

# A Notion of Dimension based on Probability on Groups

Agelos Georgakopoulos\*

Mathematics Institute  
University of Warwick  
CV4 7AL, UK

## Abstract

We introduce notions of dimension of an infinite group, or more generally, a metric space, defined using percolation. Roughly speaking, the percolation dimension  $pdim(G)$  of a group  $G$  is the fastest rate of decay of a symmetric probability measure  $\mu$  on  $G$ , such that Bernoulli percolation on  $G$  with connection probabilities proportional to  $\mu$  behaves like a Poisson branching process with parameter 1 in a sense made precise below. We show that  $pdim(G)$  has several natural properties: it is monotone decreasing with respect to subgroups and quotients, and coincides with the growth rate exponent for several classes of groups.

## 1 Background and Motivation

We introduce new invariants of infinite groups that behave similarly to the growth rate but are less susceptible to the effect of dead-ends. We will define a notion of dimension  $pdim(G)$  of a finitely generated group  $G$  using (long-range, Bernoulli) percolation. It will turn out to have several natural properties. In particular, for groups of polynomial growth it follows from parallel work of Spanos & Tointon [25] that  $pdim(G)$  coincides with the growth exponent. Importantly, unlike most parameters defined via percolation,  $pdim(G)$  does not depend on the choice of a generating set.

The growth rate is one of the most important invariants of infinite groups due to its interplay with other properties of the group, as witnessed by Gromov’s polynomial growth theorem or the fact that non-amenable groups have exponential growth. Nevertheless, there are cases where the growth of a group can be somewhat deceiving. Let me start explaining this with an example that is not a group, but much easier to explain. The graph in Figure 1 is the so-called *canopy tree*  $T$ , frequently used as an example of a local limit of an infinite sequence of finite graphs<sup>1</sup>. It is easy to see that  $T$  has exponential growth. However, in certain respects it behaves like an ‘1-dimensional’ graph: for example, it has  $p_c(T) = 1$ , i.e. it has a trivial phase transition for Bernoulli percolation. Indeed,  $T$  can be obtained by attaching finite trees along an 1-way infinite path

\*Supported by EPSRC grants EP/V048821/1, EP/V009044/1, and EP/Y004302/1.

<sup>1</sup>More specifically,  $T$  is the Benjamini–Schramm limit of  $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $T_n$  stands for the binary tree of depth  $n$  [5, 21]; but this is not important here.

$P$ , and it will behave much more like  $P$  than the infinite binary tree with respect to most statistical mechanics models despite its large growth rate. One explanation to this is that the vast majority of directions that a walker on  $T$  can explore lead into *dead-ends*, i.e. they cannot be extended to increase the distance from a fixed vertex.




Figure 1: The *canopy tree*  $T$  consists of an 1-way infinite path  $x_0x_1 \dots$  and a binary tree of depth  $i$  attached to each  $x_i$ .

Such phenomena arise in Cayley graphs of groups, although in much more subtle ways. Notable examples include Wilson's groups of non-uniform exponential growth [28], and the groups of oscillating intermediate growth of Kassabov & Pak [18].

The notion of dimension we will introduce below assigns dimension 1 to the above example  $T$ . It has several desirable properties such as being monotone decreasing with respect to subgroups and quotients of groups.

Statistical mechanics usually studies physical phenomena, but there is a recent trend of studying its stochastic processes on (Cayley graphs of) arbitrary groups, and making a connection between the algebraic or geometric properties of the group and the behaviour of the process. The most studied examples are random walk and (Bernoulli) percolation. The pioneering result in this direction is Kesten's theorem that the random walk return probability decays exponentially if and only if the group is non-amenable [19]. An analogous result of Benjamini & Schramm for percolation states that the group  $G$  is non-amenable if and only if there is a  $G$ -invariant Bernoulli percolation model with a non-uniqueness phase [4]. Such results initiated the area of probability on groups, some of the recent advances of which involve deep machinery from both worlds of probability and group theory, see [9, 10, 17, 22, 25, 26] for some examples.

Typically, such results use our understanding of groups in order to deduce properties of the stochastic process. As the wealth and depth of such results grows, the question of whether we can go in the opposite direction becomes pressing: can percolation theory be used as a tool to obtain deterministic results about groups? I hope that the notions defined here, being numerical invariants of a groups independent of a choice of a Cayley graph, may make a step in this direction.

Additional motivation for the notions defined here comes from Gromov's [15] *asymptotic dimension*  $asdim(G)$  of a group  $G$ . Like  $asdim(G)$ , the dimension we will define is designed so as to capture the large scale geometry of a group, it generalises to arbitrary metric spaces, and has desirable properties like monotonicity with respect to subgroups.

The idea of 'embedding' a stochastic process into a space in order to study

its coarse metric properties is not new, notions with a similar flavour include Ball's [2] Markov type and Gaboriau's [11] cost of a group.

This note is structured as follows. We start with the formal definition of  $pdim(G)$  in Section 2, and provide some basic properties in Section 3. The highlight of this section is Corollary 3.3, stating that  $pdim(G)$  coincides with the exponent of the growth rate when  $G$  has polynomial growth. In Section 4 we offer a variant  $\nu dim(G)$  of  $pdim(G)$  defined using self-avoiding walks instead of percolation, and show that  $\nu dim(G) = pdim(G)$  when  $G$  has polynomial growth (Corollary 4.1). In Section 5 we adapt our notions to groups of super-polynomial growth. The main result here is that every non-amenable group achieves the maximum possible value of  $pdim(G)$  (Theorem 5.2). Section 6 introduces a notion of percolative group that is implicit in the aforementioned results but might be of independent interest to percolation theorists. Section 7 extends some of our definitions to metric spaces. We conclude with some open problems in Section 8.

## 2 Definition of the dimension of a group

Given a group  $G$ , we call a probability measure  $\mu : G \rightarrow [0, 1]$  *symmetric*, if  $\mu(g) = \mu(g^{-1})$  for every  $g \in G$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}(G)$  denote the set of all symmetric probability measures on  $G$ . For simplicity  $G$  will be finitely generated, but our definitions can be adapted to topological groups endowed with a metric.

One can use  $\mu$  to define an *edge-weighted Cayley graph* of  $G$ , in which the generating set is the support of  $\mu$  and every edge  $gh$  is given the weight  $\mu(g^{-1}h)$ . With this notion in mind, it is rather straightforward to adapt any model of statistical mechanics defined on graphs into one where the 'strengths of interactions' are given by  $\mu$ . Thus any  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$  can be used to define a plethora of models. Examples include random walk, various percolation models, self-avoiding walks, and the Ising model.

Any  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$  naturally defines a percolation process on  $G$  as follows. Given  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , we define a random (multi-)graph  $G^\mu(\lambda)$  with vertex set  $G$ , by letting the number of (parallel) edges between two elements  $g, h \in G$  be an independent Poisson random variable with mean  $\lambda\mu(g^{-1}h)$ . Note that  $G^\mu(\lambda)$  is a  $G$ -invariant percolation model, i.e. the natural action of  $G$  on  $G^\mu(\lambda)$  defined by multiplication from the left preserves the probability distribution of  $G^\mu(\lambda)$ . This setup is a generalisation of Long Range Percolation, which has been studied in statistical mechanics since the 80's, see e.g. [1]. Similarly to the standard percolation threshold  $p_c$ , we define

$$\lambda_c(\mu) := \sup\{\lambda \mid \mathbb{P}(G^\mu(\lambda) \text{ has an infinite component}) = 0\}. \quad (1)$$

Note that  $\lambda_c(\mu) \geq 1$  since an exploration of the component of the identity in  $G^\mu(\lambda)$  is dominated by a Poisson branching process with parameter  $\lambda$ . Answering a question from [12], Xiang & Zou proved that every countable group admits a symmetric measure  $\mu$  such that  $\lambda_c(\mu)$  is finite [29], thereby generalising the non-triviality of  $p_c$  [9] to locally finite groups.

Apart from percolation, one can use the same  $\mu$  to define long-range versions of other models, e.g. the connective constant. We will elaborate on this in Section 4.

This is more than just an economical way for constructing many models at once. Firstly, having a common defining measure  $\mu$  allows for some direct comparisons between various models (see (6) below for an example). Secondly, our probability measures  $\mathcal{M}(G)$  offer in some sense a ‘normalised’ framework: it is more informative to compare the two percolation models on a common group  $G$  arising from  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(G)$  than the percolation models on two Cayley graphs of  $G$  with different degrees.

We now add geometry to the picture by recalling that any choice of a Cayley graph  $\text{Cay}(G, S)$  of a finitely generated group  $G$  with respect to a generating set  $S$  turns  $G$  into a metric space, and the ‘large-scale’ properties of the metric are independent of the choice of  $S$ . This will allow us to associate a *rate of decay*  $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$  to any  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ , independent of the choice of  $S$ . Roughly speaking, we then define the dimension of  $G$  as the supremal  $s$  such that there is a sequence of  $\mu_i \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ , each of rate of decay  $s$ , and exhibiting ‘mean-field behaviour’. When defining *percolation dimension*  $\text{pdim}(G)$ , mean-field behaviour means that  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_c(\mu_i) = 1$ , where  $\lambda_c$  is defined by (1). In other words, it means that the model approximates the Poisson Branching Process in the sense that at criticality, the average degree of the root vertex converges to 1 as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ .

We now state the formal definition of  $\text{pdim}(G)$ . Let  $X = \text{Cay}(G, S)$  be a Cayley graph of  $G$  with respect to a finite generating set  $S$  (hence  $G$  is finitely generated). Let  $|g| := d_X(g, e)$  denote the distance from  $g$  to the identity  $e$  with respect to the graph metric of  $X$ . For any  $s, b \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , we define the set of symmetric probability measures  $\mathcal{M}_s^b(G) \subset \mathcal{M}(G)$  with decay rate  $s$  (and constant  $b$ ) as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}_s^b(G) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G) \mid \mu(g) < b|g|^{-s}\}. \quad (2)$$

**Definition 2.1.** *The percolation dimension  $\text{pdim}(G)$  of  $G$  is defined by*

$$\text{pdim}(G) := \sup \left\{ s \mid \exists b \in \mathbb{R}_+ \text{ such that } \liminf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s^b(G)} \lambda_c(\mu) = 1 \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Note that although  $|g|$ , and hence  $\mathcal{M}_s^b(G)$ , depends on the choice of  $S$ , the value of  $\text{pdim}(G)$  does not: different choices of  $S$  may impose a different choice of  $b$  in the above definition, but they cannot affect the existence of such a constant. This is similar to the standard calculation showing that the growth rate of  $G$  is independent of the choice of  $S$ .

Rather than defining one concept, (3) can be thought of as a recipe for defining many such concepts: we can replace percolation by many other models; for example we will define the *connective dimension* in Section 4. In (2) we made the decay rate polynomial in  $|g|$ , but we can change it to stretched-exponential; see Section 5. Finally, we can replace  $X = \text{Cay}(G, S)$  by an arbitrary graph or metric space  $X$  and adapt the definition of  $\mu$  by dropping its symmetry; see Section 7. I think of this versatility as an advantage: it is a tool that can be tailored to the desired application.

### 3 Properties of $\text{pdim}(G)$

It is far from clear from the definitions that  $\text{pdim}(G)$  is a non-trivial quantity, let alone a well-behaved one. The following establishes this:

**Proposition 3.1.** *For every  $d \geq 1$ , we have  $\text{pdim}(\mathbb{Z}^d) = d$ .*

More generally, we will see below that for every  $G$  of polynomial growth,  $\text{pdim}(G)$  equals the growth exponent. In particular,  $\text{pdim}(G)$  turns out to be an integer for such groups.

To prove these claims we will use the following proposition, which states that the exponent of the (polynomial) growth rate of  $G$  upper bounds  $\text{pdim}(G)$ . Given a Cayley graph  $X$ , we let  $B_X(n)$  denote the ball of radius  $n$  around the identity in  $X$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $X$  be a Cayley graph of a group  $G$  such that  $|B_X(n)| < cn^k$  for some  $c, k \in \mathbb{R}$  and every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $\text{pdim}(G) \leq k$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose, to the contrary, that  $\text{pdim}(G) \geq k + \epsilon$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . Pick some  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  (which will depend on  $\epsilon, c, k$  in a way that we make precise below), and let  $A_0 := B_o(M)$ , and for every  $i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ , define the “annulus”  $A_i := B_o(M2^i) \setminus B_o(M2^{i-1})$ .

Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{k+\epsilon}^b(G)$  for some  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then for every  $i > 0$ , we have

$$\mu(A_i) \leq c(M2^i)^k b(M2^{i-1})^{-(k+\epsilon)} \quad (4)$$

because  $A_i$  has at most  $|B_o(M2^i)| \leq c(M2^i)^k$  elements, each of which elements  $g$  has  $\mu(g) \leq b(M2^{i-1})^{-(k+\epsilon)}$  by the definitions. Rearranging (4) by cancelling out the factor  $(M2^i)^k$  we deduce  $\mu(A_i) \leq bc2^{k+\epsilon}M^{-\epsilon}2^{-i\epsilon}$ . Note that the only term depending on  $i$  here is  $2^{-i\epsilon}$ , which decays exponentially in  $i$ , and in particular it is summable. Therefore,

$$\mu(A_0) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_i) \geq 1 - bc2^{k+\epsilon}M^{-\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i\epsilon}.$$

Easily, we can choose  $M = M(b, c, \epsilon, k)$  large enough that  $\mu(A_0) > 1/2$ .

Let  $\mu_j, j \in \mathbb{N}$  be a sequence of elements of  $\mathcal{M}_{k+\epsilon}^b(G)$  witnessing the fact that  $\text{pdim}(G) \geq k + \epsilon$ , i.e.  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_c(\mu_j) = 1$ . Since the above calculations did not depend on the choice of  $\mu$ , we deduce that  $\mu_j(A_0) > 1/2$  for every  $j$ .

Since  $A_0$  is fixed and finite, we deduce that there is  $\delta > 0$  such that for every  $j$  there is  $g_j$  with  $\mu_j(g_j) > \delta$ . It follows that we expect  $\delta' \approx \delta$  parallel edges between the identity  $o$  and  $g_j$ , and so the expected simple degree of  $o$  is at most  $\lambda - \delta'$ , which is less than 1 when  $\lambda \rightarrow 1$ . This contradicts our assumption  $\lambda_c(\mu_k) \rightarrow 1$  by comparison with the Poisson branching process with rate  $\lambda - \delta'$  and the argument we appealed to after (1).  $\square$

**Remark:** In the last proof we only used the assumption  $|B_o(n)| < cn^k$  on a sequence  $n_i$  of values of  $n$  forming a geometric progression.

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* The lower bound  $\text{pdim}(\mathbb{Z}^d) \geq d$  can be deduced from a result of [23], re-proved in [7], or from results of [16]. The upper bound  $\text{pdim}(\mathbb{Z}^d) \leq d$  is provided by Proposition 3.2.  $\square$

In parallel work, Spanos & Tointon [25, Theorem 1.1] prove a deep result extending the aforementioned lower bounds to all groups of polynomial growth. Combining this result with Proposition 6.1 below, and again using Proposition 3.2 for the upper bound, we immediately obtain the following generalisation of Proposition 3.1:

**Corollary 3.3.** *For every group  $G$  of polynomial growth  $\Theta(n^d)$ , we have  $pdim(G) = d$ .*

Next, we remark that if  $H$  is a subgroup of  $G$ , then  $pdim(H) \leq pdim(G)$ , just because  $\mathcal{M}_s^b(H) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_s^{b'}(G)$  when choosing the Cayley graphs appropriately. Moreover, one can show that if  $H$  is a quotient of  $G$ , then  $pdim(H) \leq pdim(G)$ , by lifting any measure  $\mu_i \in \mathcal{M}_s(H)$  to a measure in  $\mathcal{M}_s(G)$ .

## 4 Long-range connective constant, and connective dimension

As mentioned above, we can replace percolation by many other models of statistical mechanics in the definition of  $pdim$ . In this section we elaborate on one such example, based on the connective constant.

Recall that a *self-avoiding walk* (SAW) in a graph  $X$  is a sequence  $x_1 \dots x_n$  of distinct vertices such that  $x_i x_{i+1}$  is an edge for every relevant  $i$ . The *connective constant*  $\nu(X)$  of  $X$  is the exponential growth rate of the number  $c_n = c_n(X)$  of SAWs of length  $n$  starting at a fixed vertex; that is,  $\nu(X) := \lim c_n^{1/n}$ .

The definition of  $\nu(X)$  can be adapted to our long-range setup of a group  $G$  endowed with a symmetric probability measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$  as follows.

To each sequence  $S = (e =) g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n$  of distinct elements of  $G$  (which we think of as a ‘*long-range SAW*’), we assign a weight  $w_\mu(S) := \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mu(g_i g_{i-1}^{-1})$ , and define  $\sigma_n(\mu) := \sum_{S=(e=)g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n} w_\mu(S)$ . We then define the *connective constant*  $\nu(\mu)$  of  $\mu$  by  $\nu(\mu) := \lim_n \sigma_n(\mu)^{1/n}$ .

If  $X = Cay(G, S)$ , and  $\mu$  is the equidistribution on  $X$ , then

$$\nu(\mu) = \nu(X)/|S|, \quad (5)$$

because  $\sigma_n(\mu) = c_n(X)/|S|^n$ .

Thus  $\nu(\mu)$  generalises  $\nu(X)$  in the same way that  $\lambda_c(\mu)$  generalises  $p_c(X)$ . Grimmett & Li have obtained generalisations of results about  $\nu(X)$  to  $\nu(\mu)$  [14]. Moreover, similarly to the well-known inequality  $p_c(X) \geq \frac{1}{\nu(X)}$  [20] for a graph  $X$ , one can prove the inequality

$$\lambda_c(\mu) \geq \frac{1}{\nu(\mu)}. \quad (6)$$

In analogy to  $pdim(G)$ , we define the *connective dimension*  $\nu dim(G)$  of  $G$  by

$$\nu dim(G) := \sup \left\{ s \mid \exists b \in \mathbb{R}_+ \text{ such that } \limsup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s^b(G)} \nu(\mu) = 1 \right\}. \quad (7)$$

Again, we interpret the condition  $\limsup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s^b(G)} \nu(\mu) = 1$  as being asymptotically tree-like. Indeed, it follows from (5) that  $\nu(\mu) \leq \frac{|S|-1}{|S|} < 1$ , and if  $F_n$  is a free group freely generated by a set  $S_n$  of size  $n$ , then  $\lim \frac{|S_n|-1}{|S_n|} = 1$ .

Similar argument to those in Proposition 3.2 upper bound  $\nu\dim(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ , and more generally  $\nu\dim(G)$  of any  $G$  of polynomial growth  $\Theta(n^d)$  by  $d$ . Indeed, as in that proof, for any  $k > d$  and any sequence  $\mu_j \in \mathcal{M}_k^b, j \in \mathbb{N}$ , we find elements  $g_j \in G$  with  $\mu_j(g_j) > \delta > 0$  for every  $j$ . It follows that  $\nu(\mu_j) \leq 1 - \delta/2$ , because whenever a long-range SAW traverses an edge of the form  $sg_j$ , it cannot traverse the edge  $g_j s$  in the next step, and the latter edge has weight  $\mu_j(g_j^{-1}) = \mu_j(g_j) > \delta$ .

On the other hand, (6) yields  $\nu\dim(G) \geq p\dim(G)$  for every  $G$ . Putting these facts together, and combining with Corollary 3.3, proves

**Corollary 4.1.** *For every group  $G$  of polynomial growth  $\Theta(n^d)$ , we have*

$$\nu\dim(G) = p\dim(G) = d.$$

This raises the metaconjecture that our dimensions do not depend on the choice of the model.

## 5 Groups of super-polynomial growth.

Usually, having large growth makes it easier to percolate. Nevertheless, the problem of whether every finitely generated group has a Cayley graph  $X$  with  $p_c(X) < 1$  remained open long after it was known for groups of polynomial growth, and it was settled in [9]. In analogy, we ask

**Problem 5.1.** *Does  $p\dim(G) = \infty$  hold for every group of super-polynomial growth?*

We expect groups of intermediate growth to pose the greatest challenge here. For such groups, it is more natural however to consider the *exponential percolation dimension*  ${}_e p\dim(G)$ , which we now introduce. This is defined exactly like  $p\dim(G)$ , except that we now change the polynomial decay condition  $\mu(g) < b|g|^{-s}$  in the definition of  $\mathcal{M}_s^b(G)$  into the stretched exponential decay  $\mu(g) = O(r^{|g|^s})$  for some  $r < 1$  and  $s \in (0, 1]$ . In other words, we let  ${}_e \mathcal{M}_s^r(G) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G) \mid \mu(g) < r^{|g|^s}\}$ , and define  ${}_e p\dim(G)$  as in (3), except that we replace  $\mathcal{M}$  by  ${}_e \mathcal{M}$ .

Thus  $s = 1$  corresponds to exponential decay. In analogy to Proposition 3.2, we obtain, by repeating the same arguments, the following bound:

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $X$  be a Cayley graph of a group  $G$  such that  $|B_X(n)| < r^{|n|^s}$  for some  $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$  and every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  ${}_e p\dim(G) \leq s$ .*

It might be that every  $G$  of exponential growth has  ${}_e p\dim(G) = 1$ . We will prove this when  $G$  is non-amenable:

**Theorem 5.2.** *For every finitely generated non-amenable group  $G$ , we have  ${}_e p\dim(G) = 1$ .*

The main idea of the proof of this was contributed by Gabor Pete (private communication).

*Proof.* Let  $\Sigma$  be a finite symmetric generating set of  $G$ , and let  $G_1 := \text{Cay}(G, \Sigma)$  be the corresponding Cayley graph. It was proved by Thom [27] that for every

$k \in \mathbb{N}$  there is a symmetric generating set  $S_k \subseteq \Sigma^k$  of  $G$  such that  $\rho_{S_k} \leq 4k \ln(|\Sigma|) \rho(\Sigma)^k$ , where  $\rho_S := \rho(\text{Cay}(G, S))$  is the spectral radius<sup>2</sup> of the Cayley graph corresponding to a finite symmetric generating set  $S$  of  $G$ . Moreover, it is well-known that  $|S|^{-1} \leq \rho_S^2$  holds for every such  $S \subset G$  (by comparison with a  $2S$ -regular tree). Putting these two inequalities together we obtain

$$|S_k|^{-1} \leq \rho_{S_k}^2 \leq ck^2 \rho_\Sigma^{2k}. \quad (8)$$

Recall that Kesten's Theorem [19] states that  $\rho_\Sigma < 1$  whenever  $G$  is non-amenable. Let  $r := 1/\rho_\Sigma$ .

Define  $\mu_k \in \mathcal{M}(G)$  to be the equidistribution on  $S_k$ . The two extremes of (8) imply that  $|S_k| > r^k$  for large enough  $k$ . Hence  $\mu_k(g) \leq r^{-|g|}$  for every  $g \in S_k$  since  $|g| \leq k$  by the choice of  $S_k$ . In other words,  $\mu_k \in {}_e\mathcal{M}_r^1$  for large enough  $k$ .

We claim that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_c(\mu_k) = 1$ , which means that  ${}_e\text{pdim}(G) \geq 1$  by the definitions, and hence  ${}_e\text{pdim}(G) = 1$  by Proposition 5.1 and the fact that no group has super-exponential growth. Equivalently, since  $\mu_k$  is the equidistribution on  $S_k$ , our percolation model governed by  $\mu_k$  is identically distributed with standard Bernoulli bond percolation on  $G_k := \text{Cay}(G, S_k)$ , so our claim can be reformulated as  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(G_k)p_c(G_k) = 1$ , where  $d(G_k)$  is the degree of the vertices of  $G_k$ .

For this, we recall the edge Cheeger constant  $\iota(X)$  of a graph  $X$ , defined as  $\inf_{F \subset V(X), |F| < \infty} |\partial_E F|/|F|$ , where  $\partial_E F$  denotes the set of edges with exactly one end-vertex in  $F$ . It follows from Kesten's theorem [19] that  $\iota(X) \geq 1 - \rho(X)$ . Thus we have  $\lim_k \iota(G_k) \geq 1$  by the above remark.

Finally, by a theorem of Benjamini & Schramm we have  $p_c(X) < \frac{1}{d(X)\iota(X)}$  for every graph  $X$  with  $\iota(X) > 0$ , see [24, formula (12.13)]. Putting these facts together, we obtain  $\lim_k d(G_k)p_c(G_k) \leq 1$ , which proves our claim.  $\square$

## The Gap Conjecture

One of the best-known open problems in geometric group theory is the *Gap Conjecture*  $GC(\beta)$  [13]. It postulates that if the growth rate of a finitely generated group  $G$  is  $o(e^{\sqrt{n}})$  (or more generally,  $o(e^{n^\beta})$  for a fixed  $\beta \leq 1/2$ ), then  $G$  has polynomial growth. The analogous question for  ${}_e\text{pdim}(G)$  is

**Conjecture 5.2.** *There is  $\beta > 0$  such that  ${}_e\text{pdim}(G) < \beta$  implies  ${}_e\text{pdim}(G) = 0$  for every finitely generated group  $G$ .*

Moreover, the following seems plausible:

**Conjecture 5.3.** *For every finitely generated group  $G$  of super-polynomial growth we have  ${}_e\text{pdim}(G) > 0$ .*

Note that these two conjectures combined would imply the Gap Conjecture  $GC(\beta)$  by Proposition 5.1.

---

<sup>2</sup>The *spectral radius*  $\rho(X)$  of a graph  $X$  can be defined as  $\limsup p_n^{1/n}$ , where  $p_n$  denotes the probability that random walk will be back to its starting vertex at step  $n$ . We will not work with its definition here; we will only use certain inequalities involving  $\rho(X)$ .



## 6 Percolative Groups

Corollary 3.3 is proved by considering  $\mu_n$  to be the equidistribution in the ball of radius  $n$  of a Cayley graph of  $G$ , and Theorem 5.2 follows a similar idea. This raises the question of whether all groups have this property. Let me state it more precisely.

Let  $X = \text{Cay}(G, S)$  be a finitely generated Cayley graph of a group  $G$ . Let  $\mu_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$  be the equidistribution on the ball of radius  $n$  of  $X$ . Call  $X$  *percolative*, if  $\lim \lambda_c(\mu_n) = 1$ . Call  $G$  weakly percolative if it has a percolative Cayley graph, and call  $G$  (strongly) percolative if each of its finitely generated Cayley graphs is percolative.

**Question 6.1.** *Is every group weakly/strongly percolative?*

I suspect that the groups of [18, 28] fail to be percolative.

Spanos & Tointon [25, Theorem 1.1] proved that virtually nilpotent groups are strongly percolative. The following proposition provides the lower bound needed for the proof of Corollary 3.3.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $X$  be a percolative Cayley graph of a group  $G$  such that  $|B_X(n)| > bn^s$  (respectively,  $|B_X(n)| > b^{|n|^s}$ ) for some  $b, s \in \mathbb{R}$  and infinitely many  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $\text{pdim}(G) \geq s$  (resp.  $\text{epdim}(G) \geq s$ ).*

*Proof.* Let  $\{n_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfy  $|B_X(n_i)| > bn_i^s$  for every  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $\mu_i$  denote the equidistribution on the ball of radius  $n_i$  of  $X$ . Thus we have  $\lim \lambda_c(\mu_i) = 1$  by our assumptions, and so it only remains to check that the  $\mu_i$  have the desired decay rate. To see this, pick  $g \in G$ , and note that

$$\mu_i(g) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{g \in B_X(n_i)}}{|B_X(n_i)|} \leq \frac{1}{bn_i^s} \leq b^{-1}|g|^{-s},$$

since  $\mathbb{1}_{g \in B_X(n_i)} = 1$  implies  $|g| \leq n_i$ . Thus  $\mu_i \in \mathcal{M}_s^{b^{-1}}$  as desired, and hence  $\text{pdim}(G) \geq s$ .

The proof of the claim  $\text{epdim}(G) \geq s$  follows the same lines.  $\square$

## 7 Beyond Groups

It is possible to modify our definitions of dimension to make them applicable to the much more general setup where the group  $G$  is replaced by a metric space  $(X, d)$  as follows. We consider sequences of finite or infinite edge-weighted graphs  $G_i = (V_i, \mu_i)$ , playing the role of the  $\mu$ 's in (3), (7), where  $V_i \subset X$  obey an arbitrary but fixed lower bound on their pairwise distances, and  $\mu_i : V_i^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is symmetric (we can interpret  $G_i$  as an unweighted graph by letting the support of  $\mu_i$  be its edge set  $E_i$ , but we will not use  $E_i$  explicitly). As above, we let the (possibly model-dependent) dimension of  $(X, d)$  be the fastest decay-rate of a family of such  $(V_i, \mu_i)$  that achieve ‘tree-like behaviour’. Tree-likeness can still be defined using percolation, and we can define  $\text{pdim}(X, d)$  as in Definition 3. Alternatively, if the  $G_i$  are finite, then instead of an infinite component we can ask for a *giant component*, i.e. one containing a fixed proportion of the vertices in each  $V_i$ , in a sequence of models with rates  $\mu_i$  where the average vertex degree converges to 1.

Such definitions can be applied to sequences and families of metric spaces or graphs, as well as to random rooted infinite graphs. Thus one can study e.g. the (percolation) dimension of the family of planar graphs of maximum degree  $d$ , or of a unimodular random graph [6]. A particularly interesting case to consider is a triangulation  $X$  of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with uniform volume growth of order  $\Theta(r^a)$  for non-integer  $a > 1$ ; such triangulations have been constructed in [5].

Working with finite graphs  $G_i = (V_i, \mu_i)$  as above allows us to consider further models. For example, we define the *spectral dimension* by interpreting tree-likeness as the requirement that our  $G_i$  form a sequence of Ramanujan graphs.

## 8 Other problems

We conclude with some open problems.

**Problem 8.1.** *Is  $pdim(G) > 0$  true for every finitely generated group?*

**Problem 8.2.** *Is  $pdim(G \times H) = pdim(G) + pdim(H)$  for every two finitely generated groups  $G, H$ ? (where  $\times$  denotes the cartesian product).*

Such statements have been studied extensively for  $asdim(G)$ , see [3].

A concrete group for which it would be interesting, and perhaps realistic, to determine  $pdim$  of is the lamplighter group  $L_d$  over  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $d \geq 1$ , which is known to have dead ends of arbitrary depth [8]. We know that  $pdim(L_d) \geq d$  by Proposition 3.1. As far as I can see,  $pdim(L_d)$  could take any value in  $[d, \infty]$ , and we could even have  $pdim(L_d) = 1$ .

The following is in my opinion the most interesting currently open problem about our notions:

**Conjecture 8.3.**  *$pdim(G)$ ,  $vdim(G)$  and  $pdim(G)$  are invariant under quasi-isometries between finitely generated groups.*

## Acknowledgement

I am grateful to Gabor Pete for providing the main idea of the proof of Theorem 5.2.

## References

- [1] M. Aizenman, H. Kesten, and C. M. Newman. Uniqueness of the infinite cluster and continuity of connectivity functions for short- and long-range percolation. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 111:505–532, 1987.
- [2] K. Ball. Markov chains, Riesz transforms and Lipschitz maps. *GAF*, 2(2):137–172, 1992.
- [3] G. Bell and A. Dranishnikov. Asymptotic dimension. *Topology and its Applications*, 155(12):1265–1296, 2008.

- [4] I. Benjamini and O. Schramm. PERCOLATION BEYOND  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , MANY QUESTIONS AND A FEW ANSWERS. *Elect. Comm. in Probab.*, 1:71–82, 1996.
- [5] I. Benjamini and O. Schramm. Recurrence of distributional limits of finite planar graphs. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 6, 2001.
- [6] Itai Benjamini. Coarse Geometry and Randomness. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer, 2013.
- [7] B. Bollobás, S. Janson, and O. Riordan. Spread-out Percolation in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 31(2):239–246, 2007.
- [8] S. Cleary and J. Taback. Dead end words in lamplighter groups and other wreath products. *Q. J. Math.*, 56(2):165–178, 2005.
- [9] H. Duminil-Copin, S. Goswami, A. Raoufi, F. Severo, and A. Yadin. Existence of phase transition for percolation using the Gaussian Free Field. *Duke Math. J.*, 169(18):3539–3563, 2020.
- [10] P. Easo and T. Hutchcroft. The critical percolation probability is local. *arXiv:2310.10983*, 2023.
- [11] D. Gaboriau and B. Seward. Cost,  $\ell^2$ -Betti numbers and the sofic entropy of some algebraic actions. *J. Anal. Math.*, 139:1–65, 2019.
- [12] A. Georgakopoulos and J. Haslegrave. Percolation on an infinitely generated group. *Comb., Probab. Comput.*, 29(4):587–615, 2020.
- [13] R. Grigorchuk. On the Gap Conjecture concerning group growth. *Bulletin of Mathematical Sciences*, 4(1):113–128, 2014.
- [14] G. R. Grimmett and Z. Li. Weighted self-avoiding walks. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 52:77–102, 2020.
- [15] M. Gromov. Asymptotic invariants of infinite groups. In *Geometric group theory, Vol. 2 (Sussex, 1991)*, number 182 in London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., pages 1–295. Camb. Univ. Press, 1993.
- [16] M. Heydenreich, R. van der Hofstad, and A. Sakai. Mean-Field Behavior for Long- and Finite Range Ising Model, Percolation and Self-Avoiding Walk. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 132:1001–1049, 2008.
- [17] T. Hutchcroft and M. Tointon. Non-triviality of the phase transition for percolation on finite transitive graphs. *to appear in J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 2023.
- [18] M. Kassabov and I. Pak. Groups of Oscillating Intermediate Growth. *Annals of Mathematics*, 177(3):1113–45, 2013.
- [19] H. Kesten. Full Banach mean values on countable groups. *Math. Scand.*, 7:144–156, 1959.
- [20] Russell Lyons and Yuval Peres. *Probability on Trees and Networks*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2016. Available at <http://pages.iu.edu/~rdlyons/>.

- [21] A. Nachmias. Planar Local Graph Limits. In *Planar Maps, Random Walks and Circle Packing*, volume 2243 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 61–71. Springer, Cham, 2020.
- [22] C. Panagiotis and F. Severo. Gap at 1 for the percolation threshold of Cayley graphs. *arXiv:2111.00555*.
- [23] M.D. Penrose. On the spread-out limit for bond and continuum percolation. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 3:253–276, 1993.
- [24] Gabor Pete. *Probability and Geometry on Groups*. A book in preparation. Available at <http://https://math.bme.hu/gabor/PGG.pdf>.
- [25] P. Spanos and M. Tointon. Spread-Out Percolation On Transitive Graphs Of Polynomial Growth. Preprint 2024.
- [26] R. Tessera and M. Tointon. Balls in groups: volume, structure and growth. *arXiv:2403.02485*.
- [27] A. Thom. A remark about the spectral radius. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2015(10):2856–2864, 2014.
- [28] J. Wilson. On exponential growth and uniformly exponential growth for groups. *Invent. math.*, 155:287–303, 2004.
- [29] K. Xiang and L. Zou. Every countable infinite group admits a long range percolation with a phase transition. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 165:108827, 2020.