RANDOM DIRICHLET ENVIRONMENT VIEWED FROM THE PARTICLE IN DIMENSION $d \geq 3$[1]

By Christophe Sabot

Université de Lyon

We consider random walks in random Dirichlet environment (RWDE), which is a special type of random walks in random environment where the exit probabilities at each site are i.i.d. Dirichlet random variables. On $\mathbb{Z}^d$, RWDE are parameterized by a $2d$-tuple of positive reals called weights. In this paper, we characterize for $d \geq 3$ the weights for which there exists an absolutely continuous invariant probability distribution for the process viewed from the particle. We can deduce from this result and from [*Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **47** (2011) 1–8] a complete description of the ballistic regime for $d \geq 3$.

1. Introduction. Multidimensional random walks in random environment have received a considerable attention in the last ten years. Some important progress has been made in the ballistic regime (after the seminal works [11, 29, 30, 32]) and for small perturbations of the simple random walk [5, 31]. We refer to [34] for a detailed survey. Nevertheless, we are still far from a complete description, and some basic questions are open such as the characterization of recurrence, ballisticity. The point of view of the environment viewed from the particle has been a powerful tool to investigate the random conductance model; it is a key ingredient in the proof of invariance principles [13, 15, 18, 28] but has had a rather little impact on the nonreversible model. The existence of an absolutely continuous invariant measure for the process viewed from the particle (the so called "equivalence of the static and dynamical point of view") is only known in a few cases: for dimension 1, cf. Kesten [12] and Molchanov [19] pages 273–274; in the case of balanced environment of Lawler [16]; for "nonnestling" RWRE in dimension $d \geq 4$ at low disorder, cf. Bolthausen and Sznitman [4]; and in a weaker form for ballistic RWRE (equivalence in half-space), cf. [23, 24]. Note that invariance principles have nevertheless been obtained under special assumptions: under the ballistic assumption [2, 24] and for weak disorder in dimension $d \geq 3$, [6, 31].

Random walks in Dirichlet environment (RWDE) is a special case where at each site the environment is chosen according to a Dirichlet random variable. One remarkable property of Dirichlet environments is that the annealed law of RWDE

is the law of a directed edge reinforced random walk as remarked initially in Pemantle's Ph.D. thesis [20, 21], the idea of reinforced random walks going back to Diaconis and Coppersmith; cf. [22] for a survey. While this model of environment is fully random (the support of the distribution on the environment is the space of weakly elliptic environment itself), it shows some surprising analytic simplifications; cf. [8, 9, 25–27]. In particular, in [25], the author proved that RWDE are transient on transient graphs; cf. [25] for a precise result. This result uses in a crucial way a property of statistical invariance by time reversal; cf. Lemma 1 of [25].

RWDE are parametrized by $2d$ reals called the weights (one for each direction in $\mathbb{Z}^d$) which govern the behavior of the walk. In this paper we characterize on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, $d \geq 3$, the weights for which there exists an invariant probability measure for the environment viewed from the particle, which is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of the environment. More precisely, it is shown that there is an absolutely continuous invariant probability exactly when the parameters are such that the time spent in finite size traps has finite expectation. Together with previous results on directional transience [27] it leads, using classical results on stationary ergodic sequences, to a complete description of the ballistic regimes for RWDE in dimension larger or equal to 3. Besides, we think that the proof of the existence of an absolutely continuous invariant distribution for the environment viewed from the particle could be a first step toward an implementation of the technics developed to prove functional central limit theorems; cf., for example, [14].

2. Statement of the results. Let $(e_1, \ldots, e_d)$ be the canonical base of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, and set $e_j = -e_{j-d}$, for $j = d+1, \ldots, 2d$. The set $\{e_1, \ldots, e_{2d}\}$ is the set of unit vectors of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. We denote by $\|z\| = \sum_{i=1}^{d} |z_i|$ the L_1-norm of $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. We write $x \sim y$ if $\|y - x\| = 1$. We consider elliptic random walks in random environment to nearest neighbors. We denote by Ω the set of environments

$$\Omega = \left\{ \omega = (\omega(x, y))_{x \sim y} \in]0, 1]^E, \right.$$

$$\left. \text{such that for all } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \omega(x, x + e_i) = 1 \right\}.$$

An environment ω defines the transition probability of a Markov chain on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, and we denote by P_x^ω the law of this Markov chain starting from x.

$$P_x^\omega[X_{n+1} = y + e_i | X_n = y] = \omega(y, y + e_i).$$

The classical model of nonreversible random environment corresponds to the model where at each site $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ the environment $(\omega(x, x + e_i))_{i=1,\ldots,2d}$ is chosen independently according to the same law. Random Dirichlet environment corresponds to the case where this law is a Dirichlet law. More precisely, we choose

some positive weights $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{2d})$, and we define $\lambda = \lambda^{(\alpha)}$ as the Dirichlet law with parameters $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{2d})$. It means that $\lambda^{(\alpha)}$ is the law on the simplex

$$(2.1) \qquad \left\{ (x_1, \ldots, x_{2d}) \in]0, 1]^{2d}, \sum_{i=1}^{2d} x_i = 1 \right\}$$

with density

$$(2.2) \qquad \frac{\Gamma(\sum_{i=1}^{2d} \alpha_i)}{\prod_{i=1}^{2d} \Gamma(\alpha_i)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{2d} x_i^{\alpha_i - 1} \right) dx_1 \cdots dx_{2d-1},$$

where Γ is the usual Gamma function $\Gamma(\alpha) = \int_0^\infty t^{\alpha-1} e^{-t} dt$. [In the previous expression $dx_1 \cdots dx_{2d-1}$ represents the image of the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{2d-1}$ by the application $(x_1, \ldots, x_{2d-1}) \rightarrow (x_1, \ldots, x_{2d-1}, 1 - (x_1 + \cdots + x_{2d-1}))$]. Obviously, the law does not depend on the specific role of x_{2d}.) We denote by $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$ the law obtained on Ω by picking at each site $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ the transition probabilities $(\omega(x, x+e_i))_{i=1,\ldots,2d}$ independently according to $\lambda^{(\alpha)}$. We denote by $\mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}$ the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$ and by $\mathbb{P}_x^{(\alpha)}[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}[P_x^{(\omega)}(\cdot)]$ the annealed law of the process starting at x. This type of environment plays a special role since the annealed law corresponds to a directed edge reinforced random walk with an affine reinforcement, that is,

$$\mathbb{P}_x^{(\alpha)}[X_{n+1} = X_n + e_i | \sigma(X_k, k \le n)] = \frac{\alpha_i + N_i(X_n, n)}{\sum_{k=1}^{2d} \alpha_k + N_k(X_n, n)},$$

where $N_k(x, n)$ is the number of crossings of the directed edge $(x, x + e_k)$ up to time n. This is just a consequence of the fact that the Dirichlet law is the mixing measure of Polya urns so that at each site the annealed process choose a direction following a Polya urn with parameters $(\alpha_i)_{i=1,\ldots,2d}$; cf. [20] or [21]. When the weights are constant equal to α, the environment is isotropic: when α is large, the environment is close to the deterministic environment of the simple random walk, when α is small the environment is very disordered. The following parameter κ is important in the description of the RWDE:

$$\kappa = 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2d} \alpha_i \right) - \max_{i=1,\ldots,d} (\alpha_i + \alpha_{i+d}).$$

If $i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ realizes the maximum in the last term, then κ is the sum of the weights of the edges exiting the set $\{0, e_{i_0}\}$ (or $\{0, -e_{i_0}\}$). The real κ must be understood as the strength of the trap $\{0, e_{i_0}\}$: indeed, if $\tilde{G}^\omega(0, 0)$ is the Green function at $(0, 0)$ of the Markov chain in environment ω killed at its exit time of the set $\{0, e_{i_0}\}$, then $\tilde{G}^\omega(0, 0)^s$ is integrable if and only if $s < \kappa$ [33]. In [25] it has been proved for $d \ge 3$ that the same is true for the Green function $G(0, 0)$ on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ itself: it has integrable s-moment if and only if $s < \kappa$.

Denote by $(\tau_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ the shift on the environment defined by

$$\tau_x \omega(y, z) = \omega(x + y, x + z).$$

Let X_n be the random walk in environment ω. The process viewed from the particle is the process on the state space Ω defined by

$$\overline{\omega}_n = \tau_{X_n} \omega.$$

Under $P_0^{\omega_0}$, $\omega_0 \in \Omega$ (resp., under $\mathbb{P}_0$), $\overline{\omega}_n$ is a Markov process on state space Ω with generator R given by

$$Rf(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \omega(0, e_i) f(\tau_{e_i} \omega),$$

for all bounded measurable function f on Ω, and with initial distribution δ_{ω_0} (resp., $\mathbb{P}$); cf., e.g., [3]. Compared to the quenched process, the process viewed from the particle is Markovian. Since the state space is huge, one needs to take advantage of this point of view, to have the existence of an invariant probability measure, absolutely continuous with respect to the initial measure on the environment. The following theorem solves this problem in the special case of Dirichlet environment in dimension $d \geq 3$ and is the main result of the paper.

THEOREM 1. *Let $d \geq 3$ and $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$ be the law of the Dirichlet environment with weights $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{2d})$. Let $\kappa > 0$ be defined by*

$$\kappa = 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2d} \alpha_i \right) - \max_{i=1,\ldots,d} (\alpha_i + \alpha_{i+d}).$$

(i) *If $\kappa > 1$, then there exists a unique probability distribution $\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}$ on Ω absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$ and invariant by the generator R. Moreover $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}}{d\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}}$ is in $L_p(\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)})$ for all $1 \leq p < \kappa$.*
(ii) *If $\kappa \leq 1$, there does not exist any probability measure invariant by R and absolutely continuous with respect to the measure $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$.*

We can deduce from this result and from [27, 33], a characterization of ballisticity for $d \geq 3$. Let d_α be the mean drift at first step

$$d_\alpha = \mathbb{E}_0^{(\alpha)}(X_1) = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{2d} \alpha_i} \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \alpha_i e_i.$$

THEOREM 2. *Let $d \geq 3$.*

(i) *(cf. [33]) If $\kappa \leq 1$, then*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{X_n}{n} = 0, \qquad \mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)} \ a.s.$$

(ii) *If $\kappa > 1$ and $d_\alpha = 0$, then*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{X_n}{n} = 0, \qquad \mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)} \; a.s.$$

and for all $i = 1, \ldots, d$

$$\liminf X_n \cdot e_i = -\infty, \qquad \limsup X_n \cdot e_i = +\infty, \qquad \mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)} \; a.s.$$

(iii) *If $\kappa > 1$ and $d_\alpha \neq 0$, then there exists $v \neq 0$ such that*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{X_n}{n} = v, \qquad \mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)} \; a.s.$$

Moreover, for the integers $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ such that $d_\alpha \cdot e_i \neq 0$ we have

$$(d_\alpha \cdot e_i)(v \cdot e_i) > 0.$$

For the integers $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ such that $d_\alpha \cdot e_i = 0$

$$\liminf X_n \cdot e_i = -\infty, \qquad \limsup X_n \cdot e_i = +\infty, \qquad \mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)} \; a.s.$$

REMARK 1.   This answers in the case of RWDE for $d \geq 3$ the following question: is directional transience equivalent to ballisticity? The answer is formally "no" but morally "yes": indeed, it is proved in [27] that for all i such that $d_\alpha \cdot e_i \neq 0$, $X_n \cdot e_i$ is transient; hence, for $\kappa \leq 1$ directional transience and zero speed can coexist. But, it appears in the proof of [33] that the zero speed is due to finite size traps that come from the nonellipticity of the environment. When $\kappa > 1$, the expected exit time of finite boxes is always finite (cf. [33]) and in this case (ii) and (iii) indeed tell that directional transience is equivalent to ballisticity. For general RWRE (and for RWDE in dimension 2) this is an important unsolved question. Partial important results in this direction have been obtained by Sznitman in [29, 30] for general uniformly elliptic environment for $d \geq 2$.

REMARK 2.   A law of of large number (with eventually random or null velocity) has been proved for general (weakly) elliptic RWRE by Zerner (cf. [35]) using the technics of regeneration times developed by Sznitman and Zerner in [32]. Nevertheless, when the directional 0–1 law is not valid it is still not known whether there is a deterministic limiting velocity (this was solved for $d \geq 5$ by Berger, [1]).

REMARK 3.   In case (i), it would be interesting to understand the behavior of $X_n \cdot e_i$ depending on the value of $d_\alpha \cdot e_i$ as in (ii) and (iii). It is not yet possible due to the absence of absolutely continuous invariant measure for the process viewed from the particle. We nevertheless think that this question should be settled in a further work.

3. Proof of Theorem 1(i).   Let us first recall a few definitions and give some notations. By a directed graph we mean a pair $G = (V, E)$ where V is a countable set of vertices and E the set of (directed) edges is a subset of $V \times V$. For simplicity, we do not allow multiple edges or loops [i.e., edges of the type (x, x)]. We denote by $\underline{e}$, respectively $\overline{e}$, the tail and the head of an edge $e \in E$, so that $e = (\underline{e}, \overline{e})$. A directed path from a vertex x to a vertex y is a sequence $\sigma = (x_0 = x, \ldots, x_n = y)$ such that for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$, (x_{i-1}, x_i) is in E. The divergence operator is the function $\mathrm{div} : \mathbb{R}^E \mapsto \mathbb{R}^V$ defined for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^E$ by

$$\forall x \in V, \qquad \mathrm{div}(\theta)(x) = \sum_{e \in E, \underline{e}=x} \theta(e) - \sum_{e \in E, \overline{e}=x} \theta(e).$$

We consider $\mathbb{Z}^d$ as a directed graph: $G_{\mathbb{Z}^d} = (\mathbb{Z}^d, E)$ where the edges are the pair (x, y) such that $\|y - x\| = 1$. On E we consider the weights $(\alpha(e))_{e \in E}$ defined by

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, i = 1, \ldots, 2d, \qquad \alpha\big((x, x + e_i)\big) = \alpha_i.$$

Hence, under $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$, at each site $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, the exit probabilities $(\omega(e))_{\underline{e}=x}$ are independent and distributed according to a Dirichlet law with parameters $(\alpha(e))_{\underline{e}=x}$.

When $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we denote by $T_N = (\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z})^d$ the d-dimensional torus of size N. We denote by $G_N = (T_N, E_N)$ the associated directed graph image of the graph $G = (\mathbb{Z}^d, E)$ by projection on the torus. We denote by $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ the shortest path distance on the torus. We write $x \sim y$ if $(x, y) \in E_N$. Let Ω_N be the space of (weakly) elliptic environments on T_N

$$\Omega_N = \bigg\{ \omega = (\omega(x, y))_{(x,y) \in E_N} \in {]0, 1]}^{E_N},$$

$$\text{such that } \forall x \in T_N, \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \omega(x, x + e_i) = 1 \bigg\}.$$

Ω_N is naturally identified with the space of the N-periodic environments on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. We denote by $\mathbb{P}_N^{(\alpha)}$ the Dirichlet law on the environment obtained by picking independently at each site $x \in T_N$ the exiting probabilities $(\omega(x, x + e_i))_{i=1,\ldots,2d}$ according to a Dirichlet law with parameters $(\alpha_i)_{i=1,\ldots,2d}$.

For ω in Ω_N we denote by $(\pi_N^\omega(x))_{x \in T_N}$ the invariant probability measure of the Markov chain on T_N with transition probabilities ω (it is unique since the environments are elliptic). Let

$$f_N(\omega) = N^d \pi_N^\omega(0),$$

and

$$\mathbb{Q}_N^{(\alpha)} = f_N \cdot \mathbb{P}_N^{(\alpha)}.$$

Thanks to translation invariance, $\mathbb{Q}_N^{(\alpha)}$ is a probability measure on Ω_N. Theorem 1 is a consequence of the following lemma.

LEMMA 1. *Let $d \geq 3$. For all $p \in [1, \kappa[$*

$$\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \|f_N\|_{L_p(\mathbb{P}_N^{(\alpha)})} < \infty.$$

Once this lemma is proved, the proof of Theorem 1 is routine argument; cf., for example, [3], pages 18 and 19. Indeed, we consider $\mathbb{P}_N^{(\alpha)}$ and $\mathbb{Q}_N^{(\alpha)}$ as probability measures on N-periodic environments. Obviously, $\mathbb{P}_N^{(\alpha)}$ converges weakly to the probability measure $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$. By construction, $\mathbb{Q}_N^{(\alpha)}$ is an invariant probability measure for the process of the environment viewed from the particle. Since Ω is compact, we can find a subsequence N_k such that $\mathbb{Q}_{N_k}^{(\alpha)}$ converges weakly to a probability measure $\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}$ on Ω. The probability $\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}$ is invariant for the process viewed from the particle, as a consequence of the invariance of $\mathbb{Q}_N^{(\alpha)}$. Let g be a continuous bounded function on Ω: we have for p such that $1 < p < \kappa$ and $q = \frac{p}{p-1}$

$$\left| \int g \, d\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)} \right| = \left| \lim_{k \to \infty} \int g f_{N_k} \, d\mathbb{P}_{N_k}^{(\alpha)} \right|$$

$$\leq \limsup_{k \to \infty} \left(\int |g|^q \, d\mathbb{P}_{N_k}^{(\alpha)} \right)^{1/q} \left(\int f_{N_k}^p \, d\mathbb{P}_{N_k}^{(\alpha)} \right)^{1/p}$$

$$\leq c_p \|g\|_{L_q(\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)})},$$

where

$$c_p = \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \|f_N\|_{L_p(\mathbb{P}_N^{(\alpha)})} < \infty.$$

As a consequence, $\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$ and

$$\left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}}{d\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}} \right\|_{L_p(\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)})} \leq c_p.$$

The uniqueness of $\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}$ is classical and proved, for example, in [3], page 11.

PROOF OF LEMMA 1. The proof is divided into three steps. The first step prepares the application of the property of "time reversal invariance" (Lemma 1 of [25] or Proposition 1 of [27]). The second step is a little trick to increase the weights in order to get the optimal exponent. The third step makes a crucial use of the "time-reversal invariance" and uses a lemma of the type "max-flow min-cut problem" proved in the next section.

Step 1: Let $(\omega_{x,y})_{x \sim y}$ be in Ω_N. The time-reversed environment is defined by

$$\check{w}_{x,y} = \pi_N^\omega(y) \omega_{y,x} \frac{1}{\pi_N^\omega(x)}$$

for x, y in T_N, $x \sim y$. At each point $x \in T_N$

$$\sum_{\underline{e}=x} \alpha(e) = \sum_{\overline{e}=x} \alpha(e) = \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \alpha_j.$$

It implies by Lemma 1 of [25] that if $(\omega_{x,y})$ is distributed according to $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$, then $\check{w}$ is distributed according to $\mathbb{P}^{(\check{\alpha})}$ where

$$\forall (x, y) \in E_N, \qquad \check{\alpha}_{(x,y)} = \alpha_{(y,x)}.$$

Let p be a real, $1 \leq p < \kappa$

$$(f_N)^p = (N^d \pi_N^\omega(0))^p$$

$$(3.1) \qquad = \left(\frac{\pi_N^\omega(0)}{1/N^d \sum_{y \in T_N} \pi_N^\omega(y)} \right)^p$$

$$\leq \prod_{y \in T_N} \left(\frac{\pi_N^\omega(0)}{\pi_N^\omega(y)} \right)^{p/N^d},$$

where in the last inequality we used the arithmetico-geometric inequality. If $\theta : E_N \to \mathbb{R}_+$, we define $\check{\theta}$ by

$$\check{\theta}_{(x,y)} = \theta_{(y,x)} \qquad \forall x \sim y.$$

For two functions γ and β on E_N (resp., on T_N), we write γ^β for $\prod_{e \in E_N} \gamma(e)^{\beta(e)}$ (resp., $\prod_{x \in T_N} \gamma(x)^{\beta(x)}$). We clearly have

$$\frac{\check{\omega}^{\check{\theta}}}{\omega^\theta} = \prod_{e \in E_N} \frac{(\omega(e) \pi_N(\underline{e}) \pi_N(\overline{e})^{-1})^{\theta(e)}}{\omega_e^{\theta(e)}}$$

$$(3.2) \qquad = \prod_{x \in T_N} \pi_N(x)^{\sum_{e,\underline{e}=x} \theta(e) - \sum_{e,\overline{e}=x} \theta(e)}$$

$$= \pi_N^{\operatorname{div}(\theta)}.$$

Hence, for all $\theta : E_N \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$(3.3) \qquad \operatorname{div}(\theta) = \frac{p}{N^d} \sum_{y \in T_N} (\delta_0 - \delta_y)$$

we have, using (3.1) and (3.2),

$$(3.4) \qquad f_N^p \leq \frac{\check{\omega}^{\check{\theta}}}{\omega^\theta}.$$

Step 2: Considering that $1 = \sum_{\|e\|=1} \omega(0, e)$, we have

$$1 = 1^\kappa \leq (2d)^\kappa \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \omega(0, e_i)^\kappa.$$

Hence, we get

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}(f_N^p) \leq (2d)^\kappa \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}(\omega(0, e_i)^\kappa f_N^p).$$

Hence, we need now to prove that for all $i = 1, \ldots, 2d$,

(3.5) $$\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}(\omega(0, e_i)^\kappa f_N^p) < \infty.$$

Considering (3.4), we need to prove that for all $i = 1, \ldots, 2d$, we can find a sequence (θ_N), where $\theta_N : E_N \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfies (3.3) for all N, such that

(3.6) $$\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}\left(\omega_{(0, e_i)}^\kappa \frac{\check{\omega}^{\check{\theta}_N}}{\omega^{\theta_N}}\right) < \infty.$$

Step 3: This is related to the max-flow min-cut problem; cf., for example, [17], Section 3.1 or [10]. Let us first recall the notion of minimal cut-set sums on the graph $G_{\mathbb{Z}^d}$. A cut-set between $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and ∞ is a subset S of E such that any infinite simple directed path (i.e., an infinite directed path that does not pass twice by the same vertex) starting from x must pass through one (directed) edge of S. A cut-set which is minimal for inclusion is necessarily of the form

(3.7) $$S = \partial_+(K) = \{e \in E, \underline{e} \in K, \overline{e} \in K^c\},$$

where K is a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ containing x such that any $y \in K$ can be reached by a directed path in K starting at x. Let $(c(e))_{e \in E}$ be a set of nonnegative reals called the capacities. The minimal cut-set sum between 0 and ∞ is defined as the value

$$m((c)) = \inf\{c(S), S \text{ is a cut-set separating } 0 \text{ and } \infty\},$$

where $c(S) = \sum_{e \in S} c(e)$. Observe that the infimum can be taken only on minimal cut-set, that is, cut-set of the form (3.7).

The proof uses the following lemma, whose proof is deferred to the next section since it is of a different nature.

LEMMA 2.   *Let $d \geq 3$. Let $(c(e))_{e \in E}$ be such that*

$$\inf_{e \in E} c(e) > 0; \qquad \sup_{e \in E} c(e) < \infty.$$

There exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that for N large enough there exists a function $\theta_N : E_N \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

(3.8)
$$\operatorname{div}(\theta_N) = m((c)) \frac{1}{N^d} \sum_{x \in T_N} (\delta_0 - \delta_x),$$

$$\|\theta_N\|_2^2 = \sum_{e \in E_N} \theta_N(e)^2 < c_1$$

and such that

$$\theta_N(e) \leq c(e) \qquad \forall e \in E_N, \tag{3.9}$$

when we identify E_N with the edges of E such that $\underline{e} \in [-N/2, N/2[^d$.

The strategy now is to use this result to find a sequence (θ_N) which satisfies (3.6). Let $(\alpha^{(i)}(e))_{e \in E}$ be the weights obtained by increasing the weight α by κ on the edge $(0, e_i)$, and leaving the other values unchanged

$$\alpha^{(i)}(e) = \begin{cases} \alpha^{(i)}(e) = \alpha(e), & \text{if } e \neq (0, e_i), \\ \alpha^{(i)}((0, e_i)) = \alpha((0, e_i)) + \kappa = \alpha_i + \kappa. \end{cases}$$

Let us first note that for all $i = 1, \ldots, 2d$,

$$m\big((\alpha^{(i)})\big) \geq \kappa. \tag{3.10}$$

Take $i = 1, \ldots, d$: if S contains the edge $(0, e_i)$, then $\alpha^{(i)}(S) \geq \alpha^{(i)}_{(0, e_i)} \geq \kappa$. Otherwise, for all $j = 1, \ldots, d$, $j \neq i$, S must intersect the paths $(ke_j)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(-ke_j)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(0, e_i, (e_i + ke_j)_{k \in \mathbb{N}})$, $(0, e_i, (e_i - ke_j)_{k \in \mathbb{N}})$. These intersections are disjoints, and it gives two edges with weights (α_j) and two edges with weights (α_{j+d}). Moreover, S must intersect the paths $(ke_i)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(-ke_i)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. It gives one edge with weight α_i and one with weight α_{i+d}. Hence,

$$\alpha^{(i)}(S) \geq 2\left(\sum_{j=1}^{2d} \alpha_j\right) - (\alpha_i + \alpha_{i+d}) \geq \kappa.$$

The same reasoning works for $i = d+1, \ldots, 2d$.

Let us now prove (3.6) for $i = 1$; the same reasoning works for all. We apply Lemma 2 with $c(e) = \alpha^{(1)}(e)$. It gives for N large enough a function $\tilde{\theta}_N : E_N \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ which satisfies

$$\text{div}(\tilde{\theta}_N) = \frac{m(\alpha^{(1)})}{N^d} \sum_{y \in T_N} (\delta_0 - \delta_y),$$

and $\tilde{\theta}_N(e) \leq \alpha^{(1)}(e)$ and with bounded L_2 norm. It implies that $\theta_N = \frac{p}{m(\alpha^{(1)})} \tilde{\theta}_N$ satisfies

$$\text{div}(\theta_N) = \frac{p}{N^d} \sum_{y \in T_N} (\delta_0 - \delta_y),$$

and by (3.10) that $\theta_N(e) \leq \frac{p}{\kappa} \tilde{\theta}_N(e) \leq \frac{p}{\kappa} \alpha^{(1)}(e)$ and that θ_N has a bounded L_2-norm.

Let r, q be positive reals such that $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ and $pq < \kappa$. Using Hölder inequality and Lemma 1 of [25], we get

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}\left(\omega(0, e_1)^\kappa \frac{\check{\omega}^{\check{\theta}_N}}{\omega^{\theta_N}}\right) \leq \mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}(\omega(0, e_1)^{q\kappa} \omega^{-q\theta_N})^{1/q} \mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}(\check{\omega}^{r\check{\theta}_N})^{1/r}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}(\omega(0, e_1)^{q\kappa} \omega^{-q\theta_N})^{1/q} \mathbb{E}^{(\check{\alpha})}(\omega^{r\check{\theta}_N})^{1/r}.$$

We set $\alpha(x) = \sum_{\underline{e}=x} \alpha(e)$ and $\theta_N(x) = \sum_{\underline{e}=x} \theta_N(e)$. Observe that $\alpha(x) = \check{\alpha}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \alpha_j$ for all $x \in T_N$. We set $\alpha_0 = \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \alpha_j$. For any function $\xi : E_N \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$(3.11) \qquad \mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}(\omega^\xi) = \prod_{x \in T_N} \left(\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{2d} \Gamma(\alpha_i + \xi(x, x + e_i))}{\Gamma(\sum_{i=1}^{2d} \alpha_i + \xi(x, x + e_i))} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_0)}{\prod_{i=1}^{2d} \Gamma(\alpha_i)} \right)$$

if $\xi(x, x + e_i) > -\alpha_i$ for all $x \in T_N$, $i = 1, \ldots, 2d$, and $+\infty$, otherwise. Indeed, using the explicit form of Dirichlet distribution (2.2) and the independence at each site, we get for any $\xi : E_N \mapsto \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}(\omega^\xi) = \left(\frac{\Gamma(\alpha_0)}{\prod_{i=1}^{2d} \Gamma(\alpha_i)} \right)^{|T_N|} \prod_{x \in T_N} \int \prod_{i=1}^{2d} x_i^{\alpha_i + \xi(x, x+e_i) - 1} \, dx_1 \cdots dx_{2d-1}$$

where the last integrals are on the simplex $\{(x_1, \ldots, x_{2d}), x_i > 0, \sum x_i = 1\}$. These integrals are Dirichlet integrals which are finite if and only if $\alpha_i + \xi(x, x + e_i) > 0$ for all x and i. There explicit value [cf. (2.2)] gives formula (3.11). A straightforward application of (3.11) gives

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}(\omega(0, e_1)^{q\kappa} \omega^{-q\theta_N})$$

$$= \left(\frac{\prod_{\substack{e \in E_N \\ e \neq (0, e_1)}} \Gamma(\alpha(e) - q\theta_N(e))}{\prod_{\substack{x \in T_N \\ x \neq 0}} \Gamma(\alpha_0 - q\theta_N(x))} \right) \left(\frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1 + q\kappa - q\theta_N((0, e_1)))}{\Gamma(\alpha_0 + q\kappa - q\theta_N(0))} \right)$$

$$\times \left(\frac{\prod_{x \in T_N} \Gamma(\alpha_0)}{\prod_{e \in E_N} \Gamma(\alpha(e))} \right).$$

Observe that all the terms are well defined since $q\theta_N \leq \frac{pq}{\kappa} \alpha^{(1)}$ and $qp < \kappa$. We have the following inequalities:

$$\alpha_1 \left(1 - \frac{qp}{\kappa} \right) \leq \alpha_1 + q\kappa - q\theta_N((0, e_1)) \leq \alpha_1 + q\kappa$$

and

$$\alpha_0 \left(1 - \frac{qp}{\kappa} \right) \leq \alpha_0 + q\kappa - q\theta_N(0) \leq \alpha_0 + q\kappa,$$

which imply that

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}(\omega(0, e_1)^{q\kappa} \omega^{-q\theta_N})^{1/q}$$

$$\leq A_1 \left(\frac{\prod_{\substack{e \in E_N \\ e \neq (0, e_1)}} \Gamma(\alpha(e) - q\theta_N(e))}{\prod_{\substack{x \in T_N \\ x \neq 0}} \Gamma(\alpha_0 - q\theta_N(x))} \right)^{1/q} \left(\frac{\prod_{\substack{x \in T_N \\ x \neq 0}} \Gamma(\alpha_0)}{\prod_{\substack{e \in E_N \\ e \neq (0, e_1)}} \Gamma(\alpha(e))} \right)^{1/q},$$

where

$$A_1 = \left(\frac{\Gamma(\alpha_0)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)} \frac{\sup_{s \in [\alpha_1(1 - qp/\kappa), \alpha_1 + q\kappa]} \Gamma(s),}{\inf_{s \in [\alpha_0(1 - qp/\kappa), \alpha_0 + q\kappa]} \Gamma(s)} \right)^{1/q}.$$

Similarly, we get

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\check{\alpha})}(\omega^{r\check{\theta}_N}) = \left(\frac{\prod_{e \in E_N} \Gamma(\check{\alpha}(e) + r\check{\theta}_N(e))}{\prod_{x \in T_N} \Gamma(\check{\alpha}(x) + r\check{\theta}_N(x))}\right)\left(\frac{\prod_{x \in T_N} \Gamma(\check{\alpha}(x))}{\prod_{e \in E_N} \Gamma(\check{\alpha}(e))}\right)$$

$$= \left(\frac{\prod_{e \in E_N} \Gamma(\alpha(e) + r\theta_N(e))}{\prod_{x \in T_N} \Gamma(\alpha_0 + r\check{\theta}_N(x))}\right)\left(\frac{\prod_{x \in T_N} \Gamma(\alpha_0)}{\prod_{e \in E_N} \Gamma(\alpha(e))}\right),$$

where in the last line we used that $\check{\alpha}((x, y)) = \alpha((y, x))$ and $\check{\theta}((x, y)) = \theta((y, x))$ and that $\check{\alpha}(x) = \sum_{\overline{e}=x} \alpha_e = \alpha(x) = \alpha_0$ for all x. Note that $\check{\theta}(0) = \theta(0) - p$ and $\check{\theta}(x) = \theta(x) + \frac{p}{N^d}$ for $x \neq 0$, thanks to (3.3). We have the following inequalities:

$$\alpha_1 \leq \alpha((0, e_1)) + r\theta_N((0, e_1)) \leq \alpha_1(1 + r) + r\kappa,$$

$$\alpha_0 \leq \alpha(0) + r\check{\theta}_N(0) \leq \alpha_0(1 + r) + r\kappa.$$

This gives that

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\check{\alpha})}(\omega^{r\check{\theta}_N})^{1/r}$$

$$\leq A_2 \left(\frac{\prod_{\substack{e \in E_N \\ e \neq (0,e_1)}} \Gamma(\alpha(e) + r\theta_N(e))}{\prod_{\substack{x \in T_N \\ x \neq 0}} \Gamma(\alpha_0 + r\theta_N(x) + pr/N^d)}\right)^{1/r} \left(\frac{\prod_{\substack{x \in T_N \\ x \neq 0}} \Gamma(\alpha_0)}{\prod_{\substack{e \in E_N \\ e \neq (0,e_1)}} \Gamma(\alpha(e))}\right)^{1/r},$$

where

$$A_2 = \left(\frac{\Gamma(\alpha_0)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)} \frac{\sup_{s \in [\alpha_1, \alpha_1(1+r)+r\kappa]} \Gamma(s)}{\inf_{s \in [\alpha_0, \alpha_0(1+r)+r\kappa]} \Gamma(s)}\right)^{1/r}.$$

Combining these inequalities it gives

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}\left(\omega(0, e_1)^{\kappa} \frac{\check{\omega}^{\check{\theta}_N}}{\omega^{\theta_N}}\right)$$

$$\leq A_1 A_2 \exp\left(\sum_{\substack{e \in E_N \\ e \neq (0,e_1)}} \nu(\alpha(e), \theta_N(e)) - \sum_{\substack{x \in T_N \\ x \neq 0}} \tilde{\nu}(\alpha_0, \theta_N(x))\right),$$

where

$$\nu(\alpha, u) = \frac{1}{r} \ln \Gamma(\alpha + ru) + \frac{1}{q} \ln \Gamma(\alpha - qu) - \ln \Gamma(\alpha)$$

and

$$\tilde{\nu}(\alpha, u) = \frac{1}{r} \ln \Gamma\left(\alpha + ru + \frac{pr}{N^d}\right) + \frac{1}{q} \ln \Gamma(\alpha - qu) - \ln \Gamma(\alpha).$$

Let $\underline{\alpha} = \min \alpha_i, \overline{\alpha} = \max \alpha_i$. By Taylor's inequality and since $\underline{\alpha} \leq \alpha(e) \leq \overline{\alpha}$ for all $e \in E_N$, $q\theta_N(e) \leq \frac{qp}{\kappa}\alpha(e)$ for all $e \neq (0, e_1)$ and $qp < \kappa$, we can find a constant $c > 0$ such that for all $e \neq (0, e_1)$,

$$|\nu(\alpha(e), \theta(e))| \leq c\theta(e)^2$$

and for all $x \neq 0$,

$$|\tilde{v}(\alpha_0, \theta(x))| \leq c\left(\theta(x)^2 + \frac{p}{N^d}\right).$$

Hence, we get a positive constant $C > 0$ independent of $N > N_0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\alpha)}\left(\omega(0, e_1)^\kappa \frac{\check{\omega}^{\check{\theta}_N}}{\omega^{\theta_N}}\right) \leq \exp\left(C\left(\sum_{e \in E_N} \theta_N(e)^2 + \sum_{x \in T_N} \theta_N(x)^2\right)\right).$$

Thus (3.6) is true, and this proves Lemma 1. □

4. Proof of Lemma 2. The strategy is to apply the max-flow min-cut theorem (cf. [17], Section 3.1 or [10]) to an appropriate choice of capacities on the graph G_N. We first need a generalized version of the max-flow min-cut theorem.

PROPOSITION 1.   *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite directed graph. Let $(c(e))_{e \in E}$ be a set of nonnegative reals (called capacities). Let x_0 be a vertex and $(p_x)_{x \in V}$ be a set of nonnegative reals. There exists a nonnegative function $\theta : E \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ such that*

$$\text{(4.1)} \qquad\qquad \text{div}(\theta) = \sum_{x \in V} p_x (\delta_{x_0} - \delta_x),$$

$$\text{(4.2)} \qquad\qquad \forall e \in E, \qquad \theta(e) \leq c(e),$$

if and only if for all subset $K \subset V$ containing x_0 we have

$$\text{(4.3)} \qquad\qquad c(\partial_+ K) \geq \sum_{x \in K^c} p_x,$$

where $\partial_+ K = \{e \in E, \underline{e} \in K, \overline{e} \in K^c\}$ and $c(\partial_+ K) = \sum_{e \in \partial_+ K} c(e)$. The same is true if we restrict condition (4.3) to the subsets K such that any $y \in K$ can be reached from 0 following a directed path in K.

PROOF.   If θ satisfies (4.1), then

$$\sum_{e, \underline{e} \in K, \overline{e} \in K^c} \theta(e) - \sum_{e, \overline{e} \in K, \underline{e} \in K^c} \theta(e) = \sum_{x \in K} \text{div}(\theta)(x) = \sum_{x \in K^c} p_x.$$

It implies (4.3) by (4.2) and positivity of θ.

The reversed implication is an easy consequence of the classical max-flow min-cut theorem on finite directed graphs ([17], Section 3.1 or [10]). Suppose now that (c) satisfies (4.3). Consider the new graph $\tilde{G} = (V \cup \delta, \tilde{E})$ defined by

$$\tilde{E} = E \cup \{(x, \delta), x \in V\}.$$

We consider the capacities $(\tilde{c}(e))_{e \in \tilde{E}}$ defined by $c(e) = \tilde{c}(e)$ for $e \in E$ and $c((x, \delta)) = p_x$. The strategy is to apply the max-flow min-cut theorem with capacities $\tilde{c}$ and with source x_0 and sink δ. Any minimal cut-set between x_0 and δ in

the graph $\tilde{G}$ is of the form $\partial_+^{\tilde{G}} K$ where $K \subset V$ is a subset containing x_0 but not δ and such that any point $y \in K$ can be reached from x_0 following a directed path in K. Observe that

$$\tilde{c}(\partial_+^{\tilde{G}} K) = c(\partial_+^G K) + \sum_{x \in K} p_x.$$

Hence, (4.3) implies

$$\tilde{c}(\partial_+^{\tilde{G}} K) \geq \sum_{x \in V} p_x.$$

Thus the max-flow min-cut theorem gives a flow $\tilde{\theta}$ on $\tilde{G}$ between x_0 and δ with strength $\sum_{x \in V} p_x$ and such that $\tilde{\theta} \leq \tilde{c}$. This necessarily implies that $\tilde{\theta}((x, \delta)) = p_x$. The function θ obtained by restriction of $\tilde{\theta}$ to E satisfies (4.2) and (4.1). $\quad\square$

LEMMA 3. *Let $d \geq 3$. There exists a positive constant $C_2 > 0$, such that for all $N > 1$, and all x, y in T_N there exists a unit flow θ from x to y (i.e., $\theta : E_N \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathrm{div}(\theta) = \delta_x - \delta_y$) such that for all $z \in T_N$,*

$$(4.4) \qquad \theta(z) = \sum_{\underline{e}=z} \theta(e) \leq 1 \wedge \left(C_2\left(d(x, z)^{-(d-1)} + d(y, z)^{-(d-1)}\right)\right).$$

PROOF. By translation and symmetry, we can consider only the case where $x = 0$ and $y \in [N/2, N[^d$ when T_N is identified with $[0, N[^d$. We construct a flow on $G_{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ supported by the set

$$D_y = [0, y_1] \times \cdots \times [0, y_d]$$

as an integral of sufficiently dispersed path flows. It thus induces by projection a flow on T_N with the same L_2 norm. Let us give some definitions. A sequence $\sigma = (x_0, \ldots, x_n)$ is a path from x to y in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ if $x_0 = x$, $x_n = y$ and $\|x_{i+1} - x_i\|_1 = 1$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. We say that σ is a positive path if moreover $x_{i+1} - x_i \in \{e_1, \ldots, e_d\}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. To any path from x to y we can associate the unit flow from x to y defined by

$$\theta_\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{(x_{i-1}, x_i)}.$$

For $u \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we define C_u by

$$C_u = \left\{ z = (z_1, \ldots, z_d) \in \mathbb{R}_+^d, \sum_{i=1}^d z_i = u \right\}.$$

Clearly if $y \in \mathbb{N}^d$ and if $\sigma = (x_0 = 0, \ldots, x_n = y)$ is a positive path from 0 to y, then $n = \|y\|_1$ and $x_k \in C_k$ for all $k = 0, \ldots, \|y\|$.

Set

$$\Delta_y = D_y \cap \left\{ u = (u_1, \ldots, u_d) \in \mathbb{R}_+^d, \sum_{i=1}^d u_i = \frac{\|y\|_1}{2} \right\}.$$

For $u \in \Delta_y$, let L_u be the union of segments

$$L_u = [0, u] \cup [u, y].$$

We can consider L_u as the continuous path $l_u : [0, \|y\|] \mapsto D_y$ from 0 to y defined by

$$\{l_u(t)\} = L_u \cap C_t.$$

Observe that $u \in D_y$ implies that $l_u(t)$ is nondecreasing on each coordinate. There is a canonical way to associate with l_u a discrete positive path σ_u from 0 to y such that for all $k = 0, \ldots, \|y\|$,

(4.5) $$\|l_u(k) - \sigma_u(k)\| \leq 2d.$$

Indeed, let $\tilde{l}_u(t)$ be defined by taking the integer part of each coordinate of $l_u(t)$. At jump times of $\tilde{l}_u(t)$ the coordinates increase at most by 1. We define $\sigma_u(k)$ as the positive path which follows the successive jumps of $\tilde{l}_u(t)$: if at a time t there are jumps at several coordinates, we choose to increase first the coordinate on e_1, then on e_2... We have by construction $k - d \leq \|\tilde{l}_u(k)\| \leq k$, hence $\tilde{l}_u(k) \in \{\sigma_u(k - d), \ldots, \sigma_u(k)\}$, so $\|\sigma_u(k) - \tilde{l}_u(k)\| \leq d$. Since $\|l_u(k) - \tilde{l}_u(k)\| \leq d$ it gives (4.5). We then define

$$\theta_u = \theta_{\sigma_u},$$

and

$$\theta = \frac{1}{|\Delta_z|} \int_{\Delta_z} \theta_u \, du$$

(where $|\Delta_z| = \int_{\Delta_z} du$), which is a unit flow from 0 to y. Clearly, $\theta(z) \leq 1$ for all $z \in T_N$. For $k = 0, \ldots, \|y\|_1$ and $z \in \mathcal{H}_k$, we have

$$\theta(z) \leq \frac{1}{|\Delta_z|} \int_{\Delta_z} \mathbb{1}_{\|l_u(k) - z\| \leq 2d} \, du.$$

Hence, we have for k such that $1 < k \leq \frac{\|y\|}{2}$,

$$\theta(z) \leq \frac{1}{|\Delta_z|} \int_{\Delta_z} \mathbb{1}_{\|u - z\|y\|/(2k)\| \leq d\|y\|/k} \, du.$$

Since $y \in [N/2, N[^d$, there is a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\theta(z) \leq C_2 k^{-(d-1)}.$$

Similarly, if $\|y\|/2 \leq k < \|y\|$,

$$\theta(z) \leq C_2(\|y\| - k)^{-(d-1)}.$$

Moreover $\theta(z)$ is null on the complement of D_y. By projection on G_N it gives a function on E_N with the right properties. This proves Lemma 3. $\square$

We are ready to prove Lemma 2. Let $(c(e))$ be such that $0 < C' < c(e) < C'' < \infty$. For all $y \in T_N$ we denote by $\theta_{0,y}$ a unit flow from 0 to y satisfying the conditions of Lemma 3. We set

$$\tilde{\theta}_N = \frac{m(c)}{N^d} \sum_{y \in T_N} \theta_{0,y}.$$

The strategy is to apply proposition 1 to a set of capacities constructed from $\tilde{\theta}_N$ and c. Clearly,

$$(4.6) \qquad \operatorname{div}(\tilde{\theta}_N) = \frac{m(c)}{N^d} \sum_{y \in T_N} (\delta_0 - \delta_y),$$

and by simple computation we get that

$$(4.7) \qquad \tilde{\theta}_N(z) \leq C_2 m(c)\left(1 \wedge \left(d(0,z)^{-(d-1)}\right) + \frac{d2^d}{N^{d-1}}\right).$$

This implies that

$$\sum_{z \in T_N} \tilde{\theta}_N^2(z) \leq 2C_2^2 m(c)^2 \sum_{z \in T_N}\left(1 \wedge \left(d(0,z)^{-2(d-1)}\right) + \frac{(d2^d)^2}{N^{2(d-1)}}\right)$$

$$\leq 2C_2^2 m(c)^2 \left((d2^d)^2 N^{-d+2} + \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} 1 \wedge \left(d(0,z)^{-2(d-1)}\right)\right).$$

Considering that the number of points z at distance k from 0 is smaller than $2d(2k+1)^{d-1}$, we get that

$$\sum_{z \in T_N} \tilde{\theta}_N^2(z) \leq 2C_2^2 m(c)^2 \left((d2^d)^2 N^{-d+2} + 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-2d+2}(2d)(2k+1)^{d-1}\right).$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{z \in T_N} \tilde{\theta}_N^2(z) \leq 2C_2^2 m^2(c)(d2^d)\left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-(d-1)}\right) + 2C_2^2 m^2(c)(d2^d)^2 N^{-(d-2)},$$

and there is a constant $C_3 > 0$ depending solely on C', C'', d such that

$$\sum_{z \in T_N} \tilde{\theta}_N^2(z) \leq C_3, \qquad \sum_{e \in E_N} \tilde{\theta}_N^2(e) \leq C_3.$$

By (4.6) we know that for all $K \subset T_N$ containing 0 we have

$$\sum_{e \in E_N, \underline{e} \in K, \overline{e} \in K^c} \tilde{\theta}_N(e) - \sum_{e \in E_N, \overline{e} \in K, \underline{e} \in K^c} \tilde{\theta}_N(e) = m(c) \frac{|K^c|}{N^d},$$

hence,

$$(4.8) \qquad\qquad \tilde{\theta}_N(\partial_+ K) \geq m(c) \frac{|K^c|}{N^d}.$$

The strategy is to modify $\tilde{\theta}_N$ locally around 0 in order to make it lower or equal to c but large enough to be able to apply Proposition 1. Let us fix some notations. For a positive integer r, $B_E(x_0, r)$ denotes the set of edges

$$B_E(x_0, r) = \{e \in E, \underline{e} \in B(x_0, r), \overline{e} \in B(x_0, r)\}$$

and

$$\underline{B}_E(x_0, r) = \{e \in E, \underline{e} \in B(x_0, r)\}.$$

By (4.7), there exist some positive integer η_0 and $\tilde{N}_0$, such that for all $N \geq \tilde{N}_0$ and $e \notin B_E(0, \eta_0)$, we have

$$(4.9) \qquad\qquad |\tilde{\theta}_N(e)| \leq \frac{C'}{2}.$$

Choose now $\eta_1 > \eta_0$ such that

$$(4.10) \qquad\qquad \eta_1 - \eta_0 \geq 4\frac{m(c)}{C'} + 2.$$

Finally we can find an integer $N_0 \geq \max(\tilde{N}_0, 2\eta_1)$ large enough to satisfy

$$(4.11) \qquad\qquad N_0^d \geq m(c)\frac{|B(0, \eta_1)|}{C'}.$$

We consider $(\tilde{c}_N(e))_{e \in E_N}$ defined by

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{c}_N(e) = c(e), & \text{if } \underline{e} \text{ or } \overline{e} \in B(0, \eta_1), \\ \tilde{c}_N(e) = \tilde{\theta}_N(e), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that, thanks to (4.9), for all $e \in E_N$, $\tilde{c}_N(e) \leq c(e)$ when we identify E_N with the edges of E, which starts in $[-N/2, N/2[^d$. In the rest of the proof we prove that for all $N \geq N_0$ and for all $K \subset T_N$ that contains 0 and which are such that any $y \in K$ can be reached from 0 following a directed path in K, we have

$$(4.12) \qquad\qquad \tilde{c}_N(\partial_+ K) \geq m(c)\frac{|K^c|}{N^d}.$$

By application of Proposition 1, it would give a flow θ_N, which satisfies (3.8) and (3.9), and with a bounded L_2 norm, indeed,

$$\sum_{e \in E_N} \theta_N(e)^2 \leq C_3 + |B_E(0, \eta_1)|(C'')^2.$$

We only need to check inequality (4.12) for K such that K^c has a unique connected component. Indeed, if K^c has several connected components, say $R_1, \ldots, R_k$, then

$$\partial_- R_i = \{e \in E_N, \overline{e} \in R_i, \underline{e} \in R_i^c\} = \{e \in E_N, \overline{e} \in R_i, \underline{e} \in K\}.$$

Hence, $\partial_+ K$ is the disjoint union of

$$\partial_+ K = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{k} \partial_- R_i.$$

Hence if we can prove (4.12) for $K_i = R_i^c$, we can prove it for K. Thus we assume, moreover, that K^c has a unique connected component in the graph G_N. There are four different cases:

- If $K \subset B(0, \eta_1)$, then

$$\tilde{c}_N(\partial_+ K) = c(\partial_+ K).$$

  Moreover, viewed on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ (when T_N is identified with $[-N/2, N/2[)$ $\partial_+ K$ is a cut-set separating 0 from ∞ (indeed, $N \geq N_0 \geq 2\eta_1$), thus

$$c(\partial_+ K) \geq m(c) \geq m(c) \frac{|K^c|}{N^d}.$$

- If $B(0, \eta_0) \subset K$, by (4.8) and (4.9), then

$$\tilde{c}_N(\partial_+ K) \geq \tilde{\theta}_N(\partial_+ K) \geq m(c) \frac{|K^c|}{N^d}.$$

- If $K^c \subset B(0, \eta_1)$, then by (4.11),

$$\frac{|K^c|}{N^d} \leq \frac{|B(0, \eta_1)|}{N_0^d} \leq \frac{C'}{m(c)},$$

  hence,

$$\tilde{c}_N(\partial_+ K) = c(\partial_+ K) \geq C' \geq m(c) \frac{|K^c|}{N^d},$$

  since $\partial K^c \neq \varnothing$.

- Otherwise K contains at least one point x_1 in $B(0, \eta_1)^c$, and K^c contains at least one point y_0 in $B(0, \eta_0)$ and one point y_1 in $B(0, \eta_1)^c$. Hence there is a path between y_0 and y_1 in K^c and a directed path between 0 and x_1 in K. Let $S(0, i)$ denote the sphere with center 0 and radius i for the shortest path distance in G_N. It implies that we can find a sequence $z_{\eta_0}, \ldots, z_{\eta_1}$ such that $z_i \in K \cap S(0, i)$ and a sequence $z'_{\eta_0}, \ldots, z'_{\eta_1}$ such that $z'_i \in K^c \cap S(0, i)$. Since there is a directed path in $S(0, i) \cup S(0, i-1)$ between z_i and z'_i, and a directed path in K between 0 and z_i, it implies that there exists at least $\lfloor \frac{1}{2}(\eta_1 - \eta_0) \rfloor$ different edges in $\partial_+ K \cap B_E(0, \eta_1)$. Hence

$$\tilde{c}_N(\partial_+ K) \geq \lfloor \tfrac{1}{2}(\eta_1 - \eta_0) \rfloor C' \geq m((c)).$$

This concludes the proof of (4.12) and of the lemma.

5. Proof of Theorem 1(ii) and Theorem 2. These results are based on classical results on ergodic stationary sequence; cf. [7], pages 343–344. Let us start with the following lemma.

LEMMA 4. *Suppose that there exists an invariant probability measure $\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}$, absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$ and invariant for R. Then $\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}$ is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$ and the Markov chain $(\overline{w}_n)$ with generator R, and the initial law $\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}$ is stationary and ergodic. Let $(\Delta_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the sequence*

$$\Delta_i = X_i - X_{i-1}.$$

Under the invariant annealed measure $\mathbb{Q}_0^{(\alpha)}(\cdot) = \mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}(P_0^\omega(\cdot))$, the sequence (Δ_i) is stationary and ergodic.

PROOF. The first assertion on $\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}$ is classical and proved, for example, in [3], Theorem 1.2. Since $\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}$ is an invariant probability measure for $\overline{\omega}_n$, it is clear that (Δ_i) is stationary. The ergodicity of (Δ_i) is a consequence of the ergodicity of (ω_n). Indeed, since the environment is i.i.d. and not deterministic, there exists a measurable function $f : \Omega \times \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{Z}$ such that a.s. $\Delta_i = f(\omega_{i-1}, \omega_i)$ (indeed, for $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$ almost all ω, $\tau_x(\omega) = \omega$ if and only if $x = 0$, which means that the increment Δ_i is almost surely uniquely determined by the observation of ω_{i-1} and ω_i). This implies the ergodicity of the sequence (Δ_i). □

PROOF OF THEOREM 1(II). Suppose that there exists an invariant probability measure $\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}$, absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$ and invariant for R. Since (X_n) is $\mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)}$ a.s. (hence, $\mathbb{Q}_0^{(\alpha)}$ a.s.) transient ([25], Theorem 1), it implies that

$$E^{\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}}\big(P_0^\omega(H_0^+ = \infty)\big) > 0,$$

where H_0^+ is the first positive return time of X_n to 0. Let R_n be the number of points visited by (X_k) at time $n - 1$

$$R_n = |\{X_k, k = 0, \ldots, n - 1\}|.$$

Theorem 6.3.1 of [7] and Lemma 4 tell that

(5.1) $\mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)}$ a.s., $\dfrac{R_n}{n} \to E^{\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}}\big(P_0^\omega(H_0^+ = \infty)\big) > 0.$

Let $i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ be a direction which maximizes $\alpha_i + \alpha_{i+d}$. Theorem 3 of [33] tells that if $\kappa \leq 1$, then the expected exit time under $\mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)}$ of the finite subset $\{0, e_{i_0}\}$ or $\{0, -e_{i_0}\}$ is infinite. By independence of the environment under $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}$, we can easily get that $\frac{R_n}{n} \to 0$, $\mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)}$ a.s. This contradicts (5.1). □

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. (i) is Proposition 12 of [33]. Under the annealed invariant law $\mathbb{Q}_0^{(\alpha)}$, (Δ_k) is a stationary ergodic sequence with values in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ (hence

for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, 2d\}$, $\Delta_k \cdot e_i$ is also a stationary ergodic sequence with values in $\mathbb{Z}$). Birkhoff's ergodic Theorem ([7], page 337) gives for free the law of large number

$$\mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)} \text{ a.s.,} \qquad \frac{X_n}{n} \to E^{\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}}(E_0^\omega(X_1)).$$

If $d_\alpha \cdot e_i = 0$ then by symmetry of the law of the environment it implies that $E^{\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}}(E_0^\omega(X_1)) \cdot e_i = 0$, hence by Theorem 6.3.2 of [7], we have that $X_n \cdot e_i = 0$ infinitely often. By Lemma 4 of [36] it implies (ii) and the last assertion of (iii).

For $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we set $A_l = \{X_n \cdot l \to \infty\}$. If $l \neq 0$ and if $\mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)}(A_l) > 0$, then Kalikow 0–1 law ([11], [36], Proposition 3) tells that $\mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)}(A_l \cup A_{-l}) = 1$. Suppose now that $d_\alpha \cdot e_i > 0$ for an integer i in $\{1, \ldots, 2d\}$. In [27] we proved that $\mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)}(A_{e_i}) > 0$, this implies that $X_n \cdot e_i$ visits 0 a finite number of times $\mathbb{Q}_0^{(\alpha)}$ a.s. By Theorem 6.3.2 of [7] it implies that

$$E^{\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}}(E_0^\omega(X_1)) \cdot e_i \neq 0.$$

Moreover, we know that

$$\mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)} \text{ a.s.,} \qquad \frac{X_n}{n} \to E^{\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}}(E_0^\omega(X_1)).$$

Hence, $\mathbb{P}^{(\alpha)}(A_{\pm e_i}) = 1$, where $\pm$ corresponds to the sign of $E^{\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}}(E_0^\omega(X_1)) \cdot e_i$. Since we know that $\mathbb{P}_0^{(\alpha)}(A_{e_i}) > 0$, it implies that

$$E^{\mathbb{Q}^{(\alpha)}}(E_0^\omega(X_1)) \cdot e_i > 0. \qquad \square$$

REFERENCES

[1] BERGER, N. (2008). Limiting velocity of high-dimensional random walk in random environment. *Ann. Probab.* **36** 728–738. MR2393995

[2] BERGER, N. and ZEITOUNI, O. (2008). A quenched invariance principle for certain ballistic random walks in i.i.d. environments. In *In and Out of Equilibrium*. 2. *Progress in Probability* **60** 137–160. Birkhäuser, Basel. MR2477380

[3] BOLTHAUSEN, E. and SZNITMAN, A.-S. (2002). *Ten Lectures on Random Media. DMV Seminar* **32**. Birkhäuser, Basel. MR1890289

[4] BOLTHAUSEN, E. and SZNITMAN, A.-S. (2002). On the static and dynamic points of view for certain random walks in random environment. *Methods Appl. Anal.* **9** 345–375. MR2023130

[5] BOLTHAUSEN, E. and ZEITOUNI, O. (2007). Multiscale analysis of exit distributions for random walks in random environments. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **138** 581–645. MR2299720

[6] BRICMONT, J. and KUPIAINEN, A. (1991). Random walks in asymmetric random environments. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **142** 345–420. MR1137068

[7] DURRETT, R. (1996). *Probability*: *Theory and Examples*, 2nd ed. Duxbury Press, Belmont, CA. MR1609153

[8] ENRIQUEZ, N. and SABOT, C. (2006). Random walks in a Dirichlet environment. *Electron. J. Probab.* **11** 802–817 (electronic). MR2242664

[9] ENRIQUEZ, N., SABOT, C. and ZINDY, O. (2009). Limit laws for transient random walks in random environment on $\mathbb{Z}$. *Ann. Inst. Fourier* (*Grenoble*) **59** 2469–2508. MR2640927

[10] FORD, L. R. JR. and FULKERSON, D. R. (1962). *Flows in Networks*. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ. MR0159700

[11] KALIKOW, S. A. (1981). Generalized random walk in a random environment. *Ann. Probab.* **9** 753–768. MR0628871

[12] KESTEN, H. (1977). A renewal theorem for random walk in a random environment. In *Probability* (*Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, *Vol. XXXI*, *Univ. Illinois*, *Urbana*, *Ill.*, 1976) 67–77. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI. MR0458648

[13] KIPNIS, C. and VARADHAN, S. R. S. (1986). Central limit theorem for additive functionals of reversible Markov processes and applications to simple exclusions. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **104** 1–19. MR0834478

[14] KOMOROWSKI, T., OLLA, S. and LANDIM, C. Fluctuations in Markov processes. Available at http://w3.impa.br/~landim/notas.html.

[15] KOZLOV, S. M. (1985). The averaging method and walks in inhomogeneous environments. *Russ. Math. Surv.* **40** 73–145.

[16] LAWLER, G. F. (1982/83). Weak convergence of a random walk in a random environment. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **87** 81–87. MR0680649

[17] LYONS, R. and PERES, Y. Probabilities on trees and network. Preprint. Available at http://php.indiana.edu/~rdlyons/prbtree/prbtree.html.

[18] MATHIEU, P. (2008). Quenched invariance principles for random walks with random conductances. *J. Stat. Phys.* **130** 1025–1046. MR2384074

[19] MOLCHANOV, S. (1994). Lectures on random media. In *Lectures on Probability Theory* (*Saint-Flour*, 1992) (P. Bernard, ed.). *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1581** 242–411. Springer, Berlin. MR1307415

[20] PEMANTLE, R. (1988). Random processes with reinforcement. Ph.D. thesis, Dept. Mathematics, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

[21] PEMANTLE, R. (1988). Phase transition in reinforced random walk and RWRE on trees. *Ann. Probab.* **16** 1229–1241. MR0942765

[22] PEMANTLE, R. (2007). A survey of random processes with reinforcement. *Probab. Surv.* **4** 1–79. MR2282181

[23] RASSOUL-AGHA, F. (2003). The point of view of the particle on the law of large numbers for random walks in a mixing random environment. *Ann. Probab.* **31** 1441–1463. MR1989439

[24] RASSOUL-AGHA, F. and SEPPÄLÄINEN, T. (2009). Almost sure functional central limit theorem for ballistic random walk in random environment. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **45** 373–420. MR2521407

[25] SABOT, C. (2011). Random walks in random Dirichlet environment are transient in dimension $d \geq 3$. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **151** 297–317.

[26] SABOT, C. (2006). Markov chains in a Dirichlet environment and hypergeometric integrals. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **342** 57–62. MR2193397

[27] SABOT, C. and TOURNIER, L. (2011). Reversed Dirichlet environment and directional transience of random walks in Dirichlet environment. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **47** 1–8. MR2779393

[28] SIDORAVICIUS, V. and SZNITMAN, A.-S. (2004). Quenched invariance principles for walks on clusters of percolation or among random conductances. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **129** 219–244. MR2063376

[29] SZNITMAN, A.-S. (2001). On a class of transient random walks in random environment. *Ann. Probab.* **29** 724–765. MR1849176

[30] SZNITMAN, A.-S. (2002). An effective criterion for ballistic behavior of random walks in random environment. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **122** 509–544. MR1902189

[31] SZNITMAN, A.-S. and ZEITOUNI, O. (2006). An invariance principle for isotropic diffusions in random environment. *Invent. Math.* **164** 455–567. MR2221130

[32] SZNITMAN, A.-S. and ZERNER, M. (1999). A law of large numbers for random walks in random environment. *Ann. Probab.* **27** 1851–1869. MR1742891

[33] TOURNIER, L. (2009). Integrability of exit times and ballisticity for random walks in Dirichlet environment. *Electron. J. Probab.* **14** 431–451. MR2480548

[34] ZEITOUNI, O. (2004). Random walks in random environment. In *Lectures on Probability Theory and Statistics*. *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1837** 189–312. Springer, Berlin. MR2071631

[35] ZERNER, M. P. W. (2002). A nonballistic law of large numbers for random walks in i.i.d. random environment. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* **7** 191–197 (electronic). MR1937904

[36] ZERNER, M. P. W. and MERKL, F. (2001). A zero–one law for planar random walks in random environment. *Ann. Probab.* **29** 1716–1732. MR1880239

UNIVERSITÉ DE LYON
UNIVERSITÉ LYON 1, CNRS UMR5208
INSTITUT CAMILLE JORDAN, 43, BD DU 11 NOV.,
69622 VILLEURBANNE CEDEX
FRANCE
E-MAIL: sabot@math.univ-lyon1.fr