arXiv:2001.06447v1 [math.PR] 17 Jan 2020

Crossing estimates from metric graph and discrete GFF

Jian Ding *
University of Pennsylvania
dingjian@wharton.upenn.edu

Mateo Wirth *
University of Pennsylvania
mwirth@wharton.upenn.edu

Hao Wu †
Tsinghua University
hao.wu.proba@gmail.com

February 18, 2022

Abstract

We compare level-set percolation for Gaussian free fields (GFFs) defined on a rectangular subset of $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ to level-set percolation for GFFs defined on the corresponding metric graph as the mesh size δ goes to 0. In particular, we look at the probability that there is a path that crosses the rectangle in the horizontal direction on which the field is positive. We show this probability is strictly larger in the discrete graph. In the metric graph case, we show that for appropriate boundary conditions the probability that there exists a closed pivotal edge for the horizontal crossing event decays logarithmically in δ. In the discrete graph case, we compute the limit of the probability of a horizontal crossing for appropriate boundary conditions.

Keywords. Gaussian free field, crossing event, scaling limit, pivotal edge.

1 Introduction

In this note we will prove several results on level-set percolation of Gaussian free fields on the square lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2$. The thrust of our results is that the probability that there exists a crossing of the domain in which the field is defined differs depending on whether we consider a discrete Gaussian free field or a metric graph Gaussian free field. Additionally, in the metric graph case we prove a bound on the probability that there exists a closed pivotal edge for the crossing. We begin with some basic definitions before stating our main results.

We call two vertices $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ adjacent, and write $u \sim v$, if $|u - v| = 1$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the standard Euclidean norm. Throughout, we will let $V \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ be a proper subset of $\mathbb{Z}^2$. For such a set, we let $\partial V = \{v \in V : \exists u \in V^c, u \sim v\}$ and $V^o = V \setminus \partial V$. We will denote by $\{S_t : t \geq 0\}$ the continuous-time simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ with expected holding time 1 at each vertex, by $\mathbb{P}_v$ the law of S where $S_0 = v$, and by $\mathbb{E}_v$ the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}_v$. For $V \neq \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $f : \partial V \to \mathbb{R}$ we call a Gaussian process $\{\phi(v) : v \in V\}$ a discrete Gaussian free field (discrete GFF) on V with boundary condition f if its mean is the harmonic extension of f to V and its covariance is the Green's function on V. That is, letting $\zeta = \inf\{t \geq 0 : S_t \in \partial V\}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi(v)] = \mathbb{E}_v[f(S_\zeta)], \quad v \in V \tag{1.1}$$

$$\mathrm{Cov}[\phi(u)\phi(v)] = G(u, v) = \mathbb{E}_u\left[\int_0^\zeta \mathbb{1}_{\{S_t = v\}} dt\right], \quad u, v \in V\,. \tag{1.2}$$

We note that $\phi(v) = f(v)$ for $v \in \partial V$ (since $\mathrm{Var}[\phi(v)] = G(v, v) = 0$), and that the distribution of ϕ is uniquely determined by (1.1) and (1.2).

*Partially supported by an NSF grant DMS-1757479.
†Supported by Chinese Thousand Talents Plan for Young Professionals and Beijing Natural Science Foundation (Z180003).

Next, we extend these definitions to metric graphs on $\mathbb{Z}^2$. To simplify notation, we will identify each subset V of the lattice with the graph with vertex set V and where two vertices $u, v \in V$ are connected by an edge if $u \sim v$. We denote by E the edge set of this graph. To each $e \in E$ we associate a different compact interval I_e of length 2 and identify the endpoints of this interval with the two vertices adjacent to e. The metric graph $\tilde{V}$ associated to V is then defined to be $\tilde{V} = \cup_{e \in E} I_e$. With these definitions, it was shown in [Lu16] that the metric graph Gaussian free field (metric graph GFF) on $\tilde{V}$ with boundary condition f, denoted by $\{\tilde{\phi}(v) : v \in \tilde{V}\}$, can be constructed by extending ϕ to $\tilde{V}$ in the following manner: for adjacent vertices u and v, the value of $\tilde{\phi}$ on the edge $e(u, v)$, conditioned on $\phi(u)$ and $\phi(v)$, is given by an independent bridge of length 2 of a Brownian motion with variance 2 at time 1 with boundary values $\phi(u)$ and $\phi(v)$.

With these definitions in place, we specify the crossing events that we will study in this paper. It will be convenient to think of $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ as a subset of the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$. That is, taking $\mathbb{Z}^2$ as a subset of $\mathbb{C}$ in the obvious way, we identify the interval I_e corresponding to an edge $e = e(u, v)$ in the discrete graph with the line segment between u and v (this requires re-scaling I_e). For $L > 0$, we let R_L be the rectangle

$$R_L = \{z : 0 < \Re(z) < L,\, 0 < \Im(z) < 1\}.$$

Given such a rectangle, we let (a, b, c, d) be its corners, listed in counter-clockwise order with $b = 0$. For $\delta > 0$, we let $V_\delta = R_L \cap \delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ and $(a_\delta, b_\delta, c_\delta, d_\delta)$ be the corners of V_δ, listed in counter-clockwise order so that b_δ is closest to the origin (we always take $\delta \leq (L \wedge 1)/3$ so that the corners are distinct and V_δ^o is non-empty). For two vertices $u, v \in \partial V_\delta$, we let $[u, v)$ be the counter-clockwise arc from u to v in ∂V_δ which contains u but not v. We let ϕ_δ be a discrete GFF on V_δ. We say ϕ_δ has zero boundary condition if $\phi_\delta(v) = 0$ for $v \in \partial V_\delta$, and that it has alternating boundary condition if there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\phi_\delta(v) = \begin{cases} \lambda, & v \in [a_\delta, b_\delta) \cup [c_\delta, d_\delta), \\ -\lambda, & v \in [b_\delta, c_\delta) \cup [d_\delta, a_\delta). \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

In either case, we let $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ be the corresponding Gaussian free field on the metric graph $\tilde{V}_\delta$ such that $\tilde{\phi}_\delta(v) = \phi_\delta(v)$ for $v \in V_\delta$. Our goal is to study the probability that ϕ_δ (resp. $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$) gives a positive horizontal crossing of V_δ (resp. $\tilde{V}_\delta$). That is, we want to study the event that there exists a path in V_δ (resp. $\tilde{V}_\delta$) from $[a_\delta, b_\delta)$ to $[c_\delta, d_\delta)$ such that ϕ_δ (resp. $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$) is non-negative on this path. We denote this event by

$$\left\{[a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\phi_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right\}$$

in the discrete case and similarly in the metric graph case. If $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ has zero boundary condition, the probability of a positive crossing as defined above is equal to zero. For ϕ_δ this probability is one since we can just take a path on ∂V_δ. Therefore, in this case we take $[a'_\delta, b'_\delta) = \{u \in V_\delta^o : \exists v \in [a_\delta, b_\delta), u \sim v\}$ and similarly for $[c'_\delta, d'_\delta)$, and consider the event

$$\left\{[a'_\delta, b'_\delta) \overset{\phi_\delta > 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c'_\delta, d'_\delta)\right\},$$

and similarly for $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$. It is clear that with probability 1, $\phi(v) \neq 0$ for all $v \in V_\delta^o$, and the zero set of $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ has no isolated points. We will assume that these conditions hold throughout.

In the zero-boundary case, we show that the probability that there is a positive crossing in the metric graph decays to 0 as $\delta \to 0$ (and provide a bound on the rate of decay), while the probability that there is a positive crossing in the discrete graph remains bounded away from zero.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $L > 0$ be a constant, ϕ_δ be a zero-boundary discrete GFF on V_δ, and $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ be the corresponding metric graph GFF on $\tilde{V}_\delta$. There exist constants $c = c(L) > 0$ and $\delta_0 = \delta_0(L) > 0$ such that for $\delta \leq \delta_0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left([a'_\delta, b'_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta > 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c'_\delta, d'_\delta)\right) \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{|\log(\delta)|}}. \tag{1.4}$$

In contrast there exists $\eta_1 = \eta_1(L) > 0$ such that for $\delta \le \delta_0$,

$$\eta_1 \le \mathbb{P}\left([a'_\delta, b'_\delta) \overset{\phi_\delta \ge 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c'_\delta, d'_\delta)\right) \le 1 - \eta_1. \tag{1.5}$$

For alternating boundary conditions, we show that the probability that there is a positive crossing in the metric graph remains bounded away from zero as $\delta \to 0$, but is also strictly smaller than the probability that there is a positive crossing in the discrete graph.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $L, \lambda > 0$ be positive constants, ϕ_δ be a discrete GFF on V_δ with alternating boundary condition* (1.3)*, and $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ be the corresponding metric graph GFF on $\tilde{V}_\delta$. There exist constants $\eta_2 = \eta_2(L, \lambda) > 0$, $\eta_3 = \eta_3(L, \lambda) > 0$, and $\delta_0 = \delta_0(L) > 0$ such that for $\delta \le \delta_0$,*

$$\eta_2 \le \mathbb{P}\left([a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \ge 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right) \le 1 - \eta_2, \tag{1.6}$$

$$\eta_3 \le \mathbb{P}\left([a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\phi_\delta \ge 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right) \le 1 - \eta_3. \tag{1.7}$$

Additionally, there exists $\eta_4 = \eta_4(L, \lambda) > 0$ such that for $\delta \le \delta_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left([a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\phi_\delta \ge 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right) - \mathbb{P}\left([a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \ge 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right) \ge \eta_4. \tag{1.8}$$

It is then natural to ask what are the limits of the crossing probabilities in (1.5), (1.6) and (1.7). We will give an explicit answer to the one in (1.7); for the other cases, see discussion in Section 6. There exists $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\mathbb{Z}^2) > 0$ such that the level line in discrete GFF with alternating boundary condition (1.3) converges to $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2; -2)$ process, see Section 6. Consequently, we have the following.

Theorem 1.3. *When $\lambda = \lambda_0$, the crossing probability in* (1.7) *has the following limit:*

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \mathbb{P}\left([a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\phi_\delta \ge 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right) = \frac{(\varphi(b) - \varphi(a))(\varphi(d) - \varphi(c))}{(\varphi(c) - \varphi(a))(\varphi(d) - \varphi(b))}, \tag{1.9}$$

where φ is any conformal map from R_L onto the upper-half plane $\mathbb{H}$ with $\varphi(a) < \varphi(b) < \varphi(c) < \varphi(d)$.

For the metric graph GFF, we can also prove a bound on the probability that there exists a closed pivotal edge for the event that there is a positive crossing. To specify what we mean, we begin by defining an edge percolation model. Let E_δ be the edge set of the nearest-neighbor graph on V_δ and $\omega : E_\delta \to \{0, 1\}$ be such that $\omega(e) = 1$ if $\tilde{\phi}_\delta(u) \ge 0$ for all $u \in I_e$ and $\omega(e) = 0$ otherwise. We say that e is open if $\omega(e) = 1$ and that e is closed otherwise. For an edge $e \in E_\delta$, we let ω^e and ω_e be defined by

$$\omega^e(f) = \begin{cases} 1, & f = e, \\ \omega(f), & f \ne e. \end{cases} \qquad \omega_e(f) = \begin{cases} 0, & f = e, \\ \omega(f), & f \ne e. \end{cases} \tag{1.10}$$

We write

$$\left\{[a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\omega}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right\}$$

for the event that there is a path of open edges in ω from $[a_\delta, b_\delta)$ to $[c_\delta, d_\delta)$ (note that this is exactly the event that there is a positive horizontal crossing in $\tilde{V}_\delta$). We can then define

$$\{e \text{ is pivotal}\} = \left\{[a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\omega^e}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right\} \setminus \left\{[a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\omega_e}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right\},$$

$$\{e \text{ is closed pivotal}\} = \{e \text{ is pivotal}\} \cap \{w(e) = 0\},$$

$$\{\text{there exists a closed pivotal edge}\} = \cup_{e \in E_\delta} \{e \text{ is closed pivotal}\}.$$

With these definitions, we obtain the following result

Theorem 1.4. *Let $L, \lambda > 0$ be positive constants and $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ be the metric graph GFF on $\tilde{V}_\delta$ with alternating boundary condition* (1.3)*. There exist constants $c = c(L, \lambda) > 0$ and $\delta_0 = \delta_0(L) > 0$ such that for $\delta \le \delta_0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{there exists a closed pivotal edge}) \le \frac{c}{\sqrt{|\log(\delta)|}}.$$

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the main tools used in the proofs. In Section 3 we prove the results in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 pertaining to the metric graph GFF $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$, and in Section 4 we prove the results in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 pertaining to the discrete GFF ϕ_δ. Assuming the conclusions proved there, we are able to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2 here. Finally, we will discuss the limits of the probabilities in (1.5), (1.6) and (1.7), and prove Theorem 1.3 in Section 6.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The bound (1.4) is proved in Section 3.1. The bound (1.5) is proved in Section 4.2. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Note that it suffices to prove the lower bound in (1.6) to prove (1.6) and (1.7). This follows from the following considerations. First, since ϕ_δ and $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ coincide on V_δ, the existence of a positive crossing in the metric graph implies the existence of such a crossing in the discrete graph. That is,

$$\left\{ [a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \ge 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta) \right\} \subseteq \left\{ [a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\phi_\delta \ge 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta) \right\}.$$

Therefore, the lower bound in (1.6) implies the lower bound in (1.7). Next, by symmetry, the lower bound in (1.6) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}\left([b_\delta, c_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \le 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [d_\delta, a_\delta) \right) \ge \eta_2(L^{-1}, \lambda).$$

The same bound then holds for the probability that there is a strictly negative vertical crossing in the discrete graph (here we use the fact that ϕ_δ is almost surely not equal to zero on V_δ). Finally, since the existence of a strictly negative vertical crossing in the discrete graph implies that there is no positive horizontal crossing (either in the metric graph or the discrete graph), the upper bounds in (1.6) and (1.7) follow. Thus, both (1.6) and (1.7) follow from the lower bound in (1.6) which is proved in Section 3.2.

Finally, the bound in (1.8) is proved in Section 4.3. □

Discussions on future directions

- The level loops of zero-boundary metric graph GFF will converge to the so-called conformal loop ensemble CLE with $\kappa = 4$. From there, we believe that the optimal estimate for the crossing probability in (1.4) is $|\log(\delta)|^{-2}$. However, our method only provides an upper bound $|\log(\delta)|^{-1/2}$. To get the optimal estimate requires more delicate tools.
- The level lines of zero-boundary discrete GFF will converge to the so-called branching $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-1;-1)$ process. Then the limit of the crossing probability in (1.5) should be the probability of certain crossing event of $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-1;-1)$. It is an interesting question to derive an explicit formula for such probability. The limit of crossing probabilities in (1.6) and (1.7) for general λ are also unknown.
- We provide an estimate on the existence of pivotal edge in metric graph GFF. It is more important to understand the pivotal vertices in discrete GFF and its connection to continuum GFF.

Acknowledgements. We thank J. Aru, T. Lupu, A. Sepúlveda for helpful discussion on GFF.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we collect some technical tools and introduce some notation that will be used in the proofs of the main results.

Notation. For a real vector $\mathbf{x}$ (in any dimension), we denote by $|\mathbf{x}|$ the Euclidean norm of $\mathbf{x}$, by $|\mathbf{x}|_{\ell_1}$ its ℓ_1-norm, and by $|\mathbf{x}|_{\ell_\infty}$ its ℓ_∞-norm. For a finite set A, we will also use $|A|$ to denote the cardinality of A. The meaning will be clear from context. We use A^c to denote the complement of the set (or event) A.

Throughout the proofs we let c, c' be positive constants which only depend on L and λ as in the main theorems, and whose value may change each time they appear.

2.1 Discrete GFF and metric graph GFF

We begin with an alternate construction of the metric graph GFF which more clearly shows it is a natural analog to the discrete GFF. Namely, one can construct $\tilde{\phi}$ by first defining a Brownian motion $\{\tilde{B}_t : t \geq 0\}$ on $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ as in [Lu16, Section 2]: $\tilde{B}$ behaves like a standard Brownian motion in the interior of the edges, while on the vertices it chooses to do excursions on each incoming edge uniformly at random. For a subset $V \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$, we let $\tilde{\zeta} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \tilde{B}_t \in \partial V\}$, and $\{G(u,v) : u, v \in \tilde{V}\}$ be the density of the 0-potential of $\{\tilde{B}_t : 0 \leq t < \tilde{\zeta}\}$ (with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\tilde{V}$), where u and v are now arbitrary points in $\tilde{V}$ (not necessarily vertices). It is shown in [Lu16] that the trace of $\tilde{B}$ on V (when parametrized by its local time at the vertices) is exactly the continuous-time simple random walk on V, and therefore the definition of G here coincides with the one in (1.2) for $u, v \in V$, justifying the abuse of notation. Due to this relation between the metric graph Brownian motion and the simple random walk, we will, by a slight abuse of notation, let $\mathbb{P}_v$ be the law of $\tilde{B}_t$ where $\tilde{B}_0 = v$ and $\mathbb{E}_v$ be the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}_v$. It was also shown in [Lu16] that the value of G on $\tilde{V} \setminus V$ can be obtained by interpolation from the value on V. For two pairs of adjacent vertices (u_1, v_1) and (u_2, v_2) in V, and two points w_1 and w_2 on the corresponding edges, taking the convention that either the edges are distinct or $(u_1, v_1) = (u_2, v_2)$ and letting $r_1 = |w_1 - u_1|$ and $r_2 = |w_2 - u_2|$, we have (c.f. [Lu16, Equation (2.1)])

$$\begin{aligned} G(w_1, w_2) =& (1-r_1)(1-r_2)G(u_1,u_2) + r_1 r_2 G(v_1,v_2) + (1-r_1)r_2 G(u_1,v_2) \\ &+ r_1(1-r_2)G(v_1,u_2) + 4(r_1 \wedge r_2 - r_1 r_2)\mathbb{1}_{(u_1,v_1)=(u_2,v_2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

We call a process $\{\tilde{\phi}(v) : v \in \tilde{V}\}$ a Gaussian free field on $\tilde{V}$ if it is a continuous Gaussian process such that there exists a function $f : \partial V \to \mathbb{R}$ for which

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\phi}(v)] = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_v[f(\tilde{B}_{\tilde{\zeta}})], \quad \mathrm{Cov}[\tilde{\phi}(u)\tilde{\phi}(v)] = G(u,v).$$

We note that this definition extends to any compact, connected subset $K \subset \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^2$.

We remark on a consequence of the construction above. For any finite subset $A \subset \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^2$, we can define an electric network with vertex set $W = \mathbb{Z}^2 \cup A$, where any two vertices $u, v \in W$ are connected with an edge of conductance $(4|u-v|)^{-1}$ if there is a continuous path in $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ from u to v which does not contain any other points in W (note this path is always contained in I_e for some edge in standard nearest-neighbor graph). Then, if $V \subset W$ is a connected (proper) subset and $\tilde{\phi}$ is a metric graph GFF on $\tilde{V}$, $\{\tilde{\phi}(v) : v \in V\}$ is a discrete GFF on (the electric network with vertex set) V.

Next, we state the FKG inequality for the GFF, which will be used repeatedly throughout the paper. Let $\tilde{\phi}$ be a metric graph GFF and $\mathcal{F}$ be the σ-field generated by $\tilde{\phi}$. An event $A \in \mathcal{F}$ is increasing if $\mathbb{1}_A$ is increasing as a function of $\tilde{\phi}$. For two increasing events A and B, we have [Pi82]

$$\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) \geq \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B). \tag{2.2}$$

By symmetry, the same holds for decreasing events.

2.2 Excursion sets and first passage sets

Next, we introduce certain random subsets of V_δ and $\tilde{V}_\delta$ that are related to the existence of positive crossings. Let $E_\delta^{\geq 0}$ (resp. $\tilde{E}_\delta^{\geq 0}$) be the excursion set of ϕ_δ (resp. $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$) above 0. That is,

$$E_\delta^{\geq 0} = \{v \in V_\delta \,:\, \phi_\delta(v) \geq 0\},$$

and similarly for $\tilde{E}_\delta^{\geq 0}$. The excursion set below zero, $E_\delta^{\leq 0}$ (resp. $\tilde{E}_\delta^{\leq 0}$), is defined similarly. Next, we introduce the first passage set of ϕ_δ (resp. $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$) above 0. This set, which we denote by $\mathbb{A}_{\delta,0}$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}$) is the union of all connected components of $E_\delta^{\geq 0}$ that intersect the boundary. That is,

$$\mathbb{A}_{\delta,0} = \{v \in V_\delta \,:\, \exists \text{ nearest-neighbor path } \gamma \text{ from } v \text{ to } \partial V_\delta \text{ such that } \phi_\delta \geq 0 \text{ on } \gamma\}.$$

We will denote by $\mathbb{A}_{\delta,0}^l$ the union of all connected components of $\mathbb{A}_{\delta,0}$ intersecting $[a_\delta, b_\delta)$. That is, the left part of the first passage set. Similarly, we denote by $\mathbb{A}_{\delta,0}^r$ the union of all connected components of $\mathbb{A}_{\delta,0}$ intersecting $[c_\delta, d_\delta)$ (the right part of the first passage set). Note that there is a positive horizontal crossing of R_L when $\mathbb{A}_{\delta,0}^l = \mathbb{A}_{\delta,0}^r$. We denote by $\mathbb{V}_{\delta,0}$ the first passage set *below* 0, by $\mathbb{V}_{\delta,0}^b$ the union of all connected components of $\mathbb{V}_{\delta,0}$ intersecting $[b_\delta, c_\delta)$ (the bottom part of the first passage set), and by $\mathbb{V}_{\delta,0}^t$ the union of all connected components of $\mathbb{V}_{\delta,0}$ intersecting $[d_\delta, a_\delta)$ (the top part of the first passage set). The metric graph first passage sets $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}$, $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l$, $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^r$, and so on are defined similarly.

2.3 Exploration martingales

In this section we introduce a family of martingales which form the basis of the proofs of our results. We begin with some basic definitions and some fundamental results. For a subset $W \subset \tilde{V}_\delta$, we let $\mathcal{F}_W$ be the sigma algebra generated by $\{\tilde{\phi}_\delta(w) \,:\, w \in W\}$.

Definition 2.1 (Optional set)**.** *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a random compact subset of $\tilde{V}_\delta$ that almost surely has finitely many connected components. We say $\mathcal{K}$ is an optional set for $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ if for every deterministic, open subset W of $\tilde{V}_\delta$, $\{\mathcal{K} \subset W\} \in \mathcal{F}_W$. Similarly, we say $\mathcal{K}$ is optional for ϕ_δ if the following holds. For any deterministic open subset W of $\tilde{V}_\delta$, $\{\mathcal{K} \subset W\} \in \mathcal{F}_{W \cap V_\delta}$.*

We note that in the definition above, we use the subspace topology on $\tilde{V}_\delta$ considered as a subspace of $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^2$.

For an optional set $\mathcal{K}$, we define its σ-field $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{K}$ by

$$\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{K} = \left\{A \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{V}_\delta} \,:\, A \cap \{\mathcal{K} \subset W\} \in \mathcal{F}_W, \text{ for all deterministic, open } W \subset \tilde{V}_\delta\right\}.$$

Sometimes, it will be useful to consider the field $\text{sign}(\tilde{\phi}) = \{\text{sign}(\tilde{\phi}(v)) \,:\, v \in \tilde{V}_\delta\}$, where sign is the function

$$\text{sign}(x) = \begin{cases} -1, & x < 0, \\ 0, & x = 0, \\ 1, & x > 0. \end{cases}$$

For a subset $W \subset \tilde{V}_\delta$, we let $\mathcal{G}_W$ be the σ-field generated by $\{\text{sign}(\tilde{\phi}(w)) \,:\, w \in W\}$. We extend this notation to optional sets in the obvious way.

The strong Markov property of the metric graph GFF, stated below, will allow us to perform detailed analysis of the exploration martingales and is thus fundamental to our proofs.

Theorem 2.2 (Strong Markov property, [Lu16])**.** *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be optional for $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$. Given $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{K}$, the process $\{\tilde{\phi}_\delta(v) \,:\, v \in \overline{\tilde{V}_\delta \setminus \mathcal{K}}\}$ is a metric graph GFF on $\overline{\tilde{V}_\delta \setminus \mathcal{K}}$ with boundary condition given by the restriction of $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ to $\partial\mathcal{K} \cup \partial\tilde{V}_\delta$.*

We introduce some notation for harmonic extension. Assume the same setup as in Theorem 2.2, and let $\tilde{B}$ be a Brownian motion on $\tilde{V}_\delta$. Set $\tilde{\zeta} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \tilde{B}_t \in \partial\tilde{V}_\delta\}$ as in Section 2.1 and $\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \tilde{B}_t \in \mathcal{K}\}$ be the hitting time of $\mathcal{K}$. We define, for $v \in \tilde{V}_\delta$ and $w \in \mathcal{K} \cup \partial\tilde{V}_\delta$,

$$\mathrm{Hm}(v, w; \mathcal{K}) = \mathbb{P}_v\left(\tilde{B}_{\tau\wedge\tilde{\zeta}} = w\right).$$

Note that the harmonic measure $\mathrm{Hm}(v, \cdot; \mathcal{K})$ is always supported on a finite set of points since $|\partial\mathcal{K}| < \infty$ for compact $\mathcal{K}$ with finitely many connected components. With this notation, in Theorem 2.2, we have in fact, for $u, v \in \tilde{V}_\delta$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\phi}_\delta(v) \mid \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{K}] = \sum_{w\in\tilde{V}_\delta} \mathrm{Hm}(v, w; \mathcal{K})\tilde{\phi}_\delta(w),$$
$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\phi}_\delta(u)\tilde{\phi}_\delta(v) \mid \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{K}] = G(u, v) - \sum_{w\in\mathcal{K}} \mathrm{Hm}(u, w; \mathcal{K})G(w, v).$$

Note also that Theorem 2.2 implies the strong Markov property of the discrete GFF since any random subset $\mathcal{K} \subset V_\delta$ which is optional for ϕ_δ is optional for $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$.

Moreover, we define

$$\mathrm{Hm}(v, \mathcal{K}) = \sum_{w\in\mathcal{K}} \mathrm{Hm}(v, w; \mathcal{K}) = \mathbb{P}_v(\tau \leq \tilde{\zeta});$$

for $U \subset \tilde{V}_\delta$ a finite subset, we define

$$\mathrm{Hm}(U, \mathcal{K}) = \sum_{u\in U} \mathrm{Hm}(u, \mathcal{K}).$$

We can now introduce the exploration martingales. For a finite subset $U \subset V_\delta$, we define the "observable" X_U by

$$X_U = \sum_{v\in U} \tilde{\phi}_\delta(v).$$

For $\mathcal{I}_0$ a deterministic, compact subset of $\tilde{V}_\delta$ (with finitely many connected components), we will let M be the Doob martingale for X_U as we explore $E_\delta^{\geq 0}$, or $\tilde{E}_\delta^{\geq 0}$ from $\mathcal{I}_0$. We will specify whether the exploration happens on the metric graph or discrete graph whenever we use an exploration martingale.

To make this precise, we specify what we mean by exploring the excursion set from $\mathcal{I}_0$. We begin with the exploration on $\tilde{E}_\delta^{\geq 0}$ as it is simpler to explain. Let $\tilde{D}_\delta^{\geq 0}$ be the metric graph distance on $\tilde{E}_\delta^{\geq 0}$, and $\mathcal{I}_t$ be the ball of radius t around $\mathcal{I}_0$ with respect to $\tilde{D}_\delta^{\geq 0}$. We use the convention that for $u, v \in \tilde{V}_\delta$ with $u \notin \tilde{E}_\delta^{\geq 0}$ and $u \neq v$, $\tilde{D}_\delta^{\geq 0}(u, v) = \infty$ and $\tilde{D}_\delta^{\geq 0}(u, u) = 0$. It is easy to show that $\mathcal{I}_t$ is an optional set for each $t \geq 0$ [DW19].

The exploration corresponding to $E_\delta^{\geq 0}$ is similar in spirit but slightly more cumbersome to describe. In this case we take $\mathcal{V}_0 \subset V_\delta$ and $\mathcal{I}_0$ the metric graph on $\mathcal{V}_0$. We begin the exploration by setting $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{V}_0 \cap E_\delta^{\geq 0}$, and $\mathcal{B}_0 = \mathcal{V}_0 \cap E_\delta^{<0}$. For $k \geq 1$ an integer, we let

$$\mathcal{A}_k = \{v \in (V_\delta^o \setminus \mathcal{V}_{k-1}) \cap E_\delta^{\geq 0} : \exists u \in \mathcal{A}_{k-1},\, u \sim v\},$$
$$\mathcal{B}_k = \{v \in (V_\delta^o \setminus \mathcal{V}_{k-1}) \cap E_\delta^{<0} : \exists u \in \mathcal{A}_{k-1},\, u \sim v\},$$
$$\mathcal{V}_k = \mathcal{V}_{k-1} \cup \mathcal{A}_k \cup \mathcal{B}_k,$$

and $\mathcal{I}_k$ be the metric graph on $\mathcal{V}_k$ (as with M, whether $\mathcal{I}_k$ corresponds to the metric graph or discrete graph construction will be clear from context). In words, at each time step we explore all unexplored vertices that are adjacent to an explored vertex on which the field is non-negative. Note that $\mathcal{I}_k$ is an optional set, and in fact $\mathcal{I}_k \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{V}_{k-1}}$. To extend this definition to real t, we proceed by interpolation. That

is, if we let $\mathcal{E}_k = \{(u,v) : u \in \mathcal{I}_{k-1}, v \in \mathcal{A}_k \cup \mathcal{B}_k, u \sim v\}$ be the edges between $\mathcal{I}_{k-1}$ and $\mathcal{I}_k \setminus \mathcal{I}_{k-1}$ then for $k-1 < t < k$ we let

$$\mathcal{I}_t = \mathcal{I}_{k-1} \cup \left(\bigcup_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{E}_k} [u, (k-t)u + (t-k-1)v] \right).$$

Note that as before $\mathcal{I}_t \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{V}_{k-1}}$ and so $\mathcal{I}_t$ is an optional set for any t.

Explorations on $E_{\tilde{\delta}}^{\leq 0}$ and $\tilde{E}_{\tilde{\delta}}^{\leq 0}$ are defined in the same way. As alluded to above, we take

$$M_t = \mathbb{E}[X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}_t}].$$

It is straightforward to check that M is a continuous martingale [DW19]. We now turn to the quadratic variation of the exploration martingale.

It is straightforward to check that for a Doob martingale, the quadratic variation is equal to the decrease in the conditional variance [DW19]. That is,

$$\langle M \rangle_t = \mathrm{Var}[X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}_0}] - \mathrm{Var}[X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}_t}].$$

We denote by G_t the Green's function on $\tilde{V}_\delta \setminus \mathcal{I}_t$, and write

$$\mathrm{Hm}_t(u,v) = \mathrm{Hm}(u,v;\mathcal{I}_t). \tag{2.3}$$

We get from Theorem 2.2 that

$$\mathrm{Var}[X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}_t}] = \sum_{u,u'\in U} G_t(u,u') = \sum_{u,u'\in U} \left[G(u,u') - \sum_{v\in\mathcal{I}_t} \mathrm{Hm}_t(u,v) G(v,u') \right]. \tag{2.4}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M \rangle_t &= \sum_{u,u'\in U} \left[\sum_{v\in\mathcal{I}_t} \mathrm{Hm}_t(u,v) G(v,u') - \sum_{v'\in\mathcal{I}_0} \mathrm{Hm}_0(u,v') G(v',u') \right], \\ &= \sum_{u,u'\in U} \sum_{v\in\mathcal{I}_t} \mathrm{Hm}_t(u,v) G_0(v,u'), \\ &= \sum_{v\in\mathcal{I}_t} \mathrm{Hm}_t(U,v) G_0(v,U), \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where $G_0(v,U) = \sum_{u\in U} G_0(v,u)$.

2.4 Brownian motion tools

In this section, we recall two facts about continuous martingales and Brownian motion that will be useful throughout the paper. The first is [RY99, Theorem 1.7 in Chapter V], stated below, which is a version of the Dubins-Schwarz theorem for martingales of bounded quadratic variation.

Theorem 2.3. *Let be M a continuous martingale, $T_t = \inf\{s : \langle M \rangle_s > t\}$, and W be the following process*

$$W_t = \begin{cases} M_{T_t} - M_0 & t < \langle M \rangle_\infty, \\ M_\infty - M_0 & t \geq \langle M \rangle_\infty. \end{cases}$$

Then W is a Brownian motion stopped at $\langle M \rangle_\infty$.

When applying this theorem, we will generally denote by B a Brownian motion which satisfies $B_t = M_{T_t} - M_0$ for $t < \langle M \rangle_\infty$ but is not stopped at $\langle M \rangle_\infty$, so that $W_t = B_{t \wedge \langle M \rangle_\infty}$. Suppose M is the exploration martingale in Section 2.3. By Theorem 2.3, the process $\{M_{T_t} - M_0 : t \geq 0\}$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}_0}$, so we will generally take B to be independent of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}_0}$ as well.

The second result gives the distribution of the hitting time of a line by Brownian motion.

Proposition 2.4. *Let B be a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion, Φ be the distribution function of the standard normal distribution, and $\bar{\Phi}(x) = 1 - \Phi(x)$. For $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b > 0$, let $\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0 : B_t \leq mt - b\}$. Then for $T > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau \leq T) = \bar{\Phi}\left(\frac{b}{\sqrt{T}} - m\sqrt{T}\right) + e^{2bm}\bar{\Phi}\left(\frac{b}{\sqrt{T}} + m\sqrt{T}\right).$$

Proof. The density of τ is given in [BS02, Equation (2.0.2) in Part II]. Taking an integral then gives the desired result. □

We note two facts that follow directly from Proposition 2.4 and will be used repeatedly throughout the paper. First, letting $m = 0$ we obtain that $\sup\{B_s : 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ and $-\inf\{B_s : 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ have the same distribution as $|B_t|$. Second, for $m < 0$ and $b > 0$ we have by letting $T \to \infty$ that $\mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty) = e^{2bm} < 1$.

2.5 Random walk estimates

We conclude this section with some results about Green's functions and harmonic measures which will be used later. The first result follows from [LL10, Theorem 4.4.4, Proposition 4.6.2]. It will be useful in comparing the Green's function in different domains. Below and throughout the paper, a subset $V \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ is simply connected if for any loop in V, all the vertices in the interior of the loop (i.e. separated from infinity by the loop) are contained in V.

Lemma 2.5. *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that the following holds. For $V \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ simply connected, let G be the Green's function on V. For $v \in V^o$, let $\Delta = \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial V)$ be the Euclidean distance between v and ∂V. Then*

$$\left| G(v,v) - \frac{\pi}{2}\log(\Delta + 1) \right| \leq C.$$

Next, we provide two estimates on harmonic measures for a random walk started near the boundary of a box. The first provides an upper bound on the probability that a random walk started near the left side of a box doesn't exit the box through the left side. Recall that S is a simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}^2$, $\mathbb{P}_v$ is the law of S started at v, and that we take $\mathbb{Z}^2 \subset \mathbb{C}$ in the obvious way.

Lemma 2.6. *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the following holds. For $N, M \geq 2$, $R = [0, N] \times [-M, M]$, $V = R \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$, and $\zeta = \min\{n \geq 1 : S_n \in \partial V\}$. We have*

$$\mathbb{P}_1(\Re(S_\zeta) \neq 0) \leq \frac{c}{N \wedge M}.$$

Proof. Let $\zeta' = \min\{n \geq 1 : \Re(S_n) = 0\}$ and $K = N \wedge M$. We have by [LL10, Theorem 8.1.2] that

$$\mathbb{P}_1(|\Im(S_{\zeta'})| > K) \leq \frac{c}{K}.$$

Let $D = \partial V \setminus \{z : \Re(z) = 0\}$ and note that there exists a universal constant $c' > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_v(|\Im(S_{\zeta'})| > K) \geq c', \quad \forall v \in D.$$

Finally, the conclusion follows by noting

$$\mathbb{P}_1(|\Im(S_{\zeta'})| > K) = \sum_{v \in D} \mathbb{P}_1(S_\zeta = v)\mathbb{P}_v(|\Im(S_{\zeta'})| > K) \geq c' \mathbb{P}_1(\Re(S_\zeta) \neq 0).$$

□

The second result provides a lower bound on the probability that a random walk started near the left side of a box will exit the box through the right side.

Lemma 2.7. *For any $a > 0$ there exists a constant $c_a > 0$ such that the following holds. For $N, M \geq 2$ with $M \geq aN$, $R = [0, N] \times [-M, M]$, $V = R \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$, and $\zeta = \min\{n \geq 1 : S_n \in \partial V\}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}_1(\Re(S_\zeta) = N) \geq \frac{c_a}{N}.$$

Proof. Let $M' = M/2$, $V' = (-\infty, N] \times [-M', M'] \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$, and $\zeta' = \min\{n \geq 1 : S_n \in \partial V'\}$. For an integer k, let $v_k = 1 + ik$. By the invariance principle, there exists a constant $c_a > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{v_k}(\Re(S_{\zeta'}) = N) \geq c_a, \quad |k| \leq M'/2.$$

Let $D = \{v_k : |k| \leq M' - 1\}$, $\tau = \min\{n \geq 1 : S_n \in D\} \wedge \zeta'$, and G be the Green's function on V'. By a last exit decomposition, we have for $v \in D$

$$\mathbb{P}_v(\Re(S_{\zeta'}) = N) = \sum_{v' \in D} G(v, v')\mathbb{P}_{v'}(\Re(S_\tau) = N).$$

By [DL18, Lemma 1], $\max\{G(v, D) : v \in D\} \leq c'_a N$. Therefore, combining the last two displays and summing over $v \in D$ gives

$$c_a N \leq \sum_{v \in D} \mathbb{P}_v(\Re(S_{\zeta'}) = N) \leq c'_a N \sum_{v \in D} \mathbb{P}_v(\Re(S_\tau) = N).$$

Finally, we note that for any $v \in D$, $\mathbb{P}_v(\Re(S_\tau) = N) \leq \mathbb{P}_1(\Re(S_\zeta) = N)$, so the conclusion follows. □

3 Estimates of crossing probabilities in the metric graph

3.1 The zero-boundary case

In this section we prove (1.4). The proof consists of analyzing the exploration martingale M, introduced in Section 2.3, corresponding to an exploration on $\tilde{E}_\delta^{\geq 0}$ with $\mathcal{I}_0 = [c'_\delta, d'_\delta)$ and $U = \{u \in \partial V_\delta^o : \Re(u) \leq L/4\}$. Recall that

$$M_t = \mathbb{E}[X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}_t}] = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}_t} \mathrm{Hm}_t(U, v)\tilde{\phi}_\delta(v).$$

We let $\mathcal{I}_0^- = \{v \in \mathcal{I}_0 : \tilde{\phi}_\delta(v) < 0\}$. Since $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ is non-negative on $\mathcal{I}_t \setminus \mathcal{I}_0^-$, we have

$$M_t \geq \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}_0^-} \mathrm{Hm}_t(U, v)\tilde{\phi}_\delta(v).$$

Noting that $\mathrm{Hm}_t(U, v)$ is decreasing in t for $v \in \mathcal{I}_0^-$ (since $\mathcal{I}_t$ is increasing), we conclude

$$M_t - M_0 \geq -\sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}_0} \mathrm{Hm}_0(U, v)(\tilde{\phi}_\delta(v) \vee 0). \tag{3.1}$$

Next, we turn to bounding the quadratic variation. In particular, we claim that there exists $c = c(L) > 0$ such that

$$\left\{ [a'_\delta, b'_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c'_\delta, d'_\delta) \right\} \subseteq \{ \langle M \rangle_\infty \geq c |\log(\delta)| \} . \tag{3.2}$$

Before proving (3.2), we show how it can be used to conclude the proof of (1.4). Suppose $(B_s)_{s \geq 0}$ is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion. Combining Theorem 2.3 with (3.1) and (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left([a'_\delta, b'_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c'_\delta, d'_\delta) \right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{0 \leq s \leq c|\log(\delta)|} B_s \geq - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}_0} \mathrm{Hm}_0(U, v)(\tilde{\phi}_\delta(v) \vee 0) \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{c|\log(\delta)|}} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}_0} \mathrm{Hm}_0(U, v) \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\phi}_\delta(v) \vee 0] \\
&\leq \frac{c'}{\sqrt{|\log(\delta)|}} \mathrm{Hm}(U, \mathcal{I}_0),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we used the fact that, for t and $a > 0$, we have by Proposition 2.4 that $\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{0 \leq s \leq t} B_s \geq -a\right) \leq a/\sqrt{t}$; and in the third inequality we used the fact that $G(v, v) \leq 4$ for $v \in \mathcal{I}_0$ (since v is adjacent to ∂V_δ). It remains to bound $\mathrm{Hm}(U, \mathcal{I}_0)$. Since $U, \mathcal{I}_0 \subset V_\delta$, we can consider a discrete time simple random walk S (on $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$), killed on ∂V_δ (instead of the metric graph Brownian motion $\tilde{B}$). For a vertex $u \in U$, we have $\mathrm{Hm}(u, \mathcal{I}_0) \leq c\delta$ by Lemma 2.6. Since $|U| \leq c/\delta$, we conclude

$$\mathrm{Hm}(U, \mathcal{I}_0) \leq c.$$

Thus,the proof will be complete once we prove (3.2).

Proof of (3.2). We begin by noting that on $\left\{ [a'_\delta, b'_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c'_\delta, d'_\delta) \right\}$ there exists a vertex $u^* \in [a'_\delta, b'_\delta)$ such that the set $\mathcal{I}_\infty$ contains a nearest neighbor path $\gamma \subset V_\delta^o$ connecting u^* to the complement of the box of radius $L/4$ around u^*. We will show that for any such u^* and any such γ, we have

$$\mathrm{Var}[X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}_0}] - \mathrm{Var}[X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_{\gamma \cup \mathcal{I}_0}] \geq c|\log(\delta)|.$$

Recall that G_0 denotes the Green's function on $\tilde{V}_\delta \setminus \mathcal{I}_0$ and that

$$\mathrm{Var}[X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}_0}] - \mathrm{Var}[X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_{\gamma \cup \mathcal{I}_0}] = \sum_{v \in \gamma} \mathrm{Hm}_0(U, v; \gamma) G_0(v, U).$$

Let S be a discrete-time simple random walk (on $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$) killed on $\partial V_\delta \cup \mathcal{I}_0$ and T_U be the hitting time of U by S. It is easy to see that

$$G_0(v, U) \geq \mathbb{P}_v(T_U < \infty) \geq c, \quad \forall v \in \gamma,$$

for some universal constant $c > 0$. Therefore, it remains to show

$$\mathrm{Hm}_0(U, \gamma) \geq c|\log(\delta)|. \tag{3.3}$$

To this end, we partition U and γ as follows. For $n \geq 0$ an integer, we let Q_n be the box of radius $r_n = 2^{-n-2}L$ centered at u^*, $A_n = Q_n \setminus Q_{n+1}$, $U_n = U \cap A_n$, and $\gamma_n = \gamma \cap A_n$. We note that $N = \max\{n \geq 1 : r_n \geq 1000\delta\}$ satisfies $N \geq c|\log(\delta)|$. Finally, we claim there exists a universal constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\mathrm{Hm}_0(U_n, \gamma_n; \gamma) \geq c, \quad 0 \leq n \leq N .$$

For the proof, let $u_1 \in U_n$ be such that $2r_n/3 - \delta < |u_1 - u^*|_{\ell_\infty} \leq 2r_n/3$, $u_2 \in U_n$ be such that $5r_n/6 \leq |u_2 - u^*|_{\ell_\infty} < 5r_n/6 + \delta$, and $Q_{n,2}$ be a box of radius $r_n/12$ centered at u_2. With these choices, the distances between u_1 and $Q_{n,2}$, and between $\{u_1\} \cup Q_{n,2}$ and A_n^c are of the same order as r_n. Therefore, if we let S be a simple random walk and $\mathfrak{E}$ be the event that S hits $Q_{n,2} \cap U$ and then completes a loop around u^* before exiting A_n, we have $\mathbb{P}_{u_1}(\mathfrak{E}) \geq c$. Note that such a walk necessarily contains a path from U_n to γ_n which does not hit ∂V_δ. Therefore, letting T be the hitting time of $U_n \cup \gamma_n$ by S, and ζ be the hitting time of A_n^c, we have by a last exit decomposition

$$\mathbb{P}_{u_1}(\mathfrak{E}) \leq \sum_{u \in U} G_n^*(u_1, u) \mathbb{P}_u(S_{T \wedge \zeta} \in \gamma_n),$$

where $G_n^*(u_1, u)$ is the expected number of visits a random walk started at u_1 makes to u after hitting $Q_{n,2} \cap U_n$, and before exiting A_n. It is immediate that $\mathbb{P}_u(S_{T \wedge \zeta} \in \gamma_n) \leq \mathrm{Hm}(u, \gamma_n; \gamma)$, and we have that

$$G_n^*(u_1, u) \leq G_n(u_1, u) \wedge \max\{G_n(u', u) \,:\, u' \in Q_{n,2} \cap U_n\},$$

where G_n is the Green's function on $A_n \cap \delta\mathbb{Z}^2$. It follows from [LL10, Theorem 4.4.4, Proposition 4.6.2] that G_n^* is uniformly bounded. That is, there exists a universal constant c such that

$$G_n^*(u_1, u) \leq c, \quad u \in U_n.$$

Finally, this implies that

$$\mathrm{Hm}_0(U_n, \gamma_n; \gamma) \geq \sum_{u \in U_n} \mathbb{P}_u(S_{T \wedge \zeta} \in \gamma_n) \geq c \mathbb{P}_{u_1}(\mathfrak{E}) \geq c.$$

This concludes the proof. □

3.2 The alternating boundary case

In this section we prove the lower bound in (1.6). The proof consists of two main claims, both of which are proved using an exploration martingale. Recall that $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0}$) is the first passage set of $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ above zero (resp. below zero). First, letting $\Pi = \{z \,:\, |\Im(z) - 1/2| \leq 1/4\}$, we claim that there exists a constant $c_1 = c_1(L, \lambda) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cap \Pi = \emptyset\right) \geq c_1. \tag{3.4}$$

Next, we claim that conditional on this event, the probability that there is a positive crossing is bounded uniformly away from zero. That is, letting $\mathbb{P}^+$ denote the law of $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ given $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0}}$ (and $\mathbb{E}^+$ be the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}^+$), there exists a constant $c_2 = c_2(L, \lambda) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}^+\left([a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right) \geq c_2 \quad \text{a.s. on } \{\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cap \Pi = \emptyset\}. \tag{3.5}$$

Assuming (3.4) and (3.5), we obtain the lower bound in (1.6):

$$\mathbb{P}\left([a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left([a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta), \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cap \Pi = \emptyset\right) \geq c_1 c_2.$$

Thus it remains to show (3.4) and (3.5).

Proof of (3.4). For this proof, we consider an exploration martingale M, introduced in Section 2.3, corresponding to an exploration of $\tilde{E}_\delta^{\leq 0}$ from $\mathcal{I}_0 = [b_\delta, c_\delta) \cup [d_\delta, a_\delta)$ with observable corresponding to

$$U = \left\{ u \,:\, u \in [a'_\delta, b'_\delta) \cup [c'_\delta, d'_\delta), \left| \Im(u) - \frac{1}{2} \right| \leq \frac{3}{8} \right\}$$

The following processes will be useful in the analysis

$$\pi_t = \mathrm{Hm}_t(U, [a_\delta, b_\delta) \cup [c_\delta, d_\delta)), \quad \mu_t = \mathrm{Hm}_t(U, \mathcal{I}_t).$$

Note that we have $M_0 = \lambda(\pi_0 - \mu_0)$ and $M_t \leq \lambda \pi_t$. Since π_t is decreasing,

$$M_t - M_0 \leq \lambda \mu_0.$$

Note that by Lemma 2.6 there exists $c > 0$ such that $\mathrm{Hm}(u, \mathcal{I}_0) \leq c\delta$ for all $u \in U$, which implies $\mu_0 \leq c$. Let $T = \tilde{D}_\delta^{\leq 0}(\mathcal{I}_0, \Pi)$ be the time that the exploration reaches Π. On $\{\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cap \Pi \neq \emptyset\}$, the set $\mathcal{I}_T$ contains a nearest neighbor path $\gamma \subset V_\delta^0$ crossing one of the strips making up the region

$$\Pi' = \left\{ z \,:\, \frac{1}{4} \leq \left| \Im(z) - \frac{1}{2} \right| \leq \frac{3}{8} \right\}.$$

We claim that for there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for any such path

$$\mathrm{Var}(X_U) - \mathrm{Var}(X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_\gamma) \geq c. \tag{3.6}$$

Assuming this bound for now, we have

$$\langle M \rangle_T \geq \min_\gamma \{\mathrm{Var}(X_U) - \mathrm{Var}(X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_\gamma)\} \geq c,$$

almost surely on $\{\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cap \Pi \neq \emptyset\}$ (here we used the fact that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}_0}$ is the trivial σ-field since $\mathcal{I}_0 \subset \partial V_\delta$). Applying Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.4 gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cap \Pi \neq \emptyset) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq c} B_t \leq c' \lambda \right) \leq 1 - c''.$$

Turning to the proof of (3.6), we have by the invariance principle that $G(v, U) \geq c$ for any $v \in \gamma$. Therefore

$$\mathrm{Var}(X_U) - \mathrm{Var}(X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_\gamma) = \sum_{v \in \gamma} \mathrm{Hm}(U, v; \gamma) G(v, U) \geq c \, \mathrm{Hm}(U, \gamma).$$

Finally, by Lemma 2.7 there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $\mathrm{Hm}(u, \gamma) \geq c\delta$ for all $u \in U \cap \Pi$. Since $|U \cap \Pi| \geq c\delta^{-1}$, it follows that $\mathrm{Hm}(U, \gamma) \geq c$. This concludes the proof. □

Proof of (3.5). Let $\tilde{V}_\delta^+$ be the connected component of $\tilde{V}_\delta \backslash \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0}$ containing $[a_\delta, b_\delta) \cup [c_\delta, d_\delta)$, $V_\delta^+ = \tilde{V}_\delta^+ \cap \delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ be the vertices in $\tilde{V}_\delta^+$, and $U = [c'_\delta, d'_\delta) \cap V_\delta^+$. For any $u \in U$, let $\mathrm{adj}(u)$ be the (unique) vertex in $[c_\delta, d_\delta)$ adjacent to u. For $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, let $u_\epsilon = \epsilon u + (1 - \epsilon)\,\mathrm{adj}(u)$ and

$$U_\epsilon = \{u_\epsilon \,:\, u \in U\}.$$

Finally, we let M_ϵ be the exploration martingale corresponding to an exploration on $\tilde{E}_\delta^{\geq 0}$ from $\mathcal{I}_0 = [a_\delta, b_\delta)$ with obsevable X_{U_ϵ}. As in the proof of (3.4), we will use the processes

$$\pi_{\epsilon,t} = \mathrm{Hm}_t^+(U_\epsilon, [c_\delta, d_\delta)), \quad \mu_{\epsilon,t} = \mathrm{Hm}_t^+(U_\epsilon, \mathcal{I}_t),$$

where Hm_t^+ is the harmonic measure on $\mathcal{I}_t \cup \partial\tilde{V}_\delta^+$. That is, letting $\tilde{\zeta}^+$ be the hitting time of $\partial\tilde{V}_\delta^+$ and τ_t be the hitting time of $\mathcal{I}_t$, $\mathrm{Hm}_t^+(u,v) = \mathbb{P}_u(\tilde{B}_{\tau_t \wedge \tilde{\zeta}^+} = v)$. Note that Hm_0^+ is simply the harmonic measure on $\partial\tilde{V}_\delta^+$ so we will write Hm^+ in this case instead. Note that $M_{\epsilon,t} \geq \lambda\pi_{\epsilon,t}$ and $M_{\epsilon,0} = \lambda(\mu_{\epsilon,0} + \pi_{\epsilon,0})$, so we obtain

$$M_{\epsilon,t} - M_{\epsilon,0} \geq -\lambda(\mu_{\epsilon,0} + \pi_{\epsilon,0} - \pi_{\epsilon,t}),$$

with equality if and only if $M_{\epsilon,t} = M_{\epsilon,\infty}$ and $\mathcal{I}_t \cap U_\epsilon = \emptyset$ (i.e. the exploration has stopped by time t before hitting U_ϵ). To conclude the proof, we need to lower bound $\mu_{\epsilon,0}$ and upper bound $\langle M_\epsilon \rangle_t$.

First, we claim that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that $\mu_{\epsilon,0} \geq c_1\epsilon$. Indeed, we have by Lemma 2.7 and the assumption $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cap \Pi = \emptyset$ that for any $u \in U$ such that $|\Im(u) - 1/2| \leq 1/8$

$$\mathrm{Hm}^+(u, [a_\delta, b_\delta)) \geq c_1\delta.$$

It follows that $\mathrm{Hm}^+(U, [a_\delta, b_\delta)) \geq c_1$. Next, by construction a metric graph Brownian motion started at u_ϵ will hit u before $\mathrm{adj}(u)$ with probability ϵ. This gives

$$\mu_{\epsilon,0} = \epsilon\,\mathrm{Hm}^+(U, [a_\delta, b_\delta)) \geq c_1\epsilon.$$

Second, for the upper bound on the quadratic variation, we claim that there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\langle M_\epsilon \rangle_t \leq c_2\epsilon(\pi_{\epsilon,0} - \pi_{\epsilon,t}), \quad \forall t \leq \tilde{D}_\delta^{\geq 0}([a_\delta, b_\delta), U_\epsilon).$$

For the proof, note that for such t we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{\epsilon,0} - \pi_{\epsilon,t} &= \sum_{v \in \partial\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_t} \mathrm{Hm}_t^+(U_\epsilon, v)\,\mathrm{Hm}^+(v, [c_\delta, d_\delta)), \\
\langle M_\epsilon \rangle_t &= \sum_{v \in \partial\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_t} \mathrm{Hm}_t^+(U_\epsilon, v) G^+(v, U_\epsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

where G^+ is the Green's function of a metric graph Brownian motion killed on $\partial\tilde{V}_\delta^+$. To proceed, let τ_{u_ϵ} be the hitting time of u_ϵ and recall $\tilde{\zeta}^+$ is the hitting time of $\partial\tilde{V}_\delta^+$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
G^+(v, U_\epsilon) &= \sum_{u \in U} \mathbb{P}_v(\tau_{u_\epsilon} < \tilde{\zeta}^+) G^+(u_\epsilon, u_\epsilon), \\
&= \epsilon \sum_{u \in U} \mathbb{P}_v(\tau_{u_\epsilon} < \tilde{\zeta}^+)[\epsilon G^+(u,u) + 4(1-\epsilon)], \\
&\leq 4\epsilon \sum_{u \in U} \mathbb{P}_v(\tau_{u_\epsilon} < \tilde{\zeta}^+),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we used (2.1) to express $G^+(u_\epsilon, u_\epsilon)$ as a sum of terms involving u and $\mathrm{adj}(u)$. Since $\mathrm{adj}(u) \in \partial\tilde{V}_\delta^+$ we have $G^+(u, \mathrm{adj}(u)) = G^+(\mathrm{adj}(u), \mathrm{adj}(u)) = 0$. In the inequality we used the fact that $G^+(u,u) \leq 4$ since u is adjacent to $\partial\tilde{V}_\delta^+$. Finally, assuming from now on that $\epsilon < 1/2$, we have

$$\mathrm{Hm}^+(v, \mathrm{adj}(u)) \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_v(\tau_{u_\epsilon} < \tilde{\zeta}^+).$$

It follows that $\langle M_\epsilon \rangle_t \leq 16\epsilon(\pi_{\epsilon,0} - \pi_{\epsilon,t})$. Putting both bounds together we conclude that (conditional on $\{\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cap \Pi = \emptyset\}$)

$$\left\{ M_{\epsilon,t} - M_{\epsilon,0} \geq -\frac{c_2\lambda}{\epsilon}\langle M_\epsilon \rangle_t - c_1\lambda\epsilon,\ 0 \leq t \leq \tilde{D}_\delta^{\geq 0}([a_\delta, b_\delta), U_\epsilon) \right\} \subseteq \{[a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}}{\longleftrightarrow} U_\epsilon\}.$$

Applying Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.4 (after re-scaling the Brownian motion) we obtain for some $c > 0$ (independent of ϵ),

$$\mathbb{P}^+\left([a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} U_\epsilon\right) \geq \mathbb{P}(B_t \geq -\lambda(c_2 t + c_1), t \geq 0) \geq c,$$

where B is a standard Brownian motion. Letting $\epsilon \to 0$ concludes the proof. □

4 Estimates of crossing probabilities in the discrete graph

The goal of this section is to prove (1.5) and (1.8). Both proofs begin with the observation that in the discrete graph, when we explore the excursion set $E_\delta^{\geq 0}$ starting from $\mathcal{I}_0$, the set $\partial\mathcal{I}_\infty \setminus \partial V_\delta$ is contained in $E_\delta^{<0}$. We show that in fact, suitably defined averages of the field on this set are bounded away from 0 with high probability. Following the literature on the subject, we call this phenomenon entropic repulsion. It was previously studied in a similar context in [DL18].

4.1 Entropic repulsion for explorations on the discrete graph

In this section we formalize the idea, stated above, that when there is no horizontal crossing the values of the field on the outer boundary of the explored set are strictly negative. We begin with some setup. For this section, we let $\tilde{K} \subset \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ be compact and simply connected and $V = \tilde{K} \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$. For $U, I \subset V$, we let D and D' be

$$D = \{v \in I : \mathrm{Hm}(U, v; I) > 0\}, \quad D' = \{v \in I : \mathrm{Hm}(U, v; I \setminus D) > 0\},$$

where $\mathrm{Hm}(\cdot, \cdot; W)$ is the harmonic measure on $W \cup \partial\tilde{K}$. That is, D is the subset of ∂I that can be reached from U, and D' is the subset of $\partial(I \setminus D)$ that can be hit from U (equivalently from D). As the notation suggests, U corresponds to the "observable" in the definition of the exploration martingale, while I corresponds to the explored set. We will assume the pair (U, I) satisfies some geometric conditions. First, that for any $v \in D$, all edges incident on v are contained in $\tilde{K}$. That is, $\mathrm{dist}(v, \partial\tilde{\mathcal{K}}) \geq 1$, where dist denotes the Euclidean distance. Second, that for any $v \in D$, there exists $w \in I \setminus D$ such that $v \sim w$. We let ξ be given by

$$\xi(U, I) = \frac{1}{\mathrm{Hm}(U, I)} \sup\{\mathrm{Hm}(U, w; I \setminus D) : w \in D'\}.$$

The reason the supremum is over $w \in D'$ is the following. For any $v \in D$ there exists $w \in D'$ such that $v \sim w$ which gives

$$\mathrm{Hm}(U, w; I \setminus D) \geq \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{Hm}(U, v; I).$$

Therefore, $\mathrm{Hm}(U, v; I) \leq 4\xi(U, I)\,\mathrm{Hm}(U, I)$ for any $v \in D$. Finally, we let $\tilde{\phi}$ be a metric graph GFF on $\tilde{K}$ with boundary condition f satisfying $|f(v)| \leq \lambda$ for all $v \in \partial\tilde{K}$. As usual, we let ϕ be the restriction of $\tilde{\phi}$ to V. Note that ϕ is a discrete GFF on $V \cup \partial\tilde{K}$ with boundary condition f. The goal is to show that when $\xi(U, I)$ is small and we condition ϕ to be negative on D, the typical value of the field on D (as seen from U) is bounded away from zero with high probability.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\tilde{K}$, U, and I satisfy the conditions above. Additionally, let I^+ and I^- be a partition of I such that $D \subseteq I^-$ and for every $v \in D$, there exists $w \in I^+$ such that $v \sim w$. Let $\mathfrak{E}$ be the following event*

$$\mathfrak{E} = \{\tilde{\phi}(v) < 0 : v \in I^-\} \cap \{\tilde{\phi}(v) \geq 0 : v \in I^+\}.$$

Let Y be the following random variable

$$Y = \sum_{v \in D} \mathrm{Hm}(U, v; I)\phi(v).$$

There exists a universal function r satisfying $r(x) \to 0$ as $x \to 0$ and a constant $\Delta = \Delta(\lambda) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \leq -\Delta \,\mathrm{Hm}(U, I) \mid \mathfrak{E}) \geq 1 - r(\xi(U, I)).$$

The proof follows along the same lines as [DL18, Lemma 6], and consists of bounding the conditional mean and variance of Y given $\mathfrak{E}$ and the field on I^+. We isolate three lemmas that will be used repeatedly throughout the rest of the paper.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\{B_{1,v}\}_{v \in V}$ and $\{B_{2,v}\}_{v \in V}$ be a sequence of non-empty intervals satisfying*

$$\inf B_{1,v} \leq \inf B_{2,v}, \quad \sup B_{1,v} \leq \sup B_{2,v}, \quad \forall v \in V.$$

Let $\tilde{\phi}_1$ and $\tilde{\phi}_2$ be metric graph GFFs on $\tilde{K}$ with boundary conditions f_1 and f_2 such that $f_1(v) \leq f_2(v)$ for $v \in \partial\tilde{K}$, and let ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 be the corresponding discrete graph GFFs. We assume that $B_{j,v} = \{f_j(v)\}$ for $v \in \partial\tilde{K} \cap V$. Finally, for $j = 1, 2$ let $\mathfrak{E}_j$ be the event

$$\mathfrak{E}_j = \{\phi_j(v) \in B_{j,v}, v \in V\}.$$

Then the law of ϕ_1 given $\mathfrak{E}_1$ is stochastically smaller than the law of ϕ_2 given $\mathfrak{E}_2$.

Proof. The proof is the same as the proof of [DL18, Equation (49)]; we reproduce it here for completeness. Let ν_1 be the law of ϕ_1 given $\mathfrak{E}_1$ and ν_2 be the law of ϕ_2 given $\mathfrak{E}_2$. Further, let $\tilde{K}'$ be the closure of an open neighborhood of $\tilde{K}$ such that $\tilde{K}' \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 = V$. Let $\tilde{\phi}'$ be a metric graph GFF on $\tilde{K}'$ with zero boundary condition, say, and ϕ' be the corresponding discrete GFF on the graph with vertex set $V' = V \cup \partial\tilde{K}$. We note that μ, the law of ϕ', has density $\mu(dr) = \exp(-H(r))dr$ (where r is a $|V'|$-dimensional vector) such that for every $r, r' \in \mathbb{R}^{|V'|}$

$$H(r \wedge r') + H(r \vee r') \leq H(r) + H(r'),$$

where $\wedge$ and $\vee$ are taken coordinate by coordinate. Additionally, we note ν_j is simply the law of the restriction of ϕ' to V, conditioned on the event

$$\mathfrak{E}'_j = \{\phi'(v) = f_j(v), v \in \partial\tilde{K}\} \cap \{\phi'(v) \in B_{j,v}, v \in V\}.$$

We let μ_j be the law of ϕ' conditioned on $\mathfrak{E}'_j$. For $q > 0$ and $B \subset \mathbb{R}$, we define the function

$$W_B^{(q)}(t) = q \,\mathrm{dist}(t, B)^4. \tag{4.1}$$

We can then approximate μ_1 and μ_2 by probability measures satisfying the following

$$\mu_j^{(q)}(dr) \propto \exp\left(-\sum_{v \in V \cup \partial\tilde{K}} W_{B_{j,v}}^{(q)}(r_v)\right)\mu(dr),$$

where we set $B_{j,v} = [f_j(v)]$ for $v \in \partial\tilde{K}$. It is clear that for any $t, t' \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $v \in V \cup \partial\tilde{K}$ we have

$$W_{B_{1,v}}^{(q)}(t \wedge t') + W_{B_{2,v}}^{(q)}(t \vee t') \leq W_{B_{1,v}}^{(q)}(t) + W_{B_{2,v}}^{(q)}(t').$$

Therefore, it follows from [Pr74] that $\mu_2^{(q)}$ is stochastically smaller than $\mu_1^{(q)}$ for any $q > 0$. As $q \to \infty$, $\mu_i^{(q)}$ converges weakly to μ_i, so it follows μ_2 is stochastically smaller than μ_1. Finally, this implies that ν_1 is stochastically smaller than ν_2. □

In light of this lemma (and the fact that Y is an increasing function of ϕ) we will assume, without loss of generality, that $I^- = D$ and I^+ is the set of all vertices in V separated from U by D. That is,

$$I^+ = \{v \in V \,:\, \mathrm{Hm}(U, v; D \cup \{v\}) = 0\}.$$

With this assumption, we are ready to begin the moment analysis. We start with the variance as the argument is easier.

Lemma 4.3.

$$\mathrm{Var}[Y \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}] \le \mathrm{Var}[Y \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}] \quad a.s.$$

Proof. The proof is the same as that of [DL18, Equation (56)]; we reproduce it here for completeness. Let $\mathbf{Y} = (\phi(v))_{v\in D}$, μ be the law of $\mathbf{Y}$ given $\mathcal{F}_{I^+}$, and ν be the law of $\mathbf{Y}$ given $\mathcal{F}_{I^+}$ and $\mathfrak{E}$. Let m and Σ be the mean and variance of $\mathbf{Y}$ given $\mathcal{F}_{I^+}$ and note that Σ is deterministic. Recall $\mu(dr) \propto \exp(-\frac{1}{2}(r-m)\Sigma^{-1}(r-m))dr$. For $q > 0$, we approximate ν by a probability measure $\nu^{(q)}$ satisfying the following

$$\nu^{(q)} \propto \exp\left(-q \sum_{v\in D} r_v^4 \mathbb{1}_{r_v \ge 0}\right) \mu(dr).$$

Since the second derivative of $f(t) = t^4 \mathbb{1}_{t\ge 0}$ is non-negative, we have that $\nu^{(q)}$ is of the form $\nu^{(q)}(dr) = \exp(-H(r))dr$ where $\inf_r \mathrm{Hess}(H)(r) \ge \frac{1}{2}\Sigma^{-1}$. Therefore, by the Brascamp-Lieb inequality [BL76], for a random vector $\mathbf{Y}^{(q)} \sim \nu^{(q)}$ and any $l \in \mathbb{R}^{|D|}$, we have $\mathrm{Var}[l \cdot \mathbf{Y}^{(q)}] \le \mathrm{Var}[l \cdot \mathbf{Y} \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}]$. As $q \to \infty$, $\nu^{(q)}$ converges weakly to ν, so we have

$$\mathrm{Var}[l \cdot \mathbf{Y} \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}] \le \mathrm{Var}[l \cdot \mathbf{Y} \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}] \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since Y is of the form $l \cdot \mathbf{Y}$, the conclusion follows. □

We obtain from this

Corollary 4.4.

$$\mathrm{Var}[Y \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}] \le 16\xi(U, I)\,\mathrm{Hm}(U, I)^2, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Proof. We note

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}[Y \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}] &= \sum_{v,v'\in D} \mathrm{Hm}(U, v; I)\,\mathrm{Hm}(U, v'; I) G_{\tilde{K}\setminus I^+}(v', v), \\ &= \sum_{v\in D} \mathrm{Hm}(U, v; I) G_{\tilde{K}\setminus I^+}(U, v)\end{aligned}$$

where $G_{\tilde{K}\setminus I^+}$ is the Green's function on $\tilde{K} \setminus I^+$ and we have used the fact that

$$\sum_{v'\in D} \mathrm{Hm}(U, v'; I) G_{\tilde{K}\setminus I^+}(v', v) = G_{\tilde{K}\setminus I^+}(U, v), \ \forall v \in D.$$

Note that

$$G_{\tilde{K}\setminus I^+}(U, D) \le 4\,\mathrm{Hm}(U, I),$$

where we have used the fact that a random walk started on D will hit I^+ with probability at least $1/4$ before returning to D. Therefore, we have

$$\mathrm{Var}[Y \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}] \le 4\,\mathrm{Hm}(U, I) \sup_{v\in D} \mathrm{Hm}(U, v; I) \le 16\xi(U, I)\,\mathrm{Hm}(U, I)^2.$$

□

To conclude, we need a high-probability bound on the conditional expectation of Y given $\mathcal{F}_{I^+}$ and $\mathfrak{E}$. We begin with an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *There exists a universal continuous, increasing function $g : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ such that for any $w \in \tilde{K}^o$ and any $\epsilon > 0$ the following holds. Let $\mathfrak{E}_w$ be the event*

$$\mathfrak{E}_w = \{\tilde{\phi}(w) = 0\} \cap \{\tilde{\phi}(u) > 0 \,\forall u \in \tilde{K},\, \mathrm{dist}(u, \partial\tilde{K} \cup \{w\}) \geq \epsilon\}.$$

For $v \in \tilde{K}$ such that $|v - w| \leq r$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi(v) \mid \mathfrak{E}_w] \leq g(r) + \lambda.$$

Proof. We follow the proof of [DL18, Lemma 6]. First, by an argument similar to the proof of [DL18, Equation (48)], there exists a function $R : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for any $a, b > 0$, there exists a function $h_{a,b}$ that is harmonic on $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^2 \setminus \{w\}$ and satisfies

$$\Big| h_{a,b}(u) - a \log\left(|u - w| + 2\right) - b \Big| \leq R(a), \quad \forall u \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^2.$$

Let $\tilde{\varphi}_{a,b}$ be a Gaussian free field on $\tilde{K}$ with boundary condition $h_{a,b}$ on $\partial\tilde{K} \cup \{w\}$, and $\varphi_{a,b}$ be the restriction of $\tilde{\varphi}$ to V. Let $A \subset \tilde{K}$ be a countable, dense subset of $\{u : u \in \tilde{K},\, \mathrm{dist}(u, \partial\tilde{K} \cup \{w\}) \geq \epsilon\}$, and $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be an increasing sequence of finite subsets of A such that $\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = A$. Applying Lemma 4.2 to A_n and taking a limit, we have that for any $a, b > 0$ such that $h_{a,b}(u) > 0$ for all $u \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^2$, the following holds

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\phi}(v) \mid \mathfrak{E}_w] \leq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\varphi}_{a,b+\lambda}(v) \mid \tilde{\varphi}_{a,b+\lambda}(u) > 0, \forall u \in \tilde{K},\, \mathrm{dist}(u, \partial\tilde{K} \cup \{w\}) \geq \epsilon].$$

By the FKG inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\phi}(v) \mid \mathfrak{E}_w] \leq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\varphi}_{a,b+\lambda}(v) \mid \tilde{\varphi}_{a,b+\lambda}(u) > 0, \forall u \in \tilde{K}].$$

Next, we claim there exist universal constants $c_a, c_b > 0$ such that for all $a \geq c_a$ and $b \geq c_b$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\varphi}_{a,b}(u) > 0,\, \forall\, u \in \tilde{K}) \geq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{4.2}$$

Indeed, it is straightforward to check by a union bound that there exist universal constants $c_a', c_b' > 0$ such that for all $a \geq c_a'$ and $b \geq c_b'$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\varphi_{a,b}(u) \geq \frac{h_{a,b}(u)}{2},\, \forall\, u \in V\right) \geq \frac{3}{4}.$$

Next, recall from the introduction that given $\mathcal{F}_V$, for each segment $e(u,v) \subset \tilde{K}$ with endpoints $u, v \in V \cup \partial\tilde{K} \cup \{w\}$ the restriction of $\tilde{\varphi}_{a,b}$ to $e(u,v)$ is a Brownian bridge of length $2|u - v|$ of a Brownian motion with variance 2 at time 1. Thus, applying [BS02, Formula 1.3.8] we see the following holds almost surely on $\{\tilde{\varphi}_{a,b}(u) \geq h_{a,b}(u)/2,\, \forall\, u \in V\}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\varphi}_{a,b}(x) > 0,\, \forall\, x \in e(u,v) \mid \mathcal{F}_V) = 1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2|u-v|}\varphi_{a,b}(u)\varphi_{a,b}(v)} \geq 1 - e^{-\frac{1}{8}h_{a,b}(u)h_{a,b}(v)}.$$

Therefore, there exist universal constants $c_a'', c_b'' > 0$ such that for all $a \geq c_a''$ and $b \geq c_b''$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\varphi}_{a,b}(u) > 0,\, \forall\, u \in \tilde{K} \mid \varphi_{a,b}(u) \geq \frac{h_{a,b}(u)}{2},\, \forall\, u \in V\right) \geq \frac{2}{3}.$$

Combining this with the second-to-last display and letting $c_j = c'_j \vee c''_j$ for $j \in \{a, b\}$ gives (4.2). Note that $\mathrm{Var}[\tilde{\varphi}_{a,b}(v)] \le c \log(r+2)$ for some universal constant $c > 0$, and by assumption $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\varphi}_{a,b}(v)] = h_{a,b}(v) \le a \log(r+2) + b + R(a)$ so it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\varphi}_{c_a, c_b+\lambda}(v) \mid \tilde{\varphi}_{c_a,c_b+\lambda}(u) > 0, \, \forall \, u \in \tilde{K}] \le g(r) + \lambda,$$

for some universal (continuous, increasing) function g (which can be calculated explicitly in terms of c, c_a, and c_b). □

Finally, combining the three lemmas we can prove the following corollary, which gives a high probability bound on $\mathbb{E}[Y \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}]$.

Corollary 4.6. *There exists a constant $\Delta_1 = \Delta_1(\lambda) > 0$ and a universal function r_1 which satisfies $r_1(x) \to 0$ as $x \to 0$, such that the following holds*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}[Y \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}] \le -\Delta_1 \operatorname{Hm}(U, I) \mid \mathfrak{E}) \ge 1 - r_1(\xi(U, I)).$$

Before proving this, we show how it implies Proposition 4.1. Let $\Delta = \Delta_1/2$ and $X = \mathbb{P}(Y \le -\Delta \operatorname{Hm}(U, I) \mid \mathfrak{E}, \mathcal{F}_{I^+})$. We have

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \le -\Delta \operatorname{Hm}(U, I) \mid \mathfrak{E}) = \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathfrak{E}].$$

Additionally, we have by Chebyshev's inequality and Corollary 4.4 that there exists a function r_2 such that $r_2(x) \to 0$ as $x \to 0$ and

$$X \ge 1 - r_2(\xi(U, I)), \quad \text{a.s. on } \{\mathbb{E}[Y \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}] \le -\Delta_1 \operatorname{Hm}(U, I)\}.$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \le -\Delta \operatorname{Hm}(U, I) \mid \mathfrak{E}) \ge 1 - r_1(\xi(U, I)) - r_2(\xi(U, I)).$$

Proof of Corollary 4.6. We have

$$\mathbb{E}[Y \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}] = \sum_{v \in D} \operatorname{Hm}(U, v; I) \mathbb{E}[\phi(v) \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}].$$

Let $\mathfrak{E}^+ = \{\phi(v) \ge 0 : v \in I^+\}$. By Lemma 4.2, we have for any $v \in D$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi(v) \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}] \le \mathbb{E}[\phi(v) \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}^+, \phi(v) < 0] \le \mathbb{E}[\phi(v) \wedge 0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}^+].$$

Note that given $\mathcal{F}_{I^+}$, $\phi(v)$ has a normal distribution with variance at least 1. Therefore, letting $m_v = \mathbb{E}[\phi(v) \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}^+]$, there exist universal constants $a, b > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi(v) \wedge 0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}^+] \le -a e^{-b m_v^2}.$$

Thus, it suffices to show that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the following holds

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{v \in D} \operatorname{Hm}(U, v; I) m_v \le c \operatorname{Hm}(U, I) \mid \mathfrak{E} \right) \ge 1 - r_1(\xi(U, I)). \tag{4.3}$$

Indeed, by Markov's inequality $\sum_{v \in D} \operatorname{Hm}(U, v; I) m_v \le c \operatorname{Hm}(U, I)$ implies

$$\sum_{v \in D} \operatorname{Hm}(U, v; I) \mathbb{1}_{m_v \le 2c} \ge \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Hm}(U, I),$$

and consequently

$$\mathbb{E}[Y \mid \mathcal{F}_{I^+}, \mathfrak{E}] \le -\frac{ae^{-4bc^2}}{2} \operatorname{Hm}(U, I).$$

Turning to the proof of (4.3), let Y' be the following random variable

$$Y' = \sum_{w \in D'} \operatorname{Hm}(U, w; I^+)\phi(w).$$

It follows from the definition of the harmonic measure that

$$\sum_{v \in D} \operatorname{Hm}(U, v; I) m_v - Y' = \sum_{v \in D} \operatorname{Hm}(U, v; I) \sum_{w \in \partial \tilde{K} \setminus I^+} \operatorname{Hm}(v, w; I^+)\tilde{\phi}(w),$$

where for $w \in \partial \tilde{K}$, $\operatorname{Hm}(v, w; I^+)$ is the probability that a metric graph Brownian motion started at v exits $\tilde{K}$ through w without hitting I^+. In particular, we have

$$\sum_{v \in D} \operatorname{Hm}(U, v; I) m_v \le Y' + \lambda \operatorname{Hm}(U, I).$$

Therefore, to prove (4.3) it suffices to show

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Y' \le c \operatorname{Hm}(U, I) \mid \mathfrak{E}\right) \ge 1 - r_1(\xi(U, I)).$$

We show this by bounding the conditional mean and variance of Y'. First, by Lemma 4.2, we can replace $\mathfrak{E}$ by $\mathfrak{E}' = \{\phi(v) = 0,\, v \in D\} \cap \mathfrak{E}^+$. Next, Lemma 4.3 and a straightforward adaption of the proof of Corollary 4.4 give

$$\operatorname{Var}[Y' \mid \mathfrak{E}'] \le \operatorname{Var}[Y' \mid \phi(v) = 0,\, v \in D] \le 4\xi(U, I) \operatorname{Hm}(U, I)^2.$$

Finally, Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.2 (and the fact that every $w \in D'$ is adjacent to a vertex in D) give

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi(w) \mid \mathfrak{E}'] \le g(1) + \lambda, \quad \forall w \in D'.$$

The conclusion then follows easily. □

4.2 Zero boundary case

In this section we prove (1.5). We let M be an exploration martingale, as introduced in Section 2.3, corresponding to an exploration on $E_\delta^{\ge 0}$ from $\mathcal{I}_0 = [c_\delta, d_\delta)$ with $U = [a'_\delta, b'_\delta)$. Here the exploration is on $E_\delta^{\ge 0}$, but with the understanding that we do not explore any vertices on $\partial V_\delta \setminus \mathcal{I}_0$ (equivalently, the exploration is on $E_\delta^{>0}$ with the understanding that $\mathcal{I}_1 = [c'_\delta, d'_\delta)$). With this setup, we have $M_0 = 0$. The main step of the proof consists of bounding $\xi_k = \xi(U, \mathcal{I}_k)$. In particular, we claim that there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\sup\{\xi_k : k \ge 1\} \le \frac{c}{|\log(\delta)|}, \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{4.4}$$

Before proving (4.4), we show how it implies (1.5). To simplify notation, we will write $\{D^{>0}(\mathcal{I}_0, U) = \infty\}$ for the event that $[a'_\delta, b'_\delta)$ is not connected to $[c'_\delta, d'_\delta)$ in $E_\delta^{>0}$. Assuming (4.4), Proposition 4.1 implies that there exists $\Delta > 0$ such that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\epsilon, L) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(M_\infty \le -\Delta \operatorname{Hm}(U, \mathcal{I}_\infty) \mid D^{>0}(\mathcal{I}_0, U) = \infty) \ge 1 - \epsilon, \quad \forall \delta \le \delta_0. \tag{4.5}$$

To conclude, we need to upper bound the quadratic variation. Recall that Hm_t is the harmonic measure on $\mathcal{I}_t \cup \partial V_\delta$. By (2.5)

$$\langle M \rangle_t = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}_t} \mathrm{Hm}_t(U, v) G(v, U) \leq 4 \, \mathrm{Hm}(U, \mathcal{I}_t), \tag{4.6}$$

where we have used the fact that a random walk started on U has probability at least $1/4$ of hitting ∂V_δ before returning to U, which implies $G(v, U) \leq 4$ for all $v \in \tilde{V}_\delta$.

Finally, by Lemma 2.7, $\mathrm{Hm}(U, \mathcal{I}_0) \geq c$. Combining this with (4.5) and (4.6) and applying Theorem 2.3, we see that there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(L) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } M_t \leq -\Delta \, \mathrm{Hm}(U, I_t)) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\exists t \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } B_t \leq -\Delta\left(c \vee \frac{t}{4}\right)\right) \leq 1 - 2\epsilon.$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}(D^{>0}(\mathcal{I}_0, U) = \infty) \leq 1 - \epsilon, \quad \forall \delta \leq \delta_0.$$

Proof of (4.4). Let $D_k = \{v \in \mathcal{I}_k : \mathrm{Hm}_k(U, v) > 0\}$, $\mathcal{I}'_k = \mathcal{I}_k \setminus D_k$, and Hm'_k be the harmonic measure on $\mathcal{I}'_k \cup \partial V_\delta$. Let S be a random walk on $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ killed on ∂V_δ, $\tau_k = \min\{n \geq 1 : S_n \in U \cup \mathcal{I}'_k\}$, and G'_k be the Green's function of the random walk killed on $\partial V_\delta \cup \mathcal{I}'_k$. We have for $u \in U$ and $v \in \partial \mathcal{I}'_k$

$$\mathrm{Hm}_k(u', v) = \sum_{u \in U} G'_k(u', u) \mathbb{P}_u(S_{\tau_k} = v).$$

By reversibility, $\mathbb{P}_u(S_{\tau_k} = v) = \mathbb{P}_v(S_{\tau_k} = u)$. Noting also that G'_k is symmetric, summing over u' gives

$$\mathrm{Hm}_k(U, v) = \sum_{u \in U} \mathbb{P}_v(S_{\tau_k} = u) G'_k(u, U) \leq 4 \mathbb{P}_v(S_{\tau_k} \in U),$$

where we have used the fact that $G'_k(u, U) \leq G(u, U) \leq 4$. There exists a universal constant $p > 0$ such that for any integer $n \geq 0$ a random walk started at v will complete a loop around $B(v, 2^n)$ before exiting $B(v, 2^{n+1})$ (here $B(v, r)$ is the open Euclidean ball of radius r around v). Since any loop around $v \in \mathcal{I}'_k$ that is contained in V must intersect $\mathcal{I}'_k$, it follows that there exist $A, \alpha > 0$ such that the following holds for all $k \geq 1$ and $v \in \partial \mathcal{I}'_k$,

$$\mathbb{P}_v(S_{\tau_k} \in U) \leq A \left(\frac{\delta}{\mathrm{dist}(v, U)}\right)^\alpha.$$

It remains to lower bound $\mathrm{Hm}(U, \mathcal{I}_k)$ in terms of $\mathrm{dist}(\mathcal{I}_k, U)$. We have already noted that there exists $c > 0$ such that $\mathrm{Hm}(U, \mathcal{I}_k) \geq \mathrm{Hm}(U, \mathcal{I}_0) \geq c$ for all k. On the other hand, a simple adaptation of the proof of (3.3) shows that there exists a constant $c' > 0$ such that whenever $\mathrm{dist}(\mathcal{I}_k, U) \leq (L \wedge 1)/2$ we have

$$\mathrm{Hm}(U, \mathcal{I}_k) \geq c' \log\left(\frac{L \wedge 1}{\mathrm{dist}(U, \mathcal{I}_k) + \delta}\right).$$

Combining the lower bounds on $\mathrm{Hm}(U, \mathcal{I}_k)$ with the upper bound on $\mathrm{Hm}_k(U, v)$ gives the desired conclusion. □

4.3 Alternating boundary case

In this section, we prove (1.8). We recall the inclusion

$$\left\{[a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right\} \subset \left\{[a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\phi_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right\}.$$

Therefore, it suffices to find an event $\mathfrak{E}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{E} \subset \left\{ [a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\phi_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta) \right\} \setminus \left\{ [a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta) \right\},$$

and $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{E}) \geq c$.

As usual, we provide a sketch of the proof here, leaving the technical arguments to the end of the section. By (3.4) we can assume that $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cap \Pi = \emptyset$ and work conditional on $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0}}$. We let $\mathbb{P}^+$ denote the law of $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ given $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0}}$. The first step of the proof is to upper bound the probability that $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ contains a positive horizontal crossing. We claim that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the following holds almost surely on $\{\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cap \Pi = \emptyset\}$

$$\mathbb{P}^+ \left([a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\!/\;\;} [c_\delta, d_\delta) \right) \geq c. \tag{4.7}$$

Consequently, we assume $[a_\delta, b_\delta)$ is not connected to $[c_\delta, d_\delta)$ and work conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cup \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^l_{\delta,0}}$. We let $\mathbb{P}^{0,l}$ be the law of $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ given $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cup \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^l_{\delta,0}}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{0,l}$ be the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}^{0,l}$. We claim that there exists a further constant $c' > 0$ such that the following holds almost surely on $\{\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cap \Pi = \emptyset\} \cap \left\{ [a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\!/\;\;} [c_\delta, d_\delta) \right\}$

$$\mathbb{P}^{0,l} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^l_{\delta,0} \overset{\phi_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta) \right) \geq c'. \tag{4.8}$$

This concludes the proof. We now turn to proving the two technical claims.

4.3.1 Proof of (4.7)

As in Section 3.2, we let $\tilde{V}^+_\delta$ be the connected component of $\tilde{V}_\delta \setminus \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0}$ containing $[a_\delta, b_\delta)$ and $[c_\delta, d_\delta)$, Hm^+ be the harmonic measure on $\tilde{V}^+_\delta$, and G^+ be the Green's function of a metric graph Brownian motion killed on $\partial \tilde{V}^+_\delta$. The proof proceeds by analyzing an exploration martingale M, as introduced in Section 2.3, corresponding to an exploration of $\tilde{E}^{\geq 0}_\delta$ from $\mathcal{I}_0 = [a_\delta, b_\delta) \cup [c_\delta, d_\delta)$ with observable X_U corresponding to the following set U. For each $v \in \partial \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0}$, we let $\eta_v = \mathrm{dist}(v, \delta\mathbb{Z}^2)$. Since $|\partial \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0}| < \infty$ and $\partial \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0} \cap V_\delta = \emptyset$ almost surely, we have

$$\eta = \min\{\eta_v \,:\, v \in \partial \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0}\} > 0, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Then, we let U be the following set

$$U = \left\{ u \,:\, u \in \tilde{V}^+_\delta,\, \left| \Re(u) - \frac{L}{2} \right| \leq \frac{3L}{8},\, \mathrm{dist}(u, \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0}) = \frac{\eta}{2} \right\}.$$

The following processes will be useful in the analysis

$$\pi_t = \mathrm{Hm}^+_t(U, \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0}), \quad \mu_t = \mathrm{Hm}^+_t(U, \mathcal{I}_t),$$

where as usual Hm^+_t is the hermonic measure on $\mathcal{I}_t \cup \partial \tilde{V}^+_\delta$. We have $M_t \geq 0$ for all t and $M_0 = \lambda \mu_0$, so in particular $M_t - M_0 \geq -\lambda \mu_0$. To conclude the proof, we need to upper bound μ_0 and lower bound the quadratic variation of M. In particular, we claim that there exist constants $c, c' > 0$ such that the following holds

$$\mu_0 \leq c \frac{\eta}{\delta},$$
$$\langle M \rangle_\infty \geq c' \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta} \right)^2, \quad \text{a.s. on } \left\{ [a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta) \right\}.$$

Before proving the claim, we note that it implies by an application of Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.4

$$\mathbb{P}\left([a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{0 \leq t \leq c'} B_t \geq -c\lambda\right) \leq 1 - c''.$$

For the proof, consider the electric network with vertex set $W = \mathbb{Z}^2 \cup U \cup \partial \tilde{V}_\delta^+$ where two vertices $u, v \in W$ are connected with an edge of conductance $C_{u,v} = (4|u-v|/\delta)^{-1}$ if there exists a path in $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ connecting u to v which does not contain any other points in W. For this section, we will write $u \sim v$ if u and v are connected in this network, and we let $C_u = \sum_{v \sim u} C_{u,v}$. Note that G^+ (as defined above) is the Green's function of the continuous time simple random walk on W killed on $\partial \tilde{V}_\delta^+$. To simplify some definitions, we take S to be a discrete-time simple random walk on W (not killed on $\partial \tilde{V}_\delta^+$).

We now turn to proving the upper bound on μ_0. Let $\tau_0 = \min\{n \geq 1 : S_n \in U \cup \partial \tilde{V}_\delta^+\}$ be the hitting time of $U \cup \partial \tilde{V}_\delta^+$. We have by a last exit decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hm}^+(u, \mathcal{I}_0) &= \sum_{u' \in U} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}_0} C_{u'} G^+(u, u') \mathbb{P}_{u'}(S_{\tau_0} = v), \\ &= \sum_{u' \in U} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}_0} C_v G^+(u', u) \mathbb{P}_v(S_{\tau_0} = u') \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $C_{u'} \mathbb{P}_{u'}(S_{\tau_0} = v) = C_v \mathbb{P}_v(S_{\tau_0} = u')$ and $G^+(u, u') = G^+(u', u)$. Summing over $u \in U$ gives

$$\mu_0 = \sum_{u' \in U} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}_0} C_v \mathbb{P}_v(S_{\tau_0} = u') G^+(u', U) \leq \left[\max_{u' \in U} G^+(u', U)\right] \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}_0} C_v \mathbb{P}_v(S_{\tau_0} \in U).$$

It is straightforward to show that $G^+(u', U) \leq 2\eta/\delta$ for all $u' \in U$, and it is clear that $C_v = 1$ for all $v \in \mathcal{I}_0$ such that $\mathbb{P}_v(S_{\tau_0} \in U) > 0$. Further, we note that $\mathbb{P}_v(S_{\tau_0} \in U) \leq c\delta$ since it is bounded by the probability that a random walk on $\delta\mathbb{Z}$ (started from the origin) reaches $L/8$ before returning to zero. It follows that $\mu_0 \leq c\eta/\delta$ as claimed.

Next, we turn to proving the lower bound on the quadratic variation. Begin by noting that if there exists a horizontal crossing, then $\mathcal{I}_\infty$ contains a nearest neighbor path $\gamma \subset V_\delta^+$ crossing the following strip

$$\Pi' = \left\{z : \left|\Re(z) - \frac{L}{2}\right| \leq \frac{L}{4}\right\}.$$

We claim that for any such γ

$$\mathrm{Var}^+(X_U) - \mathrm{Var}^+(X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_\gamma) = \sum_{v \in \gamma} \mathrm{Hm}^+(U, v; \gamma) G^+(v, U) \geq c\left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^2.$$

For the proof, note that there exists $c > 0$ such that $\mathrm{Hm}^+(v, U) \geq c$ for all $v \in \gamma$, where c is independent of γ and v. This follows from the fact that a random walk started in Π' will exit V_δ before exiting the strip $\{z : |\Re(z) - L/4| \leq 3L/8\}$ with probability bounded uniformly away from zero. Such a walk will necessarily hit U before $\partial \tilde{V}_\delta$. Next, it is straightforward to show that $G^+(u, U) \geq G^+(u, u) \geq \eta/\delta$ for all $u \in U$, so we conclude $G^+(v, U) \geq c\eta/\delta$, Consequently

$$\mathrm{Var}^+(X_U) - \mathrm{Var}^+(X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_\gamma) \geq c\frac{\eta}{\delta} \mathrm{Hm}^+(U, \gamma).$$

To lower bound the harmonic measure, the idea is to replace γ with a line. More precisely, we take

$$\gamma^* = \left\{w \in V_\delta : \Im(w) \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \delta\right), \left|\Re(w) - \frac{L}{2}\right| \leq \frac{L}{4}\right\},$$

and note that there exists a universal constant $c > 0$ such that for $w \in \gamma^*$, $\mathrm{Hm}^+(w, \gamma) \geq c$. This follows from the fact that a random walk started at w will hit the line $\{z : \Re(z) = L/2\}$ before $\partial \tilde{V}_\delta^+$, and then exit V_δ before exiting Π' is bounded uniformly away from 0. Therefore, we have $\mathrm{Hm}^+(U, \gamma) \geq c\,\mathrm{Hm}^+(U, \gamma^*)$. To bound $\mathrm{Hm}^+(U, \gamma^*)$ from below, we proceed by a last-exit decomposition. Let $\tau = \min\{n \geq 1 : S_n \in U \cup \partial \tilde{V}_\delta^+ \cup \gamma^*\}$. By the same argument given in the proof of the upper bound on μ_0,

$$\mathrm{Hm}^+(U, \gamma^*) = \sum_{w \in \gamma^*} \sum_{u \in U} C_w \mathbb{P}_w(S_\tau = u) G^+(u, U) \geq \frac{\eta}{\delta} \sum_{w \in \gamma^*} \mathbb{P}_w(S_\tau \in U),$$

where we have used the fact that $C_w = 1$ for all $w \in \gamma^*$ and $G^+(u, u) \geq \eta/\delta$ for all $u \in U$. Finally, by Lemma 2.7 we have

$$\sum_{w \in \gamma^*} \mathbb{P}_w(S_\tau \in U) \geq c.$$

This concludes the proof.

4.3.2 Proof of (4.8)

Let $\tilde{V}_\delta^{l,0}$ be the connected component of $\tilde{V}_\delta \setminus (\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l \cup \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{\delta,0})$ containing $[c_\delta, d_\delta)$, and $V_\delta^{l,0} = \tilde{V}_\delta^{l,0} \cap \delta\mathbb{Z}^2$. Let W be the following set of vertices

$$W = \{v \in V_\delta^{l,0} : \mathrm{dist}(v, \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l) \leq \delta\}.$$

We note that

$$\left\{[c_\delta, d_\delta) \overset{\phi_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l\right\} = \left\{[c'_\delta, d'_\delta) \overset{\phi_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} W\right\}.$$

Consequently, we would like to explore $E_\delta^{\geq 0} \cap V_\delta^{l,0}$ from W, but in order to apply Proposition 4.1 we need to start our exploration "one step" away from the boundary. That is, letting $\mathcal{I}_0$ and U be given by

$$\mathcal{I}_0 = \left\{v \in V_\delta^{l,0} : \delta < \mathrm{dist}(v, \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l) \leq 2\delta\right\},$$
$$U = [c'_\delta, d'_\delta) \cap \left\{z : \left|\Im(z) - \frac{1}{2}\right| \leq \frac{1}{8}\right\},$$

we will show that

$$\mathbb{P}^{l,0}\left(U \overset{\phi_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} \mathcal{I}_0\right) \geq c. \tag{4.9}$$

Assuming this result for now, we show how to conclude the proof of (4.8). Recall that $\mathcal{G}_{V_\delta^{l,0} \setminus W}$ is the σ-field generated by $\{\mathrm{sign}(\phi_\delta(v)) : v \in V_\delta^{l,0} \setminus W\}$ and note that we have

$$\left\{U \overset{\phi_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} \mathcal{I}_0\right\} \in \mathcal{G}_{V_\delta^{l,0} \setminus W}.$$

Note also that if U is connected to $\mathcal{I}_0$, there exists a random vertex $w^* \in W$ such that if $\phi_\delta(w^*) > 0$, then U is connected to W (and thus to $[a_\delta, b_\delta)$). Note that w^* is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{G}_{V_\delta^{l,0} \setminus W}$. Therefore, it suffices to show that there exists a universal constant $c > 0$ such that for all $w \in W$

$$\mathbb{P}^{l,0}\left(\phi_\delta(w) > 0 \mid \mathcal{G}_{V_\delta^{l,0} \setminus W}\right) \geq c \quad \text{a.s.}$$

It will then follow that

$$\mathbb{P}^{l,0}\left(\phi_\delta(w^*) > 0 \mid \mathcal{G}_{V_\delta^{l,0}},\, U \overset{\phi_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} \mathcal{I}_0\right) \geq c \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By Lemma 4.2, it suffices to show that for $\mathfrak{E} = \{\phi_\delta(v) < 0,\, \forall v \in V_\delta^{l,0} \setminus W\}$,

$$\mathbb{P}^{l,0}\left(\phi_\delta(w) > 0 \mid \mathfrak{E}\right) \geq c, \quad \forall w \in W.$$

The proof is as follows. By the Markov property of the GFF, we have for any $w \in W$,

$$\phi_\delta(w) = Y_w + Z_w,$$

where Z_w is normal, mean zero, and independent of $\mathcal{F}_{V_\delta^{l,0}\setminus W}$, and $Y_w = \mathbb{E}^{l,0}[\phi_\delta(w) \mid \mathcal{F}_{V_\delta^{l,0}\setminus W}]$. It is straightforward to show that there exist $c, c' > 0$ such that

$$c\frac{\operatorname{dist}(w, \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^l_{\delta,0})}{\delta} \le \operatorname{Var}^{l,0}[Z_w] \le \operatorname{Var}^{l,0}[\phi_\delta(w)] \le c'\frac{\operatorname{dist}(w, \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^l_{\delta,0})}{\delta}.$$

Finally, by Lemma 4.5 there exists $c'' > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}^{l,0}\left[Y_w \mid \mathcal{G}_{V_\delta^{l,0}\setminus W}\right] \ge -c''\frac{\operatorname{dist}(w, \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^l_{\delta,0})}{\delta}.$$

Combining these bounds we obtain $\mathbb{P}(\phi_\delta(w) > 0 \mid \mathfrak{E}) \ge c$ as promised. This concludes the proof.

Proof of (4.9). We assume without loss of generality that $\operatorname{dist}(U, \mathcal{I}_0) \ge 10\delta$. Otherwise the probability of connection is lower bounded by 2^{-20}, say.

As usual, we consider an exploration martingale M corresponding to an exploration of $E_{\bar{\delta}}^{\ge 0} \cap V_\delta^{l,0}$ from $\mathcal{I}_0$ with observable X_U, with U as above. The goal is to bound both the value of the martingale and its quadratic variation. As usual, we introduce the following processes

$$\pi_t = \operatorname{Hm}_t^{l,0}(U, [c_\delta, d_\delta)), \quad \mu_t = \operatorname{Hm}_t^{l,0}(U, \mathcal{I}_t).$$

We will use Proposition 4.1 to show that there exists $c > 0$ such that for any ϵ, there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\epsilon) > 0$ such that for $\delta \le \delta_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(M_\infty - M_0 \le -c\mu_0 - \lambda(\pi_0 - \pi_\infty) \mid D_{\bar{\delta}}^{\ge 0}(\mathcal{I}_0, U) = \infty\right) \ge 1 - \epsilon. \tag{4.10}$$

Postponing the proof of this claim until the end of the section, we show how it can be used to obtain the desired result. Fist, we bound the quadratic variation as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle M\rangle_t &= \sum_{v\in\mathcal{I}_t} \operatorname{Hm}_t^{l,0}(U, v) G_0^{l,0}(v, U) \\
&\le 16 \sum_{v\in\mathcal{I}_t} \operatorname{Hm}_t^{l,0}(U, v) \operatorname{Hm}_0^{l,0}(v, [c_\delta, d_\delta)) \\
&= 16(\pi_0 - \pi_t)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that a random walk started on U hits $[c_\delta, d_\delta)$ before returning to U with probability at least $1/4$ to obtain

$$G_0^{l,0}(v, U) \le 4 \operatorname{Hm}_0^{l,0}(v, U) \le 16 \operatorname{Hm}_0^{l,0}(v, [c_\delta, d_\delta)).$$

Next, we note that by Lemma 2.7 we have for some $c > 0$

$$\mu_0 \ge \operatorname{Hm}^+(U, [a_\delta, b_\delta)) \ge c.$$

Thus, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough and $\delta < \delta_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}^{l,0}\left(U \overset{\phi_\delta \ge 0}{\longleftrightarrow} \mathcal{I}_0\right) \le \mathbb{P}\left(\inf\left\{B_t + \frac{\lambda}{16}t \,:\, t \ge 0\right\} \le -c\right) + \epsilon \le 1 - c'.$$

Turning to the proof of (4.10), we begin by upper bounding M_∞. To this end, we let $\xi_k = \xi(U, \mathcal{I}_k)$ and note as in (4.4) that there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\sup\{\xi_k \,:\, k \geq 0\} \leq \frac{c}{|\log(\delta)|}.$$

The proof is the same as that of (4.4) so we omit further details. We can then apply Proposition 4.1 with

$$I^+ = \{v \in \mathcal{I}_\infty \,:\, \mathrm{sign}(\phi_\delta(v)) = 1\}, \quad I^- = \{v \in \mathcal{I}_\infty \,:\, \mathrm{sign}(\phi_\delta(v)) = -1\},$$

and obtain that there exists $\Delta = \Delta(\lambda) > 0$ such that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that for $\delta \leq \delta_1$

$$\mathbb{P}^{l,0}\left(M_\infty \leq -\Delta\mu_\infty + \lambda\pi_\infty \mid U \overset{\phi_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\!/\;\;} \mathcal{I}_0\right) \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Next, we lower bound M_0. Trivially, $\mathbb{E}^{l,0}[M_0] = \lambda\pi_0$. For the variance, we have

$$\mathrm{Var}^{l,0}[M_0] = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}_0} \mathrm{Hm}_0^{l,0}(U, v) G^{l,0}(v, U) \leq 64\xi_0\mu_0^2 \leq \frac{c}{|\log(\delta)|}\mu_0^2,$$

where we have used the facts

$$\begin{aligned} G^{l,0}(U, \mathcal{I}_0) &\leq 16\, \mathrm{Hm}^{l,0}(U, \mathcal{I}_0), \\ \mathrm{Hm}_0^{l,0}(U, v) &\leq 4\xi_0\, \mathrm{Hm}_0^{l,0}(U, \mathcal{I}_0), \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{I}_0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists δ_2 such that for $\delta < \delta_2$,

$$\mathbb{P}^{l,0}\left(M_0 \geq -\frac{\Delta}{2}\mu_0 + \lambda\pi_0\right) \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Combining the two bounds, and noting that μ_t is increasing we obtain that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta < \delta_1 \wedge \delta_2$

$$\mathbb{P}^{l,0}\left(M_\infty - M_0 \leq -\frac{\Delta}{2}\mu_0 - \lambda(\pi_0 - \pi_\infty) \mid U \overset{\phi_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\!/\;\;} \mathcal{I}_0\right) \geq 1 - 2\epsilon.$$

This concludes the proof of (4.10). □

5 (Non)-Existence of closed pivotal edges for metric graph percolation

In this section we prove Theorem 1.4. First, we recall some definitions and notation. Let $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ be a metric graph GFF on $\tilde{V}_\delta$ with alternating boundary condition (1.3). Denote by E_δ the edge set of the nearest-neighbor graph on V_δ. We let $\omega : E_\delta \to \{0, 1\}$ be such that $\omega(e) = 1$ if $\tilde{\phi}_\delta(u) \geq 0$ for all $u \in I_e$ and $\omega(e) = 0$ otherwise. In the former case, we say the edge is open, in the latter that it is closed. The notations ω^e and ω_e are defined in (1.10). An edge e is pivotal if there is a horizontal crossing in ω^e but there is no such crossing in ω_e. Note that the pivotality of an edge does not depend on the status of the edge itself. We say that e is a closed pivotal edge (resp. open pivotal edge) if e is pivotal and it is closed (resp. open). Our goal is to show that the probability that there exists a closed pivotal edge decays to 0 as $\delta \to 0$. In particular, we want to show that there exists a constant $c > 0$ (depending only on L) such that the following holds

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{there exists a closed pivotal edge}) \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{|\log(\delta)|}}. \tag{5.1}$$

By symmetry, it suffices to consider only edges e on the left half of V_δ. That is, if we let

$$E_\delta^l = \left\{ e \in E \,:\, \exists\, x \in I_e,\, \Re(x) \le \frac{L}{2} \right\},$$

it suffices to show

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\text{there exists a closed pivotal edge in } E_\delta^l\right) \le \frac{c}{\sqrt{|\log(\delta)|}}.$$

In fact, we will show that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\text{there exists a closed pivotal edge in } E_\delta^l \mid \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l}\right) \le \frac{c}{\sqrt{|\log(\delta)|}} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Note that if there is a positive horizontal crossing in the metric graph (that is, $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l \cap [c_\delta, d_\delta) \neq \emptyset$) then there are no closed pivotal edges and that this event is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{A}_{\delta,0}^l}$. Therefore, we assume from now on that this is not the case.

To simplify notation, we let $\mathbb{P}^l$ denote the law of $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ given $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l}$ and $\mathbb{E}^l$ denote the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}^l$. Similarly, we let $\tilde{V}_\delta^l$ be the connected component of $\tilde{V}_\delta \setminus \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l$ containing $[c_\delta, d_\delta)$ and $V_\delta^l = \tilde{V}_\delta^l \cap \delta\mathbb{Z}^2$. Note that, given that there is no horizontal crossing in the metric graph, the set of closed pivotal edges consists of all edges with one endpoint in $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l$ and the other in $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^r$. Therefore, given $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{A}_{\delta,0}^l}$ the set of pivotal edges is increasing in $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^r$ and therefore increasing in $\{\tilde{\phi}_\delta(v) \,:\, v \in \tilde{V}_\delta^l\}$. We will therefore assume from now on that $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ has zero boundary condition on $[b_\delta, c_\delta) \cup [d_\delta, a_\delta)$.

The proof is essentially the same as that of (4.7) and consists of analyzing an exploration martingale M, as introduced in Section 2.3, corresponding to an exploration on $\tilde{E}_\delta^{\ge 0}$ from $\mathcal{I}_0 = [c_\delta, d_\delta)$ with observable given by the following set. For each $v \in \partial\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l \setminus \partial\tilde{V}_\delta$, we let $\eta_v = \operatorname{dist}(v, V_\delta^l)$. Since $|\partial\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l| < \infty$ and $\partial\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l \cap \delta\mathbb{Z}^2 \subset \partial\tilde{V}_\delta$ almost surely, we have

$$\eta = \min\{\eta_v \,:\, v \in \partial\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l \setminus \partial\tilde{V}_\delta > 0\} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

We then set the observable set U to be

$$U = \left\{ u \in \tilde{V}_\delta^l \,:\, \operatorname{dist}(u, \partial\tilde{V}_\delta^l) = \frac{\eta}{2},\, \Re(u) \le \frac{3L}{4} \right\}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that U is non-empty (and indeed that there exists $u \in U$ with $\Re(u) \le (L/2) + \delta$) since otherwise there can be no pivotal edges in E_δ^l. As usual, we let Hm_t^l be the harmonic measure on $\mathcal{I}_t \cup \partial\tilde{V}_\delta^l$ and $\mu_t = \mathrm{Hm}_t^l(U, \mathcal{I}_t)$. As usual, since $\mathcal{I}_0 \subset \partial\tilde{V}_\delta^l$ we write Hm^l for Hm_0^l. Note that $M_0 = \lambda\mu_0$ and $M_t \ge 0$ for all t, so $M_t - M_0 \ge -\lambda\mu_0$. We claim that there exist constants $c, c' > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0 &\le c\frac{\eta}{\delta}, \\ \langle M \rangle_\infty &\ge c' \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^2 |\log(\delta)|, \quad \text{a.s. on } \{\text{there exists a closed pivotal edge in } E_\delta^l\}. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming this claim for now, an application of Theorem 2.3 then gives (after rescaling the Brownian motion)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^l(\text{there exists a closed pivotal edge in } E_\delta^l) &\le \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{0 \le t \le c'|\log(\delta)|} B_t \ge -c\lambda \right) \\ &\le \frac{c''}{\sqrt{|\log(\delta)|}}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the claim we introduce the electric network with vertex set $W = \delta\mathbb{Z}^2 \cup U \cup \partial\tilde{V}_\delta^l$ where two vertices $u, v \in W$ are connected with an edge of conductance $C_{u,v} = (4|u-v|/\delta)^{-1}$ if there exists a path in $\delta\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ connecting u to v which does not contain any other points in W. For the rest of this proof, we will write $u \sim v$ if u and v are connected in this network, and we let $C_u = \sum_{v\sim u} C_{u,v}$. We let G^l be the Green's function corresponding to the continuous time simple random walk on W killed on $\partial\tilde{V}_\delta^l$, but take S to be a discrete-time simple random walk on W (not killed on $\partial\tilde{V}_\delta^l$).

For the upper bound on μ_0, we let $\tau = \min\{n \geq 1 : S_n \in U \cup \partial\tilde{V}_\delta^l\}$. By the arguments given in the proof of (4.7),

$$\mathrm{Hm}^l(U, \mathcal{I}_0) = \sum_{u\in U}\sum_{v\in\mathcal{I}_0} C_v \mathbb{P}_v(S_\tau = u) G^l(u, U) \leq 2\frac{\eta}{\delta}\sum_{v\in\mathcal{I}_0} \mathbb{P}_v(S_\tau \in U),$$

where we used the facts that $C_v = 1$ for all $v \in \mathcal{I}_0$ such that $\mathbb{P}_v(S_\tau \in U) > 0$ and $G^l(u, U) \leq 2\eta/\delta$ for all $u \in U$. Finally, there exists $c > 0$ such that $P_v(S_\tau \in U) \leq c\delta$ since this probability is upper bounded by the probability that a one-dimensional simple random walk hits $L/4$ before returning to zero. Since $|\mathcal{I}_0| \geq c'/\delta$ we conclude that $\mu_0 \leq c\eta/\delta$ as promised.

To lower bound the quadratic variation, we note that if there exists a closed pivotal edge in E_δ^l, then $\mathcal{I}_\infty$ contains a nearest-neighbor path γ in V_δ^l satisfying the following conditions. First, that it crosses the following strip

$$\Pi' = \left\{ z : \frac{L}{2} + \delta \leq \Re(z) \leq \frac{5L}{8} \right\}. \tag{5.2}$$

Second, that there exists $v^* \in \gamma$ and $w \in \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\delta,0}^l \cap \delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ satisfying $\Re(w) \leq L/2 + \delta$ and $|w - v^*| = \delta$. We claim that there exists $c > 0$ such that for any such path

$$\mathrm{Var}^l(X_U) - \mathrm{Var}^l(X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_\gamma) \geq c\left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^2 |\log(\delta)|.$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}^l(X_U) - \mathrm{Var}^l(X_U \mid \mathcal{F}_\gamma) &= \sum_{v\in\gamma} \mathrm{Hm}(U, v; \gamma \cup \partial\tilde{V}_\delta^l) G^l(v, U), \\ &\geq c\frac{\eta}{\delta}\,\mathrm{Hm}(U, \gamma; \gamma \cup \partial\tilde{V}_\delta^l),\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\mathrm{Hm}^l(v, U) \geq c$ for all $v \in \gamma$ since it is lower bounded by the probability that a simple random walk on $\delta\mathbb{Z}$ started at $\delta\lceil 5L/8\delta\rceil$ hits 0 before $\delta\lfloor 3L/4\delta\rfloor$ and the fact that $G(u, U) \geq \eta/\delta$ for all $u \in U$. Therefore, we want to show that there exists $c > 0$ such that for any path γ that satisfies the conditions above,

$$\mathrm{Hm}(U, \gamma; \gamma \cup \partial\tilde{V}_\delta^l) \geq c\frac{\eta}{\delta}|\log(\delta)|.$$

The proof is essentially identical to that of (3.3). For $n \geq 0$ an integer, we let Q_n be the box of radius $r_n = 2^{-n-2}L$ centered at v^*, $A_n = Q_n \setminus Q_{n+1}$, $U_n = U \cap A_n$, and $\gamma_n = \gamma \cap A_n$. We note that $N = \max\{n \geq 1 : r_n \geq 1000\delta\}$ satisfies $N \geq c|\log(\delta)|$. Finally, we claim that there exists a universal constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\mathrm{Hm}(U_n, \gamma_n; \gamma \cup \partial\tilde{V}_\delta^l) \geq c\frac{\eta}{\delta}, \quad 1 \leq n \leq N\,.$$

For the proof, we begin as usual with a last-exit decomposition. Take $1 \leq n \leq N$ and let $\tau = \min\{k \geq 1 : S_k \in U \cup \gamma \cup \partial\tilde{V}_\delta^l\}$ (recall S is a random walk on W). We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Hm}(U_n, \gamma_n; \gamma \cup \partial\tilde{V}_\delta^l) &= \sum_{u\in U_n}\sum_{u'\in U}\sum_{v\in\gamma_n} G^l(u, u') C_{u'} \mathbb{P}_{u'}(S_\tau = v), \\ &= \sum_{u\in U_n}\sum_{u'\in U}\sum_{v\in\gamma_n} G^l(u', u) C_v \mathbb{P}_v(S_\tau = u'), \\ &\geq \frac{\eta}{\delta}\sum_{v\in\gamma_n} \mathbb{P}_v(S_\tau \in U).\end{aligned}$$

From here, the details of the proof are the same as for the proof of (3.3). Let $v_1 \in \gamma_n$ be such that $2r_n/3 - \delta < |v_1 - v^*|_{\ell_\infty} \le 2r_n/3$, $v_2 \in \gamma_n$ be such that $5r_n/6 \le |v_2 - v^*|_{\ell_\infty} < 5r_n/6 + \delta$, and $Q_{n,2}$ be the box of radius $r_n/12$ centered at v_2. With these choices, the distance between v_1 and $Q_{n,2}$, and between $\{v_1\} \cup Q_{n,2}$ and A_n^c are of the same order as r_n. Therefore, letting $\mathfrak{E}$ be the event that S hits $Q_{n,2} \cap \gamma$ and then hits U before exiting A_n, there exists a universal constant $c > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{v_1}(\mathfrak{E}) \ge c$. By a last exit decomposition

$$\mathbb{P}_{v_1}(\mathfrak{E}) \le \sum_{v \in \gamma} G^{l,*}(v_1, v)\mathbb{P}_v(S_\tau \in U_n),$$

where $G^{l,*}(v_1, v)$ is the expected number of visits a random walk started at v_1 makes to v after hitting $Q_{n,2} \cap \gamma$ and before exiting A_n. Finally, it follows easily from [LL10, Theorem 4.4.4, Proposition 4.6.2] that $G^{l,*}(v_1, \cdot)$ is uniformly bounded. That is, there exists a universal constant $c > 0$ such that

$$G^{l,*}(v_1, v) \le c, \quad v \in A_n \cap \delta\mathbb{Z}^2.$$

This concludes the proof.

6 Limits of crossing probabilities

In this section, we discuss level lines of discrete GFF and metric graph GFF. Fix the rectangle $R_L = (0, L) \times (0, 1)$ and $V_\delta = R_L \cap \delta\mathbb{Z}^2$. Recall that the four corners of R_L are denoted by a, b, c, d in counter-clockwise order with $b = 0$, and that the four corners of V_δ are denoted by $a_\delta, b_\delta, c_\delta, d_\delta$ in counter-clockwise order with b_δ closest to the origin, i.e. $b_\delta = (\delta, \delta) \in \delta\mathbb{Z}^2$.

Consider discrete GFF ϕ_δ on V_δ with either zero boundary condition or alternating boundary condition (1.3). In either case, we say that the vertices on $[a_\delta, b_\delta)$ have positive value and the vertices on $[b_\delta, c_\delta)$ have negative value. The level line η_δ of ϕ_δ is defined as follows: it starts from $b_\delta^\diamond = (0, 3\delta/2)$, lies on the dual lattice of $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ and turns at every dual-vertex in such a way that it has vertices with positive value on its left and negative value on its right. If there is an indetermination when arriving at a dual-vertex, turn left. The level lines stop when they hit the boundary segments $[c_\delta, d_\delta)$ or $[d_\delta, a_\delta)$. We will consider the convergence of η_δ in this section. We use the following metric on planar curves: suppose η_1 and η_2 are unparameterized continuous curves, then

$$d(\eta_1, \eta_2) = \inf_{u_1, u_2} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\eta_1(u_1(t)) - \eta_2(u_2(t))|,$$

where the inf is over increasing homeomorphisms $u_1, u_2 : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$. Using techniques in [SS09], we have the following convergence of the law on η_δ.

Theorem 6.1. *There exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that, when $\lambda = \lambda_0$, the law of η_δ converges weakly to $\eta \sim SLE_4(-2; -2)$ in R_L from b to d with force points $(a; c)$ as $\delta \to 0$. As a consequence,* (1.9) *holds.*

To prove Theorem 6.1, we will first introduce SLE process in Section 6.1 and then complete the proof in Section 6.2. We will discuss the limit of crossing probabilities in (1.5) at the end of Section 6.2. We will discuss the limit of crossing probabilities in (1.6) in Section 6.3.

6.1 Preliminaries on SLE

We denote by $\mathbb{H}$ the upper-half plane. We call a compact subset K of $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ an $\mathbb{H}$-hull if $\mathbb{H} \setminus K$ is simply connected. By Riemann's mapping theorem, there exists a unique conformal map g_K from $\mathbb{H} \setminus K$ onto $\mathbb{H}$ with the normalization $\lim_{z \to \infty} |g_K(z) - z| = 0$. With such normalization, we say that g_K is normalized at ∞.

We consider the following collections of $\mathbb{H}$-hulls. First, consider families of conformal maps $(g_t, t \geq 0)$ obtained by solving the Loewner equation: for each $z \in \mathbb{H}$,

$$\partial_t g_t(z) = \frac{2}{g_t(z) - W_t}, \quad g_0(z) = z,$$

where $(W_t, t \geq 0)$ is a real-valued continuous function, which we call the driving function. Second, for each $z \in \mathbb{H}$, define the swallowing time T_z to be

$$\sup \left\{ t \geq 0 : \inf_{s \in [0,t]} |g_s(z) - W_s| > 0 \right\}.$$

Finally, denote by K_t the closure of $\{z \in \mathbb{H} : T_z \leq t\}$. Then g_t is the conformal map from $\mathbb{H} \setminus K_t$ onto $\mathbb{H}$ normalized at ∞. The collection of $\mathbb{H}$-hulls $(K_t, t \geq 0)$ is called a Loewner chain parameterized by the half-plane capacity.

For $\kappa \geq 0$, Schramm Loewner Evolution, denoted by SLE_κ, is the Loewner chain with driving function $W_t = \sqrt{\kappa} B_t$ where $(B_t, t \geq 0)$ is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion. It was proved in [RS05] that $(K_t, t \geq 0)$ is almost surely generated by a continuous transient curve, i.e. there exists a continuous curve η such that, for each $t \geq 0$, the set $\mathbb{H} \setminus K_t$ is the unbounded connected component of $\mathbb{H} \setminus \eta[0, t]$ and $\lim_{t \to \infty} |\eta(t)| = \infty$. In this section, we focus on $\kappa \in (0, 4]$ when the curve is simple.

$\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho^L; \rho^R)$ is a variant of SLE_κ process where one keeps track of two extra marked points on the boundary. Let $y^L \leq 0 \leq y^R$ and $\rho^L, \rho^R \in \mathbb{R}$. An $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho^L; \rho^R)$ process with force points $(y^L; y^R)$ is the Loewner chain driven by W_t that solves the following system of SDEs:

$$dW_t = \sqrt{\kappa} dB_t + \frac{\rho^L dt}{W_t - V_t^L} + \frac{\rho^R dt}{W_t - V_t^R}, \quad dV_t^L = \frac{2dt}{V_t^L - W_t}, \quad dV_t^R = \frac{2dt}{V_t^R - W_t},$$

where $W_0 = 0, V_0^L = y^L, V_0^R = y^R$. It turns out that such process exists for all time if $\rho^L, \rho^R > -2$. If $\rho^L \leq -2$ or $\rho^R \leq -2$, it exists up to the first time that the process swallows y^L or y^R. Moreover, the process is generated by continuous curve up to and including the same time.

The above SLE processes are defined in $\mathbb{H}$, for other simply connected domains we define SLE process via conformal image. Suppose Ω is a non-trivial simply connected domain and a, b, c, d are four boundary points lying on locally connected components in counterclockwise order. Then $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho^L; \rho^R)$ in Ω from b to d with force points $(a; c)$ is $\varphi^{-1}(\eta)$ where η is an $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho^L; \rho^R)$ from 0 to ∞ with force points $(y^L; y^R)$ and φ is any conformal map from Ω onto $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\varphi(a) = y^L \leq \varphi(b) = 0 \leq \varphi(c) = y^R < \varphi(d) = \infty$.

In this section, we focus on $\mathrm{SLE}_4(\rho^L; \rho^R)$ with $\rho^L = \rho^R = -2$ and force points $y^L < 0 < y^R$. Then the above SDEs become

$$dW_t = 2dB_t + \frac{2dt}{V_t^L - W_t} + \frac{2dt}{V_t^R - W_t}, \quad dV_t^L = \frac{2dt}{V_t^L - W_t}, \quad dV_t^R = \frac{2dt}{V_t^R - W_t}. \tag{6.1}$$

Denote by η the continuous curve corresponding to the Loewner chain driven by W. Let T be the first time that the process swallows y^L or y^R. We will calculate the probability $\mathbb{P}(\eta(T) = y^R)$. Set

$$\hat{W}_t = \frac{2W_t - V_t^L - V_t^R}{V_t^R - V_t^L}.$$

Then $T = \inf\{t : \hat{W}_t \in \{-1, +1\}\}$. Itô's formula gives

$$d\hat{W}_t = \frac{4dB_t}{V_t^R - V_t^L}.$$

In particular, $(\hat{W}_{t \wedge T}, t \geq 0)$ is a bounded martingale. Optional stopping theorem gives $\mathbb{E}[\hat{W}_T] = \hat{W}_0$. From there, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\eta(T) = y^R\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\hat{W}_T = 1\right) = \frac{-y^L}{y^R - y^L}. \tag{6.2}$$

This gives (1.9) assuming the convergence of the level line in Theorem 6.1.

Below, we perform a time change in the system which will be useful in Section 6.2. This is analog of [SS09, Section 4.5]. Define a new time parameter, for $t \geq 0$,

$$s(t) := \log\left(\frac{V_t^R - V_t^L}{y^R - y^L}\right).$$

Set $\tilde{W}_s = \hat{W}_t$ when $s = s(t)$. Then we have

$$d\tilde{W}_s = q(\tilde{W}_s)d\tilde{B}_s, \quad \text{where } q(x) = \sqrt{2(1-x^2)}, \tag{6.3}$$

and $(\tilde{B}_s, s \geq 0)$ is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion. The process $\tilde{W}$ starts from $\tilde{W}_0 = \frac{-y^L - y^R}{y^R - y^L}$, evolves according to (6.3), and stops when it hits $\{-1, +1\}$ at finite time T. From above, we see how to transform from the process in (6.1) to the one in (6.3). We will show that this is one-to-one transform up to a scaling constant.

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose $(\tilde{Y}_s)$ is a continuous process starting from $\tilde{Y}_0 \in (-1, 1)$, evolving according to $d\tilde{Y}_s = q(\tilde{Y}_s)d\tilde{B}_s$, and stopped when it hits $\{-1, +1\}$. Define*

$$t(s) = \frac{1}{8}\int_0^s e^{2u}(1 - \tilde{Y}_u^2)du, \quad s(t) = \sup\{s : t(s) \leq t\}.$$

Define

$$Y_t = \frac{1}{2}e^{s(t)}\tilde{Y}_{s(t)} + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{s(t)} e^u \tilde{Y}_u du - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{Y}_0.$$

Then (Y_t) is a continuous process starting from 0 and evolving according to

$$dY_t = 2dB_t + \frac{2dt}{V_t^L - Y_t} + \frac{2dt}{V_t^R - Y_t}, \quad dV_t^L = \frac{2dt}{V_t^L - Y_t}, \quad dV_t^R = \frac{2dt}{V_t^R - Y_t}, \tag{6.4}$$

where $V_0^L = -\frac{1}{2}(1 + \tilde{Y}_0)$ and $V_0^R = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \tilde{Y}_0)$.

Proof. Set

$$B_t = \frac{1}{4}\int_0^{s(t)} e^u q(\tilde{Y}_u)d\tilde{B}_u;$$

$$V_t^L = V_0^L - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{s(t)} e^u(1 - \tilde{Y}_u)du, \quad V_t^R = V_0^R + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{s(t)} e^u(1 + \tilde{Y}_u)du.$$

Then (B_t) is a standard Brownian motion, and (Y_t, V_t^L, V_t^R) solves (6.4). □

6.2 Scaling limits of level lines in discrete GFF

We will derive Theorem 6.1 in this section following the proof in [SS09]. Although our setup is different from it is in [SS09], similar techniques work. In fact, our setting is much easier to treat. As the proof in [SS09] is long and technical (and we do not know how to simplify it), we only sketch the proof in our setting.

Recall that ϕ_δ is discrete GFF on V_δ with alternating boundary condition (1.3), and η_δ is the level line of ϕ_δ starting from $b_\delta^\diamond$ and stopped when it hits the boundary segment $[c_\delta, a_\delta)$. Fix a conformal map φ from R_L onto $\mathbb{H}$ with $\varphi(a) < \varphi(b) = 0 < \varphi(c) < \varphi(d) = \infty$. Denote by $y^L = \varphi(a) < 0$ and by $y^R = \varphi(c) > 0$. Consider $\varphi(\eta_\delta)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ parameterized by the half-plane capacity. Denote by W_t^δ its driving function and by g_t^δ the corresponding family of conformal maps. For $\epsilon > 0$, let T_ϵ^δ be the first time that $\varphi(\eta_\delta)$ gets within ϵ-distance of the points $\varphi(a_\delta)$ or $\varphi(c_\delta)$. Recall that (W_t) is the driving function of $\eta \sim \mathrm{SLE}_4(-2; -2)$ as in (6.1). Let T_ϵ be the first time that η gets within ϵ-distance of the points y^L or y^R.

Lemma 6.3. *For any fixed $\epsilon, \alpha > 0$ small, there is $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\epsilon, \alpha) > 0$ such that, if $\delta \le \delta_0$, the interface η_δ can be coupled with η so that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T_\epsilon^\delta \wedge T_\epsilon]} |W_t^\delta - W_t| \ge \alpha \right) \le \alpha.$$

Proof. Denote by $\tilde{W}^\delta$ the coordinate change of W^δ as in Section 6.1. Let $\mathcal{F}_s$ be the σ-field generated by $\sigma(\tilde{W}_r^\delta, r \le s)$. We will first prove the following conclusion which is analog of [SS09, Proposition 4.2]. For any $\epsilon, \alpha, \beta > 0$ small, there exists $C > 0$ depending on ϵ and there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ depending on ϵ, α, β such that the following holds. If $\delta \le \delta_0$ and s_0, s_1 are two stopping times for $\tilde{W}^\delta$ such that almost surely $s_0 \le s_1 \le T_\epsilon^\delta$, $s_1 - s_0 \le \beta^2$, and $\sup_{s \in [s_0, s_1]} |\tilde{W}_s^\delta - \tilde{W}_{s_0}^\delta| \le \beta$, then the following two estimates hold with probability at least $1 - \alpha$:

$$\left| \mathbb{E}\left[\Delta \tilde{W}^\delta \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{s_0} \right] \right| \le C\beta^3, \quad \left| \mathbb{E}\left[(\Delta \tilde{W}^\delta)^2 - q(\tilde{W}_{s_0}^\delta)^2 \Delta s \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{s_0} \right] \right| \le C\beta^3, \tag{6.5}$$

where $\Delta s = s_1 - s_0$ and $\Delta \tilde{W}^\delta = \tilde{W}_{s_1}^\delta - \tilde{W}_{s_0}^\delta$. Roughly speaking, (6.5) corresponds to the discrete version of (6.3).

For $t > 0$, let F_t^δ be the function defined on V_δ that is $-\lambda_0$ on vertices to the right side of $\eta_\delta[0, t]$, $+\lambda_0$ on the vertices to the left side of $\eta_\delta[0, t]$, equal to the boundary data on ∂V_δ, and is harmonic at all other vertices in V_δ. Suppose $v \in V_\delta$ such that the distance between v and ∂R_L is at least $1/4$. For $k = 0, 1$, define $X_k = \mathbb{E}[\phi_\delta(v) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{s_k}]$ and let $\mathcal{A}_k$ be the event

$$|X_k - F_{s_k}(v)| \ge \beta^5.$$

By [SS09, Proposition 3.27], we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_k) \le \frac{1}{4}\alpha\beta^5$ if δ is small enough. Consequently, we have

$$|X_0 - F_{s_0}(v)| \le \beta^5, \quad \text{on } \mathcal{A}_0^c;$$
$$|\mathbb{E}[X_1 - F_{s_1}(v) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{s_0}]| \le \beta^5 + O(1)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_1 \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{s_0}).$$

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the event $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_1 \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{s_0}) \ge \beta^5$, then $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) \le \frac{1}{4}\alpha$. Combing the above two estimates and the fact that $\mathbb{E}[X_1 \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{s_0}] = X_0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[F_{s_1}(v) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{s_0}] - F_{s_0}(v) = O(\beta^5), \quad \text{on } \mathcal{A}_0^c \cap \mathcal{A}^c.$$

For $k = 0, 1$, let H_k be the (continuous) function that is $-\lambda_0$ to the right side of $\eta_\delta[0, s_k]$, $+\lambda_0$ to the left side of $\eta_\delta[0, s_k]$, equal to the boundary data on ∂R_L, and is harmonic in $R_L \setminus \eta_\delta[0, s_k]$. Then $H_k(v) - F_{s_k}(v)$ is small if δ is small enough and the distance between v and $\eta_\delta[0, s_k]$ is bounded from below. Precisely, let $\mathcal{B}_k$ be the event $|H_k(v) - F_{s_k}(v)| \ge \beta^5$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_k) \le \frac{1}{4}\alpha\beta^5$ if δ is small enough. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the event $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_1 \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{s_0}) \ge \beta^5$, then $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}) \le \frac{1}{4}\alpha$. From the above estimate, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[H_1(v) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{s_0}] - H_0(v) = O(\beta^5), \quad \text{on } \mathcal{A}_0^c \cap \mathcal{A}^c \cap \mathcal{B}_0^c \cap \mathcal{B}^c. \tag{6.6}$$

For $k = 0, 1$, denote by

$$Z_k = \frac{2g_{s_k}^\delta(\varphi(v)) - g_{s_k}^\delta(y^L) - g_{s_k}^\delta(y^R)}{g_{s_k}^\delta(y^R) - g_{s_k}^\delta(y^L)}.$$

Then we have

$$H_k(v) = \lambda_0 - \frac{2\lambda_0}{\pi} \arg(Z_k - 1) + \frac{2\lambda_0}{\pi} \arg(Z_k - \tilde{W}_{s_k}^\delta) - \frac{2\lambda_0}{\pi} \arg(Z_k + 1).$$

By the calculation in [SS09, Proof of Proposition 4.2], we have

$$\frac{\pi}{2\lambda_0}(H_1(v)-H_0(v))=\frac{y}{x^2+y^2}\left(\frac{x}{x^2+y^2}\left(q(\tilde{W}^\delta_{s_0})^2\Delta s-(\Delta\tilde{W}^\delta)^2\right)-\Delta\tilde{W}^\delta\right)+O(\beta^3),$$

where $x=\Re(Z_0-\tilde{W}^\delta_{s_0})$ and $y=\Im(Z_0)$. Plugging into (6.6), with probability at least $1-\alpha$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{x}{x^2+y^2}\left(q(\tilde{W}^\delta_{s_0})^2\Delta s-(\Delta\tilde{W}^\delta)^2\right)-\Delta\tilde{W}^\delta\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{s_0}\right]=O(\beta^3).$$

By different choice of v, we obtain (6.5).

Recall that W is driving function of $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2;-2)$. Denote by $\tilde{W}$ the coordinate change of W as in Section 6.1. With (6.5) at hand, by arguments in [SS09, Section 4.4], we have the following conclusion. For any fixed $\epsilon,\alpha>0$ small, there is $\delta_0>0$ such that, if $\delta\le\delta_0$, there is coupling between $\tilde{W}^\delta$ and $\tilde{W}$ so that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{s\in[0,T^\delta_\epsilon\wedge T_\epsilon]}|\tilde{W}^\delta_s-\tilde{W}_s|\ge\alpha\right)\le\alpha.$$

Finally, by Lemma 6.2 and arguments in [SS09, Section 4.6], we obtain the conclusion. □

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Recall that η_δ is the level line of ϕ_δ, we parameterize $\varphi(\eta_\delta)$ by the half plane capacity, and we denote by W^δ_t its driving function. Recall that $\eta\sim\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2;-2)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ with force points $y^L=\varphi(a)<0$ and $y^R=\varphi(c)>0$, we denote by W_t its driving function. From Lemma 6.3, W^δ is close to W in local uniform topology. Combing with [SS09, Section 4.7 and Lemma 4.16], $\varphi(\eta^\delta)$ and η are close in Hausdorff metric. Precisely, for any fixed $\epsilon,\alpha>0$ small, there is $\delta_0>0$ such that, if $\delta\le\delta_0$, the interface η_δ can be coupled with η so that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T^\delta_\epsilon\wedge T_\epsilon]}d_H(\varphi(\eta_\delta[0,t],\eta[0,t])\ge\alpha\right)\le\alpha,$$

where d_H denotes the Hausdoff metric. For such argument to work, it is important that $(\eta(t),0\le t\le T)$ hits $\mathbb{R}$ only at the two end points $\eta(0)=0$ and $\eta(T)\in\{y^L,y^R\}$. Then, using arguments in [SS09, Section 4.8], we arrive at the following conclusion. For any fixed $\epsilon,\alpha>0$ small, there is $\delta_0>0$ such that, if $\delta\le\delta_0$, the interface η_δ can be coupled with η so that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T^\delta_\epsilon\wedge T_\epsilon]}|\varphi(\eta_\delta(t)-\eta(t)|\ge\alpha\right)\le\alpha.$$

It remains to get the convergence of the whole process. Suppose η_* is any subsequential limit of η_δ in Hausdorff metric. From the above argument, we see that $\varphi(\eta_*)$ has the same law as η up to T_ϵ for any $\epsilon>0$. Note that η is continuous up to and including T. We may conclude that $\varphi(\eta_*)$ has the same law as η up to T. This gives the convergence of the whole process. Consequently, we obtain the convergence of the crossing probability (combining with (6.2))

$$\lim_{\delta\to0}\mathbb{P}\left([a_\delta,b_\delta)\overset{\phi_\delta\ge0}{\longleftrightarrow}[c_\delta,d_\delta)\right)=\mathbb{P}(\eta(T)=y^R)=\frac{-y^L}{y^R-y^L}.$$

□

We end this section by a discussion on the convergence of discrete GFF level lines in Theorem 6.1 when $\lambda \neq \lambda_0$. By analyzing level lines of continuous GFF as in [WW17], we believe that the level line η_δ of ϕ_δ converges weakly to $\eta \sim \mathrm{SLE}_4(-2\rho, \rho-1; \rho-1, -2\rho)$ in R_L from b to d with force points $(a, b^-; b^+, c)$ where $\rho = \lambda/\lambda_0$. However, the techniques in [SS09] do not apply to this general setting directly to our knowledge. In particular, the authors in [SS09] derived the convergence of driving function when $\lambda = 0$: they proved that the driving function of η_δ weakly converges to the driving function of $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-1;-1)$ in the local uniform topology; however, the convergence in stronger topology is still missing. Assuming the convergence of η_δ to $\eta \sim \mathrm{SLE}_4(-1;-1)$ in Haudorff metric, we may conclude that the crossing probability in (1.5) is convergent:

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \mathbb{P}\left([a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\phi_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right) = \mathbb{P}(\eta \text{ hits } [c,d) \text{ before } [d,a)).$$

Whereas, to get an explicit formula as in (1.9) for the right-hand side is another open question.

6.3 Scaling limits of level lines in metric graph GFF

Recall that $\tilde{\phi}_\delta$ is metric graph GFF on $\tilde{V}_\delta$. Suppose the boundary condition is the following: (note that this is different from the one in (1.3))

$$\tilde{\phi}_\delta(v) = \begin{cases} \lambda, & v \in [a_\delta, b_\delta) \cup [c_\delta, d_\delta), \\ 0, & v \in [b_\delta, c_\delta) \cup [d_\delta, a_\delta). \end{cases} \tag{6.7}$$

Recall that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^l_{\delta,0} = \left\{ v \in \tilde{V}_\delta : \exists \text{ continuous path } \gamma \text{ connecting } v \text{ to } [a_\delta, b_\delta) \text{ such that } \tilde{\phi}_\delta \geq 0 \text{ on } \gamma \right\}.$$

Define the frontier of $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^l_{\delta,0}$ as follows: Consider the set of all the points in $\partial\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^l_{\delta,0}$ that are connected in $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^l_{\delta,0}$ to $[a_\delta, b_\delta)$ and in $\tilde{V}_\delta \setminus \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^l_{\delta,0}$ to $[b_\delta, c_\delta)$. This set contains no vertices and the edges it intersects in the dual graph give a path from the point $b^\diamond_\delta$ to the point $(3\delta/2, 1)$ (near a) or the point $(L, 3\delta/2)$ (near c). We call such path the frontier of $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^l_{\delta,0}$. Using conclusions in [ALS18, Section 5.2], we may conclude that, when $\lambda = 2\lambda_0$, the frontier of $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^l_{\delta,0}$ weakly converges to $\mathrm{SLE}_4(-2;-2)$ in R_L from b to d with force points $(a; c)$ in Hausdorff metric as $\delta = 2^{-n} \to 0$. Consequently, we have the convergence of the crossing probabilities: (see [ALS18, Remark 5.11])

$$\lim_{\delta = 2^{-n} \to 0} \mathbb{P}\left([a_\delta, b_\delta) \overset{\tilde{\phi}_\delta \geq 0}{\longleftrightarrow} [c_\delta, d_\delta)\right) = \frac{(\varphi(b)-\varphi(a))(\varphi(d)-\varphi(c))}{(\varphi(c)-\varphi(a))(\varphi(d)-\varphi(b))}, \tag{6.8}$$

where φ is any conformal map from R_L onto the upper-half plane $\mathbb{H}$ with $\varphi(a) < \varphi(b) < \varphi(c) < \varphi(d)$. We emphasize that the metric graph GFF (6.8) has the boundary condition (6.7) with $\lambda = 2\lambda_0$ which is different from the one in (1.3).

Let us go back to the boundary condition (1.3) and to (1.6) in Theorem 1.2. Suppose we have metric graph GFF with boundary condition (1.3). Using conclusions in [ALS18], we may conclude that the crossing probabilities in (1.6) are convergent. By Theorem 1.2, we know that the limit should be different from the one in the case of discrete GFF. To derive the explicit formula for this limit is an interesting question. We will give this explicit formula when $\lambda = 2\lambda_0$ in a forthcoming paper [LW20].

References

[ALS18] J. Aru, T. Lupu, A. Sepúlveda. First passage sets of the 2D continuum Gaussian free field: convergence and isomorphisms. Preprint, arXiv:1805.09204.

[BS02] A. N. Borodin, P. Salminen. Handbook of Brownian Motion - Facts and Formulae. *Birkhäuser-Verlag*, 2002.

[BL76] H.J. Brascamp, E. H. Lieb. On extensions of the Brunn-Minkowski and Prékopa-Leindler theorems, including inequalities for log concave functions, and with an application to the diffusion equation. *J. Functional Analysis.* 22(4), 366-389, 1976.

[DL18] J. Ding, L. Li. Chemical distances for percolation of planar gaussian free fields and critical random walk loop soups. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 360(2), 523-553, 2018.

[DW19] J. Ding, M. Wirth. Percolation for level-sets of Gaussian free fields on metric graphs. *Ann. Probab.*, to appear.

[Ke97] H. Kesten. Hitting probabilities of random walks on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 25:165-184, 1987.

[LL10] G. F. Lawler, V. Limic. Random Walk: A Modern Introduction. *Cambridge University Press*, 2010.

[Lu16] T. Lupu. From loop clusters and random interlacements to the free field. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(3):2117–2146, 2016.

[LW18] T. Lupu, W. Werner. The random pseudo-metric on a graph defined via the zero-set of the Gaussian free field on its metric graph. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* 171(3-4): 775-818, 2018.

[LW20] M. Liu, H. Wu. Scaling limits of crossing probabilities in metric graph GFF. In preparation.

[Pr74] C.J. Preston. A generalization of the FKG inequalities. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 36, 233241, 1974.

[Pi82] L. D. Pitt. Positively correlated normal variables are associated. *Ann. Probab.* 10, 496499, 1982.

[RS05] S. Rohde, O. Schramm. Basic properties of SLE. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 161(2):883–924, 2005.

[RY99] D. Revuz, M. Yor. Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion. *Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg*, 1999.

[SS09] O. Schramm, S. Sheffield. Contour lines of the two-dimensional discrete Gaussian free field. *Acta Math*, 202(1):21-137, 2009.

[WW17] M. Wang, H. Wu. Level lines of Gaussian Free Field I: Zero-boundary GFF. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 127(4):1045–1124, 2017.