

Large nearest neighbour balls in hyperbolic stochastic geometry

Moritz Otto^a

Christoph Thäle^b

Abstract

Consider a stationary Poisson process in a d -dimensional hyperbolic space. For $R > 0$ define the point process $\xi_R^{(k)}$ of exceedance heights over a suitable threshold of the hyperbolic volumes of k th nearest neighbour balls centred around the points of the Poisson process within a hyperbolic ball of radius R centred at a fixed point. The point process $\xi_R^{(k)}$ is compared to an inhomogeneous Poisson process on the real line with intensity function e^{-u} and point process convergence in the Kantorovich-Rubinstein distance is shown. From this, a quantitative limit theorem for the hyperbolic maximal k th nearest neighbour ball with a limiting Gumbel distribution is derived.

Keywords. Geometric extreme value theory, hyperbolic stochastic geometry, nearest neighbour balls, Poisson process approximation.

MSC. 52A55, 60D05, 60G55.

1 Introduction

The study of extreme values, or more generally processes of exceedance heights and associated order statistics, is a classical topic in probability theory. A systematic study of extreme values for random geometric systems is more recent and we refer, for example, to [7, 8, 11, 13] for particular results on the Poisson-Voronoi, -Delaunay or -line tessellation, to [22, 32] for distinguished results on random interpoint distances, and to [5, 14, 29, 30, 33, 34] for general approaches leading to various other stochastic-geometric applications. A systematic study of random processes of exceedance heights in stochastic geometry is the content of [5, 14, 27].

In this paper we are interested in quantitative limit theorems for so-called large k th nearest neighbour balls, another classical stochastic geometry model whose investigation goes back to [19] and which has recently been studied in [5, 12, 18]. In particular, nearest neighbour balls (that is, k th nearest neighbour balls with $k = 1$) can be regarded as spatial analogues of the concept of spacings in dimension one. In its simplest form the model can be described as follows: Take a sequence $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of independent random points which are uniformly distributed on the d -dimensional unit cube $[0, 1]^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For $n \geq 1$, $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ let $r(i, k)$ be the distance of X_i to its k th nearest neighbour among the points X_1, \dots, X_n , where the distance is measured by the Euclidean distance. Then for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ define the random variable

$$C_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1} \left\{ \mathcal{H}_e^d(B_e(X_i, r(i, n))) \geq \frac{t + \log n}{n} \right\},$$

^aotto@math.au.dk, Department of Mathematics, Aarhus University, Denmark

^bchristoph.thaele@rub.de, Faculty of Mathematics, Ruhr University Bochum, Germany

where \mathcal{H}_e^d stands for the d -dimensional Hausdorff measure and $B_e(X_i, r(i, n))$ for the d -dimensional ball of radius $r(i, n)$ centred at X_i with respect to the Euclidean structure on \mathbb{R}^d . In other words, C_n counts the number of exceedances of volumes of nearest neighbour balls that are larger than the threshold $(t + \log n)/n$. It follows from the results in [5, 12, 18] that, after suitable normalization, C_n converges in distribution, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, to a Poisson random variable with mean e^{-t} . Moreover, the rate of convergence, measured in the total variation distance, is of order $(\log \log n)/\log n$. This result immediately leads to a limit theorem for the maximum volume $M_n := \max\{\mathcal{H}_e^d(B_e(X_i, r(i, n))) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ of the k th nearest neighbour balls, which says that nM_n converges, after suitable centring, to a Gumbel distribution, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. A similar result holds if the sample of n independent random points is replaced by a homogeneous Poisson process in $[0, 1]^d$ with intensity n .

While the results and references just mentioned deal with k th nearest neighbour balls in a d -dimensional *Euclidean* space, we follow another line of current research in stochastic geometry and introduce and study a similar model in a d -dimensional *hyperbolic* space \mathbb{H}^d of constant negative curvature -1 . Random geometric systems in such a non-Euclidean set-up have so far been studied in the context of random polytopes [2, 3, 17], random graphs [6, 16, 15] and tessellations [17, 21]. However, the study of extreme values in hyperbolic stochastic geometry has so far left no trace in the existing literature. The present paper can be understood as a first attempt in this direction.

In principle it is possible to rephrase the Euclidean model of large k th nearest neighbour balls in a hyperbolic space, where the cube (which does not exist in hyperbolic geometry) is replaced by a hyperbolic ball of radius one, say. However, in this case, one can localize the problem and work with approximations in the corresponding tangent spaces. Within these tangent spaces the model is Euclidean again and we get back a result similar to that in [5, 12, 18]. For this reason, we modify the set-up as follows: We start with a stationary Poisson process in \mathbb{H}^d and look at large k th nearest neighbour balls associated with points in a family of hyperbolic balls of radius $R \rightarrow \infty$. Up to a rescaling, in a Euclidean space this set-up is the same as fixing the radius of the ball and increasing the intensity of the Poisson process (or equivalently the number of points). However, this is no more the case in a hyperbolic space. Even more, since the problem in this form cannot locally be approximated by Euclidean models in tangent space, we will arrive at results which are of a different nature and ‘feel’ the negative curvature of the underlying space. This phenomenon is very much in line with similar observations made in [20, 23] for Poisson hyperplane tessellations in hyperbolic space, for example.

In the next section we formally describe the framework we work with and present our results.

2 Set-up and results

Fix a dimension parameter $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider a d -dimensional hyperbolic space \mathbb{H}^d together with the intrinsic (Riemannian) metric d_h and the corresponding d -dimensional Hausdorff measure \mathcal{H}^d . Although all our results are independent of a concrete model for \mathbb{H}^d , for concreteness one may consider the Beltrami-Klein model in which \mathbb{H}^d is identified with the open Euclidean unit ball \mathbb{B}^d and the Riemannian metric is given by

$$ds^2 = \frac{dx_1^2 + \dots + dx_d^2}{1 - x_1^2 - \dots - x_d^2} + \frac{(x_1 dx_1 + \dots + x_d dx_d)^2}{(1 - x_1^2 - \dots - x_d^2)^2},$$




Figure 1: Construction of nearest neighbour balls ($k = 1$) in the Beltrami-Klein model for the hyperbolic plane. The ball B_R is shown in black with a white centre, the black points are points from η together with their nearest neighbour balls. The area of the two blue balls exceed the value $v_1(R)$.

see [9, 31] for details and further models for \mathbb{H}^d . While in this model hyperbolic hyperplanes are non-empty intersections of Euclidean hyperplanes with \mathbb{B}^d , hyperbolic balls are represented by Euclidean ellipsoids, see Figure 1. For $z \in \mathbb{H}^d$ and $r > 0$ let $B(z, r) := \{x \in \mathbb{H}^d : d_h(x, z) \leq r\}$ denote the closed hyperbolic ball of radius r centred at z . We abbreviate $B_r := B(p, r)$, where $p \in \mathbb{H}^d$ is some arbitrary fixed point, referred to as the origin of \mathbb{H}^d .

Let η be a Poisson process in \mathbb{H}^d with intensity measure \mathcal{H}^d . For $R > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$v_k(R) := R(d-1) + (k-1) \log(R(d-1)) - \log\left(\frac{(k-1)! \omega_d}{2^{d-1}(d-1)}\right), \quad (2.1)$$

where $\omega_d = \frac{2\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})}$ is the surface area of the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Euclidean unit sphere. For $x \in \mathbb{H}^d$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a general, locally finite and simple counting measure μ on \mathbb{H}^d let $r(x, k, \mu)$ denote the hyperbolic distance to the k th nearest neighbour of x in μ (with respect to the hyperbolic distance). In the focus of our results is the point process

$$\xi_R^{(k)} := \sum_{x \in \eta \cap B_R} \delta_{\mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(x, k, \eta - \delta_x)}) - v_k(R)}, \quad R > 0, \quad (2.2)$$

on the real line \mathbb{R} . This process describes the exceedance heights over the threshold $v_k(R)$ of the volumes of k th nearest neighbour balls centred around the points of η within a ball B_R of radius R , see Figure 1. Our main results quantify on the positive real half-axis \mathbb{R}_+ the approximation of $\xi_R^{(k)}$ by a suitable Poisson process, where we distinguish the cases $k = 1$ and $k \geq 2$. The distance is thereby measured by means of the so-called Kantorovich-Rubinstein distance which for two finite simple counting measures μ_1 and μ_2 on \mathbb{H}^d is given by

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{KR}}(\mu_1, \mu_2) := \sup_h (\mathbb{E}[h(\mu_1)] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mu_2)]),$$

where the supremum is taken over all measurable 1-Lipschitz functions with respect to the total variation distance on the space of finite simple counting measures on \mathbb{H}^d .

Theorem 1. Let ζ be an inhomogeneous Poisson process on \mathbb{R}_+ with intensity measure $\mathbb{E}\zeta$ given by $\mathbb{E}\zeta((u, \infty)) = e^{-u}$, $u > 0$.

- (i) Suppose that $k = 1$. Then there is a constant $C_1 > 0$ only depending on d such that for all $R > 0$ and $c > 0$,

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{KR}}(\xi_R^{(1)} \cap (c, \infty), \zeta \cap (c, \infty)) \leq C_1 R^{-1}.$$

- (ii) Suppose that $k \geq 2$. Then there are constants $C_k, R_k > 0$ only depending on d and on k such that for all $R \geq R_k$ and $c > 0$,

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{KR}}(\xi_R^{(k)} \cap (c, \infty), \zeta \cap (c, \infty)) \leq \begin{cases} C_k R^{-\frac{1}{2}} & : d = 2 \\ C_k R^{-\frac{d-2}{k(d-2)+1}} & : d \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

In particular, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the point process $\xi_R^{(k)}$ converges in distribution to the Poisson process ζ , as $R \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 2. (i) Instead of comparing $\xi_R^{(k)}$ and ζ on $(c, \infty) \subset \mathbb{R}_+$, it is also possible to compare them on $(c, \infty) \subset [-T, \infty)$, where $T > 0$ is some arbitrary fixed number. In this case ζ has to be considered as an inhomogeneous Poisson process on the whole real line \mathbb{R} (or at least on $[-T, \infty)$). Theorem 1 still holds in this set-up, but the constants C_k and R_k do then additionally depend on T as well.

- (ii) The distinction between $d = 2$ and $d \geq 3$ in (ii) and the qualitatively different results in these cases reflect, in a sense, the volume growth of balls in the hyperbolic space. In fact, the proof of Theorem 1 involves estimates of the volume of a $(d - 1)$ -dimensional hyperbolic ball of radius s , as $s \rightarrow \infty$. While for $d = 2$ the 1-volume grows linearly in s , as in a Euclidean space, for $d \geq 3$ a polynomial volume growth does not hold any more. Here, the volume growth is exponential in s . However and in contrast to the case $k \geq 2$ the proof of the special case $k = 1$ only uses estimates for the volume of a d -dimensional hyperbolic ball, which grows exponentially for all $d \geq 2$. This explains the difference between part (i) and (ii) in Theorem 1.

- (iii) We leave it as an open problem to decide whether (or not) the bounds in Theorem 1 are optimal.

The following extreme value statement for the distribution of the maximal volume of k th nearest neighbour balls in $\eta \cap B_R$ is a direct consequence of Theorem 1. It can be understood as the hyperbolic analogue to results for the asymptotic distribution of maximal k th nearest neighbour balls in Euclidean space, see [5], Section 6.2, and [12] for general $k \in \mathbb{N}$ as well as [18] for an elementary proof in the special case $k = 1$.

Corollary 3. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $c > 0$ and denote by $C_k, R_k > 0$ the constants appearing in Theorem 1.

- (i) Suppose that $k = 1$. Then for all $R > 0$ we have that

$$\left| \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{x \in \eta \cap B_R} \mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(x, 1, \eta - \delta_x)}) - v_1(R) \leq c \right) - \exp(e^{-c}) \right| \leq C_1 R^{-1}.$$

(ii) Suppose that $k \geq 2$. Then for all $R \geq R_k$ we have that

$$\left| \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{x \in \eta \cap B_R} \mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(x,k,\eta-\delta_x)}) - v_k(R) \leq c \right) - \exp(e^{-c}) \right| \leq \begin{cases} C_k R^{-\frac{1}{2}} & : d = 2 \\ C_k R^{-\frac{d-2}{k(d-2)+1}} & : d \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

In particular, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the random variable $\max_{x \in \eta \cap B_R} \mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(x,k,\eta-\delta_x)}) - v_k(R)$ converges in distribution to a Gumbel distribution, as $R \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. In view of the inequality

$$|\mathbb{P}(\xi_R^{(k)} \cap (c, \infty) = \emptyset) - \mathbb{P}(\zeta \cap (c, \infty) = \emptyset)| \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{KR}}(\xi_R^{(k)} \cap (c, \infty), \zeta \cap (c, \infty)),$$

the claim follows directly from Theorem 1. \square

The remaining parts of this paper are structured as follows. In Section 3 we provide some necessary background material from hyperbolic geometry and prove some auxiliary geometric estimates. We also rephrase there a general bound for quantitative Poisson approximation from [5] on which the proof of Theorem 1 is based. The latter is provided in Section 4 for $k \geq 2$ and in Section 5 we show how the latter can be modified to get the improved rate in the special case $k = 1$.

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Hyperbolic geometry

In this section we collect some preliminary material from hyperbolic geometry, which is relevant in our context, and refer to the monograph [31] and the survey article [9] for further information. We recall that $B(z, r)$ stands for a d -dimensional geodesic ball of radius $r > 0$ centred at $z \in \mathbb{H}^d$. If $z = p$ we simply write B_r for $B(p, r)$. The volume of B_r is given by

$$\mathcal{H}^d(B_r) = \omega_d \int_0^r \sinh^{d-1}(u) du, \quad (3.1)$$

where we recall that ω_d is the surface area of the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Euclidean unit sphere, see [31, Equation (3.26)]. Identity (3.1) is a consequence of the polar integration formula in hyperbolic geometry [10, pp. 123-125], which says that

$$\int_{\mathbb{H}^d} f(x) \mathcal{H}^d(dx) = \omega_d \int_{\mathbb{S}_p^{d-1}} \int_0^\infty \sinh^{d-1}(u) f(\exp_p(uv)) du \sigma_p(dv), \quad (3.2)$$

where \mathbb{S}_p^{d-1} is the $(d-1)$ -dimensional unit sphere in the tangent space T_p at p , σ_p the normalized spherical Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{S}_p^{d-1} \subset T_p$ and $\exp_p(uv)$ stands for the point in \mathbb{H}^d arising by applying the exponential map $\exp_p : T_p \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^d$ to the point $uv \in T_p$. In particular, we have the following bounds for $\mathcal{H}^d(B_r)$.

Lemma 4. *Let $d \geq 2$. Then there are constants $\Gamma_d, \tilde{\gamma}_d > 0$ only depending on d such that $\tilde{\gamma}_d e^{r(d-1)} \leq \mathcal{H}^d(B_r) \leq \Gamma_d e^{r(d-1)}$ for all $r \geq 2$.*




Figure 2: Illustration in the Beltrami-Klein model for the hyperbolic plane of the argument used in the proof of Lemma 5. Shown are the two balls $B(x, r)$ and $B(z, r)$ with $d_h(x, z) < r$, as well as two perpendiculars through points of $B_r(z, x)$.

Proof. It is elementary to check that $\sinh(u) \geq u$ for any $u \geq 0$ and that $\sinh(u) \geq e^u/3$ for $u \geq 1$. Since $d \geq 2$ we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^d(B_r) &\geq \omega_d \int_0^1 u^{d-1} du + \frac{\omega_d}{3^{d-1}} \int_1^r e^{(d-1)u} du \\ &= \frac{\omega_d}{d} + \frac{\omega_d}{(d-1)3^{d-1}} (e^{r(d-1)} - e^{d-1}) \\ &\geq \frac{\omega_d}{(d-1)3^{d-1}} (e^{r(d-1)} - e^{d-1}) \\ &\geq \tilde{\gamma}_d e^{r(d-1)} \end{aligned}$$

with the choice $\tilde{\gamma}_d = \frac{\omega_d}{2(d-1)3^{d-1}}$, where for the last inequality we used that $r \geq 2$. On the other hand, $\sinh(u) \leq e^u/2$ for all $u \geq 0$ and we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}^d(B_r) \leq \frac{\omega_d}{2^{d-1}} \int_0^r e^{(d-1)u} du \leq \Gamma_d e^{r(d-1)}$$

with $\Gamma_d = \frac{\omega_d}{(d-1)2^{d-1}}$. □

The following lemma is an essential ingredient of the proof of Theorem 1. It provides a bound for the volume of the difference of two nearby hyperbolic balls with the same radius.

Lemma 5. *Let $x, z \in \mathbb{H}^d$ and $0 < s := d_h(x, z) \leq r$.*

(i) *If $d = 2$ then $s(2r - s) \leq \mathcal{H}^2(B(z, r) \setminus B(x, r)) \leq 2rs$.*

(ii) *If $d \geq 3$ then $\gamma_{d-1}s(r - s/2)^{d-1} \leq \mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r) \setminus B(x, r)) \leq \Gamma_{d-1}se^{(d-2)(r-s/2)}$, and if additionally $r - s/2 \geq 2$ then $\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r) \setminus B(x, r)) \geq \tilde{\gamma}_{d-1}se^{(d-2)(r-s/2)}$, where Γ_{d-1} and $\tilde{\gamma}_{d-1}$ are the same constants as in Lemma 4 and $\gamma_{d-1} := \frac{\omega_{d-1}}{d-2}$.*

Proof. We start by observing that the boundary of the intersection $B(z, r) \cap B(x, r)$ is a $(d-2)$ -dimensional sphere of radius $\bar{r} := \operatorname{arcosh}\left(\frac{\cosh(r)}{\cosh(s/2)}\right)$ according to [31, Theorem 3.5.3]. Let $B_r(z, x)$

be the corresponding $(d-1)$ -dimensional ball. For each $y \in B_r(z, x)$ let $L(y)$ be the hyperbolic line through y which is orthogonal to the hyperbolic hyperplane containing $B_r(z, x)$. By construction, the set $(B(z, r) \setminus B(x, r)) \cap L(y)$ is a hyperbolic segment of length $r - (r - s) = s$ and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r) \setminus B(x, r)) &\geq \int_{B_r(z, x)} \mathcal{H}^1((B(z, r) \setminus B(x, r)) \cap L(y)) \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(dy) \\ &= s \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(B_r(z, x)), \end{aligned}$$

see Figure 2. To derive a lower bound for $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(B_r(z, x))$ we use that $\bar{r} \geq r - s/2$ according to [20, Lemma 6] and our assumption. According to Lemma 4 the $(d-1)$ -volume of a $(d-1)$ -dimensional geodesic ball $B_{r-s/2}^{d-1}$ of radius $r - s/2 \geq 2$ can be bounded from below by $\tilde{\gamma}_{d-1} e^{(d-2)(r-s/2)}$, provided that $d \geq 3$. If $r - s/2 < 2$ we can use the estimate $\sinh(u) \geq u$ for all $u \geq 0$ to conclude that $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(B_{r-s/2}^{d-1}) \geq \omega_{d-1} \int_0^{r-s/2} u^{d-2} du = \frac{\omega_{d-1}}{d-2} (r-s/2)^{d-1}$. For $d = 2$, we simply have $\mathcal{H}^1(B_{r-s/2}^1) = 2r - s$. This proves the lower bounds.

To derive upper bounds, we replace in the same hyperbolic hyperplane $B_r(z, x)$ by a $(d-1)$ -dimensional hyperbolic ball $B_r(z, x) \subseteq \tilde{B}_r(z, x)$ having the same centre as $B_r(z, x)$ but radius r to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r) \setminus B(x, r)) &\leq \int_{\tilde{B}_r(z, x)} \mathcal{H}^1((B(z, r) \setminus B(x, r)) \cap L(y)) \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(dy) \\ &= s \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\tilde{B}_r(z, x)). \end{aligned}$$

If $d \geq 3$ we get from Lemma 4 that $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\tilde{B}_r(z, x)) \leq \Gamma_{d-1} e^{(d-2)(r-s/2)}$. Moreover, for $d = 2$, $\mathcal{H}^1(\tilde{B}_r(z, x)) = 2r$ and we conclude the result. \square

3.2 Poisson approximation

In this section we rephrase as special case of [5, Theorem 4.1] which we will use to prove Theorem 1. We work with a Polish space \mathbb{X} and denote by $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{X}}$ the space of locally finite, simple counting measures on \mathbb{X} . As usual, we identify each element in $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{X}}$ with its support. Let $f : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be measurable functions and define for $\mu \in \mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{X}}$ the random point process

$$\xi[\mu] := \sum_{x \in \mu} g(x, \mu) \delta_{f(x, \mu)}, \quad (3.3)$$

whose intensity measure is denoted by $\mathbb{E}\xi[\mu](\cdot)$. To each point $x \in \mathbb{X}$ we associate in a measurable way a closed set $S_x \subset \mathbb{X}$ with $x \in S_x$. It is assumed that f and g are localized in the sense that

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, \mu) &= g(x, \mu \cap S_x) \\ f(x, \mu) &= f(x, \mu \cap S_x) \quad \text{if } g(x, \mu) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

To rephrase the result from [5] we need the total variation distance $\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{TV}}(\nu_1, \nu_2)$ between two measure ν_1, ν_2 on \mathbb{X} , which is defined as

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{TV}}(\nu_1, \nu_2) := \sup_B |\nu_1(B) - \nu_2(B)|,$$

where the supremum runs over all Borel subsets B of \mathbb{X} satisfying $\nu_1(B), \nu_2(B) < \infty$. Now, let η be a Poisson process on \mathbb{X} with intensity measure $\mathbb{E}\eta(\cdot)$, and define the quantities

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &:= \int_{\mathbb{X}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbf{1}\{S_x \cap S_z \neq \emptyset\} \mathbb{E}[g(x, \eta + \delta_x)] \mathbb{E}[g(z, \eta + \delta_z)] \mathbb{E}\eta(dz) \mathbb{E}\eta(dx), \\ E_2 &:= \int_{\mathbb{X}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbf{1}\{S_x \cap S_z \neq \emptyset\} \mathbb{E}[g(x, \eta + \delta_x + \delta_z)g(z, \eta + \delta_x + \delta_z)] \mathbb{E}\eta(dz) \mathbb{E}\eta(dx), \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_{(\cdot)}$ denotes the Dirac measure. Assuming finally that $\mathbb{E}\xi[\eta](\mathbb{R}) < \infty$, [5, Theorem 4.1] says that the Kantorovich-Rubinstein distance $\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{KR}}(\xi[\eta], \zeta)$ between $\xi[\eta]$ and a Poisson process ζ on \mathbb{R} with finite intensity measure $\mathbb{E}\eta(\cdot)$ can be estimated from above by

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{KR}}(\xi[\eta], \zeta) \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{TV}}(\mathbb{E}\xi[\eta], \mathbb{E}\zeta) + 2(E_1 + E_2). \quad (3.4)$$

We refer to [5, 14] for a dual formulation as well as more details on the Kantorovich-Rubinstein distance between random points measures. Let us also remark that if in (3.4) the Kantorovich-Rubinstein distance is replaced by the total variation distance, the result without the factor 2 on the right-hand side can be found in [1].

4 Proof of Theorem 1: The case $k \geq 2$

Our goal is to apply the Poisson approximation bound (3.4). To this end, we need to specify \mathbb{X} , η , the functions f and g as well as the sets S_x . For the space \mathbb{X} we take the d -dimensional hyperbolic space \mathbb{H}^d and for η a Poisson process on \mathbb{H}^d with intensity measure \mathcal{H}^d . To ensure finiteness of the involved intensity measures we fix some arbitrary $c > 0$ and define the two functions $g, f : \mathbb{H}^d \times \mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{H}^d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, \mu) &:= \mathbf{1}\{x \in B_R\} \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(x,k,\eta-\delta_x)}) - v_k(R) > c\}, \\ f(x, \mu) &:= \mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(x,k,\eta-\delta_x)}) - v_k(R), \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that $r(x, k, \mu)$ denotes the distance to the k th nearest neighbour of a point x in the support of a simple counting measure μ . Then the point process of exceedances (2.2) restricted to the interval (c, ∞) has the same distribution as $\xi[\eta]$ in (3.3) using the functions f and g as just defined. Next, for $x \in \mathbb{H}^d$ let $S_x := B(x, r_c)$ be the closed ball with \mathcal{H}^d -measure $c + v_k(R)$ and centre at x . We emphasize that this choice implicitly determines the radius r_c via (3.1). By construction, the functions f and g are localized by the sets S_x . Since $\mathcal{H}^d(B_s) = \omega_d \int_0^s \sinh(u)^{d-1} du$ for $s > 0$ by (3.1) and $\sinh(u) = \frac{e^u - e^{-u}}{2}$, we find the inequalities

$$\omega_d \left[\frac{e^{s(d-1)}}{(d-1)2^{d-1}} - \frac{(d-1)e^{s(d-3)}}{(d-3)2^{d-1}} \right] \leq \mathcal{H}^d(B_s) \leq \omega_d \frac{e^{s(d-1)}}{(d-1)2^{d-1}}, \quad s > 0. \quad (4.1)$$

Together with the definition of $v_k(R)$ in (2.1), this gives

$$\log \left(\frac{(d-1)2^{d-1}}{\omega_d} \right) + \log v_k(R) \leq r_c(d-1) \leq \beta_0 + \log v_k(R) \quad (4.2)$$

for some constant $\beta_0 > \log \left(\frac{(d-1)2^{d-1}}{\omega_d} \right)$. Finally, we let ζ be an inhomogeneous Poisson process on \mathbb{R}_+ with intensity measure $\mathbb{E}\zeta((u, \infty)) = e^{-u}$, $u > 0$, as in the statement of Theorem 1. We can now apply (3.4) to conclude that for all $R > 0$,

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{KR}}(\xi_R^{(k)} \cap (c, \infty), \zeta \cap (c, \infty)) \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{TV}}(\mathbb{E}\xi_R^{(k)} \cap (c, \infty), \mathbb{E}\zeta \cap (c, \infty)) + 2(E_1 + E_2), \quad (4.3)$$

where the error terms E_1 and E_2 are given by

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &:= \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \mathbb{1}\{x, z \in B_R, B(x, r_c) \cap B(z, r_c) \neq \emptyset\} \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(x,k,\eta)}) > c + v_k(R)] \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(z,k,\eta)}) > c + v_k(R)] \mathcal{H}^d(dz) \mathcal{H}^d(dx), \\ E_2 &:= \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \mathbb{1}\{x, z \in B_R, B(x, r_c) \cap B(z, r_c) \neq \emptyset\} \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(x,k,\eta+\delta_z)}) > c + v_k(R), \mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(z,k,\eta+\delta_x)}) > c + v_k(R)] \mathcal{H}^d(dz) \mathcal{H}^d(dx). \end{aligned}$$

The remaining parts of the proof bound individually the three terms on the right hand side of (4.3).

Bounding the total variation distance. In a first step we investigate the intensity measure of $\xi_R^{(k)}$. Let $r_c > 0$ be such that $\mathcal{H}^d(B_{r_c}) = v_k(R) + c$ and note that $\mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(x,k,\mu)}) > v_k(R) + c$ if and only if $\mu(B(x, r_c)) \leq k - 1$. From the Mecke equation for Poisson processes [25, Theorem 4.1] we obtain that for all $u > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\xi_R^{(k)}((u, \infty)) = \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \mathbb{1}\{x \in B_R\} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(x,k,\eta)}) > u + v_k(R)] \mathcal{H}^d(dx).$$

Since the distribution of η is invariant under hyperbolic isometries and $\mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(x,k,\eta)}) > u + v_k(R)$ if and only if there are at most $k - 1$ points of η in a ball with \mathcal{H}^d -measure $u + v_k(R)$ around x , the expression is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{H}^d(B_R) e^{-u-v_k(R)} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \frac{(u + v_k(R))^\ell}{\ell!} \\ &= e^{-u} \mathcal{H}^d(B_R) \frac{2^{d-1} (d-1) e^{-R(d-1)} (k-1)!}{\omega_d(R(d-1))^k} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \frac{(u + R(d-1) + (k-1) \log(R(d-1)) - \log(\frac{(k-1)! \omega_d}{2^{d-1} (d-1)}))^\ell}{\ell!}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the definition (2.1) of $v_k(R)$ and the Poisson property of η . Now, (4.1) gives

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{TV}}(\mathbb{E}\xi_R^{(k)} \cap (c, \infty), \mathbb{E}\zeta \cap (c, \infty)) \leq \left| e^{-c} \mathcal{H}^d(B_R) e^{-v_k(R)} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \frac{(c + v_k(R))^\ell}{\ell!} - e^{-c} \right| \leq \beta_1 R^{-1} \quad (4.4)$$

for some constant $\beta_1 > 0$ only depending on k and d .

Bounding E_1 . Since $B(x, r_c) \cap B(z, r_c) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if the hyperbolic distance of x and z is at most $2r_c$, we obtain from the invariance of η under hyperbolic isometries that E_1 is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\xi_R^{(k)}((c, \infty)) \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{H}^d(B_{r(p,k,\eta)}) > c + v_k(R)] \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \mathbb{1}\{B(p, r_c) \cap B(z, r_c) \neq \emptyset\} \mathcal{H}^d(dz) \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E}\xi_R^{(k)}((c, \infty)))^2 \frac{\mathcal{H}^d(B_{2r_c})}{\mathcal{H}^d(B_R)}. \end{aligned}$$

From (4.1) and the definition of $v_k(R)$ we have that

$$r_c \leq \frac{1}{d-1} \log R + \beta_2 \quad (4.5)$$

for some constant $\beta_2 > 0$ only depending on d . Hence, there is another constant $\beta_3 > 0$ only depending on d such that for all $R > 0$,

$$E_1 \leq \beta_3 R^2 e^{-R(d-1)}. \quad (4.6)$$

Bounding E_2 . Let $a \in (0, 1]$, its precise value will be specified later. In order to bound E_2 we distinguish by the value of the hyperbolic distance between x and z , and rewrite E_2 as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \mathbf{1}\{x \in B_R, z \in B_R \cap B(x, ar_c)\} \mathbb{P}[\eta(B(x, r_c)) \leq k-2] \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{P}[\eta(B(z, r_c) \setminus B(x, r_c)) \leq k-2] \mathcal{H}^d(dz) \mathcal{H}^d(dx) \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & + \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \mathbf{1}\{x \in B_R, z \in B_R \cap (B(x, 2r_c) \setminus B(x, ar_c))\} \mathbb{P}[\eta(B(x, r_c)) \leq k-1] \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{P}[\eta(B(z, r_c) \setminus B(x, r_c)) \leq k-1] \mathcal{H}^d(dz) \mathcal{H}^d(dx). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

By invariance of η under hyperbolic isometries, the first term (4.7) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \xi_R^{(k)}((c, \infty)) \frac{\mathbb{P}[\eta(B_{r_c}) \leq k-2]}{\mathbb{P}[\eta(B_{r_c}) \leq k-1]} \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \mathbf{1}\{z \in B_{ar_c}\} \mathbb{P}[\eta(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c}) \leq k-2] \mathcal{H}^d(dz) \\ & = \omega_d \mathbb{E} \xi_R^{(k)}((c, \infty)) \frac{\mathbb{P}[\eta(B_{r_c}) \leq k-2]}{\mathbb{P}[\eta(B_{r_c}) \leq k-1]} \\ & \quad \times \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-2} \int_0^{ar_c} \sinh(s)^{d-1} \exp\{-\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c})\} \frac{(\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c}))^\ell}{\ell!} ds, \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

where we applied the polar integration formula (3.2) with $z := \exp_p(sv)$ for some arbitrary $v \in \mathbb{S}_p^{d-1}$ in (4.9). Now, we distinguish the cases $d = 2$ and $d \geq 3$. To bound the integral term for $d = 2$ we use Lemma 5 (i) and the fact that $\sinh(s) \leq e^s/2$ for all $s \geq 0$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{ar_c} \sinh(s) \exp\{-\mathcal{H}^2(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c})\} \frac{(\mathcal{H}^2(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c}))^\ell}{\ell!} ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{ar_c} e^s \exp\{-s(2r_c - s)\} \frac{(2r_c s)^\ell}{\ell!} ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \exp\{-sr_c(2-a)\} \frac{(2r_c s)^\ell}{\ell!} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $u = sr_c(2-a)$ this is the same as

$$\frac{(2r_c)^\ell}{2\ell!} \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{u}{r_c(2-a)}\right)^\ell e^{-u} \frac{du}{r_c(2-a)} = \frac{2^{\ell-1}}{r_c(2-a)}.$$

We thus arrive at the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \xi_R^{(k)}((c, \infty)) \frac{\mathbb{P}[\eta(B_{r_c}) \leq k-2]}{\mathbb{P}[\eta(B_{r_c}) \leq k-1]} \int_{\mathbb{H}^2} \mathbf{1}\{z \in B_{ar_c}\} \mathbb{P}[\eta(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c}) \leq k-2] \mathcal{H}^2(dz) \\ & \leq \beta_4 \mathbb{E} \xi_R^{(k)}((c, \infty)) \frac{\mathbb{P}[\eta(B_{r_c}) \leq k-2]}{\mathbb{P}[\eta(B_{r_c}) \leq k-1]} \frac{1}{r_c}, \end{aligned}$$

independently of a , where $\beta_4 > 0$ is some absolute constant.

Next, we recall that for a general Poisson random variable X with mean $\lambda > 0$ and any bounded function $g: \{0, 1, \dots\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ one has that

$$\mathbb{E}[\lambda g(X+1)] = \mathbb{E}[Xg(X)];$$

in fact, this is the famous Chen-Stein characterization of the Poisson distribution. In particular, applying this to the function $g(n) = \mathbf{1}\{n \leq k\}$ we see that

$$\lambda \mathbb{P}(X \leq k-1) = \mathbb{E}[X \mathbf{1}\{X \leq k\}] \leq k \mathbb{P}(X \leq k).$$

Applying this to the Poisson random variable $\eta(B_{r_c})$ which has mean $\mathcal{H}^d(B_{r_c}) = v_k(R) + c$ and using the lower bound in (4.2) we conclude that

$$\beta_4 \mathbb{E} \xi_R^{(k)}((c, \infty)) \frac{\mathbb{P}[\eta(B_{r_c}) \leq k-2]}{\mathbb{P}[\eta(B_{r_c}) \leq k-1]} \frac{1}{r_c} \leq \beta_4 \mathbb{E} \xi_R^{(k)}((c, \infty)) \frac{k-1}{v_k(R) + c} \frac{1}{r_c} \leq \frac{\beta_5}{v_k(R) r_c} \leq \frac{\beta_6}{R \log R}$$

for suitable constants $\beta_5, \beta_6 > 0$ only depending on k for $d = 2$.

On the other hand, if $d \geq 3$ we can build upon Lemma 5 (ii) and apply the polar integration formula (2.2) with $z := \exp_p(sv)$ for some arbitrary $v \in \mathbb{S}_p^{d-1}$ to see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{ar_c} \sinh(s)^{d-1} \exp\{-\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c})\} \frac{(\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c}))^\ell}{\ell!} ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2^{d-1}} \int_0^{ar_c} e^{(d-1)s} \exp\{-\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c})\} \frac{(\Gamma_{d-1} s e^{(d-1)(r_c-s/2)})^\ell}{\ell!} ds. \end{aligned}$$

To lower bound $\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c})$ we use again Lemma 5 (ii) to see that

$$\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c}) \geq \begin{cases} \gamma_{d-1} s (r_c - \frac{s}{2})^{d-1} & : r_c - \frac{s}{2} < 2 \\ \tilde{\gamma}_{d-2} s e^{(d-1)(r_c - \frac{s}{2})} & : r_c - \frac{s}{2} \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

However, if $r_c \geq 5$ we always have that $2(r_c - 2) > r_c \geq s$, which implies that in this case we can always work with the lower bound $\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c}) \geq \tilde{\gamma}_{d-1} s e^{(d-2)(r_c - \frac{s}{2})}$. Moreover, we note that $r_c \geq 5$ can be achieved by choosing the parameter R large enough. Thus, for such R we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2^{d-1}} \int_0^{ar_c} e^{(d-1)s} \exp\{-\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c})\} \frac{(\Gamma_{d-1} s e^{(d-2)(r_c-s/2)})^\ell}{\ell!} ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2^{d-1}} \int_0^{ar_c} e^{(d-1)s} \exp\{-\tilde{\gamma}_{d-1} s e^{(d-2)(r_c - \frac{s}{2})}\} \frac{(\Gamma_{d-1} s e^{(d-2)(r_c-s/2)})^\ell}{\ell!} ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2^{d-1}} \frac{(\Gamma_{d-1} e^{(d-1)r_c})^\ell}{\ell!} \int_0^\infty \exp\left\{-s \left(\tilde{\gamma}_{d-1} e^{\frac{r_c(d-2)(2-a)}{2}} - (d-1)\right)\right\} s^\ell ds \\ & \leq \beta_7 \exp\left\{-r_c(d-2) \frac{2-a(\ell+1)}{2}\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which takes its maximum value $\beta_7 e^{-r_c \frac{(d-2)(2-ak+a)}{2}}$ for $\ell = k-2$, where $\beta_7 > 0$ is a constant only depending on d .

Now, we consider (4.8). By invariance of η under hyperbolic isometries, (4.8) is the same as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \xi_R^{(k)}((c, \infty)) \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \mathbb{1}\{z \in B_{2r_c} \setminus B_{ar_c}\} \mathbb{P}[\eta(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c}) \leq k-1] \mathcal{H}^d(dz) \\ & = \omega_d \mathbb{E} \xi_R^{(k)}((c, \infty)) \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \int_{ar_c}^{2r_c} \sinh(s)^{d-1} \exp\{-\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c})\} \frac{(\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c}))^\ell}{\ell!} ds, \end{aligned}$$

where we again applied the polar integration formula (3.2) with $z := \exp_p(sv)$ for some arbitrary $v \in \mathbb{S}_p^{d-1}$. Using that $\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c}) \geq \mathcal{H}^d(B_{s/2})$ for $d_h(p, z) = s$, we find from Lemma 4 that $\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c}) \geq \tilde{\gamma}_d e^{(d-1)s/2}$ (the result can indeed be applied, since $s \geq ar_c \geq 2$ for large enough R). Since the function $u \mapsto e^{-u} u^\ell$ is decreasing for $u \geq u_0$ large enough, we obtain for R large enough,

$$\int_{ar_c}^{2r_c} \sinh(s)^{d-1} \exp\{-\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c})\} \frac{(\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B_{r_c}))^\ell}{\ell!} ds$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{2^{d-1}} \int_{ar_c}^{2r_c} e^{(d-1)s} \exp\left\{-\tilde{\gamma}_d e^{(d-1)s/2}\right\} \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_d^\ell e^{\ell(d-1)s/2}}{\ell!} ds \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2^{d-1}} \int_{ar_c}^{2r_c} \exp\left\{-\tilde{\gamma}_d e^{(d-1)s/2}\right\} \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_d^\ell e^{(\ell+2)(d-1)s/2}}{\ell!} ds \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2^{d-1}} \int_{ar_c}^{2r_c} \exp\left\{-\tilde{\gamma}_d e^{(d-1)s/2}\right\} \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_d^\ell e^{(\ell+2)(d-1)s/2}}{\ell!} e^{(d-1)s/2} e^{-(d-1)s/2} ds \\
&\leq \frac{e^{-r_c \frac{(d-1)a}{2}}}{2^{d-1}} \int_{ar_c}^{2r_c} \exp\left\{-\tilde{\gamma}_d e^{(d-1)s/2}\right\} \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_d^\ell e^{(\ell+2)(d-1)s/2}}{\ell!} e^{(d-1)s/2} ds \\
&\leq \beta_8 e^{-r_c \frac{(d-1)a}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta_8 > 0$ is a constant only depending on d .

Summarizing, we have shown that, for large enough R ,

$$E_2 \leq \begin{cases} \beta_6 (R \log R)^{-1} + \beta_9 e^{-r_c \frac{(d-1)a}{2}} & : d = 2 \\ \beta_7 \exp\left\{-r_c (d-2) \frac{2-a(\ell+1)}{2}\right\} + \beta_9 e^{-r_c \frac{(d-1)a}{2}} & : d \geq 3, \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

where $\beta_9 > 0$ is a constant only depending on d and k .

Completing the proof. After having estimated all terms in (4.3) we first conclude for $d = 2$ from (4.4), (4.6) and (4.10) that for all sufficiently large R ,

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{KR}}(\xi_R^{(k)} \cap (c, \infty), \zeta \cap (c, \infty)) \leq \beta_1 R^{-1} + 2\beta_3 R^2 e^{-R} + \beta_6 (R \log R)^{-1} + \beta_9 e^{-r_c \frac{a}{2}}$$

for any $a \in (0, 1]$. From this together with (4.5) we conclude that

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{KR}}(\xi_R^{(k)} \cap (c, \infty), \zeta \cap (c, \infty)) \leq C_k R^{-a/2},$$

where $C_k > 0$ is some constant only depending on k . Choosing $a = 1$ gives the result of Theorem 1(ii) for $d = 2$.

On the other hand, for $d \geq 3$ and using again (4.4), (4.6) and (4.10) we arrive at the bound

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{KR}}(\xi_R^{(k)} \cap (c, \infty), \zeta \cap (c, \infty)) \leq \beta_1 R^{-1} + 2\beta_3 R^2 e^{-R(d-1)} + \beta_7 e^{-r_c \frac{(d-2)(2-ak+a)}{2}} + \beta_9 e^{-r_c \frac{(d-1)a}{2}},$$

which again holds for sufficiently large R . Now, we choose a in such a way that the two last terms have the same exponent, that is, we choose a such that $\frac{(d-1)a}{2} = \frac{(d-2)(2-ak+a)}{2}$. This leads to $a = \frac{2(d-2)}{k(d-2)+1}$ and we note that this choice for a satisfies $a \in (0, 1)$, since $a < 1$ is equivalent to $(k-2)(d-2) > -1$. This together with (4.5) leads to the bound

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{KR}}(\xi_R^{(k)} \cap (c, \infty), \zeta \cap (c, \infty)) \leq C_k R^{-\frac{d-2}{k(d-2)+1}}$$

for large enough R , where $C_k > 0$ is a suitable constant that depends only on d and on k . This proves the assertion for $d \geq 3$. \square




Figure 3: Illustration in the Beltrami-Klein model for the hyperbolic plane of the argument used in the proof of Theorem 1 (i). Shown are the balls $B(p, r_c)$ and $B(z, r_c)$, where $d_h(p, z) = r_c$. The blue ball has radius $r_c/2$.

5 Proof of Theorem 1: The case $k = 1$

The strategy of the proof of Theorem 1 in the case $k = 1$ is the same as for $k \geq 2$. In fact, for $k = 1$ the bounds for the total variation distance of the intensity measures and for E_1 are still given by (4.4) and (4.6), respectively, with $k = 1$ there. However, the estimate for E_2 can be improved and simplified in the case $k = 1$. Namely, we use that $(\eta - \delta_x)(B(x, r_c)) = 0$ and $(\eta - \delta_z)(B(z, r_c)) = 0$ implies for $x, z \in \eta$ that $d_h(z, x) \geq r_c$. Hence, we obtain for E_2 the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 &\leq \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \mathbf{1}\{z \in B_R, x \in B_R \cap B(z, 2r_c) \setminus B(z, r_c)\} \mathbb{P}[\eta(B(z, r_c)) = 0] \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{P}[\eta(B(z, r_c) \setminus B(x, r_c)) = 0] \mathcal{H}^d(dz) \mathcal{H}^d(dx) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \xi_R^{(1)}((c, \infty)) \int_{\mathbb{H}^d} \mathbf{1}\{x \in B(p, 2r_c) \setminus B(p, r_c)\} \mathbb{P}[\eta(B(z, r_c) \setminus B(x, r_c)) = 0] \mathcal{H}^d(dx). \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

Let $z \in \mathbb{H}^d \setminus B(p, r_c)$ and observe that $\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B(p, r_c)) \geq \mathcal{H}^d(B_{r_c/2})$, since the set difference $B(z, r_c) \setminus B(p, r_c)$ contains a hyperbolic ball of radius $r_c/2$, see Figure 3. Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}[\eta(B(z, r_c) \setminus B(x, r_c)) = 0] = \exp(-\mathcal{H}^d(B(z, r_c) \setminus B(x, r_c))) \leq \exp(-\mathcal{H}^d(B_{r_c/2})).$$

This gives for (5.1) the bound

$$\mathbb{E} \xi_R^{(1)}((c, \infty)) \mathcal{H}^d(B_{2r_c}) \exp(-\mathcal{H}^d(B_{r_c/2})),$$

which by (4.1) and (4.2) can further be bounded by

$$\beta_{10} R^2 \exp(-\beta_{11} R^{1/2}) \quad (5.2)$$

for some constants $\beta_{10}, \beta_{11} > 0$ only depending on d . Combining (5.2) with the estimates of the total variation distance and E_1 from above gives

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{KR}}(\xi_R^{(1)} \cap (c, \infty), \zeta \cap (c, \infty)) \leq \beta_1 R^{-1} + 2\beta_3 R^2 e^{-R(d-1)} + \beta_{10} R^2 \exp(-\beta_{11} R^{1/2}) \leq C_1 R^{-1}$$

for all $R > 0$, where $C_1 > 0$ is a suitable constant only depending on d . \square

Acknowledgement

This work has been supported by the DFG priority program SPP 2265 *Random Geometric Systems*.

References

- [1] BARBOUR, A.D. AND BROWN, T.C. (1992). Stein’s method and point process approximation. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 43 9–31.
- [2] BESAU, F., D. ROSEN AND THÄLE, C. (2021). Random inscribed polytopes in projective geometries. *Math. Ann.* 381, 1345–1372.
- [3] BESAU, F. AND THÄLE, C. (2020). Asymptotic normality for random polytopes in non-Euclidean geometries. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 373, 8911–8941.
- [4] BHATTACHARJEE, C. AND SCHULTE, M. (2022). Large degrees in scale-free inhomogeneous random graphs. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 32, 696–720.
- [5] BOBROWSKI, O., SCHULTE, M. AND YOGESHWARAN, D. (2021). Poisson process approximation under stabilization and Palm coupling. *arXiv:2104.13261*.
- [6] BODE, M., FOUNTOLAKIS, N. AND MÜLLER, T. (2015). On the largest component of a hyperbolic model of complex networks. *Electron. J. Combinat.* 22, 3–24.
- [7] BONNET, G. AND CHENAVIER, N. (2020). The maximal degree in a Poisson-Delaunay graph. *Bernoulli* 26, 948–979.
- [8] CALKA, P. AND CHENAVIER, N. (2014). Extreme values for characteristic radii of a Poisson-Voronoi tessellation. *Extremes* 17, 359–385.
- [9] CANNON, J.W., FLOYD, W.J., KENYON, R. AND PARRY, W.R. (1997). Hyperbolic geometry. In *Flavors of Geometry*, MSRI Publications.
- [10] CHAVEL, I. (1993). *Riemannian Geometry - A Modern Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- [11] CHENAVIER, N. AND HEMSLEY, R. (2016). Extremes for the inradius in the Poisson line tessellation. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* 48, 544–573.
- [12] CHENAVIER, N., HENZE, N. AND OTTO, M. (2022). Limit laws for large k th-nearest neighbor balls. *J. Appl. Probab.* 59, 880–894.
- [13] CHENAVIER, N. AND ROBERT, C.Y. (2018). Cluster size distributions of extreme values for the Poisson-Voronoi tessellation. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 28, 3291–3323.
- [14] DECREUSEFOND, L., SCHULTE, M. AND THÄLE, C. (2016). Functional Poisson approximation in Kantorovich–Rubinstein distance with applications to U-statistics and stochastic geometry. *Ann. Prob.* 44, 2147–2197.
- [15] FOUNTOLAKIS, N. VAN DER HOORN, P., MÜLLER, T. AND SCHEPERS, M. (2021). Clustering in a hyperbolic model of complex networks. *Electron. J. Probab.* 26, article 13.
- [16] FOUNTOLAKIS, N. AND MÜLLER, T. (2018). Law of large numbers for the largest component in a hyperbolic model of complex networks. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 28, 607–650.
- [17] GODLAND, T., KABLUCHKO, Z. AND THÄLE, C. (2022). Beta-star polytopes and hyperbolic stochastic geometry. *Adv. Math.* 404, article 108382, 69 pages.
- [18] GYÖRFI, L., HENZE, N. AND WALK, H. (2019). The limit distribution of the maximum probability nearest-neighbour ball. *J. Appl. Probab.* 56, 574–589.

- [19] HENZE, N. (1982). The limit distribution for maxima of 'weighted' r th-nearest-neighbour distances. *J. Appl. Probab.* 19, 344–354.
- [20] HEROLD, F., HUG, D. AND THÄLE, C. (2021). Does a central limit theorem hold for the k -skeleton of Poisson hyperplanes in hyperbolic space? *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* 179, 889–968.
- [21] ISOKAWA, Y. (2000). Poisson-Voronoi tessellations in three-dimensional hyperbolic spaces. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* 32, 548–662.
- [22] JAMMALAMADAKA, S.R. AND JANSON, S. (2015). Asymptotic distribution of the maximum interpoint distance in a sample of random vectors with a spherically symmetric distribution. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 25, 3571–3591.
- [23] KABLUCHKO, Z., ROSEN, D. AND THÄLE, C. (2022). Fluctuations of λ -geodesic Poisson hyperplanes in hyperbolic space. *arXiv 2205.12820*.
- [24] LAO, W. AND MAYER, M. (2008). U-max-statistics. *J. Multivariate Anal.* 99, 2039–2052.
- [25] LAST, G. AND PENROSE, M. (2017). *Lectures on the Poisson Process*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [26] MAYER, M. AND MOLCHANOV, I. (2007). Limit theorems for the diameter of a random sample in the unit ball. *Extremes* 10, 129–150.
- [27] OTTO, M. (2020). Poisson approximation of Poisson-driven point processes and extreme values in stochastic geometry. *arXiv:2005.10116*.
- [28] OWADA, T. AND YOGESHWARAN, D. (2022+). Sub-tree counts on hyperbolic random geometric graphs. To appear in *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* <https://doi.org/10.1017/apr.2022.1>
- [29] PIANOFORTE, F. AND SCHULTE, M. (2021). Poisson approximation with applications to stochastic geometry. *Electron. J. Probab.* 26, article 149, 36 pages.
- [30] PIANOFORTE, F. AND SCHULTE, M. (2022). Criteria for Poisson process convergence with applications to inhomogeneous Poisson–Voronoi tessellations. *Stochastic Processes Appl.* 147, 388–422.
- [31] RATCLIFFE, J.C. (2019). *Foundations of Hyperbolic Manifolds*. 3rd edn., Springer, Berlin.
- [32] SCHREMPP, M. (2019). Limit laws for the diameter of a set of random points from a distribution supported by a smoothly bounded set. *Extremes* 22, 167–191.
- [33] SCHULTE, M. AND THÄLE, C. (2012). The scaling limit of Poisson-driven order statistics with applications in geometric probability. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 122, 4096–4120.
- [34] SCHULTE, M. AND THÄLE, C. (2016). Poisson point process convergence and extreme values in stochastic geometry. In *Stochastic Analysis for Poisson Point Processes* Bocconi Springer Ser. 7, Bocconi Univ. Press.