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ABSTRACT. We consider the Kob Andersen model, a cooperative lattice gas with kinetic constraints which has been widely analysed in the physics literature in connection with the study of the liquid/glass transition. Cooperative here means that the facilitating sites (the vacancies) must collectively cooperate in order to ensure global motion of the particles. Our main result, which significantly improves upon previous ones, is a pure diffusive scaling of the relaxation time $T_{rel}(L) \approx L^2$ in a finite box of side $L$ of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, $d \geq 2$, with sources at the boundary. The main tools combine a recent set of ideas and techniques developed to establish universality results for kinetically constrained spin models, with methods from oriented percolation and canonical flows for Markov chains.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Kinetically constrained lattice gases (KCLG) are interacting particle systems on the integer lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with hard core exclusion, i.e. with the constraint that on each site there is at most one particle. A configuration is therefore defined by giving for each site $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ the occupation variable $\eta_x \in \{0, 1\}$, which represents an empty or occupied site respectively. The evolution is given by a continuous time Markov process of Kawasaki type, which allows the exchange of the occupation variables across a bond $e = (x, y)$ of neighboring sites $x$ and $y$ with rate $c_e(\eta)$ (bonds are non oriented, namely $(x, y) \equiv (y, x)$ and $c_{y,x}(\omega) = c_{x,y}(\omega)$). This exchange rate equals one if the current configuration satisfies an a priori specified local constraint and zero otherwise. In the former case we say that the exchange is legal. A key feature of the constraint is that it does not depend on the occupation variables $\eta_x, \eta_y$ and therefore for any $q \in [0, 1]$ detailed balance w.r.t. $(1-q)$-Bernoulli product measure $\mu$ is verified. Thus, $\mu$ is an invariant reversible measure for the process. However, at variance with the simple symmetric exclusion process (SSEP), that corresponds to the case in which the constraint is always verified, KCLG have several other invariant measures. This is related to the fact that due to the constraints there exist blocked configurations, namely configurations for which all exchange rates are equal to zero.

KCLG have been introduced in physics literature (see [12, 25] for a review) to model the liquid/glass transition that occurs when a liquid is suddenly cooled. In particular they were devised to mimic the fact that the motion of a molecule in a low temperature (dense) liquid can be inhibited by the geometrical constraints created by the
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surrounding molecules. Thus, to encode this local caging mechanism, the exchange rates of KCLG require a minimal number of empty sites in a certain neighborhood of \( e = (x, y) \) in order for the exchange at \( e \) to be allowed. There exists also a non-conservative version of KCLG, the so called Kinetically Constrained Spin Models, which feature a Glauber type dynamics and have been recently studied in several works (see e.g. [7, 19, 20] and references therein).

In this paper we focus on the class of KCLG which has been most studied in physics literature, the so-called Kob-Anderson (KA) models [14]. Each KA model leaves on \( \mathbb{Z}^d \), with \( d \geq 2 \), and is characterized by an integer parameter \( k \) with \( k \in [2, d] \). The nearest neighbor exchange rates are defined as follows: \( c_{x,y}(\eta) = 1 \) if at least \( k - 1 \) neighbors of \( x \) different from \( y \) are empty and at least \( k - 1 \) neighbors of \( y \) different from \( x \) are empty too, \( c_{x,y} = 0 \) otherwise. The name KA-\( kf \) model is used in the literature to refer to the model with parameter \( k \). The choices \( k = 1 \) and \( k > d \) are discarded: \( k = 1 \) would correspond to SSEP; \( k > d \) would yield the existence of finite clusters of particles which are blocked, and therefore for this choice at any \( q < 1 \) the infinite volume process would not be ergodic\(^2\). For example for \( k = 3, d = 2 \) a \( 2 \times 2 \) square fully occupied by particles is blocked: none of these particles can ever jump to their neighboring empty positions.

In [27] it has been proven that for all \( k \in [2, d] \) the infinite volume KA-\( kf \) models are ergodic for all \( q \in (0, 1] \), thus disproving previous conjectures [10, 14, 15] on the occurrence of an ergodicity breaking transition at \( q_c > 0 \) based on numerical simulations. In [4] it has been proved that for all \( q \in (0, 1] \) the rescaled position of the tracer at time \( \epsilon^{-2}t \) converges as \( \epsilon \to 0 \), to a \( d \)-dimensional Brownian motion with non-degenerate diffusion matrix. This again disproves a conjecture that had been put forward in physics literature on the occurrence of a diffusive/non-diffusive transition at a finite critical density \( q_c > 0 \) [14, 15]. Motivated by the fact that numerical simulations [14, 18] suggest the possibility of an anomalous slowing down at high density, in [8] the relaxation time \( T_{rel} \) (namely the inverse of the spectral spectral gap) has been studied. For KA-\( 2f \) in dimension \( d = 2 \) it has been proved that in a box of linear size \( L \) with boundary sources, \( T_{rel} \) is upper bounded by \( L^2 \log L \) at any \( q \in (0, 1] \). The same technique can be extended to establish an analogous upper bound for all choices of \( d \) and \( k \in [2, d] \). By using this result in [8] it is also proved that the infinite volume time auto-correlation of local functions decays at least as \( 1/t \) modulo logarithmic corrections [8]. A lower bound as \( 1/t^{d/2} \) follows by comparison with SSEP.

The description of the state of the art for KCLG would not be complete without mentioning that a purely diffusive scaling \( L^2 \) for the inverse of the spectral gap has been established for some KCLG [3, 13, 22], with and without boundary sources. However, all the models considered in these papers belong to the so called class of non-cooperative KCLG, namely models for which the constraints are such that it is possible to construct a finite group of vacancies, the mobile cluster, with two key properties. (i) For any configuration it is possible to move the mobile cluster to any other position in the lattice by a sequence of allowed exchanges; (ii) any nearest neighbor exchange is allowed if
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\(^1\)Here \( f \) stands for "facilitation", since \( k \) denotes the minimal number of empty sites to allow motion.

\(^2\)Here ergodic means that zero is a simple eigenvalue for the generator of the Markov process in \( L^2(\mu) \).
the mobile cluster is in a proper position in its vicinity. The existence of finite mobile clusters is a key tool in the analysis of non-cooperative KCLG and allows the application of some techniques (e.g. paths arguments) developed for SSEP. It is immediate to verify that instead, for all $k \in [2, d]$, KA models belong to the cooperative class, which contain all models that are not non-cooperative. For example for $k = d = 2$, one can easily check that there cannot exist a finite mobile cluster by noticing that any a fully occupied double column which spans the lattice can never be destroyed.

Besides being a challenging mathematical issue, developing a new set of techniques to prove a purely diffusive scaling for KA and for cooperative models in general is important from the point of view of the modelization of the liquid/glass transition, since in this context cooperative models are undoubtedly the most relevant ones. Indeed, very roughly speaking, non cooperative models behave like a rescaled SSEP with the mobile cluster playing the role of a single vacancy and are less suitable to describe the rich behavior of glassy dynamics.

Here we significantly improve upon the existing results, by establishing $T_{\text{rel}}(L) \approx L^2$ for all KA-$k_f$ models in a finite box of side $L$ of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, $d \geq 2$, with sources at the boundary (Theorem 1). This is the first result establishing a pure diffusive scaling for a cooperative KCLG. The technique that we develop, which is completely different from the one in [8], combines a set of ideas and techniques recently developed by two of the authors to establish universality results for kinetically constrained spin models [19], with methods from oriented percolation and canonical flows for Markov chains. Although we have applied our technique for KA models, we expect our tools to be robust enough to be extended to analyze other KCLG in the ergodic regime.

Our main result (cf. Theorem 1) establishes an upper bound on $T_{\text{rel}}$ of the form $T_{\text{rel}}(q, L) \leq C(q) \times L^2$ with a diverging prefactor $C(q)$ as $q \to 0$. Remarkably, the divergence of $C(q)$ is qualitatively in agreement with that conjectured by the physicists [27] and based on the assumption that the dominant mechanism driving the system to equilibrium is a complex cooperative motion of rare large droplets of vacancies.

The plan of the paper is the following. In Section 2 we introduce the notation and the results. In Section 3 we prove our result, Theorem 1, in several steps. We start by performing a coarse graining (section 3.1), and proving a coarse-grained constrained Poincaré inequality (section 3.3). A key ingredient for this proof is the probability that a certain good event has a large probability, a result that is proved in Section 3.2 by using tools from supercritical oriented percolation. In Section 3.4 and 3.5 we use canonical flows techniques in order to bound from above the r.h.s. of the coarse-grained Poincaré inequality with the Dirichlet form of KA model, and we conclude by using the variational characterization of the spectral gap.

2. The Kob-Andersen model and the main result

Given an integer $L$, and a parameter $q \in (0, 1)$, we let $\Lambda = [L]^d$

$$\partial \Lambda = \{ x \in \Lambda : \exists y \notin \Lambda \text{ with } \|x - y\|_1 = 1 \}.$$ 

and consider the probability space $(\Omega_\Lambda, \mu_\Lambda)$ where

$$\Omega_\Lambda = \{ \eta \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^d} : \eta_x = 0 \text{ for all } x \notin \Lambda \}$$
and $\mu_\Lambda$ is the product Bernoulli(1-$q$) measure. Given $\eta \in \Omega_\Lambda$ and $V \subset \Lambda$, we shall say that $V$ is empty (for $\eta$) if $\eta_x = 0 \forall x \in V$.

Fix an integer $k \in [2,d]$ and, for any given a pair of nearest neighbor sites $x, y$ in $\Lambda$, write $c_{xy}(\cdot)$ for the indicator of the event that both $x$ and $y$ have at least $k-1$ empty neighbors among their nearest neighbors in $\Lambda$ without counting $x, y$

$$c_{xy}(\eta) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_{z:||x-z||=1,z\neq y}(1-\eta_z) \geq k-1 \text{ and } \sum_{z:||y-z||=1,z\neq x}(1-\eta_z) \geq k-1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and set

$$\eta^x_z := \begin{cases} \eta_z & \text{if } z \notin \{x, y\} \\ \eta_x & \text{if } z = y \\ \eta_y & \text{if } z = x. \end{cases}$$

$$\eta^x_z := \begin{cases} \eta_z & \text{if } z \neq x \\ 1-\eta_x & \text{if } z = x. \end{cases}$$

The Kob-Andersen model in $\Lambda$ with parameter $k$, for short the KA-$k$f model, with constrained exchanges in $\Lambda$ and unconstrained sources at the boundary $\partial \Lambda$ is the continuous time Markov process defined through the generator which acts on local functions $f : \Omega_\Lambda \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\mathcal{L}f(\eta) = \sum_{x,y \in \Lambda, ||x-y||=1} c_{xy}(\eta)[f(\eta'^y_x) - f(\eta)] + \sum_{x \in \partial \Lambda} [(1-\eta_x)(1-q)+\eta_x q][f(\eta'^x_x) - f(\eta)].$$

In words, every pair of nearest neighbors sites $x, y$ such that $c_{xy}(\eta) = 1$, with rate one and independently across the lattice, exchange their states $\eta_x, \eta_y$. In the sequel we will sometimes refer to such a move as a legal exchange. Furthermore every boundary site, with rate one and independently from anything else, updates its state by sampling it from the Bernoulli(1-$q$) measure. Notice that these latter moves are unconstrained and that for $k = 1$ the KA-$1$f chain coincides with the symmetric simple exclusion in $\Lambda$ with sources at $\partial \Lambda$. It is easy to check that the KA-$k$f chain is reversible w.r.t $\mu_\Lambda$ and irreducible thanks to the boundary sources. Let $T_{rel}(q, L)$ be its relaxation time i.e. the inverse of the spectral gap in the spectrum of its generator $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda$ (see e.g. [16]).

**Theorem 1.** For any $q \in (0,1)$ there exists a constant $C(q)$ such that

$$L^2 \leq T_{rel}(q, L) \leq C(q)L^2.$$ 

Moreover, as $q \to 0$ the constant $C(q)$ can be taken equal to

$$C(q) = \begin{cases} \exp(k-1) \left( c/q^{1/(d-k+1)} \right) & \text{if } 3 \leq k \leq d, \\ \exp(c \log(q)^2/q) & \text{if } k = 2 \leq d, \end{cases}$$

where $\exp(r)$ denotes the $r$-times iterated exponential and $c$ is a numerical constant.

**Remark 2.1.** The lower bound in the theorem follows from a simple comparison of the KA-$k$f chain with the symmetric simple exclusion in $\Lambda$ and it was already established in [8]. An interesting open problem already for $k = 2$ is to prove a diffusive lower bound of the form $C'(q) L^2$ with $C'(q)$ diverging to $+\infty$ as $q \to 0$. 

3. Proof of Theorem 1

The standard variational characterisation of the spectral gap of \( \mathcal{L} \) (see e.g. [16]) implies immediately that the upper bound on \( T_{\text{vol}}(q, L) \) of Theorem 1 is equivalent to the Poincaré inequality

\[
\text{Var}(f) \leq C(q)L^2 D(f) \quad \forall f : \Omega_\Lambda \mapsto \mathbb{R},
\]

where \( C(q) \) is as (2.3), \( \text{Var}(f) \) denotes the variance of \( f \) w.r.t. the reversible measure \( \mu \) and \( D(f) \) is the Dirichlet form associated to the generator (2.2)

\[
D(f) = \sum_{x,y \in \Lambda \atop \|x-y\|_1 = 1} \mu(c_{xy}(\nabla_{xy} f)^2) + \sum_{x \in \partial \Lambda} \mu(\text{Var}_x(f)),
\]

where \( \nabla_{xy} f(\eta) := f(\eta_{xy}) - f(\eta) \) \( \text{Var}_x(f) \) is the local variance w.r.t. \( \eta_{xy} \).

We will prove (3.1) in several steps.

The first step consists in proving a coarse-grained constrained Poincaré inequality with long range constraints (see Proposition 3.11) under the assumption that the probability \( \pi_\ell(k, d) \) of a certain good event (see Definition 3.7) is sufficiently large. Here \( \ell \) is the mesoscopic scale characterising the coarse-grained construction and \( 2 \leq k \leq d \) is the parameter of the KA-model. The necessary tools for this part are developed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2.

The second step (see Section 3.4) consists of developing canonical flows techniques (see e.g. [16] Chapter 13.5) for the KA model in order to bound from above the r.h.s. of the coarse-grained Poincaré inequality by \( C(\ell, q)(L/\ell)^2 D(f) \), with \( C(\ell, q) \leq e^{O(\ell^{-1}(|\log(q)| )+\log(\ell))} \) (see Proposition 3.18 and Corollary 3.19).

The final step (see Section 3.6) proves that it is possible to choose \( \ell = \ell(q, k, d) \) in such a way that \( \pi_\ell(d, k) \) is large enough and \( C(\ell, q) \leq C(q) \) as \( q \to 0 \), where \( C(q) \) is as in (2.3).

3.1. Coarse graining. Let \( \ell \) be such that \( N := L/\ell \in \mathbb{N} \). W.l.o.g. we also assume that \( \sqrt{N} \in \mathbb{N} \). Later on (see Section 3.6) we will choose \( \ell \) as a function of \( q \) and suitably diverging as \( q \to 0 \). We will then consider the coarse grained lattice of boxes with side \( \ell \). We will denote this lattice by \( \mathbb{Z}^d_\ell \). As a graph it is equal \( \mathbb{Z}^d \), but its elements represent coarse grained boxes rather than sites. Let also \( \Lambda_\ell = [N]^d \subset \mathbb{Z}^d_\ell \), where we use the notation \([N]\) for the set \( \{1, \ldots , N\} \). Vertices of the coarse-grained lattice \( \mathbb{Z}^d_\ell \) will always be denoted using letters \( i, j, \ldots \) while vertices of the original lattice \( \mathbb{Z}^d \) will be denoted \( x, y, \ldots \). The boundary \( \partial \Lambda_\ell \subset \Lambda_\ell \) of \( \Lambda_\ell \) will consists of the vertices of \( \Lambda_\ell \) with at least one nearest neighbour (in \( \mathbb{Z}^d_\ell \)) not in \( \Lambda_\ell \). We partition the lattice \( \mathbb{Z}^d \) into mesoscopic boxes of side \( \ell \) indexed by vertices in \( \mathbb{Z}^d_\ell \). If \( B := [\ell]^d \) then \( B_i \) will denote the box \( B + \ell i, i \in \mathbb{Z}_\ell^d \). In particular \( \Lambda = \bigcup_{i \in \Lambda_\ell} B_i \). Sometimes we shall simply write “the box \( i \)” meaning the box \( B_i \). For \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \) we denote by \( B(x) \) the mesoscopic box containing \( x \).

Definition 3.1 (Frameable configurations). Given the \( d \)-dimensional cube \( C_n = [n]^d \) and an integer \( j \leq d \) we define the \( j \)th-frame of \( C_n \) as the union of all \((j - 1)\)-dimensional faces
containing the vertex \((1, \ldots, 1)\) of \(C_n\). Next we introduce the set of \((d, j)\)-frameable configurations of \([0,1]^C\) as those configurations which are connected by legal KA-\(j\) exchanges inside \(C_n\) to a configuration for which the \(j\)th-frame of \(C_n\) is empty.

We are finally ready for our definition of a box being good for a given configuration.

**Definition 3.2** (Good boxes). Given \(\eta \in \Omega_\Lambda\), we say that the box \(B\) is \((d,k)\)-good for \(\eta\) if all \((d-1)\)-dimensional slices of \(B\) parallel to the axes are \((d-1, k-1)\)-frameable for all configurations \(\eta' \in \Omega_\Lambda\) that differ from \(\eta\) in at most one site. The probability that the \(d\)-dimensional box \(B\) is \((d,k)\)-good will be denoted by \(\pi_\ell(d,k)\).

**Remark 3.3.** For \(d=2\), \(k=2\) a box is \((2,2)\)-good if it contains at least two empty sites in every row and every column.

**Notation warning** Whenever the value of \(d, k\) is clear from the context we shall simply write that a box is good if it is \((d, k)\)-good. We shall also say that a vertex \(i \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d\) is \((d,k)\)-good if the box \(B_i\) is \((d,k)\)-good.

### 3.2. Tools from oriented percolation

In this section we collect and prove certain technical results from oriented percolation which will be crucial to prove the aforementioned coarse-grained constrained Poincaré inequality. We shall work on the coarse-grained lattice \(\mathbb{Z}_d^d\) so that any vertex \(i \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d\) is representative of the mesoscopic box \(B_i\) in the original lattice \(\mathbb{Z}^d\). The main result here is Proposition \[3.9\]. Throughout this section the parameters \(d, k\) will be kept fixed.

**Definition 3.4** (Paths). An up-right or oriented path \(\gamma\) in \(\mathbb{Z}_d^d\) starting at \(i\) and of length \(n\) \(\in \mathbb{N}\) is a sequence \((\gamma^{(1)}, \ldots, \gamma^{(n)}) \subset \mathbb{Z}_d^d\) such that \(\gamma^{(1)} = i\) and \(\gamma^{(t+1)} \in \{\gamma^{(t)} + \vec{e}_1, \gamma^{(t)} + \vec{e}_2\}\) for all \(t \in [n-1]\). \(\gamma\) is focused if \(d_\gamma(t) := d(\gamma^{(t)}, \{j : j = i + s(\vec{e}_1 + \vec{e}_2), s \in \mathbb{N}\})\) satisfies \(\max_{t \in [n]} d_\gamma(t) \leq \sqrt{n}\). Two consecutive elements of \(\gamma\) form an edge of \(\gamma\) and we say that \(\gamma, \gamma'\) are edge-disjoint if they do not share an edge. Finally, we say that \(\gamma\) is good if \(\gamma^{(t)}\) is good for all \(t \in [n]\).

**Definition 3.5** (Good family of paths). Fix \(i \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d\). A family of paths \(\mathcal{G}\) is said to form a good family for \(i\) if the following conditions hold:

1. All paths in \(\mathcal{G}\) are good up-right focused paths starting at \(i\) of length \(2N\).
2. The paths of \(\mathcal{G}\) are almost edge-disjoint i.e. any common edge is at distance at most \(\sqrt{N}\) from \(i\).
3. \(|\mathcal{G}| \geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{N}\).

**Remark 3.6.** Since each vertex can be starting point of at most two edge disjoint paths, the cardinality of \(\mathcal{G}\) necessarily satisfies \(|\mathcal{G}| \leq 2\sqrt{N}\).

Given \(i \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d\) let \(D_i\) be the segment

\[
D_i = \left\{ i + \left(\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{N} - t\right)\vec{e}_1 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{N} + t\right)\vec{e}_2 : -\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{N} \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{N} \right\}. \quad (3.3)
\]

Let also \(H^{(n)}, V^{(n)}\) be the rectangular subsets of the form

\[
H^{(n)} = \{ j \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d : j = i + a\vec{e}_1 + b\vec{e}_2, a \in [0, \ell_n], b \in [0, \ell_{n-1}] \} \\
V^{(n)} = \{ j \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d : j = i + a\vec{e}_1 + b\vec{e}_2, a \in [0, \ell_{n-1}], b \in [0, \ell_n] \}
\]
where $\ell_n = 10^n$. We shall prove that the existence of a good family of paths is guaranteed by the simultaneous occurrence of certain events $A, B$ and $\{C_n\}_{n=1}^{n_\ast}$, where $n_\ast = \min\{n : \ell_n \geq \sqrt{N}\}$ (cf. Figure 1).

**Figure 1.** A graphical illustration of the proof of Lemma 3.8. For better rendering the drawn paths are not perfectly oriented and the ratio among the sides of rectangles in the drawings is not 1/10 as it should be. The blue segment corresponds to the set $D_i$. The red paths are the good up-right paths guaranteed by the event $B$. The black paths are the good up-right hard crossings guaranteed by the events $C_n$. 

### Definition 3.7 (The events $A$, $B$ and $C_n$).

(i) Let $R_i$ be the rectangle in $\mathbb{Z}_d^2$ whose short sides are $D_i$ and $D_i + 2N(\vec{e}_1 + \vec{e}_2)$. Then $A$ is the event that there are at least $1.9\sqrt{N}$ edge-disjoint good up-right paths contained in $R_i$ and connecting $D_i$ with $D_i + 2N(\vec{e}_1 + \vec{e}_2)$.

(ii) $B$ is the event that the set $\bigcup_{t \in [0, \sqrt{N}]} \{i + t\vec{e}_1\} \cup \{i + t\vec{e}_2\}$ is connected to at least $0.7\sqrt{N}$ vertices of $D_i \setminus (H_n \cup V_n)$ by a good up-right path,

(iii) $C_n$ is the event that $i$ is good and there exists a good up-right hard-crossing of both $V^{(n)}$ and $H^{(n)}$, i.e. a good up-right path connecting the two short sides of $V_n(H_n)$ and which is contained in $V_n(H_n)$.

### Lemma 3.8. Assume that $A \cap B \cap C_n$ occurs for all $n \in [n_\ast]$. Then there exists a good family of paths for $i$. 

---
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Proposition 3.9. For any \( \lambda > 0 \) there exists \( \pi_* < 1 \) such that for \( \pi_\ell \geq \pi_* \) and all \( n, N \in \mathbb{N} \)

\[
(a) \quad \mu(C_n) \geq 1 - e^{-\lambda \ell n},
(b) \quad \mu(B) \geq 1 - e^{-\lambda \sqrt{N}},
(c) \quad \mu(A) \geq 1 - e^{-\lambda \sqrt{N}}. 
\]

In particular a family of good paths starting at \( i \) exists w.h.p if \( \pi_\ell \) is sufficiently close to one.

Proof. (a) This can be proven by a contour argument. Consider the rectangle \( V(n) \),
and assume that it does not contain a good hard crossing. Then consider the path on
the dual lattice that forms the upper contour of the set of sites that are connected
to the bottom of the rectangle via an up-right good path. Since there is no vertical
crossing, this path necessarily takes \( \ell_n \) steps to the right and ends somewhere on the
right boundary of $V^{(n)}$. By using the fact that each time this dual path makes a step to the right or downwards, this implies the presence of a bad vertex, it is not difficult to prove that for $\pi_\ell$ sufficiently large depending on $\lambda$ it holds

$$\mu(\text{there is not a good hard crossing}) = \mu(C_n^c) \leq e^{-\lambda \ell n}$$

(b) Consider the down-left good oriented paths starting from sites of $D_1 \setminus (H_n \cup V_n^*)$. The event $B$ certainly occurs if at least $7/8$ of the points in this set are the starting point of an infinite down-left good oriented path. The upper bound on the probability of $B$ then follows directly from [9, Theorem 1].

(c) The main tool here is the max-flow min-cut theorem (see e.g. [5]). For any directed graph $(V, E)$ we consider a capacity function, giving every edge $e \in E$ a positive number $c_e \in \mathbb{R}^+$. For two sets of vertices $s$ and $t$, we say that a flow from $s$ to $t$ is a positive function of the edges, $f: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that: (i) for all $e \in E$ it holds $f_e \leq c_e$, (ii) for all $v \notin s \cup t$ it holds $\sum_{u \rightarrow v \in E} f_{u,v} = \sum_{v \rightarrow w \in E} f_{v,w}$, namely for vertices outside $s \cup t$ the incoming flow equals the outgoing flow. The value of the flow is defined as the total flow going in $t$ (which is the same as the flow leaving $s$), namely $\sum_{w \in t} \sum_{v \in V \cap \{j^* \mid \langle \vec{e}_1, j^* \rangle = N \text{ or } \langle \vec{e}_2, j^* \rangle = N \}} f_{v,w}$.

A cut $(S, T)$ will be a partition of $V$ in two subsets $S$ and $T$, such that $s \subseteq S$ and $t \subseteq T$. The value of the cut is the sum of capacities of the edges pointing from $S$ to $T$.

**Theorem.** (Max-Flow Min-Cut theorem) The maximal value of a flow is equal the minimal value of a cut. Moreover, if all capacities are in $\mathbb{Z}$, there is a maximal flow with integer values.

In order to use this theorem, we first define our graph. The vertex set is

$$V = \left\{ i + a\vec{e}_1 + b\vec{e}_2 : a, b \in [N], a + b \geq \sqrt{N}, |a - b| \leq \sqrt{N} \right\} \cap \Lambda_\ell,$$

and the edges are

$$E = \left\{ (j, j') : j \text{ is good and } j' \in \{ j + \vec{e}_1, j + \vec{e}_2 \} \right\}.$$

We define $s$:

$$s = \left\{ j \in V : \|i - j\|_1 = \sqrt{N} \right\},$$

and $t$:

$$t = V \cap \{ j \mid \langle \vec{e}_1, j \rangle = N \text{ or } \langle \vec{e}_2, j \rangle = N \}.$$

Giving all edges capacity 1, the maximal value of a flow will be the number of edge disjoint paths that we are after. We have thus reduced the problem to the following claim:

**Claim 3.10.** If $\pi_\ell$ is large enough, for the graph above with probability greater than $1 - e^{-\lambda \sqrt{N}}$, the value of any cut is at least $1.9 \sqrt{N}$.

---

3 Though the Theorem is stated for the contact process, it also holds for oriented percolation as stated in [9]).
Proof of the claim. In order to prove the claim, we will construct, for every fixed cut \((S, T)\), a dual path \(\gamma^*_{S,T}\) that will separate \(S\) from \(T\). We will then show that such a path intersects at least \(1.9\sqrt{N}\) edges in \(E\).

First, let us define a dual graph \(V^*\) for some fixed \((S, T)\). Its vertices will be the faces of \(\Lambda_{\ell}\) that have at least three neighbors in \(V\). That is,

\[
V^* = \left\{ i^* \in \Lambda_{\ell} + \frac{1}{2} \vec{e}_1 + \frac{1}{2} \vec{e}_2 : \# \left\{ i \in V : \| i^* - i \|_1 = 1 \right\} \geq 3 \right\}.
\]

![Figure 2](image_url)

**Figure 2.** Black dots are the vertices of \(V\), grey dots are the vertices of \(V^*\), diamonds are the left and right boundary of \(V^*\).

Its (directed) edges will depend on the cut \((S, T)\). For \(i^*, j^* \in V^*\), \((i^*, j^*)\) is an edge if \(\| i^* - j^* \|_1 = 1\), and if it has a site of \(S\) to its left and a site of \(T\) to its right. We will separate the vertices of \(V^*\) in three parts:

1. The right boundary
   \[
   \left\{ i + \left( \sqrt{N} + \frac{1}{2} + a \right) \vec{e}_1 + \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right) \vec{e}_2 : a \in [N] \right\} \cup V^*,
   \]
2. the left boundary
   \[
   \left\{ i + \left( \sqrt{N} + \frac{1}{2} + a \right) \vec{e}_1 + \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right) \vec{e}_2 : a \in [N] \right\} \cup V^*,
   \]
3. the interior, which will include all vertices that are neither in the right nor in the left boundary.

Focusing on a fixed vertex \(j^* \in V^*\), we can count the edges going into \(j^*\) and the edges going out of \(j^*\) if we know which of the neighboring vertices of \(V\) (namely \(\{ j \in V : \| j^* - i \|_1 = 1 \}\)) are in \(S\) and which are in \(T\). By checking all possibilities, one
can verify that the incoming degree of a vertex in the interior of $V^*$ equals its outgoing degree (see right part of Fig. 3).

At the boundaries, however, there could be vertices that have an outgoing degree different from the incoming degree. Consider a site on the right boundary (see left part of Fig. 3)

$$j_a^* = i + \left( \sqrt{N} + \frac{1}{2} + a \right) \bar{e}_1 + \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right) \bar{e}_2.$$ Let

$$j_a^+ = j_a^* + \frac{1}{2} \bar{e}_1 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{e}_2$$ and

$$j_a^- = j_a^* - \frac{1}{2} \bar{e}_1 - \frac{1}{2} \bar{e}_2.$$ If both $j_a^+$ and $j_a^-$ are in $S$, or if both are in $T$, then the incoming degree of $j_a^*$ is the same as its outgoing degree. However, if $j_a^+ \in S$ and $j_a^- \in T$ then the incoming degree is 1 and the outgoing degree is 0. For the case $j_a^+ \in T$ and $j_a^- \in S$, we have an outgoing degree 1 and incoming degree 0.

$$j_a^+ = j_a^- + 1,$$ therefore the total outgoing degree of sites on the right boundary is

$$\# \left\{ a : j_a^- \in S, j_a^- + 1 \in T \right\},$$

and the total incoming degree is

$$\# \left\{ a : j_a^- \in T, j_a^- + 1 \in S \right\}.$$ But since the first site (i.e., $j_0^-$) is in $s$ and the last site is in $t$, the incoming degree must be smaller by 1 than the outgoing degree.

By the exact same argument, we can find that the incoming degree of the left boundary is larger by 1 than its outgoing degree. This implies that there exists a dual path

$$\gamma_s = (j_s(1), \ldots, j_s(n)),$$ where $j_s(1)$ in on the right boundary and $j_s(n)$ is on the left boundary. In particular, $n \geq 2\sqrt{N}$.

The value of the cut $(S, T)$ is at least the number of edges in $E$ pointing from $S$ to $T$ and crossing $\gamma_s$. Thanks to the choice of the direction of the edges in $V^*$, this could be written as

$$\# \left\{ t : j_s^{(t+1)} - j_s^{(t)} \in \{-\bar{e}_1, \bar{e}_2\} \text{ and } (j_s^{(t+1)}, j_s^{(t)}) \text{ crosses an edge in } E \right\}.$$
We therefore consider the number of steps that \( \gamma_\ast \) takes in each direction:

\[
R = \# \{ t : j_{\ast}^{(t+1)} - j_{\ast}^{(t)} = \vec{e}_1 \},
\]
\[
L = \# \{ t : j_{\ast}^{(t+1)} - j_{\ast}^{(t)} = -\vec{e}_1 \},
\]
\[
U = \# \{ t : j_{\ast}^{(t+1)} - j_{\ast}^{(t)} = \vec{e}_2 \},
\]
\[
D = \# \{ t : j_{\ast}^{(t+1)} - j_{\ast}^{(t)} = -\vec{e}_2 \}.
\]

Observe that \( i_{\ast}^{(n)} - i_{\ast}^{(1)} = (R - L) \vec{e}_1 + (U - D) \vec{e}_2 \), and since

\[
(\vec{e}_1 - \vec{e}_2, j_{\ast}^{(1)}) = (\vec{e}_1 - \vec{e}_2, i) \pm \sqrt{N},
\]
\[
(\vec{e}_1 - \vec{e}_2, j_{\ast}^{(n)}) = (\vec{e}_1 - \vec{e}_2, i) \mp \sqrt{N},
\]

\( U + L - D - R = 2\sqrt{N} \). Therefore, since \( U + L + R + D = n \) we get \( U + L = \frac{n}{2} \pm \sqrt{N} \).

We will consider the erased edges, namely

\[
\{ (j, j') : j \text{ is bad and } j' \in \{ j + \vec{e}_1, j + \vec{e}_2 \} \}.
\]

Assume now that the value of the cut is less than \( 1.9\sqrt{N} \), from the previous observations it follows that \( \gamma_\ast \) must cross at least \( U + L - 1.9\sqrt{N} = n/2 - 0.9\sqrt{N} \) erased edges. Since every such erased edge comes from a bad vertex, and since at most two erased edges could share the same bad vertex, at least \( n/4 - 0.45\sqrt{N} \) of the vertices to the left of \( \gamma_\ast \) are bad. Therefore, the probability that there exists a cut with value less than \( \leq 1.9\sqrt{N} \) is upper bounded by the probability that there exists a dual path of length \( n \geq 2\sqrt{N} \) with at least \( n/4 - 0.45\sqrt{N} \) bad vertices on its left. Since there are at most \( 2^n \) dual paths of length \( n \), if \( \pi_\ell \) was taken large enough depending on \( \lambda \), we get

\[
\mu(\text{value of any cut is } \geq 1.9\sqrt{N}) \geq 1 - \sum_{n=2\sqrt{N}}^{\infty} 2^n \sum_{k=n/4-0.45\sqrt{N}}^{n} \binom{n}{k} (1 - \pi)^k \geq 1 - e^{-\lambda\sqrt{N}}.
\]

\( \square \)

The proof of the proposition is complete.

\( \square \)

3.3. A long range Poincaré inequality. Recall the setting of Sections 3.1, 3.2 and in particular Definition 3.5 of a good family of paths for a vertex \( i \in \mathbb{Z}^d_\ell \). Let \( Q_i = i + \{ 0, 1 \}^d \setminus \{ 0 \}^d \subset \mathbb{Z}^d_\ell \) and define

\[
\hat{c}_i = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if any } j \in Q_i \text{ is good and there exists a good family of paths for } i + \vec{e}_1, \\
0 & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

\( \hat{c}_i \) (3.4)

In this section we shall prove the following result. Recall that \( \pi_\ell := \pi_\ell (d, k) \) is the probability that any given \( i \in \mathbb{Z}^d_\ell \) is \( (d, k) \)-good.
Proposition 3.11. There exists $\pi_* < 1$ such that for any $\pi_\ell \geq \pi_*$ and any local function $f : \Omega_\Lambda \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\text{Var}(f) \leq 4 \sum_{i \in \Lambda} \mu(\hat{c}_i \text{Var}_{B_i}(f)). \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. We will closely follow the proof of [19, Theorem 2.6]. Let $\hat{c}_i$ be the indicator of the event $A \cap B \cap \cap_{i=1}^n C_n$ (see Definition 3.7), together with the requirement that $Q_i$ is good. By Lemma 3.8 $c_i \leq \hat{c}_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Hence, in order to prove (3.5), it is enough to prove the stronger constrained Poincaré inequality in which in the r.h.s. of (3.5) the constraint $\hat{c}_i$ is replaced by $\hat{c}_i$. Using Proposition 3.9 together with the obvious bound $\mu(Q_i \text{ is good}) \geq 1 - \left(2^d - 1\right)(1 - \pi_\ell)$, the proof of the latter is now identical to the one given in [19, Theorem 2.6]. \qed

3.4. Constructing the canonical path on the coarse-grained lattice. In this section we will construct a set of $T$-step moves – sequences of at most $T \in \mathbb{N}$ legal moves for the KA dynamics (i.e. legal exchanges or resampling of boundary sites) that could be chained together in order to flip the state of an arbitrary point $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. The construction of the move is quite cumbersome, so we will only give here the required definitions and the statement of the result. For details see [26, Appendix].

The next definition describes how to move from one configuration to the other using only legal KA exchanges.

Definition 3.12 ($T$-step move). Fix an integer $k \leq d$. Given a finite connected subset $V$ of $\Lambda$ and $\mathcal{M} \subset \Omega$, a $T$-step move for KA-kf dynamics $M = (M_0, \ldots, M_T)$ taking place in $V$ and with domain $\text{Dom}(M) = \mathcal{M}$ is a function from $\mathcal{M}$ to $\Omega^{T+1}$ such that the sequence $M_\eta = (M_0\eta, \ldots, M_T\eta), \eta \in \mathcal{M}$, satisfies:

(i) $M_0\eta = \eta$,

(ii) for any $t \in [T]$, the configurations $M_{t-1}\eta$ and $M_t\eta$ are either identical or linked by a legal move contained in $V$, that is either a legal KA-kf exchange among sites $x, y \in V$ or a resampling at a boundary site $z \in \partial V$.

Definition 3.13 (Information loss and energy barrier). Given a $T$-step move $M$ its information loss $\text{Loss}_t(M)$ at time $t \in [T]$ is defined as

$$2^{\text{Loss}_t(M)} = \sup_{\eta' \in \text{Dom}(M)} \# \{\eta \in \text{Dom}(M) \mid M_t\eta = M_t\eta', M_{t+1}\eta = M_{t+1}\eta'\}.$$ 

In other words, knowing $M_t\eta$ and $M_{t+1}\eta$, we are guaranteed that $\eta$ is one of at most $2^{\text{Loss}_t(M)}$ configurations. We also set $\text{Loss}(M) := \sup_t \text{Loss}_t(M)$. The energy barrier of $M$ is defined as

$$E(M) = \sup_{\eta \in \text{Dom}(M)} \sup_{t \in [T]} |\# \{\text{empty sites in } M_t\eta\} - \# \{\text{empty sites in } \eta\}|.$$ 

The main result is the following proposition that guarantees the existence of a $T$-step move with a bounded information loss and energy barrier that allows to flip the configuration at $x$ (namely to go from $\eta \to \eta^x$) provided $\eta$ has a certain up-right good path. Recall that $Q_t = i + \{0, 1\}^d \setminus \{0\}^d \subset \mathbb{Z}_t^d$ and that $N = L/\ell$. 

Proposition 3.14. Fix an integer \( k \leq d \). Fix \( i \in \Lambda_\ell \) and \( x \in B_i \). If \( i + \vec{e}_1 \in \Lambda_\ell \) fix also an up-right path \( \gamma \) connecting \( i + \vec{e}_1 \) to \( \partial \Lambda_\ell \). Then there exists a \( T \)-step move \( M \) with
\[
\text{Dom}(M) = \{ \eta | \gamma \text{ is good and all } j \in Q_i \cap \Lambda_\ell \text{ are good} \},
\]

taking place in \( \bigcup_{j \in \gamma} B_j \cup (Q_i \cap \Lambda_\ell) \) and such that, for all \( \eta \in \text{Dom}(M) \) and all \( t \in [T] \), \( M_t \in \text{Dom}(M) \) and \( M_T \eta \) is the configuration \( \eta \) flipped at \( x \). Moreover \( M \) can be chosen to satisfy:
\[
\text{Loss}(M) \leq C \log_2(\ell) \ell^{d-1}, \quad E(M) \leq C \ell^{d-1}
\]
and
\[
T \leq CN \ell^\lambda, \quad \left| \mathcal{T}^{(j)}_M \right| \leq C \ell^\lambda \quad \forall j \in \Lambda_\ell \text{ for } k = 1, 2
\]
\[
T \leq CN2 \ell^d, \quad \left| \mathcal{T}^{(j)}_M \right| \leq C2^{\ell^d} \quad \forall j \in \Lambda_\ell \text{ for } k \geq 3
\]

where \( \mathcal{T}^{(j)}_M \) is the set of indices \( t \in [T] \) such that for some \( \eta \in \text{Dom}(M) \) the configurations \( (M_t \eta, M_{t+1} \eta) \) are linked together by a legal KA-transition inside \( B_j \). The constants \( C, \lambda \) may depend only on \( k \) and \( d \).

The proof of this proposition, which is obtained by concatenating several more basic moves as illustrated in the next section in the case \( k = d = 2 \), is unfortunately a bit cumbersome and technical. For the interested reader we refer to [26] and to the supplementary file attached to the arXiv version of this paper.

3.4.1. Sketch of the proof of Proposition 3.14 for \( k = d = 2 \). Recall Definitions 3.1 and 3.2 of frameable and good boxes. Two key ingredients to construct the \( T \)-step move of Proposition 3.14 are contained in the following Claims that can be readily proved using Fig. 4, Fig. 5 and Fig. 6.

Claim 3.15. If \( B_i \) is good and there is an empty column (or row) external and adjacent to one of its sides, by legal exchanges we can reach a configuration that is framed inside \( B_i \).

Claim 3.16. Suppose that the three boxes \( B_{i+\vec{e}_1} \), \( B_{i+\vec{e}_2} \) and \( B_{i+\vec{e}_1+\vec{e}_2} \) are framed. Then, for any couple of sites \( x, y \in B_i \), we can construct a path of legal exchanges inside \( B_i \cup \partial^+ \) (\( \partial^+ \) is the outer boundary of \( B_i \)) that connects \( \eta \) to \( \eta^{x,y} \).

Then, in order to construct a \( T \)-step move that flips the configuration at site \( x \), we can combine these results with the fact that we can create an empty vertical (or horizontal) segment of size \( \ell \) at the boundary \( \partial \Lambda \) with an energy barrier \( \ell \).

Finally, we refer to [26] and to the supplementary file attached to the arXiv version of this paper for the construction of a path that "moves" the empty segment created at the boundary through the good path in such a way that we can at any stage reconstruct.
the original configuration on all sites except at most $C\ell \log_2 \ell$, thus yielding the desired upper bound on the information loss.

3.5. **From the long range Poincaré inequality to the Kob-Andersen dynamics.** In this section we bound from above the Dirichlet form with the long range constraints appearing in the r.h.s. of (3.5) with that of the KA model in $\Lambda$ (3.2). Given $i \in \Lambda_\ell$ our
aim is to bound the quantity $\mu(\hat{c}_i \text{Var}_{B_i}(f))$ appearing in the r.h.s. of (3.5) using the $T$-step moves that have been constructed in the previous section. In order to do that, it is convenient to first condition on the environment of the coarse-grained variables $\{\mathbb{1}_{\{B_j \text{ is good}\}}\}_{j \notin i}$. The main advantage of the above conditioning is that the good family for the vertex $i + \hat{e}_1$, whose existence is guaranteed by the long range constraint $\hat{c}_i$, become deterministic. We will thus work first in a fixed realisation of the coarse-grained variables satisfying $\hat{c}_i = 1$ and only at the end we will take an average and we will sum over $i$. The main technical step of the above program is as follows.

Given $i \in \Lambda$ let $\gamma$ be an up-right focused path $\gamma$ of length $2N$ starting at $i + \hat{e}_1$ and let $G_{i,\gamma}$ be the event that $\gamma$ is good and all $j \in Q_i \cap \Lambda_T$ are good. Let also $V_{i,\gamma} := B_i \cup_{j \in \gamma \cap Q_i} B_j$ and let $\mathcal{F}_i$ be the $\sigma$-algebra generated by the random variables $\{\mathbb{1}_{\{B_j \text{ is good}\}}\}_{j \notin i}$. Notice that $G_{i,\gamma}$ is measurable w.r.t. $\mathcal{F}_i$. Finally write

$$D_{i,\gamma}(f \mid \mathcal{F}_i) := \sum_{x,y \in V_{i,\gamma} \cap \Lambda} \mu(x, y (\nabla xy f)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_i) + \sum_{x \in V_{i,\gamma} \cap \partial \Lambda} \mu(\text{Var}_x(f) \mid \mathcal{F}_i).$$

Clearly the average w.r.t. $\mu$ of $D_{i,\gamma}(f \mid \mathcal{F}_i)$ represents the contribution coming from the set $V_{i,\gamma} \cap \Lambda$ to the total Dirichlet form $D(f)$.

**Lemma 3.17.** On the event $G_{i,\gamma}$

$$\mu(\text{Var}_{B_i}(f) \mid \mathcal{F}_i) \leq O(N) e^{O(d^{-1}(\log(q) + \log(\ell)))} D_{i,\gamma}(f \mid \mathcal{F}_i) \quad \forall f : \Omega_\Lambda \mapsto \mathbb{R}.$$ for $k = 2$, and

$$\mu(\text{Var}_{B_i}(f) \mid \mathcal{F}_i) \leq O(N) e^{O(d^{-1}(\log(q) + \log(\ell)))} D_{i,\gamma}(f \mid \mathcal{F}_i) \quad \forall f : \Omega_\Lambda \mapsto \mathbb{R}.$$ when $k \geq 2$.

**Proof.** Assume $\mathbb{1}_{G_{i,\gamma}} = 1$. Since the marginal of $\mu(\cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_i)$ on $\{0, 1\}^{B_i}$ is a product measure we have immediately that

$$\mu(\text{Var}_{B_i}(f) \mid \mathcal{F}_i) \leq \sum_{x \in B_i} \mu(\text{Var}_x(f) \mid \mathcal{F}_i),$$

and it is sufficient to prove that

$$\max_{x \in B_i} \mu(\text{Var}_x(f) \mid \mathcal{F}_i) \leq O(N) e^{O(d^{-1}(\log(q) + \log(\ell)))} D_{i,\gamma}(f \mid \mathcal{F}_i) \quad \forall f : \Omega_\Lambda \mapsto \mathbb{R}.$$ for $k = 2$, and with $\ell^d$ in the exponent for $k > 2$. Given $x \in B_i$, Proposition 3.14 and the assumption $\mathbb{1}_{G_{i,\gamma}} = 1$ imply that there exists a $T$-step move $M$ with Dom(M) = $G_{i,\gamma}$, taking place in $V_{i,\gamma} \cap \Lambda$ and such that for all $\eta \in \text{Dom}(M)$ $M_T \eta$ is the configuration $\eta$ flipped at $x$. Notice that $M$ does not change the variables $\{\mathbb{1}_{\{B_j \text{ is good}\}}\}_{j \notin i}$. Hence, on
the event $G_{i,\gamma}$,

$$\Var_x(f) = pq \left( f(\eta) - f(\eta') \right)^2 \leq \left( \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (f(M_t\eta) - f(M_{t+1}\eta)) \right)^2 \leq T \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (f(M_t\eta) - f(M_{t+1}\eta))^2. \tag{3.6}$$

In order to proceed it is convenient to introduce the following notation.

A pair of configurations $e = (\eta, \eta') \in \Omega^2$ is called a KA-edge if $\eta \neq \eta'$ and $\eta'$ is obtained from $\eta$ by applying to $\eta$ either a legal exchange at some bond $b_e$ of $\Lambda$ or a spin flip at some site $z_e \in \partial \Lambda$. If $b_e$ or $z_e$ belong to a given $V \subset \Lambda$ we say that the edge $e$ occurs in $V$. Given a KA-edge $e = (\eta, \eta')$ we write $\nabla_e f := f(\eta') - f(\eta)$. Finally the collection of all KA-edges in $\Omega^2$ is denoted $\Omega_{KA}$.

By construction, if $M_{t+1}\eta \neq M_t\eta$ then $e_t := (M_t\eta, M_{t+1}\eta)$ is a KA-edge and the r.h.s. of (3.6) can be written as

$$T \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_{e_t} \left( \nabla_{e_t} f \right)^2,$$

where $c_{e_t}$ is the kinetic constraint associated to the KA-edge $e_t$. Taking the expectation over $\eta$ w.r.t. $\mu(\cdot | F_i)$ yields

$$\mu \left( \Var_x(f) | F_i \right) \leq T \sum_{e \in \Omega_{KA}} \sum_{t=0}^{T} \mu(e) \mu(M_t\eta | F_i) \left( \nabla_{e_t} f \right)^2. \tag{3.7}$$

Next we use the following chain of observations (recall Proposition 3.14 and the relevant definitions therein).

(i) For any KA-edge $e$ and any $\eta$ such that $e = (M_t\eta, M_{t+1}\eta)$ for some $t \leq T$ it holds that (for $q < 1/2$)

$$\mu(\eta) \leq q^{-E(M)} \mu(M_t\eta).$$

(ii) Since the $T$-move $M$ takes place in the set $V_{i,\gamma} \cap \Lambda$, in the r.h.s. of (3.7) we can replace $\sum_{e \in \Omega_{KA}}$ by

$$\sum_{e \in \Omega_{KA}} \sum_{\eta \in \Omega_{KA}}$$

(iii) Given a KA-edge $e$ occurring in some $B_j \subset V_{i,\gamma} \cap \Lambda$,

$$\sum_{\eta \in \Omega_{KA}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} 1_{\{e = (M_t\eta, M_{t+1}\eta)\}} \leq 2^{\text{Loss}(M)} | T^{(j)} |.$$

Using the above remarks, on the event $G_{i,\gamma}$,

$$\mu \left( \Var_x(f) | F_i \right) \leq T 2^{\text{Loss}(M)} | T^{(j)} | q^{-E(M)} \sum_{e = (\eta, \eta') \in \Omega_{KA}} \mu(\eta | F_i) c_e(\eta) \left( \nabla_e f \right)^2.$$
This expression, by Proposition 3.14, satisfies the required bound.

We are now ready to state the main result of this section. For simplicity in the sequel we shall write \( C(\ell, q) \) for any positive function such that

\[
C(\ell, q) = e^{O(\ell^{d-1}|\log(q)|+\log(\ell))}, \quad \text{as } \ell \uparrow +\infty, q \downarrow 0.
\]

for \( k = 2 \), and with \( \ell^d \) in the exponent for \( k \geq 2 \). Of course the constant in the \( O(\cdot) \) notation may change from line to line.

Proposition 3.18. Let \( D(\ell)(f) = \mu(\sum_{i \in \Lambda} \hat{c}_i \Var_{B_i}(f)) \) and let \( D(f) \) be the Dirichlet form of the KA model. Then

\[
D(\ell)(f) \leq O(N^2)C(\ell, q)D(f).
\]

Corollary 3.19. Fix \( 2 \leq k \leq d \) together with \( q \in (0,1) \). Assume that it is possible to choose the mesoscopic scale \( \ell \) depending only on \( k, d, q \) in such a way that \( \pi_{\ell}(d,k) \geq \pi_\star \), where \( \pi_\star \) is the constant appearing in Proposition 3.11. Then

\[
\Var(f) \leq O(N^2)C(\ell, q)D(f).
\]

Equivalently

\[
T_{\text{rel}}(q,L) \leq O(L^2)C(\ell, q).
\]

Proof of the Corollary. The first part of the corollary follows at once from Propositions 3.11 and 3.18. The second part is an immediate consequence of the first one and of the variational characterisation of the relaxation time (see the beginning of Section 3).

Proof of Proposition 3.18. Recall definition (3.4) of the long range constraints \( \hat{c}_i \) and let us consider one term \( \mu(\hat{c}_i \Var_{B_i}(f)) \) appearing in the definition of \( D(\ell)(f) \). Observe that \( \hat{c}_i \) is measurable w.r.t. the \( \sigma \)-algebra \( F_i \). Conditionally on \( F_i \) and assuming that \( \hat{c}_i = 1 \), let \( G \) be a family of good paths for the vertex \( i + e_1 + e_2 \in Z^d \). Clearly \( \hat{c}_i = 1 \) implies that \( G_{i,\gamma} \) occurs for each path \( \gamma \in G \). Hence, by applying Lemma 3.17 to each path in \( G \) we get

\[
\mu(\Var_{B_i}(f) \mid F_i) \leq O(N)C(\ell, q) \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{\gamma \in G} D_{i,\gamma}
\]

\[
= O(N)C(\ell, q) \left[ \sum_{x,y \in \Lambda : \|x-y\|_1 = 1} \mu(c_{xy}(\nabla_{xy}f)^2 \mid F_i) \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{\gamma \in G} 1_{\{x,y \subset V_{i,\gamma}\}} \right. \]

\[
+ \sum_{x \in \partial \Lambda} \mu(\Var_{x}(f) \mid F_i) \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{\gamma \in G} 1_{\{x \subset V_{i,\gamma}\}} \right].
\]

(eq:D_averaged_over_paths)

For a given bond \((x, y) \subset \Lambda \) (respectively \( x \in \partial \Lambda \) ) let \( j = j(x) \) be such that \( B_j \ni x \) and let \( \Pi_j \) denote the \((e_1, e_2)\)-plane in \( Z^d_\ell \) containing \( j \). Since all the paths forming the
family $\mathcal{G}$ belong to the plane $\Pi_i$, and are focused we immediately get that

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}|} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}} 1_{\{(x,y) \in V_{i,\gamma}\}} = 1_{\{(j \in \Pi_i, j \in \mathcal{R}_i)\}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}|} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}} 1_{\{(x,y) \in V_{i,\gamma}\}},$$

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}|} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}} 1_{\{x \in \partial V_{i,\gamma}\}} = 1_{\{(j \in \Pi_i, j \in \mathcal{R}_i)\}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}|} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}} 1_{\{x \in \partial V_{i,\gamma}\}},$$

where $\mathcal{R}_i$ is the set of points at distance at most $\sqrt{N}$ from the set $\{k : k = i + s(\vec{e}_1 + \vec{e}_2), s \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Next, for $(x, y) \subset \Lambda$ (respectively $x \in \partial \Lambda$) such that $||i - j||_1 \leq \sqrt{N}$ we bound $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}|} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}} 1_{\{(x,y) \in V_{i,\gamma}\}}$ (respectively $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}|} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}} 1_{\{x \in \partial V_{i,\gamma}\}}$) by one. If instead $||i - j||_1 > \sqrt{N}$ then we use the fact that the paths of $\mathcal{G}$ are almost edge-disjoint to bound from above both sums by $2/|\mathcal{G}| \leq 2/\sqrt{N}$.

In conclusion, the first and second term inside the square bracket in the r.h.s. of (3.9) are bounded from above by

$$\sum_{x, y \in \Lambda} \mu(c_{xy}(\nabla_{xy} f)^2 | F_i) 1_{\{j \in \Pi_i, j \in \mathcal{R}_i\}} \left[ 1_{\{||i - j||_1 \leq \sqrt{N}\}} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{N}} 1_{\{||i - j||_1 > \sqrt{N}\}} \right]$$

and

$$\sum_{x \in \partial \Lambda} \mu(\text{Var}_x(f) | F_i) 1_{\{j \in \Pi_i, j \in \mathcal{R}_i\}} \left[ 1_{\{||i - j||_1 \leq \sqrt{N}\}} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{N}} 1_{\{||i - j||_1 > \sqrt{N}\}} \right]$$

respectively. Clearly the same bounds hold for their average w.r.t. $\mu$.

In order to conclude the proof it is enough to sum over $i$ the above expressions and use the fact that, uniformly in $x \in \Lambda$,

$$\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\ell} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_i} 1_{\{j \in \Pi_i, j \in \mathcal{R}_i\}} \left[ 1_{\{||i - j||_1 \leq \sqrt{N}\}} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{N}} 1_{\{||i - j||_1 > \sqrt{N}\}} \right] \leq O(N).$$

$\square$

3.6. Completing the proof of Theorem 1. Using Corollary 3.19 the proof of Theorem 1 is complete if we can prove that for all $\pi^* < 1$, for any given $q \in (0, 1)$ and $2 \leq k \leq d$ it is possible to choose $\ell = \ell(q, k, d)$ in such a way that

(i) the probability that any given $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is $(d, k)$-good satisfies $\pi_\ell(d, k) \geq \pi^*$;

(ii) $C(\ell, q) \leq C(q)$ as $q \to 0$, where $C(q)$ is as in 2.3 and $C(\ell, q)$ satisfies (3.3).

Let us start by stating a key result on the probability of the set of frameable configurations

Proposition 3.20 (Probability of frameable configurations [27]). Fix $q$ and let $\mathcal{F}_q(\ell, d, j)$ be the probability that the cube $C_\ell = [\ell]^d$ is $(d, j)$-frameable. Then there exists $C > 0$ s.t. for $q \rightarrow 0$

$$\mathcal{F}_q(\ell, d, j) \geq 1 - Ce^{-\ell q/\Xi_{d,j}} \quad \forall \ell_q \text{ s.t. } \Xi_{d,k}(q) = O(\ell_q)$$
with
\[ \Xi_{d,1}(q) := \left(\frac{1}{q}\right)^{1/d} \]
and
\[ \Xi_{d,j}(q) := \exp(j-1) \left(\frac{1}{q^{d-j+1}}\right) \quad \forall j \in [2, d]. \]

**Proof.** The case \( j = 1 \) follows immediately from the definition of frameable configurations (see Definition 3.1). The cases \( j \in [2, d] \) are proven in Section 2 of [27], see formula (34) and (36), where the results are stated in terms of the parameter \( s = j - 1 \). Actually, the definition of frameable in [27] is more restrictive than our Definition 3.1. Indeed in [27] the frame that should be emptiable is composed by all the faces of dimension \( j - 1 \) containing one corner of \( C^n \) (and not only those that contain the vertex \((1, \ldots, 1)\)). However, since we only need a lower bound on the probability of being frameable we can directly use the results of [27]. \( \square \)

Then, by using Proposition 3.20 and the Definition 3.2, we get that there exists \( c > 0 \) s.t. by choosing
\[
\ell(q, k, d) = \exp(k-2) \left(\frac{c}{q^{d-j+1}}\right) \quad \forall k \in [3, d]
\]
and
\[
\ell(q, 2, d) = \log q \quad \frac{1}{q^{d-1}}
\]
we get
\[
\pi_\ell(d, k) \geq \left(1 - C \exp^{-\ell/\Xi_{d,j-1,k-1}}\right)^{\ell d}
\]
which goes to 1 as \( q \to 0 \), and thus implies that condition (i) is satisfied for all \( q \in (0, 1) \) (since \( \pi_\ell(d, k) \) is non decreasing with \( q \)). Finally, it is immediate to verify that the above choice of \( \ell \) satisfies also condition (ii) for all \( k \in [2, d] \).

**REFERENCES**
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There is a misprint in formula (34) of [27]: in the exponential a minus sign is missing.
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