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Abstract

The symmetric six-vertex model with parameters $a,b,c>0$ is expected to exhibit different behavior in the regimes $a+b < c$ (antiferroelectric), $|a-b| < c \leq a+b$ (disordered) and $|a-b| > c$ (ferroelectric). In this work, we study the way in which the transition between the regimes $a+b = c$ and $a+b < c$ manifests in the thermodynamic limit.

It is shown that the height function of the six-vertex model delocalizes with logarithmic variance when $a+b = c$ while remaining localized when $a+b < c$. In the latter regime, the extremal translation-invariant Gibbs states of the height function are described. Qualitative differences between the two regimes are further exhibited for the Gibbs states of the six-vertex model itself.

Via a coupling, our results further allow to study the self-dual Ashkin–Teller model on $\mathbb{Z}^2$. It is proved that on the portion of the self-dual curve $\sinh 2J = e^{-2U}$ where $J < U$ each of the two Ising configurations exhibits exponential decay of correlations while their product is ferromagnetically ordered. This is in contrast to the case $J = U$ (the critical 4-state Potts model) where it is known that all correlations have power-law decay.

The proofs rely on the recently established order of the phase transition in the random-cluster model, which relates to the six-vertex model via the Baxter–Kelland–Wu coupling. Additional ingredients include the introduction of a random-cluster model with modified weight for boundary clusters, analysis of a spin (mixed Ashkin-Teller model) and bond representation (of the FK-Ising type) for the six-vertex model, both of which are proved to be strongly positively associated, and the introduction of triangular lattice contours and associated bijection for the analysis of the Gibbs states of the height function.

1 Introduction

The six-vertex model is a classical model in statistical mechanics, which was initially introduced by Pauling [49] in 1935 to study the structure of ice in three dimensions. A two-dimensional version as well as ferroelectric (Slater [62]) and antiferroelectric (Rys [59]) variants were later introduced, see [3, Chapter 8], [41], and [58] for introductory texts. In this work we discuss the two-dimensional six-vertex model, whose configurations are orientations of edges of the square grid (indicated by arrows on the edges) which satisfy
the ice rule: at each vertex, there are exactly two outgoing and two incoming arrows, yielding six possible local configurations. The local possibilities are assigned nonnegative weights $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2$ and the probability of each arrow configuration is proportional to the product of local weights; see Figure 1.

The model is typically studied under the assumption that the weights are invariant to reversal of all arrows, that is, $a_1 = a_2, b_1 = b_2, c_1 = c_2$ (zero external electric field), with the three weights termed $a, b, c$. Following Yang–Yang [67], Lieb [45, 43, 42, 44] and Sutherland [64] who found an expression for the free energy using the Bethe ansatz [7], it is predicted that the behaviour of the model is governed by the value of

$$\Delta := \frac{a^2 + b^2 - c^2}{2ab}$$

with the following distinguished regimes:

- $\Delta > 1$ (equivalently, $c < |a - b|$): the ferroelectric phase, closely related to the stochastic six-vertex model; see [8] and references therein.

- $-1 \leq \Delta < 1$ (equivalently, $|a - b| < c \leq a + b$): the disordered phase. The case $\Delta = 0$, termed the free fermion point, enjoys additional integrability properties; see, e.g., [38, 17]. The uniform model $a = b = c$ is called square ice and has $\Delta = 1/2$.

- $\Delta < -1$ (equivalently, $c > a + b$): the antiferroelectric phase; see [19, 18] for recent rigorous confirmation of some of the predictions regarding this case and exposition of the Bethe ansatz.

The degenerate case $c = 0$ is known as the corner percolation model [52].

The goal of this work is to go beyond the study of the free energy of the six-vertex model and discuss the behavior of natural observables in the different regimes. As significant progress has recently been made on the ferroelectric phase [8, 15, 4], our focus here is on the antiferroelectric and disordered phases. Our main results are:

- Variance of the height function of the six-vertex model on a finite domain is uniformly bounded when $a + b < c$ and logarithmic in the distance to the boundary of the domain when $a + b = c$.

- Complete description of all translation-invariant, under parity-preserving translations, extremal Gibbs states for the height function when $a + b < c$: for every state there exists an integer $n$ for which there is a unique infinite cluster of height $n$ and of height $n + 1$, while all other heights together form exponentially small clusters.
• An Ashkin–Teller-type spin representation (introduced by Rys [59]) of the six-vertex model is shown to be independently ferromagnetically ordered in both Ising spins when $a + b < c$ while being disordered when $a + b = c$.

• Classification of the Gibbs states of the six-vertex representation which exhibit infinitely many disjoint oriented circuits of alternating vertical and horizontal edges surrounding the origin: when $a + b < c$, there are two such extremal states and in each one the orientation of each edge has a non-uniform distribution; when $a + b = c$, there is a unique such state.

In particular, the above proves the existence of (staggered) long-range order in the anti-ferroelectric phase under flat boundary conditions and the absence of such order for the parameter range on the boundary of the anti-ferroelectric and disordered phases ($a + b = c$).

In addition, our results can be applied to the standard Ashkin–Teller model on the square grid: we show that it exhibits a self-dual regime of parameters where the product of the two Ising spins is ferromagnetically ordered while the spins themselves are disordered (exponential decay of correlations). This is in agreement with predictions in the physics literature.

Organization. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we state our main results and introduce the models — height function, Ashkin–Teller-type spin representation, Ashkin–Teller model, random-cluster model with a modified boundary-cluster weight; we also provide the main ideas of the proof. In Section 3, we describe (an extension of) the BKW coupling between the six-vertex and the random-cluster models. In Section 4, we state known results about the random-cluster model. In Section 5, we discuss the monotonicity properties of the height-function measure. In Section 6, we prove our results for the height representation using the BKW coupling and a technique of T-circuits; as a corollary we derive some results for the random-cluster model. In Section 7, we describe the FK–Ising representation of the six-vertex model, show some of its properties and prove our results for the spin representation. In Section 8, we describe a coupling between the six-vertex and the Ashkin–Teller models and prove our results for the latter model.
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2 Main results

Our main results concern the fluctuations of the height function and structure of the Gibbs states of the six-vertex model, properties of its spin representation (also known as a mixed Ashkin–Teller model), phase diagram of the standard Ashkin–Teller model, and the Gibbs states of a random-cluster model with a modified weight for boundary clusters.

2.1 Height function

Consider the square lattice \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) whose edges are parallel to the coordinate axes and faces are centered at points with integer coordinates. A face centered at \((i, j)\) is called even if \(i + j\) is even, and it is called odd if \(i + j\) is odd. Let \( F(\mathbb{Z}^2) \) denote the set of faces of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \). We say that \( h : F(\mathbb{Z}^2) \to \mathbb{Z} \) is a height function if the following holds (see Figure 3):

- for any two adjacent faces \( u, v \), \(|h(u) - h(v)| = 1\);
- for any face \( u \), the parity of \( h(u) \) is the same as the parity of \( u \).

Height functions are in a natural correspondence with six-vertex configurations; see Figures 2 and 3. This correspondence is a bijection up to the addition of a constant to all the heights. For a height function, the six-vertex configuration corresponding to it is the gradient field.

We say that a finite subgraph \( D \subset \mathbb{Z}^2 \) is a domain if there exists a simple cyclic path \( P \) such that \( D \) coincides with the part of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) surrounded by \( P \), including \( P \) itself. The path \( P \) is then termed the boundary of \( D \) and is denoted by \( \partial D \). Let \( t \) be a height function. The finite-volume height-function measure on a domain \( D \) with boundary conditions \( t \) is supported on height functions that coincide with \( t \) at all faces outside of \( D \), depends on three parameters \( a, b, c > 0 \) and is defined by

\[
\text{HF}_{D,a,b,c}^t(h) = \frac{1}{Z_{\text{HF},a,b,c}^t} \cdot a^{n_1(h)+n_2(h)} b^{n_3(h)+n_4(h)} c^{n_5(h)+n_6(h)},
\]
A Gibbs state is called invariant under parity-preserving translations when $a + b < c$. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by $\Lambda_N$ the domain defined by the set of faces centered at all pairs of integers $(i, j)$ that satisfy $|i \pm j| \leq N - 1$.

Figure 3: Left: Height function with 0, 1 boundary conditions. Right: Ashkin–Teller-type spin representation of this height function (++ boundary conditions).

where $Z_{hf,a,b,c}^t$ is a normalizing constant and $n_i(h)$ is the number of vertices of $\mathcal{D}$ that are of type $i$ according to Figure 2, up to an additive constant.

For integer $n$ and domain $\mathcal{D}$, let $HF_{\mathcal{D},a,b,c}^{n+1}$ be the height-function measure on $\mathcal{D}$ with boundary conditions given by a function that takes values in $\{n, n + 1\}$ (each face according to its parity); see Figure 3. Note that if $f$ is sampled from $HF_{\mathcal{D},a,b,c}^{0,1}$ then $f + 2n$ is distributed as $HF_{\mathcal{D},a,b,c}^{2n,2n+1}$ and $-f + 2n$ is distributed as $HF_{\mathcal{D},a,b,c}^{2n-1,2n}$.

In the next theorem, we show that the variance of the height at a fixed face is uniformly bounded when $a + b < c$ and logarithmic in the distance to the boundary when $a + b = c$.

**Theorem 1** (Fluctuations). Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a domain. Take $a, b, c > 0$ such that $a + b \leq c$. Let $h_{\mathcal{D},a,b,c}^{0,1}$ be a random height function on $\mathcal{D}$ distributed according to $HF_{\mathcal{D},a,b,c}^{0,1}$. Then there exist $c_1, C_1, C_2 > 0$ depending only on $(c - a - b)$ such that, for every face $u$ of $\mathcal{D}$,

$$
\text{Var}(h_{\mathcal{D},a,b,c}^{0,1}(u)) \leq C_2,
$$

if $a + b < c$ \hspace{1cm} (1)

$$
c_1 \log \text{dist}(u, \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \mathcal{D}) \leq \text{Var}(h_{\mathcal{D},a,b,c}^{0,1}(u)) \leq C_1 \log \text{dist}(u, \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \mathcal{D}),
$$

if $a + b = c$. \hspace{1cm} (2)

We note that (1) is proven in [18] for periodic boundary conditions (i.e., when the height functions are defined on a torus).

Other cases in which logarithmic fluctuations of the height function were established are: $c/a = c/b = \sqrt{2}$ \hspace{1cm} [17, 38] (free fermion, can be mapped to the dimer model), $c/a = c/b \in (\sqrt{2} - \varepsilon, \sqrt{2} + \varepsilon)$ \hspace{1cm} [30] (perturbation around the free fermion point, dimers with a small interaction), $a = b = c$ \hspace{1cm} [60] 10, 21 (uniform case, square ice). Also, it was shown previously [50] that in high dimensions the variance is finite.

A measure HF on height functions is called a Gibbs state for height functions with parameters $a, b, c > 0$ if the following holds: Let $h$ be sampled from HF. For any domain $\mathcal{D}$, conditioned on the values of $h$ on the faces outside of $\mathcal{D}$, the distribution of $h$ equals $HF_{\mathcal{D},a,b,c}^t$, where $t$ is an arbitrary height function which agrees with $h$ outside of $\mathcal{D}$. A Gibbs state is called extremal if it has a trivial tail $\sigma$-algebra.

The next theorem characterizes the extremal measures invariant under parity-preserving translations when $a + b < c$. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by $\Lambda_N$ the domain defined by the set of faces centered at all pairs of integers $(i, j)$ that satisfy $|i \pm j| \leq N - 1$.
Theorem 2 (Gibbs states: height functions). Let \(a, b, c > 0\) satisfy \(a + b < c\). For each integer \(n\) and sequence of domains \(\{D_k\}\) increasing to \(\mathbb{Z}^2\) the sequence of finite-volume measures \(HF_{a,b,c}^{n,n+1}\) converges to a Gibbs state \(HF_{a,b,c}^{n,n+1}\), which does not depend on \(\{D_k\}\). The limiting Gibbs states are extremal and invariant under parity-preserving translations, and each Gibbs state with these two properties equals \(HF_{a,b,c}^{n,n+1}\) for some integer \(n\). Moreover, the following properties are satisfied:

- under \(HF_{a,b,c}^{n,n+1}\), clusters (in augmented connectivity) of even and odd heights different from \(n\) and \(n+1\) exhibit exponential decay. Precisely, there exist \(M, \alpha > 0\) for which

\[
HF_{a,b,c}^{n,n+1}(\exists \gamma: (0,0) \to \partial \Lambda_N \text{ s.t. } \forall k h(\gamma_k) \notin \{n,n+1\} \text{ and } |\gamma_k-\gamma_{k+1}| \leq 2) \leq Me^{-\alpha N};
\]

where \(|u-v|\) denotes the \(\ell^1\) distance between the faces \(u,v\).

- \(HF_{a,b,c}^{n,n+1}\) is invariant under the operation \(h((i,j)) \mapsto 2n+1-h((-i+1,j))\), whence

\[
HF_{a,b,c}^{n,n+1}(h((0,0)) + h((1,0))) = 2n+1;
\]

- Each \(HF_{a,b,c}^{n,n+1}\) is positively associated and the stochastic ordering relation \(HF_{a,b,c}^{m,m+1} \prec HF_{a,b,c}^{n,n+1}\) holds for \(m < n\).

It is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 2 that \(HF_{a,b,c}^{n,n+1}\)-a.s., there exist infinitely many disjoint level lines separating the heights \(n\) and \(n+1\).

### 2.2 Spin representation (mixed Ashkin-Teller model)

Define the spin representation of a height function \(h\) on the faces of \(\mathbb{Z}^2\) by the assignment of the spin +1 (resp. -1) to a face \(u\) if \(h(u) \equiv 0,1 \text{ (mod } 4)\) (resp. \(h(u) \equiv 2,3 \text{ (mod } 4)\)); see Figure 3. For any spin configuration obtained in this way, around each vertex there is a pair of diagonally adjacent spins which agree. We say that such a spin configuration satisfies the ice rule and denote the set of all such spin configurations on the faces of \(\mathbb{Z}^2\) by \(\mathcal{E}_{\text{spin}}(\mathbb{Z}^2)\). The correspondence between height functions and spin configurations satisfying the ice rule is a bijection up to an additive constant (see Figure 2) and we define the spin measure \(\text{Spin}_{D,a,b,c}^\tau\) as the push-forward of the height function measure \(HF_{D,a,b,c}^\tau\) under this mapping.

More precisely, given \(\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{spin}}(\mathbb{Z}^2)\), the finite-volume spin measure \(\text{Spin}_{D,a,b,c}^\tau\) on the domain \(D\) with boundary conditions \(\tau\), is supported on spin configurations that satisfy the ice rule and coincide with \(\tau\) at all faces outside of \(D\) and is defined by:

\[
\text{Spin}_{D,a,b,c}^\tau(\sigma) = \frac{1}{Z_{\text{spin},a,b,c}} \cdot a^{n_1(\sigma)+n_2(\sigma)+n_3(\sigma)+n_4(\sigma)} e^{\gamma_5(\sigma)+n_5(\sigma)+n_6(\sigma)},
\]

where \(Z_{\text{spin},a,b,c}\) is a normalizing constant and \(n_i(\sigma)\) is the number of vertices of \(D\) that are of type \(i\) according to Figure 2 up to a global spin flip.

When \(\tau\) has a constant value at all even faces and a (possibly different) constant value at all odd faces, the spin measure is denoted by \(\text{Spin}_{D,a,b,c}^{\tau+}\), \(\text{Spin}_{D,a,b,c}^{\tau-}\), \(\text{Spin}_{D,a,b,c}^{\tau+}\), or \(\text{Spin}_{D,a,b,c}^{\tau-}\), where the first sign in the superscript stands for the value on even faces and the second sign stands for the value on odd faces.
A measure Spin on $\mathcal{E}_{\text{spin}}(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ is called a Gibbs state for the spin representation with parameters $a, b, c > 0$ if the following holds: Let $\sigma$ be sampled from Spin. For any domain $\mathcal{D}$, conditioned on the values of $\sigma$ on the faces outside of $\mathcal{D}$, the distribution of $\sigma$ equals $\text{Spin}^\tau_{\mathcal{D},a,b,c}$, where $\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{spin}}(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ is an arbitrary configuration which agrees with $\sigma$ outside of $\mathcal{D}$. Let $\mathcal{G}_{a,b,c}^{\text{spin}}$ denote the set of all extremal Gibbs states that are invariant under parity-preserving translations.

In the next theorem, we study the Gibbs states of the spin representation. For $a + b = c$, we construct a measure $\text{Spin}_{a,b,c} \in \mathcal{G}_{a,b,c}^{\text{spin}}$ and show that it is unique under some restrictions. For $a + b < c$, we construct four distinct measures (push-forwards of height measures $HF^{n,n+1}_{a,b,c}$ for different values of $n$) and show that, under these measures, the correlations of spins at faces of the same parity are uniformly positive.

**Theorem 3** (Gibbs states: spin representation).

1) Let $a, b, c > 0$ satisfy $a + b = c$. There exists a measure $\text{Spin}_{a,b,c} \in \mathcal{G}_{a,b,c}^{\text{spin}}$ with the following properties:

- For any sequence of domains $\{\mathcal{D}_k\}$ increasing to $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and any $\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{spin}}(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ which is constant on either the even or odd faces, the sequence of finite-volume measures $\text{Spin}^\tau_{\mathcal{D}_k,a,b,c}$ converges to $\text{Spin}_{a,b,c}$.

- The measure $\text{Spin}_{a,b,c}$ is invariant under all translations.

- Samples from $\text{Spin}_{a,b,c}$ exhibit no infinite cluster of faces having the same parity and the same spin (here two faces of the same parity are considered adjacent if they share a vertex), almost surely.

- Every element of $\mathcal{G}_{a,b,c}^{\text{spin}}$ different from $\text{Spin}_{a,b,c}$ must exhibit at least one infinite cluster of each of the four types — even pluses, even minuses, odd pluses, odd minuses.

2) Let $a, b, c > 0$ satisfy $a + b < c$. For each $s, t \in \{-, +\}$ and sequence of domains $\{\mathcal{D}_k\}$ increasing to $\mathbb{Z}^2$, the sequence of finite-volume measures $\text{Spin}^s_{\mathcal{D}_k,a,b,c}$ converges to a Gibbs state $\text{Spin}^s_{a,b,c} \in \mathcal{G}_{a,b,c}^{\text{spin}}$ which does not depend on $\{\mathcal{D}_k\}$. The four limiting measures are distinct. Moreover, the measure $\text{Spin}^s_{\mathcal{D}_k,a,b,c}$ satisfies the following properties:

- Samples from $\text{Spin}^s_{a,b,c}$ exhibit a unique infinite cluster of even faces with sign $s$ and a unique infinite cluster of odd faces with sign $t$, almost surely.

- There exists $M > 0$ such that, for any faces $u$ and $v$ of the same parity,

$$\text{Spin}^s_{a,b,c}(\sigma(u)\sigma(v)) > M.$$
Theorem 4 (Positive association: spin representation). Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a domain and consider $\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{spin}}(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ that is equal to 1 at all odd faces outside of $\mathcal{D}$. Take $a, b, c > 0$ such that $a, b \leq c$. Then the marginal of $\text{Spin}_{\mathcal{D}, a, b, c}$ on $\sigma^*$ satisfies the FKG inequality, so that, for any increasing events $A, B \subset \{-1, 1\}^{F^*(\mathbb{Z}^2)}$, one has

$$\text{Spin}_{\mathcal{D}, a, b, c}(A \cap B) \geq \text{Spin}_{\mathcal{D}, a, b, c}(A) \cdot \text{Spin}_{\mathcal{D}, a, b, c}(B).$$

Remark. The restriction to constant boundary conditions for the spins at odd faces is essential — the FKG inequality may fail if the boundary conditions assign mixed signs to odd faces.

The FKG inequality established in Theorem 4 should be put in analogy with a similar property established for other models: [11, Proposition A.1] (XY model), [12, Lemma 1] (Ashkin–Teller model), [20, Proposition 8] and [31, Theorem 2.6] (loop $O(n)$ model). In particular, the result in [12], via the mapping between the spin representation and the standard Ashkin–Teller model described in Section 8 (see also [36] for the case of the infinite-coupling limit Ashkin–Teller model) allows to derive Theorem 4 when $c/a = c/b \geq \sqrt{2}$. Also, the proof of Theorem 4 is closely related to that of [31, Theorem 2.6].

The spin representation of the six-vertex model was considered already by Rys [59]. In the terminology of [36], it can be called an infinite-coupling limit mixed Ashkin–Teller model. The term ‘mixed’ refers to the fact that the spin configurations $\sigma^*$ and $\sigma^\circ$ are defined on two lattices that are dual to each other, while in the standard Ashkin–Teller model both spin configurations are defined on the same lattice (see Section 2.4). The term ‘infinite-coupling limit’ refers, in our case, to the the ice rule constraint.

We refer the interested reader to the upcoming work of Lis [46] where the FKG inequality is established in the case of two interacting Potts models, and to the work by Owczarek and Baxter [48] where a more general Temperley–Lieb interactions model is introduced.

### 2.3 Orientations of edges in the six-vertex model

In this section, we state an immediate consequence of Theorem 3 for the six-vertex model in its classical representation in terms of edge-orientations. As stated in the introduction, a six-vertex configuration on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ is an orientation of the edges of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ that satisfies the ice-rule at every vertex (two incoming and two outgoing edges); see Figure 1. Given a six-vertex configuration $\vec{\tau}$ on $\mathbb{Z}^2$, the finite-volume six-vertex measure $\text{SixV}_{E, a, b, c}$ on a finite subset of edges $E \subset E(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ with boundary conditions $\vec{\tau}$, is supported on six-vertex configurations that coincide with $\vec{\tau}$ at all edges outside of $E$ and is defined by:

$$\text{SixV}_{E, a, b, c}(\vec{\omega}) = \frac{1}{Z_{\text{SixV}, E, a, b, c}} a^{n_1(\vec{\omega}) + n_2(\vec{\omega})} b^{n_3(\vec{\omega}) + n_4(\vec{\omega})} c^{n_5(\vec{\omega}) + n_6(\vec{\omega})},$$

where $n_i(\vec{\omega})$ denotes the number of endpoints of edges in $E$ at which the six-vertex configuration $\vec{\omega}$ is of type $i$ (see Figure 1) and where $Z_{\text{SixV}, E, a, b, c}$ is the partition function.

Gibbs states are defined in the standard way. Our analysis classifies Gibbs states of a certain form (these are expected to be the only Gibbs states for which the associated height function has zero slope but that is not proved here).
Corollary 2.1 (Gibbs states: six-vertex model). A Gibbs state is termed ‘flat’ if in a configuration sampled from that state, almost surely, there are infinitely many disjoint oriented circuits of alternating vertical and horizontal edges surrounding the origin.

1. When \( a + b < c \), there are exactly two extremal flat Gibbs states. Both these states are invariant under parity-preserving translations and differ from each other by a global edge-orientation flip. Moreover, in each of these states, the orientation of each edge has a non-uniform distribution.

2. When \( a + b = c \), the six-vertex model has a unique flat Gibbs state. This state is extremal and invariant under all translations.

We remark that, when \( a + b < c \), extremality and the symmetry breaking established in Corollary 2.1 imply that if two edges are far enough from each other, then the correlation of their orientations is uniformly positive, in the sense that, with probability strictly bigger than one half, for both of them the even face next to them is on the same side. However, unlike in Theorem 3 for the spin representation, this is not established for nearby edges.

2.4 Ashkin-Teller model

Originally, the model was introduced [2] as a generalization of the Ising model to a four-component system. The definition in terms of two coupled Ising models that we provide below is due to Fan [26].

We consider the Ashkin–Teller model on the square grid. It will be convenient to work not with \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) itself but with the graph \((\mathbb{Z}^2)^\bullet\) on even faces of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) with edges linking diagonally adjacent faces (this graph is also a square lattice). Let \( \Omega \) be a subgraph of \((\mathbb{Z}^2)^\bullet\) and \( J, U > 0 \) be two parameters. The Ashkin–Teller measure is supported on pairs of spin configurations \((\tau, \tau') \in \{1, -1\}^{V(\Omega)} \times \{1, -1\}^{V(\Omega)}\) and is defined by

\[
\text{AT}_{\Omega,J,U}(\tau, \tau') = \frac{1}{Z_{\Omega,J,U}} \cdot \exp \left[ \sum_{uv \in E(\Omega)} J(\tau(u)\tau(v) + \tau'(u)\tau'(v)) + U\tau(u)\tau(v)\tau'(u)\tau'(v) \right],
\]

where \( Z_{\Omega,J,U} \) is a normalizing constant and the sum is taken over all edges in \( \Omega \). The reason for this choice of lattices is the coupling between the Ashkin–Teller model on \((\mathbb{Z}^2)^\bullet\) and the six-vertex model on \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) (Proposition 8.1), where

\[
\tau \tau' = \sigma^*;
\]

and the parameters satisfy the following relations:

\[
\sinh 2J = e^{-2U}, \quad a = b = 1, \quad c = \coth 2J.
\]

The first equation describes the self-dual curve of parameters for the Ashkin–Teller model and was first found by Mittag and Stephen [47] (see Figure 4). The relation between the Ashkin–Teller and the eight-vertex model was noticed already by Fan [26] and then made explicit by Wegner [66] (see also [40, Section III]). In the particular case given by (3), this turns into a correspondence between the Ashkin–Teller and the six-vertex model (see
Figure 4: Conjectured phase diagram of the Ashkin–Teller model. The self-dual curve \( \sinh 2J = e^{-2U} \) is in bold: when \( J > U \), it is critical; when \( J < U \), it is expected to be not critical (dashed) and split into two critical curves dual to each other (no conjecture for their exact location). Phase I: \( \tau, \tau', \tau \tau' \) are ferromagnetically ordered. Phase II: \( \tau, \tau', \tau \tau' \) are disordered. Phase III: \( \tau \tau' \) is ferromagnetically ordered, while \( \tau, \tau' \) are disordered. Phase IV: \( \tau \tau' \) is antiferromagnetically ordered, while \( \tau, \tau' \) are disordered. The line \( U = J \) (dotted) corresponds to the 4-Potts model. The line \( U = 0 \) corresponds to the double-Ising model.

The novelty of our work is that this correspondence is described explicitly (Section 8) as a coupling of these two models with their FK–Ising representation that we introduce (Section 7.1), thus allowing to use one model to derive results about the other. We note that Ikhlef and Rajabpour [37] conjectured that the interface in a related graphical representation converges to SLE(4, \( \sqrt{g - 1} \), \( \sqrt{g - 1} \)) in the scaling limit, where \( g \in [0, 4] \) and satisfies \( 2 \sin(g \pi/8) = \coth 2J \).

Let \( \Omega_k \) be the subgraph of \((\mathbb{Z}^2)^*\) spanned on the vertices \((i, j) \in [-k - 1, k + 1] \times [-k - 1, k + 1] \). Define \( \mathcal{A}_{\Omega_k, J, U}(\tau, \tau') \) to be the Ashkin–Teller measure condition on the event that \( \tau = \tau' \) at all boundary vertices of \( \Omega_k \).

In the next theorem, we show that on the self-dual curve when \( J < U \), correlations in \( \tau \) and \( \tau' \) decay exponentially (disordered regime) while correlations in the product \( \tau \tau' \) are uniformly positive (ordered regime); see Figure 4.

**Theorem 5.** Let \( J, U > 0 \) be such that \( \sinh 2J = e^{-2U} \) and \( J < U \). Then, the sequence of measures \( \mathcal{A}_{\Omega_k, J, U} \) has a weak limit that is translation-invariant and ergodic. Denote it by \( \mathcal{A}_{J, U} \). Then, there exist \( C, \alpha > 0 \) such that, for any two vertices \( u, v \) of \((\mathbb{Z}^2)^*\),

\[
\mathcal{A}_{J, U}^f(\tau(u)\tau'(u)\tau(v)\tau'(v)) \geq C, \quad (4) \\
\mathcal{A}_{J, U}^f(\tau(u)\tau(v)) = \mathcal{A}_{J, U}^f(\tau'(u)\tau'(v)) \leq e^{-\alpha|u-v|}. \quad (5)
\]

This theorem is in agreement with the predicted [39, 16] phase diagram of the Ashkin–Teller model (see also [36, Section 5] for a recent survey with explicit computations). More precisely, it is natural to look on the transition when changing the parameters along the
lines when \( J/U \) is constant. When \( J > U \), it has recently been shown by Raoufi \[55\] that a sharp phase transition occurs at the self-dual curve in a sense that the correlations of \( \tau \), \( \tau' \) and \( \tau \tau' \) decay exponentially fast in the distance when \( \sinh 2J < e^{-2U} \) and stay uniformly positive when \( \sinh 2J > e^{-2U} \) (the proof uses a monotonic random-cluster representation developed in \[54\] and a general approach \[24\] allowing to show sharpness for monotonic measures). The critical behavior is understood only at \( J = U = \frac{1}{3} \log 3 \) (critical 4-state Potts model) where all correlations are known to have power-law decay \[25\] and at \( J = \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \sqrt{2}) \), \( U = 0 \) (two independent critical Ising models) where correlations in \( \tau \) and \( \tau' \) decay as \( |u - v|^{1/4} \) \[63\] \[14\].

When \( J/U \) is small enough, it is known \[53\] \[34\] that there exist three phases — a disordered phase, an ordered phase and an intermediate phase when \( \tau \) and \( \tau' \) are disordered but \( \tau \tau' \) is ordered. This intermediate phase is absent when \( J > U \) and it is conjectured to be non-trivial for all \( J < U \). We believe this conjecture to be true and our Theorem \[5\] strongly supports it as it shows that the part of the self-dual curve \( \sinh 2J = e^{-2U} \) when \( J < U \) is indeed in this intermediate phase. However, our results do not show that the intermediate phase extends beyond the self-dual curve.

The following corollary is a straightforward consequence of the positive association of the six-vertex model established in Theorem \[4\] and the coupling between the six-vertex and the Ashkin–Teller models described in Proposition \[8.1\].

**Corollary 2.2.** For any \( k \), the marginal of the measure \( AT^{\Omega_{k,J,U}}_{\hat{f}^+} \) on the product of the spins \( \tau \tau' \) is positively associated.

### 2.5 Monotonicity in the boundary coupling constant

To simplify the notation, this section is restricted to the case \( a = b = 1 \).

We call a subgraph \( \mathcal{D} \) of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) a *domain of fixed parity* if there exists a simple cycle \( \partial_E \mathcal{D} \) consisting of alternating vertical and horizontal edges of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \), such that \( \mathcal{D} \) coincides with the graph defined by vertices and edges surrounded by \( \partial_E \mathcal{D} \) (including \( \partial_E \mathcal{D} \) itself). Denote by \( \partial_{\text{ext}} \mathcal{D} \) (and call it the *exterior boundary* of \( \mathcal{D} \)) the set of faces in \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \mathcal{D} \) that are adjacent to faces in \( \mathcal{D} \). If \( \mathcal{D} \) is a domain of fixed parity, then all faces in \( \partial_{\text{ext}} \mathcal{D} \) are of the same parity, and depending on it we call \( \mathcal{D} \) an *even domain* or an *odd domain*. Denote by \( \partial_\mathcal{D} \) the set of vertices belonging to exactly one face of \( \mathcal{D} \); see Figure \[5\].

Given a domain \( \mathcal{D} \) of fixed parity, denote by \( HF_{\mathcal{D},c}^{0.1;\alpha} \) a product-measure on the height functions equal to \( 0 \) and \( 1 \) at even (resp. odd) faces outside of \( \mathcal{D} \), where each \( c \)-type vertex on Fig. \[2\] receives weight \( c_b \) if it is on the boundary \( \partial_\mathcal{D} \) and \( c \) if it is any other vertex of \( \mathcal{D} \). More precisely, \( HF_{\mathcal{D},c}^{0.1;\alpha} \) is defined by

\[
HF_{\mathcal{D},c}^{0.1;\alpha}(h) = \frac{1}{Z_{\mathcal{D},c}^0} e^{w(h)} c_b^{w_b(h)},
\]

where \( Z_{\mathcal{D},c}^0(\mathcal{D}) \) is a normalizing constant, \( w(h) \) and \( w_b(h) \) denote the number of vertices in \( \mathcal{D} \setminus \partial_\mathcal{D} \) (resp. \( \partial_\mathcal{D} \)) around which equal heights are assigned to diagonally adjacent faces.

It is well-known that the height-function measure is positively associated when \( c \geq 1 \) (see \[6\] Proposition 2.2 and Proposition \[5.1\] below). This property implies monotonicity with respect to the boundary coupling constant \( c_b \).
Figure 5: Left: Even domain $D$. The edge-boundary $\partial_E D$ is in bold. Marked boundary vertices are those with coupling constant $c_b$. Faces of exterior boundary $\partial_{ext} D$ are shown in gray. Boundary conditions are 0, 1. Right: A sample of a random-cluster configuration on the square grid (rotated by $45^\circ$). Open edges of the configuration are shown in black, closed edges are dashed, dual edges are in gray. Here $k_b = 9$ (nine boundary clusters) and $k_i = 4$ (four non-boundary clusters).

Proposition 2.3 (Monotonicity in $c_b$: heights). Let $D$ be an even domain. Take any $c \geq 1$ and $c_b, c_b' \in [0, \infty]$, such that $c_b \leq c_b'$. Then,

\[ HF^{0,1}_{D \setminus \partial_V D, c} \leq HF^{0,1}_{D, c} \leq HF^{0,1}_{D \setminus \partial_{ext} D, c}, \]

where $D \setminus \partial_V D$ denotes the graph obtained from $D$ after removing all vertices $\partial_V D$ together with edges incident to them.

Similarly, the FKG inequality stated in Theorem 4 for the marginals of the spin representation on the even and the odd sublattices, implies that these marginals are stochastically ordered in $c_b$. More precisely, let $Spin_{D,c}^{c_b}$ be supported on the set of spin configurations on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ that are equal to +1 outside of $D$ and defined by

\[ Spin_{D,c}^{c_b}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{Z_{\text{spin},c}(D)} c_b^{w_b(\sigma)} w_c(\sigma), \]

where $Z_{\text{spin},c}(D)$ is a normalizing constant, $w(\sigma)$ and $w_b(\sigma)$ denote the number of vertices inside $D \setminus \partial_V D$ (resp. $\partial_V D$) around which equal spins are assigned to diagonally adjacent faces.

Proposition 2.4 (Monotonicity in $c_b$: spins). Let $D$ be an odd domain. Take any $c \geq 1$ and $c_b, c_b' \in [0, \infty]$, such that $c_b \leq c_b'$. Then, for any increasing event $A \subset \{1, -1\}^{F^*(D)}$, one has

\[ Spin_{D,c}^{c_b}(A) \leq Spin_{D,c}^{c_b'}(A). \]

2.6 FK model with a modified boundary-cluster weight

A random-cluster model with a different weight $q_b \in [1, q]$ for boundary clusters appears natural, since we show that it is coupled with the six-vertex model (see Theorem 7). We also hope that this model is of an independent interest, since it allows to interpolate
between free and wired boundary conditions. Indeed, following our work, this generalization was recently used in [57] to give a short proof of the discontinuity of the phase transition for $q > 4$.

Let $\Omega$ be a subgraph of a square lattice and let $E(\Omega)$ denote the set of edges in $\Omega$. Given a configuration $\eta \in \{0,1\}^{E(\Omega)}$, we call an edge $e \in E(\Omega)$ open if $\eta(e) = 1$ and closed if $\eta(e) = 0$. Thus, each configuration $\eta$ can be viewed as a subset of $E(\Omega)$ given by the set of open edges in $\eta$; see Figure 5.

Given $q, q_b > 0$ and $p \in [0,1]$, the random-cluster measure $\text{RC}_{\Omega,q,p}^{q_b}$ is supported on $\eta \in \{0,1\}^{E(\Omega)}$ and is defined by
\[
\text{RC}_{\Omega,q,p}^{q_b}(\eta) := \frac{1}{Z_{\text{RC},\Omega,q,p}^{q_b}} \cdot q^{k_b(\eta)} q_b^{k(\eta)} p^{o(\eta)} (1 - p)^{c(\eta)},
\] (10)
where $Z_{\text{RC},\Omega,q,p}^{q_b}$ is a normalizing constant, $k_b(\eta)$ denotes the number of boundary clusters of $\eta$ (i.e. connected components containing at least one boundary vertex), $k(\eta)$ denotes the number of the interior (i.e. non boundary) clusters, $o(\eta)$ denotes the number of open edges in $\eta$, and $c(\eta)$ denotes the number of closed edges in $\eta$.

In the classical definition of the random-cluster measure due to Fortuin and Kasteleyn [27] (see also [34, Section 1.2]), one does not distinguish between boundary clusters and interior clusters. The boundary conditions are defined only by merging (wiring) certain boundary vertices, thus influencing the count of boundary clusters. If all boundary vertices are wired together, the boundary conditions are called wired, and if there is no wiring, the boundary conditions are called free. It is easy to see that $q_b = 1$ corresponds to the wired boundary conditions, $q_b = q$ corresponds to the free boundary conditions, and the measures $\text{RC}_{\Omega,q,p}^{q_b}$ with different values of $q_b \in [1,q]$ thus interpolate between wired and free boundary conditions (see Proposition 4.1 below).

In [5] (see also [23, 24] for alternative proofs), it was shown that when $q \geq 1$ the random-cluster model undergoes a phase transition at $p_c(q) := \sqrt{\frac{q}{q-1}}$ in terms of the correlation length — independently of the boundary conditions, the model exhibits exponential decay of the size of clusters when $p < p_c(q)$, and the origin is connected to any distance with a uniformly positive probability when $p > p_c(q)$. In particular, for all $p \neq p_c(q)$, the infinite-volume limit does not depend on the boundary conditions.

We focus on the critical case $p = p_c(q)$. Here it was shown that the free and wired measures are the same [23] when $q \in [1,4]$, and different [18, 57] when $q > 4$. This raises a natural question — when $q > 4$, what is the limit for each particular value of $q_b \in [1,q]$? In the next theorem, we partially answer it.

**Theorem 6.** i) Let $q > 4$ and $\lambda > 0$ be such that $\sqrt{q} = e^\lambda + e^{-\lambda}$. Take any sequence $\Omega_k$ of increasing domains. Then

- for all $q_b \in [1,e^{-\lambda}\sqrt{q}]$, the limit of $\text{RC}_{\Omega_k,q,p_c(q)}^{q_b}$ is the same and is equal to the wired random-cluster Gibbs measure;
- for all $q_b \in [e^\lambda\sqrt{q}, q]$, the limit of $\text{RC}_{\Omega_k,q,p_c(q)}^{q_b}$ is the same and is equal to the free random-cluster Gibbs measure.

ii) When $q \in [1,4]$, the infinite-volume limit of $\text{RC}_{\Omega_k,q,p_c(q)}^{q_b}$ is the same, for any $q_b \in [1,q]$, and is equal to the unique random-cluster Gibbs measure.

It is reasonable to expect that the limiting measure is wired for all $q_b \in [1,\sqrt{q})$ and free for all $q_b \in (\sqrt{q}, q]$.
2.7 Overview of the proofs for \( a = b = 1 \)

The special case \( a = b \) is called the \( F \)-model and was first considered by Rys \cite{59} (apparently named after Rys’ advisor Fierz \cite{29, 61}). A crucial tool in our analysis is a coupling introduced by Baxter–Kelland–Wu (BKW) \cite{4}, extending an earlier partition function relation by Temperley–Lieb \cite{65}. BKW described a coupling of the random-cluster model on a finite planar graph \( G \) with a six-vertex model on the medial graph of \( G \). We apply the coupling for domains in \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \), on which the random-cluster model is coupled to the F-model with the choice of parameters

\[
q = (c^2 - 2)^2, \quad p = p_c(q) := \frac{\sqrt{q}}{\sqrt{q+1}}.
\]

This choice leads to a critical random-cluster model; the value of \( p_c(q) \) at which the phase transition occurs was computed in \cite{5} (see also \cite{23, 24} for alternative proofs). The coupling allows to make use of recent results establishing the order of the phase transition in the random-cluster model with coupling constants depending on \( \sigma \) on even faces and \(-\) otherwise. The latter should be viewed as a pair of spin configurations: \( \sigma^0 \) on odd faces and \( \sigma^1 \) on even faces. Similarly to the standard Ashkin–Teller model, the distribution of \( \sigma^1 \) given a particular realization of \( \sigma^0 \) is that of the Ising model (with coupling constants depending on \( \sigma^0 \)). Positive association of \( \sigma^1 \) for all \( c \geq 1 \) stated in
Theorem 4 is then derived from the positive association of the partition function of the Ising model.

More precisely, in the proof of Theorem 4, we consider the FK representation of the Ising model. Averaging over all configurations $\sigma^*$, we obtain an edge-representation of the six-vertex model that we call an FK–Ising representation (related to a random-cluster representation of the Ashkin–Teller model introduced in [54]). As in the standard FK representation of the Ising model, two points connected to each other by a path of edges must be assigned the same spin, and otherwise they are assigned spin plus or minus independently. Connectivity properties of the FK–Ising representation of the six-vertex model are analyzed using Theorem 2 and this proves Theorem 3 for $c > 2$.

The proof of Theorem 3 for $c = 2$ uses the positive association of the marginals of the spin representation shown in Theorem 4 and a version of the BKW coupling that we develop in Theorem 7. This version allows to consider the six-vertex model with the standard weight $c$ given also to the boundary vertices and results in a modified random-cluster model, in which connected components touching the boundary receive the cluster weight $q_b$, satisfying the relation

$$q = q_b + \frac{q}{q_b}.$$ 

This coupling is then used in the opposite direction to derive from Theorem 2 some properties of this modified random-cluster model for $q > 4$ stated in Theorem 6. The BKW coupling further allows assignment of different edge-weights to different edges and this is used to treat the case $a \neq b$ (see Section 2.8).

Finally, we use the FK–Ising representation of the six-vertex model to describe a coupling between the six-vertex and the Ashkin–Teller models and transfer results from the former to the latter. In particular, we show that the FK–Ising representation is positively associated and has a unique infinite cluster (follows from Theorem 2). This implies that the product of spins $\tau \tau'$ is ordered. Since the spins $\tau$ and $\tau'$ of the Ashkin–Teller model are obtained by assigning spins plus or minus uniformly at random to the dual clusters of the FK–Ising representation, it remains to show these clusters are exponentially small. By a general non-coexistence theorem ([24, Theorem 1.5]), all dual clusters are finite. An exponential decay of their sizes is then derived from the BKW coupling and an exponential decay of dual clusters in the critical wired random-cluster measure for $q > 4$.

### 2.8 Extension to the case $a \neq b$

Though the proofs below address only the case $a = b = 1$, they can be adapted to the general case in a straightforward manner using the result of Duminil-Copin, Li, and Manolescu [22] that extends previously known results for the critical random-cluster model on the square lattice to the case of isoradial graphs. For our purposes, it is enough to consider the self-dual (critical) random-cluster model on a rectangular lattice. In this case, on vertical and horizontal edges parameters $p_v^c$ and $p_h^c$ (depending on $q$) satisfy

$$\frac{p_v^c}{1 - p_v^c} \cdot \frac{p_h^c}{1 - p_h^c} = q.$$ 

(11)

Then, [22, Theorem 1.1] implies that, for $q \in [1, 4]$, the phase transition is of the second order and one has Russo–Seymour–Welsh estimates on crossings (see item iv in Proposition 4.1), and [22, Theorem 1.2] implies that, for $q > 4$, the phase transition is of the
first order and the wired infinite-volume measure exhibits a unique infinite cluster and exponential decay of dual clusters.

Coupling between the six-vertex and the random-cluster models stated in Theorem 7 can be shown along the same lines, one just needs to adjust the choice of parameters:

\[ q := -2\Delta + 2, \quad p^v := \frac{a\sqrt{q}}{a\sqrt{q} + b}, \quad p^h := \frac{b\sqrt{q}}{b\sqrt{q} + a}. \]

It is easy to check that these parameters indeed satisfy the self-duality relation (11). The value of \( \lambda \) is (up to a sign flip) defined by

\[ \cosh \lambda = -\Delta, \]

the values of \( q_b \) and \( c_b \) are then chosen in the same way as in Theorem 7 and the values of \( a \) and \( b \) on the boundary in the second item of Theorem 7 are taken to be equal to 1.

In the FK–Ising-type representation \( \xi \) introduced in Section 7.2, the probability of an edge \( e \not\in \omega(\sigma^\bullet) \cup \theta(\sigma^\circ) \) to be open in \( \xi \) will be equal either \( \frac{c-b}{c} \) or \( \frac{c-a}{c} \) depending on the type of \( e \) (‘vertical’ or ‘horizontal’ in the random-cluster interpretation).

Importantly, our proof that \( \xi \) is FKG (Proposition 7.4) applies only to the case when \( 2a \leq c \) and \( 2b \leq c \). We use this FKG inequality in Section 8 only in the symmetric case \( a = b = 1 \). We do not know whether the FKG inequality holds in the whole region of parameters \( a + b \leq c \), however the FKG lattice condition does fail when \( 2a > c \) or \( 2b > c \).

The rest of the arguments rely only on translation-invariance and apply as written.

3 Coupling between the six-vertex and the random-cluster models

The correspondence between the six-vertex and the random-cluster models is known since the seminal paper by Temperley and Lieb [65] and was described geometrically by Baxter, Kelland, and Wu [4] (BKW). While in the original paper [4], the parameters of the six-vertex model on the boundary are different from those inside the domain, here we extend the statement to the setup when the parameters are the same inside the domain and on its boundary. Following our work, this extension of the coupling was already used in [57] to provide a new proof of the first-order phase transition in the random-cluster model with \( q > 4 \). We note that, in the case of a torus, the coupling is detailed in [18, Section 3.3].

We start by introducing the graphs where the random-cluster model will be defined. Let \( D \) be a domain. Recall that \( \partial_E D \) denotes the circuit formed by boundary edges of \( D \), and \( \partial_{\text{ext}} D \) denotes the set of faces in \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus D \) that are adjacent to faces in \( D \). For every face \( u \in \partial_{\text{ext}} D \) and every vertex \( z \) on \( \partial_E D \) belonging to \( u \), we call the pair \( (u, z) \) a corner of \( D \). The corner \( (u, z) \) is called even or odd depending on the parity of \( u \).

Consider a graph on the set of all even faces and corners of \( D \) by drawing edges according to the rule:

- any two even faces of \( D \) having a common vertex are linked by an edge;
- even corner \( (u, z) \) and even face \( v \) of \( D \) are linked by an edge if \( z \in v \);
• even corners \((u, z)\) and \((v, z')\) of \(D\) are linked by an edge if \(z = z'\).

In this graph, we identify every two corners \((u, z)\) and \((u, z')\) such that \(zz'\) is an edge of \(D\). The resulting graph is denoted by \(D^\bullet\). All faces of \(D^\bullet\) are of degree four and are in bijection with odd faces of \(D\). Also, if one merges together corners of \(D\) corresponding to the same face, one obtains from \(D^\bullet\) a subgraph of a square lattice. Graph \(D^\circ\) is defined in the same way on odd faces and corners of \(D\); see Figure 6.

By the definition, edges of \(D^\bullet\) and \(D^\circ\) are in bijection with vertices of \(D\). Given a vertex \(z\) of \(D\), denote the edges of \(D^\bullet\) and \(D^\circ\) corresponding to it by \(e_z\) and \(e_z^*\). For any edge configuration \(\eta \in \{0, 1\}^{E(D^\bullet)}\), the dual configuration \(\eta^* \in \{0, 1\}^{E(D^\circ)}\) is defined by:

\[
\forall e \in E(D^\bullet) \quad \eta(e) = 1 - \eta^*(e^*).
\]

Every height function \(h\) can be considered as a function on vertices of \(D^\bullet\) and \(D^\circ\) by setting \(h(u, z) := h(u)\), for every corner \((u, z)\) of \(D\).

We say that a height function \(h \in E_{nf}^{0, 1}(D)\) is compatible with an edge-configuration \(\eta \in \{0, 1\}^{E(D^\bullet)}\) and write \(\eta \perp h\), if it has a constant value at every cluster of \(\eta\) and \(\eta^*\) (primal and dual clusters); see Figure 7. We say that cluster \(C\) of \(\eta\) and cluster \(C^*\) of \(\eta^*\) are adjacent, and denote this by \(C \sim C^*\), if there exist \(u \in C\) and \(u^* \in C^*\) that share a vertex.

For two adjacent clusters \(C\) and \(C^*\), we write \(C \prec C^*\) if \(C\) is surrounded by \(C^*\).

Recall the height-function measures \(HF_{D^\bullet, c}\) and \(HF_{D^\circ, c}\) defined in Sections 2.1 and 2.5, the random-cluster measure \(RC_{D^\bullet, q, p}\) defined in Section 2.6, and that \(p_c(q) := \sqrt{q}/\sqrt{q+1}\).

**Theorem 7.** 1) Let \(D\) be a domain and \(\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\). Take

\[
c = e^{\lambda/2} + e^{-\lambda/2}, \quad q = [e^\lambda + e^{-\lambda}]^2, \quad q_b = e^{-\lambda} \sqrt{q}.
\]
Then, the measures $HF^0_{D,c}$ and $RC^q_{D*,q,p_c(q)}$ can be coupled in such a way that the joint law is supported on pairs of compatible configurations $(h, \eta)$ and can be written in any of the following two ways:

$$
P_{\text{cluster}}(h, \eta) \propto \exp \left[ \lambda \sum_{C \subset C^*} (h(C^*) - h(C))(-1)^{c \prec C^*} \right], \quad (12)
$$

$$
P_{\text{edge}}(h, \eta) \propto \exp \left[ \frac{\lambda}{4} \sum_{uv \in D^*} (h(u^*) + h(v^*) - h(u) - h(v))(-1)^{\perp uv \eta} \right], \quad (13)
$$

where in (12), vertices $u^*$ and $v^*$ are the endpoints of the edge $(uv)^*$.  

2) If $D$ is an even domain, then the same holds for $HF^0_{D,c}$ and $RC^q_{D*,q,p_c(q)}$ when

$$
c = e^{\lambda/2} + e^{-\lambda/2}, \quad c_b = e^{\lambda/2}, \quad q = [e^{\lambda} + e^{-\lambda}]^2.
$$

**Proof.** 1) We write $P_{hf}$ and $P_{RC}$ instead of $HF^0_{D,c}$ and $RC^q_{D*,q,p_c(q)}$ for brevity. To prove the claim, it is enough to show that $P_{\text{edge}}(h, \eta) = P_{\text{cluster}}(h, \eta)$ and that:

$$
\forall h \in E^0_{hf}(D) \quad \sum_{\eta \perp h} P_{\text{edge}}(h, \eta) = P_{hf}(h) \quad (14)
$$

$$
\forall \eta \in \{0, 1\}^{E(D^*)} \quad \sum_{h \perp \eta} P_{\text{cluster}}(h, \eta) = P_{RC}(\eta). \quad (15)
$$

Relation (14) follows immediately. Indeed, summing $P_{\text{edge}}$ over all edge configurations compatible with $h$, one obtains that every vertex of $D$ contributes $e^{\lambda/2} + e^{-\lambda/2} = c$ if the corresponding four heights agree on diagonals, and it contributes 1 otherwise. This coincides with the definition of $P_{hf}(h)$.

We now show (15). The height at the unique boundary cluster $C^*$ of $\eta^*$ equals 1 and the height at every boundary cluster $C$ of $\eta$ equals 0, whence the contribution of each such pair $(C, C^*)$ to the LHS of (15) equals $e^{-\lambda} = q_b / \sqrt{q}$. All height functions $h$ compatible with $\eta$ can be obtained by exploring the adjacency graph of clusters of $\eta$ and $\eta^*$ starting from the boundary and at each step choosing independently whether the height is increasing or decreasing by one. Thus, every non-boundary cluster of $\eta$ and $\eta^*$ contributes $e^\lambda + e^{-\lambda} = \sqrt{q}$ to the LHS of (15). Substituting this in (15), we get

$$
\sum_{h \perp \eta} P_{\text{cluster}}(h, \eta) \propto \sqrt{q}^{k_b(\eta)} \lambda^{k_b(\eta)} \left( \frac{q_b}{\sqrt{q}} \right) = \sqrt{q}^{k(\eta^*) - k(\eta) - 1} q_b^{k(\eta)} q_b^{k(\eta)} = \left( \frac{p_c(q)}{1 - p_c(q)} \right)^{o(\eta) - |V(D^*)|} q^{k_b(\eta)} q_b^{k_b(\eta)} \propto P_{RC}(\eta),
$$

where in the first line we use that $k_b(\eta) = k(\eta) - k_b(\eta)$ and $k_b(\eta^*) = k(\eta) - 1$; in the second line we used the identity $k(\eta^*) - k(\eta) - 1 = o(\eta) - |V(D^*)|$ (follows from Euler’s formula and can be checked by induction in $o(\eta)$) and the fact that $\sqrt{q} = \frac{p_c(q)}{1 - p_c(q)}$.

It remains to show that (13) and (12) describe the same probability measure. For any pair of adjacent non-boundary clusters $C$ and $C^*$ that satisfy $C \prec C^*$ and any height function $h$ compatible with $\eta$ and such that $h(C) - h(C^*) = 1$, define $h_{C,C^*}$ on the faces
of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) such that \( h_{C^*}(\cdot) = h(\cdot) - 2 \) on \( C \) and its interior, and \( h_{C^*}(\cdot) = h(\cdot) \) outside of \( C \). It is immediate that

\[ P_{\text{cluster}}(h_{C^*}, \eta) = e^{-2\lambda P_{\text{cluster}}(h, \eta)}. \]

We now prove that the same is true for \( P_{\text{edge}} \), see Figure 7 for an illustration. The edges of \( D \) separating \( C \) from \( C^* \) form a cyclic path \( \ell \) of alternating vertical and horizontal edges that does not visit twice the same edge (but can visit twice the same vertex of \( D \)). Consider the difference between the expression in (13) computed for \( h_{C^*} \), and for \( h \):

\[
\Delta_{C^*} : = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{uv \in D^*} (h_{C^*}(u^*) + h_{C^*}(v^*) - h_{C^*}(u) - h_{C^*}(v))(-1)^{uv \notin \eta} \quad (16)
- \frac{1}{4} \sum_{uv \in D^*} (h(u^*) + h(v^*) - h(u) - h(v))(-1)^{uv \notin \eta}.
\]

Only edges of \( D^* \) corresponding to vertices on \( \ell \) have a non-zero contribution to \( \Delta_{C^*} \):

- if \( z \) has degree 2 in \( \ell \), then \( e_z \) contributes \( \lambda/2 \) if \( e_z \in \eta \) and \(-\lambda/2 \) if \( e_z^* \in \eta^* \);
- if \( z \) has degree 4 in \( \ell \), then \( e_z \) contributes \( \lambda \) if \( e_z \in \eta \) and \(-\lambda \) if \( e_z^* \in \eta^* \).

Going along \( \ell \) in a clockwise direction, we obtain that every left turn occurs at an edge of \( \eta \) (and contributes \( \lambda/2 \) to \( \Delta_{C^*} \)) and every right turn occurs at an edge of \( \eta^* \) (and contributes \(-\lambda/2 \) to \( \Delta_{C^*} \)). Since \( \ell \) is a non-self-intersecting curve oriented clockwise, it has 4 more right turns than left turns, whence \( \Delta(h_{C^*}, \ell) = -2\lambda \) and

\[ P_{\text{edge}}(h_{C^*}, \eta) = e^{-2\lambda P_{\text{edge}}(h, \eta)}. \]

The operation \( h \mapsto h_{C^*} \) can be described analogously when \( C^* \) is surrounded by \( C \). The combination of such operations can bring any height function \( h \in \mathcal{E}_{b,1}^0(D) \) to the 0, 1 height function that is equal to 0 at all even faces and to 1 at all odd faces. Since we showed that this operation has the same effect on \( P_{\text{edge}} \) and \( P_{\text{cluster}} \), it is enough to show
that the two probability measures are equal when \( h \) is a 0, 1 height function. In the latter case, we have:

\[
P_{\text{cluster}}(h, \eta) \propto \exp \left[ \lambda \sum_{C \sim C^*} (-1)^{1_{C \prec C^*}} \right] = \exp \left[ \lambda (k(\eta^*) - k(\eta) - 1) \right],
\]

\[
P_{\text{edge}}(h, \eta) \propto \exp \left[ \frac{\lambda}{4} \sum_{u,v \in \partial D} 2(-1)^{1_{uv \not\in \eta}} \right] = \exp \left[ \frac{\lambda}{2} (\sigma(\eta) - c(\eta)) \right].
\]

By Euler’s formula, the right-hand sides of the above equations are the same up to a constant and this finishes the proof.

2) The second item is a straightforward consequence of the first item when one conditions all boundary edges to be open (where an edge of \( \partial D \) is a boundary edge if its endpoints are corners of \( D \)). Indeed, this sets wired boundary conditions for the random-cluster and the contribution of the boundary edges to (14) equals \( e^{\lambda/2} = c_b \).

Since height functions are in correspondence with spin configurations (see Section 2.2), the coupling with the random-cluster model can also be stated for the spin representation. Similar to above, we say that a spin configuration \( \sigma \in E^{++}_{\text{spin}}(D) \) and an edge-configuration \( \eta \in \{0, 1\}^{\partial D} \) are compatible if \( \sigma \) is constant at each cluster of \( \eta \) and \( \eta^* \).

**Corollary 3.1.** In the notation of Theorem 7, measures \( \text{Spin}^{++}_{D,c} \) and \( \text{RC}^{\eta}_{D^*,q,p_c(q)} \) (and measures \( \text{Spin}^{+\cdot\lambda/2}_{D,c} \) and \( \text{RC}^1_{D^*,q,p_c(q)} \) if \( D \) is even) can be coupled in such a way that the joint law is supported on pairs of compatible configurations \((\sigma, \eta)\) and can be written in either of the following ways:

\[
P_{\text{cluster}}(\sigma, \eta) \propto \exp \left[ \lambda \sum_{C \sim C^*} \sigma(C)\sigma(C^*)(-1)^{1_{C \prec C^*}} \right], \tag{17}
\]

\[
P_{\text{edge}}(\sigma, \eta) \propto \exp \left[ \frac{\lambda}{4} \sum_{u,v \in \partial D} (\sigma(u)\sigma(u^*) + \sigma(v)\sigma(v^*))(-1)^{1_{uv \not\in \eta}} \right]. \tag{18}
\]

For \( c = 2 \), the coupling becomes a uniform measure.

**Corollary 3.2.** 1) Measures \( \text{HF}^{0,1}_{D,2} \) and \( \text{RC}^2_{D^*,4,p_c(4)} \) can be coupled in such a way that the joint law is a uniform measure on pairs \((h, \eta)\) of compatible configurations. In particular, the distribution of the height at a particular face \( u \) of \( D \) according to \( \text{HF}^{0,1;\lambda}_{D,2} \) is that of a simple random walk that starts at 0, at each step goes up or down by 1 uniformly, and makes in total as many steps as there are clusters of \( \eta \) and \( \eta^* \) surrounding \( u \), where \( \eta \) is distributed according to \( \text{RC}^2_{D^*,4,p_c(4)} \).

If \( D \) is an even domain, the same holds for measures \( \text{HF}^{0,1;\lambda}_{D,2} \) and \( \text{RC}^1_{D^*,4,p_c(4)} \).

2) Similarly, measures \( \text{Spin}^{++}_{D,2} \) and \( \text{RC}^1_{D^*,4,p_c(4)} \) can be coupled in such a way that the joint law is a uniform measure on pairs \((\sigma, \eta)\) of compatible configurations; and the same for \( \text{Spin}^{+\cdot1}_{D,2} \) and \( \text{RC}^1_{D^*,4,p_c(4)} \) if \( D \) is an even domain.
4 Input from the random-cluster model

In this section, we discuss some fundamental properties of the random-cluster model $\text{RC}^q_{\Omega,q,p}$ introduced in Section 2.6 with a priori different weights $q_b$ and $q$ for boundary and non-boundary clusters. These properties are derived in a straightforward manner from the known results on the standard random-cluster model — classical results are described in [34], and the relevant recent results were established in [5, 25, 18].

Denote by $\text{RC}^\text{wired}_{\Omega,q,p}$ and $\text{RC}^\text{free}_{\Omega,q,p}$ the standard random-cluster measures on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ with wired and free boundary conditions. As defined above,

$$p_c(q) = \frac{\sqrt{q}}{\sqrt{q} + 1}.$$  

Define a partial order on $\{0, 1\}^{E(\Omega)}$ as follows: $\eta \preceq \eta'$ if $\eta(e) \leq \eta'(e)$ for any $e \in E(\Omega)$. An event $A \subset \{0, 1\}^{E(\Omega)}$ is called increasing if its indicator is an increasing function with the respect to this partial order. For two measures $\mu$ and $\nu$ on $\{0, 1\}^{E(\Omega)}$, one says that $\mu$ stochastically dominates $\nu$ and writes $\mu \succeq \nu$, if $\mu(A) \geq \nu(A)$, for any increasing event $A$.

**Proposition 4.1.** Let $q \geq 1$, $p \in [0, 1]$, $q_b \in [1, q]$, and $\Omega$ be a finite subgraph of $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

i) One has $\text{RC}^1_{\Omega,q,p} = \text{RC}^\text{wired}_{\Omega,q,p}$ and $\text{RC}^q_{\Omega,q,p} = \text{RC}^\text{free}_{\Omega,q,p}$. In particular, as $\Omega \not\subset \mathbb{Z}^2$, the infinite-volume limits $\text{RC}^1_{q,p}$ and $\text{RC}^q_{q,p}$ are well-defined and coincide with the wired and free random-cluster Gibbs measures.

ii) Let $q' \geq 1$, $q'_b \in [1, q]$, $p' \in [0, 1]$ satisfy $q' \geq q$, $q'_b \geq q_b$ and $p' \leq p$. Then,

$$\text{RC}^{q'_b}_{\Omega,q',p'} \succeq \text{RC}^{q_b}_{\Omega,q,p}.$$  

iii) Let $p \neq p_c(q)$ and $\Omega_k$ be a sequence of domains increasing to $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Then the infinite-volume limit of $\text{RC}^{q_b}_{\Omega_k,q,p}$ exists, is independent of $q_b$ and coincides with the unique random-cluster Gibbs measure with parameters $q, p$ that we denote by $\text{RC}^{q}_{q,p}$.

iv) The statement of item iii) holds true also if $q \in [1, 4]$ and $p = p_c(q)$. Also, the following Russo–Seymour–Welsh (RSW) type estimate holds for any vertex $u \in \Omega$ and some constants $c, C > 0$ independent of $\Omega$:

$$c \log \text{dist}(u, \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \Omega), < E_{\text{RC}^{q_b}_{\Omega,q,p}}(N_\Omega) < C \log \text{dist}(u, \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \Omega),$$  

(19)

where $N_\Omega$ is the number of connected components surrounding $u$.

v) Let $q > 4$. Then, under $\text{RC}^1_{\Omega,q,p_c}$, the size of any dual cluster has exponential tails. In particular, $\text{RC}^1_{q,p_c}$-a.s. there exists a unique infinite cluster and, under $\text{RC}^q_{q,p_c}$, the sizes of clusters exhibit exponential decay.

**Proof.** i) When $q_b = q$, all clusters receive the same weight. There is no imposed connectivity on the boundary. Thus, this value of $q_b$ corresponds to free boundary conditions.

When $q_b = 1$, the number of boundary clusters has no influence on the distribution. This is equivalent to counting all of them as one cluster. Thus, this value of $q_b$ corresponds to wired boundary conditions.
In the same as for the standard random-cluster model ([34, Theorem (3.21)]), the statement follows from the FKG inequality shown below in Proposition 4.2. Alternatively, one can derive it by checking the Holley’s criterion directly (see [57]).

By [34, Theorem (6.17)] and item i), for any $q \geq 1$ and $p \neq \sqrt{q} / \sqrt{q+1}$, measures $RC^{1}_{\Omega,q,p}$ and $RC^{q}_{\Omega,q,p}$ have the same limit, as $k$ tends to infinity. By item ii), for any $q_b \in [1, q]$,

$$RC^{1}_{\Omega,q,p} \geq RC^{q_b}_{\Omega,q,p} \geq RC^{q}_{\Omega,q,p},$$

whence the claim follows.

By [5], when $q \geq 1$, the random-cluster model exhibits a phase transition at $p = p_c(q)$ (see also [23, 24] for alternative proofs). It was shown [25] that, when $q \in [1, 4]$, the phase transition is of the second order. In particular, this means that the Gibbs measure is unique. In the same way as in item iii), this implies that the limit of $RC^{q_b}_{\Omega,q,p}$ is independent of $q_b \in [1, q]$.

The estimate (19) is a standard consequence of the RSW theory developed in [25]. We provide only a sketch of the proof. It is enough to consider only $q_b = q$, since for $q_b = 1$ the proof is completely analogous and then the statement can be extended to any $q_b \in (1, q]$ by monotonicity shown in Item ii). The key of the argument is the following claim that allows to bound $N_{\Omega}$ from above and below by Bernoulli random variables with different parameters. To see how the estimate (19) follows from the claim, we refer the reader to the proof of [31, Theorem 1.2 (v)]. The only difference is that in our case one has two type of clusters — primal and dual. However, since Claim 1 takes care of both of them, this does not have any impact on the proof.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $u = 0$.

Claim 1. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{open}}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\text{closed}}$ be the events that there exists a circuit of open (resp. closed) edges in $\Omega \setminus \Lambda_{\text{rad}(\Omega)/2}$ that goes around 0. Then there exists a constant $c' > 0$ not depending on $\Omega$ such that we have

$$c' < RC^{1}_{\Omega,q,p_c}(\mathcal{E}_{\text{closed}}) < 1 - c' \quad \text{and} \quad c' < RC^{q}_{\Omega,q,p_c}(\mathcal{E}_{\text{open}}) < 1 - c'.$$

Proof. Inequalities for $\mathcal{E}_{\text{closed}}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\text{open}}$ are completely analogous, so we will show only the first one. The lower bound follows readily from the box-crossing property established in Theorems 2 and 3 of [25] for $q \in [1, 4]$ under any boundary conditions. The upper bound is also a rather straightforward consequence of the Russo–Seymour–Welsh theory but it is less standard so we prefer to give details below.

Let $r := \text{dist}(0, \Omega^c)$. Let $\mathcal{F}_1$ be the event that there exists a circuit of open edges contained in $\Lambda_{r/2} \setminus \Lambda_{r/4}$ and going around 0. Let $\mathcal{F}_2$ be the event that there exists an open path linking two different points on the boundary of $\Omega$ and passing through $\Lambda_{r/4}$. Since $\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{closed}} = \emptyset$, it is enough to show that there exists $c' > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{RC,\Omega,q,p_c}(\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2) > c'.$$

Events $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ are increasing, thus it is enough to show the statement for each of them separately. By the definition of $r$, there exists vertex $z \in \Lambda_{r+1}$ that belongs to the boundary of $\Omega$. Then $RC^{1}_{\Omega,q,p_c}(\mathcal{F}_2)$ is greater or equal than the probability to have an
open circuit going around \( z \) and crossing \( \Lambda_{r/4} \) under \( \text{RC}_{q,p_c} \) (the unique infinite-volume measure). The latter, as well as \( \text{RC}_{\Omega,q,p_c}(\mathcal{F}_1) \), can be bounded below as explained in the beginning of the proof.

\( v \) This is shown in [13] (see also [57] for a recent short proof).

It is well-known that when \( q \geq 1 \), the standard random-cluster model is positively associated ([34, Theorem (3.8)]). Below we show this for the FKG inequality for heights, proof of Proposition 2.3.

**Proposition 4.2** (FKG inequality). Let \( q \geq 1, p \in [0,1], q \in [1,q] \) and \( \Omega \) be a subgraph of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \). Then \( \mathbb{P}_{\text{RC},q,p} \) for any two increasing events \( A, B \) one has:

\[
\text{RC}_{q,p}^q(A \cap B) \geq \text{RC}_{q,p}^q(A) \cdot \text{RC}_{q,p}^q(B).
\]

**Proof.** We write \( \mathbb{P} \) instead of \( \text{RC}_{q,p}^q \) for brevity. By [34, Theorem (2.19)], it is enough to show that \( \mathbb{P} \) satisfies the FKG lattice condition, and by [34, Theorem (2.22)] it is sufficient to consider only pairs of configurations that differ on exactly two edges. In this case, the lattice conditions take the form:

\[
\mathbb{P}(\eta^f) \mathbb{P}(\eta^e) \geq \mathbb{P}(\eta^f) \mathbb{P}(\eta^e),
\]

where \( e, f \in E(\Omega), \eta \in \{0,1\}^{E(\Omega)} \), all four configurations \( \eta^f, \eta^e, \eta^f, \eta^e \) agree with \( \eta \) on \( E(\Omega) \setminus \{e, f\} \), \( e \in \eta^f \cap \eta^e, f \in \eta^f \cap \eta^e, e \notin \eta^f \cup \eta^e, f \notin \eta^f \cup \eta^e \).

The term counting number of edges cancels out in (20) and it remains to take care of the number of clusters. We are going to use the following notation:

\[
\Delta_i(e) = k_i(\eta^e) - k_i(\eta^e), \quad \Delta_i(f) = k_i(\eta^f) - k_i(\eta^f), \quad \Delta_i(e, f) = k_i(\eta^{ef}) - k_i(\eta^{ef});
\]

\[
\Delta_b(e) = k_b(\eta^e) - k_b(\eta^e), \quad \Delta_b(f) = k_b(\eta^f) - k_b(\eta^f), \quad \Delta_b(e, f) = k_b(\eta^{ef}) - k_b(\eta^{ef}).
\]

In this notation, we need to show that:

\[
\log q \cdot (\Delta_i(e) + \Delta_i(f) - \Delta_i(e, f)) + \log q_b \cdot (\Delta_b(e) + \Delta_b(f) - \Delta_b(e, f)) \geq 0.
\]

It is easy to see that \( \Delta_i(e) + \Delta_i(f) - \Delta_i(e, f) \geq 0 \). Also, \( \Delta_i(e) + \Delta_b(f) - \Delta_b(e, f) \geq -1 \), because if \( \Delta_b(e, f) = 2 \), then each of \( e \) and \( f \) connects two different boundary clusters. Using the inequalities \( q \geq 1 \) and \( q_b \in [1,q] \), it is then enough to show that \( \Delta_b(e) + \Delta_b(f) - \Delta_b(e, f) = -1 \) implies \( \Delta_i(e) + \Delta_i(f) - \Delta_i(e, f) \geq 1 \).

Indeed, assume that \( \Delta_b(e) + \Delta_b(f) - \Delta_b(e, f) = -1 \). Then \( \Delta_b(e, f) = 1, \Delta_b(e) = 0, \Delta_b(f) = 0 \). This means that clusters in \( \eta^e \) containing endpoints of \( e \) and \( f \) can be denoted by \( C_1, C_2, C_3 \), so that: \( e \) connects \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \); \( f \) connects \( C_2 \) and \( C_3 \); \( C_1 \) and \( C_3 \) are boundary clusters; \( C_2 \) is an interior cluster. Clearly, in this case \( \Delta_i(e) + \Delta_i(f) - \Delta_i(e, f) = 1 \) and the proof is finished.

\[\square\]

5 FKG for heights, proof of Proposition 2.3

In this section we prove monotonicity of the height-function measure \( \text{HF}_{p,c}^{0,1} \) in \( c_b \) stated in Proposition 2.3. Naturally, this statement is tightly linked to the positive association property (FKG inequality) satisfied by the height-function measure. We include the proof of this FKG inequality for completeness. Proposition 2.3 then follows from it in a standard way by taking a derivative in \( c_b \).
**Proposition 5.1.** Let $D$ be a domain of fixed parity. Take $c \geq 1$, $c_b \geq 0$. Then, $HF_{D,c}^{0,1,c_b}$ satisfies the FKG inequality: for any increasing events $A, B$ on $Z^D$, one has

$$HF_{D,c}^{0,1,c_b}(A \cap B) \geq HF_{D,c}^{0,1,c_b}(A)HF_{D,c}^{0,1,c_b}(B).$$

**Proof.** For shortness we will write $P$ instead of $HF_{D,c}^{0,1,c_b}$. By Proposition 1, it is enough to check for any two height functions $f, g$ on $D$ with $0,1$ boundary conditions that the FKG lattice condition is satisfied:

$$P(f \lor g) \cdot P(f \land g) \geq P(f) \cdot P(g),$$

where $f \lor g$ and $f \land g$ denote the point-wise maximum and minimum respectively. We start the proof by the following claim.

**Claim.** If $f(u) > g(u)$ for some $u \in F(D)$, then on all four faces adjacent to $u$ we have that $f \lor g$ coincides with $f$ and $f \land g$ coincides with $g$.

**Proof.** Functions $f$ and $g$ must have the same parity at $u$. Thus, $f(u) > g(u)$ implies that $f(u) - g(u) \geq 2$. Take any face $v$ adjacent to $u$. Since $f, g$ are height functions, $|f(u) - f(v)| = 1$ and $|g(u) - g(v)| = 1$. Thus, $f(b) \geq g(b)$. \hfill $\square$

Note that the Claim implies that, on any two adjacent faces $u, v$ in $D$, each of the functions $f \lor g$ and $f \land g$ coincides either with $f$ or with $g$ (or with both of them). We know that $|f(u) - f(v)| = 1$ and $|g(u) - g(v)| = 1$. Thus, the same holds for $f \lor g$ and $f \land g$, and hence these two functions are also height functions.

It remains to show for any vertex $z$ of $D$ that its contribution to the LHS of (21) is greater or equal than to the RHS of (21). Denote by $(u_i)_{i=1,2,3,4}$ the four faces of $D$ containing $z$ (in this cyclic order). If $z$ contributes 1 to $P(f)$ and $P(g)$, then the statement is trivial since $c \geq 1$. Thus, we can assume that $f(u_1) = f(u_3)$, and $f(u_2) = f(u_4)$. Then, similarly to the Claim above, we have that on $(u_i)_{i=1,2,3,4}$ either $f \lor g$ coincides with $f$ and $f \land g$ coincides with $g$, or vice versa. In either case, the contribution of $z$ to both sides of (21) is the same. \hfill $\square$

**Proof of Proposition 2.3.** Recall that $\sigma_{h}^{0,1}(D)$ is the set of all height functions on $D$ with $0,1$ boundary conditions. Let $A$ be any increasing event on $\sigma_{h}^{0,1}(D)$. We need to show that the derivative of $HF_{D,c}^{0,1,c_b}(A)$ in $c_b$ is non-negative. Define $Z$ and $Z(A)$ by

$$Z := Z_{h}^{0,1,c_b} = \sum_{f \in \sigma_{h}^{0,1}(D)} e^{w_f} c_b^{w_b(f)} \quad \text{and} \quad Z(A) := \sum_{f \in A} e^{w_f} c_b^{w_b(f)}.$$

Then $HF_{D,c}^{0,1,c_b}(A) = Z(A)/Z$, and its derivative in $c_b$ can be written as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial c_b} HF_{D,c}^{0,1,c_b}(A) = \frac{1}{Z} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial c_b} Z(A) - \frac{Z(A)}{Z} \cdot \frac{1}{Z} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial c_b} Z = \frac{1}{c_b} \left[ E(w_b 1_A) - E(w_b) E(1_A) \right],$$

where $E$ denotes the expectation with respect to $HF_{D,c}^{0,1,c_b}$.

Random variable $w_b$ is equal to the number of vertices $z \in \partial \nu D$, such that the unique face of $D$ containing $z$ has height 1. Since the height at these faces can be either 1 or $-1$,
the variable \( w_b \) is increasing. Thus, the RHS of the last equality is positive by the FKG inequality (Proposition 5.1).

This implies the second inequality of the claim and the rest follows, since

\[
HF_{D_\partial D,e}^{0,1:0} = HF_{D_\partial D,e}^{0,1:0} \quad \text{and} \quad HF_{D_\partial D,e}^{0,1:0} = HF_{D_\partial D,e}^{0,1:0}.
\]

\( \square \)

Remark. It follows from the proof that varying \( c_b \) from 0 to \( \infty \) allows to continuously interpolate between 0, -1 and 0, 1 boundary conditions.

6 Proof of Theorems 1, 2, 6

Throughout this section we assume that \( a = b = 1 \) and \( c \geq 2 \). The proofs can be adapted to the general case \( a + b \leq c \) in a straightforward way (see Section 2.8).

6.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Let \( D \) be a domain. Define \( D^{\text{even}} \) and \( D^{\text{odd}} \) as the domains obtained from \( D \) by removing from \( D \) all its boundary faces that are even (resp. odd). It is easy to see that \( D^{\text{even}} \) is an even domain and \( D^{\text{odd}} \) is an odd domain.

Take the unique \( \lambda \geq 0 \), such that \( e^{\lambda/2} + e^{-\lambda/2} = c \). The following comparison inequalities follow from Proposition 2.3 or can be obtained along the same lines:

\[
HF_{D,e}^{0,1,1/2} \leq HF_{D^{\text{even}},e}^{0,1,1/2} \leq HF_{D,e}^{0,1,1/2} \leq HF_{D^{\text{odd}},e}^{0,1,1/2} \leq HF_{D,e}^{2,1}.
\] (22)

Since \( HF_{D,e}^{2,1} \) is the image of \( HF_{D,e}^{0,1,1/2} \) under the bijection \( h(\cdot) \mapsto h(\cdot) + 2 \) between \( \mathcal{E}_{h_{\beta}}^{0,1} \) and \( \mathcal{E}_{h_{\beta}}^{2,1} \), it is enough to prove Theorem 1 for measures \( HF_{D^{\text{even}},e}^{0,1,1/2} \) and \( HF_{D^{\text{odd}},e}^{0,1,1/2} \).

We prove the statement only for \( D^{\text{even}} \) (the case of \( D^{\text{odd}} \) is analogous) and, to simplify the notation, we assume that \( D \) is an even domain, so that \( D^{\text{even}} = D \). Note that

\[
\text{Var}_{HF}(h^2(0,0)) = \mathbb{E}_{HF}(h^2(0,0)) - [\mathbb{E}_{HF}(h(0,0))]^2,
\]

where the variance and the expectation are with respect to the height-function measure \( HF_{D,e}^{0,1,1/2} \). Since \( \mathbb{E}_{HF}(h(0,0)) \in [0, 1] \) by (22), it is enough to estimate \( \mathbb{E}_{HF}(h^2(0,0)) \).

Take \( q := (e^{\lambda} + e^{-\lambda})^2 \). For an edge-configuration \( \eta \) on \( D^* \), denote the number of primal and dual clusters of \( \eta \) surrounding the origin \((0,0)\) by \( N(\eta) \). By the coupling stated in Theorem 7, given \( \eta \) sampled according to \( RC_{\mathcal{H}^q,q;\beta}(q) \), the height at the origin is distributed as a simple random walk on \( \mathbb{Z} \) starting at 0, making \( N(\eta) \) steps and at each step going up or down by 1 with probability \( e^{\lambda}/\sqrt{q} \) (resp. \( e^{\lambda}/\sqrt{q} \)), whence

\[
\mathbb{E}_{HF}(h^2(u)) = \mathbb{E}_{RC}(\mathbb{E}_{\text{coupling}}(h^2(u) \mid \eta)) = \mathbb{E}_{RC}(\text{Var}_{\text{coupling}}(h(u) \mid \eta) + \mathbb{E}_{\text{coupling}}(h(u) \mid \eta)^2)
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_{RC}(N_u(\eta)) \cdot 4 + \mathbb{E}_{RC}(N_u(\eta)^2) \cdot (e^{\lambda} - e^{-\lambda})^2.
\]

If \( c = 2 \), then \( \lambda = 0 \) and \( q = 4 \), whence the second term cancels out and the first term is treated in Item iv) of Proposition 4.1. If \( c > 2 \), then \( q > 4 \) and by Item v) of Proposition 4.1, the size of any dual cluster in \( \eta \) has exponential tails. In particular, it means that \( RC_{\mathcal{H}^q,q;\beta}(q)(N_u(t) > t) < e^{-\alpha t} \), for a certain constant \( \alpha > 0 \) depending only on \( q \), whence the statement follows. \( \square \)
6.2 Proof of Theorem 2

The main step in the proof is Proposition 6.1, which is proven by considering percolation on faces of particular heights. This is somewhat reminiscent to the approach used in [60]. However, we emphasize that unlike in [60], here we consider percolation on a suitable triangular lattice ($\mathbb{T}^*$ and $\mathbb{T}^e$ defined below). The latter has a benefit of being self-dual and we hope that this approach will turn out to be useful in the future research.

**Proposition 6.1.** Fix $c > 2$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $D_k$ be an increasing sequence of domains exhausting $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Then the weak limit of the sequence of measures $HF_{D_k,c}^{n,n+1}$ exists. Denote this limit by $HF_{c}^{n,n+1}$. Then, $HF_{c}^{n,n+1}$ is extremal and invariant under parity-preserving translations. Moreover, $HF_{c}^{n,n+1}$-a.s. faces of height $n$ contain an infinite cluster (in the diagonal connectivity) with exponentially small holes; and the same holds for faces of height $n + 1$.

The first step is to prove a similar statement under modified boundary conditions.

**Lemma 6.2.** Let $c > 2$. Take $\lambda > 0$ such that $e^{\lambda/2} + e^{-\lambda/2} = c$. Let $D_k$ be an increasing sequence of even domains exhausting $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Then, the weak limit of $HF_{D_k,c}^{0,1,e^{\lambda}/2}$ exists. Denote this limit by $HF_{even,c}^{0,1,e^{\lambda}/2}$. Then, $HF_{even,c}^{0,1,e^{\lambda}/2}$ is extremal and invariant under parity-preserving translations. Moreover, $HF_{even,c}^{0,1,e^{\lambda}/2}$-a.s. faces of height 0 contain an infinite cluster (in the diagonal connectivity) with exponentially small holes.

Similarly, for odd domains. The limit $HF_{odd,c}^{0,1,e^{\lambda}/2}$ exhibits an infinite cluster of height 1.

**Proof.** We prove the statement only for even domains, since the case of odd domains is completely analogous. As was already mentioned above, the centers of even faces of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ form another square lattice that we denote by $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$.

Take $q := (2^2 - 2)^2$. Let $RC_q^1$ be the wired infinite-volume random-cluster measure on $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$ with parameters $q$ and $p_c(q) := \frac{\sqrt{q}}{\sqrt{q} + 1}$. By Item v) of Proposition 4.1, $RC_q^1$-a.s. there is a unique infinite cluster and the size of dual clusters has exponential tails, that is there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$RC_q^1(\exists \text{ dual cluster of size } > k) < e^{-\alpha k}. \quad (23)$$

Define a random height function $h$ in the following way: sample $\eta \in \{0, 1\}^{E((\mathbb{Z}^2)^*)}$ according to $RC_q^1$, set $h$ to be 0 on the unique infinite cluster of $\eta$, then sample $h$ in the holes of this cluster according to $[12]$ in Theorem 7 for $c_b = e^{\lambda/2}$ and $q_b = 1$. Denote by $HF_{even,c}^{0,1,e^{\lambda}/2}$ the distribution of $h$.

Note that measure $HF_{even,c}^{0,1,e^{\lambda}/2}$ is well-defined since the values of $h$ in different holes of $\eta$ are independent (conditioned on $\eta$) and the size of each hole has exponential tails. Properties of $HF_{even,c}^{0,1,e^{\lambda}/2}$ (extremality, invariance under parity-preserving translations and existence of an infinite cluster of height 0) follow from the corresponding properties of $RC_q^1$ (extremality, invariance under all translations and existence of an infinite cluster). It remains to show that $HF_{D_k,c}^{0,1,e^{\lambda}/2}$ tends to $HF_{even,c}^{0,1,e^{\lambda}/2}$.

Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$ and take $n$ big enough so that $e^{-\alpha n} < \varepsilon$.

Recall the definition of $D^*$ for a domain $D$ given in Section 3. Since $RC_{D^*,q}^1$ tends $RC_q^1$, there exists $K > 0$ such that $D_K \supset A_{4n}$ and, for all $k > K$, the total variation distance
between the restriction of $RC^1_{q}$ and $RC^1_{D^*_q}$ to $\Lambda^*_n$ is less than $\varepsilon$. Fix any $k > K$. Define $C_{n,k}$ to be the exterior-most circuit of open edges in $\eta$ contained in $\Lambda^*_n$ that goes around $\Lambda^*_n$ (take $C_{n,k} := \emptyset$ if no such circuit exists).

Using the estimate on the total variation distance we get that

$$\sum_C |RC^1_q(C_{n,k} = C) - RC^1_{q,D^*_q}(C_{n,k} = C)| < \varepsilon,$$

where the sum is taken over all circuits $C \subset \Lambda^*_n \setminus \Lambda^*_n$.

Also note that by (23) we have

$$RC^1_{q,D^*_k}(C_{n,k} \subset \eta, C_{n,k} \leftrightarrow \partial D^*_k) > 1 - 2e^{-\alpha n} > 1 - 2\varepsilon, \quad \text{for} \quad (\text{odd}) \text{-} \text{even}$$

$$RC^1_{q,C_{n,k} \subset \eta, C_{n,k} \leftrightarrow \infty) > 1 - 2e^{-\alpha n} > 1 - 2\varepsilon. \quad \text{for} \quad \text{even} - \text{odd}$$

If $\eta$ satisfies conditions in (25) and (26), then given $C_{n,k}$ the heights on $\Lambda_n$ sampled according to $HF^{0,1,e^{\lambda/2}}_{\text{even},c}$ and $HF^{0,1,e^{\lambda/2}}_{\text{odd},c}$ have the same law. Putting this together with the estimates (24), (25) and (26) we get that the total variation distance between restrictions of $HF^{0,1,e^{\lambda/2}}_{\text{even},c}$ and $HF^{0,1,e^{\lambda/2}}_{\text{odd},c}$ to $\Lambda_n$ is less than $5\varepsilon$, whence convergence follows.

As we will show below, measures $HF^{0,1,e^{\lambda/2}}_{\text{even},c}$ and $HF^{0,1,e^{\lambda/2}}_{\text{odd},c}$ are in fact equal. The next step in the proof of Proposition 6.1 is to establish certain percolation statements for the faces of height 1 under $HF^{0,1,e^{\lambda/2}}_{\text{even},c}$ and for the faces of height 0 under $HF^{0,1,e^{\lambda/2}}_{\text{odd},c}$.

Denote by $T^*$ (resp. $T^o$) the graph on the even (resp. odd) faces of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, where a face $(i,j)$ is linked by an edge to faces $(i \pm 1, j \pm 1)$ and $(i \pm 2, j)$. It is easy to see that both $T^*$ and $T^o$ are isomorphic to the standard triangular lattice.

For $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, denote by $\Lambda_K(i,j)$ the ball of radius around $(i,j)$:

$$\Lambda_K(i,j) := \{(u,v) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : |(u - i) \pm (v - j)| \leq K - 1\}.$$

Let $C^*_K$ be the exterior-most circuit of height 0 in $\Lambda_K(0,0)$ that surrounds the face $(0,0)$ (take $C^*_K := \emptyset$ if there is no such circuit). Similarly, let $C^1_K$ be the exterior-most circuit of height 1 in $\Lambda_K(1,0)$ that surrounds the face $(1,0)$; see Figure 8.

**Lemma 6.3.** Let $c > 2$. Then, the distribution of $C^1_K$ under $HF^{0,1,e^{\lambda/2}}_{\text{even},c}$ coincides with the distribution of $C^0_K$ under $HF^{0,1,e^{\lambda/2}}_{\text{odd},c}$ shifted by 1 to the right. Also, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$HF^{0,1,e^{\lambda/2}}_{\text{even},c} (C^1_K \text{ surrounds } \Lambda_N(0,0)) \xrightarrow{K \to \infty} 1 \quad \text{ (27)}$$

**Proof.** For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f_k$ be distributed according to $HF^{0,1,e^{\lambda/2}}_{\Lambda_{2k+1}(0,0),c}$. Define $g_k$ by:

$$g_k(i,j) = 1 - f_k(i - 1, j) \quad \text{ (28)}$$

It is straightforward that $g_k$ is supported on height functions and the image of 0,1 boundary conditions under this mapping are again 0,1 boundary conditions, though on a slightly different domain. More precisely, the domain is $1 + \Lambda_{2k+1}(0,0)$, which is the same as $\Lambda_{2k+1}(1,0)$. In conclusion, height function $g_k$ is distributed according to $HF^{0,1,e^{\lambda/2}}_{\Lambda_{2k+1}(1,0),c}$.
Domains $\Lambda_{2k+1}(1,0)$ form a sequence of even domains, whence by Lemma 6.2, the weak limit of $HF_{\Lambda_{2k+1}(1,0),e}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$ is $HF_{\Lambda_{2k+1}(0,0),c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$. Also, by Lemma 6.2, the weak limit of $HF_{\Lambda_{2k+1}(0,0),c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$ is $HF_{\text{odd},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$. Thus, measure $HF_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$ is obtained from $HF_{\text{odd},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$ by the operation described in (28).

Finally, it is easy to see that under the operation (28), circuit $C_{n}^k$ is mapped into circuit $C_{n}^1$. This finishes the proof of the first statement. It remains to show (27), which is equivalent to showing that $HF_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$-a.s. there are infinitely many disjoint $T^\circ$-circuits of height 1 surrounding the origin.

By Lemma 6.2, measure $HF_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$ is extremal. Thus, the $HF_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$-probability to have infinitely many disjoint $T^\circ$-circuits of height 0 surrounding the origin is either 0 or 1. Assume that this probability is 0. By duality between $T^\circ$-circuits of height 1 and infinite $T^\circ$-clusters consisting of faces of height at most $-1$, this implies that

$$HF_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}(F_{\leq -1}^o \text{ contains an infinite } T^\circ \text{-cluster}) = 1, \tag{29}$$

where $F_{\leq -1}^o$ denotes the set of faces of odd height which is smaller or equal to $-1$. By Lemma 6.2, measure $HF_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$ is invariant under parity-preserving transformations. Applying the argument of Burton and Keane [9] in the same way as in [10] Theorem 4.9, we obtain that the infinite cluster appearing in (29) is almost surely unique.

Define $HF_{\text{even},c}^{0,-1,\lambda/2}$ as the weak limit of $HF_{\Lambda_{2k},c}^{0,-1,\lambda/2}$ as $k$ tends to infinity (the existence of this limit follows from Lemma 6.2). By (29) and FKG for the heights (Proposition 5.1),

$$HF_{\text{even},c}^{0,-1,\lambda/2}(F_{\leq -1}^o \text{ contains an infinite } T^\circ \text{-cluster}) = 1.$$

Applying transformation $f \mapsto -f$, one gets

$$HF_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}(F_{\geq 1}^o \text{ contains an infinite } T^\circ \text{-cluster}) = 1,$$

where $F_{\geq 1}^o$ denotes the set of faces of odd height which is greater or equal to 1.

Together with (29), the last formula means that $HF_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$-a.s. each of the two sets $F_{\leq -1}^o$ and $F_{\geq 1}^o$ contains a unique infinite $T^\circ$-cluster. Note that the union of the sets $F_{\leq -1}^o$ and $F_{\geq 1}^o$ is the set of all vertices of $T^\circ$ (corresponds to the set of odd faces of the original $\mathbb{Z}^2$ lattice). Since the measure $HF_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$ is extremal and is obtained as the limit of finite-volume measures satisfying the FKG property (Proposition 5.1), it is also FKG. Finally, the set $F_{\geq 1}^o$ is an increasing random variable, hence its distribution under $HF_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$ is also FKG.

In conclusion, the distribution of $F_{\geq 1}^o$ is FKG and in both $F_{\geq 1}^o$ and its compliment there is almost surely a unique infinite cluster. This contradicts [24, Theorem 1.5]. We note that the latter theorem was established for pairs of dual edge-configurations but it adapts in a straightforward manner to the setting of pairs of site-configurations on the triangular lattice used here.

We are now ready to finish the proof of Proposition 6.1.

\textbf{Proof of Proposition 6.1.} Without loss of generality, one can assume that $n = 0$. The main step of the proof is to show that $HF_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2} = HF_{\text{odd},c}^{0,1,\lambda/2}$.  
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Figure 8: The origin is marked with a cross. Left: Height function is sampled from the outside up to $T^0$-circuit $C_1^1$ (orange) — the exterior-most $T^0$-circuit of height 1 contained inside $\Lambda_1(0,0)$ (bounded by the gray contour). Right: Height function is obtained from the one on the left applying a composition of the shift by 1 to the right and operation $h \mapsto 1 - h$. This maps $C_1^1$ to $C_0^1$ (orange) — the exterior-most $T^*$-circuit of height 0 contained inside $\Lambda_1(0,1)$ (in gray). Both: The red contour surrounds domain $D_C$ — the unique connected component in $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus (C_1^1 \cup C_0^1)$ that contains the origin. The left and the right height functions are sampled on $D_C$ independently. Then, the FKG inequality implies that, on $D_C$, the left function stochastically dominates the right function.

Take any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. By Lemma 6.3, there exist $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\text{HF}_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda^{1/2}}(C_1^1 \text{ surrounds } \Lambda_N(0,0)) > 1 - \varepsilon.$$ 

Consider any $T^0$-circuit $C^1$ which surrounds $\Lambda_N(0,0)$ and for which $\text{HF}_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda^{1/2}}(C_1^1 = C_1^1) > 0$. Define $C^0$ as the $T^*$-circuit obtained from $C^1$ after a shift by 1 to the right. Let $D_C$ be the set of faces in the connected component of $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus (C^1 \cup C^0)$ containing $\Lambda_N(0,0)$. Conditioned on the event that $C_K^1 = C^1$, the heights at the faces of the circuit $C^0$ are at least 0, whence

$$\text{HF}_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda^{1/2}}(\cdot | C_1^1 = C_1^1)_{|\Lambda_N(0,0)} \geq \text{HF}_{D_C,c}^{0,1}(\cdot)_{|\Lambda_N(0,0)}. $$

Similarly, conditioned on the event that $C_K^0 = C^0$, the heights at the faces of the circuit $C^1$ are at most 1, whence

$$\text{HF}_{\text{odd},c}^{0,1,\lambda^{1/2}}(\cdot | C_K^0 = C_0^1)_{|\Lambda_N(0,0)} \leq \text{HF}_{D_C,c}^{0,1}(\cdot)_{|\Lambda_N(0,0)}. $$

Let $h^1$ and $h^0$ be height functions sampled according to $\text{HF}_{\text{even},c}^{0,1,\lambda^{1/2}}$ and $\text{HF}_{\text{odd},c}^{0,1,\lambda^{1/2}}$, respectively, that are coupled in such a way that, for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ in the exterior of $C_K^1$, one has

$$h^0((x, y)) = 1 - h^1((x - 1, y)),$$

and the distributions of $h^1$ and $h^0$ on $D_C$ are independent; see Figure 8. Since the value of $C_K^1$ is determined only by the faces on $C_K^1$ and outside of $C_K^1$, such coupling exists. Then, the last two inequalities imply

$$h^1(\cdot | C_K^1 = C_1^1)_{|\Lambda_N(0,0)} \geq h^0(\cdot | C_K^0 = C_0^1)_{|\Lambda_N(0,0)}. $$
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Summing over all circuits $C^1$ (and hence $C^0$), sending $\varepsilon$ to zero and taking arbitrary $N$,

$$\mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{even},c} \geq \mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{odd},c}.$$ 

Now we turn to showing the opposite inequality. Let $\mathcal{D}_k$ be any increasing sequence of even domains exhausting $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Define the sequence $\mathcal{D}_k'$ of odd domains obtained from $\mathcal{D}_k$ after a shift by one to the right. Since $\mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{even},c}$ is the limit of $\mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{even},c}$ and $\mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{odd},c}$ is the limit of $\mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{odd},c}$, it is enough to show that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{even},c} \geq \mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{odd},c}.$$ 

By Proposition 2.3

$$\mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{even},c} \leq \mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{odd},c}.$$ 

Finally, similarly to the above,

$$\mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{odd},c} \leq \mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{odd},c}.$$ 

In conclusion,

$$\mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{even},c} = \mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{odd},c}.$$ 

Hence, for any sequence of even domains $\mathcal{D}_k$, both sequences of measures $\mathrm{HF}^0_{\mathcal{D}_k,c}$ and $\mathrm{HF}^0_{\mathcal{D}_k',c}$ converge and have the same limit that we denote by $\mathrm{HF}^0_{c}$. Then, the limit is independent of the sequence of even domains $\mathcal{D}_k$. Also, by (22), the same holds for any sequence of domains that exhausts $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Properties of $\mathrm{HF}^0_{c}$ follow immediately from Lemma 6.2. 

The following corollary is a straightforward consequence of the convergence proven in Lemma 6.2, the fact that $\mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{even},c} = \mathrm{HF}^0_{\text{odd},c}$ proven in Proposition 6.1 and the monotonicity in $c_b$ established in Proposition 2.3.

**Corollary 6.4.** Let $c > 2$. Then, $\mathrm{HF}_{\mathcal{D}_k,c}$ converges to $\mathrm{HF}^0_{c}$ when $c_b \geq e^{\lambda}/2$, and $\mathrm{HF}_{\mathcal{D}_k,c}$ converges to $\mathrm{HF}^0_{c-1}$ when $c_b \leq e^{-\lambda}/2$.

We are now ready to finish the proof of Theorem 2.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** Fix $c > 2$. Existence and the required properties of the family of extremal Gibbs measures $\{\mathrm{HF}^n_{c,n+1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \subset \mathcal{G}^\text{hl}$ is established in Proposition 6.1. Take any $\mathrm{HF} \in \mathcal{G}^\text{hl}$. It remains to show that $\mathrm{HF} = \mathrm{HF}^n_{c,n+1}$, for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, define the following events:

$$\mathcal{F}_{2n} := \{\exists \text{ infinitely many disjoint } T^\text{c}-\text{circuits of height } 2n \text{ around } (0,0)\},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{2n+1} := \{\exists \text{ infinitely many disjoint } T^\text{h}-\text{circuits of height } 2n + 1 \text{ around } (0,0)\}.$$ 

Since $\mathrm{HF}$ is an extremal measure, we have that $\mathrm{HF}(\mathcal{F}_n) \in \{0,1\}$.

Assume there exist $m,n \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that $m < n$ and $\mathrm{HF}(\mathcal{F}_m) = \mathrm{HF}(\mathcal{F}_n) = 1$. All faces that are adjacent to a face of height $m$ have height at most $m + 1$. Thus $\mathrm{HF}$-a.s.,
there exist infinitely many circuits (in the usual \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) connectivity, even and odd faces are alternating) of height at most \( m + 1 \). By FKG for the heights (Proposition 5.1), this implies that \( \mathcal{HF} \preceq \mathcal{HF}_c^{m,m+1} \). Similarly, \( \mathcal{HF} \succeq \mathcal{HF}_c^{n-1,n} \). Then necessarily \( n = m + 1 \) and \( \mathcal{HF} = \mathcal{HF}_c^{m,m+1} \), which would finish the argument.

Without loss of generality, below we assume that for any \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \),
\[
\mathcal{HF}(\mathcal{F}_{2n}) = 0. 
\]  
(30)
Define the following events:
\[
A_{2n} := \{ \exists \text{ infinite } T^*\text{-cluster of height } \geq 2n \},
\]
\[
B_{2n} := \{ \exists \text{ infinite } T^*\text{-cluster of height } \leq 2n \}.
\]
By (30), for any \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \),
\[
\mathcal{HF}(A_{2n+2} \cup B_{2n-2}) = 1.
\]
Thus, for any \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \)
\[
either \mathcal{HF}(A_{2n+2}) = 1 or \mathcal{HF}(B_{2n-2}) = 1. 
\]  
(31)
Without loss of generality, assume that, for \( n = 0 \), the first alternative in (31) occurs, that is \( \mathcal{HF}(A_2) = 1 \) (the case \( \mathcal{HF}(B_2) = 1 \) is completely analogous). Then, by [24, Theorem 1.5], applied here in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 6.3, \( \mathcal{HF}(B_0) = 0 \). Applying (31) for \( n = 1 \), we obtain that \( \mathcal{HF}(A_4) = 1 \). Continuing in the same way, we obtain \( \mathcal{HF}^1(A_{2n}) = 1 \), for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) (and hence, for all \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \)). This implies that \( \mathcal{HF} \succeq \mathcal{HF}_c^{2n-1,2n} \), for all \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \). This leads to a contradiction, since then, for any \( L \in \mathbb{Z} \),
\[
\mathcal{HF}(h(0,0) < L) \leq \mathcal{HF}_c^{2n-1,2n}(h(0,0) < L) \xrightarrow{L \to \infty} 0. 
\]

6.3 Proof of Theorem 6

Proof. Item ii) of Theorem 6 follows from Item iv) of Proposition 4.1, which is in turn implied by known results for the random-cluster model. It remains to show Item i).

Let \( q > 4 \). By Theorem 7, \( \mathcal{RC}^{e^{-\lambda}q}_{\mathcal{D}_c^q,\mathcal{P}_c(q)} \) can be coupled with \( \mathcal{HF}^{0,1}_{\mathcal{D}_c^q,\mathcal{P}_c(q)} \) and \( \mathcal{RC}^{1}_{\mathcal{D}_c^q,\mathcal{P}_c(q)} \) can be coupled with \( \mathcal{HF}^{0,1(1)\sqrt{q}}_{\mathcal{D}_c^q,\mathcal{P}_c(q)} \). As shown in the proof of Proposition 6.1, sequences of measures \( \mathcal{HF}^{0,1}_{\mathcal{D}_c^q,\mathcal{P}_c(q)} \) and \( \mathcal{HF}^{0,1(1)\sqrt{q}}_{\mathcal{D}_c^q,\mathcal{P}_c(q)} \) have the same limit. Since the coupling rule (13) is completely local, this implies that sequences of measures \( \mathcal{RC}^{e^{-\lambda}q}_{\mathcal{D}_c^q,\mathcal{P}_c(q)} \) and \( \mathcal{RC}^{1}_{\mathcal{D}_c^q,\mathcal{P}_c(q)} \) also have the same limit. By the monotonicity in \( q_b \) established in Proposition 4.1, we get that the limit of \( \mathcal{RC}^{1}_{\mathcal{D}_c^q,\mathcal{P}_c(q)} \) also exists and is equal to \( \mathcal{RC}^{1}_{\mathcal{P}_c(q)} \), for all \( q_b \in [1, e^{-\lambda} \sqrt{q}] \). □

7 Proofs: Theorems 3, 4, Proposition 2.4, Corollary 2.1

Throughout this section we assume that \( a = b = 1 \) (see Section 2.8 for \( a \neq b \)).

The main tools in the proof are the FK–Ising-type representation \( \xi \) introduced in Section 7.2 and the height representation of the six-vertex model.

31
Let $D$ be a domain on $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Recall a pair of dual graphs $D^*$ and $D^\circ$ defined on even and odd faces of $D$ (Section 3). Recall that, for a spin configuration $\sigma$ on $\mathbb{Z}^2$, the restrictions of $\sigma$ to even and odd faces are denoted by $\sigma^*$ and $\sigma^\circ$.

Define $\theta(\sigma^\circ) \subset E(D^\circ)$, such that $uv \in \theta(\sigma^\circ)$ iff $\sigma^\circ(u) \neq \sigma^\circ(v)$. Similarly, for $\theta(\sigma^*) \subset E(D^*)$. Define $\omega(\sigma^\circ) \subset E(D^\circ)$, such that $e \in \omega(\sigma^\circ)$ iff $e^* \in \theta(\sigma^*)$.

7.1 FK–Ising-type representation: item 2 of Theorem 3, Corollary 2.1

The FK–Ising representation of the six-vertex model that we discuss in this section is directly related (see the remark after Proposition 8.1) to the random-cluster representation of the Ashkin–Teller model introduced by Pfister and Velenik [54] and is used in Section 3 to describe the coupling between the two models. For the Ashkin–Teller model, this representation allowed to derive the Lebowitz inequality [13] and the sharpness of the phase transition when $J > U$ [55]. Here we choose to define this representation in terms of the six-vertex model in order to avoid confusion between different models and restrict the appearance of the Ashkin–Teller model to Section 8. We refer the reader to the work of Ray and Spinka [56] and to the upcoming work of Lis [46] where the representations on the primal and the dual lattices are considered simultaneously.

Given $\sigma^*$ and $\sigma^\circ$, define a random edge-configuration $\xi \in \{0,1\}^{E(D^\circ)}$, such that: if $e \in \theta(\sigma^\circ)$, then $\xi(e) = 0$; if $e \in \omega(\sigma^*)$, then $\xi(e) = 1$; if $e \in E(D^\circ) \setminus (\omega(\sigma^*) \cup \theta(\sigma^\circ))$, then $\xi(e) = 1$ with probability $\frac{c-1}{c}$ and $\xi(e) = 0$ with probability $\frac{1}{c}$; see Figure 9. We call $\xi$ the FK–Ising representation of the six-vertex model. Measure $\text{FKIs}_{D^\circ,c}$ is defined as the distribution of $\xi$ when $\sigma$ is distributed according to $\text{Spin}_{D^\circ⁺}^\circ$.

It is easy to see that $\sigma$ has constant value on clusters of $\xi$ and $\xi^\circ$ (in the terminology of Section 3 these two configurations are compatible). In the next lemma, we state further properties of this coupling.

Lemma 7.1. i) The joint law of $\sigma$ and $\xi$ can be written as:

$$ (\sigma, \xi) \propto (c-1)^{|\xi| - |\omega(\sigma^*)|} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma^\circ \perp \xi} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma^* \perp \xi}. $$

ii) Measure $\text{FKIs}_{D^\circ,c}$ can be written in the following way:

$$ \text{FKIs}_{D^\circ,c}(\xi) = \frac{1}{2Z^*} \cdot (c-1)^{|\xi|} |\xi|^{\xi_\perp} \sum_{\sigma^*: \omega(\sigma^*) \subset \xi} \left( \frac{1}{c-1} \right)^{|\omega(\sigma^*)|} \mathbf{1}_{E(D^\circ)} \mathbf{1}_{\theta(\sigma^\circ)} \mathbf{1}_{\theta(\sigma^\circ) \cap \xi = \emptyset}. $$

iii) Let $\xi$ be distributed according to $\text{FKIs}_{D^\circ,c}$. Assign plus to all boundary clusters of $\xi$ and plus or minus with probability $1/2$ independently to all other clusters of $\xi$. Then, the obtained spin configuration has the same distribution as the marginal distribution of $\text{Spin}_{D^\circ⁺}^\circ$ on $\sigma^\circ$.

Proof. i) By the definition of $\xi$, one has

$$ (\sigma, \xi) \propto \text{Spin}_{D^\circ⁺}^\circ(\sigma) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\omega(\sigma^*) \subset \xi} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\theta(\sigma^\circ) \cap \xi = \emptyset} \cdot \left( \frac{c-1}{c} \right)^{|\xi| - |\omega(\sigma^*)|} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{c} \right)^{|\mathcal{E}(D^\circ)\setminus(\xi \cup \theta(\sigma^\circ))|}. $$

The indicators in the formula are equivalent to saying that $\sigma$ and $\xi$ are compatible. Since $\text{Spin}_{D^\circ⁺}^\circ(\sigma)$ is proportional to $c^{|\mathcal{E}(D^\circ)| - |\omega(\sigma^*)| - |\theta(\sigma^\circ)|}$, the formula above turns into (32).
Figure 9: FK–Ising representation $\xi$ of the six-vertex model: if spins of $\sigma^\bullet$ disagree, then the edge is open in $\xi$ (gray); if spins of $\sigma^\circ$ disagree, then the edge is closed in $\xi$ (the dual edge is shown in black); if spins of $\sigma^\bullet$ agree and spins of $\sigma^\circ$ agree, then the edge is open w.p. $\frac{c-1}{c}$ and closed w.p. $\frac{1}{c}$.

**ii)** To show (33), we sum (32) over all $\sigma$ compatible with $\xi$ in two steps. First, we sum over all $\sigma^\circ$ that are pluses at all boundary clusters of $\xi$ and have a constant value at all other clusters of $\xi$ — this results in multiplication by $2^k(\xi^1)-1$. Then, we sum over all $\sigma^\bullet$ that are pluses at all boundary clusters of $\xi^\ast$ and have a constant value at all other clusters of $\xi^\ast$ and obtain (33).

**iii)** By (32), the marginal distribution of $\sigma^\circ$ according to $Spin^{++}_{D,c}$ conditioned on $\xi$ is uniform on all spin configurations on $D^\circ$ that are pluses at all boundary clusters of $\xi$ and have a constant value at all other clusters of $\xi$. This proves the claim. □

In order to discuss the properties of the FK–Ising representation in the infinite volume for $c > 2$, we first state a straightforward consequence of Theorem 2 for the thermodynamic limits of spin measures.

**Lemma 7.2.** Let $c > 2$. Then, the measure $Spin^{++}_{D,c}$, as $D \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^2$, converges to a limiting measure $Spin^{++}_c$ that is extremal, translation-invariant and exhibits a unique infinite cluster of pluses at even faces and a unique infinite cluster of pluses at odd faces, while clusters at all other faces are exponentially small. Similarly, for the limits $Spin^{+-}_c$, $Spin^{-+}_c$, $Spin^{-}_c$ under the corresponding boundary conditions. In particular the four limiting measures are distinct.

**Proof.** Follows immediately from the properties of measures $HF^{n,n+1}_c$ stated in Theorem 2. □

The next corollary follows readily from Lemma 7.1 and extremality of $Spin^{++}_c$.

**Corollary 7.3.** The weak limit of $\text{FKIs}_{D,c}$ as $D \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ exists. Denote it by $\text{FKIs}_c$. Then, $\text{FKIs}_c$ can be coupled with $Spin^{++}_c$ in such a way that the joint law is supported on pairs of compatible configurations $(\sigma, \xi)$ and satisfies the following properties:

- given $\sigma$, for any two adjacent odd faces $u, v$ such that $\sigma(u) = \sigma(v)$ and $\sigma(u^\ast) = \sigma(v^\ast)$ (here $u^\ast v^\ast$ is an edge dual to $uv$), one has $\xi(uv) = 1$ with probability $(c-1)/c$;
- given $\xi$, for every finite cluster $C$ of $\xi$, the value of $\sigma$ on $C$ is constant plus or minus with probability $1/2$, and the value of $\sigma$ is fixed to be plus on infinite clusters of $\xi$. 33
In particular, measure FKi₁ is extremal and translation-invariant and the following relation holds for any two odd faces \( u, v \) of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \):

\[
\text{Spin}_{c}^+(\sigma^o(u)\sigma^o(v)) = \text{FKi}_c(u \leftrightarrow v). \tag{34}
\]

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 3 for \( c > 2 \).

**Proof of Item 2 of Theorem 3.** By Lemma 7.2, it remains to show that correlations of spins at faces of the same parity is uniformly positive. Without loss of generality, it is enough to consider only \( \text{Spin}_{c}^+ \) and only the case of odd faces.

By Corollary 7.3, the measure FKi₁ is extremal and translation-invariant. It is also easy to see that FKi₁ satisfies the finite-energy property. Thus, the argument of Burton and Keane [9] can be applied to show that either FKi₁-a.s. there is no infinite cluster in \( \xi \) or FKi₁-a.s. there exists a unique infinite cluster in \( \xi \). In the former case, by Lemma 7.1, the marginal of \( \text{Spin}_{c}^+ \) on \( \sigma^o \) is symmetric with respect to the sign flip which contradicts Theorem 3. Thus, FKi₁-a.s. there exists a unique infinite cluster in \( \xi \). By extremality of the coupling measure between \( \text{Spin}_{c}^+ \) and FKi₁, the unique infinite cluster is almost surely assigned a plus, whence, similarly to (34), for any odd face \( u \),

\[
\text{Spin}_{c}^+(\sigma^o(u)) = \text{FKi}_c(u \xrightarrow{\xi} \infty) = C > 0.
\]

Extremality of \( \text{Spin}_{c}^+(\sigma^o(u)) \) then implies that there exists \( N > 0 \) such that, for any two odd faces \( u, v \) with \( |u - v| \geq N \),

\[
\text{Spin}_{c}^+(\sigma^o(u)\sigma^o(v)) \geq \frac{1}{2}C^2.
\]

By (34) and the finite-energy property of FKi₁, there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that, for any two odd faces \( u, v \) with \( |u - v| < N \),

\[
\text{Spin}_{c}^+(\sigma^o(u)\sigma^o(v)) = \text{FKi}_c(u \xrightarrow{\xi} \infty) \geq \delta > 0.
\]

We now prove Corollary 2.4. We will view each configuration \( \bar{\omega} \) of the six-vertex model as an element in \( \{1, -1\}^{E(\mathbb{Z}^2)} \), where \( \bar{\omega}(e) = 1 \) iff when following \( e \) in the direction that it is assigned in \( \bar{\omega} \), the even face bordering \( e \) is on the left.

**Proof of Corollary 2.4.** Define SixV₁ as the push-forward of \( \text{Spin}_{c}^+ \) to the six-vertex configurations under the mapping depicted on Figure 2. Then, extremality and invariance under parity-preserving translations follow directly from the same properties of \( \text{Spin}_{c}^+ \) established in Theorem 3. It remains to show that every edge \( e \in E(\mathbb{Z}^2) \) with SixV₁-probability strictly greater than \( 1/2 \) is oriented in such a way that the neighboring even face of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) is to the left of \( e \). This is equivalent to showing that,

\[
\text{Spin}_{c}^+(\sigma(u)\sigma(v^*)) > 0,
\]

for any even face \( v \) and odd face \( u^* \) that are adjacent to each other. Consider an even face \( v \) adjacent to \( u^* \) and an odd face \( v^* \) adjacent to \( u \) and \( v \).

Take \( \lambda > 0 \) such that \( e^{\lambda/2} + e^{-\lambda/2} = c \). It follows from Lemma 6.2 that the weak limit of \( \text{Spin}_{c}^+; e^{\lambda/2} \) over even domains exists and is equal to \( \text{Spin}_{c}^+ \). Take \( q := (e^\lambda + e^{-\lambda})^2 \), \( p_c(q) := \sqrt{\frac{q}{q + 1}} \). By Corollary 3.1, when \( D \) is an even domain measures \( \text{Spin}_{e^{\lambda/2}}^{+} \) and \( \text{RC}_{\text{SixV}_c^+} \) can be coupled in such a way that the joint law is given by (18) and thus:
• if $\sigma(u) \neq \sigma(v)$, then edge $uv$ is closed;

• if $\sigma(u^*) \neq \sigma(v^*)$, then edge $uv$ is open;

• if $\sigma(u) = \sigma(v) = \sigma(u^*) = \sigma(v^*)$, then edge $uv$ is open with probability $e^{\lambda/2}/c$ and closed with probability $e^{-\lambda/2}/c$;

• if $\sigma(u) = \sigma(v) \neq \sigma(u^*) = \sigma(v^*)$, then edge $uv$ is open with probability $e^{-\lambda/2}/c$ and closed with probability $e^{\lambda/2}/c$.

Taking a thermodynamic limit, one obtains

\[
\text{RC}^1_{q,p_c(q)}(uv \text{ open}) = \text{Spin}_{c^+}^+(\sigma(u^*) \neq \sigma(v^*)) + \frac{1}{c} e^{\lambda/2} \cdot \text{Spin}_{c^+}^+(\sigma(u)\sigma(u^*) = \sigma(v)\sigma(v^*) = 1) + \frac{1}{c} e^{-\lambda/2} \cdot \text{Spin}_{c^+}^+(\sigma(u)\sigma(u^*) = \sigma(v)\sigma(v^*) = -1). \tag{35}
\]

Similarly, when $D$ is an odd domain measures $\text{Spin}_{D,c}^{++,c^{+\lambda}/2}$ are $\text{RC}^1_{D,c,q,p_c(q)}$ are coupled and

\[
\text{RC}^1_{q,p_c(q)}(u^*v^* \text{ closed}) = \text{Spin}_{c^+}^+(\sigma(u^*) \neq \sigma(v^*)) + \frac{1}{c} e^{-\lambda/2} \cdot \text{Spin}_{c^+}^+(\sigma(u)\sigma(u^*) = \sigma(v)\sigma(v^*) = 1) + \frac{1}{c} e^{\lambda/2} \cdot \text{Spin}_{c^+}^+(\sigma(u)\sigma(u^*) = \sigma(v)\sigma(v^*) = -1), \tag{36}
\]

where $\text{RC}^1_{q,p_c(q)}$ stands for the wired random-cluster measure on odd faces. By duality,

\[
\text{RC}^1_{q,p_c(q)}(u^*v^* \text{ closed}) = \text{RC}^0_{q,p_c(q)}(uv \text{ open}).
\]

Subtracting (36) from (35), we obtain

\[
\text{RC}^1_{q,p_c(q)}(uv \text{ open}) - \text{RC}^0_{q,p_c(q)}(uv \text{ open}) = \frac{1}{c}(e^{\lambda/2} - e^{-\lambda/2})\text{Spin}_{c^+}^+(\sigma(u)\sigma(u^*) + \sigma(v)\sigma(v^*)).
\]

It was proven in [118] that, for $q > 4$, the wired and free Gibbs measures of the critical random-cluster model in two dimensions are different (see Proposition [4.1]). This, together with the FKG inequality, implies that the LHS in the last formula is strictly positive. Also, by translation invariance of $\text{Spin}_{c^+}^+$, we have $\text{Spin}_{c^+}^+(\sigma(u)\sigma(u^*)) = \text{Spin}_{c^+}^+(\sigma(v)\sigma(v^*)).$

Substituting this in the last formula finishes the proof, since $\lambda > 0$. □

The next two propositions describe properties of the FK–Ising representation of the six-vertex model required for the proof of Theorem [5] for the Ashkin–Teller model (Section [8]). We want to emphasize that, unlike other statements in this section, we do not know how to prove in a general case $a \neq b$. This is why we avoid using these properties in the proof of Item 2 of Theorem [3] written above.

**Proposition 7.4** (Positive association of $\xi$). Let $c \geq 2$ and $D$ be a domain. Then, measure $\text{FKIs}_{D,c}$ satisfies the FKG inequality.

**Proof.** By [34] Thm 4.11, it is enough to check the FKG lattice condition, so that for any $e, f \in E(D^*)$ and any edge-configuration $\xi$ where both $e$ and $f$ are closed, the following holds:

\[
\text{FKIs}_{D,c}^{++}(\xi_e,f)\text{FKIs}_{D,c}^{++}(\xi_e,f) = \text{FKIs}_{D,c}^{++}(\xi_e,f)\text{FKIs}_{D,c}^{++}(\xi_e,f),
\]
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where configurations $\xi^e$, $\xi^f$, $\xi^\circ$, and $\xi^\circ_c$ coincide on $E(D^c) \setminus \{e, f\}$; edge $e$ is open in $\xi^e$ and $\xi^f$ and closed in $\xi^e$ and $\xi^f$; edge $f$ is open in $\xi^e$ and $\xi^f$ and closed in $\xi^e$ and $\xi^f$.

Substitute (33) in this equation. The term $(c-1)^k\xi_c^k(e)$ is just the usual FK–Ising measure and it is standard (and is re-proven in Section 4) that it satisfies the FKG lattice condition. Thus, it is enough to show that

\[
\sum_{\sigma^*} \omega(\sigma^*) \in \xi^e \left( \frac{1}{c-1} \right)^{|\omega(\sigma^*)|} \sum_{\sigma^*} \omega(\sigma^*) \in \xi^f \left( \frac{1}{c-1} \right)^{|\omega(\sigma^*)|} \sum_{\sigma^*} \omega(\sigma^*) \in \xi^\circ \left( \frac{1}{c-1} \right)^{|\omega(\sigma^*)|} \sum_{\sigma^*} \omega(\sigma^*) \in \xi^\circ_c \left( \frac{1}{c-1} \right)^{|\omega(\sigma^*)|}.
\]

Let $P$ denote the Ising measure of parameter $\beta = \frac{1}{2} \log(c-1)$ with plus boundary conditions on the graph obtained from $D^\circ$ after identifying all vertices belonging to the same connected component of $(\xi^e)^*$. Also, denote the endpoints of $e^*$ (resp. $f^*$) by $u_e$ and $v_e$ (resp. $u_f$ and $v_f$). Then, the ratios can be written in terms of $P$ as follows:

\[
P(\sigma^*(u_e) = \sigma^*(v_e), \sigma^*(u_f) = \sigma^*(v_f)) \geq P(\sigma^*(u_e) = \sigma^*(v_e)) \cdot P(\sigma^*(u_f) = \sigma^*(v_f)).
\]

The last inequality follows from the second Griffiths’ inequality in the Ising model [33, Theorem 2] (see also [51, Theorem 2.3]) and thus holds whenever $\beta \geq 0$, that is $c \geq 2$.

**Proposition 7.5.** Let $c > 2$. Then $\text{FKIs}_{c}$-a.s. there exists an infinite cluster, while dual clusters are exponentially small — there exist $M, \alpha > 0$ such that, for any even faces $u, v$,

\[
\text{FKIs}_{c}(u \leftrightarrow v) \leq M e^{-\alpha|u-v|}.
\]

**Proof.** Since $\text{FKIs}_{c}$ is obtained as a limit of finite-volume measures, Lemma 7.4 implies that it satisfies FKG inequality for any increasing events of finite support. By Corollary 7.3 measure $\text{FKIs}_{c}$ is extremal. Hence, approximating any increasing events with increasing events of finite support and using the martingale convergence theorem, we get that $\text{FKIs}_{c}$ is FKG.

In the proof of Item 2 of Theorem 3 it was shown that $\text{FKIs}_{c}$ a.s. exhibits a unique infinite cluster. Denote it by $C^\infty$. Applying the argument of Burton and Keane [9] to $\xi^*$, we obtain that either $\text{FKIs}_{c}$-a.s. there is no infinite cluster in $\xi^*$ or $\text{FKIs}_{c}$-a.s. there exists a unique infinite cluster in $\xi^*$. The latter option, together with the FKG inequality and existence of $C^\infty$, contradicts [21, Theorem 1.5]. Hence, $\text{FKIs}_{c}$ exhibits no infinite dual cluster.

Recall that a box of size $n$ centered at the origin is denoted by $\Lambda_n$. We now show

\[
\text{FKIs}_{c}(C^\infty \cap \Lambda_n = \emptyset) \leq M' e^{-\alpha' n},
\]

for some $M', \alpha' > 0$. Indeed, assume that all clusters of $\xi$ that intersect $\Lambda_n$ are finite. Then, by Corollary 7.3 the distribution of $\sigma^\circ$ on $\Lambda_n$ conditioned on $\xi$ is invariant under a global sign flip. By duality, this implies that, conditioned on $\xi$, the $\text{Spin}_{c}^{++}$-probability that the set of odd faces having spin minus contains a $T^c$-crossing (recall definitions above Lemma 6.3 linking opposite sides of $\Lambda_n$ equals $1/2$. By Theorem 3, the unconditioned $\text{Spin}_{c}^{++}$-probability of the latter event is exponentially small, whence (37) follows.

It remains to show that (37) implies exponential decay of connectivities in $\xi^*$. For any $u \in \partial\Lambda_n$, let $A_u$ be an event that $u$ is connected to the origin by a path in $\xi^* \cap \Lambda_n$.
Define, \( A'_u := A_u + u \) and \( A''_u := A_u + 2u \). Combining the crossings and using the FKG inequality and translational invariance of \( \text{FKIs}_c \), we obtain
\[
\text{FKIs}_c(0 \leftrightarrow 3u \text{ in } \Lambda_n \cup \Lambda_n(u) \cup \Lambda_n(2u)) \geq \text{FKIs}_c(A_u)^3.
\]
Note that the crossing described above does not intersect \( \Lambda_n + \frac{3}{2} \cdot n(1+i) \). Since \( \text{FKIs}_c \) is invariant under rotation by \( \frac{\pi}{2} \), we obtain bounds on existence of crossings \( 3u \leftrightarrow 3u + 3iu, 3u + 3iu \leftrightarrow 3iu \), and \( 3iu \leftrightarrow 0 \) none of which intersects \( \Lambda_n + \frac{3}{2} \cdot n(1+i) \). Combining these crossings and using the FKG inequality once again, we get
\[
\text{FKIs}_c(\exists \text{ circuit } \Gamma \subset \xi^* \text{ surrounding } \Lambda_n + \frac{3}{2} \cdot n(1+i)) \geq \text{FKIs}_c(A_u)^{12}.
\]
The LHS of the above inequality is exponentially small by (37), then so is \( \text{FKIs}_c(A_u) \) and the proof is finished.

### 7.2 FKG for spins: Theorem 4, Proposition 2.4

By [34, Thm 4.11], in order to show the FKG inequality stated in Theorem 4, it is enough to show the FKG inequality stated in Theorem 4. Theorem 4.4

**Proposition 7.6** (FKG lattice condition). Let \( D \) be a domain, \( c \geq 1 \) and \( \tau \in \{1,-1\}^{F^2(\mathbb{Z})} \) be such that \( \tau \) is a plus at all odd faces. Then, for every \( \sigma, \sigma' \in \{1,-1\}^{F^2(\mathbb{Z})} \),
\[
\text{Spin}^\tau_{D,c}[\sigma^1 \lor \sigma^2] \cdot \text{Spin}^\tau_{D,c}[\sigma^1 \land \sigma^2] \geq \text{Spin}^\tau_{D,c}[\sigma^1] \cdot \text{Spin}^\tau_{D,c}[\sigma^2]. \tag{38}
\]

Recall graphs \( D^* \) and \( D^\circ \) dual to each other introduced in Section 3. The proof goes through the FK–Ising and the dual FK–Ising representations on these graphs — we use that each of the terms in (39) can be interpreted as the partition function of an FK model with free boundary conditions on the set of all pluses of \( \sigma^* \) times the same on the set of all minuses of \( \sigma^* \), and we derive the claim from the FKG inequality for the FK model applied separately to these partition functions.

Define \( E(\sigma^*) \) as the set of all spin configurations \( \sigma^* \) on \( D^\circ \), for which \( \text{Spin}^\tau_{D,c}[\sigma^*] > 0 \) (in other words, \( \omega(\sigma^*) \cap \theta(\sigma^*) = \emptyset \) and \( \sigma^* \) is a plus at all corners of \( D \)).

**Proof of Proposition 7.6**. By [34, Theorem (2.22)], it is enough to show (38) for any two configurations which differ in exactly two places, i.e. that for any \( \sigma^* \in \{-1,1\}^{F^2(\mathbb{Z})} \) that coincides with \( \tau \) outside of \( D \), and for any \( u, v \in F^2(D) \),
\[
\text{Spin}^\tau_{D,c}[\sigma^*] \geq \text{Spin}^\tau_{D,c}[\sigma^*], \tag{39}
\]

where \( \sigma^*_{u,v} \) is the configuration coinciding with \( \sigma^* \) except (possibly) at \( u \) and \( v \), and such that \( \sigma^*_{u,v}(u) = \varepsilon \) and \( \sigma^*_{u,v}(v) = \varepsilon' \).

By the definition, the marginal of \( \text{Spin}^\tau_{D,c} \) on even spins can be written as:
\[
\text{Spin}^\tau_{D,c}(\sigma^*) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\sigma^* \in E(\sigma^*)} |E(D^\circ)\setminus(\omega(\sigma^*)\cup\theta(\sigma^*))| \geq \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\sigma^* \in E(\sigma^*)} \sum_{\xi \in \omega(\sigma^*)} (c - 1)^{|\xi\setminus\omega(\sigma^*)|} \tag{40}
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\xi \supset \omega(\sigma^*)} \sum_{\sigma^* \in E(\sigma^*): \theta(\sigma^*) \cap \xi = \emptyset} (c - 1)^{|\xi\setminus\omega(\sigma^*)|} = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\xi \supset \omega(\sigma^*)} \sum_{\theta(\sigma^*) \cap \xi = \emptyset} \sum_{\xi \supset \omega(\sigma^*)} (c - 1)^{|\xi|} 2^{|\xi| - 1},
\]
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where the 1st equality holds since edges not belonging to \(\omega(\sigma^0) \cup \theta(\sigma^0)\) are exactly those contributing \(c\) to the probability of a configuration; the 2nd equality holds by definition of the FK–Ising representation \(\xi\) (Section 7.1); the 3rd equality is obtained by exchanging the order of summation; the 4th equality uses the fact that every non-boundary cluster of \(\xi\) receives in \(\sigma^0\) a constant spin plus or minus independently, and \(\xi^1\) denotes a configuration obtained from \(\xi\) by wiring (i.e., merging) all vertices corresponding to corners of \(\mathcal{D}\).

The sum on the RHS of the last formula is a partition function of the FK–Ising model on \(\mathcal{D}^0\) conditioned on all edges in \(\omega(\sigma^*)\) being open. Performing the usual duality transformation and using that

\[
k(\xi^1) - 1 = k(\xi^*) + |\xi^*| - |E(\mathcal{D}^*)| - |V(\mathcal{D}^*)|
\]

(follows from Euler’s formula, can be proven by induction), we obtain

\[
\operatorname{Spin}^{\mathcal{D},c}_{\mathcal{D}^0}(\sigma^*) = \frac{2^{-|V(\mathcal{D}^*)|}}{2Z} \cdot \left(\frac{c-1}{2}\right)^{|E(\mathcal{D}^*)|} \omega(\sigma^*) \sum_{\xi^* \in E(\mathcal{D}^*) \setminus \theta(\sigma^*)} \left(\frac{2}{c-1}\right)^{|\xi^*|} 2^{k(\xi^*)}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{Z'} \left(\frac{1}{c+1}\right)^{\omega(\sigma^*)} \sum_{\xi^* \in E(\mathcal{D}^*) \setminus \theta(\sigma^*)} \left(\frac{2}{c+1}\right)^{|\xi^*|} \left(\frac{c-1}{c+1}\right)^{|E(\mathcal{D}^*) \setminus \theta(\sigma^*)| - |\xi^*|} 2^{k(\xi^*)},
\]

(41)

where \(Z'\) is the normalizing constant independent of \(\sigma^*\).

The sum in the RHS is the partition function of the FK–Ising model (random-cluster model with \(q = 2\)) with parameter \(p = \frac{2}{c+1}\) on \(\mathcal{D}^c \setminus \theta(\sigma^*)\) under free boundary conditions. Denoted by \(Z_{FK}(\mathcal{D}^c \setminus \theta(\sigma^*))\), it is equal to the product of \(Z_{FK}(P(\sigma^*))\) and \(Z_{FK}(P(\sigma^*))\), where \(P(\sigma^*)\) (resp. \(M(\sigma^*)\)) denotes the subgraph of \(\mathcal{D}^c\) spanned on the vertices having spin plus (resp. minus) in \(\sigma^*\). Then the last equation takes form:

\[
\operatorname{Spin}^{\mathcal{D},c}_{\mathcal{D}^0}(\sigma^*) = \frac{1}{Z'} \left(\frac{1}{c+1}\right)^{\theta(\sigma^*)} \cdot Z_{FK}(P(\sigma^*)) \cdot Z_{FK}(M(\sigma^*)),
\]

(42)

Before inserting this into (39), note that

\[
|\theta(\sigma^*_{++})| + |\theta(\sigma^*_{+-})| - |\theta(\sigma^*_{-+})| - |\theta(\sigma^*_{--})| = -2 \cdot 1_{u \sim v},
\]

where by \(u \sim v\) we mean that \(u\) and \(v\) are adjacent in \(\mathcal{D}^c\). Thus, it is enough to show the following two inequalities:

\[
(c + 1)^{1_{u \sim v}} \cdot \frac{Z_{FK}(P(\sigma^*_{++}))}{Z_{FK}(P(\sigma^*_{++}))} \geq \frac{Z_{FK}(P(\sigma^*_{--}))}{Z_{FK}(P(\sigma^*_{--}))} \cdot \frac{Z_{FK}(P(\sigma^*_{++}))}{Z_{FK}(P(\sigma^*_{++}))},
\]

(43)

\[
(c + 1)^{1_{u \sim v}} \cdot \frac{Z_{FK}(M(\sigma^*_{++}))}{Z_{FK}(M(\sigma^*_{++}))} \geq \frac{Z_{FK}(M(\sigma^*_{--}))}{Z_{FK}(M(\sigma^*_{--}))} \cdot \frac{Z_{FK}(M(\sigma^*_{++}))}{Z_{FK}(M(\sigma^*_{++}))}.
\]

Without loss of generality, we will show only the first inequality. Each ratio in it can be written as certain probability in the FK–Ising measure on \(P(\sigma^*_{--})\). Indeed, graph \(P(\sigma^*_{--})\) is obtained from \(P(\sigma^*_{++})\) by removing vertex \(u\) together with all edges that are incident to it. Let \(E_u\) (resp. \(E_v\)) be the set of edges in \(P(\sigma^*_{++})\) incident to \(u\) (resp. \(v\)). Then,

\[
\frac{Z_{FK}(P(\sigma^*_{++}))}{Z_{FK}(P(\sigma^*_{++}))} = \frac{1}{Z_{FK}(P(\sigma^*_{++}))} \cdot \sum_{\xi^* \in P(\sigma^*_{++})} \left(\frac{2}{c+1}\right)^{|\xi^*|} \left(\frac{c-1}{c+1}\right)^{|E(P(\sigma^*_{++}))-|E^-(\xi^*_{++})|-|\xi^*|} 2^{k(\xi^*)}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{Z_{FK}(P(\sigma^*_{++}))} \cdot \sum_{\xi^* \in P(\sigma^*_{++})} \left(\frac{2}{c+1}\right)^{|\xi^*|} \left(\frac{c-1}{c+1}\right)^{|E(P(\sigma^*_{++}))-|E^-(\xi^*_{++})|-|\xi^*|} 2^{k(\xi^*)-1} 1_{\xi^* \cap E_u = \emptyset},
\]
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where we used that, when \( \xi^* \cap E_u = \emptyset \) the number of clusters in \( \xi^* \) gets increased by one when it is viewed as a spanning subgraph of \( P(\sigma^*_{++}) \) instead of a spanning subgraph of \( P(\sigma^*_{+}) \) (since we need to count a singleton \( u \)). Let \( \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}} \) denote the FK–Ising measure on \( P(\sigma^*_{++}) \) with parameter \( \frac{2}{c+1} \). In order to write the RHS of the last equation as \( \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}} \)–probability, it remains to substitute \( |E(P(\sigma^*_{++}))| \) with \( |E(P(\sigma^*_{+}))| \). Since \( |E(P(\sigma^*_{++}))| - |E(P(\sigma^*_{+}))| = |E_u| \), we obtain

\[
\frac{Z_{\text{FK}}(P(\sigma^*_{++}))}{Z_{\text{FK}}(P(\sigma^*_{+}))} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{c+1}{c-1} \right)^{|E_u|} \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(\xi^* \cap E_u = \emptyset)
\]

Similarly,

\[
\frac{Z_{\text{FK}}(P(\sigma^*_{+-}))}{Z_{\text{FK}}(P(\sigma^*_{++}))} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{c+1}{c-1} \right)^{|E_v|} \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(\xi^* \cap E_v = \emptyset),
\]

\[
\frac{Z_{\text{FK}}(P(\sigma^*_{--}))}{Z_{\text{FK}}(P(\sigma^*_{++}))} = \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{c+1}{c-1} \right)^{|E_u \cup E_v|} \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(\xi^* \cap (E_u \cup E_v) = \emptyset).
\]

Substituting this in [43] and using that \( |E_u| + |E_v| - |E_u \cup E_v| = 1_{u \sim v} \), we get that it is enough to show

\[
(c - 1)^{1_{u \sim v}} \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(\xi^* \cap (E_u \cup E_v) = \emptyset) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(\xi^* \cap E_u = \emptyset) \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(\xi^* \cap E_v = \emptyset). \tag{44}
\]

If \( u \not\sim v \), then the last inequality turns into the FKG inequality for the FK–Ising model, which is a well known fact (see eg. [34, Thm. (3.8)] and also Section 4 above).

Assume that \( u \sim v \). Dividing all probabilities in [44] by \( \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(uv \not\in \xi^*) \) and rewriting them as conditional probabilities, we obtain that it is enough to show that

\[
\frac{c - 1}{\mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(uv \not\in \xi^*)} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(\xi^* \cap (E_u \cup E_v) = \emptyset | uv \not\in \xi^*) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(\xi^* \cap E_u = \emptyset | uv \not\in \xi^*) \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(\xi^* \cap E_v = \emptyset | uv \not\in \xi^*).
\]

Since the conditional probability \( \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(\cdot | uv \not\in \xi^*) \) is equal to the FK–Ising measure on \( P(\sigma^*_{++}) \setminus \{uv\} \), it also satisfies the FKG inequality. Thus, in order to finish the proof, it remains to show

\[
c - 1 \geq \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(uv \not\in \xi^*).
\]

Recall that the parameter of the FK–Ising measure is equal to \( \frac{2}{c+1} \). Pairing up edge-configurations on \( P(\sigma^*_{++}) \) that coincide everywhere except for \( uv \), one obtains

\[
2 \cdot \frac{c+1}{c+1} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(uv \in \xi^*) \geq \frac{2}{c+1} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\text{FK}}(uv \not\in \xi^*),
\]

whence the claim follows readily. \( \square \)

**Corollary 7.7.** Let \( \mathcal{D} \) be an even domain, \( c \geq 1 \) and \( c_b > 0 \). Then the marginal distribution of \( \text{Spin}^+ \) on \( \sigma^* \) satisfies the FKG inequality.

**Proof of Proposition 2.4** The proof of Proposition 2.3 given in Section 5 can be adapted mutatis mutandis using the FKG inequality stated in Corollary 7.7. \( \square \)
7.3 Proof of item 1 of Theorem 3

Proof. Let \( \tau \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{spin}}(\mathbb{Z}^2) \) be a constant plus at all odd faces. By Theorem 4

\[
\text{Spin}_{D,2}^+ \prec \text{Spin}_{D,2}^\tau \prec \text{Spin}_{D,2}^+, \quad (45)
\]

where by \( \prec \) we mean the stochastic domination of the marginals on the spin configurations at even faces. We start by proving that \( \text{Spin}_{D,2}^+ \) and \( \text{Spin}_{D,2}^\tau \) converge to the same limit and then we show how this implies that the limit of \( \text{Spin}_{D,2}^\tau \) is also the same.

By Corollary 3.2, measure \( \text{Spin}_{D,2}^\tau \) can be obtained from the random-cluster measure \( \text{RC}_{D^\varepsilon,4,p_c(4)} \) by assigning plus to all boundary clusters and assigning plus or minus independently with probability 1/2 to all other clusters. By Proposition 4.1, the limit of \( \text{RC}_{D^\varepsilon,4,p_c(4)} \), as \( D \uparrow \mathbb{Z}^2 \), exists, is the unique random-cluster Gibbs measure \( \text{RC}_{4,p_c(4)} \) with parameters \( q = 4, p = p_c(4) \) and exhibits infinitely many primal and dual clusters surrounding the origin. Then, the infinite-volume limit of \( \text{Spin}_{D,2}^\tau \) also exists, can be obtained from \( \text{RC}_{4,p_c(4)} \) by assigning plus or minus independently with probability 1/2 to every cluster and thus exhibits infinitely many circuits of even (or odd) faces having constant spin plus (or minus). Denote this measure by \( \text{Spin} \). Similarly, the infinite-volume limit of \( \text{Spin}_{D,2}^\tau \) is also equal to \( \text{Spin} \).

Extremality of \( \text{Spin} \) and invariance under all translations follow from the same properties of the random-cluster measure \( \text{RC}_{4,p_c(4)} \).

By (45), the above immediately implies that the limit of the marginal distribution of \( \text{Spin}_{D,2}^\tau \) on the spin configurations at even faces exists and is equal to the corresponding marginal of \( \text{Spin} \). In particular, for any \( \varepsilon, N > 0 \), when \( D \) is large enough,

\[
\text{Spin}_{D,2}^\tau(\exists \text{ circuits } C_+ \text{ and } C_- \text{ surrounding } \Lambda_N \text{ s.t. } \sigma^*(C_+) = 1, \sigma^*(C_-) = -1) > 1 - \varepsilon,
\]

where by \( \sigma^*(C_+) = 1 \) and \( \sigma^*(C_-) = -1 \) we mean that \( \sigma^* \) is constant plus at \( C_+ \) and constant minus at \( C_- \). When this occurs, the ice-rule implies existence of a circuit \( C \) of odd faces between \( C_+ \) and \( C_- \), on which \( \sigma \) is constant plus or minus. Then there exists a simple cyclic path \( \gamma \) between \( C \) and \( C_+ \) such that all even faces bordering \( \gamma \) have constant spin plus and all odd faces bordering \( \gamma \) have constant spin (plus or minus). This implies that for any fixed \( n > 0 \), when \( N \) is large enough, the restriction of \( \text{Spin}_{D,2}^\tau \) to the box \( \Lambda_n \) is \( \varepsilon \)-close to the restriction of the measure \( \text{Spin} \) to the same box. Letting \( \varepsilon \) tend to zero finishes the proof.

8 Proof of Theorem 5

The main tool in the proof is the FK–Ising-type representation \( \text{FKIs}_r \) introduced in Section 7.1 that allows to transfer to the Ashkin–Teller model the results established in Theorem 3 for the spin representation of the six-vertex model.

In the next proposition we describe a coupling between the six-vertex and the Ashkin–Teller models; see Figure 10. Recall graphs \( D^* \) and \( D^o \) dual to each other and the notion of compatible spin and edge configurations (Section 3).

Proposition 8.1. Let \( D \) be a domain on \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \). Let \( U, J \) be such that \( \sinh 2J = e^{-2U} \). Take \( c = \coth 2J \). Let \( (\tau, \tau'), \xi, \) and \( (\sigma^*, \sigma^o) \) be random variables distributed according
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Figure 10: Coupling between the six-vertex and the Ashkin–Teller models through the FK–Ising representation.

To measures $\text{AT}^{f^+}_{\mathbb{D}^*,\mathcal{J},\mathcal{U}}$, $\text{FKls}_{\mathbb{D}^+,\mathcal{C}}$, and $\text{Spin}^{++}_{\mathbb{D},\mathcal{C}}$. Then, these random variables can be coupled in such a way that the joint law takes form:

$$(\tau, \tau', \xi, \sigma^*, \sigma^0) \propto 2^{-k(\xi^*)}(c - 1)^{|\xi| - |\omega(\tau\tau')|}1_{\tau\tau'\xi=\sigma^*}1_{\tau\perp \xi}1_{\tau\sigma^*\perp \sigma^0\xi},$$

where by $\tau \perp \xi^*$ we mean that $\tau$ has a constant value on every cluster of $\xi^*$, and similarly for other spin and edge configurations.

**Proof.** First, note that, given $\sigma^*$ and $\tau$, the value of $\tau'$ is uniquely determined by $\tau\tau' = \sigma^*$. Also, there are exactly $2^{k(\xi^*)}$ different spin configurations $\tau$ that are constant on every cluster of $\xi^*$ (two possibilities per cluster). Thus, summing (46) over all possible values of $(\tau, \tau')$, we obtain Figure 10. By Lemma 7.1, the latter gives $\text{FKls}_{\mathbb{D}^+,\mathcal{C}}$ and $\text{Spin}^{++}_{\mathbb{D},\mathcal{C}}$ as marginals.

It remains to show that the marginal of the distribution defined by (46) on $(\tau, \tau')$ coincides with $\text{AT}^{f^+}_{\mathbb{D}^*,\mathcal{J},\mathcal{U}}$. Substituting $\sigma^*$ with $\tau\tau'$ and summing (46) over all spin configurations $\sigma^0$ on $\mathbb{D}^*$ that have a constant value at each cluster of $\xi$, which is fixed to be a plus at boundary clusters, we obtain

$$(\tau, \tau', \xi) \propto 2^{k(\xi^*)}e^{-k(\xi^*)}(c - 1)^{|\xi| - |\omega(\tau\tau')|}1_{\tau\perp \xi}1_{\tau\tau'\perp \xi^*}.$$
Otherwise, $uv$ contributes $(c - 1) \cdot \frac{1}{c - 1} = 1$ to the RHS. It remains to check that these contributions are the same in case of the Ashkin–Teller measure $\mathbb{AT}_{\mathcal{D}^*}^{f^*}$. Indeed, if $\tau(u) = \tau(v)$ and $\tau'(u) = \tau'(v)$, then $uv$ contributes $e^{2J + U}$ to $\mathbb{AT}_{\mathcal{D}^*}^{f^*}$. If $\tau(u) \neq \tau(v)$ and $\tau'(u) \neq \tau'(v)$, then $uv$ contributes $e^{-2J + U}$ to $\mathbb{AT}_{\mathcal{D}^*}^{f^*}$. Otherwise, $uv$ contributes $e^{-U}$ to $\mathbb{AT}_{\mathcal{D}^*}^{f^*}$. Multiplying all these contributions by $e^U$ and comparing to the above, we get that it is enough to check that
\[
e^{2J + 2U} = c + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad e^{-2J + 2U} = c - 1.
\]
Since $e^{-2U} = \sinh 2J$ and $c = \coth 2J$, we have
\[
e^{2J + 2U} = \frac{2e^{2J}}{e^{2J} - e^{-2J}} = \frac{2e^{2J} + e^{-2J}}{e^{2J} - e^{-2J}} + 1 = c + 1,
\]
\[
e^{-2J + 2U} = \frac{2e^{-2J}}{e^{2J} - e^{-2J}} = \frac{2e^{2J} + e^{-2J}}{e^{2J} - e^{-2J}} - 1 = c - 1.
\]

**Remark.** By (47), given $\tau$ and $\tau'$, configuration $\xi^*$ can be sampled at every edge $uv$ independently in the following way: if $\tau(u) \neq \tau(v)$ or $\tau'(u) \neq \tau'(v)$, then $uv \notin \xi^*$; if $\tau(u) = \tau(v)$ and $\tau'(u) = \tau'(v)$, then $uv \in \xi^*$ w.p. $1 - e^{-4J}$ and $uv \notin \xi^*$ w.p. $e^{-4J}$. Thus, $\xi^*$ coincides with $\omega_1 \cup \omega_2$ in (53) and with $\left[\mu^{-1}(0,0)\right]^c$ in (54).

**Corollary 8.2.** Let $\mathcal{D}, U, J, c$ be as in Proposition 8.1. Let $\xi$ be distributed according to $\text{FKls}_{\mathcal{D}^*, c}$. Assign 1 or −1 uniformly at random independently to every cluster of $\xi^*$. Then, the obtained random spin configuration on $\mathcal{D}^*$ has the same distribution as the marginal of $\mathbb{AT}_{\mathcal{D}^*}^{f^*}$ on $\tau$ (or, equivalently, $\tau'$).

In particular, the following holds:
\[
\mathbb{AT}_{\mathcal{D}^*}^{f^*}(\tau(u)\tau(v)) = \text{FKls}_{\mathcal{D}^*, c}(u \xrightarrow{\xi^*} v).
\]

**Proof.** This follows from Proposition 8.1 since, for a fixed value of $\tau \tau'$, the coupling (46) (or (47)) does not depend on the value of $\tau$ at clusters of $\xi^*$.

We now have all the ingredients to finish the proof of Theorem 3.

**Proof of Theorem 3.** We start by showing that a limit of $\mathbb{AT}_{\mathcal{D}^*, J, U}^{f^*}$ as $\mathcal{D} \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ exists. Consider coupling $(\tau, \tau', \xi, \sigma^*, \sigma^*)$ introduced in Proposition 8.1. Then, the joint distribution of $(\tau, \tau', \xi)$ coincides with the joint distribution of $(\sigma^*, \xi)$ which, by Corollary 7.3, converges to an extremal measure as $\mathcal{D} \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^2$. By Corollary 8.2, given $\tau$ and $\xi$, the distribution of $\tau'$ according to the coupling (47) is obtained by assigning spins 1 and −1 uniformly at random independently to different clusters of $\xi^*$. By Proposition 7.3, clusters of $\xi^*$ are finite, and thus, the joint law of $(\tau, \tau', \xi)$ described by (47) also converges to an extremal measure. Taking the marginal on $(\tau, \tau')$, we obtain convergence of the Ashkin–Teller measures to an extremal limit denoted by $\mathbb{AT}_{J, U}^{f^*}$, which is also translation-invariant.

It is easy to see that $\Omega_k$ defined in Section 2.4 coincides with $\mathcal{D}^*$ when $\mathcal{D}$ is the square $[-k - \frac{1}{2}, k + \frac{1}{2}] \times [-k - \frac{1}{2}, k + \frac{1}{2}]$. Thus, the above implies that the sequence of measures $\mathbb{AT}_{\mathcal{D}^*, J, U}^{f^*}$ converges to $\mathbb{AT}_{J, U}^{f^*}$.

By our construction, the marginal of $\mathbb{AT}_{J, U}^{f^*}$ on $\tau \tau'$ coincides with the marginal of $\text{Spin}_{J, U}^{c^*}$ on $\sigma^*$. The distribution of $\sigma^*$ coincides with that of $\sigma^*$ shifted by one. Thus, by (34), for any two even faces $u, v$ of $\mathbb{Z}^2$,
\[
\mathbb{AT}_{J, U}^{f^*}(\tau(u)\tau'(u)\tau(v)\tau'(v)) = \text{FKls}_{c^*}((u + (0, 1)) \xrightarrow{\xi^*} (v + (0, 1))) \geq \text{FKls}_{c^*}((0, 1) \xrightarrow{\xi^*} \infty)^2 > 0,
\]
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where we used translation-invariance of FKIs and that, by Proposition 7.5, FKIs exhibits an infinite cluster.

This proves bound (4). Similarly, by [48], exponential decay of connectivities in $\xi^*$ established in Proposition 7.5 implies (5).

9 Open questions

It is natural to try to extend the statement of Theorem 5 outside of the self-dual curve $\sinh 2J = e^{-2U}$ — this would prove that the critical line that follows the self-dual curve when $J \geq U$ (see [24, 55]) indeed splits into two critical curves immediately after $J = U = 1$ (both transitions are sharp by [24, 55]).

Question 1. Fix $\alpha < 1$. Show that the line $J = \alpha U$ contains the whole interval of parameters for which, under $\mathcal{A}^f_{j,l}$, correlations of spins $\tau$ and $\tau'$ exhibit exponential decay while the product $\tau \tau'$ is ferromagnetically ordered.

Fix $a = b = 1$ and $c > 2$. By Corollary 6.4 the sequence of measures $\text{HF}^{0,1,c}_{D_{b},c}$, as $D_k \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^2$, converges to $\text{HF}^{0,1}_{c}$ when $c_b \geq e^{\lambda/2}$ and to $\text{HF}^{0,-1}_{c}$ when $c_b \leq e^{-\lambda/2}$. What happens when $c_b \in (e^{-\lambda/2}, e^{\lambda/2})$?

Question 2. Show that, as $D_k \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^2$, the measure $\text{HF}^{0,1,c}_{D_b,c}$ converges to $\text{HF}^{0,1}_{c}$ when $c_b > 1$, to $\text{HF}^{0,-1}_{c}$ when $c_b < 1$, and to the mixture of phases $\frac{1}{2}(\text{HF}^{0,1}_{c} + \text{HF}^{0,-1}_{c})$ at $c_b = 1$.

Fix $q > 4$. By [18] (see [57] for a recent short proof), the free and the wired Gibbs states for the critical random-cluster model with cluster-weight $q$ are distinct (and by [32] there is no other extremal Gibbs states). By Theorem 6 the measure $\text{RC}^{q}_{\Omega,p_c(q),q}$ converges to the free measure when $q_b \in [e^{-\lambda}\sqrt{q}, q]$ and to the wired measure when $q_b \in [1, e^{-\lambda}\sqrt{q}]$. What happens when $q_b \in (e^{-\lambda}\sqrt{q}, e^{\lambda}\sqrt{q})$, or $q_b < 1$, or $q_b > q$? It is easy to see that measures with parameters $q_b$ and $q/q_b$ are dual to each other.

Question 3. Show that $\text{RC}^{q}_{\Omega,p_c(q),q}$ converges to the free measure when $q_b > \sqrt{q}$, to the wired measure when $q_b < \sqrt{q}$, and to the mixture of phases $\frac{1}{2}(\text{RC}^{\text{free}}_{p_c(q),q} + \text{RC}^{\text{wired}}_{p_c(q),q})$ when $q_b = \sqrt{q}$. The self-dual point $q_b = \sqrt{q}$ is then critical.

Fix $a = b = 1$. By Theorem 1 the FKG inequality for the marginal distribution on spin configurations on one of the two sublattices holds for any $c \geq 1$. However, the FKG inequality for the random-cluster model holds only when $q \geq 1$ which via BKW coupling corresponds to $c \geq \sqrt{3}$. Since the absence of an FKG inequality for the random-cluster model when $q < 1$ is the main reason why this regime of parameters is less studied, this motivates the following question.

Question 4. Find an image of the six-vertex FKG inequality under the Baxter–Kelland–Wu coupling (see Theorem 7).

Finally, we expect that the positive association property for the spin representation proved in Theorem 4 and valid for $c \geq 1$ may possibly be of use in showing that the variance of the height function diverges logarithmically for all $c \in [1, 2]$. 
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