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Abstract. Let $G$ be a quasi-transitive graph on $V$. A random field $X = (X_v)_{v \in V}$ whose distribution is invariant under all automorphisms of $G$ is said to be a factor of i.i.d. if there exists an i.i.d. process $Y = (Y_v)_{v \in V}$ and an equivariant map $\varphi$ such that $\varphi(Y)$ has the same distribution as $X$. Such a map, also called a coding, is said to be finitary if, for every $v \in V$, there exists a finite (but random) set $U \subset V$ such that $\varphi(Y)_v$ is determined by $\{Y_u\}_{u \in U}$. We construct a coding for the random-cluster model on general quasi-transitive graphs, and show that the coding is finitary whenever the free and wired measures coincide. This strengthens a result of H"aggstr"om–Jonasson–Lyons [18]. We also prove that the coding radius has exponential tails in the sub-critical regime. As a corollary, we obtain a finitary coding for the sub-critical Potts model on $G$ whose coding radius has exponential tails. In the case of $G = Z^d$, we also construct a finitary, translation-equivariant coding for the sub-critical random-cluster and Potts models using a finite-valued i.i.d. process $Y$. To do this, we extend a mixing-time result of Martinelli–Olivieri [22] to infinite-range monotone models on quasi-transitive graphs of sub-exponential growth. Our methods also apply to any monotone model satisfying mild technical (but natural) requirements.

1. Introduction

Consider an infinite graph $G = (V, E)$ and a random field $X = (X_v)_{v \in V}$ whose distribution is invariant under all automorphisms of $G$. This paper is concerned with the question of existence of codings (factor maps): is it possible to express $X$ as an automorphism-equivariant function of a random field $Y = (Y_v)_{v \in V}$, where the $Y_v$'s are independent and identically distributed? The answer to this question depends on the graph $G$ and the random field $X$. The theory of such codings traces back to the seminal work of Ornstein [23] and later Keane and Smorodinsky [20], who studied the case in which $G = Z$ and $X$ itself is an i.i.d. process. In this case, Keane and Smorodinsky showed that $X$ and $Y$ are finitarily isomorphic – a stronger condition than the one we require. The study of the one-dimensional problem when $X$ is a more general process remains an active research topic.

In the setting of the $d$-dimensional lattice $Z^d$, it is very natural to ask whether the Ising model is a factor of an i.i.d. process. This model, perhaps the most famous of the statistical physics models, is infamously trivial on $Z$, but exhibits a phase transition on $Z^d$ when $d \geq 2$ – and hence, it is appropriate to study it on non one-dimensional lattices. In an unpublished work, Ornstein and Weiss [24] (see also [1] for a published version) showed that the (infinite-volume) plus state of the Ising model at any positive temperature is a factor of an i.i.d. process. Steif [29] showed a similar but stronger result for monotone spin systems. In both of these cases, the factor maps may be infinitely dependent, in the sense that determining the value of $X$ at the origin may require knowing the value of infinitely many elements of $Y$. Van den Berg and Steif [2] showed that the sub-critical Ising model has a finitary coding. Explicitly, they construct a factor map $\varphi$ from an i.i.d. process $Y$ to any sub-critical Ising model such that $\varphi(Y)$ at the origin depends on a finite (but random) number of $Y_v$'s; in fact, their work quantifies this finiteness by controlling the coding radius of the map, proving that the “amount of information” required to determine $\varphi(Y)$ at the origin...
origin has exponential tails. The same work showed that no such finitary coding can exist for the super-critical Ising model on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Recent works constructed finitary codings for Markov random fields with spatial mixing properties \[27\], or long-range interacting particles systems that satisfy a “high noise” condition \[12\].

The initial goal of this project was to show that the random-cluster model on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is a finitary factor of an i.i.d. process. Unlike the Ising model, the random-cluster model has infinite-range interactions – i.e. the state of an edge in the random-cluster model may have a nonvanishing effect on the state of an edge that is arbitrarily far away from it. Häggström–Jonasson–Lyons \[18\] constructed a factor map for the random-cluster model on a general quasi-transitive graph, but did not study whether it is finitary. Although the methods we use yield more general results, the main result of this paper is the construction of a finitary coding for the random-cluster model on an arbitrary quasi-transitive graph when the free and wired measures coincide. For the sub-critical random-cluster models, the coding radius of the factor will have exponential tails. As a consequence, we obtain results for the Potts model on such graphs. In the case of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, we also prove the existence of a finite-valued coding – i.e. a factor map in which each $Y_v$ is supported on a finite set.

The general framework discussed in this paper is that of monotone specifications. A formalization of concepts first introduced in the work of Dobrushin \[7\] and Landford–Ruelle \[21\], specifications are families of finite-volume measures, indexed by sets and configurations, that satisfy certain consistency relations. They are called monotonic (or attractive) if the measures respect a partial ordering on configurations, in the sense of stochastic domination; this property is a generalization of the FKG property of the random-cluster model, or Griffiths’ inequalities for the Ising model. The generality of the framework has many possible applications. Here, we discuss applications to the critical loop $O(n)$ model on the hexagonal lattice, and to subcritical long-range Ising models. In the latter case, a finitary coding was only known for sufficiently high temperatures (see \[11\], for example).

We end by briefly discussing the algorithmic aspects of our results. There is an extensive literature focused on perfect simulations of infinite-range models \[4, 6, 12, 13\]; for an example involving the “high noise” regimes of the random-cluster model on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, see \[5\]. The proofs given in this paper rely on the method of coupling-from-the-past of Propp and Wilson \[26\]. This technique uses dynamics in order to get a perfect simulation of the stationary distribution of a finite-state Markov chain. In our setting, we apply coupling-from-the-past to the single-site Glabuer dynamics (in the same spirit as previous works, e.g., \[2, 19\]). As such, there is an interest in controlling not only the spatial dependence of the factor map (i.e. the coding radius), but also the mixing time, which measures the number of steps of the dynamics required to perfectly sample $X$ at the origin. The celebrated work of Martinelli and Olivieri \[22\] relates spatial and temporal mixing in the context of the finite-range, finite-energy, monotone models on $\mathbb{Z}^d$; as part of this work, we prove a generalization of this result to infinite-range, monotone models on quasi-transitive graphs of sub-exponential growth. With this perspective, it is clear that the existence of space-time finitary factors has algorithmic implications: one may create a perfect sample of $X$ on a finite subset of $\mathbb{V}$ by applying the space-time finitary factor map to the i.i.d. process $Y$ on some random (and possibly much larger) finite subset of $\mathbb{V}$. Controlling the size of the latter set is tantamount to quantitative control on the coding radius and mixing time.

2. Definitions and Results

2.1. Factors and coding radius. Let $\mathbb{V}$ be countably infinite and let $\Gamma$ be a group acting on $\mathbb{V}$. The action is quasi-transitive if it partitions $\mathbb{V}$ into finitely many orbits. Let $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S})$ and $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T})$ be two measurable spaces, and let $X = (X_v)_{v \in \mathbb{V}}$ and $Y = (Y_v)_{v \in \mathbb{V}}$ be $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S})$-valued and $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T})$-valued
Γ-invariant random fields. For the rest of the paper, we will assume that all probability spaces are standard.

A coding from $Y$ to $X$ is a measurable function $\varphi: T^V \to S^V$, which is $\Gamma$-equivariant, i.e., commutes with the action of every element in $\Gamma$, and satisfies $\varphi(Y)^d = X$. Such a coding is also called a factor map or homomorphism from $Y$ to $X$; when such a coding exists, we say that $X$ is a $\Gamma$-factor of $Y$.

Suppose that $G$ is a locally-finite graph on vertex set $V$ and that $\Gamma$ acts quasi-transitively on $V$ by automorphisms of $G$. Thus, $G$ is a quasi-transitive graph; heuristically, such a graph has finitely many “different types” of vertices (whereas a transitive graph has exactly one). We say that a pair of configurations $y, y' \in T^V$ agree up to distance $r$ around a vertex $v$ if $y_w = y'_w$ for all $v$ with $\text{dist}(v, w) \leq r$. We say that $\varphi$ is determined at distance $r$ around $v$ at a configuration $y$ if $\varphi(y)_v = \varphi(y')_v$ for any $y'$ which agrees with $y$ up to distance $r$. The coding radius of $\varphi$ at the vertex $v$ and the configuration $y$, which we denote by $R_v(y)$, is the minimal distance that determines $\varphi$ at $v$ and $y$. It may happen that no such $r$ exists, in which case, $R_v(y) = \infty$. Thus, associated to a coding is a random variable $R_v = R_v(Y)$ which describes the coding radius at $v$. A coding is called finitary if $R_v$ is almost surely finite for every $v \in V$. When there exists a finitary coding from $Y$ to $X$, we say that $X$ is a finitary $\Gamma$-factor of $Y$.

We categorize factor maps as follows: When $X$ is a $\Gamma$-factor of an i.i.d. (independent and identically distributed) process, we say it is $\Gamma$-iid, and when it is a finitary $\Gamma$-factor of an i.i.d. process, we say it is $\Gamma$-ffiid. A still stronger notion is $\Gamma$-ffv-ffiid which requires $\Gamma$-finitary and that $\Gamma$ acts quasi-transitively on $V$. For the rest of the paper, if a measure is said to be fiid (or any variant thereof) without an explicit mention of $\Gamma$, we assume the group is taken to be the full automorphism group of the graph.

2.2. The random-cluster model and main results. The main goal of this paper is to show that certain measures – namely, the random-cluster measures on an infinite, locally finite, quasi-transitive graph $G = (V,E)$ – are (finitary) factors of i.i.d. processes. Under assumptions of uniqueness of the Gibbs measure, the factors will be finitary; if we additionally assume the measure is subcritical in some sense, the coding will have exponential tails. Finally, in the case of the subcritical random-cluster model on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, we show the unique Gibbs measure is f-fiid with stretched-exponential tails.

Let us now define the random-cluster model; for background on the model and the results mentioned below, we direct the reader to the monographs [16] and [8]. Consider a finite subgraph $G_n = (V_n,E_n)$ of $G$, and let $\partial V_n$ denote the set of vertices in $V_n$ that have a neighbor in $V \setminus V_n$, and let $\partial E_n$ denote the set of edges in $E \setminus E_n$ that share an endpoint with an edge in $E_n$. A percolation configuration $\omega$ is an element of $\{0,1\}^E_n$. An edge $e$ is said to be open (in $\omega$) if $\omega_e = 1$, otherwise it is closed. A configuration $\omega$ can be seen as a subgraph of $G_n$ with vertex set $V_n$ and edge-set $\{e \in E_n : \omega_e = 1\}$. When speaking of connections in $\omega$, we view $\omega$ as such a subgraph. A cluster is a connected component of $\omega$. Let $o(\omega)$ and $c(\omega)$ denote the number of open edges and closed edges in $\omega$, respectively. Let $k^0(\omega)$ denote the number of clusters of $\omega$, and $k^1(\omega)$ the number of clusters of $\omega$ when all clusters intersecting $\partial V_n$ are counted as a single cluster.

The random-cluster measure in $G_n$ with parameters $p \in [0,1]$ and $q > 0$ and boundary conditions $i \in \{0,1\}$ is given by

$$
\phi_{G_n,p,q}^i(\omega) = \frac{p^o(\omega)(1-p)^c(\omega)q^{k^1(\omega)}}{Z'(G_n,p,q)},
$$
where \( Z^i(G_n, p, q) \) is a normalizing constant, called the partition function, which makes \( \phi^i_{G_n, p, q} \) a probability measure. We call the measures free and wired when \( i = 0 \) and \( i = 1 \), respectively. Our results apply in the regime \( q \geq 1 \), where the random-cluster model has the FKG property (a monotonicity property). Formally, when \( q \geq 1 \),

\[
\phi^i_{G_n, p, q}(A \cap B) \geq \phi^i_{G_n, p, q}(A) \cdot \phi^i_{G_n, p, q}(B)
\]

for any increasing events \( A \) and \( B \), where we say that an event \( A \subset \{0, 1\}^{E_n} \) is increasing if \( \omega \in A \) implies \( \omega' \in A \) for any \( \omega \subset \omega' \). In this regime, it is straightforward to show that sequence of measures \( (\phi^i_{G_n, p, q})_n \) converges weakly as \( n \to \infty \), as long as \( G_n \) increases to \( G \). The limiting measures, \( \phi^0_{p, q} \) and \( \phi^1_{p, q} \), which are probability measures supported on \( \{0, 1\}^{E} \), are called the free and wired infinite-volume random-cluster measures. Both measures are independent of the choice of the exhausting sequence \( (G_n)_n \), and are invariant under all automorphisms of \( G \).

We now define the notion of free-DLR random-cluster measures and wired-DLR random-cluster measures, following the work of Dobrushin [7] and Lanford–Ruelle [21]. Let \( \mu \) be a probability measure on \( \{0, 1\}^{E} \). We say that \( \mu \) is a free-DLR random-cluster measure (with parameters \( p \) and \( q \)) if, for any edge \( e = \{u, v\} \in E \) and \( \mu \)-a.e. configuration \( \xi \in \{0, 1\}^{E \setminus \{e\}} \),

\[
\mu(\omega_e = 1 \mid \omega_{E \setminus \{e\}} = \xi) = \begin{cases} p \frac{p}{p + (1 - p)q} & \text{if } u \equivalent \xi v \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

where \( u \equivalent \xi v \) indicates that \( u \) and \( v \) are connected in the graph defined by \( \xi \setminus \{e\} \). Similarly, we say that \( \mu \) is a wired-DLR random-cluster measure if

\[
\mu(\omega_e = 1 \mid \omega_{E \setminus \{e\}} = \xi) = \begin{cases} p \frac{p}{p + (1 - p)q} & \text{if } u \equivalent_{\infty} \xi v \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

where \( u \equivalent_{\infty} \xi v \) indicates that either \( u \) and \( v \) are connected in \( \xi \setminus \{e\} \) or both \( u \) and \( v \) belong to infinite clusters of \( \xi \). It is standard that \( \phi^0_{p, q} \) is always a free-DLR random-cluster measure and that \( \phi^1_{p, q} \) is always a wired-DLR random-cluster measure.

A measure satisfying one of the DLR conditions is called a Gibbs measure for the random-cluster model with parameters \( p \) and \( q \). The measures \( \phi^0_{p, q} \) and \( \phi^1_{p, q} \) play a special role among all Gibbs measures:

\[
\phi^0_{p, q} \leq_{st} \mu \leq_{st} \phi^1_{p, q}
\]

where \( \leq_{st} \) indicates stochastic domination of measures (i.e. \( \mu \leq_{st} \nu \) iff \( \mu(A) \leq \nu(A) \) for any increasing event \( A \)). This implies that there exists a unique Gibbs measure for the random-cluster model with parameters \( p \) and \( q \geq 1 \) if and only if \( \phi^0_{p, q} = \phi^1_{p, q} \). In this case, we may omit the superscript for notational clarity and write \( \phi_{p, q} \) for the unique Gibbs measure.

**Remark 1.** For amenable quasi-transitive connected graphs, any Gibbs measure has either zero or one infinite cluster with probability 1; in this case, there is no distinction between free-DLR and wired-DLR measures. For more general graphs, the number of infinite clusters may be infinite. In this scenario, this distinction is essential: for example, \( \phi^1_{p, q} \) may not satisfy the free-DLR condition for certain graphs and values of \( p \) and \( q \), but always satisfies the wired-DLR condition. Similarly, \( \phi^0_{p, q} \) may not be a wired-DLR random-cluster measure (see Section 6.4 of [14] for further discussion).

A standard coupling argument shows that as \( p \) increases, the measure \( \phi^i_{p, q} \) increases as well (in the sense of stochastic domination). This implies that, for each \( i \in \{0, 1\} \), there exists a critical
parameter $p_i^c(q) \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$
\phi_{p,q}^i[\exists \text{ an infinite cluster}] = \begin{cases} 
0 & p < p_i^c(q), \\
1 & p > p_i^c(q).
\end{cases}
$$

Since $\phi_{p,q}^1$ and $\phi_{p,q}^0$ are the largest and smallest Gibbs measures, respectively, we immediately conclude that $p_i^c(q) \leq p_i^0(q)$. On amenable graphs, the two values are equal; it is believed that, for any non-amenable graph, there exists a value of $q$ for which $p_i^c(q) < p_i^0(q)$. Häggström [17] showed that strict inequality indeed holds for $d$-regular trees and $q > 2$. In the regime $p < p_i^c(q)$, where no measure has an infinite cluster, it is straightforward to show that $\phi_{p,q}^0 = \phi_{p,q}^1$, and hence that there is a unique Gibbs measure.

The first main theorem of this paper concerns the factor map properties of $\phi_{p,q}^{0/1}$.

**Theorem 1.** Let $G$ be an infinite quasi-transitive graph. Then, for any $p \in [0, 1]$ and $q \geq 1$,

- both $\phi_{p,q}^0$ and $\phi_{p,q}^1$ are ffid.
- If $\phi_{p,q}^0 = \phi_{p,q}^1$, then $\phi_{p,q}$ is ffid.
- If $p < p_i^1(q)$, then $\phi_{p,q}$ is ffiid with exponential tails.

We note that the random-cluster model is not a Markov random field. To see this, consider a finite subgraph $G_n$ of $G$. To determine the conditional distribution of $\phi_{p,q}^{0/1}$ inside $G_n$, we must not only know the state of the edges in $\partial E_n$, but also their connectivity (i.e. which boundary edges are connected outside of $G_n$). Thus, Theorem 1.1 of [28] does not allow us to deduce any information about the random-cluster model for non-integer $q$. As far as the authors are aware, this is the first result that shows a finitary coding for the random-cluster model when $q \notin \mathbb{N}$.

We say that $G$ is amenable if there exists a sequence $\{F_n\}$ of non-empty finite subsets of $\mathbb{V}$ such that $|\partial F_n|/|F_n| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Although it is not explicitly stated, Häggström–Jonasson–Lyons [18] prove the first item in Theorem 1. That paper is concerned with the closely-related notion of Bernoullicity, a classical mixing property from ergodic theory. In fact, on certain amenable with mild geometric conditions – namely quasi-transitive amenable graphs that satisfy

$$V_{v,r} \setminus V_{v,r-1} \notin V_{u,r} \quad \text{for any distinct } u, v \in V \text{ and infinitely many } r \in \mathbb{N},$$

the notions are identical. A slightly stronger version of this condition appears in Theorem 6 below.

We can also prove a partial converse for the second item in Theorem 1 in the amenable case:

**Theorem 2.** Let $G$ be an infinite quasi-transitive amenable graph and let $p \in [0, 1]$ and $q \geq 1$. If $\phi_{p,q}$ is ffiid, then $\phi_{p,q}^0 = \phi_{p,q}^1$.

For certain “well-connected” amenable graphs, including $\mathbb{Z}^d$, a minor modification of the argument shows that $\phi_{p,q}^0$ cannot be ffiid when $\phi_{p,q}^0 = \phi_{p,q}^1$ (see Remark 3). We do not know whether $\phi_{p,q}^0 + \phi_{p,q}^1$ forces $\phi_{p,q}^0$ to not be ffiid for a general amenable graph, nor do we know whether $\phi_{p,q}^1$ is allowed to be ffiid on non-amenable graphs when there are multiple Gibbs measures. However, it is possible for $\phi_{p,q}^0$ to be ffiid when there exist multiple Gibbs measures on a non-amenable graph: consider a $d$-regular tree and $q > 2$; as mentioned above, Häggström [17] shows that $p_i^c(q) < p_i^0(q)$, and thus, $\phi_{p,q}^0 + \phi_{p,q}^1$ for any $p \in (p_i^c(q), p_i^0(q))$. However, on any tree and for any $p$ and $q$, $\phi_{p,q}$ is exactly Bernoulli percolation of parameter $p/[p + q(1 - p)]$, and thus is trivially ffiid.

We now turn to the case of $G = \mathbb{Z}^d$. Like any amenable graph, we know that $p_i^c(q) = p_i^0(q)$ for any $q \geq 1$. In addition, $\phi_{p,q}^1 = \phi_{p,q}^0$ for any $p < p_c(q)$ and for all but countably many values of $p > p_c(q)$ (for a given value of $q$). In dimension $d = 2$, more is known: if $q \in [1, 4)$, then $\phi_{p,q}^0 = \phi_{p,q}^1$ for all $p$, and if $q > 4$, then $\phi_{p,q}^0 = \phi_{p,q}^1$ for all $p \neq p_c(q)$. It is conjectured that such a dichotomy (where 4 is replaced by some $q_c(d)$) holds for all $d \geq 2$. 


The second main result of this paper is concerned with the existence of finite-valued codings for the subcritical random-cluster model on $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

**Theorem 3.** Let $d \geq 2$, $G = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\Gamma$ be the translation group of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Let $q \geq 1$ and $p < p_c(q)$. Then $\phi_{p,q}$ is $\Gamma$-ff-ffid with stretched-exponential tails.

We note that the coding we produce above is translation invariant, not automorphism invariant. The construction we use does not produce a reflection-invariant factor map, though we believe that such a construction should be possible, and that similar statements should hold for more general quasi-transitive graphs of sub-exponential growth and their full automorphism group. The proof of Theorem 3 relies on a new mixing-time result for a natural single-single dynamics of the sub-critical random-cluster model on an arbitrary infinite quasi-transitive graph $G$ of sub-exponential growth (see Section 6).

### 2.3. The Potts model.

The random-cluster model is closely related to the Potts model. This model, introduced by Potts [25] following a suggestion of his adviser Domb, has been the subject of intensive study by mathematicians and physicists over the last three decades. For a review of the physics results, see [30].

Set $q \geq 2$ to be an integer. The Potts measure on a finite subgraph $G_n = (V_n, E_n)$ of an infinite graph $G = (\chi, E)$, at inverse temperature $\beta$ and boundary conditions $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, q\}$, is defined by the formula

$$
\mu_{G_n, \beta, q}^i(\sigma) := \frac{e^{\beta \mathcal{H}_{G_n}^i(\sigma)}}{Z_{G_n, \beta, q}}, \quad \sigma \in \{1, \ldots, q\}^V_n,
$$

where

$$
\mathcal{H}_{G_n}^i(\sigma) := \sum_{(x,y) \in E_n} 1[\sigma_x = \sigma_y] + \sum_{(x,y) \in \partial E_n} 1[\sigma_x = i],
$$

and $Z_{G_n, \beta, q}^i$ is a normalizing constant which makes $\mu_{G_n, \beta, q}^i$ a probability measure. Above, $1[\cdot]$ denotes the indicator function. Note that when $i = 0$, the second sum is zero for all $\sigma$. We define infinite-volume measures $\mu_{\beta, q}^i$ via weak limits. The case $q = 2$ is known as the Ising model.

The well-known Edwards–Sokal coupling allows us to describe $\mu_{\beta, q}^i$, for a fixed $i \neq 0$, using the wired random-cluster measure $\phi_{p,q}^i$: Let $\{\Sigma_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a collection of independent uniform random variables on $\{1, \ldots, q\}$, and let $\omega$ be an arbitrary percolation configuration. Enumerate the finite connected components of $\omega$ arbitrarily, and for every $v$ in the $k$th finite connected component, set $\sigma_v = \Sigma_k$. If $v$ is in an infinite component, set $\sigma_v = i$ (as in the boundary conditions of $\mu_{\beta, q}^i$). Letting $p = 1 - e^{-\beta}$ and assuming that $\omega$ is distributed as $\phi_{p,q}^i$, then $(\sigma_v)_{v \in \chi}$ is distributed as $\mu_{\beta, q}^i$.

One may similarly describe $\mu_{\beta, q}^0$ using the free random-cluster measure $\phi_{p,q}^0$, with the only difference being that $\omega$ is distributed as $\phi_{p,q}^0$ and that vertices belonging to infinite clusters of $\omega$ are also assigned a value from $\Sigma$.

Like the random-cluster model, the different infinite-volume Potts measures may be highly affected by their boundary conditions. However, if $\beta < \beta_c^w(q)$, where $\beta_c^w(q) := \log[1 - p_c^i(q)]$, there are no infinite clusters in $\phi_{p,q}^i$, and thus $\mu_{\beta, q}^i$ is independent of $i$. This implies the existence of a unique Gibbs measure $\mu_{\beta, q}$. The Edwards–Sokal coupling allows us to use our earlier theorems to conclude some results about the coding properties of the Potts model:

**Theorem 4.** Let $G$ be an infinite quasi-transitive graph, $q \geq 2$ be an integer and $0 \leq \beta < \beta_c^w(q)$.

- $\mu_{\beta, q}$ is ffid with exponential tails.
- If $G = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\Gamma$ is the translation group, then $\mu_{\beta, q}$ is $\Gamma$-ff-ffid with stretched-exponential tails.

This theorem generalizes Corollary 1.5 of [25], since it holds on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ for all $\beta < \beta_c(q, d)$, when $d \geq 2$ and $q \geq 2$. The result means we now have shown finitary codings (from finite-valued processes)
for nearly all possible Potts models on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ – when $\beta > \beta_c(q,d)$, it is known that no finitary coding can exist \cite{28, Theorem 1.3}. It is also known that, for some $q_0$ sufficiently large (depending on $d$), $\mu_{\beta_c(q,d),d}^1 \neq \mu_{\beta_c(q,d),d}^0$ whenever $q > q_0$ – i.e. the Potts model has a first-order phase transition, and hence is not ffid at criticality. The only untreated cases remaining are the Potts model at $\beta_c(q,d)$ for $d \geq 3$ and $q \in [3, q_0]$.

2.4. Notation. We now set up some notation which will be used for the rest of the paper. Let $G$ be an infinite locally-finite quasi-transitive graph on a countable set $\mathbb{V}$ (all graphs in this paper satisfy these conditions). Denote the graph distance in $G$ by $d(\cdot, \cdot)$. For sets $U, V \subset \mathbb{V}$, we write $d(U, V) := \min_{u \in U, v \in V} d(u, v)$ and $d(u, V) := d(\{u\}, V)$. We denote $\partial V := \{u \in \mathbb{V} : d(u, \mathbb{V} \setminus V) = 1\}$ and $\partial v := \partial\{v\}$. Let

$$V_{u, r} := \{u \in \mathbb{V} : d(u, v) \leq r\}$$

be the ball of radius $r$ around $v$. We also denote

$$B(r) := \max_{v \in \mathbb{V}} |V_{u, r}|.$$ 

Recall that $\Gamma$ is a group acting on $\mathbb{V}$. We extend the action of $\Gamma$ to $A^{\mathbb{V}}$ (for any set $A$) by $\gamma \omega := (\omega_{\gamma^{-1}v})_{v \in \mathbb{V}}$.

Let $\mu$ and $\nu$ be probability measures on a common discrete space $\mathbb{A}$. We denote by $\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV}$ the total variation distance between $\mu$ and $\nu$, i.e.,

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} |\mu(a) - \nu(a)| = \max_{A \subseteq \mathbb{A}} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)|.$$ 

When $\mathbb{A}$ is partially ordered, we say that $\mu$ is stochastically dominated by $\nu$, and write $\mu \leq_{st} \nu$, if $\mu(A) \leq \nu(A)$ for any increasing event $A$.

3. The General Result

Let $\mathbb{V}$ be countably infinite, $\Gamma$ be a group acting quasi transitively on $\mathbb{V}$ and $(S, \preceq)$ be a totally-ordered discrete spin space with a maximal element $\ast$. We extend the order on $S$ to the product partial order on

$$\Omega := S^{\mathbb{V}},$$

whose maximal element we denote by $\ast$. Thus, given two elements $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega$,

$$\omega \preceq \omega' \iff \omega_v \preceq \omega'_v \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathbb{V}.$$ 

For a finite $V \subset \mathbb{V}$ and $\tau \in \Omega$, define

$$\Omega_{V}^\tau := \{\omega \in \Omega : \omega_{\mathbb{V} \setminus V} = \tau_{\mathbb{V} \setminus V}\}.$$ 

Denote

$$\Omega^+ := \bigcup_{V \subset \mathbb{V} \text{ finite}} \Omega_{V}^\tau = \{\omega \in \Omega : \omega \preceq \ast \text{ outside a finite set}\}.$$ 

An upwards specification is a family of measures

$$\rho = \{\rho_{V}^\tau\}_{V \subset \mathbb{V} \text{ finite, } \tau \in \Omega^+},$$

where $\rho_{V}^\tau$ is a probability measure supported on $\Omega_{V}^\tau$, that satisfies the consistency relations that, for any finite $U \subset V \subset \mathbb{V}$ and any $\tau, \tau' \in \Omega^+$,

$$\rho_{V}^\tau = \rho_{V}^{\tau'} \quad \text{whenever } \tau_{\mathbb{V} \setminus V} = \tau'_{\mathbb{V} \setminus V}$$

and

$$\rho_{V}^\tau(\cdot | \Omega_{U}^\tau) = \rho_{U}^\tau \quad \text{whenever } \rho_{V}^\tau(\Omega_{U}^\tau) > 0.$$ 

If we expand this family by defining measures for any $\tau \in \Omega$ and requiring the same consistency relations, we obtain a specification. Upwards specifications are simpler objects than specifications.
– for one thing, there are only countably many measures in an upwards specification, whereas a specification requires uncountably many measures. For any \( v \in V \), we write \( \rho_{v}^{\uparrow} \) as a shorthand for \( \rho_{\{v\}}^{\uparrow} \).

An upwards specification is \( \Gamma \)-invariant if

\[
\rho_{\gamma \in \Gamma}^{\uparrow} (\xi_{v}^{-1} \omega, \cdot) = \rho_{v}^{\uparrow} \quad \text{for any } \gamma \in \Gamma, \ V \subset V \text{ finite and } \tau \in \Omega^{+}.
\]

An upwards specification \( \rho \) is irreducible if, for any finite \( V \), the set \( \{ \omega \in \Omega^{+} : \rho_{v}^{\uparrow} (\omega) > 0 \} \) contains \( + \) and is connected in the Hamming graph on \( \Omega^{+} \). An upwards specification is monotonic if

\[
\rho_{V}^{\uparrow} \preceq_{\text{st}} \rho_{V}^{\uparrow'} \quad \text{for any } V \subset V \text{ finite and } \tau, \tau' \in \Omega^{+} \text{ such that } \tau \leq \tau'.
\]

When \( S \) has a minimal element \( - \), we similarly define a notion of a downwards specification by replacing \( + \) with \( - \), the minimal element in \( \Omega \), and replacing \( \Omega^{+} \) with \( \Omega^{-} \), the set of configurations which are equal \( - \) outside a finite set. When \( S \) has both a minimal and maximal element, we may also define a notion of an upwards-downwards specification, where \( \Omega^{+} \) is replaced with \( \Omega^{+} \cup \Omega^{-} \) above.

Such an upwards-downwards specification \( \rho \) may be equivalently seen as a pair \( (\rho^{+}, \rho^{-}) \), where \( \rho^{+} \) is an upwards specification and \( \rho^{-} \) is a downwards specification. In this case, \( \Gamma \)-invariance of \( \rho^{-} \) is equivalent to \( \Gamma \)-invariance of both \( \rho^{+} \) and \( \rho^{-} \), while monotonicity of \( \rho^{+} \) is equivalent to monotonicity of both \( \rho^{+} \) and \( \rho^{-} \) along with an ordering between \( \rho^{+} \) and \( \rho^{-} \) in the sense that

\[
\rho_{V}^{+} \preceq_{\text{st}} \rho_{V}^{-} \quad \text{for any } V \subset V \text{ finite and } \tau, \tau' \in \Omega^{+} \text{ such that } \tau \leq \tau'.
\]

On the other hand, by irreducibility of \( \rho \), we mean that both \( \rho^{+} \) and \( \rho^{-} \) are irreducible, without requiring a joint condition.

Let \( \rho \) be a monotone upwards specification. By monotonicity, \( \rho_{U}^{\uparrow} \) stochastically dominates \( \rho_{V}^{\uparrow} \) whenever \( U \subset V \). Thus, there exists a weak limit

\[
\mu^{+} := \lim_{V \supset U} \rho_{V}^{\uparrow}.
\]

The limit \( \mu^{+} \) is in general a sub-probability measure on \( \Omega \) (not necessarily supported on \( \Omega^{+} \)), and is \( \Gamma \)-invariant when \( \rho \) is. If \( S \) is finite, then \( \mu^{+} \) is a probability measure. When \( \rho \) is a monotone downwards specification, we similarly define \( \mu^{-} \). In particular, when \( \rho \) is an upwards-downwards specification, both \( \mu^{+} \) and \( \mu^{-} \) are well-defined.

**Theorem 5.** Let \( G \) be an infinite graph on vertex set \( V \) and let \( \Gamma \) be a group acting quasi-transitively on \( V \) by automorphisms of \( G \). Let \( S \) be a totally-ordered discrete spin space.

1. Suppose that \( S \) has a maximal element and let \( \rho \) be a monotone \( \Gamma \)-invariant irreducible upwards specification. If \( \mu^{+} \) is a probability measure, then it is \( \Gamma \)-fiid.
2. Suppose that \( S \) is finite and let \( \rho \) be a monotone \( \Gamma \)-invariant irreducible upwards-downwards specification. Then \( \mu^{+} \) is \( \Gamma \)-fiid with a coding radius that satisfies

\[
\mathbb{P}(R_{v} > r) \leq (|S| - 1) \cdot \left\| \rho_{V,v}^{\uparrow} (\sigma_{v} \cdot \cdot) - \rho_{V,v}^{\downarrow} (\sigma_{v} \cdot \cdot) \right\|_{TV} \quad \text{for all } v \in V \text{ and } r \geq 0.
\]

In particular, if \( \mu^{+} = \mu^{-} \) then \( \mu^{+} \) is \( \Gamma \)-fiid.

The state spaces for the i.i.d. process \( Y \) in the above theorem are unrestricted (one may think of \( (T, \mathcal{T}) \) as Lebesgue space on \( [0,1] \)). In the next section, we wish to control the “amount of temporal information” used by the coding – heuristically, how many times must the factor map query a (finite-valued) input at any vertex. To this end, we equip the space \( (T, \mathcal{T}) \) with a more explicit structure, namely, we assume that \( T = \tilde{T}^{\mathbb{N}} \), where \( \tilde{T} \) is finite. Recall that the coding radius of a coding \( \varphi : T^{\mathbb{N}} \to S^{\mathbb{N}} \) at a vertex \( v \in V \) and a configuration \( x \in T^{V} \) is the minimal \( r \geq 0 \) such that \( \varphi (y_{v}) \) is determined by \( (y_{w})_{w \in V, r} \). We analogously define \( R_{v}^{*} (y) \), the space-time coding radius of \( \varphi \) at \( v \) and \( y \), to be the minimal \( r \geq 0 \) such that \( \varphi (y_{v}) \) is determined by \( (y_{w} (i))_{w \in V, r, 0 \leq i \leq r} \). We say that such a coding is space-time finitary if \( R_{v}^{*} = R_{v}^{*} (Y) \) is almost surely finite for every \( v \). In this
setting, when $Y$ is said to be an i.i.d. process, we mean that $\{Y_v(n)\}_{v \in \mathbb{V}, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a collection of i.i.d. random variables supported on the finite set $\hat{T}$.

We add one final piece of notation before we state the theorem: an upwards-downwards specification $\rho$ is \textit{marginally-finite} if $\{\rho^+_{v,r}(\sigma_v \in \cdot)\}_{v \in \mathbb{V}, r \in \Omega^+ \cup \Omega^-}$ is a finite collection of distinct measures.

**Theorem 6.** Let $G$ be an infinite graph on vertex set $\mathbb{V}$ and let $\Gamma$ be a group acting quasi-transitively on $\mathbb{V}$ by automorphisms of $G$. Suppose that

$$\mathbb{V}_{u,r} \setminus \mathbb{V}_{v,r-1} \not\in \mathbb{V}_{u,r} \quad \text{for any distinct } u, v \in \mathbb{V} \text{ and } r \geq 0. \quad (5)$$

Let $S$ be a totally-ordered finite spin space and $\rho$ be a monotone $\Gamma$-invariant irreducible marginally-finite upwards-downwards specification.

- If $\mu^* = \mu^-$, then there exists a space-time finitary coding from an i.i.d. process $Y$ to $\mu^+$.
- Suppose that there exist $C, c > 0$ such that

$$\|\rho^+_{v,r}(\sigma_v \in \cdot) - \tilde{\rho}^+_{v,r}(\sigma_v \in \cdot)\|_{TV} \leq Ce^{-cr} \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathbb{V} \text{ and } r \geq 0. \quad (6)$$

If $G$ has sub-exponential growth, i.e., $B(r) = \exp(o(r))$, then the tails of the space-time coding radius beat any stretched-exponential, i.e., $\mathbb{P}(R^+_n \geq r) \leq \exp(-r^{1-o(1)})$. Moreover, if $G$ has growth $B(r) = \exp(o\left(\frac{1}{\log r}\right))$, then the space-time coding radius has exponential tails.

Condition (6) is commonly referred to as \textit{weak spatial mixing}. The proof of the second item in Theorem 6 relies on controlling the mixing-time of a natural single-single dynamics for specifications satisfying weak spatial mixing (see Section 6).

In the case of $G = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\Gamma$ being restricted to translations, we can use the setup of [28] to deduce the existence of fv-ffiid codings:

**Corollary 7.** Let $G = \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\Gamma$ be the group of translations, $S$ be a totally-ordered finite spin space, and $\rho$ be a monotone $\Gamma$-invariant irreducible marginally-finite upwards-downwards specification that satisfies (6). Then $\mu^*$ is $\Gamma$-fv-ffiid with stretched-exponential tails.

We believe that finite-valued codings should exist for a much larger class of graphs (perhaps graphs satisfying (5) and having sub-exponential growth).

### 4. Applications

In this section, we show how the general results given in Section 3 imply Theorem 1, Theorem 3, and Theorem 4. We also take this opportunity to discuss other applications of the general results. The proof of Theorem 2 is conceptually distinct, and therefore we will delay it until Section 9.

#### 4.1. Deducing the results for the random-cluster and Potts models.

We consider here the random-cluster model on an infinite quasi-transitive graph $G = (\mathbb{V}, E)$.

The free-DLR and wired-DLR random-cluster measures defined in Section 2 can be extended to define specifications $\rho^{\text{free}}$ and $\rho^{\text{wired}}$, respectively. Let $\rho = (\rho^+, \rho^-)$ be the upwards-downwards specification given by $\rho^+ := (\rho^+_{V,V_{\text{finite}}, \tau \in \Omega^+})_{V \subset \mathbb{V}, \tau \in \Omega^+}$ and $\rho^- := (\rho^+_{V,V_{\text{finite}}, \tau \in \Omega^-})_{V \subset \mathbb{V}, \tau \in \Omega^-}$. Whenever $q \geq 1$, the FKG property of the random-cluster model implies that $\rho$ is a monotone specification. It is clear from the definition of the random-cluster model that $\rho$ is $\Gamma$-invariant. Since

$$\rho^{\text{free}, \tau}(\sigma_e = s), \rho^{\text{wired}, \tau}(\sigma_e = s) : \tau \in \Omega, \ e \in E, \ s \in \{0, 1\} = \left\{p, 1 - p, \frac{p}{p + (1-p)q}, \frac{(1-p)q}{p + (1-p)q}\right\},$$

it is clear that $\rho$ is irreducible and marginally-finite.

**Proof of Theorem 4 and Theorem 8.** The first and second items of Theorem 4 are immediate consequences of Theorem 5. Define $E_{v,r}$ be the set of edges whose distance (taken in the line graph...
of $G$) from $e$ is at most $r$. For the third item of Theorem \[10\] it remains only to show that, when $p < p^*_e(q)$, there exist $C,c > 0$ such that

$$\|\rho_{E_{e,r}}^{wired,*}(\sigma_e \cdot \cdot) - \rho_{E_{e,r}}^{free,*}(\sigma_e \cdot \cdot)\|_{TV} \leq Ce^{-cr}$$

for all $e \in E$ and $r \geq 0$.

It is classical that, if $v$ is one of the endpoints of $e$,

$$\|\rho_{E_{e,r}}^{wired,*}(\sigma_e \cdot \cdot) - \rho_{E_{e,r}}^{free,*}(\sigma_e \cdot \cdot)\|_{TV} \leq \phi_{\psi_{v,r}}^{1}(e \leftrightarrow \partial V_{v,r-1}).$$

The exponential decays of the right-hand side is exactly the content of \[10\] Theorem 1.2.

In light of the above, Theorem \[3\] is a direct application of Corollary \[7\].

Before dealing with the Potts model, there is a technical issue we must face: Potts configurations belong to $\{1, \ldots, q\}^\mathbb{V}$, while random-cluster configurations belong to $\{0, 1\}^E$. Let $\Gamma$ be a group acting on $V$ by automorphisms of $G$. If $\mathcal{G}$ is the line graph of $G$, then $\Gamma$ can be canonically embedded in the automorphism group of $\mathcal{G}$. In a slight abuse of notation, we allow $\gamma \in \Gamma$ to act on $E$ through this identification. This allows us to discuss factors from processes on $V$ to processes on $E$. The lemma below shows that we can produce any i.i.d. process on $E$ using an i.i.d. process on $V$ in a $\Gamma$-equivariant manner.

**Lemma 8.** Let $G$ be an infinite quasi-transitive graph and let $\Gamma$ denote its full automorphism group. Then any i.i.d. process on $E$ is a $\Gamma$-factor of an i.i.d. process on $V$ with bounded coding radius.

**Proof.** Let $X = (X_e)_{e \in E}$ be an i.i.d. process, where each $X_e$ takes values in a measurable space $(T, \mathcal{T})$. Let $\Delta$ be the maximal degree of $G$. We will show by direct construction that $X$ is a $\Gamma$-factor of the i.i.d. process $(Y,Z) = (Y_v,Z_v)_{v \in V}$, where $Y_v$ and $Z_v$ are independent, $Y_v = (Y_v^1, \ldots, Y_v^\Delta)$ is a collection of $\Delta$ i.i.d. random variables having the same distribution as $X_e$, and $Z_v$ is a uniform random variable on $[0, 1]$.

Define

$$\psi : (T^\Delta \times [0, 1]^V) \to T^E$$

by

$$\psi(y^1, \ldots, y^\Delta, z)_{\{u,v\}} := \begin{cases} y_u^{[\{w : w \leq z_u \leq z_v\}\}} & \text{if } z_u < z_v \\ y_v^{[\{w : w \leq z_v \leq z_u\}\}} & \text{if } z_u \geq z_v \end{cases}.$$

In words, the value associated to an edge $\{u,v\}$ is obtained as follows: $z$ induces an order on the vertices of $G$; the edge $\{u,v\}$ chooses its smaller endpoint with respect to this order – say, $u$ – and takes on the value $y_u^i$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, \Delta\}$. To determine the value of $i$, the set of edges that chose $u$ is ordered according to the value of $z$ at the other endpoint – the first edge takes $y_u^1$, the second $y_u^2$, etc.

If $z_u \neq z_v$ for any distinct $u,v \in V$, then no value of $y_u^i$ is assigned to more than one edge. Thus, we have $\psi(Y,Z) \overset{d}{=} X$. Since it is clear that $\psi$ is $\Gamma$-equivariant and has coding radius at most 2, the lemma follows.

Before moving on, we note that Lemma \[8\] does not allow one to transform a finite-valued coding on the edges to a finite-valued coding on the vertices – such a statement for a general graph would require a more delicate proof.

We also require the following simple lemma.

**Lemma 9.** The composition of finitary codings with exponential tails is also a finitary coding with exponential tails.

**Proof.** Let $X$, $Y$ and $Z$ be processes on $V$. Let $\varphi$ be a coding from $Y$ to $X$ and let $\varphi'$ be a coding from $Z$ to $Y$, both having exponential tails. Denote $\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi' \circ \varphi$. We denote the coding radii of $\varphi$, $\varphi'$ and $\tilde{\varphi}$ at $v$ by $R_v$, $R_v^\varphi$ and $R_v^{\varphi'}$, respectively. Let $C,c,c' > 0$ be such that $\mathbb{P}(R_v > r) \leq Ce^{-cr}$ and
\[ \Pr(R_v' > r) \leq Ce^{-c r} \] for all \( r > 0 \). Let \( \Delta \) be the maximal degree of \( G \) and set \( a := c/[2(c + \log \Delta)] \).

Fix \( v \in V \) and define
\[ S_{v,r} := \bigcap_{u \in V_v} \{ R_u \leq (1 - a)r \}. \]

By the union bound and the definition of \( a \),
\[ \Pr[S_{v,r}^c] \leq B(ar) \cdot Ce^{-(1-a)r} \leq C \Delta_{ar} e^{-(1-a)r} \leq Ce^{-cr/2}. \]

It straightforward to see that on the event \( \{ R_v' \leq ar \} \cap S_{v,r} \), we have that \( \tilde{R}_v \leq r \). Thus,
\[ \Pr[\tilde{R}_v > r] \leq \Pr[S_{v,r}^c] + \Pr[R_v' > ar] \leq Ce^{-cr/2} + Ce^{c ar}. \]

**Proof of Theorem 3.** Let \( \Gamma \) be the full automorphism group of \( G \), and \( \beta < \beta^w_c(q) \); we set \( p = 1 - e^{-\beta} \). Under these conditions, \( \phi^1_{p,q} = \phi^0_{p,q} \) and, by Theorem 1, there exists some measurable space \( (T, T) \) and a coding \( \varphi : T^E \to \{0, 1\}^E \) from \( Y \) to \( \phi_{p,q} \), and whose coding radius has exponential tails. Since \( \varphi \) is invariant under any automorphism of the line graph of \( G \), we have that \( \varphi \circ \gamma = \gamma \circ \psi \) for any \( \gamma \in \Gamma \) (since \( \Gamma \) is canonically embedded in the automorphism group of the line graph).

Next, we wish to construct the Edwards–Sokal coupling in a \( \Gamma \)-equivariant manner. Define \( \Psi : \{0, 1\}^Y \times \{1, \ldots, q\}^Y \times \{0, 1\}^E \to \{1, \ldots, q\}^Y \) by
\[ \Psi(z, \sigma, \omega)_v := \sigma_u, \quad \text{where } u = \arg\min\{z_w : w \xrightarrow{\omega} v\}, \]
where we recall that \( w \xrightarrow{\omega} v \) indicates that there exists a path of \( \omega \)-open edges connecting \( w \) and \( v \). Heuristically, \( \Psi(z, \sigma, \omega)_v \) outputs the color \( \sigma_u \), where \( u \) is the vertex in the connected component of \( v \) which has the minimal \( z \) value. By construction, \( \Psi \) is \( \Gamma \)-equivariant. Let \( (Z, \Sigma) \) be an i.i.d. process on \( V \), where \( Z_v \) and \( \Sigma_v \) are independent and uniform on \( \{0, 1\} \) and \( \{1, \ldots, q\} \), respectively. Then the Edwards–Sokal coupling implies that \( \Psi(Z, \Sigma, \omega) \equiv \mu_{\beta, q} \) whenever \( \omega \) is sampled from \( \phi_{p,q} \) independently of \( (Z, \Sigma) \). Finally, the coding radius of \( \Psi \) at \( v \) is clearly bounded by one plus the diameter of the connected component of \( v \) in \( \omega \). Since \( p < p_c \), an appeal to [10, Theorem 1.2] shows that the coding radius of \( \Psi \) has exponential tails.

Suppose now that \( Y \) and \( (Z, \Sigma) \) are independent. Then the composition \( \Psi \circ (\text{id}, \text{id}, \varphi) \) is a coding from \( (Z, \Sigma, Y) \) to \( \mu_{\beta, q} \). By Lemma 8 this implies that we can create a coding \( \varphi' \) from an i.i.d. process on \( V \) to the Potts model \( \mu_{\beta, q} \). By Lemma 9 this coding has exponential tails, proving the first item of the theorem.

For the second item, we set \( G = \mathbb{Z}^d \) and \( \Gamma \) to be the translation group of the lattice. The extra structure here allow us to skip the more complicated constructions above and do things “by hand.” Let \( \{e_1, \ldots, e_d\} \) denote the the standard basis of \( \mathbb{Z}^d \). Any \( e \in E \) has a unique representation \( e = \{v, v + e_i\} \), where \( v \in \mathbb{Z}^d \) and \( 1 \leq i \leq d \). Define \( \tilde{\psi} : (T^d)^Y \to T^E \) by
\[ \tilde{\psi}(y^1, \ldots, y^d)_{e} := y^i_{0}, \quad \text{where } e = \{v, v + e_i\}. \]
We also define \( \tilde{\Psi} : \{1, \ldots, q\}^Y \times \{0, 1\}^E \) by
\[ \tilde{\Psi}(\sigma, \omega)_v := \sigma_u, \quad \text{where } u = \min\{w : w \xrightarrow{\omega} v\}, \]
where the minimum over vertices is taken in the lexicographical order on \( \mathbb{Z}^d \). Both \( \tilde{\psi} \) and \( \tilde{\Psi} \) are \( \Gamma \)-equivariant, as the lexicographical order is translation-invariant. We note that a more sophisticated argument would be needed if \( \Gamma = \text{Aut}(G) \), as the lexicographical order is not reflection-invariant.

Theorem 3 gives us a \( \Gamma \)-fv-fiid coding \( \hat{\varphi} \) for \( \phi_{p,q} \) with exponential tails. Then \( \hat{\varphi} \circ (\text{id}, \hat{\varphi} \circ \tilde{\psi}) \) is a \( \Gamma \)-fv-fiid coding for \( \mu_{\beta, q} \). As before, the coding radius of this map has exponential tails, completing the proof. \( \square \)
4.2. The loop \( O(n) \) model. Let \( \Omega \) be a finite subdomain (i.e a simply connected subset) of \( \mathbb{H} \), the hexagonal lattice, and let \( \text{LoopConf}(\Omega) \) be the set of subgraphs where every vertex is of degree 0 or 2. For any \( n, x > 0 \), define the loop \( O(n) \) model \( \nu_{n,x,\Omega} \) by

\[
\nu_{n,x,\Omega}(\omega) = \frac{x^{e(\omega)} n^{k(\omega)}}{Z_{n,x,\Omega}} \cdot 1_{\omega \in \text{LoopConf}(\Omega)},
\]

where \( e(\omega) \) is the number of edges, \( k(\omega) + 1 \) is the number of connected components in \( \omega \), and \( Z_{n,x,\Omega} \) is the constant needed to normalize \( \nu_{n,x,\Omega} \) into a probability measure. The loop \( O(n) \) model is conjectured to undergo a phase transition for any \( n \leq 2 \) when the value of \( x \) equals

\[
x_c(n) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2} - n}}.
\]

We can also consider the cluster representation of the loop \( O(n) \) model. Set \( \mathbb{V} := \mathbb{T} \) and \( S := \{+,-\} \). The cluster representation measure with edge-weight \( x > 0 \) and loop-weight \( n > 0 \) is the probability measure \( \mu^\tau_{V} \) defined by the formula

\[
\mu^\tau_{V}(\sigma) := \frac{n^{k(\sigma)} e^{(\sigma)}}{Z^\tau_{V}} \cdot 1_{\{\sigma_{\mathbb{V},V} = \tau_{\mathbb{V},V}\}},
\]

for every \( \sigma \in S^{\mathbb{T}} \), where \( k(\sigma) + 1 \) is the sum of the number of connected components of pluses and minuses in \( \sigma \) that intersect \( V \) or its neighborhood, \( e(\sigma) := \sum_{u \sim v} 1_{\sigma_u \neq \sigma_v} \) is the number of edges \( \{u,v\} \) that intersect \( V \) and have \( \sigma_u \neq \sigma_v \), and \( Z^\tau_{V} \) is the unique constant making \( \mu^\tau_{V} \) a probability measure. Clearly, both \( k(\sigma) \) and \( e(\sigma) \) depend on \( V \), but we omit it in the notation for brevity.

One can recover the loop \( O(n) \) model from the cluster representation: set \( V = \Omega \) and \( \tau = + \), and let \( \sigma \) be distributed as \( \mu^\tau_{V} \). For any \( \sigma \), let \( D(\sigma) \) be the subgraph given by the “domain walls” of the connected components of \( \sigma \). \( D(\sigma) \) is the loop \( O(n) \) model; since \( D(\sigma) \) has a bounded coding radius, Lemma \ref{lem:griffiths} allows us to transfer any coding properties of \( \mu^\tau_{V} \) to \( \nu_{\Omega,n,x} \) and therefore the same holds for any infinite-volume measures associated with the loop \( O(n) \) and its cluster representation.

It is shown in \cite{9} that the cluster representation is monotonic whenever \( n \geq 1 \) and \( nx^2 \leq 1 \). Therefore, in this regime, there is a largest and smallest Gibbs measure, which we denote by \( \mu^+ \) and \( \mu^- \). Our results imply that \( \mu^+ \) (and similarly, \( \mu^- \)) is always ffiid and that it is ffiid whenever it coincides with \( \mu^- \). Using another result from \cite{9}, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 10.** For \( n \geq 1 \) and \( nx^2 \leq 1 \), there is a unique loop \( O(n) \) measure. This measure is ffiid. Moreover, if \( n \in [1,2] \) and \( x = x_c(n) \), then this measure is ffiid.

It is interesting to determine whether the unique loop \( O(n) \) measure in the regime \( n \geq 1 \) and \( nx^2 \leq 1 \) is always ffiid.

4.3. Long-range Ising models. Set \( S = \{-1,+1\} \) and let \( \sigma \) be a configuration. Let \( J = (J_A)_{A \in \mathbb{V}} \) finite be a collection of non-negative numbers called the coupling constants satisfying that

\[
\sum_{A \in \mathbb{V}}_{v \in A} J_A < \infty \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathbb{V}.
\]

The Ising measure with coupling constants \( J \) is given by

\[
\mu^\tau_{V}(\sigma) := \frac{1_{\{\sigma_{\mathbb{V},V} = \tau_{\mathbb{V},V}\}}}{Z^\tau_{V}} \cdot \exp \left[ \sum_{A \in \mathbb{V}}_{A \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset} J_A \sigma_A \right],
\]

where \( \sigma_A := \prod_{v \in A} \sigma_v \). We assume that the coupling constants are \( \Gamma \)-invariant in the sense that \( J_A = J_A \) for all \( A \) and \( \gamma \in \Gamma \).

Griffiths’s inequalities \cite{15} ensures that the model is monotone so that there exist largest and smallest Gibbs measures \( \mu^+ \) and \( \mu^- \), respectively.
Corollary 11. Let $G$ be an infinite vertex-transitive graph and let $J$ be non-negative coupling constants as above. Then $\mu^+$ and $\mu^-$ are fidi. In addition, if $\mu^+=\mu^-$ then $\mu^+$ is fidi.

5. Coupled Glauber dynamics and coupling-from-the-past

This section will use a coupled version of a spatially-truncated heat-bath Glauber dynamics for a general spin system with upwards and downwards specification. We begin with an informal description of the method.

5.1. Overview of the dynamics. Consider the sequence of finite graphs $(\mathcal{V}_{v,r})_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a monotonic irreducible upwards (or upwards-downwards) specification $\rho$. We will define a natural single-site dynamics on each $\mathcal{V}_{v,r}$, called the $+$ dynamics. A single step of this dynamics started at an arbitrary initial configuration $\omega^{(0)} \in \Omega^+_{\mathcal{V}_{v,r}}$ is defined by applying the following evolution:

- Order $\mathcal{V}_{v,r} = \{v_1, \ldots, v_m\}$ in a $\Gamma$-invariant way.
- Obtain $\omega^{(1)}$ from $\omega^{(0)}$ by resampling the value at $v_1$, i.e., $\omega^{(1)}$ is sampled from $\rho_{v_1}^{(0)}$.
- Repeat inductively, resampling $\omega_{v_k}$ using $\omega^{(k-1)}$, until all sites have been resampled.
- The final configuration $\omega^{(m)}$ is the new state.

When $\rho$ is an upwards-downwards specification, the above can be applied to configurations in $\Omega^-_{\mathcal{V}_{v,r}}$, producing the $-$ dynamics.

In Section 5.2, we construct the $+$ dynamics on $\mathcal{V}_{v,r}$ so that all initial configurations $\xi$ in $\Omega^+_{\mathcal{V}_{v,r}}$ are coupled at all times. The irreducibility assumption ensures the dynamics constructed above are ergodic for any fixed $r$. Thus, in the limit as the number of steps of the dynamics tends to infinity, the distribution converges to $\rho^+_{\mathcal{V}_{v,r}}$. Taking $r$ to infinity as well (in a suitable manner) gives convergence in distribution to $\mu^+$. The method of coupling-from-the-past allows us to move from distributional limits to stronger notions of convergence, and thus construct a coding for $\mu^+$, as will be seen in Section 5.3. Finally, in Section 5.4 we consider the $+$ and $-$ dynamics simultaneously (in a properly coupled manner), and deduce that, under the appropriate assumptions, the coding radius $R$ satisfies (4). This allows us to transfer quantitative control on the total variation distance between $\rho^+_{\mathcal{V}_{v,r}}$ and $\rho^-_{\mathcal{V}_{v,r}}$ to quantitative control on the coding radius; in particular, it shows that $\mu^+ = \mu^-$ is sufficient to prove that both measures are fidi.

5.2. The coupled dynamics. Let $Y = (Y_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ be an i.i.d. process and suppose that, for each $v \in \mathcal{V}$,$$Y_v = (Y_{v,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$is a collection of i.i.d. random variables. Further suppose that $(\mathcal{A}, \pi)$ and $(\mathcal{B}, \theta)$ are two probability spaces and that, for each $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,$$Y_{v,n} = (A_{v,n}, B_{v,n})$$are two independent random variables sampled from $\pi$ and $\theta$, respectively. We denote $A_n := (A_{v,n})_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ and $B_n := (B_{v,n})_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$. The dynamics we construct are functions of $Y$ (specifically, the $n$-th step of the dynamics is a function of $A_n$ and $B_n$), which thus yields a coding $\varphi$ from $Y$ to $\mu^+$. We now explain how to choose $(\mathcal{A}, \pi)$, $(\mathcal{B}, \theta)$ and $\varphi$. To remain general, we not explicitly define $(\mathcal{A}, \pi)$, $(\mathcal{B}, \theta)$ and $\varphi$, but rather let them be arbitrary objects satisfying certain properties required for the proof. This gives us a framework which is sufficiently flexible to prove both Theorem 5 and Theorem 6. After each definition, we also provide constructions to ensure that the objects we require actually exist. In fact, these will be used for the proof of Theorem 6; more delicate versions of these constructions, in which $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are finite, will be required for Theorem 6 (see Section 7).

As mentioned above, the dynamics we construct are a coupled version of single-site Glauber dynamics of the given upwards specification. We begin by selecting $(\mathcal{A}, \pi)$ and a measurable
function
\[ F: \Omega^+ \times \mathbb{V} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow S, \]

which is used to define a single-site update. Specifically, we require that

- The random variable \( F(\omega, v, \cdot) \) matches the specification at \( v \):
  \[ \pi \left( F(\omega, v, \cdot) = s \right) = \rho^\omega_v[\sigma_v = s] \quad \text{for any } \omega \in \Omega^+ \text{ and } s \in S. \]  
  \[ (7) \]

- \( F \) is monotonic in \( \omega \):
  \[ F(\omega, v, a) \leq F(\omega', v, a) \quad \text{for any } a \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } \omega, \omega' \in \Omega^+ \text{ such that } \omega \leq \omega', \]
  \[ (8) \]

- \( F \) is \( \Gamma \)-invariant:
  \[ F(\omega, v, a) = F(\gamma \omega, \gamma v, a) \quad \text{for any } a \in \mathcal{A}, \omega \in \Omega^+ \text{ and } \gamma \in \Gamma. \]
  \[ (9) \]

At this point, we place no additional restrictions on \( \mathcal{A} \) (in Section 7 we will need \( \mathcal{A} \) to be finite).

This allows to give a simple construction for \( F \): set \( \mathcal{A} := [0, 1] \), \( \pi := \text{Leb} \), the Lebesgue measure on the interval, and, for any \( \omega \in \Omega^+ \) and \( s \in S \),
\[ a_*(\omega, v, s) := \rho^\omega_v[\sigma_v < s] \quad \text{and} \quad a^*(\omega, v, s) := \rho^\omega_v[\sigma_v \leq s]. \]

It is straightforward to check that, for any \( \omega \in \Omega^+, s' \in S \) and \( a \in (a_*(\omega, v, s'), a^*(\omega, v, s')) \),
\[ \min\{s \in S : a^*(\omega, v, s) \geq a\} = \max\{s \in S : a_*(\omega, v, s) \leq a\} = s'. \]

Therefore, choosing an arbitrarily \( s_0 \in S \), we may now define \( F \) by
\[ F(\omega, v, a) := \begin{cases} \min\{s \in S : a^*(\omega, v, s) \geq a\} = \max\{s \in S : a_*(\omega, v, s) \leq a\} & \text{if } a \in \mathcal{A}' \\ s_0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \]

where
\[ \mathcal{A}' := \bigcap_{\omega \in \Omega^+} \bigcap_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \bigcup_{s \in S} (a_*(\omega, v, s), a^*(\omega, v, s)). \]

We note that \( \mathcal{A}' \) has Lebesgue measure one as its complement is the countable union of Lebesgue measure zero sets. Using that the upwards specification is monotone and \( \Gamma \)-invariant, it follows from the definition of \( F \) that \( (8) \) and \( (9) \) hold. To see that \( (7) \) holds, note that
\[ \pi \left( F(\omega, v, \cdot) \leq s \right) = \text{Leb}\left( \{a \in [0, 1] : a^*(\omega, v, s) \geq a\} \right) = a^*(\omega, v, s) = \rho^\omega_v[\sigma_v \leq s]. \]

For any \( v \in \mathcal{V} \) and \( a \in \mathcal{A} \), we define
\[ F_{v,a}: \Omega^+ \rightarrow \Omega^+ \]
by
\[ F_{v,a}(\omega)_u := \begin{cases} F(\omega, v, a) & \text{if } u = v \\ \omega_u & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \quad \omega \in \Omega^+, \ u \in \mathcal{V}. \]

Note that \( (9) \) implies that \( F_{v,a}(\omega) = F_{v,a}(\gamma \omega) \) for \( \gamma \in \Gamma \) and \( \omega \in \Omega^+ \).

We now describe how to choose the updating sites. In our dynamics, the set of updated sites are deterministic; we must, however, be careful as to the order of the chain of single-site updates which make up a single step of the dynamics. The most straightforward way to order the sites is to associate a uniform \([0, 1]\) random variable to each, and use the inherited linear order. This approach is very useful, but is slightly too rigid to allow use to study the coding properties we are interested in – specifically, this will be an issue when we are looking for finite-valued factors. Thus, we give a more abstract definition.

Let \( (\mathcal{B}, \mathfrak{B}) \) be a measurable space and let \( \mathcal{O}: \mathcal{B}^\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \) be measurable and \( \Gamma \)-invariant - i.e.
\[ \mathcal{O}(\gamma \eta, \gamma u, \gamma v) = \mathcal{O}(\eta, u, v) \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \Gamma. \]
We regard \( \eta \in \mathcal{B}^\mathbb{V} \) as inducing via \( \mathcal{O} \) an order \( \preceq_\eta \) on \( \mathbb{V} \), where \( \mathcal{O}(\eta, u, v) = 1 \) indicates that \( u \) precedes \( v \) in this order. Formally, \( \preceq_\eta \) is a binary relation on \( \mathbb{V} \), defined by
\[
u \preceq_\eta v \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \mathcal{O}(\eta, u, v) = 1. \tag{10}
\]
A general choice of \( \mathcal{O} \) and \( \eta \) does not result in a linear ordering – or even a preorder, for that matter! For a probability measure \( \theta \) on \( \mathcal{B} \), we say that \( \mathcal{O} \) is \( \theta \)-compatible if \( \preceq_\eta \) is almost surely a linear ordering, when \( (\eta_v)_{v \in \mathbb{V}} \) are i.i.d. samples from \( \theta \). If \( \mathcal{B} = [0, 1] \) and \( \theta \) is the uniform measure, we can choose \( \mathcal{O}(\eta, u, v) = 1_{\eta_u \leq \eta_v} \). This function is clearly \( \theta \)-compatible, and recovers the simplest ordering described earlier.

Given a finite sequence \( q = ((v_1, a_1), \ldots, (v_k, a_k)) \in (\mathbb{V} \times \mathcal{A})^k \), we denote
\[
F_q := F_{v_1, a_1} \circ \cdots \circ F_{v_k, a_k}.
\]
Given \( (\nu, \eta) \in \mathcal{A}^\mathbb{V} \times \mathcal{B}^\mathbb{V} \), a vertex \( \nu \in \mathbb{V} \) and an integer \( r \geq 0 \), we define
\[
q(\nu, \eta, v, r) := ((v_1, a_1), \ldots, (v_m, a_m)),
\]
where \( m = |\mathbb{V}_{v, r}| \), \( \mathbb{V}_{v, r} = \{v_1, \ldots, v_m\} \), \( v_1 \preceq_\eta \cdots \preceq_\eta v_m \), \( a_i = \nu_v \).

This gives rise to a coupled dynamics on \( \Omega \), namely,
\[
F_q(\nu, \eta, v, r) : \Omega^+ \to \Omega^+.
\]

For any \( v \in \mathbb{V} \) and \( r \in \mathbb{N} \), define
\[
Q^{+, v, r} : \Omega \to \Omega^+_v
\]
to be the natural projection, i.e.
\[
Q^{+, v, r}(\omega)_u := \begin{cases} 
\omega_u & \text{if } u \in \mathbb{V}_{v, r} \\
+ & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]
This allows us to define the random function from \( \Omega \) to \( \Omega^+ \):
\[
\tilde{f}^{+, v, r}_n := F_q(A_n, B_n, v, r) \circ Q^{+, v, r}.
\]
The function \( \tilde{f}^{+, v, r}_n \) describes the \( n \)th round of updates in the coupled dynamics. We also define
\[
f^{+, v, r}_n := \tilde{f}^{+, v, r}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \tilde{f}^{+, v, r}_n. \tag{11}
\]
There are two important things to note about \( f^{+, v, r}_n \). First, the order of composition is reverse from the usual convention. This will prove essential to our construction. For further discussion, see Section 5.3. Second, for any \( v, r \) and \( n \), \( f^{+, v, r}_n \) is a deterministic function of \( Y \)

Having chosen our definitions carefully, we easily obtain the following.

**Lemma 12.** For any \( r \geq 0 \) and \( v \in \mathbb{V} \),
\[
f^{+, v, r}_n(+) \xrightarrow{(d)} \rho^{+, v, r}_v \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.
\]

**Proof.** The consistency relations of the upwards specification \( \rho^+ \) imply that \( \rho^{+, v, r}_v \) is stationary with respect to \( F^{+, A}_n \) for any \( u \in \mathbb{V}_{v, r} \), where \( A \) is sampled from \( \pi \). Thus, \( \rho^{+, v, r}_v \) is also stationary with respect to \( \tilde{f}^{+, v, r}_n \),

We now consider the countable-state Markov chain
\[
g^{+, v, r}_n := \tilde{f}^{+, v, r}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \tilde{f}^{+, v, r}_n,
\]
given by composing the \( \tilde{f}^{+, v, r}_n \) in the usual order. The chain is aperiodic (as \( \tilde{f}^{+, v, r}_i(+) \) equals + with positive probability) and irreducible (since \( \rho^+ \) is irreducible). Since there exists a stationary distribution, the Markov chain is ergodic on the states with positive \( \rho^{+, v, r}_v \) measure, and thus \( g^{+, v, r}_n(+) \) converges in distribution to \( \rho^{+, v, r}_v \). Since \( g^{+, v, r}_n(+) \) and \( f^{+, v, r}_n(+) \) have the same distribution, we are done. \( \square \)
If we assume that $S$ has a minimal element $\omega$ and $\rho$ is an upwards-downwards specification, we may extend $F$ to $\Omega^+ \cup \Omega^-$, define a projection $Q_{\nu,v,r}$, and thus create $f_{n,v,r}^+$ and $f_{n,v,r}^-$ in order to define the dynamics. Lemma [12] also applies to this dynamics.

5.3. Monotonicity and existence of factors. We can think of $f_{n,v,r}^+$ as a (random) function from $\Omega$ to $\Omega_{\nu,v,r}^+$ which inherits several monotonicity properties from the upward specification $\rho^+$ (which must be stationary with respect to it).

**Lemma 13.** The function $f_{n,v,r}^+(\omega)$ preserves the order in $\omega$ and is decreasing in $r$. That is, for any $n, r \geq 0$ and $v \in \mathbb{V}$,

$$f_{n,v,r}^+(\omega) \leq f_{n,v,r}^+(\omega') \text{ for any } \omega, \omega' \in \Omega \text{ such that } \omega \leq \omega',$$

and

$$f_{n,v,r+1}^+(\omega) \leq f_{n,v,r}^+(\omega) \text{ for any } \omega \in \Omega.$$

In particular,

$$f_{n+1,v,r}^+(\omega) \leq f_{n,v,r}^+(\omega).$$

**Proof.** Thanks to [5], we know that $F_{u,a}(\omega) \leq F_{u,a}(\omega')$ for all $a \in A$, $u \in \mathbb{V}_{v,r}$, and $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega^+$ such that $\omega \leq \omega'$. Furthermore, $Q_{\nu,v,r}^+$ also maintains the order on $\Omega$ for fixed $v$ and $r$, and we conclude that $f_{n,v,r}^+$, a composition of monotone functions, is also monotonic.

We now turn to prove the second monotonicity statement. Since $Q_{\nu,v,r}^+$ is decreasing in $r$, it suffices to show that, almost surely,

$$F_{q(A_n,B_n,v,r+1)}(\omega) \leq F_{q(A_n,B_{n+1},v,r)}(\omega) \text{ for all } \omega \in \Omega_{\nu,v,r}^+.$$

Fix $\nu \in A^\mathbb{V}$ and $\eta \in B^\mathbb{V}$ such that $\leq \eta$ is a total order on $\mathbb{V}$. Write $\mathbb{V}_{v,r} = \{v_1, \ldots, v_B(v)\}$ and $\mathbb{V}_{v,r+1} = \{v_1, \ldots, v_B(v)\}$, where $v_1 \leq \eta \cdots \leq \eta v_B(v)$ and $u_1 \leq \eta \cdots \leq \eta u_B(v)$. It is clear that $v_i = u^\nu$ and $v_j = u^\eta$ then $i \leq j$ if and only if $i' \leq j'$. Therefore, for some functions $G_i: \Omega^+ \rightarrow \Omega^+$ such that $G_i(\nu)_{\nu,v,r} = \omega_{\nu,v,r}$ for all $\omega \in \Omega^+$, we have

$$F_{q(\nu,v,r+1)} = G_0 \circ F_{v_1,v_1} \circ G_1 \circ F_{v_2,v_2} \circ \cdots \circ F_{v_B(v),v_B(v)} \circ G_B.$$ 

Observe that, for any $\omega \in \Omega_{\nu,v,r}^+$, we have $G_i(\omega) \leq \omega$ and $F_{u,0}(\omega) \in \Omega_{\nu,v,r}^+$ for any $u \in \mathbb{V}_{v,r}$. Thus, given $\omega \in \Omega_{\nu,v,r}^+$, removing every composition with $G_i$ from the above sequence defining $F_{q(\nu,v,r+1)}(\omega)$ only increases the output, showing that $F_{q(\nu,v,r+1)}(\omega) \leq F_{q(\nu,v_r,v+1)}(\omega)$, as desired.

The final inequality now follows, since $\ast$ is the maximal element of $\Omega$:

$$f_{n+1,v,r}^+(\omega) = f_{n,v,r}^+ f_{n+1,v,r}^+(\omega) \leq f_{n,v,r}^+ (\omega).$$

We deduce a simple but crucial consequence of the above lemma and the definition of $f_{n,v,r}^+$:

**Corollary 14.** The random variable

$$\sigma_{n,v,r}^+ := \lim_{n \to \infty} f_{n,v,r}^+$$

is defined almost-surely and has the distribution $\rho_{\nu,v,r,\ast}^+$. Furthermore, if $\mu^+$ is a probability measure,

$$\sigma^+ := \lim_{r \to \infty} \sigma_{n,v,r}^+ = \lim_{n,v,r \to \infty} f_{n,v,r}^+$$

is also a well-defined random variable, independent of $v$, with distribution $\mu^+$.

**Proof.** The sequence $\{f_{n,v,r}^+(\omega)\}_n$ is decreasing, and must have an almost-sure limit, taking value in $\mathbb{S}_\nu$ for some possibly larger $\mathbb{S} \supset S$ (if $S$ is not finite, and thus not compact in the discrete topology, we cannot be sure that the limit is supported on $\Omega$ a priori). However, by Lemma [12]
the distribution of the limiting random variable is known to be \( \rho^*_{\nu,v,r} \), which is supported on \( \Omega^* \), giving the desired result.

By Lemma 13, \( \sigma^{+,v,r} \) is decreasing in \( r \), meaning it, too, has an almost-sure limit in a possibly larger space as \( r \) goes to infinity. Thanks to the monotonicity of the specifications, the resulting limit is independent of \( v \). Since \( \mu^* \) is defined by exhaustion, \( \sigma^+ \) must have distribution \( \mu^* \), meaning \( \sigma^+ \) is almost-surely supported in \( \Omega \). To complete the proof, we note that the array \( \{ f_n^{+,v,r}(+) \}_{n,r} \) is monotonically decreasing pointwise in both \( n \) and \( r \), and thus extracting any diagonal sequence maintains the almost-sure convergence properties above. \( \square \)

**Remark 2** (Coupling-from-the-past). Let us momentarily reconsider the standard, "forward" dynamics given by \( g_n^{+,v,r} := f_n^{+,v,r} \circ \cdots \circ f_1^{+,v,r} \). In distribution, the random variables \( f_n^{+,v,r}(+) \) and \( g_n^{+,v,r}(+) \) are identical for any fixed \( n \). However, \( g_n^{+,v,r}(+) \) cannot be monotonic in \( n \) - if our configuration + evolved to be some different configuration \( \omega \) at time \( n \), there is no reason to believe that the next step in the dynamic is smaller than \( \omega \! \). In fact, \( g_n^{+,v,r}(+) \) does not have an almost-sure limit, as it continues changing after every application of the \( g_n \).

On the other hand, \( f_n^{+,v,r}(\omega) \) is defined from the past, and can be thought of as evaluating the forward dynamics at time 0, with "initial" conditions of \( \omega \) at time \( -n \). Since \( f_n^{+,v,r}(\omega) \) is a function from \( \Omega \) to \( \Omega^{+,v,r} \), we can sample \( f_{n+1}^{+,v,r} \) given \( f_n^{+,v,r} \) by taking \( \omega \) to the (random) configuration \( f_{n+1}^{+,v,r}(\omega) \), and then mapping it to the (deterministic, given the conditioning) configuration assigned to it by \( f_n^{+,v,r} \). This concatenation construction is the conceptual justification for the existence of almost-sure limits in coupling-from-the-past.

**Proof of Theorem 5, item 1.** The existence of an i.i.d. coding follows by explicit construction: for any \( v \in \mathbb{V} \), \( \sigma^+_v = \lim_{n,r \to \infty} f_{n,v,r}(+) \). Since \( \mu^+ \) is a probability measure by assumption, Corollary 14 shows that \( \sigma^+ \) is distributed as \( \mu^+ \); the \( \Gamma \)-invariance of the specifications implies that \( \sigma^+ \) is a deterministic and \( \Gamma \)-equivariant function of \( Y \). \( \square \)

### 5.4. Finitary factors via quantitative bounds on coding radius.

For this section, we assume that \( S \) is a finite spin space and that \( \rho \) is a monotone \( \Gamma \)-invariant irreducible upwards-downwards specification. In this case, \( S \) has both a maximal and minimal element, and both \( \mu^+ \) and \( \mu^- \) are probability measures.

As mentioned above, the construction in Section 5.2 extends to upwards-downwards specifications. Observe that \( f_n^{+,v,r} \) enjoys similar properties as \( f_n^{+,v,r} \), with the notable difference that \( f_n^{+,v,r}(\omega) \) is *increasing* in \( r \) (it still preserves the order in \( \omega \)). As in Corollary 14, \( \sigma^{+,v,r} \) and \( \sigma^- \) are defined almost surely and are distributed as \( \rho^*_{\nu,v,r} \) and \( \mu^- \), respectively.

We stress that the + and – dynamics are coupled as they are both defined through the same process \( Y \). In particular, almost surely,

\[
f_n^{-,v,r}(\omega) \leq f_n^{+,v,r}(\omega') \quad \text{for any } v \in \mathbb{V}, \ r \in \mathbb{N}, \ \omega, \omega' \in \Omega \text{ such that } \omega \leq \omega'.
\]

This implies that, almost surely,

\[
\sigma^{-,v,r} \leq \sigma^- \leq \sigma^+ \leq \sigma^{+,v,r} \quad \text{for any } v \in \mathbb{V}.
\]

For finite spin spaces, we have the following lemma which relates the probability of disagreement under monotone couplings to total-variation bounds:

**Lemma 15.** Let \( X \) and \( Y \) be random variables taking value in a totally-ordered, finite spin space \( S \). If \( \mathbb{P}[X \leq Y] = 1 \), then

\[
\mathbb{P}[X \neq Y] \leq (|S| - 1) \cdot \|X - Y\|_{TV}.
\]

**Proof.** Identifying \( S \) with the set \( \{0, \ldots, |S| - 1\} \), we see that, by Markov’s inequality,

\[
\mathbb{P}[X \neq Y] = \mathbb{P}[Y - X \geq 1] \leq \mathbb{E}[Y - X] = \mathbb{E}_{\text{op}}[Y - X] \leq (|S| - 1)\mathbb{P}_{\text{op}}[X \neq Y],
\]

where \( \mathbb{E}_{\text{op}} \) denotes the expectation under the uniform distribution on \( S \). \( \square \)
Proof of Theorem 5 item 2. We let \((A, \pi)\) and \(F\) be as above. We let \((B, \theta)\) be the Lebesgue measure space on \([0,1]\) and set \(O(\eta, u, v) := 1_{\eta u \leq v}\). With this choice, it is clear that \(\sigma^{+,v,r}\) is measurable with respect to \(Y_{v,r}\). Recall that \(\sigma^+\) describes a coding from \(Y\) to \(\mu^+\). Our goal is then to bound its coding radius \(R_v\).

Define the random variable

\[
\tilde{R}_v := \min \{ r \geq 0 : \sigma^{+,v,r} = \sigma^{-,v,r} \},
\]

where we set \(\tilde{R} = \infty\) if the two spins do not agree for any \(r\). Thus, \(\sigma^+_v = \sigma^{+,v,r}\) for any \(r \geq \tilde{R}_v\). Since \(\sigma^{+,v,r}\) is independent of \((Y_u)_{ufV,v,r}\) and \(\tilde{R}_v\) is a stopping time with respect to the filtration of \((Y_{v,r})_r\), it is clear that \(R_v \leq \tilde{R}_v\).

By Lemma 15

\[
\mathbb{P}[\tilde{R}_v > r] = \mathbb{P}[\sigma^{+,v,r} \neq \sigma^{-,v,r}] \leq (|S| - 1) \cdot \| \rho_{Y,v,r}^+(\sigma_v) - \rho_{Y,v,r}^-(\sigma_v) \|_{TV},
\]

as required. In particular, if \(\mu^+ = \mu^-\), it is clear the total variation distance must vanish as \(r \to \infty\), so that \(R_v\) is almost-surely finite.

\[
\square
\]

6. Weak spatial mixing implies exponential mixing in time

In this section, we prove bounds on the mixing-time of the dynamics considered in Section 5. Throughout this section, we will assume that \(S\) is finite and that we are given a monotone \(\Gamma\)-invariant irreducible upwards-downwards specification \(\rho\). In particular, we use the coupled + and − dynamics as in Section 5.4.

A monotone \(\Gamma\)-invariant (upwards-downwards) specification \(\rho\) is said to satisfy weak spatial mixing with rate \(c > 0\) if (9) holds for some \(C\). Martinelli and Olivieri [22] show that when \(G = \mathbb{Z}^d\) and \(\rho\) is a monotone \(\Gamma\)-invariant specification satisfying a finite-range assumption and a finite-energy assumption, weak spatial mixing implies that the mixing-time of the single-site Glauber dynamics (as considered in Section 5.1) has exponential tails (their setting is a continuous-time dynamics on \(\mathbb{Z}^d\), but the proof easily adapts to our discrete-time dynamics on \(\mathbb{Z}^d\)). In our notation, this means that the total-variation distance between \(\lim_{r \to \infty} f_n^{+,v,r}(+)\) and \(\lim_{r \to \infty} f_n^{-,v,r}(-)\) is exponentially small in \(n\). Using the order constructed in Section 5.2 we can see that the finite range assumption implies that \(f_n^{+,v,n}(+)\) and \(f_n^{-,v,n}(-)\) are exponentially close, as both \(f_n^{+,v,r}(+)\) and \(f_n^{-,v,r}(-)\) depend only on \(\{A_{u,i}, B_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_v, C_r, i \leq n}\) for some constant \(C > 0\) depending on the range of the specification.

We extend the result of Martinelli–Olivieri in a number of directions. First, we allow an arbitrary quasi-transitive graph \(G\) of sub-exponential growth (though we require a slightly stronger quantitative bound on the rate of growth for the full conclusion). Second, we drop the finite-range and finite-energy assumptions, requiring only an irreducibility assumption. Third, we work with a monotone upwards-downwards specification, instead of a complete specification. Lastly, we keep track not only of the amount of time required until mixing, but also the amount of space (in the graph \(G\)) required.

**Theorem 16.** Let \(G\) be an infinite graph and \(\Gamma\) be a group acting quasi-transitively on \(V\) by automorphisms of \(G\). Let \(S\) be a totally-ordered finite spin space and \(\rho\) be a monotone \(\Gamma\)-invariant irreducible upwards-downwards specification that satisfies weak spatial mixing with rate \(c > 0\). If \(G\) has sub-exponential growth, i.e., \(B(r) = e^{\varphi(r)}\) as \(r \to \infty\), then

\[
\max_{v \in V} \| f_n^{+,v,n}(+) - f_n^{-,v,n}(-) \|_{TV} \leq e^{-n^{1-o(1)}} \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.
\]
Moreover, if there exists $\beta < c \log 2$ such that $B(r) \leq e^{\frac{\beta r}{n}}$ for large $r$, then there exists $c' > 0$ such that
\[
\max_{v \in V} \| f_n^{+,v,n}(+)_v - f_n^{-,v,n}(-)_v \|_{TV} \leq e^{-c'n} \quad \text{for large } n.
\]

For the proof, we require the following calculus lemma, whose proof we postpone to the end of the section.

**Lemma 17.** Let $\psi: \mathbb{N} \to (0, \infty)$ be monotone decreasing to zero and let $b: \mathbb{N} \to [0, \infty)$ be sub-linear. Suppose that, for some $C, c > 0$,
\[
\psi(2n) \leq e^{b(n)} \psi(n)^2 + Ce^{-cs} \quad \text{for all } n \geq s \geq 1.
\]
Then $\psi(n)$ decays faster than any stretched-exponential, i.e., $\psi(n) \leq \exp(-n^{1-o(1)})$. In addition, if $b(n) \leq \frac{2n}{\log n}$ for some $\beta < c \log 2$ and all sufficiently large $n$, then $\psi(n)$ decays exponentially fast.

**Proof of Theorem 16.** For $n, r \geq 0$, define
\[
\phi(n, r) := \max_{v \in V} \mathbb{P}[f_n^{+,v,r}(+)_v \neq f_n^{-,v,r}(-)_v].
\]
Throughout the proof, we repeatedly use Lemma 17 without explicit mention; in particular, we use the fact that $\phi(n, r)$ is decreasing in both $n$ and $r$, as easily follows.

It suffices to show that $\psi(n) := \phi(n, n)$ has the desired decay rate. Note that the weak spatial mixing assumption implies that $\mu^+ = \mu^-$, which, together with irreducibility, implies that $\psi(n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus, the theorem will follow from Lemma 17 once we establish the following inequality:
\[
\psi(2n) \leq \phi(2n, n + s) \leq 2B(s)\psi(n)^2 + 3C|S|e^{-cs} \quad \text{for all } n \geq s \geq 0.
\]
In fact, we show the slightly stronger inequality:
\[
\phi(n + m, r + s) \leq 2B(s)\phi(n, r)\phi(m, r + s) + 2C|S|e^{-cs} + C|S|e^{-cr} \quad \text{for all } n, m, s \geq 0 \text{ and } r \geq s. \tag{12}
\]
The earlier inequality follows by setting $n = m = r$.

Recall that $f_n^{+,v,r}$ is measurable with respect to the i.i.d. process $Y$. Let $\xi_v^+ \sim \rho_{\xi_v}^+ r$ and $\xi_v^- \sim \rho_{\xi_v}^- r$ be a random variables, independent of $Y$, satisfying that $\xi_v^+ \geq \xi_v^-$ almost surely. Note that $f_n^{+,v,r}(\xi_v^+) \sim \rho_{\xi_v}^+ r$ and $f_n^{+,v,r}(\xi_v^-) \sim \rho_{\xi_v}^- r$. By comparing $f_n^{+,v,r}(+)_v$ to $f_n^{+,v,r}(\xi_v^+)_v$ and $f_n^{+,v,r}(-)_v$ to $f_n^{+,v,r}(\xi_v^-)_v$, and using Lemma 15, we see that
\[
\phi(n, r) \leq \phi^+(n, r) + \phi^-(n, r) + |S| \max_{v \in V} \| \rho_{\xi_v}^+(\sigma_v \in \cdot) - \rho_{\xi_v}^-(\sigma_v \in \cdot) \|_{TV}, \tag{13}
\]
where
\[
\phi^+(n, r) := \max_{v \in V} \mathbb{P}[f_n^{+,v,r}(+)_v \neq f_n^{+,v,r}(\xi_v^+)_v], \quad \phi^-(n, r) := \max_{v \in V} \mathbb{P}[f_n^{-,v,r}(-)_v \neq f_n^{-,v,r}(\xi_v^-)_v].
\]
Next, we now show that
\[
\phi^+(n + m, r + s) \leq B(s)\phi(n, r)\phi(m, r + s) + |S| \max_{v \in V} \| \rho_{\xi_v}^+(\sigma_v \in \cdot) - \rho_{\xi_v}^-(\sigma_v \in \cdot) \|_{TV}. \tag{14}
\]
This statement will give (12) thanks to (6) and (13). We show (11) only for $\phi^+$ as the proof for $\phi^-$ is similar. Recall from (11) that $f_n^{+,v,r+s}$ is the composition of $n + m$ independent copies of $f_n^{+,v,r+s}$. Letting $h_n^{+,v,r+s}$ be identical in distribution to $f_n^{+,v,r+s}$ and independent of $Y$ and $\xi_v^+$, we see that $f_m^{+,v,r+s} \circ h_n^{+,v,r+s}$ has the same distribution as $f_n^{+,v,r+s}$. Therefore,
\[
\phi^+(n + m, r + s) = \max_{v \in V} \mathbb{P}[f_n^{+,v,r+s}(h_n^{+,v,r+s}(\xi_v^+_v))_v \neq f_n^{+,v,r+s}(h_n^{+,v,r+s}(\xi_v^+_v))_v],
\]
Now, letting $E_{v,u}$ denote the event that $h_n^{+,v,r+s}(v) = h_n^{+,v,r+s}(\xi_v^+_v)$ and letting $E_v := \bigcap_{u \in V, v} E_{v,u}$,
\[
\phi^+(n + m, r + s) \leq \max_{v \in V} \mathbb{P}(E^c_v) \cdot \mathbb{P}[f_n^{+,v,r+s}(+)_v \neq f_n^{+,v,r+s}(-)_v]
\]
\[
+ \max_{v \in V} \mathbb{P}[f_m^{+,v,r+s}(h_n^{+,v,r+s}(\xi_v^+_v))_v \neq f_m^{+,v,r+s}(h_n^{+,v,r+s}(\xi_v^+_v))_v].
\]
This follows by two different types of monotonicity: if the configurations did not couple by time \( n \), we may assume they take on their maximal difference. If they do, we may assume the boundary conditions outside \( \mathbb{V}_{v,s} \) take on the worst possible state.

For the first term, since \( \mathbb{V}_{u,r} \subset \mathbb{V}_{v,r+s} \) for \( u \in \mathbb{V}_{v,s} \), we have

\[
P(E^c_{v,u}) \leq P[h_{n,v,r+s}^+(*)_u \neq h_{n,v,r+s}^-(*)_u] \leq P[h_{n,v,r}^+(*)_u \neq h_{n,v,r}^-(*)_u] \leq \phi(n,r), \quad u \in \mathbb{V}_{v,s},
\]
so that

\[
P(E^c_{v,u}) \leq \sum_{u \in \mathbb{V}_{v,s}} P(E^c_{v,u}) \leq B(s)\phi(n,r).
\]

For the second term, we note that \( s \leq r \) implies that \( \rho_{\mathbb{V}_{v,s}}^r \leq \rho_{\mathbb{V}_{v,r}}^r \leq \rho_{\mathbb{V}_{v,s}}^r \). Since \( \xi^r_v \sim \rho_{\mathbb{V}_{v,r}}^r \), we see that

\[
f_m^+(h_{n,v,r+s}^+(\xi^r_v)) \leq f_m^+(h_{n,v,s}^+(\xi^r_v)) \leq \rho_{\mathbb{V}_{v,s}}^r,
\]
\[
f_m^-(h_{n,v,r+s}^+(\xi^r_v)) \geq f_m^-(h_{n,v,s}^+(\xi^r_v)) \geq \rho_{\mathbb{V}_{v,s}}^r.
\]

Thus, Lemma \( \text{[15]} \) gives that

\[
P[f_m^+(h_{n,v,r+s}^+(\xi^r_v)) \neq f_m^-(h_{n,v,r+s}^+(\xi^r_v))] \leq |S| \cdot \|\rho_{\mathbb{V}_{v,s}}^r (\sigma_v \in \cdot) - \rho_{\mathbb{V}_{v,s}}^r (\sigma_v \in \cdot)\|_{TV}.
\]

Putting this together yields \( \text{[14]} \).

**Proof of Lemma \( \text{[17]} \).** Denote \( a_n := -\log \psi(n) \) and observe that the main assumption implies that

\[
a_{2n} \geq cs - \log(1 + C) \quad \text{for any } n \geq s \geq 1 \text{ such that } cs + b(s) \leq 2a_n. \quad \text{(15)}
\]

The restriction that \( s \leq n \) is a nuisance; to rid ourselves of it, we note that either \( a_n \geq cn/2 \) for infinitely many \( n \), or, whenever \( n \) is large, any solution to \( cs + b(s) \leq 2a_n \) satisfies \( s \leq n \). In the former case, it is not difficult to check that \( a_n = \Omega(n) \), so that \( \psi(n) \) decays exponentially. We may therefore assume that this is not the case.

We begin by showing that \( \psi(n) \) decays faster than any stretched-exponential, that is, that \( a_n \) grows faster than \( n^\delta \) for any \( 0 < \delta < 1 \). Since \( b(s) \) is sub-linear by assumption, for any fixed \( \epsilon > 0 \), we have \( cs + b(s) \leq 2x \) for all \( x \leq (2/c - \epsilon)x \) and large \( x \). Since \( a_n \to \infty \) as \( n \to \infty \), it follows from \( \text{[15]} \) that \( a_{2n} \geq c(2/c - \epsilon)a_n - \log(1 + C) \geq (2 - c\epsilon - \epsilon)a_n \) for large \( n \). We conclude that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} a_{2n}2^{-\delta n} = \infty \quad \text{for any } 0 < \delta < 1.
\]

It is then straightforward to show that \( a_n = n^{1-o(1)} \), establishing the first part of the lemma.

Towards showing an exponential bound under the additional assumption on the growth rate of \( b(n) \), let \( \beta < c \log 2 \) be such that \( b(n) \leq \frac{\beta n}{\log n} \). Let \( \beta/c < \alpha < \log 2 \). We claim that

\[
s \leq \frac{2x}{c}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\log x}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad cs + b(s) \leq 2x \quad \text{for large } x.
\]

Indeed, since \( s \Rightarrow cs + b(s) \) is increasing, this follows from

\[
2x(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\log x}) + \frac{2x\beta}{c}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\log x}) \leq 2x\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\log x}\right) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{c\log \left[\frac{2x}{c}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\log x})\right]}\right) \leq 2x.
\]

Thus, by \( \text{[15]} \), there exists \( N \) such that

\[
a_{2n} \geq 2a_n(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\log a_n}) \quad \text{for all } n \geq N.
\]

Let \( 0 < \gamma < 1 - \frac{\alpha}{\log 2} \) and let \( A > 0 \) be small enough so that \( a_{2N} \geq AN/(\log N)^{1-\gamma} \). We prove by induction that

\[
a_n \geq \frac{An}{(\log n)^{1-\gamma}} \quad \text{for all } n \in \{N, 2N, 4N, 8N, \ldots\}.
\]
Towards upgrading this bound to the desired exponential bound, define
\[ a_{2n} \geq a_n \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\log a_n}\right) \geq \frac{2An}{(\log n)^{1-\gamma}} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\log An - \log(\log n)^{1-\gamma}}\right) \]
\[ = \frac{2An}{(\log 2n)^{1-\gamma}} \cdot \frac{(\log 2n)^{1-\gamma}}{(\log n)^{1-\gamma}} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\log An - \log(\log n)^{1-\gamma}}\right). \]
The induction step now follows using that
\[ (1 - \gamma) \log 2 > \alpha \] and that
\[ \frac{(\log 2n)^{1-\gamma}}{(\log n)^{1-\gamma}} = \left(1 + \frac{2\log 2}{\log n}\right)^{1-\gamma} \geq 1 + \frac{(1 - \gamma) \log 2}{\log n}. \]
We conclude that
\[ \psi(n) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{An}{(\log n)^{1-\gamma}}\right) \quad \text{for all } n \in \{N, 2N, 4N, 8N, \ldots \}. \quad (16) \]
Towards upgrading this bound to the desired exponential bound, define
\[ \ell(n) := e^{\left(\log n\right)^{1-\gamma/2}} \psi(n) + e^{-cn/4 + \sqrt{\gamma}}. \]
Using the recursion assumption with \( s = n \), we see that for large \( n \),
\[ \ell(2n) = e^{\left(\log 2n\right)^{1-\gamma/2}} \psi(2n) + e^{-cn/2 + \sqrt{\gamma}} \]
\[ \leq e^{\left(\log 2n\right)^{1-\gamma/2} + \log n} \psi(n)^2 + e^{\left(\log 2n\right)^{1-\gamma/2} - cn} + e^{-cn/2 + \sqrt{2n}} \]
\[ \leq e^{\left(\log n\right)^{1-\gamma/2}} \psi(n)^2 + e^{-cn/2 + \sqrt{2n} + 1} \]
\[ \leq \ell(n)^2. \]
Since (16) implies that \( \liminf_{n \to \infty} \ell(n) = 0 \), there exists \( M \geq 1 \) such that \( \ell(M) \leq 1/e \) and \( \ell(2n) \leq \ell(n)^2 \) for all \( n \geq M \). Then \( \ell(2^n M) \leq e^{-2^n} \) for all \( n \geq 0 \). Since \( \max_{n \leq m \leq 2n} \ell(m) \leq e^{n/(\log n)^{1-\gamma/2}} \ell(n) \), it easily follows that \( \ell(n) \) decays exponentially fast, and we conclude that \( \psi(n) \) also decays exponentially fast. \( \square \)

7. Space-time finitary codings

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 6. As such, the graph \( G \) will be an infinite quasi-transitive graph satisfying (5), \( S \) will be finite (and identified with \( \{0, 1, \ldots, |S| - 1\} \)), and \( \rho \) will be a monotone \( \Gamma \)-invariant irreducible marginally-finite upwards-downwards specification such that \( \mu^+ = \mu^- \).

We will reuse the dynamics of Section 5 but will now demand that the spaces \( \mathcal{A} \) and \( \mathcal{B} \) are both finite. Before we construct suitable versions of \( (\mathcal{A}, \pi) \), \( F \), \( (\mathcal{B}, \theta) \) and \( \mathcal{O} \), let us outline the properties required to obtain a space-time finitary coding.

For any \( v \in V \), define
\[ T_v := \min \left\{ n : f_n^{+;v,n}(\ast)_v = f_n^{-;v,n}(\ast)_v \right\}. \]
The assumption \( \mu^+ = \mu^- \) implies that \( \sigma^+ = \sigma^- \) (as was shown in the proof of Theorem 5 item 2). Thus, from Corollary 14 we conclude that \( T_v \) is almost surely finite, and, in particular,
\[ \sigma_v^+ = \sigma_v^- = f_{T_v}^{+;v,T_v}(\ast) = f_{T_v}^{-;v,T_v}(\ast), \quad v \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \]
With a finite-valued construction of \( (\mathcal{A}, \pi) \) and \( (\mathcal{B}, \theta) \), this does not allow us to conclude that the coding \( \varphi \) is finitary (let alone space-time finitary). Indeed, \( T_v \) does not bound the coding radius as it is not necessarily a stopping time with respect to the filtration \( (V_{v,r}) \). This is because the ordering \( \preceq_B \) restricted to \( V_{v,r} \) may depend on \( \{B_{u,n}\}_{u \in V_{v,r}} \).
To deal with this issue, for \( \eta \in \mathcal{B}^V \), we define
\[
R_{u,v}(\eta) := \min \{ r \geq 0 : 1_{\{u \rightarrow v\}} = 1_{\{u \rightarrow v\}}^r \text{ for any } \eta' \text{ satisfying } \eta'_u = \eta'_{v} \},
\]
where we again set the variable to \( \infty \) if the set is empty. In words, \( R_{u,v}(\eta) \) is the minimal radius around \( u \) and \( v \) needed to determine the relative \( \leq_{\eta} \)-order between \( u \) and \( v \). We now set
\[
T^* \varepsilon := 2 \min \{ n : f_{n,v}^+, \varepsilon (v) = f_{n,v}^- (v) \varepsilon \text{ and } R_{u,v}(B_i) \leq n \text{ for all } u, w \in \mathcal{V}_v, n \}
\]
The factor of 2 is introduced to accommodate the fact that \( \varepsilon \) implies the occurrence of \( \varepsilon \). Thus, the first part of Theorem 6 will follow once we can construct finite probability spaces (\( A, \pi \)) and (\( B, \theta \)) and their associated functions that imply \( T^* \varepsilon \) is almost surely finite. The second part will require quantitative bounds on the tails of \( T^* \varepsilon \), which will require the use of the mixing time results of the previous section.

7.1. Constructing finite probability spaces. We begin by choosing (\( A, \pi \)) and \( F \). We set
\[
\mathcal{A} := \left\{ \rho_v^\omega [\sigma_v \leq s] \right\}_{\omega \in \Omega^+ \cup \Omega^-, v \in \mathcal{V}, s \in S}.
\]
Since \( S \) is finite and \( \rho \) is marginally-finite, we immediately see that \( \mathcal{A} \) is finite as well. Thus, we may order the finite number of elements of \( \mathcal{A} \) in increasing order, \( 0 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_m = 1 \), where \( m := |\mathcal{A}| \). Letting \( a_0 := 0 \), we define \( \pi \) by
\[
\pi(\{a_i\}) := a_i - a_{i-1}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m.
\]
We then define \( F \) by
\[
F(\omega, v, a_i) := \min \{ s \in S : \rho_v^\omega [\sigma_v \leq s] \geq a_i \}, \quad \omega \in \Omega^+ \cup \Omega^-, 1 \leq i \leq m.
\]
It is straightforward to check that (7), (8) and (9) hold, where we recall that, in all those equations, we allow \( \omega \in \Omega^+ \cup \Omega^- \). We now turn to choosing (\( B, \theta \)) and \( O \). We set \( B := \{1, \ldots, D\} \) for some integer \( D \geq 2 \) and we set \( \theta \) to be the uniform measure on \( B \). Given \( \eta \in \mathcal{B}^V \) and \( v \in \mathcal{V} \), define \( Z_v(\eta) = (Z_{v,n}(\eta))_{n \geq 0} \in \mathbb{N}^V \) by
\[
Z_{v,0}(\eta) := \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}_v \cap \mathcal{V}_{v,n-1}} \eta_u,
\]
where it is understood that \( Z_{v,0}(\eta) := \eta_v \). We now define
\[
O(\eta, u, v) := 1_{Z_u(\eta) \leq Z_v(\eta)},
\]
where \( \leq \) is used to indicate the lexicographical order on \( \mathbb{N}^V \). This creates a preorder \( \leq \) on \( \mathcal{V} \). The following lemma shows that \( O \) is \( \theta \)-compatible, i.e., that \( \leq \) is almost surely a total ordering, when \( (\eta_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \) are i.i.d. samples of \( \theta \).

**Lemma 18.** Let \( G \) be an infinite quasi-transitive graph satisfying (5). Then \( O \) is \( \theta \)-compatible and, letting \( \eta = (\eta_v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \) be i.i.d. random variables sampled from \( \theta \),
\[
\mathbb{P}(R_{u,v}(\eta) > r) \leq D^{-r} \quad \text{for any distinct } u, v \in \mathcal{V} \text{ and } r \geq 0.
\]

**Proof.** Fix \( u, v \in \mathcal{V} \) distinct. Consider the event
\[
A_n := \bigcap_{i=1}^n \{ Z_v(i, \eta) = Z_v(i, \eta) \}.
\]
Observe that \( O \) is \( \theta \)-compatible if and only if \( \mathbb{P}(A_n) \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \). Observe also that \( R_{u,v}(\eta) > n \) implies the occurrence \( A_n \). Thus, the lemma will follow once we show that \( \mathbb{P}(A_n \mid A_{n-1}) \leq 1 \) for all \( n \geq 1 \). By (5), there exists some \( w_n \in (\mathcal{V}_{u,n} \setminus \mathcal{V}_{u,n-1}) \setminus \mathcal{V}_{v,n} \). Then
\[
\mathbb{P}(A_n \mid \eta_{\mathcal{V} \setminus \{w_n\}}) \leq \max_{k \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{P}(\eta_{w_n} = k) \leq 1.
\]
Since \( A_{n-1} \) is measurable with respect to \( \eta_{\mathcal{V} \setminus \{w_n\}} \), it follows that \( \mathbb{P}(A_n \mid A_{n-1}) \leq 1 \). \( \square \)
7.2. **Proof of Theorem 6.** The first item of the theorem will follow once we show that $T^*_v$ is almost surely finite. By monotonicity, $f^{+,v,n}_n(+) = f^{+,v,n}_n(-)$ for all $n \geq T_v$. Thus, since $T_v$ is almost surely finite, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{P}(E_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, where $E_n$ is the event that there exists $0 \leq i \leq n$ and a pair of vertices $u, v \in V_n$ for which $R_{u,v}(B_i) \geq n$. Indeed, taking $D$ to be larger than $3\Delta^2$, where $\Delta$ is the degree of $G$, the union bound and Lemma 18 allow us to conclude that
\[
\mathbb{P}(E_n) \leq (n + 1)B(n)D^{-n} \leq 10n\Delta 2^n D^{-n} \leq 2^{-n}
\]
for any sufficiently large $n$.

This completes the proof of the first item of the theorem.

We now turn to the second item of the theorem. Since, on the complement of $E_n$, $T_v \leq n$ implies that $T^*_v \leq 2n$, we see that
\[
\mathbb{P}(T^*_v > 2n) \leq \mathbb{P}(E_n) + \mathbb{P}(\{T^*_v > 2n\} \cap E_n) \leq \mathbb{P}(E_n) + \mathbb{P}(T_v > n).
\]

Thus, for large $n$,
\[
\mathbb{P}(T^*_v > 2n) \leq 2^{-n} + |S| \cdot \|f^{+,v,n}_n(+) - f^{-,v,n}_n(-)\|_{TV},
\]
and the theorem follows from Theorem 16.

8. **Finite-valued codings**

In this section, we prove Corollary 7. To this end, we require a result from [27]. Before stating it, we introduce the necessary notation. Suppose that $Y = (Y_{v,i})_{v \in \mathbb{Z}^d, i \geq 0}$ are i.i.d. random variables taking values in a finite set $\mathcal{F}$. Let 0 be the origin of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, and $F = (F_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be a strictly increasing sequence of subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{N}$ with $F_0 := \{(0, 0)\}$, and consider the associated $\sigma$-algebras $\{\mathcal{F}^n_v\}_{v \in \mathbb{Z}^d, n \geq 0}$ defined by
\[
\mathcal{F}^n_v := \sigma\{Y_{v+u,i}, (a,b) \in \mathcal{F}_n\}.
\]

A random field $\tau = (\tau_v)_{v \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is said to be a $F$-stopping-process for $Y$ if, for every $v$, $\tau_v$ is an almost surely finite stopping time with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}^n_v)_{n \geq 0}$. Given a $F$-stopping-process, we denote by $Y^\tau$ the random field
\[
Y^\tau := \{(Y_{v+u,i})_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{F}_n}\}_{v \in \mathbb{Z}^d}.
\]

Note that $(Y^\tau)_v$ takes values in the finite-configuration space $\cup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{F}_n$. We say that $F$ is linear if
\[
\Delta_n := \max\{\max\{|u|, i\} : (u, i) \in \mathcal{F}_n\} \leq \Delta n \quad \text{for some } \Delta \geq 1 \text{ and all } n \geq 0.
\]

In the special case when $\tau$ is a $F^*$-stopping-process, where $F^*_n := \{0\} \times \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$, we call $\tau$ a simple stopping-process, in which case, $Y^\tau$ can unambiguously be thought of as $(Y_{v,i})_{v \in \mathbb{Z}^d, 0 \leq i \leq \tau_v}$.

**Proposition 19 (27, Proposition 1.7).** Let $Y = (Y_{v,i})_{v \in \mathbb{Z}^d, i \geq 0}$ be an i.i.d. process, let $F$ be linear, and let $\tau$ be a stationary $F$-stopping-process for $Y$ and $\sigma$ a stationary simple stopping-process for $Y$. Suppose $\tau_v$ has exponential tails and $\mathbb{E}[F_{\tau_v}] < \mathbb{E}\sigma_v + 1$. Then $Y^\tau$ is a finitary factor of $Y^\sigma$ with stretched-exponential tails.

**Proof of Corollary 7.** By Theorem 6, there exists a space-time finitary coding $\varphi$ from an i.i.d. process $Y$ to $\mu^+$ whose space-time coding radius $R^*$ has exponential tails. Let $R^*_v$ denote the space-time coding radius of the vertex $v \in \mathcal{V}$.

Define $F_n := \{(u, i) : |u| \leq n, 0 \leq i \leq n\}$ and note that the random field $\tau = (R^*_n)_{v \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is a stationary $F$-stopping-process for $Y$. Since $\tau_v$ has exponential tails, it follows that $\mathbb{E}[F_{\tau_v}] < \infty$. Since, by definition of the process $Y^\tau$, $\varphi(Y)_v$ is a function of $(Y^\tau)_v$, which does not depend on $v$ (i.e., $\varphi(Y)$ is a finitary factor of $Y^\tau$ with coding radius 0), it suffices to show that $Y^\tau$ is $fv$-fluid with stretched-exponential tails. Indeed, letting $M$ be any integer larger than $\mathbb{E}[F_{\tau_v}]$, Proposition 19 applied with $\sigma_v := M$ for all $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, yields that $Y^\tau$ is a finitary factor $((Y_{v,i})_{0 \leq i \leq M})_{v \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ with stretched-exponential tails. Since the latter process is a finite-valued i.i.d. process, the proof is complete.
9. Obstructions to finitary codings for the wired random-cluster model

We conclude the paper by providing the postponed proof for Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. Suppose that \( \phi_{p,q}^0 \neq \phi_{p,q}^1 \) and assume towards a contradiction that \( \phi_{p,q}^1 \) is fflid. Let \( \rho^0 \) and \( \rho^1 \) denote the free-DLR and wired-DLR specifications, respectively. We write \( \omega \) for a generic random element of \( \{0,1\}^E \).

Since \( G \) is amenable and edge-transitive, there exists a sequence \( F_n \subset E \) of non-empty finite subsets such that \( \frac{|\partial F_n|}{|F_n|} \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \). For \( n \geq 1 \), denote
\[
Z_n := \frac{1}{|F_n|} \sum_{i \in F_n} \omega_i.
\]

Denote \( a_0 := \phi_{p,q}^0(\omega_e) \) and \( a_1 := \phi_{p,q}^1(\omega_e) \) and note that \( a_0 < a_1 \). Since \( \phi_{p,q}^1 \) is fflid, it follows that the convergence in the ergodic theorem occurs at an exponential rate for \( \phi_{p,q}^1 \) (this was shown in [3] for the case \( G = \mathbb{Z}^d \), and the proof there goes through with no changes for an arbitrary quasi-transitive graph \( G \)). Hence, denoting \( a := \frac{1}{2}(a_0 + a_1) \),
\[
\phi_{p,q}^1(\omega_n \leq a) \leq Ce^{-2c|F_n|} \quad \text{for some } C, c > 0 \text{ and all } n \geq 1.
\]

By Markov’s inequality,
\[
\phi_{p,q}^1(T_n) \leq Ce^{-|F_n|}, \quad \text{where } T_n := \{ \tau \in \{0,1\}^E : \rho_{\tau,1}^{c\cdot E}(\omega_n \leq a) \geq e^{-c|F_n|} \}.
\]
Let us show that the all 0 configuration \( 0 \) belongs to \( T_n \) for large \( n \). Since \( \rho_{V}^{0,1} = \rho_{V}^{0} \) for all finite \( V \subset \mathbb{V} \), it suffices to show that \( 0 \in T_n^0 \) for all \( n \). By monotonicity of the specification \( \rho^0 \), \( T_n^0 \) is a decreasing set for each \( n \), and thus it suffices to show that \( T_n^0 \) is non-empty for large \( n \). Indeed, by Markov’s inequality,
\[
1 - \phi_{p,q}^0(T_n^0) = \phi_{p,q}^0(\rho_{F_n}^{\omega,0}(\omega_n \leq a) < e^{-c|F_n|}) \leq \phi_{p,q}^0(\rho_{F_n}^{\omega,0}(\omega_n \leq a) \leq o(1)) = \phi_{p,q}^0(\rho_{F_n}^{\omega,0}(\omega_n > a) \geq 1 - o(1)) \leq (1 + o(1)) \cdot \phi_{p,q}^0(\rho_{F_n}^{\omega,0}(\omega_n > a)).
\]
Thus, using the fact that \( \phi_{p,q}^0 \) is a free-DLR random-cluster measure and that \( Z_n \) is measurable with respect to \( \omega_{F_n} \), applying Markov’s inequality again, we obtain that
\[
1 - \phi_{p,q}^0(T_n^0) \leq (1 + o(1)) \cdot \phi_{p,q}^0(\omega_n > a) \leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{a_0}{a}.
\]
Since \( a_0 < a \), we conclude that \( T_n^0 \) is non-empty for large \( n \), and thus that \( 0 \in T_n^1 \) for large \( n \). Let \( \Omega_{\partial F_n}^0 \) denote the set of configurations that equal zero on \( \partial F_n \). Observe that \( \rho_{\tau,1}^{F_n} = \rho_{F_n}^{0,1} \) for all \( n \) and \( \tau \in \Omega_{\partial F_n}^0 \). Thus, \( \Omega_{\partial F_n}^0 \subset T_n^1 \) for large \( n \), so that
\[
\phi_{p,q}^1(\omega_{\partial F_n} = 0) = \phi_{p,q}^1(\Omega_{\partial F_n}^0) \leq Ce^{-c|F_n|} \quad \text{for large } n.
\]
On the other hand, by finite energy, we have the lower bound
\[
\phi_{p,q}^1(\omega_{\partial F_n} = 0) \geq \left( \frac{p}{p + (1 - p)q} \right)^{|\partial F_n|} \quad \text{for all } n.
\]
Since \( \frac{|\partial F_n|}{|F_n|} \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \), we have reached a contradiction. \( \square \)

Remark 3. The proof we provided for Theorem 2 adapts a similar result in [28]. By definition, a Markov random field’s finite-volume measure \( \rho_{\tau}^X \) depends on \( \tau \) only through \( \tau_{\partial V} \). Although the random-cluster model is not a Markov random field, it does have a notion of “decoupling boundary conditions” – namely, the empty (free) boundary conditions. For both the free-DLR and wired-DLR
random-cluster specifications, \( \phi_{p,q}^d \) does not depend on \( \tau_{\partial V} \) if \( \tau_{\partial V} = 0 \). This allows us to “force” free boundary conditions at a cost which is exponential in \( |\partial V| \). Unfortunately, it is not clear that one could force wired conditions at such a cost for a general amenable graph, and therefore we cannot prove an analogue of Theorem 2 for \( \phi_{p,q}^0 \).

Suppose we assume that \( G \) satisfies the following “strong” amenability property: there exist a sequence \( (F_n, H_n) \) of non-empty subsets of \( E(G) \) such that \( \frac{|H_n|}{|F_n|} \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \) and \( H_n \) contains \( \partial F_n \), is disjoint from \( F_n \) and is connected. This property clearly implies that \( G \) is amenable. Under these conditions, the proof presented above can be adapted to \( \phi_{p,q}^0 \). The property holds for \( \mathbb{Z}^d \) with \( d \geq 2 \), and can also be verified for the lamplighter group over \( \mathbb{Z}^d \) for any \( d \geq 1 \). We do not know if it holds for all infinite, one-ended, amenable, edge-transitive graphs.
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