# **Phase Coexistence and Slow Mixing for the Hard-Core Model on**  $\mathbb{Z}^2$

Antonio Blanca<sup>1,\*</sup>, David Galvin<sup>2,\*\*</sup>, Dana Randall<sup>3,\*\*\*</sup>, and Prasad Tetali<sup>4,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Computer Science Division, U.C. Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720 ablanca@cs.berkeley.edu

<sup>2</sup> Department of Mathematics, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46656 dgalvin1@nd.edu

<sup>3</sup> School of Computer Science, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332-0765 r[and](#page-15-0)all@cc.gatech.edu

<sup>4</sup> School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332-0280 tetali@math.gatech.edu

**Abstract.** For the hard-core model (independent sets) on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  with fugacity  $\lambda$ , we give the first explicit result for phase coexistence by showing that there are multiple Gibbs states for all  $\lambda > 5.3646$ . Our proof begins along the lines of the standard Peierls argument, but we add two significant innovations. First, building on the idea of fault lines introduced by Randall [19], we construct an event that distinguishes two boundary conditions and yet always [has](#page-15-0) long contours associated with it, obviating the need to accurately enumerate short contours. Second, we obtain vastly improved bounds on the number of contours by relating them to a new class of self-avoiding walks on an oriented version of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . We also extend our characterization of fault lines to show that local Markov chains will mix slowly when  $\lambda > 5.3646$  on lattice regions with periodic (toroidal) boundary conditions and when  $\lambda > 7.1031$  with non-periodic (free) boundary conditions. The arguments here rely on a careful analysis that relates contours to taxi walks and represent a sevenfold improvement to the previously best known values of  $\lambda$  [19].

### **1 Introduction**

The hard-core model was introduced in statistical physics as a model for lattice gases, where each molecule occupies non-trivial space in the lattice, requiring occupied sites to be non-adjacent. Viewing a lattice such as  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  as a graph, allowed configurations of molecules naturally correspond to independent sets in the graph.

Given a finite graph G, let  $\Omega$  be the set of independent sets of G. Given a (fixed) *activity* (or *fugacity*)  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , the weight associated with each independent set I is  $w(I) = \lambda^{|I|}$ . The associated *Gibbs* (or *Boltzmann*) *distribution*  $\mu = \mu_{G,\lambda}$  is defined on *Q* assuming *G* is finite as  $u(I) = w(I)/Z$  where the normalizing constant fined on  $\Omega$ , assuming G is finite, as  $\mu(I) = w(I)/Z$ , where the normalizing constant  $Z = Z(G, \lambda) - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} w(i)$  is commonly called the *partition function*. Physicists  $Z = Z(G, \lambda) = \sum_{J \in \Omega} w(J)$  is commo[nly c](#page-15-1)alled the *partition function*. Physicists are interested in the behavior of models on an infinite graph (such as the integer lattice are interested in the behavior of models on an infinite graph (such as the integer lattice

 $\star$  Supported by a UC Berkeley Chancellor's Fellowship for Graduate Study and an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Supported in part by the Simons Foundation and by NSA grant number H98230-13-1-0248.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Supported in part by NSF grant CCF-1219202.

*<sup>†</sup>* Supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1101447.

P. Raghavendra et al. (Eds.): APPROX/RANDOM 2013, LNCS 8096, pp. 379–394, 2013. -c Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2013

 $\mathbb{Z}^d$ ), where the Gibbs measure is defined as a certain weak limit with appropriate conditional probabilities. For many models it is believed that as a parameter of the system is varied – such as the inverse temperature  $\beta$  for the Ising model or the activity  $\lambda$  for the hard-core model – the system undergoes a phase transition at a critical point.

F[or t](#page-15-2)he classical Ising model, Onsager, in seminal work [17], established the precise [v](#page-15-3)alue of the critical temperature  $\beta_c(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  to be  $\log(1+\sqrt{2})$ . Only recently have the analogous values for the (more general)  $q$ -state Potts model been established [3]. Establishing such a precise value for the hard-core model with currently available methods seems nearly impossible. Even the *existence* of suc[h a \(](#page-15-4)unique) cr[itic](#page-15-5)al activity  $\lambda_c$ , where there is a transition from a unique Gibbs state to the coexistence of multiple Gibbs states, remains conjectural for  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  ( $d > 2$ ; it is folklore that there is no such transition for  $d = 1$ ), while it is simply untrue for general graphs (even general trees, in fact, thanks to a result of Brightwell et al. [7]). Regardless, a non-rigorous prediction from the statistical physics literature [2] suggests  $\lambda_c \approx 3.796$  for  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ .

Thus, from a statistical physics or probability viewpoint, understanding the precise dependence on  $\lambda$  for the existence of unique or multiple Gibbs states is a natural and challeng[ing](#page-15-6) problem. Moreover, breakthrough works of Weitz [25] and Sly [22] have recently identified  $\lambda_c(\mathbb{T}_\Delta)$  – the critical activity for the hard-core model on an infinite Δ-regular tree – as a *computational* threshold where estimating the hard-core partition function on general Δ-regular graphs undergoes a transition beyond which there is no PTAS unless  $NP = RP$ , further motivating the stud[y o](#page-15-7)f [ph](#page-15-8)y[sica](#page-15-4)l transitions and their computational implic[ation](#page-15-9)s. While it is not surprising that [for m](#page-15-4)any problems computing the partition function *exactly* is intractable, it is remarkable that even approximating it for the hard-core model above a certain critical thr[esh](#page-15-6)old also turns out to be hard.

<span id="page-1-0"></span>Starting with Dobrushin [8] in 1968, physicists have been developing techniques to c[har](#page-15-10)acterize the regimes on either side of  $\lambda_c$  for the hard-core model. Most attention has focused on establishing ever larger values of  $\lambda$  below which there is always uniqueness of phase. The problem has proved to be a fruitful one for the blending of ideas from physics, discrete probability and theoretical computer science (see, e.g., [18] [4], [25]). The state of the art is work by Vera et al. [24], expanding on ideas from Weitz [25] and Restrepo et al. [20], establishing uniqueness for  $\lambda < 2.48$ .

Much less is known about the regime of phase coexistence. Dobrushin [8] established phase coexistence for all  $\lambda > C$ , but did not explicitly calculate C. Borgs had estimated that  $C = 80$  was the *theoretical* lower limit of Dobrushin's argument [5], but a recent computation by the second author suggests that the *actual* consequence of the argument is more like  $C \approx 300$ . We are now prepared to state our first main result.

### **Theorem 1.** *For*  $\lambda > 5.3646$ *, the hard-core model on*  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  *with activity*  $\lambda$  *admits multiple Gibbs states.*

From a computational standpoint, there are two natural questions to ask concerning the hard-core model on a finite graph. Can the partition function be approximated, and how easy is it to sample from a given Gibbs distribution? For both, a powerful method is given by Markov chain algorithms – carefully constructed random walks on the space of independent sets of a graph whose equilibrium distributions are the desired Gibbs distributions. One of the most commonly studied families are the *local-update* chains, such as Glauber dynamics, that change a bounded number of vertices at each step.

The efficiency of the Markov chain method relies on the underlying chain being rapidly mixing; that is, i[t m](#page-15-4)ust fairly quickly reach a distribution that is close to stationary. For many problems, local chains seem to mix rapidly below some critical point, while mixing slowly above that point. Most notably for the Ising model on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , simple [loc](#page-15-9)al Markov chains are rapidly mixing (in fact, with optimal rate) for  $\beta < \beta_c(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  and slowly mixing for  $\beta > \beta_c(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ . Recently the Ising picture was completed by Lubezky and Sly [13], who showed polynomial mixing at  $\beta = \beta_c(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ .

<span id="page-2-1"></span>Once again, the known bounds are less sharp for the hard-core model. Luby and Vigoda [14] showed that Glauber dynamics on indepen[den](#page-15-11)t sets is fast when  $\lambda \leq 1$  on the 2-dimensional lattice and torus. Weitz [25] reduced the analysis on the grid to the tree, thus establishing that in this same setting Glauber dynamics is fast up to the critical point f[or](#page-15-0) the 4-regular tree, in effect for  $\lambda < 1.6875$ . Again, the best result to date is due to Vera et al. [24] who proved that Glauber dynamics on the space of hard-core configur[ati](#page-2-0)ons on boxes in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  is rapidly mixing for all  $\lambda < 2.48$ .

As with phase-coexistence, it is believed there is a critical value  $\lambda_c^{\text{mix}}$  at which Glauber dynamics for sampling hard-core configurations flips from mixing in time polynomial in n, to exponential in n, and that it coincides with  $\lambda_c$ . Borgs et al. [6] showed that Glauber dynamics is slow on toroidal lattice regions in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  (for  $d \geq 2$ ), when  $\lambda$  is sufficiently large, in particular establishing a finite constant above which mixing is slow on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . The first effective bound was provided by Randall [19], who showed slow mixing f[or](#page-1-0)  $\lambda > 50.526$  $\lambda > 50.526$  $\lambda > 50.526$  on boxes with periodical boundary conditions, and for  $\lambda > 56.812$ on boxes with free boundary  $\frac{1}{1}$  (but did not address the question of phase coexistence).

Our second main result establishes slow mixing of Glauber dynamics on boxes in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ for  $\lambda$  that is an order of magnitude lower than the previously best known bounds.

**Theorem 2.** *For*  $\lambda > 5.3646$ *, the mixing time of G[lau](#page-15-8)ber dynamics for the hard-core model on n by n boxes* in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  *with periodic boundary conditions and activity*  $\lambda$  *is exponential in n. For free boundary conditions, we have the same result with*  $\lambda > 7.1031$ *.* 

<span id="page-2-0"></span>The proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 utilize combinatorial, computational and physical insights. The standard approach to showing multiple Gibbs distributions, introduced by Dobrushin [8], is to consider the limiting distributions corresponding to two different boundary conditions on boxes in the lattice centered at the origin, and find a statistic that separates these two limits. For the hard-core model, it suffices (see [4]) to compare the *even boundary condition* – all vertices on the boundary of a box at an even distance from the origin are occupied – and its counterpart the odd boundary condition, and the distinguishing statistic is typically the occupation of the origin. Under odd boundary condition the origin sh[ould](#page-15-0) be unlikely to be occupied, since independent sets with odd [boundary and \(even\) origin occupied must have a](http://www.math.gatech.edu/~randall/ind-fix.pdf) *contour* – a two-layer thick unoccupied loop of vertices separating an inner region around the origin that is in "even phase" from an outer region near the boundary that is in "odd phase". For large enough  $\lambda$ , such an unoccupied layer is costly, and so such configurations are unlikely.

As we will see presently, the effectiveness of this approach, known as a *Peierls argument*, is driven by the number of contours of each possible length – better upper bounds

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Note that stronger bounds were reported in [19] due to a missing factor of 2 in the computations; see http://www.math.gatech.edu/~randall/ind-fix.pdf for the corrected version.

on the number of contours translate directly to better upper bounds on  $\lambda_c$ . Previous (unpublished) work on phase coexistence in the hard-core model on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  had viewed contours as simple polygons in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , which are closely related to the very well studied family of self-avoiding walks. While this is essentially the best possible point of view when applying the Peierls argument on the Ising model, it is far from optimal for the hard-core model. One of the two major breakthroughs of the present paper is the discovery that hard-core contours, if appropriately defined, can be viewed as simple polygons in the oriented *Manhattan lattice* (orient edges of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  that are parallel to the x-axis (resp.  $y$ -axis) positively if their  $y$ -coordinate (resp. x-coordinate) is even, and negatively otherwise), with the additional constraint that contours cannot make two consecutive turns. The number of such polygons can be understood by analyzing a new class of self-avoiding walks, that we refer to as *taxi walks*. The number of taxi walks turns out to be significantly smaller than the number of ordinary self-avoiding walks, leading to much better bounds on  $\lambda_c$  than could possibly have been obtained previously.

The number  $\tilde{c}_n$  of taxi walks of length n is asymptotically controlled by a single number  $\mu_t > 0$ , the *taxi walk connective constant*, in the sense that  $(\tilde{c}_n)^{1/n} \sim \mu_t$  as  $n \to \infty$ . Adapting methods of Alm [1] we obtain good estimates on  $\mu_t$ , allowing us to understand  $\tilde{c}_n$  for large n. It is difficult to control  $\tilde{c}_n$  for small n, however, presenting a major stumbling block to the effectiveness of the Peierls argument. Using the statistic "occupation of origin" to distinguish the two boundary conditions, one inevitably has to control  $\tilde{c}_n$  for both small and large n. The lack of precise information about the number of short contours leads to discrepancies between theoretical lower limits and actual bounds, such as that between  $C = 80$  (theoretical best possible) and  $C \approx 300$ for phase coexistence on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , discussed earlier.

The second breakthrough of the present paper is the idea of using an event to distinguish the two boundary conditions with the property that every independent set in the event has a *long* contour. This allows us to focus exclusively on the asymptotic growth rate of contours/taxi walks, and obviates the need for an analysis of short contours. The immediate result of this breakthrough is that the actual limits of our arguments agree exactly with their theoretical counterparts. The distinguishing event we use extends the idea of *fault lines*, whic[h we](#page-15-0) discuss in more detail below in the context of slow mixing.

The traditional argument for slow mixing is based on the observation that when  $\lambda$ is large, the Gibbs distributio[n fa](#page-15-0)vors dense configurations, and Glauber dynamics will take exponential time to converge to equilibrium. The slow convergence arises because the Gibbs distribution is bimodal: dense configurations lie predominantly on either the odd or the even sublattice, while configurations that are roughly half odd and half even have much smaller probability. Since Glauber dynamics changes the numbers of even and odd vertices by at most 1 in each step, the Markov chain has a bottleneck.

Our work builds on a novel idea from [19], namely using *fault lines* to establish slow mixing for Glauber dynamics on hard-core configurations for large  $\lambda$ , improving upon what was best known at that time. Randall [19] gave an improvement by realizing that the state space could be partitioned according to certain *topological obstructions* in configurations, rather than the relative numbers of odd or even vertices. This approach gives better bounds on  $\lambda$ , and also greatly simplifies the calculations. First consider an  $n \times n$  lattice region G with free (non-periodic) boundary conditions. A configuration I

<span id="page-4-0"></span>

**Fig. 1.** Independent sets with (a) a spanning path with four alternation points in  $G_{\lozenge}$ , (b) a fault line with one alternation point and (c) a fault line with no alternation points

is said to have a *fault line* if there is a width two path of unoccupied vertices in I from the top of  $G$  to the bottom or from the left boundary of  $G$  to the right. Configurations without a fault line must have a *cross* of occupied vertices in either the even or the odd sublattices forming a connected path in  $G<sup>2</sup>$  from both the top to the bottom and from the left to the right of G, where  $G^2$  connects vertices at distance 2 in G. Roughly speaking the set of configurations that have a fault line forms a cut set that must be crossed to move from a configuration that has an odd cross to one with an even cross, and it was shown that fault lines are exponentially unlikely when  $\lambda$  is large. Likewise, if  $\ddot{G}$  is an  $n \times n$  region with periodic boundary conditions, it was shown that either there is an odd or an even cross forming non-contractible loops in two different directions or there is a pair of non-contractible fault lines, allowing for a similar argument.

<span id="page-4-1"></span>We improve the argument by refining our consideration of fault lines, which had previously been characterized as (rotated) self-avoiding walks in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . Here we observe that, suitably modified, they are in fact taxi walks and so the machinery developed for phase coexistence can be brought to bear in the mixing context.

### **2 Combinatorial Background: Crosses, Fault Lines and Taxi Walks**

We begin by introducing the notions of crosses and fault lines. Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a simply connected region in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , say the  $n \times n$  square. We define the graph  $G_{\lozenge} =$  $(V_{\Diamond}, E_{\Diamond})$  as follows. The vertices  $V_{\Diamond}$  are the midpoints of edges in E. Vertices u and v in  $V_{\Diamond}$  are connected by an edge in  $E_{\Diamond}$  if and only if they are the midpoints of incident edges in E that are perpendicular. Notice that  $G_{\lozenge}$  is a region in a smaller Cartesian lattice that has been rotated by 45 degrees. We will also make use of the *even and odd subgraphs* of G. For  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ , let  $G_b = (V_b, E_b)$  be the graph whose vertex set  $V_b \subseteq V$  contains all vertices with parity b (i.e., the sum of their coordinates has parity b), with  $(u, v) \in E_b$  if u and v are at Hamming distance 2. We refer to  $G_0$  and  $G_1$  as the even and odd subgraphs. The graphs  $G_{\diamondsuit}, G_0$  and  $G_1$  play a central role in defining features of independent sets that determine distinguishing events in our proof of phase coexistence and the partition of the state space for our proofs of slow mixing.

Given an independent set  $I \in \Omega$ , we say that a simple path p in  $G_{\lozenge}$  is *spanning* if it extends from the top boundary of  $G_{\lozenge}$  to the bottom, or from the left boundary to the

<span id="page-5-0"></span>



**Fig. 2.** The figure shows: (a)  $G_1$ , (b) an independent set with an odd bridge in  $G_1$ , and (c) two odd bridges forming an odd cross in  $G_1$ 

right, and each vertex in  $p$  corresponds to an edge in  $G$  such that both endpoints are unoccupied in  $I$ . It will be convenient to color [the](#page-4-0) vertices on  $p$  according to whether the corresponding edge in  $G$  has an odd or an even vertex to its left as we traverse the path. Specifically, suppose vertex  $v \in V_{\lozenge}$  on the path p bisects an edge  $e_v \in E$ . Color *v blue* if the odd vertex in  $e<sub>v</sub>$  is to the left when the path crosses v, and *red* otherwise (note that each  $v \in E$  has one odd and one e[ve](#page-5-0)n endvertex). When the color of the vertices along the path changes, we have an *alternation point* (see Fig. 1 (a) and (b)). It was shown in [19] that if an independent set has a spanning path, then it must also have one with zero or one alternation points. We call such a path a *fault line*, and let  $\Omega_F$  be the set of independent sets in  $\Omega$  with at least one fault line (see Fig. 1 (b) and (c)).

<span id="page-5-1"></span>We say that  $I \in \Omega$  has an *even bridge* if there is a path from the left to the right [bo](#page-1-0)undary or from the top to the bottom boundary in  $G_0$  [co](#page-2-1)nsisting of occupied vertices in I. Simi[larly](#page-15-0), we say it has an *odd bridge* if it traverses  $G_1$  in either direction. We say that I has a *cross* if it has both left-right and a top-bottom bridges. See Fig. 2.

Notice that if an independent set has an even top-bottom bridge it cannot have an odd left-right bridge, so if it has a cross, both of its bridges must have the same parity. We let  $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega$  be the set of configurations that contain an even cross and let  $\Omega_1 \subseteq \Omega$ be the set of those with an odd cross.

We can now partition the state space  $\Omega$  into three sets, with one separating the other two; this partition is critical to the proofs of both Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. The following lemma was proven in [19].

**Lemma 1.** *The set of independent sets on* G *can be partitioned into sets*  $\Omega$ <sub>*F*</sub>,  $\Omega$ <sub>0</sub> *and* Ω1*, consisting of configurations with a fault line, an even cross or an odd cross. If*  $I \in \Omega_0$  and  $I' \in \Omega_1$  then  $|I \triangle I'| > 1$ .

It will be useful to extend these definitions to the torus as well. Let n be even, and let  $\hat{G}$ be the  $n \times n$  toroidal region  $\{0, \ldots, n-1\} \times \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ , where  $v = (v_1, v_2)$  and  $u = (u_1, u_2)$  are connected if  $v_1 = u_1 \pm 1 \pmod{n}$  and  $v_2 = u_2$  or  $v_2 = u_2 \pm 1 \pmod{n}$ and  $v_1 = u_1$ . Let  $\widehat{\Omega}$  be the set of independent sets on  $\widehat{G}$  and let  $\widehat{\pi}$  be the Gibbs distribution. As before, we consider Glauber dynamics that connect configurations with symmetric difference of size one. We define  $\widehat{G}_{\Diamond}, \widehat{G}_0$  and  $\widehat{G}_1$  as above to represent the graph connecting the midpoints of perpendicular edges (including the boundary edges), and the odd and even subgraphs. As with  $\tilde{G}$ , all of these have toroidal boundary conditions.

Given  $I \in \hat{\Omega}$ , we say that I has a *fault*  $F = (F_1, F_2)$  if there are a *pair* of vertexdisjoint non-contractible cycles  $F_1, F_2$  in  $\widehat{G}_\Diamond$  whose vertices correspond to edges in  $\widehat{G}$ whose endpoints are unoccupied, and such that the vertices on each cycle are all red or all blue (i.e., the endpoints in  $\widehat{G}$  to one side of either cycle have the same parity). We say that I has a *cross* if it has at least two non-contractible cycles of occupied sites in I with different winding numbers. The next lemma (from [19]) utilizes faults to partition  $\Omega$ .

**Lemma 2.** *The set of independent sets on*  $\widehat{G}$  *ca[n b](#page-15-0)e partitioned into sets*  $\widehat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{\Omega}_0, \widehat{\Omega}_1$ *, consisting of configurations with a fault, an even cross or an odd cross. If*  $I \in \hat{\Omega}_0$  *and*  $I' \in \widehat{\Omega}_1$  then  $|I \triangle I'| > 1$ .

The strategy for the proofs of phase coexistence and slow mixing will be to use a Peierls argument to define a map from  $\Omega_F$  to  $\Omega$  that takes configurations with fault lines to ones with exponentially larger weight. The map is not injective, however, so we need to be careful about how large the pre-image of a configuration can be, and for this it is necessary to get a good bound on the number of fault lines. In [19] the number of fault lines was bounded by the number of self-avoiding walks in  $G_{\lozenge}$  (or  $G_{\lozenge}$  on the torus). However, this is a gross overcount because this includes all spanning paths with an arbitrary number of alternation points. Instead, we can get much better bounds by only counting self-avoiding walks with zero or one alternation points.

To begin formalizing this idea, we put an orientation on the edges of  $G_{\Diamond}$ . Each edge  $(u, v) \in E_{\lozenge}$  corresponds to two edges in E that share a vertex  $w \in V$ . We orient the edge "clockwise" around w if w is even and "counterclockwise" if w is odd. For paths with zero alternation points, all of the edges must be oriented in the same direction (with respect to this edge orientation). If we rotate  $G_{\lozenge}$  so that the edges are axis aligned, then this simply means that the horizontal (resp. vertical) edges alternate direction according to the parity of the  $y$ - (resp.  $x$ -) coordinates, like in many well-known metropolises.

<span id="page-6-0"></span>We now define taxi walks. Let  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  be an orientation of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  in which an edge parallel to the x-axis (resp.  $y$ -axis) is oriented in the positive x-direction if its  $y$ -coordinate is even (resp. oriented in the positive  $y$ -direction if its x-coordinate is even), and is oriented in the negative direction otherwise (note that this agrees with the orientation placed on  $G_{\wedge}$ above). It is common to refer to  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  as the *Manhattan lattice*: streets are horizontal, with even streets oriented East and odd streets oriented West, and avenues are vertical, with even avenues oriented North and odd avenues oriented South.

**Definition 1.** A taxi walk *is an oriented walk in*  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  *that begins at the origin, never revisits a vertex, and never takes two left or two right turns in a row.*

We call these taxi walks because the violation of either restriction during a real taxi ride would cause suspicion among savvy passengers.

**Lemma 3.** *If an independent set* I *has a fault line* F *with no alternations, then it also has a fault line*  $F'$  so that either  $F'$  or  $F'^R$  (the reversal of  $F'$ ) is a taxi walk.

**Proof:** It is straightforward to see that if I has a fault line F with no alternation points, then it must have all of its edges oriented the same way (in  $G_{\lozenge}$ ) and it must be selfavoiding. Suppose  $F$  is a minimal length fault line in  $I$  without any alternations, and suppose that  $F$  has two successive turns. Because of the parity constraints, the vertices

<span id="page-7-0"></span>immediately before and after these two turns must both connect edges that are in the same direction, and these five edges can be replaced by a single edge to form a shorter fault line without any alternations. This is a contradiction to  $F$  being minimal.

The same argument shows that if  $F$  is a fault line with an alternation point, then there is a fault line that is the concatenation of two taxi walks (or the reversals of taxi walks). Lemma 3, and the extension just mentioned, are key ingredients in our proofs of both phase coexistence and slow mixing. They allow us to assume, as we do throughout, that all fault lines we work with are essentially taxi walks. For phase coexistence we will also need to understand the connection between Peierls contours and taxi walks.

Given an independent set I in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , let  $(I^{\mathcal{O}})^+$  be the set of odd vertices in I together with their neighbors. Let R be any finite component of  $(I^{\mathcal{O}})^+$ , and let W be the unique infinite component of  $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus R$ . Let C be the complement of W (going from R to C essentially "fills in holes" in R). Finally, let  $\gamma$  be the set of edges with one end in W and one in C, and write  $\gamma_{\Diamond}$  for the subgraph of  $G_{\Diamond}$  induced by  $\gamma$ .

#### **Lemma 4.** *In*  $G_{\diamondsuit}$ ,  $\gamma_{\diamondsuit}$  *is a directed cycle that does not take two consecutive turns. Consequently, if an edge is removed from*  $\gamma$ *, the resulting path in*  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  *(suitably translated and rotated) is a taxi walk.*

**Proof:** Because  $\gamma$  separates W from its complement,  $\gamma_{\Diamond}$  must include a cycle surrounding a vertex of C, and since  $\gamma$  is in fact a *minimal* edge cutset (W and C are both connected),  $\gamma_{\lozenge}$  must consist of just this cycle. To see both that  $\gamma_{\lozenge}$  is correctly (i.e. uniformly) oriented in  $G_{\lozenge}$ , and that it does not take two consecutive turns, note that if either of these conditions [were](#page-15-13) violated then we must have one of the following: a vertex of W (or C) all of whose neighbors are in C (or W), or a unit square in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  with both even vertices in  $C$  and both odd vertices in  $W$  (an easy case analysis). All of these situations lead to a 4-cycle in  $\gamma_0$ , a contradiction since  $\gamma_0$  is a cycle whose length is evidently greater than 4 (in fact it must have length at least 12).  $\Box$ 

A critical step in our arguments will be bounding the number of taxi walks. We start by recalling facts about standard self-avoiding walks (which have been studied extensively, although many basic questions remain; see, e.g., [15]). On  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , the number  $c_n$  of walks of length n grows exponentially with n as  $2^n \leq c_n \leq 4 \times 3^{n-1}$ , since there are at most 3 ways to extend a self-avoiding walk of length  $n - 1$  and walks that only take steps to the right or up can always be extended in 2 ways. Hammersley and Welsh [11] showed that  $c_n = \mu^n \exp(O(\sqrt{n}))$ , where  $\mu \approx 2.64$  is known as the *connective constant*. It<br>is believed that  $\exp(O(\sqrt{n}))$  here can be replaced by  $\Theta(n^{11/32})$  (this is supported by inat  $c_n = \mu$  exp( $O(\sqrt{n})$ ), where  $\mu \approx 2.04$  is known as the *connective constant.* It<br>is believed that  $\exp(O(\sqrt{n}))$  here can be replaced by  $\Theta(n^{11/32})$  (this is supported by<br>considerable experimental and heuristical eviden considerable experimental and heuristical evidence).

Letting  $\tilde{c}_n$  be the number of taxi walks of length n, we quickly get  $2^{n/2} < \tilde{c}_n <$  $4 \times 3^{n-1}$ . The upper bound here uses  $\tilde{c}_n < c_n$ , and for the lower bound we observe that if we take two steps at a time in one direction we can always go East or North. With little extra work, we can make a significant improvement:

**Lemma 5.** Let  $\tilde{c}_n$  be the number of taxi walks of length n. Then  $\tilde{c}_n = O((1+\sqrt{5})/2)^n$ .

**Proof:** At each vertex there are exactly two outgoing edges in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . If we arrive at v from  $u$ , then one of the outgoing edges continues the walk in the same direction and the other is a turn. The two allowable directions are determined by the parity of the

<span id="page-8-2"></span>coordinates of v, so we c[an](#page-13-0) encode each walk as a bitstring  $s \in \{0,1\}^{n-1}$ . If  $s_1 = 0$ then the walk starts by going East (along a street) and if  $s_0 = 1$  the walk starts North along an avenue. For all  $i > 1$ , if  $s_i = 0$  the walk continues in the same direction as the previous step, while if  $s_i = 1$  then the walk turns in the permissible direction. In this encoding, the condition forbidding consecutive turns forces  $s$  to avoid having two 1's i[n](#page-12-0) a row, and hence  $\tilde{c}_n \le f_n = O(\phi^n)$ , [wh](#page-8-0)ere  $f_n$  is the *n*th Fibonacci number and  $\phi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2 \approx 1.618$  is the golden ratio.

General considerations ([dis](#page-1-0)cus[sed](#page-2-1) in Section 5) imply that there is a *taxi walk connect[ive](#page-13-0) constant*  $\mu_t > 0$  such that  $\tilde{c}_n = f_t(n)\mu_t^n$ , where  $f_t(n)$  grows sub-exponentially. A consequence of this is that consequence of this is that

<span id="page-8-1"></span><span id="page-8-0"></span>if 
$$
\mu > \mu_t
$$
 then for all large  $n, \tilde{c}_n < \mu^n$ . (1)

Lemma 5 implies  $\mu_t \leq \phi$ , and as we shall see from Theorems 4 and 5 below, this is enough to obtain phase coexistence, and sl[ow](#page-1-0) mixing on t[he](#page-8-1) torus, for all  $\lambda > \phi^4$  −  $1 \approx 5.85$ . To obtain the stronger Theorems 1 and 2 we use more sophisticated tools, described in Section 5, to improve our bounds on  $\tilde{c}_n$ .

**Theorem 3.** *We have*  $1.5196 < \mu_t < 1.5884$  *and*  $4.3332 < \mu_t^4 - 1 < 5.3646$ *.* 

### **3** Proof of Theorem 1 (phase coexistence on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  for large  $\lambda$ )

We work towards the following statement that implies Theorem 1 via Theorem 3.

**Theorem 4.** *The hard-core model on*  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  *with activity*  $\lambda$  *admits multiple Gibbs states* for all  $\lambda > \mu_t^4 - 1$ , where  $\mu_t$  *is the connective constant of taxi walks.* 

We will not review the theory of Gibbs states, but just say informally that an interpretation of the existence of multiple Gibbs states is that the local behavior of a randomly chosen independent set i[n a](#page-15-8) box can be made to depend on a boundary condition, even in the limit as the size of the box grows to infinity. See e.g. [10] for a general treatment, or [4] for a treatment specific to the hard-core model on the lattice.

Let  $U_n$  be the box  $[-n, +n]^2$ , and  $I^e$  the independent set consisting of all even ver-<br>es of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}^e$  be the set of independent sets that agree with  $I^e$  off  $U$  and  $u^e$ tices of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . Let  $\mathcal{J}_n^e$  be the set of independent sets that agree with  $I^e$  off  $U_n$ , and  $\mu_n^e$ the distribution supported on  $\mathcal{J}_n^e$  in which each set is selected with probability proportional to  $\lambda^{|I \cap U_n|}$ . Define  $\mu_n^0$  analogously (with "even" everywhere replaced by "odd"). We [wi](#page-5-1)ll exhibit an event A with the property that for all large  $n$ ,  $\mu_n^{\circ}(\mathcal{A}) \leq 1/3$  and  $\mu_2^{\circ}(\mathcal{A}) > 2/3$ . This is well known (see e.g. [4]) to be enough to establish existence of  $\mu_n^{\circ}(A) \ge 2/3$ . This is well known (see e.g. [4]) to be enough to establish existence of multiple Gibbs states multiple Gibbs states.

The event A depends on a parameter  $m = m(\lambda)$  whose value will be specified later. Specifically, A consists of all independent sets in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  whose restriction to  $U_m$  contains either an odd cross or a fault line. We will show that  $\mu_n^e(\mathcal{A}) \leq 1/3$  for all sufficiently large n; reversing the roles of odd and even throughout, the same argument gives that large *n*; reversing the roles of odd and even throughout, the same argument gives that under  $\mu_n^{\circ}$  the probability of  $U_m$  having either an *even* cross or a fault line is also at most 1/3, so that (by Lemma 1)  $\mu_n^{\circ}(\mathcal{A}) \geq 2/3$ .<br>Write  $\mathcal{A}^e$  for  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{T}^e$  note that for all

Write  $\mathcal{A}_n^e$  for  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{J}_n^e$ ; note that for all large *n* we have  $\mu_n^e(\mathcal{A}) = \mu_n^e(\mathcal{A}_n^e)$ . To show  $\Lambda^e(\mathcal{A}_n^e) < 1/3$  we will use the fact that  $I \subseteq \mathcal{A}_n^e$  is in even phase (predominantly even- $\mu_n^{\text{e}}(\mathcal{A}_n^{\text{e}}) \leq 1/3$  we will use the fact that  $I \in \mathcal{A}_n^{\text{e}}$  is in even phase (predominantly even-<br>occupied) outside  $I$  but because of either the odd cross or the fault line in  $I$  it is occupied) outside  $U_n$ , but because of either the odd cross or the fault line in  $U_m$  it is

not in even p[has](#page-7-0)e close to  $U_m$ ; so there must be a contour marking the furthest extent of the even phase inside  $U_n$ . We will modify [I](#page-7-0) inside the contour via a weight-increasing map, showing that an odd cross or fault line is unlikely.

#### **3.1 The Contour and Its Properties**

Fix  $I \in \mathcal{A}_n^e$ . If I has an odd cross in  $U_m$ , we proceed as follows (using the notation from the discussion preceding Lemma 4). Let R be the component of  $(I^{\overrightarrow{O}})^+$  that includes a particular odd cross. Note that because I agrees with  $I^e$  off  $U_n$ , R does not reach the boundary of  $U_n$ , and so as in the discussion preceding Lemma 4, we can associate to R a cutset  $\gamma$  separating it from the boundary of  $U_n$ .

Noti[ce](#page-10-0) that  $\gamma$  is an edge cutset in  $U_n$  separati[ng](#page-7-0) an interior connected region that meets  $U_m$  from an exterior connected region that includes the boundary of  $U_n$ , with all edges from the interior of  $\gamma$  to the exterior that all go from an unoccupied even vertex to an unoccupied odd vertex. This implies that  $|\gamma|$ , the number of edges in  $\gamma$ , is a multiple of 4, specifically four times the difference between the number of even and odd vertices in the int[eri](#page-15-11)or of  $\gamma$ . Because the interior includes t[wo](#page-15-15) points of the odd cross that are at distance at least  $2m + 1$  from each other in  $U_m$ , we h[av](#page-15-11)e a lower bound on  $\gamma$  that is linear in m; in particular, clearly  $|\gamma| \geq m$ . Note also that by Lemma 4,  $\gamma_0$  must be a closed taxi walk. (See Fig. 3 (a).)

We now come to the heart of the Peierls argument. If we modify  $I$  by shifting it by one axis-parallel unit (positively or negatively) in the interior of  $\gamma$  and leaving it unchanged elsewhere, then the resulting set is still independent, and we may augment it with any vertex in the interior whose neighbor in the direction opposite to the shift is in the exterior. This is a straightforward verification; see [6, Lemma 6] or [9, Proposition 2.12] where this is proved in essentially the same [se](#page-6-0)tting. Furthermore, from [6, Lemma 5] each of the four possible shift directions free up exactly  $|\gamma|/4$  vertices that can be added to the modified independent set.

We now describe the contour if I has a fault line in  $U_m$ . If there happens to be an odd occupied vertex in  $U_m$  then we construct  $\gamma$  as before, starting with some arbitrary component of  $(I^{\mathcal{O}})^+$  that meets  $U_m$  in place of the component of an odd cross. If the resulting  $\gamma$  has a fault line in its interior, then  $\gamma$  and its associated  $\gamma_{\Diamond}$  satisfy all the previously established properties immediately.

Otherwise, choose a fault line, which we can assume by Lemma 3 is a taxi walk or the concatenation of two taxi walks. Whether it has zero or one alternation points, we can find a path  $P = u_1u_2...u_k$  $P = u_1u_2...u_k$  $P = u_1u_2...u_k$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  with k linear in m, with  $u_1$  and  $u_k$  both odd, with no two consecutive edges parallel, and with the midpoints of the edges of the path inducing an alternation-free sub-path of the chosen fault line (essentially we are just taking a long piece of the fault line, on an appropriately chosen side of the alternation point, if there is one). This sub-path  $F_1$  is a taxi walk. Next, we find a second path in  $G_{\Diamond}$ , disjoint from  $F_1$ , that always bisects completely unoccupied edges, and that taken together with  $F_1$  completely encloses  $P$ . If there are no occupied odd vertices adjacent to even vertices of  $P$ , such a path is easy to find: we can shift  $F_1$  one unit in an appropriate direction, and close off with an additional edge at each end (see Fig. 3 (b)). If there are some odd occupied vertices adjacent to some even vertices of  $P$ , then this translate of  $F_1$  has to be looped around the corresponding components of  $(I^{\mathcal{O}})^+$ .

<span id="page-10-0"></span>

Fig. 3. Independent sets in  $\mathcal{A}_n^e$  with (a) an odd cross in  $U_m$  with the corresponding C and  $\gamma_0$  and (b) a fault line in  $U_m$  with the corresponding P and  $\gamma_{\phi}$ 

Such a loo[pin](#page-15-11)g is p[os](#page-15-15)sible because  $(I^{\mathcal{O}})^+$  does not reach the boundary of  $U_n$ , nor does it enclose the fault line (if it did, we would be in the case of the previous paragraph).

This second path we have constructed may not be a taxi walk; however, following the proof of Lemma 3, we see that a *minimal* path  $F_2$  satisfying the conditions of our constructed path is indeed a taxi walk. We take the concatenation of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  to be  $\gamma_{\Diamond}$  in this case, and take  $\gamma$  to be the set of edges that are bisected by vertices of  $\gamma_{\Diamond}$ . The contours in this case satisfy all the properties of those in the previous case. The standard strategies outlined in [6] and [9] can easily be used to derive the properties in this case. The one difference is that now  $\gamma_{\Diamond}$  may not be a closed taxi walk; but at worst it is the concatenation of two taxi walks, both of length linear in  $m$  (and certainly it can be arranged that each has length at least  $m/2$ ).

#### <span id="page-10-1"></span>**3.2 The Peierls Argument**

For  $J \in \mathcal{J}_n^e$  set  $w(J) = \lambda^{[J \cap U_n]}$ . Our aim is to show that  $w(\mathcal{A}_n^e)/w(\mathcal{J}_n^e) \leq 1/3$ .<br>For  $I \in \mathcal{A}^e$  let  $\varphi(I)$  be the set of independent sets obtained from *I* by shifting in the For  $I \in \mathcal{A}_n^e$ , let  $\varphi(I)$  be the set of independent sets obtained from I by shifting in the interior parallel to  $(1, 0)$  and adding all subsets of the  $|\alpha|/4$  vertices by which the shifted interior parallel to  $(1, 0)$  and adding all subsets of the  $|\gamma|/4$  vertices by which the shifted independent set can be augmented. For  $J \in \varphi(I)$ , let S denote the set of added vertices. Define a bipartite graph on partite sets  $\mathcal{A}_n^e$  and  $\mathcal{J}_n^e$  by joining  $I \in \mathcal{A}_n^e$  to  $J \in \mathcal{J}_n^e$  if  $J \in \varphi(I)$ . Give edge IJ weight  $w(I)\lambda^{|S|} = w(J)$  (where S is the set of vertices added to I to obtain I) to  $I$  to obtain  $J$ ).

The sum of the weights of edges out of those  $I \in \mathcal{A}_n^e$  with  $|\gamma(I)| = 4\ell$  is  $(1 + \lambda)^{\ell}$ <br>nes the sum of the weights of those I. For each  $I \in \mathcal{I}^e$  the sum of the weights of times the sum of the weights of those I. For each  $J \in \mathcal{J}_n^e$ , the sum of the weights of edges into J from this set of I's is  $w(J)$  times the degree of J to the set. If  $f(\ell)$  is a uniform upper bound on this degree, then

$$
\frac{w(\mathcal{A}_n^{\mathbf{e}})}{w(\mathcal{J}_n^{\mathbf{e}})} \le \sum_{\ell \ge m/4} \frac{f(\ell)}{(1+\lambda)^{\ell}}.\tag{2}
$$

The lower bound on  $\ell$  here is crucial. The standard Peierls argument takes  $A$  to be the event that a fixed vertex is occupied, and the analysis of probabilities associated with

this event requires dealing with short contours, leading to much weaker bounds than we are able to obt[ain](#page-8-2).

To control  $f(\ell)$ , observe that for each  $J \in \mathcal{J}_n^e$  and contour  $\gamma$  of length 4 $\ell$  there is at one  $I$  with  $\gamma(I) = \gamma$  such that  $I \in \mathcal{O}(I)$  (Leap be reconstructed from L and  $\gamma$ ) most one I with  $\gamma(I) = \gamma$  such that  $J \in \varphi(I)$  (I can be recons[tru](#page-10-1)cted from J and  $\gamma$ , since the set  $S$  of added vertices can easily be identified; cf. [9, Section 2.5]). It follows that we may bound  $f(\ell)$  by the number of contours of length 4 $\ell$  with a vertex of  $U_m$  in their interiors.

Fix  $\mu > \mu_t$ . By the properties of contours we have established, up to translations of contour[s th](#page-2-1)is number is at most the maximum of  $\mu^{4\ell}$  and  $\sum_{j+k=4\ell; j,k\geq m/2} \mu^j \mu^k =$  $4\ell\mu^{4\ell}$  (for all large m, here using (1). The restriction of  $G_{\lozenge}$  to  $U_m$  has at most  $4(2m +$  $1)^2 \le 17m^2$  edges, so there are at most this many translates of a contour that can have a vertex of  $U_m$  in its interior. We may bound  $f(\ell)$  by  $68m^2\ell\mu^{4\ell}$  and so the sum in (2)<br>by  $\sum_{\ell \ge m} 68m^2\ell(\mu^4/(1+\lambda))^{\ell}$ . For any fixed  $\lambda > \mu^4 - 1$ , there is an m large enough<br>so that this sum is at most 1/3; w so that this sum is at most  $1/3$ ; we take any such m to be  $m(\lambda)$ , completing the proof.

#### **4 Proof of Theorem 2 (slow mixing of Glauber dynamics)**

Let  $G \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$  be an  $n \times n$  lattice region and let  $\Omega$  be the set of independent sets on  $G$ . Our goal is to sample from  $\Omega$  according to the Gibbs distribution, where each  $I \in \Omega$ is assigned probability  $\pi(I) = \lambda^{|I|}/Z$ , where  $Z = \sum_{I' \in \Omega} \lambda^{|I'|}$ . Glauber dynamics is a local Markov chain that connects two independent sets if they have symmetric difference of size one. The Metro[pol](#page-15-16)is probabilities [16] that force the chain to converge to the Gibbs distribution are given by

$$
P(I, I') = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2n} \min\left(1, \lambda^{|I'|-|I|}\right), & \text{if } I \oplus I' = 1, \\ 1 - \sum_{J \sim I} P(I, J), & \text{if } I = I', \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
$$

The conductance, introduced by Jerrum and Sinclair [21], is a good measure of a chain's [m](#page-4-1)ixing rate. Let

$$
\Phi = \min_{S \in \Omega: \pi(S) \le 1/2} \frac{\sum_{x \in S, y \notin S} \pi(x) P(x, y)}{\pi(S)},
$$

where  $\pi(S) = \sum_{x \in S} \pi(x)$ . From [21] we kno[w tha](#page-15-0)t  $\frac{\Phi^2}{2} \leq Gap(P) \leq 2\Phi$ , where  $Can(P)$  is the spectral gap of the transition matrix. The spectral gap is well-known to  $Gap(P)$  is the spectral gap of the transition matrix. The spectral gap is well-known to the a measure of the mixing rate of a Markov chain, so a partition of the state space be a measure of the mixing rate of a Markov chain, so a partition of the state space witnessing exponentially small conductance is sufficient to show slow mixing. The machinery of Section 2 provides such a partition.

We are now ready to present the proof of slow mixing, starting first with the twodimensional torus. In the interest of space, we defer the proof of the second part of Theorem 2 showing slow mixing on regions with free boundary conditions for the full version of the paper. The proof is similar to the argument described in [19] and utilizing the improvements given here for the torus.

Let *n* be even, and let  $\widehat{G} = \{0, \ldots, n-1\} \times \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$  be the  $n \times n$  lattice region with toroidal boundary conditions. Let  $\widehat{\Omega}$  be the set of independent sets on  $\widehat{G}$ , and  $\widehat{\pi}$  the

Gibbs distribution. Lemma 2 shows that  $\hat{\Omega}$  may be partitioned into  $\hat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{F}}$  (independent sets with a fault),  $\widehat{Q}_0$  (independent sets with an even cross) and  $\widehat{Q}_1$  (independent sets with an odd cross), and that furthermore  $\widehat{Q}_0$  and  $\widehat{Q}_1$  are not directly connected by moves in the chain. It remains to show that  $\hat{\pi}(\hat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{F}})$  is exponentially smaller than both  $\hat{\pi}(\hat{\Omega}_0)$ and  $\hat{\pi}(\hat{\Omega}_1)$ . (Clearly  $\hat{\pi}(\hat{\Omega}_0) = \hat{\pi}(\hat{\Omega}_1)$  by symmetry.) Notice that on the torus we may assume that fault lines have no alternation points; since they start and end at the same place, the number of alternation points must be even.

For an independent set  $I \in \hat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{F}}$  with fault  $F = (F_1, F_2)$ , partition I into two sets,  $I_A$  and  $I_B$ , depending on which side of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  they lie. Define the length of F to be the number of edges (in  $G_{\Diamond}$ ) on  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ . Note that if  $F_1$  has no alternation points then it has length  $N = 2n + 2\ell$  for some positive integer  $\ell$ .<sup>2</sup><br>Let  $I' = \sigma(I, F)$  be the configuration formed by shifting

Let  $I' = \sigma(I, F)$  be the configuration formed by shifting  $I_A$  one to the right. Let  $F'_1 = \sigma(F_1)$  and  $F'_2 = \sigma(F_2)$  be the images of the fault under this shift. We define<br>the points that lie in  $F_2 \cap F'_1$  and  $F_2 \cap F'_2$  to be the points that fall "in between" F the points that lie in  $F_1 \cap F_1'$  and  $F_2 \cap F_2'$  to be the points that fall "in between" F and  $F' := (F'_1, F'_2)$ . It will be convenient to order the set of possible fault lines so that given a configuration  $I \in \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{F}}$  we can identify its *first* fault. The following results are modified from [19] and rely on the new characterization of faults as taxi walks.

<span id="page-12-0"></span>**Lemma 6.** Let  $\widehat{\Omega}_F$  be the configurations in  $\widehat{\Omega}_F$  with first fault  $F = (F_1, F_2)$ . Write the *length of*  $F$  *as*  $4n + 4\ell$ *. Then*  $\pi(\widehat{\Omega}_F) \leq (1 + \lambda)^{-(n+\ell)}$ *.* 

**Proof:** We define an injection  $\phi_F : \widehat{\Omega}_F \times \{0,1\}^{n+\ell} \hookrightarrow \Omega$  so that  $\widehat{\pi}(\phi_F(I,r)) =$  $\hat{\pi}(I)\lambda^{[r]}$ . The injection is formed by cutting the torus  $\hat{G}$  along  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  and shifting one of the two connected pieces in any direction by one unit. There will be exactly  $n+k$ one of the two connected pieces in any direction by one unit. There will be exactly  $n+\ell$ unoccupied points near  $F$  that are guaranteed to have only unoccupied neighbors. We add a subset of the vertices in this set to I according to bits that are one in the vector  $r$ . Given this map, we have

<span id="page-12-1"></span>
$$
1 = \widehat{\pi}(\widehat{\Omega}) \ge \sum_{I \in \widehat{\Omega}_F} \sum_{r \in \{0,1\}^{n+\ell}} \widehat{\pi}(\phi_F(I,r)) = \sum_{I \in \widehat{\Omega}_F} \widehat{\pi}(I) \sum_{r \in \{0,1\}^{n+\ell}} \lambda^{|r|}.
$$

 $\Box$ 

**Theorem 5.** Let  $\widehat{\Omega}$  be the set of independent sets on  $\widehat{G}$  weighted by  $\widehat{\pi}(I) = \lambda^{|I|}/Z$ , where  $Z = \sum_{i} \lambda^{|I|} I_i$  at  $\Omega$ , he the set of independent sets on  $\widehat{G}$  with a foult. Then *where*  $Z = \sum_{\mu}$ *et*  $\widehat{\Omega}$  *be the set of independent sets on*  $\widehat{G}$  *weighted by*  $\widehat{\pi}(I) = \lambda^{|I|}/Z$ ,<br>  $I \in \widehat{\Omega} \lambda^{|I|}$ . Let  $\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}$  *be the set of independent sets on*  $\widehat{G}$  *with a fault. Then* for any  $\lambda > \mu_t^4 - 1$ , there is a constant  $c > 0$  such that  $\widehat{\pi}(\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}) \leq e^{-cn}$ .

**Proof:** Fix  $\mu$  satisfying  $\lambda > \mu^4 - 1 > \mu_t^4 - 1$ , where  $\mu_t$  is the taxi walk connective constant. Summing over locations for the two faults  $F_t$  and  $F_0$  and using I emma 6. constant. Summing over locations for the two faults  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  and using Lemma 6,

$$
\widehat{\pi}(\widehat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{F}}) = \sum_{F} \widehat{\pi}(\widehat{\Omega}_{F}) \leq \sum_{F} (1+\lambda)^{-(n+\ell)} \leq n^2 \sum_{i=0}^{(n^2-2n)/2} \left(\frac{\mu^4}{1+\lambda}\right)^{n+i}.
$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In [19, Section 2.2] this is erroneously presented as  $N = n + 2\ell$ , and the missing factor 2 remains absent for all the remaining calculations; the corrected calculations lead to the weaker bounds quoted in the introduction.

The second inequality here uses Theorem 3. By our choice of  $\mu$  we get (for large n)  $\pi(\Omega_{\mathcal{F}}) \le e^{-cn}$  for some constant  $c > 0$ ; and we can easily modify this constant to deal with all smaller values of n. with all smaller values of  $n$ .

<span id="page-13-0"></span>From Theorem 3, we know that  $\mu_t^4 - 1 < 5.3646$ . From Theorem 5, we thus get the first part of Theorem 2, as well as the following stronger result first part of Theorem 2, as well as the following stronger result.

**Corollary 1.** *Fix*  $\lambda > \mu_t^4 - 1$ . Glauber dynamics for sampling independent sets on the<br> $\infty \times \infty$  to we  $\widehat{C}$  takes time at least  $e^{cn}$  to wix, for some constant  $e > 0$  (depending on ).  $n \times n$  *torus*  $\widehat{G}$  *takes time at least*  $e^{cn}$  *to mix, for some constant*  $c > 0$  *(depending on*  $\lambda$ ).

<span id="page-13-1"></span>**Proof:** We will bound the conductance by considering  $S = \hat{\Omega}_0$ . It is clear that  $\hat{\pi}(S) \leq$ 

$$
1/2 \text{ since } \overline{S} = \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{F}} \cup \widehat{\Omega}_{1} \text{ and } \widehat{\pi}(\widehat{\Omega}_{0}) = \widehat{\pi}(\widehat{\Omega}_{1}). \text{ Thus,}
$$
\n
$$
\Phi \le \frac{\sum_{s \in \widehat{\Omega}_{0}, t \in \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{F}}} \widehat{\pi}(s) P(s, t)}{\widehat{\pi}(\widehat{\Omega}_{0})} = \frac{\sum_{s \in \widehat{\Omega}_{0}, t \in \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{F}}} \widehat{\pi}(t) P(t, s)}{\widehat{\pi}(\widehat{\Omega}_{0})} \le \frac{\sum_{t \in \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{F}}} \widehat{\pi}(t)}{\widehat{\pi}(\widehat{\Omega}_{0})} = \frac{\widehat{\pi}(\widehat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{F}})}{\widehat{\pi}(\widehat{\Omega}_{0})}.
$$

Given Theorem 5, it is trivial to show that  $\hat{\pi}(\hat{\Omega}_0) > 1/3$ , thereby establishing that the conductance is exponentially small. It follows that Glauber dynamics takes exponential time to converge.

### **5 Taxi Walks: Bounds and Limits**

We conclude by justifying the upper bound on the number of taxi walks given in Theorem 3, as well as providing a lower bound on  $\mu_t$ . It is necessary to first establish the submultiplicativity of  $\tilde{c}_n$  (or, equivalently, the subadditivity of  $\log \tilde{c}_n$ ).

**Lemma 7.** *Let*  $\tilde{c}_n$  *be the number of taxi walks of length* n *and let*  $1 \le i \le n - 1$ *. Then*  $\widetilde{c}_n \leq \widetilde{c}_i \widetilde{c}_{n-i}$ 

**Proof:** As with traditional self-avoiding walks, the key is to recognize that if we split a ta[xi w](#page-13-1)alk of length  $n$  into two pieces, the resulting pieces are both self-avoiding. Let  $s = s_1, \ldots, s_n$  be a taxi walk of length n and let  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ . Then the initial segment of the walk  $s_1 = s_1, \ldots, s_{i+1}$  is a taxi walk of length i. Let  $p = (x, y)$  be the ith vertex of the walk s. Let  $s_F$  be the final  $n-i$  steps of the walk s starting at p. We define  $f(s_F)$ by translating the walk so that  $f(p)$  is the origin, reflecting horizontally if  $p_x$  is odd and reflecting vertically if  $p_y$  is odd. Notice that this always produces a valid taxi walk of length  $n - i$  and the map f is invertible given p. Therefore  $\widetilde{c}_n \leq \widetilde{c}_i \widetilde{c}_{n-i}$ .

It follows from Lemma 7 that  $a_n = \log \tilde{c}_n$  is subadditiv[e,](#page-13-2) i.e.,  $a_{n+m} \le a_n + a_m$ . By Fekete's [Lemma \(see, e.g., \[23, Lemma 1.2.2\]\) we](http://nd.edu/~dgalvin1/TD/) know  $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n/n$  exists and

<span id="page-13-2"></span>
$$
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{a_n}{n} = \inf \frac{a_n}{n}.
$$
\n(3)

Thus, we can write the number of taxi walks as  $\tilde{c}_n = \mu_t^n f_t(n)$ , where  $\mu_t$  is the connective constant associated with taxi walks and  $f_t(n)$  is subexponential in n tive constant associated with taxi walks and  $f_t(n)$  is subexponential in n.

Subadditivity gives us a strategy for getting a better bound on  $\mu_t$ . From (3) we see that for all  $n$ ,  $\log \tilde{c}_n/n$  is an upper bound for  $\log \mu_t$ . We exactly enumerated taxi walks of length n, for  $n \leq 60$ ; see http://nd.edu/~dgalvin1/TD/ for this and other

data. Using  $c_{60} = 2189670407434$  gives a bound of  $\mu_t < 1.6058$ . Note that exact counts for larger n will immediately improve our bounds on both  $\mu_t$  and  $\lambda_c$ .

The connective constant for ordinary self-avoiding walks has been well studied, and some of the methods used to obtain bounds there can be adapted to deal with taxi walks. In p[ar](#page-15-12)ticular, a method of Alm [1] is useful. Fix  $n>m>0$ . Construct a square matrix  $A(m, n)$  whose ij entry counts the number of taxi walks of length n that begin with the ith taxi walk of length m, and end with the jth taxi walk of length m, for some fixed ordering of the walks of length  $m$ . To make sense of this, it is necessary to choose, for each  $v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ , an orientation preserving map  $f_v$  of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  that sends the origin to v; saying that a walk of length  $n$  ends with the jth walk of length  $m$  means that if the length m terminal segment of the walk is transformed by  $f_v^{-1}$  to start at the origin, where  $v$  is the first vertex of the terminal segment, then the result is the jth walk of length m. Then a theorem of Alm [1] may be modified to show that  $\mu_t$  is bounded above by  $\lambda_1(A(m, n))^{1/(n-m)}$ , where  $\lambda_1$  indicate[s the](#page-15-18) largest positive eigenvalue. (Note that when  $m = 0$  this recovers the subadditivity bound discussed earlier) when  $m = 0$  this recovers the subadditivity bound discussed earlier).

We have calculated  $A(20, 60)$ . This is a square matrix of dimension 20114, and a simple symmetry argument reduces the dimension by a factor of 2. Using MATLAB, we could estimate the largest eigenvalue to obtain  $\mu_t < 1.5884$  and  $\mu_t^4 - 1 < 5.3646$ .

A similar strategy can be used to derive lower bounds on  $\mu_t$  in order to determine the theoretical limitations of our approach of characterizing contours by taxi walks. We have already given the trivial lower bound  $\mu_t \geq \sqrt{2}$ . To improve this, we consider *bridges* (introduced for ordinary self-avoiding walks by Kesten [12]). A *bridge*, for our purposes, is a taxi walk that begins by moving from the origin  $(0, 0)$  to the point  $(1, 0)$ , never revisits the y-axis, and ends by taking a step parallel to the x-axis to a point on the walk that has maximum  $x$ -coordinate over all points in the walk (but note that this maximum does not have to be uniquely achieved at the final point).

Let  $b_n$  be the number of bridges of length n. Then bridges are supermultiplicative, i.e.,  $b_n \geq b_i b_{n-i}$  (and  $\log b_n$  is superadditive). To see this, note that if  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  are bridges, then they both begin and end at vertices whose y-coordinates are even because they are taking steps to the East. If the parities of the  $x$ -coordinates of the first vertices in  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  agree, then the concatenation of  $\beta_1$  and an appropriate translation of  $\beta_2$ is also a bridge; if the parities are different then concatenation of  $\beta_1$  with a translation of  $\beta_2$  after reflecting horizontally will be a valid bridge. Notice that the parity of the  $x$ -coordinate of the two pieces allows us to recover whether a reflection was necessary to keep the walk on the directed Manhattan lattice, so bridges are indeed supermultiplicative. It similarly follows that there are at least  $b_n^k$  taxi walks of length kn (just concatenate  $k$  length  $n$  bridges), so that

$$
\mu_t = \lim_{m \to \infty} \tilde{c}_m^{1/m} \ge \lim_{k \to \infty} (b_n^k)^{1/nk} = b_n^{1/n}.
$$

We have enumerated bridges of length up to 60, in particular discovering that  $b_{60} =$ 80312795498, leading to  $\mu_t > 1.5196$  and  $\mu_t^4 - 1 > 4.3332$ .<br>A consequence of our lower bound on  $\mu_t$  is that our approximately

A consequence of our lower bound on  $\mu_t$  is that our approach to phase coexistence cannot give anything better than  $\lambda_c \leq 4.3332$ ; this tells us that new ideas will be needed to reach the value of 3.796 suggested by computations as the true value of  $\lambda_c$ .

## <span id="page-15-12"></span><span id="page-15-8"></span><span id="page-15-3"></span><span id="page-15-1"></span>**References**

- <span id="page-15-11"></span><span id="page-15-10"></span>1. Alm, S.: Upper bounds for the connective constant of self-avoiding walks. Combinatorics, Probability & Computing 2, 115–136 (1993)
- 2. Baxter, R., Entig, I., Tsang, S.: Hard-square lattice gas. J. Stat. Phys. 22, 465–489 (1980)
- <span id="page-15-2"></span>3. Beffara, V., Duminil-Copin, H.: The self-dual point of the two-dimensional random-cluster model is critical for  $q > 1$ . Probability Theory and Related Fields 153, 511–542 (2012)
- <span id="page-15-6"></span>4. van den Berg, J., Steif, J.E.: Percolation and the hard-core lattice model. Stochastic Processes and their Applications 49, 179–197 (1994)
- <span id="page-15-15"></span>5. Borgs, C.: Personal communication
- 6. Borgs, C., Chayes, J.T., Frieze, A., Kim, J.H., Tetali, P., Vigoda, E., Vu, V.H.: Torpid mixing of some MCMC algorithms in statistical physics. In: Proc. 40th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), pp. 218–229 (1999)
- <span id="page-15-18"></span><span id="page-15-14"></span>7. Brightwell, G.R., Häggström, O., Winkler, P.: Non-monotonic behavior in hard-core and Widom-Rowlinson models. J. Stat. Phys. 94, 415–435 (1999)
- 8. Dobrushin, R.L.: The problem of uniqueness of a Gibbs random field and the problem of phase transitions. Functional Analysis and its Applic. 2, 302–312 (1968)
- <span id="page-15-13"></span>9. Galvin, D., Kahn, J.: On phase transitions in the hard-core model on  $Z<sup>d</sup>$ . Combinatorics, Probability & Computing 13, 137–164 (2004)
- 10. Georgii, H.-O.: Gibbs Measures and Phase Transitions. de Gruyter, Berlin (1988)
- 11. Hammersley, J.M., Welsh, D.J.A.: Further results on the rate of convergence to the connective constant of the hyper cubic lattice. Quarterly J. of Mathematics 2, 108–110 (1962)
- 12. Kesten, H.: On the number of self-avoiding walks. J. Math. Phys. 4, 960–969 (1963)
- <span id="page-15-7"></span>13. Lubezky, E., Sly, A.: Critical Ising on the square lattice mixes in polynomial time. To appear in Communications in Mathematical Physics
- <span id="page-15-0"></span>14. Luby, M., Vigoda, E.: Fast convergence of the Glauber dynamics for sampling independent sets. Random Structures & Algorithms 15, 229–241 (1999)
- 15. Madras, N., Slade, G.: The Self-Avoiding Walk. Birkhäuser, Boston (1993)
- 16. Metropolis, N., Rosenbluth, A.W., Rosenbluth, M.N., Teller, A.H., Teller, E.: Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. J. of Chemical Physics 21, 1087–1092 (1953)
- <span id="page-15-16"></span>17. Onsager, L.: Crystal statistics. I. A two-dimensional model with an order-disorder transition. Physics Review Letters 65, 117–149 (1944)
- <span id="page-15-5"></span>18. Radulescu, D.C., Styer, D.F.: The Dobrushin-Shlosman phase uniqueness criterion and applications to hard squares. J. Stat. Phys. 49, 281–295 (1987)
- <span id="page-15-17"></span>19. Randall, D.: Slow mixing of Glauber dynamics via topological obstructions. In: Proc. 17th ACM-SIAM Symp. on Discrete Algorithms (SODA), pp. 870–879 (2006)
- <span id="page-15-9"></span>20. Restrepo, R., Shin, J., Tetali, P., Vigoda, E., Yang, L.: Improved mixing condition on the grid for counting and sampling independent sets. In: Proc. 52nd IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), pp. 140–149 (2011)
- <span id="page-15-4"></span>21. Sinclair, A.J., Jerrum, M.R.: Approximate counting, uniform generation and rapidly mixing Markov chains. Information and Computation 82, 93–133 (1989)
- 22. Sly, A.: Computational Transition at the Uniqueness Threshold. In: Proc. 51st IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), pp. 287–296 (2010)
- 23. Steele, J.M.: Probability Theory and Combinatorial Optimization. SIAM (1997)
- 24. Vera, J.C., Vigoda, E., Yang, L.: Improved bounds on the phase transition for the hard-core model in 2-dimensions. In: Raghavendra, P., Raskhodnikova, S., Jansen, K., Rolim, J.D.P. (eds.) APPROX/RANDOM 2013. LNCS, vol. 8096, pp. 705–719. Springer, Heidelberg (2013)
- 25. Weitz, D.: Counting independent sets up to the tree threshold. In: Proc. 38th ACM Symp. on the Theory of Computing (STOC), pp. 140–149 (2006)