

# Harmonic deformation of Delaunay triangulations

Pablo A. Ferrari<sup>a,\*</sup>, Pablo Groisman<sup>a,\*</sup>, Rafael M. Grisi<sup>b,1,2,\*\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Departamento de Matemática  
Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales  
Universidad de Buenos Aires  
Pabellón I, Ciudad Universitaria  
C1428EGA Buenos Aires, Argentina.*

<sup>b</sup>*Instituto de Matemática e Estatística  
Universidade de São Paulo  
Rua do Matão, 1010. Cidade Universitária  
São Paulo, SP, Brasil, CEP 05508-090.*

---

## Abstract

We construct harmonic functions on random graphs given by Delaunay triangulations of ergodic point processes as the limit of the zero-temperature harness process.

**Keywords:** Harness process, Point processes, Harmonic functions on graphs, Corrector

**MSC:** 60F17, 60G55, 60K37

---

## 1. Introduction

Let  $S$  be a homogeneous intensity-1 Poisson process on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $S^\circ = S \cup \{0\}$  its palm version. Call  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  the probability and expectation associated to  $S$ . The Voronoi cell of a point  $s$  in  $S^\circ$  is the set of sites in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that are closer to  $s$  than to any other point in  $S^\circ$ . Two points are *neighbors* if the intersection of the closure of the respective Voronoi cells has dimension  $d - 1$ . The graph with vertices  $S^\circ$  and edges given by pairs of neighbors is called the Delaunay triangulation of  $S^\circ$ . The goal is to construct a function  $H : S^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that the graph with vertices  $H(S)$  and edges  $\{(H(s), H(s')), s \text{ and } s' \text{ are neighbors}\}$  has the following properties:

---

\*Corresponding author

\*\*Principal corresponding author

*Email addresses:* pferrari@dm.uba.ar (Pablo A. Ferrari), pgroisma@dm.uba.ar (Pablo Groisman), rafael.grisi@ufabc.edu.br (Rafael M. Grisi)

*URL:* <http://mate.dm.uba.ar/~pferrari> (Pablo A. Ferrari), <http://mate.dm.uba.ar/~pgroisma> (Pablo Groisman)

<sup>1</sup>Present Address: Centro de Matemática, Computação e Cognição, Universidade Federal do ABC, Rua Santa Adélia, 166, Santo André, SP, Brasil, 09210-170

<sup>2</sup>Phone / Fax: (+55 11) 4996 3166.

(a) each vertex  $H(s)$  is in the barycenter of its neighbors and (b)  $|H(s) - s|/|s|$  vanishes as  $|s|$  grows to infinity along any straight line. If such an  $H$  exists, the resulting graph is the *harmonic deformation* of the Delaunay triangulation of  $S$ . This problem has been solved in the graph induced by the supercritical percolation cluster in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  by Biskup and Berger [5] and Matthieu and Piatnitski [15]; the function  $H(s) - s$  is called *corrector* in those papers. See also Caputo, Faggionato and Prescott [7] for a percolation-type graph in point processes on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .




Figure 1: Delaunay triangulation of a Poisson process and its harmonic deformation.

The coordinates  $h_1, \dots, h_d$  of  $H$  are *harmonic functions* from  $S^0$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ ; that is  $h_i(s)$  is the mean of  $\{h_i(s'), s' \text{ neighbor of } s\}$ . The sublinearity of the corrector, requirement (b) above, amounts to ask that  $h_i$  have *inclination* 1 in the direction of the  $i$ -th canonical vector. Roughly speaking, a function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has *inclination*  $\alpha$  in the direction  $u$  (a unit vector) if  $(f(Ku) - K\alpha)/K$  converges to zero as  $K$  goes to infinity.

Fixing a direction  $u$ , we construct a harmonic function  $h : S^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with inclination one in the direction  $u$  as the limit (and a fixed point) of a stochastic process introduced by Hammersley called harness process. The process is easily described by associating to each point  $s$  of  $S^0$  a one-dimensional homogeneous Poisson process of rate 1. Fix an initial surface  $\eta_0 : S^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and for each point  $s$  at the epochs  $\tau$  of the Poisson process associated to  $s$  update  $\eta_\tau(s)$  to the average of the heights  $\{\eta_{\tau-}(s'), s' \text{ neighbor of } s\}$ . It is clear that if  $h$  is harmonic, then  $h$  is invariant for this dynamics. We start the harness process with  $\eta_0 = \gamma$ , the plane defined by  $\gamma(s) = s_1$ , where  $s_i$  is the  $i$ -th coordinate of  $s$  and show that  $\eta_t(\cdot) - \eta_t(0)$  converges to  $h$  in  $L_2(\mathcal{P} \times P)$ , where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the law of the point configuration  $S$  and  $P$  is the law of the dynamics.

We prove that the inclination is invariant for the harness process for each  $t$  and in the limit when  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . In a finite graph the average of the square of the height differences of neighbors is decreasing with time for the harness process. Since essentially the same happens in infinite

volume, the gradients of the surface converge under the harness dynamics. It remains to show that: (1) the limit of the gradients is a gradient field and (2) the limit is harmonic. Both statements follow from almost sure convergence along subsequences.

A key ingredient of the approach is the expression of the inclination of a surface as the scalar product of the gradient of the surface with a specific field (see Section 4). This implies that the limiting surface has the same inclination as the initial one.

## 2. Preliminaries and main result

**Point processes.** Let  $S \in \mathcal{N}$  be a homogeneous Poisson process on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of rate 1; call  $\mathcal{P}$  its law and  $\mathcal{E}$  the associated expectation. Here  $\mathcal{N}$  is the space of locally finite point configurations of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ; use the notation  $\mathbf{s}$  for elements of  $\mathcal{N}$ . The elements  $s$  of  $\mathbf{s}$  are called *points* and the elements  $x$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  are called *sites*. The Palm version of  $S$  is the point process  $S^0 = S \cup \{0\}$ . For  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{N}$  let the *Voronoi cell* of  $s \in \mathbf{s}$  be defined by  $\text{Vor}(s) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x - s| \leq |x - s'|, \text{ for all } s' \in \mathbf{s} \setminus \{s\}\}$ . If the intersection of the Voronoi cells of  $s$  and  $s'$  is a  $(d - 1)$ -dimensional surface, we say that  $s$  and  $s'$  are *Voronoi neighbors*. Let the *graph*  $G(\mathbf{s}) = (\mathbf{s}, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{s}))$  with  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{s}) := \{(s, s') : s \text{ and } s' \text{ are Voronoi neighbors in } \mathbf{s}\}$ . If  $S$  is a Poisson process,  $G(S^0)$  is a triangulation a.s. called the *Delaunay triangulation* of  $S^0$ . To a site  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we associate the *center* of the Voronoi cell containing  $x$ :  $\text{Cen}(x) = \text{Cen}(x, \mathbf{s}) = s \in \mathbf{s}$  if  $x \in \text{Vor}(s)$ ; if  $x$  belongs to the Voronoi cell of more than one point, take any rule to decide who is the center. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi_1 &:= \{(s, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{N} : s \in \mathbf{s}\} \\ \Xi_2 &:= \{(s, s', \mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{N} : s, s' \in \mathbf{s}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Functions  $\eta : \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are called *surfaces* and functions  $\zeta : \Xi_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are called *fields*. If  $\eta(s, \mathbf{s}) = \eta(0, \tau_s \mathbf{s})$  for every  $s \in \mathbf{s}$  we say that  $\eta$  is a *translation invariant* surface. A field  $\zeta$  is *covariant* if  $\zeta(s' - s, s'' - s, \mathbf{s}) = \zeta(s', s'', \tau_s \mathbf{s})$  for all  $s, s', s'' \in \mathbf{s}$ . A field  $\zeta$  is a *flux* if  $\zeta(s, s', \mathbf{s}) = -\zeta(s', s, \mathbf{s})$  for all  $s, s' \in \mathbf{s}$ . The *conductances* induced by  $G(\mathbf{s})$  is the field  $a$  defined by

$$a(s, s', \mathbf{s}) := \mathbf{1}\{s \text{ and } s' \text{ are Voronoi neighbors in } \mathbf{s}\}. \quad (2.1)$$

The *Laplacian* operator associated to  $(\mathbf{s}, a)$  is defined on surfaces  $\eta$  by

$$\Delta \eta(s, \mathbf{s}) = \sum_{s' \in \mathbf{s}} a(s, s', \mathbf{s}) [\eta(s', \mathbf{s}) - \eta(s, \mathbf{s})] \quad (2.2)$$

The *gradient* of a surface  $\eta$  is the field defined by

$$\nabla \eta(s, s', \mathbf{s}) = a(s, s', \mathbf{s}) [\eta(s', \mathbf{s}) - \eta(s, \mathbf{s})].$$

For fields  $\zeta : \Xi_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  the *divergence*  $\text{div} \zeta : \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given by

$$\text{div} \zeta(s, \mathbf{s}) = \sum_{s' \in \mathbf{s}} a(s, s', \mathbf{s}) \zeta(s, s', \mathbf{s}).$$

Hence  $\Delta\eta(s) = \text{div}\nabla\eta(s)$ , for every  $s \in \mathbf{s}$ . To simplify notation we drop the dependence on the point configuration when it is clear from the context. The Laplacian, gradient and divergence depend on the conductances, but we drop this dependence in the notation, as they are fixed by (2.1) along the paper.

A function  $h : \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called *harmonic* if  $\Delta h(s) = 0$  for all  $s \in \mathbf{s}$ .

Let  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be a unit vector. We say that a surface  $\eta$  has *inclination*  $I_u(\eta, \mathbf{s})$  in the direction  $u$  if the following limit exists and does not depend on  $s$

$$I_u(\eta, \mathbf{s}) := \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\eta(\text{Cen}(s + Ku), \mathbf{s}) - \eta(s, \mathbf{s})}{K}. \quad (2.3)$$

The *inclination* of a surface  $\eta$  is the vector  $I(\eta) = (I_{e_1}(\eta), \dots, I_{e_d}(\eta))$ , where  $e_k, k = 1, \dots, d$  are the canonical vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

Given a surface  $\eta$ , let  $M_s\eta$  be the surface obtained by substituting the height  $\eta(s)$  with the average of the heights at the neighbors of  $s$ :

$$(M_s\eta)(s') = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{a(s)} \sum_{s' \in \mathbf{s} \setminus \{s\}} a(s, s') \eta(s') := \bar{\eta}(s), & \text{if } s' = s \\ \eta(s'), & \text{if } s' \neq s, \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

where  $a(s) = \sum_{s' \in S} a(s, s')$ . Take a point configuration  $\mathbf{s}$  and define the generator

$$L_{\mathbf{s}}f(\eta) = \sum_{s \in \mathbf{s}} [f(M_s\eta) - f(\eta)]. \quad (2.5)$$

That is, at rate 1, the surface height at  $s$  is updated to the mean of the heights at the neighbors of  $s$ . We show that for  $\mathcal{P}$ -almost all  $\mathbf{s}$  there exists a Markov process  $\eta_t(\cdot, \mathbf{s})$  on the space of surfaces with generator  $L_{\mathbf{s}}$  which is called *noiseless Harness process*. We construct this process as a function of a family of independent one-dimensional Poisson processes  $T = (T_n, n = 1, 2, \dots)$  independent of the point configuration  $S$ . Consider  $S = (s_n, n \geq 1)$ , an arbitrary but fixed enumeration of the points of  $S$  (for instance,  $s_n$  may be the  $n$ -th closest point to the origin). The process is constructed by updating the surface at  $s_n$  at the epochs of  $T_n$ . Let  $P$  be the distribution of  $T$  and  $E$  its expectation.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $S^\circ$  be the Palm version of the Poisson process and let  $\gamma$  be a surface with covariant gradient, inclination  $I(\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $C(|\nabla\gamma|^r) < \infty$  for some  $r > 4$ . Then: (a) There exists a harmonic function  $h : \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $h(0, S^\circ) = 0$  and  $I(h) = I(\gamma)$   $\mathcal{P}$ -a.s. (b) if  $\eta_t$  is the harness process with initial condition  $\gamma$ , then,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}E[\eta_t(s_n) - \eta_t(0) - h(s_n)]^2 = 0,$$

for any  $n \geq 1$ . (c) In dimensions  $d = 1$  and  $d = 2$ ,  $h$  is the only harmonic function with covariant gradient.

Let  $c \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ; the *plane*  $\gamma(s, S^0) = c \cdot s$ ,  $s \in S^0$  satisfies the hypotheses of the theorem with  $I(\gamma) = c$ . The theorem says that a surface with inclination  $c$  evolving along the harness process and seen from the height at the origin converges to a harmonic function  $h$  with the same inclination and with  $h(0) = 0$ .

Let  $H = (h_1, \dots, h_d)$ , where  $h_i$  is the harmonic function obtained in Theorem 2.1 for the inclination 1 in the direction  $e_i$ . The graph with vertices  $H(S^0) = (H(s), s \in S^0)$  and conductances  $\tilde{a}(H(s), H(s')) := a(s, s')$  is harmonic:

$$H(s) = \frac{1}{a(s)} \sum_{s' \in S^0} a(s, s') H(s') \quad (2.6)$$

that is, each point is in the barycenter of its neighbors in the neighborhood structure induced by the Delaunay triangulation of  $S$ . This graph, called the *harmonic deformation* of the Delaunay triangulation, does not coincide with the Delaunay triangulation of  $H(S^0)$ .

**Random walks in random graphs and martingales.** Let  $Y_t = Y_t^{S^0}$ , be the random walk on  $S^0$  which jumps from  $s$  to  $s'$  at rate  $a(s, s')$ . The random walk  $H(Y_t)$  on  $H(S^0)$  is a martingale because  $H(S^0)$  is harmonic. Hence it is straightforward to verify that the walk  $H(Y_t)$  satisfies the conditions of the martingale central limit theorem (Durrett, [9, p. 417]) and so the invariance principle holds in this case. The extension of the invariance principle from the walk  $H(Y_t)$  to the walk  $Y_t$  requires the sublinearity in  $|s|$  of the corrector  $\chi(s) = H(s) - s$ .

Mathieu and Piatnitski [15] and Berger and Biskup [5] constructed the corrector when  $G(S)$  is given by the supercritical percolation cluster. Both papers prove sharp bounds on the asymptotic behavior of the corrector and, as a consequence, the quenched invariance principle for  $Y_t$  for every dimension  $d \geq 2$ . A key ingredient in those proofs are heat kernels estimates obtained by Barlow [1] (in [5] they are used just for  $d \geq 3$ ). Previously, Sidoravicius and Sznitman [16] obtained the quenched invariant principle for  $d \geq 4$ . Several papers obtained generalizations of similar results on subgraphs of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  ([2, 6, 15]).

Caputo, Faggionato and Prescott [7] proved a quenched invariance principle for random walks on graphs given by ergodic spatial point processes also based on the construction of the corrector. They consider random conductances with exponential decay governed by i.i.d. energy marks, which does not include the Delaunay-Voronoi case.

We obtain harmonic functions as limits of the zero temperature harness process. The inclination of a surface is obtained as a scalar product with a specific field and it is invariant for the process. This allows to show that also the harmonic limits have the same inclination as the starting surface.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 3 we give basic definitions, define the space  $\mathcal{H}$  of gradients of surfaces as a Hilbert space and show a useful integration by parts formula. In Section 4 we show that the inclination of a surface can be seen as the inner product of its gradient with a specific field in  $\mathcal{H}$ . In Section 5 we construct the process by means of the Harris graphical method. In Section 6 we prove the main theorem. Section 7 deals with the uniqueness of the harmonic function in  $d = 2$ . In Section 8 we give a brief description on how to export these

results to general stationary point processes.

### 3. Point processes, fields and gradients

Let  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be the set of all locally finite subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , i.e., for all  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{s}(B)$  is finite for every bounded set  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $\mathbf{s}(B)$  is the number of points in  $\mathbf{s} \cap B$ . We consider the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{N})$ , the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing the sets  $\{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^d) : \mathbf{s}(B) = k\}$ , where  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is bounded and  $k$  is a positive integer. For any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , denote by  $\tau_x$  the translation by  $x$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\tau_x \mathbf{s} = \{s - x : s \in \mathbf{s}\}$ .

**Cesàro means and the space  $\mathcal{H}$ .** Let  $C$  be the measure in  $\Xi_2$  defined on  $\zeta : \Xi_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$C(\zeta) = \int_{\Xi_2} \zeta dC = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s, S^0) \zeta(0, s, S^0) \quad (3.1)$$

This measure is absolutely continuous with respect to the second order Campbell measure associated to  $\mathcal{P}$  with density  $Z(u, v, \mathbf{s}) = a(u, v, \mathbf{s}) \delta_0(u)$ . The space  $\mathcal{H} := L_2(\Xi_2, \mathbb{R}, C)$  is Hilbert.

If two fields  $\zeta$  and  $\zeta'$  coincide in every neighbor of the origin, then their difference has zero  $C$ -measure and hence a field in  $\mathcal{H}$  is characterized by its values at the neighbors of the origin (and the origin). Observe also that each class of  $\mathcal{H}$  has a covariant representant (the one that is obtained by extending to the nodes that are not neighbors of the origin covariantly, i.e.  $\zeta(s, s', \mathbf{s}) := \zeta(0, s' - s, \tau_s \mathbf{s})$  for  $s, s' \in \mathbf{s}$ ). So hereafter, when we refer to a field in  $\mathcal{H}$ , we assume that is its covariant representant.

The space  $\mathcal{H}$  was previously considered by Mathieu and Piatnitski [15] in a context where  $(S^0, a)$  are given by the infinite cluster for supercritical percolation in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . The Hilbert structure of this space is useful to obtain weak convergence for the dynamics once one proves that they are bounded in norm.

Let  $\zeta \in \Xi_2$  and define its Cesàro limit by

$$C(\zeta) := \lim_{\Lambda \nearrow \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2|\Lambda|} \sum_{\{s, s'\} \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset} a(s, s', S) \zeta(s, s', S).$$

where  $\Lambda = \Lambda(K) := [-K, K]^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Since  $S$  is ergodic, by the Point Ergodic Theorem [8, pp. 318] we have that almost surely  $C(\zeta) = C(\zeta)$ . In the same way, for translation invariant functions  $\eta : \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we can define, with a slight abuse of notation its Cesàro mean and we have  $C(\eta) = C(\eta) = \mathcal{E}(\eta(0, S^0))$ .

We now state the well known Mass Transport Principle.

**Lemma 3.1** (Mass Transport Principle [3, 4, 11, 13]). *Let  $\zeta : \Xi_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a covariant field such that either  $\zeta$  is nonnegative or  $\mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} |\zeta(0, s, S^0)| < \infty$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} \zeta(0, s, S^0) = \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} \zeta(s, 0, S^0). \quad (3.2)$$

*Proof.* Let  $B_z = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^d + z$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} \zeta(0, s, S^0) &= \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S \cap B_0} \sum_{s' \in S} \zeta(s, s', S) = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S \cap B_0} \sum_{s' \in S \cap B_z} \zeta(s, s', S) \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S \cap B_{-z}} \sum_{s' \in S \cap B_0} \zeta(s, s', S) = \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{s' \in S \cap B_0} \zeta(s, s', S) = \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} \zeta(s, 0, S^0). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\zeta$  is covariant, the surfaces  $\eta(s, S^0) = \sum_{s' \in S^0} \zeta(s, s', S^0)$  and  $\eta'(s, S^0) = \sum_{s' \in S^0} \zeta(s', s, S^0)$  are translation invariant. Hence the first and last identities follow from the refined Campbell formula [8, 12]. The third identity follows from stationarity. Fubini grants the interchange of sums and expectations.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2** (Integration by parts formula). *Let  $\phi: \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a translation invariant surface and  $\zeta: \Xi_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a flux. Assume  $\zeta \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{E}[a(0)\phi^2(0)] < \infty$ , then*

$$C(\nabla\phi \cdot \zeta) = -C(\phi \cdot \text{div}\zeta). \quad (3.3)$$

*Proof.* Note that

$$\begin{aligned} C(\nabla\phi \cdot \zeta) &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s, S^0) \nabla\phi(0, s, S^0) \zeta(0, s, S^0) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s, S^0) \phi(s, S^0) \zeta(0, s, S^0) - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s, S^0) \phi(0, S^0) \zeta(0, s, S^0) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s, S^0) \phi(s, S^0) \zeta(0, s, S^0) - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E} [\phi(0, S^0) \text{div}\zeta(0, S^0)]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\zeta$  and  $a$  are covariant and  $\phi$  is translation invariant,  $a(s, s', S^0) \phi(s', S^0) \zeta(s, s', S^0)$  is covariant and Lemma 3.1 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s, S^0) \phi(s, S^0) \zeta(0, s, S^0) &= \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(s, 0, S^0) \phi(0, S^0) \zeta(s, 0, S^0) \\ &= -\mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s, S^0) \phi(0, S^0) \zeta(0, s, S^0) = -\mathcal{E} [\phi(0, S^0) \text{div}\zeta(0, S^0)]. \end{aligned}$$

We used that  $\zeta$  is a flux and  $a$  is symmetric.  $\square$

#### 4. Inclination

Let  $\eta$  be a surface with covariant gradient  $\nabla\eta \in \mathcal{H}$ . A new definition of inclination  $\mathcal{I}_u(\eta)$  is given as the internal product of the gradient field  $\nabla\eta$  with a conveniently chosen field  $\omega_u$ . We prove that this definition coincides with the previous inclination  $I_u(\eta)$ . For neighbors  $s, s' \in S$  let  $b(s, s'; S)$  be the  $(d-1)$ -dimensional side in common of the Voronoi cells of  $s$  and  $s'$  and let






Figure 2: Definition of the field  $\omega_u$  for  $u = e_1$

$b_u(s, s'; S)$  be the  $d - 1$  dimensional Lebesgue measure of the projection of  $b(s, s'; S)$  over the hyperplane perpendicular to  $u$  (see Figure 2). Define

$$\omega_u(s, s'; S) := \frac{1}{2} \text{sg}((s' \cdot u) - (s \cdot u)) b_u(s, s'; S) a(s, s'; S). \quad (4.1)$$

Our second definition of inclination is

$$\mathcal{I}_u(\eta) := C(\nabla \eta \cdot \omega_u). \quad (4.2)$$

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $\eta$  be a surface with covariant  $\nabla \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ . Then*

$$I_u(\eta) = \mathcal{I}_u(\eta), \quad (4.3)$$

$\mathcal{P}$  almost surely.

Before proving the proposition we show some technical lemmas. Let  $O_u$  be the  $d - 1$  dimensional hyperplane orthogonal to  $u$ :  $O_u = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : y \cdot u = 0\}$ . For  $y \in O_u$  let  $l_u(y) = \{y + \alpha u; \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$  the line containing  $y$  with direction  $u$ . Fix  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{N}$ , define  $L_u(y, \mathbf{s}) := \{s \in \mathbf{s} : \text{Vor}(s) \cap l_u(y) \neq \emptyset\}$ , the set of points whose Voronoi cell intersects the line  $l_u(y)$ . Define  $w : \mathbb{R}^d \times \Xi_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \times \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$w(y; s, s', \mathbf{s}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b(s, s', \mathbf{s}) \cap l_u(y) \neq \emptyset; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

the indicator that  $s$  and  $s'$  are neighbors and its boundary intersects the line  $l_u(y)$ . Define

$$\theta(y; s, \mathbf{s}) = \sum_{s' \in \mathbf{s}} s' a^+(s, s', \mathbf{s}) w(y; s, s', \mathbf{s}),$$






Figure 3: Points of  $L(0, \mathbf{s})$  (red and big). The horizontal line is  $l_y$ .

where  $a^+(s, s', S) = a(s, s', S) \mathbf{1}\{(s' \cdot u) > (s \cdot u)\}$ . In words, for  $s \in L_u(y, \mathbf{s})$ ,  $\theta(y; s, \mathbf{s})$  is the neighbor of  $s$  in the direction  $u$  such that their boundary intersects  $l_u(y)$ . The above definition is valid only for those “good”  $y$  such that  $l_u(y)$  does not contain points belonging to three Voronoi cells, neither intersect more than one point in the boundary of two cells. The set of those good  $y$  has full  $d - 1$  Lebesgue measure; in the sequel we take only those good  $y$ .

For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $x^* \in O_u$  be the projection of  $x$  over the hyperplane  $O_u$ . Observe that  $w$  satisfies

$$w(y; s, s', \mathbf{s}) = w(y - x^*; s - x, s' - x, \tau_x \mathbf{s}), \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$\theta(y; s, \mathbf{s}) - x = \theta(y - x^*; s - x, \tau_x \mathbf{s}), \quad (4.5)$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $\zeta \in \mathcal{H}$  be a flux and  $u, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{s \in S} \zeta(s, \theta(y; s, S), S) \mathbf{1}_{L_u(y, S)}(s) \mathbf{1}_A(s \cdot u) = \ell(A) C(\zeta \cdot \omega_u) \quad (4.6)$$

for all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  with Lebesgue measure  $\ell(A) < \infty$ .

Notice that  $\{(s \cdot u) : s \in L_u(y, S)\}$  is the one-dimensional stationary point process obtained by projecting the points of  $L_u(y, S)$  to  $l_u(y)$ . One can think that each point  $s$  has a weight  $\zeta(s, \theta(y; s, S), S)$ . The expression on the left of (4.6) is the average of these weights for the points projected over  $A$ . The expression on the right of (4.6) says that this average contributes to the expression as much as the Lebesgue measure of the projection over  $O_u$  of the boundary between  $s$  and its neighbor in  $L$  to its right.

*Proof.* By rotation invariance we can take  $u = e_1$  and by translation invariance  $y = 0$ . In this case  $O_u = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 = 0\}$ ,  $s \cdot u = s_1$ , the first coordinate of  $s$  and  $x^* = (0, x_2, \dots, x_d)$ . Define

$$g(s, \mathbf{s}) := \zeta(s, \theta(0; s, \mathbf{s}), \mathbf{s}) \mathbf{1}_{L_u(0, \mathbf{s})}(s) \mathbf{1}_A(s_1).$$

From (4.4), (4.5), the Generalized Campbell formula and Fubini,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S} |g(s, S)| &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{E} |g(s, \tau_{-s} S^0)| ds \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{E} |\zeta(0, \theta(-s^*; 0, S^0), S^0)| \mathbf{1}_{L_u(-s^*, S^0)}(0) \mathbf{1}_A(s_1) ds \\
&= \ell(A) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \mathcal{E} \sum_{s' \in S^0} |\zeta(0, s', S^0)| \mathbf{1}\{\theta(-s^*; 0, S^0) = s'\} \mathbf{1}_{L_u(-s^*, S^0)}(0) ds^* \\
&= \ell(A) \mathcal{E} \sum_{s' \in S^0} |\zeta(0, s', S^0)| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \mathbf{1}\{\theta(s^*; 0, S^0) = s'\} \mathbf{1}_{L_u(-s^*, S^0)}(0) ds^*
\end{aligned}$$

(we abuse notation by calling  $s^*$  the  $d - 1$  dimensional vector  $(x_2, \dots, x_d)$ ). For  $s' \in S^0$  such that  $a^+(0, s', S^0) = 1$ ,

$$\{s' = \theta(-s^*; 0, S^0), 0 \in L_u(-s^*, S^0)\} = \{l_u(-s^*) \cap b(0, s', S^0) \neq \emptyset\},$$

that is,  $-s^* \in b_u(0, s', S^0)$ . Hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \mathbf{1}\{\theta(-s^*; 0, S^0) = s'\} \mathbf{1}_{L_u(-s^*, S^0)}(0) ds^* = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \mathbf{1}_{\{b_u(0, s', S^0)\}}(-s^*) ds^* = \omega_u(0, s', S^0).$$

It follows that

$$\mathcal{E} \left| \sum_{s \in S} g(s, S) \right| = \ell(A) \mathcal{E}^o \sum_{s' \in S^0} a^+(0, s', S^0) |\zeta(0, s', S^0)| \omega_u(0, s', S^0) < \infty.$$

So we can repeat the above arguments to prove

$$\mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S} g(s, S) = \ell(A) \mathcal{E}^o \sum_{s' \in S^0} a^+(0, s', S^0) \zeta(0, s', S^0) \omega_u(0, s', S^0). \quad (4.7)$$

From the Mass Transport Principle (Lemma 3.1) and since

$$a^+(s, 0, S^0) \zeta(s, 0, S^0) \omega_u(s, 0, S^0) = a^-(0, s, S^0) \zeta(0, s, S^0) \omega_u(0, s, S^0)$$

it follows that

$$\mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S} g(s, S) = \ell(A) \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E} \sum_{s' \in S^0} a(0, s', S^0) \zeta(0, s', S^0) \omega_u(0, s', S^0) = \ell(A) C(\nabla \eta \cdot \omega_u).$$

□

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* Again without loosing generality we take  $u = e_1$  and  $u \cdot s = s_1$ . Initially consider discrete  $t = K \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $\nabla \eta$  is covariant and  $\text{Cen}(\cdot)$  is translation invariant (in the sense that  $\text{Cen}(x - z, \tau_z \mathbf{s}) + z = \text{Cen}(x, \mathbf{s})$ ),

$$\eta(\text{Cen}(s + Ku, S^0), S^0) - \eta(s, S^0) = \eta(\text{Cen}(Ku, \tau_s S^0), \tau_s S^0) - \eta(0, \tau_s S^0).$$

Since  $S^0$  is point-stationary, if the limit in (2.3) exists, it is independent of  $s \in S^0$ .

Let  $A_K := [0, K] \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$  and define

$$\bar{s}_K = \operatorname{argmax}\{(s \cdot e_1) : s \in L(0, S^0) \cap A_K\}, \quad s_K = \theta(0; \bar{s}_K, S^0),$$

that is,  $s_K$  is the first point of  $L(0, S^0)$  to the right of  $A_K$ .

Let  $Z_K = \eta(\operatorname{Cen}(Ku, S^0), S^0) - \eta(s_K(S^0), S^0)$  and observe that (see Figure 3)

$$\eta(\operatorname{Cen}(Ku), S^0) - \eta(0, S^0) = \sum_{s \in L(0, S^0) \cap A_K} (\eta(s, S^0) - \eta(\theta(0; s, S^0), S^0)) + Z_K \quad (4.8)$$

From (4.8),  $I_u(\eta)$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} I_u(\eta) &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{s \in L(0, S^0) \cap A_K} \nabla \eta(s, \theta(0; s, S^0), S^0) + \frac{Z_K}{K} \\ &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{s \in S^0} \nabla \eta(s, \theta(0; s, S^0), S^0) \mathbf{1}_{L(0, S^0)}(s) \mathbf{1}_{[0, K]}(s_1) + \frac{Z_K}{K}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

So we have to show that

$$\tilde{I} := \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{s \in S^0} \nabla \eta(s, \theta(0; s, S^0), S^0) \mathbf{1}_{L(0, S^0)}(s) \mathbf{1}_{[0, K]}(s_1) + \frac{Z_K}{K} = C(\nabla \eta \cdot \omega_u), \quad (4.10)$$

$\mu_0$ -a.s., where  $\mu_0$  is the law of  $S^0$ .

Since  $\nabla \eta$  and  $\omega_u$  are covariant, the inclination is invariant under translations  $\tau_u$ , so we can forget the point at the origin and work with the stationary process  $S$  with law  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Since  $(Z_K)_{K \geq 0}$  is a stationary sequence, the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 4.2 show that  $\mathcal{E}|Z_0| \leq C(\operatorname{div}|\nabla \eta| \ell(\operatorname{Vor}(0))) < \infty$ , and so  $Z_K/K$  goes to zero almost surely as  $K$  goes to  $\infty$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{s \in S} \nabla \eta(s, \theta(0; s, S), S) \mathbf{1}_{L(0, S)}(s) \mathbf{1}_{[0, K]}(s_1) &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{s \in S} \nabla \eta(s, \theta(0; s, S), S) \mathbf{1}_{L(0, S)}(s) \mathbf{1}_{[k, k+1]}(s_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \phi(\tau_{ku} S) \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where  $\phi(S) := \sum_{s \in S} \nabla \eta(s, \theta(0; s, S), S) \mathbf{1}_{L(0, S)}(s) \mathbf{1}_{[0, 1]}(s_1)$ .

Since the law of  $S$  is mixing, taking limits when  $K \rightarrow \infty$ , by Birkoff's ergodic theorem,

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \phi(\tau_{ku} S) = \mathcal{E}[\phi(S)] = C(\nabla \eta \cdot \omega_u) \quad \mathcal{P} - \text{a.s.}, \quad (4.12)$$

by Lemma 4.2. If  $t$  is a continuous parameter ( $K = t$ ) the result also holds once one note that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} |\eta(\operatorname{Cen}(tu, S^0)) - \eta([t]u, S^0)| = 0 \quad \mathcal{P} - \text{a.s.}$$

□

## 5. The harness process

Given a configuration of points  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{N}$  we construct the process  $\eta_t^\gamma$  with values on the space of surfaces, with initial condition given by a surface  $\gamma: \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and generator given by (2.5).

### 5.1. Graphical Construction

Let  $T = (T_n, n = 1, 2, \dots)$  be a family of independent Poisson processes of intensity 1,  $T_n \subset \mathbb{R}$ , independent of  $S^0$ . For fixed  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{N}$  and an arbitrary enumeration of the points of  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, \dots)$  we use the epochs of  $T_n$  to update the heights at  $s_n$  as follows. Fix  $t > 0$  and define a family  $(B_{[t,u]}^s; u \leq t, s \in \mathbf{s})$  of backward simple random walks on  $\mathbf{s}$  starting at  $s \in \mathbf{s}$  at time  $t$  and jumping at the epochs in  $T$  as follows: set  $B_{[t,t]}^s = s$  and if at time  $u+$  the random walk is at  $s_n$  and  $u \in T_n$  then the walk chooses uniformly one neighbor of  $s_n$  (that is, with probability  $\frac{1}{a(s_n, \mathbf{s})}$ ) and jumps over it. For this introduce independent variables  $U = (U_n^k, k, n \geq 1)$ ; the variable  $U_n^k$  is used to perform the  $k$ -th jump from  $s_n$ . These jumps are independent of  $T$  and  $S$ . We call  $P$  and  $E$  the probability and expectation induced by  $(T, U)$ . Let  $\mathbb{P} = \mathcal{P} \times P$  and call  $\mathbb{E}$  the expectation with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ .

$$p_t(s, s', S, T) = \mathbb{P}(B_{[t,0]}^s = s' | S, T),$$

the probability that  $B_{[t,0]}^s = s'$  conditioned on the sigma field generated by  $(S, T)$ . Define  $\eta_t^\gamma(s, S, T)$  as the mean of  $\gamma(B_{[t,0]}^s)$  conditioned on the sigma-field generated by  $(S, T)$ :

$$\eta_t^\gamma(s, S, T) = \sum_{s' \in S} p_t(s, s', S, T) \gamma(s'). \quad (5.1)$$

The time evolution of the  $\eta$  process is:  $\eta_0^\gamma(s, S, T) = \gamma(s)$  and if  $s = s_n$  and  $t \in T_n$  is an epoch of  $T_n$ , then

$$p_t(s, s', S, T) = \sum_{u \in S} \frac{a(s, u, S)}{a(s, S)} p_{t-}(u, s', S, T),$$

so  $\eta_t^\gamma(s, S, T)$  is updated by

$$\eta_t^\gamma(s, S, T) = \sum_{s' \in S} \sum_{u \in S} \frac{a(s, u, S)}{a(s, S)} p_{t-}(u, s', S, T) \gamma(s') = M_s \eta_{t-}^\gamma(s, S, T), \quad (5.2)$$

while  $\eta_t^\gamma(s', S, T)$  remains unchanged for  $s' \neq s$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Given  $\gamma: \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\nabla \gamma \in \mathcal{H}$ , the process  $\eta_t^\gamma(\cdot, S, \cdot)$ , is well defined  $\mathcal{P}$ -a.s. and has generator given by (2.5).*

*Proof.* To prove that the process is well defined we need to show that the sum on the right hand side of (5.1) is finite  $\mathcal{P}$ -a.s. But it follows directly by Proposition Appendix A.2 in the appendix that

$$\mathbb{E}|\eta_t^\gamma(0, S^0, T)| \leq \mathbb{E} \sum_{s' \in S^0} p_t(0, s', S^0, T) |\gamma(s', S^0)| \leq Ct.$$

This shows that the process is almost surely well defined at the origin. By point-stationarity the result is immediately extended to all  $s \in S^0$ . The fact that  $\eta_t^\gamma(\cdot, S, \cdot)$  has generator given by (2.5), follows from (5.2) since  $S$  is locally finite  $\mathcal{P}$ -a.s.  $\square$

We have constructed the process  $\eta_t^\gamma$  as a deterministic function of  $S$  and  $T$ , the point configuration plus the time epochs associated to the points. That is, a random function in  $\Xi$ . Let  $(S, T) = ((s_n, T_n), n \geq 1)$  and  $\tau_s(S, T) = ((s_n - s, T_n), n \geq 1)$ , for  $s \in S$ . Since  $p_t(s, s', (S, T)) = p_t(0, s' - s, \tau_s(S, T))$ , if  $\gamma(0, s) = 0$  for every  $s \in \mathcal{N}^0$  and  $\nabla \gamma$  is covariant,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_t^\gamma(s, (S^0, T)) &= \sum_{s' \in S^0} p_t(s, s', (S^0, T)) \gamma(s', S^0) \\ &= \sum_{s' \in S^0} p_t(0, s' - s, \tau_s(S^0, T)) \gamma(s' - s, \tau_s S^0) + \gamma(s, S^0) \\ &= \sum_{s' \in \tau_s S^0} p_t(0, s', \tau_s(S^0, T)) \gamma(s', \tau_s S^0) + \gamma(s, S^0) = \eta_t^\gamma(0, \tau_s(S^0, T)) + \gamma(s, S^0). \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

If we call

$$\psi_t(s, (S^0, T)) := \eta_t^\gamma(0, \tau_s(S^0, T)), \tag{5.4}$$

then we have rewritten the process as a translation invariant surface  $\psi_t$  plus the initial condition: if  $\eta_0 = \gamma$ , then

$$\eta_t = \psi_t + \gamma \tag{5.5}$$

In particular, it follows that  $\nabla \eta_t^\gamma$  is a covariant (random) field  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

The dependence of  $\eta_t^\gamma$  on  $(S, T)$  will be dropped from the notation when clear from the context.

The following bound –shown in the Appendix– implies that the process is well defined (as an element in  $\mathcal{H}$ ) for all time.

**Lemma 5.2.** *If  $C(|\nabla \gamma|^r) < \infty$  then*

$$C(|\nabla \psi_t^\gamma|^r) \leq 2^{r-1} \mathbb{E}[a(0) |\psi_t^\gamma(0)|^r] < \infty.$$

As a consequence of (5.5) and Lemma 5.2 we can now show that the inclination is invariant under the dynamics.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Given  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $I_u(\eta_t^\gamma - \gamma) = 0$ , a.s. for all  $t \geq 0$ .*

*Proof.* First observe that

$$\operatorname{div} \omega_u(0, S^0) = \sum_{s \in S} \omega_u(0, s, S^0) = \sum_{\substack{s \in S \\ (s \cdot u) > 0}} b_u(0, s, S^0) - \sum_{\substack{s \in S \\ (s \cdot u) < 0}} b_u(0, s, S^0) = 0, \quad \mathcal{P} - \text{a.s.}$$

because each term in the subtraction is the  $(d-1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure of the projection of the Voronoi cell of the origin over the hyperplane orthogonal to  $u$ . Recall that for any

$t \geq 0$ ,  $\eta_t^\gamma = \gamma + \psi_t^\gamma$  for the translation invariant surface  $\psi_t^\gamma$  defined in (5.4), so we can integrate by parts to get

$$\begin{aligned} I_u(\eta_t^\gamma) &= C(\nabla \eta_t^\gamma \cdot \omega_u) = C(\nabla \gamma \cdot \omega_u) + C(\nabla \psi_t \cdot \omega_u) \\ &= C(\nabla \gamma \cdot \omega_u) - C(\psi_t \cdot \operatorname{div} \omega_u) = C(\nabla \gamma \cdot \omega_u) = I_u(\gamma). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

## 6. The process converges to a harmonic surface

In this section we show that if  $\gamma$  is a surface with inclination  $I(\gamma)$ , whose gradient is in  $\mathcal{H}$  and has more than 4 moments, then there exists a surface  $h_\gamma$  with  $\nabla h_\gamma \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $\nabla \eta_t^\gamma$  converges strongly in  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\nabla h_\gamma$ . Furthermore  $h_\gamma$  is harmonic and has the same inclination as  $\gamma$ . We split the proof in several lemmas.

**Lemma 6.1.** *If  $C(|\nabla \gamma|^r) < \infty$  for some  $r > 4$ , then for all  $t > 0$*

$$\frac{d}{dt} C(|\nabla \eta_t^\gamma|^2) = -2\mathbb{E} \left[ a(0)^{-1} |\Delta \eta_t^\gamma(0, S^0, T)|^2 \right]. \quad (6.1)$$

*Proof.* We drop the dependence on the initial condition  $\gamma$ ,  $S^0$  and  $T$  and write  $\eta_t = \eta_t^\gamma(\cdot, S^0, T)$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}_2 = \bigcup_{s_n \in V_2} T_n$ , the epochs corresponding to sites in  $V_2$ , the set of second neighbors of the origin. Define the events

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &:= F_1(t, h) = \{|\mathcal{T}_2 \cap [t, t+h]| = 1\}; \\ F_{1,s} &:= F_{1,s}(t, t+h) = F_1 \cap \{|\mathcal{T}(s) \cap [t, t+h]| = 1\} \cap \{s \in V_2\}; \\ F_2 &:= F_2(t, h) = \{|\mathcal{T}_2 \cap [t, t+h]| \geq 2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that given  $S$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_2$  is a Poisson process with intensity  $|V_2|$ , hence

$$\mathbb{P}(F_1|S^0) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{F_1}|S^0] = |V_2| h e^{-|V_2|h}, \quad (6.2)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(F_{1,s}|S^0) = h e^{-|V_2|h} \mathbf{1}_{V_2}(s), \quad (6.3)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(F_2|S^0) \leq h^2 |V_2|^2. \quad (6.4)$$

We have to compute

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s) (|\nabla \eta_{t+h}(0, s)|^2 - |\nabla \eta_t(0, s)|^2) (\mathbf{1}_{F_1} + \mathbf{1}_{F_2}) = I + II \quad (6.5)$$

Using that

$$|\nabla \eta_{t+h}(0, s)|^2 - |\nabla \eta_t(0, s)|^2 = [\nabla \eta_{t+h}(0, s) - \nabla \eta_t(0, s)]^2 + 2 \nabla \eta_t(0, s) [\nabla \eta_{t+h}(0, s) - \nabla \eta_t(0, s)].$$

and

$$\Delta^* \eta(s) := \frac{1}{|a(s)|} \sum_{s' \in S^0} a(s, s') (\eta(s') - \eta(s)) = M_s \eta(s) - \eta(s),$$

we compute each term in (6.5). Assume  $F_1$  occurs.

- If the mark is neither at the origin nor at a neighbor of it, then  $a(0, s) = 0$ ,  $\nabla \eta_{t+h}(0, s) = \nabla \eta_t(0, s)$ , and the difference is zero.
- If the mark is at the origin and  $a(0, s) = 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla \eta_{t+h}(0, s)|^2 - |\nabla \eta_t(0, s)|^2 &= [-M_0 \eta_t(0) + \eta_t(0)]^2 + 2 \nabla \eta_t(0, s)[-M_0 \eta_t(0) + \eta_t(0)] \\ &= -2 \nabla \eta_t(0, s) \Delta^* \eta_t(0) + |\Delta^* \eta_t(0)|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

- If the mark is at some  $s$  such that  $a(0, s) = 1$ , we have  $\nabla \eta_{t+h}(0, s') = \nabla \eta_t(0, s')$ , for all  $s' \neq s$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla \eta_{t+h}(0, s)|^2 - |\nabla \eta_t(0, s)|^2 &= [M_s \eta_t(s) - \eta_t(s)]^2 + 2 \nabla \eta_t(0, s)[M_s \eta_t(s) + \eta_t(s)] \\ &= 2 \nabla \eta_t(0, s) \Delta^* \eta_t(s) + |\Delta^* \eta_t(s)|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

Given  $S^0$ , the process  $\mathcal{T}_2 \cap [t, t+h]$  is independent of  $\eta_t$ , so conditioning on  $S^0$  by (6.2), (6.3), (6.6) and (6.7), we get that the first term in (6.5) equals

$$h \mathcal{E} e^{-|V_2|h} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s) (2 \nabla \eta_t(0, s) \nabla \Delta^* \eta_t(0, s) + |\Delta^* \eta_t(s)|^2 + |\Delta^* \eta_t(0)|^2).$$

By monotone convergence and the Mass Transport Principle (3.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbb{E} \sum_{s \in S} a(0, s) (|\nabla \eta_{t+h}(0, s)|^2 - |\nabla \eta_t(0, s)|^2) \mathbf{1}_{F_1} \\ = 2 \mathbb{E} \sum_{s \in S} a(0, s) \nabla \eta_t(0, s) \nabla \Delta^* \eta_t(0, s) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sum_{s \in S} a(0, s) (|\Delta^* \eta_t(s)|^2 + |\Delta^* \eta_t(0)|^2) \\ = 2 \mathbb{E} \sum_{s \in S} a(0, s) \nabla \eta_t(0, s) \nabla \Delta^* \eta_t(0, s) + \mathbb{E} a(0) |\Delta^* \eta_t|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

Now we compute the second term in (6.5). Let  $1/p + 1/q = 1$ , then

$$h^{-1} \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S} |\nabla \eta_s(0, s)|^2 \mathbf{1}_{F_2} \leq h^{-1} [\mathcal{E} (\sum_{s \in S} |\nabla \eta_s(0, s)|^2)^p]^{1/p} [\mathcal{E} \mathbf{1}_{F_2}]^{1/q}.$$

Integrating respect to  $P$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h^{-1} \mathbb{E} \sum_{s \in S} |\nabla \eta_s(0, s)|^2 \mathbf{1}_{F_2} &\leq h^{-1} [\mathbb{E} (a(0)^{p-1} \sum_{s \in S} |\nabla \eta_s(0, s)|^{2p})]^{1/p} [\mathcal{E} \mathbf{1}_{F_2}]^{1/q} \\ &\leq A \mathbf{m}^r(s) [\mathcal{E} |V_2|^2]^{1/q} h^{2/q-1}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constants  $A, r > 0$ , where  $\mathbf{m}^r(s)$  is the  $r$ -th moment of a Poisson random variable with mean  $s$ . Choosing  $q < 2$  and applying this bound for  $s = t$  and  $s = t + h$  we get

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbb{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s) (|\nabla \eta_{t+h}(0, s)|^2 - |\nabla \eta_t(0, s)|^2) \mathbf{1}_{F_2} = 0. \quad (6.9)$$



From (6.5), (6.8), (6.9) and the integration by parts formula we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} C(|\nabla \eta_t|^2) &= 2C(\nabla \eta_t \nabla \Delta^* \eta_t) + \mathbb{E}[a(0)|\Delta^* \eta_t|^2] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}[a(0)|\Delta^* \eta_t|^2]. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**Corollary 6.2.** *If  $\gamma$  satisfies the hypotheses in Lemma 6.1, then*

- (a)  $C(|\nabla \eta_t^\gamma|^2)$  is non-increasing in  $t$ ;
- (b)  $C(|\nabla \eta_t^\gamma|^2)$  is strictly decreasing at time  $t$  if and only if  $\eta_t^\gamma$  is not harmonic for  $(a, S^\circ)$ ;
- (c)  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} a(0)^{-1} \Delta \eta_t^\gamma(0) = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and in  $L_2(P)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}$ -a.s.;
- (d)  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta \eta_t^\gamma = 0$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

*Proof.* Let

$$Z_t := \frac{|\Delta \eta_t^\gamma(0)|^2}{a(0)} = a(0)|\Delta^* \eta_t^\gamma(0)|^2,$$

and observe that from Lemma 6.1 we have  $\int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}[Z_t] dt < \infty$ . Fix  $t_0 = 0$  and denote  $0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots$  the ordered epochs of the superposition of the Poisson processes associated to the point at the origin and its neighbors. This is a Poisson process with intensity  $a(0) + 1$ . For each  $n \geq 0$ , given  $S^\circ$ ,  $Z_{t_n}$  is independent of  $(t_{n+1} - t_n)$ . Hence,

$$\int_0^\infty \mathbb{E} Z_t dt = \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty Z_t dt = \sum_{k=0}^\infty \mathbb{E}[Z_{t_k}(t_{k+1} - t_k)] = \sum_{k=0}^\infty \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{Z_{t_k}}{a(0) + 1}\right) < \infty,$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{k=0}^\infty \Delta \eta_{t_k}^\gamma(0) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta \eta_t^\gamma(0) = 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

The  $L_2(P)$  convergence follows by dominate convergence using that  $\Delta \eta_t^\gamma(0) \leq \sum_{k=0}^\infty \Delta \eta_{t_k}^\gamma(0)$ .  $\square$

**Proof of (a) and (b) of Theorem 2.1.** We drop the dependence on the initial surface  $\gamma$ . Consider the numbering of the points of  $S^\circ$  introduced by Holroyd and Peres [13]. Under this numbering  $\tau_{s_n} S^\circ$  has the same law as  $S^\circ$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

*Existence.* We want to prove the existence of  $h : \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , harmonic in  $\mathcal{G}(S^\circ)$ , with  $\nabla h$  covariant and such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} |a(0, s_n) \nabla \eta_t(0, s_n) - a(0, s_n) \nabla h(0, s_n)|^2 = 0.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |a(0, s_n) (\nabla \eta_t(0, s_n) - \nabla h(0, s_n))|^2 &\leq \mathbb{E} \sum_{s \in S^\circ} a(0, s) |\nabla \eta_t(0, s) - \nabla h(0, s)|^2 \\ &= 2C(|\nabla \eta_t - \nabla h|^2). \end{aligned}$$

So, it is enough to show that  $\nabla\eta_t \rightarrow \nabla h$  strongly in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Since by Corollary 6.2,  $C(|\nabla\eta_t|^2)$  is bounded,  $\nabla\eta_t$  is weakly compact, and hence for every sequence  $\{t_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ , there exists a subsequence  $\{t_{k_j}\}_{j \geq 0}$  and a field  $\zeta_\infty \in \mathcal{H}$  such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} C(\nabla\eta_{t_{k_j}} \cdot \zeta) = C(\zeta_\infty \cdot \zeta), \quad \text{for all } \zeta \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (6.10)$$

*Uniqueness.* Let  $\{t_k\}_{k \geq 0}$  be a subsequence such that  $\nabla\eta_{t_k} \rightharpoonup \zeta_\infty$ , a weak limit. By (5.5),

$$C(|\zeta_\infty|^2) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} C(\nabla\eta_{t_k} \cdot \zeta_\infty) = C(\nabla\gamma \cdot \zeta_\infty) + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} C(\nabla\psi_{t_k} \cdot \zeta_\infty). \quad (6.11)$$

where  $\psi_t$  is defined in (5.4). Integrating by parts and using Hölder,

$$\begin{aligned} |C(\nabla\psi_{t_k} \cdot \zeta_\infty)| &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |C(\nabla\psi_{t_k} \cdot \nabla\eta_{t_j})| = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |C(\psi_{t_k} \cdot \Delta\eta_{t_j})| \\ &\leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(a(0)|\psi_{t_k}|^2)^{1/2} \mathbb{E}(a(0)^{-1}|\Delta\eta_{t_j}|^2)^{1/2} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

by Corollary 6.2. Therefore,

$$C(|\zeta_\infty|^2) = C(\nabla\gamma \cdot \zeta_\infty). \quad (6.13)$$

Let  $\nabla\eta_{t_k} \rightharpoonup \zeta_\infty$  and  $\nabla\eta_{t_j} \rightharpoonup \zeta'_\infty$  subsequences converging to two weak limits  $\zeta_\infty$  and  $\zeta'_\infty$ . By (6.10) and (6.11),

$$C(\zeta_\infty \cdot \zeta'_\infty) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} C(\nabla\eta_{t_k} \cdot \zeta'_\infty) = C(\nabla\gamma \cdot \zeta'_\infty) + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} C(\nabla\psi_{t_k} \cdot \zeta'_\infty) = C(|\zeta'_\infty|^2), \quad (6.14)$$

by (6.12) and (6.13). The same holds for  $\zeta_\infty$  and so  $C(|\zeta'_\infty|^2) = C(|\zeta_\infty|^2) = C(\zeta_\infty \cdot \zeta'_\infty)$ . This implies  $C(|\zeta_\infty - \zeta'_\infty|^2) = 0$ , i.e. there is a unique limit point.

*Strong convergence.* By (5.5) and integration by parts,

$$C(|\nabla\eta_t|^2) = C(\nabla\gamma \nabla\eta_t) + C(\nabla\psi_t \nabla\eta_t) = C(\nabla\gamma \nabla\eta_t) - C(\psi_t \Delta\eta_t). \quad (6.15)$$

From Hölder's inequality,

$$(C(\psi_t \Delta\eta_t))^2 \leq \mathbb{E}(a(0)|\psi_t(0)|^2) \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{|\Delta\eta_t(0)|^2}{a(0)}\right). \quad (6.16)$$

Since by Lemma 6.1  $\mathbb{E}\frac{|\Delta\eta_t|^2}{a(0)}$  is integrable, there exists a subsequence  $(t_k)_{k \geq 0}$  such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{|\Delta\eta_{t_k}(0)|^2}{a(0)}\right) = 0.$$

From Lemma Appendix A.3 in the appendix,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}|\gamma(B_{[t_k, 0]}^0)|^2}{t_k} t_k \mathbb{E}\frac{|\Delta\eta_{t_k}(0)|^2}{a(0)} = 0. \quad (6.17)$$

Using (6.13), (6.15) and (6.17),  $C(|\nabla\eta_t|^2) \rightarrow C(|\zeta_\infty|^2)$ , and hence  $\nabla\eta_t$  converges strongly in  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\zeta_\infty$ .

*Zero divergence.* By Hölder's inequality

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(a(0)^{-2} |\Delta\eta_t - \operatorname{div}\zeta_\infty|^2) \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} C(|\nabla\eta_t - \zeta_\infty|^2) = 0.$$

It follows now by Corollary 6.2 that

$$\operatorname{div}\zeta_\infty = 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (6.18)$$

*Covariance.* As we've pointed out before, a field  $\zeta \in \mathcal{H}$  is characterized by its values on the edges leaving the origin. Therefore, by taking  $\zeta_\infty(s, s', S^0) := \zeta_\infty(0, s' - s, \tau_s S^0)$  we can consider  $\zeta_\infty$  to be covariant.

*Gradient field.* To show that  $\zeta_\infty$  is a gradient field we prove that it verifies the co-cycle property, that is there exists  $\mathcal{N}^* \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ , with  $\mathcal{P}(S^0 \in \mathcal{N}^*) = 1$  and such that for all  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{N}^*$  and every closed path  $s_{i_0}, s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_k} = s_{i_0} \in \mathbf{s}$  with  $a(s_{i_j}, s_{i_{j-1}}) = 1$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$  we have  $\sum_{j=1}^k \zeta_\infty(s_{i_j}, s_{i_{j-1}}, \mathbf{s}) = 0$ .

Let  $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $a(s_n, s_m) \nabla\eta_t(s_n, s_m) \xrightarrow{L_2(\mathbb{P})} a(s_n, s_m) \zeta_\infty(v_i, v_j)$ , we have a subsequence that converges almost surely. Denote by  $\mathcal{N}_{a,m} \subset \mathcal{N}$  the set where convergence holds. Using a standard diagonal argument we get a subsequence  $(t_k)_{k \geq 0}$  such that

$$a(s_n, s_m) \nabla\eta_{t_k}(s_n, s_m) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} a(s_n, s_m) \zeta_\infty(s_n, s_m) \quad \text{for all } n, m \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Define  $\mathcal{N}^* = \bigcap_{n,m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{N}_{a,m}$ . Since the co-cycle property holds for every  $t$  the a.s. convergence implies the co-cycle property for  $\zeta_\infty$ .

*Inclination.* Since the inclination is a continuous functional in  $\mathcal{H}$  and it is constant for the dynamics, the limit  $\zeta_\infty$  has the inclination of the initial surface in every direction. This completes the proof of (a) and (b) of the theorem.  $\square$

## 7. Uniqueness of Harmonic Functions in $d = 2$ .

In this section we prove uniqueness (up to a constant factor) of the harmonic function with covariant gradient for  $d = 2$  using the following result of Berger and Biskup. They show uniqueness of the harmonic function on the supercritical bond-percolation cluster in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , but the proof can be easily adapted to our case. The details can be found in [10].

**Theorem 7.1** (Theorem 5.1 of Berger and Biskup [5]). *For  $c \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , let  $\gamma(s) = c \cdot s$ , and  $h : \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a harmonic function for  $a(\cdot, \cdot, S^0)$  with covariant gradient and  $I(h) = I(\gamma)$ . Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{s \in S \cap [-n, n]^2} \{ |h(s) - c \cdot s| \} = 0, \quad \mathcal{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (7.1)$$

**Proof of (c) of Theorem 2.1.** It is enough to show that if  $h: \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a harmonic function with  $I(h) = 0$ , then  $\nabla h = 0$  or, equivalently,  $C(|\nabla h|^2) = 0$ . Recall that if  $\nabla h \in \mathcal{H}$  then, with probability 1,

$$C(|\nabla h|^2) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2n^2} \sum_{s \in S \cap [-n, n]^2} \sum_{s' \in S} a(s, s') |\nabla h(s, s')|^2$$

Let  $S_n = S \cap [-n, n]^2$ . Using that  $h$  is harmonic rewrite the sum at the right hand side as

$$\sum_{\substack{s \in S_n \\ s' \in S}} a(s, s') |\nabla h(s, s')|^2 = \sum_{\substack{s \in S_n \\ s' \in S \setminus S_n}} a(s, s') (h(s') + h(s)) \nabla h(s, s')$$

Then, with  $\mathcal{P}$ -probability 1,

$$C(|\nabla h|^2) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2n^2} \sum_{\substack{s \in S_n \\ s' \in S \setminus S_n}} a(s, s') (h(s') + h(s)) \nabla h(s, s').$$

Since this limit exists a.s., we are done if we can show that the r.h.s converges to zero in probability. Observe that

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{s \in S_n \\ s' \in S \setminus S_n}} a(s, s') (h(s') + h(s)) \nabla h(s, s') \right| \leq \max_{\substack{s \in S_n, \\ s' \in S \setminus S_n}} \{a(s, s') |h(s) + h(s')|\} \sum_{\substack{s \in S_n \\ s' \in S \setminus S_n}} a(s, s') |\nabla h(s, s')|.$$

Let  $U_n := \{\text{There exists } s \in S_n \text{ and } s' \in S \setminus S_{2n} \text{ such that } a(s, s') = 1\}$ . It's not hard to show that  $\mathcal{P}(U_n) \leq K_1 e^{-K_2 n}$  for some constants  $K_1, K_2 > 0$ . Therefore, by Borel-Cantelli and Theorem 7.1, given  $\varepsilon$  we can take  $n$  big enough such that

$$2n^{-1} \max_{s \in S_n, s' \in S \setminus S_n} \{a(s, s') |h(s) + h(s')|\} \leq \frac{1}{n} \max_{s \in S_{2n}} \{|h(s)|\} < \varepsilon.$$

It follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2n^{-1} \max_{s \in S_n, s' \in S \setminus S_n} \{a(s, s') |h(s) + h(s')|\} = 0, \quad \mathcal{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

and therefore it is enough to show that there exists a sequence  $(Z_n)_{n \geq 1}$  such that

$$Z_n \geq \frac{1}{n} \phi_n(S) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s \in S_n} \sum_{s' \in S \setminus S_n} a(s, s') |\nabla h(s, s')|,$$

almost surely and  $Z_n$  converges in probability.

Given  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , let  $\phi_{A,B}(S) := \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{s' \in S} a(s, s') |\nabla h(s, s')| \mathbf{1}_A(s) \mathbf{1}_B(s')$ , and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} \phi_{A,B} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{E} \sum_{s' \in \tau_{-s} S^0} a(s, s', \tau_{-s} S^0) |\nabla h(s, s', \tau_{-s} S^0)| \mathbf{1}_A(s) \mathbf{1}_B(s') ds \\ &= \mathcal{E} \sum_{s' \in S^0} a(0, s', S^0) |\nabla h(0, s', S^0)| \ell(A \cap \tau_{s'} B) \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

Let  $A_n = [-n, n]^2$  and  $\mathcal{X}_n$  be the family of half planes defined by the borders of  $A_n$ , and disjoint with  $A_n$ . It's clear that

$$\sum_{\substack{s \in S_n \\ s' \in S \setminus S_n}} a(s, s') |\nabla h(s, s')| \leq \sum_{B \in \mathcal{X}_n} \phi_{A_n, B}(S).$$

We now show the convergence of  $\frac{1}{n} \phi_{A_n, B}(S)$  for a fixed  $B \in \mathcal{X}_n$ . The convergence of the other terms follows from the same arguments.

Before proceeding, we have yet another approximation to take care of. Let  $H_n = \mathbb{R} \times [n, +\infty)$ ,  $G_n = [-n, n] \times (-\infty, n]$ , and observe that

$$\phi_{A_n, H_n}(S) \leq \phi_{G_n, H_n}(S), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Let us see what happens with a fixed line first. To do that, let  $G = [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^-$  and  $G_n^o = [-n, n] \times \mathbb{R}^-$ . Now, if we define  $T = \tau_{e_1}$ , by the covariance of  $\nabla h$  and Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem, it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \phi_{G_n^o, H_0}(S) = \frac{1}{n} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=-n}^{n-1} \phi_{G, H_0}(T^k S) = 2\mathcal{E}[\phi_{G, H_0}(S)] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By the covariance of  $\nabla h$  it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}(|\phi_{G_n, H_n}(S) - 2\mathcal{E}[\phi_{G, H_0}(S)]| > \varepsilon n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}(|\phi_{G_n^o, H_0}(\tau_{ne_2} S) - 2\mathcal{E}[\phi_{G, H_0}(S)]| > \varepsilon n) = 0,$$

and the result follows.  $\square$

## 8. Stationary point processes

Let  $S$  be a stationary point process in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with Palm version  $S^o$ . Theorem 2.1 can be extended to  $S$  satisfying the following assumptions.

**A1** The law of  $S$  is mixing.

**A2** For every ball  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $|S \cap \partial B| < d + 2$ .

**A3**  $\mathcal{E} \exp(\beta a(0, S^o)) < \infty$  for some positive constant  $\beta$ .

**A4**  $\mathcal{C}(\omega_u^2) < \infty$  for every  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

**A5**  $S$  aperiodic, meaning that  $\mathcal{P}(\exists x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\} : \tau_x S = S) = 0$ .

**A6**  $\mathcal{E}[\sum_{s \in S^o} a(0, s) |s|^r] < \infty$  for some  $r > 4$ .

**A7**  $S^o$  can be written as  $S^o = \{s_n; n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ , and  $\tau_{s_n} S^o \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} S^o$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

**A8**  $\mathbb{E}[\ell(\text{Vor}(0, S^0))^2] < \infty$ .

The reason for most of the assumptions above are clear from the proofs on the previous sections. Assumption **A1** is needed to guarantee that the Ergodic Theorem holds in (4.12). **A2** is used to define the Delaunay triangulation. Although this does not hold for the supercritical percolation cluster, the proof in this article can be adapted to deal with that case. Assumption **A3** is used several times but it can be replaced for finite moment of third order for the number of neighbors. Assumption **A5** is used in the appendix, in order to recover the random walk from the environment process.

## 9. Final Comments

### 9.1. Invariance Principle

The key ingredient to obtain an invariance principle from the existence of a harmonic deformation of the original graph is a uniform sublinear bound of the corrector as in (7.1). This bound follows from the arguments of Berger and Biskup [5] in  $d = 2$  and hence the quenched invariance principle holds in the Delaunay triangulation of a Poisson process and also for an ergodic process that satisfies assumptions **A1-A8**. Details can be found in [10]. For  $d \geq 3$  the proofs of a quenched invariance principle rely on heat kernel estimates like those obtained by Barlow [1], which do not follow from the sublinear behavior of the corrector along lines. An extension of these bounds to our case would imply the invariant principle in the Delaunay triangulation.

### 9.2. The process trajectory is orthogonal to the space of harmonic functions.

Since the inclination in the direction  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is a continuous functional in  $\mathcal{H}$ , by Riesz Theorem, there exist a field  $\omega_u \in \mathcal{H}$  such that the inclination is given by the scalar product with  $\omega_u$ . In our case, we have found explicitly that field (the one given in (4.1)).

Given an initial condition  $\gamma$ , the process  $\psi_t = \eta_t^\gamma - \gamma$  is a translation invariant surface and has zero inclination. The convergence of  $\nabla \psi_t$  follows from the convergence of  $\nabla \eta_t^\gamma$ , and the limiting field is the gradient of the corrector  $\nabla \chi_\gamma := \nabla h_\gamma - \nabla \gamma$ , for  $h_\gamma$  given by Theorem 2.1. Integrating by parts and using translation invariance, for  $\zeta \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $\text{div} \zeta \equiv 0$ ,

$$\mathcal{C}(\nabla(\gamma - \eta_t^\gamma)\zeta) = -\mathcal{C}((\gamma - \eta_t^\gamma)\text{div} \zeta) = 0, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Hence  $\gamma - \eta_t^\gamma$  is orthogonal to the subspace of fields in  $\mathcal{H}$  with zero divergence (which contains the gradients of all harmonic functions). In fact,  $\nabla h_\gamma$  is the orthogonal projection of  $\nabla \gamma$  over this subspace. In particular, we have

$$\nabla \gamma = \nabla h_\gamma + (\nabla \gamma - \nabla h_\gamma) \tag{9.1}$$

Mathieu and Piatnitski [15] also consider  $L_2(\Xi_2, \mathcal{C})$ . Equation (9.1) corresponds to their decomposition of the space as  $L_2(\Xi_2, \mathcal{C}) = L_2^{sol} \oplus L_2^{pot}$ . Taking  $\gamma_i(s) := (e_i \cdot s)$ ,  $i \leq d$ , the function  $\chi := (\chi_{\gamma_1}, \dots, \chi_{\gamma_d})$  is what they call the *corrector*.

### 9.3. Regularization effect.

The regularization effect observed in Fig. 1 can be explicitly formulated as follows. If one takes  $n$  arbitrary points  $s_1, \dots, s_n \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , the barycenter minimizes the following sum of scalar products

$$\arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{k=1}^n [(s_k - x) \cdot (s_{k+1} - x)] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n s_k. \quad (9.2)$$

where  $s_{n+1} = s_1$ . Take a point configuration  $\mathbf{s}$  and  $s, s' \in \mathbf{s}$  neighbors in the Delaunay triangulation of  $\mathbf{s}$ . The directed edge  $(s, s')$  is shared by the triangles  $ss'\alpha_+$  and  $ss'\alpha_-$ , where  $\alpha_+(s, s')$  is the first common neighbor of  $s$  and  $s'$  in the clockwise direction and  $\alpha_-(s, s')$  is the other common neighbor. We show the following extension of (9.2) to harmonic surfaces.

**Lemma 9.1.** *Let  $S$  be a stationary point process. Then the harmonic deformation of the Delaunay triangulation of  $S$  minimizes*

$$\mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s) [G(s) \cdot G(\alpha_+(0, s))] \quad (9.3)$$

among deformations  $G : S^0 \mapsto G(S^0)$  of  $S^0$  such that  $G(0) = 0$  and the corrector  $G(s) - s$  has coordinates with gradient in  $\mathcal{H}$ .

We prove this Lemma below. Given a surface  $\eta : \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  define the fields  $\zeta_+^\eta, \zeta_-^\eta : \Xi_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\zeta_\pm^\eta(s, s') := a(s, s') \nabla \eta(s, \alpha_\pm(s, s')).$$

Any two surfaces  $\eta, \phi : \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy

$$C(\nabla \eta \zeta_+^\phi) = C(\zeta_-^\eta \nabla \phi). \quad (9.4)$$

Also note that

$$\sum_{s' \in S^0} a(s, s') \zeta_\pm^\eta(s, s') = \Delta \eta(s) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{s' \in S^0} a(s, s') \zeta_\pm^\eta(s', s) = 0. \quad (9.5)$$

If  $\phi$  is a translation invariant surface (that is  $\phi(s, \mathbf{s}) = \phi(0, \tau_s \mathbf{s})$ ) then, by the mass transport principle,

$$\begin{aligned} 2C(\nabla \phi \zeta_\pm^\eta) &= \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s) \nabla \phi(0, s) \zeta_\pm^\eta(0, s) \\ &= \mathcal{E} \phi(0) \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s) \zeta_\pm^\eta(s, 0) - \mathcal{E} \phi(0) \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s) \zeta_\pm^\eta(0, s) \\ &= -C(\phi \Delta \eta) = C(\nabla \phi \nabla \eta), \end{aligned} \quad (9.6)$$

where the first identity in the bottom line follows from the integration by parts formula and the second one from (9.5).



**Lemma 9.2.**

$$\frac{d}{dt}C(\nabla\eta_t\zeta_+^{\eta_t}) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}C(|\nabla\eta_t|^2) = -\mathbb{E}\left[a(0)^{-1}|\Delta\eta_t(0, S^0)|^2\right]. \quad (9.7)$$

*Proof.* Using (9.4) and  $\nabla\eta_t = \nabla\gamma + \nabla\psi_t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 2C(\nabla\eta_t\zeta_+^{\eta_t}) &= 2C(\nabla\gamma\zeta_+^\gamma) + 2C(\zeta_+^\gamma\nabla\psi_t) + 2C(\nabla\psi_t\zeta_+^{\eta_t}) \\ &= 2C(\nabla\gamma\zeta_+^\gamma) + C(\nabla\gamma\nabla\psi_t) + C(\nabla\psi_t\nabla\eta_t) \\ &= 2C(\nabla\gamma\zeta_+^\gamma) + C(\nabla\gamma\nabla\eta_t) + C(\nabla\psi_t\nabla\eta_t) - C(|\nabla\gamma|^2) \\ &= 2C(\nabla\gamma\zeta_+^\gamma) + C(|\nabla\eta_t|^2) - C(|\nabla\gamma|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where the second identity follows from (9.6). This shows the first identity in (9.7); the second identity is (6.1).  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 9.1.* Lemma 9.2 shows that  $C(\nabla\eta_t\zeta_+^{\eta_t})$  is non-increasing, and that it is strictly decreasing if and only if  $\eta_t$  is not harmonic and hence

$$C(\nabla g\zeta_+^g) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if } g \text{ is harmonic}$$

Taking  $g_i$  as the coordinates of  $G$  and using that  $G(0) = 0$ , we get (9.3).  $\square$

#### 9.4. Some simulations.

In Figure 4 we show some pictures of this object. The first two pictures show level curves of (a linear interpolation of) the surface  $\gamma - h$ . In the first one blue means negative, red means positive and in black is the (inflated) boundary. In the second one, several level curves are drawn. From blue (minimum) to red (maximum). Use the picture in the bottom-right to interpret the colors of the intermediate values.

The next picture is the Voronoi tilling of the harmonic points. Observe that this is not (necessarily) the dual graph of the harmonic graph given by the harmonic deformation of the original Delaunay triangulation since this is not necessarily the Delaunay triangulation of the points. Is easy to construct examples where this in fact happens, and it can be seen in simulations. However, it can be appreciated in simulations that the density of triangles in the harmonic graph that are not Delaunay triangles is very low.

Finally, on the bottom-right, the level curves of the harmonic surface with inclination  $(1, 0)$  is shown, that is the limit of the dynamics with initial condition given by the plane  $\gamma(x, y) = x$ . Observe that the surface is pretty close to the original condition.




Figure 4: Some harmonic pictures

## Appendix A. The Random Walk and the Environment Process

The *environment seen from the particle* was used by De Masi et al. [14] to show the averaged invariance principle for the random walk in the supercritical bond-percolation cluster. We adapt some of those results to our setting.

Let  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{N}$  and  $s \in \mathbf{s}$ . Let  $\tilde{X}_n$  be a discrete time random walk on  $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{s})$  with law  $\tilde{P}_{\mathbf{s}}$  defined by  $\tilde{X}_0^s = s$  and for  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\tilde{P}_{\mathbf{s}}(\tilde{X}_n^s = s'' | \tilde{X}_{n-1}^s = s') = \frac{a(s', s'', \mathbf{s})}{a(s', \mathbf{s})}.$$

That is, the walk starts at  $s$  and if it is at  $s' \in \mathbf{s}$ , then it chooses a neighbor uniformly at random and jumps over it. Let  $\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{s}}$  be the expectation with respect to  $\tilde{P}_{\mathbf{s}}$ .

To build the continuous time walk, let  $N = \{T_s; s \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a rate 1 homogeneous Poisson Process in  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , independent of  $(\tilde{X}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ , and define

$$X_t := \tilde{X}_{N(t)}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $N(t) = N(0, t]$  is the number of points of  $N$  in the interval  $(0, t]$ . Let  $P_{\mathbf{s}} = \tilde{P}_{\mathbf{s}} \otimes Q$ , where  $Q$  is the law of  $N$  in  $(\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^+), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^+)))$ . The law of  $X_t^0$  coincides with the law of the walk  $B_{[t, 0]}^0$  defined in Section 5, so that the results below hold for  $B_{[t, 0]}^0$ .

Given the process  $\tilde{X}_n^0$  (with initial state  $0 \in \mathbf{s}$ ), define the process

$$\mathbf{s}_n = \tau_{\tilde{X}_n} \mathbf{s}.$$

This process can be thought as the *environment as seen from the particle* moving according to  $\tilde{X}_n^0$ . The process  $\mathbf{s}_n$  is Markov with values in  $\mathcal{N}$  and for all  $n$ ,  $0 \in \mathbf{s}_n$ . We use  $P_{\mathbf{s}}$  to denote the law of  $\mathbf{s}_n$  in  $\mathcal{N}^{\mathbb{Z}^+}$  with initial state  $\mathbf{s}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be the set of aperiodic  $\mathbf{s}$ :

$$\mathcal{M} = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{N}: \tau_x \mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{s} \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, x \neq 0\}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

If  $\mathbf{s}$  is aperiodic, then the trajectory of  $\mathbf{s}_n$  determines univoquely the trajectory of the walk  $\tilde{X}_n^0$ . The Poisson Process is aperiodic almost surely.

Let  $S$  be an ergodic point process in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , with Palm version  $S^0$ . Denote by  $\mathbf{v}_o$  the probability measure on  $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{N}))$  given by

$$\int f(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{v}_o(d\mathbf{s}) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{E}a(0)} \mathcal{E}[a(0)f(S^0)].$$

for bounded measurable  $f: \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

**Lemma Appendix A.1.** *The process  $(\mathbf{s}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is reversible and ergodic under  $\mathbf{v}_o$ .*

*Proof.* To check reversibility, let  $f, g: \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be bounded measurable functions. Define  $\phi(s, s', S^0) = a(s, s', S^0)f(\tau_s S^0)g(\tau_{s'} S^0)$  and observe that  $\phi$  is covariant and integrable, and therefore, by means of the Mass Transport Principle (Lemma 3.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \int E_s f(\mathbf{s}) g(S_1) \nu_o(d\mathbf{s}) &= (1/\mathcal{E}a(0)) \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s, S^0) f(S^0) g(\tau_s S^0) \\ &= (1/\mathcal{E}[a(0)]) \mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s, S^0) f(\tau_s S^0) g(S^0) \\ &= \int E_s f(S_1) g(\mathbf{s}) \nu_o(d\mathbf{s}). \end{aligned}$$

To show ergodicity, let  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{N})$  be such that  $\mathbf{s}_0 \in A$  implies that  $\mathbf{s}_1 \in A$ . If  $\mathbf{s} \in A$  then  $\tau_s \mathbf{s} \in A$  for every  $s \in \mathbf{s}$ . In fact, by the connectivity of  $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{s})$ , given  $s \in \mathbf{s}$  there exists  $n > 0$  such that  $\tau_s \mathbf{s} \in \theta_n A = A$ . Therefore, it follows that

$$\mathcal{P}_o(A) := \mathcal{P}(S^0 \in A) = \lim_{\Lambda \nearrow \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} \sum_{s \in S} \mathbf{1}_{\tau_s S \in A} \in \{0, 1\}$$

and, as  $\nu_o \ll \mathcal{P}_o$  and  $\mathcal{P}_o \ll \nu_o$ , it follows that  $\nu_o(A) \in \{0, 1\}$ .  $\square$

Using the previous Lemma and Hölder's inequality we get

**Proposition Appendix A.2.** *Let  $r \geq 1$  and  $\gamma: \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . If  $C := \mathcal{E}[\sum_{s \in S} a(0, s) |\gamma(s, S^0)|^r] < \infty$  then*

$$\mathbb{E}|\gamma(X_t)|^r = \mathcal{E}E|\gamma(X_t)|^r \leq \mathcal{E}(a(0)E|\gamma(X_t)|^r) \leq C\mathbf{m}^r(t),$$

where  $\mathbf{m}^r(t)$  is the  $r$ -th moment of a Poisson random variable with rate  $t$ .

To obtain estimates for  $\mathcal{C}(|\nabla \eta_t^Y|^r)$  we study the process of the *environment as seen from the random walker* on  $S^0$ , as in [14]. The law of  $S^0$  is reversible and ergodic for this process, which allows us to make estimates on the original random walk. See more details in the Appendix. Let  $B_{[t, 0]}^0$  as in Section 5 be a random walk on the points of  $S^0$  starting at  $0 \in S^0$ , and denote its law by  $P_{S^0}^0$ .

*Proof of Lemma 5.2.* By the Mass Transport Principle Lemma 3.1 and Proposition Appendix A.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(|\nabla \psi_t|^r) &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s) |\nabla \psi_t(0, s)|^r \leq 2^{r-2} \mathbb{E} \sum_{s \in S^0} a(0, s) [|\psi_t(0)|^r + |\psi_t(s)|^r] \\ &\leq 2^{r-1} \mathbb{E} a(0) |\psi_t(0)|^r \leq 2^{r-1} \mathbb{E} a(0) |\gamma(B_{[t, 0]}^0)|^r \leq 2^r \mathcal{C}(|\nabla \gamma|^r) \mathbf{m}^r(t) \quad \mathcal{P} - \text{a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{m}^r(t)$  denotes the  $r$ -th moment of a Poisson random variable with mean  $t$ .  $\square$

The following Lemma is a part of the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [14].

**Lemma Appendix A.3.** *If  $\gamma: \Xi_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is such that*

$$\mathcal{E} \sum_{s \in S} a(0, s) |\gamma(s)|^2 < \infty,$$

*then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}(a(0)E|\gamma(\tilde{X}_n)|^2)}{n} < \infty, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

*and*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}(a(0)E|\gamma(X_t)|^2)}{t} < \infty. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

## References

- [1] M. T. Barlow, *Random walks on supercritical percolation clusters*, Ann. Probab. **32** (2004), no. 4, 3024–3084. MR MR2094438 (2006e:60146)
- [2] M. T. Barlow and J.-D. Deuschel, *Invariance principle for the random conductance model with unbounded conductances*, Ann. Probab. **38** (2010), no. 1, 234–276. MR 2599199
- [3] I. Benjamini, R. Lyons, Y. Peres, and O. Schramm, *Group-invariant percolation on graphs*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **9** (1999), no. 1, 29–66. MR MR1675890 (99m:60149)
- [4] Itai Benjamini and Oded Schramm, *Percolation in the hyperbolic plane*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (2001), no. 2, 487–507 (electronic). MR MR1815220 (2002h:82049)
- [5] N. Berger and M. Biskup, *Quenched invariance principle for simple random walk on percolation clusters*, Probab. Theory Rel. Fields **137** (2007), no. 1-2, 83–120.
- [6] Marek Biskup and Timothy M. Prescott, *Functional CLT for random walk among bounded random conductances*, Electron. J. Probab. **12** (2007), no. 49, 1323–1348. MR 2354160 (2009d:60336)
- [7] P. Caputo, A. Faggionato, and T. Prescott, *Invariance principle for Mott variable range hopping and other walks on point processes.*, ArXiv e-prints.
- [8] D. J. Daley and D. Vere-Jones, *Introduction to the theory of point processes, volume 2: General theory and structure*, 2nd ed., Springer-Berlin, 2008.
- [9] R. Durrett, *Probability: Theory and examples*, 2nd ed. ed., Duxbury Press, 1996.
- [10] Rafael M. Grisi, *Deformação harmônica da triangulação de delaunay*, Ph.D. thesis, Universidade de São Paulo, Brasil, 2009.
- [11] Olle Häggström, *Infinite clusters in dependent automorphism invariant percolation on trees*, Ann. Probab. **25** (1997), no. 3, 1423–1436. MR MR1457624 (98f:60207)

- [12] M. Heveling and G. Last, *Characterization of palm measures via bijective point-shifts*, The Annals of Probability **33** (2005), no. 5, 1698–1715.
- [13] A. E. Holroyd and Y. Peres, *Trees and matchings from point processes*, Elect. Comm. in Probab. **8** (2003), 17–27.
- [14] A. De Masi, P. A. Ferrari, S. Goldstein, and W. D. Wick, *Invariance principle for reversible markov processes with applications to random motions in random environments*, Journal of Statistical Physics **55** (1989), no. 3-4, 787–855.
- [15] P. Mathieu and A. Piatnitski, *Quenched invariance principle for simple random walks on percolation clusters*, Proceedings A of the Royal Society **463** (2007), 2287–2307.
- [16] Vladas Sidoravicius and Alain-Sol Sznitman, *Quenched invariance principles for walks on clusters of percolation or among random conductances*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **129** (2004), no. 2, 219–244. MR MR2063376 (2005d:60155)