to $\partial S(2^{j+2})$. For such a choice of the corridors (2.34) will hold (recall (2.40)). Therefore, by Lemma 3

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}\{A \cap B \mid \text{configuration in } S(2^j) = \omega_j, D \cap E\} \\ \geq \hat{P}\{A \cap B \mid \text{configuration in } S(2^j) = \omega_j\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.41)$$

for any configuration ω_j in $S(2^j)$ for which $\theta(S(2^j), n, I)$ occurs. Since $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are disjoint from each other and disjoint from $S(2^j)$, the right hand side of (2.41) equals $\hat{P}\{A \cap B\} = \hat{P}\{A\}\hat{P}\{B\}$, and this in turn is bounded below by some $C_6 = C_6(n) > 0$, by virtue of (2.17), (2.18). This finally gives for any fixed configuration ω_j in $\theta(S(2^j), n, I)$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}\{\text{configuration on } S(2^j) \text{ equals } \omega_j, A \cap B \cap D \cap E\} \\ \geq C_6 \hat{P}\{\text{configuration in } S(2^j) \text{ equals } \omega_j, D \cap E\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.42)$$

It is easy to see (see Fig. 10) that if $A \cap B \cap D \cap E$ occurs, then $\mathcal{C}_i$ is connected to s_i via some paths in $S(a_i, \sqrt{n} 2^j)$. Thus, $r_i, \mathcal{C}_i$ together with the latter paths in $S(a_i, \sqrt{n} 2^j)$ and s_i contain a path from $\underline{0}$ to $\partial S(2^{j+2})$ which is occupied, except possibly at $\underline{0}$, and which stays in $\mathcal{A}(i, j+2)$ outside

Figure 10. The large square is $S(2^j)$ and the small rectangle on the right is R_1

outside $S(2^{j+1})$ ($i = 1, 3$). A similar statement holds for r_{1+i}^* , $\mathcal{C}_{1+i}^*$ and s_{1+i}^* . Thus the event on the left hand side of (2.42) is contained in $\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^{j+2}))$.

We also remarked already that given ω_j in $\Theta(S(2^j), n, I)$, $\Lambda(S(2^j), n, I)$ occurs only if $D \cap E$ occur. Therefore summation of (2.42) over ω_j in $\Theta(S(2^j), n, I)$ gives

$$\hat{P}\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^{j+2}))\} \geq C_6 \hat{P}\{\Lambda(S(2^j), n, I)\} \geq C_5 C_6 n^4 \hat{P}\{\Lambda(S(2^j), n)\}.$$

We finally proved (2.38). Compared with (2.38), it is trivial to prove that

$$\hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^j))\} \leq C_7 \hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+1}))\} \quad (2.43)$$

for some $1 < C_7 < \infty$ which does not depend on j , $\hat{P}$, v or n (again under (2.21), $v \in S(2^{j-1})$, and $2^j \leq L(p, \epsilon_0)$). (2.43) merely requires the extension of four paths from v to $\partial S(2^j)$ to paths up to $\partial S(2^{j+1})$ plus insertion of crossings of $\mathcal{A}(i, j+1)$ and $\mathcal{B}(1+i, j+1)$, $i = 1, 3$. Fig. 11 illustrates how this

Figure 11. The three squares are (starting from the inside) $S(2^{j-1})$, $S(2^j)$ and $S(2^{j+1})$. The solidly drawn occupied path exist when $\Delta(v, S(2^j))$ occurs, and when the dashed paths are added we obtain $\Delta(v, S(2^{j+1}))$.

can be done for one path. Lemma 3 and (2.17), (2.18) then guarantee that

$$\hat{P}\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^{j+1})) | \Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^j))\}$$

is bounded away from zero, or equivalently, that (2.43) holds.

We shall need below the following inequality, which follows immediately from iterating (2.43):

$$\hat{P}\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^j))\} \geq c_8 c_7^{-j}. \quad (2.44)$$

Now for the proof of (2.37). Fix $0 < \delta \leq (32 c_7^2)^{-1}$, and then n such that (2.29) holds for this δ . Obviously

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} &\leq \hat{P}\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^{k-2}))\} \\ &= \hat{P}\{\Lambda(S(2^{k-2}), n)\} + P\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^{k-2})) \setminus \Lambda(S(2^{k-2}), n)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.45)$$

If $\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^{k-2})) \setminus \Lambda(S(2^{k-2}), n)$ occurs, then there exist four paths r_1, r_2^*, r_3, r_4^* from $\underline{0}$ to $S(2^{k-2})$ with the properties listed in the definition of Γ ; however, at least one of the components $\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{C}_{1+i}^*$ does not have an $(n, k-2)$ -fence. In particular $\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^{k-3}))$ still occurs, while either the event in the left hand side of (2.29) with k replaced by $k-2$ occurs, or a similar event with $\mathcal{J}_R$ replaced by $\mathcal{J}_T, \mathcal{J}_L$ or $\mathcal{J}_B$, or occupied replaced by vacant. By virtue of Lemma 2 and symmetry the probability of any of these events occurring is at most 8δ . In addition, these events depend on $S(2^{k-2}) \setminus S(2^{k-3})$ only, and therefore are independent of $\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^{k-3}))$. Therefore the last term in (2.45) is at most

$$(8\delta) \hat{P}\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^{k-3}))\},$$

so that

$$\hat{P}\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} \leq \hat{P}\{\Lambda(S(2^{k-2}), n)\} + 8\delta \hat{P}\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^{k-3}))\}.$$

We can iterate this argument to obtain

$$\hat{P}\{\Gamma(0, S(2^k))\} \leq \sum_{k/2 < j \leq k-2} (8\delta)^{k-2-j} \hat{P}\{\Lambda(S(2^j), n)\} + (8\delta)^{-3+k/2}.$$

Now use (2.38), (2.43) and (2.44) to conclude that the right hand side is at most

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k/2 < j \leq k-2} (8\delta)^{k-2-j} C_4(n) (C_7)^{k-2-j} P\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} + \\ & + (8\delta)^{-3+k/2} C_8^{-1} C_7^k \hat{P}\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\}. \end{aligned}$$

(2.37) follows from our choice of δ . □

Corollary 3. There exist constants C_1 - C_4 such that

$$C_1 \hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+2}))\} \leq P\{\Gamma(v, R)\} \leq C_2 \hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+2}))\}, \quad (2.46)$$

$$C_3 \hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+2}))\} \leq \hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+3}))\} \leq C_2 \hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+2}))\}, \quad (2.47)$$

uniformly for all $\hat{P}$ satisfying (2.21), $v \in S(2^j)$, and any rectangle R for which $S(2^{j+1}) \subset R \subset S(2^{j+3})$, $2^{j+3} \leq L(p, \epsilon_0)$. For the measures P_p and $v \in S(2^j)$, $2^{j+3} \leq L(p, \epsilon_0)$ we even have

$$C_4 P_p\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^{j+2}))\} \leq P_p\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+2}))\} \leq C_2 P_p\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^{j+2}))\}. \quad (2.48)$$

Remark: In Lemma 8 we shall obtain a much better version of (2.48).

Proof: From the definitions of Γ and Δ , it is clear that

$$\hat{P}\{\Gamma(v, R_1)\} \geq \hat{P}\{\Gamma(v, R_2)\} \quad \text{if } v \in R_1 \subset R_2, \quad (2.49)$$

and for any ℓ

$$\hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^\ell))\} \leq \hat{P}\{\Gamma(v, S(2^\ell))\}, \quad v \in S(2^{\ell-1}). \quad (2.50)$$

If we write $\hat{p}^v$ for the measure $\hat{p}$ translated by v , then $S(2^j) \subset R - v \subset S(2^{j+4})$, and the monotonicity properties (2.49), (2.50) show that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{p}\{\Gamma(v, R)\} &= \hat{p}^v\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, R - v)\} \\
 &\geq \hat{p}^v\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^{j+4}))\} \geq \hat{p}^v\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^{j+4}))\} \\
 &\geq C_7^{-4} \hat{p}^v\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^j))\} \quad (\text{by (2.43)}) \\
 &\geq (C_7^4 C_0)^{-1} \hat{p}^v\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^j))\} \quad (\text{by (2.37) for } \hat{p}^v) \\
 &= (C_7^4 C_0)^{-1} \hat{p}\{\Gamma(v, S(v, 2^j))\} \\
 &\geq (C_7^4 C_0)^{-1} \hat{p}\{\Gamma(v, S(2^{j+2}))\} \\
 &\geq (C_7^4 C_0)^{-1} \hat{p}\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+2}))\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

This proves the left hand inequality in (2.46). For the right hand inequality we write

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{p}\{\Gamma(v, R)\} &\leq \hat{p}\{\Gamma(v, S(2^{j+1}))\} \\
 &\leq C_0 \hat{p}\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+1}))\} \\
 &\leq C_0 C_7 \hat{p}\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+2}))\},
 \end{aligned}$$

using (2.49), (2.37) and (2.43) in succession.

The left hand inequality in (2.47) is just (2.43). For the right hand inequality use (2.50) and (2.46):

$$\hat{p}\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+3}))\} \leq \hat{p}\{\Gamma(v, S(2^{j+3}))\} \leq C_2 \hat{p}\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+2}))\}.$$

Finally, for (2.48) we use $\hat{p}_p^v = p_p$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_p\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^{j+2}))\} &\leq P_p\{r(\underline{0}, S(2^{j+2}))\} \\
 &= P_p\{r(v, S(v, 2^{j+2}))\} \\
 &\leq C_2 P_p\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+2}))\} \quad (\text{by (2.46)}),
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_p\{\Delta(v, S(2^{j+2}))\} &\leq P_p\{r(v, S(2^{j+2}))\} \\
 &= P_p\{r(\underline{0}, S(-v, 2^{j+2}))\} \\
 &\leq C_2 P_p\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^{j+2}))\} \quad (\text{by (2.46)}).
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Next we need an analogue of Lemma 4 for connections from ∂R to the outside of R , rather than to a point in R . For a rectangle $R \subset S(2^k)$ with interior $\overset{o}{R}$, define

$\tilde{\Gamma}(S(2^k), R) = \{ \exists \text{ two occupied paths } r_1 \text{ and } r_3 \text{ on } \mathcal{G}$
 from the left and right edge of $\partial S(2^k)$, respectively, to
 ∂R , and two vacant paths r_2^* and r_4^* on $\mathcal{G}^*$ from the
 top and bottom edge of $\partial S(2^k)$, respectively to ∂R ; these
 paths are pairwise disjoint, and except for their endpoint
 on ∂R lie in $S(2^k) \setminus R$; $r_1 \cup r_3$ separates r_2^* from r_4^*
 in $S(2^k) \setminus \overset{o}{R}$.

We define the analogue of Δ for the present situation only if R is a square of the form $S(v, 2^j) \subset S(2^{k-2})$. In this case let $S' = S(v, 2^{j+1})$, and for the analogues of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ in the definition of Δ take the following strips in $S' \setminus \overset{o}{S}(r, 2^j)$:

$$\tilde{A}(1,j) = [v(1) - 2^{j+1}, v(1) - 2^j] \times [v(2) - 2^j, v(2) + 2^j],$$

$$\tilde{A}(3,j) = [v(1) + 2^j, v(1) + 2^{j+1}] \times [v(2) - 2^j, v(2) + 2^j],$$

$$\tilde{B}(2,j) = [v(1) - 2^j, v(1) + 2^j] \times [v(2) + 2^j, v(2) + 2^{j+1}],$$

$$\tilde{B}(4,j) = [v(1) - 2^j, v(1) + 2^j] \times [v(2) - 2^{j+1}, v(2) - 2^j].$$

The proper analogue for $\Delta(v, S(2^j))$ is now

$\tilde{\Delta}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^j)) := \tilde{\Gamma}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^j))$ occurs and the four paths r_i, r_{1+i}^* , $i = 1, 3$, are such that $r_i \cap (S' \setminus \overset{\circ}{S}(v, 2^j)) \subset \tilde{A}(i, j)$ and $r_{1+i}^* \cap (S' \setminus \overset{\circ}{S}(v, 2^j)) \subset \tilde{B}(1+i, j)$, $i = 1, 3$; in addition there exist occupied vertical crossings on $\mathcal{G}$ of $\tilde{A}(i, j)$ and vacant horizontal crossings on $\mathcal{G}^*$ of $\tilde{B}(1+i, j)$, $i = 1, 3$.

Figure 12 illustrates the definition in part.

Figure 12. Two of the required paths for $\tilde{\Delta}(S(2^k), S)$ with $S = S(v, 2^j)$.

Lemma 5. There exists a constant C_0 such that for all $\hat{P}$ satisfying (2.21)
and all $2^k \leq L(p, \epsilon_0)$, $S(v, 2^j) \subset S(2^{k-2})$ one has

$$\hat{P}\{\tilde{r}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^j))\} \leq C_0 \hat{P}\{\tilde{\Delta}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^j))\}. \quad (2.51)$$

Proof: We only state explicitly what we mean by an (n, j) fence for r_1 , an occupied path on $\mathcal{G}$ from the left edge of $S(2^k)$ to $\partial S(v, 2^j)$. As before this depends on the location of the endpoint of r_1 ; for the sake of argument we take it again on the right edge of $S(v, 2^j)$. Now we take for the analogue of $\mathcal{J}_R$, $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_R$, the right half of the annulus $S(v, 2^{j+1} - 1) \setminus \overset{\circ}{S}(v, 2^j)$ (see Fig. 13). We break $\partial \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_R$ up into the following four pieces:

Figure 13. The inner and outer square are $S(v, 2^j)$ and $S' = S(v, 2^{j+1})$, respectively. $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_R$ is hatched; the part B_1 of its boundary is boldly drawn. r_1 and some pieces of $\mathcal{C}$ are dashed.

$B_1 :=$ the union of right half of $\partial S(v, 2^{j+1} - 1)$ from
 $(v(1), v(2) + 2^{j+1} - 1)$ to $(v(1), v(2) - 2^{j+1} + 1)$,
 with the two vertical segments
 $\{v(1)\} \times [v(2) - 2^{j+1} + 1, v(2) - 2^j]$ and
 $\{v(1)\} \times [v(2) + 2^j, v(2) + 2^{j+1} - 1]$.

$$A = [v(1), v(1) + 2^j] \times \{v(2) - 2^j\},$$

$$B_2 = \{v(1) + 2^j\} \times [v(2) - 2^j, v(2) + 2^j],$$

$$C = [v(1), v(1) + 2^j] \times \{v(2) + 2^j\}.$$

Note that $A \cup B_2 \cup C$ is just the right half of $\partial S(v, 2^j)$. For r' we take the piece of r_1 from its last intersection with B_1 till its endpoint on the right edge of $S(v, 2^j)$, B_2 . $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(r_1, j)$ is defined as the occupied component of r' in $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_R$.

r' is a crosscut of $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_R$ connecting B_1 with B_2 . Again any such crosscut $\tilde{r}$ divides $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_R \setminus \tilde{r}$ into two components $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}^-(\tilde{r})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}^+(\tilde{r})$, which have A and C as part of their boundary, respectively. In $\mathcal{C}$ there exists a crosscut $\mathcal{R}$ from B_1 to B_2 for which $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mathcal{R})$ is minimal, by virtue of Prop. 2.3 in [13]. $a = a(\mathcal{C})$ is taken to be the endpoint of $\mathcal{R}$ on B_2 . We say that r_1 or $\mathcal{C}$ has an (n, j) -fence if all three of the following conditions hold:

if s is any occupied path on $\mathcal{G}$ from $\partial S(2^k)$ to $\partial S(v, 2^j)$ which lies in $\overset{\circ}{S}(2^k) \setminus S(v, 2^j)$, except for its endpoints, and with corresponding component $\mathcal{C}(s, j)$,
 and if $\mathcal{C}(s, j) \cap \mathcal{C}(r_1, j) = \emptyset$, then
 $|a(\mathcal{C}(s, j)) - a(\mathcal{C}(r_1, j))| > 2\sqrt{n} 2^j,$

(2.52)

if r^* is any vacant path on $\mathcal{G}^*$ from $\partial S(2^k)$ to $\partial S(v, 2^j)$ which lies in $\overset{o}{S}(2^k) \setminus S(v, 2^j)$, except for its endpoints, and with the corresponding vacant component $\mathcal{C}^*(r^*, j)$ then $|a^*(\mathcal{C}^*(s, j)) - a(\mathcal{C}(r_1, j))| > 2\sqrt{n} 2^j$, (2.53)

there exists an occupied vertical crossing s on $\mathcal{G}$ of the rectangle

$$[a(1) - n2^j, a(1)] \times [a(2) - \sqrt{n} 2^j, a(2) + \sqrt{n} 2^j] \cap S(v, 2^j),$$

which is connected to $\mathcal{C}(r_1, k)$ by an occupied path on $\mathcal{G}$ in $S(a, \sqrt{n} 2^j)$. (2.54)

In (2.54) $a = a(\mathcal{C}(r_1, j))$, while in (2.53) $\mathcal{C}^*$ and a^* are, as before, defined by changing "occupied and $\mathcal{G}$ " to "vacant and $\mathcal{G}^*$ " on the appropriate places in the definition of $\mathcal{C}$ and a .

We can now copy the proofs of Lemma 2 and 4 without essential changes to obtain Lemma 5. Only instead of (2.45) we work "outwards" instead of inwards, i.e., we replace (2.45) by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}\{\tilde{\Gamma}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^j))\} &\leq \hat{P}\{\tilde{\Gamma}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^{j+2}))\} \\ &= \hat{P}\{\tilde{\Lambda}(S(v, 2^{j+2}), n)\} + \hat{P}\{\tilde{\Gamma}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^{j+2})) \setminus \tilde{\Lambda}(S(v, 2^{j+2}), n)\} \end{aligned}$$

with an obvious analogue $\tilde{\Lambda}$ of Λ . □

Lemma 6. There exist constants C_1 and C_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 \hat{P}\{\Gamma(v, S(2^k))\} &\leq \hat{P}\{\tilde{\Gamma}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^j))\} \cdot \hat{P}\{\Gamma(v, S(v, 2^j))\} \\ &\leq C_2 \hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^k))\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.55)$$

uniformly in $\hat{P}$ satisfying (2.21) and $v \in S(2^{k-3}), S(v, 2^j) \subset S(2^{k-2}), 2^k \leq L(p, \epsilon_0)$.

Proof: By (2.46) and (2.43)

$$\hat{P}\{r(v, S(2^k))\} \leq C_2 \hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^{k-1}))\} \leq C_2 C_7 \hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^k))\}.$$

Now $\Delta(v, S(2^k))$ requires the existence of two appropriate paths r_1 and r_3 from v to the left and right edge of $S(2^k)$, respectively, and two other paths r_2^* and r_4^* to the top and bottom edge, respectively. It is easy to see that these paths all have to reach $\partial S(v, 2^{j-1})$ first (so that $r(v, S(v, 2^{j-1}))$ occurs) and then continue to connect $\partial S(v, 2^j)$ with $\partial S(2^k)$ (so that also $\tilde{r}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^j))$ occurs). Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^k))\} &\leq \hat{P}\{r(v, S(v, 2^{j-1}))\} \text{ and } \tilde{r}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^j)) \\ &= P\{r(v, S(v, 2^{j-1}))\} \cdot P\{\tilde{r}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^j))\}, \end{aligned}$$

since $r(v, S(v, 2^{j-1}))$ and $r(S(2^k), S(v, 2^j))$ depend on vertices in $S(v, 2^{j-1})$ and the complement of $S(v, 2^j)$, respectively. The left hand inequality of (2.55) now follows from

$$\hat{P}\{r(v, S(v, 2^{j-1}))\} \leq C_2 C_1^{-1} \hat{P}\{r(v, S(v, 2^j))\}, \quad (2.56)$$

which, in turn, follows for $j \leq k$ from two applications of (2.46) (once with $R = S(v, 2^{j-1})$ and once with $R = S(v, 2^j)$, and $\hat{P}$ replaced by $\hat{P}^v$).

As for the right hand inequality in (2.55), observe that if $\tilde{\Delta}(S(2^k), (S(v, 2^j)))$ occurs, then there exists an occupied path r_1' on $\mathcal{G}$ from the left edge of $S(v, 2^j)$ to the left edge of $S(v, 2^k)$. $r_1' \cap (S(v, 2^{j+1}) \setminus S(v, 2^j)) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(1, j)$ and in addition there exists an occupied vertical crossing s_1' on $\mathcal{G}$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(1, j)$. Note that, s_1' necessarily intersects r_1' in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(1, j)$. If also $\Delta(v, S(v, 2^{j-1}))$ (this is the translate by v of $\Delta(0, S(2^{j-1}))$) occurs, then there exists a path r_1'' in $S(v, 2^{j-1})$ from v to the left edge of $S(v, 2^{j-1})$ which stays in $v + \mathcal{A}(1, j - 1)$ outside $\overset{\circ}{S}(v, 2^{j-2})$; r_1'' is occupied, except

possibly in v . Finally there exists an occupied vertical crossing s_1'' of $v + \mathcal{A}(1, j - 1)$, which necessarily intersects r_1'' in $v + \mathcal{A}(1, j - 1)$. Now recall that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(1, j) = v + \mathcal{A}(1, j + 1)$ (see Fig. 14). Therefore, an occupied

Fig. 14. Connecting r_1'' to r_1' by the dashed path c_1 .

horizontal crossing c_1 on $\mathcal{G}$ of $v + [-2^{j+1}, -2^{j-2}] \times (-2^{j-2}, 2^{j-2})$ will connect s_1' and s_1'' . If such a c_1 exists, then there exists a path r_1 from v to the left edge of $S(2^k)$ which consists of pieces of r_1'' , s_1'' , c_1 , s_1' and r_1' . Since

$$\hat{P}\{\exists \text{ occupied horizontal crossing on } \mathcal{G} \text{ of } v + [-2^{j+1}, -2^{j-2}] \times (-2^{j-2}, 2^{j-2})\} \geq \delta_5,$$

(by (2.17)) we obtain from Lemma 3 that

$\hat{P}\{\exists \text{ path } r_1 \text{ on } \mathcal{J} \text{ from } v \text{ to the left edge of } S(2^k)$
 which is occupied except possibly at $v | \tilde{\Delta}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^j))$ and
 $\Delta(v, S(v, 2^{j-1}))\} \geq \delta_5$.

A slight extension of the above argument also allows us to construct a path r_3 from v to the right edge of $S(2^k)$ and two paths r_2^* and r_4^* to the top and bottom edges of $S(2^k)$, respectively. This yields (again by Lemma 3 and (2.17), (2.18)),

$$\hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^k)) | \tilde{\Delta}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^j)) \text{ and } \Delta(v, S(v, 2^{j-1}))\} \geq \delta_5^4.$$

Finally then

$$\hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(2^k))\} \geq \delta_5^4 \hat{P}\{\tilde{\Delta}(S(2^k), S(v, 2^j))\} \cdot \hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(v, 2^{j-1}))\}, \quad (2.57)$$

which implies the second inequality of (2.55) (by (2.51) and (2.37) for $\hat{P}^v$).

□

The next lemma is the promised weakened version of (2.13).

Lemma 7. Assume $p_0(v)$ and $p_1(v)$ both satisfy (2.21) and $p_1(v) \geq p_0(v)$ for
all v . Let $\hat{P}_t$ be the product measure with

$$\hat{P}_t\{v \text{ occupied}\} = p_t(v) := tp_1(v) + (1 - t)p_0(v).$$

Then for some constants $C_1, \zeta > 0$ (independent of $p, p_0(\cdot), p_1(\cdot)$).

$$\int_0^1 dt \sum_{v \in S(2^{j-2})} (p_1(v) - p_0(v)) \hat{P}_t\{r(v, S(2^j))\} \leq C_1 2^{-\zeta(k-j)}$$

$$\text{for all } 2^{j+1} \leq 2^k \leq L(p, \varepsilon_0). \quad (2.58)$$

If $p_0(w) = p_c$ and $p_1(w) = p > p_c$ for all w , or vice versa, then for all $2^{j+1} \leq 2^k \leq L(p, \varepsilon_0)$

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{2j} \left| \int_{p_c}^p ds P_S\{r(\underline{0}, S(2^j))\} \right| &\asymp \left| \int_{p_c}^p ds \sum_{v \in S(2^{j-2})} P_S\{r(v, S(2^j))\} \right| \\ &\leq C_1 2^{-\zeta(k-j)} |\sigma((2^k, 2^k); 1, p) - \sigma((2^k, 2^k); 1, p_c)|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.59)$$

Proof: Note that $\hat{p}_t(r(v, S(2^j)))$ depends only on the $p_i(w)$ for $w \in S(2^j)$ and for (2.58) we may therefore change the $p_i(\cdot)$ outside $S(2^j)$ in any way which is compatible with (2.21). We leave $p_i(\cdot)$ unchanged in $S(2^{j+1})$, but change it outside $S(2^{j+1})$ so that it becomes periodic with periods $(0, 2^{j+2})$ and $(2^{j+2}, 0)$. We may therefore assume that

$$p_i(v) = p_i(v + (n_1 2^{j+2}, n_2 2^{j+2})), \quad n_i \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Of course if $p_0(w) = p_c$, $p_1(w) = p$ for all w , then no change will be performed in the p_i and we have $\hat{p}_t = p_{p(t)}$ with $p(t) = tp + (1-t)p_c$.

Recall that $C(S(2^j))$ denotes the event

$$\{ \exists \text{ occupied horizontal crossing on } \mathcal{L} \text{ of } S(2^j) \}.$$

With $\hat{p}_t$ fixed as in the last paragraph we shall prove for $j \leq k - 10$

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{\zeta(k-j)} \hat{p}_t\{\Delta(v, S(2^j))\} &\leq C_9 \sum^* \hat{p}_t\{v + 2^{j+2} \underline{n} \\ &\text{is pivotal for } C(S(2^k))\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.60)$$

where $\sum^*$ in (2.60) denotes the sum over the integral vectors $\underline{n} = (n_1, n_2)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} S(2^{j+2} \underline{n}, 2^{j+1}) &= [n_1 2^{j+2} - 2^{j+1}, n_1 2^{j+2} + 2^{j+1}] \times \\ &\times [n_2 2^{j+2} - 2^{j+1}, n_2 2^{j+2} + 2^{j+1}] \subset S(2^{k-3}). \end{aligned}$$

(2.60) will imply our lemma because by Russo's formula (compare (2.10))

$$\sum_{v \in S(2^{j-2})} [p_1(v) - p_0(v)] \hat{P}_t^* \{v + 2^{j+2} \underline{n}\}$$

$$\text{is pivotal for } C(S(2^k)) \} \leq \frac{d}{dt} \hat{P}_t \{C(S(2^k))\}.$$

Thus (2.46) and (2.60) show that the left hand side of (2.58) is at most

$$C_2 C_9 2^{-\varepsilon(k-j)} [\hat{P}_1 \{C(S(2^k))\} - \hat{P}_0 \{C(S(2^k))\}]. \quad (2.61)$$

This implies (2.58) if $j \leq k - 10$. For $k-10 < j < k$ (2.58) is automatically valid for large enough C_1 , because the left hand side of (2.58) is bounded as can be seen from Russo's formula. Indeed, by (2.46)

$$\sum_{v \in S(2^{j-2})} (p_1(v) - p_0(v)) \hat{P}_t \{I(v, S(2^j))\}$$

$$\leq C_2 \sum_{v \in S(2^{j-2})} (p_1(v) - p_0(v)) \hat{P}_t \{\Delta(v, S(2^j))\}$$

$$\leq C_2 \sum_{v \in S(2^{j-2})} (p_1(v) - p_0(v)) \hat{P}_t \{v \text{ is pivotal}$$

$$\text{for } C(S(2^j))\} \leq C_2 \frac{d}{dt} \hat{P}_t \{C(S(2^j))\} \quad (2.62)$$

(compare (2.10)).

The equivalence in (2.59) follows for $j < k$ from (2.46) and (2.48) (with j replaced by $j-2$). The inequality in (2.59) follows for $j \leq |k-11|$ from (2.61) with k replaced by $k-1$ (recall that $\sigma((2^k, 2^k); 1, p) = P_1 \{C(S(2^{k-1}))\}$). For $k-11 < j < k$ the inequality in (2.59) again follows by taking C_1 large enough from (2.62) with $C(S(2^j))$ replaced by $C(S(2^{k-1}))$. (This requires $k-1-j$ applications of (2.43).)

We turn to the proof of (2.60). For the remainder we take $j \leq k-10$. As in the second inequality of (2.62), the sum in the right hand side of (2.60) is at least

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum^* \hat{p}_t \{ \Delta(v + 2^{j+2} \underline{n}, S(2^k)) \} \\
 & \geq C_2^{-1} \sum^* \hat{p}_t \{ \Gamma(v + 2^{j+2} \underline{n}, S(v + 2^{j+2} \underline{n}, 2^{j+1})) \} \\
 & \quad \hat{p}_t \{ \tilde{\Gamma}(S(2^k), S(v + 2^{j+2} \underline{n}, 2^{j+1})) \} \quad (\text{by (2.55)}) \\
 & = C_2^{-1} \hat{p}_t \{ \Gamma(v, (S(v, 2^{j+1}))) \} \\
 & \quad \cdot \sum^* \hat{p}_t \{ \tilde{\Gamma}(S(2^k), S(v + 2^{j+2} \underline{n}, 2^{j+1})) \} \quad (\text{by periodicity}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since for $v \in S(2^{j-2})$,

$$\hat{p}_t \{ \Gamma(v, S(2^{j+1})) \} \geq C_1 \hat{p}_t \{ \Delta(v, S(2^j)) \} \quad \text{by (2.46),}$$

we only have to prove

$$\sum^* \hat{p}_t \{ \tilde{\Gamma}(S(2^k), S(v + 2^{j+2} \underline{n}, 2^{j+1})) \} \geq C_{10} 2^{\zeta(k-j)}, j \leq k-10, v \in S(2^{j-2}), \quad (2.63)$$

(2.63) can be proved in the same way as Lemma 8.2 of [13]. We shall indicate why this is so, but leave the details to the reader. Let $\mathcal{R}$ denote the lowest occupied horizontal crossing on $\mathcal{G}$ of $S(2^k)$, if it exists.⁶ The probability that $\mathcal{R}$ exists and lies entirely in the strip $T := [-2^k, 2^k] \times [-2^{k-4}, 2^{k-4}]$ is bounded away from 0. To see this note that $\mathcal{R}$ will exist and lie in T if there exists a vacant horizontal crossing r^* on $\mathcal{G}^*$ of $[-2^k, 2^k] \times [-2^{k-4}, 0)$ and r^* is connected by a vacant path on $\mathcal{G}^*$ in $S(2^k)$ to the bottom edge of $S(2^k)$ and if in addition there is an occupied

⁶ Again we are somewhat cavalier in not bringing in the planar modification

$\mathcal{G}_{pl}$ for constructing the lowest crossing (or the left most crossing below).

crossing on $\mathcal{G}$ of $[0, 2^{k-4}]$. The $\hat{P}_t$ -probability of all these events simultaneously is at least δ_{32}^3 by (2.17), (2.18).

Now assume that $\{\mathcal{R} = r_0\}$ occurs for some path r_0 in T from the left to the right edge of T . $S(2^k) \setminus r_0$ consists then of two components $S^-(r_0)$ and $S^+(r_0)$, with the bottom and top edge of $S(2^k)$ in their boundary, respectively. In this situation each vertex w of r_0 is connected by a path r^* on $\mathcal{G}^*$ to the bottom edge of $S(2^k)$ and with r^* minus its endpoints contained in $S^-(r_0)$, and r^* vacant, except at w . This follows from Prop. 2.2 in [13] (recall that r_0 is the lowest occupied crossing of $S(2^k)$). If R is any rectangle with $w \in \tilde{R} \subset R \subset S(2^k)$, then there exist two occupied paths r_1, r_3 from ∂R to the left and right edge of $\partial S(2^k)$, respectively, (these are pieces of $\mathcal{R} = r_0$), and there exists a vacant path from ∂R to the bottom edge of $S(2^k)$ (this is a piece of r^*). Thus, if there is in addition a vacant path from ∂R to the top edge of $S(2^k)$, then $\tilde{r}(S(2^k), R)$ occurs for the rectangle R .

Now assume that in addition to $\{\mathcal{R} = r_0\}$ there is a path s^* on $\mathcal{G}^*$ from some $w \in r_0$ to the top edge of $S(2^k)$, and that $s^* \setminus \{w\} \subset S^+(r_0)$, and s^* is vacant except at w . Then there is a left most such path (again by Prop. 2.3 of [13]). Write $\mathcal{J}^*$ for the leftmost such path. Arguing as above, and using the fact that the vertices in $S^+(r_0)$ are independent of $\{\mathcal{R} = r_0\}$ we see that

$$\hat{P}_t\{\mathcal{J}^* \text{ exists and lies in } [0, 2^{k-4}] \times [-2^k, 2^k] \mid \mathcal{R} = r_0\} \geq \delta_{32}^3$$

(see [13], Lemma 7.4 for similar arguments).

If r_0 is a fixed horizontal crossing of T on $\mathcal{G}$ and $s^* \subset [0, 2^{k-4}] \times [-2^k, 2^k]$ a fixed path on $\mathcal{G}^*$ from some point a on r_0 to the top edge of $S(2^k)$ in $S^+(r_0)$ (except for the point a), then $S^+(r) \setminus s^*$

again has two components. Write $S' = S'(r_0, s^*)$ for the component which contains the upper right hand corner, $(2^k, 2^k)$, of $S(2^k)$, in its boundary (see Fig.

Fig. 15

15). Denote the piece of r_0 from a to the right edge of $S(2^k)$ by r . If now $S(v + 2^{j+2}\underline{n}, 2^{j+1})$ is a square which intersects r , in a point w say, and

$$S(2^{j+2}\underline{n}, 2^{j+1}) \subset S(2^{k-3}), \quad (2.64)$$

and if there exists a vacant path t^* on g^* which lies in S' (except for its endpoints) and connects a point in $S(v + 2^{j+2}\underline{n}, 2^{j+1})$ with s^* , then $\tilde{I}(S(2^k), S(v + 2^{j+2}\underline{n}, 2^{j+1}))$ occurs. Also (2.64) assures that this square is then counted in λ^* in (2.60). The existence of such a t^* is independent of the event $\{\mathcal{R} = r_0, \mathcal{J}^* = s^*\}$, because by Prop. 2.3 in [13], the occupancies of the vertices in $S'(r_0, s^*)$ are independent of the event $\{\mathcal{R} = r_0, \mathcal{J}^* = s^*\}$ (cf. Lemma 7.4 of [13] again). Note that if s^* intersects $S(v + 2^{j+2}\underline{n}, 2^{j+1})$ then we don't need t^* at all; $\tilde{I}(S(2^k), S(v + 2^{j+2}\underline{n}, 2^{j+1}))$ automatically occurs in this situation. Also, since we took $v \in S(2^{j-2})$, $j \leq k - 10$ and $a \in (r \cap s^*) \subset [0, 2^{k-4}] \times [0, 2^{k-4}]$, (2.64) will hold for all $\underline{n}$ for which $S(v + \underline{n}2^{j+2}, 2^{j+1})$ intersects $S(a, 3 \cdot 2^{\ell})$, provided we restrict ourselves to

$$j \leq \ell - 4, \quad \ell \leq k - 6. \quad (2.65)$$

Finally, for such an ℓ set $Y(v, \underline{n}, a, \ell, r_0, s^*) = 1$ if $S(v + 2^{j+2}\underline{n}, 2^{j+1})$ intersects r and $S(a, 3 \cdot 2^\ell)$, and if there exists a vacant path t^* as above, which in addition lies in the square $S(a, 3 \cdot 2^\ell)$; set $Y(v, \underline{n}, a, \ell, r_0, s^*) = 0$ otherwise. The condition on the existence of t^* is taken as fulfilled whenever s^* itself intersects $S(v + 2^{j+2}\underline{n}, 2^{j+1})$. Define

$$Z(\ell) = \min \hat{E}_t \left\{ \sum_{\underline{n}} Y(v, \underline{n}, a, \ell, r_0, s^*) \right\}. \quad (2.66)$$

where $\hat{E}_t$ denotes expectation with respect to $\hat{P}_t$ and the min is over all permissible choices of $\hat{P}_t$, periodic with periods $(2^{j+2}, 0)$ and $(0, 2^{j+2})$, $v \in S(2^{j-2})$, $r_0 \subset T$, $a \in r_0$, $S(a, 3 \cdot 2^\ell) \subset S(2^k)$, and s^* a vacant connection in $S^+(r)$ from a to the top edge of $S(2^k)$. Note that the last condition is a relaxation of $s^* \subset [0, 2^{k-4}] \times [-2^k, 2^k]$. The stronger condition on s^* is only used to guarantee (2.64) whenever $Y(v, \underline{n}, a, \ell, r_0, s^*) = 1$ with an ℓ satisfying (2.65); for estimating Z it is, however, not useful to restrict s^* so much and relaxing the restrictions on s^* moves the min in (2.66) in the right direction. We have now arrived at the situation of Lemma 8.2 of [13]. In exactly the same way as in that lemma we can now show

$$Z(\ell) > (1 + C_{11})Z(\ell - 3), \quad (2.67)$$

as long as ℓ satisfies (2.65). Moreover, $Z(\ell) > 0$ for all $\ell > j + 4$, since we get a contribution of size 1 to (2.66) from the square $S(v + 2^{j+2}\underline{n}, 2^{j+1})$ which contains a . It is now immediate from (2.67) by iteration, and the fact that $Z(\ell)$ increases in ℓ , that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum^* \hat{P}_t \{ \tilde{r}(S(2^k), S(v + 2^{j+2}\underline{n}, 2^{j+1})) \} &> \min_{r_0, s^*} \hat{P} \{ \mathcal{R} = r_0, \mathcal{J}^* = s^* \} \\ \cdot \sum^* P_t \{ Y(v, \underline{n}, a, k - 6, r_0, s^*) = 1 \mid \mathcal{R} = r_0, \mathcal{J}^* = s^* \} &> \\ &> C_{12}Z(k - 6) > C_{13}(1 + C_{11})^{(k-j)/3}. \end{aligned}$$

(The conditioning on $\{\mathcal{R} = r, \mathcal{Y}^* = s^*\}$ has no influence, since the Y 's are defined in terms of vertices in $S'(r_0, s^*)$, and hence independent of $\{\mathcal{R} = r_0, \mathcal{Y} = s^*\}$, as observed above.) Thus (2.63) and (2.60) hold. $\square$

It remains to put our lemmas together to complete the proof of Theorem 1.

Let $n \leq L(p, s_0)$ and choose the largest k with $2^k \leq n$. It suffices to prove Theorem 1 with n replaced by 2^k , by virtue of (2.20). Also

$\pi(p, 2^k) = \pi(1, 2^k)$, and by virtue of (2.22) we may replace $\pi(p_c, 2^k)$ by $\pi(0, 2^k)$, where

$$\pi(t, 2^k) = \hat{P}_t\{0 \rightsquigarrow \partial S(2^k)\} = \hat{P}_t\{A(2^k)\},$$

and $\hat{P}_t$ is defined by (2.6). In addition we have (2.8). Integration of (2.8) over t from 0 to 1 yields, by the method of (2.10),

$$\left| \log \frac{\pi(1, 2^k)}{\pi(0, 2^k)} \right| \leq C_3 |p - p_c| \left[1 + \sum_R \sum_{\substack{R(v)=R \\ |v| \leq 2^{k-3}}} \int_0^1 \hat{P}_t\{I(v, R)\} dt \right]. \quad (2.67)$$

Now, if R is given by (2.4), then the only v 's with $R(v) = R$ are the ones satisfying (2.3). Therefore, by (2.46) (after translation by $(-x_1 2^{j-2}, -x_2 2^{j-2})$ and changing j to $j - 1$) for any v satisfying (2.3)

$$\hat{P}_t\{I(v, R)\} \leq C_2 C_1^{-1} \hat{P}_t\{I(v, (x_1 2^{j-2}, x_2 2^{j-2}) + S(2^j))\}.$$

By (2.50) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 dt |p - p_c| \sum_{\substack{v \text{ satisfying} \\ (2.3)}} \hat{P}_t\{I(v, (x_1 2^{j-2}, x_2 2^{j-2}) + S(2^j))\} \\ & \leq C_1 2^{-\zeta(k-j)}. \end{aligned}$$

Substitution into (2.67) and using the fact that only x, j with

$|x_1|, |x_2| \leq 17, j \leq k - 4$ can occur in (2.3) (see (2.5)) we obtain

$$\left| \log \frac{\pi(1, 2^k)}{\pi(0, 2^k)} \right| \leq C_4 \left[1 + \sum_{j \leq k-4} 2^{-\zeta(k-j)} \right] \leq C_5.$$

This takes the place of (2.13) and Theorem 1 follows.

3. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 2, 3 AND COR. 1, 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. The first and last inequality in Theorem 2 are immediate from Theorem 1. The second inequality is obvious from

$$\{\underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \partial S(L)\} \subset \{\underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \infty\}.$$

Finally the third inequality was proven in [19], Section 4 (see also proof of (1.25) below). □

Cor. 1 is immediate, if one takes into account that (1.18) implies (1.6) with $\delta = 2\delta_r - 1$ (cf. [14]).

Proof of Theorem 3. We prove (1.25). Clearly for $L = L(p, \epsilon_0)$ and any $\epsilon_1 > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} E_p \{[\#W]^t; \#W < \infty\} &> [\epsilon_1 L^2 \pi(p, L)]^t P_p \{\underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \partial S(L)\} \cdot \\ &\cdot P_p \{\#W > \epsilon_1 L^2 \pi(p, L) \mid \underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \partial S(L)\} \\ &> C_1^{t+1} \epsilon_1^t [L(p, \epsilon_0)]^{2t} [\pi(p_c, L(p, \epsilon_0))]^{t+1} \cdot \\ &\cdot P_p \{\#W > \epsilon_1 L^2 \pi(p, L) \mid \underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \partial S(L)\}. \quad (3.1) \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (54) in the second part of Theorem 8 of [15] can be copied almost without changes to show that $\epsilon_1 > 0$ can be chosen to make the last probability in (3.1) at least 1/2. Thus

$$E_p \{[\#W]^t; \#W < \infty\} > \frac{1}{2} C_1^{t+1} \epsilon_1^t [L(p, \epsilon_0)]^{2t} [\pi(p_c, L(p, \epsilon_0))]^{t+1}.$$

In the opposite direction we first observe that the first part of the proof of Theorem 8 of [15] gives without essential changes that

$$\begin{aligned} E_p \{[\#(W \cap S(2n))]^t \mid \underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \partial S(n)\} &\leq C_t [n^2 \pi(p, n)]^t \\ \text{for } n &\leq L(p, \epsilon_0), \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$E_p\{[\# \text{ of vertices in } S(L) \text{ connected by occupied paths to } \partial S(L)]^t\} \leq C_t [n^2 \pi(p, n)]^t. \quad (3.3)$$

As in [14] we introduce the "radius of W "

$$R = R(W) = \max\{|v| : v \in W\},$$

and define $(\underline{n} = (n_1, n_2), L = L(p, \varepsilon_0))$

$$B(\underline{n}) = B(\underline{n}, p) = [(n_1 - 1)L, (n_1 + 1)L] \times [(n_2 - 1)L, (n_2 + 1)L]$$

Then, still as in [14],

$$\begin{aligned} E_p\{[\#W]^t; \#W < \infty\} &\leq C_{14} + \sum_{1 \leq 2^k \leq L} E_p\{[\#W \cap S(2^{k+1})]^t; 2^k \leq R < 2^{k+1}\} \\ &+ E_p\{[\#(W \cap S(L))] + \sum_{\underline{n} \neq 0} (\#W \cap B(\underline{n}))^t; L < R < \infty\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

By (3.2) the first sum on the right hand side of (3.4) is at most

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{1 \leq 2^k \leq L} P_p\{R \geq 2^k\} E_p\{[\#(W \cap S(2^{k+1}))]^t \mid R \geq 2^k\} \leq \\ &\leq C_t \sum_{1 \leq 2^k \leq L} \pi(p, 2^k) [2^{2k} \pi(p, 2^k)]^t \\ &\leq (C_2)^{t+1} C_t \sum_{1 \leq 2^k \leq L} 2^{2kt} [\pi(p_c, 2^k)]^{t+1} \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

(by Theorem 1). We claim that for any k_0

$$\frac{\pi(p_c, 2^k)}{\pi(p_c, 2^{k_0})} \leq C_{15} 2^{(k_0 - k)/2}, \quad k \leq k_0. \quad (3.6)$$

We postpone the proof of (3.6) till the end of this proof. Once we have (3.6), the right hand side of (3.5) is seen to be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{16} 2^{2k_0 t} [\pi(p_c, 2^{k_0})]^{t+1} \sum_{0 \leq k \leq k_0} 2^{-(k_0 - k)(2t - 1/2(t+1))} \\ & \leq C_{17} 2^{2k_0 t} [\pi(p_c, 2^{k_0})]^{t+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

for $t > 1/3$, where now k_0 is such that

$$2^{k_0} \leq L(p, \epsilon_0) < 2^{k_0+1},$$

and C_{17} depends on t only. The second sum in (3.4) has to be treated slightly differently, according as $t \geq 1$ or $\frac{1}{3} < t < 1$. We only consider the former case; the case $t < 1$ is easier, since then

$$(\sum a_n)^t \leq \sum a_n^t$$

for $a_n \geq 0$. For $t \geq 1$, the second sum in the right hand side of (3.4) is at most

$$[(E_p \{[\#W \cap S(L)]\}^t; R > L)^{1/t} + \sum_{n \neq 0} (E_p \{[\#(W \cap B(n))]\}^t; R < \infty)^{1/t}]^t. \quad (3.8)$$

By (3.2)

$$\begin{aligned} & E_p \{[\#(W \cap S(L))]^t; R > L\} \\ & \leq P_p \{R > L\} E_p \{[\#(W \cap S(L))]^t | \underline{0} \rightsquigarrow \partial S(L)\} \\ & \leq \pi(p, L) C_t [L^2 \pi(p, L)]^t \\ & \leq C_{18} L^{2t} [\pi(p_c, L)]^{t+1} \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

(since $\{R > L\} = \{0 \rightsquigarrow \partial S(L)\}$, and Theorem 1 for the last inequality).

Furthermore, for $B(\underline{n}) \cap S(L) = \emptyset$

$$[\#(W \cap B(\underline{n}))]^t I[R < \infty] \leq$$

$$\begin{aligned} & [\# \text{ of vertices in } B(\underline{n}) \text{ connected by occupied paths to } \partial B(\underline{n})]^t \\ & \cdot I[0 \rightsquigarrow \partial S(L/2)] I[\partial S(L) \text{ is connected by an occupied path} \\ & \text{outside } S(L/2) \text{ to } \partial S(1/2(|n_1| + |n_2| - 3)L)]. \quad I[\exists \text{ vacant} \\ & \text{circuit on } \mathcal{G}^* \text{ surrounding } \underline{0} \text{ and some point of } \partial B(\underline{n})]. \quad (3.10) \end{aligned}$$

If $p < p_c$ then we estimate the expectation of the right hand side of (3.10) by ignoring the last factor and using the independence of the other factors. This gives by virtue of (3.3), (2.20) and (2.24)

$$\begin{aligned} E_p \{[\#(W \cap B(\underline{n}))]^t; R < \infty\} \\ & \leq C_t [L^2 \pi(p, L)]^t \pi(p, L/2) \cdot P_p \{ \partial S(L) \rightsquigarrow \partial S(1/2(|n_1| + |n_2| - 3)L) \} \\ & \leq C_{19} L^{2t} [\pi(p_c, L)]^{t+1} \exp(-1/2 C_7 (|n_1| + |n_2|)). \quad (3.11) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $p > p_c$ we ignore the third factor in the right hand side of (3.10) to obtain, by using the Harris-FKG inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} E_p \{[\#(W \cap B(\underline{n}))]^t; R < \infty\} \\ & \leq E_p \{ [\# \text{ of vertices in } B(\underline{n}) \text{ connected by occupied paths} \\ & \text{to } \partial B(\underline{n})]^t I[0 \rightsquigarrow \partial S(L/2)] P_p \{ \exists \text{ vacant circuit} \\ & \text{on } \mathcal{G}^* \text{ surrounding } \underline{0} \text{ and some point of } \partial B(\underline{n}) \} \\ & \leq C_{20} L^{2t} [\pi(p_c, L)]^{t+1} \cdot \sum_{j=-\infty}^{+\infty} P_p \{ \exists \text{ vacant paths on } \mathcal{G}^* \\ & \text{from } (jL, 0) + [-L, L]^2 \text{ to } \partial((jL, 0) + S(|j-1|L)) \\ & \text{and to } \partial S(1/2(|n_1| + |n_2| - 3)L) \}. \quad (3.12) \end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality we used the fact that any circuit surrounding the origin must intersect the x-axis in some square

$[(j-1)L, (j+1)L] \times [-L, L] = (jL, 0) + [-L, L]^2$, as well as the y-axis. By (2.25) the right hand side of (3.12) is for $p > p_c$ at most

$$C_{21} L^{2t} [\pi(p_c, L)]^{t+1} (|n_1| + |n_2|) \cdot \exp - \frac{1}{4} C_7 (|n_1| + |n_2|). \quad (3.13)$$

Putting together the estimates (3.9)-(3.13) we see that (3.8) is at most

$$C_{22}(t) L^{2t} [\pi(p_c, L)]^{t+1}.$$

Finally, in (3.7),

$$\pi(p_c, 2^{k_0}) \quad \pi(p_c, L)$$

by virtue of (2.20). Therefore

$$E_p \{[\#W]^t; \#W < \infty\} \leq C_{23}(t) [1 + L^{2t} [\pi(p_c, L)]^{t+1}]$$

with $L = L(p, \varepsilon_0)$; the "one" in the right hand side may be ignored, since $\pi(p_c, L) > CL^{-1/2}$ (see [28], (3.15) or (3.6) above).

To complete the proof of (1.25) we prove (3.6). Firstly

$$\pi(p_c, 2^{k_0}) > C_1 \pi(p_c, 2^k)$$

$$\cdot P_{cr} \{ \text{occupied path outside } S(2^k) \text{ from } \partial S(2^k) \text{ to } \partial S(2^{k_0}) \} \quad (3.14)$$

for the same reasons as given for (6) in [15]; see Sect. 3 of [15] as well as (2.7) above. Secondly, exactly as in (3.15) of [28] we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 < c_2 &\leq P_{cr}\{ \exists \text{ occupied horizontal crossing of } [-2^{k_0}, 2^{k_0}]^2 \} \\
 &\leq \sum_{|j| \leq 2^{k_0-k}} P_{cr}\{ \exists \text{ two disjoint occupied horizontal} \\
 &\quad \text{paths outside } (0, j2^k) + \overset{o}{S}(2^k) \text{ from } \partial(0, j2^k) + S(2^k)) \\
 &\quad \text{to the union of the left and right edge of } S(2^{k_0}) \} \\
 &\leq 2(2^{k_0-k} + 1) \cdot [P_{cr}\{ \exists \text{ occupied path outside } \overset{o}{S}(2^k) \text{ from} \\
 &\quad \partial S(2^k) \text{ to } \partial S(2^{k_0}) \}]^2
 \end{aligned}$$

In view of (3.14) this proves (3.6) and completes the proof of (1.25).

The reader should now be able to prove (1.26) in a similar way by using

$$P_p\{0 \rightsquigarrow y\} \asymp [\pi(p_c, |y|)]^2 \quad \text{for } |y| \leq L(p, \varepsilon_0)$$

(cf. [14], formula (4)) and

$$\sum_{y \in S(L)} |y|^t [\pi(p_c, |y|)]^2 \leq L^{t+2} [\pi(p_c, L)]^2$$

(since $n^{1/2}\pi(p_c, n)$ is essentially increasing in n ; cf. (3.6) and (2.20)). $\square$

Cor. 2 is again self-evident (again use [14] as in Cor. 1), with the exception of the inequality $\nu > (\delta + 1)/\delta$. This last inequality can be obtained from $\Delta_2 > 2$ (which is proven in [9], formula 3) or from $\gamma > 2(\delta - 1)/\delta$ (which is proven in [17]).

4. SYMMETRY OF THE CRITICAL EXPONENTS

In this section we prove (1.23) and (1.24). Note that the critical exponents β , γ , η have all been related to ν and δ (or δ_r). δ is defined in terms of P_{cr} only. Thus, once we have (1.23), all critical exponents have to be the same on the left ($p \uparrow p_c$) and right ($p \downarrow p_c$), provided they exist

of course. α_+ and α_- have to be equal by virtue of the Sykes-Essam relation; cf. [13], Theorem 9.2. We formulate the principal step Lemma 8. The most important corollaries of this lemma, namely (4.4) and (4.5), have appeared in the literature before (see for instance [6], eq. (14)). To formulate the lemma we define for $v \in S(n)$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(v, S(n)) &:= \{v \text{ is pivotal for } C(S(n))\} = \\ &= \{ \exists \text{ paths } r_1 \text{ and } r_3 \text{ on } \mathcal{G} \text{ from } v \text{ to the} \\ &\quad \text{left and right edge of } S(n), \text{ respectively,} \\ &\quad \text{and paths } r_2^* \text{ and } r_4^* \text{ on } \mathcal{G}^* \text{ from } v \text{ to the} \\ &\quad \text{top and bottom edge of } S(n), \text{ respectively; any two} \\ &\quad \text{of these paths only have the point } v \text{ in common;} \\ &\quad r_i \text{ is occupied and } r_{1+i}^* \text{ is vacant, } i = 1, 3, \text{ except} \\ &\quad \text{possibly at } v \} \quad (\text{see Fig. 3}), \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 8. For each fixed $0 < \kappa < 1$ there exist constants $0 < C_i = C_i(\kappa) < \infty$, $i = 1, 2$, such that

$$C_1 \leq \frac{\hat{P}\{\Omega(v, S(n))\}}{P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(n))\}} \leq C_2 \quad (4.1)$$

uniformly for $\hat{P}$ satisfying (2.21) and

$$n \leq L(p, \varepsilon_0) \quad \text{and} \quad v \in S(\kappa n). \quad (4.2)$$

Before proving Lemma 8 we make some more comments on the proof of (1.23).

Note that the definitions immediately give

$$\Delta(v, S(n)) \subset \Omega(v, S(n)) \subset \Gamma(v, S(n)). \quad (4.3)$$

Lemma 4 and Cor. 3 therefore give us a handle on the probability of Ω , and these results, together with (4.1), lead to

$$|\sigma((n,n);1,p) - \sigma((n,n);1,p_c)| \asymp |p - p_c| n^2 P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(n))\}, \quad n \leq L(p, \varepsilon_0). \quad (4.4)$$

When we take $n = L(p, \varepsilon_0)$ we obtain

$$L^2 P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(L))\} \asymp \frac{1}{|p - p_c|} \quad (4.5)$$

for $L = L(p, \varepsilon_0)$, since we have defined $L(p, \varepsilon_0)$ in such a way that the left hand side of (4.4) is of order 1 when $n = L(p, \varepsilon_0)$. The result will be that

$$L(p, \varepsilon_0) \asymp L_0(|p - p_c|),$$

where $L_0(\delta)$ is the smallest n for which

$$n^2 P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(n))\} \geq \frac{1}{\delta}. \quad (4.6)$$

Clearly this will imply (1.23).

Proof of Lemma 8. This proof is quite similar to that of Theorem 1 but fortunately almost all the work was done already for Theorem 1. Our first step is to prove (4.1) with $v = \underline{0}$ only. To see that this suffices assume that v has distance m to $\partial S(n)$ with $m \geq (1 - \kappa)n$. Let ℓ be such that

$$2^\ell \leq m < 2^{\ell+1}, \quad (4.7)$$

and as before, let $\hat{P}^v$ be the translate of $\hat{P}$ by v . Then $S(v, 2^\ell) \subset S(n)$, and by (4.3) and (2.49),

$$\hat{P}\{\Omega(v, S(n))\} \leq \hat{P}\{I(v, S(n))\} \leq \hat{P}\{I(v, S(v, 2^\ell))\} = \hat{P}^v\{I(\underline{0}, S(2^\ell))\}.$$

Now, if k is such that

$$2^k \leq n < 2^{k+1},$$

then $k - \ell \leq 1 - (\log 2)^{-1} \log(1 - \kappa)$. A bounded number of applications of (2.56) therefore shows

$$\hat{P}^v\{r(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} \leq c_3 \hat{P}^v\{r(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\}$$

for a c_3 depending on κ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}\{\Omega(v, S(n))\} &\leq c_3 \hat{P}^v\{r(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} \\ &\leq c_3 c_0 \hat{P}^v\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} \quad (\text{by (2.37)}) \\ &\leq c_3 c_0 \hat{P}^v\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\}. \end{aligned}$$

In the other direction, note first that a small extension of (2.43) gives for ℓ as in (4.7)

$$\hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(v, 2^\ell))\} \leq c_7 \hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(n))\},$$

this time with c_7 depending on κ . But also, by (4.3), (2.37) and (2.49)

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}\{\Omega(v, S(n))\} &\geq c_7^{-1} \hat{P}\{\Delta(v, S(v, 2^\ell))\} = c_7^{-1} \hat{P}^v\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^\ell))\} \\ &\geq (c_7 c_0)^{-1} \hat{P}^v\{r(\underline{0}, S(2^\ell))\} \geq (c_7 c_0)^{-1} \hat{P}^v\{r(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} \\ &\geq (c_7 c_0)^{-1} \hat{P}^v\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, under (4.2) $\hat{P}\{\Omega(v, S(n))\}$ is uniformly of the same order as $\hat{P}^v\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\}$. In particular, for $v = \underline{0}$ and $\hat{P} = P_{cr}$, $P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(n))\}$ and $P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\}$ are of the same order. Thus (4.1) will be implied by

$$c_4 \leq \frac{\hat{P}^v\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\}}{P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\}} \leq c_5. \quad (4.8)$$

In other words, it suffices to prove (4.1) for $v = \underline{0}$ only, and $n = 2^k \leq L(p, \epsilon_0)$, as long as our estimates are valid uniformly for all $\hat{P}$ satisfying (2.21).

As in Sect. 2 we shall estimate

$$[P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\}]^{-1} \hat{P}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\}$$

by first changing the probabilities for a site to be occupied for all w outside $S(2^{k-3})$, and after that apply Russo's formula to estimate the influence of the sites in $S(2^{k-3})$. Let P^* be the measure which chooses w occupied with probability

$$p^*(w) = \begin{cases} p(w) = \hat{P}\{w \text{ is occupied}\} & \text{if } w \notin S(2^{k-3}), \\ p_c & \text{if } w \in S(2^{k-3}). \end{cases}$$

Of course all sites are independent under P^* . Our second step is to show that

$$C_6 \leq \frac{P^*\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\}}{P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\}} \leq C_7, \quad (4.9)$$

which is the analogue of (2.22). (4.9) follows quickly from previous estimates.

For instance

$$\begin{aligned} P^*\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} &\leq P^*\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^{k-3}))\} \quad (\text{by (4.3) and (2.49)}) \\ &= P_{cr}\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^{k-3}))\} \quad (\text{since } P^* = P_{cr} \text{ when} \\ &\quad \text{restricted to } S(2^{k-3})) \\ &\leq C_2^3 C_1^{-3} P_{cr}\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} \quad (\text{by (2.56)}) \\ &\leq C_2^3 C_1^{-3} C_0 P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} \quad (\text{by (2.37) and (4.3)}). \end{aligned}$$

The lower bound in (4.9) is proved by interchanging P_{cr} and P^* .

Now that we have (4.9) we define $\hat{P}_t$ as the measure according to which the sites are independently occupied, with probability

$$p(t, w) = \begin{cases} p(w) & \text{if } w \notin S(2^{k-3}), \\ (1-t)p_c + tp(w) & \text{if } w \in S(2^{k-3}), \end{cases}$$

for the site w . Note that $\hat{P}_1 = \hat{P}$, $\hat{P}_0 = P^*$, and that $\hat{P}_t$ satisfies (2.21) for all $t \in [0, 1]$. We next estimate

$$\frac{d}{dt} \hat{P}_t \{ \Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k)) \}.$$

Observe that $\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k)) = A \cap B$, where

$A = \{ \exists \text{ two paths } r_1 \text{ and } r_3 \text{ on } \mathcal{G} \text{ from } \underline{0} \text{ to the left and right edge of } S(2^k), \text{ respectively; these paths only have the vertex } \underline{0} \text{ in common and are occupied, except possibly at } \underline{0} \},$

$B = \{ \exists \text{ two paths } r_2^* \text{ and } r_4^* \text{ on } \mathcal{G}^* \text{ from } \underline{0} \text{ to the top and bottom edge of } S(2^k), \text{ respectively; these paths only have the vertex } \underline{0} \text{ in common and are vacant, except possibly at } \underline{0} \}.$

A is increasing and B is decreasing so that by Lemma 1

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \hat{P}_t \{ \Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k)) \} &= \sum_{w \in S(2^{k-3})} (p(w) - p_c) \\ &[\hat{P}_t \{w \text{ is pivotal for } A \text{ but not for } B, \text{ and } B \text{ occurs}\}] - \sum_{w \in S(2^{k-3})} (p(w) - p_c) [P_t \{w \text{ is} \\ &\text{pivotal for } B, \text{ but not for } A \text{ and } A \text{ occurs}\}]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

We only estimate the first sum in the right hand side; the second sum can be estimated by interchanging the roles of "occupied" and "vacant". It is not difficult to obtain (e.g. from Prop. 2.2 in [13]) that $w \neq \underline{0}$ is pivotal for A , but not for B and B occurs, if and only if B occurs as well as the following events $E(w)$ and $E^*(w)$ (see Fig. 16):

$E(w) = \{ \exists \text{ two paths } r_1 \text{ and } r_3 \text{ on } \mathcal{G}$
 from $\underline{0}$ to the left and right edge of
 $S(2^k)$, respectively; these paths only
 have the vertex $\underline{0}$ in common and one of
 them contains w ; r_1 and r_3 are
 occupied, except possibly at $\underline{0}$ and w }

$E^*(w) = \{ \exists \text{ two paths } r_5^* \text{ and } r_6^* \text{ on } \mathcal{G}^*$
 from w to the top and bottom edge of
 $S(2^k)$, respectively; these paths only
 have the vertex w in common and do not
 contain $\underline{0}$; r_5^* and r_6^* are vacant except
 possibly at w }.

Figure 16. Illustration of $B \cap E(w) \cap E^*(w)$. Solidly drawn paths are occupied, dashed paths are vacant, except possibly at $\underline{0}$ and w . Note that r_2^* and r_5^* do not have to be disjoint; in this figure they partly coincide. r_4^* and r_6^* may also intersect.

It follows from the definition that if R_0 and R_w are squares in $S(2^k)$ such that $\underline{0} \in R_0$, $w \in R_w$, then on $E(w) \cap E^*(w)$ both $\Gamma(\underline{0}, R_0)$ and $\Gamma(w, R_w)$ must occur. If R_0 and R_w are disjoint, then the latter events are in addition independent. This observation already suffices to handle the w with $2^{k-5} < |w| \leq 2^{k-3}$. Define $\ell = \ell(w)$ by

$$2^\ell < |w| \leq 2^{\ell+1}. \quad (4.11)$$

The w with $|w| \leq 16$ will be trivial, so that we may assume $\ell \geq 4$. We choose $R_0 = S(2^{\ell-2})$, $R_w = S(w, 2^{\ell-2})$. We then have for $\ell = k - 5$ or $k - 4$

$$\hat{P}_t\{w \text{ is pivotal for } A \text{ but not for } B, \text{ and } B \text{ occurs}\} \leq \hat{P}_t\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^{\ell-2}))\}$$

$$\cdot \hat{P}_t\{\Gamma(w, S(w, 2^{\ell-2}))\} \leq (C_2 C_1^{-1})^7 \hat{P}_t\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} \hat{P}_t\{\Gamma(w, S(w, 2^{\ell-2}))\}$$

(by (2.56))

$$\leq C_3 \hat{P}_t\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} \hat{P}_t\{\Gamma(w, S(w, 2^{\ell-2}))\} \quad (\text{by (2.37) and (4.3)}). \quad (4.12)$$

For $16 < |w| \leq 2^{k-5}$, or $\ell < k - 5$, we have to be slightly more careful. In addition to $\Gamma(\underline{0}, R_0)$ and $\Gamma(w, R_w)$ we must also have $\tilde{\Gamma}(S(2^k), S(2^{\ell+2}))$ if $B \cap E(w) \cap E^*(w)$ occurs (since the paths r_1, r_2^*, r_3, r_4^* connect $\partial S(2^{\ell+2})$ to $\partial S(2^k)$). Moreover $R_0 \cap R_w \cap S(2^{\ell+2}) = \emptyset$ so that $\Gamma(\underline{0}, R_0)$ and $\Gamma(w, R_w)$ are independent of $\tilde{\Gamma}(S(2^k), S(2^{\ell+2}))$. The left hand side of (4.12) is therefore bounded by

$$\hat{P}_t\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^{\ell-2}))\} \hat{P}_t\{\tilde{\Gamma}(S(2^k), S(2^{\ell+2}))\} \hat{P}_t\{\Gamma(w, S(w, 2^{\ell-2}))\}. \quad (4.13)$$

By (2.56) and (2.55) the product of the first two factors in (4.13) is at most

$$C_3 \hat{P}_t\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\} \leq C_3 \hat{P}_t\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^k))\},$$

so that (4.12) holds for all $w \in S(2^{k-3})/S(16)$. Putting this into (4.10) we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \log \hat{P}_t\{\Omega(0, S(2^k))\} \leq C_4 \left[1 + \sum_{\ell=4}^{k-4} \sum_{2^\ell < |w| \leq 2^{\ell+1}} (p(w) - p_c) P_t\{\Gamma(w, S(w, 2^{\ell-2}))\} \right].$$

Finally, for $2^\ell < |w| \leq 2^{\ell+1}$,

$$\hat{P}_t\{\Gamma(w, S(w, 2^{\ell-2}))\} \leq C_2^6 C_1^{-6} \hat{P}_t\{\Gamma(w, S(w, 2^{\ell+4}))\} \quad (\text{by (2.56)})$$

$$\leq C_2^6 C_1^{-6} \hat{P}_t\{\Gamma(w, S(2^{\ell+3}))\} \quad (\text{by (2.49)}).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \log \frac{\hat{P}\{\Omega(0, S(2^k))\}}{P^*\{\Omega(0, S(2^k))\}} \right| &= \left| \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} \log \hat{P}_t\{\Omega(0, S(2^k))\} dt \right| \leq \\ &\leq C_5 \left[1 + \sum_{\ell=4}^{k-4} \int_0^1 \sum_{w \in S(2^{\ell+1})} |p(w) - p_c| P_t\{\Gamma(w, S(2^{\ell+3}))\} dt \right] \\ &\leq C_6 \left[1 + \sum_{\ell=4}^{k-4} 2^{-\zeta(k-\ell)} \right] \leq C_7 \quad (\text{by (2.58)}). \end{aligned}$$

Together with (4.9) this proves (4.8), and hence (4.1). $\square$

Lemma 9. Let $L = L(p, \varepsilon_0)$ and denote by $\hat{P}(\kappa)$ the measure according to which v is occupied with probability

$$p(\kappa, v) = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } v \notin S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \kappa L \rfloor), \\ p_c & \text{if } v \in S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \kappa L \rfloor), \end{cases}$$

and with all v independent. Then there exists a $0 < \kappa = \kappa(\varepsilon_0) < 1$ such that for all p sufficiently close to p_c

$$\begin{aligned} &|P_p\{\exists \text{ occupied horizontal crossing of } S(\lfloor \frac{L}{2} \rfloor)\} \\ &- \hat{P}(\kappa)\{\exists \text{ occupied horizontal crossing of } S(\lfloor \frac{L}{2} \rfloor)\}| \\ &> \frac{1}{8} C_3 > 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

where C_3 is as in (2.15).

Proof: For the sake of argument take $p > p_c$ throughout. With C_3 as in (2.15) and $L = L(p, \epsilon_0)$ we have (compare (1.22))

$$\sigma((L+1, L); 1, p_c) \leq 1 - C_3, \quad \sigma((L, L); 1, p) \geq 1 - \epsilon_0 \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2} C_3. \quad (4.15)$$

so that

$$|\sigma((L+1, L); 1, p_c) - \sigma((L, L); 1, p)| \geq \frac{1}{2} C_3.$$

To show that this variation in σ is due in part to vertices in "the center of $S(L)$ " (in $S(\kappa L)$, to be more precise) we show first that for any rectangle $[0, a] \times [0, b]$ with

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{a}{b} \leq 2, \quad a, b \leq 2L(p, \epsilon_0), \quad (4.16)$$

and $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\lambda = \lambda(\epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\left| \frac{\hat{P}\{C([0, c] \times [0, b])\}}{\hat{P}\{C([0, a] \times [0, b])\}} - 1 \right| \leq \epsilon$$

$$\text{uniformly for } P \text{ satisfying } \hat{\alpha} (2.21) \text{ and for } \left| \frac{c}{a} - 1 \right| \leq \lambda. \quad (4.17)$$

(Recall that $C(R) = \{ \exists \text{ occupied horizontal crossing on } \mathcal{J} \text{ of } R \}$). (4.17) is rather close to Lemma 3 of [11]. If $a < c$, then clearly

$$C([0, c] \times [0, b]) \subset C([0, a] \times [0, b]). \quad (4.18)$$

Thus for $a < c$ we should show

$$\hat{P}\{C([0, a] \times [0, b]) \text{ but not } C([0, c] \times [0, b])\} \leq \epsilon \hat{P}\{C([0, a] \times [0, b])\}. \quad (4.19)$$

For this purpose let $\mathcal{R}$ be the lowest occupied crossing of the rectangle $R := [0,a] \times [0,b]$, and let its right endpoint be (a,H) . For the moment we consider only the situation with $H \leq b/2$. Let r be a fixed horizontal crossing of R with endpoint (a,h) with $h \leq b/2$. Denote by $R^-(r)$ the lower component of $R \setminus r$ and by $\bar{R}^-(r)$ its closure. Now consider the annuli

(see Fig. 17)

$$A_j = T_{j+1} \setminus T_j, \text{ where } T_j = [a - 3^j, c + 3^j] \times [h - 3^j, h + 3^j]$$

for $3^j \geq c - a$, $3^{j+1} < b/2$. If $\{\mathcal{R} = r\}$ and any A_j contains a circuit C which surrounds T_j and all of whose sites outside $\bar{R}^-$ are occupied, then a piece of $\mathcal{R}$ plus a piece of C forms an occupied horizontal crossing of $[0,c] \times [0,b]$. Thus, if E_j denotes the event that such a circuit exists in A_j , then

Figure 17. The hatched region is a typical A_j and the dashed curve is a possible circuit C which connects r to $\{c\} \times R$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{P}\{\text{there is no occupied horizontal crossing of } [0,c] \times [0,b] \mid \mathcal{R} = r\} \\ & \leq \hat{P}\{\text{none of the } E_j \text{ occur} \mid \mathcal{R} = r\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

Now given $\mathcal{R} = r$, the E_j only depend on sites outside $\bar{R}^-(r)$, and since $\{\mathcal{R} = r\}$ depends only on sites in $\bar{R}^-(r)$ (compare Prop. 2.3 of [13]) we have

$$P\{E_j \mid \mathcal{R} = r\} \geq P\{\exists \text{ occupied circuit in } A_j\}.$$

The last probability is at least $\delta > 0$ for some fixed δ , by virtue of (4.16) and (2.19), as long as $3^j > c - a$, $3^{j+1} \leq b/2$. If we take $c - a \leq \lambda a$ for some small λ , then we can use all j with $\lambda a \leq 3^j \leq a/12$, of which there are $C_2 |\log \lambda|$. Since the different A_j are disjoint, the events E_j are conditionally independent, given $\mathcal{R} = r$. It follows that the right hand side of (4.20) is at most

$$(1 - \delta)^{C_2 |\log \lambda|} \quad \text{on } \{H \leq b/2\}.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{P}\{\text{there is no occupied horizontal crossing on } \mathcal{G} \text{ of} \\ & [0,c] \times [0,b], \text{ but } \mathcal{R} \text{ exists and } H \leq \frac{b}{2}\} \\ & \leq (1 - \delta)^{C_2 |\log \lambda|} \sigma((a,b); 1, p) \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

If $H > b/2$, then the highest occupied crossing of $[0,a] \times [0,b]$ must end above (a,H) , and hence in the upper half of the right edge of $[0,a] \times [0,b]$. By interchanging the role of the up and downwards direction we see that the contribution to the left hand side of (4.19) contained in $\{H > b/2\}$ is also bounded by (4.21). Consequently, if $a \leq c \leq a(1 + \lambda)$ then

$$1 \geq \frac{\hat{P}\{C([0,c] \times [0,b])\}}{\hat{P}\{C([0,a] \times [0,b])\}} \geq 1 - 2(1 - \delta)^{C_2 |\log \lambda|}.$$

By interchanging the role of a and c one obtains (4.17) also when $a > c$.

One may also replace $\hat{P}\{C([0,c] \times [0,b])\}$ by $\hat{P}\{\exists \text{ vacant crossing on } g^* \text{ of } [0,c] \times [0,b]\}$ and $\hat{P}\{C([0,a] \times [0,b])\}$ by the analogous probability. We merely have to change "occupied on g " by "vacant on g^* " everywhere in the proof.

With the help of these inequalities it is now easy to prove the lemma. By⁷ (4.18) and by duality analogous to (1.22)

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}(\kappa)\{C(S(\frac{L}{2}))\} &\leq P(\kappa)\{C([- \frac{1}{2} \kappa L, \frac{1}{2} \kappa L] \times [- \frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2}])\} \\ &\leq 1 - \hat{P}(\kappa)\{\exists \text{ vacant vertical crossing} \\ &\text{on } g^* \text{ of } [- \frac{1}{2} \kappa L + 1, \frac{1}{2} \kappa L - 1] \times [- \frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2}]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

By the analogue of (4.17) for vacant crossings we may choose κ so close to 1 that the last member of (4.22) is at most

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \frac{1}{8} C_3 - \hat{P}(\kappa)\{\exists \text{ vacant vertical crossing on } g^* \text{ of} \\ [- \frac{1}{2} \kappa L + 1, \frac{1}{2} \kappa L - 1] \times [- \frac{1}{2} \kappa L, \frac{1}{2} \kappa L]\} \\ = 1 + \frac{1}{8} C_3 - P_{cr}\{\exists \text{ vacant vertical crossing on } g^* \text{ of} \\ [- \frac{1}{2} \kappa L + 1, \frac{1}{2} \kappa L - 1] \times [- \frac{1}{2} \kappa L, \frac{1}{2} \kappa L]\} \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

(by definition of $\hat{P}(\kappa)$). We now reverse our steps with P_{cr} instead of $\hat{P}(\kappa)$. By duality as in (1.22), and a monotonicity property analogous to (4.18), (4.23) is at most

⁷ For simplicity we suppress the largest integer symbol; e.g. we write $\frac{1}{2} \kappa L$ instead of $\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \kappa L \rfloor$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{8} C_3 + P_{cr} \{C([- \frac{1}{2} \kappa L + 1, \frac{1}{2} \kappa L - 1] \times [- \frac{1}{2} \kappa L, \frac{1}{2} \kappa L])\} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{8} C_3 + P_{cr} \{C([- \frac{1}{2} \kappa L + 1, \frac{1}{2} \kappa L - 1] \times [- \frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2}])\} \quad (4.24) \end{aligned}$$

Applying (4.17) once more for κ close to 1 and L large, we finally see that (4.24) is at most

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} C_3 + P_{cr} \{C([- \frac{1}{2} L - 1, \frac{1}{2} L + 1] \times [- \frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2}])\} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4} C_3 + \sigma((L+1, L); 1, p_c) \quad (\text{by periodicity}) \\ & \leq 1 - \frac{3}{4} C_3 \quad (\text{by (4.15)}). \end{aligned}$$

Also, by (4.15), for large L

$$P_p \{C(S(\lfloor \frac{L}{2} \rfloor))\} \geq \sigma((L, L); 1, p) - \frac{1}{8} C_3 \geq 1 - \frac{5}{8} C_3.$$

This proves (4.14) if $p > p_c$. A similar argument works for $p < p_c$. $\square$

Theorem 4. There exist constants $C_i = C_i(\epsilon_0)$, $i = 4, 5$, such that for small
 $\delta > 0$ and L_0 as in (4.6)

$$\begin{aligned} C_4 & \leq \frac{L(p_c + \delta, \epsilon_0)}{L_0(\delta)} \leq C_5 \quad \text{and} \\ C_4 & \leq \frac{L(p_c - \delta, \epsilon_0)}{L_0(\delta)} \leq C_5. \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

Moreover, (1.24) holds.

Proof: We restrict ourselves throughout to the inequalities for the case $p = p_c + \delta > p_c$. We fix $\kappa < 1$ so that (4.14) holds and drop the κ from the notation. Thus $\hat{p}$ will stand for $\hat{p}(\kappa)$ in this proof. We take

$$\hat{P}_t = (1 - t)\hat{P} + tP_p,$$

corresponding to

$$P_t(v \text{ is occupied}) = p(t, v) = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } v \notin S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \kappa L \rfloor) \\ tp + (1-t)p_c & \text{if } v \in S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \kappa L \rfloor) . \end{cases}$$

To prove the left inequality in (4.25) we start with (4.14) and apply Russo's formula:

$$\frac{1}{8} C_3 \leq (p - p_c) \int_0^1 dt \sum_{v \in S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \kappa L \rfloor)} \hat{P}_t\{v \text{ is pivotal for } C(S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \kappa L \rfloor))\}. \quad (4.26)$$

By virtue of Lemma 8 the summand here is

$$\hat{P}_t\{\Omega(v, S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \kappa L \rfloor))\} \leq C_2 P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \kappa L \rfloor))\}.$$

The usual comparisons ((4.3), (2.37) and (2.43); compare Cor. 3) show

$$P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \kappa L \rfloor))\} \leq C_3 P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(L))\}, \quad (4.27)$$

so that we obtain from (4.26)

$$\frac{1}{8} C_3 \leq (p - p_c) C_4 L^2 P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(L))\}$$

or

$$L^2 P_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(L))\} > \frac{C_5}{p - p_c} \quad (4.28)$$

(recall $L = L(p, \epsilon_0)$ and C_5 depends on ϵ_0 only).

We next use (4.27) to derive the following general inequality: If

$L_1 \leq L_2$ and $L_2 = L_2(p_2, \epsilon_0)$ for some $p_2 > p_c$, then

$$L_2^{2p_{cr}}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(L_2))\} \geq C_6 \left(\frac{L_2}{L_1}\right)^\zeta L_1^2 p_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(L_1))\}. \quad (4.29)$$

To prove (4.29) take j, k such that

$$2^j \leq L_1 < 2^{j+1} \quad \text{and} \quad 2^k \leq L_2 < 2^{k+1}.$$

Assume first that $j+1 \leq k$. An application of (2.59) then yields

$$2^{2j} \int_{p_c}^{p_2} ds p_s\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(2^j))\} \leq C_7 2^{-\zeta(k-j)} \leq C_7 2^\zeta \left(\frac{L_1}{L_2}\right)^\zeta. \quad (4.30)$$

By (4.1), (4.3) and (2.46), respectively, the left hand side is at least

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{2j} \int_{p_c}^{p_2} ds p_s\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^j))\} &\geq C_1 2^{2j} (p_2 - p_c) p_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(2^j))\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} C_1 (L_1)^2 (p_2 - p_c) p_{cr}\{\Delta(\underline{0}, S(2^j))\} \\ &\geq C_8 L_1^2 (p_2 - p_c) p_{cr}\{\Gamma(\underline{0}, S(L_1))\} \\ &\geq C_8 L_1^2 (p_2 - p_c) p_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(L_1))\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

Combining (4.30), (4.31) and (4.28) for $p = p_2$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{L_2}{L_1}\right)^\zeta L_1^2 p_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(L_1))\} &\leq \frac{C_9}{p_2 - p_c}, \\ &\leq C_9 C_5^{-1} L_2^2 p_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(L_2))\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

Thus (4.29) holds if $j+1 \leq k$. For $j = k$ (4.29) can be guaranteed by taking C_6 sufficiently large, since then $L_1 \leq L_2 \leq 2L_1$ and $p_{cr}\{\Omega(\underline{0}, S(L_i))\}$, for $i = 1$ and 2 are of the same order by comparisons of the same kind as in the last two inequalities of (4.31).

Note also that the special case $p_2 = p$, $L_1 = L_2 = L := L(p, \varepsilon_0)$ of (4.32) shows

$$L^2 p_{cr} \{ \Omega(\underline{0}, S(L)) \} \leq \frac{C_9}{p - p_c} . \quad (4.33)$$

Now let $p - p_c = \delta > 0$ and define, as above, $L_0(\delta)$ as the smallest solution of (4.6). Then (4.28) shows

$$L = L(p, \epsilon_0) = L(p_c + \delta, \epsilon_0) \geq L_0^{-1}(C_5 \delta) . \quad (4.34)$$

Also (4.33) and (4.29) for $L_1 = L_0(C_5^{-1} \delta)$, $p_2 = p$, $L_2 = L$ imply

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{C_9}{\delta} &\geq L^2 p_{cr} \{ \Omega(\underline{0}, S(L)) \} \\ &\geq C_6 \left(\frac{L}{L_0} \right)^{\zeta} L_0^2 p_{cr} \{ \Omega(\underline{0}, S(L_0)) \} \\ &\geq C_6 \left(\frac{L}{L_0(C_5^{-1} \delta)} \right)^{\zeta} \frac{C_5}{\delta} \quad (\text{by (4.6) for } C_5^{-1} \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$L(p_c + \delta, \epsilon_0) \leq [C_5^{-1} C_6^{-1} C_9]^{1/\zeta} L_0(C_5^{-1} \delta),$$

which together with (4.34) proves

$$L(p_c + \delta, \epsilon) \asymp L_0(C_5^{-1} \delta). \quad (4.35)$$

Finally observe that the derivation of (4.35) holds for any C_5 for which (4.28) holds. In particular we may assume $C_5 < 1$ and replace C_5 by C_5^2 . (4.35) then shows that

$$L_0(C_5^{-2} \delta) \asymp L_0(C_5^{-1} \delta) , \quad \delta \neq 0 .$$

Replacing δ by $C_5 \delta$ in the last relation we obtain $L_0(C_5^{-1} \delta) \asymp L_0(\delta)$.

The first line of (4.25) therefore follows from (4.35).

Lastly, (1.24) is immediate from (4.25). Indeed, every proof works if ϵ_0 is reduced; this only changes the various constants. In particular, for $0 < \epsilon_i \leq \epsilon_0$, $i = 1, 2$

$$C_4(\epsilon_i) \leq \frac{L(p, \epsilon_i)}{L_0(|p - p_c|)} \leq C_5(\epsilon_i).$$

Since L_0 does not depend on ϵ_i , this implies (1.24). □

5. COMMENTS TO TABLE OF CRITICAL EXPONENTS

The second column of the table at the end of the introduction is copied from [27]; see also [7], [18] and [20]. The values on a Bethe tree appear in Appendix 1 of [10] on the line $d = 6$; several of these values can also be found in [8], Sect. 3, or can be computed along the lines given in that reference. In particular, on the binary tree, with each bond open with probability p (see [8], p. 429)

$$\begin{aligned} P_p\{W \text{ contains } n \text{ bonds}\} \\ &= P_p\{W \text{ contains } (n+1) \text{ vertices}\} \\ &= \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2(n+1)}{n} p^n (1-p)^{n+2}. \end{aligned}$$

The analogue of $\Delta(p)$ should presumably be

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(n+1)} \binom{2(n+1)}{n} p^n (1-p)^{n+2}.$$

Direct calculations show that $\Delta''(p)$ is continuous but $\Delta'''(p)$ is bounded with a jump at $p_c = \frac{1}{2}$. Hence $\alpha = -1$.

$\xi(p)$ can be defined exactly as in the introduction, once one decides on the meaning of $|y|$ on the tree. If one thinks of the tree as lying in infinite Euclidean space, with each edge of a new generation being in a new dimension,

then the "Euclidean distance" of an n -th generation point to the root of the tree is $\sqrt{n}$. With this choice for distance

$$\sum_y |y|^2 P_p\{w_0 \rightsquigarrow y \text{ and } \#W < \infty\}$$

becomes

$$\sum_n n E_p\{Z_n\},$$

where Z_n is the number of n -th generation points connected by occupied paths to the root, and $\rho = P_p\{\#W < \infty\}$. This can be calculated by standard branching process calculations and yields $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$.

Lastly we discuss the rigorous bounds in the first column. $\alpha < 0$ follows from a small extension of the proof of Theorem 9.4 in [13]. $\beta < 1$ was proven by J. and L. Chayes [5], and the improvement to $\beta < 1$ will appear in [16]. $\nu > 1$ follows from $\nu \geq (\delta + 1)/\delta$ in Cor. 2 and $\delta < \infty$ (see [13], Theorem 8.2). The lower bound for γ results from

$$\gamma = 2\nu \frac{\delta - 1}{\delta + 1} \geq 2 \frac{\delta - 1}{\delta} \quad (\text{see Cor. 2})$$

if one uses $\delta \geq 5$, so that we merely have to show $\delta \geq 5$. The bound $\delta \geq 5$, and hence the bound $\gamma \geq 8/5$ have only been proven for bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

Proof of $\delta \geq 5$ for bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$. By the results of [14] it suffices to prove $\delta_r \geq 3$, or the statement

$$\pi(p_c, r) \geq C_1 n^{-1/3} \tag{5.1}$$

(which does not presuppose the existence of δ_r). The proof of (5.1) is a small improvement on the proof of (3.15) in [28]. The present proof of (5.1) is due to J. van den Berg and slightly simpler than the author's original proof. We

saw in the proof of Lemma 7 that there is a strictly positive probability that the lowest occupied horizontal crossing $\mathcal{R}$ of $S(2^k)$ lies in $T = [-2^k, 2^k] \times [-2^{k-4}, 2^{k-4}]$. Moreover, if $\mathcal{R}$ exists and intersects the line $x = 0$ in $w \in \{0\} \times [-2^{k-4}, 2^{k-4}]$, then w is connected by occupied paths r_1 and r_3 to the left and right edge of $S(2^k)$, respectively, and by a path r_2^* to the bottom edge of $S(2^k)$. r_2^* is vacant, except at w , and any pair of r_1, r_2^*, r_3 only have the point w in common. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < C_2 &\leq \sum_{|n| \leq 2^{k-4}} P_{cr} \{ \mathcal{R} \text{ exists and contains } (0,n) \} \\ &\leq \sum_{|n| \leq 2^{k-4}} P_{cr} \{ \text{paths } r_1, r_2^*, r_3 \text{ as above connect} \\ &\quad (0,n) \text{ to } \partial S(2^k) \} \\ &\leq \sum_{|n| \leq 2^{k-4}} P_{cr} \{ \exists \text{ vacant path on } \mathcal{G}^* \text{ from a} \\ &\quad \text{neighbor of } (0,n) \text{ to } \partial S(2^k) \} \cdot P_{cr} \{ \exists \text{ two} \\ &\quad \text{disjoint occupied paths from neighbors of } (0,n) \\ &\quad \text{to } \partial S(2^k) \} \text{ (by Harris-FKG inequality)} \leq \\ &\quad C_3 2^k [\pi(p_c, 2^k)]^3 \end{aligned}$$

For the last inequality we used self-duality of bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} P_{cr} \{ \exists \text{ vacant path on } \mathcal{G}^* \text{ from a neighbor of } (0,n) \text{ to } \partial S(2^k) \} &\leq \\ \pi(p_c, 2^k - 2^{k-4} - 1) &\leq C_4 \pi(p_c, 2^k) \quad (\text{see (2.20)}). \end{aligned}$$

The rest is as in (3.15) of [28].

□

Remark. Even for site percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ we have $\delta_r \geq 2$ and hence $\delta = 2\delta_r - 1 \geq 3$, by [28], (3.15), and [14]. Thus in any case $\gamma \geq 4/3$.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Aizenman and D. Barsky, in preparation.
- [2] M. Aizenman, J. Chayes, L. Chayes, J. Fröhlich and L. Russo. On a sharp transition from area law to perimeter law in a system of random surfaces, Comm. Math. Phys. 92, 19-69, (1983).
- [3] M. Aizenman and C. Newman, Tree graph inequalities and critical behavior in percolation models, J. Stat. Phys. 36, 107-143 (1984).
- [4] J.T. Chayes and L. Chayes, An inequality for the infinite cluster density in percolation, to appear in Phys. Rev. Lett. See also contribution to Proc. Workshop on Percolation and Ergodic Theory of Infinite Particle Systems, IMA, 1986.
- [5] J.T. Chayes, L. Chayes and J. Fröhlich, The low-temperature behavior of disordered magnets, Comm. Math. Phys. 100, 399-437 (1985).
- [6] A. Coniglio, Shapes, surfaces and interfaces in percolation clusters in Proc. Les Houches Conf. on "Physics of finely divided matter", 1985, M. Daoud ed.
- [7] M.P.M. den Nijs, A relation between the temperature exponents of the eight-vertex and q-state Potts model, J. Phys. A 12, 1857-1868 (1979).
- [8] R. Durrett, Some general results concerning the critical exponents of percolation processes, Z. Wahrsch. verw. Geb. 60, 421-437 (1985).
- [9] R. Durrett and B. Nguyen, Thermodynamic inequalities for percolation, Comm. Math. Phys. 99, 253-269 (1985).
- [10] J.W. Essam, Percolation theory, Rep. Prog. Phys. 43, 833-912 (1980).
- [11] Y. Higuchi, Coexistence of the infinite (*) clusters; a remark on the square lattice site percolation, Z. Wahrsch. verw. Geb. 61, 75-81 (1982).
- [12] H. Kesten, The critical probability of bond percolation on the square lattice equals $1/2$, Comm. Math. Phys. 74, 41-59 (1980).
- [13] H. Kesten, Percolation Theory for Mathematicians, Birkhäuser (1982).
- [14] H. Kesten, A scaling relation at criticality for 2D-percolation, to appear in Proc. Workshop on Percolation and Ergodic Behavior of Infinite Particle Systems, IMA, Minneapolis, (1986).
- [15] H. Kesten, The incipient infinite cluster in two-dimensional percolation, to appear in Theor. Probab. Rel. Fields.

- [16] H. Kesten and Y. Zhang, Strict inequalities for some critical exponents in 2D percolation, in preparation.
- [17] C. Newman, Inequalities for γ and related critical exponents, Proc. Workshop on Percolation and Ergodic Theory of Infinite Particle Systems, IMA, 1986.
- [18] B. Nienhuis, E.K. Riedel and M. Schick, Magnetic exponents of the two-dimensional q -state Potts model, J. Phys. A 13, L. 189-192 (1980).
- [19] B.G. Nguyen, Correlation lengths for percolation processes, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Cal., Los Angeles, 1985.
- [20] R.P. Pearson, Conjecture for the extended Potts model magnetic eigenvalue, Phys. Rev. B 22, 2579-2580 (1980).
- [21] L. Russo, A note on percolation, Z. Wahrsch. verw. Geb. 43, 39-48 (1978).
- [22] L. Russo, On the critical percolation probabilities, Z. Wahrsch. verw. Geb. 56, 229-237 (1981).
- [23] P.D. Seymour and D.J.A. Welsh, Percolation probabilities on the square lattice, Ann. Discrete Math. 3, 227-245 (1978).
- [24] R.T. Smythe and J.C. Wierman, First-passage Percolation on the Square Lattice, Lecture notes in mathematics, Vol. 671, Springer, 1978.
- [25] H.E. Stanley, Introduction to Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, Oxford University Press, 1971.
- [26] D. Stauffer, Scaling theory of percolation clusters, Phys. Rep. 54, No. 1, 1-74 (1979).
- [27] D. Stauffer, Scaling properties of percolation clusters, pp. 9-25 in Disordered Systems and Localization, C. Castellani, C.Di Castro and L. Peliti eds., Lecture notes in physics, vol. 149, Springer, 1981.
- [28] J. van den Berg and H. Kesten, Inequalities with applications to percolation and reliability, J. Appl. Prob. 22, 556-569 (1985).