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#### Abstract

In the spherical Poisson Boolean model, one takes the union of random balls centred on the points of a Poisson process in Euclidean $d$-space with $d \geq 2$. We prove that whenever the radius distribution has a finite $d$-th moment, there exists a strictly positive value for the intensity such that the vacant region percolates.
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## 1 Introduction

The Boolean model [6, 8] is a classic model of continuum percolation [11, 3] and more general stochastic geometry [9, 4, 14, 10]. In the spherical version of this model, an occupied region in Euclidean $d$-space is defined as a union of balls (sometimes called grains) of fixed or random radius centred on the points of a Poisson process of intensity $\lambda$. One may define a critical value $\lambda_{c}$ of $\lambda$, depending on the radius distribution, above which the occupied region percolates, and a further critical value $\lambda_{c}^{*}$, below which the complementary vacant region percolates. It is a fundamental question whether these critical values are non-trivial, i.e. strictly positive and finite.

For fixed or bounded radii, the non-triviality of $\lambda_{c}$ and $\lambda_{c}^{*}$ for $d \geq 2$ is well known and may be proved using discretization and counting arguments from lattice percolation theory. For unbounded radii, it took some years to fully characterize those radius distributions for which $\lambda_{c}$ is non-trivial [8, 7]. In the present work we carry out a similar task for $\lambda_{c}^{*}$.

We now describe the model in more detail (for yet more details we refer the reader to [11] or [10]). Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $d \geq 2$. Let $\mu$ be a probability measure on $[0, \infty)$ with $\mu(\{0\})<1$. Let $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$. On a suitable probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ (with associated expectation operator $\mathbb{E}$ ), let $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda}=\left\{y_{k}: k \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$ be a homogeneous Poisson point process in $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ of intensity $\lambda$ (here viewed as a random subset of $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ enumerated in order of increasing distance from the origin), and let $\rho, \rho_{1}, \rho_{2}, \ldots$ be independent nonnegative random variables with common distribution $\mu$, independent of $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda}$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ and $r \geq 0$ we let $B(x, r):=\left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d}:\|y-x\| \leq r\right\}$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm. The occupied and vacant regions of the (Poisson, spherical) Boolean model are random sets $Z_{\lambda} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}$ and $Z_{\lambda}^{*} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}$, given respectively by

$$
Z_{\lambda}=\cup_{y_{k} \in \mathcal{P}_{\lambda}} B\left(y_{k}, \rho_{k}\right) ; \quad Z_{\lambda}^{*}=\mathbb{R}^{d} \backslash Z_{\lambda} .
$$

[^0]Let $U_{\lambda}$ be the event that $Z_{\lambda}$ percolates, i.e. has an unbounded connected component, and let $U_{\lambda}^{*}$ be the event that $Z_{\lambda}^{*}$ percolates. By an ergodicity argument (see [11], or [10], Exercise 10.1), $\mathbb{P}\left[U_{\lambda}\right] \in\{0,1\}$ and $\mathbb{P}\left[U_{\lambda}^{*}\right] \in\{0,1\}$. Also $\mathbb{P}\left[U_{\lambda}\right]$ is increasing in $\lambda$, while $\mathbb{P}\left[U_{\lambda}^{*}\right]$ is decreasing in $\lambda$. Define the critical values

$$
\lambda_{c}:=\inf \left\{\lambda: \mathbb{P}\left[U_{\lambda}\right]=1\right\} ; \quad \lambda_{c}^{*}:=\inf \left\{\lambda: \mathbb{P}\left[U_{\lambda}^{*}\right]=0\right\}
$$

It is well known that $\lambda_{c}$ and $\lambda_{c}^{*}$ are finite, and that if $\mathbb{E}\left[\rho^{d}\right]=\infty$ then $Z_{\lambda}=\mathbb{R}^{d}$ almost surely, for any $\lambda>0$ (see [8], [11] or [10]), so that $\lambda_{c}=\lambda_{c}^{*}=0$. Hence $\mathbb{E}\left[\rho^{d}\right]<\infty$ is a necessary condition for $\lambda_{c}$ or $\lambda_{c}^{*}$ to be strictly positive. In the case of $\lambda_{c}$, Gouéré [7] has shown that this condition is also sufficient:
Theorem 1. [7] If $\mathbb{E}\left[\rho^{d}\right]<\infty$ then $\lambda_{c}>0$.
We here present a similar result for $\lambda_{c}^{*}$ :
Theorem 2. If $\mathbb{E}\left[\rho^{d}\right]<\infty$ then $\lambda_{c}^{*}>0$.
Theorem 2 says that for the spherical Poisson Boolean model with $\mathbb{E}\left[\rho^{d}\right]<\infty$, there exists a non-zero value of the intensity $\lambda$ for which the vacant region percolates. In fact we can say more:
Theorem 3. For any $\mu$, if $d=2$ then $\lambda_{c}^{*}=\lambda_{c}$. If $d \geq 3$ then $\lambda_{c}^{*} \geq \lambda_{c}$.
Sarkar [13] has proved the strict inequality $\lambda_{c}^{*}>\lambda_{c}$ for $d \geq 3$ when $\rho$ is deterministic, i.e. when $\mu$ is a Dirac measure.

Theorem 2 could be seen as a trivial corollary of Theorems 1 and 3. However, we would like to prove Theorems 2 and 3 separately, to emphasise that our proof of Theorem 2 is self-contained (and quite short), whereas our proof of Theorem 3 is not, as we now discuss.

In parallel and independent work, Ahlberg, Tassion and Teixeira [2] prove a similar set of results to our Theorems 2 and 3; their proof seems to be completely different from ours. Earlier, in [1] they proved for $d=2$ that (among other things) $\lambda_{c}^{*}=\lambda_{c}$ whenever $\mathbb{E}\left[\rho^{2} \log \rho\right]<\infty$.

We prove Theorem 2 in the next two sections. The proof of Theorem 3 is given by adapting our proof of Theorem 2 using results in [1], and is therefore heavily reliant on [1]; we give this argument in Section 4.

Finally, we consider the relation between $\lambda_{c}^{*}$ and a different percolation threshold, defined in terms of expected diameter. For non-empty $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}$, let $D(B):=\sup _{x, y \in B}(\| x-$ $y \|)$, the Euclidean diameter of $B$, and set $D(\emptyset)=0$. Let $W_{\lambda}$ be the connected component of $Z_{\lambda}$ containing the origin, and set

$$
\lambda_{D}:=\inf \left\{\lambda: \mathbb{E}\left[D\left(W_{\lambda}\right)\right]=\infty\right\}
$$

It is easy to see that that $\lambda_{D} \leq \lambda_{c}$. Therefore by Theorem 3, for any $\mu$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{c}^{*} \geq \lambda_{D} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In Section 5 we present an alternative, rather simple, direct proof of (1.1) (not reliant on any other results, either here or in [1]).

A further result in [7] says that $\lambda_{D}>0$, if and only if $\mathbb{E}\left[\rho^{d+1}\right]<\infty$. Therefore (1.1) provides an alternative proof that $\lambda_{c}^{*}>0$ under this stronger moment condition. Moreover, it is known in many cases that $\lambda_{D}=\lambda_{c}$ (see e.g. [11, 15, 5]), and in all such cases our proof of (1.1) provides another way to show that $\lambda_{c}^{*} \geq \lambda_{c}$.

Our proof of Theorems 2 and 3 for $d=2$ uses a form of multiscale methodology, inspired by [7], which may be of use in other settings. We conclude this section with an outline of the method. At length-scale $r$, we define functions $f(r)$ and $g(r)$. Up to
a constant multiple, $f(r)$ is the probability of a 'local' event (defined in terms of a box-crossing, using only grains centred near the box) while $g(r)$ is the probability of an 'outside influence' event that is still determined at length-scale $r$.

We show that $g\left(10^{n}\right)$ is summable in $n$ (see Lemma 2 below), and also that $f\left(10^{n+1}\right) \leq$ $f\left(10^{n}\right)^{2}+g\left(10^{n+1}\right)$ (see (2.2) and (2.6) below). From this we can deduce that there exists $n_{0}$ such that $\sum_{n \geq n_{0}}\left(f\left(10^{n}\right)+g\left(10^{n}\right)\right)<1$, if only we can get started by showing $f\left(n_{0}\right)$ is sufficiently small. This can be done either by taking $\lambda$ small (in the proof of Theorem 2 ) or for general $\lambda<\lambda_{c}$, by taking $n_{0}$ large and using a result from [1] (in the proof of Theorem 3). Finally, we can take a sequence of boxes of length $10^{n+n_{0}}$, such that if none of these is crossed then $Z_{\lambda}^{*}$ percolates.

We let $o$ denote the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{d}$, and for $r>0$ put $B(r):=B(o, r)$.

## 2 Preparation for the proof

Throughout this section we assume that $d=2$. We give some definitions and lemmas required for our proof of Theorem 2 .

Given $\lambda>0$, for each Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{2}$ we define the random set

$$
Z_{\lambda}^{A}:=\cup_{\left\{k: y_{k} \in \mathcal{P}_{\lambda} \cap A\right\}} B\left(y_{k}, \rho_{k}\right)
$$

Also, for $r>0$ set $A_{r}:=\cup_{x \in A} B(x, r)$, the (deterministic) $r$-neighbourhood of $A$.
Given $r>0$, let $S(r):=[-5 r, 5 r] \times[-r / 2, r / 2]$, the closed $10 r \times r$ horizontal rectangle (or 'strip') centred at $o$. Note that $S(r)_{r}$ is a $12 r \times 3 r$ rectangle with its corners smoothed (this smoothing is not important to us).

Let $F_{\lambda}(r)$ be the event that there is a short-way crossing of $S(r)$ by $Z_{\lambda}^{S(r)_{r}}$ (that is, by grains centred within the $r$-neighbourhood of $S(r)$ ). Also define the event

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{\lambda}(r)=\left\{Z_{\lambda}^{B\left(10^{6} r\right) \backslash S(r)_{r}} \cap S(r) \neq \emptyset\right\} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 1. There is a constant $C_{1} \geq 1$ such that for all $\lambda>0$ and $r>0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{P}\left[F_{\lambda}(10 r)\right] \leq C_{1}\left(\mathbb{P}\left[F_{\lambda}(r)\right]^{2}+\mathbb{P}\left[G_{\lambda}(r)\right]\right) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Fix $(\lambda, r)$. Set $S:=S(10 r)=[-50 r, 50 r] \times[-5 r, 5 r]$. Let $T:=[-50 r, 50 r] \times$ $[-4.5 r,-3.5 r]$ and $\tilde{T}:=[-50 r, 50 r] \times[3.5 r, 4.5 r]$, so that $T$ and $\tilde{T}$ are horizontal $100 r \times r$ thin strips along $S$ near the bottom and top of $S$, respectively.

We shall now define a collection $R_{1}, \ldots, R_{37}$ of horizontal $10 r \times r$ and vertical $r \times 10 r$ rectangles that knit together in such a way that if there is a long-way vacant crossing of each of $R_{1}, \ldots, R_{37}$ then there is a long-way vacant crossing of $T$ (this is a well known technique in these kinds of proof). We shall arrange that they are all contained within the band $\mathbb{R} \times[-12 r,-2 r]$ and their $r$-neighbourhoods $\left.\left(R_{1}\right)_{r}, \ldots,\left(R_{37}\right)_{r}\right)$ all lie within the lower half of the region $S_{10 r}:=(S(10 r))_{10 r}$.

Here are the details. Let $R_{1}, R_{2}, \ldots, R_{19}$ be horizontal $10 r \times r$ rectangles centred on $(-45 r,-4 r),(-40 r,-4 r), \ldots,(45 r,-4 r)$ respectively. Let $R_{20}, \ldots, R_{37}$ be vertical $r \times 10 r$ rectangles centred at $(-42.5 r,-7 r),(-37.5 r,-7 r), \ldots,(42.5,-7 r)$ respectively.

Similarly, we define a collection $R_{38}, \ldots, R_{74}$ of $10 r \times r$ and $r \times 10 r$ rectangles, such that if each of these has a long-way vacant crossing then there is a long-way vacant crossing of $\tilde{T}$. Each rectangle $R_{37+i}, 1 \leq i \leq 37$, is defined simply as the reflection of $R_{i}$ in the $x$-axis.

For $1 \leq i \leq 74$, let $D_{i}$ be the disk of radius $10^{6} r$ with the same centre as $R_{i}$. Let $A_{i}$ denote the event that there exists a grain of the Boolean model that intersects $R_{i}$ and has its centre in the region $D_{i} \backslash\left(R_{i}\right)_{r}$. Let $B_{i}$ denote the event that the rectangle $R_{i}$ can
be crossed the short way in the union of grains that are centred inside $\left(R_{i}\right)_{r}$. If $R_{i}$ is crossed the short way in the union of grains centred in $D_{i}$, then $A_{i} \cup B_{i}$ must occur.

Suppose $F_{\lambda}(10 r)$ occurs, i.e. there is a short-way occupied crossing of $S$, using grains centred in $S_{10 r}$. Then there is no long-way vacant crossing of $S$, and hence no long-way vacant crossing either of $T$ or of $\tilde{T}$. Hence

$$
\begin{align*}
F_{\lambda}(10 r) & \subset \cup_{(i, j) \in\{1, \ldots, 37\}^{2}}\left(\left(A_{i} \cup B_{i}\right) \cap\left(A_{37+j} \cup B_{37+j}\right)\right) \\
& \subset\left(\cup_{i=1}^{74} A_{i}\right) \cup\left(\cup_{(i, j) \in\{1, \ldots, 37\}^{2}}\left(B_{i} \cap B_{37+j}\right)\right) . \tag{2.3}
\end{align*}
$$

For $i, j \in\{1, \ldots, 37\}$, since $\left(R_{i}\right)_{r} \cap\left(R_{j}\right)_{r}=\emptyset$ the events $B_{i}$ and $B_{37+j}$ are independent. Hence by (2.3) and the union bound we have (2.2), taking $C_{1}=37^{2}$.

Lemma 2. Suppose $\mathbb{E}\left[\rho^{2}\right]<\infty$. Let $\lambda_{0} \in(0, \infty)$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n \geq 1} \sup _{\lambda \in\left(0, \lambda_{0}\right]} \mathbb{P}\left[G_{\lambda}\left(10^{n}\right)\right]<\infty \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Given $\lambda, r>0$, if $G_{\lambda}(r)$ occurs then there exists a point $y_{k} \in \mathcal{P}_{\lambda} \cap B\left(10^{6} r\right) \backslash S(r)_{r}$ with associated radius $\rho_{k}>r$. Therefore by Markov's inequality $\mathbb{P}\left[G_{\lambda}(r)\right]$ is bounded above by the expected number of such points $y_{k}$. Therefore

$$
\mathbb{P}\left[G_{\lambda}(r)\right] \leq \lambda \pi\left(10^{6} r\right)^{2} \mathbb{P}[\rho>r]=10^{12} \lambda \pi r^{2} \mathbb{P}\left[\rho^{2}>r^{2}\right]
$$

Hence,

$$
\sum_{n \geq 1} \sup _{\lambda \in\left(0, \lambda_{0}\right]} \mathbb{P}\left[G_{\lambda}\left(10^{n}\right)\right] \leq 10^{12} \lambda_{0} \pi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 100^{n} \mathbb{P}\left[\rho^{2}>100^{n}\right]
$$

which is finite because we assume $\mathbb{E}\left[\rho^{2}\right]<\infty$.
Lemma 3. Suppose $\mathbb{E}\left[\rho^{2}\right]<\infty$. Then there exist $b>0$ and $\lambda>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{P}\left[F_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right)\right]+\mathbb{P}\left[G_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right)\right]\right) \leq 1 / 2 \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $C_{1} \geq 1$ be as in Lemma 1. Given $\lambda, r>0$ we define

$$
f_{\lambda}(r):=C_{1} \mathbb{P}\left[F_{\lambda}(r)\right] ; \quad g_{\lambda}(r):=C_{1}^{2} \mathbb{P}\left[G_{\lambda}(r / 10)\right]
$$

Then by (2.2) we have

$$
\begin{align*}
f_{\lambda}(r) & \leq C_{1}^{2}\left(\mathbb{P}\left[F_{\lambda}(r / 10)\right]^{2}+\mathbb{P}\left[G_{\lambda}(r / 10)\right]\right) \\
& =f_{\lambda}(r / 10)^{2}+g_{\lambda}(r) \tag{2.6}
\end{align*}
$$

Let $C_{2}=9$. Using (2.4), we can choose $b$ to be a big enough power of 10 so that for all $\lambda \in(0,1]$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right) \leq C_{2}^{-2} \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now fix this $b$. Choose $\lambda \leq 1$ to be small enough so that $f_{\lambda}(b) \leq C_{2}^{-1}$. Using (2.6) repeatedly, we have $f_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right) \leq C_{2}^{-1}$ for all $n$. Then using (2.6) repeatedly again, we have for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right) & \leq \frac{f_{\lambda}\left(10^{n-1} b\right)}{C_{2}}+g_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right) \leq \cdots \\
& \leq C_{2}^{-n-1}+\frac{g_{\lambda}(10 b)}{C_{2}^{n-1}}+\frac{g_{\lambda}(100 b)}{C_{2}^{n-2}}+\cdots+\frac{g_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right)}{C_{2}^{0}}
\end{aligned}
$$

and therefore

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\sum_{n \geq 1} f_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right) \leq\left(C_{2}^{-2}+g_{\lambda}(10 b)+g_{\lambda}(100 b)+g_{\lambda}(1000 b)+\cdots\right) \\
\times\left(1+C_{2}^{-1}+C_{2}^{-2}+\cdots\right)
\end{array}
$$

so by (2.7) and the fact that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_{2}^{-k} \leq 2$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n \geq 1}\left(\mathbb{P}\left[F_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right)\right]+\mathbb{P}\left[G_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right)\right]\right) & \leq \sum_{n \geq 1}\left(f_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right)+g_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right)\right) \\
& \leq 2 C_{2}^{-2}+3 \sum_{n \geq 1} g_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right) \leq 5 C_{2}^{-2}
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence (2.5).

## 3 Proof of Theorem 2

We can now complete the proof of Theorem 2. We assume from now on that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{E}\left[\rho^{d}\right]<\infty \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consider first the case with $d=2$. Let $b$ and $\lambda$ be as given in Lemma 3.
Let $S_{1}, S_{2}, S_{3}, \ldots$ be a sequence of 'strips', i.e. closed rectangles of aspect ratio 10, with successive lengths (the short way) $10 b, 100 b, 1000 b, \ldots$ alternating between horizontal and vertical strips with each strip $S_{n}$ centred at the origin. Then each strip $S_{n}$ crosses the next one $S_{n+1}$ the short way.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define the events

$$
\begin{gathered}
H_{n}:=\left\{S_{n} \text { is crossed by } Z_{\lambda}^{S_{n+2}} \text { the short way }\right\} \\
J_{n}:=\left\{Z_{\lambda}^{\left.S_{n+4} \backslash S_{n+2} \cap S_{n} \neq \emptyset\right\}} .\right.
\end{gathered}
$$

Lemma 4. If none of the events $H_{1}, J_{1}, H_{2}, J_{2}, \ldots$ occurs then $Z_{\lambda}^{*}$ percolates.
Proof. Suppose none of the events $H_{1}, J_{1}, H_{2}, J_{2}, \ldots$ occurs.
We claim for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $Z_{\lambda}^{\mathbb{R}^{2} \backslash S_{n+2}} \cap S_{n}=\emptyset$. Indeed, if $Z_{\lambda}^{\mathbb{R}^{2} \backslash S_{n+2}} \cap S_{n} \neq \emptyset$ then for some integer $m \geq n+2$ with $m-n$ even we have $Z_{\lambda}^{S_{m+2} \backslash S_{m}} \cap S_{n} \neq \emptyset$, and then since $n \leq m$ we also have $S_{n} \subset S_{m}$ so that $Z_{\lambda}^{S_{m+2} \backslash S_{m}} \cap S_{m} \neq \emptyset$, contradicting the assumed non-occurrence of $J_{m-2}$.

For each $n$, by the assumed non-occurrence of $H_{n}$ along with the preceding claim there is no short-way crossing of $S_{n}$ by $Z_{\lambda}$ so there is a long-way crossing of $S_{n}$ by $Z_{\lambda}^{*}$, i.e. a path $\gamma_{n} \subset S_{n} \cap Z_{\lambda}^{*}$ that crosses $S_{n}$ the long way.

Then for each $n$ we have $\gamma_{n} \cap \gamma_{n+1} \neq \emptyset$, so $\cup_{n} \gamma_{n}$ is an unbounded connected set contained in $Z_{\lambda}^{*}$. Therefore $Z_{\lambda}^{*}$ percolates.

Proof of Theorem 2. Suppose $d=2$. Let $\lambda$ and $b$ be as given in Lemma 3. Recall the definition of events $F_{\lambda}(r)$ and $G_{\lambda}(r)$ at (2.1). We claim now for each $n$ that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{P}\left[H_{n} \cup J_{n}\right] \leq \mathbb{P}\left[F_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right)\right]+\mathbb{P}\left[G_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right)\right] \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, suppose the parity of $n$ is such that $S_{n}$ is horizontal. Then, in terms of earlier notation, $S_{n}=S\left(10^{n} b\right)$. Since $S_{n+4} \subset B\left(10^{6+n} b\right)$ we have $J_{n} \subset G_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right)$ and $H_{n} \subset$ $F_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right) \cup G_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right)$. Then (3.2) follows from the union bound.

Using first Lemma 4, then (3.2), and finally (2.5), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
1-\mathbb{P}\left[U_{\lambda}^{*}\right] & \leq \mathbb{P}\left[\cup_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(H_{n} \cup J_{n}\right)\right] \\
& \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{P}\left[F_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right)\right]+\mathbb{P}\left[G_{\lambda}\left(10^{n} b\right)\right]\right) \leq 1 / 2
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore by ergodicity $\mathbb{P}\left[U_{\lambda}^{*}\right]=1$ so $\lambda \leq \lambda_{c}^{*}$. Hence we have $\lambda_{c}^{*}>0$ as required.
Now suppose $d \geq 3$. Let $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda}$, be the intersection of $Z_{\lambda}$ with the two-dimensional subspace $\mathbb{R}^{2} \times\left\{o^{\prime \prime}\right\}$ of $\mathbb{R}^{d}$, where $o^{\prime \prime}$ denotes the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{d-2}$.

Let $\omega_{d-2}$ denote the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^{d-2}$. It can be seen that $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda}$ is a two-dimensional Boolean model with intensity

$$
\lambda \omega_{d-2}(d-2) \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[\rho \geq r] r^{d-3} d r=\lambda \omega_{d-2} \mathbb{E}\left[\rho^{d-2}\right]=: \lambda^{\prime}
$$

which is finite by our assumption (3.1). Moreover if $\sigma$ denotes a random variable with the radius distribution in this planar Boolean model we claim that $\mathbb{E}\left[\sigma^{2}\right]<\infty$. This can be demonstrated by a computation, but it is more quickly seen using the fact that, since $\mathbb{P}\left[o \in Z_{\lambda}\right]<1$ for the original Boolean model by (3.1), also $\mathbb{P}\left[o \in \tilde{Z}_{\lambda}\right]<1$, which would not be the case if $\mathbb{E}\left[\sigma^{2}\right]$ were infinite.

Therefore by the two-dimensional case already considered, for small enough $\lambda>0$ we have $\lambda^{\prime}$ small enough so that the complement (in the space $\mathbb{R}^{2} \times\left\{o^{\prime \prime}\right\}$ ) of $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda}$ percolates. Hence $Z_{\lambda}^{*}$ percolates for small enough $\lambda>0$, so $\lambda_{c}^{*}>0$.

## 4 Proof of Theorem 3

As mentioned in Section 1, if $\mathbb{E}\left[\rho^{d}\right]=\infty$ then $\lambda_{c}=\lambda_{c}^{*}=0$, so without loss of generality we assume (3.1).

First suppose $d=2$. We need to prove that $\lambda_{c}^{*}=\lambda_{c}$.
Suppose $\lambda>\lambda_{c}$. Let $V_{\lambda}^{*}$ be the event that there is an unbounded component of $Z_{\lambda}^{*}$ intersecting with $B(1)$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set $Q(n):=[-n, n]^{2}$. Let $E(n)$ be the event that there exists a path in $Z_{\lambda}^{*}$ from $Q(n)$ to $\mathbb{R}^{2} \backslash Q(3 n)$.

The annulus $Q(3 n) \backslash Q(n)$ can be written as the union of two $3 n \times n$ and two $n \times 3 n$ rectangles, and if $Z_{\lambda}$ crosses each of these four rectangles the long way then $Q(n)$ is surrounded by an occupied circuit contained in $Q(3 n)$ so $E(n)$ does not occur. Hence by Theorem 1.1 (i) of [1] and the union bound, $\mathbb{P}[E(n)] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $V_{\lambda}^{*} \subset \cap_{n=1}^{\infty} E(n)$, we therefore have $\mathbb{P}\left[V_{\lambda}^{*}\right]=0$ and hence $\mathbb{P}\left[U_{\lambda}^{*}\right]=0$. Hence $\lambda \geq \lambda_{c}^{*}$ so $\lambda_{c}^{*} \leq \lambda_{c}$.

Now suppose $\lambda<\lambda_{c}$. Then by Theorem 1.1(iii) of [1], in the proof of our Lemma 3 we can choose $b$ large enough so that we have both (2.7), and the inequality $f_{\lambda}(b)<C_{2}^{-1}$. Then the rest of the proof of Lemma 3 carries through for this $(b, \lambda)$, so the conclusion of Lemma 3 holds for this $(b, \lambda)$. Then the proof (for $d=2$ ) in Section 3 works for this $(b, \lambda)$, showing that $\lambda \leq \lambda_{c}^{*}$ for any $\lambda<\lambda_{c}$ and hence that $\lambda_{c}^{*} \geq \lambda_{c}$. Thus $\lambda_{c}^{*}=\lambda_{c}$ for $d=2$.

Now suppose that $d \geq 3$ and $\lambda<\lambda_{c}$. Then as discussed in Section 3, $Z_{\lambda} \cap\left(\mathbb{R}^{d-2} \times\left\{o^{\prime \prime}\right\}\right)$ is a two-dimensional Boolean model possessing no infinite component, so the radius distribution for this two-dimensional Boolean model has finite second moment and the intensity $\lambda^{\prime}$ of this two-dimensional Boolean model is subcritical (in fact, strictly subcritical since we can repeat the argument for any $\lambda_{1} \in\left(\lambda, \lambda_{c}\right)$ ). Therefore by the argument just given for $d=2$, the complement (in $\mathbb{R}^{d-2} \times\left\{o^{\prime \prime}\right\}$ ) of this Boolean model percolates, and therefore the original $Z_{\lambda}^{*}$ also percolates so $\lambda \leq \lambda_{c}^{*}$. Hence $\lambda_{c}^{*} \geq \lambda_{c}$, and the proof is complete.

## 5 Alternative proof of (1.1)

We divide the nonnegative $x$-axis into unit intervals $I_{0}, I_{1}, I_{2}, \ldots$ where $I_{k}=[k, k+$ 1) $\times\left\{o^{\prime}\right\}$ (here $o^{\prime}$ is the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ ). For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let $W_{k, \lambda}$ be the union of $I_{k}$ and all components of $Z_{\lambda}$ which intersect $I_{k}$

Lemma 5. If $0<\lambda<\lambda_{D}$, then $\mathbb{E}\left[D\left(W_{0, \lambda}\right)\right]<\infty$.
Proof. Fix $\lambda \in\left(0, \lambda_{D}\right)$. Then $\mathbb{E}\left[D\left(W_{\lambda}\right)\right]<\infty$. Let $F$ be the event that $I_{0} \subset Z_{\lambda}$, and set $F^{c}:=\Omega \backslash F$. Then $0<\mathbb{P}[F]<1$. If $F$ occurs then $W_{0, \lambda}=W_{\lambda}$. Hence by the Harris-FKG inequality (see [11] or [10]),

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[D\left(W_{0, \lambda}\right)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[D\left(W_{0, \lambda}\right) \mid F\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[D\left(W_{\lambda}\right) \mid F\right]<\infty,
$$

as required.
Given $\lambda>0$, define the event

$$
E_{\lambda}:=\left(\cap_{k=2}^{\infty}\left\{D\left(W_{k, \lambda}\right) \leq k / 2\right\}\right) \cap\left\{Z_{\lambda} \cap\left(I_{0} \cup I_{1}\right)=\emptyset\right\} .
$$

Lemma 6. If $0<\lambda<\lambda_{D}$, then $\mathbb{P}\left[E_{\lambda}\right]>0$.
Proof. Fix $\lambda \in\left(0, \lambda_{D}\right)$. Then by Lemma 5.

$$
\sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{P}\left[D\left(W_{k, \lambda}\right)>k / 2\right]=\sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{P}\left[D\left(W_{0, \lambda}\right)>k / 2\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[2 D\left(W_{0, \lambda}\right)\right]<\infty .
$$

Choose $k_{0} \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k_{0}>2$, such that $\sum_{k \geq k_{0}} \mathbb{P}\left[D\left(W_{k, \lambda}\right)>k / 2\right]<1 / 2$. Then by the union bound and complementation, $\mathbb{P}\left[\cap_{k=k_{0}}^{\infty}\left\{D\left(W_{k, \lambda}\right) \leq k / 2\right\}\right] \geq 1 / 2$. Moreover $\mathbb{P}\left[\cap_{k=0}^{k_{0}}\left\{Z_{\lambda} \cap\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.I_{k}=\emptyset\right\}\right]>0$. Hence by the Harris-FKG inequality,

$$
\mathbb{P}\left[E_{\lambda}\right] \geq \mathbb{P}\left[\left(\cap_{k=k_{0}}^{\infty}\left\{D\left(W_{k, \lambda}\right) \leq k / 2\right\}\right) \cap\left(\cap_{k=0}^{k_{0}}\left\{Z_{\lambda} \cap I_{k}=\emptyset\right\}\right)\right]>0
$$

Lemma 7. Suppose that $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}$ is closed, connected and unbounded, and that $\mathbb{R}^{d} \backslash A$ has an unbounded connected component. Then $\partial A$, the boundary of $A$, has an unbounded connected component.

Proof. Let $B$ be an unbounded component of $\mathbb{R}^{d} \backslash A$. Denote the closure of $B$ by $\bar{B}$. Then both $\bar{B}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{d} \backslash B$ are closed and connected. By the unicoherence of $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ [12], the set $\bar{B} \cap A=\bar{B} \cap\left(\mathbb{R}^{d} \backslash B\right)$ is connected. Moreover it is unbounded, and contained in $\partial A$.

Given $\varepsilon>0$, let $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, \varepsilon}:=\cup_{k: \rho_{k}>0} B\left(y_{k}, \varepsilon \rho_{k}\right)$ and let $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, \varepsilon}^{*}:=\mathbb{R}^{d} \backslash \tilde{Z}_{\lambda, \varepsilon}$. Let $Z_{\lambda}^{0}:=$ $\cup_{\left\{k: r_{k}=0\right\}}\left\{y_{k}\right\}$, the union of balls of radius zero contributing to our Boolean model ( $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, \varepsilon}$ is the union of all the other balls, scaled by $\varepsilon$ ). If $\mathbb{P}[\rho=0]>0$ then $Z_{\lambda}^{0}$ is (almost surely) non-empty but locally finite.

Lemma 8. Let $\varepsilon \in(0,1)$. If $E_{\lambda}$ occurs then $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, \varepsilon}^{*} \cup Z_{\lambda}^{0}$ percolates.
Proof. Suppose $E_{\lambda}$ occurs. Let $A$ be the union of the half-line $[1, \infty) \times\left\{o^{\prime}\right\}$, with all components of $Z_{\lambda}$ intersecting this half-line. Then $A$ is connected, unbounded, and contained in the half-space $[1, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ so $o$ lies in an unbounded component of $\mathbb{R}^{d} \backslash A$. Therefore by Lemma 7, $\partial A$ has an unbounded connected component

No point of $\partial A$ lies in the interior of any of the balls $B\left(y_{k}, \rho_{k}\right)$. Therefore $\partial A \subset$ $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, \varepsilon}^{*} \cup Z_{\lambda}^{0}$. Thus $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, \varepsilon}^{*} \cup Z_{\lambda}^{0}$ has an unbounded connected subset.

Proof of (1.1). Assume $\lambda_{D}>0$ (else there is nothing to prove). Suppose $\lambda \in\left(0, \lambda_{D}\right)$ and $\varepsilon \in(0,1)$. By the last two lemmas, with strictly positive probability the set $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, 1-\varepsilon}^{*} \cup Z_{\lambda}^{0}$ percolates. Almost surely, $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, 1-\varepsilon}^{*}$ is open, $Z_{\lambda}^{0}$ is locally finite and all points of $Z_{\lambda}^{0}$ lie either in $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, 1-\varepsilon}^{*}$ or in the interior of $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, 1-\varepsilon}$. Therefore if the set $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, 1-\varepsilon}^{*} \cup Z_{\lambda}^{0}$ percolates, so does $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, 1-\varepsilon}^{*}$, and so does $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, 1-\varepsilon}^{*} \backslash Z_{\lambda}^{0}$. Thus the set $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda, 1-\varepsilon}^{*} \backslash Z_{\lambda}^{0}$, which is equal to $\mathbb{R}^{d} \backslash \cup_{k} B\left(y_{k},(1-\varepsilon) \rho_{k}\right)$, percolates with strictly positive probability, and hence by ergodicity, with probability 1 . Hence by scaling (see [11]) the set $Z_{(1-\varepsilon)^{d} \lambda}^{*}$ also percolates almost surely, so that $\lambda_{c}^{*} \geq(1-\varepsilon)^{d} \lambda$, and therefore $\lambda_{c}^{*} \geq \lambda_{D}$.
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