Unimodular Hausdorff and Minkowski Dimensions
François Baccelli∗, Mir-Omid Haji-Mirsadeghi†, and Ali Khezeli‡
February 4, 2020

Abstract
This work introduces two new notions of dimension, namely the unimodular Minkowski and Hausdorff dimensions, which are inspired from the classical analogous notions. These dimensions are defined for unimodular discrete spaces, introduced this work, which provide a common generalization to stationary point processes under their Palm version and unimodular random rooted graphs. The use of unimodularity in the definitions of dimension is novel. Also, a toolbox of results is presented for the analysis of these dimensions. In particular, analogues of Billingsley’s lemma and Frostman’s lemma are presented. These lemmas are instrumental in deriving upper bounds on dimensions, whereas lower bounds are obtained from specific coverings. The notions of unimodular Hausdorff measure and unimodular dimension function are also introduced. This toolbox is used to connect the unimodular dimensions to other notions such as growth rate (various further connections will also be considered in future papers of the authors). It is also used to analyze the dimensions of a set of examples pertaining to point processes, branching processes, random graphs, random walks, and self-similar discrete random spaces. This work is structured in two papers, with the present paper being the first.

1 Introduction
Infinite discrete random structures are ubiquitous: random graphs, branching processes, point processes, graphs or zeros of discrete random walks, discrete or Euclidean percolation, to name a few. The main novelty of the present paper is the definition of new notions of dimension for a class of such structures that, heuristically, enjoy a form of statistical homogeneity. The mathematical framework proposed to handle such structures is that of unimodular (random) discrete spaces, where unimodularity is defined here by a straightforward version
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of the mass transport principle (the reader can restrict attention to unimodular graphs and skip the definition of unimodular discrete spaces at first reading). This framework unifies unimodular random graphs and networks, stationary point processes (under their Palm version) and point-stationary point processes. It does not require more than a metric; for instance, no edges or no underlying Euclidean space are needed. The statistical homogeneity of such spaces has been used to define localized versions of global notions such as, e.g., intensity. The main novelty of the present paper is the use of this homogeneity to define the notions of unimodular Minkowski and Hausdorff dimensions, which are inspired by the analogous classical notions. The definitions are obtained naturally by replacing the infinite sums pertaining to coverings by the expectation of certain random variables at the origin (which is a distinguished point). These definitions are local but capture large scale properties of the space.

The definitions are complemented by a toolbox for the analysis of unimodular dimensions. Several analogues of the important results known about the classical Hausdorff and Minkowski dimensions are established, like for instance the comparison of the unimodular Minkowski and Hausdorff dimensions as well as unimodular versions of Billingsley’s lemma and Frostman’s lemma. These lemmas allow one to connect the dimension to the (polynomial) growth rate of the space. Analogues of the Hausdorff measure are also defined for unimodular discrete spaces. This can be used to quantify the size of sets with the same dimension. The notion of unimodular dimension function is also defined for a finer quantification of the dimension. While many ideas in this toolbox are imported from the continuum setting, their adaptation is nontrivial and there is no automatic way to import results from the continuum to the discrete setting. For some results, the statements fundamentally differ from their continuum analog; e.g., the statement of Billingsley’s lemma and the result that a subspace may have a larger Minkowski dimension in this setting.

Several notions of dimension are already defined in the literature for discrete spaces. For instance, one can mention the growth rate, the notion of discrete dimension for discrete subsets of Euclidean spaces [7] and Gromov’s notion of asymptotic dimension [19]. Various other dimensions and exponents are also defined for graphs (see e.g., Subsection [11] below). Connections between unimodular dimensions and some of these earlier notions are clarified. Here are instances of these connections, established under conditions spelled out in the paper: It is shown that the discrete dimension [7] is an upper bound for the unimodular Hausdorff dimension when both notions are defined (i.e., for point-stationary point processes). If the polynomial growth rate exists, then it is equal to the unimodular Hausdorff dimension; If the space admits a scaling limit (such limits are random continuum metric spaces), then the ordinary Hausdorff dimension of the limit is an upper bound for the unimodular Hausdorff dimension. Note that these comparison results imply relations between the growth rate, scaling limits and discrete dimension, which are of independent interest and which are new to the best of the authors’ knowledge.

The paper also contains new mathematical results of independent interest. A weak version of Birkhoff’s pointwise ergodic theorem is stated for all unimodular
discrete spaces. A unimodular version of the max flow min cut theorem is also proved for unimodular one-ended trees, which is used in the proof of the unimodular Frostman lemma. Also, for unimodular one-ended trees, a relation between the growth rate and the height of the root is established as explained below.

Finally, the framework is used to derive concrete results on the dimension of several instances of unimodular random discrete metric spaces. This is done for the zeros and the graph of discrete random walks, sets defined by digit restriction, trees obtained from branching processes and drainage network models, dimension doubling of the simple random walk, etc. Some general results are obtained for all unimodular trees. For instance, a general relation is established between the unimodular dimensions of a unimodular one-ended tree and the tail of the distribution of the height of the root. The dimensions of some unimodular discrete random fractals are also discussed. The latter are defined in this paper as unimodular discrete analogues of self similar sets such as the Koch snowflake, the Sierpinski triangle, etc.

This framework opens several further research directions. There is a large set of open questions on the dimensions of specific instances of such unimodular discrete spaces. In particular, this framework might be useful for the study of some examples which are of interest in mathematical physics (e.g., some unimodular spaces constructed from percolation clusters and self-avoiding random walks). Also, the definitions and many of the results are valid for exponential (or other) gauge functions. They might have applications in group theory (or other areas), where most interesting examples have super-polynomial growth.

1.1 Introduction to the Definitions of Dimension

Recall that the Minkowski dimension of a compact metric space $X$ is defined using the minimum number of balls of radii $\epsilon$ needed to cover $X$. Now, consider a (unimodular) discrete space $D$ (it is useful to have in mind the example $D = \mathbb{Z}^{k}$ to see how the definitions work). It is convenient to consider coverings of $D$ by balls of equal but large radii. Of course, if $D$ is unbounded, then an infinite number of balls is needed to cover $D$. So one needs another measure to assess how many balls are used in a covering. Let $S \subseteq D$ be the set of centers of the balls in the covering. The idea pursued in this paper is that if $D$ is unimodular, then the intensity of $S$ is a measure of the average number of points of $S$ per points of $D$ ($S$ should be equivariant for the intensity to be defined, as discussed later). This gives rise to the definition of the unimodular Minkowski dimension naturally.

The idea behind the definition of the unimodular Hausdorff dimension is similar. Recall that the $\alpha$-dimensional Hausdorff content of a compact metric space $X$ is defined by considering the infimum of $\sum_{i} R_{i}^{\alpha}$, where the $R_{i}$’s are the radii of a sequence of balls that cover $X$. Also, it is convenient to force an upper bound on the radii. Now, consider a unimodular discrete space $D$ and a covering of $D$ by balls which may have different radii. Let $R(v)$ be the radius of the ball centered at $v$. It is convenient to consider a lower bound on the radii, say $R(\cdot) \geq$
1. Again, if $D$ is unbounded, then $\sum_v R(v)^\alpha$ is always infinite. The idea is to leverage the unimodularity of $D$ and consider the average of the values $R(\cdot)^\alpha$ per point as a replacement of the sum. Under the unimodularity assumption, this can be defined by $\mathbb{E}[R(o)^\alpha]$, where $o$ stands for the distinguished point of $D$ (called the origin) and by convention, $R(o)$ is zero if there is no ball centered at $o$. This is used to define the unimodular Hausdorff dimension of $D$ in a natural way.

The literature contains various definitions to study dimension for discrete structures. Here is a brief summary of those relevant in the present context. The connections of the earlier definitions with the proposed ones will be discussed in the next subsection. One is the growth rate of the cardinality of a large ball. Another is the discrete dimension \cite{7} which uses the idea behind the definition of the Hausdorff dimension by considering coverings of $\Phi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$ by large balls and considering the cost $(r + |x|)^\alpha$ for each ball in the covering, where $r$ and $x$ are the radius and the center of the ball and $\alpha$ is a constant (in fact, this is a modified version of the definition of \cite{7} mentioned in \cite{11}). Other definitions are the spectral dimension of a graph (defined in terms of the return probabilities of the simple random walk), the typical displacement exponent of a graph (see \cite{13} for both notions), the isoperimetric dimension of a graph \cite{12}, the resistance growth exponent of a graph, the stochastic dimension of a partition of $\mathbb{Z}^k$ \cite{8}, etc.

In statistical physics, one also assigns dimension and various exponents to finite models. Famous examples are self-avoiding walks and the boundaries of large percolation clusters. More on the matter is provided in \cite{4}.

### 1.2 Organization of the Material and Summary of Results

The material is organized in two companion papers (the current paper and \cite{5}) that will be referred to as Parts I and II respectively. The aim of this subsection is to give a brief summary of the main results and their localizations in the two parts.

Part I is centered on the framework, the definitions and the basic properties of unimodular dimensions. It also contains a large set of examples which will be continued in Part II. These examples stem from point process theory, random graphs, random walks, self-similarity or from analogues in the continuum. Section 2 defines unimodular discrete spaces and equivariant processes, which are needed throughout. The topological properties needed for having a standard probability space is discussed in Appendix A (based on a metrization of local weak convergence of rooted discrete spaces). Section 3 presents the definitions of the unimodular Minkowski and Hausdorff dimensions and the unimodular Hausdorff measure. It also provides some basic properties of unimodular dimensions as part of the toolbox for the analysis of unimodular dimensions. Various examples are discussed in Section 4. Some of the lemmas and proofs are given in Appendices B and C.

Part II discusses the connections between the proposed dimensions and the growth rate of the space. Analogues of the mass distribution principle and
Billingsley’s lemma are presented, which provide upper bounds for the unimodular Hausdorff dimension in terms of the growth rate (weighted versions of these inequalities are also given). General lower bounds are presented as well. These results are very useful for calculating the unimodular dimensions in many examples. An important result in the opposite direction is an analogue of Frostman’s lemma. Roughly speaking, it states that the mass distribution principle is sharp if the weights are chosen appropriately. This lemma is a powerful tool to study the unimodular Hausdorff dimension.

In the Euclidean case, another proof of Frostman’s lemma is provided using a version of the max-flow min-cut theorem for unimodular one-ended trees, which is of independent interest. Part II also contains a section about examples that completes the examples discussed in Part I.

Some further topics are discussed in a preprint [4] which contains extensions of the notions of dimension and also their connections to classical notions.

2 Unimodular Discrete Spaces

The main objective of this section is the definition of unimodular discrete spaces as a common generalization of unimodular graphs, Palm probabilities and point-stationary point processes. If the reader is familiar with unimodular random graphs, he or she can restrict attention to the case of unimodular graphs and jump to Subsection 2.5 at first reading.

2.1 Notation

The following notation will be used throughout. The set of nonnegative real (resp. integer) numbers is denoted by $\mathbb{R}^\geq$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}^\geq$). The minimum and maximum binary operators are denoted by $\wedge$ and $\vee$ respectively. The number of elements in a set $A$ is denoted by $\#A$, which is a number in $[0, \infty]$. If $P(x)$ is a property about $x$, the indicator $1_{\{P(x)\}}$ is equal to 1 if $P(x)$ is true and 0 otherwise.

Discrete metric spaces (discussed in details in Subsection 2.2) are denoted by $D$, $D'$, etc. Graphs are an important class of discrete metric spaces. So the symbols and notations are mostly borrowed from graph theory.

For $r > 0$, $N_r(v) := N_r(D, v)$ refers to the closed $r$-neighborhood of $v \in D$; i.e., the set of points of $D$ with distance less than or equal to $r$ from $v$. An exception is made for $r = 0$ (Subsection 2.3), where $N_0(v) := \emptyset$. The diameter of a subset $A$ is denoted by $\text{diam}(A)$. For a function $f : [1, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^\geq$, the polynomial growth rates and polynomial decay rates are defined by the following...
formulas:

\[
\begin{align*}
growth(f) &:= -\decay(f) := \lim_{r \to \infty} \log f(r)/\log r, \\
\end{align*}
\]

2.2 The Space of Pointed Discrete Spaces

Throughout the paper, the metric on any metric space is denoted by \(d\), except when explicitly mentioned. In this paper, it is always assumed that the discrete metric space is \textbf{boundedly finite}; i.e., every set included in a ball of finite radius in \(D\) is finite. The term \textit{discrete space} will always refer to boundedly finite discrete metric space. A \textbf{pointed set} (or a \textit{rooted set}) is a pair \((D, o)\), where \(D\) is a set and \(o\) a distinguished point of \(D\) called the \textbf{origin} (or the \textit{root}) of \(D\). Similarly, a \textbf{doubly-pointed} set is a triple \((D, o_1, o_2)\), where \(o_1\) and \(o_2\) are two distinguished points of \(D\).

Let \(\Xi\) be a complete separable metric space called the \textbf{mark space}. A \textbf{marked pointed discrete space} is a tuple \((D, o; m)\), where \((D, o)\) is a pointed discrete space and \(m\) is a function \(m : D \times D \to \Xi\). The mark of a single point \(x\) may also be defined by \(m(x) := m(x, x)\), where the same symbol \(m\) is used for simplicity. An \textbf{isomorphism} (or \textit{rooted isomorphism}) between two such spaces \((D, o; m)\) and \((D', o'; m')\) is an isometry \(\rho : D \to D'\) such that \(\rho(o) = o'\) and \(m'(\rho(u), \rho(v)) = m(u, v)\) for all \(u, v \in D\). An isomorphism between doubly-pointed marked discrete spaces is defined similarly. An isomorphism from a space to itself is called an \textbf{automorphism}.

Most of the examples of discrete spaces in this work are graphs and discrete subsets of the Euclidean space. More precisely, connected and locally-finite simple graphs equipped with the graph-distance metric [2] are instances of discrete spaces. Similarly, \textit{networks}; i.e., graphs equipped with marks on the edges [2], are instances of marked discrete spaces.

Let \(D^\ast\) (resp. \(D^{\ast\ast}\)) be the set of equivalence classes of pointed (resp. doubly-pointed) discrete spaces under isomorphism. Let \(D'_\ast\) and \(D'_{\ast\ast}\) be defined similarly for marked discrete spaces with mark space \(\Xi\) (which is usually given). The equivalence class containing \((D, o)\), \((D, o; m)\) etc., is denoted by brackets \([D, o], [D, o; m]\), etc. Appendix A defines metrics on \(D_\ast, D_{\ast\ast}\), etc, and shows that they are Borel subspaces of some Polish space (the Polish space is defined similarly by allowing \textit{multiplicity} for the points). This enables one to define \textit{random pointed discrete spaces}, etc., which are discussed in the next subsection. Heuristically, two elements of \(D_\ast\) are \textit{close} if two large neighborhoods of the origins are \textit{almost isomorphic}. In fact, the metric on \(D_\ast\) is a metrization of the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov topology (see e.g., [30]).
2.3 Random Pointed Discrete Spaces

Definition 2.1. A random pointed discrete space is a random element in \( D_* \) and is denoted by bold symbols \([D, o]\). Here, \( D \) and \( o \) represent the discrete space and the origin respectively.

The results of Appendix [A] ensure that a standard probability space can be used in the above definition, and hence, the classical tools of probability theory are available. The probability space is not referred to explicitly in this paper. Note that the whole symbol \([D, o]\) represents one random object, which is a random equivalence class of pointed discrete spaces. Therefore, any formula using \( D \) and \( o \) should be well defined for equivalence classes; i.e., should be invariant under pointed isomorphisms.

The following convention is helpful throughout.

Convention 2.2. In this paper, bold symbols are usually used in the random case or when extra randomness is used. For example, \([D, o]\) refers to a deterministic element of \( D_* \), and \([D, o]\) refers to a random pointed discrete space.

Note that the distribution of a random pointed network \([D, o]\) is a probability measure on \( D_* \) defined by \( \mu(A) := \mathbb{P}([D, o] \in A) \) for events \( A \subseteq D_* \).

Definition 2.3. A random pointed marked discrete space is a random element in \( D'_* \) and is denoted by bold symbols \([D, o; m]\). Here, \( D, o \) and \( m \) represent the discrete space, the origin and the mark function respectively.

Most examples in this work are either random rooted graphs (or networks) [2] or point processes (i.e., random discrete subset of \( \mathbb{R}^k \)) and marked point processes that contain 0, where 0 is considered as the origin. Other examples are also studied by considering different metrics on such objects.

2.4 Unimodular Discrete Spaces

Once the notion of random pointed discrete space is defined, the definition of unimodularity is a straight variant of [2]. In what follows, the notation is similarly to [6]. Here, the symbol \( g[D, o, v] \) is used as a short form of \( g([D, o, v]) \). Similarly, brackets \([\cdot]\) are used as a short form of \((\cdot)\).

Definition 2.4. A unimodular discrete space is a random pointed discrete space, namely \([D, o]\), such that for all measurable functions \( g : D_* \to \mathbb{R}^\geq \),

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{v \in D} g[D, o, v] \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{v \in D} g[D, v, o] \right]. \tag{2.1}
\]

Similarly, a unimodular marked discrete space is a random pointed marked discrete space \([D, o; m]\) such that for all measurable functions \( g : D'_* \to \mathbb{R}^\geq \),

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{v \in D} g[D, o, v; m] \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{v \in D} g[D, v, o; m] \right]. \tag{2.2}
\]

Note that the expectations may be finite or infinite.
When there is no ambiguity, the term \( g[D, o, v] \) is also denoted by \( g_D(o, v) \) or simply \( g(o, v) \). The sum in the left (respectively right) side of (2.1) is called the **outgoing mass from** \( o \) (respectively **incoming mass into** \( o \)) and is denoted by \( g^+(o) \) (respectively \( g^-(o) \)). The same notation can be used for the terms in (2.2). So (2.1) and (2.2) can be summarized by

\[
E[g^+(o)] = E[g^-(o)].
\]

These equations are called the **mass transport principle** in the literature. The reader is encouraged to see [2] and the examples therein for further discussion on the mass transport principle and unimodularity.

As a basic example, every finite metric space \( D \), equipped with a random root \( o \in D \) chosen uniformly, is unimodular. Also, the lattices in the Euclidean space rooted at 0; e.g., \([\mathbb{Z}^k, 0] \) and \([\delta \mathbb{Z}^k, 0] \) are unimodular. In addition, unimodularity is preserved under weak convergence, as observed in [10] for unimodular graphs.

The following two examples show that unimodular discrete spaces unify unimodular graphs and point-stationary point processes. Most of the examples in this work are of these types.

**Example 2.5 (Unimodular Random Graphs).** In the case of random rooted graphs and networks, the concept of unimodularity in Definition 2.4 coincides with that of [2] (see also Remark A.5 regarding the topologies). Therefore, unimodular random graphs and networks are special cases of unimodular (marked) discrete spaces.

**Example 2.6 (Point-Stationary Point Processes).** **Point-stationarity** is defined for point processes \( \Phi \) in \( \mathbb{R}^k \) such that \( 0 \in \Phi \) a.s. (see e.g., [25]). This definition is equivalent to (2.1) except that \( g \) is required to be invariant under translations only (and not under all isometries). This implies that \([\Phi, 0] \) is unimodular. In addition, by considering the mark \( m(x, y) := y - x \) on pairs of points of \( \Phi \), point-stationarity of \( \Phi \) will be equivalent to the unimodularity of \([\Phi, 0; m] \) (see also Remark A.5 regarding the topologies). Note also that \( \Phi \) can be recovered from \([\Phi, 0; m] \).

For example, if \( \Phi \) is a stationary point process in \( \mathbb{R}^k \) (i.e., its distribution is invariant under all translations) with finite intensity (i.e., finite expected number of points in the unit cube), then the Palm version of \( \Phi \) is a point-stationary point process, where the latter is heuristically obtained by conditioning \( \Phi \) to contain the origin (see e.g., Section 13 of [15] for the precise definition). Also, if \((X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \) is a stochastic process in \( \mathbb{R}^k \) with stationary increments such that \( X_0 = 0 \) and \( X_i \neq X_j \) a.s. for every \( i \neq j \), then the image of this random walk is a point-stationary point process.

### 2.5 Equivariant Process on a Unimodular Discrete Space

In many cases in this paper, an unmarked unimodular discrete space \([D, o] \) is given and various ways of assigning marks to \( D \) are considered. Intuitively, an **equivariant process** on \( D \) is an assignment of (random) marks to \( D \) such that the new marked space is unimodular. Formally, it is
a unimodular marked discrete space $[D', o'; m]$ such that the space
$[D', o']$, obtained by forgetting the marks, has the same distribution
as $[D, o]$.

In this paper, it is more convenient to work with a disintegrated form of this
heuristic, defined below, despite of being more technical. Lemma 2.11 and
Proposition B.1 show that the two notions are equivalent. In the follo-
wing, the mark space $Ξ$ is fixed as in Subsection 2.2.

**Definition 2.7.** Let $D$ be a deterministic discrete space which is boundedly-
finite. A marking of $D$ is a function from $D \times D$ to $Ξ$; i.e., an elemen-
t of $Ξ^{D \times D}$.

A random marking of $D$ is a random element of $Ξ^{D \times D}$.

**Definition 2.8.** An equivariant process $Z$ with values in $Ξ$ is a map that
assigns to every deterministic discrete space $D$ a random marking $Z_D$ of $D$
satisfying the following properties:

(i) $Z$ is compatible with isometries in the sense that for every isometry $ρ : D_1 \to D_2$, the random marking $Z_{D_1} \circ ρ^{-1}$ of $D_2$ has the same distribution
as $Z_{D_2}$.

(ii) For every measurable subset $A \subseteq D'_*$, the following function on $D_*$ is
measurable:

$$[D, o] \mapsto \mathbb{P}[[D, o; Z_D] ∈ A].$$

In addition, given a unimodular discrete space $[D, o]$, such a map is also called
an equivariant process on $D$. In this case, one can also let $Z(⋅)$ be undefined
for a class of discrete spaces, as long as it is defined for almost all realizations
of $D$. It is important that extra randomness be allowed here.

**Convention 2.9.** If $D$ is clear from the context, $Z_D(⋅)$ is also denoted by $Z(⋅)$
for simplicity.

Note that in the above definition, $D$ is deterministic and is not an equivalence
class of discrete spaces. However, for an equivariant process on $[D, o]$, one can
define $[D, o; Z_D]$ as a random pointed marked discrete space with distribution
$Q$ defined by

$$Q(A) := \int \int 1_A[D, o; m]dP_D(m)d\mu([D, o]), \quad (2.3)$$

where $P_D$ is the distribution of $Z_D$ (for every $D$) and $μ$ is the distribution
of $[D, o]$ (note that only the distribution of $Z_D$ is important and no common
probability space is assumed for different $D$'s). It can be seen that $Q(A)$ is
indeed well defined and is a probability measure on $D'_*$.

The following basic examples help to illustrate the definition.

**Example 2.10.** By choosing the marks of points (or pairs of points) in an
i.i.d. manner, one obtains an equivariant process. Also, the following periodic
marking of $Z$ is an equivariant process on $Z$: Choose $U ∈ \{0, 1, \ldots, n − 1\}$
uniformly at random and let $Z(x) := 1$ if $x \in n\mathbb{Z} + U$ and $Z(x) := 0$ otherwise. Moreover, given a measurable function $z : D_{**} \to \mathbb{Z}$, one can define $Z_D(u, v) := z[D, u, v]$, which is called a deterministic process here.

**Lemma 2.11.** Let $[D, o]$ be a unimodular discrete space. If $Z$ is an equivariant process on $D$, then $[D, o; Z_D]$ is also unimodular.

The proof is moved to Appendix C. It is important here that the distribution of $Z_D$ does not depend on the origin (as in Definition 2.8).

**Remark 2.12.** One can easily extend the definition of equivariant processes to allow the base space to be marked. Therefore, for point-stationary point processes, one can replace condition (i) by invariance under translations only (see Example 2.6). In particular, every stationary stochastic process on $\mathbb{Z}^k$ defines an equivariant process on $\mathbb{Z}^k$.

**Definition 2.13.** An equivariant subset $S$ is the set of points with mark 1 in some $\{0, 1\}$-valued equivariant process. In addition, if $[D, o]$ is a unimodular discrete space, then the intensity of $S$ in $D$ is defined by $\rho_D(S) := \mathbb{P}[o \in S_D]$.

For example, $S_D := \{v \in D : \#N_1(v) = 4\}$ defines an equivariant subset. Also, let $D = \mathbb{Z}$ and $S_D$ be the set of even numbers with probability $p$ and the set of odd numbers with probability $1 - p$. Then, $S$ is an equivariant subset of $\mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $p = \frac{1}{2}$ (notice Condition (i) of Definition 2.8).

**Lemma 2.14.** Let $[D, o]$ be a unimodular discrete space and $S$ an equivariant subset. Then $S_D \neq \emptyset$ with positive probability if and only if it has positive intensity. Equivalently, $S_D = D$ a.s. if and only if $\rho_D(S) = 1$.

**Proof.** The claim is implied by the mass transport principle (2.2) for the function $g[D, u, v; S] := 1_{\{v \in S\}}$. The details are left to the reader. \qed

The above lemma is a generalization of similar results in [6] and [2].

### 2.6 Notes and Bibliographical Comments

The mass transport principle is originally introduced in [21]. The concept of unimodular graphs is first defined for deterministic transitive graphs in [9] and developed to random rooted graphs and networks in [2].

Unimodular graphs have many analogies and connections to (Palm versions of) stationary point processes and point-stationary point processes, as discussed in Example 9.5 of [2] and also in [6] and [24]. As already explained in this section, the framework of unimodular discrete spaces, introduced in this section, can be regarded as a common generalization of these concepts.

Special cases of the notion of equivariant processes have been considered in various literature. The first formulation in Subsection 2.5 is considered in [2] for unimodular graphs. *Factors of IID* [26] are special cases of equivariant processes where the marks of the points are obtained from i.i.d. marks (Example 2.10) in an equivariant way. *Covariant subsets* and *covariant partitions* of unimodular...
graphs are defined similarly in [6], but no extra randomness is allowed therein. In the case of stationary (marked) point processes, the first formulation of Subsection 2.5 is used in the literature. However, the authors believe that the general formulation of Definition 2.8 is new even in those special cases.

3 The Unimodular Minkowski and Hausdorff Dimensions

This section presents the new notions of dimension for unimodular discrete spaces. As mentioned in the introduction, the statistical homogeneity of unimodular discrete spaces is used to define discrete analogous of the Minkowski and Hausdorff dimensions. Also, basic properties of these definitions are discussed.

3.1 The Unimodular Minkowski Dimension

Definition 3.1. Let \([D, o]\) be a unimodular discrete space and \(r \geq 0\). An equivariant \(r\)-covering \(R\) of \(D\) is an equivariant subset of \(D\) (Definition 2.13) such that the set of balls \(\{N_r(v) : v \in R_D\}\) cover \(D\) almost surely. Here, the same symbol \(R\) is used for the following equivariant process (Definition 2.8):

\[
R(v) := R_D(v) := \begin{cases} r, & \text{there is a ball centered at } v \text{ in the covering}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}
\]

for \(v \in D\). Let \(C_r\) be the set of all equivariant \(r\)-coverings. Define

\[
\lambda_r := \lambda_r(D) := \inf \{\text{intensity of } R \text{ in } D : R \in C_r\}, \tag{3.1}
\]

where the intensity is defined in Definition 2.13.

Note that \(\lambda_r\) is non-increasing in terms of \(r\). A smaller \(\lambda_r\) heuristically means that a smaller number of balls per point is needed to cover \(D\). So define

Definition 3.2. The upper and lower unimodular Minkowski dimensions of \(D\) are defined by

\[
\overline{\text{udim}}_M(D) := \overline{\text{decay}} (\lambda_r), \\
\underline{\text{udim}}_M(D) := \underline{\text{decay}} (\lambda_r),
\]

as \(r \to \infty\). If the decay rate of \(\lambda_r\) exists, define the unimodular Minkowski dimension of \(D\) by

\[
\text{udim}_M(D) := \text{decay} (\lambda_r).
\]

One has

\[
0 \leq \underline{\text{udim}}_M(D) \leq \overline{\text{udim}}_M(D) \leq \infty.
\]

Remark 3.3. It is essential that extra randomness is allowed in the definition of equivariant \(r\)-coverings (based on Definition 2.8). In general, one may have to go beyond i.i.d. marks. See for instance Example 3.4 below.
The following are first illustrations of the definition.

**Example 3.4.** The randomly shifted lattice $S_n := (2n + 1)Z^k - U_n$, where $U_n \in \{-n, \ldots, n\}^k$ is chosen uniformly, is an equivariant $n$-covering of $Z^k$ equipped with the $l_\infty$ metric (other metrics can be treated similarly). This implies that $\lambda_n \leq \mathbb{P}[0 \in S_n] = (2n + 1)^{-k}$, and hence, $\text{udim}_M(Z^k) \geq k$.

**Example 3.5.** If $D$ is finite with positive probability, then it can be seen that any non-empty equivariant subset has intensity at least $\mathbb{E}[1/\#D]$ (use the mass transport principle when sending mass $1/\#D$ from every point of the subset to every point of $D$). This implies that $\text{udim}_M(D) = 0$.

**Remark 3.6** (Bounding the Minkowski Dimension). In all examples in this work, lower bounds on the unimodular Minkowski dimension are obtained by constructing explicit examples of $r$-coverings. Upper bounds can be obtained by constructing disjoint or bounded coverings, as discussed in Subsection 3.2 below, or by comparison with the unimodular Hausdorff dimension defined in Subsection 3.3 below (see Theorem 3.22).

### 3.2 Optimal Coverings for the Minkowski Dimension

**Definition 3.7.** Let $[D, o]$ be a unimodular discrete space and $r \geq 0$. If the infimum in the definition of $\lambda_r$ (3.1) is attained by an equivariant $r$-covering $S$; i.e., $\mathbb{P}[o \in S_D] = \lambda_r$, then $S$ is called an **optimal** $r$-covering for $D$.

**Theorem 3.8.** Every unimodular discrete space has an optimal $r$-covering for every $r \geq 0$.

This theorem is proved in Appendix B by tightness arguments. As a corollary, this implies that $\lambda_r > 0$ for every $r$ since any non-empty equivariant subset has positive intensity. In general, finding an optimal covering is difficult. In some specific examples, the following is easier to study.

**Definition 3.9.** Let $K < \infty$ and $r \geq 0$. An $r$-covering of $D$ is **$K$-bounded** if each point of $D$ is covered at most $K$ times a.s. A sequence $(R_n)$ of equivariant coverings of $D$ is called **uniformly bounded** if there is $K < \infty$ such that each $R_n$ is $K$-bounded.

**Lemma 3.10.** If $R$ is a $K$-bounded equivariant $r$-covering of $D$, then

$$\frac{1}{K} \mathbb{P}[R(o) \neq 0] \leq \lambda_r \leq \mathbb{P}[R(o) \neq 0]. \quad (3.2)$$

So if $(R_n)$ is a sequence of equivariant coverings which is uniformly bounded, with $R_n$ an $n$-covering for each $n \geq 1$, then

$$\text{udim}_M(D) = \text{decay}(\mathbb{P}[R_n(o) \neq 0]),$$

$$\text{udim}_M(D) = \text{decay}(\mathbb{P}[R_n(o) \neq 0]).$$
Proof. The rightmost inequality in (3.2) is immediate from the definition of $\lambda_r$.
Let $R'$ be another equivariant $r$-covering. Let $g(u,v) = 1$ if $R'(u) = R(v) = r$ and $d(u,v) \leq r$. Then $g^+(o) \leq K \mathbb{P}(R(o) \neq 0)$ and $g^-(o) \geq \mathbb{1}_{\{R(o) \neq 0\}}$. Hence by the mass transport principle (2.2), $\frac{1}{r} \int_0^r g^+(s) ds \leq \mathbb{P}(R(o) \neq 0)$ and the leftmost inequality in (3.2) then follows from the definition of $\lambda_r$. The last two equalities follow immediately from (3.2).

Corollary 3.11. If $R$ is an equivariant disjoint $r$-covering of $D$ (i.e., the balls used in the covering are pairwise disjoint a.s.), then it is an optimal $r$-covering for $D$.

Example 3.12. The covering of $\mathbb{Z}^k$ (equipped with the $l_\infty$ metric) constructed in Example 3.4 is a disjoint covering. So it is optimal and hence $\overline{\text{udim}}_M(\mathbb{Z}^k) = k$. For $\mathbb{Z}^k$ equipped with the Euclidean metric, one can construct a $3^k$-bounded covering similarly and deduce the same result.

Example 3.13. Let $T_k$ be the $k$-regular tree. Consider a deterministic covering of $T_k$ by disjoint balls of radius $n$. By choosing $o$ in one of these balls uniformly at random, it can be seen that an equivariant disjoint $n$-covering of $[T_k, o]$ is obtained (the proof is left to the reader). So Corollary 3.11 implies that $\lambda_n = 1/\# N_n(o)$ which has exponential decay when $k \geq 3$. Hence, $\overline{\text{udim}}_M(T_k) = \infty$ for $k \geq 3$.

Proposition 3.14. For any point-stationary point process $\Phi$ in $\mathbb{R}$ endowed with the Euclidean metric, by letting $p(r) := \mathbb{P}(\Phi \cap (0,r) = \emptyset)$, one has

\[
\overline{\text{udim}}_M(\Phi) = \text{decay} \left( \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r p(s) ds \right) \leq 1 \land \text{decay} (p(r)),
\]

\[
\overline{\text{udim}}_M(\Phi) = \text{decay} \left( \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r p(s) ds \right) \geq 1 \land \text{decay} (p(r)).
\]

Proof. Let $r > 0$ and $\varphi$ be a discrete subset of $\mathbb{R}$. Let $U_r$ be a random number in $[0, r)$ chosen uniformly. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, put a ball of radius $r$ centered at the largest element of $\varphi \cap [nr + U_r, (n+1)r + U_r)$. Denote this random $r$-covering of $\varphi$ by $R_\varphi$. One can see that $R$ is equivariant under translations (see Remark 2.12). This implies that $R$ is an equivariant covering (verifying Condition (1) of Definition 1.2.8 is skipped here). One has

\[
\mathbb{P}(0 \in R_\varphi) = \mathbb{P}([\Phi \cap (0, U_r) = \emptyset]) = \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r \mathbb{P}(\Phi \cap (0,s) = \emptyset) ds.
\]

Now, since $R$ is a 3-bounded covering, Lemma 3.10 implies both equalities in the claim. The rightmost inequalities are straightforward and are proved in Lemma C.2.

3.3 The Unimodular Hausdorff Dimension

The definition of the unimodular Hausdorff dimension is based on coverings of the discrete space by balls of possibly different radii. Such a covering can be
represented by an assignment of marks to the points, where the mark of a point \( v \) represents the radius of the ball centered at \( v \). For reasons explained in the introduction (Subsection 1.1), the radii are assumed to be at least 1. Also, by convention, if there is no ball centered at \( v \), the mark of \( v \) is defined to be 0.

In relation with this convention, the following notation is used for all discrete spaces \( D \) and points \( v \in D \):

\[
N_r(v) := \begin{cases} 
\{ u \in D : d(v, u) \leq r \}, & r \geq 1, \\
\emptyset, & r = 0.
\end{cases}
\]

In words, \( N_r(v) \) is the closed ball of radius \( r \) centered at \( v \), except when \( r = 0 \).

**Definition 3.15.** Let \( [D, o] \) be a unimodular discrete space. An equivariant (ball-) covering \( R \) of \( D \) is an equivariant process on \( D \) (Definition 2.8) with values in \( \Xi := \{0\} \cup [1, \infty) \) such that the family of balls \( \{N_{R(v)}(v) : v \in D\} \) covers the points of \( D \) almost surely. For simplicity, \( N_{R(v)}(v) \) will also be denoted by \( N_{R(o)}(v) \). Also, for \( 0 \leq \alpha < \infty \) and \( 1 \leq M < \infty \), let

\[
\mathcal{H}^\alpha_M(D) := \inf \{ \mathbb{E}[R(o)^\alpha] : R(v) \in \{0\} \cup [M, \infty), \forall v, \text{ a.s.} \},
\]

(3.3)

where the infimum is over all equivariant coverings \( R \) such that almost surely, \( \forall v \in D : R(v) \in \{0\} \cup [M, \infty) \), and, by convention, \( 0^0 := 0 \). Note that \( \mathcal{H}^\alpha_M(D) \) is a non-decreasing function of both \( \alpha \) and \( M \).

**Definition 3.16.** Let \( [D, o] \) be a unimodular discrete space. The number \( \mathcal{H}^\alpha_1(D) \), defined in (3.3), is called the \( \alpha \)-dimensional Hausdorff content of \( D \). The **unimodular Hausdorff dimension** of \( D \) is defined by

\[
\text{udim}_H(D) := \sup \{ \alpha \geq 0 : \mathcal{H}^\alpha_1(D) = 0 \},
\]

(3.4)

with the convention that \( \sup \emptyset = 0 \).

The key point of assuming equivariance in the above definition is that by Lemma 3.11, \([D, o; R]\) is a unimodular marked discrete space. Note also that extra randomness is allowed in the definition of equivariant coverings. Note also that

\[
0 \leq \mathcal{H}^\alpha_1(D) \leq 1,
\]

since for the covering by balls of radii 1, one has \( \mathbb{E}[R(o)^\alpha] = 1 \).

Examples 3.17 and 3.20 below provide basic illustrations of the unimodular Hausdorff dimension.

**Example 3.17.** If \( D \) is finite with positive probability, then one can show similarly to Example 3.5 that \( \mathbb{E}[R(o)^\alpha] \geq \mathbb{E}[1/\#D] \) for every \( R \), and hence, \( \text{udim}_H(D) = 0 \). Also, for the covering \( S_n \) of \( \mathbb{Z}^k \) constructed in Example 3.3, one has \( \mathbb{E}[S_n(o)^\alpha] = (2n + 1)^{\alpha-k} \). If \( \alpha < k \), this implies that \( \mathcal{H}^\alpha_k(\mathbb{Z}^k) = 0 \), and hence, \( \text{udim}_H(\mathbb{Z}^k) \geq k \). The upper bound \( \text{udim}_H(\mathbb{Z}^k) \leq k \) is implied by Lemma 3.18 below. So \( \text{udim}_H(\mathbb{Z}^k) = k \).
Lemma 3.18. Let $[D, o]$ be a unimodular discrete space and $\alpha \geq 0$. If there exists $c \geq 0$ such that $\forall r \geq 1 : \# N_r(o) \leq cr^\alpha$ a.s., then $\text{udim}_H(D) \leq \alpha$.

Proof. Let $R$ be an arbitrary equivariant covering. For all discrete spaces $D$ and $u, v \in D$, let $g_D(u, v)$ be 1 if $d(u, v) \leq R_D(u)$ and 0 otherwise. One has $g^+(u) = \# N_R(u)$ and $g^-(u) \geq 1$ a.s. (since $R$ is a covering). By the assumption and the mass transport principle (2.2), one gets

$$\mathbb{E}[R(o)^\alpha] \geq \frac{1}{c} \mathbb{E}[\# N_R(o)] = \frac{1}{c} \mathbb{E}[g^+(o)] = \frac{1}{c} \mathbb{E}[g^-(o)] \geq \frac{1}{c}.$$  

Since $R$ is arbitrary, one gets $H^\alpha_1(D) \geq \frac{1}{c} > 0$, and hence, $\text{udim}_H(D) \leq \alpha$. □

Remark 3.19 (Bounding the Hausdorff Dimension). In most examples in this work, a lower bound on the unimodular Hausdorff dimension is provided, either by comparison with the Minkowski dimension (see Subsection 3.4 below), or by explicit construction of a sequence of equivariant coverings $R_1, R_2, \ldots$ such that $\mathbb{E}[R_n(o)^\alpha] \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Note that this gives $H^\alpha_1(D) = 0$, which implies that $\text{udim}_H(D) \geq \alpha$. Constructing coverings does not help to find upper bounds for the Hausdorff dimension. The derivation of upper bounds is mainly discussed in Part II. The main tools are the mass distribution principle (Theorem II.2.2), which is a stronger form of Lemma 3.18 above, and the unimodular Billingsley’s lemma (Theorem II.2.6).

Example 3.20. Let $[D, o]$ be $[Z, 0]$ with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ and $[Z^2, 0]$ with probability $\frac{1}{2}$. It is shown below that $\text{udim}_M(D) = \text{udim}_M(D) = 1$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the equivariant $n$-covering of Example 3.4 makes sense for $D$ and is uniformly bounded. One has $\mathbb{P} [R(0) > 0] = \frac{1}{2}(n^{-1} + n^{-2})$. This implies that $\text{udim}_M(D) = \text{decay}(\frac{1}{2}(n^{-1} + n^{-2})) = 1$ and also $\text{udim}_H(D) \geq 1$. On the other hand, for any equivariant covering $S$, one has

$$\mathbb{E}[S(o)] \geq \mathbb{E}[S(o) | D = Z] \mathbb{P}[D = Z] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[S(o) | D = Z].$$

Let $c > 2$. The proof of Lemma 3.18 for $[Z, 0]$ implies that $\mathbb{E}[S(o) | D = Z] \geq \frac{1}{c}$. This implies that $H^1_1(D) \geq \frac{1}{c} > 0$. So $\text{udim}_H(D) \leq 1$.

Remark 3.21. In Example 3.20 above, different samples of $D$ have different natures heuristically. This is formalized by saying that $[D, o]$ is non-ergodic; i.e., there is an event $A \subseteq D$, such that the proposition $[D, o] \in A$ does not depend on the origin of $D$ and $0 < \mathbb{P} [[D, o] \in A] < 1$. The concept of ergodicity will be discussed in 4. In this work, the focus is mainly on the ergodic case. However the definitions and results do not require ergodicity. In the non-ergodic cases, like in Example 3.20, it is desirable to assign a dimension to every sample of $D$. This will be formalized as sample dimension in 4.

3.4 Comparison of Hausdorff and Minkowski Dimensions

Theorem 3.22 (Minkowski vs Hausdorff). One has

$$\text{udim}_M(D) \leq \text{udim}_M(D) \leq \text{udim}_H(D).$$
Proof. The first inequality holds by the definition. For the second one, the definition of $\lambda_r$ implies that for every $\alpha \geq 0$ and $r \geq 1$,

$$\inf \{ E[R(o)^\alpha] : R is an equivariant r-covering \} = r^\alpha \lambda_r.$$  

This readily implies that $H^\alpha_1(D) \leq r^\alpha \lambda_r$ for every $r \geq 1$. By the definition of the Minkowski dimension, if $\alpha < \udim(D)$, one gets that $H^\alpha_1(D) = 0$, and hence, $\udim(D) \geq \alpha$. This implies the claim. \qed

Remark 3.23. There exist examples in which the inequalities in Theorem 3.22 are strict (see e.g., Subsections 4.2.2 and 4.4). However, equality holds in most of the examples that arise naturally. So, one can say that the equality $\udim(D) = \udim(D)$ expresses some kind of *regularity* for the unimodular discrete space $D$, regarded as a fractal object.

### 3.5 The Unimodular Hausdorff Measure

Consider the setting of Subsection 3.3. For $0 \leq \alpha < \infty$, let

$$H^\alpha_\infty(D) := \lim_{M \to \infty} H^\alpha_M(D) \in [0, \infty],$$

where $H^\alpha_M(D)$ is defined in (3.3). Note that the limit exists because of monotonicity.

**Definition 3.24.** The $\alpha$-dimensional Hausdorff measure of $D$ is

$$\mathcal{M}^\alpha(D) := (H^\alpha_\infty(D))^{-1}.$$  

Rather than being a measure in the mathematical sense, this is a quantification of the size of $D$ and can be used to compare unimodular spaces with equal dimension. The following results gather some elementary properties of the function $H^\alpha_M$ and the Hausdorff measure.

**Lemma 3.25.** One has

(i) $H^0_1(D) \leq H^0_M(D) \leq M^\alpha H^0_1(D)$.

(ii) If $H^0_1(D) = 0$, then $H^0_\infty(D) = 0$; i.e., $\mathcal{M}^0(D) = \infty$.

(iii) If $\alpha \geq \beta$, then $H^\alpha_M(D) \geq M^{\alpha-\beta} H^\beta_M(D)$.

**Proof.**

(i). If $R$ is an equivariant covering, then $MR$ is also an equivariant covering and satisfies $\forall v \in D : MR(v) \in \{0\} \cup [M, \infty)$ a.s.

(ii). The claim is implied by part (i).

(iii). If $R$ is an equivariant covering such that $\forall v \in D : R(v) \in \{0\} \cup [M, \infty)$ a.s., then $R(o)^\alpha \geq M^{\alpha-\beta} R(o)^\beta$ a.s. \qed

**Lemma 3.26.** One has

$\forall \alpha < \udim(D) : \mathcal{M}^\alpha(D) = \infty$,

$\forall \alpha > \udim(D) : \mathcal{M}^\alpha(D) = 0$.  
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Proof. For $\alpha < \dim_H(D)$, one has $H_1^\alpha(D) = 0$. So part (ii) of Lemma 3.25 implies that $M_3^\alpha(D) = \infty$. For $\alpha > \dim_H(D)$, there exists $\beta$ such that $\alpha > \beta > \dim_H(D)$. For this $\beta$, one has $H_1^\beta(D) > 0$ and part (iii) of the same lemma implies that $H_3^\beta(D) = M^\beta - H_3^\beta(D) \geq M^\beta - H_1^\beta(D)$. This implies that $H_3^\alpha(D) = \infty$, which proves the claim. 

Remark 3.27. For $\alpha := \dim_H(D)$, the $\alpha$-dimensional Hausdorff measure of $D$ can be zero, finite or infinite. The lattice $\mathbb{Z}^k$ is a case where $M^\alpha(D)$ is positive and finite (Proposition 3.29 below). Examples II.3.11 and II.3.12 provide examples of the infinite and zero cases respectively.

The exact computation of the Hausdorff measure is generally difficult. The following propositions provide basic examples.

Proposition 3.28 ($0$-dimensional Hausdorff Measure). One has

$$M^0(D) = \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ 1 / \#D \right] \right)^{-1}.$$

Proof. As in Example 3.17, one gets $H_1^0(D) \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ 1 / \#D \right]$. It is enough to show that equality holds. If $D$ is finite a.s., this can be proved by putting a single ball of radius $M \vee \text{diam}(D)$ centered at a point of $D$ chosen uniformly at random. Second, assume $D$ is infinite a.s. It is enough to construct an equivariant covering $R$ such that $\mathbb{P} \left[ R(o) > 0 \right]$ is arbitrarily small. Let $p > 0$ be arbitrary and $S$ be the Bernoulli equivariant subset obtained by selecting each point with probability $p$ in an i.i.d. manner. For all infinite discrete spaces $D$ and $v \in D$, let $\tau_D(v)$ be the closest point of $S_D$ to $v$ (if there is a tie, choose one of them uniformly at random independently). It can be seen that $\tau_D^{-1}(u)$ is finite almost surely (use the mass transport principle for $g(x, y) := 1_{\{y = \tau_D(v)\}}$). For $u \in S_D$, let $R(u) := 1 \vee \text{diam}(\tau_D^{-1}(u))$ be the diameter of the Voronoi cell of $u$. For $u \in D \setminus S_D$, let $R(u) := 0$. It is clear that $R$ is a covering, and in fact, an equivariant covering. One has $\mathbb{P} \left[ R(o) > 0 \right] = \mathbb{P} \left[ o \in S_D \right] = p$, which is arbitrarily small. So the claim is proved in this case.

Finally, assume $D$ is finite with probability $q$. For all deterministic discrete spaces $D$, let $R_D$ be one of the above coverings depending on whether $D$ is finite or infinite. It satisfies $\mathbb{P} \left[ R(o) > 0 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ 1 / \#D \right] + p(1 - q)$. Since $p$ is arbitrary, the claim is proved. 

Proposition 3.29. The $k$-dimensional Hausdorff measure of the scaled lattice $[\delta \mathbb{Z}^k, 0]$, equipped with the $l_\infty$ metric, is given by

$$M_k^k(\delta \mathbb{Z}) = \left( \frac{2}{\delta} \right)^k.$$

Proof. Let $S_n$ be the covering in Example 3.4 scaled by factor $\delta$. One has $\mathbb{E} \left[ S_n(o)^k \right] = (n\delta)^k / (2n + 1)^k$. This easily implies that $H_1^k(\delta \mathbb{Z}) \leq (\delta/2)^k$. On the other hand, the proof of Lemma 3.18 shows that $H_\infty^k(\delta \mathbb{Z}) \geq c \delta^k$, where $c$ is any constant such that $r^k \geq c \#N_r(0)$ for large enough $r$. It follows that $H_\infty^k(\delta \mathbb{Z}) \geq (\delta/2)^k$ and the claim is proved.
3.6 The Effect of a Change of Metric

To avoid confusion when considering two metrics, a pointed discrete space is denoted by \((D, d, o)\) here, where \(d\) is the metric on \(D\) and \(o\) is the origin. Note that if \(d'\) is another metric on \(D\), then \(d' \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times D}\). So \(d'\) can be considered as a marking of \(D\) in the sense of Definition 2.7 and \((D, d; d')\) is a pointed marked discrete space.

Definition 3.30. An equivariant (boundedly finite) metric is an \(\mathbb{R}\)-valued equivariant process \(d'\) (Definition 2.8) such that, for all discrete spaces \(D\), \(d'_D\) is almost surely (w.r.t. the extra randomness) a metric on \(D\) and \((D, d'_D)\) is a boundedly-finite metric space.

If in addition, \([D, d, o]\) is a unimodular discrete space, then \([D, d, o; d']\) is a unimodular marked discrete space by Lemma 2.11. Now, the measurability result of Lemma A.6 in the appendix implies that \([D, d', o; d]\), obtained by swapping the metrics, makes sense as a random pointed marked discrete space.

By verifying the mass transport principle (2.2) directly, it is easy to show that \([D, d', o; d]\) is unimodular.

The following result is valid for both the Hausdorff and the (upper and lower) Minkowski dimensions.

Theorem 3.31 (Change of Metric). Let \([D, d, o]\) be a unimodular discrete space and \(d'\) be an equivariant metric. If \(d' \leq c d + a\) a.s., with \(c\) and \(a\) constants, then the dimension of \((D, d')\) is larger than or equal to that of \((D, d)\). Moreover, for every \(\alpha \geq 0\), \(M^\alpha(D, d') \geq c^{-\alpha} M^\alpha(D, d)\).

Proof. The claim is implied by the fact that the ball \(N_v((D, d'), v)\) contains the ball \(N_v((D, d), v)\).

As a corollary, if \(\frac{1}{2}d - a \leq d' \leq cd + a\) a.s., then \((D, d')\) has the same unimodular dimensions as \((D, d)\). Also, \(cD\) has the same dimension as \(D\) and \(M^\alpha(cD) = c^{-\alpha} M^\alpha(D)\).

For instance, this result can be applied to Cayley graphs, which are an important class of unimodular graphs [2]. It follows that the unimodular dimensions of a Cayley graph do not depend on the generating set. In fact, it will be proved in Subsection II.3.6 that these dimensions are equal to the polynomial growth degree of \(H\).

Example 3.32. Let \([G, o]\) be a unimodular graph. Examples of equivariant metrics on \(G\) are the graph-distance metric corresponding to an equivariant spanning subgraph (e.g., the drainage network model of Subsection 4.5 below) and metrics generated by equivariant edge lengths. More precisely, if \(l\) is an equivariant process which assigns a positive weight to the edges of every deterministic graph, then one can let \(d'(u, v)\) be the minimum weight of the paths that connect \(u\) to \(v\). If \(d'\) is a metric for almost every realization of \(G\) and is boundedly-finite a.s., then it is an equivariant metric.
3.7 Dimension of Subspaces

Let \([D, o]\) be a unimodular discrete space and \(S\) be an equivariant subset which is almost surely nonempty. Lemma 2.14 implies that \(P[o \in S_D] > 0\). So one can consider \([S_D, o]\) conditioned on \(o \in S_D\). By directly verifying the mass transport principle (2.1), it is easy to see that \([S_D, o]\) conditioned on \(o \in S_D\) is unimodal (see the similar claim for unimodal graphs in [6]).

**Convention 3.33.** For an equivariant subset \(S\) as above, the unimodal Hausdorff dimension of \([S_D, o]\) (conditioned on \(o \in S_D\)) is denoted by \(u\dim_H(S_D)\). The same convention is used for the Minkowski dimension, the Hausdorff measure, etc.

**Theorem 3.34.** Let \([D, o]\) be a unimodular discrete space and \(S\) an equivariant subset such that \(S_D\) is nonempty a.s. Then,

(i) One has

\[
\frac{u\dim_H(S_D)}{u\dim_M(S_D)} = \frac{u\dim_H(D)}{u\dim_M(D)}; \\
\frac{u\dim_M(S_D)}{u\dim_M(D)} \geq 1.
\]

(ii) If \(\rho\) is the intensity of \(S\) in \(D\), then for every \(\alpha \geq 0\), the \(\alpha\)-dimensional Hausdorff measure of \(S_D\) satisfies

\[
2^{-\alpha} \rho M^\alpha(D) \leq M^\alpha(S_D) \leq \rho M^\alpha(D).
\]

**Remark 3.35.** Subsection 4.8.1 below defines a modification \(\mathcal{M}'_\alpha(D)\) of the unimodal Hausdorff measure by considering coverings by arbitrary sets. With this definition, one would have \(\mathcal{M}'_\alpha(S_D) = \rho \mathcal{M}'_\alpha(D)\). This can be proved similarly to Theorem 3.34 with the modification that there is no need to double the radii.

**Remark 3.36.** In the setting of Theorem 3.34, \(u\dim_M(S_D)\) can be strictly larger than \(u\dim_M(D)\) (see e.g., Subsection 4.4.3). Also, equality is guaranteed if \(S_D\) is a \(r\)-covering of \(D\) for some constant \(r\).

**Proof of Theorem 3.34.** First, part (i) is proved.

(\[\square\]) The definition of \(\mathcal{H}'_\alpha(S_D)\) implies that there exists a sequence \(R_n\) of equivariant coverings of \(S_D\) such that \(R_n(\cdot) \in \{0\} \cup [n, \infty)\) for all \(n = 1, 2, \ldots\) and \(E[R_n(o)^\alpha | o \in S_D] \to \mathcal{H}'_\alpha(S_D)\). One may extend \(R_n\) to be defined on \(D\) by letting \(R_n(v) := 0\) for \(v \in D \setminus S_D\). Let \(\epsilon > 0\) be arbitrary and \(B_n \subseteq D\) be the union of \(N_{(1+\epsilon)R_n(v)}(v)\) for all \(v \in D\). Define \(R'_n(u) := (1+\epsilon)R_n(u)\) for \(u \in B_n\) and \(R'_n(u) := 1/\epsilon\) for \(u \notin B_n\). It is clear that \(R'_n\) is an equivariant covering of \(D\). Also,

\[
E[R'_n(o)^\alpha] = (1+\epsilon)^\alpha E[R_n(o)^\alpha] + \frac{1}{\epsilon^\alpha} P[o \notin B_n] = \rho (1+\epsilon)^\alpha E[R_n(o)^\alpha | o \in S_D] + \frac{1}{\epsilon^\alpha} P[o \notin B_n]. \tag{3.7}
\]
Since the radii of the balls in $\mathbf{R}_n$ are at least $n$, one gets that $\mathbf{B}_n$ includes the $\epsilon n$-neighborhood of $\mathbf{S}_D$. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{o} \notin \mathbf{B}_n] \leq \mathbb{P}[N_{\epsilon n}(\mathbf{o}) \cap \mathbf{S}_D = \emptyset]$. Since $\mathbf{S}_D$ is nonempty a.s., this in turn implies that $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{o} \notin \mathbf{B}_n] \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ (note that the events $N_{\epsilon n}(\mathbf{o}) \cap \mathbf{S}_D = \emptyset$ are nested and converge to the event $\mathbf{S}_D = \emptyset$). So (3.7) implies that

$$
\liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ R_n'(\mathbf{o})^\alpha \right] = \rho(1 + \epsilon)^\alpha \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ R_n(\mathbf{o})^\alpha | \mathbf{o} \in \mathbf{S}_D \right] = \rho(1 + \epsilon)^\alpha \mathcal{H}_\infty^\alpha(\mathbf{S}_D).
$$

Note that the radii of the balls in $\mathbf{R}_n$ are at least $n \wedge (1/\epsilon)$. Therefore, one obtains $\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon n/\epsilon}^\alpha(\mathbf{D}) \leq \rho(1 + \epsilon)^\alpha \mathcal{H}_\infty^\alpha(\mathbf{S}_D)$. By letting $\epsilon \to 0$, one gets $\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon n}^\alpha(\mathbf{D}) \leq \rho \mathcal{H}_\infty^\alpha(\mathbf{S}_D)$; i.e., $\mathcal{M}^\alpha(\mathbf{S}_D) \leq \rho \mathcal{M}^\alpha(\mathbf{D})$.

Conversely, let $\mathbf{R}_n$ be a sequence of equivariant coverings of $\mathbf{D}$ for $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ such that $\mathbf{R}_n(\cdot) \in \{0\} \cup [n, \infty)$ a.s. and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}_n(\mathbf{o})^\alpha] \to \mathcal{H}_\infty^\alpha(\mathbf{D})$. Fix $n$ in the following. Let $\mathbf{B} := \mathbf{B}_D := \{v : N_{\mathbf{R}_n}(v) \cap \mathbf{S}_D \neq \emptyset\}$. For each $v \in \mathbf{B}$, let $\mathbf{v}_n(v)$ be an element uniformly chosen at random in $N_{\mathbf{R}_n}(v) \cap \mathbf{S}_D$. For $v \notin \mathbf{B}$, let $\mathbf{v}_n(v)$ be undefined. For $w \in \mathbf{S}_D$, let $\mathbf{R}_n(w) := 2 \max \{\mathbf{R}_n(v) : v \in \mathbf{v}_n^{-1}(w)\}$. It can be seen that $\mathbf{R}_n$ is an equivariant covering of $\mathbf{S}_D$. One has

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{R}_n'(\mathbf{o})^\alpha \right] \leq 2^\alpha \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_v \mathbf{R}_n(v)^{\alpha/2} \mathbb{1}_{\{v \in \mathbf{v}_n^{-1}(\mathbf{o})\}} \right] = 2^\alpha \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_v \mathbf{R}_n(\mathbf{o})^{\alpha/2} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{o} \in \mathbf{v}_n^{-1}(v)\}} \right] \leq 2^\alpha \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{R}_n(\mathbf{o})^\alpha \right],
$$

where the equality is by the mass transport principle. It follows that

$$
\rho \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{R}_n'(\mathbf{o})^\alpha | \mathbf{o} \in \mathbf{S}_D \right] \leq 2^\alpha \mathcal{H}_\infty^\alpha(\mathbf{D}).
$$

So $\rho \mathcal{H}_\infty^\alpha(\mathbf{S}_D) \leq 2^\alpha \mathcal{H}_\infty^\alpha(\mathbf{D})$. Hence, $\mathcal{M}^\alpha(\mathbf{S}_D) \geq 2^{-\alpha} \rho \mathcal{M}^\alpha(\mathbf{D})$ and the claim is proved.

The first claim is implied by part (i) and Lemma 3.26. For the two other claims, let $\mathbf{R}$ be an arbitrary equivariant $r$-covering of $\mathbf{D}$. Similarly to the above arguments, let $\mathbf{v}(v)$ be an element picked at random in $N_{\mathbf{r}}(v) \cap \mathbf{S}_D$ and let $\mathbf{R}' := \{\mathbf{v}(v) : v \in \mathbf{D}, N_{\mathbf{r}}(v) \cap \mathbf{S}_D \neq \emptyset\}$. Note that $\mathbf{R}'$ is a $2r$-covering of $\mathbf{S}_D$. So (3.8) implies that for all $\alpha \geq 0$, $\rho \lambda_{2r}(\mathbf{S}_D) \leq 2^{\alpha} \lambda_r(\mathbf{D})$. The claims follow when taking the log and letting $r$ go to infinity.}

### 3.8 Other Variants of the Definitions

#### 3.8.1 Covering By Arbitrary Sets

According to Remark 3.35, it is more natural to redefine the Hausdorff measure by considering coverings by subsets which are not necessarily balls (as in the continuum setting). A technical challenge is to define such coverings in an equivariant way. This will be done at the end of this subsection using the
notion of equivariant processes of Subsection 2.5. Once an equivariant covering \( C \) is defined, one can define the average diameter of sets \( U \in C \) per point by
\[
E \left[ \sum_{U \in C} \frac{1}{\# U} 1_{\{o \in U\}} \text{diam}(U) \right].
\]
The same idea is used to redefine \( H_{\alpha}^M(D) \) as follows:
\[
H'_{\alpha,M}(D) := \inf_{C} \left\{ E \left[ \sum_{U \in C} \frac{1}{\# U} 1_{\{o \in U\}} \left( M \vee \frac{1}{2} \text{diam}(U) \right)^\alpha \right] \right\},
\]
where the infimum is over all equivariant coverings \( C \). Here, taking the maximum with \( M \) is similar to the condition that the subsets have diameter at least \( 2M \) (note for instance that a ball of radius \( M \) might have diameter strictly less than \( 2M \)). Finally, define the modified unimodular Hausdorff measure \( M'_\alpha(D) \) similarly to (3.6). Remark 3.35 shows an advantage of this definition. Also, the reader can verify that
\[
2^{-\alpha} H_{2M}^0(D) \leq H'_{\alpha,M}(D) \leq H_M^\alpha(D).
\]
This implies that the notion of unimodular Hausdorff dimension is not changed by this modification. One can also obtain a similar equivalent form of the unimodular Minkowski dimension. This is done by redefining \( \lambda_r \) by considering equivariant coverings by sets of diameter at most \( 2r \). The details are left to the reader (see also the arXiv version). A similar idea will be used in Subsection 4.1.2 to calculate the Minkowski dimension of one-ended trees.

Finally, here is the promised representation of the above coverings as equivariant processes (it should be noted that such a covering cannot be defined as a numbered sequence of equivariant subsets and the collection should be necessarily unordered). To show the idea, consider a covering \( C = \{U_1, U_2, \ldots\} \) of a deterministic discrete space \( D \), where each \( U_i \) is bounded. For each \( U_i \), assign the mark \((X_i, \text{diam}(U))\) to every point of \( U_i \), where \( X_i \in [0, 1] \) is chosen i.i.d. and uniformly. Note that multiple marks are assigned to every point and the covering can be reconstructed from the marks. With this idea, let the mark space \( \Xi \) be the set of discrete subsets of \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) (regard every discrete set as a counting measure and equip \( \Xi \) with a metrization of the vague topology). This mark space can be used to represent equivariant coverings by equivariant processes as defined in Subsection 2.5 (for having a complete mark space, one can extend \( \Xi \) to the set of discrete multi-sets in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \)).

3.8.2 Gauge Functions and the Unimodular Dimension Function

There exist unimodular discrete spaces \( D \) in which the \( \text{udim}_H(D) \)-dimensional Hausdorff measure is either zero or infinity. For such spaces, it is convenient to generalize the unimodular Hausdorff measure as follows. Consider an increasing function \( \varphi: \{0\} \cup [1, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty) \); e.g., \( \varphi(r) = r^\alpha \), called a gauge function.
Define $H^*_M(D)$ by $\inf_{R} \{ \mathbb{E} [ \phi(R(o))] \}$ similarly to (3.3). Then, define $M^*_\phi(D)$ similarly to (3.6). If $0 < M^*_\phi(D) < \infty$, then $\phi$ is called a **unimodular dimension function** for $D$. This generalization will be used in [4] for having stronger form of the results about connections with scaling limits and some other results.

As an example, it is natural to guess that a dimension function for the zeros of the simple random walk is $\phi(r) := \sqrt{r \log \log r}$ (see Subsections 4.3 and II.3.3.1 for further discussion). Does there exist a unimodular discrete space without any dimension function? The answer is not known yet. The answer to the analogous question in the continuum setting is positive [17], but the proof ideas don’t seem to work in the unimodular discrete setting.

In addition, given a family of gauge functions $(\phi_\alpha)_{\alpha \geq 0}$ that is increasing in $\alpha$ and such that $\forall \alpha > \beta : \lim_{r \to \infty} \phi_\alpha(r)/\phi_\beta(r) = \infty$, one can redefine the unimodular Hausdorff dimension by $\sup \{ \alpha : M^{r_\alpha}(D) = 0 \}$ (see e.g., the next paragraph). The reader can redefine the unimodular Minkowski dimension similarly. Then, the results of this section can be extended to this setting except that Theorem 3.31 and the results of Subsection 3.8.1 require the **doubling condition** $\sup_{r \geq 1} \phi(2r)/\phi(r) < \infty$. The general result of Subsection 4.1.2 can also be extended under the doubling condition. Also, the upper bounds in the unimodular mass distribution principle, the unimodular Billingsley lemma and the unimodular Frostman lemma in Part II hold in this more general setting (some other results of Part II require the doubling condition). However, for the ease of reading, the results are presented in the original setting of this section.

As an example of the above framework, one can define the **exponential dimension** by considering $\phi_\alpha(r) := e^{\alpha r}$. It might be useful for studying unimodular spaces with super-polynomial growth, which are more interesting in group theory (see Subsection II.3.6). Note that exponential gauge functions do not satisfy the doubling condition, and hence, the reader should be careful about using the results of this work for such gauge functions.

### 3.9 Notes and Bibliographical Comments

Several definitions and basic results of this section have analogues in the continuum setting. The following is a list of the analogies. Note however that there is no systematic way of translating the results in the continuum setting to unimodular discrete spaces. In particular, inequalities are most often, but not always, in the other direction. The comparison of the unimodular Minkowski and Hausdorff dimensions (Theorem 3.22) is analogous to the similar comparison in the continuum setting (see e.g., (1.2.3) of [11]), but in the reverse direction. Theorem 3.31 regarding changing the metric is analogous to the fact that the ordinary Minkowski and Hausdorff dimensions are not increased by applying a Lipschitz function. Theorem 3.34 regarding the dimension of subsets is analogous to the fact that the ordinary dimensions do not increase by passing to subsets. Note however that equality holds in Theorem 3.34 for the unimodular Hausdorff dimension (and also for the unimodular Minkowski dimension in most usual examples) in contrast to the continuum setting.
4 Examples

This section presents a large set of examples of unimodular discrete spaces together with discussions about their dimensions. Recall that the tools for bounding the dimensions are summarized in Remarks 3.6 and 3.19. As mentioned in Remark 3.19 bounding the Hausdorff dimension from above usually requires the unimodular mass transport principle or the unimodular Billingsley lemma, which will be stated in Part II. So the upper bounds for most of the following examples are completed in Part II.

4.1 General Unimodular Trees

In this subsection, general results are presented regarding the dimension of unimodular trees with the graph-distance metric. Specific instances are presented later in the section. It turns out that the number of ends of the tree plays an important role (an end in a tree is an equivalence class of simple paths in the tree, where two such paths are equivalent if their symmetric difference is finite).

It is well known that the number of ends in a unimodular tree belongs to \( \{0,1,2,\infty\} \). Unimodular trees without end are finite, and hence, are zero dimensional (Example 3.17). The only point to mention is that there exists an algorithm to construct an optimal \( n \)-covering for such trees. This algorithm is similar to the algorithm for one-ended trees, discussed below, and is skipped for brevity. In addition, it will be shown in Part II that unimodular trees with infinitely many ends have exponential growth, and hence, have infinite Hausdorff dimension. The remaining two cases are discussed below.

4.1.1 Unimodal Two-Ended Trees

If \( T \) is a tree with two ends, then there is a unique bi-infinite path in \( T \) called its trunk. Moreover, each connected component of the complement of the trunk is finite.

**Theorem 4.1.** For all unimodal two-ended trees \( [T,o] \) endowed with the graph-distance metric, one has \( \udim_M(T) = \udim_H(T) = 1 \). Moreover, if \( \rho \) is the intensity of the trunk of \( T \), then the modified 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure of \( T \) is \( M'_1(T) = 2\rho^{-1} \).

**Proof.** For all two-ended trees \( T \), let \( S_T \) be the trunk of \( T \). Then, \( S \) is an equivariant subset (Definition 2.13). Therefore, Theorem 3.34 implies that \( \udim_H(T) = \udim_H(S_T) \). Since the trunk is isometric to \( \mathbb{Z} \) as a metric space, Example 3.17 implies that \( \udim_H(T) = 1 \). In addition, Remark 3.35 and Proposition 3.29 imply that \( M'_1(T) = \rho^{-1}M'_1(\mathbb{Z}) = 2\rho^{-1} \).

The claim concerning the unimodular Minkowski dimension is implied by Corollary II.2.9 of Part II, which shows that any unimodular infinite graph satisfies \( \udim_M(G) \geq 1 \) (this theorem will not be used throughout).
4.1.2 Unimodular One-Ended Trees

Unimodular one-ended trees arise naturally in many examples (see [2]). In particular, the (local weak) limit of many interesting sequences of finite trees/graphs are one-ended ([3, 2]). In terms of unimodular dimensions, it will be shown that unimodular one-ended trees are the richest class of unimodular trees.

First, the following notation is borrowed from [6]. Every one-ended tree \( T \) can be regarded as a family tree as follows. For every vertex \( v \in T \), there is a unique infinite simple path starting from \( v \). Denote by \( F(v) \) the next vertex in this path and call it the parent of \( v \). By deleting \( F(v) \), the connected component containing \( v \) is finite. This set is denoted by \( D(v) \) and its elements are called the descendants of \( v \). The maximum distance of \( v \) to its descendants is called the height of \( v \) and is denoted by \( h(v) \).

\[ \text{Theorem 4.2.} \quad \text{If } [T, o] \text{ is a unimodular one-ended tree endowed with the graph-distance metric, then} \]
\[ \text{udim}_M(T) = 1 + \text{decay} (P[h(o) \geq n]), \quad (4.1) \]
\[ \text{udim}_M(T) = 1 + \text{decay} (P[h(o) \geq n]). \quad (4.2) \]

In addition,
\[ \text{udim}_H(T) \geq \text{decay} (P[h(o) = n]) \geq \text{udim}_M(T). \quad (4.3) \]

It is not known whether (4.3) is sharp or not. It should also be noted that \( \text{decay} (P[h(o) = n]) \) can be strictly larger than \( 1 + \text{decay} (P[h(o) \geq n]) \) (see e.g., Subsection 4.2.2), however, they are equal in most usual examples.

**Lemma 4.3.** For every unimodular one-ended tree \([T, o]\), the output of the following greedy algorithm is an optimal equivariant \( n \)-covering of \( T \).

\[
\text{while true do}
\]
\[
\quad \text{Let } A \text{ be the set of vertices which are not yet covered;}
\]
\[
\quad \text{Let } T' \text{ be the subtree spanned by } A \text{ and the shortest paths connecting the vertices in } A;
\]
\[
\quad \text{Put balls of radii } n \text{ at all vertices of height } n \text{ in } T';
\]
\[
\text{end}
\]

It should be noted that \( A \) might be a disconnected subset of \( T \) in the above algorithm. Note also that the algorithm does not finish in finite time, but for each vertex \( v \) of \( T \), it is determined in finite time whether a ball is put at \( v \) or not. So the output of the algorithm is well defined.

The proof of Lemma 4.3 is omitted since it is similar to that of the next lemma. The latter studies a variant of the algorithm which considers coverings by cones rather than balls. Nevertheless, it will be shown below that the Minkowski dimensions do not change.

The cone with height \( n \) at \( v \in T \) is defined by \( C_n(v) := N_n(v) \cap D(v) \); i.e., the first \( n \) generations of the descendants of \( v \), including \( v \) itself. Let \( \lambda'_n \) be the
infinum intensity of equivariant coverings by cones of height \( n \). The claim is that
\[
\lambda'_{2n} \leq \lambda_n \leq \lambda'_n. \tag{4.4}
\]
This immediately implies that
\[
\underline{\lim}_M(T) = \text{decay}(\lambda'_n), \quad \overline{\lim}_M(T) = \overline{\text{decay}}(\lambda'_n). \tag{4.5}
\]
To prove (4.4), note that any covering by cones of height \( n \) is also a covering by balls of radii \( n \). This implies that \( \lambda_n \leq \lambda'_n \). Also, if \( S \) is a covering by balls of radii \( n \), then \( \{ F^n(v) : v \in S \} \) is a covering by cones of height \( 2n \). By the mass transport principle (2.2), one can show that the intensity of the latter is not greater than the intensity of \( S \). This implies that \( \lambda'_{2n} \leq \lambda_n \). So (4.4) is proved.

**Lemma 4.4.** For every unimodular one-ended tree \([T, o]\), the output \( S \) of the following greedy algorithm is an optimal equivariant covering of \( T \) by cones of height \( n \).

1. \( S := \emptyset \);
2. \( \text{while true do} \)
3. \( T := T \setminus \bigcup_{v \in S} D(v) \);
4. \( \text{end} \)

**Proof.** Let \( A \) be any equivariant covering of \( T \) by cones of height \( n \). Consider a realization \((T; A)\) of \([T; A]\). Let \( v \) be a vertex such that \( h(v) = n \). Since \( A \) is a covering by cones of height \( n \), \( A \) should have at least one vertex in \( D(v) \) (to see this, consider the farthest leaf from \( v \) in \( D(v) \)). Now, for all such vertices \( v \), delete the vertices in \( A \cap D(v) \) from \( A \) and then add \( v \) to \( A \). Let \( A_1 \) be the subset of \( T \) obtained by doing this operation for all vertices \( v \) of height \( n \). So \( A_1 \) is also a covering of \( T \) by cones of height \( n \). Now, remove all vertices \( \{ v : h(v) = n \} \) and their descendants from \( T \) to obtain a new one-ended tree. Consider the same procedure for the remaining tree and its intersection with \( A \). Inductively, one obtains a sequence of subsets \( A = A_0, A_1, \ldots \) of \( T \) such that, for each \( i \), \( A_i \) is a covering of \( T \) by cones of height \( n \) and agrees with \( S_T \) on the set of vertices that are removed from the tree up to step \( i \).

By letting \([T; A]\) be random, the above induction gives a sequence of equivariant subsets \( A = A_0, A_1, \ldots \) on \( T \). It can be seen that the intensity of \( A_1 \) is at most that of \( A \) (this can be verified by the mass transport principle (2.2)). It is left to the reader to obtain inductively that \( \mathbb{P}[o \in A_{i+1}] \leq \mathbb{P}[o \in A_i] \). Also, \( \lim_{i \to \infty} A_i = S \) as equivariant subsets of \( T \). This implies that \( \mathbb{P}[o \in A] \geq \mathbb{P}[o \in S] \), hence, \( S \) is an optimal covering by cones of height \( n \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 4.5.** Under the above setting, one has
\[
\mathbb{P}[h(o) \mod (n+1) = -1] \leq \lambda'_n \leq \mathbb{P}\left[h(o) \mod \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} + 1 \right\rfloor = -1 \right]. \tag{4.6}
\]

**Proof.** An equivariant covering will be constructed to prove the second inequality in (4.6). Let \( A_n := \{ v \in T : h(v) \mod n = -1 \} \) and \( A'_n := \{ F^{n-1}(v) : v \in \)
The claim is that $A_n'$ is a covering of $T$ by cones of height $2n-2$. Let $v \in T$ be an arbitrary vertex. Let $k$ be such that $(k-1)n - 1 < h(v) \leq kn - 1$. Let $j$ be the first nonnegative integer such that $h(F^j(v)) \geq kn - 1$ and let $w := F^j(v)$. One has $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$. By considering the longest path in $D(w)$ from $w$ to the leaves, one finds $z \in D(w)$ such that $h(z) \mod n = -1$ and $0 \leq d(w, z) \leq n - 1$. Therefore $w$ (and hence $v$) is a descendant of $F^{n-1}(z)$. Also, $d(w, F^{n-1}(z)) \leq n - 1$. It follows that $d(v, F^{n-1}(z)) \leq 2n - 2$. So $v$ is covered by the cone of height $2n - 2$ at $F^{n-1}(z)$. Since $F^{n-1}(z) \in A_n'$, it is proved that $A_n'$ gives a $(2n-2)$-covering by cones. It follows that $\lambda_{2n-2} \leq P[o \in A_n'] \leq P[o \in A_n]$ (where the last inequality can be verified by the mass transport principle (2.1)). This implies the second inequality in (4.6).

To prove the first inequality in (4.6), let $S$ be the optimal covering by cones of height $n$ given by the algorithm in Lemma 4.4. Send unit mass from each vertex $v \in S$ to the first vertex in $v, F(v), \ldots, F^n(v)$ which lies in $A_{n+1}$ (if there is any). So the outgoing mass from $v$ is at most $1_{\{v \in S\}}$. In the next paragraph, it is proved that the incoming mass to each $w \in A_{n+1}$ is at least 1. This in turn (by the mass transport principle) implies that $P[o \in S] \geq P[o \in A_{n+1}]$, which proves the first inequality in (4.6).

The final step consists in proving that the incoming mass to each $w \in A_{n+1}$ is at least 1. If $h(w) = n$, then $w \in S$ and the claim is proved. So assume $h(w) > n$. By considering the longest path in $D(w)$ from $w$, one can find a vertex $z$ such that $w = F^{n+1}(z)$ and $h(z) = h(w) - (n + 1)$. This implies that no vertex in $\{F(z), \ldots, F^n(z)\}$ is in $A_{n+1}$. So to prove the claim, it suffices to show that at least one of these vertices or $w$ itself lies in $S$. Note that in the algorithm in Lemma 4.4 at each step, the height of $w$ decreases by a value at least 1 and at most $n + 1$ until $w$ is removed from the tree. So in the last step before $w$ is removed, the height of $w$ is in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$. This is possible only if in the same step of the algorithm, an element of $\{F(z), \ldots, F^n(z), w\}$ is added to $S$. This implies the claim and the lemma is proved.

Now, the tools needed to prove the main results are available.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Lemma 4.5 and (4.5) imply that the upper and lower Minkowski dimensions of $T$ are exactly the upper and lower decay rates of $P[h(o) \mod n = -1]$ respectively. So one should prove that these rates are equal to the upper and lower decay rates of $P[h(o) \geq n]$ plus 1.

The first step consists in showing that $P[h(o) = n]$ is non-increasing in $n$. To see this, send unit mass from each vertex $v$ to $F(v)$ if $h(v) = n$ and $h(F(v)) = n + 1$. Then the outgoing mass is at most $1_{\{h(v) = n\}}$ and the incoming mass is at least $1_{\{h(v) = n + 1\}}$. The result is then followed by the mass transport principle. This monotonicity implies that $n \cdot P[h(o) \mod n = -1] \geq P[h(o) \geq n - 1]$. Similarly, by monotonicity,

\[
\frac{n}{2} P[h(o) \mod n = -1] \leq P[h(o) \mod n \in \{-1, -2, \ldots, -\left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil\}]
\leq P[h(o) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor].
\]
These inequalities conclude the proof of (4.1) and (4.2).

It remains to prove (4.3). The second inequality follows from (4.1) and the fact that $\text{decay} (\mathbb{P}[h(o) = n_i]) \geq \text{decay} (\mathbb{P}[h(o) \geq n_i]) + 1$, which is not hard to see. We now prove the first inequality. Fix $0 < \epsilon < \alpha < \text{decay} (\mathbb{P}[h(o) = n_i])$.

So there is a sequence $n_0 < n_2 < \cdots$ such that $\mathbb{P}[h(o) = n_i] < n_i^{-\alpha}$ for each $i$. One may assume the sequence is such that $n_i \geq 2^i$ for each $i$. Now, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the following covering of $T$:

$$R_k(v) := \begin{cases} 2(n_i - n_{i-1}), & \text{if } h(v) = n_i \text{ and } i > k, \\ 2n_k, & \text{if } h(v) = n_k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By arguments similar to Lemma 4.5 it can be seen that $R_k$ is indeed a covering. It is claimed that $\mathbb{E}[R_k(h(o))^{\alpha - \epsilon}] \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.

If the claim is proved, then $\text{udim}_H(T) \geq \alpha - \epsilon$ and the proof of (4.3) is concluded. Let $c := 2^{\alpha - \epsilon}$. One has

$$\mathbb{E}[R_k(h(o))^{\alpha - \epsilon}] = cn_k^{\alpha - \epsilon} \mathbb{P}[h(o) = n_k] + c \sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} (n_i - n_{i-1})^{\alpha - \epsilon} \mathbb{P}[h(o) = n_i] \leq cn_k^{\alpha - \epsilon} + c \sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} (n_i - n_{i-1})^{\alpha - \epsilon} n_i^{-\alpha}.$$

Therefore, it is enough to prove that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (n_i - n_{i-1})^{\alpha - \epsilon} n_i^{-\alpha} < \infty. \quad (4.7)$$

It is easy to see that the maximum of the function $(x - n_{i-1})^{\alpha - \epsilon} x^{-\alpha}$ over $x \geq n_{i-1}$ happens at $x = $ $n_{i-1}$ and the maximum value is $c'n_i^{-\epsilon}$, where $c' = (\frac{n}{n-1})^{\alpha - \epsilon}$ is a constant. So the left hand side of (4.7) is at most $c' \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} n_i^{-\epsilon}$, which is finite by the assumption $n_i \geq 2^i$. So (4.7) is proved and the proof is completed.

4.2 Instances of Unimodular Trees

This subsection discusses the dimension of some explicit unimodular trees. More examples are given in Subsection 4.5 below, in Part II (e.g., the unimodular Galton-Watson tree and the Poisson weighted infinite tree), and also in [4] (e.g., uniform spanning forests).

4.2.1 The Canopy Tree

The canopy tree $C_k$ with offspring cardinality $k$ is constructed as follows. Its vertex set is partitioned in levels $L_0, L_1, \ldots$. Each vertex in level $n$ is connected to $k$ vertices in level $n - 1$ (if $n \neq 0$) and one vertex (its parent) in level $n + 1$. Let $o$ be a random vertex of $C_k$ such that $\mathbb{P}[o \in L_n]$ is proportional to $k^{-n}$. Then, $[C_k, o]$ is a unimodular random tree.
Below, three types of metrics are considered on $C_k$. First, consider the graph-distance metric. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $S := \{ v \in C_k : h(v) \geq n \}$, where $h(v)$ is the height of $v$ defined in Subsection 4.1.2. The set $S$ gives an equivariant $n$-covering and $\mathbb{P}[o \in S]$ is exponentially small as $n \to \infty$. So $\text{udim}_M(C_k) = \text{udim}_H(C_k) = \infty$.

Second, for each $n$, let the length of each edge between $L_n$ and $L_{n+1}$ be $a^n$, where $a > 1$ is constant. Let $d_1$ be the resulting metric on $C_k$. Given $r > 0$, let $S_1$ be the set of vertices having distance at least $r/a$ to $L_n$ (under $d_1$). One can show that $S_1$ is an $r$-covering of $(C_k, d_1)$ and decay $(\mathbb{P}[o \in S_1]) = \log k / \log a$. Therefore, $\text{udim}_M(C_k, d_1) \geq \log k / \log a$. On the other hand, one can see that the ball of radius $a^n$ centered at $o$ (under $d_1$) has cardinality of order $k^n$. One can then use Lemma 3.18 to show that $\text{udim}_H(C_k, d_1) \leq \log k / \log a$. So $\text{udim}_M(C_k, d_1) = \text{udim}_H(C_k, d_1) = \log k / \log a$.

Third, replace $a^n$ by $a!$ in the second case and let $d_2$ be the resulting metric. Then, the cardinality of the ball of radius $r$ centered at $o$ has order less than $r^\alpha$ for every $\alpha > 0$. One can use Lemma 3.18 again to show that $\text{udim}_H(C_k, d_2) \leq \alpha$. This implies that $\text{udim}_M(C_k, d_2) = \text{udim}_H(C_k, d_2) = 0$.

### 4.2.2 The Generalized Canopy Tree

This example generalizes the canopy tree of Subsection 4.1.1. The goal is to provide an example where the lower Minkowski dimension, the upper Minkowski dimension and the Hausdorff dimension are all different when suitable parameters are chosen.

Fix $p_0, p_1, \ldots > 0$ such that $\sum p_i = 1$. Let $U_0, U_1, \ldots$ be an i.i.d. sequence of random number in $[0, 1]$ with the uniform distribution. For each $n \geq 0$, let $\Phi_n := (\frac{1}{p_0} (\mathbb{Z} + U_n)) \times \{n\}$, which is a point process on the horizontal line $y = n$ in the plane. Let $o_n := (\frac{1}{p_0} U_n, n) \in \Phi_n$ and $\Phi := \cup_i \Phi_i$. Then, $\Phi$ is a point process in the plane which is stationary under horizontal translations. Choose $m$ independent of the sequence $(U_i)_i$ such that $\mathbb{P}[m = n] = p_n$ for each $n$. Then, let $o := o_m$.

Construct a graph $T$ on $\Phi$ as follows: For each $n$, connect each $x \in \Phi_n$ to its closest point (or closest point on its right) in $\Phi_{n+1}$. Note that $T$ is a forest by definition. However, the next lemma shows that $[T, o]$ is a unimodular tree.

**Definition 4.6.** The **generalized canopy tree** with parameters $p_0, p_1, \ldots$ is the unimodular tree $[T, o]$ constructed above.

Note that in the case where $p_n$ is proportional to $k^{-n}$ for $k$ fixed, $[T, o]$ is just the ordinary canopy tree $C_k$ of Subsection 4.1.1. Also, one can generalize the above construction by letting $\Phi_n$ be a sequence of point processes which are (jointly) stationary under horizontal translations (see e.g., the arXiv version).

**Lemma 4.7.** One has

(i) $[\Phi, o]$, endowed with the Euclidean metric, is a unimodular discrete space.

(ii) $T$ is a tree a.s. and $[T, o]$ is unimodular.
Proof. For part (i), it is enough to show that $\Phi - o$ is a point-stationary point process in the plane (see Example 2.6). This is proved in Lemma C.3. The main ingredients are using stationarity of $\Phi$ under horizontal translations and the fact that $\Phi_n - o_n$ is point-stationary (the proof is similar to that of the formula for the Palm version of the superposition of stationary point processes, e.g., in [29].)

To prove (ii), note that $T$ can be realized as an equivariant process on $\Phi$ (see Definition 2.8 and Remark 2.12). Therefore, by Lemma 2.11 and Theorem 3.31, it is enough to prove that $T$ is connected a.s. Nevertheless, the same lemma implies that the connected component $T'$ of $T$ containing $o$ is a unimodular tree. Since it is one-ended, Theorem 3.9 of [6] implies that the foils $T' \cap \Phi_i$ are infinite a.s. By noting that the edges do not cross (as segments in the plane), one obtains that $T' \cap \Phi_i$ should be the whole $\Phi_i$; hence, $T' = T$. Therefore, $T$ is connected a.s. and the claim is proved. 

**Proposition 4.8.** The sequence $(p_n)_n$ can be chosen such that

$$udim_M(T) < \overline{udim}_M(T) < \overline{udim}_H(T),$$

where $T$ is endowed with the graph-distance metric. Moreover, for any $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma \leq \infty$, the sequence $(p_n)_n$ can be chosen such that

$$\overline{udim}_M(T) \leq \alpha, \quad \overline{udim}_M(T) = \beta, \quad \overline{udim}_H(T) \geq \gamma.$$

For example, it is possible to have $\overline{udim}_M(T) = 0$ and $\overline{udim}_H(T) = \infty$ simultaneously.

**Proof.** $T$ is a one-ended tree (see Subsection 4.1.2). Assume the sequence $(p_n)_n$ is non-increasing. So the construction implies that there is no leaf of the tree in $\Phi_n$ for all $n > 0$. Therefore, for all $n \geq 0$, the height of every vertex in $\Phi_n$ is precisely $n$. So by letting $q_n := \sum_{i \geq n} p_i$, Theorem 4.2 implies that

$$\overline{udim}_H(T) \geq \text{decay} (p_n), \quad \overline{udim}_M(T) = 1 + \text{decay} (q_n), \quad \overline{udim}_M(T) = 1 + \text{decay} (q_n).$$

For simplicity, assume $0 < \alpha$ and $\gamma < \infty$ (the other cases can be treated similarly). Define $n_0, n_1, \ldots$ recursively as follows. Let $n_0 := 0$. Given that $n_i$ is defined, let $n_{i+1}$ be large enough such that the line connecting points $(n_i, n_i^{-\beta})$ and $(n_{i+1}, n_{i+1}^{-\beta})$ intersects the graph of the function $x^{-\alpha}$ and has slope larger than $-n^{-\gamma}$. Now, let $q_n := n_i^{-\beta}$ for each $i$ and define $q_n$ linearly in the interval $[n_i, n_{i+1}]$. Let $p_n := q_n - q_{n+1}$. It can be seen that $p_n$ is non-increasing, $\text{decay} (q_n) \leq \alpha$, $\text{decay} (q_n) = \beta$ and $\text{decay} (p_n) \geq \gamma$. 
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4.2.3 Unimodular Eternal Galton-Watson Trees

Eternal Galton-Watson (EGW) trees are defined in [6]. Unimodular EGW trees (in the nontrivial case) can be characterized as unimodular one-ended trees in which the descendants of the root constitute a Galton-Watson tree. Also, the latter Galton-Watson tree is necessarily critical. Here, the trivial case that each vertex has exactly one offspring is excluded (where the corresponding EGW tree is a bi-infinite path). In particular, the Poisson skeleton tree [3] is an eternal Galton-Watson tree.

Recall that the offspring distribution of a Galton-Watson tree is the probability measure \((p_0, p_1, \ldots)\) on \(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\) where \(p_n\) is the probability that the root has \(n\) offsprings.

**Proposition 4.9.** Let \([T, o]\) be a unimodular eternal Galton-Watson tree. If the offspring distribution has finite variance, then \(\text{udim}_M(T) = 2\).

**Proof.** By Kesten’s theorem [23] for the Galton-Watson tree formed by the descendants of the root, \(\lim_n n^2 \mathbb{P}[h(o) \geq n] \) exists and is positive. It follows that \(\mathbb{P}[h(o) \geq n] \) decay \(\mathcal{O}(1)\). So the claim is implied by Theorem 4.2. \(\square\)

In fact, the same result holds for the Hausdorff dimension of \(T\), which will be proved in Theorem II.3.7.

**Conjecture 4.10.** If the offspring distribution is in the domain of attraction of an \(\alpha\)-stable distribution, where \(\alpha \in [1, 2]\), then

\[
\text{udim}_M(T) = \text{udim}_H(T) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1}.
\]

4.3 Examples Associated with Random Walks

Let \(\mu\) be a probability measure on \(\mathbb{R}^k\). Consider the simple random walk \((S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}\), where \(S_0 = 0\) and the jumps \(S_n - S_{n-1}\) are i.i.d. with distribution \(\mu\). In this subsection, unimodular discrete spaces are constructed based on the image and the zero set of this random walk and their dimensions are studied in some special cases. The graph of the simple random walk will be studied in Subsection II.3.3.2.

4.3.1 The Image of the Simple Random Walk

Assume the random walk is transient; i.e., visits every given ball only finitely many times. It follows that the image \(\Phi = \{S_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}\) is a random discrete subset of \(\mathbb{R}^k\). If no point is visited more than once a.s. (as in the following theorem), then it can be seen that \(\Phi\) is a point-stationary point process, hence, \([\Phi, 0]\) is a unimodular discrete space. In the general case, by similar arguments, one should bias the distribution of \([\Phi, 0]\) (Definition 4.11) by the inverse of the multiplicity of the origin; i.e., by \(1/\#\{n : S_n = 0\}\), to obtain a unimodular discrete space. This claim can be proved by direct verification of the mass transport principle.
Proposition 4.11. Let \( \Phi := \{S_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \) be the image of a simple random walk \( S \) in \( \mathbb{R} \), where \( S_0 := 0 \). Assume the jumps \( S_n - S_{n-1} \) are positive a.s.

(i) \( \text{udim}_M(\Phi) = \text{decay} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ S_1 \mathbb{1}_{ \{ S_1 \leq r \} } \right] \right) \geq 1 \wedge \text{decay} (\mathbb{P} [S_1 > r]). \)

(ii) \( \text{udim}_M(\Phi) = \text{decay} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ S_1 \mathbb{1}_{ \{ S_1 \leq r \} } \right] \right) \leq 1 \wedge \text{decay} (\mathbb{P} [S_1 > r]). \)

(iii) If \( \beta := \text{decay} (\mathbb{P} [S_1 > r]) \) exists, then \( \text{udim}_M(\Phi) = 1 \wedge \beta. \)

In fact, the same claims are valid for the Hausdorff dimension as well. This will be shown in Theorem II.3.9.

Proof. For every \( r > 0 \), one has \( \mathbb{P} [\Phi \cap (0, r) = \emptyset] = \mathbb{P} [S_1 \geq r] \). So the claims are direct consequences of Proposition 3.14. \( \square \)

The image of the nearest-neighbor simple random walk in \( \mathbb{Z}^k \) will be studied in \[4\]. It will be shown that it has dimension 2 when \( k \geq 2 \). Furthermore, a doubling property will be proved in this case.

As another example, if \([T, o]\) is any unimodular tree such that the simple random walk on \( T \) is transient a.s., then the image of the (two sided) simple random walk on \( T \) is another unimodular tree (after biasing by the inverse of the multiplicity of the root). The new tree is two-ended a.s., and hence, is 1-dimensional by Theorem 4.1.

4.3.2 Zeros of the Simple Random Walk

Proposition 4.12. Let \( \Psi \) be the zero set of the symmetric simple random walk on \( \mathbb{Z} \) with uniform jumps in \( \{\pm 1\} \). Then, \( \text{udim}_M(\Psi) = \frac{1}{2} \).

In fact, the same result holds for the Hausdorff dimension of \( \Psi \), which will be proved in Proposition II.3.10.

Proof. Represent \( \Psi \) uniquely as \( \Psi := \{S_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \) such that \( S_0 := 0 \) and \( S_n > S_{n+1} \) for each \( n \). Then, \( (S_n)_n \) is another simple random walk and \( \Psi \) is its image. The distribution of the jump \( S_1 \) is explicitly computed in the classical literature on random walks (using the reflection principle). In particular, there exist \( c_1, c_2 > 0 \) such that \( c_1 r^{-\frac{1}{2}} < \mathbb{P} [S_1 > r] < c_2 r^{-\frac{1}{2}} \) for every \( r \geq 1 \). Therefore, the claim is implied by Proposition 4.11. \( \square \)

4.4 A Subspace with Larger Minkowski Dimension

Let \( \Phi \subseteq \mathbb{R} \) be an arbitrary point-stationary point process and \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \). Let \( S_1 \) be the first point of \( \Phi \) on the right of the origin. Assume \( \beta := \text{decay} (\mathbb{P} [S_1 > r]) \) exists (e.g., the case in Theorem 4.1) and \( \alpha < \beta < 1 \). Then, Proposition 3.14 gives that \( \text{udim}_M(\Phi) = \beta. \)

Consider the intervals divided by consecutive points of \( \Phi \). In each such interval, namely \((a, b)\), add \( [(b - a)\alpha] - 1 \) points to split the interval into \( [(b - a)\alpha] \) equal parts. Let \( \Phi' \) denote the resulting point process. By the assumption
\( \alpha < \beta \), one can show that \( \mathbb{E} [S^\alpha_i] < \infty \). Now, by biasing the distribution of \( \Phi \) (Definition C.1) by \( [S^\alpha_i] \) and changing the origin to a point of \( \Phi' \cap [0, S_1) \) chosen uniformly at random, one obtains a point-stationary point process \( \Psi \) (see Theorem 5 in [24] and also the examples in [2]). The distribution of \( \Psi \) is determined by the following equation (where \( h \) is any measurable nonnegative function).

\[
\mathbb{E} [h(\Psi)] = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E} [\lceil S^\alpha_i \rceil]} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{x \in \Phi' \cap [0, S_1)} h(\Phi' - x) \right].
\] (4.8)

**Proposition 4.13.** Let \( \Phi \) and \( \Psi \) be as above. Then, \( \Phi \) has the same distribution as an equivariant subspace of \( \Psi \) (conditioned on having the root) and

\[
\text{udim}_M(\Phi) = \beta > \frac{\beta - \alpha}{1 - \alpha} = \text{udim}_M(\Psi).
\]

Before presenting the proof, note that Theorem 3.34 implies that \( \text{udim}_H(\Phi) = \text{udim}_H(\Psi) \). Therefore, the proposition implies \( \text{udim}_M(\Psi) < \text{udim}_H(\Psi) \).

**Proof.** Let \( A \) be the set of newly-added points in \( \Psi \), which can be defined by adding marks from the beginning and is an equivariant subset of \( \Psi \). By (4.8), one can verify that \( \Psi \setminus A \) conditioned on \( 0 \notin A \) has the same distribution as \( \Phi \) (see also Proposition 6 in [24]). Also, by letting \( c := \mathbb{E} [\lceil S^\alpha_i \rceil] \), (4.8) gives

\[
\mathbb{P} [\Psi \cap (0, r) = 0] = \frac{1}{c} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{x \in \Phi' \cap [0, S_1)} 1_{\{\Phi' - x \cap (0, r) = 0\}} \right] = \frac{1}{c} \mathbb{E} \left[ \lceil S^\alpha_i \rceil 1_{\{\Phi \cap (0, r) = 0\}} \right] = \frac{1}{c} \mathbb{E} \left[ \lceil S^\alpha_i \rceil 1_{\{S_1 / [S^\alpha_i] > r\}} \right].
\]

One can easily deduce that decay \( \mathbb{P} [\Psi \cap (0, r) = 0] = (\beta - \alpha)/(1 - \alpha) \). Therefore, Proposition 3.14 gives the claim. \( \square \)

### 4.5 A Drainage Network Model

Practical observations show that large river basins have a fractal structure. For example, [20] discovered a power law relating the area and the height of river basins. There are various ways to model river basins and their fractal properties in the literature. In particular, [28] formalizes and proves a power law with exponent 3/2 for a specific model called *Howard’s model*. Below, the simpler model of [27] is studied. One can ask similar questions for Howard’s model or other drainage network models.

Connect each \( (x, y) \) in the even lattice \( \{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : x + y \text{ mod } 2 = 0 \} \) to either \( (x - 1, y - 1) \) or \( (x + 1, y - 1) \) with equal probability in an i.i.d. manner to obtain a directed graph \( T \). Note that the downward path starting at a given vertex is the rotated graph of a simple random walk. It is known that \( T \) is
connected and is a one-ended tree (see e.g., [28]). Also, by Lemma 2.11 \([T, 0]\) is unimodular.

Note that by considering the Euclidean metric on \(T\), the Hausdorff dimension of \(T\) is 2. In the following, the graph-distance metric is considered on \(T\).

**Proposition 4.14.** Under the graph-distance metric, one has \(\text{udim}_M(T) = \frac{3}{2}\).

Before presenting the proof, it is worthwhile mentioning that the same result is valid for the Hausdorff dimension of \(T\), which will be proved in Theorem II.3.14.

**Proof.** The idea is to use Theorem 4.2. Following [28], there are two backward paths (going upward) in the odd lattice that surround the descendants \(D(o)\) of the origin. These two paths have exactly the same distribution as (rotated) graphs of independent simple random walks starting at \((-1, 0)\) and \((1, 0)\), respectively, until they hit for the first time. In this setting, \(h(o)\) is exactly the hitting time of these random walks. So classical results on random walks imply that \(P[h(o) \geq n]\) is bounded between two constant multiples of \(n^{-\frac{3}{2}}\) for all \(n\). So Theorem 4.2 implies that \(\text{udim}_M(T) = \frac{3}{2}\). \(\square\)

### 4.6 Self Similar Unimodular Discrete Spaces

This section provides a class of examples of unimodular discrete spaces obtained by discretizing self-similar sets. Let \(l \geq 1\) and \(f_1, \ldots, f_l\) be similitudes of \(\mathbb{R}^k\) with similarity ratios \(r_1, \ldots, r_l\) respectively (i.e., \(\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^k : |f_i(x) - f_i(y)| = r_i|x - y|\)). For every \(n \geq 0\) and every string \(\sigma = (j_1, \ldots, j_n) \in \{1, \ldots, l\}^n\), let \(f_\sigma := f_{j_1} \cdots f_{j_n}\). Also let \(|\sigma| := n\). Fix a point \(o \in \mathbb{R}^k\) (one can similarly start with a finite subset of \(\mathbb{R}^k\) instead of a single point). Let \(K_0 := \{o\}\) and \(K_{n+1} := \bigcup_j f_j(K_n)\) for each \(n \geq 0\). Equivalently,

\[
K_n = \{f_\sigma(o) : |\sigma| = n\}. \tag{4.9}
\]

Recall that if \(r_i < 1\) for all \(i\), then by contraction arguments, \(K_n\) converges in the Hausdorff metric to the attractor of \(f_1, \ldots, f_l\) (see e.g., Section 2.1 of [11]). The attractor is the unique compact set \(K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k\) such that \(K = \bigcup_i f_i(K)\). In addition, if the \(f_i\)'s satisfy the open set condition; i.e., there is a bounded open set \(V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k\) such that \(f_i(V) \subseteq V\) and \(f_i(V) \cap f_j(V) = \emptyset\) for each \(i, j\), then the Minkowski and Hausdorff dimensions of \(K\) are equal to the similarity dimension, which is the unique \(\alpha \geq 0\) such that \(\sum r_i^\alpha = 1\).

The following is the main result of this section. It introduces a discrete analogue of self-similar sets by scaling the sets \(K_n\) and taking local weak limits.

**Theorem 4.15.** Let \(o_n\) be a point of \(K_n\) chosen uniformly at random, where \(K_n\) is defined in (4.9). Assume that \(r_i = r < 1\) for all \(i\) and the open set condition is satisfied. Then,

(i) \([r^{-n}K_n, o_n]\) converges weakly to some unimodular discrete space.
(ii) The unimodular Minkowski and Hausdorff dimension of the limiting space are equal to \( \alpha := \log l/|\log r| \). Moreover, it has positive and finite \( \alpha \)-dimensional Hausdorff measure.

The proof is given at the end of this subsection. In fact, a point process \( \Psi \) in \( \mathbb{R}^k \) will be constructed such that \( [r^{-n}K_n, o_n] \) converges weakly to \([\Psi, o]\). In addition, \( \Psi - o \) is point-stationary. It can also be constructed directly by the algorithm in Remark 4.22 below.

**Definition 4.16.** The unimodular discrete space in Theorem 4.15 is called a self similar unimodular discrete space.

It should be noted that self similar unimodular discrete spaces depend on the choice of the initial point \( o \) in general.

The following are examples of unimodular self similar discrete spaces. The reader is also invited to construct a unimodular discrete version of the Sierpinski carpet similarly.

**Example 4.17.** If \( f_1(x) := x/2 \) and \( f_2(x) := (1 + x)/2 \), then the limiting space is just \( \mathbb{Z} \). Similarly, the lattice \( \mathbb{Z}_k \) and the triangular lattice in the plane are self similar unimodular discrete spaces.

**Example 4.18 (Unimodular Discrete Cantor Set).** Start with two points \( K_0 := \{0, 1\} \). Let \( f_1(x) := x/3 \) and \( f_2(x) := (2 + x)/3 \). Then, \( K_n \) is the set of the interval ends in the \( n \)-th step of the definition of the Cantor set. Here, it is easy to see that the random set \( \Psi_n := 3^n(K_n - o_n) \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \) converges weakly to the random set \( \Psi \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \) defined as follows: \( \Psi := \cup_n T_n \), where \( T_n \) is defined by letting \( T_0 := \{0, \pm 1\} \) and \( T_{n+1} := T_n \cup (T_n \pm 2 \times 3^n) \), where the sign is chosen i.i.d., each sign with probability \( 1/2 \). Note that each \( T_n \) has the same distribution as \( \Psi_n \), but the sequence \( T_n \) is nested. In addition, since \( o_n \) is chosen uniformly, \( \Psi_n \) and \( \Psi \) are point-stationary point processes, and hence \([\Psi, 0] \) is unimodular (a deterministic discrete Cantor set exists in the literature which is not unimodular). Theorem 4.15 implies that \( u\dim_M(\Psi) = u\dim_H(\Psi) = \log 2/\log 3 \).

**Example 4.19 (Unimodular Discrete Koch Snowflake).** Let \( C_n \) be the set of points in the \( n \)-th step of the construction of the Koch snowflake. Let \( x_n \) be a random point of \( C_n \) chosen uniformly and \( \Phi_n := 3^n(C_n - x_n) \). It can be seen that \( \Phi_n \) tends weakly to a random discrete subset \( \Phi \) of the triangular lattice which is almost surely a bi-infinite path (note that the cycle disappears in the limit). It can be seen that \( \Phi \) can be obtained by Theorem 4.15. In this paper, \( \Phi \) is called the unimodular discrete Koch snowflake. Also, Theorem 4.15 implies that \( u\dim_M(\Phi) = u\dim_H(\Phi) = \log 4/\log 3 \).

In addition, \( \Phi \) can be constructed explicitly as \( \Phi := \cup_n T_n \), where \( T_n \) is a random finite path in the triangular lattice with distinguished end points \( A_n \) and \( B_n \) defined inductively as follows: Let \( T_1 := \{A_1, B_1\} \), where \( A_1 \) is the origin and \( B_1 \) is a neighbor of the origin in the triangular lattice chosen uniformly at random. For each \( n \geq 1 \), given \( (T_n, A_n, B_n) \), let \( (T_{n+1}, A_{n+1}, B_{n+1}) \) be...
There are 4 ways to attach the copies and one of them should be chosen at random with equal probability (the copies should be attached to $T_n$ relative to the position of $A_n$ and $B_n$). It can be seen that no points overlap.

Remark 4.20. If the $r_i$'s are not all equal, the guess is that there is no scaling of the sequence $[K_n, o_n]$ that converges to a nontrivial unimodular discrete space (which is not a single point). This has been verified by the authors in the case $o \in V$. In this case, by letting $a_n$ be the distance of $o_n$ to its closest point in $K_n$, it is shown that for any $\epsilon > 0$, $P\left[\frac{a_n}{(\bar{r})^n} < \epsilon\right] \to \frac{1}{2}$ and $P\left[\frac{a_n}{(\bar{r})^n} > \frac{1}{2}\right] \to \frac{1}{2}$, where $\bar{r}$ is the geometric mean of $r_1, \ldots, r_l$. This implies the claim (note that the notion of convergence in Appendix A implies that; e.g., $\{0, \frac{1}{n}\}$ does not converge to $\{0\}$).

To prove Theorem 4.15 it is useful to consider the following nested version of the sets $K_n$ (note that $K_n$ is not necessarily contained in $K_{n+1}$, unless $o$ is a fixed point of some $f_i$). Let $u_1, u_2, \ldots$ be i.i.d. uniform random numbers in $\{1, \ldots, l\}$ and $\delta_n := (u_n, \ldots, u_1)$. Let $o'_n := f_{\delta_n}(o)$. Let $K_n := f_{\delta_n}^{-1}K_n = f_{u_1}^{-1} \cdots f_{u_n}^{-1}K_n$. The chosen order of the indices in $\delta_n$ ensures that $K_n \subseteq K_{n+1}$ for all $n$. It is easy to see that $[K_n, o]$ has the same distribution as $[r^{-n}K_n, o'_n]$. For $v \in K_n$, let

$$w_n(v) := \# \{\sigma : |\sigma| = n, f_\sigma(o) = f_{\delta_n}(v)\}.$$

One has $w_n(v) \leq w_{n+1}(v)$. Note that in the case $o \in V$, $w_n(\cdot) = 1$ and the
arguments are much simpler. The reader can assume this at first reading.

In the following, for \( x \in \mathbb{R}^k \), \( B_r(x) \) represents the closed ball of radius \( r \) centered at \( x \) in \( \mathbb{R}^k \).

**Lemma 4.21.** Let \( \hat{K} := \bigcup_n K_n \) and \( w(v) := \lim_n w_n(v) \) for \( v \in \hat{K} \).

(i) \( w(\cdot) \) is uniformly bounded.

(ii) Almost surely, \( \hat{K} \) is a discrete set.

(iii) The distribution of \( [\hat{K}, o] \), biased by \( 1/w(o) \) (Definition C.1), is the limiting distribution alluded to in Theorem 4.15.

**Proof.** (i). Assume \( f_{\sigma_1(o)} = \cdots = f_{\sigma_k(o)} \) and \( |\sigma_j| = n \) for each \( j \leq k \). Let \( D \) be a fixed number such that \( V \) intersects \( B_D(o) \). Now, the sets \( f_{\sigma_j}(V) \) for \( 1 \leq j \leq k \) are disjoint and intersect a common ball of radius \( Dr^n \). Moreover, each of them contains a ball of radius \( abr^n \) and each is contained in a ball of radius \( br^n \) (for some fixed \( a, b > 0 \)). Therefore, Lemma 2.2.5 of [11] implies that \( k \leq \left( \frac{D+2b}{a} \right)^k =: C \). This implies that \( w_n(\cdot) \leq C \) a.s., hence \( w(\cdot) \leq C \) a.s.

(ii). Let \( D \) be arbitrary as in the previous part. Assume \( f_{\delta_1}^{-1} f_{\sigma_j(o)} \in B_D(o) \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, k \). Now, for \( j = 1, \ldots, k \), the sets \( f_{\sigma_j}(V) \) are disjoint and intersect a common ball of radius \( 2Dr^n \). As in the previous part, one obtains \( k \leq \left( \frac{2D+2b}{a} \right)^k \). Therefore, \#\( N_D(o) \leq \left( \frac{2D+2b}{a} \right)^k \) a.s. Since this holds for all large enough \( D \), one obtains that \( \hat{K} \) is a discrete set a.s.

(iii). Note that the distribution of \( o'_n \) is just the distribution of \( o_n \) biased by the multiplicities of the points in \( K_n \). It follows that biasing the distribution of \( [K_n, o] \) by \( 1/w_n(o) \) gives just the distribution of \( [r^{-n} K_n, o_n] \). The latter is unimodular since \( o_n \) is uniform in \( K_n \). So the distribution of \( [\hat{K}, o] \) biased by \( 1/w(o) \) is also unimodular and satisfies the claim of Theorem 4.15. \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem 4.15** Convergence is proved in Lemma 4.21. The rest of the proof is based on the construction of a sequence of equivariant coverings of \( \hat{K} \). In this proof, with an abuse of notation, the dimension of \( \hat{K} \) means the dimension of the unimodular space obtained by biasing the distribution of \( \hat{K} \) by \( 1/w(o) \) (see Lemma 4.21). Let \( D > \text{diam}(K) \) be given, where \( K \) is the attractor of \( f_1, \ldots, f_l \). Let \( m > 0 \) be large enough so that \( \text{diam}(K_m) < D \). Note that each element in \( \hat{K} \) can be written as \( f_{\delta_h}^{-1} f_{\sigma}(o) \) for some \( n \) and some string \( \sigma \) of length \( n \). Let \( \gamma_m \) be a string of length \( m \) chosen uniformly at random and independently of other variables. For an arbitrary \( n \) and a string \( \sigma \) of length \( n \), let

\[
U_\sigma := f_{\delta_{n+m}}^{-1} f_{\sigma}(K_m),
\]

\[
z_\sigma := f_{\delta_{n+m}}^{-1} f_{\sigma} f_{\gamma_m}(o).
\]

Note that \( U_\sigma \subseteq \hat{K} \) is always a scaling of \( K_m \) with ratio \( r^{-m} \) and \( z_\sigma \in U_\sigma \). Now, define the following covering of \( \hat{K} \):

\[
R_m(v) := \begin{cases} 
Dr^{-m}, & \text{if } v = z_\sigma \text{ for some } \sigma, \\
0, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]
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It can be seen that $R_m$ gives an equivariant covering. Also, note that $R_m(o) > 0$ if and only if $f_o f_m(o) = f_{o + n}^m(o)$ for some $n$ and some string $\sigma$ of length $n$. Let $A_{n,m}(o)$ be the set of possible outcomes for $\gamma_m$ such that there exists a string $\sigma$ of length $n$ such that the last equation holds. One can see that this set is increasing with $n$ and deduce that $w_m(o) \leq \# A_{n,m}(o) \leq w_{n+m}(o)$. By letting $w'_m(o) := \# \bigcup_n A_{n,m}(o)$, it follows that $w_m(o) \leq w'_m(o) \leq w(o)$. According to the above discussion, $R_m(o) > 0$ if and only if $\gamma_m \in \bigcup_n A_{n,m}(o)$. So

$$P[R_m(o) > 0 | u_0, u_1, \ldots] = w'_m(o)r^{\alpha}.$$ 

Therefore, by considering the biasing that makes $\hat{K}$ unimodular, one gets

$$E\left[\frac{1}{w(o)}1_{\{R_m(o) > 0\}}\right] = E\left[\frac{w'_m(o)r^{\alpha}}{w(o)}\right] \leq r^{\alpha}. \quad (4.10)$$

Since the balls in the covering have radius $Dr^{-m}$, one gets $\dim_k(\hat{K}) \geq \alpha$.

On the other hand, by (4.10) and monotone convergence, one finds that

$$E\left[\frac{1}{w(o)}1_{\{R_m(o) > 0\}}\right] \geq \frac{1}{2}r^{\alpha},$$

for large enough $m$. Similar to the proof of part (i) of Lemma 4.21, one can show that the sequence of coverings $R_m$ (for $m = 1, 2, \ldots$) is uniformly bounded. Therefore, Lemma 4.10 implies that $\dim_k(\hat{K}) = \alpha$. Moreover, since $E[R_m(o)^\alpha/w(o)]$ is bounded (by $D^{\alpha}$), one can get that $\dim_k(\hat{K}) > 0$.

Lemma 3.18 will be used to bound the Hausdorff dimension. Let $D > 1$ be arbitrary. Choose $m$ such that $r^{-m} \leq D < r^{-m-1}$. By Lemma 4.21 there are finitely many points in $\hat{K} \cap B_D(o)$. Therefore, one finds $n$ such that $K \cap K \cap B_D(o) = \hat{K} \cap B_D(o)$. It follows that the sets $\{U_\sigma : |\sigma| = n\}$ cover $\hat{K}$. Now, assume $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_k$ are strings of length $n$ such that $U_\sigma_i$ are distinct and intersects $B_D(o)$. One obtains that

$$\#B_D(o) \cap \hat{K} \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \#B_D(o) \cap U_\sigma_j \leq kl^m = kr^{-m} \leq kD^{\alpha}. \quad (4.11)$$

Consider the sets $V_\sigma := f_{s_{\sigma}^{-1}} f_\sigma(V)$ which are disjoint (since $\sigma_j$’s have the same length). Note that if $\epsilon > \text{diam}(V \cup \{o\})$ is fixed, then the $\epsilon$-neighborhood of $V$ contains $K_m$. Therefore, all $V_\sigma$’s intersect a common ball of radius $D + cr^{-m} \leq (1+\epsilon)D$. Moreover, each of them contains a ball of radius $ar^{-m} \geq arD$ and is contained in a ball of radius $br^{-m} \leq bD$ (for some $a, b > 0$ not depending on $D$). Therefore, Lemma 2.2.5 of [11] implies that $k \leq (\frac{(1+\epsilon)+2b}{ar})^k$. Therefore, (4.11) implies that

$$\#B_D(o) \cap \hat{K} \leq CD^{\alpha}, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Therefore, Lemma 3.18 implies that $\dim_k(\hat{K}) \leq \alpha$. Moreover, the proof of the lemma shows that $\dim_k(\hat{K}) < \infty$. This completes the proof. \[ \square \
**Remark 4.22.** Motivated by Examples 4.18 and 4.19, it can be seen that every unimodular self similar discrete space can be constructed by successively attaching copies of a set to itself. This is expressed in the following algorithm.

\[
\hat{K}_0 := \{o\};
\]
Let \(g_0\) be the identity map;
Choose i.i.d. random numbers \(i_1, i_2, \ldots\) uniformly in \(\{1, \ldots, l\}\);
for \(n = 1, 2, \ldots\) do
\[
\hat{K}_n := \bigcup_{j=1}^{l} g_{n-1}f_{i_j}^{-1}g_{n-1}^{-1}(\hat{K}_{n-1});
\]
Let \(g_n := g_{n-1}f_{i_n}^{-1}\);
end

### 4.7 Notes and Bibliographical Comments

Some of the examples in this section, listed below, are motivated by analogous examples in the continuum setting. In fact, the unimodular dimensions of these examples are equal to the ordinary dimensions of the analogous continuum examples. This connection will be discussed further in [4] via scaling limits.

Theorem 4.9 and Conjecture 4.10 regarding the EGW are inspired by the dimension of the Brownian continuum random tree and stable trees respectively (see Theorem 5.5 of [16]), which are scaling limits of Galton-Watson trees conditioned to be large. The zero set of the simple random walk (Theorem 4.12) is analogous to the zero set of Brownian motion. Self-similar unimodular discrete spaces are inspired by continuum self-similar sets (see e.g., Section 2.1 of [11]) as discussed in Subsection 4.6.

### Appendices

**Appendix A  A Metric on the Space of Pointed Discrete Spaces**

In this appendix, a metric is defined on \(D_*\) and it is shown that \(D_*\) is a Borel subset of some Polish space. The same is done for the sets \(D_{**}, D'_*\) and \(D'_{**}\).

**Definition A.1.** Let \((D, o)\) and \((D', o')\) be pointed discrete spaces. An \(r\)-embedding between \((D, o)\) and \((D', o')\), where \(r > 0\), is an injective function...
$f : N_r(o) \to D'$ such that $f(o) = o'$ and has distortion at most $\frac{1}{r}$; i.e.,
\[
\forall x, y \in N_r(o) : |d(x, y) - d(f(x), f(y))| \leq \frac{1}{r}.
\] (A.1)

If such a function exists, then $(D, o)$ is $r$-embeddable in $(D', o')$. If each one of $(D, o)$ and $(D', o')$ is $r$-embeddable in the other, then they are called $r$-similar.

Note that the image of $f$ is not necessarily contained in $N_r(o')$. However, by (A.1), it is contained in $N_{r+1/r}(o')$. Note also that if $(D, o)$ is $r$-embeddable in $(D', o')$ and $0 < s < r$, then the former is also $s$-embeddable in the latter.

**Definition A.2.** For two pointed discrete spaces $(D, o)$ and $(D', o')$, define

\[
\kappa((D, o), (D', o')) := 1 \wedge \inf\{\epsilon > 0 : (D, o) and (D', o') are 1/\epsilon-similar\}.
\]

The definition clearly depends only on the isomorphism classes of $(D, o)$ and $(D', o')$. So $\kappa$ is well defined as a function on $D_* \times D_*$. At the end of this subsection, $\kappa$ is extended to a distance function on the set $\hat{D}_*$, which heuristically is the set of pointed discrete spaces in which every point has some multiplicity.

**Theorem A.3.** The function $\kappa$ is a metric on $\hat{D}_*$. Moreover, $\hat{D}_*$ is a Polish space and contains $D_*$ as a Borel subset.

The proof of this theorem is given in Appendix C. It should be noted that $D_*$ is not complete itself.

Similar definitions and arguments can be proposed for $D_{**}, D'_*$ and $D'_{**}$. The latter is briefly explained below. Let $(D, o, p; m)$ and $(D', o', p'; m')$ be two doubly-pointed marked discrete spaces. Define $r$-embeddings similarly to Definition A.1 by adding the constrains $f(p) = p'$ (which requires $r \geq d(o, p)$) and in addition,

\[
\forall x, y \in N_r(o) : d\left(m(x, y), m'(f(x), f(y))\right) \leq \frac{1}{r}.
\]

Being $r$-similar and $\kappa$ are also defined in the same way. The result analogous to Theorem A.3 is the following theorem. It can be proved with the same arguments and its proof is skipped.

**Theorem A.4.** The sets $D_{**}, D'_*$ and $D'_{**}$, equipped with the distance function $\kappa$, are metric spaces and are Borel subsets of some Polish spaces.

**Remark A.5.** The Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov topology (see e.g., [30]) is defined on the set of boundedly-compact pointed metric spaces equipped with boundedly-finite Borel measures. This induces a topology on $D_*$ (here, one should equip every discrete metric space $D$ with the counting measure on $D$). It can be seen that the metric $\kappa$ is a metrization of this topology. It can also be seen that $\kappa$ extends the metric between rooted graphs used in [2] and called the Benjamini-Schramm metric [10]. Also, on the class of discrete subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$, its topology extends the classical one in the context of point processes, which is that of vague convergence (see e.g., Appendix A of [14]).
The following lemma is needed in Subsection 3.6. Its proof is provided in Appendix C.

Lemma A.6. Let \( N \subseteq D'_* \) be the set of pointed marked discrete spaces \([\langle D, d \rangle, o; d']\) with mark space \( \mathbb{R} \) such that \( d' \) is a boundedly-finite metric on \( D \). Then, \( N \) is a Borel subset of \( D'_* \) and the map \( \rho : N \to N \) defined by \( \rho([\langle D, d \rangle, o; d']) := ([\langle D, d' \rangle, o; d]) \) is Borel measurable.

Now, the precise definition of the set \( \hat{D}_* \) is provided. Here, multiplicity of points is represented by the notion of pseudo metrics. Recall that a set \( D \) equipped with a function \( d : D \times D \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) is called a pseudo metric space, if \( d \) has the properties of a metric except that, \( d(x, y) = 0 \) does not necessarily imply \( x = y \). The balls \( N_r(v) \) are defined in the usual way. In this paper, it is always assumed that the pseudo metric is boundedly finite; i.e., every subset of \( D \) included in a ball of finite radius is finite. For the sake of simplicity, the term discrete pseudo metric space (abbreviated as DPMS) will be used to refer to boundedly finite pseudo metric spaces. Pointed DPMSs and isomorphisms are defined in the usual way. Let \( \hat{D}_* \) be the set of equivalence classes of pointed DPMSs under isomorphism. Note that \( D_* \subseteq \hat{D}_* \). Now, \( r \)-embeddability, \( r \)-similarity and the function \( \kappa \) can be defined in exactly the same way as in Definitions A.1 and A.2.

Appendix B  Tightness for Equivariant Processes

The following proposition is a converse to Lemma 2.11. Its proof is moved to Appendix C.

Proposition B.1. Let \( [D, o] \) be a unimodular discrete space. If \( [D', o'; m'] \) is a unimodular marked discrete space such that \( [D', o'] \) (obtained by forgetting the marks) has the same distribution as \( [D, o] \), then there is an equivariant process \( Z \) such that \( [D, o; Z_D] \) has the same distribution as \( [D', o'; m'] \).

Remark B.2. Lemma 2.11 and Proposition B.1 imply that equivariant processes on \( D \) are equivalent to unimodular marked discrete spaces \( [D', o'; m'] \) such that \( [D', o'] \) has the same distribution as \( [D, o] \). This enables one to define weak convergence of equivariant processes on \( D \) as probability measures on \( D'_* \).

Lemma B.3. Let \( [D, o] \) be a unimodular discrete space. If \( \Xi \) is a compact metric space, then the set of \( \Xi \)-valued equivariant processes on \( D \) is tight and compact under weak convergence (see Remark B.3).

Proof. Let \( M \) be the set of unimodular marked discrete spaces \( [D', o'; m'] \) with marks in \( \Xi \) such that \( [D', o'] \) has the same distribution as \( [D, o] \). By Remark B.2 it is enough to prove that \( M \) is tight and compact. It is easy to see that \( M \) is closed (under weak convergence). So it is enough to show that it is tight. Let \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \( \pi : D'_* \to D_* \) be the projection of forgetting the marks. By Prokhorov’s theorem, there is a compact set \( K \subseteq D_* \) such that...
\( \mathbb{P} \left[ [D, o] \in K \right] > 1 - \epsilon \). So for any equivariant process \([D', o'; m']\) on \([D, o]\) with values in \( \Xi \), \( \mathbb{P} \left[ [D', o'; m'] \in \pi^{-1}(K) \right] > 1 - \epsilon \). It is shown below that \( \pi^{-1}(K) \) is compact. This implies that \( M \) is tight and the claim is proved.

To prove compactness of \( \pi^{-1}(K) \), let \([D_n, o_n; m_n] \in \pi^{-1}(K)\) be an arbitrary sequence. By compactness of \( K \), one may assume \([D_n, o_n] \) is convergent. Let \( r > 0 \) be given. According to the proof of Lemma C.5, the sequence \#\(N_r(o_n)\) is bounded. Now, the proof of the claim that \([D_n, o_n; m_n]\) has a convergent subsequence is similar to that of Lemma C.5 and is left to the reader (one should first show that the sequence of balls \([N_r(o_n), o_n; m_n]\) has a convergent subsequence and then, deduce the claim by a diagonal argument).

This tightness criterion implies the existence of optimal coverings as follows.

**Proof of Theorem 3.8.** Let \( S_1, S_2, \ldots \) be a sequence of \( r \)-coverings of \( D \) such that \( \mathbb{P} \left[ o \in S_n \right] \to \lambda_r \). By Lemma B.3 and choosing a subsequence if necessary, one may assume from the beginning that the equivariant subsets \( S_n \) converge weakly to an equivariant subset \( S \) of \( D \). Since each \( S_n \) is an \( r \)-covering, \( \mathbb{P} \left[ S_n \cap N_r(o) = \emptyset \right] = 0 \). It is straightforward to deduce \( \mathbb{P} \left[ S \cap N_r(o) = \emptyset \right] = 0 \). So by putting balls of radius \( r \) on the points of \( S, o \) is covered a.s. So Lemma 2.14 implies that every point is covered a.s.; i.e., \( S \) is an \( r \)-covering. Also, by weak convergence, \( \mathbb{P} \left[ o \in S \right] = \lim_n \mathbb{P} \left[ o \in S_n \right] = \lambda_r \). This implies that \( S \) is an optimal \( r \)-covering.

**Appendix C  Proofs and Auxiliary Lemmas**

Some of the definitions, proofs and lemmas are gathered in this appendix to prevent distraction from the main thread of the paper.

**Definition C.1.** Let \( \mu \) be a probability measure on a measurable space \( X \) and \( w : X \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \) be a measurable function. Assume \( 0 < c := \int_X w(x)d\mu(x) < \infty \). By biasing \( \mu \) by \( w \) we mean the measure \( \nu \) on \( X \) defined by

\[
\nu(A) := \frac{1}{c} \int_A w(x)d\mu(x).
\]

The choice of \( c \) implies that \( \nu \) is a probability measure (in some literature, the normalizing factor \( \frac{1}{c} \) is dropped in the definition). It is the unique probability measure on \( X \) whose Radon-Nikodym derivative w.r.t. \( \mu \) is proportional to \( w \).

In particular, let \( X := D_\ast \) and \( \mu \) be the distribution of a random pointed discrete space \([D, o]\). Denote by \([D', o']\) the random pointed discrete space with distribution \( \nu \) defined above. For every measurable function \( f : D_\ast \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \), one gets

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ f[D', o'] \right] = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E} \left[ w[D, o] \right]} \mathbb{E} \left[ f[D, o] w[D, o] \right].
\]

It can be seen that biasing \( \mu \) by \( w \) is equal to \( \mu \) if and only if \( w \) is almost surely constant w.r.t. \( \mu \); i.e., for some constant \( k \in \mathbb{R} \) one has \( w = k \), \( \mu \)-a.s.
Lemma C.2. Let $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a non-increasing function and $g(r) := \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r f(s) \, ds$. Then, $\text{decay} (g) \geq 1 \land \text{decay} (f)$ and $\text{decay} (g) \leq 1 \land \text{decay} (f)$.

Proof. For $\beta < \text{decay} (f(r))$, one has $f(r) < r^{-\beta}$ for large enough $r$. If in addition $\beta < 1$, one gets that $\frac{1}{r} \int_0^r f(s) \, ds \leq c r^{-\beta}$ for some constant $c$. This implies the first claim. Similarly, for $\beta > \text{decay} (f(r))$, one can show that $\beta \geq \text{decay} \left( \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r f(s) \, ds \right)$. In addition, for $c := \int_0^1 f(s) \, ds$ and all $r \geq 1$, one has $\frac{1}{r} \int_0^r f(s) \, ds \geq \frac{c}{r}$. So $\text{decay} (g) \leq 1$. This implies the second claim and the proof is complete.

Proof of Lemma 2.11. In what follows, (2.3) is written in the forms $Q(A) = \mathbb{P} [ [D, o, Z_D] \in A ]$ or $Q(A) = \mathbb{E} [ \int 1_A [D, o, m] dP_D(m) ]$ by keeping in mind that a realization of $[D, o]$ is considered in the term inside the expectation. To prove unimodularity, let $f : D'_{\text{u}} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a measurable function. For all deterministic discrete spaces $D$ and $x, y \in D$, let

$$g(D, x, y) := \mathbb{E} [ f(D, x, y; Z_D) ] = \int f(D, x, y; m) dP_D(m).$$

One has

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{x \in D} f[D, o, x; Z_D] \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int \sum_{x \in D} f[D, o, x; m] dP_D(m) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{x \in D} g[D, o, x] \right].$$

One can similarly obtain that $\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{x \in D} f[D, x, o; Z_D] \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{x \in D} g[D, x, o] \right]$. Therefore, the claim follows by (2.1) for $g$.

Lemma C.3. In the setting of Subsection 4.2.2, $\Phi - o$ is a point-stationary point process.

Proof. Let $g = g(\varphi, x, y)$ be a (measurable) function that assigns a real number to every discrete subset $\varphi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ and each $x, y \in \varphi$ which is invariant under (joint) translations of $\varphi, x$ and $y$. The claim is that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{x \in \Phi} g(\Phi, o, x) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{x \in \Phi} g(\Phi, x, o) \right].$$

By additivity, it is enough to assume that $g(\Phi, x, y)$ is zero except when $x \in \Phi_i$ and $y \in \Phi_j$ for some fixed $i$ and $j$. So (C.1) is equivalent to

$$p_i \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{x \in \Phi_j} g(\Phi_i, o_i, x) \right] = p_j \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{x \in \Phi_i} g(\Phi_i, o_j, x) \right].$$

(C.2)
Define $h : \mathbb{Z}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ by $h(k, l) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum \sum g(\Phi, x, y) \right]$, where the sum is over all pairs of points $x, y \in \Phi$ such that

$$x \in [k, k+1) \times \{i\}, \quad y \in [l, l+1) \times \{j\}.$$ 

It can be seen that (C.2) can be written as

$$\sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} h(0, l) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} h(k, 0). \quad (C.3)$$

Note that the coefficients $p_i$ and $p_j$ disappear in this formula since one has $P [o_i \in [0,1) \times \{i\}] = p_i$. Now, the invariance of $g$ under translations and the stationarity of $\Phi$ under horizontal translations imply that $h(0, k) = h(-k, 0)$. This proves (C.3). So (C.1) is also proved and hence, $\Phi - o$ is a point-stationary point process.

For the following lemmas, recall $\kappa$ and $\hat{D}_*$ from Appendix A.

**Lemma C.4.** The function $\kappa$ is a metric on $\hat{D}_*$.

**Proof.** The definition readily implies that $\kappa$ is well defined on $\hat{D}_*$ and is symmetric. Also, it is clear that for all $[D, o] \in \hat{D}_*$, one has $\kappa([D, o], [D, o]) = 0$.

Conversely, assume $(D, o)$ and $(D', o')$ are pointed DPMSs satisfying the condition $\kappa((D, o), (D', o')) = 0$. The first claim is that for all $r > 0$, there is a pointed-isomorphism between $N_r(o)$ and $N_r(o')$. Let $r > 1$ be given. Let $s \geq r$ be large enough, which will be determined later. Since $\kappa((D, o), (D', o')) = 0 < \frac{1}{s}$, the definition of $\kappa$ implies that there is an injective function $f : N_r(o) \to D'$ such that $f(o) = o'$ and the distortion of $f$ is at most $\frac{1}{s} \leq \frac{1}{r}$. By (A.1), the image of $f$ is contained in $N_{r+1/s}(o')$. Assume $s$ is large enough to ensure that $N_{r+1/s}(o') = N_r(o')$ (which is possible since $N_r(o')$ is a closed ball). So the range of $f$ is contained in $N_r(o')$. Being injective implies that $\# N_r(o) \leq \# N_r(o')$. By switching the roles of the two spaces, one similarly proves the other direction of the inequality; Hence $\# N_r(o) = \# N_r(o')$. This implies that $f : N_r(o) \to N_r(o')$ is a bijection. Since the distortion is at most $\frac{1}{s}$ and the sets are discrete, by choosing $s$ large enough, $f$ is necessarily an isometry between $N_r(o)$ and $N_r(o')$. So the above claim is proved.

For each integer $n \geq 1$, let $A_n$ be the finite set of pointed-isomorphisms from $N_n(o)$ to $N_n(o')$ which is already shown to be nonempty. It is clear that for $n \geq 2$ and $f \in A_n$, the restriction of $f$ to $N_{n-1}(o)$ belongs to $A_{n-1}$. Therefore, by König’s infinity lemma, there is a sequence of isomorphisms $f_n \in A_n$ such that the restriction of $f_n$ to $N_{n-1}(o)$ is equal to $f_{n-1}$ for each $n$. Now, one can safely define $\rho(v) := \lim f_n(v)$ for each $v \in D$. It is easy to see that $\rho$ is an isomorphism between $(D, o)$ and $(D', o')$. So $[D, o] = [D', o']$.

It remains to prove the triangle inequality for $\kappa$. Let $(D_i, o_i), 1 \leq i \leq 3$ be pointed DPMSs. Let $\kappa_{ij} := \kappa((D_i, o_i), (D_j, o_j))$. One has to prove $\kappa_{13} \leq \kappa_{12} + \kappa_{23}$. If $\kappa_{12} + \kappa_{23} \geq 1$, the claim is clear. So assume $\kappa_{12} + \kappa_{23} < 1$. Let $\epsilon > \kappa_{12}$ and $\delta > \kappa_{23}$ be arbitrary such that $\epsilon + \delta < 1$. Below, it is proved that $\kappa_{13} \leq \epsilon + \delta$. Since $\epsilon$ and $\delta$ are arbitrary, the claim follows.
Since $\kappa_{12} < 1$, $\kappa_{12} < \epsilon$ and $\epsilon + \delta > \epsilon$, by Definition A.2 there is an injective function $f : \mathcal{N}_{1/(\epsilon + \delta)} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_2$ with distortion at most $\epsilon$ such that $f(o_1) = o_2$. Similarly, there is an injective function $g : \mathcal{N}_{1/\delta} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_3$ with distortion at most $\delta$ such that $f(o_2) = o_3$. The image of $f$ is contained in $\mathcal{N}_{1/(\epsilon + \delta) + \epsilon}(o_2)$. It is straightforward that $\epsilon + \delta < 1$ implies $1/(\epsilon + \delta) + \epsilon < 1/\delta$. Therefore, $g \circ f : \mathcal{N}_{1/(\epsilon + \delta)}(o_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_3$ is well defined. By the definition of distortion in (A.1), one readily gets that the distortion of $g \circ f$ is at most $\epsilon + \delta$. This means that $(\mathcal{D}_1, o_1)$ is $(\epsilon + \delta)^{-1}$-embeddable in $(\mathcal{D}_3, o_3)$. By swapping the roles of the two spaces, one gets that they are $(\epsilon + \delta)^{-1}$-similar. This means that $\kappa_{13} \leq \epsilon + \delta$ and the claim is proved.

**Lemma C.5.** The metric space $\mathcal{D}_* \hat{D}_*$ is complete and separable.

**Proof.** It is straightforward to see that every element of $\mathcal{D}_*$ can be approximated by a sequence of finite pointed DPMSs for which the pseudo metrics are rational valued. This implies the separability of $\hat{D}_*$. To prove completeness, assume $\{(\mathcal{D}_r, o_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\hat{D}_*$ under the metric $\kappa$. One needs to show that it has a convergent subsequence.

The first claim is that, for all given $r > 0$, $\{(\mathcal{D}_r, o_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded. Assume this is not the case. So for each $m$, there is $n > m$ such that $\# \mathcal{N}_r(o_n) > \# \mathcal{N}_r(o_m)$. The reader can verify that this implies that $\kappa((\mathcal{D}_n, o_n), (\mathcal{D}_m, o_m)) \geq 1/2$, which contradicts being a Cauchy sequence. So this claim is proved.

The second claim is that for $r > 0$ given, the sequence of balls $\{\mathcal{N}_r(o_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has a convergent subsequence under the metric $\kappa$ (it should be noted that the whole sequence is not necessarily convergent). By the above argument and passing to a subsequence, one may assume $\# \mathcal{N}_r(o_n) = l$ for each $n$, where $l$ is constant. For each $n$, consider an arbitrary order on the points of $\mathcal{N}_r(o_n)$ but let $o_n$ be the first in this order. Let $A(n)$ be the distance matrix of $\mathcal{N}_r(o_n)$ (i.e., $A(n)_{i,j}$ is the distance from the $i$-th point to the $j$-th point). Note that the entries of these matrices are in $[0, 2r]$. Therefore, one can find a convergent subsequence of these matrices, say converging to matrix $A$. It is easy to see that $(i, j) \mapsto A(n)_{i,j}$ is a pseudo metric on $\{1, \ldots, l\}$. Let $D'_m$ be the resulting DPMS with origin $o'_m := 1$. Now, it is easy to see that $\kappa(\mathcal{N}_r(o_n), (D'_m, o'_m)) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and the second claim is proved.

Third, by a diagonal argument using the second claim, one can assume that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lim_n \mathcal{N}_m(o_n)$ exists (in $\hat{D}_*$), say $(\mathcal{D}'_m, o'_m)$. Fix $m$ and let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. So for large enough $n$, one has $\kappa(\mathcal{N}_m(o_n), (\mathcal{D}'_m, o'_m)) < \epsilon$ and $\kappa(\mathcal{N}_m(o_n), (\mathcal{D}'_{m-1}, o'_{m-1})) < \epsilon$. If $\epsilon < 1/m$, there exist injective functions $f : \mathcal{D}'_m \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_m(o_n)$ and $g : \mathcal{N}_{m-1}(o_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'_{m-1}$ with distortion less than $\epsilon$ and respecting the origins. Therefore, $g \circ f$ is well-defined on $\mathcal{N}_{m-1}(o'_m)$, has injective and has distortion less than $2\epsilon$. By letting $\epsilon$ tend to zero while $m$ is fixed, one finds an isometric embedding of $\mathcal{N}_{m-1}(o'_m)$ into $\mathcal{D}'_{m-1}$, where $\mathcal{N}_m(\cdot)$ is the open ball $\{u \in D : d(o, u) < r\}$. By considering $\epsilon$-embeddings in the other side, one also finds an isometric embedding of $\mathcal{N}_{m-1}(o'_m)$ into $\mathcal{D}'_{m}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{N}_{m-1}(o'_m)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{N}_{m-1}(o'_{m-1})$. It follows that the sequence $D'_m(o'_m)$ of pointed DPMSs can be paste together to form a pseudo metric space, namely...
(D, o), which is discrete and boundedly finite. Also, $N_m^m(o)$ is isometric to $N_m^m(o'_m)$ for each m. It follows easily that $κ((D_n, o_n), (D, o)) → 0$. In other words, $[D_n, o_n] → [D, o]$. □

Proof of Theorem A.3 It is proved in the above lemmas that $\hat{D}_∗$ is a complete separable metric space. So it remains to prove that $D_∗$ is a Borel subset of $\hat{D}_∗$. For integers $m, n ≥ 1$, let $A_{m, n}$ be the set of elements $[D, o] ∈ \hat{D}_∗$ such that for all distinct pairs $x, y ∈ N_m^m(o)$ (where $N_m^m(o)$ is the open ball defined above), one has $d(x, y) ≥ \frac{1}{m}$. It is not hard to show that $A_{m, n}$ is a closed subset of $\hat{D}_∗$ and also $D_∗ = \cap_m \cup_n A_{m, n}$. This proves the claim. □

Proof of Lemma A.6 The proof of the first claim is similar to that of Theorem A.3. For $n ∈ \mathbb{N}$ and $ε > 0$, let $N_{n, ε}$ be the set of $[(D, d), o; d'] ∈ D_∗$ such that the restriction of $d'$ to $N_m^m(o)$ is a metric and $\forall u ≠ v ∈ N_m^m(o) : d'(u, v) ≥ ε$. It is not hard to see that $N_{n, ε}$ is closed in $\hat{D}_∗$. Also, one has $N' = \cap_n \cup_m N_{n, 1/m}$. This implies that $N'$ is Borel subset of $D_∗$.

For the second claim, it is enough to prove that the inverse image of any open ball in $\mathcal{N}$ under $ρ$ is measurable. Let $ξ_0 := [(D_0, d_0), o_0; d'_0] ∈ N$ and consider the open ball $U := B_r(ξ_0) := \{ξ ∈ \mathcal{N} : ρ(ξ) < ε\}$ in $\mathcal{N}$. Let $r > 1/ε$ be an arbitrary rational number and $M ∈ \mathbb{N}$. Let $A_{r, M}$ be the set of $[(D, d), o; d'] ∈ N$ such that $ρ(N_M^m(o))$ and $ξ_0$ are $r$-similar (Definition A.1), where $N_M^m(o)$ is equipped with the origin and metrics induced from $[(D, d), o; d']$. It is not hard to show that $A_{r, M}$ is a closed subset of $\mathcal{N}$. Also, one has $ρ^{-1}(U) = \cup_{r > 1/ε} \cap_M A_{r, M}$. This implies that $ρ^{-1}(U)$ is a Borel subset of $\mathcal{N}$ and the claim is proved. □

Proof of Proposition B.1 The claim is proved by invariant disintegration applied to the action of a group constructed in [18]. Let $π : D_∗ → D_*$ be defined by $π[D, o; m] := [D, o]$. First, assume that $D$ has no automorphisms other than the identity a.s. Let $D$ be the class of discrete spaces with no nontrivial automorphisms. Consider the equivalence relations $R$ and $R'$ on $D_*$ and $D_*$ respectively, defined by:

$$∀D ∈ D : ∀u, v ∈ D : [D, u] ∼_R [D, v] \text{ and } [D, u; m] ∼_{R'} [D, v; m].$$

Here, for all discrete spaces $D ≠ D$, the elements $[D, u]$ and $[D, u; m]$ are not equivalent to any other elements. It can be seen that $R$ and $R'$ are Borel equivalence relations (see [18] for the definition). By Theorem 1 of [18], there is a countable group $H$ acting measurably on $D_*$ such that for every $[D, o] ∈ D_*$, its $R$-equivalence class is just $\{h · [D, o] : h ∈ H\}$. Note that when $D ∈ D$, the $R$-equivalence class of $[D, o]$ (resp. $[D, o; m]$) is countable and has a natural bijection with $D$. If so, the action of every $h ∈ H$ induces a natural map $h_D : D → D$ and this map is bijective. Hence, $H$ acts on $D_*$ as well by letting $h · [D, o; m] := [D, h_D(o); m]$ when $D ∈ D$ and $h · [D, o; m] := [D, o; m]$ when $D ∉ D$. Note that this action generates the equivalence relation $R'$.

Since $D$ has no nontrivial automorphisms a.s., so does $D_*$. So, given $h ∈ H$, the map $h_D'$ is bijective a.s. Therefore, by using the mass transport principle (2.2), one can show that $h · [D', o'; m']$ has the same distribution as
\[D',o';m']\] (this is analogous to Mecke’s theorem. See also [25] or Proposition 3.6 of [6]). In addition, the joint distribution of \([D',o';m'],[D',o']\) is invariant under the diagonal action of the group \(H\). Therefore, the invariant disintegration theorem [22] gives a kernel \(t\) from \(D\) to \(D'\), that is invariant under the diagonal action of \(H\) and such that \(t([D,o],\cdot)\) is supported on \(\pi^{-1}[D,o]\) and \(t\) pushes the distribution of \([D',o']\) to the distribution of \([D',o';m']\). For every deterministic \(D \in D\) and \(o \in D\), the probability measure \(t([D,o],\cdot)\) gives a random element \(Z_{(D,o)} \in \Xi^D\). It can be shown from the invariance of \(t\) that \(Z_{(D,h,o)}\) has the same distribution as \(Z_{(D,o)}\) for every \(h \in H\). Hence, \(Z_{(D,v)}\) has the same distribution as \(Z_{(D,o)}\) for every \(v \in D\). So one can finally write \(Z_D\) instead of \(Z_{(D,o)}\). It can be seen that \(Z\) satisfies the claim.

Now, consider the general case when \(D\) may have nontrivial automorphisms. Let \(U\) be the equivariant process obtained by adding i.i.d. marks to the point \(s\) with the uniform distribution on \([0,1]\). Then, \([D,o;U]\) is unimodular and has no nontrivial automorphisms a.s. Also, by Remark 2.12, \([D',o';(U,m')]\) is an equivariant process on \([D,o;U]\). Now, one can repeat the above arguments line by line, which results in a random element in \(\Xi^{D \times D}\) for every \(D\) that is equipped with distinct marks in \([0,1]\). By regarding the latter marks as an additional source of randomness, this gives the desired \(Z_D\) for non-marked \(D\), which satisfies the claim.

\[\square\]
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