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Abstract

We consider an embedding of planar maps into an equilateral triangle $\Delta$ which we call the Cardy embedding. The embedding is a discrete approximation of a conformal map based on percolation observables that are used in Smirnov’s proof of Cardy’s formula. Under the Cardy embedding, the planar map induces a metric and an area measure on $\Delta$ and a boundary measure on $\partial \Delta$. We prove that for uniformly sampled triangulations, the metric and the measures converge jointly in the scaling limit to the Brownian disk conformally embedded into $\Delta$ (i.e., to the $\sqrt{8/3}$-Liouville quantum gravity disk). As part of our proof, we show that the set of all interfaces between different clusters for critical site percolation on the uniform triangulations converge to the conformal loop ensemble $\text{CLE}_6$ on the Brownian disk, in a quenched sense. We also establish the scaling limit of the percolation crossing probability for a uniformly sampled triangulation with four boundary marked points.
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1 Introduction

Random planar geometry has been a central topic in probability in the last two decades. The main goal is to construct and study random surfaces. One natural approach is to consider the scaling limit of random planar maps. Inspired by Riemannian geometry, a natural point
of view is to consider a planar map as an abstract metric measure space. In this regards, Le Gall [Le 13], Miermont [Mie13], and others (e.g. [BJM14]Abr16[ABA17]BLG13) proved that a large class of uniformly sampled random planar maps converge in the scaling limit to a random metric measure space with the topology of the sphere, known as the Brownian map. In the case where the random planar map has a macroscopic boundary, the scaling limit is the Brownian disk [BM17], which is a metric measure space with the topology of a disk.

Liouville quantum gravity (LQG) is another approach for constructing a random surface, which takes the perspective of conformal geometry. Since the foundational work of Polyakov [Pol81], LQG has been an active research area in theoretical physics. The mathematical study of LQG was initiated by Duplantier and Sheffield [DS11]. The idea is to consider an instance $h$ of the Gaussian free field (GFF) on a planar domain $D$ and study the surface with metric tensor $e^{\gamma h/\dim_{\gamma}}(dx^2 + dy^2)$.

This definition does not make rigorous sense since $h$ is a distribution and not a function. However, by first regularizing $h$ and then taking a limit, for each $\gamma \in (0, 2)$, the random area measure $\mu_h := e^{\gamma h}d^2z$ on $D$ exists and is nontrivial. If $D$ has a nontrivial boundary, the measure $\xi_h := e^{\gamma h/2}dz$ on $\partial D$ can also be defined. Very recently, Gwynne and Miller [GM19] proved that one may construct a metric (i.e., a distance function) $d_h$ by regularizing the metric tensor. For $\gamma = \sqrt{8/3}$, this metric agrees with the metric constructed earlier by Miller and Sheffield [MS15a,MS16a,MS16b], which gives a metric space with the law of a Brownian surface. There is a coordinate change rule depending on $\gamma$ that relates fields on two conformally equivalent domains such that $(d_h, \mu_h, \xi_h)$ is invariant under conformal maps. The random geometry defined by $(h, d_h, \mu_h, \xi_h)$ is called $\gamma$-LQG.

A fundamental belief in random planar geometry which has been guiding its development is the following. Given any $\gamma \in (0, 2)$, there is a family of random planar maps whose scaling limit under discrete conformal embeddings converge to $\gamma$-LQG. In particular, uniform random planar maps converge to $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG in this sense. Here a discrete conformal embedding means a discrete approximation of the Riemann mapping. Notable examples include the circle packing and the Tutte embedding. See e.g. [DS11, LG14, DKRV16] for precise conjectures. Before the current paper, this convergence had not been verified for any natural combinatorial random planar maps under any discrete conformal embedding. See Section 1.4 for results on planar maps obtained from coarse graining of a $\gamma$-LQG surface.

Cardy [Car92] predicted an explicit formula for the scaling limit of the left/right crossing probability for critical planar percolation in rectangles of any aspect ratio. Cardy’s formula was proved by Smirnov [Smi01] in the case of site percolation on the triangular lattice. A by-product of Smirnov’s proof is a discrete conformal embedding based on percolation observables, which we call the Cardy embedding (see Definition 1.1). In this paper, we prove that large uniform triangulations converge to $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG under the Cardy embedding (see Theorem 1.3).

Smirnov’s proof of Cardy’s formula and Schramm’s discovery of the Schramm-Loewner evolution (SLE) [Sch00] mark the beginning of a range of works which greatly improved our understanding of the scaling limit of critical percolation on the triangular lattice [CN06, SW01, SS11, GPS13, HLS18]. Smirnov’s proof is famously difficult to adapt to percolation monographs.

\footnote{Here $\dim_{\gamma}$ is the dimension of the surface. We have $\dim_{\gamma} = 4$ for $\gamma = \sqrt{8/3}$.}
in other settings \cite{Bef07}, even for bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$. In this paper we prove that in the random environment defined by uniform triangulations, critical site percolation has a quenched scaling limit (see Theorems 1.4 and 1.5). To our knowledge this is the first full quenched scaling limit result for critical percolation beyond site percolation on the triangular lattice. The only other quenched scaling limit result we are aware of is for the crossing probability of squares for Poisson Voronoi percolation \cite{AGMT16}.

This paper is the culmination of a seven-paper research program including \cite{HLLS18, HLS18, BHS18, AHS19, GHS19, GHSS19} and this paper. Other papers that are important to this program include \cite{GPS10, GPS13, GPS18a, DMS14, GM17a}. See Section 1.3 for an overview of the program and an outline of this paper.

1.1 The Cardy embedding as a discrete conformal embedding

The Riemann mapping theorem asserts that any two simply connected planar domains with boundary are related by a conformal map. The Riemann mapping admits natural discrete approximations which we call discrete conformal embeddings. As a notable example, Thurston conjectured that the circle packing gives an approximation of the Riemann mapping from a simply connected domain to the unit disk. This conjecture was proved in \cite{RS87}.

Consider the equilateral triangle $\Delta := \{(x, y, z) : x + y + z = 1, x, y, z > 0\}$. We view $\Delta$ as an oriented surface with disk topology and boundary $\partial \Delta$ where the orientation is such that $(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0)$, and $(0, 0, 1)$ are ordered counterclockwise. Define $\overline{\Delta} = \Delta \cup \partial \Delta$. See Figure 1 for an illustration. Given a Jordan domain $D$ with three distinct boundary points $a, b, c$ in counterclockwise order, there exists a unique Riemann mapping from $D$ to $\Delta$ that maps $a, b,$ and $c$ to $(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0),$ and $(0, 0, 1),$ respectively. We denote this mapping by $C_{\text{dy}} D$. The dependence on $(a, b, c)$ is dropped to lighten the notation. Smirnov’s elegant proof of Cardy’s formula provides an approximation scheme for $C_{\text{dy}} D$ based on percolation observables. This gives another example of a discrete conformal embedding which we call the Cardy embedding.

We now define the Cardy embedding in the general setting of triangulations of polygons. Recall that a planar map is a planar graph (multiple edges and self-loops allowed) embedded into the sphere, viewed modulo orientation-preserving homeomorphisms. For a planar map $M$, we write $\mathcal{V}(M), \mathcal{E}(M),$ and $\mathcal{F}(M)$ for the set of vertices, edges, and faces, respectively. A map is rooted if one of its edges, called the root edge, is distinguished and oriented. The face to the right of the root edge is called the root face. Given an integer $\ell \geq 2$, a rooted planar map $M$ is called a triangulation with boundary length $\ell$ if every face in $\mathcal{F}(M)$ has degree 3, except the root face, which has degree $\ell$. We write $\partial M$ for the graph consisting of the edges and vertices on the root face of $M$. A vertex on $M$ is called a boundary vertex if it is on $\partial M$. Otherwise, it is called an inner vertex. We similarly define boundary edges and inner edges. If the boundary of $M$ consists of $\ell$ distinct boundary vertices, we say that $M$ is a triangulation of an $\ell$-gon.\footnote{Equivalently, the boundary is simple. Therefore, triangulations of polygons are sometimes called triangulations with simple boundary. See e.g. \cite{GHS19}.} Let $\mathfrak{T}(\ell)$ be the set of triangulations of an $\ell$-gon and define $\mathfrak{T} := \bigcup_{\ell \geq 2} \mathfrak{T}(\ell)$. We call an element in $\mathfrak{T}$ a triangulation of a polygon.

Given $M \in \mathfrak{T}$, a site percolation on $M$ is a coloring of $\mathcal{V}(M)$ in two colors, say, red and blue. The Bernoulli-$1/2$ site percolation on $M$ is the random site percolation $\omega$ on $M$ such that
each inner vertex is independently colored red or blue with equal probability. The coloring of
the boundary vertices is called the boundary condition of \( \omega \). The boundary condition can
have any distribution independent of \( \omega|_{\mathcal{V}(M)\cup \partial \mathcal{V}(M)} \).

Given a triangulation of a polygon \( M \) with three distinct boundary edges \( a, b, c \) ordered
clockwise, we denote by \((a, b)\) the set of boundary vertices of \( M \) situated between \( a \)
and \( b \) in clockwise order (including one endpoint of \( a \) and one endpoint of \( b \)). Define
\((b, c)\) and \((c, a)\) similarly. For a vertex \( v \in \mathcal{V}(M) \), let \( E_a(v) \) be the event that there exists a
simple path (i.e., a sequence of distinct vertices on \( M \) where any two consecutive vertices are
adjacent) \( P \) on \( M \) such that

(a) \( P \) contains one endpoint in \((c, a)\) and one endpoint in \((a, b)\), while all other vertices of
\( P \) are inner blue vertices;

(b) either \( v \in P \) or \( v \) is on the same side of \( P \) as the edge \( a \).

We define the events \( E_b(v) \) and \( E_c(v) \) similarly. Note that \( E_a(v) \), \( E_b(v) \), and \( E_c(v) \) do not depend on the boundary condition of \( \omega \).

Given any nonnegative vector \((x, y, z) \in [0, \infty)^3\), let \((x, y, z)_\Delta := (x+y+z)^{-1}(x, y, z)
with the convention that \((0, 0, 0)_\Delta := (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)\). In other words, \((x, y, z)_\Delta \) is the projection
of \((x, y, z)\) onto the equilateral triangle \( \Delta \) along its own direction. The Cardy embedding is a
mapping from the vertex set of a triangulation of a polygon to \( \Delta \), defined using observables
of site percolation on top of it.

**Definition 1.1** (Cardy embedding). Given a triangulation of a polygon \( M \) with three distinct
boundary edges \( a, b, c \) ordered clockwise, let \( \text{Ber}_M \) be the probability measure corre-
sponding to the Bernoulli-\( \frac{1}{2} \) site percolation on \( M \). The Cardy embedding \( \text{Cdy}_M \) of \((M, a, b, c)\)
is the function from \( \mathcal{V}(M) \) to \( \Delta \) given by

\[
\text{Cdy}_M(v) = (\text{Ber}_M[E_a(v)], \text{Ber}_M[E_b(v)], \text{Ber}_M[E_c(v)])_{\Delta}
\quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{V}(M).
\]

Smirnov’s theorem \([\text{Smi01}]\) can be phrased in terms of the Cardy embedding as follows.
Suppose \( D \) is a Jordan domain with three distinct marked boundary points \( a, b, c \) ordered
clockwise. Let \( T \) denote the triangular lattice. Given a small mesh size \( \delta > 0 \), let
\( D^\delta \) be a lattice approximation of \( D \) via \( \delta T \) such that \( D^\delta \) is a triangulation of a polygon (see
Section 2.1 for a precise definition). Let \( a^\delta, b^\delta, c^\delta \) be points on \( \partial D^\delta \) that approximate \( a, b, c \),
respectively. Let \( \text{Cdy}^\delta \) be the Cardy embedding of \((D^\delta, a^\delta, b^\delta, c^\delta)\) and recall the Riemann
mapping \( \text{Cdy}_D \) from \( D \) to \( \Delta \).

**Theorem 1.2** (Smirnov). In the setting above, \( \lim_{\delta \to 0} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}(D^\delta)} |\text{Cdy}^\delta(v) - \text{Cdy}_D(v)| = 0 \).

In Definition 1.1 let \( e \) be an edge lying on the arc \((c, a)\) and let \( v \) be the endpoint of \( e 
\quad \text{closer to } a \). Then \( \text{Ber}_M[E_a(v)] \) is the so-called crossing probability between \((c, e)\) and \((a, b)\).
Recall that Cardy derived a formula for the crossing probability between the two vertical sides
of the rectangle \( D = [0, R] \times [0, 1] \) for arbitrary \( R > 0 \). We will now explain why Theorem 1.2
gives a rigorous proof of this formula, which explains why we call our embedding the Cardy
embedding. Let the marked boundary points of \( D \) be \((R, 0), (R, 1), \) and \((0, 1)\). By Theorem
1.2, the \( x \)-coordinate of \( \text{Cdy}_D(0, 0) \) is the \( \delta \to 0 \) limit of the crossing probability between the
left and right sides of \( D^\delta \). By the Schwarz-Christoffel formula, the value of \( \text{Cdy}_D(0, 0) \) can
be expressed explicitly as a function of \( R \). This function can be seen to agree with Cardy’s
formula.
1.2 Main results

1.2.1 Scaling limit of uniform triangulations under the Cardy embedding

Our first main result is that large uniform triangulations of polygons converge to $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG under the Cardy embedding. We will focus on a particular variant where self-loops are not allowed while multiple-edges are allowed; these are often called type II triangulations of a polygon. See Remark 1.7 for extensions to other variants. We consider the critical Boltzmann measure, which is defined as follows. For $\ell \geq 3$, let $\mathcal{T}_2(\ell)$ be the set of maps in $\mathcal{T}(\ell)$ with no self-loops (but multiple-edge are allowed). Given $\ell \geq 3$, it is well-known that if each element $M \in \mathcal{T}_2(\ell)$ is assigned weight $(2/27)^n$, where $n$ is the number of vertices of $M$, then the resulting measure on $\mathcal{T}_2(\ell)$ is finite. Let $\text{Bol}_2(\ell)$ be the probability measure obtained by normalizing this measure. Following [AS03], we call a map with law $\text{Bol}_2(\ell)$ a Boltzmann triangulation of type II with boundary length $\ell$.

Fix a sequence of integers $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $(3n)^{-1/2}\ell_n \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. Let $M^n$ be sampled from $\text{Bol}_2(\ell_n)$. Denote the root edge of $M^n$ by $a^n$ and sample two other boundary edges $b^n$ and $c^n$ uniformly at random, conditioning on $a^n, b^n, c^n$ being distinct and ordered counterclockwise. (We assume $\ell_n \geq 3$ for all $n$ so that this is always possible.) Let $d_{M^n}^{gr} : \mathcal{V}(M^n) \times \mathcal{V}(M^n) \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ be the graph distance of $M^n$ and define $d^n := (3n/4)^{-1/4}d_{M^n}^{gr}$. Let $\mu^n$ be $(2n)^{-1}$ times the counting measure on $\mathcal{V}(M^n)$. We obtain a random compact metric space endowed with two measures, which we denote by $M^n = (M^n, d^n, \mu^n, \xi^n)$. In collaboration with Albenque [AHS19], we proved that $M^n$ converge in law to a variant of the Brownian disk called the free Brownian disk with unit perimeter, which we denote by BD$_1$ (see Theorem 1.9). Moreover, the marked edges $(a^n, b^n, c^n)$ converge to three marked points on the boundary of BD$_1$. By works of Miller and Sheffield [MS15a, MS16a, MS16b], there exists a variant $h_{\Delta}$ of the Gaussian free field on $\Delta$ such that $(\Delta, d_{\Delta}, \mu_{\Delta}, \xi_{\Delta}) := (\Delta, c_4d_{h_{\Delta}}, c_m\mu_{h_{\Delta}}, \xi_{h_{\Delta}})$ has the law of BD$_1$ with the three marked points being $(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0)$, and $(0, 0, 1)$. Here $(d_{h_{\Delta}}, \mu_{h_{\Delta}}, \xi_{h_{\Delta}})$ is the metric/measure triple in $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG corresponding to $h_{\Delta}$ as mentioned above Section 1.1 and $c_4, c_m$ are implicit positive constants coming from Miller and Sheffield’s theorem. See Theorem 2.8 and Definition 2.9 for precise definitions.

Let $\text{Cdy}^n$ be the Cardy embedding of $(M^n, a^n, b^n, c^n)$. Now we define a triple $(d_{\Delta}^n, \mu_{\Delta}^n, \xi_{\Delta}^n)$ which is the pushforward of $M^n$ onto $\overline{\Delta}$ under $\text{Cdy}^n$. To be precise, for $x \in \overline{\Delta}$, let $\mathbf{v}(x)$ be the vertex of $M^n$ which is closest to $x$ under the Cardy embedding, i.e., we let $\mathbf{v}(x)$ be the vertex $v \in \mathcal{V}(M^n)$ such that $|\text{Cdy}_{M^n}(v) - x|$ is minimized over $v \in \mathcal{V}(M^n)$.

Let

$$d_{\Delta}^n(x, y) := d^n(\mathbf{v}(x), \mathbf{v}(y)), \quad \text{for } x, y \in \overline{\Delta}, \quad (1)$$

$$\mu_{\Delta}^n(U) := \mu^n(\{v \in \mathcal{V}(M^n) : \text{Cdy}_{M^n}(v) \in U\}), \quad \text{for each Borel set } U \subset \overline{\Delta},$$

$$\xi_{\Delta}^n(U) := \xi^n(\{v \in \partial\mathcal{V}(M^n) : \text{Cdy}_{M^n}(v) \in U\}), \quad \text{for each Borel set } U \subset \overline{\Delta}.$$

Our first main result can be stated as follows.

**Theorem 1.3.** In the setting above, $(d_{\Delta}^n, \mu_{\Delta}^n, \xi_{\Delta}^n)$ converge jointly in law to $(d_{\Delta}, \mu_{\Delta}, \xi_{\Delta})$ as $n \to \infty$, where we equip the first coordinate with the uniform topology and the latter two coordinates with the Prokhorov topology on Borel measures on $\overline{\Delta}$.

---

3 We assume that draws in the definition of $\mathbf{v}(x)$ are resolved in some arbitrary way.
1.2.2 Quenched scaling limit of site percolation on uniform triangulations

Our second main result is on the scaling limit of Bernoulli-$\frac{1}{2}$ site percolation on large uniform triangulations. We start by considering the simplest observable, namely, the crossing probability between two boundary arcs. Let $(M^n, a^n, b^n, c^n)$ and $h_\Delta$ be as in Theorem 1.3. Conditioning on $(M^n, a^n, b^n, c^n)$, uniformly sample an edge $e^n$ on the arc $(c^n, a^n)$ and let $v^n$ be the endpoint of $e^n$ which is closer to $a^n$. By the discussion below Theorem 1.2, $\text{Ber}_{M^n}[E_{a^n}(v^n)]$ is the crossing probability between the arcs $(c^n, v^n)$ and $(a^n, b^n)$. In the continuum, let $v$ be a point on the counterclockwise arc on $\partial \Delta$ from $(0, 0, 1)$ to $(1, 0, 0)$ sampled according to the measure $\xi_\Delta$ on $\partial \Delta$ restricted to this arc. In other words, $v$ is a random point on this arc such that conditioning on $h_\Delta$, the ratio between the $\xi_\Delta$-masses of the counterclockwise arcs from $(0, 0, 1)$ to $v$ and the one from $(0, 0, 1)$ to $(1, 0, 0)$ is uniformly distributed between 0 and 1. Let $x(v)$ be the $x$-coordinate of $v$. Then we have the following.

**Theorem 1.4.** In the setting described above, $\text{Ber}_{M^n}[E_{a^n}(v^n)]$ converge in law to $x(v)$.

It is clear from Theorem 1.4 that the following more symmetric looking variant holds. Let $(e^n_1, e^n_2, e^n_3, e^n_4)$ be four uniformly sampled edges on $\partial M^n$, conditioning on the edges being distinct and ordered counterclockwise. Then the crossing probability between the arcs $(e^n_1, e^n_2)$ and $(e^n_3, e^n_4)$ converge in law to a random variable, whose law is straightforward to describe in terms of the measure $\xi_\Delta$. We skip a more formal statement to avoid extra notations.

Earlier scaling limit results for percolation on random planar maps have considered observables involving both the randomness of the planar map and the percolation. This includes for example [GM17a, BHS18, CK15, Ang05] and Theorem 1.11 below. In the context of random processes in random environment, this type of statements are referred as *annealed* scaling limit results. Alternatively, we can consider percolation observables which are functions only of the map. The crossing probability $\text{Ber}_{M^n}[E_{a^n}(v^n)]$ in Theorem 1.4 is an example of...
such an observable. Convergence of such observables are referred to as quenched scaling limit results. To our best knowledge, this paper is the first work where quenched scaling limit results for percolation on random planar maps are established. We note that a variant of Theorem 1.4 with SLE$_6$ in place of percolation is stated in [Cur15] as a theorem conditional on an unproven assertion.

We also formulate a quenched scaling limit result where the random environment is given by a large uniform triangulation under the Cardy embedding. In order to capture the full information of the percolation, we consider the loop ensemble observable $\text{SLE}_6$, which is defined as follows. Given a triangulation of a polygon $M$, let $\omega$ be a site percolation on $M$ with monochromatic blue boundary condition. Namely, the color of each boundary vertex is blue. Removing all edges on $M$ whose endpoints have opposite colors, we call each connected component in the remaining graph a percolation cluster, or simply a cluster, of $\omega$. By definition, vertices in each cluster have the same color. Moreover, each pair of neighboring vertices that are on different clusters must have opposite colors. We call the cluster containing $\partial M$ the boundary cluster. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a non-boundary cluster of $\omega$, one can canonically define a loop on $M$ surrounding $\mathcal{C}$ as a path of vertices in the dual map of $M$. We orient the path such that the vertices to the left (resp., right) of the path are red (resp., blue). The collections of such loops is called the loop ensemble of $\omega$, and we denote it by $\Gamma(M,\omega)$. See Figure 1 for an illustration. Note that $\omega$ is uniquely determined by $\Gamma(M,\omega)$.

Given a Jordan domain $D$, a loop ensemble in $D$ is a collection of oriented loops, each viewed as a curve in $D \cup \partial D$ modulo monotone reparametrization and rerooting. Let $\mathcal{L}(D)$ denote the space of loop ensembles in $D$. Recall the lattice approximation $D^\delta$ to $D$ in Theorem 1.2. Let $\omega^\delta$ be sampled from $\text{Ber}_{D^\delta}$ with monochromatic blue boundary condition. It was proved in [CN06] that $\Gamma(D^\delta,\omega^\delta)$ converge in law as $\delta \to 0$ to a random variable $\Gamma$ taking values in $\mathcal{L}(D)$. A random variable with the law of $\Gamma$ is called a conformal loop ensemble with parameter $\kappa = 6$ (CLE$_6$) on $D$. See Theorem 2.10 for a precise statement of this result including the topology of convergence.

Recall $(M^n,a^n,b^n,c^n)$ and $\text{Ber}_{M^n}$ in Theorem 1.3. Let $\omega^n$ be sampled from $\text{Ber}_{M^n}$ with monochromatic blue boundary condition. Then the pushforward of $\Gamma(M^n,\omega^n)$ under $\text{Cdy}_{M^n}$ defines a random variable $\Upsilon^n_\Delta$ in $\mathcal{L}(\Delta)$. To be precise, each loop $\gamma \in \Gamma(M^n,\omega^n)$ can be represented as an ordered sequence (modulo cyclic permutations) of edges $e_1, \ldots, e_{k_\gamma} \in \mathcal{E}(M^n)$ such that the two end-points $u_j$ and $v_j$ of each edge $e_j$ have opposite colors. We draw $\gamma$ as a loop in $\Delta$ by drawing the line segment between the points $\frac{1}{2}(\text{Cdy}_{M^n}(u_{j-1}) + \text{Cdy}_{M^n}(v_{j-1}))$ and $\frac{1}{2}(\text{Cdy}_{M^n}(u_{j}) + \text{Cdy}_{M^n}(v_{j}))$ for $j = 1, \ldots, k_\gamma$ (with the indices viewed modulo $k_\gamma$).

**Theorem 1.5.** In the setting above, let $\Gamma$ be a CLE$_6$ on $\Delta$ and let $f : \mathcal{L}(\Delta) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded continuous function. Then $\lim_{n \to \infty} \text{Ber}_{M^n} [f(\Upsilon^n_\Delta) \mid (M^n,a^n,b^n,c^n)] = \mathbb{E}[f(\Gamma)]$ in probability.

Besides crossing probabilities and loop ensembles, we can also consider the so-called percolation interfaces. For example, instead of assuming that $\omega^n$ has monochromatic blue boundary condition, we may require that $\omega^n$ is blue on $(a^n,b^n)$ and red on $(b^n,a^n)$. Then the percolation interface is the ordered sequence of edges starting at $a^n$ and ending at $b^n$, such that the two end-points of each edge have opposite colors and two consecutive edges share a vertex. It will be clear from our proof of Theorem 1.5 that under the Cardy embedding, this

---

4In Section 2.4, $\Gamma$ is called a CLE$_6$ with monochromatic blue boundary condition.
percolation interface converges to a random curve on $\overline{\Delta}$ in the same sense as the convergence in Theorem 1.5. The limiting random curve is called a chordal SLE$_6$ on $\Delta$ from $(1,0,0)$ to $(0,1,0)$.

1.2.3 Comments on the universality of the main results

In this section we remark that several closely related results to those stated above can be proved by similar methods.

Remark 1.6 (Irrelevant details in Definition 1.1). Our main results also hold for slightly different definitions of the Cardy embedding than the one in Definition 1.1. For example, we can modify some details in the definition of $E_a(v)$, such as letting $a,b,c$ be vertices instead of edges, or requiring that $v$ does not lie on $P$. Moreover, by Remark 4.2, $\max_{v \in V(M^n)} |\Ber_{M^n}(E_{a^n}(v)) + \Ber_{M^n}(E_{b^n}(v)) + \Ber_{M^n}(E_{c^n}(v)) - 1| = o_n(1)$. Therefore it is not important exactly how we project the triple of crossing probabilities onto $\overline{\Delta}$. We can also choose the three boundary edges differently, e.g. by fixing the renormalized boundary length between the edges. With this change we will get a limiting field $h_{\Delta}$ such that the LQG length it induces along each side of $\partial \Delta$ is fixed.

Remark 1.7 (Other variants of uniform triangulations). Recall that a triangulation is of type I (resp., type II; type III) if multi-edges and self-loops are allowed (resp., multi-edges are allowed but not self-loops; neither multi-edges nor self-loops are allowed). In [AHS19] we consider natural couplings between Boltzmann triangulations of types I, II, and III, and prove that triangulated disks of all three types converge in the scaling limit to the Brownian disk. By the definition of the couplings, it is easy to see that Theorems 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5 still hold for Boltzmann triangulations of types I and III.

By universality, our main results are also believed to hold for uniformly sampled planar maps with other local constraints (quadrangulations, general maps, etc). Establishing these results require nontrivial work. The main ingredient which is missing is convergence of the pivotal measure on the planar map. In the case of type II triangulations we obtain this via the bijection in [BHS13].

Remark 1.8 (Surfaces with other topologies). With the techniques of this paper, we can also prove convergence under conformal embedding of uniform triangulations with whole-plane topology and sphere topology, respectively. For example, in the sphere case we can choose three vertices $a$, $b$, and $c$ uniformly at random and send these to $0$, $1$, and $\infty$, respectively; this should approximately fix the embedding of the remaining vertices. We define the embedding by considering properties of percolation interfaces on the map, and by using that these paths converge to SLE$_6$ curves or CLE$_6$ loops in the scaling limit. For example, for an arbitrary vertex $w$ we can consider the law of the position of $w$ relative to the percolation interfaces between the marked vertices. We also expect that without much difficulty our results extend to uniform triangulations with non-simple topology as long as the convergence to the Brownian surface of the same topology is established.

As will be explained in Section 1.4 universality of our main results is believed to hold in even bigger generality than what is discussed in this section. For example, they are also believed to hold for other types of embeddings such as circle packings. Our paper does not
imply anything on convergence under these embeddings, since there are few rigorous links between other embeddings and the Cardy embedding.

1.3 Outline of the program

Recall that the current work is the final paper in a program also involving [HLLS18, HLS18, BHS18, AHS19, GHS19, GHSS19]. In this section we give an overview of this program at the same time as we sketch the proofs of the main results stated in Section 1.2.

1.3.1 Scaling limit of multiple site percolations on uniform triangulations

Recall that $\mathcal{M}^n$ in Theorem 1.3 is sampled from $\text{Bol}_2(\ell_n)$ and has a root edge denoted by $a^n$. Also recall that $\mathcal{M}^n = (\mathcal{M}^n, d^n, \mu^n, \xi^n)$. In Section 1.2.1 $\xi^n$ is viewed as the uniform measure on $\mathcal{V}(\partial \mathcal{M}^n)$. In this section, instead of a measure, we think of $\xi^n$ as a curve of duration $[0, 1]$, tracing $\partial \mathcal{M}^n$ clockwise starting and ending at $a^n$. This way, we view $\mathcal{M}^n$ as a compact metric measure space decorated with a curve. The natural topology for such objects is the so-called Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov-uniform (GHPU) topology, which is introduced in [GM17b]. It is the natural variant of the Gromov-Hausdorff topology for spaces which are also equipped with a measure and a curve. In the continuum, the free Brownian disk with unit perimeter $\text{BD}_1$ can also be naturally viewed as a compact metric measure space decorated with a curve. See Section 2.2 for more details on the GHPU topology and the Brownian disk.

With Albenque, we proved the following.

**Theorem 1.9** ([AHS19]). $\mathcal{M}^n$ converge in law to $\text{BD}_1$ in the GHPU topology as $n \to \infty$.

Logically speaking, Theorem 1.9 is the first step of our program. However, historically speaking, the starting point is the following observation. Conditioning on $\mathcal{M}^n$, let $\{\omega^n_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of independent samples from $\text{Ber}(\mathcal{M}^n)$. If we can prove that $\{(\mathcal{M}^n, \omega^n_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ jointly converge to its continuum counterpart in a sufficiently strong topology, then all the results in Section 1.2 will follow. We first formulate such a convergence result precisely and then we explain why it is sufficient.

Given $\mathcal{M}^n$ and $\{\omega^n_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ as above, let $\Upsilon^n_i := \Gamma(\mathcal{M}^n, \omega^n_i)$ be the loop ensemble associated with $\omega^n_i$ as defined in Section 1.2. Then $(\mathcal{M}^n, \Upsilon^n)$ can be viewed as a compact metric measure space decorated with a curve and a loop ensemble. The natural topology for such objects is the so-called Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov-uniform-loop (GHPUL) topology, which was first introduced in [GHS19]. This is the natural variant of the GHPU topology for cases where the metric space is further decorated by a loop ensemble; see Section 2.2.

In the continuum, there exists a variant of the GFF on the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$, denoted by $h$, such that $(\mathbb{D} \cup \partial \mathbb{D}, c_d h, c_m \mu_h, \xi_h)$ has the law of $\text{BD}_1$ as a metric measure space decorated with a curve [MS15a, MS16a, MS16b]. The curve is defined by tracing $\partial \mathbb{D}$ clockwise, starting and ending at 1, with the speed prescribed by the boundary measure $\xi_h$. Since $(\Delta, h_\Delta)$ in Theorem 1.3 and $(\mathbb{D}, h)$ both correspond to $\text{BD}_1$, the two fields are related (in law) by a conformal map between $\mathbb{D}$ and $\Delta$ and the change of coordinates formula (11). Let $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of independent samples of CLE$_6$ on $\mathbb{D}$, which is also independent of $h$. Then $(\mathbb{D} \cup \partial \mathbb{D}, c_d h, c_m \mu_h, \xi_h, \Gamma_i)$ can be viewed as a compact metric measure space decorated with a curve and loop ensemble; see
Section 2.4. For simplicity, we write \((\mathbb{D} \cup \partial \mathbb{D}, c_1 d_n, c_m \mu_h, \xi_h, \Gamma_i)\) as \((\mathbb{D}, h, \Gamma_i)\). The following theorem is a precise formulation of the aforementioned convergence of \(\{(M^n, \omega_i^n)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}\).

**Theorem 1.10.** In the setting of the paragraph above, for each \(k \in \mathbb{N}\), \(\{(M^n, \gamma_i^n)\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}\) jointly converge in law to \(\{(\mathbb{D}, h, \Gamma_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}\) in the GHPUL topology.

The proofs of the main theorems in Section 1.2 based on Theorem 1.10 constitute Section 4. Here we briefly explain the idea, starting from Theorem 1.4. Recall \(v^n\) defined there. For \(i \in \mathbb{N}\), let \(E_{v^n}^{i, n}(v^n)\) be defined as \(E_{\omega^n}(v^n)\), with \(\omega^n_i\) being the site percolation on \(M^n\). Our proof of Theorem 1.10 implies that \(\{1_{E_{v^n}^{i, n}(v^n)}\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}\) also converge jointly to their continuum counterparts. By the law of large numbers, \(\text{Ber}_{M^n}[E_{\omega^n}(v^n)] - k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k} 1_{E_{v^n}^{i, n}(v^n)}\) converge to 0 in probability as \(k \to \infty\). This proves Theorem 1.4. See Section 4.2 for more details.

Now suppose we are in the setting of Theorem 1.3. By the same reasoning as in the previous paragraph, if \(v^n\) is sampled uniformly from \(\mathcal{V}(M^n)\), then \(\text{Ber}_{M^n}(E_{\omega^n}(v^n))\), \(\text{Ber}_{M^n}(E_{\omega^n}(v^n))\), and \(\text{Ber}_{M^n}(E_{\omega^n}(v^n))\) jointly converge to their continuum counterparts. This essentially gives the convergence of \(\mu_{\Delta, k}^n\) to \(\mu_{\Delta}\). A similar argument gives the convergence of \(\xi_{\Delta, k}^n\). For the metric \(d_{\Delta, k}^n\), let \((v^n, u^n)\) be a pair of vertices uniformly sampled from \(\mathcal{V}(M^n) \times \mathcal{V}(M^n)\). Then by the GHPU convergence of \(M^n\), \(d^n(v^n, u^n)\) converge to its continuum counterpart. Now the uniform convergence of \(d_{\Delta, k}^n\) follows from the continuity of \(d_{\Delta}\). This gives Theorem 1.3. See Section 4.1 for more details. Theorem 1.5 follows from an argument similar to Theorem 1.4 based of the law of large numbers. See Section 4.2.

The bulk of this paper (Sections 3, 5, and 6), as well as the bulk of the whole program, is to establish Theorem 1.10. We give an overview of its proof in Sections 1.3.2, 1.3.3, and 1.3.4.

### 1.3.2 Annealed scaling limit for one site percolation

The \(k = 1\) case of Theorem 1.10 is proved in our joint work with Gwynne.

**Theorem 1.11 (GHS19).** Theorem 1.10 holds when \(k = 1\).

The single interface variant of Theorem 1.11 was proved in GM17a, conditioning on the assumption that Theorem 1.9 holds. Based on this variant, Theorem 1.11 was proved in GHS19 via an iterative construction of CLE\(_6\) with chordal SLE\(_6\) (see Lemma 2.12 for this construction) and its discrete analog.

Theorem 1.11 is an example of an annealed scaling limit result for percolated triangulations, where the convergence is in the sense of GHPUL. In another paper of this program BHS18, we discovered, together with Bernardi, a bijection between lattice walks with steps in \(\{(0,1),(1,0),(-1,-1)\}\) and percolated type II triangulations. Many percolation observables are encoded nicely in this bijection. The two most relevant examples are the crossing events in Definition 1.1 along with the counting measure on self-intersection and mutual-intersection points of macroscopic loops in the loop ensemble. These points are called **pivotal points**. See Section 1.3.3.

The bijection in BHS18 is an example of a **mating-of-trees** bijection. Its continuum counterpart is an encoding of a CLE\(_6\) and an independent \(\sqrt{8/3}\)-LQG surface by a 2D Brownian motion. This encoding was introduced in a foundational paper by Duplantier, Miller, and Sheffield DMS14. See also BHS18 Section 6. Using this bijection and
the continuum theory in [DMS14], the scaling limit of many percolation observables were established in [BHS18], including those concerning crossing events and pivotal points. This type of scaling limit result is sometimes referred to as convergence in the mating-of-trees sense.

In [GHS19], it was proved that the GHPUL convergence in Theorem 1.11 holds jointly with the mating-of-trees convergence in [BHS18]. See Proposition 6.23 and (17) for consequences of such joint convergence.

The two works [BHS18] and [GHS19] give a rather complete annealed scaling limit result for percolation on triangulations. This was achieved by employing the full strength of the continuum theory of SLE$_{6}$ and CLE$_{6}$ coupled with $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG (including [DMS14,GM18] and [BHS18, Section 6]), as well as three powerful tools in the discrete: a labeled tree encoding of the graph metric in the spirit of Schaefer [Sch97] (see [AHS19]), a Markovian exploration of uniform triangulations called the peeling process (see [GM17a]), and the mating-of-trees bijection in [BHS18].

When attacking Theorem 1.10 for $k \geq 2$, the toolbox becomes quite limited. The main methodological innovation of this paper is to supply an approach for doing so. We will explain this approach in Sections 1.3.3 and 1.3.4.

### 1.3.3 Dynamical percolation on uniform triangulations

All the difficulties with proving Theorem 1.10 for general $k \in \mathbb{N}$ are present already in the $k = 2$ case; see Section 3. Therefore we focus on this case.

Our high level idea is the following. Let $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ be a subsequential limit of $(\mathcal{M}_i^n, \Upsilon_i^n)_{i=1,2}$, whose existence is guaranteed by Theorem 1.11. It suffices to show that $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ are independent. Suppose we have a dynamic $(\omega^n_t)_{t \geq 0}$ which is stationary conditioned on $\mathcal{M}_i^n$ and has one-time conditional marginal law Ber$_{\mathcal{M}_i^n}$. Moreover, suppose the process $(\mathcal{M}_i^n, \Gamma(\mathcal{M}_i^n, \omega^n_t))_{t \geq 0}$ has a GHPUL scaling limit whose one-time marginal law is given by $(\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{h}, \Gamma_1)$. We denote this process by $(\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{h}, \Gamma_t)_{t \geq 0}$. For $t > 0$, since $\omega^n_1$ and $\omega^n_2$ are completely independent while $\overline{\omega}^n_0$ and $\overline{\omega}^n_t$ may not be, the correlation between $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ should be no stronger than that of $\Gamma_0$ and $\Gamma_t$. If we further know that $(\Gamma_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is ergodic, then by sending $t \rightarrow \infty$ we must have that $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ are independent. See Section 3 for a precise version of this reasoning.

It remains to establish the existence of a dynamic as described in the previous paragraph. The most natural candidate is the following. Let $\mathcal{M}_i^n$ be as in Theorem 1.10 and let $\omega^n_i$ be sampled from Ber$_{\mathcal{M}_i^n}$. Given $(\mathcal{M}_i^n, \omega^n_i)$, put i.i.d. exponential clocks of rate $n^{-1/4} / \delta$ at each interior vertex. When the clock at $v$ rings, flip the color of $v$. For $t \geq 0$, let $\overline{\omega}^n_t$ be the site percolation at time $t$. We call $(\overline{\omega}^n_t)_{t \geq 0}$ a dynamical percolation on $\mathcal{M}_i^n$.

We set the rate $r_n = n^{-1/4}$ because we expect that under this rate, $(\mathcal{M}_i^n, \omega^n_i)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the property in the second paragraph, namely, the dynamic has an ergodic scaling limit. If $\mathcal{M}_i^n$ is replaced by $\delta \mathcal{P}$ for $\delta > 0$, then the same dynamic was studied by Garban, Pete, and Schramm [GPS13, GPS18a], and the existence of a scaling limit was established. However, their proof is hard to adapt to the random triangulation case since it relies on the fact that

---

5 An exponential clock of rate $r > 0$ is a clock which rings at a discrete set of times such that the time between two consecutive rings is given by independent exponential random variables with parameter $r$. In other words, the set of times at which the process rings has the law of a Poisson process on $\mathbb{R}^+$ of intensity $r$. 

---
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\( T \) is nicely embedded into \( \mathbb{C} \) (see GPS18a, Section 8 in particular). We expect that proving the aforementioned convergence of \((M^n, \omega^n)_{t \geq 0}\) is a technically challenging problem.

To get around this difficulty, we introduce a cutoff variant of \((\omega^n_0)_{t \geq 0}\). In the cutoff variant of the process, we only update vertices that cause macroscopic changes. Let us first quantify the notion of macroscopic change.

Let \( \omega^n \) be a site percolation on \( M^n \) with monochromatic blue boundary condition. Given a non-boundary cluster \( C \) of \( \omega^n \), let \( \partial C \) be the connected component of \( V(M^n) \setminus V(C) \) containing \( \partial M^n \). Let \( \overline{C} \) be the largest subgraph of \( M^n \) such that \( v \in V(C) \) if and only if \( v \notin \partial C \). For each \( \gamma \in \Gamma(M^n, \omega^n) \), let \( \text{reg}(\gamma) = \overline{C} \) where \( C \) is the cluster of \( \omega^n \) surround by \( \gamma \). We call \( \text{area}(\gamma) := \mu^n(\text{reg}(\gamma)) \) the area of \( \gamma \). For \( v \in V(M^n) \setminus V(\partial M^n) \), let \( \omega^n_v \) be obtained from \( \omega^n \) by flipping the color of \( v \), and let \( \mathcal{L}^n_v \) be the symmetric difference between \( \Gamma(M^n, \omega^n) \) and \( \Gamma(M^n, \omega^n_v) \). For \( \epsilon > 0 \), we say that \( v \) is an \( \epsilon \)-pivotal point of \( \omega^n \) if there are at least three loops in \( \mathcal{L}^n_v \) with area at least \( \epsilon \). Morally speaking, \( v \) is an \( \epsilon \)-pivotal point if flipping the color of \( v \) results in a macroscopic change of “size” at least \( \epsilon \).

We now consider the following modification of \((M^n, \omega^n_0)_{t \geq 0}\): when the clock of a vertex \( v \) rings at time \( t \), the color of \( v \) is flipped if and only if \( v \) is an \( \epsilon \)-pivotal point of \( \omega^n_0 \). We denote this modified dynamic by \((M^n, \omega^n_{\text{cutoff}})_{t \geq 0}\).

Let \( h \) be as in Theorem 1.10 and let \( \Gamma \) be a CLE\(_6\) on \( \mathbb{D} \) independent of \( h \). We can mimic the definition in the discrete to define the \( \epsilon \)-pivotal points of \((h, \Gamma)\) (see Definition 2.14). Let \( P_{\epsilon} \) be the set of \( \epsilon \)-pivotal points of \((h, \Gamma)\). Then \( \bigcup_{\epsilon > 0} P_{\epsilon} \) is simply the collection of all self-intersections and mutual intersections of loops in \( \Gamma \). We call points in \( \bigcup_{\epsilon > 0} P_{\epsilon} \) the pivotal points of \( \Gamma \). The analogue of color flipping in the continuum is merging and splitting of loops of \( \Gamma \); see Section 2.4.

In [BHS18], a measure \( \nu^\epsilon_{h, \Gamma} \) supported on the \( \epsilon \)-pivotal points of \((h, \Gamma)\), called the \( \sqrt{8/3} \)-LQG \( \epsilon \)-pivotal measure, was defined based on the theory of mating of trees [DMS14]. (See Definition 5.15 for a precise definition.) Let \( \nu^\epsilon_{piv, \Gamma} \) be \( n^{-1/4} \) times the counting measure on the \( \epsilon \)-pivotal points of \( \omega^n_0 \). As alluded to in Section 1.3.2, it was proved in [BHS18, GHS19] that for some constant \( c_p > 0 \),

\[
(M^n, \nu^\epsilon_{piv, \Gamma}(M^n, \omega^0_n)) \text{ converge in law to } (\mathbb{D}, (h, c_p \nu^\epsilon_{piv, \Gamma}, \Gamma))
\]

(2)

Here the convergence is for a variant of the GHPUL topology that takes into account the additional measure \( \nu^\epsilon_{piv} \).

The Markovian dynamic \((\omega^n_{t, \epsilon})_{t \geq 0}\) can be described as follows. Starting from the configuration at time \( t = 0 \), we wait for an exponential clock of rate \( \nu^\epsilon_{piv}(V(M^n)) \) to ring. Once the clock rings, a vertex \( v \) is chosen according to \( \nu^\epsilon_{piv} \) and the color of \( v \) is flipped. Then we iterate this procedure. In light of this description and (2), we can show that \((M^n, \Gamma(M^n, \omega^n_{t, \epsilon}))_{t \geq 0}\) has a GHPUL scaling limit whose one-time marginal law is given by \((\mathbb{D}, (h, c_p \nu^\epsilon_{piv, \Gamma}, \Gamma))\). We denote this process by \((\mathbb{D}, (h, \Gamma^\epsilon)_{t \geq 0}) \). For each \( \epsilon > 0 \), the process \((\Gamma^\epsilon)_{t \geq 0}\) is not ergodic. However, we will explain in Section 1.3.4 that

\[
(\Gamma^\epsilon_t)_{t \geq 0} \text{ converge to an ergodic process as } \epsilon \to 0.
\]

(3)

As we will see, (3) suffices to prove the \( k = 2 \) case of Theorem 1.10. Recall the setting of the second paragraph. The correlation between \( \Gamma_1 \) and \( \Gamma_2 \) should be no stronger than that of \( \Gamma^\epsilon_0 \) and \( \Gamma^\epsilon_t \) for each \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \( t > 0 \). First sending \( \epsilon \to 0 \) and then \( t \to \infty \) we conclude the proof. Again see Section 3 for how to make this reasoning rigorous.
1.3.4 Quantum pivotal measure and Liouville dynamical percolation

The proof of (3) is done in Sections 5 and 6, based on [HLLS18, HLS18, GHSS19].

The first key step is to achieve a good understanding of the measure \( \nu_{h, \Gamma}^{\epsilon} \). Recall \((\mathbb{D}, h, \Gamma)\) in (2) and the set \( \mathcal{P}_\epsilon \) of \( \epsilon \)-pivotal points of \((h, \Gamma)\) in Section 1.3.3. It is well-known that \( \mathcal{P}_\epsilon \) is a fractal of dimension \( d = 3/4 \) (see e.g. [SW01]). For \( r > 0 \), let \( m^r_\epsilon \) be \( r^{d-2} \) times Lebesgue measure restricted to the \( r \)-neighborhood of \( \mathcal{P}_\epsilon \). Then we claim that

as \( r \to 0 \), the measure \( m^r_\epsilon \) converge to a random Borel measure \( m_\epsilon \) supported on \( \mathcal{P}_\epsilon \). (4)

In [HLLS18], with the application to (4) in mind, we proved with Lawler and Li that (4) holds with \( \mathcal{P}_\epsilon \) replaced by the cut points of a planar Brownian motion. Now (4) follows from the connection between Brownian cut points and double points of SLE\(_6\). (See Proposition 5.33.) We call \( m_\epsilon \) the 3/4-dimensional occupation measure of \( \mathcal{P}_\epsilon \).

By (3), \( \nu_{h, \Gamma}^{\epsilon} \) is the scaling limit of \( \mu^n \) restricted to the discrete analog of \( \mathcal{P}_\epsilon \) under a proper renormalization. In light of the convergence of \( \mu^n \) to \( \mu_h \), intuitively speaking, \( \nu_{h, \Gamma}^{\epsilon} \) should be the measure \( \mu_h \) restricted to \( \mathcal{P}_\epsilon \) under a proper renormalization. Namely, \( \nu_{h, \Gamma}^{\epsilon} \) should be the LQG analog of the occupation measure of \( \mathcal{P}_\epsilon \) on the \( \sqrt{8/3} \)-LQG surface prescribed by \( h \). Since \( \mathcal{P}_\epsilon \) has dimension 3/4, the Knizhnik-Polyakov-Zamolodchikov (KPZ) relation (see e.g. [DS11]) suggests that

\[
\nu_{h, \Gamma}^{\epsilon} = ce^{h/\sqrt{\epsilon}} m_\epsilon \quad \text{for a deterministic constant } c, \tag{5}
\]

where \( e^{h/\sqrt{\epsilon}} m_\epsilon \) is the Gaussian multiplicative chaos of \( h \) over the base measure \( m_\epsilon \), which can be defined by a regularization procedure. (See Definition 5.2.) The rigorous proof of (5) is given in Section 5. Although the argument is quite technical, the underlying idea is simply that both \( \nu_{h, \Gamma}^{\epsilon} \) and \( e^{h/\sqrt{\epsilon}} m_\epsilon \) are canonical in sense that they satisfy a few natural properties that uniquely determine the measure. (See Lemma 5.36 for an illustration of this idea.)

We will use (5) to approximate the process \((\Gamma_t)_{t \geq 0}\) in (3) by a variant of dynamical percolation on the triangular lattice \( \mathbb{T} \). This enables us to use powerful tools that are only available for site percolation on \( \mathbb{T} \), including various scaling limit results and the sharp noise sensitivity established in [GPS10].

Fix \( \delta > 0 \), and suppose \( \mathbb{D}_\delta \) is the lattice approximation of \( \mathbb{D} \) via \( \delta \mathbb{T} \). Let \( \omega^\delta \) be sampled from \( \text{Ber}_{\delta^3} \) independently of \( h \). In [GPS13], it was proved that the counting measure on the pivotal points of \( \omega^\delta \) under proper rescaling converge to a random measure. In [HLS18], we proved with Li that this limiting measure is given by the 3/4-dimensional occupation measure of the continuum pivotal points of the limiting CLE\(_6\). In light of (5), we can consider a variant of the dynamical percolation on \( \mathbb{D}_\delta \), where the rate of the exponential clock at a vertex \( v \) is proportional to \( (a \text{ regularized version of } e^{h(v)/\sqrt{\delta}} \). This is the so-called discrete Liouville dynamical percolation (LDP) driven by \( e^{h/\sqrt{\delta}} \) introduced by Garban, Sepúlveda, and us in [GHSS19]. Now we can define an \( \epsilon \)-cutoff dynamic of the discrete LDP on the triangular lattice by mimicking the definition of \( (M^n, \omega^\epsilon_n)_{n \geq 0} \) in Section 1.3.3 and then use (5) to argue that the loop ensemble evolution of this cutoff dynamic converge to the process \((\Gamma_t)_{t \geq 0}\) in (3).

Now to conclude the proof of (3), we just need to show that for the LDP driven by \( e^{h/\sqrt{\epsilon}} \), as \( \epsilon \to 0 \), the family of \( \epsilon \)-cutoff dynamics stabilize to a limiting process which is ergodic. The paper [GHSS19] achieved this goal modulo two differences. First, following [GPS13, GPS18a],...
in [GHSS19] we work under a different cutoff on the pivotal points which is based on alternating four arm events. (See the notion of \( \rho \)-important points in Section 6.4.1.) Compared to the \( \varepsilon \)-pivotal points, this cutoff is not so natural in the context of random planar maps because it relies on the ambient space. However, it is convenient for fine multi-scale analysis on \( \mathbb{T} \), which gives the desired stability when removing the cutoff. The limiting process is called the continuum Liouville dynamical percolation driven by \( e^{h/\sqrt{6}} \). In Section 6 we study the relation between the two cutoffs and show that \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} (\Gamma_{\varepsilon})_{t \geq 0} \) exists and equals the limit of the cutoff dynamic defined using \( \rho \)-important points (see Figure 13).

The second difference from [GHSS19] is that there the planar percolation is not encoded by the loop ensemble, but rather by crossing information for all topological rectangles in the plane. The latter is called the quad-crossing configuration. Similarly as above, the quad crossing configuration is not so natural in the context of random planar maps due to its dependence on the ambient space. On the other hand, the quad crossing perspective is crucial in our proof of ergodicity in [GHSS19], which relies on Fourier analysis of Boolean functions following [GPS10]. This difference in observable will not be a problem if we know that the CLE\(_6\) and the scaling limit of the quad-crossing configuration of \( \omega^\delta \) determine each other. This has long been conjectured to be true (see [SS11]). The fact that the CLE\(_6\) determines quad-crossing configuration is essentially proved in [CN06], as pointed out in [GPS13]. We establish measurability in the reverse direction in this paper; see Theorem 6.8.

### 1.3.5 Structure of this paper

In Section 2 we provide necessary background on \( \sqrt{8/3} \)-LQG, SLE\(_6\), CLE\(_6\), and the topological spaces relevant for the convergence results. In Section 3 we prove Theorem 1.10 assuming two lemmas which are proved in Section 6. In Section 4 we conclude the proof of Theorems 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5 using Theorem 1.10. In Section 5 we establish (5) via an extensive analysis of the CLE\(_6\) pivotal points. In Section 6 we establish the two aforementioned lemmas using Liouville dynamical percolation. We advise the reader to first read Sections 2, 3, and 4 without going into the details of the more technical Sections 5 and 6.

### 1.4 Related works and outlook

Theorem 1.3 solves a special case of the aforementioned conjecture that Liouville quantum gravity describes the scaling limit of random planar maps under discrete conformal embeddings. The general version of the conjecture can be formulated as follows. For the ease of discussion, assume that there are \( m_1 \) different ways to sample a random planar map of a given size. The map can be required to be a triangulation, quadrangulations, simple map, etc., and the probability measure can be uniform (like in our paper) or nonuniform. For example, we can reweight the uniform distribution by the partition function of a statistical mechanics model such as the uniform spanning tree (UST), the Ising model, or the Fortuin-Kasteleyn (FK) random cluster model.

We also assume that there are \( m_2 \) different ways to embed a planar map into a domain in \( \mathbb{C} \). Besides the Cardy embedding considered in this paper and the aforementioned circle packing and the Tutte embedding, one can also consider the square tiling and the embedding obtained by applying the uniformization theorem to the planar map viewed as a piecewise
smooth 2D Riemannian manifold. See the paragraph below for even more examples. The general conjecture predicts convergence of random planar maps under conformal embedding to $\gamma$-LQG in each of the $m_1 m_2$ situations obtained by specifying the law of the random planar map and the embedding method, where the value of $\gamma$ depends on the law of the planar map. For example, uniformly sampled planar maps give $\gamma = \sqrt{8/3}$. Consider a statistical mechanics model on a planar map whose partition function is approximately $(\det \Delta)^{-c/2}$, where $\det \Delta$ represents the determinant of the Laplacian of the planar map and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ is the so-called central charge of the model. Suppose our random planar map is sampled such that the probability of sampling a particular map is proportional to the partition function of the statistical mechanics model on the planar map. Choose $\gamma \in (0, 2)$ such that $c = 25 - 6(2/\gamma + \gamma/2)^2$. Then the scaling limit of the random planar map is conjecturally given by $\gamma$-LQG. For example, the UST has central change $c = -2$, and therefore the scaling limit of UST weighted random planar maps is $\sqrt{2}$-LQG. For the Ising model, we have $c = 1/2$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{3}$. Our paper is the first work which solves one version of this conjecture. We remark that convergence to LQG under a conformal embedding (namely, the Tutte embedding) has been established earlier for a large class of random planar maps obtained from coarse-graining an LQG surface, e.g. the so-called mated-CRT map [GMS17b] and the Poisson Voronoi tessellation of the Brownian disk [GMS18b], except that the convergence established there is only convergence of the vertex counting measures, not of both the measures and the graph metric.

The Cardy embedding is a representative for a class of embeddings which are defined using observables of statistical physics models on planar maps. The Tutte embedding is another such example, where the model is simple random walk and the observables are given by the harmonic measure. One can define natural embeddings of planar maps in other universality classes by using observables of other statistical physics models. For example, in the case of the FK random cluster model one can use properties of the FK loops to define an embedding similarly to the case of percolation. For a UST weighted map with sphere topology one can first send three uniformly sampled vertices $v_1, v_2,$ and $v_3$ to $0, 1,$ and $\infty$, respectively, and then determine the position in $\mathbb{C}$ of an arbitrary vertex $w$ by considering the topology of the tree branches connecting $w, v_1, v_2,$ and $v_3$. The $s$-embedding recently introduced for the Ising model in [Che17] is of a similar flavor as these embeddings. In light of this, the “number” $m_2$ of possible discrete conformal embeddings is quite large.

Using the aforementioned $m_1$ random planar map models and $m_2$ discrete conformal embeddings, we obtain $m_1 m_2$ random environments in which we can study a statistical physics model, such as random walk or percolation. We conjecture the following universality. If the random process converges to a conformally invariant process on a regular lattice, then the same convergence holds for the random process in one of these $m_1 m_2$ random environments, in a quenched sense. Our results in Section 1.2.2 are examples of this type of convergence where the random process is site percolation, while the random environment is provided by the uniform triangulation under the Cardy embedding. As another example, we expect that since random walk on regular lattices converge to planar Brownian motion, the random walk in one of these $m_1 m_2$ environments converge to planar Brownian motion in a quenched sense. In total, we have formulated $m_1 m_2 m_3$ conjectural quenched scaling limit results. Our results in Section 1.2.2 is the only place where this conjecture has been verified for natural combinatorial random planar maps. The quenched scaling limit of random walk has been
established in [GMS18a] for a large class of random planar maps obtained by coarse gaining LQG.

It may be possible to use the approach introduced in this paper to prove the conjectures above when the random planar map is weighted by a statistical mechanical model and the discrete conformal embedding is defined using observables of the same model. In this case, if one can establish a variant of Theorem 1.10 then one can prove convergence of the planar map under conformal embedding. Note that in our case, uniform planar maps can be thought of as percolation weighted planar maps and the Cardy embedding is defined via percolation observables. At a conceptual level, our dynamical approach should still work in the more general setting. However, carrying out this approach beyond the setting of our current paper is a challenge. In particular, we use the metric convergence of uniform triangulations to the Brownian disk and a sharp mixing property for the scaling limit of dynamical percolation on the planar map. Both of these ingredients are currently missing for other planar maps and statistical physics models, each of which is a major open question in their own sake.

Convergence of model-decorated random planar maps to LQG has been established for a much more general class of planar map models in the so-called peanosphere sense. This topology of convergence is based on the mating-of-trees framework of [DMS14]. In the discrete, a number of mating-of-trees type bijections have been discovered, similar in spirit as the one we discovered with Bernardi [BHS18]. With such kind of bijections and the mating-of-trees framework for LQG coupled with SLE/CLE, convergence in the peanosphere sense means convergence to Brownian motion of the random walk encoding the decorated map. See [She16b,GKMW18,KMSW19], and see [GMS17a,GST5,GST7,GHS16,LSW17,BHS18] for stronger variants of peanosphere convergence. Here we point out that this convergence does not concern the metric or conformal structure of the map. Moreover, it is an annealed instead of quenched convergence result if we view it as a convergence result for a random process in a random environment.

Dynamical percolation is an important tool in the current paper, and we prove a weak notion of convergence of dynamical percolation on the random planar map to Liouville dynamical percolation; namely, we prove convergence of the variant of the process where only $\varepsilon$-pivotal points change color. An interesting open problem is to prove convergence of true dynamical percolation on the random planar map to Liouville dynamical percolation. One can also attempt to establish similar scaling limit results for other related models, such as the minimal spanning tree, invasion percolation, and near-critical percolation. See [GPS18a,GPS18b] for scaling limit of results for these models on the triangular lattice.
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2 Preliminaries

2.1 Basic notations

Sets. Let $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \ldots \}$ be the set of positive integers. Let $\mathbb{C}$ be the complex plane. Let $\mathbb{R}_+ = (0, \infty)$ (resp., $\mathbb{R}_- = (-\infty, 0)$) be the set of positive (resp., negative) real numbers. Let $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$, $\mathbb{H} = \{z : \text{Re} \ z > 0\}$, and $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{R} \times (0, \pi)$.

Domains. A (planar) domain is a connected subset of $\mathbb{C}$. Given a domain $D$, let $\partial D$ denote the set of prime ends of $D$. If $\partial D$ is a simple closed curve, we call $D$ a Jordan domain. Given a simply connected domain $D$, we say $D$ is $C^0$ if any conformal map $\phi : \mathbb{D} \to D$ can be extended continuously to $\partial \mathbb{D}$. (Here, if $D$ is unbounded, we use the spherical metric on $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$). If $D$ is $C^0$ and the continuous extension of $\phi$ is smooth except for finitely many points, we say that $D$ is piecewise smooth. A Jordan domain $D$ is called a dyadic polygon if $\partial D$ is contained in $\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{-k} \mathbb{Z}^2$, where $2^{-k} \mathbb{Z}^2 := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 2^k x \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ or } 2^k y \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Given two domains $D_1, D_2 \subset \mathbb{C}$ we write $D_1 \Subset D_2$ if $D_1 \cup \partial D_1 \subset D_2$.

Lattice. Let $\mathbb{T}$ denote the regular triangular lattice where each face is an equilateral triangle and the points $(0,0), (1,0)$ belong to $\mathbb{T}$. For $\delta > 0$, let $\delta \mathbb{T}$ be $\mathbb{T}$ rescaled by $\delta$. A Jordan domain $D$ is called a $\delta$-polygon if $\partial D$ lies on $\delta \mathbb{T}$. If $D$ is a general Jordan domain, let $D^\delta$ be the largest $\delta$-polygon whose set of inner vertices (namely, vertices on $\delta \mathbb{T}$ that are inside the $\delta$-polygon) is contained in $D$ and forms a connected set on $\delta \mathbb{T}$.

Including all vertices and edges in $D^\delta \cap \delta \mathbb{T}$, we obtain a triangulation of a polygon, which we call the $\delta$-approximation of $D$ and still denote by $D^\delta$.

Measures. Given measurable spaces $E, F$, a measure $\mu$ on $E$ and a measurable map $f : E \to F$, the pushforward of $\mu$ under $f$ is denoted by $f_\# \mu$. Let $\rho$ be a measurable nonnegative function on $E$. We let $\rho \mu$ denote the measure whose Radon-Nikodym with respect to $\mu$ is $\rho$.

Random variables. Given two random variables $X$ and $Y$, we write $X \overset{d}{=} Y$ if $X$ and $Y$ have the same law. If $Z$ and $W$ are two random variables on the same probability space, we say that $Z$ (almost surely) determines $W$ if and only if there exists a random variable $W'$ measurable with respect to the $\sigma$-algebra generated by $Z$ such that $W = W'$ almost surely.

2.2 Topological preliminaries

In this section we define the topologies used in Theorems 1.9 and 1.10, following [GHS19]. We start by defining the GHPU topology in Theorem 1.9. Given a metric space $(X, d)$, for two closed sets $E_1, E_2 \subset X$, their Hausdorff distance is given by

$$d_H^d(E_1, E_2) := \max\{\sup_{x \in E_1} \inf_{y \in E_2} d(x, y), \sup_{y \in E_2} \inf_{x \in E_1} d(x, y)\}.$$  

For two finite Borel measures $\mu_1, \mu_2$ on $X$, their Prokhorov distance is given by

$$d_P^d(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \inf\{\epsilon > 0 : \mu_1(A) \leq \mu_2(A) + \epsilon \text{ and } \mu_2(A) < \mu_1(A) + \epsilon \text{ for all closed set } A \subset X\}.$$  

In case of a draw, we choose $D^\delta$ arbitrarily from the set of largest $\delta$-polygons, but note that $D^\delta$ will be uniquely determined for all sufficiently small $\delta$. 
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Let $C_0(\mathbb{R}, X)$ be the space of continuous curves $\xi: \mathbb{R} \to X$ which extend continuously to the extended real line $[-\infty, \infty]$, i.e., the limits $\lim_{t \to +\infty} \xi(t)$ and $\lim_{t \to -\infty} \xi(t)$ exist. The uniform distance between $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in C_0(\mathbb{R}, X)$ is given by

$$d^U_d(\xi_1, \xi_2) := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} d(\xi_1(t), \xi_2(t)).$$

For a finite interval $[a, b]$, we can view a curve $\xi: [a, b] \to X$ as an element of $C_0(\mathbb{R}, X)$ by defining $\xi(t) = \xi(a)$ for $t < a$ and $\xi(t) = \xi(b)$ for $t > b$.

Let $M^{\text{GHPU}}$ be the set of quadruples $\mathfrak{X} = (X, d, \mu, \xi)$ where $(X, d)$ is a compact metric space, $\mu$ is a finite Borel measure on $X$, and $\xi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}, X)$. If we are given elements $\mathfrak{X}^1 = (X^1, d^1, \mu^1, \xi^1)$ and $\mathfrak{X}^2 = (X^2, d^2, \mu^2, \xi^2)$ of $M^{\text{GHPU}}$ and isometric embeddings $i^1: (X^1, d^1) \to (W, D)$ and $i^2: (X^2, d^2) \to (W, D)$ for some metric space $(W, D)$, we define the GHPU distortion of $(i^1, i^2)$ by

$$\text{Dis}^{\text{GHPU}}_{\mathfrak{X}^1, \mathfrak{X}^2}(W, D, i^1, i^2) := d^H_D(i^1(1), i^2(1)) + d^P_D((i^1)_*\mu^1, (i^2)_*\mu^2) + d^U_d(i^1 \circ \xi^1, i^2 \circ \xi^2).$$

(6)

The Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov-Uniform distance between $\mathfrak{X}^1$ and $\mathfrak{X}^2$ is given by

$$d^{\text{GHPU}}(\mathfrak{X}^1, \mathfrak{X}^2) = \inf_{(W, D), i^1, i^2} \text{Dis}^{\text{GHPU}}_{\mathfrak{X}^1, \mathfrak{X}^2}(W, D, i^1, i^2),$$

(7)

where the infimum is over all compact metric spaces $(W, D)$ and isometric embeddings $i^1: X^1 \to W$ and $i^2: X^2 \to W$. By GM17b, $d^{\text{GHPU}}$ is a complete separable metric on $M^{\text{GHPU}}$ provided we identify any two elements of $M^{\text{GHPU}}$ which differ by a measure- and curve-preserving isometry.

Given a graph $G$, identify each edge of $G$ with a copy of the unit interval $[0, 1]$. We define a metric $d^G_G$ on $G$ by requiring that this identification is an isometric embedding of $[0, 1]$ into $(G, d_G, \mu_G)$. Let $\mu_G$ denote the counting measure on the vertex set of $G$. For a discrete interval $[a, b]_Z := [a, b] \cap \mathbb{Z}$, a function $\rho: [a, b]_Z \to \mathcal{E}(G)$ is called an edge path if $\rho(i)$ and $\rho(i + 1)$ share an endpoint for each $i \in [a, b - 1]_Z$. We can extend an edge path $\rho$ from $[a, b]_Z$ to $[a - 1, b]$ in such a way that $\rho$ is continuous and $\rho([i - 1, i])$ lies on the edge $\rho(i)$. Note that there are multiple ways to extend $\rho$, but any two different extensions result in curves with uniform distance at most 1.

Recall the Boltzmann triangulation $M^n$ in Theorem [1.9] whose boundary length $\ell^n$ satisfies $(3n)^{-1/2} \ell^n \to 1$. Then $\partial M^n$ can be viewed as an edge path $\beta^n$ tracing the boundary clockwise starting and ending at the root edge. Set

$$d^n := (3n/4)^{-1/4} d^G_G, \quad \mu^n := (2n)^{-1} \mu_G, \quad \text{and} \quad \xi^n(t) := \beta^n(t \ell^n) \text{ for } t \in [0, 1].$$

(8)

Then $M^n := (M^n, d^n, \mu^n, \xi^n)$ is a random variable in $M^{\text{GHPU}}$. Now the precise meaning of Theorem [1.9] becomes clear. It states that $M^n$ converge in law to a random variable $BD_1$ in

\footnote{In contrast to some other papers [AHS19, GHS19], we orient $\partial M^n$ clockwise because in Theorem [1.11] the percolation has monochromatic blue boundary condition. We want to be consistent with the orientation induced by the percolation where blue color is on the right-hand side. Also see Section [2.3] where we require the domain to have clockwise oriented boundary when the CLE$_6$ has monochromatic blue boundary condition. Note that the law of $(M^n, d^n, \mu^n, \xi^n)$ in $M^{\text{GHPU}}$ is unchanged if we swap the orientation of $\partial M^n$.}
the GHPU topology. A random variable with the law of BD is called a **free Brownian disk with unit perimeter**. We refer to [BM17] for an explicit construction of BD using the Brownian snake. For the purpose of this paper, we can take Theorem 1.9 as our definition of BD1.

Now we define the GHPU topology used in Theorem 1.10. Given a metric space \((X, d)\), an **unrooted oriented loop** on \(X\) is a continuous map from the circle to \(X\) identified up to reparametrization by orientation-preserving homeomorphisms of the circle. Define the pseudo-distance between two continuous maps from the circle \(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}\) to \(X\) by

\[
d^u_d(\ell, \ell') = \inf \sup_{\psi \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} d(\ell(t), \ell'(\psi(t))),
\]

where the infimum is taken over all orientation-preserving homeomorphisms \(\psi : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}\). Then \(d^u_d\) induces a complete metric, which we still denote by \(d^u_d\), on unrooted oriented loops. The space of parametrized loops is separable with respect to \(d^u_d\).

A closed set of unrooted oriented loops on \(X\) with respect to the \(d^u_d\)-metric is called a **loop ensemble** on \(X\). We let \(L(X)\) be the space of loop ensembles on \(X\) equipped with the Hausdorff metric

\[
d^H_L(c, c') = \max\{d^L_0(c, c'), d^L_0(c', c)\},
\]

where

\[
d^L_0(c, c') = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : \forall \ell \in c, \exists \ell' \in c' \text{ such that } d^X_\varepsilon(\ell, \ell') \leq \varepsilon\}.
\]

Let \(\mathcal{M}^{\text{GHPUL}}\) be the set of 5-tuples \(\mathbf{x} = (X, d, \mu, \eta, c)\) where \((X, d)\) is a compact metric space, \(\mu\) is a finite Borel measure on \(X\), \(\eta \in C_0(\mathbb{R}, X)\), and \(c \in \mathcal{L}(X)\). If we are given elements \(\mathbf{x}^1 = (X^1, d^1, \mu^1, \eta^1, c^1)\) and \(\mathbf{x}^2 = (X^2, d^2, \mu^2, \eta^2, c^2)\) in \(\mathcal{M}^{\text{GHPUL}}\) and isometric embeddings \(i^1 : (X^1, d^1) \to (W, D)\) and \(i^2 : (X^2, d^2) \to (W, D)\) for some metric space \((W, D)\), we define the \(\text{GHPU-Loop (GHPUL) distortion}\) of \((i^1, i^2)\) by

\[
\text{Dis}_{\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{x}^2}^{\text{GHPUL}}(W, D, i^1, i^2) := \text{Dis}_{\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{x}^2}^{\text{GHPU}}(W, D, i^1, i^2) + d^L_d(i^1(c^1), i^2(c^2)),
\]

where \(\text{Dis}_{\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{x}^2}^{\text{GHPU}}(\cdot)\) is the GHPU distortion as defined in (6).

The \(\text{GHPU-Loop (GHPUL) distance}\) between \(\mathbf{x}^1\) and \(\mathbf{x}^2\) is given by

\[
d^{\text{GHPUL}}(\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{x}^2) = \inf_{(W, D), i^1, i^2} \text{Dis}_{\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{x}^2}^{\text{GHPUL}}(W, D, i^1, i^2),
\]

where the infimum is over all compact metric spaces \((W, D)\) and isometric embeddings \(i^1 : X^1 \to W\) and \(i^2 : X^2 \to W\). It can be proved following e.g. [GM17b, Proposition 1.3] that the space \((\mathcal{M}^{\text{GHPUL}}, d^{\text{GHPUL}})\) is a complete separable metric space.

Recall \(\mathcal{M}^n\) in Theorem 1.10. Let \(\omega^n\) be sampled from \(\text{Ber}_{\mathcal{M}^n}\) with monochromatic blue boundary condition and let \(\Upsilon^n := \Gamma(\mathcal{M}^n, \omega^n)\) be the loop ensemble of \(\omega^n\) defined in Section 1.2.2. Given a loop \(\gamma \in \Upsilon^n\), the edges traversed by \(\gamma\) form an edge path. Therefore \(\gamma\) can be viewed as an unrooted oriented loop on \(\mathcal{M}^n\). This way, \(\Upsilon^n\) can be viewed as an element in \(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}^n)\) and \((\mathcal{M}^n, d^n, \mu^n, \xi^n, \Upsilon^n)\) is a random variable in \(\mathcal{M}^{\text{GHPUL}}\). We write \((\mathcal{M}^n, d^n, \mu^n, \xi^n, \Upsilon^n)\) as \((\mathcal{M}^n, \Upsilon^n)\) for simplicity. In Theorem 1.10 \(\{\mathcal{M}^n, \Upsilon^n\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}\) should be understood as a sequence of identically distributed random variables in \(\mathcal{M}^{\text{GHPUL}}\) with the law of \((\mathcal{M}^n, \Upsilon^n)\).
2.3 $\sqrt{8/3}$-Liouville quantum gravity

Let us recall the definition of the Gaussian free field (GFF). Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be a domain and let $h$ be a random distribution on $D$. We call $h$ a zero-boundary GFF on $D$ if for any compactly supported smooth function $f : D \to \mathbb{R}$, $(h, f)$ is a centered Gaussian with variance $\iint f(x)G_D(x, y)f(y)\,d^2x\,d^2y$, where $G_D(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Green’s function on $D$ with Dirichlet boundary condition. We call $h$ a free-boundary GFF on $D$ if for any smooth function $g$ on $D$ with $\int_D g(x)\,d^2x = 0$, $(h, g)$ is a centered Gaussian with variance $\iint f(x)G_N(x, y)f(y)\,d^2x\,d^2y$, where $G_N(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Green’s function on $D$ with Neumann boundary condition. The law of the zero-boundary GFF is unique while the law of free-boundary GFF is only unique up to additive constant. The zero-boundary GFF and the free-boundary GFF are not pointwise defined functions, but almost surely belong to the Sobolev space $H^{-1}(D)$. We refer to [She07, She16a, DMS14] for more details on the GFF.

Let $\mathcal{D}H = \{(D, h) : D \subseteq \mathbb{C} \text{ is a simply connected } \mathcal{C}^0 \text{ domain, } h \text{ is a distribution on } D\}$. Fix $\gamma \in (0, 2)$. Given $(D, h), (\tilde{D}, \tilde{h}) \in \mathcal{D}H$, let $\phi : \tilde{D} \to D$ be a conformal map. We write

\[(D, h) \overset{\gamma}{\sim} (\tilde{D}, \tilde{h}) \text{ if and only if } \tilde{h} = h \circ \phi + Q \log |\phi'| \text{ for } Q := 2/\gamma + \gamma/2.\]

(11)

We write $(D, h) \sim \gamma (\tilde{D}, \tilde{h})$ if and only if there exists a conformal map $\phi : \tilde{D} \to D$ such that $(D, h) \overset{\gamma}{\sim} (\tilde{D}, \tilde{h})$. Then $\sim \gamma$ defines an equivalence relation on $\mathcal{D}H$. Let $\mathcal{D}H_{\gamma} := \mathcal{D}H/\sim \gamma$. By the Riemann mapping theorem, $\mathcal{D}H_{\gamma}$ is in bijection with distributions on $\mathbb{H}$ if we identify distributions $h$ and $\tilde{h}$ on $\mathbb{H}$ satisfying $(\mathbb{H}, h) \sim \gamma (\mathbb{H}, \tilde{h})$. This allows us to define a topology on $\mathcal{D}H_{\gamma}$ from the natural topology of distributions on $\mathbb{H}$ so that we can consider the Borel $\sigma$-algebra and probability measures on $\mathcal{D}H_{\gamma}$. An element in $\mathcal{D}H_{\gamma}$ is called a generalized surface with disk topology. A random variable taking values in $\mathcal{D}H_{\gamma}$ is called a $\gamma$-Liouville quantum gravity surface (γ-LQG surface). More generally, we can define generalized surfaces decorated with additional structures, such as metrics, measures, points, and curves.

**Definition 2.1.** For $i = 1, 2$, let $(D^i, h^i) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}H}$. Let $d^i$, $\mu^i$, $x^i$, and $\eta^i$ be a metric, a measure, a point, and a curve on $D \cup \partial D$, respectively. Let $\phi : D^2 \to D^1$ be a conformal map. If $(D^1, h^1) \overset{\gamma}{\sim} (D^2, h^2)$, $d^2(\cdot, \cdot) = d^1(\phi(\cdot), \phi(\cdot))$, $\mu^1 = \phi_* \mu^2$, $x^1 = \phi(x^2)$, and $\eta^1 = \phi \circ \eta^2$, we write $(D^1, h^1, d^1, \mu^1, x^1, \eta^1) \overset{\gamma}{\sim} (D^2, h^2, d^2, \mu^2, x^2, \eta^2)$. If there are multiple metrics, measures, points and/or curves, define $\overset{\gamma}{\sim}$ similarly. We define the equivalence relation $\sim \gamma$ for these tuples in the same way as we defined $(D, h) \sim \gamma (\tilde{D}, \tilde{h})$.

**Convention 2.2.** In this paper we focus on $\gamma = \sqrt{8/3}$. Accordingly, $Q = 5/\sqrt{6}$ in (11). We will simply write $\mathcal{D}H$, $\overset{\gamma}{\sim}$, and $\sim$ instead of $\mathcal{D}H_{\sqrt{8/3}}$, $\overset{\sqrt{8/3}}{\sim}$, and $\overset{\sqrt{8/3}}{\sim}$, respectively. In particular, if $S$ is an element in $\overline{\mathcal{D}H}$, possibly with decorations as in Definition 2.1, then we write its equivalence class under $\sim$ as $S/\sim$.

Next we introduce a general class of random distributions which covers all the distributions considered in this paper (see Remark 2.6).

**Definition 2.3** (Free Liouville field). A random distribution $\hat{h}$ on $\mathbb{H}$ is called a free Liouville field on $\mathbb{H}$ if there exists a pair $(h', g)$ such that
1. $h'$ is a free-boundary GFF on $\mathbb{H}$, $g$ is a random continuous function on $\mathbb{H} \cup \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \mathbb{R}_- = \mathbb{H} \cup \partial \mathbb{H} \setminus \{0\}$, and

2. the law of $\hat{h}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of $h' + g|_\mathbb{H}$.

Given a simply connected domain $D$, a random distribution $h$ on $D$ is called a free Liouville field on $D$ if there exists a free Liouville field $\hat{h}$ on $\mathbb{H}$ such that $(D, h) \sim (\mathbb{H}, \hat{h})$.

Let $D$ be a simply connected $C^\infty$ domain and let $h$ be a free Liouville field on $D$. For $\gamma \in (0, 2)$, one can define the $\gamma$-LQG area measure $\mu_h := e^{\gamma h} d^2 z$ by a regularization procedure [DS11] (also see Definition 5.2). Let $\phi : \mathbb{H} \to D$ be a conformal map and $\tilde{h}$ be such that $(D, h) \overset{\mathcal{D}}{\sim} (\mathbb{H}, \tilde{h})$. One can similarly define a nontrivial measure $\xi_h := e^{\gamma \tilde{h}(z)/2} d z$ on $\partial \mathbb{H}$ and then define $\xi_h := \phi^{-1}_* \xi_{\tilde{h}}$. By [DS11], the definition of $\xi_h$ does a.s. not depend on the choice of $\phi$ (see also [SW16]). We call $\xi_h$ the $\gamma$-LQG boundary measure of $(D, h)$.

By [MS15a, MS16a], a metric $d_h$ may be defined on $D \cup \partial D$ using a growth process called the quantum Loewner evolution (QLE). Recently, [GM19] constructed $d_h$ via a more direct regularization procedure. We list two important properties of $(d_h, \mu_h, \xi_h)$:

\begin{align*}
\mu_{h+c} &= e^{\gamma c} \mu_h, \quad \xi_{h+c} = e^{\gamma c/2} \xi_h, \quad \text{and} \quad d_{h+c} = e^{\gamma c/4} d_h \quad \text{a.s. } \forall c \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (12) \\
(\mathbb{H}, \tilde{h}, d_{\tilde{h}}, \mu_{\tilde{h}}, \xi_{\tilde{h}}) &\overset{\mathcal{D}}{\sim} (D, h, d_h, \mu_h, \xi_h) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (13)
\end{align*}

Now we introduce the main $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG surface that will be considered in this paper. It will be most convenient to introduce it on the horizontal strip $S = \mathbb{R} \times (0, \pi)$. Let $h$ be a free-boundary GFF on $S$. Then $h$ can uniquely written as $h = h^c + h^\ell$, where $h^c$ is constant on vertical lines of the form $u + [0, i \pi]$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}$, and $h^\ell$ has mean zero on all such vertical lines. Since the law of the free-boundary GFF is unique modulo an additive constant, the law of $h^\ell$ does not depend on the choice of additive constant for $h$, and we call $h^\ell$ the lateral component of the free-boundary GFF on $S$.

**Definition 2.4.** Let $\gamma = \sqrt{8/3}$, $Q = 5/\sqrt{6}$, and $a = Q - \gamma = 1/\sqrt{6}$. Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be such that $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ has the law of $B_{2t} - at$, where $B_t$ is a standard Brownian motion. Furthermore, $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is independent of $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and has the law of $B_{2t} - at$ conditioned on being negative. Let $h^\ell(t + si) = X_t$ for each $t + si \in S$. Let $h^2$ be a random distribution on $S$ independent of $X_t$, which has the law of the lateral component of the free-boundary GFF on $S$. Let $h^s = h^1 + h^2$ and $M := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} X_t$. Let $h^d$ be a random distribution on $S$, whose law is given by

\begin{equation}
|h^s| - 2\gamma^{-1} \log \xi_{h^s}(\partial S) \quad \text{rewighted by } e^{-\gamma M^4/4} \xi_{h^s}(\partial S)^{1/2}.
\end{equation}

A $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG surface with the law of $(S, h^d, +\infty)/\sim$ is called a unit boundary length $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG disk (with one boundary marked point).

**Remark 2.5** (Definitions of $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG disk). Various equivalent definitions of the unit boundary length $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG disk are given in [DMS14, MS15b]. We choose to work with Definition 2.4 because the field is described explicitly. Here we show the equivalence of Definition 2.4 and the construction in [DMS14, Section 4.5]. In the notations of Definition 2.5, the construction in [DMS14] can be described as follows. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be the probability measure
given by \( h^e \) before the reweighting in (14) and let \( \overline{h}^e := h^e - M \). Let \( \overline{\partial} := \xi_{\overline{\partial}}(\partial S) \) so that \( e^{-M/2} \xi_{h^e}(\partial S) = \overline{\partial} \). Let the pair \((e^*, \overline{h}^e)\) be sampled from the product measure \( 1_{x > 0} x^{-3/2} dx \otimes \mathbb{P}^e \). Then the conditional law of \((S, \overline{h}^e + 2\gamma^{-1} \log e^*, +\infty)\) given the event \( e^* \overline{\partial} = 1 \) is the unit boundary \( \sqrt{8/3}\)-LQG disk as defined in [DMS14].

To see the equivalence with Definition [2.4], we first note that when \( e^* \overline{\partial} = 1 \), we have \( \overline{h}^e + 2\gamma^{-1} \log e^* = \overline{h}^e - 2\gamma^{-1} \log \xi_{h^e}(\partial S) \). Moreover, for each \( \varepsilon > 0 \), by Bayes’ rule, the conditional law \( \mathbb{P}^e \left[ \cdot \mid e^* \overline{\partial} \in [1, 1 + \varepsilon] \right] \) equals \( c \overline{\partial}^{1/2} \mathbb{P}^e \), where \( c \) is a normalizing constant not depending on \( \varepsilon \). Sending \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) we obtain the equivalence.

**Remark 2.6** (Free Liouville field). It is clear by definition that \( h^e \) in Definition [2.4] is a free Liouville field. The field which will be defined in Definition [5.4] below is also easily seen to be a free Liouville field. All other random distributions in this paper are explicit variants of these two fields, and it is straightforward to check that they are all free Liouville fields.

We now give the precise definition of the field \( \mathbf{h} \) in Theorem [1.10]

**Definition 2.7.** Let \( \phi : \mathbb{D} \to S \) be the conformal map satisfying \( \phi(0) = \pi i/2 \) and \( \phi(1) = +\infty \). Let \( \mathbf{h} \) be the free Liouville field on \( \mathbb{D} \) such that \((S, \mathbf{h}^d) \sim (\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{h})\), where \( \mathbf{h}^d \) is as in Definition [2.4].

By [13], Theorem [1.10] remains true if we replace \( \phi \) by another conformal map from \( \mathbb{D} \) to \( S \). We choose this particular definition both for concreteness and for technical convenience in Section [6] (see Lemma [6.1]).

Now we are ready to explain that the Brownian disk \( \text{BD}_1 \) can be identified with the pair \((\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{h})\) in Theorem [1.10]

**Theorem 2.8.** ([MS16b]) Let \( \mathbf{h} \) be as in Definition [2.7] and let \((d, \mu, \xi)\) be as above [12]. Identify the boundary measure \( \xi \) with a curve of duration 1 which traces \( \partial D \) clockwise starting from 1 in the speed specified by \( \xi \). Then there exist constants \( c_d, c_m > 0 \) such that \((\mathbb{D} \cup \partial \mathbb{D}, c_d d, c_m \mu, \xi)\), viewed as a random variable in \( \mathbb{M}^{\text{GHPU}} \), is a free Brownian disk with unit perimeter.

We conclude this section by the precise description of the law of \( h_\Delta \) in Theorem [1.3]. Let \( \mathbf{h} \) be as in Definition [2.7]. Conditioning on \( \mathbf{h} \), independently sample two points \( v_1, v_2 \) on \( \partial \mathbb{D} \) according to the measure \( \xi \). By possibly relabeling \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \), we assume that \( 1, v_1, v_2 \) are ordered counterclockwise. Let \( \psi : \mathbb{D} \to \Delta \) be the conformal map that maps 1, \( v_1 \), and \( v_2 \) to \((1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), \) and \((0, 0, 1)\), respectively.

**Definition 2.9.** In Theorem [1.3], \( h_\Delta \) denotes a random distribution with the law of \( \mathbf{h} \circ \psi + Q \log |\psi'| \), where \( (\mathbf{h}, \psi) \) is defined as in the paragraph above. Moreover, \( d_\Delta := c_d d, \mu_\Delta := c_m \mu \), and \( \xi_\Delta := \xi_{h_\Delta} \), with \( d_\Delta, \mu_\Delta, \xi_\Delta \) as above [12] and constants \( c_d, c_m \) as in Theorem [2.8].

### 2.4 Chordal SLE_{6} and CLE_{6}

Let \( \mathcal{D}_{s,s} = \{(D, a, b) : D \) is a simply connected \( C^0 \) domain, \( a, b \in \partial D, \ a \neq b \} \). The clockwise (resp., counterclockwise) arc on \( \partial D \) from \( a \) to \( b \) is called the left (resp., right) boundary of \((D, a, b)\). Suppose \( \eta \) is a curve on \( D \cup \partial D \) from \( a \) to \( b \) for some \((D, a, b) \in \mathcal{D}_{s,s} \). For each
When $D(\text{CN06}) \ell$ a loop $d$ loops in $\Gamma$ almost surely, whose contained in $\Gamma$. We call these loops trivial loops in $\Gamma$. There are countably many nontrivial boundary condition. A random variable with the law of the loop ensemble obtained Definition 2.11. The next theorem can be viewed as the definition 1 red or blue independently with probability $\omega$. Let $\eta$ be an SLE$_6$ on $(D, a, b)$, parametrized such that the parametrization on each initial segment is determined by the same segment modulo initial segment is determined by the same segment modulo increasing parametrization. For each $t > 0$, on the event $D_t \neq \emptyset$, we have that $D_t$ is $C^0$ a.s. and the conditional law of $\eta$ after $t$ is that of an SLE$_6$ on $(D_t, \eta(t), b)$.

- **Target invariance:** Let $\eta$ (resp., $\eta'$) be a chordal SLE$_6$ on $(D, a, b)$ (resp., $(D, a', b')$) such that $b \neq b'$. Let $\tau$ (resp., $\tau'$) be the first time $\eta$ (resp., $\eta'$) hits the arc on $\partial D$ between $b$ and $b'$ that does not contain $a$. Then $\eta|_{[0, \tau]}$ and $\eta'|_{[0, \tau']}$ are equal in law modulo increasing reparametrization.

It is proved by Schramm [Sch00] that the first two properties define a one-parameter family of random curves called (chordal) SLE$_\kappa$ with $\kappa \in (0, \infty)$. The target invariance property singles out SLE$_6$. By [RS05], if $\eta$ is an SLE$_6$ curve on $(D, a, b)$, then $\eta$ is a.s. a non-simple curve which create “bubbles” (bounded simply connected domains) by hitting its past and the domain boundary. Furthermore, the range of $\eta$ has zero Lebesgue measure almost surely. When $D_t \neq \emptyset$, we call the left and right boundary of $(D_t, \eta(t), b)$ the left and right frontier of $\eta$ at time $t$, respectively. These curves are denoted by $\eta^0_t$ and $\eta^t_t$, respectively. By definition, $\eta^0_t$ and $\eta^0_t$ are simply the left and right boundary of $(D, a, b)$. For $t > 0$, the laws of $\eta^0_t$ and $\eta^t_t$ away from $\partial D$ are variants of SLE$_{8/3}$ [Dub09]. We refer to [Law05] for more background on SLE$_6$.

Given $\delta > 0$ and a Jordan domain $D$, let $D^\delta$ be the $\delta$-approximation of $D$ (see Section 2.1). Let $\omega^\delta$ be a Bernoulli-$\frac{1}{2}$ site percolation on $D^\delta$, namely, each inner vertex of $D^\delta$ is colored red or blue independently with probability $\frac{1}{2}$. Let $\Gamma^\delta$ be the loop ensembles of $\omega^\delta$ with monochromatic blue boundary condition. The next theorem can be viewed as the definition of CLE$_6$ on $D$.

**Theorem 2.10 (CN06).** As $\delta \to 0$, $\Gamma^\delta$ converge in law to a random variable $\Gamma$ in $\mathcal{L}(D)$ in the $d_{\mathbb{R}^2}$-metric (see Section 2.2), where $d$ is the Euclidean metric on $D$.

**Definition 2.11.** A random variable with the law of $\Gamma$ is called a CLE$_6$ on $D$ with monochromatic blue boundary condition. A random variable with the law of the loop ensemble obtained by reversing the orientation of each loop in $\Gamma$ is called a CLE$_6$ on $D$ with monochromatic red boundary condition.

With probability 1, for each $z \in D$, the loop whose trace is the single point $a$ is also contained in $\Gamma$. We call these loops trivial loops in $\Gamma$. There are countably many nontrivial loops in $\Gamma$ almost surely, whose $d_{\mathbb{R}^2}$-closure equals $\Gamma$. Throughout the paper when we declare a loop $\ell \in \Gamma$ we always assume that $\ell$ is a nontrivial loop.
We now explain how to sample a \( \text{CLE}_6 \) iteratively from chordal \( \text{SLE}_6 \). We start by assigning an orientation to \( \partial D \), either clockwise or counterclockwise. If we want the \( \text{CLE}_6 \) to have blue (resp., red) boundary condition, then we assign clockwise (resp., counterclockwise) orientation to \( \partial D \). Fix two distinct points \( a, b \in \partial D \). Let \( \overline{ab} \) be the segment on \( \partial D \) from \( a \) to \( b \) in the same orientation as \( \partial D \). We first sample an \( \text{SLE}_6 \eta^{ab} \) on \((D,a,b)\). Suppose \( \mathcal{B} \) is a connected component of \( D \setminus \overline{ab} \). We call \( \mathcal{B} \) a dichromatic bubble if \( \partial \mathcal{B} \cap \overline{ab} \neq \emptyset \). Let \( x_B \) and \( \hat{x}_B \) be the last and first, respectively, point on \( \partial \mathcal{B} \) visited by \( \eta^{ab} \), and let \( \eta^B \) be the segment of \( \eta^{ab} \) in between. For each dichromatic bubble \( \mathcal{B} \), conditioning on \( \eta \), let \( \eta_B \) be a chordal \( \text{SLE}_6 \) on \( (\mathcal{B}, x_B, \hat{x}_B) \). Moreover, we assume that these \( \eta_B \)'s are conditionally independent given \( \eta \). Let \( \ell_B \) be the concatenation of \( \eta^B \) and \( \eta_B \). Let \( \Gamma^b_a = \{ \ell_B : \mathcal{B} \text{ is a dichromatic bubble} \} \). Suppose \( \mathcal{B} \) is a connected component of \( D \setminus \bigcup_{\ell \in \Gamma^b_a} \ell \). Then the orientation of loops in \( \Gamma^b_a \) and \( \partial D \) together define an orientation on each monochromatic bubble, either clockwise or counterclockwise. If the orientation is clockwise (resp., counterclockwise), we call \( \mathcal{B} \) a monochromatic blue (resp., red) bubble. Conditioning on \( \Gamma^b_a \), for each such bubble \( \mathcal{B} \) we independently sample a \( \text{CLE}_6 \) \( \Gamma_B \) in \( \mathcal{B} \) with monochromatic boundary condition whose color matches \( \mathcal{B} \).

**Lemma 2.12** ([CN06]). Given \( \eta^{ab}, \Gamma^b_a, \) and \( \{ \Gamma_B \} \) as above, let \( \Gamma \) be the union of \( \Gamma^b_a \) and the collection of nontrivial loops in \( \Gamma_B \), where \( \mathcal{B} \) ranges over all monochromatic bubbles. Then if \( \partial D \) is oriented clockwise (resp., counterclockwise), then \( \Gamma \) has the law of the nontrivial loops of a \( \text{CLE}_6 \) on \( D \) with monochromatic blue (resp., red) boundary condition. Moreover, \( \Gamma \) determines \( \Gamma^b_a \) and \( \eta^{ab} \) almost surely. We call \( \eta^{ab} \) the interface of \( \Gamma \) on \((D,a,b)\).

Both \( \Gamma^b_a \) and \( \eta^{ab} \) can be defined as explicit functions of \( \Gamma \). Consider all the loops in \( \Gamma \) having nonempty intersection with \( \overline{ab} \). There is a natural partial order \( \prec \) on these loops where \( \ell \prec \ell' \) if and only if \( \ell \) is in a connected component of \( D \setminus \ell' \) whose boundary contains neither \( a \) nor \( b \). Then \( \Gamma^b_a \) is exactly the set of maximal elements for the partial order \( \prec \). Moreover, for each loop \( \ell \in \Gamma^b_a \), it is possible to recover \( \eta_B \) and \( \eta^B \). By concatenating \( \eta^B \) for all \( \mathcal{B} \) and taking a closure, we obtain \( \eta^{ab} \).

As a consequence of the conformal invariance of \( \text{SLE}_6 \) and the iterative construction above, the law of \( \text{CLE}_6 \) is also conformally invariant. Namely, let \( \Gamma \) be a \( \text{CLE}_6 \) on a Jordan domain \( D \). Let \( D' \) be another Jordan domain and let \( \phi : D \to D' \) be a deterministic conformal map. Then the law of \( \{ \phi \circ \ell \}_{\ell \in \Gamma} \) is a \( \text{CLE}_6 \) on \( D' \) with the same boundary condition as \( \Gamma \).

Now we record some important geometric properties of \( \text{CLE}_6 \). Suppose we are in the setting of Theorem 2.10, where \( \partial D \) is viewed as an oriented curve. Let \( \overline{\Gamma} = \Gamma \cup \{ \partial D \} \). For each \( \ell \in \overline{\Gamma} \), let \( -\ell \) be the connected component of \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \ell \) whose closure contains \( \partial D \), where (here and below) we identify \( \ell \) with its range. Let \( \text{reg}(\ell) \) be the closure of the union of all connected components of \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \ell \) other than \( -\ell \) whose boundary is visited by \( \ell \) in the same orientation as \( \ell \) is visiting \( \partial(\ell) \). We call \( \text{reg}(\ell) \) the region surrounded by \( \ell \). By convention we let \( \text{reg}(\partial D) = D \). Given \( \ell \neq \ell' \in \overline{\Gamma} \), we say that \( \ell \) and \( \ell' \) are nested if and only if \( \ell \subset \text{reg}(\ell') \) or \( \ell' \subset \text{reg}(\ell) \).

**Definition 2.13.** Suppose \( D \) and \( \Gamma \) are as in Theorem 2.10. A point \( v \in \mathbb{D} \) is called a pivotal point of \( \Gamma \) if one of the following two occurs:

1. there exist exactly two loops \( \ell, \ell' \in \Gamma \) such that \( v \in \ell \cap \ell' \), both of which visit \( v \) exactly once;
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2. there exists a single loop $\ell \in \Gamma$ that visits $v$ and $\ell$ visits $v$ exactly twice.

If $D$ and $\Gamma$ are as in Theorem 2.10 then the following hold almost surely.

- **locally finiteness**: For each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist finitely many loops in $\Gamma$ with diameter larger than $\varepsilon$.

- **finite chaining**: Given any pair of loops $\ell, \ell' \in \overline{\Gamma}$, there is a finite set of loops $\ell_0 = \ell, \ell_1, \ldots, \ell_k = \ell'$ such that for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, $\ell_{i-1} \cap \ell_i \neq \emptyset$.

- **parity**: Given any pair of loops in $\ell, \ell' \in \overline{\Gamma}$ with $\ell \cap \ell' \neq \emptyset$, $\ell, \ell'$ have opposite orientation if and only if they are nested.

- **no triple points**: Given $v \in \ell$ for some $\ell \in \Gamma$, if $v$ is not a pivotal point of $\Gamma$, then $\ell$ visits $v$ only once and there exists no other loops in $\Gamma$ visiting $v$.

If $v$ is a pivotal point of $\Gamma$, by flipping the color at $v$, we mean merging $\gamma, \gamma'$ into a single loop in Case 1 of Definition 2.13 and splitting $\gamma$ into two loops in Case 2 of Definition 2.13. If a loop does not visit $v$, flipping the color at $v$ keeps the loop unchanged. Let $\Gamma_v$ denote the set of loops obtained after flipping the color at $v$. By the parity property of CLE$_6$, $\Gamma$ induces an orientation on each loop in $\Gamma_v$, making it an ensemble of unrooted oriented loops (after including trivial loops). Moreover, the symmetric difference $L_v$ of $\Gamma$ and $\Gamma_v$ always contains exactly three loops. Now we define the continuum $\varepsilon$-pivotal points by mimicking the discrete definition in Section 1.3.3.

**Definition 2.14.** Given a Jordan domain $D$, let $\Gamma$ be a CLE$_6$ on $D$ and let $h$ be a free Liouville field on $D$ independent of $\Gamma$. Given $\ell \in \Gamma$, set $\mu_h(\ell) := \mu_h(\operatorname{reg}(\ell))$. Given a pivotal point $v$ of $\Gamma$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we call $v$ an $\varepsilon$-pivotal point of $(h, \Gamma)$ if $\mu_h(\ell) \geq \varepsilon$ for all $\ell \in L_v$. 
Remark 2.15 (CLE on top of $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG). Suppose we are in the setting of Theorem 2.8. Let $\Gamma$ be a CLE on $\mathbb{D}$ with monochromatic blue boundary condition. Then $(\mathbb{D} \cup \partial \mathbb{D}, \mathcal{E}_i \mathbb{D}, c_0, c_m, \mu, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{\bar{h}}_i, \mathbf{h}, \Gamma)$ is a random variable in $\mathcal{M}^{GHPUL}$. When it is clear from context, we will denote this random variable by $(\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{h}, \Gamma)$. In particular, $(\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{h}, \Gamma, i)$ in Theorem 1.10 should be understood in this sense. Now Theorem 1.11 asserts that $(\mathcal{M}^n, \mathcal{Y}^n)$ defined at the end of Section 2.2 converge in law to $(\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{h}, \Gamma)$ in the GHPUL topology.

3 A dynamical percolation on random triangulations

In this section we prove Theorem 1.10. The argument is “soft” as long as the “hard” input Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 are supplied. We postpone the proofs of these two lemmas to Section 6.

For $\varepsilon > 0$, recall the dynamics $(\mathcal{M}^n, \mathcal{Y}^n)$ defined in Section 1.3.3. The following elementary observation is crucial to us. We leave the proof to the reader.

Lemma 3.1. Conditioning on $\mathcal{M}^n$, the process $(\mathcal{Y}^n_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is stationary.

For $t > 0$, let $\mathcal{Y}^n_t := \Gamma(\mathcal{M}^n, \mathcal{Y}^n_t)$ be the loop ensemble of $\mathcal{Y}^n_t$. Recall $\mathcal{M}^n \in \mathcal{M}^{GHPUL}$ in Section 2.2, which is obtained by rescaling $\mathcal{M}^n$ according to (8). We view $(\mathcal{M}^n, \mathcal{Y}^n)_{t \geq 0}$ as a process taking values in $\mathcal{M}^{GHPUL}$ as explained at the end of Section 2.2. In Section 6, we will prove the following.

Lemma 3.2. For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, $(\mathcal{M}^n, \mathcal{Y}^n_t)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converge in law as $n \to \infty$ to a stationary sequence $(\mathcal{Y}^\varepsilon_t)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in the GHPUL topology.

We restrict the index set to positive integers in Lemma 3.2 to avoid unnecessary topological technicalities for continuous time processes.

Recall $(\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{h}, \Gamma)$ in Remark 2.15. By Theorem 1.11, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{Y}^\varepsilon_t$ in Lemma 3.2 is equal in law to $(\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{h}, \Gamma)$ as a random variable in $\mathcal{M}^{GHPUL}$. More generally, there exists a sequence of CLE’s $(\mathbf{\bar{y}}^\varepsilon_t)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ coupled with $\mathbf{h}$ such that $(\mathcal{Y}^\varepsilon_t)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \overset{d}{=} (\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{\bar{y}}^\varepsilon_t)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Lemma 3.3. Let $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{\bar{y}}^\varepsilon_t)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be defined as above. There exists a sequence of CLE’s $(\mathbf{\bar{y}}^\varepsilon_t)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ coupled with $\mathbf{h}$ such that as $\varepsilon \to 0$, $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{\bar{y}}^\varepsilon_t)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converge in law to $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{\bar{y}}^\varepsilon_t)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in the $H^1(\mathbb{D}) \times L(\mathbb{D})$ topology. Moreover, $(\mathbf{\bar{y}}^\varepsilon_t)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is stationary ergodic process.

To deduce Theorem 1.10 from the above lemmas we use the following observation.

Lemma 3.4. Let $X$ and $(\mathbf{Y}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be random variables on the same probability space. Suppose $(X, \mathbf{Y}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is stationary and $(\mathbf{Y}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is ergodic. Then $X$ and $\mathbf{Y}_i$ are independent.

Proof. Let $f$ and $g$ be two bounded measurable functions defined on the space in which $X$ and $\mathbf{Y}_i$, respectively, take values. By stationarity of $(X, \mathbf{Y}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$,

$$\text{Cov}(g(X), f(\mathbf{Y}_i)) = \text{Cov}\left(g(X), \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} f(\mathbf{Y}_i)\right).$$

Now Lemma 3.4 follows from the Birkhoff ergodic theorem. \qed

27
Proof of Theorem 1.10. Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Consider the process $(M_t^n, \omega_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$ in Lemma 6.24. Conditioning on $M^n$, let $\omega^n$ be sampled from Ber$_{\lambda_M^n}$ such that $\omega^n$ is conditionally independent of $(\omega_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$. Let $T^n = \Gamma(M^n, \omega^n)$. By Theorem 1.11 $(M^n, T_i^n)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(M^n, Y^n)$ are tight in the GHPUL topology. By the Skorokhod representation theorem, given any subsequence $N \subset \mathbb{N}$, we can choose a further subsequence $N' \subset N$ such that there exists a coupling of $\{(M^n, \omega^n, \omega_t^n)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} : n \in N'\}$ where both $(M^n, T_i^n)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(M^n, Y^n)$ have almost sure GHPUL limits as $n \to \infty$ along $N'$. By Lemma 2.8 the GHPUL limit of $M^n$ can be written as $(\Delta, c_d d_h, c_m \mu_h, \xi_h)$, where $h$ is as defined in Definition 2.7. As in Lemma 3.2 we denote the GHPUL limit of $(M^n, T_i^n)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ by $(D, h, \hat{\Gamma})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, where $(\hat{\Gamma})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of CLE$_6$'s on $\mathbb{D}$. By Theorem 1.11 there exists a CLE$_6$ $\Gamma$ on $\mathbb{D}$ with monochromatic blue boundary condition such that $(D, h, \Gamma)$ is the GHPUL limit of $(M^n, Y^n)$.

By Lemma 3.3 we can choose a sequence $\varepsilon_m \downarrow 0$ such that as $m \to \infty$, $(h, \Gamma, \Gamma_i^n)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converge in law to a stationary sequence, which we denote by $(\hat{h}, \hat{\Gamma}, \Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Applying Lemma 3.4 to $X = (\hat{h}, \hat{\Gamma})$ and $Y_i = \Gamma_i$, we see that $(\hat{h}, \hat{\Gamma})$ is independent of $\Gamma_i$. Since the law of $(M^n, Y^n, \Gamma_i^n)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equal to the law of $(M^n, \Gamma_i^n, Y_i^n)$ in Theorem 1.10 which does not depend on $\varepsilon$, the law of $(h, \Gamma, \Gamma_i^n)$ does not depend on $\varepsilon$ either. In fact, it must equal the law of $(\hat{h}, \hat{\Gamma}, \Gamma_i)$. Therefore $(h, \Gamma)$ is independent of $\Gamma_i$. In particular, the law of $(h, \Gamma, \Gamma_i)$ does not depend on the choice of subsequences $N$ and $N'$. Therefore $(M^n, Y^n)$ and $(M^n, \bar{Y}_i^n)$ jointly converge in law to $(\mathbb{D}, h, \Gamma)$ and $(\mathbb{D}, h, \Gamma_i)$, respectively. This gives Theorem 1.10 when $k = 2$.

For $k \geq 3$ we assume by induction that Theorem 1.10 holds for $k - 1$. Now we replace $\omega^n$ above by $k - 1$ independent percolations sampled from Ber$_{\lambda_M^n}$ and apply the exact same argument as above. Then by the induction hypothesis, $\Gamma$ and $\hat{\Gamma}$ above each become $k - 1$ independent copies of CLE$_6$ which are also independent of $h$. We again use Lemma 3.4 to conclude the proof.

4 Convergence under the Cardy embedding

In this section we will conclude the proof of Theorems 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5.

4.1 Convergence of the planar map under the Cardy embedding: Proof of Theorem 1.3

Recall $h_\Delta$, $d_\Delta = c_d h_\Delta$, $\mu_\Delta = c_m h_\Delta$, and $\xi_{h_\Delta}$ in Theorem 1.3 whose precise meaning can be found in Definition 2.9. Let $\Gamma$ be a CLE$_g$ on $\Delta$ with monochromatic blue boundary condition independent of $h_\Delta$. Then we can identify $(\Delta, h_\Delta, \Gamma)$ with a random variable in $M^{\text{GHPUL}}$ as explained in Remark 2.15 with $(\mathbb{D}, h)$ replaced by $(\Delta, h_\Delta)$. We first state a basic variant of Theorem 1.10 for maps with marked points. Note that elements in $M^{\text{GHPUL}}$ with marked points can be naturally endowed a topology as in Section 2.2 which includes the convergence of the marked points.

Lemma 4.1. Let $(M^n, a^n, b^n, c^n)$ and $\{Y^n_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be as in Theorem 1.10. Let $h_\Delta$ be as above and let $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be independent CLE$_6$'s which are also independent of $h_\Delta$. Let $(\hat{v}_i^n, \hat{\omega}_i^n, \hat{v}_{i,1}^n) := (a^n, b^n, c^n)$. Let $\hat{z}_1$, $\hat{z}_2$, and $\hat{z}_3$ be equal to $(1, 0, 0)$, $(0, 1, 0)$, and $(0, 0, 1)$, respectively. Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Conditioning on $(M^n, Y_i^n, \Gamma_1^n, \Gamma_2^n, \ldots)$, let $\hat{v}_1^n$ (resp., $v_1^n, \ldots, v_m^n$) be vertices of $\partial M^n$.
(resp., $\mathbb{M}^n$) which are sampled uniformly and independently at random. Conditioning on
$(h, \Gamma, \Delta)$, let $\hat{\Delta}_4$ (resp., $z_1, \ldots, z_m$) be boundary (resp., interior) points of $\Delta$ which are sampled independently from the measure $\xi_\Delta$ (resp., $\mu_\Delta$). Then the following convergence holds jointly in law for the GHPUL topology with $m + 4$ marked points as $n \to \infty$

$$(\mathcal{M}^n, \Upsilon^i_n, \hat{v}_1^n, \ldots, \hat{v}_4^n, v_1^n, \ldots, v_m^n) \to (\Delta, h, \Gamma, \hat{\Delta}_1, \ldots, \hat{\Delta}_4, z_1, \ldots, z_m), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}.$$  

Proof. The convergence of $\hat{v}_1^n, \ldots, \hat{v}_4^n$ follows from the uniform convergence of the boundary curve, and the convergence of $v_1^n, \ldots, v_m^n$ follows from the convergence of $\mu^n$.

Given $\zeta > 0$ choose $m = m(\zeta) \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large as described in our proof below. Consider a coupling such that the convergence of Lemma 4.1 is almost sure. We will prove that $(d_\Delta, \mu_\Delta, \xi_\Delta)$ converge to $(d, \mu, \xi)$ in probability, which implies Theorem 1.3.

First we will argue that for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$,

$$\text{Cdy}^n(v_i^n) \to z_i \text{ in probability for the Euclidean metric on } \overline{\Delta}. \quad (15)$$

This is sufficient to show that $\mu_\Delta^n$ converge to $\mu_\Delta$ in probability since $v_i^n$ (resp., $z_i$) has the law of a vertex (resp., point) sampled uniformly at random from the discrete (resp., continuum) area measure. We will only prove (15) for $i = 1$ since the other cases can be handled in the exact same way. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $E_{j,1}^n := \{\omega_j \in \alpha_\eta(v_1^n)\}$, namely, $E_{j,1}^n$ is the event $\alpha_\eta(v_1^n)$ in Definition 1.1 for $\omega_j$. Similarly, let $E_{j,2}^n := \{\omega_j \in \alpha_\eta(v_1^n)\}$ and $E_{j,3}^n := \{\omega_j \in \alpha_\eta(v_1^n)\}$. Let $E_{1,1}^j, E_{2,1}^j, E_{3,1}^j$ be the continuum analogs of $E_{j,1}^n, E_{j,2}^n, E_{j,3}^n$ defined in terms of $z_1 \in \Delta$ and the CLE$_6$ $\Gamma_j$. We describe $E_{1,1}^j$ precisely following [BHS18, Sections 6.9]; $E_{2,1}^j$ and $E_{3,1}^j$ can be defined similarly by permuting the indices. Let $\eta$ be the interface of $\Gamma$ on $(\Delta, \hat{\Delta}_3, \hat{\Delta}_2)$ as defined in Lemma 2.12. Then

$$E_{1,1}^j \text{ is the event that } z_1 \text{ is strictly on the same side of } \eta \text{ as } \hat{z}_1. \quad (16)$$

To be precise, letting $\gamma$ be the simple path from the boundary arc $\hat{z}_1 \hat{z}_2$ to the boundary arc $\hat{z}_3 \hat{z}_1$ consisting of points $z$ on $\eta$ which can be connected to $\hat{z}_1$ without visiting any points on $\eta$, the event $E_{1,1}^j$ occurs if and only if there is a path in $\Delta$ connecting $z_1$ and $\hat{z}_1$ which does not contain any points of $\gamma$. By [GHS19, Proposition 6.7] (which builds on [BHS18, Theorem 7.6]) the following convergence holds in probability

$$(1_{E_{1,1}^j}, 1_{E_{2,1}^j}, 1_{E_{3,1}^j}) \to (1_{E_{1,1}^j}, 1_{E_{2,1}^j}, 1_{E_{3,1}^j}), \quad j = 1, \ldots, k. \quad (17)$$

By the law of large numbers and the definition of $\text{Cdy}^n$, by choosing $k$ (depending only on $\zeta$) sufficiently large it holds with probability at least $1 - \zeta$ for any fixed $n$ that

$$\left| \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} (1_{E_{1,1}^j}, 1_{E_{2,1}^j}, 1_{E_{3,1}^j}) - \text{Cdy}^n(v_1^n) \right| < \zeta, \quad \left| \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} (1_{E_{1,1}^j}, 1_{E_{2,1}^j}, 1_{E_{3,1}^j}) - z_1 \right| < \zeta. \quad (18)$$

By the triangle inequality, (17), and (18), for all sufficiently large $n$ (depending only on $n$), with probability at least $1 - 2\zeta$,

$$|\text{Cdy}^n(v_1^n) - z_1| \leq 3\zeta. \quad (19)$$
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Since $\zeta$ was arbitrary, we obtain (15), which concludes the proof that $\mu^n_\Delta \to \mu_\Delta$ in probability.

We prove that $\xi^n_\Delta \to \xi_\Delta$ in probability by a very similar argument. As above, it is sufficient to show that $C\text{d}y^n(\widehat{v}^n_i) \to \widehat{z}_i$ in probability for the Euclidean metric as $n \to \infty$. Again the result follows by applying [GHS19,BHS18], which give convergence in probability of the three crossing events $\widehat{E}^1_i, \widehat{E}^2_i, \widehat{E}^3_i$ (now defined with $\widehat{v}^n_i$ instead of $v^n_i$). Note that the convergence result for $\widehat{E}^1_i, \widehat{E}^2_i, \widehat{E}^3_i$ in [GHS19,BHS18] is stated for the case where the four boundary points have deterministic distances along the boundary from the root, rather than being sampled uniformly and independently at random, but the proof in [GHS19,BHS18] is identical for the case of random points.

To conclude the proof of Theorem 1.3 we need to show that $d^n_\Delta$ converge in probability to $d_\Delta$. Recall that $d^n$ is the graph distance on $M^n$ rescaled by $(3n/4)^{-1/4}$. Most of the proof will be devoted to showing that with probability $1 - o_\zeta(1)$,

$$\sup_{v',v'' \in \mathcal{V}(M^n)} |d^n(v',v'') - d_\Delta(C\text{d}y^n(v'), C\text{d}y^n(v''))| = o_\zeta(1).$$

(20)

Here and in the rest of the proof, $o_\zeta(1)$ represents a term which goes to 0 as $\zeta \to 0$, uniformly in all other parameters. First we will explain that (20) implies uniform convergence of $d^n_\Delta$ to $d_\Delta$ in probability. By the triangle inequality and the definition (1) of $d^n_\Delta$,

$$\sup_{x,y \in \Delta} |d^n_\Delta(x,y) - d_\Delta(x,y)| \leq \sup_{x,y \in \Delta} |d^n(\mathcal{V}(x),\mathcal{V}(y)) - d_\Delta(C\text{d}y^n(\mathcal{V}(x)), C\text{d}y^n(\mathcal{V}(y)))|$$

$$+ \sup_{x,y \in \Delta} |d_\Delta(C\text{d}y^n(\mathcal{V}(x)), C\text{d}y^n(\mathcal{V}(y))) - d_\Delta(x,y)|.$$  

(21)

By (20), the first term on the right side converges to 0 in probability as $n \to \infty$. To prove that the second term on the right side also converges to 0, we will prove that the following convergence holds in probability as $n \to \infty$,

$$\sup_{x \in \Delta} |C\text{d}y^n(\mathcal{V}(x)) - x| \to 0.$$  

(22)

This is sufficient to establish convergence to 0 of the second term due to uniform continuity of $d_\Delta$. To establish (22) it is sufficient to show that for arbitrary $\overline{z} \in \Delta$ and with $B(\overline{z}, \zeta)$ the ball of radius $\zeta$ centered at $\overline{z}$,

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}[\exists v \in \mathcal{V}(M^n) \text{ such that } C\text{d}y^n(v) \in B(\overline{z}, \zeta)] \geq 1 - 2\zeta.$$  

(23)

Choose $m$ sufficiently large in a way depending only on $\zeta$, such that with probability at least $1 - \zeta$, at least one of the points $z_1, \ldots, z_m$ are contained in $B(\overline{z}, \zeta/2)$; this is possible since $\mu_\Delta$ almost surely assigned positive mass to any open set. Proceeding as in the proof of (19), if $z_j \in B(\overline{z}, \zeta/2)$ then it holds with probability at least $1 - \zeta$ for sufficiently large $n$ that $C\text{d}y^n(v^n_j) \in B(\overline{z}, \zeta)$. This implies (23), which shows that $d^n_\Delta$ converge to $d_\Delta$ in probability for the uniform topology.

To conclude the proof, we need to establish (20). First choose $\rho > 0$ (depending only on $\zeta$) sufficiently small, such that with probability at least $1 - \zeta$, any Brownian metric ball of radius $2\rho$ has Euclidean radius smaller than $\zeta$ when embedded into $\overline{\Delta}$. By possibly increasing
with probability at least 1, we can guarantee that the metric balls centered at \(z_1, \ldots, z_m\) of radius \(\rho\) cover \(\Delta\) with probability at least 1 - \(\zeta\).

Throughout the proof we will only consider the percolation \(\omega_1^n\) and the CLE\(_6\) \(\Gamma_1\). In the definition of \(E_j^n\) in (16), we set \(j = 1\) and recall the interface \(\eta\) and the simple curve \(\gamma\) defined there. By the previous paragraph and properties of the coupling in Definition 4.1 with probability at least 1 - 3\(\zeta\) for sufficiently large \(n\), the metric balls of radius \(3\rho/2\) centered at \(v_1^n, \ldots, v_m^n\) cover \(M^n\). We condition on this event in the remainder of the proof. Let \(v', v'' \in \mathcal{V}(M^n)\), and choose \(v'_1, v''_1 \in \{v_1^n, \ldots, v_m^n\}\) such that \(v'\) (resp., \(v''\)) is contained in the metric ball of radius \(3\rho/2\) centered at \(v'_1\) (resp., \(v''_1\)). Let \(z'_1, z''_1 \in \Delta\) denote the limit of \(v'_1, v''_1\), respectively. By the triangle inequality,

\[
|d^n(v', v'') - d_\Delta(C_{\text{dy}}(v'), C_{\text{dy}}(v''))| 
\leq |d^n(v', v'') - d^n(v'_1, v''_1)| + |d^n(v'_1, v''_1) - d_\Delta(C_{\text{dy}}(v'_1), C_{\text{dy}}(v''_1))| + |d_\Delta(C_{\text{dy}}(v'_1), C_{\text{dy}}(v''_1)) - d_\Delta(C_{\text{dy}}(v'), C_{\text{dy}}(v''))|. \tag{24}
\]

To prove (20), it is sufficient to bound the right side of (24) as \(n \to \infty\), uniformly over all choices of \(v', v'' \in \mathcal{V}(M^n)\). The first term on the right side of (24) is bounded by \(3\rho/2\) by the choice of \(v'_1, v''_1\). To bound the second term on the right side of (24), we use that

\[
|d^n(v'_1, v''_1) - d_\Delta(C_{\text{dy}}(v'_1), C_{\text{dy}}(v''_1))| \leq |d^n(v'_1, v''_1) - d_\Delta(z'_1, z''_1)| + |d_\Delta(z'_1, z''_1) - d_\Delta(C_{\text{dy}}(v'_1), C_{\text{dy}}(v''_1))|. \tag{25}
\]

The first term on the right side of (25) converges to 0 as \(n \to \infty\), since we consider a coupling such that the convergence in Lemma 4.1 is almost sure. By (15), \(C_{\text{dy}}(v'_1) \to z'_1\) and \(C_{\text{dy}}(v''_1) \to z''_1\) in probability. Using this and continuity of \(d_\Delta(\cdot, \cdot)\), we see that the second term on the right side of (25) converges to 0 a.s. Observe that our bounds for the right side of (25) hold uniformly over all \(v'_1, v''_1 \in \{v_1^n, \ldots, v_m^n\}\).

To show that the third term on the right side of (24) has size \(o(1)\) for sufficiently large \(n\), uniformly over all choices of \(v', v'' \in \mathcal{V}(M^n)\), it is sufficient to show that for all sufficiently large \(n\) (depending on \(\zeta\)), the following holds with probability at least 1 - \(\zeta\)

\[
\sup_{j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}} \sup_{v' \in \mathcal{V}(M^n) : d_\Delta(v', v_j) < 3\rho/2} |C_{\text{dy}}(v') - C_{\text{dy}}(v_j)| = o(1). \tag{26}
\]

By SLE duality, the curve \(\gamma\) described above is an SLE\(_{8/3}\)-type curve; in particular, it has Hausdorff dimension 4/3 a.s. Assuming \(\gamma\) is parametrized by \([0, 1]\) such that \(\gamma(0)\) (resp., \(\gamma(1)\)) is a point on the arc \(\bar{\zeta}_1\bar{\zeta}_2\) (resp., \(\bar{\zeta}_3\bar{\zeta}_1\)), the points \(\gamma(0)\) and \(\gamma(1)\) are random and their laws are absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure. By these observations, with probability at least 1 - \(o(1)\), for all fixed \(z \in \Delta\) we have \(\gamma([0, 1]) \cap B(z, \zeta) = \emptyset\), where \(B(z, \zeta)\) is the ball of Euclidean radius \(\zeta\) centered at \(z\). Using this result with \(z = z_1, \ldots, z_m\), along with the definition of the Cardy embedding, we obtain (26). Combining the bounds for the terms on the right side of (24), we see that for all sufficiently large \(n\) (depending on \(\zeta\)), with probability at least 1 - 5\(\zeta\),

\[
\sup_{v', v'' \in \mathcal{V}(M^n)} |d^n(v', v'') - d_\Delta(C_{\text{dy}}(v'), C_{\text{dy}}(v''))| = o(1). \tag{27}
\]

Since \(\zeta\) is arbitrary, this concludes the proof that \(d_\Delta \to d_\Delta\) in probability.
Remark 4.2. We argue above that $\text{Cdy}^n(v^n_j) \to z_j$ in probability as $n \to \infty$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$. We also show that, up to an error of order $o_p(1)$, the probabilities $\text{Ber}_{M^n}[E_a(v)], \text{Ber}_{M^n}[E_b(v)],$ and $\text{Ber}_{M^n}[E_c(v)]$ are the same for all points in the metric ball of radius $\rho$ centered at $v^n_j$. Combining these two results, we get that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \max_{v \in V(M^n)} [\text{Ber}_{M^n}[E_a^n(v)] + \text{Ber}_{M^n}[E_b^n(v)] + \text{Ber}_{M^n}[E_c^n(v)] - 1] = 0 \text{ in probability.}$$

4.2 Quenched scaling limit: Proof of Theorems 1.4 and 1.5

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Recall the setting in the proof of convergence of $\xi^n_\Delta$. The argument there implies that $\text{Cdy}^n(\widehat{\gamma}_4^n)$ converge in law to $\text{Cdy}^n(\widehat{\zeta}_4)$. Now conditioning on the event that $\widehat{\gamma}_4^n$ falls on the arc $(e^n, a^n)$ and on the event that $\widehat{\zeta}_4$ falls into the counterclockwise arc on $\partial \Delta$ from $(0, 0, 1)$ to $(1, 0, 0)$, we obtain Theorem 1.4. \hfill \Box

We will use the following lemma in the proof of Theorem 1.5. Note that, unlike in Lemma 4.1, the marked points are not necessarily uniform.

Lemma 4.3. Suppose $v^n \in V(M^n)$ and $z \in \Delta$ are random points such that $(M^n, v^n)$ converge in law to $(\Delta, h_\Delta, z)$ in the GHPU topology with one marked point. Let $\bar{z}^n := \text{Cdy}^n(v^n)$. Then $(M^n, v^n)$, $d^n_\Delta, \mu^n_\Delta, \xi^n_\Delta$, and $\bar{z}^n$ jointly converge in law to $(\Delta, h_\Delta, z)$, $d_\Delta, \mu_\Delta, \xi_\Delta$, and $z$.

Proof. By tightness of $\bar{z}^n$ and the Skorokhod representation theorem, we may assume that along a subsequence, we are under a coupling such that $(M^n, v^n)$, $d^n_\Delta, \mu^n_\Delta,$ and $\xi^n_\Delta$ converge a.s. to $(\Delta, h_\Delta, z)$, $d_\Delta, \mu_\Delta,$ and $\xi_\Delta$, respectively. Moreover, $\bar{z}^n$ converge to a random point $\bar{z}$ almost surely. We further assume that in our coupling, the GHPUL convergence in Lemma 4.1 holds almost surely for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$. It suffices to show that $\bar{z} = z$ a.s. By the assumptions of our coupling, almost surely $d^n(v^n, v^n_j) \to d(z, z_j)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. By [15], we see that $z^n_j := \text{Cdy}^n(v^n_j)$ converge to $z_j$ in probability. Since $\bar{z}^n \to \bar{z}$ almost surely, we have that $d^n(v^n_j, v^n_j) \to d(\bar{z}, z_j)$ in probability for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore $d(\bar{z}, z_j) = d(z, z_j)$ a.s. for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\{z_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is dense in $\bar{\Delta}$, $\bar{z} = z$ a.s. \hfill \Box

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Suppose we are in the setting of Lemma 4.1. By Theorem 1.10 and the Skorokhod representation theorem, we further assume that

$$(M^n, Y^n_1, Y^n_2, \ldots) \to (\Delta, h_\Delta, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \ldots)$$

almost surely for the GHPU topology.

Let $\gamma^n_m$ be the $m$th loop in $Y^n_1$, where the loops are ordered by decreasing area (with area as defined at the very beginning of Section 3). As explained in [GHS19, Section 6.3] (which is based on [BHS18]), if we parametrize $\gamma^n_m$ by its natural parametrization then $(M^n, \gamma^n_m)$ converge to $(\Delta, h_\Delta, \gamma_m)$ in the GHPU topology. By Skorokhod embedding we may assume that this convergence is almost sure. Therefore, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a (random) $\delta > 0$ such that if two edges $e, e'$ on $\gamma^n_m$ has quantum natural distance at most $\delta$ (namely, the short segment between $e, e'$ on $\gamma^n_m$ has less than $\delta n^{3/4}$ edges), then $d^n(e, e') \leq \varepsilon$. This statement has nothing to do with the embedding, and gives equicontinuity for $\gamma^n_m$ for the metric $d^n$.

Now we consider $\gamma^n_m$ as a curve in $\bar{\Delta}$. We will use the above paragraph to argue that $\gamma^n_m$ is equicontinuous for the Euclidean metric. Note that when we estimate the modulus of
continuity for $\gamma^n_m$, we may restrict to the midpoints of the edges because the linear extension does not change this modulus continuity. To transfer the equicontinuity for the $d^n_\Delta$ metric to equicontinuity for the Euclidean metric, we use that $d^n_\Delta$ converges to $d_\triangle$ in the uniform topology and that $d_\triangle$ is bi-continuous with respect to Euclidean metric. We conclude that $\gamma^n_m$ is equicontinuous for the Euclidean metric.

By equicontinuity, at least along a subsequence, $\gamma^n_m$ (viewed as a curve in $\Delta$) converge almost surely in the uniform topology to a curve $\gamma'$ on $\Delta$. We will argue that $\gamma^n_m = \gamma^n_m$ almost surely, which will imply that $\gamma^n_m$ converges to $\gamma_m$ (not only along a subsequence). If we sample an edge uniformly from $\gamma_m$, this edge converges to its continuum analog (viewed as point in our metric measure space). By Lemma 4.3 this convergence also holds if we view the points as embedded into $\Delta$, and by Skorokhod embedding we may assume this convergence is almost sure for the Euclidean metric on $\Delta$. By sampling a dense set of edges, we see that $\gamma^n_m = \gamma^n_m$ on the probability 1 event that all these edges converge. We conclude that $\gamma^n_m$ converge to $\gamma_m$ as $n \to \infty$.

The argument above proves convergence of loops with large area, i.e., for arbitrary $\zeta > 0$ we get convergence of all loops with area larger than $\zeta$. Loops with area $< \zeta$ have $d^n$-diameter $o(\zeta(1))$. By the two-sided continuity of $d_\triangle$ and the Euclidean metric, we see that the loops with area $< \zeta$ also have Euclidean diameter $o(\zeta(1))$. Since there is a dense set of infinitesimal loops in the scaling limit, $\Upsilon_1^n \to \Gamma_1$ a.s. as a loop ensemble in $\Delta$ equipped with the Euclidean metric.

Repeating the argument above for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we get that $\Upsilon^n_j \to \Gamma_j$ a.s. as a loop ensemble in $\Delta$. It follows that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $f(\Upsilon^n_j) \to f(\Gamma_j)$ almost surely as $n \to \infty$. Therefore the following convergence also holds almost surely for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} f(\Upsilon^n_j) \to \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} f(\Gamma_j). \tag{28}$$

By the law of large numbers, the left (resp., right) side of (28) converge in probability to $\mathbb{E}[f(\Upsilon^n_{\triangle}) | M^n]$ (resp., $\mathbb{E}[f(\Gamma)]$) as $k \to \infty$. Combining this with (28) gives the theorem. 

5 The quantum pivotal measure of CLE$_6$

In this section we prove (5), which says that the $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG $\varepsilon$-pivotal measure is a Gaussian multiplicative chaos (GMC) over the 3/4-dimensional occupation measure on $\varepsilon$-pivotal points. Let us first define the general notions of occupation measures and GMC.

**Definition 5.1 (Occupation measure).** Given a compact set $A \subset \mathbb{C}$ and $r > 0$, let $A_r = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - x| \leq r \text{ for some } x \in A\}$. For $d \in (0, 2)$, let $m_{A,d}^r$ be the measure given by $r^{d-2}$ times Lebesgue measure restricted to $A_r$. If the limit $m_A = \lim_{r \to 0} m_{A,d}^r$ exists a.s. for the weak topology on the set of Borel measures and has finite positive total mass, we call $m_A$ the $d$-occupation measure of $A$.

It is clear that there is at most one $d \in (0, 2)$ such that the $d$-occupation measure of $A$ exists. If $m_A$ exists, then $m_A(\mathbb{C})$ is the so-called $d$-dimensional Minkowski content of $A$. 
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Definition 5.2 (GMC). Let $h$ be a free Liouville field on a domain $D$ and let $\mu$ be a random finite Borel measure on $D$. For each $r > 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$, let $h_r(z)$ be the integration of $h$ against the unit mass uniform measure on the circle $\{w \in \mathbb{C} : |w - z| = r\}$, if this circle is contained in $D$. Let $h_r(z) = 0$ otherwise. For $\alpha > 0$, we define the measure $e^{\alpha h}\mu$ by $\lim_{r \to 0} r^{3/2} e^{\alpha h_r}\mu$ if the limit exists almost surely in the weak topology and is nonzero a.s. on the event $\mu \neq 0$.

In Definition 5.2 we require $\lim_{r \to 0} r^{3/2} e^{\alpha h_r}\mu$ to exist almost surely as $r \to 0$, rather than considering a limit in probability (or in law, or a.s. along some subsequence of $r$’s) as in most other literature on GMC. This will be used in Lemma 5.29.

As will be clear from the proof, the particular law of $h$ does not play an important role in this section. Therefore we consider a more general setting that includes $\mathbb{S}$ as a special case.

Suppose $D$ is a simply connected $C^0$ domain, $a$ is point on $\partial D$, and $h$ is a free Liouville field on $D$. Define $L := \xi_h(\partial D)$. Recall from Convention 2.2 that $\gamma = \sqrt{8/3}$. If $(D, h - 2\gamma^{-1} \log L, a)/\sim$ is independent of $L$ and has the law of a $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG disk with unit boundary length, then we say that $(D, h, a)/\sim$ is a $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG disk and call $L$ the boundary length of the disk.

Now suppose $D$ is a Jordan domain with $a \in \partial D$. Let $h$ be a free Liouville field on $D$ such that $(D, h, a)/\sim$ is a $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG disk. Let $\Gamma$ be a CLE$_6$ on $D$ with monochromatic blue boundary condition which is independent of $h$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ be the set of $\varepsilon$-pivotal points of $(h, \Gamma)$ as in Definition 5.15. In [BHS18 Section 6], a measure $\nu^\varepsilon_{h, \Gamma}$ was defined on $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ based on the theory of mating of trees [DMS14]. In this section we prove the following.

**Proposition 5.3.** In the setting of the paragraph above, the $3/4$-occupation measure $m_\varepsilon$ of $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ exists. Moreover, $e^{h/\sqrt{6}} m_\varepsilon$ exists in the sense of Definition 5.2. Finally, $\nu^\varepsilon_{h, \Gamma} = ce^{h/\sqrt{6}} m_\varepsilon$ a.s. for some deterministic constant $c > 0$.

We will recall the mating-of-trees theory for SLE$_6$ on $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG surfaces in Section 5.1. In Section 5.2 we give a definition of $\nu^\varepsilon_{h, \Gamma}$ which is a slight reformulation of the one in [BHS18]. When $(D, h, a) = (D, \mathbf{h}, 1)$, $\nu^\varepsilon_{h, \Gamma}$ in Proposition 5.3 is exactly the measure $\nu^\varepsilon_{h, \Gamma}$ in (5). The bulk of this section, Section 5.3, is devoted to the proof of Proposition 5.3. The reader may skip Sections 5.1, 5.3 and proceed directly to Section 6 if she is willing to accept Proposition 5.3 without a proof.

### 5.1 Mating-of-trees theory for SLE$_6$ on $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG surfaces

The definition of $\nu^\varepsilon_{h, \Gamma}$ and the proof of Proposition 5.3 both rely on the mating-of-trees theory for SLE$_6$ on $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG surfaces. The general theory is built in the foundational paper [DMS14]. It is further developed in [CM18] and revisited in [BHS18 Section 6]. In this subsection we review the theory needed for Proposition 5.3.

Recall notions in Section 2.4. Given $(D, a, b) \in D_{\ast \ast}$, let $\eta$ be an SLE$_6$ on $(D, a, b)$ under a certain parametrization. Let $h$ be a free Liouville field on $D$ which is independent of $\eta$ viewed as a curve modulo monotone reparametrization. A set $B \subset D$ is called a **bubble** of $\eta$ if it is a connected component of $D \setminus \eta$. Let $t_B = \sup \{ t \geq 0 : B \subset D_t \}$. We call $x_B := \eta(t_B)$ the **root** of $B$.

---

8The process $(z, r) \mapsto h_r(z)$ is well-defined as a continuous process on $\{(z, r) \in D \times \mathbb{R}_+ : |z - w| > r \ \forall w \in \mathbb{C} \setminus D\}$ (see e.g. [DS11]) and is known as the circle average process.
Let $U$ be either $D_t$ for some $D_t \neq \emptyset$ or a bubble of $\eta$. By [She16a,DMS14], the conditional law of $h|_U$ given $U$ is a free Liouville field, which define a $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG boundary measure on $\partial U$. A connected subset of $\partial U$ is called a \textit{segment} of $\partial U$ if it is the image of a connected subset of $\partial D$ under a conformal map $\phi : D \to U$. Given a segment $V$ of $\partial U$, we call the mass of $V$ under the $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG boundary measure the \textit{quantum length} of $V$ with respect to $h$. When the field is clear from the context, we will simply called it the quantum length of $V$. In particular, when $U = D$ so that $V$ is a boundary arc of $D$, the quantum length of $V$ with respect to $h$ equals $\xi_h(V)$. The quantum length of the left (resp., right) boundary of $(D,a,b)$ is called the left (resp., right) boundary length of $(D,h,a,b) \sim$ (or simply $(D,a,b)$ if the field is clear from the context).

The key observable in the mating-of-trees theory is the so-called boundary length process. For $D_t \neq \emptyset$, recall the left and right frontier $\eta^L_t$ and $\eta^R_t$ of $\eta$ defined in Section 2.4. Let $z$ be a point on $\eta^L_t \cap \partial D$. (If the left boundary length of $(D,a,b)$ is finite we can simply choose $z = b$.) Let $L_t$ be the quantum length of the clockwise arc from $\eta(t)$ to $z$ on $\partial D_t$ minus the quantum length of the clockwise arc from $0$ to $z$ on $\partial D$. It is clear that the value of $L_t$ does not depend on the choice of $z$. Define $R_t$ similarly with $z$ on $\eta^R_t \cap \partial D$ instead. The process $L$ (resp. $R$) has a downward jump at time $t$ if and only if $t = t_B$ for some bubble $B$ to the left (resp. right) of $\eta$. Moreover, the size of the jump equals the quantum length of $\partial B$. We call $Z = (L, R)$ the \textit{boundary length process} of $(D, h, a, b, \eta)$. By [13], $Z$ is a.s. determined by $(D, h, a, b, \eta) \sim$.

The quantum wedges is a family of LQG surfaces which plays a key role in the mating-of-trees theory. They were first introduced in [She16a] and were later studied in e.g. [DMS14].

**Definition 5.4.** Fix $W > 4/3$ and $a > 0$ such that $W = 4/3 + \sqrt{8/3}a$ [DMS14, Table 1.1]. Let $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be such that for $(B_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ a standard two-sided Brownian motion,

- $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ $= (B_{2t} - at)_{t \geq 0}$,
- $(X_t)_{t \leq 0}$ has the law of $(B_{2t} - at)_{t \leq 0}$ conditioned to be positive, and
- $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(X_t)_{t \leq 0}$ are independent.

Let $h^1(t + si) = X_t$ for each $t + si \in \mathcal{S}$. Let $h^2$ be the free Liouville field on $\mathcal{S}$ independent of $X_t$ whose law is the lateral component of the free-boundary GFF on $\mathcal{S}$. Let $h = h^1 + h^2$. Then the law of the $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG surface $(\mathcal{S}, h, +\infty, -\infty) \sim$ is called the $W$-\textit{quantum wedge}.

**Remark 5.5.** Quantum wedges have the following symmetry. If $(D, h^w, a, b) \sim$ is a $W$-quantum wedge, then $(D, h^w + c, a, b) \sim \overset{d}{=} (D, h^w, a, b) \sim$ for each deterministic $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

The 2-quantum wedge has an additional symmetry. If $(D, h^w, a, b) \sim$ is a 2-quantum wedge and $s > 0$, let $a_s \in D$ be on the left boundary of $(D, a, b)$ such that the left boundary length of $(D, a, a_s)$ equals $s$. Then $(D, h^w, a_s, b) \sim$ has the law of a 2-quantum wedge.

So far we have not specified a parametrization of $\eta$. In the mating-of-trees theory, the most convenient one is the so-called quantum natural parametrization.\(^9\)

---

\(^9\)In [DMS14] quantum wedges are parametrized in six different ways. See [DMS14, Table 1.1] for their relations. Our choice in Definition 5.4 is called parametrization by \textit{weight}. The notion of $\alpha$-quantum wedge in [DMS14] is different from the one in Definition 5.4 since $\alpha$ refers to the log singularity parameter, while our $W$ refers to the weight. These are related by $W = \gamma(\gamma/2 + Q - \alpha)$, where $\gamma = \sqrt{8/3}$ and $Q = 5/\sqrt{6}$.

\(^{10}\)In [DMS14] and several other papers this parametrization is called the quantum natural time rather than the quantum natural parametrization.
Proposition 5.6 (\cite{DMS14}). Given \((D,a,b) \in \mathcal{D}_{*,*}\), let \(h^w\) be a free Liouville field on \(D\) such that \(W := (D, h^w, a, b)/\sim\) is a 2-quantum wedge. Let \(\eta\) be an SLE\(_6\) on \((D, a, b)\) independent of \(h^w\). There exists a parametrization of \(\eta\) such if \(Z = Z^w = (L^w, R^w)\) denotes the boundary length process of \((D, h^w, a, b, \eta)\), then \(L^w\) and \(R^w\) are two independent Lévy processes with Lévy measure \(\frac{3}{4\sqrt{\pi}}|x|^{-5/2}1_{x < 0}\). We call such a parametrization a quantum natural parametrization of \(\eta\) under \(h^w\).

Remark 5.7 (Uniqueness of the quantum natural parametrization). Suppose \((X_t)_{t \geq 0}\) is a Lévy processes with Lévy measure \(\frac{3}{4\sqrt{\pi}}|x|^{-5/2}1_{x < 0}\). Then \((X_t)_{t \geq 0}\) is a.s. determined by \((X_t)_{t \geq 0}\) modulo monotone reparametrization. Therefore the quantum natural parametrization of \(\eta\) in Proposition 5.6 as well as in Proposition 5.8 below is unique in the sense that two such parametrizations under the same \(h\) must be a.s. identical. Moreover, for \((D', a', b') \in \mathcal{D}_{*,*}\), if \(\phi : D \to D'\) and \(h'\) are such that \((D, h, a, b) \overset{\phi}{\sim} (D', h', a', b')\), then \(\phi \circ \eta\) is an SLE\(_6\) on \((D', a', b')\), with the quantum natural parametrization under \(h'\).

The following proposition, which is extracted from the main results of \cite{GM18}, provides a definition of the quantum natural parametrization for SLE\(_6\) on \(\sqrt{8/3}\)-LQG disk.

Proposition 5.8. Given constants \(\ell, r > 0\), let \((D, a, b) \in \mathcal{D}_{*,*}\) and let \(h\) be a free Liouville field on \(D\) such that \((D, h, a)/\sim\) is a \(\sqrt{8/3}\)-LQG disk with boundary length \(\ell + r\) and the right boundary of \((D, a, b)\) has quantum length \(r\). Let \(\eta\) be a chordal SLE\(_6\) on \((D, a, b)\) independent of \(h\). There exists a parametrization of \(\eta\), defined on some random interval \([0, \sigma]\), such that the boundary length process \(Z^d = (L^d, R^d)\) of \((D, h, a, b, \eta)\) has the following law. Let \(Z^w = (L^w, R^w)\) be as in Proposition 5.6 and let \(\sigma^w = \inf\{t \geq 0 : L^w(t) \leq -\ell \text{ or } R^w(t) \leq -r\}\). Then for each \(t > 0\), the law of \(Z^d|_{[0,t]} \cdot 1_{t < \sigma^w}\) is absolutely continuous with respect to \(Z^w|_{[0,t]} \cdot 1_{t < \sigma^w}\) with Radon-Nikodym derivative given by \((L^w(t) + R^w(t) + \ell + r)^{-5/2}1_{t < \sigma^w}\).

Moreover, \(\lim_{t \to \sigma^w} Z^d(t) = (-\ell, -r)\) almost surely. Such a parametrization is called a quantum natural parametrization of \(\eta\) under \(h\).

Intuitively, the law of \(Z^d\) is the conditional law of \(Z^w\) until exiting \((-\ell, \infty) \times (-r, \infty)\), conditioning on exiting at \((-\ell, -r)\).

The following reversibility of quantum natural parametrization is needed for Section 5.3.

Lemma 5.9. Let \(h, \eta, \text{ and } \sigma\) be as in Proposition 5.8 with \(\eta\) having the quantum natural parametrization. Let \(\widehat{\eta}(t) = \eta(\sigma - t)\) for \(t \in [0, \sigma]\), so that \(\widehat{\eta}\) is the time reversal of \(\eta\). Then the law of \((D, h, b, a, \widehat{\eta})/\sim\) is that of \((D, h, a, b, \eta)/\sim\) with \(\ell\) and \(r\) swapped. In particular, \(\widehat{\eta}\) has the quantum natural parametrization under \(h\).

Proof. Although there are ways to prove Lemma 5.9 directly in the continuum, we point out that this lemma immediately follows from \cite{GM17a}, which asserts that \((D, a, b, h, \eta)\) in Proposition 5.8 is the GHPU-scaling limit of the Boltzmann triangulation decorated with a percolation interface. The desired result in the continuum follows from the obvious reversibility in the discrete. \(\square\)

\footnote{In fact, the quantum natural parametrization in \cite{DMS14} is defined only up to a multiplicative constant, which we fix by specifying the Lévy measure of \(Z\).}
Now we state the mating-of-trees theorem for SLE$_6$ on a 2-quantum wedge or a quantum disk, proved in [DMS14] and [GM18], respectively.

**Theorem 5.10.** Let $(D, h, a, b, \eta)$ be as in Proposition 5.8, with $\eta$ having the quantum natural parametrization. For a fixed $t > 0$, conditioning on $Z^d|_{[0,t]}$ and the event $D_t \neq \emptyset$,

1. the conditional law of $\{(B, h, x_B)| \sim: B$ is a bubble with $t_B \leq t\}$ is that of independent $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG disks with given boundary length, and

2. the conditional law of $(D_t, h, \eta(t), b, \eta)| \sim$ equals the law of $(D, h, a, b, \eta)/\sim$ with $(\ell, r)$ replaced by the left and right, respectively, boundary length of $(D_t, h, \eta(t), b)/\sim$. Furthermore, the surface is conditionally independent of the $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG disks in Assertion 1.

3. $(D, h, a, b, \eta)/\sim$ is a.s. determined by $(D_t, h, \eta(t), b)/\sim$, the ordered sequence of bubbles $\{(B, h, x_B)| \sim: t_B \leq t\}$, and information about whether each bubble in this sequence is on the left or right side of $\eta$. (See Section 2.1 for the meaning of “determined by”.)

If $(D, h, a, b, \eta)$ is replaced by $(D, h^w, a, b, \eta)$ as in Proposition 5.6, all statements hold exactly with $h^w$ in place of $h$, except that in Assertion 3 the conditional law of $(D_t, h^w, \eta(t), b, \eta)/\sim$ equals the law of $(D, h^w, a, b, \eta)/\sim$.

### 5.2 $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG pivotal measure as a local time

In this section we provide a construction of the $\varepsilon$-pivotal measure using the mating-of-trees theory we reviewed in Section 5.1. Our construction differs from the one in [BHS18, Section 6] since we rely heavily on the iterative construction of CLE$_6$ (Lemma 2.12). However, as explained in Remark 5.16, the two constructions are equivalent in the sense that they give the same pivotal measure.

We start by recalling some standard facts from fluctuation theory for Lévy processes and stable subordinators which can be found in [Kyp14, Ber99]. For each $\beta \in (0, 1)$, a Lévy process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ a called a $\beta$-stable subordinator if $X$ is a.s. increasing and $X_{at}^{d} = a^{1/\beta}X_t$ for any $a > 0$. Given a stable subordinator $\tau$ of index $\beta$, let $\mathcal{R}_\tau = \{\tau(t): t \geq 0\}$ denote its range. Let $m_\tau$ be the pushforward of Lebesgue measure on $[0, \infty)$ by $\tau$, so that $m_\tau$ is a measure supported on $\mathcal{R}_\tau$. We call $m_\tau$ the **local time** on $\mathcal{R}_\tau$. The Hausdorff dimension of $\mathcal{R}_\tau$ is a.s. equal to $\beta$. Moreover, by [FP71], there exists a unique deterministic function $f_\tau$ such that almost surely for all $t > 0$,

$$m_\tau([0, t]) = \text{Hausdorff measure of } \mathcal{R}_\tau \cap [0, t] \text{ with gauge function } f_\tau. \quad (29)$$

**Lemma 5.11.** Let $X \overset{d}{=} L^w$, where $L^w$ is as in Proposition 5.6. Then there exists a 1/3-subordinator $\tau$ such that $\mathcal{R}_\tau = \{t \geq 0: X(t) = \inf_{s \in [0, t]} X(s)\}$. Moreover, $H_s = -X(\tau_s)$ is a 1/2-stable subordinator and $m_H$ equals the pushforward of $m_\tau$ under $-X$ a.s.

**Proof.** The existence of $\tau$ and the law of $H$ can be found in [Kyp14, Section 6], where $(X, H)$ is called the ladder process. The fact that $m_H = (-X)_*m_\tau$ a.s. follows by definition. \qed
**Definition 5.12.** Let \((D, a, b, h^w, \eta)\) and \(Z^w = (L^w, R^w)\) be as in Proposition 5.6 where \(\eta\) has the quantum natural parametrization and \(Z^w\) is the boundary length process. Let \(m_t^\ell\) and \(m_t^r\) be defined as \(m_t^\ell\) and \(m_t^r\) in Lemma 5.11 with \(L^w\) and \(R^w\) in place of \(X\) respectively, so \(m_t^\ell\) (resp., \(m_t^r\)) is a measure on the time set \(\mathbb{R}_+\) of \(L^w\) (resp., \(R^w\)) supported on the closure of the set of times at which \(L^w\) (resp., \(R^w\)) reach a running infimum. Let \(\nu_\eta^0 := m_t^\ell + \nu_\eta^0 t\), which by the definition of \(Z^w\) is a measure supported on \(\eta \cap \partial D\). For each \(t \geq 0\), let \(\nu_\eta^t\) be defined as \(\nu_\eta^0\) with \(D, h^w, a, r, \) and \(\eta\) replaced by \(D_t, h^w|_{D_t}, \eta(t)\), and \(\eta|_{(t, \infty)}\), respectively. We call \(\nu_\eta^t\) the **boundary touching measure** of \(\eta\) at time \(t\).

For each \(t \geq 0\), the measure \(\nu_\eta^t\) is supported on \(\{t, \infty\} \cap \partial D_t\). By Lemma 5.11 we have the following.

**Lemma 5.13.** Let \(f_H\) be as in (29) with \(\tau\) replaced by \(H\) in Lemma 5.11. Let \((D, h^w, a, b, \eta)\) be as in Proposition 5.6. For \(t \geq 0\), let the left and right frontier \(\eta^\ell_t\) and \(\eta^r_t\), respectively, be curves parametrized by their quantum lengths. Let \(m_t^\ell\) be the measure on \([0, \infty)\) induced by the Hausdorff measure of \(\{s > 0 : \exists t' > t\ such\ that\ \eta(t') = \eta^\ell_t(s)\} \) with gauge function \(f_H\).

Define \(m_t^r\) similarly with \(\eta^r_t\) in (30) replaced by \(\eta^\ell_t\). Then \(\nu_\eta^t = (\eta^\ell_t)_* m_t^\ell + (\eta^r_t)_* m_t^r\).

By the relationship between \(Z^d\) and \(Z^w\), we may define boundary touching measure for an \(SLE_6\) decorated \(\sqrt{8/3}\)-LQG disk in the exact same way as in Definition 5.12. Lemma 5.13 provides an equivalent definition only depending \(\partial D_t, h^w,\) and \(\eta \cap \partial D_t\) but not on the behavior of \(\eta\) outside of \(\partial D_t\).

**Definition 5.14.** Let \((D, h, a, b, \eta), \sigma,\) and \(Z^d = (L^d, R^d)\) be as in Proposition 5.8 such that \(\eta\) has the quantum natural parametrization. Let \(f_H\) be as in Lemma 5.13. For each \(t \geq 0\), on the event \(\{\sigma > t\}\), let \(\text{dbl}_{\eta,t} := \eta([t, \sigma]) \cap \partial D_t\). Let \(\nu_\eta^t\) be the measure supported on \(\text{dbl}_{\eta,t}\) defined in the same way as in Lemma 5.13 in terms of \(\eta^\ell_t, \eta^r_t, \eta,\) and \(f_H\). We call \(\nu_\eta^t\) the **boundary touching measure** of \(\eta\) at time \(t\). The countable collection of measures \(\{\nu_\eta^t\}_{t \in [0, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Q}}\) extends to a measure \(\nu_\eta\) on the union of their supports, which we call the **extended boundary touching (EBT) measure** of \(\eta\) for \((D, h)\).

Given \((D, a, b) \in D_{s, s}\), let \(\eta\) be an \(SLE_6\) on \((D, a, b)\) and define
\[
\text{dbl}_\eta := \{p \in D : \exists s \neq t \ such\ that\ \eta(s) = \eta(t)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dbl}_{\eta,D} := \text{dbl}_\eta \cup (\eta \cap \partial D).
\]
Then in the setting of Definition 5.14, \(\nu_\eta^t(D \setminus \text{dbl}_{\eta,D}) = 0\) for each \(t \in (0, \sigma)\) by (30).

Consider \((D, h, a, b, \eta)\) as in Definition 5.14 and \((\hat{D}, \hat{h}, \hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{\eta}) \sim_\phi (D, h, a, b, \eta)\) for a conformal map \(\phi : \hat{D} \to D\), where \((\hat{D}, \hat{a}, \hat{b})\) itself is possibly random. We say that \(\hat{\nu}_\eta := (\phi^{-1})_* \nu_\eta\) is the EBT measure of \(\hat{\eta}\) for \((\hat{D}, \hat{h})\). Given any random number \(c\) independent of \((\hat{D}, \hat{h}, \hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{\eta})\), we say that \(e^{c/\sqrt{\pi}} \hat{\nu}_\eta\) is the EBT measure of \(\hat{\eta}\) for \((\hat{D}, \hat{h} + c)\). Note that the definition of the EBT measure on \((\hat{D}, \hat{a}, \hat{b})\) does not depend on the choice of \(\phi\) and \((D, a, b)\). Also note that if \((\hat{D}, \hat{a}, \hat{b})\) and/or \(c\) are deterministic then these definitions of the EBT measure via the conformal map \(\phi\) are consistent with the one in Definition 5.14. Now we are ready to define the measure \(\nu_{\hat{h}, \hat{t}}\) in Proposition 5.3. See Figure 3 for an illustration.
Figure 3: Illustration of the construction of the pivotal measure $\nu_{\varepsilon,\Gamma}^\varepsilon$ given in Definition 5.15. The left figure illustrates the construction for a monochromatic domain $D$ (Step 1), while the right figure considers the case of a dichromatic bubble $B$ (Step 2). The $\varepsilon$-pivotal points which are captured in each step are shown in red. Note that points of intersection between an SLE$_6$ and $\partial D$ are not pivotal points, while in later iterations points of intersection between an SLE$_6$ in some domain $B$ and $\partial B \setminus \partial D$ will be pivotal points.

**Definition 5.15.** Let $D$ be a Jordan domain and let $(D, h, a)$ be a $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG disk with boundary length $L$. Let $\Gamma$ be a CLE$_6$ on $D$ independent of $h$ with monochromatic blue boundary condition. Let $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ be the set of $\varepsilon$-pivotal points of $(h, \Gamma)$. The $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG pivotal measure $\nu_{\varepsilon,\Gamma}^\varepsilon$ on $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ is the measure supported on $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ which can be constructed as follows.

**Step 1** Let $b \in \partial D$ be such that the left boundary arc of $(D, a, b)$ is $L/2$. Let $\Gamma_a^b$ and $\eta_{ab}$ be determined by $\Gamma$ as in Lemma 2.12. Set $\nu_{\varepsilon,\Gamma}^\varepsilon = \nu_{\eta_{ab}}$ on $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl} \eta_{ab}, D$ where $\nu_{\eta_{ab}}$ is the EBT measure of $\eta_{ab}$ for $(D, h)$. 

**Step 2** Recall notations in the paragraph above Lemma 2.12, for each dichromatic bubble $B$, set $\nu_{\varepsilon,\Gamma}^\varepsilon = \nu_{\eta_B}$ on $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl} \eta_B, B$ where $\nu_{\eta_B}$ is the EBT measure of $\eta_B$ for $(h|_B, B)$.

Restricted to the closure of a connected component of $D \setminus \Gamma_a$, the measure $\nu_{\varepsilon,\Gamma}^\varepsilon$ is defined by iterating Steps 1 and 2.

The fact that $\nu_{\varepsilon,\Gamma}^\varepsilon$ in Definition 5.15 is well-defined requires some justification. Let $\text{dbl} l$ be the support of $\nu_{\eta_{ab}}^l$. As explained in [BHS18, Lemma 6.9], there exists a finite set $T$ such that $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl} \eta_{ab}, D \subset \bigcup_{t \in T} \text{dbl} t$. Therefore $\nu_{\varepsilon,\Gamma}^\varepsilon$ restricted to $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl} \eta_{ab}, D$ is a finite Borel measure. In the second step, there are finitely many dichromatic bubbles with $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl} \eta_B, B \neq \emptyset$. On each such bubble, the same consideration shows that $\nu_{\varepsilon,\Gamma}^\varepsilon$ restricted to $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl} \eta_B, B$ is a finite Borel measure. By the local finiteness property of $\Gamma$, the iteration a.s. exhausts $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ in finitely many steps. We call $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl} \eta_{ab}, D$ and $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl} \eta_B, B$ the sets associated with Step 1 and Step 2, respectively. We associate sets to each iterative step in the same way. By the no-triple-points property of $\Gamma$, these sets are all disjoint. In particular, our definition of $\nu_{\varepsilon,\Gamma}^\varepsilon$ has no inconsistency in difference steps. Moreover, $\nu_{\varepsilon,\Gamma}^\varepsilon$ is a finite Borel measure on $D$.

**Remark 5.16** (Equivalent definitions of quantum pivotal measure). We now explain why the pivotal measure $\nu_{\varepsilon,\Gamma}^\varepsilon$ defined above is a.s. equal to the $\varepsilon$-LQG pivotal measure defined in [BHS18] (which was denoted by $\nu_\varepsilon$ there). We do not provide the detailed construction.
in \cite{BHS18}, but only point out how one can check the equivalence. If we do not employ Lemma 5.13 but only use the notations in Lemma 5.12 to describe Definitions 5.14 and 5.15, then restricted \( \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta^B,\varepsilon} \) as in Step 1 in Definition 5.14, the description of \( \nu_{h,\varepsilon} \) is identical to that of \( c\nu_{\varepsilon} \), where \( c \) is a positive constant coming from the fact that in \cite{BHS18} we use a different convention to normalize the local time. The normalization in \cite{BHS18} is set so that \( \nu_{\varepsilon, \text{piv}} \rightarrow \nu_{\varepsilon} \). Therefore \( c = c_\varepsilon^{-1} \) in the first paragraph of our Section 5. Recall \( \eta_B \), \( \eta^B \), and \( \ell_B \) as defined in the paragraph above Lemma 2.12. In the notation of \cite{BHS18}, Section 6.5, \( \eta_B \) and \( \eta^B \) are the so-called past and future segments of the loop \( \ell_B \), respectively. This observation together with a further bookkeeping inspection of \cite{BHS18}, Section 6.7 implies that \( \nu_{\varepsilon} = c_p \nu_{h,\varepsilon} \) on \( \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta^B,\varepsilon} \) as in Step 2 in Definition 5.15. By iteration, one may check that \( \nu_{\varepsilon} = c_p \nu_{h,\varepsilon} \) on \( \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \).

5.3 \( \sqrt{8/3} \)-LQG pivotal measure as a quantum occupation measure

In this section we will prove Proposition 5.3, i.e., we will show that \( \nu_{h,\varepsilon} = c e^{h/\sqrt{\varepsilon}} m_\varepsilon \) a.s. In Sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 we provide necessary background and basic results on quantum zippers and GMC on occupations measures, respectively. This allows us to prove a first variant of the identity \( \nu_{h,\varepsilon} = c e^{h/\sqrt{\varepsilon}} m_\varepsilon \), where the \( \varepsilon \)-pivotal points are replaced by points of intersection between two SLE\(_{\sqrt{8/3}}\)-like curves (see Lemma 5.36). In Sections 5.3.3, 5.3.4, and 5.3.5 we gradually deform the simple setting of Lemma 5.36 to the setting of interest in Proposition 5.3 using the coordinate change formula for LQG surfaces and the (local) absolute continuity between the \( \sqrt{8/3} \)-LQG disk and 2-quantum wedge.

5.3.1 Quantum zippers for \( \sqrt{8/3} \)-LQG surfaces

The proof of Proposition 5.3 will rely on the theory of quantum zippers for LQG surfaces \cite{She16a,DMS14}. We start by recalling a generalization of SLE\(_{\kappa}\) called SLE\(_{\kappa}(\rho_t; \rho_f)\), where SLE\(_{\kappa}\) is the special case SLE\(_{\kappa}(0; 0)\). Consider tuples of the form \((D, a, b; v_\ell, v_r)\), where \((D, a, b) \in D_{\star, \star}\), and \(v_\ell\) (resp. \(v_r\)) is a point on the left (resp., right) boundary of \((D, a, b)\). The points \(v_\ell\) and \(v_r\) are allowed to be equal to \(a\), in which case we will denote them by \(a^-\) and \(a^+\), respectively. Given \(\kappa > 0, \rho_\ell > -2,\) and \(\rho_f > -2\), the (chordal) SLE\(_{\kappa}(\rho_\ell; \rho_f)\) on \((D, a, b; v_\ell, v_r)\) is a probability measure on non-self-crossing curves on \(D \cup \partial D\) from \(a\) to \(b\) modulo increasing reparametrization. Away from \(\partial D\), an SLE\(_{\kappa}(\rho_\ell; \rho_f)\) curve looks locally like SLE\(_{\kappa}\) in the sense that it has the same a.s. properties. The points \(v_\ell\) and \(v_r\) are called the force points. The parameter \(\rho_\ell\) (resp. \(\rho_f\)) is called the weight of \(v_\ell\) (resp. \(v_r\)), and governs the behavior of the curve when it approaches the left (resp., right) boundary. An SLE\(_{\kappa}(\rho_\ell; \rho_f)\) curve a.s. does not touch the left (resp. right) boundary of \((D, a, b)\) except for the ending points if and only if

\[
\rho_\ell \text{ (resp. } \rho_f) \text{ is at least } \kappa/2 - 2. \tag{32}
\]

The SLE\(_{\kappa}(\rho_\ell; \rho_f)\) has conformal invariance and domain Markov properties similar to those in Section 2.4, with the two additional marked points taken into account when applying conformal maps. See \cite{MS16, MS16a, DMS14, LSW03, Dub09, Zha08} for more background on SLE\(_{\kappa}(\rho_\ell; \rho_f)\).
The **conformal removability** of \( \text{SLE}_{8/3}(\rho_{\ell}; \rho_{r}) \) will be needed (see e.g. [DMS14, Proposition 3.16]).

**Lemma 5.17.** Let \( \eta \) be an \( \text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho_{\ell}; \rho_{r}) \) on \((D, a, b) \in \mathcal{D}_{\kappa} \) with \( \rho_{\ell}, \rho_{r} > -2 \). Suppose \( U \subset D \) is open and that \( \phi : U \to \mathbb{C} \) is continuous on \( U \) and conformal on \( U \setminus \eta \). Then \( \phi \) is a.s. conformal on \( U \).

**Definition 5.18.** Let \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) be an integer. Given \((D, a, b) \in \mathcal{D}_{\kappa} \), the \( k \)-\( \text{SLE}_{8/3} \) on \((D, a, b) \) is the joint law of \( k \) curves \((\eta^1, \ldots, \eta^k)\) such that \( \eta^1 \) is an \( \text{SLE}_\kappa(-4/3; 2k/3 - 2) \) on \((D, a, b) \) and, inductively, conditioning on \( \{\eta^1\}_{1 \leq i \leq j} \) with \( 1 \leq j \leq k - 1 \), the law of \( \eta^{i+1} \) is that of an \( \text{SLE}_\kappa(-4/3; 2(k - j)/3 - 2) \) from \( a \) to \( b \) on the right side of \( \eta^i \).

The \( k \)-\( \text{SLE}_{8/3} \) is a system of flow lines in imaginary geometry [MS16c]. In particular, we have the following.

**Lemma 5.19.** Suppose \((\eta^1, \ldots, \eta^k)\) is a \( k \)-\( \text{SLE}_{8/3} \) on \((D, a, b) \in \mathcal{D}_{\kappa} \) for \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). The marginal law of \( \eta^i \) is that of an \( \text{SLE}_{8/3}(2j/3 - 2; 2(k + 1 - j)/3 - 2) \) on \((D, a, b) \). By convention we let \( \eta^0 \) and \( \eta^{k+1} \) be the left and right, respectively, boundary of \((D, a, b) \). For \( 1 \leq i \leq j \leq k \), conditioning on \( \eta^{i-1} \) and \( \eta^{j+1} \), the conditional law of \((\eta^1, \ldots, \eta^j)\) is that of a \((j - i + 1) \)-\( \text{SLE}_\kappa \) on the domain bounded by \( \eta^{i-1} \) and \( \eta^{j+1} \) with marked boundary points \( a, b \).

Lemma 5.19 and (32) immediately imply the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.20.** In the setting of Lemma 5.19, for \( 0 \leq i < j \leq k + 1 \) there a.s. exist (resp., does not exist) intersection points of \( \eta^i \) and \( \eta^j \) other than \( a, b \) if \( j = i + 1 \) (resp. \( j > i + 1 \)).

The following lemma can be deduced from [MS16c, Theorem 1.4].

**Lemma 5.21.** Let \( \eta \) be an \( \text{SLE}_6 \) on \((D, a, b) \in \mathcal{D}_{\kappa} \). Let \( D^m \) be the set of points in \( D \cup \partial D \) which are not in any bubble of \( \eta \) whose root is on \( \partial D \). Then \( D^m \) is the region bounded by two simple curves from \( a \) to \( b \), whose joint law is the 2-\( \text{SLE}_{8/3} \) on \((D, a, b) \). We call the two curves the left and right, respectively, boundary of \((D^m, a, b) \).

**Definition 5.22.** Let \((D, a, b) \in \mathcal{D}_{\kappa} \) and let \( \eta'_L \) and \( \eta'_R \) be two simple curves on \( D \cup \partial D \) from \( a \) to \( b \) which do not cross each other, such that \( \eta'_L \) is between \( \eta' \) and the left boundary of \((D, a, b) \). Let \( D' \subset \partial D \) be the open set with boundary \( \eta'_L \cup \eta'_R \). For each connected component \( \mathcal{B} \) of \( D' \), let \( a_B, b_B \in \partial \mathcal{B} \) be the two points on the intersection of the left and right boundary of \((D, a', b') \) such that \( a_B \) is visited before \( b_B \) by \( \eta'_L \) and \( \eta'_R \). Let \( \{\mathcal{B}\} \) be the collection of such components ordered such that \( \{a_B\} \) is in order of visit by \( \eta'_L \) and \( \eta'_R \). Assuming \( h \) is a distribution on \( D \), we let \( (D', h, a, b)/\sim := \{(\mathcal{B}, h, a_B, b_B)/\sim\} \) be the ordered collection of \( \sqrt{8/3} \)-LQG surfaces with two marked boundary points.

Suppose \((D, h^{\infty}, a, b, \eta)\) is as in Proposition 5.6 and \( D' = D^m \) is as in Lemma 5.21. A surface with the law of \((D', h^{\infty}, a, b)/\sim \) is called a 2/3-quantum wedge.

The main property of the 2/3-quantum wedge which we will use is the following result from quantum zipper theory (see [DMS14, Theorem 1.2]).
Proposition 5.23. Suppose \((\eta^1, \cdots, \eta^k)\) is a \(k\)-SLE\(_{3/3}\) on \((D, a, b) \in \mathcal{D}_{s,*}\) for an integer \(k \geq 2\). For \(0 \leq i \leq k\), let \(D^i\) be the domain bounded by \(\eta^i\) and \(\eta^{i+1}\), with the convention that \(\eta_0^i\) and \(\eta^k\) are the left and right boundary of \((D, a, b)\), respectively. Let \(h^w\) be a free Liouville field independent of \(\{\eta^i\}\) such that \((D, h^w, a, b)/\sim\) is a \(2(k+1)/3\)-quantum wedge. Then \(\{(D^i, h^w, a, b)/\sim\}_{0 \leq i \leq k}\) are \(k + 1\) independent \(2/3\)-quantum wedges. This collection of \(k + 1\) quantum surfaces a.s. determine \((D, h^w, a, b, \eta^1, \cdots, \eta^k)/\sim\). Moreover, for \(1 \leq i \leq k\), the \(\sqrt{8/3}\)-LQG boundary measure on \(\eta^i\) obtained by viewing \(\eta^i\) as a boundary arc of \((D^i, h^w)\) or \((D^{i-1}, h^w)\) agree.

In the setting of Proposition 5.23, let \(V\) be a segment of \(\eta^i\). We call the mass of \(V\) under the \(\sqrt{8/3}\)-LQG boundary measure the quantum length of \(V\). By the last assertion of Proposition 5.23, this is unambiguously defined. In the rest of Section 5, unless otherwise specified, we always parametrize \(\eta^i\) by the quantum length.

Definition 5.22 and Proposition 5.23 give explicit constructions of a \(2/3\)-quantum wedge. We will now give an alternative construction via a \(3/2\)-stable Lévy process \(L^w\) as in Proposition 5.6 and independent \(\sqrt{8/3}\)-LQG disks. Suppose \(\eta\) is an SLE\(_6\) on \((D, a, b) \in \mathcal{D}_{s,*}\). By Lemma 5.21, the region between the left boundary of \((D, a, b)\) and \((D_m, a, b)\), which we denote by \(D_\ell\), has the law of the domain \(D^i\) in Proposition 5.23 with \(k = 2\). Therefore, if \((D, h^w, a, b, \eta)\) is as in Proposition 5.6, \((D_\ell, h^w, a, b)/\sim\) is also a \(2/3\)-quantum wedge. By Theorem 5.10 and Definition 2.4, the law of \((D_\ell, h^w, a, b)/\sim\) can be described in terms of the the \(3/2\)-stable process \(L^w\) in Proposition 5.6 as follows. Write \((D_\ell, h^w, a, b)/\sim\) as an ordered collection of \(\sqrt{8/3}\)-LQG surfaces \(\{(B, h^w, a_B, b_B)/\sim\}\) as in Definition 5.22. Then for each element in this collection the left and right boundary lengths are prescribed by \(L^w\). Namely, there is a bijection between the jumps of \(L^w\) and the surfaces \((B, h^w, a_B, b_B)\), and if \(t\) is a jump time of \(L^w\) the associated bubble has total boundary length \(L^w_t - L^w_\ell\), left boundary length \(\inf_{s \in [0, t]} L^w_s - L^w_\ell\), and right boundary length \(L^w_\ell - \inf_{s \in [0, t]} L^w_s\). Conditioning on these boundary length data, \(\{(B, h^w, b_B)/\sim\}\) are conditionally independent \(\sqrt{8/3}\)-LQG disks.

In [DMS14, Section 4.4], the \(W\)-quantum wedge with \(W \in (0, 4/3)\) is constructed in the spirit of Definition 5.4. Wedges with \(W \in (0, 4/3)\) are called thin wedges. Just as the \(2/3\)-wedge, they may be described as an ordered chain of finite-volume LQG surfaces. We do not need the \(W \neq 2/3\) case in this paper, and therefore omit this construction.

Remark 5.24. We offer an alternative proof of Lemma 5.20 based on Proposition 5.23 since we will use the same argument in a later proof. For each \(1 \leq i \leq k\), let \(C^i = \eta^i \cap \eta^{i+1}\). By the law of \(L^w\) in Proposition 5.6 and Lemma 5.11, \(\mathcal{Z}^i := (\eta^i)^{-1}(C^i)\) has the law of the zero set of a linear Brownian motion if \(\eta^i\) is parametrized by quantum length. Moreover, \(\{\mathcal{Z}^i\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}\) are independent. Therefore \(\mathcal{Z}^{i-1} \cap \mathcal{Z}^i\) is equal in law to the zero set of a two dimensional Bessel process (i.e., the Euclidean norm of a two-dimensional Brownian motion), which is trivial, so \(\eta^{i-1} \cap \eta^{i+1} = \{a, b\}\).

### 5.3.2 Gaussian multiplicative chaos over occupation measures

In this section we prove a first version of Proposition 5.3 (see Lemma 5.36). We start by a deterministic fact on the transformation rule of the occupation measure under conformal maps. We leave its proof as an exercise to the reader.
Lemma 5.25. Let $d \in (0,2)$ and let $A$ be a compact set on $\mathbb{C}$ whose $d$-occupation measure $\nu_A$ exists. Let $\phi$ be a conformal map on a domain containing $A$. Then the $d$-occupation measure $\nu_{\phi(A)}$ of $\phi(A)$ exists and equals $|(|\phi^{-1}|)^{-d} \cdot (\phi_* \nu_A)$. If furthermore
\begin{equation}
\iint_{U \times U} \frac{\nu_A(dx) \nu_A(dy)}{|x-y|^{d-\varepsilon}} < \infty \text{ for all bounded sets } U \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0,d), \tag{33}
\end{equation}
then (33) still holds with $\nu_A$ replaced by $\nu_{\phi(A)}$.

The following lemma guarantees the existence of GMC over an occupation measure. The lemma would have followed from e.g. [Ber17] if we had considered convergence in probability instead of a.s. convergence in Definition 5.2. If $\nu_A$ is Lebesgue measure then the lemma can be proved using the strategy of [SW16, Theorem 1.1].

Lemma 5.26. Fix $d \in (0,2)$, $\alpha \in (0,\sqrt{d})$, and a Jordan domain $D$. Let $A$ be a compact set on $D$ whose $d$-occupation measure $\nu_A$ exists and satisfies (33). Let $\nu$ be a free Liouville field on $D$. Then $\nu = e^{\alpha h} \nu_A$ exists and is non-atomic.

Proof. By the definition of a free Liouville field (Definition 2.3), it is sufficient to consider the case where $h$ is a zero boundary Gaussian free field. Let $\nu_r = r^{-d/2} e^{\alpha h} \nu_A$. By the argument in [Ber17, Section 6], in order to prove that $e^{\alpha h} \nu_A$ exists it is sufficient to prove that for a fixed set $U \subseteq D$ (recall that $U \subseteq D$ means $U \cup \partial U \subseteq D$), $\nu(U)$ has an a.s. limit as $r \to 0$.

Define $\bar{h}_r(z) = \gamma h_r(z) + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \log r$. For any $s \in (0,r)$,
\begin{equation}
\mathbb{E}[(\nu_r(D) - \nu_s(D))^2] = \int_{D \times D} \mathbb{E} \left[ (e^{\bar{h}_r(z)} - e^{\bar{h}_s(z)})(e^{\bar{h}_r(w)} - e^{\bar{h}_s(w)}) \right] \nu_A(dz) \nu_A(dw). \tag{34}
\end{equation}

Let $G : \overline{D} \times \overline{D} \to \mathbb{R}$ denote the Green’s function and for $z \in D$ let $C(z;D)$ denote the conformal radius of $z$ in $D$. Recall that $\text{Var}(h_r(z)) = \log r^{-1} + \log C(z;D)$ and that $\text{Cov}[h_r(z), h_s(w)] = G(z,w)$ if $|z-w| > r + s$. Using these identities, we get that the integrand on the right side of (34) is zero when $|z-w| > 2r$. Therefore, for any $\hat{d} \in (0,d)$ and some constant $c > 0$,
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E}[(\nu_r(D) - \nu_s(D))^2] & \leq \int_{D \times D, |z-w| < 2r} \mathbb{E} \left[ (e^{\bar{h}_r(z)} - e^{\bar{h}_s(z)})^2 \right] \nu_A(dz) \nu_A(dw) \\
& \leq c \int_{D \times D, |z-w| < 2r} (r-s) \nu_A(dz) \nu_A(dw) \\
& \leq c(r-s)(2r)^{\hat{d}} \cdot \int_{D \times D} \frac{\nu_A(dz) \nu_A(dw)}{|z-w|^d}.
\end{align*}

The integral on the right side is finite by (33). We see from this estimate that for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we have a.s. convergence of $\nu_r(D)$ as $r \to 0$ along integer powers of $2^{-1/N}$. To obtain a.s. convergence as $r \to 0$ (without requiring that $r$ is a power of $2^{1/N}$), we proceed similarly as in the proof of [SW16, Theorem 1.1], and the argument is therefore omitted.

To conclude the proof, we need to show that the limiting measure $\nu$ is non-atomic. It is sufficient to show that for any $\delta > 0$ we can find an $r > 0$ such that no $r$-ball has mass
larger than $\delta$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Dividing the domain into $O(r^{-2})$ squares $S_i$ of diameter $r$, we have that for some $\tilde{d} \in (0, d)$ and constant $C > 0$,
\[
\mathbb{P}[\exists i \text{ such that } \nu(S_i) > \delta] \leq \sum_i \mathbb{P}[\nu(S_i) > \delta] \leq \sum_i \delta^{-2} \mathbb{E}[\nu(S_i)^2] \leq C \int \int_{|z - w| < r} |z - w|^{-\tilde{d}} m_A(dz)m_A(dw),
\]
where the last inequality follows from [Ber17, Section 3]. The right side converges to 0 as $r \to 0$ by [33], which concludes the proof.

We expect that Lemma 5.26 remains true for $\alpha \in [\sqrt{d}, \sqrt{2d}]$, but the $\alpha \in (0, \sqrt{d})$ case is more straightforward to verify by the $L^2$ argument above and is sufficient for our purpose.

The key tool in this section is the coordinate change formula.

**Definition 5.27 (Coordinate change).** Fix $d \in (0, 2)$ and a Jordan domain $D$. Define $Q(\alpha, d) := \alpha/2 + d/\alpha$ and let $\alpha \in (0, \sqrt{d})$ be such that $Q(\alpha, d) = 5/\sqrt{6}$. Consider a triple $(A, \phi, h)$ of random variables with the following properties: $A$ is a compact subset of $D$ whose $d$-occupation measure $m_A$ exists and satisfies [33], $h$ is a free Liouville field on $D$ such that $\nu = e^{\alpha h} m_A$ exists in the sense of Definition 5.2, and $\phi$ is a conformal map on $D$. Let $h_\phi := h \circ \phi^{-1} + 5/\sqrt{6} \cdot \log |(\phi^{-1})'|$. We say that coordinate change holds for $(A, \phi, h)$ if $e^{\alpha h} m_{\phi(A)}$ exists in the sense of Definition 5.2 and $e^{\alpha h} m_{\phi(A)} = \phi_* \nu$ a.s. Here $\phi_* \nu$ means the pushforward of $\nu$ under $\phi$.

**Proposition 5.28.** Let $(A, \phi, h)$ be as in Definition 5.27. If $(\phi, A)$ is independent of $h$, then coordinate change holds for $(A, \phi, h)$.

**Proof.** The proposition follows from [GHPR19 Proposition 2.2] for the case where $h$ is a GFF. (Here we use the assumption that $(\phi, A)$ is independent of $h$.) Adding a continuous function does not change the result, since the continuous function can be locally approximated by a constant. Finally, since coordinate change is an a.s. property, reweighting the probability measure does not change the result.

With $Q$ as in Definition 5.27, the equation $Q(\alpha, d) = Q(\gamma, 2)$ is a version of the KPZ formula for fractals with Euclidean dimension $d$ on a $\gamma$-LQG surface. Here $\alpha$ is the magnitude of the logarithmic singularity of the field at a point $z$ sampled according to the $\gamma$-LQG area measure “conditioned on $z$ being in the fractal”. We require $Q(\alpha, d) = 5/\sqrt{6}$ in Definition 5.27 due to Convention 2.2. For the pivotal points the relevant dimension is $d = 3/4$, which gives $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{6}$. This explains why we consider $e^{h/\sqrt{6}} m_\phi$ in Proposition 5.3.

**Lemma 5.29.** In the setting of Definition 5.27, suppose coordinate change holds for $(A, \phi, h)$. Let $C \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s > 0$ be two random numbers coupled with $(A, \phi, h)$. (Here $C, s$ are not necessarily independent of $(A, \phi, h)$.) Then coordinate change holds for $(A, s\phi, h + C)$.

**Proof.** Almost surely, for any $C \in \mathbb{R}$ replacing $h$ by $h + C$ changes both the measures $e^{\alpha h} m_A$ and $e^{\alpha h} m_{\phi(A)}$ by a factor of $e^{\alpha C}$. Therefore coordinate change will hold for $(A, \phi, h + C)$ if it holds for $(A, \phi, h)$. It remains to show that coordinate change holds for maps of the form $z \mapsto sz$. This property holds since we required the limit in Definition 5.2 to be almost sure (rather than e.g. a limit in probability or a limit along powers of 2).
We will frequently apply coordinate change to various settings where the independence in Proposition 5.28 does not hold. Lemma 5.31 right below is what we use in most applications. Before stating the lemma, we introduce a particular representative of the quantum wedge (i.e., a representative of the equivalence class defining the wedge) which will be technically convenient in several of our arguments.

**Definition 5.30.** Given a $W$-quantum wedge $W$ with $W > 4/3$, Let $\phi(z) := e^{-z}$ be a conformal map between $S$ and $\mathbb{H}$. Suppose $h^w$ is the free Liouville field on $\mathbb{H}$ such that $(\mathbb{H}, h^w, 0, \infty)/\sim = W$ and moreover, $h^w \circ \phi + Q \log |\phi'|$ has the law of $h$ in Definition 5.4. Then we say that $h^w$ is the field associated with $W$ under the circle average embedding.

Existence and uniqueness of the circle average embedding can easily be seen by embedding the thick wedge into the strip $S$ in Definition 5.4.

**Lemma 5.31.** Let $h^w$ be the free Liouville field on $\mathbb{H}$ such that $(\mathbb{H}, h^w, 0, \infty)/\sim$ has the law of a $W$-quantum wedge with $W \geq 2$. We further assume that $h^w$ is the field associated with the surface under the circle average embedding. Suppose $D \Subset \mathbb{H}$ is a Jordan domain (namely, $D \cup \partial D \subset \mathbb{H}$). Let $A$ be a random compact on $D$ whose $d$-occupation measure $m_A$ exists and satisfies (33). Let $\phi$ be a random conformal map on $D$. If $(A, \phi)$ is conditionally independent of $h^w|_D$ given $h^w|_{D^c}$, then coordinate change holds for $(A, \phi, h^w)$.

Lemma 5.31 is an immediately consequence of Proposition 5.28 and the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.32.** Let $h$ be the field in Lemma 5.31. Fix a domain $D \Subset \mathbb{H}$. By enlarging the probability space, $h|_D$ can be written as $h_D + g$ where $h_D$ is a zero boundary GFF on $D$ independent of $h|_{D^c}$ and $g$ is an almost surely continuous function on $D$.

**Proof.** Let $h = h^l + h^c$, where $h^l$ is the lateral component and $h^c$ is the radially symmetric component. Let $\overline{h}^c$ have the law of the radially symmetric component of the free boundary GFF on $\mathbb{H}$. Here we fix the additive constant for $\overline{h}^c$ by letting its value on $\partial D \cap \mathbb{H}$ be equal to 0. Then $\overline{h} := h^l + \overline{h}^c$ is a free boundary GFF independent of $h^c$. In particular, $\overline{h}|_D$ can be written as a zero boundary GFF $h_D$ plus the harmonic extension of $\overline{h}|_{D^c}$. Moreover, $g := h|_D - h_D$ is a a.s. continuous function on $D$. Since $h_D$ is independent of $(\overline{h}, h^c)|_{D^c}$, it is also independent of $h|_{D^c}$. \qed

Let $\eta^3$ and $\eta^4$ be as in Definition 5.18 with $k = 6$ and $(D, a, b) = (\mathbb{H}, a, b)$. Our preliminary version of Proposition 5.3 is about the set $\eta^3 \cap \eta^4$. As will be explained in Section 5.3.5, $P_\varepsilon$ is a finite union of pieces that look like segments of $\eta^3 \cap \eta^4$. The key observation is that $(\eta^3, \eta^4)$ is closely related to a well understood object called the **Brownian excursion on the upper half plane**, which can be thought of as the planar Brownian motion starting from 0 conditioned to stay inside $\mathbb{H}$. We refer to [Law05, Section 5.3] for the precise definition.

**Proposition 5.33.** The joint law of the curves $\eta^3$ and $\eta^4$ is that of the left and right, respectively, boundary of a Brownian excursion on $\mathbb{H}$. In particular, $\eta^3 \cap \eta^4$ has the same law as the cut points of a Brownian excursion on $\mathbb{H}$. Moreover, for each fixed smooth curve, $\eta^3 \cap \eta^4$ does not intersect the curve a.s.
Proof. The relation between $\eta^3, \eta^4$ and the Brownian excursion is known from [LSW03]. The nonintersection property with a smooth curve is well known for Brownian cut points. For example, it can be proved by covering the smooth curve by $O(r^{-1})$ balls of radius $r$ and use that for each of these balls the probability that it contains a cut-point is $O(r^{3/4})$.

The occupation measure of the cut points of Brownian motion and Brownian excursions is thoroughly studied in [HLLS18]. In light of the identification of $\eta^3 \cap \eta^4$, the following result is extracted from [HLLS18, Section 4.4].

**Proposition 5.34.** For two distinct points $p$ and $q$ on $\eta^3 \cap \eta^4$, let $A_{p,q}$ be the intersection of the segments of $\eta^3$ and $\eta^4$ between $p$ and $q$. Then with probability 1, there exists a non-atomic measure $m^3$ such that for all $p, q$, the $3/4$-occupation measure of $A_{p,q}$ exists and equals $m^3|_{A_{p,q}}$. Moreover, $m^3$ satisfies (33) with $m_A$ replaced by $m^3$.

**Remark 5.35 (Intersection with polygons).** In the proof of Lemma 5.36 and many other places in Sections 5.3.3 and 5.3.4, we will talk about the occupation measure of $A \cap U$ where $A$ is compact and has a well-defined occupation measure, and $U$ is a dyadic polygon. Generally speaking, the existence of an occupation measure may not respect the restriction to a polygon. However, thanks to the last statement in Proposition 5.34, in all the places we talk about it, we have $A \cap \partial U = \emptyset$ a.s. Since $\partial U$ cuts $A$ into two disjoint closed subsets away from $\partial U$, the restriction of the occupation measure to $U$ will be equal to the occupation measure of $A \cap U$. Let $h^w$ be a free Liouville field on $(\mathbb{H}, 0, \infty)$ independent of $\{\eta^i\}_{1 \leq i \leq 6}$ such that $(\mathbb{H}, h^w, 0, \infty)/\sim$ is a $14/3$-quantum wedge. In other words, we are in the setting of Proposition 5.23 with $k = 6$. By Lemma 5.26, $e^{h^w/\sqrt{6}}(dm^3|_{A_{p,q}})$ exists in the sense of Definition 5.2 and is non-atomic. Varying $p, q$ we obtain a measure supported on $\eta^3 \cap \eta^4$ which we write as $e^{h^w/\sqrt{6}} dm^3$. Now we are ready to state the preliminary version of Proposition 5.3 for $\eta^3 \cap \eta^4$.

**Lemma 5.36.** In the setting of Proposition 5.34 with $\eta^3, \eta^4, m^3$ as defined there, suppose $\eta^3$ is parametrized by quantum length. Let $f_H$ be as in Lemma 5.13 and $m_H$ be the Hausdorff measure of $(\eta^3)^{-1}(\eta^3 \cap \eta^4)$ with gauge function $f_H$. Let $\nu^3 := (\eta^3)_* m_H$. Then $\nu^3 = c e^{h^w/\sqrt{6}} dm^3$ a.s. for some deterministic constant $c > 0$.

**Proof.** We advise the reader to look at Figure 4 while reading the proof. Let $D^e$ and $D^r$ be the interior of the left and right, respectively, connected components of $\mathbb{H} \setminus D^3$. Let $W^0_0 = (D^e, h^w, 0, \infty)/\sim$, $W^0_0 = (D^e, h^w, 0, \infty)/\sim$, and $W^m_0 = (D^3, h^w, 0, \infty)/\sim$. Then by Proposition 5.23, $(h^w, \eta^3, \eta^4)$ is determined by $(W^0_0, W^3_0, W^3_0)_0$.

For each $t > 0$, let $t'$ be such that $m^3_0[0, t'] = t$ and let $D^3_1$ be the bounded component of $D^3 \setminus \{\eta^3(t')\}$. Let $W^e_t = (D^e, h^w, \eta^3(t'), \infty)/\sim$, $W^r_t = (D^r, h^w, \eta^3(t'), \infty)/\sim$, and $W^m_t = (D^3 \setminus D^3_1, h^w, \eta^3(t'), \infty)/\sim$. Then $W^m_0 \equiv W^m_0$, which can be seen from our explicit description of the $2/3$-quantum wedge after Proposition 5.23. Let $W^m_0 \setminus W^m_0$ be the collection of LQG surfaces in $W^m_0$ but not in $W^m_0$, ordered in the same way as in $W^m_0$. Then $W^m_0 \setminus W^m_0$ and $W^m_0$ are independent. Since $W^m_0$ and $W^m_0$ are $2$-quantum wedges independent of $W^m_0$ and $t'$ is determined by $W^m_0$, we see that $t'$ is independent of $W^0_0$ and $W^m_0$. Therefore, by Remark 5.5, $(W^e_t, W^m_t, W^r_t) \equiv (W^0_0, W^m_0, W^m_0)_0$, so $(\mathbb{H} \setminus D^3, h, \eta^3(t'), \infty)/\sim$ is a $14/3$-quantum wedge.

Without loss of generality we assume that $h^w$ is the field associated with $(\mathbb{H}, h^w, 0, \infty)/\sim$ under the circle average embedding. Let $X_t$ be the $e^{h^w/\sqrt{6}} dm^3$-mass of $D^3_1$. For a fixed $s > 0,
Let $D^3_{t,s}$ be the closure of $D^3_{t+s} \setminus D^3_t$ so that $X_{t+s} - X_s$ equals the $e^{h^w/\sqrt{\sigma}} dm^i$-mass of $D^3_{t,s}$. Let $\phi_t : \mathbb{H} \to \mathbb{H} \setminus D^3_t$ be the conformal map such that $h^t := h^w \circ \phi_t + Q \log |\phi_t'|$ is the field associated with $(\mathbb{H} \setminus D^3_t, h, \eta^3(t'), \infty) / \sim$ under the circle average embedding. Then $h^w \stackrel{d}{=} h^t$. Moreover, the set $\phi_t^{-1}(D^3_{t,s})$, the field $h^t$, and $(D^3_t, h^w, 0, \eta^3(t'))/\sim$ are independent.

We claim that $\hat{\phi}_t$ can be written as $s\phi$, where $s$ is a random positive scaling constant and $\phi$ is determined by $h^t|_{U^c}$ and $(D^3_t, h^w, 0, \eta^3(t'))/\sim$. We postpone the proof of this claim and proceed to prove the claim of Lemma 5.36. By Lemma 5.31 and this claim, coordinate change holds for $(A, \phi, h^t)$. An application of Lemma 5.29 gives further that coordinate change holds for $(A, \phi_t, h^t)$. Varying $U$ and using the fact that the measures involved are all non-atomic, we see that $X_{t+s} - X_t$ equals the $e^{h^w/\sqrt{\sigma}} dm^i$-mass of $\phi_t^{-1}(D^3_{t,s})$ a.s. Therefore, the process $(X_{t+s})_{s \geq 0}$ is determined by $(W_t^i, W_{t+}^i, W_{t-}^i)$ in the same way as $(X_s)_{s \geq 0}$ is determined by $(W_0^0, W_1^0, W_2^0)$. Thus $(X_s)_{s \geq 0}$ has stationary increments.

By Remark 5.5 [12], and the scaling property of 3/2-stable processes, the law of $X_t/t$ does not depend on $t$. For $M \in (0, \infty)$, let $Y^M = (X_t - X_{t-1}) \land M$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then by ergodic theorem, $\lim_{n \to \infty} n^{i-1} Y^M_t$ exists almost surely. Moreover, the limit belongs to the $\sigma$-algebra of $h^w$ and $D^3_t$ restricted to $\mathbb{H} \setminus (R\mathbb{D})$. We identify $D^3_t$ with the hull of a Brownian excursion. Taking $R \to \infty$, by the tail triviality of $h^w$ and Brownian excursion, $\lim_{n \to \infty} n^{i-1} Y^M_t = \mathbb{E}[Y^M_t] = \mathbb{E}[X_t \land M]$ a.s. On the other hand, since $n^{i-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} Y^M_t = n^{i-1} X_n$ and $n^{i-1} X_n \stackrel{d}{=} X_1$, we have $\mathbb{P}[X_1 \geq \mathbb{E}[X_1 \land M]] = 1$. Letting $M \to \infty$, we get $X_1 = \mathbb{E}[X_1]$ a.s. Therefore $X_t = ct$ a.s. for all $t \geq 0$ with $c = \mathbb{E}[X_1]$.

It remains to prove the above mentioned claim that $\hat{\phi}_t = s\phi$. We can let $s$ be such that the quantum length of $[-1, 0]$ with respect to the field $h^s := h^w(s) + Q \log s$ equals 1. Let $\phi = s^{-1}\phi_t$ so that $h^t = h^s \circ \phi + Q \log |\phi'|$. Let $x_t = \phi^{-1}(-1)$. Then the quantum length of $[x_t, 0]$ with respect to $h^t$ equals $t + 1$, which means that $x_t$ is determined by $h^t|_{U^c}$. Conditioning on $h^t|_{U^c}$ and $(D^3_t, h^w, 0, \eta^3(t'))/\sim$, let $\hat{\phi}$ be a conditionally independent sample of $\phi$. It suffices to show that $\hat{\phi} = \hat{\phi}$ a.s. Since the surface $(\mathbb{H}, h^w, 0, \infty)/\sim$ can be obtained by identifying boundary arcs of the surfaces $(\mathbb{H}, h^t, 0, \infty)/\sim$ and $(D^3_t, h^w, 0, \eta^3(t'))/\sim$ according to the quantum length, there exists a bijective map $\psi : \mathbb{H} \to \mathbb{H}$ such that $\hat{\phi} = \psi \circ \phi$. In particular, $\psi$ is conformal on the image of $\phi$, which is equal to $\mathbb{H} \setminus (s^{-1}(D^3_t \cup \partial D^3_t))$, $\psi$ is conformal inside $s^{-1}D^3_t$, and $\psi$ is continuous everywhere. By the conformal removability of $s^{-1}D^3_t$ (Lemma 5.17), $\psi$ is conformal on the entire $\mathbb{H}$, hence must be a scaling [12]. Since $\phi(x_t) = \hat{\phi}(x_t) = -1$, we have $\phi = \hat{\phi}$ a.s.

5.3.3 Deformations of the quantum wedges

Our strategy for proving Proposition 5.3 is to deform the setup of Lemma 5.36 stepwise using coordinate change in each step. Throughout this section we will work under the setting of Proposition 5.23 with $(D, a, b) = (\mathbb{H}, 0, \infty)$. Namely, $(\eta^1, \ldots, \eta^k)$ is a $k$-SLE$_{6/3}$ on $(\mathbb{H}, 0, \infty)$ for an integer $k \geq 2$. Moreover, $h^w$ is a free Liouville field independent of $\{\eta^i\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ such that $(\mathbb{H}, h^w, 0, \infty)/\sim$ is a $2(k + 1)/3$-quantum wedge. For each $1 \leq i \leq k$, we parametrize $\eta^i$ by its quantum length with respect to $h^w$. Recall that the setting of Lemma 5.36 is the

---

12The way we apply conformal removability first appeared in the proof of [She16a Theorems 1.3 and 1.4]. See also [DMS14 Theorem 1.4].
special case $k = 6$. In this section we perform deformations on quantum wedges to transfer Lemma 5.36 to a setting (Lemma 5.39) which is closely related to Proposition 5.3. To avoid possible boundary issues when applying the coordinate change, we also introduce the following notation.

**Definition 5.37.** Consider a random quadruple $(\nu, A, h, D)$ where $\nu$ is a measure on $\mathbb{C}$, $h$ is a free Liouville field, $A$ is a closed set, and $D$ is an open set. Moreover, both $A$ and $D$ are contained in the closure of the domain of definition of $h$. Suppose there exists a measure $m$ supported on $A$ such that for each dyadic polygon $U \in D$, the $3/4$-occupation measure of $A \cap U$ exists and equals $m|_U$ a.s. Moreover, $\nu = ce^{h/\sqrt{6}m}$ on $U$ a.s. for the constant $c$ in Lemma 5.36. Then we say that $\nu$ inside $D$ is an $h$-GMC over $A$.

With $\nu_{h, \Gamma}^\epsilon, P_\epsilon, h, D$ as in Proposition 5.3 we will prove that $\nu_{h, \Gamma}^\epsilon$ inside $D$ is an $h$-GMC over $P_\epsilon$, which implies Proposition 5.3 because $P_\epsilon \cap \partial D = \emptyset$.

The next lemma is the first deformation.

**Lemma 5.38.** In the setting of Proposition 5.23 described above with $(D, a, b) = (\mathbb{H}, 0, \infty)$, suppose $k \geq 2$. For each $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$, define the measure $\nu^i$ supported on $\eta^i \cap \eta^{i+1}$ as $\nu^3$ in Lemma 5.36 with $(\eta^3, \eta^4)$ there replaced by $(\eta^i, \eta^{i+1})$. Then $\nu^i$ inside $\mathbb{H}$ is an $h^w$-GMC over $\eta^i \cap \eta^{i+1}$.

**Proof.** The case $k = 6, i = 3$ case is proved in Lemma 5.36 (See Remark 5.35 for why the restriction to dyadic polygons is trivial.)
Now we consider the $k = 2, i = 1$ case. See Figure 5 for an illustration. Without loss of
generality, assume $h^w$ corresponds to the circle average embedding of the wedge. Fix a
dyadic polygon $U \subseteq \mathbb{H}$ and let $A := \eta^1 \cap \eta^2 \cap U$. Let $(\widehat{h}, \widehat{\eta}_1, \cdots, \widehat{\eta}_6)$ be equal in law to $(h^w, \eta_1, \cdots, \eta_6)$ in Lemma 5.30. Here we also further require that $h^w$ is the field associated to the wedge under
the circle average embedding. Moreover, we may assume $(\widehat{D}^{2.5}, \widehat{h}, 0, \infty) \sim (\mathbb{H}, h^w, 0, \infty) \sim \cdots$, where $\widehat{D}^{2.5} \subset \mathbb{H}$ is the domain bounded by $\widehat{\eta}_2$ and $\widehat{\eta}_5$. Let $\widehat{\phi} : \mathbb{H} \to \widehat{D}^{2.5}$ be the conformal map such that $h^w = \widehat{h} \circ \widehat{\phi} + Q \log |\widehat{\phi}|$.

Using an argument very similar to the last paragraph in the proof of Lemma 5.36 we can
write $\widehat{\phi}$ as $s \phi$, where $\phi$ is conditionally independent of $h^w|_U$ given $h^w|_{U^c}$, and $s$ is a random
scaling constant. Since $A$ is independent of $h$, by Lemmas 5.29 and 5.31 coordinate change
holds for $(A, \widehat{\phi}, h^w)$. Now the $k = 2, i = 1$ case follows from Lemma 5.36.

In the previous paragraph we deduced the case $k = 2, i = 1$ from the case $k = 6, i = 3$ by Lemma 5.31. The reverse procedure can be used to deduce the general case from the case $k = 2, i = 1$.  

Lemma 5.39. In the setting of Proposition 5.23 with $(D, a, b) = (\mathbb{H}, 0, \infty)$ and $k \geq 3$, write
$\eta^{k-2}$ as $\eta^*$. Let $\mathbb{H}^r$ be the right component of $\mathbb{H} \setminus \eta^*$. Fix $s > 0$. Let $z = \eta^*(s)$. Conditioning on $(h, \eta^*)$, let $\eta_0, \eta_s$, and $\eta'_s$ be samples of SLE$_6$ on $(\mathbb{H}^r, 0, \infty)$, $(\mathbb{H}^r, z, \infty)$, and $(\mathbb{H}^r, 0, z)$, respectively. Let $\nu_0, \nu_s, \nu'_s$ be defined as $\nu^i$ in Lemma 5.36 with $(\eta'^3, \eta'^4)$ replaced by $(\eta^*, \eta_0)$, $(\eta^*, \eta_s)$, and $(\eta^*, \eta'_s)$, respectively. Then $\nu_0$ inside $\mathbb{H}^r$ is an $h^w$-GMC over $\eta^* \cap \eta_0$. Moreover, $\nu_s$ (resp. $\nu'_s$) inside $\mathbb{H} \setminus \{z\}$ is an $h^w$-GMC over $\eta^* \cap \eta_s$ (resp. $\eta^* \cap \eta'_s$).

Proof. By Lemmas 5.21 and 5.19 $\eta^* \cap \eta_0$ is equal in law to $\eta^{k-2} \cap \eta^{k-1}$ in Lemma 5.38. Therefore the $\eta^* \cap \eta_0$ case of Lemma 5.39 follows from Lemma 5.38.

For the case of $\eta^* \cap \eta_s$, we first assume $k = 5$. Moreover, since the correctness of the statement does not depend on the value of $s$, we assume that $s$ is a uniform number on $(0, 1)$ instead of being fixed. Let $\eta^*_{s, \infty}$ (resp., $\eta^*_{0, s}$) be the segment of $\eta^*$ from $z$ (resp., 0) to $\infty$ (resp., $z$). Let $\mathbb{H}^r$ be the left component of $\mathbb{H} \setminus \eta^*$. Since we assume $k = 5$, by Remark 5.5 $(\mathbb{H}^r, h^w, z, \infty) \sim$ and $(\mathbb{H}^r, h^w, z, \infty) \sim$ are two independent 2-quantum wedges. Therefore

---

Note that $h^w$ in Lemma 5.36 corresponds to a 14/3-wedge, while the $h^w$ in the rest of this proof corresponds to a $(k + 1)/3$-wedge.
We claim that coordinate change holds for \( \eta \) as follows. We have
\[
\eta^* \cap \eta \sim \left( \mathbb{H} \setminus \eta_{0,s}, z, \infty, \eta_{s,\infty}^*, \eta_s \right) / \sim \left( \mathbb{H}, 0, \infty, \eta^*, \eta_0 \right) / \sim.
\]
By the \( \eta^* \cap \eta_0 \) case of Lemma 5.39, along with Lemmas 5.29 and 5.31, we obtain the desired result for \( \eta_{s,\infty}^* \cap \eta_s \). Here Lemmas 5.29 and 5.31 are used in the same fashion as in the argument in the proof of Lemma 5.36 showing the (set, map, field) triple there (denoted by \( (A, \phi_t, h^t) \)) satisfy coordinate change. We leave the details to the reader.

To conclude the case of \( \eta^* \cap \eta \) with \( k = 5 \), we need to handle \( \eta_{0,s,} \cap \eta_s \). To this end, let \( \mathbb{H}_- = \{ x : -x \in \mathbb{H} \} \) be the lower half plane. Let \( \phi_z : \mathbb{H} \setminus \eta_{s,\infty} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_- \) be the conformal map which can be obtained by cutting \( \eta_{s,\infty}^* \) open and glue \( \mathbb{R}_- \) and \( \mathbb{R}_+ \) according to their quantum lengths. See the left part of Figure 5. Then the picture on \( \mathbb{H}_- \) is the mirror image of the original setting of Lemma 5.39. In particular, \( \phi_z(\eta_{0,s}^* \cap \eta_s) \) has the law of an initial segment of \( \eta^* \cap \eta_0 \). Denote \( \eta_{0,s}^* \cap \eta_s \) by \( \Lambda_z \). For each dyadic polygon \( V \in \mathbb{H} \setminus \{ z \} \), \( \Lambda_z \cap V \) has a positive distance from \( \eta_{s,\infty}^* \). Therefore there exists a dyadic polygon \( U \) such that \( \Lambda_z \cap V = \Lambda_z \cap U \) and \( U \cap \eta_{s,\infty}^* = \emptyset \). Therefore it suffices to show that coordinate change can be applied to \( (\Lambda_z \cap U, \phi_z, h^w) \) for any dyadic polygon \( U \subset \mathbb{H} \setminus \eta_{s,\infty}^* \).

In order to prove the last sentence in the previous paragraph, we need to create enough independence for \( (\Lambda_z \cap U, \phi_z, h^w) \) such that Lemma 5.31 applies. (Notice that we cannot apply Lemma 5.31 directly to \( (\Lambda_z \cap U, \phi_z, h^w) \) since \( z \), and therefore also \( \phi_z \), depends on \( h^w \) along \( \eta_{s,\infty}^* \).) To this end, sample a Poisson process \( \{ s_i \}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \) on \( (0, \infty) \) and let \( z_i = \eta^*(s_i) \) with \( \eta^* \) parametrized by quantum length. Notice that \( z \) has the same law as a point sampled uniformly at random from \( \eta^*([0, 1] \setminus \{ s_i \}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) \), conditioned on this set being non-empty. For each \( v_i \) we define \( \phi_{z_i, s_i, \infty} \), \( A_{z_i} \) with \( \eta_{s,\infty}^* \) in the same way as \( \phi_z, \eta_{s,\infty}^* \), \( A_z \) with \( \eta_{s,\infty}^* \) replaced by \( \{ s_i, z_i \} \). We claim that coordinate change holds for \( (\Lambda_z \cap U, \phi_{z_i, h^w}) \) as long as \( U \subset \mathbb{H} \setminus \eta_{s,\infty}^* \). Fix \( U \). Let \( z_m \) be the \( m \)th point in \( \{ z_i \}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \) such that \( U \subset \mathbb{H} \setminus \eta_{z_i,\infty}^* \), and define \( s_i = (\eta^*)^{-1}(z_i) \). Conditioning on \( (\eta^*, h^w|_{U}) \), we see that \( z_m \) is conditionally independent of \( h^w|_U \). On the other hand, \( A_{z_m} \) is determined by \( (\eta^*, \eta_{s_m}, z_m) \). In light of Lemma 5.29, by a possible rescaling, we can also assume that \( \phi_{z_m} \) is determined by \( (\eta^*, z_m) \) so that so that \( (\phi_{z_m}, A_{z_m}) \) is conditionally independent of \( h^w|_U \) given \( (\eta^*, \eta_{s_m}, h^w|_U) \). By the independence of \( h^w \) and \( (\eta^*, \eta_{s_m}) \) as unparametrized curves, the conditional law of \( h^w|_U \) given \( (\phi_{z_m}, A_{z_m}, \eta^*, \eta_{s_m}, h^w|_U) \) is the same as only given \( h^w|_U \). By Lemma 5.32, the conditional law of \( h^w \) is that of a zero boundary GFF plus a continuous function. Now by Proposition 5.28, the coordinate change holds for \( (\Lambda_{z_m} \cap U, \phi_{z_m} h^w) \). This completes the case of \( \eta^* \cap \eta \) when \( k = 5 \).

The case \( k = 3 \) can be deduced from the case \( k = 5 \) case by coordinate change, similarly as when we extended Lemma 5.36 to Lemma 5.38. When doing this extension we use that, by the same argument as in Remark 5.24, based on zero sets of linear Brownian motions, we have \( \eta^* \cap \eta_0 \cap \partial \mathbb{H} = \{ 0, \infty \} \) when \( k = 3 \). For \( k > 3 \) we also proceed similarly as in the proof of Lemma 5.38. Conditioning on \( (h^w, \eta^* z, \eta_0) \), sample an SLE_{8/3}((k-3)/2; -4/3) curve \( h^w \) on \( (\mathbb{H}, 0, \infty) \) and let \( \mathbb{H}^t \) be the right component of \( \mathbb{H} \setminus \eta^t \). Mapping \( \mathbb{H}^t \) to \( \mathbb{H} \), we can apply the result for \( k = 3 \).

To handle the \( \eta^* \cap \eta' \) case, assume that the two choral \( \text{SLE}_6 \)'s \( \eta_0 \) and \( \eta_0 \) are percolation interfaces of a common CLE_6 on \( \mathbb{H}^t \). See the right part of Figure 6. Let \( \tau_{z} = \inf \{ t \geq 0 : \eta^* \cup \eta_0 ([0, t]) \) disconnects \( z \) from \( \infty \} \) be the time at which \( z \) is disconnected from \( \infty \) by \( \eta_0 \). Let \( \mathcal{B} \) be the complementary component of \( \eta^* \cup \eta_0 \) in \( \mathbb{H}^t \) which has \( z \) on its boundary. Sample \( \eta_0' \) by letting the initial segment of \( \eta_0' \) be equal to \( \eta_0 \). Let the rest of \( \eta_0' \) be equal to the time reversal of \( \eta_0 \) until exiting \( \mathcal{B} \cup \partial \mathcal{B} \); notice that \( \eta_0' \) will get the correct marginal law.
thanks to the reversibility and the target invariance property of SLE$_6$ (see Section 2.4). Now $\eta^* \cap \eta'_s([0, t])$ equals the symmetric difference of $\eta^* \cap \eta_0([0, t])$ and $\eta^* \cap \eta_s([0, t])$ (in addition to the point $x_B = \eta_0(\tau_z)$), so the lemma for $\eta'_s$ follows from the cases of $\eta_0$ and $\eta_s$.

### 5.3.4 Deformation from a quantum wedge to the quantum disk

Proposition 5.3 is about CLE$_6$ on a $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG disk. By the iterative construction of CLE$_6$ using chordal SLE$_6$, it is natural to first prove a variant of Proposition 5.3 for a single interface. In this section, we fix $\ell, r > 0$. Let $D$ be either an arbitrary Jordan domain or the upper half plane $\mathbb{H}$. Let $a \in \partial D$. When $D = \mathbb{H}$, we further require $a = 0$. Let $h$ be a free Liouville field on $D$ such that $(D, h, a) \sim$ is a $\sqrt{8/3}$-LQG disk with boundary length $\ell + r$. When $D = \mathbb{H}$, we further assume that law of $h$ is fixed as follows. Suppose $h^s$ is as in Definition 2.4. Let $h'$ be the Liouville free field on $\mathbb{H}$ such that $(\mathbb{H}, h', 0, \infty) \sim (\mathcal{S}, h^s - 2\gamma^{-1} \log \xi_{h^s}(\partial \mathcal{S}), +\infty, -\infty)$ through the map $z \rightarrow e^{-z}$. The law of $h$ is given by the law of $h' + 2\gamma^{-1} \log(\ell + r)$ under the reweighting (14). Let $b \in \partial D$ be such that the left and right boundary of $(D, a, b)$ have quantum length $\ell$ and $r$, respectively. Notice that $b \neq \infty$ a.s. when $D = \mathbb{H}$.

Let $\eta$ be such that conditioning on $h$, the conditional law of $\eta$ is an SLE$_6$ on $(D, a, b)$. The main result of this section is the following single interface analog of Proposition 5.3.

**Lemma 5.40.** In the setting above, recall the notions in Definition 5.14. For each $u > 0$, on the event $\{\sigma > u\}$, $\nu^u_\eta$ inside $D \setminus \{\eta(u)\}$ is an $h$-GMC over $\text{dbl}_{\eta,u}$.

Although the support of $\nu^u_\eta$ intersects $\partial D_u$ because of Definition 5.37, Lemma 5.40 only concerns the restriction of this measure to $\partial D_u \setminus \partial D$.

For the later application to CLE$_6$, we are only interested in the case when $D$ is Jordan domain $D$, but the $D = \mathbb{H}$ case is a useful intermediate step in the proof of the Jordan domain case so we include it as well. Lemma 5.40 should hold also for more general domains but we fix the setting as above for concreteness.

Let $\text{dbl}^\ell_{\eta,u}$ be the subset of $\text{dbl}_{\eta,u} \setminus \partial D$ on the left boundary of $(D_u, \eta(u), b)$. By left/right symmetry, to prove Lemma 5.40 it suffices to show that $\nu^u_{\eta|\text{dbl}^\ell_{\eta,u}}$ inside $D \setminus \{\eta(u)\}$ is an $h$-GMC over $\text{dbl}^\ell_{\eta,u}$. We prove this case by applying the coordinate change to the setting of Lemma 5.39 with $k = 3$. The basic idea is to create regions that cover $\text{dbl}^\ell_{\eta,u}$. In each region, we apply absolute continuity from Proposition 5.8 and coordinate change to deduce the desired result for $\nu^u_{\eta|\text{dbl}^\ell_{\eta,u}}$ for the $\eta^* \cap \eta_0$ case of Lemma 5.39. The following lemma is the way in which we create such regions.

**Lemma 5.41.** Suppose we are in the setting of Lemma 5.39 with $k = 3$. Let $\tau_z$ be the time when $z$ is disconnected from $\infty$ by $\eta_0$. Let $\sigma_z = \sup\{t < \tau_z : \eta_0(t) \in \eta^*\}$. Let $t_z$ be the first time $\eta^*$ reaches $\mathbb{R}_-$ after visiting $\eta(\sigma_z)$. Let $D_z$ be the interior of the complement of the unbounded component of $\mathbb{H} \setminus (\eta^*([0, t_z]) \cup \eta_0([0, \sigma_z]))$. Let $\phi_z : D_z \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ be a conformal map such that $\phi_z(0) = 0$, $\phi_z(\eta_0(\sigma_z)) = \infty$. Let $A_z = \eta^* \cap \eta_0([0, \sigma_z])$. Then $A_z \setminus \{\eta_0(\sigma_z)\} \subset D_z$. Moreover, coordinate change holds for $(A_z \cap U, \phi_z, h^w)$ for any dyadic polygon $U \subset D_z$.

**Proof.** We advise the reader to look at Figure 7 throughout the proof. Let $w \in A_z$ be such that $w \neq \eta_0(\sigma_z)$, and let $t$ be the first time for which $\eta_0(t) = w$. Then since almost surely
there are no boundary touching points of SLE$_6$ which are local cut points (see e.g. the proof of [GHM15] Example 2.4), $\eta_0(t, \sigma_z) \cap \eta_0(0, t) \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 5.20 $w \notin \mathbb{R}_-$. Therefore, $w \in D_z$ and hence $A_z \setminus \{\eta_0(\sigma_z)\} \subset D_z$.

To prove that coordinate change holds for $(A_z \cap U, \phi_z, h^w)$, recall the proof for the case of $\eta_{0,s}^t \cap \eta_s$ of Lemma 5.39, where we used the Poisson point process $\{z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ on $\eta^*$ with intensity given by the boundary length measure to prove that coordinate change holds for a certain random triple. Fix a dyadic polygon $U$. We retain the notations $\{z'_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$ defined as $(A_z, \phi_z)$ in the current lemma (i.e., Lemma 5.41).

Conditioning on $(\eta^*, \eta_0, h^w|_{U^c})$, we see that $z'_m$ is conditionally independent of $h^w|_{U}$. On the other hand, $A_{z'_m}$ are determined by $(\eta^*, \eta_0, z'_m)$. Now the exact same argument showing the coordinate change for $(A_{z_m} \cap U, \phi_{z_m}, h^w)$ in Lemma 5.39 applies here, which concludes the proof.

Recall that a 2/3-wedge $\mathcal{W}_1$ is an ordered sequence of finite-volume LQG surfaces $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$. We say that $\mathcal{W}_2$ is an **initial segment** of $\mathcal{W}_1$ if it contains a subset of the LQG surfaces $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ (with the order inherited from $\mathcal{W}_1$) such that if $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{B}}'$ are part of $\mathcal{W}_1$, $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is ordered before $\hat{\mathcal{B}}'$, and $\hat{\mathcal{B}}'$ is part of $\mathcal{W}_2$, then $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is also part of $\mathcal{W}_2$.

In the setting of Lemma 5.41, let $\mathbb{H}^t$ be the left component of $\mathbb{H} \setminus \eta^*$. For $t > 0$, let $\mathbb{H}^t_r$ be the unbounded component of $\mathbb{H}^t \setminus \eta_0(0, t)$. Let $\mathcal{X}_s = (\mathbb{H}^t \setminus \mathbb{H}^t_r, h^w, \eta_0|_{[0, \sigma_z]})/\sim$. Let $\mathcal{W}_s$ be the shortest initial segment of $(\mathbb{H}^t, h^w, 0, \infty)/\sim$ containing $z$. See Figure 7 for an illustration.

Now we describe the analogous objects in the setting of Lemma 5.40. See Figure 8. Fix $s > 0$. On the event $\sigma > u$, let $x = x(s)$ be the point on the left boundary of $(D_u, \eta(u), b)$ such that the quantum length of the clockwise arc on $\partial D_u$ from $\eta(u)$ to $x$ equals $s \wedge (L_u^d + \ell)$. (Recall the boundary length process $Z^d = (L^d, P^d)$ in Proposition 5.8.) Let $\tau_s = \inf\{t : x \notin D_t\}$ under the convention that $D_\sigma = \emptyset$. Namely, $\tau_s$ is the time when $\eta$ disconnects $x$ from $b$. Let $\sigma_s$ be the last time before $\tau_s$ at which $\eta$ visits the left boundary of $(D_u, \eta(u), b)$. Let $\mathcal{X}^u_s = (D_u \setminus D_{\sigma_s}, h, \eta|_{[u, \sigma_s]})/\sim$. As the notation suggests, this surface will be compared to $\mathcal{X}_s$ above.

Let $\bar{\eta}$ be the time reversal of $\eta$ and set $\bar{u} := \sigma - u$. Let $\overline{D}_u$ be the connected component of $D \setminus \bar{\eta}(0, \bar{u})$ whose boundary contains $a$. Define $\overline{D}^m_u$ in the same way as $D^m$ with $(D, a, b, \eta)$ replaced by $(\overline{D}_u, \eta(u), a, \bar{\eta}|_{[\bar{u}, \sigma])}$. Let $\overline{\eta}_u$ and $\overline{\eta}_u^t$ be the left and right boundaries of $\overline{D}_u$ viewed from $\eta(u)$ to 0, respectively. We parametrize them by their quantum lengths. Set $\overline{x} = \overline{x}(s)$ equal to $\overline{\eta}_u^t(s)$ if $s$ is smaller than the total quantum length of $\overline{\eta}_u^t$ and set $\overline{x}$ equal to $a$ otherwise.
Let $\mathcal{W}^m = (D^m_{\eta u}, h, \eta(u), a)/\sim$. Similarly as when defining $\mathcal{W}_s$, let $\mathcal{W}^m_{s}$ be the shortest initial segment of $\mathcal{W}^m$ containing $\bar{x}$.

**Lemma 5.42.** The conditional law of $(X^u_s, \mathcal{W}^m_{s})$ on the event \( \{ \sigma > u, x \neq b, x \neq a \} \) is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of $(X^u_s, \mathcal{W}_s)$.

We postpone the proof of Lemma 5.42 to after the proof of Lemma 5.40 and continue to compare the pictures of Lemmas 5.40 and 5.41. First we define the analog of $D_z$ from Lemma 5.41 for $(h, \eta)$ in Lemma 5.40. On the event \( x = \bar{x} \) (equivalently, \( x \in \eta(u) \)), let \( t_s \) be the first time \( \eta \) reaches \( \eta(u) \) after visiting \( \eta(\sigma_s) \). Let \( D^u_x \) be interior of the union of \( D_u \setminus D_{\sigma_s}, \eta(u), \eta(\tau_s) \), and the smallest initial segment of $D^m_u$ that contains $\eta(\sigma_s)$. The next lemma ensures that $\text{dbl}_{\eta u}$ is almost covered by $D^u_x$ as we vary $s$.

**Lemma 5.43.** On the event \( x = \bar{x} \), we have that $\text{dbl}_{\eta u} \cap D^u_x$ is the segment of $\text{dbl}_{\eta u}$ between $\eta(u)$ and $\eta(\sigma_s)$ (not including the endpoints). Let $p^\ell$ be the leftmost point on $\text{dbl}_{\eta u}$. Suppose \( s_i \) is an increasing sequence converging to the quantum length of the clockwise arc on $D_u$ from $\eta(u)$ to $p^\ell$ and $x_i := x(s_i)$. Then

$$\text{dbl}_{\eta u} \setminus \{ p^\ell, \eta(u) \} \subset \bigcup_i D^u_{x_i}.$$ 

**Proof.** The first statement follows from the exact same argument as when we proved $A_z \setminus \{ \eta_0(\sigma_z) \} \subset D_z$ in Lemma 5.41. The second statement follows from the fact that $p^\ell$ is a not an isolated point on $\text{dbl}_{\eta u}$. In particular, given $w \in \text{dbl}_{\eta u} \setminus \{ \eta(u), p^\ell \}$, there exists an $x_i$ between $w$ and $p^\ell$. For such $x_i$, we have $w \in D^u_{x_i}$. \(\square\)

On the event \( x = \bar{x} \), let $\phi_s : D^u_x \to \mathbb{H}$ be a conformal map such that $\phi_s(\eta(u)) = 0$ and $\phi_s(\eta(\sigma_s)) = \infty$. We would like to have a coordinate change property for $(\text{dbl}_{\eta u}^\ell, \phi_s, h)$ similar to the coordinate change property in Lemma 5.41. To this end, we use the analog of Lemma 5.32.
Lemma 5.44. Suppose $h^s$ is as in Definition 5.32. Let $h'$ be the Liouville free field on $H$ such that $(H, h', 0, \infty) \sim (S, h^s - 2\gamma^{-1} \log \xi_{S_h}(\partial S), +\infty, -\infty)$ through the map $z \rightarrow e^{-z}$. Then Lemma 5.32 holds with $h$ replaced by $h'$.

Proof. The proof of Lemma 5.32 shows that Lemma 5.32 holds with $h$ replaced by $h' + 2\gamma^{-1} \log \xi_{h'}(\partial S)$. This implies the current lemma since adding the random constant $2\gamma^{-1} \log \xi_{h'}(\partial S)$ does not affect the statement. □

Lemma 5.45. Suppose we are in the $D = \mathbb{H}$ case of Lemma 5.40. On the event $x = \infty$, coordinate change holds for $(\text{dbl}_{\eta_u}^\ell \cap U, \phi_s, h)$ for any dyadic polygon $U \in D_x^u$.

Proof. Recall that in the $D = \mathbb{H}$ case $h$ has the law of $h'$ in Lemma 5.44 plus $2\gamma^{-1} \log(\ell + r)$ under the reweighting in (14). By a change of measure, we can assume $h$ has the law of $h'$ in Lemma 5.44 without the reweighting. This suffices because if coordinate change holds under the reweighted measure, the it also holds under the original measure, and vice versa, since the property we want to establish is an almost sure property. Now by Lemma 5.44, the argument in the proof of Lemma 5.41 would be work if $s$ was not fixed but chosen from a Poisson point process on $\mathbb{R}_+$ with intensity given by a constant multiple of Lebesgue measure. By increasing the value of the constant multiple, we can find a dense collection of $s$ where the statement holds. To go from this collection of random numbers to a fixed number, we observe that $D_x^u$ does not change under a small enough perturbation of $s$. □

Proof of Lemma 5.40. Throughout this proof we assume $D = \mathbb{H}$ so that Lemma 5.45 applies. We can deduce the Jordan domain case of Lemma 5.40 from the $D = \mathbb{H}$ case by coordinate change. Here the deduction would follow from Proposition 5.28 immediately if the SLE$_6$ curve $\eta$ modulo monotone reparametrization were independent of $h$. This independence is broken in Lemma 5.40 only because the location of $b$ depends on $h$. This issue is easy to deal with by the target invariance of SLE$_6$. Suppose $B$ is a deterministic countable dense subset of $\partial D$. For each $n$, choose $b_n \in B$ such that $|b_n - b| < n^{-1}$. We may couple an SLE$_6$ $\eta_n$ on $(D, a, b^n)$ with $\eta$ such that $\eta$ and $\eta_n$ agree outside a radius $o_n(1)$ ball centered at $b$. This allows us to carry out the aforementioned deduction as if $b$ were deterministic.

Fix $s > 0$. Recall $x = x(s)$ and $\overline{x} = \overline{x}(s)$ defined above. We work under the condition $\{\sigma > u, x \neq b, \overline{x} \neq a\}$. Let $P_s$ be the conditional law of $(h, \eta)$ under this conditioning. Let $P_w^\sigma$ be the probability measure for $(h^w, \eta^w, \eta_0)$ in Lemma 5.41. By Lemma 5.42 there exists a random variable $R$ determined by $(X_s, W_s)$ such that $P_s^w := R P_w^\sigma$ is a probability measure, and the $P_s^w$-law of $(X_s, W_s)$ is the same as the $P_s$-law of $(X^u, W^u_s)$. Hereafter we consider a coupling of $(P_s, P_w^\sigma)$ where $X_s = X^u_s$ and $W^r_s = W_s$.

On the event $x = \infty$, $(D_x^u, h, \eta(u), \eta(\sigma_x)) \sim (D_z, h^w, 0, \eta_0(\sigma_z))$. Moreover, we can choose $\phi_z, \phi_s$ such that $\phi_z \circ \phi_s^{-1}$ is the conformal mapping relating the two surfaces. By the $\eta^w \cap \eta_0$ case of Lemma 5.39 with $j = 1$, and the coordinate change for $\phi_z$ and $\phi_s$ established in Lemmas 5.41 and 5.45 we see that $\nu^\eta_{\text{dbl}}^\ell \cap U, \phi_s, h)$ inside $D_x^u$ is an $h$-GMC over $\text{dbl}_{\eta_u}^\ell$. Furthermore, we have $\nu^\eta_{\text{dbl}}^\ell \cap U, \phi_s, h)$ is as in Definition 2.4. Let $\rho$ be the probability measure for $(\nu^\eta_{\text{dbl}}^\ell \cap U, \phi_s, h)$.

Recall $\{s_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $p^\ell$ in Lemma 5.43. Assuming $s_i$ is rational and sending $i \rightarrow \infty$, we see that $\nu^\eta_{\text{dbl}}^\ell$ inside $D \setminus \{\eta(u), p^\ell\}$ is an $h$-GMC over $\text{dbl}_{\eta_u}^\ell$. But the point $p^\ell$ is not special as we may use the domain Markov property of $\eta$ to resample $\eta$ after visiting $p^\ell$ so that $p^\ell$ is not the leftmost point. To be more precise, let $\theta^\ell_p$ denote the last time that $\eta$ hits $p^\ell$, and choose a dyadic polygon $V$ such that $\eta([0, \theta^\ell_p])$ is disjoint from $V$. We resample the segment of $\eta$ after
the time at which it hits $V$. Almost surely, conditioned on $\eta([0,\theta_\ell])$ there exists a dyadic polygon $V$ as above such that with positive conditional probability $p^f$ is not the leftmost point for the new curve. Therefore $\nu_{\eta_\ell}^s |_{\text{dbl}^s_{\eta,u}}$ inside $D \setminus \{\eta(u)\}$ is an $h$-GMC over $\text{dbl}^s_{\eta,u}$. □

It remains to prove Lemma 5.42. We start by an easier comparison.

Lemma 5.46. In the setting of Proposition 5.8, for $(D,a,b)$ and $\eta$, let $D^m$ be as defined in Lemma 5.22 and $\mathcal{W}^m := (D^m,a,b)/\sim$. Fix $s > 0$. If $s$ is smaller than the total right boundary length of $\mathcal{W}^m$, let $\mathcal{W}^m_s$ be the shortest initial segment of $\mathcal{W}^m$ such that the right boundary has quantum length at least $s$. Otherwise, let $\mathcal{W}^m_s = \mathcal{W}^m$. Then the conditional law of $\mathcal{W}^m_s$ conditioning on $\sigma$ and the event that $\{\mathcal{W}^m_s \neq \mathcal{W}^m\}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of $\mathcal{W}_s$ in Lemma 5.42.

Proof. Throughout this proof for $(h,\eta)$ we condition on $\sigma$ being a fixed number which we still denote by $\sigma$. We denote this conditional measure by $\mathbb{P}_\sigma$. Let $h^w$ be a free Liouville field on $D$ such that $(D,h^w,a,b)/\sim$ is a 2-quantum wedge. (Here we slightly abuse the notation $h^w$ as compared to Lemma 5.41.) Let $\eta^w$ be an SLE$_6$ on $(D,a,b)$ with the quantum natural parametrization of $h^w$. Let $Z^w = (L^w,R^w)$ be the boundary length process of $(D,h^w,a,b)/\sim$ as in Proposition 5.6. Let $W$ be the 2/3-quantum wedge given by $h^w$ restricted to the region bounded by the left and right boundary of $\eta^w$, as in Definition 5.22. We may assume that $\mathcal{W}_s$ is obtained from $W$ as how $\mathcal{W}^m_s$ is obtained from $\mathcal{W}^m$.

Let $\mathbb{P}^w$ be the probability measure for $(h^w,\eta^w)$. Suppose $F$ is an event measurable with respect to $\mathcal{W}_s$ such that $\mathbb{P}^w[\mathcal{W}_s \in F] = 0$. To conclude the proof it is sufficient to show that $\mathbb{P}_\sigma[\mathcal{W}^m_s \in F] = 0$. For $t \in (0,\sigma)$, let $\mathcal{Y}^w_t = (D \setminus D_t,h^w,\eta^w|_{[0,t]})/\sim$ and $\mathcal{Y}^d_t = (D \setminus D_t,h,\eta|_{[0,t]})/\sim$. By Proposition 5.8, the boundary length processes of $\eta^w|_{[0,t]}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the boundary length process of $\eta^w|_{[0,t]}$, with a Radon-Nikodym derivative determined by $Z^w(t)$. Using Theorem 5.10, this gives that the law of $\mathcal{Y}^d_t$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathcal{Y}^w_t$ with the Radon-Nikodym derivative satisfying the same condition. Let $E^d_t$ be the event that $\mathcal{W}^m_s \neq \mathcal{W}^m$ and that $\mathcal{W}^m_s$ is contained in $\mathcal{Y}^d_t$. Let $\mathcal{W}^m_s 1_{E^d_t}$ be the random variable that equals to $\mathcal{W}^m_s$ on $E^d_t$ and $\emptyset$ otherwise. Then $E^d_t$ and $\mathcal{W}^m_s 1_{E^d_t}$ are determined by $\mathcal{Y}^d_t$. Now the absolute continuity of $\mathcal{Y}^d_t$ with respect to $\mathcal{Y}^w_t$ gives $\mathbb{P}_\sigma[\mathcal{W}^m_s 1_{E^d_t} \in F,E^d_t] = 0$. Since $\lim_{t \to \sigma} \mathbb{P}_\sigma[\{\mathcal{W}^m_s \neq \mathcal{W}^m\} \setminus E^d_t] = 0$, we conclude the proof. □

By a similar covering argument as in the proof of Lemma 5.46 we get the following.

Lemma 5.47. Fix two numbers $\ell_u > -\ell$ and $r_u > -r$. The law of $\mathcal{W}^m_s$ conditioned on $Z^d(u) = (\ell_u,r_u)$ and the event $\{\sigma > u, \mathcal{W}^m_s \neq \mathcal{W}^m\}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of $\mathcal{W}^m_s$ conditioned on the event $\{\sigma > u, \mathcal{W}^m_s \neq \mathcal{W}^m\}$.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be the law of $(h,\eta)$ conditioning on the event $\{\sigma > u, \mathcal{W}^m_s \neq \mathcal{W}^m\}$. Let $\mathbb{P}_u$ be the conditional law of $\mathbb{P}$ conditioning on $Z^d(u) = (\ell_u,r_u)$. Fix $t \in (0,u)$. Given the explicit laws of $Z^w$ and $Z^d$ in Proposition 5.8 it is easy to see that the law of $(Z^d(u-t') - Z^d(u))_{t' \in [0,t]}$ under $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{P}_u$ are mutually absolutely continuous. In fact, since $L^w,R^w$ are independent, we can check the absolute continuity by inspecting each coordinate. Then the problem becomes a straightforward exercise on stable process without positive jumps. Let $\mathcal{Y}_t = (D_{u-t} \setminus D_u,h,\eta|_{[u-t,u]})/\sim$. Then by Theorem 5.10 the law of $\mathcal{Y}_t$ under $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{P}_u$ are mutually absolutely continuous. On the event $\mathcal{W}^m_s \neq \mathcal{W}^m$, for small enough $t$ we have that $\mathcal{W}^m_s$ is contained in $\mathcal{Y}_t$. Now we can conclude using the same argument as in Lemma 5.46. □
Proof of Lemma 5.44. Let \( \mathbb{P} \) be the conditional probability measure of \((h, \eta)\) conditioning on the event \( \{ \sigma > u, x \neq b, \bar{x} \neq a \} \). We first prove that the \( \mathbb{P}\)-law of \( \mathcal{W}^m_s \) is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of \( \mathcal{W}_s \). Since \( \{x \neq b\} \) is determined by \( Z^d(u) \), by Lemma 5.47, the \( \mathbb{P}\)-law of \( \mathcal{W}^m_s \) is absolutely continuous with respect to conditional law of \( \mathcal{W}^m_s \) only conditioning on \( \{ \sigma > u, \bar{x} \neq a \} \). By the reversibility of \( \eta \) in Lemma 5.9 conditioning on \( \sigma \) and the left/right boundary lengths of \((\mathcal{D}_u, \eta(u), a)\), the conditional law of \( \mathcal{W}^m_s \) is the same as \( \mathcal{W}^m \) in Lemma 5.46 with the same boundary lengths and value of \( \sigma \). Now the desired absolute continuity between \( \mathcal{W}^m_s \) and \( \mathcal{W}_s \) follows from Lemma 5.46. (Here we use the following general fact. If a regular conditioning probability is absolutely continuous with respect to a measure. Then any mixture of the regular conditional probability is also an absolutely continuous with respect to the same measure.)

Let \( \mathbb{P}[\cdot \mid Z^d(u)] \) be the conditional law of \( \mathbb{P} \) given \( Z^d(u) \). By Theorem 5.10, \( \mathcal{W}^m_s \) and \( \mathcal{X}^u_s \) are independent under \( \mathbb{P}[\cdot \mid Z^d(u)] \). By Lemma 5.47, the \( \mathbb{P}[\cdot \mid Z^d(u)] \)-law of \( \mathcal{W}^m_s \) is absolutely continuous with respect to the \( \mathbb{P} \)-law of \( \mathcal{W}^m_s \), which is further absolutely continuous with respect to the law of \( \mathcal{W}_s \) by the first paragraph of this proof. On the other hand, by Proposition 5.8 and Theorem 5.10, the \( \mathbb{P}[\cdot \mid Z^d(u)] \)-law of \( \mathcal{X}^u_s \) is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of \( \mathcal{X}_s \). Since \( \mathcal{W}_s \) and \( \mathcal{X}_s \) are independent, we see that the \( \mathbb{P}[\cdot \mid Z^d(u)] \)-law of \( (\mathcal{W}^m_s, \mathcal{X}^u_s) \) is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of \( (\mathcal{W}_s, \mathcal{X}_s) \). Now we conclude the proof by removing the conditioning on \( Z^d(u) \).

We conclude this section with the following variant of Lemma 5.40. It will be used in the next subsection when we go from \( \text{SLE}_6 \) to \( \text{CLE}_6 \).

Lemma 5.48. In the setting of Proposition 5.8, let \( \mathcal{B} \) be a bubble of \( \eta \) with root \( x_B \) such that \( \partial \mathcal{B} \cap \partial D = \emptyset \). Fix \( s' > 0 \), on the event that the quantum length of \( \partial \mathcal{B} \) is bigger than \( s' \), let \( x' := x'(s') \in \partial \mathcal{B} \) be such that if \( \mathcal{B} \) is on the left (resp. right) of \( \eta \), then the clockwise (resp., counterclockwise) arc from \( x' \) to \( x_B \) on \( \mathcal{B} \) has quantum length \( s' \). Conditioning on \((h, \eta, \mathcal{B}, x')\), sample an \( \text{SLE}_6 \) curve \( \eta' \) on \((\mathcal{B}, x_B, x')\). Let \( \nu^0_{\eta'} \) be defined as \( \nu^0_{\eta} \) in Definition 5.14 with \((\mathcal{B}, h, \eta')\) in place of \((D, h, \eta)\) there. Then \( \nu^0_{\eta'} \) inside \( D \setminus \{x_B, x'\} \) is an \( h \)-GMC over \( \eta' \cap \partial \mathcal{B} \).

Proof. By symmetry we may assume \( \mathcal{B} \) is to the left of \( \eta \). In this case, consider a pair of positive rationals \( u \) and \( s \) such that, in the notations of the proof of Lemma 5.40, \( x_B = \eta(\tau_s) \neq p^\mathcal{B} \) and \( x' \in \mathcal{P}_u^\mathcal{B} \). Such rationals exist because \( \mathcal{B} \cap \partial D = \emptyset \). We claim that \( \nu^0_{\eta'} |_{\eta' \cap \mathcal{P}_u^\mathcal{B}} \) inside \( D \setminus \{x_B, x'\} \) is an \( h \)-GMC over \( \eta' \cap \mathcal{P}_u^\mathcal{B} \). Once this is proved, we can prove Lemma 5.48 by exhausting all such \( u, s \). To prove this claim, recall \( \{s_i, x_i\} \) in the proof of Lemma 5.43. For \( i \) large enough, we have \( \mathcal{B} \subseteq D^u_{x_i} \). As in the proof of Lemma 5.40 by mapping \( \mathcal{B} \subseteq D^u_{x_i} \) to the corresponding domain in the setting of Lemma 5.44, it suffices to prove the analogous claim in that setting. This result follows from the \( k = 3 \) case of Lemma 5.49 right below.

Lemma 5.49. In the setting of Lemma 5.39, let \( \mathcal{B} \) be the bubble of \( \eta_0 \) whose boundary contains \( z \). For \( s' > 0 \), on the event \( E(s') \) that the quantum length of \( \partial \mathcal{B} \cap \eta^* \) is bigger than \( s' \), let \( z' := z'(s') \in \eta^* \cap \partial \mathcal{B} \) be such that the quantum length of the segment on \( \eta^* \) between \( x' \) and \( x_B \) equals \( s' \). Conditioning on \((h^\mathcal{B}, \eta^*, \eta_0)\) and the event \( E(s') \), sample an \( \text{SLE}_6 \) curve \( \eta' \) on \((\mathcal{B}, x_B, z')\). Let \( \nu' \) be defined as \( \nu^0 \) in Lemma 5.36 with \((\eta^3, \eta^4)\) replaced by \((\eta^*, \eta')\). Then \( \nu' \) inside \( \mathbb{H} \setminus \{x_B, z'\} \) is an \( h \)-GMC over \( \eta^* \cap \eta' \).
Proof. Couple \( \eta_0 \) and \( \eta'_0 \) as described in the last paragraph in the proof of Lemma \( \ref{lem:5.39} \). By the \( \eta'_0 \) case of Lemma \( \ref{lem:5.39} \), the statement of Lemma \( \ref{lem:5.49} \) holds with \( (\eta', \eta'_0|_{[\tau, \infty)}) \) instead of \( (\eta^*, \eta') \). Notice that \( \eta'_0|_{[\tau, \infty)} \) has the law of an SLE\( _6 \) on \( (B, x_B, z) \). By letting \( s \) vary in the set of rational numbers, the curve \( \eta' \) in Lemma \( \ref{lem:5.49} \) can be coupled together with \( \eta'_0|_{[\tau, \infty)} \) such that the curves are identical outside some given neighborhood of \( z \). This implies that the statement of the lemma also holds for \( (\eta^*, \eta') \). \hfill \( \square \)

### 5.3.5 Proof of Proposition \( \ref{prop:5.3} \)

Recall the notions in Definition \( \ref{def:5.15} \). We will prove Proposition \( \ref{prop:5.3} \) by covering \( \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \) by finitely many sets of the form in Lemmas \( \ref{lem:5.40} \) and \( \ref{lem:5.48} \) which arises in the iterative construction in Definition \( \ref{def:5.15} \). To make sure the restriction does not cause problem (see Remark \( \ref{rem:5.35} \)), we first prove the following.

**Lemma 5.50.** In Definition \( \ref{def:5.15} \), for each rational \( t \) such that \( \eta^{ab}(t) \in D \), there exists finitely many dyadic polygons \( U_1, \ldots, U_k \) such that \( \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta^{ab}, t} = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \text{dbl}_{\eta^{ab}, t} \cap U_i \).

**Proof.** Since \( \text{dbl}_{\eta^{ab}, t} \) is compact away from \( \eta^{ab}(t) \) while points very close to \( \eta^{ab}(t) \) are not in \( \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \), we see that \( \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta^{ab}, t} \) is compact. First we will prove the following

\[
\forall v \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta^{ab}, t}, \quad \exists \varepsilon' > \varepsilon \text{ such that } v \in \mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon'}.
\]  

(35)

Recall the two Cases 1 and 2 in Definition \( \ref{def:2.13} \). It is immediate that pivotal in Case 1 satisfy (35) since otherwise there would be two loops \( \ell_1, \ell_2 \) such that at least one of \( \mu_h(\ell_1) \land \mu_h(\ell_1) \) and \( \mu_h(\ell_1) \lor \mu_h(\ell_1) - \mu_h(\ell_1) \land \mu_h(\ell_1) \) is exactly equal to \( \varepsilon \), and the probability measures describing the areas of CLE\( _6 \) loops, in addition to the pairwise area differences, are non-atomic. Therefore we consider \( v \) as described in Case 2. Recall the Lévy process description of the boundary length process of \( (D, h, \eta^{ab}) \) in Proposition \( \ref{prop:5.8} \) and Theorem \( \ref{thm:5.10} \). Let \( \ell \) be a CLE\( _6 \) loop and let \( J \subset \mathbb{R} \) denote the time interval during which \( \eta^{ab} \) traces \( \ell \). Without loss of generality, assume \( \ell \) is oriented counterclockwise. Each downward jump of \( L \) during \( J \) corresponds to a component of \( \mathcal{C} \setminus \ell \) whose area contributes to \( \mu_h(\ell) \) (see Definition \( \ref{def:2.14} \)). Let \( \mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{R} \) denote the set of times at which \( L \) makes a downward jump. For \( t \in \mathcal{T} \) let \( a_t \) and \( b_t \) denote the boundary length and the area, respectively, of the component of \( \mathcal{C} \setminus \ell \) enclosed at time \( t \) by \( \eta^{ab} \). We have \( b_t = L_{t^-} - L_t \) and, conditioned on \( L_t \) and \( \mathcal{T} \), the random variables \( a_t \) are independent such that the law of \( a_t \) depends only on \( b_t \). Precisely, \( a_t \) has the law of the area of a \( \sqrt{8/3} \)-LQG disk with boundary length \( b_t \). If \( v = \eta^{ab}(s_1) = \eta^{ab}(s_2) \) is a point on \( \ell \) for \( s_1 < s_2 \) then \( \sum_{s \in [s_1, s_2] \cap \mathcal{T}} a_t \) gives the LQG area of one of the loops in \( \mathcal{L}_v \cap \Gamma_v \). Let \( L^w \) have the law described in Proposition \( \ref{prop:5.8} \) let \( \mathcal{T}^w \) denote the set of times at which \( L^w \) jumps, and for each \( t \in \mathcal{T}^w \) sample a (conditionally on \( L^w \)) independent random variable \( a_t^w \) such that \( (L^w_t - L^w_{t^-}, a_t) \) has the same law as \( (b_t, a_t) \) above. Then define \( (X_t)_{t \geq 0} \) by \( X_t = \sum_{s: a_s \leq t} a_s \).

Observe that \( X_t \) has the law of a stable subordinator since it is an increasing process with i.i.d. increments. For any given \( \varepsilon > 0 \) it holds almost surely that \( \varepsilon \) is not contained in the range of \( X \). Using this property and absolute continuity of \( L^w \) and \( L \) (Proposition \( \ref{prop:5.8} \) we obtain (35).

Using (35) we see that for each \( v \in \mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon'} \), we may find a small enough dyadic polygon \( U \) such that \( v \in U \) and \( U \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta^{ab}, t} \subset \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \). Otherwise, the nonexistence of such dyadic polygons
we consider a larger set of pivotal points, such that we recover exactly the desired set of
pivotal points, by restricting to a finite collection of dyadic polygons. We omit the detailed
formulations and proofs of the analogs of Lemma 5.50 in these settings since the reasoning is
exactly the same as in the proof of that lemma.

Now we start the iterative proof of Proposition 5.3. By the no-triple-point property of \( \Gamma \),
we have \( \partial D \cap P_\varepsilon = \emptyset \). Recall the discussion in the paragraph following Definition 5.15. There
exists a finite set \( T \) of rational numbers such that \( P_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta^{ab},t} \subset U \cup_{t \in T} \text{dbl}_{\eta^{ab},t} \). Applying Lemmas 5.40 and 5.50 to each \( \text{dbl}_{\eta^{ab},t} \), we see that \( \nu_{h,\Gamma}^\varepsilon|_{P_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta^{ab},D}} \) in \( D \) is an \( h \)-GMC over
\( P_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta^{ab},D} \). This conclude the Step 1 of the iteration.

As seen in the previous paragraph, Lemma 5.50 allows us to consider \( \text{dbl}_{\eta^{ab},t} \) instead of
\( P_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta^{ab},t} \), i.e., instead of proving that \( \nu_{h,\Gamma}^\varepsilon \) restricted to the latter set is an \( h \)-GMC over
this set, we may prove the same result for the former set. We can do a similar simplification
in the other steps of the iterative procedure to exhaust \( P_\varepsilon \) (i.e., in Step 2 and the iterations
inside the components of \( D \setminus \Gamma_a^b \)). In other words, instead of considering the \( \varepsilon \)-pivotal points
we consider a larger set of pivotal points, such that we recover exactly the desired set of
\( \varepsilon \)-pivotal points by restricting to a finite collection of dyadic polygons. We omit the detailed
formulations and proofs of the analogs of Lemma 5.50 in these settings since the reasoning is
exactly the same as in the proof of that lemma.

Let \( B \) be a dichromatic bubble in Step 2 of the iterative definition of \( \nu_{h,\Gamma}^\varepsilon \). Recall the
notations from Lemma 2.12 and the paragraph above it, including \( \Gamma_a^b, x_B, \widehat{x}_B, \eta_B \). For \( n \in \mathbb{N} \)
large enough, let \( \widehat{x}_n \in \partial B \cap \partial D \) be such that the quantum length of the segment of \( \partial D \cap \partial B \)
between \( \widehat{x}_B \) and \( b_n \) equals \( n^{-1} \). Let \( \eta_n \) be the interface of \( \Gamma \) on \( (D, a, b_n) \). Since \( \widehat{x}_B \) is away from \( P_\varepsilon \), for \( n \) large enough \( P_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta_B,D} = P_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta_n,D} \). Proceeding as for Step 1, we see
that \( \nu_{h,\Gamma}^\varepsilon|_{P_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta_B,B}} \) in \( D \) is an \( h \)-GMC over \( P_\varepsilon \cap \text{dbl}_{\eta_B,B} \).

To finish the proof, we consider a connected component \( B' \) of \( D \setminus \Gamma_a^b \) (i.e., a monochromatic
bubble). We claim that

\[
\nu_{h,\Gamma}^\varepsilon|_{P_\varepsilon \cap \partial B'} \text{ inside } D \text{ is an } h \text{-GMC over } P_\varepsilon \cap \partial B'.
\]  

(36)
We first consider the case when $\mathcal{B}'$ is a monochromatic bubble of $\eta_{ab}$. Let $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_k$ be the finite collection of boundary touching loops of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}'}$ (namely, loops in $\Gamma$ inside $\mathcal{B}'$) with $\mu_h(\text{reg}(\ell_i)) \geq \varepsilon$. Then $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \partial \mathcal{B}' \subset \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} (\ell_i \cap \partial \mathcal{B}')$. Now we divide this case into two subcases: $\partial \mathcal{B}' \cap \partial \mathcal{D} = \emptyset$ and $\partial \mathcal{B}' \cap \partial \mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$. These are illustrated in the left and right, respectively, part of Figure 9. In the first case, by left/right symmetry we further assume that $\mathcal{B}'$ is on the right of $\eta_{ab}$. Given $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that $\ell_i \cap \partial \mathcal{B}' \neq \emptyset$, let $x_i$ be the point on $\ell_i$ encountered first when tracing $\partial \mathcal{B}'$ clockwise from $x_{\mathcal{B}'}$. Let $b_n \in \partial \mathcal{B}'$ be such that the clockwise arc from $x_i$ to $b_n$ is $n^{-1}$. Let $\eta_{\mathcal{B}'}^n$ be the interface of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}'}$ on $(\mathcal{B}', x_{\mathcal{B}'}, b_n)$. Then as seen from the previous paragraph, as $n \to \infty$, the range of $\eta_{\mathcal{B}'}^n$ covers $\ell_i$ except $x_i$. By Lemma 5.48, $\nu_{h, \Gamma|\ell_i \cap \partial \mathcal{B}'}^n$ inside $D \setminus \{x_i\}$ is an $h$-GMC over $\ell_i \cap \partial \mathcal{B}'$. As in the proof of Lemma 5.40 for the fact that the leftmost point $p_i$ is not special, the point $x_i$ here is not special either thanks to the locality of SLE$_6$. In particular, $\nu_{h, \Gamma|\ell_i \cap \partial \mathcal{B}'}$ inside $D$ is an $h$-GMC over $\ell_i \cap \mathcal{B}$. Therefore (36) holds when $\mathcal{B}'$ is a monochromatic bubble of $\eta_{ab}$ and $\partial \mathcal{B}' \cap \partial \mathcal{D} = \emptyset$.

Now we assume $\mathcal{B}'$ is a monochromatic bubble of $\eta_{ab}$ and $\partial \mathcal{B}' \cap \partial \mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$. Due to our assumption that the CLE$_6$ has the monochromatic blue boundary condition, $\mathcal{B}'$ must be on the right of $\eta_{ab}$. Let $\hat{x}'$ be the other endpoint of $\partial \mathcal{B}' \cap \partial \mathcal{D}$ other than $x_{\mathcal{B}'}$. Given $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that $\ell_i \cap \partial \mathcal{B}' \cap \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$, we note that $\ell_i \cap \partial \mathcal{B}' \cap \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \subset \partial \mathcal{B}' \setminus \partial \mathcal{D}$. Let $x_i$ (resp. $y_i$) be the first (resp. last) point on $\ell_i$ encountered when tracing $\partial \mathcal{B}' \setminus \partial \mathcal{D}$ from $x_{\mathcal{B}'}$ to $\hat{x}'$. Let $\ell_i \cap \partial \mathcal{D}$ be such that the counterclockwise arc from $\hat{x}'$ to $b_n$ is $n^{-1}$. For large enough $n$, $\hat{x}'$ and $b_n$ are on the boundary of the same connected component of $\partial \mathcal{D}

6 Liouville dynamical percolation

In this section we prove Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 which conclude the proof of Theorem 1.10. Lemma 3.2 is a relatively easy consequence of [5] and an ingredient (Proposition 6.23) from [19] and [18]. For Lemma 3.3, neither the convergence nor the ergodicity seems

\footnote{This conclusion would not hold if we considered the interface of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}'}$ on $(\mathcal{B}', x_{\mathcal{B}'}, \hat{x}')$ instead, since this curve is not the time reversal of $\eta'$.
to be accessible from random planar maps and mating-of-trees perspective. To prove this lemma, we use the Liouville dynamical percolation introduced in [GHSS19]. We review this object in Sections 6.1 and 6.2 and prove Lemma 3.3 in Section 6.3 with certain ingredients supplied in later subsections.

We will use the following notions and conventions. CLE in this section will be assumed to have monochromatic blue boundary condition. Given a finite measure \( \mu \), if \( z \) is sampled from \( \mu \) normalized to be a probability measure, we will simply say that \( z \) is sampled from \( \mu \). For a metric space \( (X, d) \), recall that a process taking values in \( X \) is called càdlàg if it is right-continuous and has left limits everywhere. In this section we will often consider convergence of càdlàg processes in the Skorokhod topology. For functions \( f_j : I_j \to X \) defined on bounded intervals \( I_j \subset \mathbb{R} \) for \( j = 1, 2 \), this topology is generated by the following metric (recall (9))

\[
d_{Sk}(f_1, f_2) := \inf_{\phi} \sup_{t \in I_1} \left( d(f_1(t), f_2(\phi(t))) + |t - \phi(t)| \right),
\]

where the infimum is taken over all increasing bijections \( \phi : I_1 \to I_2 \). If \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) are defined on \([0, \infty)\), then we define \( d_{Sk} \) similarly; more precisely,

\[
d_{Sk}(f_1, f_2) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \inf_{\phi, J} \sup_{t \in [0, 2^k]} 2^{-k} \wedge \left( d(f_1(t), f_2(\phi(t))) + |t - \phi(t)| \right),
\]

where the infimum is taken over all intervals \( J \subset [0, \infty) \) containing 0 and increasing bijections \( \phi : [0, 2^k] \to J \).

### 6.1 Quad-crossing space

We start by recalling a metric space due to Schramm and Smirnov [SS11] as a method of describing the scaling limit of planar percolation other than loop ensembles. We will omit the detailed construction of the metric and only review materials necessary for this paper.

Let \( D \) be a Jordan domain. A "quad on \( D \)" is a homeomorphism \( Q \) from \([0, 1]^2 \) into \( D \), where two homeomorphisms \( Q_1 \) and \( Q_2 \) are identified as the same quad if \( Q_1([0, 1]^2) = Q_2([0, 1]^2) \), and \( Q_1(z) = Q_2(z) \) for \( z \in \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1)\} \). Let

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_1 Q &:= Q(\{0\} \times [0, 1]), & \partial_2 Q &:= Q([0, 1] \times \{0\}), \\
\partial_3 Q &:= Q(\{1\} \times [0, 1]), & \partial_4 Q &:= Q([0, 1] \times \{1\}).
\end{align*}
\]

Let \( \mathcal{Q}_D \) denote the space of all quads in \( D \). A "crossing" of a quad \( Q \) is a closed set in \( D \) containing a connected closed subset of \( Q([0, 1]^2) \) that intersects both \( \partial_1 Q \) and \( \partial_2 Q \). A natural partial order \( \leq \) can be defined on \( \mathcal{Q}_D \) by saying that \( Q_1 \leq Q_2 \) if and only if every crossing of \( Q_1 \) is also a crossing of \( Q_2 \).

We say that a subset \( S \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_D \) is "hereditary" if, whenever \( Q \in S \) and \( Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_D \) satisfies \( Q' \leq Q \), we have \( Q' \in S \). We call a closed hereditary subset of \( \mathcal{Q}_D \) a "quad-crossing configuration on \( D \)" and denote the space of quad-crossing configurations by \( \mathcal{H}(D) \). For \( \omega \in \mathcal{H}(D) \) we may identify it with a function \( \omega : \mathcal{Q}_D \to \{0, 1\} \) such that \( \omega^{-1}(1) \) is closed in \( \mathcal{Q}_D \) and such that for any \( Q_1, Q_2 \) with \( Q_1 \leq Q_2 \) and \( \omega(Q_1) = 1 \), we have \( \omega(Q_2) = 1 \). (Here we abuse notation and let \( \omega \) denote both the element of \( \mathcal{H}(D) \) and the function from \( \mathcal{Q}_D \)
We are mainly interested in the setting under which we will prove Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 in Section 6.3. Let \( \omega \rightarrow \omega(Q) \) be a site percolation on \( D^\delta \) (see the paragraph above Theorem 2.10). For each \( Q \in Q_D \), let \( \omega^\delta(Q) = 1 \) if and only if the union of all red hexagons on the dual lattice of \( D^\delta \) gives a crossing of \( Q \). This identifies \( \omega^\delta \) with an element in \( \mathcal{H} \). If \( \omega^\delta \) is sampled from Bernoulli-\( \frac{1}{2} \) site percolation, then \( \omega^\delta \) converges in law to a random variable \( \omega \) in \( \mathcal{H}(D) \) for the \( d_\mathcal{H} \)-metric \( \text{CN06,GPS13} \). In any coupling where this convergence holds almost surely, we have that \( \omega^\delta(Q) \) converges to \( \omega(Q) \) in probability for each \( Q \in Q_D \).

### 6.2 Liouville dynamical percolation

We first specify the setting under which we will prove Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 in Section 6.3. Let \( \gamma = \sqrt{8/3} \), \( Q = 5/\sqrt{6} \), and \( a = Q - \gamma = 1/\sqrt{6} \). We consider a probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) with random variables \( X_t, h^1, h^2, h^3 \) whose law are as described in Definition 2.4. Namely, \( (X_t)_{t \geq 0} \) has the law of \( B_{2t} - at \), where \( B_t \) is a standard Brownian motion, \( (X_{-t})_{t \geq 0} \) is independent of \( (X_t)_{t \geq 0} \), and \( (X_{-t})_{t \geq 0} \) the law of \( B_{2t} - at \) conditioned on being negative. Moreover, \( h^3 = h^1 + h^2 \), where \( h^1(t + si) = X_t \) for each \( t + si \in S \) and \( h^2 \) is independent of \( X_t \) with the law of the lateral component of the free-boundary GFF on \( S \). Let \( \mathbb{P}^d \) be the probability measure obtained from normalizing \( e^{-\gamma M/4} \xi_{h^3}(\partial S)^{1/2} \mathbb{P} \), where \( M = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} X_t \). Let \( h^4 := h^3 - 2\gamma^{-1} \log \xi_{h^3}(\partial S) \), so that under the \( \mathbb{P}^d \)-measure \( h^4 \) is a unit boundary length \( 8/3 \)-LQG disk by definition. Now let \( \phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow S \) be the conformal map in Definition 2.7. Let \( h \) be the field defined in Definition 2.7, i.e., \( h = h^4 \circ \phi + Q \log |\phi'| \).

The fields \( h \) and \( h \) are related by

\[
h = h - 2\gamma^{-1} \log \xi_{h}(\partial S).
\]

We are mainly interested in \( h \) because under the \( \mathbb{P}^d \)-measure, it is the field considered in Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3. However, most technical work in this section will be done with \( h \) instead because of the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.1.** In the setting above, \( h \) can be written as \( \Phi + g \), where the \( \mathbb{P} \)-law of \( \Phi \) is a free boundary GFF as in Theorem 6.3 and \( g \) is a random continuous function on \( \mathbb{D} \). Moreover,

\[
g(z) \leq Q \log |\phi'(z)| - a |\text{Re} \phi(z)|.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( h^f \) be the free boundary GFF on \( S \) with average 0 along \( i[0, \pi] \). In the definition of \( h^s \) in Definition 2.4, if the law of \( X_t \) were set to be the two-sided Brownian motion \( (B_{2t})_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \) without drift and conditioning, then the law of \( h^s \) would be given by \( h^f \). Since there exists a coupling of \( (B_{2t})_{t \geq 0} \) and \( (X_t)_{t \geq 0} \) such that \( X_t = B_{2t} - at \) for \( t \geq 0 \) and \( X_t \leq B_{-2t} + at \) for all \( t \leq 0 \), we can couple \( h^f \) and \( h^s \) on the same probability space such that

1. the lateral component of \( h^f \) (see the paragraph above Definition 2.4) equals \( h^2 \);
2. \( h^s = h^f - a \Re z \) on \( S \cap \{ z : \Re z \geq 0 \} \);
3. \( h^s \leq h^f + a \Re z \) on \( S \cap \{ z : \Re z < 0 \} \).

Since \( \Phi = h^f \circ Q \log |\phi'| \), taking \( \Phi = h^f \circ \phi \) and \( g = h - \Phi \) and using that \( \phi \) maps \([-1, 1]\) to \([0, i\pi]\), we obtain \[39\] a.s.

The following immediate corollary of Lemma 6.1 will be useful in Sections 6.4 and 6.7.

**Corollary 6.2.** For \( \Phi \) and \( \Phi \) in Lemma 6.1, given any \( r \in (0, 1) \), there exists a deterministic constant \( c_r \) such that \( \Phi \leq \Phi + c_r \) on \( r\mathbb{D} := \{ z : |z| < r \} \).

Now we review Liouville dynamical percolation in the setting specified above. Let \( \mu^\delta_0 := \lim_{\delta \to 0} \varepsilon^{a/2} e^{\alpha a} d^2 z \) be defined as in Definition 5.2 with \( \alpha = 1/\sqrt{6} \). Fix \( \delta > 0 \) and consider the lattice \( \mathbb{D}^\delta \). For each vertex \( v \) on \( \mathbb{D}^\delta \), let \( \mu^\delta_0(v) \) be the \( \mu^\delta_0 \)-mass of the hexagon on the dual lattice of \( \mathbb{D}^\delta \) corresponding to \( v \). Let \( \alpha^\delta_1(\delta, r) \) be the probability of that Bernoulli-\( 1/2 \) site percolation on \( \delta \mathbb{T} \) possesses four disjoint monochromatic paths of alternating color from the origin to the boundary of the box \([-r, r]^2\).

Now we enlarge the probability space \( (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \) to contain random variables defined as follows. For \( \delta > 0 \), let \( \omega^\delta \) be an instance of Bernoulli-\( 1/2 \) site percolation on \( \mathbb{D}^\delta \) with monochromatic blue boundary condition. The loop ensembles corresponding to \( \omega^\delta \) converge \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost surely (recall Theorem 2.10). We further require \( \Phi \) and \( \{ \omega^\delta \}_{\delta > 0} \) to be independent under \( \mathbb{P} \). Now we sample a clock in \( \Omega \) for each inner vertex of \( \mathbb{D}^\delta \) such that conditioning on \( (\Phi, \omega^\delta) \), these clocks are independent, and moreover, the clock of \( \omega^\delta \) is an exponential clock with rate \( \mu^\delta_0(v) \alpha^\delta_1(\delta, 1)^{-1} \). Now we define a dynamic on the space of site percolation configurations on \( \mathbb{D}^\delta \) as follows. Letting the initial coloring be \( \omega^\delta \), when the clock rings at an inner vertex \( v \), we flip the color at \( v \). This defines a stationary process \( (\omega_t^\delta)_{t \geq 0} \), which by Section 6.1 can be viewed as taking values in \( \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D}) \). We call \( (\omega_t^\delta)_{t \geq 0} \) the **discrete Liouville dynamical percolation** on \( \mathbb{D}^\delta \) driven by \( e^{\Phi/\sqrt{6}} \).

We will use the following key result from [GHSS19].

**Theorem 6.3.** There exists a probability space \( (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \) such that random variables with the law of \( \Phi \) and \( \{ \omega^\delta : \delta \in (0, 1) \} \) above can be defined on this probability space, in addition to a stochastic process \( (\omega_t)_{t \geq 0} \) taking values on \( \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D}) \) with the following properties.

- For each \( r \in (0, 1) \) and \( t \geq 0 \), let \( \omega_t^\delta|_{\mathbb{D}} \) (resp. \( \omega_t^\delta|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \)) be the \( \omega_t^\delta \) (resp. \( \omega_t \)) restricted to \( \mathbb{Q}_{r\mathbb{D}} \), where \( \mathbb{D} := \{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < r \} \). Then for each \( r \in (0, 1) \), \( (\omega_t^\delta)_{t \geq 0} \) is a càdlàg process and \( \lim_{t \to 0} (\omega_t^\delta)_{t \geq 0} = (\omega_t)_{t \geq 0} \) in probability in the Skorokhod topology.
- \( (\omega_t)_{t \geq 0} \) has the following mixing property. For any two events \( A, B \) in the Borel \( \sigma \)-algebra of \( (\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D}), d_H) \), \( \lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbb{P}[1_{\omega_t^\delta \in A} 1_{\omega_t \in B} \mid \Phi] = \mathbb{P}[A] \mathbb{P}[B] \) a.s.

**Proof.** Note that \( \Phi \) in Lemma 6.1 is a Gaussian field on \( r\mathbb{D} \) with kernel of the form \( -\log |x - y| + c(x, y) \), where \( c \) is continuous up to the boundary of \( r\mathbb{D} \). Therefore, if \( g \) were equal to 0 in Lemma 6.1, then \( \Phi = \phi \), Theorem 6.3 would fall into the framework of [GHSS19] and follow from [GHSS19] Theorems 1.3 and 1.4. Now, although \( g \neq 0 \), since \( g \) is uniformly bounded from above and below on \( r\mathbb{D} \), it is straightforward to check that the proof in [GHSS19] still works. □
We call \((\omega_t)_{t \geq 0}\) the continuous Liouville dynamical percolation driven by \(e^{h/\sqrt{6}}\). The boundary condition of \((\omega_t^\delta)_{t \geq 0}\) is irrelevant for Theorem 6.3. We impose the monochromatic boundary condition and restrict the update of colors only to inner vertices in order to mimic the dynamic \((M^n, \omega_t^n)_{t \geq 0}\) in Section 1.3.3.

### 6.3 Proof of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3

In this section we work on the probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) described in Theorem 6.3.

Fix a site percolation configuration \(\omega^\delta\) on \(\mathbb{D}^\delta\) with monochromatic blue boundary condition, and let \(\Gamma(\omega^\delta)\) be the loop ensemble of \(\omega^\delta\). For each loop \(\ell \in \Gamma(\omega^\delta)\), similarly as in Definition 2.14, we call the \(\mu_\ell\)-mass of the region enclosed by \(\ell\) the \(\mu_\ell\)-area of \(\ell\). Given an inner vertex \(v\) of \(\mathbb{D}^\delta\), let \(\omega^\delta_v\) be the coloring of \(\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{D}^\delta)\) such that for each \(v' \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{D}^\delta)\), \(\omega^\delta_v(v') = \omega^\delta(v')\) if and only if \(v' \neq v\). Let \(L_v\) be the symmetric difference between \(\Gamma(\omega^\delta)\) and \(\Gamma(\omega^\delta_v)\). For \(\varepsilon > 0\), we call \(\nu(\varepsilon)\) the \(\varepsilon\)-pivotal point of \((\omega^\delta)\) if there are at least three loops in \(L_v\) with \(\mu_\ell\)-area at least \(\varepsilon\). For \(\varepsilon > 0\), let \((\omega^\varepsilon_\ell)_{t \geq 0}\) be the following modification of \((\omega^\delta_\ell)_{t \geq 0}\): when the clock at an inner vertex \(v\) rings at time \(t\), the color of \(v\) is flipped if and only if \(v\) is an \(\varepsilon\)-pivotal point of \((\omega^\delta)\). Note that \((\omega^\varepsilon_\ell)_{t \geq 0}\) is defined similarly as \((\omega^\varepsilon_\ell)_{t \geq 0}\) in Section 1.3.3, i.e., by rejecting updates of vertices which are not \(\varepsilon\)-pivots.

The proof of Lemma 6.4 requires two main ingredients, one from lattice approximation (Proposition 6.7 and Lemma 6.5) and the other from planar maps (Lemma 6.6).

**Lemma 6.4.** For a probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) as described above, for each \(\varepsilon > 0\), let \((\omega^\varepsilon_\ell)_{t \geq 0}\) be defined as above and let \(\Gamma^\varepsilon_\ell = \Gamma(\omega^\varepsilon_\ell)\) for each \(t \geq 0\). There exists a process \((\Gamma^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}\) coupled with \(h\) such that \((h, \Gamma^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}\) converge in law to \((h, \Gamma^\delta_t)_{t \geq 0}\) as \(\delta \to 0\) in the Skorokhod topology as a càdlàg process taking values in \(H^{-1}(\mathbb{D}) \times \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{D})\). The conditional law of \(\Gamma^\varepsilon_0\) given \(h\) is that of a CLE6 on \(\mathbb{D}\). Moreover, conditioned on \(h\), \((\Gamma^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}\) is a stationary Markov process on \(\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{D})\) with finitely many jumps in any finite interval.

Lemma 6.4 will be proved in Section 6.6. The proof will also give the following.

**Lemma 6.5.** The law of \((h, \Gamma^\varepsilon_t)\) in Lemma 6.4 can be described as follows. Let \(m_\varepsilon\) be the 3/4-occupation measure of the \(\varepsilon\)-pivotal points of \((h, \Gamma^\varepsilon_0)\). There exists a constant \(c' > 0\) such that conditioning on \((\mathbb{D}, h, \Gamma^\varepsilon_0)\), an exponential clock rings with rate \(c' \int_0^1 e^{h/\sqrt{6}} m_\varepsilon\). Once the clock rings, sample an \(\varepsilon\)-pivotal point \(z\) from \(e^{h/\sqrt{6}} m_\varepsilon\). The process jumps to the loop ensemble obtained by flipping the color at \(z\). (Recall the notion of color flipping for CLE6 above Definition 2.14.) The remaining jumps in the process are sampled iteratively.

Lemma 6.5 provides a recipe for sampling \((h, \Gamma^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}\) without referring to the lattice approximation. Purely from the continuum perspective, it is not obvious that almost surely the 3/4-occupation measure of the \(\varepsilon\)-pivotal points of \((h, \Gamma^\varepsilon_t)\) are well-defined simultaneously for all \(t\), and that the sampling procedure in Lemma 6.5 does not explode in finite time. These facts will become clear from the argument in Section 6.6.

Since \(e^{h/\sqrt{6}} m_\varepsilon = (e^{h}(\partial \mathbb{D}))^{-1/2} e^{h/\sqrt{6}} m_\varepsilon\), by Proposition 5.3 and Lemma 6.5, there exists a deterministic constant \(c_\varepsilon > 0\) not depending on \(\varepsilon\) such that conditioning on \((h, \Gamma^\varepsilon_0)\), the first time at which the process \((\Gamma^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}\) jumps has the law of an exponential random variable with rate \(c_\varepsilon e^{h} \mu_0(\partial \mathbb{D})^{-1/2}\) for \(c_\varepsilon\) as in (2) (also see Proposition 6.23). Recall \(\mathbb{P}_d\) at
the beginning of Section 6.2. Let \((Y^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}\) be a sample of \((\mathbb{D}, h, \Gamma^\varepsilon_{\alpha \delta t_n(0, D)} |_{1/2})_{t \geq 0}\) according to its \(\mathbb{P}\)-law, where \((\mathbb{D}, h, \Gamma^\varepsilon_{\alpha \delta t_n(0, D)} |_{1/2})\) is viewed as a random variable in \(M^\text{GHPU}\) as in Remark 2.15. We will show momentarily that \((Y^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}\) restricted to the index set \(\mathbb{N}\) gives the limiting sequence \((Y^\varepsilon_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}\) in Lemma 3.2.

The following lemma is the only input from random planar maps in the proof of Theorem 1.10. We postpone its proof to Section 6.6.

**Lemma 6.6.** Let \(S^n = (S^n_t)_{t \geq 0}\) denote the Markov process \((M^n, \bar{Y}^\varepsilon_t^{(n)})_{t \geq 0}\) in Lemma 3.2 and let \((Y^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}\) be as above. For \(i \in \mathbb{N}\), let \(\tau^n_i\) and \(\tau_i\) be the \(i\)th time that \(S^n_t\) and \(Y^\varepsilon_t\), respectively, jump. Then \((S^n_{\tau^n_1}, S^n_{\tau^n_2}, \tau^n_1, \tau^n_2)\) converge in law to \((Y^\varepsilon_{\tau_1}, Y^\varepsilon_{\tau_2}, \tau_1, \tau_2)\).

**Proof of Lemma 3.2.** Suppose we are in the setting of Lemma 6.6. By Lemma 6.6, \(S^n_{\tau^n_2} |_{[0, \tau^n_2]}\) converges to \(Y^\varepsilon_{|_{[0, \tau_2]}}\) in the Skorokhod topology. Given \(s > 0\), let \(\tau^n_i\) be defined in the same way as \(\tau^n_i\) with \((S^n_t)_{t \geq 0}\) replaced by \((S^n_t)_{t \geq 0} := (S^n_t - S^n_{s})_{t \geq 0}\). Then at least along a subsequence, there is a coupling of \((S^n_t)_{t \geq 0}\) and a family of processes \(\{Y^\varepsilon_t : s \in \mathbb{Q}_+\}\) such that for each \(s \in \mathbb{Q}_+\), it holds that \(S^n_{\tau^n_{i+1}} |_{[0, \tau^n_{i+1}]}\) converges to \(Y^\varepsilon_{|_{[0, \tau_{i+1}]} = \text{a.s. in the Skorokhod topology, where each } (Y^\varepsilon_t) \text{ has the same law as } (Y^\varepsilon_t)\) above. Given a rational \(s \in (\tau_1, \tau_2)\), for \(n\) large enough \(\tau^n_{i+1} + s = \tau^n_{i+1}\) for all \(i \in \mathbb{N}\). In particular, \(S^n_{\tau^n_i} - S^n_{s} = S^n_{\tau^n_i} |_{[0, \tau^n_{i+1}]}\). This implies that in our coupling \(S^n_{\tau^n_i} |_{[0, \tau^n_{i+1}]}\) converges almost surely in the Skorokhod topology and the law of the limiting object is given by \(Y^\varepsilon_{|_{[0, \tau^n_{i+1}]}}\). By induction, the same convergence holds with \(\tau^n_i, \tau_i\) replaced by \(\tau^n_i, \tau_i\) for any \(i \in \{4, 5, \ldots\}\). By Lemma 6.5, \(\lim_{t \to \infty} \tau_i = \infty\) a.s. Therefore \((S^n_t)_{t \geq 0}\) converges to \((Y^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}\) in the Skorokhod topology.

Since every càdlàg function has countably many discontinuous points and \((Y^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}\) is stationary, for each fixed \(t \geq 0\), \(Y^\varepsilon_t\) is almost surely continuous at \(t\). This gives Lemma 3.2.

In Section 6.7, we upgrade the convergence in law in Lemma 6.4 to convergence in probability.

**Proposition 6.7.** There exists a probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) as in Lemma 6.4 such that \((Y^\varepsilon_{t, \delta})_{t \geq 0}\) converge in probability for each \(\varepsilon > 0\).

For \(\delta > 0\), let \(\omega^\varepsilon\) be the Bernoulli-\(\frac{1}{2}\) site percolation on \(D^\delta\) with monochromatic blue boundary condition. Let \(\Gamma^\delta := \Gamma(\omega^\varepsilon)\). As explained in [GPS13], \(\omega^\varepsilon\) and \(\Gamma^\delta\) jointly converge in law. Suppose \((\omega^\varepsilon, \Gamma^\varepsilon)\) is a sample from the limiting joint law. Then the quad crossing configuration \(\omega^\varepsilon\) is a.s. determined by \(\Gamma^\varepsilon\). In Section 6.5, we prove the inverse measurability statement conjectured in [SS11].

**Theorem 6.8.** \(\Gamma\) is almost surely determined by \(\omega^\varepsilon\).

To prove Lemma 3.3, we would like to take the \(\varepsilon \to 0\) limit of \((Y^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}\). However, this convergence is hard to establish directly with the \(\mathcal{L}(D)\) topology. Theorem 6.8 allows us to reduce the proof of Lemma 3.3 to a problem on quad-crossing elements.

**Proposition 6.9.** Suppose we are in the setting of Proposition 6.7. For each \(\varepsilon > 0\) and \(t \geq 0\), let \(\omega^\varepsilon_t := \omega(\Gamma^\varepsilon_t)\) be the element of \(H(D)\) corresponding to \(\Gamma^\varepsilon_t\). Then \(\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0}(\omega^\varepsilon_t |_{D})_{t \geq 0} = (\omega_t |_{D})_{t \geq 0}\) in probability in the Skorokhod topology as càdlàg processes in \(H(rD)\), where \(\omega_t |_{rD}\) is defined similarly as \(\omega_t |_{rD}\) in Theorem 6.3.
The proof of Proposition 6.9 will be given in Section 6.7.

**Proof of Lemma 3.3** Recall the constant $c_\alpha$ in the definition of $Y_t^\varepsilon$. Define $(\Gamma_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0} := \left(\Gamma_{c_\alpha t h_\varepsilon(D)^{-1/2}} \right)_{t \geq 0}$. We will see below that this process has the same law as the process $\Gamma_t^\varepsilon$ appearing in the statement of Lemma 3.3 when $t \in \mathbb{N}$, which justifies this abuse of notation. For each $t \geq 0$, let $\omega_t^\varepsilon$ be the element in $\mathcal{H}(D)$ corresponding to $\Gamma_t^\varepsilon$ so that $\omega_t^\varepsilon = \omega_{c_\alpha t h_\varepsilon(D)^{-1/2}}$. Let $\omega_t := \omega_{c_\alpha t h_\varepsilon(D)^{-1/2}}$. Restricted to $rD$, both $(\omega_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(\omega_t)_{t \geq 0}$ are stationary càdlàg processes. As in the last paragraph in the proof Lemma 3.2, for each fixed $t > 0$, Proposition 6.9 implies that $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \omega_t^\varepsilon|_{rD} = \omega_t|_{rD}$ in probability. Varying $r$ we see that $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \omega_t^\varepsilon = \omega_t$ in probability.

In light of Theorem 6.8, for each $t \geq 0$, $\omega_t$ a.s. determines an instance of CLE$_6$ on $D$, which we denote by $\Gamma_t$. Since $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0}(\Gamma_t^\varepsilon, \omega_t^\varepsilon) = (\Gamma, \omega)$ in law for each $t \geq 0$, Theorem 6.8 implies that $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \Gamma_t^\varepsilon = \Gamma_t$ under $\mathbb{P}$. By absolutely continuity, $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathbb{P}^{\omega_t^\varepsilon} = \mathbb{P}^{\omega_t}$ by (37), the mixing property described in Theorem 6.3 holds with $\omega_t$ in place of $\omega_t$ under both $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{P}^{\omega_t^\varepsilon}$. In particular $(\omega_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is ergodic under $\mathbb{P}^{\omega_t^\varepsilon}$. By Theorem 6.8, $(\Gamma_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is ergodic under $\mathbb{P}^{\omega_t}$. Recall that the $\mathbb{P}^{\omega_t}$-law of $(D, h, \Gamma_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ equals the law of $(Y_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$ in Lemma 3.3. Therefore $(\Gamma_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a stationary ergodic process as desired.

In the rest of Section 6, we first provide tools on percolation without dynamics in Sections 6.4 and 6.5. Then in Sections 6.6 and 6.7 we study the various dynamics considered in Section 6.3 and conclude the proof of Lemmas 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 and Propositions 6.7 and 6.9.

### 6.4 Lattice approximation of the pivotal measure

In this section we introduce a cutoff on the set of pivotal points. The cutoff is different from the one we use when defining $\varepsilon$-pivotal points, and we call the set of macroscopic pivotal points for the new cutoff $\rho$-important points.

The concept of $\rho$-important points has also been used in (GHS18a, GHSS19) (see the beginning of Section 6.7 for further discussion). Although lacking a clear connection to random planar maps, this cutoff is more amenable for technical analysis. We will prove some basic properties of $\rho$-important points and establish its relation with $\varepsilon$-pivotal points. These results will be used in Sections 6.6 and 6.7.

Throughout this subsection $\omega^\delta$ denotes a sample of Bernoulli-$\frac{1}{2}$ site percolation on $D^\delta$ for $\delta > 0$. Moreover, $\{\omega^\delta\}_{\delta > 0}$ are coupled such that $\Gamma^\delta := \Gamma(\omega^\delta)$ converge to a CLE$_6$ $\Gamma$ in $\mathcal{L}(D)$ almost surely (see Theorem 2.10). For technical convenience, loops in $\Gamma$ and $\Gamma^\delta$ are parametrized such that when listed in decreasing order according to the (Euclidean) area of the enclosed region, the $k$th loop converges a.s. in the uniform topology for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We enlarge our coupling to include a sample of $h$ as in Lemma 6.1 which is independent of $\{\omega^\delta\}_{\delta > 0}$. Let $\nu^\delta$ be the renormalized weighted counting measure on $D^\delta$ where each vertex $x$ is assigned mass $\mu^\delta_h(x) = \alpha^\delta_4(\delta, 1)^{-1}$. (Recall the notations above Theorem 6.3.)

### 6.4.1 Definition of $\rho$-important points

We first recall the notion of percolation interface in the discrete following (GHS19). Let $M$ be a triangulation of a polygon and let $e$ and $e'$ be two distinct edges on $M$. Recall that $(e, e')$
denotes the counterclockwise arc on $\partial M$ from $e$ to $e'$. The $(e, e')$-boundary condition for a site percolation on $M$ is the coloring of $\partial M$ where vertices on $(e, e')$ (resp., $(e', e)$) are blue (resp., red). Given a site percolation $\omega_M$ on $M$ with $(e, e')$-boundary condition, there is a unique edge path (recall Section 2.2) on $M$ from $e$ to $e'$, such that each edge on the path has a red vertex on its left side and a blue vertex on its right side. We call this path the percolation interface of $\omega_M$ on $(M, e, e')$.

Suppose $U \subset \mathbb{D}$ is a Jordan domain. For $a, b$ two distinct points on $\partial U$, let $\partial_{a,b} U$ be the counterclockwise arc on $\partial U$ from $a$ to $b$. For $x \in \partial U$, let $x^\delta$ be the edge on $\partial U^\delta$ closest to $x$ (if there is a tie, choose one arbitrarily). We always assume that $\delta$ is small enough such that $a^\delta \neq b^\delta$. Let $\eta_{U, \delta}^{ab}$ be the percolation of $\omega^\delta$ (restricted to the inner vertices of $U^\delta$) on $(U^\delta, a^\delta, b^\delta)$. As proved in [CN06] Section 5, in our coupling, for a fixed $(U, a, b)$, $\eta_{U, \delta}^{ab}$ converges in probability to a chordal SLE$_6$ on $(U, a, b)$ which we denote by $\eta_U^{ab}$. Moreover, $\eta_U^{ab}$ is a.s. determined by $\Gamma$ in an explicit way. We call $\eta_U^{ab}$ the interface of $\Gamma$ on $(U, a, b)$. In particular, when $U = \mathbb{D}$, then $\eta_{\mathbb{D}, \delta}^{ab}$ is the interface of $\Gamma$ on $(\mathbb{D}, a, b)$ as defined in Lemma 2.12.

We will identify a quad $Q$ with $(Q[0,1]^2, Q(0,0), Q(1,0), Q(1,1), (0,1))$, namely, a Jordan domain with four boundary points in counterclockwise order. We abuse notation and write $Q$ instead of $Q([0,1]^2)$ for simplicity. Suppose $Q \subset \mathbb{D}$. Let $E$ be the event that $\eta_Q^{cd}$ hits $\partial_{a,b} Q$ at a point on $\partial_{b,c} Q$. Let $\mathcal{P}^Q = \eta_Q^{cd} \cap \eta_Q^{bc}$ on $E$ and $\mathcal{P}^Q = \eta_Q^{ab} \cap \eta_Q^{cd}$ on $E^c$. Let $E_\delta$ and $\mathcal{P}^Q_\delta$ be defined in a similar way.$^{15}$ Here $\eta_Q^{ab} \cap \eta_Q^{cd}$ is the set of vertices such that $v \in \eta_Q^{ab} \cap \eta_Q^{cd}$ if on both $\eta_Q^{ab}$ and $\eta_Q^{cd}$, we can find an edge that has $v$ as an endpoint.

Let $B$ be a square of side length $\rho$ for some $\rho > 0$ and let $\tilde{B}$ be the square of side length $3\rho$ centered around $B$. Let $A = A_B := \tilde{B} \setminus (B \cup \partial B)$. For $B \cap \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset$, let $\Gamma^A$ (resp., $\Gamma^{A, \delta}$) be the collection of loops in $\Gamma$ (resp., $\Gamma^A$) intersecting both $\partial B$ and $\partial \tilde{B}$. By local finiteness of CLE$_6$ (see Section 2.4), $\Gamma^A$ contains finitely many loops.

Given $\ell, \ell' \in \Gamma^A$, if $\ell \neq \ell'$, let $\mathcal{P}^A(\ell, \ell') = \ell \cap \ell' \cap B$, and if $\ell = \ell'$, let

$$\mathcal{P}^A(\ell, \ell') = \{ z \in B : \exists s \neq t \ s.t. \ \ell(s) = \ell(t) = z \ and \ \ell([s,t]) \cap \partial \tilde{B} \neq \emptyset, \ell([s,t]) \cap \partial B \neq \emptyset \}.$$ 

Here loops in $\Gamma$ are assumed to be parametrized, and we use the convention that if $s < t$ and the domain of definition for $\ell$ is $[0, T_\ell]$, then $\ell([s,t]) := \ell([s, T_\ell]) \cup \ell([0, t])$. Note that the set $\mathcal{P}^A(\ell, \ell')$ is independent of the exact choice of parametrization.

Let $\mathcal{P}^A := \cup_{(\ell, \ell') \in \Gamma^A \times \Gamma^A} \mathcal{P}^A(\ell, \ell')$. A point $z$ is called $A$-important for $\Gamma$ if and only if $z \in P^A$. A vertex $v$ on $B \cap \mathbb{D}$ is called $A$-important for $\omega$ if and only if there are four arms from $x$ to $\tilde{B}$ with alternating colors. Here an arm refers to a connected monochromatic path. Let $\mathcal{P}^{A^B}_\delta$ be the set of $A$-important points for $\omega^\delta$.

**Definition 6.10.** For each $\rho > 0$ and each square $B$ of side length $\rho$ on the grid $\rho \mathbb{Z}^2$, let

$$\mathcal{P}^\rho_B := \bigcup_{B} \mathcal{P}^{A^B}_\delta \quad \text{for each} \ \delta > 0, \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}^\rho := \bigcup_{B} \mathcal{P}^{A^B},$$

where the union is over all squares on $\rho \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $B \cap \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset$. Points in $\mathcal{P}^\rho$ and $\mathcal{P}^\rho$ are called $\rho$-important points of $\omega^\delta$ and $\Gamma$, respectively.

$^{15}$As explained in [HLS18] Section 1.2, $\mathcal{P}^Q_\delta$ is the set of pivotal points for the event $E_\delta$. 
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Figure 10: Illustration of objects defined in the proof of Lemma 6.11. In the case shown, we have $\tilde{B} \subset \mathbb{D}$ so that $Q = \tilde{B}$. The annulus $A = A_\delta$ is shown in blue. The disk $\mathbb{D}$ is not drawn.

6.4.2 Covering annulus using quads

The following lemma says that $A$-important points for $\Gamma$ and $\omega^A$ are covered by finitely many sets of the form $\mathcal{P}^Q$ and $\mathcal{P}^Q_\delta$, respectively.

**Lemma 6.11.** Let $B$ a square of side length $\rho$ for some $\rho > 0$ such that $B \cap \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset$. Let $C$ be a countable dense subset of $\partial \tilde{B}$. Then in the coupling in this subsection, almost surely there exist quads $Q_1, \ldots, Q_n$ in $(\{B \cap \mathbb{D}, a, b, c, d\} : a, b, c, d \in C)$ and a random $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $\mathcal{P}^A$ is the disjoint union of $\{\mathcal{P}^Q_i \cap B\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ and $\mathcal{P}^A_\delta$ is the disjoint union of $\{\mathcal{P}^Q_i \cap B\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ for $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$.

**Proof.** We write $\Gamma^A$ and $\Gamma^B$ as $\{\ell^i, \ldots, \ell^K\}$ and $\{\ell^i_\delta, \ldots, \ell^K_\delta\}$, respectively, where loops are listed by decreasing enclosed Euclidean area. By the definition of our coupling and the way $\Gamma^A$ and $\Gamma^B$ are parametrized, almost surely $\lim_{\delta \to 0} K_\delta = K$ in the uniform topology, for all $1 \leq i \leq K_\delta$. For each $1 \leq i \leq K$, let $(s_{i,1}, t_{i,1}), \ldots, (s_{i,m_i}, t_{i,m_i})$ be the list of intervals of the form $\{(s, t) : \ell^i(s), \ell^i(t) \in \partial \tilde{B}, \ell^i(s, t) \subset \tilde{B}, \ell^i([s, t]) \cap \partial \mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset\}$ ordered by increasing left end-point. Since $\ell^i$ is a continuous curve with finite total length, we have $m^i < \infty$ a.s. Let $(s^i_{1,1}, t^i_{1,1}), \ldots, (s^i_{m_i}, t^i_{m_i})$ be defined similarly for $\Gamma^B$. Define $\ell^i_\delta := \ell^i_\delta([s^i_{1,1}, t^i_{1,1}])$ and $\ell^i_{\delta} := \ell^i_\delta([s^i_{1,1}, t^i_{1,1}])$. Then almost surely $m \to m^i$ and $\ell^i_{\delta} \to \ell^i_{\delta}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq K$ and $1 \leq j \leq m^i$. This convergence follows from the fact that SLE$_6$ a.s. crosses a (fixed) smooth curve upon hitting it. (See e.g. [HLS18, Lemma 2.2]).

For $1 \leq i, i', \leq K, 1 \leq j, j' \leq m^i$ such that $(i, j) \neq (i', j')$, let $\mathcal{P}^A(i, j; i', j') = \ell^i_{\delta}([s^i_{1,1}, t^i_{1,1}]) \cap \ell^{i'}_{\delta}([s^{i'}_{1,1}, t^{i'}_{1,1}])$, and let $\mathcal{P}^A_\delta(i, j; i', j')$ be the intersection of the set of vertices with an edge on $\ell^i_\delta([s^i_{1,1}, t^i_{1,1}])$ and the set of vertices with an edge on $\ell^{i'}_\delta([s^{i'}_{1,1}, t^{i'}_{1,1}])$. See Figure 10. By the non-triple-point property of CLE$_6$ (see Section 2.4), the sets $\mathcal{P}^A(i, j; i', j')$ are disjoint. Therefore $\mathcal{P}^A$ is the disjoint union of $\mathcal{P}^A(i, j; i', j') \cap \tilde{B}$ for all $(i, j) \neq (i', j')$. A similar statement holds for $\mathcal{P}^A_\delta$ for small enough $\delta$.

Let $Q = \tilde{B} \cap \mathbb{D}$. Then $Q$ is a convex piecewise smooth Jordan domain. It remains to show that for each $\mathcal{P}^A(i, j; i', j')$ there exists $\{(Q, a, b, c, d) : a, b, c, d \in C\}$ such that $\mathcal{P}^A(i, j; i', j') = \mathcal{P}^Q$. By the parity property of CLE$_6$, we may assume $\ell^i_{\delta}([s^i_{1,1}, t^i_{1,1}]), \ell^{i'}_{\delta}([s^{i'}_{1,1}, t^{i'}_{1,1}])$, $\ell^i_{\delta}([s^i_{1,1}, t^i_{1,1}]), \ell^{i'}_{\delta}([s^{i'}_{1,1}, t^{i'}_{1,1}])$ are in cyclic order on $\partial \tilde{B}$, either counterclockwise or clockwise. We focus on the former case since the latter case can be treated similarly. Choosing $a, b, c, d \in C$ counterclockwise aligned on $\partial Q$ such that $\partial_{\ell^i_{\delta}([s^i_{1,1}, t^i_{1,1}])}, \ell^i_{\delta}([s^i_{1,1}, t^i_{1,1}]) \subset \partial_{a,b} Q$ and $\partial_{\ell^{i'}_{\delta}([s^{i'}_{1,1}, t^{i'}_{1,1}])}, \ell^{i'}_{\delta}([s^{i'}_{1,1}, t^{i'}_{1,1}]) \subset \partial_{c,d} Q$. Then
\( \mathcal{P}^A(i,j;i',j') = \mathcal{P}^Q \) with \( Q := (Q, a, b, c, d) \) if \( a, b, c, d \) are sufficiently close to \( \ell^{ij}(s^{ij}), \ell^{ij}(t^{ij}), \ell^{i'j'}(s^{i'j'}), \ell^{i'j'}(t^{i'j'}) \), respectively. A similar statement holds for \( \mathcal{P}^A_\delta \) for small enough \( \delta \).

### 6.4.3 Scaling limit of discrete pivotal measures

We first gather some facts concerning the scaling limit of measures related to \( \mathcal{P}^A_\delta \).

**Proposition 6.12.** In the setting of Lemma 6.11, the 3/4-occupation measure of \( \mathcal{P}^A \) exists a.s. We denote this measure by \( m^A \). Let \( m^A_\delta \) be \( \alpha_4^\delta(\alpha, 1)^{-1} \) times the counting measure on \( \mathcal{P}^A_\delta \). Let \( \nu^A_\delta \) be the measure \( \nu_\delta \) restricted to \( \mathcal{P}^A_\delta \). There is a constant \( c' > 0 \) not depending on \( A \) such that \( \lim_{\delta \to 0} m^A_\delta = c'm^A \) and \( \lim_{\delta \to 0} \nu^A_\delta = c'e^{h/\sqrt{6}}m^A \) in probability, under the weak topology. If \( A \in \mathbb{D} \), then \( \lim_{\delta \to 0} m^A_\delta(\mathbb{D}) = c'm^A(\mathbb{D}) \) and \( \lim_{\delta \to 0} \nu^A_\delta(\mathbb{D}) = c' \int_\mathbb{D} e^{h/\sqrt{6}}m^A \) in \( L^2 \).

**Proof.** According to [HLS18] Theorem 1.10, for a fixed quad \( Q \subset \mathbb{D} \), the 3/4-occupation measure \( m_Q \) of \( \mathcal{P}^Q \) exists a.s. Moreover, \( \alpha_4^\delta(\alpha, 1)^{-1} \) times the counting measure on \( \mathcal{P}^Q_\delta \) converge to \( c'm^Q \) in probability, where \( c' > 0 \) is a deterministic constant not depending on \( Q \). By Lemma 6.11 we obtain the existence of \( m^A \) and the convergence of \( m^A_\delta \) in probability. The \( L^2 \) convergence of \( m^A_\delta(\mathbb{D}) \) follows from the moment bounds of \( m^A_\delta(\mathbb{D}) \) given in [GPS13] Lemma 4.5. By [GHSS19] Propositions A.1 and A.2, \( \lim_{\delta \to 0} \nu^A_\delta = c'e^{h/\sqrt{6}}m^A \) in probability and if \( A \in \mathbb{D} \) then \( \lim_{\delta \to 0} \nu^A_\delta(\mathbb{D}) = c' \int_\mathbb{D} e^{h/\sqrt{6}}m^A \) in \( L^2 \).

Let \( \nu^\rho_\delta \) be the restriction of \( \nu_\delta \) to \( \mathcal{P}^\rho_\delta \). The next lemma concerns the scaling limit of \( \nu^\rho_\delta \).

**Lemma 6.13.** Fix \( \rho > 0 \). The 3/4-occupation measure of \( \mathcal{P}^\rho \) exists a.s. We denote this measure by \( m^\rho \). Then \( \lim_{\delta \to 0} \nu^\rho_\delta = c'e^{h/\sqrt{6}}m^\rho \) in probability, where \( c' \) is the constant in Proposition 6.12. Moreover, \( \lim_{\delta \to 0} \nu^\rho_\delta(\mathbb{D}) = c' \int_\mathbb{D} e^{h/\sqrt{6}}m^\rho \) in \( L^1 \).

**Proof.** The existence of \( m^\rho \) and the convergence in probability in Lemma 6.13 follows from Proposition 6.12. It remains to prove the \( L^1 \) convergence. For \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), set \( r := 1 - e^{-k}/2 \). By Proposition 6.12, for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \rho > 0 \), \( \lim_{\delta \to 0} \nu^\rho_\delta(r \mathbb{D}) = c' \int_{r \mathbb{D}} e^{h/\sqrt{6}}m^\rho \) in \( L^2 \). It suffices to prove

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \limsup_{\delta \to 0} \mathbb{E}[
u^\rho_\delta(\mathbb{D} \setminus r \mathbb{D})] = 0. \tag{40}
\]

For each \( x \in \mathbb{D}^\rho \), let \( E_x \) be event that \( x \) is \( \rho \)-important. Recall that \( \nu_\delta(x) = \mu'_\delta(x)\alpha_4^\delta(\delta, 1)^{-1} \), where \( \mu'_\delta(x) \) is the \( \mu'_\delta \)-mass of the hexagon corresponding to \( x \) in the dual lattice. Therefore

\[
\mathbb{E}[\nu_\delta(x)1_{E_x}] = \mathbb{P}[E_x] \alpha_4^\delta(\delta, 1)^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\mu'_\delta(x)].
\]

For \( r_2 > r_1 > 0 \), let \( \alpha_4^\delta(r_1, r_2) \) be the probability that Bernoulli-\( \frac{1}{2} \) site percolation on \( \mathbb{H}^\delta \) has four alternating arms in the semi-annulus \( (r_2 \mathbb{D} \cap \mathbb{H}) \setminus r_1 \mathbb{D} \). Then

\[
\mathbb{P}[E_x] \leq C \alpha_4^\delta(\delta, 1 - |x|) \alpha_4^\delta(1 - |x|, \rho),
\]

where \( C \) is a constant not depending on \( \delta, r, \rho \). Since the half plane four-arm exponent is 10/3 while the plane alternating four-arm exponent is 5/4 (see [SW01]),

\[
\mathbb{E}[\nu_\delta(x)1_{E_x}] \leq C \alpha_4^\delta(\delta, 1 - |x|) \alpha_4^\delta(1 - |x|, \rho) \alpha_4^\delta(\delta, 1)^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\mu'_\delta(x)] \leq C \alpha_4^\delta(1 - |x|)^2 \mathbb{E}[\mu'_\delta(x)], \tag{41}
\]
where \( C_\rho \) is a constant only depending on \( \rho \). Here we use that \( 2 < \frac{10}{3} - \frac{5}{4} \), but any other positive number smaller than \( \frac{10}{3} - \frac{5}{4} \) would also suffice for the following argument.

Let \( \tilde{B}_k = \phi^{-1}([k, k+1] \times (0, \pi)) \) where \( \phi \) is as in Lemma 6.1. We claim that as \( k \to \infty, \tilde{B}_k \) is approximately an annulus of radii \( e^{-k} \) and \( e^{-(k+1)} \), respectively, centered at 1 and restricted to \( \mathbb{D} \). The claim can be verified by first sending \( \mathbb{R} \times (0, \pi) \) to \( \mathbb{H} \) with the map \( z \mapsto e^{-z} \), and then considering a conformal map from \( \mathbb{H} \) to \( \mathbb{D} \) which sends 0 to 1. For \( n \geq k \) define

\[
A_n^+ := \{ z \in \mathbb{D} : \Re z \geq 0, \ 1 - |z| \in (e^{-n-1}/2, e^{-n}/2), \phi(z) \in [0, k] \times (0, \pi) \}.
\]

Recall that \( a = Q - \gamma = 1/\sqrt{6} \) in Lemma 6.1. Since \( e^{(B_{2t} - at)/\sqrt{6}} \) (with \( B \) as in Definition 2.4) is a martingale, the value of \( \mathbb{E}[\mu^t_b(\phi^{-1}([n, n+1] \times (0, \pi)))] \) does not depend on \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). From here on we use \( C_\rho \) to denote a constant only depending on \( \rho \) that can vary from place to place. By (41), we have

\[
\mathbb{E}[\nu^t_\phi(A_n^+)] \leq C_\rho e^{-2n} \mathbb{E}[\mu^t_b(A_n^+)] \leq C_\rho e^{-2n} \mathbb{E}[\mu^t_b(\phi^{-1}([0, k]))] \leq C_\rho k e^{-2n}.
\]

Therefore, \( \sum_{n \geq k} \mathbb{E}[\nu^t_\phi(A_n^+)] \leq C_\rho e^{-k} \). Similarly, we have \( \mathbb{E}[\nu^t_{\tilde{\rho}}(\tilde{B}_k \setminus \tilde{B}_{k+1})] \leq C_\rho e^{-2n} \) for all \( n \geq k \), which yields \( \mathbb{E}[\nu^t_{\tilde{\rho}}(\tilde{B}_k)] \leq C_\rho e^{-2k} \). Since \( (\mathbb{D} \setminus r\mathbb{D}) \cap \{ z : \Re z \geq 0 \} \subseteq \tilde{B}_k \cup (\cup_{n \geq k} A_n^+) \), (41) holds with \( (\mathbb{D} \setminus r\mathbb{D}) \cap \{ z : \Re z \geq 0 \} \) in place of \( \mathbb{D} \setminus r\mathbb{D} \). For the remaining part of \( \mathbb{D} \setminus r\mathbb{D} \), we recall from Definition 2.4 that \( (X_{-t})_{t>0} \) has the law of \( B_{2t} - at \) conditioned to stay negative, which is stochastically dominated by the unconditional law of \( B_{2t} - at \). Therefore (41) holds with \( (\mathbb{D} \setminus r\mathbb{D}) \cap \{ z : \Re z \leq 0 \} \) in place of \( \mathbb{D} \setminus r\mathbb{D} \).

6.4.4 Mutual inclusion of \( \varepsilon \)-pivotal points and \( \rho \)-important points

The next two lemmas give the mutual inclusion of \( \varepsilon \)-pivotal points and \( \rho \)-important points, allowing us to study the former through the latter.

Lemma 6.14. Recall \( h \) at the beginning of Section 6. For \( \varepsilon > 0 \), let

\[
b^\varepsilon := 1 \wedge \sup \{ b : \mu_h(B) < \varepsilon \ \forall \text{ squares } B \text{ with side length less than } b \text{ satisfying } B \cap \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset \}.
\]

Then \( b^\varepsilon > 0 \) almost surely for sufficiently small \( \varepsilon \). Set \( \rho^\varepsilon = 0.01 b^\varepsilon \). Then each \( \varepsilon \)-pivotal point of \((h, \Gamma)\) (resp., \( \omega^\delta \)) is \( \rho \)-important for \( \Gamma \) (resp., \( \Gamma^\delta \)) for \( \rho \in (0, \rho^\varepsilon) \) and \( \delta \in (0, 10^{-10} \rho) \).

Proof. Since \( \mu_h \) is a.s. non-atomic, \( b^\varepsilon > 0 \) a.s. Given \( \rho \in (0, \rho^\varepsilon) \) and an \( \varepsilon \)-pivotal point \( z \) for \((h, \Gamma)\), let \( B \) be a box of \( \rho \mathbb{Z}^2 \) such that \( z \in B \). Set \( A := A_B \). Recall \( \Gamma^A \) in the proof of Lemma 6.11. If \( z \in \ell \cap \ell' \) for some distinct loops \( \ell, \ell' \in \Gamma \), then we must have \( \ell, \ell' \in \Gamma^A \). Similarly, if \( z \) is a double point on some \( \ell \in \Gamma \), then the two new loops \( \ell' \) and \( \ell'' \) which we get after flipping the color of \( z \) must intersect both boundaries of \( A \). Therefore \( z \) is \( \rho \)-important for \( \Gamma \). The statement for \( \omega^\delta \) follows from the same argument.

Lemma 6.15. Fix \( r \in (0, 1) \). For each \( s \in (0, 0.1r) \) and \( \zeta' \in (0, 1) \), there exists \( \varepsilon > 0 \) only depending on \( s, \zeta' \) such that

\[
\mathbb{P} \left[ v \text{ is not } \varepsilon \text{-pivotal for } \omega^\delta \ | \ v \text{ is } s \text{-important for } \omega^\delta \right] \leq \zeta', \ \forall \delta \in (0, 0.1) \text{ and } v \in \mathbb{D}^\delta \cap r\mathbb{D}.
\]
Proof. For $z_0 \in r\mathbb{D}$, let $\mathcal{B}$ be the square of side length $s$ centered at $z_0$ and set $A = A_s$. Consider the set of pairs $(\omega, v)$ where $\omega$ is a site percolation configuration on $\mathbb{D}$ with monochromatic boundary condition and $v$ is an $A$-important point. Suppose $(\omega^\delta, v^\delta)$ is uniformly chosen from this set. Here we use the same symbol $\omega^\delta$ as in Lemma 6.15, although the law of $\omega^\delta$ here is not uniform. One way to sample $(\omega^\delta, v^\delta)$ is the following: First sample a Bernoulli-$\frac{1}{2}$ site percolation $\omega^\delta$ on $\mathbb{D}$ with monochromatic boundary condition. Then reweight the law of $\omega^\delta$ by the number of $A$-important points. Finally, conditioning on $\omega^\delta$, sample the point $v^\delta$ according to the uniform measure on $A$-important points of $\omega^\delta$.

Let $\Gamma^\delta = \Gamma(\omega^\delta)$ be the associated loop ensemble. By Proposition 6.12, $(\Gamma^\delta, v^\delta)$ jointly converge to a pair $(\Gamma, v)$ that can be sampled as follows. First sample a CLE$_\kappa$ $\Gamma$ in $\mathbb{D}$. Define $\mathcal{P}^A$ as in Lemma 6.11. Then reweight the law of $\Gamma$ by $\mathfrak{m}^A(\mathbb{D})$, where $\mathfrak{m}^A$ is the $3/4$-occupation measure of $\mathcal{P}^A$. Note that this is well-defined since the measure we reweight by has finite expectation by Proposition 6.12. Finally, conditioning on $\Gamma$, sample the point $v$ according to $\mathfrak{m}^A$. By the Skorokhod representation theorem we may assume that the convergence above holds almost surely. We enlarge the sample space by considering an independent sample of the field $b$ from Lemma 6.1. Denote this probability measure by $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$. Recall $\mathcal{P}^A(i, j; i', j')$, $\ell^{i,j}$, $\ell^{i',j'}$, and their discrete analogs in the proof of Lemma 6.11. Consider the segment of $\ell^{i,j}$ starting from $\ell^{i,j}(s^{i,j})$ until the first time when it hits $\ell^{i',j'}$. Then the complement of this segment in $\mathbb{D}$ contains countable collection of components with clockwise boundary orientation. Let $\varepsilon_1$ be the largest $\mu_h$-area of components in this collection. Let $\varepsilon_2$ be similarly defined with counterclockwise in place of clockwise. We define $\varepsilon_3, \varepsilon_4$ in the same way as $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ where we trace $\ell^{i,j}$ in the reverse direction until it hits $\ell^{i',j'}$. Define $\varepsilon_i$ with $i = 5, 6, 7, 8$ in the same way where the roles of $\ell^{i,j}$ and $\ell^{i',j'}$ are swapped. Let $E_\varepsilon = \{\varepsilon_i \geq \varepsilon \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, 8\}$. Since $\varepsilon_i > 0$ almost surely for all $i$, $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}[E_\varepsilon] \to 1$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Let $E^\delta_\varepsilon$ be the exact analog of $E_\varepsilon$ defined for $\omega^\delta$. By the scaling limit result, for each $\zeta > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough only depending on $s, \zeta$ such that

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}[E^\delta_\varepsilon] > 1 - \zeta \quad \forall \delta \in (0, 0.1).$$

By the description of how loops in $\Gamma^\delta$ are changed when the color of $v^\delta$ is flipped in the proof of Lemma 6.18, we see that

on the event $E^\delta_\varepsilon$, all $A$-important points for $\omega^\delta$ are $\varepsilon$-pivotal for $\omega^\delta$. (43)

Now let us sample $(\omega^\delta, v^\delta)$ in another way. We first sample $v^\delta$ according to its marginal law. Then we sample the Bernoulli-$\frac{1}{2}$ site percolation $\omega^\delta$ on $\mathbb{D}$ conditioned on the event $F^\delta_s$ that $v^\delta$ is $A$-important. Let $\neg E^\delta_\varepsilon$ be the complement of $E^\delta_\varepsilon$. For the choice of $\zeta, \varepsilon$ in (42), we have

$$\mathbb{P}[-E^\delta_\varepsilon | F^\delta_s] = \widehat{\mathbb{P}}[-E^\delta_\varepsilon] \leq \zeta, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, 0.1).$$

By the monotonicity in the definition of $A$-importance, there is a constant $C > 0$ not depending on $z_0, s$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}[F^\delta_s] \leq C \mathbb{P}[v \text{ is } s\text{-important for } \omega], \quad \forall \delta \in (0, 0.1) \text{ and } v \in \mathbb{D} \cap r\mathbb{D}.$$  

(45)

Suppose $v \in \mathbb{D} \cap \mathcal{B}_{z_0}$. If $v$ is $s$-important for $\omega^\delta$, then $v$ must be $A$-important for $\omega^\delta$. By (43),

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ v \text{ is not } \varepsilon\text{-pivotal for } \omega^\delta \text{ while } v \text{ is } s\text{-important for } \omega^\delta \right] \leq \mathbb{P}[-E^\delta_\varepsilon, F^\delta_s], \quad \forall \delta \in (0, 0.1).$$
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By (44) and (45), for small enough $\zeta$ the upper bound in Lemma 6.15 holds for $v \in \mathbb{D}^\delta \cap B_{z_0}$. We can choose finitely many $z_i$’s such that $B_{z_i}$ cover $r\mathbb{D}$. This concludes the proof of Lemma 6.15.

6.5 The quad-crossing configuration determines the CLE$_6$

We first explain that Theorem 6.8 follows from a single interface variant (Proposition 6.16 below) and the iterative construction of CLE$_6$ in Lemma 2.12.

Proposition 6.16. In the setting of Theorem 6.8, let $\eta$ be the interface of $\Gamma$ on $(\mathbb{D}, -i, i)$. Then $\eta$ is a.s. determined by $\omega$.

Proof of Theorem 6.8 given Proposition 6.16. Let $a = -i$ and $b = i$. By Proposition 6.16, $\eta^{ab}$ is a.s. determined by $\omega$. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a dichromatic bubble of $\eta^{ab}$. Recall $x_B$, $\bar{x}_B$ and $\eta_B$ as defined above Lemma 2.12. Let $\phi: \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{D}$ be a conformal map with $\phi(x_B) = -i$ and $\phi(\bar{x}_B) = i$. Let $\phi_\ast \omega \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D})$ be defined by $\phi_\ast \omega(Q) = \omega(\phi^{-1} \circ Q)$ for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathbb{D}$.

Then $(\phi_\ast \omega, \phi \circ \eta_B) \overset{d}{=} (\omega, \eta^{ab})$, where $\phi \circ \eta_B$ and $\eta^{ab}$ are viewed as curves modulo increasing reparametrization. Since $\phi \circ \eta_B$ is a.s. determined by $\phi_\ast \omega$, we see that $\eta_B$ is a.s. determined by $\omega$. Therefore $\omega$ a.s. determine $\Gamma^b_a$. In light of Lemma 2.12, Theorem 6.8 follows by iterating this argument.

It remains to prove Proposition 6.16. We first record the relation between percolation interfaces and crossing events, which we use repeatedly in the proof of Proposition 6.16.

Lemma 6.17. In the setting of Theorem 6.8, suppose $Q$ is a quad in $\mathcal{Q}_\mathbb{D}$ whose range is piecewise continuous. Identify $Q$ with a tuple $(U, a, b, c, d)$ as described in Section 6.4.1. Let $\eta_{U}^{ac}$ be the interface of $\Gamma$ on $(U, a, c)$ (see Section 6.4.1 for the definition). Then $\omega(Q)$ is almost surely equal to the indicator function of the event that the first point where $\eta_{U}^{ac}$ hits $\partial_{b,c}U$ is on $\partial_{b,a}U$.

Proof. Suppose $\omega^d$ be a Bernoulli-$\frac{1}{2}$ site percolation on $\mathbb{D}^\delta$ coupled such that $\Gamma(\omega^d)$ converges to $\Gamma$ a.s. The crossing event $\omega^d(Q) = 1$ can be described by the hitting location of the percolation
interface of $\omega^\delta$ on $(U^\delta, a_3, c_4)$ in the same way as in Lemma 6.17 (see e.g. HLS18 Section 1.2). Sending $\delta \to 0$ we obtain the result.

Proof of Proposition 6.16. Let $\eta'$ be the interface of $\Gamma$ on $(D, a, b)$ where $D$ is a Jordan domain such that $D \cup \partial D \subset \mathbb{D}$ and $a \neq b$ are two points on $\partial D$. We may assume that $\eta'$ is parametrized by the measure determined by its $7/4$-Minkowski content. We first argue that $\eta'$ is determined by $\omega$.

Let $\rho : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{D}$ be a simple curve such that $\rho(0)$ and $\rho(1)$ are on the left and right boundary of $(D, a, b)$ (not including endpoints), respectively, and $\rho(t) \in D$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. Let $\tau$ be the first time $\eta'$ hits $\rho$. Let $U$ be the connected component of $D \setminus \rho$ whose boundary contains $a$. Then for each fixed $s \in (0, 1)$, it is a.s. the case that $\eta'(\tau) \in \rho(\lfloor s, 1 \rfloor)$ if and only if $\omega(Q) = 1$ where $Q = (U, a, \rho(1), \rho(s), \rho(0))$. Therefore $\eta'(\tau)$ is a.s. determined by $\omega$.

Let $B$ be a ball contained in $D$. For $\bullet \in \{1, r\}$, let $\rho_\bullet : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{D}$ be a simple curve such that $\rho_\bullet(0) \in \partial B$, $\rho_\bullet(t) \in D \setminus \partial B$, and $\rho_\bullet(1)$ is on the left (resp. right) boundary of $(D, a, b)$ when $\bullet$ equals $l$ (resp. $r$). By the previous paragraph the location where $\eta'$ hits $B \cup \rho_l \cup \rho_r$ is a.s. determined by $\omega$. In particular, the event $E(B, \rho_l, \rho_r)$ that $\eta'$ hits $B$ before $\rho_l \cap \rho_r$ is a.s. determined by $\omega$. Note that $\eta' \cap B \neq \emptyset$ if and only if there exists $\rho_l, \rho_r$ such that $E(B, \rho_l, \rho_r)$ occurs. Furthermore, if $E(B, \rho_l, \rho_r)$ occurs for some $\rho_l, \rho_r$, then it holds a.s. that $E(B, \rho_l, \rho_r)$ occurs for $\rho_l, \rho_r$ chosen from some countable set. This implies that the event $\eta' \cap B \neq \emptyset$ is a.s. determined by $\omega$. Therefore the range of $\eta'$ is determined by $\omega$.

Now recall $\rho, U, \tau$ as defined above. Since $\eta([0, \tau])$ is the intersection of the range of the percolation interfaces of $\Gamma$ on $(U, a, \rho(0))$ and $(U, a, \rho(1))$, by the previous paragraph $\eta'([0, \tau])$ is a.s. determined by $\omega$. Therefore, for a fixed $t > 0$, the event $\eta'([0, t]) \subset U$ is a.s. determined by $\omega$. By the inclusion-exclusion principle, $\eta'([0, t])$ is a.s. determined by $\omega$. Therefore $\eta'$ is a.s. determined by $\omega$.

Now let $(D, a, b)$ above be $(0.5\mathbb{D}, -i/2, i/2)$. Let $\omega'$ and $\omega''$ be the restriction of $\omega$ to $D$ and $\mathbb{D} \setminus (D \cup \partial D)$, respectively. Then since $\omega''$ is independent of $\eta'$ while $(\omega', \omega'')$ a.s. determine $\omega$ (see SS11 Theorem 1.19), we see that $\eta'$ is a.s. determined by $\omega'$. Since the law of $(\omega, \eta)$ and $(\omega', \eta')$ only differs by a scaling, we conclude the proof of the lemma.

6.6 Proof of Lemmas 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6

Lemma 6.4 asserts that $(\Gamma^\varepsilon, t)_{t \geq 0}$ converge in law to a process $(\Gamma^\varepsilon, t)_{t \geq 0}$, and Lemmas 6.4 and 6.5 describe the law of $(\eta, \Gamma^\varepsilon)$. Lemma 6.6 proves convergence of the $\varepsilon$-dynamics on the planar map until the second jump. In this section, we prove these three lemmas.

6.6.1 Convergence after the first flip: lattice case

Recall that $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \Gamma^\varepsilon = \Gamma^0$ a.s. by the definition of $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ in Section 6.2. Let $(\omega^\delta, \Gamma^\delta, \Gamma) := (\omega_0^\delta, \Gamma_0^\delta, \Gamma^\delta)$ so that $(\omega^\delta, \Gamma^\delta, \Gamma)$ has the same law as this triple in Section 6.4. Recall $\nu_\delta$ at the beginning of Section 6.4 and let $\nu_\delta^\rho$ and $\mathfrak{m}_\delta$ be as in Lemma 6.13. Conditioning on $\mathfrak{h}$, the ringing locations and times for the clocks in the dynamics $(\omega^\delta)_{t \geq 0}$ is a Poisson point process (p.p.p.) with intensity $\nu_\delta^\rho \otimes dt$, which we denote by $\text{PPP}_\delta$. If we only look at updates on $\mathcal{P}^\delta$, namely, $\rho$-important points of $\omega^\delta$, then we get a p.p.p. with intensity $\nu_\delta^\rho_\delta \otimes dt$, which we denote by $\text{PPP}^\rho_\delta$. Since $\nu_\delta^\rho$ converges to $c e^{\delta/\sqrt{\delta}} \mathfrak{m}_\delta$ in probability, as explained in GHSS19 Section 3.1,
we can further require the probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) to satisfy the following. For each fixed \(\rho > 0\), \(\text{PPP}^\rho_\delta\) converge almost surely to a p.p.p. with intensity \(c' e^{h/\sqrt{\delta}} m^\rho\). In particular, if piv\(\rho\) is the first point in \(\mathcal{P}^\rho_\delta\) for which the clock rings, then piv\(\rho\) converge almost surely to a random point in \(\mathcal{P}^\rho\) which we denote by piv\(\rho\). Conditioning on \((h, \Gamma)\), the point piv\(\rho\) is sampled from \(e^{h/\sqrt{\delta}} m^\rho\).

**Lemma 6.18.** Fix \(\rho > 0\). Let \(\hat{\Gamma}^\delta\) and \(\hat{\Gamma}\) be the loop ensembles obtained after flipping the color of piv\(\delta\) and piv\(\rho\) for \(\Gamma^\delta\) and \(\Gamma\), respectively. Then \(\lim_{\delta \to 0} \hat{\Gamma}^\delta = \hat{\Gamma}\) in probability in \(\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{D})\).

**Proof.** Let \(B\) be the box on \(\rho \mathbb{Z}^2 \cap \mathbb{D}\) such that piv\(\rho\) \(\in B\). Let \(A := A_B\). We retain the notation in the proof of Lemma 6.11, including the parametrizations of loops in \(\Gamma^\delta, \Gamma\). Then piv\(\rho\) must belong to some \(\mathcal{P}^\delta(i, j; i', j')\). Since \(\lim_{\delta \to 0} \text{piv}^\delta = \text{piv}^\rho\) a.s., \(\text{piv}^\delta \in \mathcal{P}^\delta(i, j; i', j')\) with probability \(1 - \omega_\delta(1)\). Here \(\omega_\delta(1)\) means a deterministic positive function of \(x\) not depending on any other parameters such that \(\lim_{x \to 0} \omega_\delta(1) = 0\). From now on whenever we declare an event \(E_\delta\) to have probability \(1 - \omega_\delta(1)\), we will work on \(E_\delta\) thereafter without explicitly mentioning it. Without loss of generality, assume \(\omega(\text{piv}^\rho)\) is blue. Fix a small \(r_0 > 0\) and let \(B(\text{piv}^\delta, r_0)\) be the Euclidean ball of radius \(r_0\) centered at piv\(\delta\). Let \(\ell_{\delta}\) be the segment of \(\ell^{i,j}\) from \(s^{i,j}\) until the first edge that has piv\(\delta\) as an endpoint, excluding this edge. Let \(\ell'_{\delta}\) be the segment of the time reversal of \(\ell^{i,j}\) from \(t^{i,j}\) to the first edge that has piv\(\delta\) as an endpoint, excluding this edge. Define \((\ell'_{\delta}, \ell'_{\delta})\) in the same way as \((\ell_{\delta}, \ell_{\delta})\) with \(\ell^{i,j}\) in place of \(\ell^{i,j}\). Since the alternating five-arm exponent for Bernoulli-\(\frac{1}{2}\) site percolation on \(\mathbb{T}\) is strictly smaller than the four-arm exponent [SW01], with probability \(1 - \omega_\delta(1)\), after the color of piv\(\delta\) is flipped to red, we have that \(\ell_{\delta}\), an edge path \(\ell^{i,j}_{\delta}\) contained in \(B(\text{piv}^\delta, r_0)\), and \(\ell'_{\delta}\) form a segment of a loop in \(\hat{\Gamma}^\delta\). The same statement holds for \(\ell_{\delta}\), an edge path \(\ell^{i,j}_{\delta}\), and \(\ell'_{\delta}\). The two segments \(\ell^{i,j}_{\delta}\) and \(\ell'^{i,j}_{\delta}\) trace small red clusters in \(B(\text{piv}^\delta, r_0)\) which have a vertex adjacent to piv\(\delta\) but have no vertex as an endpoint of an edge in \(\ell^{i,j}_{\delta}\) or \(\ell'^{i,j}_{\delta}\).

Let \(\Gamma^\delta(r_0) = \{\gamma^\delta \in \Gamma^\delta : \gamma^\delta \not\subset B(\text{piv}^\delta, r_0), \ell^{i,j}_{\delta} \not\subset \gamma^\delta, \ell'^{i,j}_{\delta} \not\subset \gamma^\delta\}\) By the non-triple-point property (see Section 2.4 of CLE\(\delta\), with probability \(1 - \omega_\delta(1)\), for each loop \(\gamma^\delta \in \Gamma^\delta(r_0)\), there is no edge traversed by \(\gamma^\delta\) that has piv\(\delta\) as an endpoint. Therefore \(\Gamma^\delta(r_0) \subset \hat{\Gamma}^\delta\). On the other hand, with probability \(1 - \omega_\delta(1)\), \(\ell^{i,j}_{\delta}([s^{i,j}, t^{i,j}]) \setminus (\ell_{\delta} \cup \ell'_{\delta})\) and \(\ell'^{i,j}_{\delta}([s^{i,j}, t^{i,j}]) \setminus (\ell'_{\delta} \cup \ell''_{\delta})\) are contained in \(B(\text{piv}^\delta, r_0)\). Let \(\ell, \ell', \ell''\), and \(\ell''\) be the \(\delta \to 0\) limit of \(\ell_{\delta}, \ell'_{\delta}, \ell''_{\delta}\) and \(\ell''_{\delta}\). In the continuum, the loop ensemble \(\hat{\Gamma}\) is obtained from \(\Gamma\) by concatenating \(\ell\) with \(\ell'\), and \(\ell''\) with

![Figure 12: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 6.18. The left (resp., right) figure shows two of the percolation interfaces before (resp., after) the color of the pivotal point piv\(\delta\) (marked in orange) has been flipped from blue to red. We show that the percolation interfaces after the flip converge by using that the orange paths \(\ell''_{\delta}\) and \(\ell''_{\delta}\) have diameter \(o_\delta(1)\) with probability \(1 - o_\delta(1)\).](image-url)
\[\ell',\text{ while keeping other loops unchanged. Therefore, there is vanishing function } o_{r_0}(1)\text{ such that for any fixed } r_0 > 0, \text{ with probability } 1 - o_{r_0}(1), \text{ } d_1^L(\hat{\Gamma}, \hat{\Gamma}^\delta) \leq o_{r_0}(1). \text{ This concludes the proof.} \]

In the proof of Lemma 6.18, the only fact we used about piv$^\delta$ and piv is that piv$^\delta \to$ piv in probability. The proof also carries through as before if we assume $\Gamma_0^\varepsilon$ converges to $\Gamma_0^\varepsilon$ in probability rather than almost surely. This gives the following more general variant of Lemma 6.18.

**Lemma 6.19.** Fix $\rho > 0$. Consider the setting above, except that we assume $\Gamma_0^{\varepsilon,\delta} \to \Gamma_0^\varepsilon$ in probability rather than almost surely. Suppose $z^\delta$ and $z$ are random points such that $z^\delta \in P_\delta^\rho$, $z \in P_\rho$, and $z^\delta \to z$ in probability. Let $\hat{\Gamma}^\delta$ and $\hat{\Gamma}$ be the loop ensembles obtained after flipping the color of $z^\delta$ and $z$ for $\Gamma^\delta$ and $\Gamma$, respectively. Then $\lim_{\delta \to 0} \hat{\Gamma}^\delta = \hat{\Gamma}$ in probability in $L(\mathbb{D})$.

### 6.6.2 A continuous time Markov chain

To prove Lemmas 6.4 and 6.5, we put $\mathfrak{h}$ and $(\omega^\varepsilon,\delta)_t \geq 0$ into the framework of continuous time Markov chains. Let $S^\delta$ be the space of site percolation configurations of $\mathbb{D}^\delta$ with monochromatic blue boundary condition. Then conditioning on $\mathfrak{h}$, $(\omega^\varepsilon,\delta)_t \geq 0$ is a continuous time Markov chain on the state space $S^\delta$ whose initial distribution is the uniform measure. Let $Q := (q_{ij})_{i,j \in S^\delta}$ be the transition rate matrix of $(\omega^\varepsilon,\delta)_t \geq 0$. Note that $Q$ depends on $\mathfrak{h}$. For any two distinct states $i$ and $j$ in $S^\delta$, if

1. the colorings of $i$, $j$ only differ at one vertex $v \in \mathbb{D}^\delta$, and
2. $v$ is an $\varepsilon$-pivotal point for $i$, or, equivalently, for $j$,

then $q_{ij} = q_{ji} = \mu^\varepsilon_h(v)\alpha^\delta_4(\varepsilon, 1)^{-1}$. Otherwise, $q_{ij} = 0$. Since $Q$ is symmetric, the uniform measure on $S^\delta$ is a stationary distribution. Namely, $(\omega^\varepsilon,\delta)_t \geq 0$ is stationary.

For each state $i \in S^\delta$, let $N^\varepsilon_i(i) := \sum_{j \neq i} \mu^\varepsilon_h(v)\alpha^\delta_4(\varepsilon, 1)^{-1}$, where the summation ranges over $\varepsilon$-pivotal points of $(\mathfrak{h}, i)$. Let $q_i := \sum_{j \neq i} q_{ij}$. Then $q_i = N^\varepsilon_i(i)$. Define the transition matrix

$$P = (p_{ij})_{i,j \in S^\delta}, \quad \text{where} \quad p_{ij} = 1_{i \neq j} q_{ij}/q_i.$$  

Let $(J^\varepsilon,\delta)_k \in N$ be the **discrete skeleton** of the continuous time Markov chain $(\omega^\varepsilon,\delta)_t \geq 0$. Namely, $(J^\varepsilon,\delta)_k \in N$ is the discrete time Markov chain on $S^\delta$ keeping track of the jumps of $(\omega^\varepsilon,\delta)_t \geq 0$. Then $(J^\varepsilon,\delta)_k \in N$ has transition matrix $P$ with the uniform measure as its initial distribution. It is elementary to see that the uniform measure on $S^\delta$ reweighted by $q_i$ is a stationary measure for $P$. In other words, let $P^\varepsilon_\delta$ be the probability measure given by $(\omega^\varepsilon,\delta)_t \geq 0$ and $\mathfrak{h}$. Define $N^\varepsilon_\delta := N^\varepsilon_\delta(\omega_0^\varepsilon)$. Let $P^\varepsilon_\delta$ be the probability measure obtained by normalizing $N^\varepsilon_\delta dP$. Then $(J^\varepsilon,\delta)_k \in N$ is stationary under $P^\varepsilon_\delta$.

Conditioning on $\mathfrak{h}$, we can sample $(\omega^\varepsilon,\delta)_t \geq 0$ in a two-step procedure:

1. Run $(J^\varepsilon,\delta)_k \in N$ with its $P$-law (conditioning on $\mathfrak{h}$).
2. Conditioning on $\mathfrak{h}$ and $(J^\varepsilon,\delta)_k \in N$, the time spent in each state $J^\varepsilon,\delta$ is an independent exponential random variable with rate $q_{J^\varepsilon,\delta} = N^\varepsilon_\delta(J^\varepsilon,\delta)$.
6.6.3 Proof of Lemmas 6.4 and 6.5

Consider the setting of Section 6.6.1 and recall that \((\omega^\delta, \Gamma^\delta, \Gamma) = (\omega^\delta, \Gamma^\delta_0, \Gamma^\delta_0)\). Moreover the Poisson point process \(\text{PPP}^\delta\) converge almost surely for each \(\rho > 0\). Fix \(\varepsilon > 0\). Now we prove that \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) satisfy the desired property in Lemma 6.4.

Lemma 6.20. Fix \(\varepsilon > 0\). Recall that \(\mathcal{N}^\delta\) is the total \(\mu^\delta\)-mass of the \(\varepsilon\)-pivotal points of \((h, \omega^\delta)\). Let \(\mathcal{N}^\varepsilon\) be the \(c' e^{h/\sqrt{\delta}} m^\varepsilon\)-mass of \(\varepsilon\)-pivotal points of \((h, \Gamma)\). Then \(\lim_{\delta \to 0} \mathcal{N}^\delta = \mathcal{N}^\varepsilon\) in probability.

Proof. Recall piv^\delta and piv^\varepsilon in Lemma 6.18 which are sampled from \(e^{h/\sqrt{\delta}} m^\delta\) and \(\nu^\delta\), respectively. Let \(E^\delta_1\) (resp., \(E^\varepsilon\)) be the event that piv^\delta (resp., piv) is \(\varepsilon\)-pivotal for \((h, \omega^\delta)\) (resp., \((h, \Gamma)\)). On the event \(\{\rho < \rho^\varepsilon\}\) with \(\rho^\varepsilon\) as in Lemma 6.14 every \(\varepsilon\)-pivotal point of \((h, \Gamma)\) is \(\rho\)-important for \(\Gamma\). Therefore

\[
\mathbb{P}[E^\varepsilon_1 \mid h] = \mathcal{N}^\varepsilon_1 \nu^\delta_1(\mathbb{D})^{-1} \text{ and } \mathbb{P}[E^\varepsilon_1 \mid h] = \mathcal{N}^\varepsilon \left(c' \int_{\mathbb{D}} e^{h/\sqrt{\delta}} m^\rho\right)^{-1} \text{ on } \{\rho < \rho^\varepsilon\}.
\]

By Lemma 6.18 and its proof, \(\lim_{\delta \to 0} \mathbb{P}[E^\varepsilon_1 \Delta E^\varepsilon] = 0\). Lemma 6.13 yields that \(\mathcal{N}^\delta_1 1_{\rho < \rho^\varepsilon} \to \mathcal{N}^\varepsilon_1 1_{\rho < \rho^\varepsilon}\) in probability. Sending \(\rho \to 0\), we conclude. □

The following variant of Lemma 6.18 is immediate from Lemma 6.14.

Lemma 6.21. Let \(\tau^\delta := \inf\{t > 0 : \omega^\varepsilon_t \neq \omega^\delta_t\}\) be the first time \((\omega^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}\) jumps. Let \(\hat{\Gamma}^\varepsilon, \hat{\Gamma}^\delta := \Gamma^\varepsilon, \Gamma^\delta\). Then \(\lim_{\delta \to 0} \hat{\Gamma}^\varepsilon, \hat{\Gamma}^\delta\) exists in probability.

Proof. Define \(\hat{\omega}^\delta := \omega^\varepsilon, \hat{\omega}^\delta\), so that \(\hat{\Gamma}^\varepsilon, \hat{\Gamma}^\delta = \Gamma(\hat{\omega}^\delta)\). Let \(z^\delta \in \mathbb{D}^\delta\) be such that \(\hat{\omega}^\delta(z^\delta) \neq \omega^\delta(z^\delta)\). By the convergence of \(\text{PPP}^\delta\) for arbitrary \(\rho\), \(z^\delta\) converge almost surely to a random point \(z \in \mathbb{D}\) sampled from \(e^{h/\sqrt{\delta}} m^\rho\). Let \(\hat{\Gamma}^\varepsilon\) be the loop ensemble obtained after flipping the color of \(z\). By Lemma 6.18 and working on events \(\{\rho < \rho^\varepsilon\}\) with arbitrarily small \(\rho\) as in the proof of Lemma 6.20 we have \(\lim_{\delta \to 0} \hat{\Gamma}^\varepsilon = \hat{\Gamma}^\varepsilon\) in probability. □

To prove the convergence in law in Lemma 6.4 we will need the following general fact on weak convergence.

Lemma 6.22. Let \(\{\mathcal{N}_\delta, X_\delta\}\) be random variables such that \(\mathcal{N}_\delta\) and \(\mathcal{N}\) take values in \((0, \infty)\), while \(X_\delta\) and \(X\) take values in some standard Borel space. Suppose \(\{\mathcal{N}_\delta\}\) is uniformly integrable and \(\mathcal{N}_\delta\) weakly converge to \(\mathcal{N}\). Let \(P_\delta\) and \(P\) denote the probability measure of \((\mathcal{N}_\delta, X_\delta)\) and \((\mathcal{N}, X)\), respectively. Let \(\mathbb{P}_\delta\) and \(\mathbb{P}\) be probability measures such that \(d\mathbb{P}_\delta = E^P][\mathcal{N}^{-1}] \mathcal{N}_\delta d\mathbb{P}_\delta\) and \(d\mathbb{P} = E^P[N^{-1}] N d\mathbb{P}\), where \(E^P\) means expectation over \(P\). Suppose \(\mathcal{N}_\delta, X_\delta\) under \(\mathbb{P}_\delta\) weakly converge to \((\mathcal{N}, X)\) under \(\mathbb{P}\). Then the same weak convergence holds under the original measures \(P_\delta\) and \(P\).

Proof. The weak convergence and uniform integrability of \(\{\mathcal{N}_\delta\}\) yield \(\lim_{\delta \to 0} E^P_\delta[N_\delta] = E^P[N]\). Since \(E^P_\delta[\mathcal{N}^{-1}_\delta] = E^P[N^{-1}\mathcal{N}^{-1}] = E^P[N^{-1}]\), we see that \(\{\mathcal{N}^{-1}_\delta\}\) is uniformly integrable under \(\mathbb{P}_\delta\). Let \(Z_\delta = f(\mathcal{N}_\delta, X_\delta)\) where \(f\) is a bounded and continuous real-valued function. Since \((Y, Y^{-1})\) under \(\mathbb{P}_\delta\) weakly converge to \((Y, Y^{-1})\) under \(\mathbb{P}\) and \(\{\mathcal{N}^{-1}_\delta\}\) is uniformly integrable under \(\mathbb{P}_\delta\), we have \(\lim_{\delta \to \infty} E^P_\delta[Z_\delta] = E^P[Y^{-1}]\). Therefore \(\lim_{\delta \to \infty} E^P_\delta[Y_\delta] = E^P[Y]\) as desired. □
Proof of Lemmas \ref{lem:markov_chains} and \ref{lem:loop_ensemble}. For a fixed \( \rho > 0 \), let \( \mathbb{P}^\rho = \mathbb{P}[\rho < \rho^\varepsilon]^{-1}1_{\rho < \rho^\varepsilon}\mathbb{P} \) with \( \rho^\varepsilon \) in Lemma \ref{lem:coupling}. Since \( N_\delta^\varepsilon 1_{\rho < \rho^\varepsilon} \leq \nu(\mathbb{D}) \), Lemma \ref{lem:occupation_measure} gives that \( \{N_\delta^\varepsilon\}_{\delta > 0} \) is uniformly integrable under \( \mathbb{P}^\rho \). Let \( \mathbb{P}_\delta^\rho \) be the probability measure obtained by normalizing \( N_\delta^\varepsilon \mathbb{P}^\rho \). Since \( \{\rho < \rho^\varepsilon\} \) is determined by \( \mathbf{h} \), the two-step sampling procedure at the end of Section \ref{sec:coupling} applies to the \( \mathbb{P}_\delta^\rho \)-conditional law of \( (\omega_\varepsilon^\delta) \) given \( \mathbf{h} \). In particular, under \( \mathbb{P}_\delta^\rho \), conditioning on \( \mathbf{h} \), \( \{J_n^\delta\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) is still a stationary Markov chain, and moreover, \( \tau_\delta \) in Lemma \ref{lem:coupling} is an exponential variable with rate \( N_\delta^\varepsilon \).

Let \( \mathbb{P}^\rho \) be the probability measure obtained by normalizing \( N_\varepsilon \mathbb{P}^\rho \). By Lemmas \ref{lem:coupling} and \ref{lem:occupation_measure} \( (\Gamma^\delta, \Gamma^\varepsilon, N_\varepsilon^\delta) \) converge to \( (\Gamma, \Gamma^\varepsilon, N_\varepsilon) \) in probability under \( \mathbb{P} \). By the two-step sampling procedure, under \( \mathbb{P}_\delta^\rho \), \( (\mathbf{h}, \Gamma^\varepsilon_\delta) \) converge in law as \( \delta \to 0 \) in the Skorokhod topology as a càdlàg process taking values in \( \mathbb{H}^{-1}(\mathbb{D}) \times \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{D}) \). Moreover, the limiting process makes finitely many jumps in any bounded interval. By Lemma \ref{lem:occupation_measure}, these two statements still hold under \( \mathbb{P}_\delta^\rho \). Slightly abusing the notion, we denote the limiting process by \( (\mathbf{h}, \Gamma^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0} \). Then the conditional law of \( (\Gamma^\varepsilon_t)_{t \geq 0} \) given \( \mathbf{h} \) is as described in Lemma \ref{lem:conditional_law}. Sending \( \rho \to 0 \) we conclude the proof.

\[ \] 6.6.4 Convergence after the first flip: planar map case

Now we turn our attention to Lemma \ref{lem:conditional_law}. We still work in the setting of the proof of Lemma \ref{lem:markov_chains}. Since the discrete skeleton of \( (\mathbf{h}, \Gamma^\varepsilon_t) \) is stationary under \( \mathbb{P}^\rho \), and since the process \( \Gamma^\varepsilon_t \) takes countably many different values, for any event \( E \) in the Borel \( \sigma \)-algebra of \( \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{D}) \) such that \( \mathbb{P}[\Gamma \in E] = 1 \), we have

\[ \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon[\Gamma^\varepsilon_t \in E \text{ for all } t \geq 0] = 1 = \mathbb{P}[\Gamma^\varepsilon_t \in E \text{ for all } t \geq 0], \]

where the second equality follows from the first by sending \( \rho \to 0 \). In particular, almost surely the 3/4-occupation measure of the \( \varepsilon \)-pivotal points of \( (\mathbf{h}, \Gamma^\varepsilon_t) \) are well-defined simultaneously for all \( t \). Let \( PV_\varepsilon \) (resp., \( \tilde{PV}_\varepsilon \)) denote the set of \( \varepsilon \)-pivotal points of \( (\mathbf{h}, \Gamma) \) (resp. \( (\mathbf{h}, \tilde{\Gamma}) \)) and let \( PV^\delta_\varepsilon \) and \( \tilde{PV}^\delta_\varepsilon \) be their counterpart for \( (\mathbf{h}, \omega^\delta) \) and \( (\mathbf{h}, \tilde{\omega}^\delta) \), respectively. Then \( \cup_{\varepsilon > 0} PV_\varepsilon = \cup_{\varepsilon > 0} \tilde{PV}_\varepsilon \) almost surely, although \( PV_\varepsilon \neq \tilde{PV}_\varepsilon \) for any \( \varepsilon \). Recall Proposition \ref{prop:occupation_measure}, where \( \nu^\varepsilon_{\mathbf{h}, \Gamma} = ce_{\mathbf{h}, \Gamma}^{\varepsilon/\sqrt{\alpha}} \tilde{m}_\varepsilon \). By \cite{A18}, for \( \varepsilon, \varepsilon' > 0 \), the \( \nu_\delta \)-measure restricted to \( PV^\delta_\varepsilon \cap PV^\delta_\varepsilon \) converges to \( c' \xi^{-1}_h(\mathbb{D})^{1/2} \nu^\varepsilon_{\mathbf{h}, \Gamma} |_{PV_\varepsilon} \) in probability, with \( c' \) in Proposition \ref{prop:coupling}. Fixing \( \varepsilon \) and varying \( \varepsilon' \) in \( \nu^\varepsilon_{\mathbf{h}, \Gamma} |_{PV_\varepsilon} \), we obtain a measure \( \nu^\varepsilon_{\mathbf{h}, \Gamma} \) supported on \( \tilde{PV}_\varepsilon \) such that the \( \nu_\delta \)-measure restricted to \( \tilde{PV}^\delta_\varepsilon \) converges to \( c^{-1}_h(\mathbb{D})^{1/2} \nu^\varepsilon_{\mathbf{h}, \Gamma} \) in probability. On the other hand, by the reweighting consideration as in the proof of Lemma \ref{lem:markov_chains}, the limit also equals \( c'e^{b/\sqrt{\alpha}} d\tilde{m}_\varepsilon \), where \( \tilde{m}_\varepsilon \) is 3/4-occupation measure of \( \tilde{PV}_\varepsilon \). Therefore \( \nu^\varepsilon_{\mathbf{h}, \Gamma} = ce_{\mathbf{h}, \Gamma}^{b/\sqrt{\alpha}} d\tilde{m}_\varepsilon \) a.s.

Let \( (M^n, \Upsilon^n) \) be as in Theorem \ref{thm:planar_map}. Let \( z^n \) be a uniformly sampled \( \varepsilon \)-pivotal point of \( \Upsilon^n \) and let \( \tilde{\Upsilon}^n \) be the loop ensemble obtained by flipping the color of \( z^n \). By \cite{BHS18} Proposition \ref{prop:loop_ensemble} and \cite{GHS19} Proposition \ref{prop:coupling}, the measure \( \nu_{\mathbf{h}, \Gamma}^{\varepsilon} \) is the limit of \( n^{-1/4} \) times the total number of \( \varepsilon \)-pivotal points of \( \tilde{\Upsilon}^n \) in a suitable topology, up to a multiplicative constant. Moreover, the following is proved in \cite{GHS19} Section 6] based on \cite{BHS18}.

\[ \]
Proposition 6.23. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and work under the probability measure $\mathbb{P}^d$. Let $z$ be a uniformly sampled $\varepsilon$-pivotal point of $\Gamma$, and let $\hat{\Gamma}$ be the loop ensemble obtained by flipping the color of $z$. Let $\nu^c_{h, \Gamma}, \nu^c_{h, \Gamma}$, $M^n, Y^n$, and $\hat{Y}^n$ be defined as right above. Let $\mathcal{N}_n^\varepsilon, \mathcal{N}_n^\varepsilon$ be $n^{-1/4}$ times the total number of $\varepsilon$-pivotal points of $Y^n, \hat{Y}^n$, respectively. Then there exists a coupling of $(M^n, Y^n, \hat{Y}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(h, \Gamma, \hat{\Gamma})$ such that almost surely $(M^n, Y^n)$ and $(M^n, \hat{Y}^n)$, respectively, converge to $(h, \Gamma)$ and $(h, \hat{\Gamma})$ in the GHPUL topology. Moreover, there exists a constant $c_p > 0$ such that $\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{N}_n^\varepsilon = c_p \nu^c_{h, \Gamma}(\mathbb{D})$ and $\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{N}_n^\varepsilon = c_p \nu^c_{h, \Gamma}(\mathbb{D})$ in probability.

Proof of Lemma 6.6. The two-step sampling procedure can be applied to $(M^n, Y_t^n)$. Now Lemma 6.7 follows from the definition of $(Y_t^\varepsilon)$ and Proposition 6.23. 

6.7 Stability of the cutoff and proof of Propositions 6.7 and 6.9

We work in the setting of Propositions 6.7 and 6.9. We will identify a site percolation configuration on $D^\delta$ with an element in $H(D)$ (see Section 6.2) as needed. Given $\omega'$, $\omega'' \in H(D)$, we will denote the $d_H$-distance of the restriction of $\omega'$ and $\omega''$ to $Q_rD$ by $d_r(\omega', \omega'')$.

Our proof of Propositions 6.7 and 6.9 rely on some stability results established in [GPS18a, GHSS19], asserting that the importance of a vertex is rather stable in time. Before stating them formally, we point out that our definition of $\rho$-important pivotal points is slightly different from the definition in [GPS18a, GHSS19]. In [GPS18a], $\rho$-important pivotal points are defined in terms of how far the monochromatic arms starting at the pivotal point can reach. For a square $B$, recall the annulus $A = A_B$ in Section 6.4.1. Our notion of $A$-important point agrees with the one in [GPS18a, GHSS19] as long as $A \subset D$. There is a small deviation in the definition near the boundary, but this is irrelevant as the results we will use from [GPS18a, GHSS19] are about $\rho$-important points in $rD$ with $r \in (0, 1)$. In this case, as explained in [GPS13, Section 4.7], these two notions of $\rho$-importance are effectively equivalent. In particular, the results we will be relying on hold for both notions. Having this clarification in mind, the following stability result is an immediate consequence of [GHSS19, Lemma 5.9] and [GPS18a, Proposition 3.9].

Lemma 6.24 ([GPS18a, GHSS19]). Fix $T > 0$. Let $X_\delta$ be the set of vertices on $D^\delta$ which are updated for the dynamics $(\omega^0_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$. Let $\Omega_\delta$ be the set of percolation configurations $\omega'$ on $D^\delta$ such that $\omega'(v) = \omega^0(v)$ for all $v \notin X_\delta$. Let $\mathcal{P}^\delta$ be the set of $\rho$-important points for $\omega^0$. Fix $r \in (0, 1)$. For all $\zeta \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\rho_1 > 0$ only depending on $T$ such that for all $\rho \in (0, \rho_1)$ and $\delta \in (0, 0.1)$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[ \max\{d_r(\omega', \omega'') : \omega'(v) = \omega''(v) \text{ for } v \in \mathcal{P}^\delta \text{ and } \omega', \omega'' \in \Omega_\delta \} > \zeta \right] < \zeta.$$ 

We also need the following variant of stability which is also essentially from [GHSS19].

Lemma 6.25. In the setting of Lemma 6.24 with $r \in (0, 1)$ and $\rho, T > 0$ fixed, let

$$Z_\delta(v) := \inf\{\rho' > 0 : \exists \omega' \in \Omega_\delta \text{ such that } v \text{ is } \rho' \text{-important for } \omega'\} \text{ for } v \in rD;$$

$$N_\delta(\rho, s) := \#\{v \in \mathcal{P}^\delta \cap X_\delta \cap rD : Z_\delta(v) \leq s\} \text{ for } s > 0,$$

where $\#$ means the cardinality. Then for all $\zeta \in (0, 1)$, there exists $s > 0$ depending on $\rho, r, T, \zeta$, such that $\mathbb{P}[N_\delta(\rho, s) = 0] > 1 - \zeta$ for all $\delta \in (0, 0.1)$. 
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Proof. By [GHSS19] Lemma 5.7, there exists a random almost surely finite number $C(h, T)$, such that for every $\delta, s, \rho$ satisfying $2\delta < s < 2^4 s < \rho \leq 1$ and every vertex $v \in \mathbb{D}^\delta \cap r\mathbb{D}$,

$$\mathbb{P}[v \in \mathcal{P}_s^\delta, Z_\delta(v) \leq s | h] \leq C(h, T)s^\beta \alpha_4^\delta(\delta, \rho),$$

where $\beta > 0$ is a constant and $\alpha_4^\delta(\delta, \cdot)$ is defined as above Theorem 6.3. Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[N_\delta(h, s) | h] = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{D}^\delta \cap r\mathbb{D}} \mathbb{P}[v \in \mathcal{P}_s^\delta \cap X_\delta, Z_X(v) \leq s | h] \leq \sum_{v \in \mathbb{D}^\delta \cap r\mathbb{D}} C(h, T)s^\beta \alpha_4^\delta(\delta, \rho) \cdot T \mu_0^\delta(v) \alpha_4^\delta(\delta, 1)^{-1}.$$

By the quasi-multiplicativity of $\alpha_4^\delta(\cdot, \cdot)$ (see e.g. [SW01]), $\alpha_4^\delta(\delta, 1)^{-1} \alpha_4^\delta(\delta, \rho) \leq c \rho^{5/4}$, so $\alpha_4^\delta(\delta, 1)^{-1} \alpha_4^\delta(\delta, \rho)$ is upper bounded by a constant $\hat{c}$ only depending on $\rho$. Therefore $\mathbb{E}[N_\delta(h, s) | h] \leq \hat{c} T \mu_0^\delta(D) C(h, T) s^\beta$. Now Lemma 6.25 follows from Markov’s inequality. 

The following lemma, which is essentially a stability result for $\varepsilon$-pivotal points, is the key to the proof of Proposition 6.9. The proof relies on Lemma 6.15, which reduces the problem to Lemma 6.25.

Lemma 6.26. In the setting of Lemma 6.24, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, let $X_{\varepsilon}^\delta$ be set of vertices on $\mathbb{D}^\delta$ updated the dynamics $(\omega_{t \in [0, T]}^\varepsilon)$. Then for all $\zeta, \rho \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{P}_s^\delta \cap X_\delta \subset X_{\varepsilon}^\delta] > 1 - \zeta$ for $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$.

Proof. Suppose we are in the setting of Lemma 6.24 with $r \in (0, 1)$ and $T > 0$ fixed. For each $v \in \mathbb{D}^\delta$, let $\tau_v$ be the time when the clock of $v$ rings for the first time so that $X_\delta = \{v \in \mathbb{D}^\delta : \tau_v \leq T\}$. For $s > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$N_\delta(s, \varepsilon) := \# \{v \in X_\delta \cap r\mathbb{D} : v \text{ is s-important for } \omega_{\tau_v}^\varepsilon \text{ but not } \varepsilon\text{-pivotal for } \omega_{\tau_v}^\varepsilon\}.$$

We claim that for all $\zeta \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ depending only on $s, r, T, \zeta$, such that

$$\mathbb{P}[N_\delta(s, \varepsilon) = 0] > 1 - \zeta/3 \quad \text{for } \delta \in (0, 0.1). \quad (46)$$

Fix $v \in \mathbb{D}^\delta \cap r\mathbb{D}$. Given a percolation configuration $\omega$ on $\mathbb{D}^\delta$, whether $v$ is $\varepsilon$-pivotal for $\omega$ only depends on $\omega_{|\mathbb{D}^\delta \setminus \{v\}}$. The same statement holds for s-importance. Let $(S_{t}^v)_{t \geq 0}$ be the same dynamics as $\omega_{t}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ with the further requirement that the clock at $v$ never rings. Then $\nu$ is independent of $(S_{t}^v)_{t \geq 0}$. Note that $(S_{t}^v)_{t \geq 0}$ is still stationary. Thus $S_{\tau_v}^v$ has the same law as $\omega_{\tau_v}^\delta$. Fix $\zeta' \in (0, 1)$ to be determined later and choose $\varepsilon$ such that Lemma 6.15 holds with $s, \zeta'$ here. Since $S_{\tau_v}^v$ and $\omega_{\tau_v}^\varepsilon$ agree on $\mathbb{D}^\delta \setminus \{v\}$, for $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[v \in X_\delta \cap r\mathbb{D}, v \text{ is s-important for } \omega_{\tau_v}^\varepsilon \text{ but not } \varepsilon\text{-pivotal for } \omega_{\tau_v}^\varepsilon] = \mathbb{P}[\tau_v \leq T, v \text{ is s-important for } S_{\tau_v}^v \text{ but not } \varepsilon\text{-pivotal for } S_{\tau_v}^v] = \mathbb{P}[\tau_v \leq T] \mathbb{P}[v \text{ is s-important for } S_{\tau_v}^v \text{ but not } \varepsilon\text{-pivotal for } S_{\tau_v}^v] = \mathbb{P}[\tau_v \leq T] \mathbb{P}[v \text{ is s-important for } \omega_0^\delta \text{ but not } \varepsilon\text{-pivotal for } \omega_0^\delta] \leq \mathbb{P}[\tau_v \leq T] \mathbb{P}[v \text{ is s-important for } \omega_0^\delta] \zeta' = \zeta' \mathbb{P}[\tau_v \leq T, v \text{ is s-important for } \omega_0^\delta].$$
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The purpose of introducing $S_t$ can be seen in the third step of this equality, where we use independence of two events. Let the measure $\nu_\delta$ be defined as in Section 6.4 with $\omega_0^\delta$ in place of $\omega^\delta$. Then

$$
\mathbb{E}[N_\delta'(s, \varepsilon)] = \sum_{v \in D | r \in \mathbb{D}} \mathbb{P}[v \in X_\delta \cap r \mathbb{D}, v \text{ is } s-\text{important for } \omega^\varepsilon_\delta \text{ but not } \varepsilon-\text{pivotal for } \omega^\varepsilon_\delta]
$$

$$
\leq \zeta' \sum_{v \in D | r \in \mathbb{D}} \mathbb{P}[\tau_v \leq T, v \text{ is } s-\text{important for } \omega_0^\delta]
$$

$$
= \zeta' \mathbb{E}[\#(P_\delta^s \cap X_\delta \cap r \mathbb{D})] \leq \zeta' T \mathbb{E}[\nu_\delta(P_\delta^s \cap (r \mathbb{D}))].
$$

Since $\max_{\delta \in (0, 0.1)} \mathbb{E}[\nu_\delta(P_\delta^s \cap (r \mathbb{D}))] < \infty$, we can choose $\zeta'$ small enough depending on $s, r, T, \zeta$ such that $\mathbb{E}[N_\delta'(s, \varepsilon)] \leq \zeta$. Now (46) follows from Markov’s inequality.

We choose $s$ such that $P[N_\delta(\rho, s) = 0] > 1 - \zeta/3$ with $N_\delta(\rho, s)$ as defined in Lemma 6.25. Then we $\varepsilon$ such that $P[N_\delta'(s, \varepsilon) = 0] > 1 - \zeta/3$. Let $E_\delta$ be the event that the clock at all $\rho$-important vertices in $r \mathbb{D}$ rings at most once. By a first moment calculation we can find $\delta_0 \in (0, 0.1)$ depending on $\zeta$ such that $P[E_\delta] \geq 1 - \zeta/3$ for $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ (in fact, a first moment calculation gives that the total number of rings during $(0, \delta_0)$ will be of order $O(\delta_0)$). On $E_\delta \cap \{N_\delta(\rho, s) = 0, N_\delta'(s, \varepsilon) = 0\}$, each $v$ in $P_\delta^s \cap X_\delta$ must be $s$-important for $\omega^\varepsilon_\delta$, hence be $\varepsilon$-pivotal for $\omega^\varepsilon_\delta$. Therefore $v \in X_\delta$, which concludes the proof.

**Proof of Proposition 6.7** Given Lemma 6.4, it remains to show that $(\Gamma_\varepsilon^\delta)_{t \geq 0}$ converge in probability (rather than converging only in law). Fix $\rho_0 > 0$. Since $\rho_0$ is arbitrary it is sufficient to prove convergence in probability on the event $\{\rho_0 < \rho^\varepsilon\}$, with $\rho^\varepsilon$ as in Lemma 6.14. Recall the setting in Section 6.6.3 and the probability measures $P^{\rho_0}$, $\tilde{P}^{\rho_0}$, and $\tilde{\tilde{P}}^{\rho_0}$ defined there. The purpose of using the measures reweighted by the pivotal measure is that it makes the discrete skeleton of the $\varepsilon$-dynamics stationary (see Section 6.6.2).

Note that the three probability measures $P^{\rho_0}$, $\tilde{P}^{\rho_0}$, and $\tilde{\tilde{P}}^{\rho_0}$ are all defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$; for example $\tilde{\tilde{P}}^{\rho_0}$ defines a reweighting of the discrete model which is different from $\tilde{P}^{\rho_0}$. However, as we will argue now, $\tilde{P}^{\rho_0}$ and $\tilde{\tilde{P}}^{\rho_0}$ are close in total variation distance when $\delta$ is small. For any event $E \in \mathcal{F}$, $|E_{\rho_0}[N_\delta^\varepsilon 1_E] - E_{\rho_0}[N_\delta^\varepsilon 1_E]| \leq E_{\rho_0}[|N_\delta^\varepsilon - N_\delta^\varepsilon|]$, where $E_{\rho_0}$ is the expectation corresponding to $P^{\rho_0}$. By the proof of Lemma 6.20, $N_\delta^\varepsilon$ converge to $N^\varepsilon$ in $L^1$ for $P^{\rho_0}$. It follows that there exists a function $\zeta_{\rho_0}(\delta)$ not depending on $E$ such that $\lim_{\delta \to 0} \zeta_{\rho_0}(\delta) = 0$ and

$$
|\tilde{\tilde{P}}^{\rho_0}[E] - \tilde{P}^{\rho_0}[E]| \leq \zeta_{\rho_0}(\delta) \quad \text{for all } E \in \mathcal{F}.
$$

Fix $T > 0$. Let $A_\delta \subset \mathbb{D} \times [0, T]$ be the set of $(x, t) \in PPP_\delta^\varepsilon$ such that $x$ is $\varepsilon$-pivotal for $\omega^\varepsilon_\delta$. For each $\rho > 0$, let $E_\rho^\varepsilon$ be the event that for each $(x, t) \in A_\delta$, if $x$ is $\varepsilon$-pivotal for $\omega^\varepsilon_\delta$ then $x \in P_\delta^\rho$. We claim that for all $\zeta \in (0, 1)$, there exist $\delta_0 > 0$ and $\rho > 0$ only depending on $\zeta, r, T$ such that

$$
\tilde{P}^{\rho_0}[E_\rho^\varepsilon] > 1 - \zeta \quad \text{for all } \delta \in (0, \delta_0).
$$

Let $M^\delta = \#\{(x, t) \in A_\delta : t \leq T\}$ denote the number of jumps for $\omega^\varepsilon_\delta$ during $[0, T]$, and note that $M^\delta$ is tight by Lemma 6.4. Therefore we can find $r \in (0, 1)$ such that with probability at least $1 - \zeta/10$ we have $x \in r \mathbb{D}$ for all $(x, t) \in A_\delta$; in the rest of the proof we fix such a value of $r$. By Lemma 6.14 and since the discrete skeleton is stationary under $\tilde{\tilde{P}}^{\rho_0}$, we can
Figure 13: Illustration of the proof of Proposition 6.9. By Lemma 6.24, for $\rho$ sufficiently small we know that the two processes to the left (resp., right) connected by a vertical arrow are close with high probability for the metric $d_t$ at any time $t \in [0,T]$. By Lemma 6.26 we know that $(\omega_t^{0,\rho,\delta})_{t \in [0,T]} = (\omega_t^{\varepsilon,\rho,\delta})_{t \in [0,T]}$ with high probability for $\varepsilon$ sufficiently small compared to $\rho$.

To conclude the proof, we apply Lemma 6.19 repeatedly. First observe that Lemma 6.19 also holds under $\mathbb{P}_{\rho_0}$ by absolute continuity. Let $\tau^\delta_k$ denote the $k$th jump of $(\Gamma_t^{\varepsilon,\delta})_{t \geq 0}$. By convergence of PPP$^\rho$, we see that the conditions of Lemma 6.19 are satisfied if we let $\tilde{z}^\delta$ (resp., $z$) denote the point of the 2nd flip in the discrete (resp., continuum) and we recenter $(\Gamma_t^{\varepsilon,\delta})_{t \geq 0}$ at time $\tau^\delta_{k-1}$. This implies convergence in probability of $(\Gamma_t^{\varepsilon,\delta})_{t \in [0,\tau^\delta_2]}$. Repeating this argument inductively, we get convergence in probability of $(\Gamma_t^{\varepsilon,\delta})_{t \geq 0}$.

Proof of Proposition 6.9. We refer to Figure 13 for an illustration of the proof. For each $t \geq 0$ let $\omega_t^{\varepsilon,0,\delta} = \omega_t^{\varepsilon,\delta}$, let $\omega_t^{0,0,\delta} = \omega_t^\delta$, and let $\omega_t^{0,\rho,\delta}$ (resp., $\omega_t^{\varepsilon,0,\delta}$) be defined just as $\omega_t^\delta$ (resp., $\omega_t^{\varepsilon,\delta}$), except that when the clock at a vertex rings we do not flip its color unless it is contained in $\mathcal{P}^\rho_\delta$. If the clock at a vertex $v \in \mathcal{P}^\rho_\delta$ rings at some time $t$ and $v$ is (resp., is not) an $\varepsilon$-pivotal for $\omega_t^{0,0,\delta}$, but is not (resp., is) an $\varepsilon$-pivotal point for $\omega_t^{0,\rho,\delta}$, then its color will be flipped (resp., will not be flipped). For any $t \in [0,T]$, by the triangle inequality,

$$d_t(\omega_t^{\varepsilon,0,\delta}, \omega_t^{0,0,\delta}) \leq d_t(\omega_t^{\varepsilon,0,\delta}, \omega_t^{0,\rho,\delta}) + d_t(\omega_t^{0,\rho,\delta}, \omega_t^{0,0,\delta}) + d_t(\omega_t^{0,0,\delta}, \omega_t^{0,0,\delta}).$$

Fix $\zeta \in (0,1)$. Recall $\rho_1$ in Lemma 6.24. For $\rho \in (0,\rho_1)$, with probability at least $1 - \zeta$,

$$\max_{t \in [0,T]} d_t(\omega_t^{\varepsilon,0,\delta}, \omega_t^{0,\rho,\delta}) + d_t(\omega_t^{0,\rho,\delta}, \omega_t^{0,0,\delta}) \leq 2\zeta.$$

On the event $\{\mathcal{P}^\rho_\delta \cap X_\delta \subset X_\delta^\varepsilon\}$, we have $(\omega_t^{0,\rho,\delta})_{t \in [0,T]} = (\omega_t^{\varepsilon,\rho,\delta})_{t \in [0,T]}$. By Lemma 6.26 this occurs with probability as least $1 - \zeta$ if $\varepsilon$ is small enough. For such $\varepsilon$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\max_{t \in [0,T]} d_t(\omega_t^{\varepsilon,\delta}, \omega_t^{\delta}) > 2\zeta\right] < 2\zeta \quad \text{for each } \zeta \in (0,1).$$

(49)

Sending $\delta \to 0$ and $\varepsilon \to 0$ in order and varying $r$ and $T$ in (49), we conclude the proof. □
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