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Abstract. It is shown that the trace of 3 dimensional Brownian motion contains arithmetic progressions of length 5 and no arithmetic progressions of length 6 a.s.

1. Introduction

In this note we comment that a.s. the trace of a 3 dimensional Brownian motion contains arithmetic progressions of length 5, and no arithmetic progressions of length 6.

Similarly, the maximal arithmetic progression in the trace of Brownian motion in \(\mathbb{R}^d\) is 3 for \(d = 4, 5\) and 2 above that (we will only prove the three dimensional result here). On the other hand, the trace of a 2 dimensional Brownian motion a.s. contains arbitrarily long arithmetic progressions starting at the origin and having a fixed difference.

Consider \(n\) steps simple random walk on the \(d\) dimensional square grid \(\mathbb{Z}^d\), look at the number of arithmetic progressions of length 3 in the range, study the distribution and large deviations?

Question: In the large deviations regime, is there a deterministic limiting shape?

2. Proofs

We start with the two dimensional case.

Proposition 1. The trace of 2 dimensional Brownian motion a.s. contains arbitrarily long arithmetic progressions starting at the origin and having a fixed difference.

Proof. Given a set \(S\) of Hausdorff dimension 1 in the Euclidean plane, 2 dimensional Brownian motion \(W\) running for unit time will intersect \(S\) in a set of Hausdorff dimension 1 as well, with positive probability, see e.g. [2], [1]. Examine the unit circle. With positive probability Brownian motion run for unit time intersects the unit circle in a set \(S_1\) of dimension 1. To each point in \(S_1\) add it to itself to get \(S_2\) a set of dimension 1. Let \(\tau_1 \geq 1\) be the first time (after 1) our Brownian motion hits the circle with radius \(3/2\). Examine it now in the time interval \([\tau_1, \tau_1 + 1]\). By the Harnack principle [1,
Theorem 3.42], the probability that Brownian motion started from \( W(\tau_1) \) to intersect \( S_2 \) in a set of dimension 1 is comparable to that of Brownian motion starting from 0 which, as already stated, is bounded away from 0. Hence \( W[\tau_1, \tau_1 + 1] \) will again intersect \( S_2 \) in a set of dimension 1. To each point in the intersection of the form \( 2x, x \in S_1 \) add \( x \) and call the resulting set \( S_3 \), again of dimension 1. Continue in the same manner to get arbitrarily long arithmetic progressions. Scale invariance implies that we get arbitrarily long arithmetic progression with probability 1. □

The argument above shows that with positive probability the trace of a unit time two dimensional Brownian motion admits uncountably many arithmetic progression of arbitrary length and difference 1.

We now prove the high dimensional result.

**Lemma 2.** A 3-dimensional Brownian motion contains no arithmetic progressions of length 6, a.s.

**Proof.** By scaling invariant we may restrict our attention to arithmetic progressions contained in the unit ball \( B \), and to spacings at least \( \delta \) for some \( \delta > 0 \). Denote the Brownian motion by \( W \). If it contains an arithmetic progression then for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \) one may find \( x_1, \ldots, x_6 \in B \cap \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^d \) such that \( W \cap B(x_i, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset \) and such that the \( x_i \) form an \( \varepsilon \)-approximate arithmetic progressions, by which we mean that \( |x_{i-1} + x_{i+1} - 2x_i| \leq 4\varepsilon \) for \( i = 2, 3, 4, 5 \). Further, the \( x_i \) are \( \delta \)-separated in the sense that \( |x_i - x_{i+1}| \geq \delta - 2\varepsilon \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 \). Denote the set of such \( x_i \) by \( \mathcal{X} \) and define

\[
H_x = 1 \{ W \cap B(x_i, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset \ \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\} \} \quad x = (x_1, \ldots, x_6)
\]

\[
X = X(\varepsilon) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} 1\{H_x\}.
\]

We now claim that

\[
\mathbb{E}(X) \leq C \quad \mathbb{E}(X^2) \geq c |\log \varepsilon|
\]

(1)

where the constants \( c \) and \( C \) may depend on \( \delta \). Both calculations are standard: the first (that of \( \mathbb{E}(X) \)), is an immediate corollary of the fact that 3d Brownian motion starting from 0 hits the ball \( B(v, \varepsilon) \) with probability \( \approx \varepsilon/(|v| + \varepsilon) \), see e.g. [1, corollary 3.19]. Here and below, \( \approx \) means that the ratio of the two quantities is bounded above and below by constants that depend only on \( \delta \). This gives

\[
\mathbb{P}(H_x) \approx \frac{\varepsilon^6}{d(0, x) + \varepsilon}
\]

(2)

where \( d(0, x) := \min\{d(0, x_i) : i = 1, \ldots, 6\} \). Denote by \( \mathcal{X}_n \) the set of \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) such that \( \varepsilon 2^n < d(0, x) \leq \varepsilon 2^{n+1} \), with \( \mathcal{X}_0 \) having the lower bound removed. We can now write

\[
\mathbb{E}(X) = \sum_{n=0}^{\log 1/\varepsilon} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}_n} \mathbb{P}(H_x) \leq C \sum_{n=0}^{\log 1/\varepsilon} 2^{3n} \cdot 2^{-n} \cdot \varepsilon^{-3} \cdot \varepsilon^5 \leq C
\]
where $2^{3n}$ is the number of possibilities for the $x_i$ closest to 0 for $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$ (this, and all other quantities in this explanation are up to constants); where $2^{-n}$ is $\mathbb{P}(W \cap B(x_1, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset)$; where $\varepsilon^{-3}$ is the number of possibilities for $x_2 - x_1$ (we use here that the determination of $x_1$ and $x_2 - x_1$ leave only a constant number of possibilities for $x_3, \ldots, x_4$); and where $\varepsilon^5$ is the probability to hit all of $B(x_1, \varepsilon), \ldots, B(x_6, \varepsilon)$ except $B(x_1, \varepsilon)$ given that you have hit $B(x_1, \varepsilon)$.

The calculation of $\mathbb{E}(X^2)$ is similar, we write $\mathbb{E}(X^2) = \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(H_x \cap H_y)$ and estimate the probability directly. We get about constant contribution from each set $\{x, y : |x_i - y_i| \approx 2^{-n} \forall i\}$ for every $n$, hence the $|\log \varepsilon|$ term.

We now make a somewhat stronger claim on the interaction between different $x$. We claim that there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that, for any $x$,

$$\mathbb{P}(H_x \cap \{X \leq \lambda |\log \varepsilon|\}) \leq \frac{C}{|\log \varepsilon|} \mathbb{P}(H_x). \quad (3)$$

To see this fix $x$ and let, for each scale $k \in \{1, \ldots, \lfloor \log(\delta/4\varepsilon) \rfloor\}$,

$$X_k := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_k} 1\{H_y\}$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_k := \{y \in \mathcal{X} : 2^k \varepsilon \leq |y_i - x_i| < 2^{k+1} \varepsilon \quad \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}\}$$

($X_k$ depends on $x$, of course, but we omit this dependency from the notation). A calculation identical to the above shows that $\mathbb{E}(X_k | H_x) \geq c$ and $\mathbb{E}(X_k^2 | H_x) \leq C$ so

$$\mathbb{P}(X_k > 0 | H_x) \geq c. \quad (4)$$

Further, the events $X_k > 0$ (still conditioned on $H_x$) are approximately independent in the following sense:

**Lemma 3.** For each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $k \in \{1, \ldots, \lfloor \log(\delta/4\varepsilon) \rfloor\}$,

$$\text{cov}(X_k > 0, X_l > 0 | H_x) \leq 2e^{-c|k-l|}. \quad (5)$$

**Proof.** Assume for concreteness that $k < l$ and that $l - k$ is sufficiently large (otherwise the claim holds trivially, if only the $c$ in the exponent is taken sufficiently small). Define two radii $r < s$ between $2^k \varepsilon$ and $2^l \varepsilon$ as follows:

$$r := 2^{(2/3)k + (1/3)l} \varepsilon \quad s := 2^{(1/3)k + (2/3)l} \varepsilon.$$

Next, define a sequence of stopping times: the even ones for exiting balls of radius $s$ and the odd ones for entering balls of radius $r$. In a formula, let $\tau_0 = 0$ and

$$\tau_{2m+1} := \inf \left\{t \geq \tau_{2m} : W(t) \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{6} B(x_i, r) \right\}$$

$$\tau_{2m} := \inf \left\{t \geq \tau_{2m-1} : W(t) \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^{6} B(x_i, s) \right\}$$
Let $M$ be the first number such that $\tau_{2M+1} = \infty$. With probability 1 $M$ is finite. We now claim that
\[
P(H_x \cap \{M \geq 6 + \lambda\}) \leq \frac{e^6}{d(0, x) + \varepsilon} (Cr/s)^{\lambda} \quad \forall \lambda = 1, 2, \ldots \quad (6)
\]

To see (6) assume $d(0, x) > c$ for simplicity. Then every visit to $B(x_i, \varepsilon)$ from $\partial B(x_i, r)$ “costs” $\varepsilon/r$ in the probability, while every visit of $B(x_j, r)$ from $\partial B(x_i, s)$ costs $r/s$ if $i = j$ and $r$ if $i \neq j$. Since $H_x$ requires a visit to all of $x_1, \ldots, x_6$ we have to pay the costs $\varepsilon/r$ and $r$ at least 6 times, and the costs of $r/s$ (or $r$, which is smaller) at least $\lambda$ times. Counting over the order in which these visits happen adds no more than a $C^\lambda$. This shows (6) in the case that $d(0, x) > c$. The other case is identical and we skip the details.

Since $\mathbb{P}(H_x) \approx e^6/(d(0, x) + \varepsilon)$ (recall (2)) this shows that the case $M > 6$ is irrelevant. Indeed, if we define $\mathcal{K} = \{X_k > 0\} \cap \{M = 6\}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \{X_i > 0\} \cap \{M = 6\}$ then
\[
|\text{cov}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{L}|H_x) - \text{cov}(X_k > 0, X_l > 0|H_x)| \leq \frac{Cr}{s} \quad (7)
\]
(for $l - k$ sufficiently large) and we may concentrate on $\text{cov}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{L}|H_x)$.

Let $\mu$ be the measure on $\mathbb{R}^{36}$ giving the distribution of $W(\tau_1), \ldots, W(\tau_{12})$ (we will not distinguish between ($\mathbb{R}^3)^{12}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{36}$). For an event $E$ we will use $\mathbb{P}(E|W = u)$ as a short for $\mathbb{P}(E|W = u \cap \{W = u\})$ (which is of course a $\mu$-almost everywhere defined function). We next observe that for $E$ equal to any of $\mathcal{L}, H_x$ and $\mathcal{K} \cap H_x$ the function $\mathbb{P}(E|W = u)$ is nearly constant i.e.
\[
\frac{\text{ess max} \mathbb{P}(E|W = u)}{\text{ess min} \mathbb{P}(E|W = u)} \leq 1 + 2e^{-c|k-l|} \quad (8)
\]
This is because $\mathcal{K}$ and $H_x$ depend only on the behaviour inside the balls $B(x_i, 2^k \varepsilon)$ while $u_{2m+1}$ are on $\partial B(x_i, r)$. This follows from the well-known fact that the distribution of $W$ on the first hitting times (after $\tau_{2m+1}$) of $B(x_i, 2^k \varepsilon)$ is independent of $u_{2m+1}$, up to an error of $(2^k \varepsilon)/r$; and similarly, the conditioning on exiting $B(x_i, s)$ at $u_{2m+2}$ only adds an error of $(2^k \varepsilon)/s$.

For the convenience of the reader we recall briefly how this is shown: consider Brownian motion started from a $y_1 \in \partial B(x_i, r)$ and let $y_2 \in \partial B(x_i, 2^{k+1} \varepsilon)$ be the first point visited in $B(x_i, 2^{k+1} \varepsilon)$, let $y_3$ be the last, and let $y_4$ be the first point visited in $B(x_i, s)$. Then the joint distribution of $y_2, y_3$ and $y_4$ can be written easily using the Poisson kernel (see [1, Theorem 3.44] for its formula). For example, the density of $y_2$ is $(r - e^{2^{k+1}})|y_2 - y_1|^{-3}$ (the density in $\mathbb{R}^3$) from which we need to subtract the density after exiting $B(x_i, s)$, which is given by an integral of similar expressions. The exact form does not matter, only the fact that the $y_1$ dependency comes from the term $|y_2 - y_1|$ is nearly constant in $y_1$ in the sense above. The same holds for the density of the transition from $y_3$ to $y_1$ and the density between $y_2$ and $y_3$ is
of course completely independent of $y_1$ and $y_4$. Conditioning on exiting in a
given $y_4$ is merely restricting to a subspace and normalising, conserving the
near independence. This justifies (8) in this case.

We have ignored here the case that $0 \in B(x_i, r)$ for some $i$, in which
case $u_1$ is inside $B(x_i, r)$ rather than on its boundary, but in this case $u_1$
is constant and certainly does not affect anything. This shows (8) for $E = H_x$
and $\mathcal{K} \cap H_x$.

The argument for the other case is similar, because $\mathcal{L}$ depends only on
what happens outside $B(x_i, 2^i \varepsilon)$ and $u_{2m}$ is on $\partial B(x_i, s)$ (this time without
exceptions). Hence we have only an error of $s/(2^i \varepsilon)$. All these errors are
exponential in $l - k$. This shows (8) is all 3 cases. In particular we get, for
all three cases for which (8) holds, that

$$\mathbb{P}(E \mid W = u) = \mathbb{P}(E)(1 + O(e^{-c|k-l|}))$$

which holds for $\mu$-almost every $u$.

The last point to note is that, conditioning on $W = u$ makes $\mathcal{L}$ independent of
$H_x$ and of $\mathcal{K}$ as the first depends only on what happens in the odd
time intervals, i.e. between $\tau_{2m}$ and $\tau_{2m+1}$, $m = 0, \ldots, 6$ while the other two
depend on what happens in the even time intervals, between $\tau_{2m-1}$ and $\tau_{2m}$, $m = 1, \ldots, 6$. Hence

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L} \cap H_x) = \int \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L} \cap H_x \mid W = u) d\mu(u)$$

by independence

$$= \int \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L} \mid W = u) \mathbb{P}(H_x \mid W = u) d\mu(u)$$

by (9) = $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}) \mathbb{P}(H_x)(1 + O(e^{-c|k-l|}))$.

A similar argument gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{K} \cap H_x) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{K} \cap H_x)(1 + O(e^{-c|k-l|})).$$

Together these two inequalities bound $\text{cov}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{L} \mid H_x)$. With (7) the lemma
is proved.

With (5) established we can easily see (3), by using Chebyshev’s inequality
for the variable $\#\{k : X_k > 0\}$, with (4) giving the first moment and (5) the
covariance. (In fact, it is not difficult to get a much better estimate than
$C/|\log \varepsilon|$, an $\varepsilon^c$ is also possible. But we will not need it).

Summing (3) over all $x$ and using (1) gives

$$\mathbb{P}(X \in (0, \lambda |\log \varepsilon|)) \leq \frac{C}{|\log \varepsilon|}$$

This, with $\mathbb{E}(X) \leq C$ shows that $\mathbb{P}(X > 0) \leq C/|\log \varepsilon|$, proving lemma
2. □

Lemma 4. A 3-dimensional Brownian motion contains arithmetic progressions of length 5, a.s.
Proof. Let $\varepsilon$ and $X = X(\varepsilon)$ be as in the proof of the previous lemma (except we now fix $\delta$ to be, say, $\frac{1}{10}$). It is straightforward to calculate

$$E(X(\varepsilon)) \geq \frac{c}{\varepsilon} \quad E(X(\varepsilon)^2) \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^2}$$

which show that $\mathbb{P}(X(\varepsilon) > 0) \geq c$. A simple calculation shows that for some $\lambda > 0$ we have that $X(\lambda \varepsilon) > 0 \implies X(\varepsilon) > 0$. Hence $\{X(\lambda^k) > 0\}$ is a sequence of decreasing events with probabilities bounded below. This implies that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_k \{X(\lambda^k) > 0\}\right) > 0.$$ 

The event of the intersection can be described in words as follows: for every $k$ there exists $x_1^{(k)}, \ldots, x_5^{(k)} \in B$ which are $\frac{1}{10}$-separated and $\lambda^k$-approximate arithmetic progression such that $W \cap B(x_i^{(k)}, \lambda^k) \neq \emptyset$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$. Taking a subsequential limit we get $x_i^{(k_n)} \rightarrow x_i$ and these $x_i$ will be $\frac{1}{10}$-separated, will form an arithmetic progression, and will be on the path of $W$. So we conclude

$$\mathbb{P}(W \text{ contains a 5-term arithmetic progression in } B) > 0.$$ 

Scaling invariance now shows that the probability is in fact 1. 

\[\blacksquare\]
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