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#### Abstract

Equip each point $x$ of a homogeneous Poisson point process $\mathcal{P}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ with $D_{x}$ edge stubs, where the $D_{x}$ are i.i.d. positive integer-valued random variables with distribution given by $\mu$. Following the stable multi-matching scheme introduced by Deijfen, Häggström and Holroyd [1], we pair off edge stubs in a series of rounds to form the edge set of a graph $G$ on the vertex set $\mathcal{P}$. In this note, we answer questions of Deijfen, Holroyd and Peres [2] and Deijfen, Häggström and Holroyd [1] on percolation (the existence of an infinite connected component) in $G$. We prove that percolation may occur a.s. even if $\mu$ has support over odd integers. Furthermore, we show that for any $\varepsilon>0$, there exists a distribution $\mu$ such that $\mu(\{1\})>1-\varepsilon$, but percolation still occurs a.s..
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## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we study certain matching processes on the real line. Let $D$ be a random variable with distribution $\mu$ supported on the positive integers. Generate a set of vertices $\mathcal{P}$ by a Poisson point process of intensity 1 on $\mathbb{R}$. Equip each vertex $x \in \mathcal{P}$ with a random number $D_{x}$ of edge stubs, where the $\left(D_{x}\right)_{x \in \mathcal{P}}$ are i.i.d. random variables with distribution given by $D$. Now form edges in rounds by matching edge stubs in the following manner. In each round, say that two vertices $x, y$ are compatible if they are not already joined by an edge and both $x$ and $y$ still possess some unmatched edge stubs. Two such vertices form a mutually closest compatible pair if $x$ is the nearest $y$-compatible vertex to $y$ in the usual Euclidean distance and vice-versa. For each such mutually closest compatible pair $(x, y)$, remove an edge stub from each of $x$ and $y$ to form the edge $x y$. Repeat the procedure indefinitely.

This matching scheme, known as stable multi-matching, was introduced by Deijfen, Häggström and Holroyd [1], who showed that it a.s. exhausts the set of edge stubs, yielding an infinite graph $G=G(\mu)$ with degree distribution given by $\mu$. Note that the graph $G(\mu)$ arising from our multi-matching process is stable a.s.; for any pair of

[^0]distinct points $x, y \in \mathcal{P}$, either $x y \in E(G)$ or at least one of $x, y$ is incident to no edge in $G$ of length greater than $|x-y|$. The concept of stable matchings was introduced in an influential paper of Gale and Shapley [3]; in the context of spatial point processes its study was initiated by Holroyd and Peres, and by Holroyd, Pemantle, Peres and Schramm [4, 5].

A natural question to ask is which degree distributions $\mu$ (if any) yield an infinite connected component in $G(\mu)$. For example if $\mu(\{1\})=1$, then no such component exists, while if $\mu(\{2\})=1$, Deijfen, Holroyd and Peres [2] suggest that percolation (the existence of an infinite component) occurs a.s.. Note that by (a version of) Kolmogorov's zero-one law, the probability of percolation occurring is zero or one. Also, as shown by Deijfen, Holroyd and Peres (see [2], Proposition 1.1), an infinite component in $G$, if it exists, is almost surely unique.

Taking the Poisson point process in $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ for some $d \geq 1$ and applying the stable multi-matching scheme mutatis mutandis, we obtain the $d$-dimensional Poisson graph $G_{d}$. Deijfen, Häggström and Holroyd proved the following result on percolation in $G_{d}$ :

Theorem 1.1. (Deijfen, Häggström and Holroyd [1, Theorem 1.2])
(i) For all $d \geq 2$ there exists $k=k(d)$ such that if $\mu(\{n \in \mathbb{N}: n \geq k\})=1$, then a.s. $G_{d}$ percolates.
(ii)) For all $d \geq 1$, if $\mu(\{1,2\})=1$ and $\mu(\{1\})>0$, then a.s. $G_{d}$ does not percolate.

Their proof of part (i) of Theorem 1.1 relies on a comparison of the $d$-dimensional stable multi-matching process with dependent site percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^{d}$. In particular, since the threshold for percolation in $\mathbb{Z}$ is trivial, their argument cannot say anything about percolation in the 1-dimensional Poisson graph $G=G_{1}$.

Related to part (ii) of Theorem 1.1, Deijfen, Häggström and Holroyd asked the following question.

Question 1 (Deijfen, Häggström and Holroyd). Does there exist some $\varepsilon>0$ such that if $\mu(\{1\})>1-\varepsilon$, then a.s. $G_{d}$ contains no infinite component?

In subsequent work on $G=G_{1}$, Deijfen, Holroyd and Peres [2] observed that simulations suggested percolation might not occur when $\mu(\{3\})=1$, and asked whether the presence of odd degrees kills off infinite components in general.

Question 2 (Deijfen, Holroyd and Peres). Is it true that percolation in $G=G_{1}$ occurs a.s., if and only if, $\mu$ has support only on the even integers?

In this paper we prove the following theorem:
Theorem 1.2. Let $\mu$ be a degree distribution such that

$$
\mu\left(\left\{n \in \mathbb{N}: n \geq 20 \cdot 3^{i}\right\}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2^{i}}
$$

for all but finitely many $i$, then a.s. the one-dimensional stable Poisson graph $G=G_{1}(\mu)$ will contain an infinite path.

Since Theorem 1.2 does not assume anything about $\mu$ besides its heavy tail, our result implies a negative answer to both Question 1 and Question 2:

Corollary 1.3. For any $\varepsilon>0$, there exist degree distributions $\mu$ with $\mu(\{1\})>1-\varepsilon$ such that the one-dimensional stable Poisson graph $G=G_{1}(\mu)$ a.s. contains an infinite connected component.


Figure 1: Restrictions on the number of nodes in various intervals when the event $E_{i}(z)$ occurs.

Corollary 1.4. There exist degree distributions $\mu$ with support on the odd integers, such that the one-dimensional stable Poisson graph $G=G_{1}(\mu)$ a.s. contains an infinite connected component.

We note however that the degree distributions $\mu$ satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.2 have unbounded support; it would be interesting to find a distribution $\mu$ with bounded support only that still gives a negative answer to Questions 1 and 2 (see the discussion of this problem in Section 3).

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

To prove Theorem 1.2, we construct a degree distribution $\mu$ for which $G_{1}(\mu)$ a.s. contains an infinite path, and then show that for any degree distribution $\mu^{\prime}$ stochastically dominating $\mu, G_{1}\left(\mu^{\prime}\right)$ also a.s. contains an infinite path.

The idea underlying our construction of $\mu$ is to set $\mu\left(\left\{d_{i}\right\}\right)=1 / 2^{i}$ for a sharply increasing sequence of integers $\left(d_{i}\right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Suppose that we are given a vertex $x_{i}$ with degree $D_{x_{i}}=d_{i}$. By choosing $d_{i}$ large enough we can ensure that with probability close to 1 , there exists some vertex $x_{i+1}$ with $D_{x_{i+1}}=d_{i+1}$ that is connected to $x_{i}$ by an edge of $G$. Let $U_{i}, i \geq 1$, be the event that a given vertex $x_{i}$ of degree $d_{i}$ is connected to some vertex $x_{i+1}$ of degree $d_{i+1}$. Starting from a vertex $x_{1}$ of degree $d_{1}$, we see that if $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} U_{i}$ occurs, then there is an infinite path $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} \ldots$ in $G$. If the events $\left(U_{i}\right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ were independent of each other, then $\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} U_{i}\right)=\prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}\left(U_{i}\right)$, which we could make strictly positive by letting the sequence $\left(d_{i}\right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ grow sufficiently quickly, ensuring in turn that percolation occurs a.s.. Of course the events $\left(U_{i}\right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ as we have loosely defined them above are highly dependent. We circumvent this problem by working with a sequence of slightly more restricted events, for which we do have full independence.

Before we begin the proof, let us introduce the following notation. Given $x \in \mathcal{P}$, let $B(x, r)$ be the collection of all vertices in $\mathcal{P}$ within distance at most $r$ of $x$. We say that a pair of vertices $(x, y)$ with degrees $\left(D_{x}, D_{y}\right)$ is strongly connected if $|B(x,|y-x|)| \leq D_{x}$ and $|B(y,|y-x|)| \leq D_{y}$. Observe that if a pair of vertices $(x, y)$ is strongly connected, then, by the stability property of the multi-matching scheme, there will a.s. be an edge of $G(\mu)$ joining $x$ and $y$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Set $d_{i}=20 \cdot 3^{i}$ and $\mu\left(\left\{d_{i}\right\}\right)=\frac{1}{2^{i}}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $z \in \mathbb{R}$ be arbitrary. Suppose that we condition on a particular vertex $x_{i}$ of degree $d_{i}$ belonging to the point process $\mathcal{P}$ and lying inside the interval $\left[z, z+0.1 d_{i}\right]$, and further condition on there being at most $0.3 d_{i}$ points of $\mathcal{P}$ in the interval of length $0.2 d_{i}$ centered at $z$. Write $F_{i}(z)$ for the event that we are conditioning on. By the standard properties of Poisson
point processes, conditioning on $F_{i}(z)$ does not affect the probability of any event defined outside the interval $\left[z-0.1 d_{i}, z+0.1 d_{i}\right]$.

Let $A_{i}(z)$ be the event that there is a vertex $x_{i+1} \in \mathcal{P}$ with degree $d_{i+1}$ such that $0.1 d_{i}<x_{i+1}-z<0.2 d_{i}$. Viewing $\mathcal{P}$ as the union of two thinned Poisson point processes, one of intensity $2^{-(i+1)}$ giving us the vertices of degree $d_{i+1}$ and another of intensity $1-2^{-(i+1)}$ giving us the rest of the vertices, we see that $\mathbb{P}\left(\left(A_{i}(z)\right)^{c}\right)=e^{-\frac{0.1 d_{i}}{2^{i+1}}}=e^{-\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{i}}$. If $A_{i}(z)$ occurs, let $x_{i+1}$ denote the a.s. unique vertex of degree $d_{i+1}$ which is nearest to $x_{i}$ among those degree $d_{i+1}$ vertices lying at distance at least $0.1 d_{i}$ to the right of $z$.

Let $B_{i}(z)$ be the event that there are at most $0.3 d_{i}$ vertices $x \in \mathcal{P}$ with $0.1 d_{i}<|x-z|<$ $0.2 d_{i}$. Furthermore, let $C_{i}(z)$ be the event that there are at most $0.3 d_{i}$ vertices $x \in \mathcal{P}$ lying in the interval $\left[z+0.2 d_{i}, z+0.4 d_{i}\right]$. A quick calculation (using the Chernoff bound, see e.g., [6]) yields that $\mathbb{P}\left(B_{i}(z)^{c}\right)=\mathbb{P}\left(C_{i}(z)^{c}\right)=e^{-2\left(3 \log \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)-1\right) 3^{i}+O(i)}$.

Finally, let $E_{i}(z)=A_{i}(z) \cap B_{i}(z) \cap C_{i}(z)$. If $E_{i}(z)$ occurs, then the vertices $x_{i}$ and $x_{i+1}$ are strongly connected, since our initial assumption $F_{i}(z)$ together with $B_{i}(z)$ tells us that

$$
\left|B\left(x_{i},\left|x_{i}-x_{i+1}\right|\right)\right| \leq\left|B\left(z, 0.2 d_{i}\right)\right| \leq 0.6 d_{i}
$$

while $F_{i}(z)$ together with $B_{i}(z) \cap C_{i}(z)$ yield that

$$
\left|B\left(x_{i+1},\left|x_{i+1}-x_{i}\right|\right)\right| \leq\left|B\left(z+0.1 d_{i}, 0.3 d_{i}\right)\right| \leq 0.9 d_{i}=0.3 d_{i+1}
$$

(see Figure 1). This last inequality (together with the fact that $x_{i+1} \in\left[z+0.1 d_{i}, z+0.2 d_{i}\right]$ ) also gives our initial conditioning $F_{i}(z)$ with $i$ replaced by $i+1$ and $z$ replaced by $z+0.1 d_{i}$; hence $E_{i}(z) \cap F_{i}(z) \subseteq F_{i+1}\left(z+0.1 d_{i}\right)$.

By the union bound, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(E_{i}(z) \mid F_{i}(z)\right) \geq 1 & -\mathbb{P}\left(\left(A_{i}(z)\right)^{c} \mid F_{i}(z)\right)-\mathbb{P}\left(\left(B_{i}(z)\right)^{c} \mid F_{i}(z)\right) \\
& -\mathbb{P}\left(\left(C_{i}(z)\right)^{c} \mid F_{i}(z)\right) \\
>1 & -e^{-\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{i}}(1+o(1))
\end{aligned}
$$

Selecting $i_{0}$ sufficiently large and some arbitrary vertex $z_{i_{0}}=x_{i_{0}}$ of degree $d_{i_{0}}$ as a starting point, we may define events $E_{i_{0}}\left(z_{i_{0}}\right), E_{i_{0}+1}\left(z_{i_{0}+1}\right), E_{i_{0}+2}\left(z_{i_{0}+2}\right), \ldots$ inductively, each conditional on its predecessors, with $z_{i+1}=z_{i}+0.1 d_{i}$ for all $i \geq i_{0}$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i \geq i_{0}} E_{i}\left(z_{i}\right) \mid F_{i_{0}}\left(z_{i_{0}}\right)\right) & =\prod_{i \geq i_{0}} \mathbb{P}\left(E_{i}\left(z_{i}\right) \mid \cap_{j<i} E_{j}\left(z_{j}\right) \cap F_{i_{0}}\left(z_{i_{0}}\right)\right) \\
& =\prod_{i \geq i_{0}} \mathbb{P}\left(E_{i}\left(z_{i}\right) \mid F_{i}\left(z_{i}\right)\right)>1-2 \sum_{i \geq i_{0}} e^{-\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{i}}>0
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, from any vertex $x_{i_{0}} \in \mathcal{P}$ of degree $d_{i_{0}}$ there is, with strictly positive probability, an infinite sequence of vertices from $\mathcal{P}, x_{i_{0}}, x_{i_{0}+1}, \ldots$, with increasing degrees $d_{i_{0}}, d_{i_{0}+1}, \ldots$, such that $\left(x_{i}, x_{i+1}\right)$ is strongly connected for every $i \geq i_{0}$. By the stability property of our multi-matching scheme, there is a.s. an infinite path in $G$ through these vertices. It follows that $G$ a.s. contains an infinite path. We now only need to make two remarks about the proof to obtain the full statement of Theorem 1.2.

Remark 2.1. The pairs $\left(x_{i_{0}}, x_{i_{0}+1}\right),\left(x_{i_{0}+1}, x_{i_{0}+2}\right), \ldots$ remain strongly connected if we increase the degrees. Also, our proof of Theorem 1.2 does not use any information about $d_{i}$ for $i<i_{0}$. Thus, for any measure $\mu^{\prime}$ which agrees with (or stochastically dominates) $\mu$ on $\left\{n \in \mathbb{N}: n \geq d_{i_{0}}\right\}, G_{1}\left(\mu^{\prime}\right)$ will percolate a.s..
Remark 2.2. Note that we could replace the distribution in the proof of Theorem 1.2 by any distribution $\mu$ such that $\mu\left(\left\{x: x \geq d_{i}\right\}\right) \geq 2^{-i}$. Instead of obtaining a (strongly
connected) sequence $x_{i}$ such that $x_{i}$ has exactly degree $d_{i}$, we get a (strongly connected) sequence $x_{i}$ such that $x_{i}$ has at least degree $d_{i}$.

## 3 Concluding remarks

Remark 3.1. The existence of degree distributions that a.s. result in an infinite component in dimensions $d \geq 2$ was established in [1, Theorem 1.2 a)]. Our proof of Theorem 1.2 for $G=G_{1}(\mu)$ easily adapts to higher dimensions $d \geq 2$ (with $d$-dimensional balls and annuli replacing intervals and punctured intervals, and the sequence $\left(d_{i}\right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ being scaled accordingly), giving a different approach to the construction of examples in that setting.

The distribution $\mu$ we construct in Theorem 1.2 has unbounded support, and the expected degree of a vertex in $G(\mu)$ is infinite. We believe however that the answer to Questions 1 and 2 should still remain negative if $\mu$ is required to have bounded support. Indeed we conjecture the following:

Conjecture 3.1. For every $\varepsilon>0$, there exists $k=k(\varepsilon)$ such that if $\mu(\{n \in \mathbb{N}: n \geq k\})>$ $\varepsilon$, then percolation occurs a.s. in $G=G_{1}(\mu)$.

One might expect that there is a critical value $d_{\star}$ of the expected degree for percolation. We believe however that no such critical value exists:

Conjecture 3.2. There is no critical value $d_{\star}$, such that if $\mathbb{E}(D)<d_{\star}$, then a.s. percolation does not occur, while if $\mathbb{E}(D)>d_{\star}$, then a.s. percolation occurs in the stable multi-matching scheme on $\mathbb{R}$.

Let us give some motivation for this conjecture. By [1, Theorem 1.2 b )], for any $\mu$ with support on $\{1,2\}$ and $\mu(\{1\})>0, G_{1}(\mu)$ a.s. does not percolate. So any putative critical value must satisfy $d_{\star} \geq 2$. Now, pick $\varepsilon>0$ and choose $\delta \gg d_{\star}$. Let $\mu$ be a degree distribution with support on $\{1, \delta\}$, such that the expected degree satisfies $\mathbb{E}(D)<d_{\star}-\varepsilon$. By the definition of $d_{\star}$ this would imply that $G(\mu)$ a.s. does not percolate. Assign degrees independently at random to the vertices of $G(\mu)$. Perform the first $\delta / 2$ stages of the stable multi-matching process. By then most degree 1 vertices have been matched (and in fact matched to other degree 1 vertices). Now force the remaining degree 1 vertices to match to their future partners. Consider the vertices that had originally been assigned $\delta$ edge stubs. A number of these edge stubs will have been used up by the process so far, and the number of edge stubs left at each vertex is not independent; nevertheless we expect most degree $\delta$ vertices will have at least $\delta / 4$ edge stubs left, and that the number of stubs left will be almost independently distributed. Thus, we believe that the stable multi-matching scheme on the remaining edge stubs of the degree $\delta$ vertices will contain as a subgraph the edges of a stable multi-matching scheme on a thinned Poisson point process on $\mathbb{R}$ corresponding to the degree $\delta$ vertices, and with degrees given by some random variable $D^{\prime}$ with $\mathbb{E}\left(D^{\prime}\right)>\delta / 4 \gg d_{\star}$. Since rescaling a Poisson point process does not affect the stable multi-matching process, this would imply that $G(\mu)$ a.s. percolates (by definition of $d_{\star}$ ), a contradiction.
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