

Convergence of the Probabilistic Interpretation of Modulus

Nathan Albin, Joan Lind and Pietro Poggi-Corradini

June 23, 2021

Abstract

Given a Jordan domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ and two arcs A, B on $\partial\Omega$, the modulus of the curve family connecting A and B in Ω is famously related, via the conformal map ϕ mapping Ω to a rectangle $R = [0, L] \times [0, 1]$ so that A and B are sent to the vertical sides, to the corresponding modulus in R . Moreover, in the case of the rectangle the family of horizontal segments connecting the two sides has the same modulus as the entire connecting family. Pulling these segments back to Ω via ϕ yields a family of extremal curves (also known as horizontal trajectories) connecting A to B in Ω . In this paper, we show that these extremal curves can be approximated by some discrete curves arising from an orthodiagonal approximation of Ω . Moreover, we show that these curves carry a natural probability mass function (pmf) deriving from the theory of discrete modulus and that these pmf's converge to the uniform distribution on the set of extremal curves. The key ingredient is an algorithm that, for an embedded planar graph, takes the current flow between two sets of nodes A and B , and produces a unique path decomposition with non-crossing paths. Moreover, some care was taken to adapt recent results for harmonic convergence on orthodiagonal maps, due to Gurel-Gurevich, Jerison, and Nachmias, to our context.

Contents

1	Introduction and results	2
2	Background and examples	3
2.1	Discrete modulus	3
2.2	Discrete harmonic functions	4
2.3	Examples	5
2.4	Orthodiagonal maps	8
2.5	Linearly connected and John domains	11
3	Non-crossing minimal subfamilies	11
3.1	Non-crossing minimal subfamily algorithm	12
3.2	Scaling limit of non-crossing minimal subfamilies	15
3.3	Further consequences of the minimal non-crossing subfamily	18
3.4	A numerical example	20
3.4.1	Approximating the modulus	21
3.4.2	Non-crossing curves	21
4	Convergence of discrete harmonic functions	22
4.1	Modified toolbox	23
4.2	Proof of Theorem 3	29

1 Introduction and results

Many objects in complex analysis are approximated by discrete analogues. In this paper, we establish the convergence of three discrete objects, discrete modulus, discrete paths that are extremal for the modulus, and discrete harmonic functions, to their continuous counterparts, the continuous modulus, the extremal curves (or horizontal trajectories) for the modulus, and harmonic functions.

Consider a Jordan domain $\Omega \in \mathbb{C}$ and two arcs on $\partial\Omega$. The modulus of the curve family connecting these arcs in Ω is well understood. In particular, there is a subfamily of extremal curves (or horizontal trajectories) that carry all the information for this modulus. We wish to approximate Ω with a plane graph G and approximate the boundary arcs with sets of vertices A and B . As previously studied in [2, 3, 4], the discrete modulus of the family of paths between A and B in G arises from putting a density on the edges of G . See Section 2.1 for the definitions. Our first task is to identify a subfamily of paths between A and B in G that is the candidate approximating family for the extremal curves in the classical setting. This is accomplished in the result below.

For a finite plane graph G , the sets of boundary vertices A and B are defined as follows: $A = S_1 \cap V$ and $B = S_2 \cap V$, where S_1, S_2 are two disjoint arcs from a simple curve in the closed outer face of G . We always assume that A and B are nonempty.

Proposition 1. *Let G be a finite plane graph, and let A and B be defined as above. Then the family of all paths in G from A to B has a unique minimal subfamily with non-crossing paths. Moreover, this family supports a pmf μ that is optimal for the dual discrete modulus problem, and both are output from the Non-crossing Minimal Subfamily Algorithm described in Section 3.*

Our next goal is to show that the candidate subfamily identified in Proposition 1 does in fact approximate the family of classical extremal curves. For this, we specialize to plane graphs that arise from finite orthodiagonal maps, a class of graphs that generalize the square grid. Roughly, an orthodiagonal map is a graph where every interior face is a quadrilateral with orthogonal diagonals. Associated with the orthodiagonal map is the so-called primal graph G^\bullet that we utilize. See Section 2.4 for definitions and notation.

The setting for the following result is as follows: Let Ω be a Jordan domain whose boundary can be decomposed into four analytic arcs that do not meet in cusps. Let A and B be two of these non-adjacent arcs. Let G_ϵ be an orthodiagonal map with edge length at most ϵ that approximates Ω within distance ϵ and has boundary vertices A_ϵ and B_ϵ approximating A and B , respectively. (See Section 2.4 for more precise definitions.)

Theorem 2. *In the setting above, consider the family of all paths in G_ϵ^\bullet from A_ϵ to B_ϵ , and let Γ_ϵ be the unique minimal subfamily with non-crossing paths obtained from Proposition 1, with corresponding pmf μ_ϵ . Then, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, μ_ϵ converges to the uniform measure on the classical extremal curves from A to B in Ω .*

The convergence in the above theorem is weak convergence and the underlying metric is the Hausdorff metric on curves. This theorem relies on the following result about discrete harmonic functions approximating continuous harmonic functions, which is an adaptation of the main theorem of [8].

Theorem 3. *Let Ω be a Jordan domain whose boundary is decomposed into four analytic arcs that do not meet in cusps, and let A and B be two of these non-adjacent arcs. Let ψ be a conformal map of Ω onto the rectangle $R = [0, 1] \times [0, m]$ taking the arcs A and B to the vertical sides of the rectangle, and let $h_c = \operatorname{Re} \psi$. Let $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ be small enough. Let $G = (V^\bullet \sqcup V^\circ, E)$ be a finite orthodiagonal map with boundary arcs S_1, T_1, S_2, T_2 with maximal edge length at most ϵ , so that the quadrilateral G approximates Ω within distance δ (in the sense of Definition 14). Let $h_d : V^\bullet \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be discrete harmonic on $\operatorname{Int}(V^\bullet)$, with the following boundary values: $h_d(z) = 0$ for $z \in V^\bullet \cap S_1$ and $h_d(z) = 1$ for $z \in V^\bullet \cap S_2$. Then, for $z \in V^\bullet \cap \bar{\Omega}$,*

$$|h_d(z) - h_c(z)| \leq \frac{C}{\log^{1/2}(\operatorname{diam}(\Omega)/(\epsilon \vee \delta))},$$

where C depends only on Ω .

An immediate consequence to this theorem is the following corollary, which generalizes a result by Norah Alrayes in [5] from the square grid setting to the orthodiagonal setting.

Corollary 4. *In the setting of Theorem 2, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ the discrete modulus of the path family between A_ϵ and B_ϵ in G_ϵ^\bullet converges to continuous modulus of the curve family between A and B in Ω .*

We end with a note about the organization of this paper. In Section 2, we introduce the needed background, including discrete modulus, discrete harmonic functions, and orthodiagonal maps, and we consider two illuminating examples. We begin Section 3 by discussing the Non-crossing Minimal Subfamily Algorithm and proving Proposition 1. Then we prove Theorem 2, using Theorem 3 as a tool. We end by discussing an interpretation of Proposition 1 in terms of current flow and a rectangle-packing result. Section 4 contains the proof of Theorem 3 and is independent of Section 3.

2 Background and examples

2.1 Discrete modulus

Let $G = (V, E, \sigma)$ be a finite weighted graph, which is also referred to as a *network*, with vertex set V , edge set E , and edge weights $\sigma : E \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. Let Γ be a family of objects in G , such as a collection of paths in G . The *usage matrix* \mathcal{N} is a $|\Gamma| \times |E|$ matrix with $\mathcal{N}(\gamma, e)$ giving the usage of edge e in object γ . In the case that γ is a path, then $\mathcal{N}(\gamma, e) = \mathbb{1}_{\{e \in \gamma\}}$.

A density $\rho : E \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ on G is called *admissible* for Γ if

$$\ell_\rho(\gamma) := \sum_{e \in E} \mathcal{N}(\gamma, e) \rho(e) \geq 1 \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \Gamma.$$

When Γ is family of paths, we consider $\ell_\rho(\gamma)$ to be the length of γ under ρ . In this setting ρ is admissible for Γ if every path has length at least 1. For $1 \leq p < \infty$, the (*discrete*) p -modulus of Γ is defined as

$$\text{Mod}_p(\Gamma) := \inf \sum_{e \in E} \sigma(e) \rho(e)^p,$$

where the infimum is taken over all admissible densities ρ . See [2, 3, 4] for further background on the discrete modulus. In the rest of this paper, we will specialize to the case when $p = 2$ and Γ is a collection of paths.

The *extremal density* ρ^* is an admissible density that satisfies

$$\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma) = \sum_{e \in E} \sigma(e) \rho^*(e)^2.$$

The extremal density is unique in this case and is characterized in the following theorem, which is the $p = 2$ case of a well-known result (see for instance, [4, Theorem 2.1], [1, Theorem 4-4], and also [6]).

Theorem 5. (*Beurling's Criterion*) *Let $G = (V, E, \sigma)$ be a network and Γ a family of paths on G . An admissible density ρ is extremal for $\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)$ if there is a subfamily $\tilde{\Gamma} \subset \Gamma$ that satisfies the following two conditions:*

(i) $\ell_\rho(\gamma) = 1$ for all $\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}$.

(ii) If $h : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\ell_h(\gamma) = \sum_{e \in \gamma} h(e) \geq 0$ for all $\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}$, then

$$\sum_{e \in E} h(e) \rho(e) \sigma(e) \geq 0.$$

Furthermore, in this case $\text{Mod}_2(\tilde{\Gamma}) = \text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)$.

A subfamily $\tilde{\Gamma}$ that satisfies the two conditions of Beurling's Criterion for ρ^* is called a *Beurling subfamily* of Γ . A *minimal subfamily* of Γ is a subfamily $\tilde{\Gamma} \subset \Gamma$ so that $\text{Mod}_2(\tilde{\Gamma}) = \text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)$ and such that removing any path from $\tilde{\Gamma}$ decreases the modulus, i.e. for any $\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ we have $\text{Mod}_2(\tilde{\Gamma} \setminus \{\gamma\}) < \text{Mod}_2(\tilde{\Gamma})$. As shown in [4], Γ will always contain a minimal subfamily, although it may not be unique, and any minimal subfamily is also a Beurling subfamily for Γ .

The following is the main property of a minimal subfamily that we will be using repeatedly. Although it can be deduced from [4, Theorem 3.5 and Section 5], it is not explicitly formulated there, and so we summarize the result here, for clarity.

Proposition 6 ([4]). *Let $G = (V, E, \sigma)$ be a finite weighted graph, and let Γ be a finite (non-empty) family of paths in G . If $\tilde{\Gamma} \subset \Gamma$ is a minimal subfamily for Γ , then there is a probability mass function (or pmf) μ^* supported on $\tilde{\Gamma}$ that is associated with the extremal density $\rho^*(e)$ for $\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)$ as follows*

$$\frac{\sigma(e)\rho^*(e)}{\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)} = \mathbb{E}_{\mu^*} [\mathcal{N}(\underline{\gamma}, e)] = \sum_{\gamma: e \in \gamma} \mu^*(\gamma). \quad (1)$$

We call μ^* an *optimal pmf* because by convex duality it can be shown to satisfy an optimization problem. For instance, when $\sigma \equiv 1$, this problem is especially nice and μ^* is a pmf that minimizes the expected overlap between two independent randomly-chosen paths:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu^*} |\gamma \cap \gamma'| = \min_{\mu} \mathbb{E}_{\mu} |\gamma \cap \gamma'| = \frac{1}{\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)},$$

where the minimum is taken over all possible pmf's μ on Γ .

Proof of Proposition 6. Theorem 3.5 (ii) of [4], shows that if $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is a minimal subfamily of Γ , then there is a unique set of Lagrange multipliers λ^* that are optimal for the dual problem to modulus, so that $\tilde{\Gamma} = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \lambda^*(\gamma) > 0\}$. Then, in Section 5 of [4], the probabilistic interpretation of modulus is given in [4, Theorem 5.1], showing that

$$\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma) = \left(\min_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Gamma)} \mu^T \mathcal{N} \mathcal{N}^T \mu \right)^{-1} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\Gamma)$ is the family of all pmf's supported on Γ . As seen in the proof of [4, Theorem 5.1], the minimization in (2) is derived from the dual problem to modulus by normalizing the Lagrangian multipliers λ so as to have total sum $\mathbf{1}^T \lambda$ equal to 1. Therefore, the optimal pmf μ^* for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is obtained by dividing λ^* by $\mathbf{1}^T \lambda^*$. \square

2.2 Discrete harmonic functions

For a network $G = (V, E, \sigma)$, when $v, w \in V$ are adjacent, we will use the notation vw to refer to the edge incident to v and w . A function $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *discrete harmonic* at $v \in V$ if

$$f(v) \sum_{w: vw \in E} \sigma(vw) = \sum_{w: vw \in E} f(w) \sigma(vw),$$

or in other words, the value of f at v is a weighted average of the values of f at the neighbors of v .

The existence and uniqueness of discrete harmonic functions with specified boundary values is well known; see for instance Section 2.1 of [10].

Proposition 7. (*Existence and uniqueness of discrete harmonic functions*) *Let $G = (V, E, \sigma)$ be a finite connected network. For $U \subset V$ and $g : V \setminus U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, there is a unique function $h : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $h = g$ on $V \setminus U$ and h is discrete harmonic on U .*

The function h given by Proposition 7 is called the *solution to the discrete Dirichlet problem* on U with boundary data g . Viewed from the electric network perspective, h is called the *voltage function*. From its discrete gradient, we obtain the *current flow* $f = \sigma dh$ given by

$$f(vw) = \sigma(vw) [h(w) - h(v)] \quad \text{for all } vw \in \vec{E}.$$

In the above, we use \vec{E} for the set of directed edges, which contains both possible orientations for all the edges of E .

More generally, a *flow* on $U \subset V$ is a function θ on \vec{E} so that each $v \in U$ satisfies *Kirchhoff's node law*, i.e.

$$\sum_{w: vw \in \vec{E}} \theta(vw) = 0.$$

The *energy* of a function $\theta : \vec{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given (with a slight abuse of notation) by

$$\mathcal{E}(\theta) = \sum_{e \in E} \frac{1}{\sigma(e)} \theta^2(e).$$

The energy of $h : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined to be the energy of its discrete gradient, i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}(h) = \mathcal{E}(\sigma dh) = \sum_{vw \in E} \sigma(vw) [h(w) - h(v)]^2.$$

We are now able to explain the close connection between the discrete 2-modulus and discrete harmonic functions. Suppose G is network with disjoint nonempty sets $A, B \subset V$. Let Γ be the family of paths in G from A to B , and let h be the solution to the discrete Dirichlet problem on $V \setminus (A \cup B)$ with $h|_A = 0$ and $h|_B = 1$. Then,

$$\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma) = \mathcal{E}(h),$$

and the extremal density is related to the solution of the Dirichlet problem as follows

$$\rho^*(vw) = |h(w) - h(v)|. \tag{3}$$

See Theorem 4.2 in [2].

2.3 Examples

We wish to illustrate the concepts from the previous sections and our main results by taking a look at two simple examples.

Example 8. For the first example, let R be the rectangle $[0, L] \times [0, 1]$, where $L \in \mathbb{N}$. Let G be the square grid in R with lattice size $1/n$ and weights $\sigma \equiv 1$. Let Γ be the family of all paths in G from $A = \{v \in V : \text{Re}(v) = 0\}$ to $B = \{v \in V : \text{Re}(v) = L\}$.

For this example, we claim the following:

1. The extremal density is $\rho^*(e) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{Ln} & \text{if } e \text{ is a horizontal edge} \\ 0 & \text{if } e \text{ is a vertical edge} \end{cases}$.
2. The subfamily of horizontal paths $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is a Beurling subfamily.
3. $\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma) = \text{Mod}_2(\tilde{\Gamma}) = \frac{1}{L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)$.
4. $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is the unique minimal subfamily.
5. The optimal pmf μ^* is unique and is uniform on $\tilde{\Gamma}$.

We will use Beurling's criterion to establish the first two claims. Note that each horizontal path $\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ has Ln horizontal edges, and so $\ell_{\rho^*}(\gamma) = 1$. To establish the second condition of Beurling's criterion, assume that $h : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\sum_{e \in \gamma} h(e) \geq 0$ for all $\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}$. Then, since $\rho^*(e) = 0$ when e is vertical,

$$\sum_{e \in E} h(e) \rho^*(e) = \frac{1}{Ln} \sum_{e \text{ horizontal}} h(e) = \frac{1}{Ln} \sum_{\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}} \sum_{e \in \gamma} h(e) \geq 0.$$

Thus Beurling's criterion (Theorem 5) shows that ρ^* is the extremal density and $\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma) = \text{Mod}_2(\tilde{\Gamma})$. We compute

$$\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma) = \sum_{e \in E} \rho^*(e)^2 = \left(\frac{1}{Ln} \right)^2 (\# \text{ of horizontal edges}) = \frac{1}{L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \right),$$

since there are $Ln(n+1)$ horizontal edges. Notice that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the discrete modulus converges to $\frac{1}{L}$, which is the corresponding continuous modulus.

An alternate approach to finding ρ^* would be to check that $h(v) = \frac{1}{L} \text{Re}(v)$ is discrete harmonic on $V \setminus (A \cup B)$. Thus h is the solution to the discrete Dirichlet problem with boundary values $h|_A = 0$ and $h|_B = 1$, and we could obtain ρ^* from (3).

We observe that $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is a minimal subfamily, since removing any curve $\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ will decrease the modulus. To see this, change ρ^* to be zero on the removed path γ and use Beurling's criterion to show that the new density is extremal for $\tilde{\Gamma} \setminus \{\gamma\}$. To show that $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is the unique minimal subfamily, assume to the contrary that $\hat{\Gamma}$ is another minimal subfamily. Then the optimal pmf $\hat{\mu}$ on $\hat{\Gamma}$ satisfies that the expected edge usage of e under $\hat{\mu}$ is given by $\rho^*(e)/\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)$ by (1). This implies that the expected edge usage for any vertical edge must be zero, and the paths in $\hat{\Gamma}$ cannot use any vertical edges. Therefore $\hat{\Gamma} \subset \tilde{\Gamma}$. However, since $\text{Mod}_2(\hat{\Gamma}) = \text{Mod}_2(\tilde{\Gamma})$, we must have $\hat{\Gamma} = \tilde{\Gamma}$.

Let μ^* be the optimal pmf on $\tilde{\Gamma}$. From (1), we see that if e is a horizontal edge and γ is the corresponding horizontal path, then

$$\mu^*(\gamma) = \mathbb{E}_{\mu^*}[\mathcal{N}(\gamma, e)] = \frac{\rho^*(e)}{\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)} = \frac{1}{n+1}.$$

This implies that μ^* is uniform on $\tilde{\Gamma}$.

We wish to vary n , and so we update our notation to show the dependence on n , i.e. let $\mu_n^* = \mu^*$ which is supported on $\tilde{\Gamma}_n = \tilde{\Gamma}$. For this example, the result of Theorem 2 is fairly intuitive: as $n \rightarrow \infty$, μ_n^* converges to the uniform measure on all horizontal curves in R , which are the extremal curves in the continuous setting.

Example 9. In our second example, we will look at a rotated rectangle. Let R be the rectangle $[0, \sqrt{2}L] \times [0, \sqrt{2}]$ rotated by $\pi/4$ (i.e. the corners of R are $0, L+iL, L-1+i(L+1), -1+i$.) In R , take the (non-rotated) square grid with lattice size $1/n$ and weights $\sigma \equiv 1$. Let Γ be the family of all paths in R from the left side $A = \{v : \text{Im}(v) = -\text{Re}(v)\}$ to the right side $B = \{v : \text{Im}(v) = -\text{Re}(v) + 2L\}$. See Figure 1.

In contrast to Example 8, there is not a unique minimal subfamily in this case, and we will describe two such subfamilies. Consider first the subfamily Γ^z of "zig-zag" paths, which alternate between increasing the real component and increasing the imaginary component (or vice-versa). These paths each have $2Ln$ steps, and each edge is used in exactly 1 path. By arguing as before, Beurling's criterion can be used to show that the extremal density is $\frac{1}{2Ln}$ on all edges and Γ^z is a Beurling subfamily. Further we see that Γ^z is also a minimal subfamily, since removing any path will decrease the modulus. From the extremal density and the fact that there are $4n^2L$ total edges, we see that $\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma) = \frac{1}{L}$, which is equal to the corresponding continuous modulus.

Another minimal subfamily Γ^r consists of the "reflected" paths which keep increasing the same component (whether real or imaginary) until they hit the boundary of R and then they switch to increasing the other component. The paths in this family will also have $2Ln$ steps each, and each edge




Figure 1: The graph for Example 9 with $L = 2$, $n = 3$, the vertices of A shown in red, and the vertices of B shown in blue.

is used in exactly 1 path. One can check that this will also be a Beurling subfamily and a minimal subfamily.

Each subfamily will have an associated optimal pmf: let μ_n^z be the pmf on the zig-zag subfamily Γ^z , and let μ_n^r be the pmf on the reflected subfamily Γ^r . Both measures will be uniform, giving the $2n$ paths in the relevant subfamily weight $\frac{1}{2n}$. Further both μ_n^z and μ_n^r will have a limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, but the limiting objects will be different. The limit for μ_n^z can be thought of as the uniform measure on the straight line paths of slope 1 in R (which are the extremal curves in the continuous setting). However, the limit for μ_n^r will be supported on paths that move in a straight line either horizontally or vertically until reflecting off the boundary of the rectangle.

To illustrate the point that not all Beurling subfamilies are minimal, we wish to examine one further subfamily. Let

$$\hat{\Gamma} = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \gamma \text{ has } 2Ln \text{ steps}\}.$$

In other words, this is the collection of all curves that have length 1 under the extremal density. This family contains both Γ^z and Γ^r . In a moment, we will show that this is a Beurling subfamily, and hence it will be the largest Beurling subfamily by construction.

Let $\hat{\mu}$ be the pmf that arises from viewing the paths in $\hat{\Gamma}$ as 1-dim simple random walk (SRW) trajectories started on the left side of R and reflected to stay in the rectangle. In other words, we can think of creating the paths dynamically as follows: Each of the $2n$ initial edges has equal probability $\frac{1}{2n}$. Once the first edge is chosen, we chose the next edge with probability 1/2 of going up or going to the right. Then we repeat. If we happen to be on the boundary, then we take the only available edge with probability 1. One can show for any fixed edge e that $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mu}}[e \in \gamma] = \frac{1}{2n}$, see Claim 10 below.

With this understanding of $\hat{\mu}$, we will be able to show that $\hat{\Gamma}$ is a Beurling subfamily by verifying Beurling's Criterion. Let $h \in \mathbb{R}^E$ with $\sum_{e \in \gamma} h(e) \geq 0$ for all $\gamma \in \hat{\Gamma}$. Then

$$\sum_{e \in E} h(e) \cdot \frac{1}{2nL} = \sum_{e \in E} h(e) \cdot \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\gamma \in \hat{\Gamma}} \hat{\mu}(\gamma) \mathbb{1}_{\{e \in \gamma\}} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\gamma \in \hat{\Gamma}} \hat{\mu}(\gamma) \sum_{e \in \gamma} h(e) \geq 0.$$

A short computation will show that $\hat{\mu}$ is a pmf on $\hat{\Gamma}$ that minimizes the expected overlap of two

independent randomly chosen paths in $\hat{\Gamma}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mu}}|\gamma \cap \gamma'| &= \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mu}} \left[\sum_{e \in E} \mathbb{1}_{\{e \in \gamma \cap \gamma'\}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{e \in E} \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mu}} [e \in \gamma \cap \gamma'] \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2n} \right)^2 \cdot 4n^2 L \\ &= L. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$L = \text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)^{-1} = \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{\mu}|\gamma \cap \gamma'|,$$

$\hat{\mu}$ is a pmf on $\hat{\Gamma}$ that minimizes expected overlap. Hence, $\hat{\mu}$ is an optimal pmf on $\hat{\Gamma}$. Note that it may not be unique, since we are only guaranteed a unique optimal pmf for a minimal subfamily, a fact that follows from [4, Theorem 3.5(ii)].

To highlight the fact that the limit in Theorem 2 depends on the correct choice of subfamily, we mention that the limit of the pmf $\hat{\mu}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ yields 1-dim reflected Brownian motion trajectories started at a uniform point on the left side of R .

Claim 10. $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mu}}[e \in \gamma] = \frac{1}{2n}$ for any edge e .

Proof. This claim can be shown by induction. In particular, we can subdivide the edges into $2nL$ distinct sets of $2n$ edges

$$E_k = \{ \text{all the edges that could be step } k \text{ in a SRW trajectory} \},$$

and we do induction on k to show that $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mu}}[e \in \gamma]$ is the same for all edges e in E_k . The base case follows by definition, since each of the initial edges has equal probability. We will show the basic idea behind the induction proof by explaining the reasoning for E_2 and E_3 . Consider the vertices that edges from E_1 lead into (we consider the edges oriented so that the SRW trajectories flow from the left side to the right side of R). Each of these vertices has exactly two edges leading into it, meaning that our SRW induces a uniform distribution on these vertices. Since each of these vertices has two edges leading out, and we will choose between them with equal probability, we have uniform probability for all edges in E_2 . Now consider the vertices that the edges from E_2 lead into. There are two special vertices, one on the top boundary and one on the bottom boundary, that only have one edge leading into them and one edge leading out. All the rest have two edges leading in and two edges leading out. While we no longer have a uniform distribution induced on these vertices, we still obtain the uniform distribution on E_3 . (Reason: We have the same chance of arriving at any internal vertex, and we have exactly half this probability of arriving at a boundary vertex. From the internal vertex, we have two edges to choose from with equal probability, while at the boundary vertex we must take the only available edge.) \square

Note that the paths in Γ^z are non-crossing, while in Γ^r and $\hat{\Gamma}$ they do cross. In Section 3 we will give an algorithm that, in the case of plane graphs, always produces the unique non-crossing minimal subfamily.

2.4 Orthodiagonal maps

A finite *orthodiagonal map* is a finite connected plane graph that satisfies the following:

- Each edge is a straight line segment.
- Each inner face is a quadrilateral with orthogonal diagonals.
- The boundary of the outer face is a simple closed curve.

See the top left image in Figure 2 for an illustration.

We will briefly describe some of the structure associated with an orthodiagonal map $G = (V, E)$. Since G is a bipartite graph, we obtain a bipartition of the vertices $V = V^\bullet \sqcup V^\circ$. Each inner face Q is determined by the four vertices on its boundary, which must alternate between V^\bullet and V° . We will write $Q = [v_1, w_1, v_2, w_2]$ with the convention that $v_1, v_2 \in V^\bullet$, $w_1, w_2 \in V^\circ$, and the vertices are ordered counterclockwise around Q . We can create two additional graphs associated with G , the *primal graph* $G^\bullet = (V^\bullet, E^\bullet)$ and the *dual graph* $G^\circ = (V^\circ, E^\circ)$. There is one primal edge and one dual edge for each inner face of G . In particular, $e_Q^\bullet \in E^\bullet$ is an edge between v_1 and v_2 in Q ; it is defined to be the line segment v_1v_2 , if this segment is contained in Q , and otherwise it is the union of the line segments v_1p and pv_2 , where $p = (w_1 + w_2)/2$ is the midpoint of w_1w_2 . The edge $e_Q^\circ \in E^\circ$ between w_1 and w_2 in Q is defined similarly. For an edge $e \in E^\bullet$, the *dual edge to e* is the unique edge $e^\circ \in E^\circ$ so that there is an inner face Q with $e = e_Q^\bullet$ and $e^\circ = e_Q^\circ$. The *primal network* (G^\bullet, σ) and the *dual network* (G°, σ) have the following edge weights:

$$\sigma(e_Q^\bullet) = \frac{|w_1w_2|}{|v_1v_2|} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(e_Q^\circ) = \frac{|v_1v_2|}{|w_1w_2|},$$

where the notation $|ab|$ is the Euclidian distance between a and b . Note that this distance is not necessarily the length of the edge.

One way to interpret these weights is through a finite-volume approximation of the Laplace equation. Let v_1 be an interior vertex in the primal graph, and consider the collection of quadrilaterals containing this vertex. The bottom right picture in Figure 2 shows an example of such a collection of quadrilaterals (light edges in the figure). The edges of the dual graph surround a polygonal region, R (thick dashed lines in the figure). If h is the potential for the continuum problem, then the divergence theorem implies that

$$0 = \int_R \Delta h \, dx = \int_{\partial R} \frac{\partial h}{\partial n} \, dS.$$

The integral on the right is a sum of integrals along the edges of R . Let w_1w_2 be some such edge, as indicated in the figure. There is a corresponding edge v_1v_2 in the primal graph. Since these edges are orthogonal, $(h(v_2) - h(v_1))/|v_1v_2|$ provides an approximation of the normal derivative along w_1w_2 . Thus, the contribution of w_1w_2 to the boundary integral can be approximated as

$$\int_{w_1w_2} \frac{\partial h}{\partial n} \, dS \approx \frac{|w_1w_2|}{|v_1v_2|} (h(v_2) - h(v_1)).$$

Performing a similar approximation on the remaining edges of R yields the approximation

$$0 \approx \sum_{u:v_1u \in E} \frac{|w_1w_2|}{|v_1u|} (h(u) - h(v_1)).$$

Thus, when the continuous potential is restricted to the graph, it approximately satisfies Kirchhoff's current law on each interior vertex, with the edge conductances defined above. Moreover, this approximation improves as the lengths of the graph edges converge to zero.

We list some further notation relating to an orthodiagonal map G :

$$\begin{aligned} \partial G &= \text{the topological boundary of the outer face of } G \\ \text{Int}(G) &= \text{the open subset enclosed by } \partial G \\ \hat{G} &= \text{Int}(G) \cup \partial G \\ \tilde{G} &= \text{the union of the convex hulls of the closures of the inner faces of } G \end{aligned}$$

In [8], Gurel-Gurevich, Jerison, and Nachmias show that one can approximate continuous harmonic functions by discrete harmonic functions on an orthodiagonal map, generalizing the work of [15] and [17].




Figure 2: Top left: An example of an orthodiagonal map with the bipartation of the vertices. Top right: The topological boundary of the map decomposed into four paths: S_1, S_2 (solid) and T_1, T_2 (dashed). Bottom left: The primal graph G^\bullet (black/red vertices and solid edges) with ∂V^\bullet shown in red and the dual graph G° (white vertices and dashed edges). Bottom right: Finite volume interpretation of the edge weights assigned to an orthodiagonal map.

Theorem 11 ([8]). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded simply connected domain, and let $g : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^2 function. Given $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, \text{diam}(\Omega))$, let $G = (V^\bullet \sqcup V^\circ, E)$ be a finite orthodiagonal map with maximal edge length at most ϵ such that the Hausdorff distance between ∂G and $\partial \Omega$ is at most δ . Let $h_c : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the solution to the continuous Dirichlet problem on Ω with boundary data $g|_{\partial \Omega}$, and let $h_d : V^\bullet \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the solution to the discrete Dirichlet problem on $V^\bullet \setminus \partial G$ with boundary data $g|_{\partial G \cap V^\bullet}$. Set*

$$C_1 = \sup_{z \in \tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla g(z)| \quad \text{and} \quad C_2 = \sup_{z \in \tilde{\Omega}} \|Hg(z)\|_2,$$

where $\tilde{\Omega} = \text{conv}(\bar{\Omega} \cup \hat{G})$. Then there is a universal constant $C < \infty$ such that for all $z \in V^\bullet \cap \bar{\Omega}$,

$$|h_d(z) - h_c(z)| \leq \frac{C \text{diam}(C_1 + C_2 \epsilon)}{\log^{1/2}(\text{diam}(\Omega)/(\delta \vee \epsilon))}.$$

In the above result, the boundary condition involves the vertices of the primal graph that are in the topological boundary of G . In our work, we need a similar result with different boundary conditions. This leads us to the following definition.

Definition 12. The graph $G = (V^\bullet \sqcup V^\circ, E)$ is a finite *orthodiagonal map with boundary arcs* S_1, T_1, S_2, T_2 , if G is a finite orthodiagonal map with the following boundary condition:

- (Boundary condition) The topological boundary of G can be subdivided into four nonempty paths S_1, T_1, S_2, T_2 , listed counterclockwise, with $S_j \cap T_k$ equal to a single vertex, for $j, k = 1, 2$.

This boundary condition allows us to think of G as a conformal rectangle with “sides” S_1, S_2 and “top/bottom” T_1, T_2 . For the associated primal and dual graphs, we define the (graph) boundaries as follows:

$$\partial V^\bullet := V^\bullet \cap (S_1 \cup S_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial V^\circ := V^\circ \cap (T_1 \cup T_2).$$

Note that ∂V^\bullet and ∂V° do not include all vertices in the topological boundary of G . Further, we define

$$\text{Int}(V^\bullet) := V^\bullet \setminus \partial V^\bullet \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Int}(V^\circ) := V^\circ \setminus \partial V^\circ,$$

and we point out that these are different from the collections of vertices in the topological interior of G^\bullet and G° . See Figure 2.

Definition 13. Let Ω be a simply connected Jordan domain in the plane such that its boundary can be decomposed into four analytic arcs A, τ_1, B, τ_2 , listed in counter-clockwise order, with the property that the arcs do not form cusps at the points where they connect. We will call Ω a *smooth quadrilateral*.

Definition 14. We wish to approximate a smooth quadrilateral Ω with a finite orthodiagonal map G with boundary arcs S_1, T_1, S_2, T_2 . We say that G *approximates* Ω *within distance* δ when $\bar{\Omega} \subset \hat{G}$ and $\text{dist}_{\hat{G}}(S_1, A)$, $\text{dist}_{\hat{G}}(S_2, B)$, and $\text{dist}_{\hat{G}}(T_k, \tau_k)$ are bounded by δ .

The notation $\text{dist}_{\hat{G}}(x, y)$ means the minimum length of all paths between x and y that remain in \hat{G} . So the notation $\text{dist}_{\hat{G}}(S_1, A) \leq \delta$ means that for all $x \in S_1$, there is a point $y \in A$ with $\text{dist}_{\hat{G}}(x, y) \leq \delta$ and vice versa.

2.5 Linearly connected and John domains

A simply connected domain Ω is *linearly connected* if there exists $K > 0$ so that any two points $z, w \in \Omega$ can be connected by a curve $\gamma \subset \Omega$ with $\text{diam}(\gamma) \leq K|z - w|$. On the other hand, a bounded simply connected domain Ω is a *John domain* if there exists $J > 0$ so that every crosscut κ of Ω satisfies $\text{diam}(H) \leq J \text{diam}(\kappa)$ for one of the two components H of $\Omega \setminus \kappa$. The inner domain of a piecewise smooth Jordan curve is linearly connected if and only if it has no inward-pointing cusps, and it is John domain if and only if there are no outward pointing cusps. (See Chapter 5 of [11].) Thus a smooth quadrilateral Ω , as defined in the previous subsection, is a linearly connected John domain. This geometric control gives us the Hölder continuity of some relevant functions.

Proposition 15. *Let Ω be a smooth quadrilateral with boundary arcs A, τ_1, B, τ_2 . Let ψ be a conformal map of Ω onto the rectangle $R = [0, 1] \times [0, m]$ taking the arcs A and B to the vertical sides of the rectangle, and let $h_c = \text{Re } \psi$. Then there exists $C > 0$ so that*

$$|h_c(z) - h_c(w)| \leq C|z - w|^{1/4} \quad \text{for all } z, w \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

Further, there exists $p \in (0, 1/2]$ and $C > 0$ so that

$$|\psi^{-1}(z) - \psi^{-1}(w)| \leq C|z - w|^p \quad \text{for all } z, w \in \bar{R}.$$

Proof. Let $F_\Omega : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega$ and $F_R : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow R$ be conformal maps with $\psi = F_R \circ F_\Omega^{-1}$. The conformal map F_R is a Hölder continuous with exponent $1/2$. Since Ω is a linearly connected domain, Theorem 5.7 of [11] implies that F_Ω satisfies a lower Hölder condition with exponent $b < 2$ on $\partial\mathbb{D}$, which is equivalent to a Hölder condition on F_Ω^{-1} with exponent $1/b > 1/2$ on $\partial\Omega$. Hence,

$$|h_c(x) - h_c(y)| \leq C|x - y|^{1/4}$$

on $\partial\Omega$. Then Theorem 1 in [9] proves the first result.

For the second statement, we use the same argument applied to $\psi^{-1} = F_\Omega \circ F_R^{-1}$. Recall that every John domain is a Hölder domain, which implies that F_Ω is Hölder continuous. \square

3 Non-crossing minimal subfamilies

In this section we assume that the finite network $G = (V, E, \sigma)$ is a *plane* graph (i.e. G is embedded in the plane with no edges crossing.) Further, we assume that there are nonempty sets of boundary

vertices A and B defined as follows: $A = S_1 \cap V$ and $B = S_2 \cap V$, where S_1, S_2 are two disjoint arcs from a simple curve \mathcal{C} in the closed outer face of G .

Let F be the conformal map from the interior of \mathcal{C} to a rectangle $[0, L] \times [0, 1]$ that takes S_1 to the left side and S_2 to the right side. We use F to obtain an orientation for G . Given a path γ from A to B , the slit vertical strip $\{z : \operatorname{Re}(z) \in [0, L]\} \setminus F(\gamma)$ has two connected components. Let U_γ be the connected component containing $-i$ (i.e. the component “under” $F(\gamma)$). Then for a subgraph H of G and a path γ in H from A to B , we say that γ is the *top path* in H from A to B if $F(H) \subset \overline{U_\gamma}$. We say that two paths from A to B are *non-crossing* when one path is the top path in the subgraph induced by these two paths. A family of paths is *non-crossing* when every pair of paths in the family is non-crossing. We note that two non-crossing paths are allowed to share vertices and edges. Also we say that an edge e is *below* a path γ if γ is the top path of the graph induced by $\{e\} \cup \gamma$.

Remark 16. Two paths γ_1 and γ_2 are crossing if one can find $e_1 \in \gamma_1 \setminus \gamma_2$ and $e_2 \in \gamma_2 \setminus \gamma_1$, so that e_1 is below γ_2 and e_2 is below γ_1 .

3.1 Non-crossing minimal subfamily algorithm

To establish the existence and uniqueness of the non-crossing minimal subfamily in Proposition 1, we will use the following algorithm that outputs the desired minimal subfamily given the extremal density ρ^* for the family of paths from A to B .

Non-crossing Minimal Subfamily Algorithm.

Input: planar network $G = (V, E, \sigma)$, sets of boundary vertices A and B as above, and the extremal density ρ^* for the family of curves from A to B in G .

Initialization: set $r(e) = \sigma(e)\rho^*(e)$ for each edge $e \in E$.

Iteration:

1. Remove any edges e for which $r(e) = 0$ from G (call such edges *zero edges*).
2. If there is one, add the top path γ in G to a growing family Γ ; if not, terminate.
3. For the top path γ identified in (2), set $m(\gamma) = \min_{e \in \gamma} r(e)$.
4. For each edge e in the top path γ identified in (2), update $r(e)$ to be $r(e) - m(\gamma)$.
5. Repeat.

Output: curve family Γ and the weights $m : \Gamma \rightarrow (0, \infty)$.

In our proof of Proposition 1, we will show that this algorithm outputs a minimal subfamily Γ of non-crossing paths, such that its corresponding optimal pmf μ^* , guaranteed by Proposition 6, is proportional to m . Before getting to the proof, we show that we can direct the non-zero edges of G to obtain a directed acyclic graph (once we remove any edges with $\rho^*(e) = 0$).

Lemma 17. *Let ρ^* be the unique extremal density for the family of paths from A to B in G , and let $E_0 = \{e \in E : \rho^*(e) = 0\}$. Then there exists an orientation of all edges in $E \setminus E_0$ so that the following hold:*

- (i) *At any vertex v not in $A \cup B$, the sum of $\sigma(e)\rho^*(e)$ over the edges leading into v equals the sum of $\sigma(e)\rho^*(e)$ over the edges leading out of v .*
- (ii) *All edges in $E \setminus E_0$ with exactly one vertex in A (resp. B) are oriented away from A (resp. towards B).*
- (iii) *Let γ be a path in $G \setminus E_0$ from A to B . Then γ is a directed path from A to B if and only if γ has length 1, i.e. $\ell_{\rho^*}(\gamma) = 1$.*
- (iv) *$G \setminus E_0$ is a directed acyclic graph.*

Proof. Let h be the solution to the discrete Dirichlet problem on $V \setminus (A \cup B)$ with $h|_A = 0$ and $h|_B = 1$, and recall that $\rho^*(vw) = |h(w) - h(v)|$. For each edge e incident to vertices v, w with $\rho^*(e) \neq 0$, we orient e from v to w when $h(w) - h(v) > 0$.

Let f be the corresponding current flow: $f(vw) = \sigma(vw)[h(w) - h(v)]$ for $vw \in \vec{E}$. For $v \in V \setminus (A \cup B)$, let E_v^{in} be the edges directed into v and E_v^{out} be the edges directed out of v . Then since f is a flow,

$$0 = \sum_{w: vw \in E} f(vw) = \sum_{e \in E_v^{\text{out}}} \sigma(e)\rho^*(e) - \sum_{e \in E_v^{\text{in}}} \sigma(e)\rho^*(e),$$

which proves (i).

Statement (ii) follows from the discrete maximum principle, which implies that $0 \leq h \leq 1$. To show (iii), let γ be a path from A to B in $G \setminus E_0$ given by vertices v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k . Then

$$\ell_{\rho^*}(\gamma) = \sum_{j=1}^k |h(v_j) - h(v_{j-1})| \geq \sum_{j=1}^k h(v_j) - h(v_{j-1}) = 1.$$

There is equality in the above equation if and only if γ is a directed path from A to B .

To show that $G \setminus E_0$ has no cycles (respecting the edge directions), we will assume for the sake of contradiction that there is a cycle of directed edges e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k with each e_j directed from v_{j-1} to v_j . Then

$$0 < \sum_{j=1}^k \rho^*(e_j) = \sum_{j=1}^k h(v_j) - h(v_{j-1}) = h(v_k) - h(v_0) = 0,$$

since $v_k = v_0$. This is a contradiction. \square

Proof of Proposition 1. We begin by analyzing the Non-crossing Minimal Subfamily Algorithm. Note that this algorithm must terminate, because we remove at least one edge from the graph during every iteration (except possibly the first one). We will show that when the algorithm terminates, then there are no edges remaining in the graph.

We claim that after each time we complete step (1), the only possible connected components of the resulting graph are singleton vertices or connected subgraphs that contain vertices from both A and B . The first time we complete step (1), we remove all edges with $\rho^*(e) = 0$. Let H be one of the resulting connected components with at least one non-zero edge. Since H is a directed acyclic graph by Lemma 17, H must contain at least one source vertex and at least one sink vertex. Properties (i) and (ii) of Lemma 17 imply that the source vertex must be in A and the sink vertex must be in B . Hence H must contain vertices from both A and B .

Now let's suppose that after some later iteration of step (1) we obtain a connected component H with at least one edge but without vertices from both A and B . For the sake of simplicity, let's assume that H does not contain a vertex from A (as a similar argument applies in the other case.) Since H is a directed acyclic graph, it must contain at least one source vertex v and $v \notin A$. Let $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$ be all the paths in the current Γ that pass through v . Then since all of the edges directed towards v have been removed at this step,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n m(\gamma_i) = \sum_{e \in E_v^{\text{in}}} \sigma(e)\rho^*(e) = \sum_{e \in E_v^{\text{out}}} \sigma(e)\rho^*(e),$$

where the last equality is by Lemma 17(i). However, this means that we have also removed all the edges directed out from v , contradicting the fact that H is a connected component larger than a singleton vertex.

Next we wish to apply Beurling's Criterion (Theorem 5) to show that the algorithm's output path family Γ is a Beurling subfamily. Our first step is to show that the paths in Γ all have length 1. This will follow from Lemma 17 (iii) once we show that each output path is a directed path from A to B . Let $\gamma \in \Gamma$ be obtained during the k th iteration of the algorithm. Let H be the connected component (of the graph obtained after step (1) of the k th iteration) that contains γ . Then H is a directed acyclic

graph and γ is the top path of H . Further, from the argument above, we know that all source vertices of H are in A and all sink vertices are in B . Suppose γ is not a directed path from A to B , and let e be an edge in γ that is oriented “to the left”. Since all the sources (resp. sinks) are in A (resp. B), there must be some directed path in H from A to B that contains e . However, the planarity of H and the fact that γ is the top path imply that H must contain a directed cycle. This contradicts Lemma 17 (iv). Therefore, γ is a directed path from A to B and hence has length 1.

Now we will check the second condition for Γ to be a Beurling subfamily. Let $h \in \mathbb{R}^E$ with

$$\sum_{e \in \gamma} h(e) \geq 0$$

for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$. We apply this assumption and the fact that

$$\sigma(e)\rho^*(e) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} m(\gamma) \mathbb{1}_{\{e \in \gamma\}},$$

to obtain the needed condition:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in E} h(e)\rho^*(e)\sigma(e) &= \sum_{e \in E} h(e) \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} m(\gamma) \mathbb{1}_{\{e \in \gamma\}} \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} m(\gamma) \sum_{e \in \gamma} h(e) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus Γ is a Beurling subfamily, which implies that $\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)$ is the same as the modulus of the family of all curves from A to B in G .

We now know the existence of a minimal subfamily of non-crossing curves, since Γ must contain such a subfamily. However, we wish to show that Γ is in fact a minimal subfamily and the only such one with non-crossing paths. Let $\tilde{\Gamma}$ be any minimal subfamily with non-crossing paths, and let $\tilde{\mu}$ be the optimal pmf supported on $\tilde{\Gamma}$ guaranteed by Proposition 6. We will show that $\Gamma \subset \tilde{\Gamma}$, which will then imply that $\Gamma = \tilde{\Gamma}$.

Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n$ be the paths of Γ in the order that they are identified in the algorithm. We will begin by proving that γ_1 must be in $\tilde{\Gamma}$. To show this by contradiction, assume γ_1 is not in $\tilde{\Gamma}$. All the edges of γ_1 must be contained in paths of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ by (1) since ρ^* is nonzero on these edges, by construction during the algorithm. Let $\tilde{\gamma}$ be a path from $\tilde{\Gamma}$ that contains the longest initial segment in common with γ_1 . Let e_0 be the edge in γ_1 immediately after this initial segment (such an edge must exist since $\tilde{\gamma} \neq \gamma_1$). Further $\tilde{\gamma}$ must contain an edge below γ_1 after the initial segment. Now there must be some other path in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ that contains e_0 , and by the choice of $\tilde{\gamma}$, this path must have some edge below the initial segment of $\tilde{\gamma}$. By Remark 16, this implies that $\tilde{\Gamma}$ contains two paths that cross, which is not possible. Hence $\gamma_1 \in \tilde{\Gamma}$. The non-crossing condition further implies that there must be some edge e in γ_1 that is contained in no other path in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ (by the argument above). Recall that $\sigma(e)\rho^*(e)/\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)$ gives the expected edge usage of e with respect to the optimal pmf $\tilde{\mu}$. Therefore,

$$\sigma(e)\rho^*(e) = \min_{a \in \gamma_1} \sigma(a)\rho^*(a) = m(\gamma_1), \tag{4}$$

because other edges $a \in \gamma_1$ may be used in multiple paths from $\tilde{\Gamma}$. We can deduce that $\tilde{\mu}(\gamma_1) = m(\gamma_1)/\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)$.

For our inductive step, assume that $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}$ are in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ with $\tilde{\mu}(\gamma_j) = \frac{m(\gamma_j)}{\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k-1$. Assume we are at the point in the algorithm where we have just identified γ_k as the top path, and let $e \in \gamma_k$. Then since e was not removed yet,

$$r(e) = \sigma(e)\rho^*(e) - \sum_{j < k: e \in \gamma_j} m(\gamma_j) > 0.$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{j < k: e \in \gamma_j} \tilde{\mu}(\gamma_j) = \frac{1}{\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)} \sum_{j < k: e \in \gamma_j} m(\gamma_j) < \frac{\sigma(e)\rho^*(e)}{\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)} = \sum_{\gamma: e \in \gamma} \tilde{\mu}(\gamma),$$

where the last equality is from (1). This means that there must be a path in $\tilde{\Gamma} \setminus \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}\}$ that contains e , since we have not accumulated enough mass from the paths $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}$. The same contradiction proof as with γ_1 above shows that $\gamma_k \in \tilde{\Gamma}$. Further, as with γ_1 , the non-crossing condition implies that there must be some edge in γ_k that is contained in no other path in $\tilde{\Gamma} \setminus \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}\}$. Such edges $e \in \gamma_k$ will satisfy

$$r(e) = \min_{a \in \gamma_k} r(a),$$

and therefore

$$\tilde{\mu}(\gamma_k) = \frac{m(\gamma_k)}{\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)}. \quad (5)$$

This completes the induction proof and establishes that $\Gamma = \tilde{\Gamma}$ and (5) holds for all $\gamma_k \in \Gamma$. \square

3.2 Scaling limit of non-crossing minimal subfamilies

In this section we will prove Theorem 2 after detailing the set-up. Let Ω be a smooth quadrilateral, as defined in Definition 13, with boundary arcs A, τ_1, B, τ_2 listed counterclockwise. Let $\epsilon_n > 0$ satisfy $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let G_n be an orthodiagonal map with boundary arcs $A_n, \alpha_n, B_n, \beta_n$ that approximates Ω within distance ϵ_n , in the sense of Definition 14, and has edge length bounded by ϵ_n . Let σ_n be the weights on the edges of G_n^\bullet . Consider the family of all paths in G_n^\bullet from A_n to B_n , and let Γ_n be the unique minimal subfamily with non-crossing paths. Recall that there is a unique extremal density ρ_n on the edges of G_n^\bullet and a unique optimal pmf μ_n on Γ_n , which are related by

$$\frac{\sigma_n(e)\rho_n(e)}{\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma_n)} = \mathbb{E}_{\mu_n}[\mathcal{N}(\gamma, e)]. \quad (6)$$

We will prove that μ_n converges to the uniform probability measure on the family of classical extremal curves in Ω as $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$.

We begin with a lemma about a useful dual minimal subfamily. Since this lemma only relates to the orthodiagonal map (and not to the underlying domain), for ease of reading, we omit the subscript n .

Lemma 18. *Consider the family of all paths in G° from α to β , and let Γ° be the unique minimal subfamily with non-crossing paths provided by Proposition 1. We claim that*

$$\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma) \cdot \text{Mod}_2(\Gamma^\circ) = 1. \quad (7)$$

Further the unique extremal density η for Γ° satisfies

$$\eta(e^\circ) = \frac{\sigma(e)\rho(e)}{\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma)} = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathcal{N}(\gamma, e)] = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma: e \in \gamma} \mu(\gamma), \quad (8)$$

where $e^\circ \in E^\circ$ is the dual edge to $e \in E^\bullet$.

Proof. From Fulkerson duality, see [3, Section 4.2], we have that

$$\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma) \cdot \text{Mod}_2(\hat{\Gamma}) = 1, \quad (9)$$

where $\hat{\Gamma}$ is the family of all AB -cuts. Recall that $S \subset V^\bullet$ is an AB -cut if $A \subset S$ and $B \cap S = \emptyset$. Moreover, the usage of S is defined by considering the boundary $\partial S = \{e = xy \in E^\bullet : |S \cap \{x, y\}| = 1\}$. Then, the usage is set to $\mathcal{N}(S, e) = \mathbb{1}_{\{e \in \partial S\}}$. Note that we can define a bijective map $r : E^\bullet \rightarrow E^\circ$ by setting $r(e) := e^\circ$ which is the dual edge to e . Therefore, applying the transformation r to each edge in ∂S , we obtain an object $r(S)$ on the dual graph G° . We want to show that $r(S)$ contains a path

connecting α and β and conversely every such path comes from a cut S . First, every node in $V^\bullet \setminus \partial G$ is contained in the interior of a closed dual face for G° . The only problem arises when the node v is in ∂G . In this case, let C be the closure of the component of v in the intersection of the unbounded face for G° with \hat{G} . Finally, consider a small ball D_v centered at v that is disjoint from any other vertex and define $C \cup D_v$ to be the dual face containing v . By taking the union of all the dual faces containing a node in S and then taking the interior of this set, we obtain an open set U containing S (and hence A) in its interior, such that $B \subset \text{Int}(U^c)$.

Now we can apply Lemma 2.4 in [7], where the quadrilateral is our set \hat{G} , and obtain a simple curve γ connecting α and β with $\gamma \subset \partial U \cap \hat{G}$. By construction we see that γ is a union of dual edges, and hence is a simple path in G° . Conversely, every such path can be continued to get a Jordan domain with A in its interior and B in its exterior. Therefore, $\text{Mod}_2(\hat{\Gamma}) = \text{Mod}_2(\Gamma^\circ)$ and (7) follows from (9). Moreover, (8) follows from (1) and [3, Theorem 4 and Theorem 7], by letting η^\bullet be the extremal density for $\hat{\Gamma}$ and setting $\eta(e^\circ) = \eta^\bullet(r(e^\circ))$ (thinking of r as an idempotent operation). \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Let ϕ be the conformal map from Ω onto the rectangle $R = (0, L) \times (0, 1)$ so that (after extending ϕ to the boundary) $\phi(A)$ is the left side of R and $\phi(B)$ is the right side of R .

Let h_n be the solution to the discrete Dirichlet problem on $\text{Int}(V_n^\bullet)$ with $h_n|_{A_n} = 0$ and $h_n|_{B_n} = L$. Similarly let \tilde{h}_n be the solution to the discrete Dirichlet problem on $\text{Int}(V_n^\circ)$ with $\tilde{h}_n|_{\alpha_n} = 0$ and $\tilde{h}_n|_{\beta_n} = 1$. Note that

$$\rho_n(v_1 v_2) = \frac{1}{L} |h_n(v_1) - h_n(v_2)| \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_n(w_1 w_2) = |\tilde{h}_n(w_1) - \tilde{h}_n(w_2)|.$$

By Theorem 3, we know that h_n approximates $\text{Re } \phi$ and \tilde{h}_n approximates $\text{Im } \phi$.

The non-crossing condition for Γ_n allows us to order the paths in Γ_n : $\gamma < \gamma'$ means $\gamma \neq \gamma'$ and γ' is the top path in the subgraph consisting of these two paths. Equivalently, $\gamma < \gamma'$ means that γ is identified after γ' in the Non-crossing Minimal Subfamily Algorithm.

Fix $\gamma' \in \Gamma_n$ and set

$$p = \sum_{\gamma \leq \gamma'} \mu_n(\gamma).$$

Let e be an edge in γ' , with dual edge e° . Now consider a curve $\gamma^\circ \in \Gamma_n^\circ$ that contains e° . First we will show that every path $\gamma \in \Gamma_n$ contains exactly one edge a with $a^\circ \in \gamma^\circ$. Note that each $\gamma \in \Gamma_n$ contains at least one such edge, since we can obtain an AB -cut from γ° . By (8), since γ° has length 1 under η_n ,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \sum_{a: a^\circ \in \gamma^\circ} \eta_n(a^\circ) = \sum_{a: a^\circ \in \gamma^\circ} \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_n: a \in \gamma} \mu_n(\gamma) \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_n: a \in \gamma} \mu_n(\gamma) [\# \text{ of edges } a \in \gamma \text{ with } a^\circ \in \gamma^\circ] \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the number of edges $a \in \gamma$ with $a^\circ \in \gamma^\circ$ must be identically equal to one.

Under the orientation of edges induced by \tilde{h}_n in Lemma 17, γ° is an oriented path from α_n to β_n by Lemma 17 (iii). Let $e^\circ = xy$, oriented with respect to this orientation. Consider the portion of γ° before x and let this be given by vertices $u_0, \dots, u_k = x$. Then

$$\tilde{h}_n(x) = \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{h}_n(u_j) - \tilde{h}_n(u_{j-1}) = \sum_{j=1}^k \eta_n(u_j u_{j-1}) \leq \sum_{\gamma \leq \gamma'} \mu_n(\gamma) = p.$$

Similarly,

$$\tilde{h}_n(y) \geq p.$$

Further by Theorem 3 and Proposition 15,

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{h}_n(y) - \tilde{h}_n(x)| &\leq |\tilde{h}_n(y) - \text{Im } \phi(y)| + |\text{Im } \phi(y) - \text{Im } \phi(x)| + |\text{Im } \phi(x) - \tilde{h}_n(x)| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\log^{1/2}(\text{diam}(\Omega)/\epsilon_n)} + C\epsilon_n^{1/4} \\ &\leq \delta_n, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $\delta_n = \frac{C}{\log^{1/2}(1/\epsilon_n)}$ for some constant C depending on Ω . So

$$p \leq \tilde{h}_n(y) \leq p + \delta_n \quad \text{and} \quad p - \delta_n \leq \tilde{h}_n(x) \leq p.$$

Now let u be a point on e . Then $|u - y| \leq 2\epsilon_n$ and by arguing as in (10) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } \phi(u) &\leq \tilde{h}_n(y) + |\text{Im } \phi(y) - \tilde{h}_n(y)| + |\text{Im } \phi(u) - \text{Im } \phi(y)| \\ &\leq p + 3\delta_n. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } \phi(u) &\geq \tilde{h}_n(x) - |\text{Im } \phi(x) - \tilde{h}_n(x)| - |\text{Im } \phi(u) - \text{Im } \phi(x)| \\ &\geq p - 3\delta_n. \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for all edges of γ' , we have that for any point u on γ'

$$\text{Im } \phi(u) \in [p - 3\delta_n, p + 3\delta_n]. \quad (11)$$

We are now ready to consider the deterministic limit points of Γ_n as $n \rightarrow \infty$, using the Hausdorff distance as our metric on curves. We claim that these limiting curves are the classical extremal curves in Ω :

$$\Gamma := \{\phi^{-1}(\{\text{Im}(z) = p\}) : p \in [0, 1]\}.$$

This will be accomplished in two steps. We will first show that the limit points of Γ_n are contained in Γ and then we will show that every curve of Γ is a limit point of Γ_n .

Suppose that γ_* is a limit point of Γ_n . Then there is a sequence $\gamma_k \in \Gamma_{n_k}$ with γ_k converging to γ_* . By Proposition 15 this implies that $\phi(\gamma_k)$ must converge to $\phi(\gamma_*)$. By (11), the oscillation of the imaginary part of $\phi(\gamma_k)$ must converge to zero, implying that $\text{Im}[\phi(\gamma_*)]$ must be constant. This shows that $\gamma_* \in \Gamma$.

To show that every curve in Γ is a possible limit, we must choose $q \in [0, 1]$ and find a $\gamma_n \in \Gamma_n$ that is close to $\phi^{-1}(\{\text{Im}(z) = q\})$. Choose the unique $\gamma_n = \gamma_n(q) \in \Gamma_n$ so that

$$\sum_{\gamma < \gamma_n} \mu_n(\gamma) < q \quad \text{and} \quad q \leq \sum_{\gamma \leq \gamma_n} \mu_n(\gamma) =: p_n. \quad (12)$$

Note that if $\gamma' \in \Gamma_n$ and $e \in \gamma'$, then by (10) we have

$$\mu_n(\gamma') \leq \sum_{\gamma: e \in \gamma} \mu(\gamma) = \eta_n(e) = |\tilde{h}_n(y) - \tilde{h}_n(x)| \leq \delta_n.$$

Therefore $p_n - q \leq \delta_n$, and this together with (11) implies that

$$\text{Im } \phi(\gamma_n) \in [q - 4\delta_n, q + 4\delta_n]. \quad (13)$$

Thus $\phi(\gamma_n)$ converges to $\{z \in R : \text{Im}(z) = q\}$ and so γ_n converges to $\phi^{-1}(\{\text{Im}(z) = q\})$.

We are now ready to prove the convergence of the probability measures μ_n . The underlying metric space is $X = (\bigcup_n \Gamma_n) \cup \Gamma$, endowed with the Hausdorff metric. We claim that the set of probability measures $\{\mu_n\}$ is *tight*, i.e., for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a compact subset K_ϵ of X such that $\mu_n(K_\epsilon) > 1 - \epsilon$ for all n . Since X is compact by construction, $\{\mu_n\}$ satisfies this condition with $K_\epsilon = X$. Therefore, Prohorov's Theorem (see [12]) implies that $\{\mu_n\}$ is conditionally compact (i.e. its closure is compact) in the space of all probability measures on X equipped with the topology of weak convergence. This implies the existence of subsequential limits of μ_n .

It remains to show that the only possible subsequential limit of μ_n is the uniform measure on Γ . To that end, let μ be a limit of μ_{n_k} , let $r \in (0, 1)$, and set

$$H_r = \{\gamma \in X : \phi(\gamma) \subset [0, L] \times [0, r]\}.$$

To characterize μ as the uniform measure on Γ , we must simply show that $\mu(H_r) = r$ for all $r \in (0, 1)$. Since μ is the limit of μ_{n_k} under weak convergence, we have that $\mu_{n_k}(H_r) \rightarrow \mu(H_r)$. Let $q_1 = r - 4\delta_n$ and $q_2 = r + 4\delta_n$, and let $\gamma_n(q_1), \gamma_n(q_2)$ be defined by (12). Then by (13), H_r contains the set

$$\{\gamma \in \Gamma_n : \gamma \leq \gamma_n(q_1)\},$$

and $H_r \cap \Gamma_n$ is contained in the set

$$\{\gamma \in \Gamma_n : \gamma \leq \gamma_n(q_2)\}.$$

Thus for $p_n(q_1)$ defined by (12),

$$\mu_n(H_r) \geq p_n(q_1) \geq q_1 = r - 4\delta_n,$$

implying that $\mu(H_r) \geq r$. Similarly

$$\mu_n(H_r) \leq p_n(q_2) \leq q_2 + \delta_n = r + 5\delta_n,$$

implying that $\mu(H_r) \leq r$. Thus we have shown that $\mu(H_r) = r$ for all $r \in (0, 1)$, which characterizes the limit measure as the uniform measure on Γ . □

3.3 Further consequences of the minimal non-crossing subfamily

As mentioned in the Introduction, Proposition 1 has an interpretation in terms of current flow. Let $G = (V, E, \sigma)$ be a finite weighted plane graph. As before, assume that there are nonempty sets of boundary vertices A and B defined as follows: $A = S_1 \cap V$ and $B = S_2 \cap V$, where S_1, S_2 are two disjoint arcs from a simple curve in the closed outer face of G . Solve the (weighted) Dirichlet problem and find a potential $h : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, so that $h|_A = 0$, $h|_B = 1$, and h is discrete harmonic on $V \setminus (A \cup B)$. The voltage potential h produces a current flow f via Ohm's law:

$$f(xy) = \sigma(xy) [h(y) - h(x)] \quad \text{for all } xy \in \vec{E}. \quad (14)$$

Mathematically, f is the gradient flow of h . Under the given hypothesis, the current flow f from A to B is unique and minimizes flow energy, which is known as Thomson's principle. The current flow has a couple of properties: it satisfies the node law at every node not in A or B , and it satisfies the cycle law. In general, flows can often be decomposed in the so-called *path formulation*. Given a path γ from A to B let x_γ be the unit flow along γ . Then the current flow f can be written as a sum $\sum a_\gamma x_\gamma$ of path flows. What Proposition 1 shows is that in the planar case, there is a unique way of decomposing the current flow f so that the paths γ in the path formulation do not cross (which makes intuitive sense physically). Moreover, the algorithm also produces the coefficients a_γ for each path.

Proposition 19. *With these notations, the current flow from A to B can be decomposed uniquely as $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} m_\gamma x_\gamma$, where the family Γ and the weights $\{m_\gamma\}$ are output by the non-crossing minimal subfamily algorithm.*

Proof. It is well-known that the modulus $\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma(A, B))$ of the family of all walks from A to B in G coincides with the effective conductance of the pair AB . In other words, if we solve the Dirichlet problem and find a potential $h : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, so that $h|_A = 0$, $h|_B = 1$, and h is discrete harmonic on $V \setminus (A \cup B)$, then $\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma(A, B))$ equals the value of the current flow $f = \sigma dh$ generated by h , which is also known as the effective conductance $\text{eff}\mathcal{C}(A, B)$ for the pair AB . (A proof that $\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma(A, B)) = \text{eff}\mathcal{C}(A, B)$ in the case when A and B are points can be found in [2, Theorem 4.2]). Let Γ be the subfamily given by the non-crossing minimal subfamily algorithm. For $\gamma \in \Gamma$, let x_γ be the unit flow along γ . Since the weights $m(\gamma)$ for $\gamma \in \Gamma$ add up to $\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma(A, B))$, then the current flow f can be written as a sum $\sum m(\gamma)x_\gamma$ of path flows, without changing its value. □

Another consequence of the non-crossing minimal subfamily algorithm is a rectangle-packing result akin to the famous square uniformization of Oded Schramm [13].

Proposition 20. *Let $G = (V, E, \sigma)$ be a plane graph with sets of boundary vertices A, B , as in the setting of the non-crossing minimal subfamily algorithm. Let $h : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the discrete harmonic on $V \setminus (A \cup B)$ with $h|_A = 0$ and $h|_B = 1$. Set $M := \mathcal{E}(h) = \text{Mod}_2 \Gamma(A, B)$ and consider the rectangle $\mathcal{R} = [0, 1] \times [0, M]$. Then there is a unique way to tile \mathcal{R} with a collection of smaller rectangles $\{R_e\}_{e \in E}$ so that the boundaries of two rectangles share a vertical segment if and only if the corresponding edges in G share a node, and they abut on the same horizontal line if and only if the corresponding edges in G share a face.*

Moreover, each rectangle R_e is of the form $[h(e), h(e) + \rho(e)] \times [\tilde{h}(e), \tilde{h}(e) + \sigma(e)\rho(e)]$, where $\rho(e)$ is the extremal density for $\text{Mod}_2 \Gamma(A, B)$, $h(e) := \min\{h(x), h(y) : e = xy\}$, and $\tilde{h}(e)$ can be computed with the non-crossing minimal subfamily algorithm.

Remark 21. Note that the area of each rectangle R_e is $\sigma(e)\rho^2(e)$, which is the contribution of e to the modulus:

$$\sum_{e \in E} \sigma(e)\rho^2(e) = \text{Mod}_2 \Gamma(A, B).$$

In other words, $\sigma(e)$ is the aspect ratio of R_e and ρ and M solve the problem of packing a collection of rectangles with given aspect ratio into a larger rectangle (respecting the combinatorics of the primal graph).

Note also that the rectangle $R(e)$ degenerates when the corresponding $\rho(e)$ is equal to zero.

Finally, Proposition 20 is stated for general planar graphs G . When, G is the primal graphs of an orthodiagonal map, then the quantity $\tilde{h}(e)$ coincides with the harmonic function defined on the dual graph with $\tilde{h} = 0$ on the bottom side and $\tilde{h} = M$ on the top side.




Figure 3: This is an example of Proposition 20 in the case of orthodiagonal maps. For the map above the primal graph (in blue) is given by the nodes A, B, H, J, K, N, P, U . Here we compute the modulus M of the family of curves connecting the set $\{A, H\}$ to the set $\{U\}$. In this case the quantity $\tilde{h}(e)$ coincides with the harmonic function defined on the dual graph with $\tilde{h} = 0$ on the set $\{C, L, T\}$ and $\tilde{h} = M$ on the set $\{I, R\}$.

Proof. Here we perform the non-crossing minimal subfamily algorithm from the bottom up and write $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$ for the output curves in the order that they are added to Γ . So γ_1 is the bottom curve, etc... We also write $m_j := m(\gamma_j)$ for the corresponding weights computed by the algorithm.

To construct the rectangle packing, we begin by mapping γ_1 to the strip $(0, 1) \times (0, m_1)$. Writing $\gamma_1 = x_0^1 \cdots x_{k_1}^1$ we trace the horizontal segments $[h(x_j^1), h(x_{j+1}^1)] \times \{0\}$, for $j = 0, \dots, k_1 - 1$, as well as the vertical segments $\{h(x_j^1)\} \times [0, m_1]$, for $j = 0, \dots, k_1$. Finally, for every edge $e = x_j^1 x_{j+1}^1$ that attains the minimum in step 3 of the algorithm, set $\tilde{h}(e) = m_1$ and trace the horizontal segment $[h(x_j^1), h(x_{j+1}^1)] \times \{m_1\}$, thus closing up the rectangle corresponding to these edges.

Rather than a formal proof by induction, we now describe the second step. Consider the second curve γ_2 and add the strip $(0, 1) \times (m_1, m_2)$. Observe that γ_2 coincides with γ_1 except for the edges that realized the minimum in the previous step. More specifically, γ_2 will replace groups of consecutive edges of the form $e = x_j^1 x_{j+1}^1$ with $\tilde{h}(e) = m_1$, with new subpaths of the form $x_{k_1}^2, \dots, x_{k_l}^2, \dots, x_{k_L}^2$, where the first and last node belong to $A \cup B \cup \{x_j^1\}$. In particular, we will have $h(x_{k_1}^2) < h(x_{k_l}^2) < \dots < h(x_{k_L}^2)$. Therefore, we now subdivide the tops of this group of rectangles that we closed up in the previous step, and add the vertical segments of the form $\{h(x_{k_l}^2)\} \times [m_1, m_2]$. Finally extend the vertical segments from the previous step that were not bounding an edge that realized the minimum.

When the algorithm ends we will have packed the rectangle $[0, 1] \times [0, M]$. Uniqueness follows by observing that, if a rectangle-packing as above is given, then one could get a non-crossing minimal subfamily simply by considering the horizontal segments connecting the left and right vertical sides of $[0, 1] \times [0, M]$. \square

3.4 A numerical example

We have implemented the non-crossing minimal subfamily algorithm, and some of its consequences, numerically. Consider the family of paths connecting the arcs ab and cd of the cross domain on the left of Figure 4.




Figure 4: Left: a Delaunay triangulation of a cross domain; Center: the triangulation shown together with its dual Voronoi graph; Right: the corresponding orthodiagonal map.

The figure shows a Delaunay triangulation of the domain, produced by the software package Triangle [14]. The circumcenters of the triangles form a dual grid known as the Voronoi diagram. In the center of Figure 4, we show the same triangulation along with its Voronoi dual. The edges of the triangulation are blue, and the edges connecting two circumcenters are red. Note that the blue and red edges are orthogonal, hence can be thought as the orthogonal diagonals of a quadrilateral. In particular, an orthodiagonal map is obtained by connecting each blue node with a neighboring red node. We have drawn the corresponding orthodiagonal map on the right in Figure 4. With some minor caveats (see below), the Delaunay triangulation can be thought as the primal graph of the orthodiagonal map and the Voronoi diagram as the dual graph. See also [16, Section 5.1].

3.4.1 Approximating the modulus

In order to approximate the modulus of the family of curves, we first choose a size parameter, $\epsilon > 0$, which controls the size of the triangles in the triangulation. The triangulation is constructed to satisfy the Delaunay property as well as two additional constraints: no triangle may have area larger than ϵ^2 and no angle in any triangle may be smaller than 20° . These additional constraints ensure that the edges of the triangulation are of order $O(\epsilon)$, which is needed to ensure convergence of the discrete modulus to the continuous modulus.

Next, we need to assign appropriate conductances to the edges in the triangulation (Figure 4, left). As stated above, the triangulation is *almost* the graph that is obtained from the blue vertices of the quadrilateral mesh (Figure 4, right) by connecting vertices that belong to the same quadrilateral. This does not quite reproduce the triangulation on the left; notably absent are the edges on the boundary of the domain. As a consequence, any vertex of the triangulation that is incident only upon boundary edges is absent from the quadrilateral mesh. In the example shown, all convex “corners” are excluded from the quadrilateral mesh. Fortunately, there is a relatively simple way to address these issues at the boundary.

Most edges of the triangulation will correspond to diagonals in the quadrilateral mesh. For these, we can use the formulas specified in Section 2.4. Namely, we assign the conductance, σ , on such an edge to be the ratio of the length of the dual edge to the length of the edge in question. To all boundary edges, we assign $\sigma = \epsilon/|E_b|$, where E_b is the set of boundary edges. Since the potential h is bounded between 0 and 1, this means, by Ohm’s law, that the contribution of all boundary edges to the current flow is $O(\epsilon)$, ensuring that the contribution of the extraneous boundary edges to the approximation is negligible as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. With this choice of conductances, we can then solve the discrete Dirichlet problem to approximate the potential function, h .

3.4.2 Non-crossing curves

Once the discrete potential is computed, the non-crossing minimal family can be determined using the algorithm described in Section 3.1. The left side of Figure 5 shows the result of this numerical study for the choice $\epsilon = 0.005$. The algorithm produced a sequence of 34403 non-crossing paths from the boundary segment ab to the boundary segment cd . We have plotted 21 of these paths, plotting roughly every 1720-th path in the sequence. The first and last path trace the boundary segments between a and d and between b and c . In the middle of Figure 5, we show the corresponding curves as computed by Driscoll’s Schwarz–Christoffel Toolbox for Matlab. Using the toolbox code, we approximated a conformal mapping between the cross and a rectangle with ab and cd sent to the vertical sides of the rectangle. Inverting that map on horizontal lines produced the image. The image on the right side of the figure shows the superposition of both sets of curves.

Using the non-crossing path decomposition, we are able to assign a two-dimensional coordinate to each vertex in the graph. The x -coordinate of each vertex is simply the value of the discrete potential h on that vertex. To obtain the y -coordinate of a vertex v , we locate the first path in the sequence passing through v and sum the flows of all previous paths. The rectangle packing for this choice of ϵ is too dense to draw, but the left side of Figure 6 shows a rectangle packing for $\epsilon = 0.075$. This choice of coordinates provides a mapping on the vertices of the triangulation that approximates the conformal map to the rectangle. The right side of the figure shows the non-crossing paths in these coordinates (for the finer, $\epsilon = 0.005$, triangulation). Except near a and d , where there is large distortion, these curves are nearly horizontal, as we would expect. Incidentally, the rectangle packing gives an indication of where one may refine the original triangulation, since the largest distortion corresponds to very large rectangles in the packing.




Figure 5: Left: non-crossing curves for a triangulation of the cross domain; Center: the corresponding curves as computed by the Schwarz-Christoffel Toolbox in Matlab; Right: the superposition of both sets of curves.




Figure 6: Left: the rectangle packing associated with a triangulation of the cross domain shown in Figure 4; Right: the images of the non-crossing curves from Figure 5 in coordinates given by the rectangle packing.

4 Convergence of discrete harmonic functions

In this section, we prove Theorem 3 by adapting the arguments in [8] to our setting.

We begin by recalling our assumptions:

- The Jordan domain Ω is a smooth quadrilateral with boundary arcs A, τ_1, B, τ_2 .
- The orthodiagonal map $G = (V^\bullet \sqcup V^\circ, E)$ with boundary arcs S_1, T_1, S_2, T_2 has maximal edge length at most ϵ and approximates Ω within distance δ . Recall that by Definition 14, we ask that $\bar{\Omega} \subset \hat{G}$.
- We assume $\lambda := \epsilon \vee \delta$ is small enough.
- The continuous harmonic function h_c is defined by $h_c = \text{Re } \psi$, where ψ is a conformal map of Ω onto a rectangle $R = [0, 1] \times [0, m]$, taking the arcs A and B to the vertical sides of the rectangle.
- The function $h_d : V^\bullet \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is discrete harmonic on $\text{Int}(V^\bullet)$ with $h_d(z) = 0$ for $z \in S_1 \cap V^\bullet$ and $h_d(z) = 1$ for $z \in S_2 \cap V^\bullet$.
- By scale invariance, we may assume $\text{diam}(\Omega) = 1$ (and so $\lambda < 1$).




Figure 7: A sketch of the setting encountered in the proof of Theorem 3. A smooth quadrilateral Ω with boundary arcs A, B (orange) and τ_1, τ_2 (black) is approximated by an orthodiagonal map G . The boundary of the sub-orthodiagonal map G_1 is dashed black and $\partial G \setminus \partial G_1$ is dashed gray.

Under these assumptions, our goal is to show for all $z \in V^\bullet \cap \bar{\Omega}$

$$|h_d(z) - h_c(z)| \leq \frac{C}{\log^{1/2}(1/\lambda)}, \quad (15)$$

where $\lambda = \epsilon \vee \delta$ and C depends only on Ω . Note that in our proofs we will use C to refer to constants that are independent of λ but may depend on Ω . The exact value of these constants may change from line to line.

4.1 Modified toolbox

We will be able to use some of the tools of [8] as they are stated in that paper. However, we need to modify a handful of the results to apply to our setting, and that is the goal of this section.

There is one last piece of terminology that we introduce before we begin. Let $G = (V^\bullet \sqcup V^\circ, E)$ be a finite orthodiagonal map with boundary arcs S_1, T_1, S_2, T_2 . We say that G_1 is a *sub-orthodiagonal map* of G when G_1 is an orthodiagonal map contained in G and the topological boundary ∂G_1 intersects $T_1 \cup T_2$. The boundary ∂V_1^\bullet are the points from V_1^\bullet that are in $\partial G_1 \setminus (T_1 \cup T_2)$ and the boundary ∂V_1° are the points in $V_1^\circ \cap (T_1 \cup T_2)$. When we prove Theorem 3 in Section 4.2, we will work with a sub-orthodiagonal map G_1 with $\text{dist}(G_1, A \cup B) \geq \lambda^{1/4}$. We require that ∂G_1 intersects $T_1 \cup T_2$, since otherwise we will be in the setting of [8] and there will be nothing for us to prove. Lastly, we note that we will want G_1 to be compactly contained in the domain of ψ , which will be accomplished by reflecting ψ over the arcs τ_k (and taking λ small enough). Since it may help to have a visual, see Figure 7 for a sketch of this setting.

We begin with a modified version of Proposition 5.2 of [8], which tells us that the energy of $h_c - h_d$ is small.

Proposition 22. *Assume we are in the setting of Theorem 3, and $G_1 = (V^\bullet \sqcup V^\circ, E)$ is a sub-orthodiagonal map of G . Assume that ψ can be extended to an open set \mathcal{O} so that $\text{dist}(\hat{G}_1, \partial \mathcal{O}) \geq 2\epsilon$.*

Let $h_c = \text{Re } \psi$, and let $h_d : V^\bullet \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be discrete harmonic on $\text{Int}(V^\bullet)$ and satisfy $h_d = h_c$ on ∂V^\bullet . Set

$$L = \|\nabla h_c\|_{\infty, \hat{G}_1} \quad \text{and} \quad M = \|Hh_c\|_{\infty, \tilde{G}_1}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{E}^\bullet(h_c - h_d) \leq C [M^2 \epsilon^2 + L^2 (\epsilon \vee \delta)],$$

where C depends only on $\text{area}(\hat{G}_1)$ and $\text{length}(\tau_1 \cup \tau_2)$.

Proof. We begin by following the initial steps in the proof of Proposition 5.2 in [8]. In particular, we wish to define the bijective map $e \rightarrow e^\dagger$ from \vec{E}^\bullet to \vec{E}° . For $e \in \vec{E}^\bullet$, let $Q = [v_1, w_1, v_2, w_2]$ be the inner face of G containing e . We set $e^\dagger = e_Q^\circ$, and we choose its orientation based on the orientation of e : if $e^- = v_1$ then choose the orientation with $(e^\dagger)^- = w_1$, and in the other case choose the opposite orientation.

Define

$$\phi(e) = \sigma(e)[h_c(e^+) - h_c(e^-)].$$

We wish to define a flow θ on G^\bullet using the harmonic conjugate \tilde{h}_c of h_c (i.e. $\tilde{h}_c = \text{Im } \psi$). However, we must take a little more care near the boundary arcs τ_k . To this end, let U_k be the component of $\hat{G}_1 \setminus \Omega$ that intersects τ_k , for $k = 1, 2$. Next, we define a projection $p : V^\circ \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$ as follows: for $w \in \bar{\Omega}$, set $p(w) = w$; for $w \in U_k \cap V^\circ$, set $p(w)$ to be a point in τ_k that is closest to w . For $e \in \vec{E}^\bullet$, define

$$\theta(e) = \tilde{h}_c(p((e^\dagger)^+)) - \tilde{h}_c(p((e^\dagger)^-)).$$

Note that if e^\dagger is not incident to a vertex in $U_1 \cup U_2$, then our definition gives

$$\theta(e) = \tilde{h}_c((e^\dagger)^+) - \tilde{h}_c((e^\dagger)^-)$$

matching the definition in [8].

Now we want to show that θ satisfies the node law on $\text{Int}(V^\bullet)$. Let $v \in \text{Int}(V^\bullet)$. Suppose first v is contained within an interior face f_v of the dual graph G° , i.e. there is a cycle of dual edges surrounding v . Let w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k be the vertices incident to f_v in counterclockwise order. Then (taking indices mod k)

$$\sum_{e \in \vec{E}^\bullet : e^- = v} \theta(e) = \sum_{j=1}^k \left[\tilde{h}_c(p(w_{j+1})) - \tilde{h}_c(p(w_j)) \right] = 0.$$

If v is not in an interior face f , then the edges e^\dagger such that $e \in \vec{E}^\bullet$ with $e^- = v$ form a path with both endpoints in ∂V° (and in fact both endpoints will be in the same path T_k). Let w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k be the vertices of this path, indexed so that connecting w_k to w_1 in the outer face of G° would give a counterclockwise cycle. Then

$$\sum_{e \in \vec{E}^\bullet : e^- = v} \theta(e) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left[\tilde{h}_c(p(w_{j+1})) - \tilde{h}_c(p(w_j)) \right] = \tilde{h}_c(p(w_k)) - \tilde{h}_c(p(w_1)) = 0,$$

where we used that $\tilde{h}_c = \text{Im } \psi$ is constant on τ_k .

Next, we apply Proposition 4.9 in [8] with $f = h_c$ and $h = h_d$ to obtain that

$$\mathcal{E}^\bullet(h_c - h_d) \leq \mathcal{E}^\bullet(h_c - h_d) + \mathcal{E}^\bullet(\theta - \sigma dh_d) = \mathcal{E}^\bullet(\phi - \theta),$$

and we note that it suffices to bound $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\phi - \theta)$. As noted in [8], the contribution to $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\phi - \theta)$ from a face $Q = [v_1, w_1, v_2, w_2]$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|v_1 v_2|}{|w_1 w_2|} \left(\frac{|w_1 w_2|}{|v_1 v_2|} [h_c(v_2) - h_c(v_1)] - [\tilde{h}_c(p(w_2)) - \tilde{h}_c(p(w_1))] \right)^2 \\ &= |v_1 v_2| \cdot |w_1 w_2| \cdot \left(\frac{h_c(v_2) - h_c(v_1)}{|v_1 v_2|} - \frac{\tilde{h}_c(p(w_2)) - \tilde{h}_c(p(w_1))}{|w_1 w_2|} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Therefore, assuming that neither w_1 nor w_2 are in $U_1 \cup U_2$, the quantity in the parentheses (using the Cauchy-Riemann equations) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{h_c(v_2) - h_c(v_1) - \langle \nabla h_c(q), \mathbf{v} \rangle |v_1 v_2|}{|v_1 v_2|} - \frac{\tilde{h}_c(z(w_2)) - \tilde{h}_c(z(w_1)) - \langle \nabla \tilde{h}_c(q), \mathbf{w} \rangle |w_1 w_2|}{|w_1 w_2|}, \quad (17)$$

where \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} are the unit vectors in the directions of $\overrightarrow{v_1v_2}$ and $\overrightarrow{w_1w_2}$, respectively, and $q \in Q$ is the intersection point of e_Q^\bullet and e_Q° . Both terms in (17) can be bounded as in [8] by

$$\left| \frac{h_c(v_2) - h_c(v_1) - \langle \nabla h_c(q), \mathbf{v} \rangle |v_1v_2|}{|v_1v_2|} \right| \leq 2M\epsilon,$$

$$\left| \frac{\tilde{h}_c(w_2) - \tilde{h}_c(w_1) - \langle \nabla \tilde{h}_c(q), \mathbf{w} \rangle |w_1w_2|}{|w_1w_2|} \right| \leq 2M\epsilon.$$

Therefore if w_1, w_2 are not in $U_1 \cup U_2$, the contribution to $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\phi - \theta)$ is at most

$$|v_1v_2| \cdot |w_1w_2| \cdot (4M\epsilon)^2 = 32 \text{area}(Q)M^2\epsilon^2.$$

Here, however, we need to deal with some extra cases. Assume that at least one of w_1 and w_2 are in $U_1 \cup U_2$. We will bound the terms in the parentheses of (16) directly. Note first that

$$\left| \frac{h_c(v_2) - h_c(v_1)}{|v_1v_2|} \right| \leq L.$$

If w_1 and w_2 are both in U_k , then $\tilde{h}_c(p(w_2)) - \tilde{h}_c(p(w_1)) = 0$. If w_1 is in U_k , but w_2 is not, then the line segment connecting w_1 to w_2 must cross τ_k and $|p(w_1) - w_1| \leq |w_1 - w_2|$, by the definition of p . (And a similar statement is true if w_2 is in U_{k+1} , taking the indices mod 2). Then

$$|p(w_1) - p(w_2)| = |p(w_1) - w_1| + |w_1 - w_2| + |w_2 - p(w_2)| \leq 3|w_1 - w_2|,$$

which implies that

$$\left| \frac{\tilde{h}_c(p(w_2)) - \tilde{h}_c(p(w_1))}{|w_1w_2|} \right| \leq L \frac{|p(w_2) - p(w_1)|}{|w_2 - w_1|} \leq 3L.$$

Thus if Q is incident to a vertex in $U_1 \cup U_2$, then the contribution to $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\phi - \theta)$ is at most

$$|v_1v_2| \cdot |w_1w_2| \cdot (4L)^2 \leq 32 \text{area}(Q)L^2.$$

The faces Q that are incident to a vertex in $U_1 \cup U_2$ must be in a narrow band containing τ_k for either $k = 1$ or $k = 2$, and the area of these bands is bounded by $2 \text{length}(\tau_1 \cup \tau_2)(\epsilon \vee \delta)$. Thus summing over all inner faces Q of G gives

$$\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\phi - \theta) \leq 32 \text{area}(\hat{G})M^2\epsilon^2 + 64 \text{length}(\tau_1 \cup \tau_2)L^2(\epsilon \vee \delta).$$

□

The next proposition generalizes Proposition 6.1 from [8] to our setting.

Proposition 23. *Assume we are in the setting of Theorem 3, and $G_1 = (V^\bullet \sqcup V^\circ, E)$ is a sub-orthodiagonal map of G . Assume that ψ can be extended to an open set \mathcal{O} so that $\text{dist}(\hat{G}_1, \partial\mathcal{O}) \geq 2\epsilon$.*

Fix $z_0 \in \text{Int}(V^\bullet) \cap \Omega$, and let D_r be the closed disk of radius $r \geq 4\epsilon$ centered at z_0 . Assume that $D_r \cap \partial V^\bullet = \emptyset$. Then there is a unit flow θ in G_1^\bullet from $V^\bullet \cap D_r$ to ∂V^\bullet so that

$$\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\theta) \leq C \log \left(\frac{\text{diam}(\Omega)}{\epsilon} \right).$$

Proof. Recall that ψ is a conformal map of Ω onto the rectangle $R = [0, 1] \times [0, m]$ taking the arcs τ_1 and τ_2 to the horizontal sides of the rectangle. Let $\psi(z_0) = x_0 + iy_0$. We may assume that $y_0 \geq m/2$, by rotating the rectangle 180° around its midpoint if needed. Let

$$g(z) = \exp \left(\frac{\pi}{y_0} z \right) + \exp \left(\frac{\pi x_0}{y_0} \right).$$

Note that g maps R conformally strictly into the annulus A with inner radius 1 and outer radius e^{π/y_0} centered at $e^{\pi x_0/y_0}$, and g maps $R' = \{z \in R : \text{Im}(z) < y_0\}$ onto $A \cap \mathbb{H}$. Further, g takes the horizontal sides of R' to intervals in \mathbb{R} , and

$$g(\psi(z_0)) = g(x_0 + iy_0) = e^{\pi \frac{x_0}{y_0}} e^{i\pi} + e^{\pi \frac{x_0}{y_0}} = 0.$$

Let $F = g \circ \psi$. We will define a flow ϕ on \vec{E}^\bullet from z_0 to ∂V^\bullet as follows. Given a face $Q = [v_1, w_1, v_2, w_2]$, let e be the orientation of e_Q^\bullet with $e^- = v_1$. If $F(e_Q^\circ) \subset \overline{\mathbb{H}}$, set

$$\phi(e) = \arg(F(w_2)) - \arg(F(w_1)) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(-e) = \arg(F(w_1)) - \arg(F(w_2)),$$

where we use a branch of the argument that is well-defined on \mathbb{H} . If $F(e_Q^\circ)$ does not intersect \mathbb{H} , then we define $\phi(e) = 0 = \phi(-e)$. If $F(e_Q^\circ)$ intersects \mathbb{H} , we define $\phi(e)$ to be the change of argument along $F(e_Q^\circ) \cap \overline{\mathbb{H}}$, respecting the orientation above.

Let $v \in \text{Int}(V^\bullet)$. Consider the set N of edges to $e \in \vec{E}^\bullet$ with $e^- = v$. The edges dual to the edges in N either form a cycle around v (in the case v is in the topological interior of \hat{G}) or a path starting and ending on a boundary arc T_k . The image of these dual edges under F either form a cycle or a path in A , which we will call γ_v . We will first consider the case that γ_v is a cycle contained in $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$. Let w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k be the corresponding vertices in V° , ordered counter-clockwise with $w_k = w_1$. Then

$$\sum_{e \in \vec{E}^\bullet : e^- = v} \phi(e) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} [\arg(F(w_{j+1})) - \arg(F(w_j))].$$

This is equal to the change of argument as we move around γ_v counter-clockwise, which is 0. Next, in the case that γ_v does not intersect \mathbb{H} , we also obtain $\sum_{e \in \vec{E}^\bullet : e^- = v} \phi(e) = 0$, since $\phi(e)$ is zero for each e in the sum. Lastly consider the case that γ_v intersects \mathbb{H} but is not a cycle completely contained in \mathbb{H} . Then $\gamma_v \cap \overline{\mathbb{H}}$ consists of one or more paths which all start and end in \mathbb{R} . If $v = z_0$, then one path will start in \mathbb{R}^+ and end in \mathbb{R}^- . All other paths will start and end with the same argument. Since $\sum_{e \in \vec{E}^\bullet : e^- = v} \phi(e)$ gives the sum of the change in argument over the path(s) of $\gamma_v \cap \overline{\mathbb{H}}$, this is equal to π when $v = z_0$ and it is equal to 0 otherwise. Thus ϕ is a flow of strength π from z_0 to ∂V^\bullet . Define

$$\theta(e) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } e^+ \text{ and } e^- \in D_r \\ \frac{1}{\pi} \phi(e) & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

Then θ is a unit flow from $V^\bullet \cap D_r$ to ∂V^\bullet .

It remains to bound the energy of θ . Let $Q = [v_1, w_1, v_2, w_2]$ be a face of G_1 so that v_1, v_2 are not both in D_r . We first consider the case that $F(e_Q^\circ)$ is contained in $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$. Then the contribution of e_Q^\bullet to $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\theta)$ is

$$\frac{|v_1 v_2|}{|w_1 w_2|} |\theta(e_Q^\bullet)|^2 = \frac{1}{\pi^2} |v_1 v_2| \cdot |w_1 w_2| \left(\frac{\arg(F(w_2)) - \arg(F(w_1))}{|w_1 w_2|} \right)^2.$$

Note that $|v_1 v_2| \cdot |w_1 w_2| = 2 \text{area}(Q)$. Since Q has diameter at most 2ϵ and has at least one vertex not in D_r , the distance of Q from z_0 is at least $r - 2\epsilon \geq 2\epsilon$. Along with the assumption that $\text{dist}(\hat{G}_1, \partial \mathcal{O}) \geq 2\epsilon$, this gives that Q has distance at least 2ϵ from the boundary of $\mathcal{O} \setminus z_0$. Hence the derivative of $\log \circ F$ is comparable at every point in Q . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|v_1 v_2|}{|w_1 w_2|} |\theta(e_Q^\bullet)|^2 &= \frac{2}{\pi^2} \text{area}(Q) \left(\frac{\arg(F(w_2)) - \arg(F(w_1))}{|w_2 - w_1|} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\pi^2} \text{area}(Q) \max_{z \in e_Q^\circ} \left| \frac{d}{dz} \log \circ F(z) \right|^2 \\ &\leq C \int_Q \frac{1}{|F(z)|^2} |F'(z)|^2 dz \\ &= C \int_{F(Q)} \frac{1}{|z|^2} dz. \end{aligned}$$

If $F(e_Q^\circ)$ intersects \mathbb{H} but is not fully contained in it, the above estimate still holds, since there are points w'_1, w'_2 on the edge e_Q° so that the contribution of e_Q^\bullet to $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\theta)$ is

$$\frac{2}{\pi^2} \text{area}(Q) \left(\frac{\arg(F(w'_2)) - \arg(F(w'_1))}{|w_1 w_2|} \right)^2 \leq \frac{2}{\pi^2} \text{area}(Q) \left(\frac{\arg(F(w'_2)) - \arg(F(w'_1))}{|w'_2 - w'_1|} \right)^2.$$

The distortion theorem implies that for $|z - z_0| = 2\epsilon$,

$$|F(z)| \geq C \epsilon |F'(z_0)| \geq C \epsilon |\psi'(z_0)| \geq C \epsilon \frac{\text{dist}(\psi(z_0), \partial\psi(\mathcal{O}))}{\text{diam}(\Omega)}.$$

Let $w_0 \in \partial\mathcal{O}$ so that $\text{dist}(\psi(z_0), \partial\psi(\mathcal{O})) = |\psi(z_0) - \psi(w_0)|$. Then by Proposition 15, there is $p \in (0, 1/2]$ so that

$$\text{dist}(\psi(z_0), \partial\psi(\mathcal{O})) = |\psi(z_0) - \psi(w_0)| \geq C |z_0 - w_0|^{1/p} \geq C (\text{dist}(z_0, \partial\mathcal{O}))^{1/p} \geq C \epsilon^{1/p}.$$

Therefore we have that for $|z - z_0| = 2\epsilon$, then $|F(z)| \geq c \epsilon^{1+1/p} / \text{diam}(\Omega) =: d$. This implies $F(Q)$ does intersect a disc of radius d centered at 0. To bound $F(\Omega)$, we note that $|F(z)| \leq 2e^{2\pi/m}$ for $z \in \Omega$. Putting this all together, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^\bullet(\theta) &\leq C \sum_{Q: \text{dist}(Q, z_0) \geq 2\epsilon} \int_{F(Q)} \frac{1}{|z|^2} dA(z) \\ &\leq C \int_0^{2\pi} \int_d^{2e^{2\pi/m}} \frac{1}{s^2} s ds dt \\ &\leq C \log \left(\frac{\text{diam}(\Omega)}{\epsilon} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lastly we need modified versions of the three results in Section 7 of [8]. The logical relationship between these results is the following:

$$\text{Lemma 7.3} \implies \text{Lemma 7.2} \implies \text{Proposition 7.1}.$$

Since these results make use of the fact that the boundary value problem, in their case, is defined on the whole topological boundary, we will need to modify them. This will have a ripple effect, causing us to update all three results, although the proofs connecting the results will follow the logic of [8] and we will omit some of the details.

We begin with stating the modification of Proposition 7.1:

Proposition 24. *Assume we are in the setting of Theorem 3, and $G_1 = (V^\bullet \sqcup V^\circ, E)$ is a sub-orthodiagonal map of G (which may be equal to G). Let $x, y \in V^\bullet$. Assume we may choose r, R so that $r \geq \frac{1}{2}|x - y|$, $R \geq 2r + 3\epsilon$, and there is a path from x to y in $G^\bullet \cap D_r$, where the notation D_r means the closed disk of radius r centered at $\frac{1}{2}(x + y)$. Further, we assume that either D_R does not intersect ∂V^\bullet or, if $G_1 = G$, then $R \leq \frac{1}{4} \text{dist}(T_1, T_2)$.*

Let $h : V^\bullet \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be discrete harmonic on $\text{Int}(V^\bullet)$. Set

$$\kappa = \max_{v, v' \in \partial V^\bullet \cap D_R} |h(v) - h(v')|,$$

with $\kappa = 0$ if there are no such vertices. Then there exists a universal constant $C < \infty$ such that

$$|h(x) - h(y)| \leq \frac{C \mathcal{E}^\bullet(h)^{1/2}}{\log^{1/2}[R/(r + \epsilon)]} + \kappa.$$




Figure 8: A sketch of the setting for Lemma 25: the topological boundary of H subdivided into paths S_1, T_1, S_2, T_2 (solid black), the path γ_x from x to $\cup S_k$ with vertices in X (dashed red), the path γ_y from y to $\cup S_k$ with vertices in Y (dashed blue), and the path γ_{xy} from x to y in D_r (dashed black).

The proof of this result is the same as the proof of Proposition 7.1 in [8], simply substituting Lemma 25 in the place of Lemma 7.2 in [8].

For the next lemma, we introduce one more definition. For $\rho > 0$, a ρ -edge of G^\bullet is an edge $e \in E^\bullet$ whose dual edge $e^\circ \in E^\circ$ connects two vertices $w, w' \in V^\circ$ with $|w| < \rho \leq |w'|$. See Figure 8 for an illustration of the setting of Lemma 25.

Lemma 25. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 24, suppose that the origin is located at $\frac{1}{2}(x + y)$ and that $h(x) < h(y)$. Define*

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \{v \in V^\bullet : h(v) \leq h(x)\} \\ Y &= \{v \in V^\bullet : h(v) \geq h(y)\} \end{aligned}$$

and set $Y' = Y \cup (\partial V^\bullet \cap D)$. Assume that $X \cap Y' = \emptyset$. Then for every $\rho \in (r + \epsilon, R - \epsilon)$, there is a path in G^\bullet from X to Y' consisting entirely of ρ -edges.

This lemma will follow from the following result about plane graphs. We say a few words about this after the proof.

Lemma 26. *Let H be a finite connected plane graph with planar dual graph H^\dagger . Let W, W^\dagger be the vertex sets of H, H^\dagger . For each $w \in W^\dagger$, let $f(w)$ denote the face of H that contains w . Assume that each inner face $f(w)$ is contained in the open disk of radius ϵ centered at w . Fix $0 < r < R$ with $r + \epsilon < R - \epsilon$, and let D_R be the closed disk of radius R centered at the origin. Let $z \in W^\dagger$ be the dual vertex contained in the outer face of H , and assume that $z \notin D_R$.*

Assume that ∂H , the topological boundary of the outer face of H , can be subdivided into 2 or 4 nonempty paths S_1, T_1 or S_1, T_1, S_2, T_2 . Let $x, y \in W$ satisfy $|x|, |y| \leq r$. Let X, Y be subsets of W such that there is a path in H from x to $\cup S_k$ whose vertices are all in X , and there is a path in H from y to $\cup S_k$ whose vertices are all in Y . Assume there is a path in H from x to y that is contained in D_r , the closed disk of radius r centered at the origin. Further assume that $S_k \cap D_R^c \neq \emptyset$.

Set $Y' = Y \cup [D_R \cap (\cup S_k)]$. If $X \cap Y' = \emptyset$, then for each $\rho \in (r + \epsilon, R - \epsilon)$, there is a path in $H \setminus (\partial H)$ from X to Y' consisting entirely of ρ -edges.

Proof. We begin by following the proof of Lemma 7.3 in [8] to obtain a cycle K in H such that all of its edges are ρ -edges. For convenience, we briefly repeat that argument here. Let $u \in W^\dagger$ be a dual vertex contained in an inner face of H with x incident to this face. Then $u \neq z$ and $|u| \leq r + \epsilon < \rho$. Let σ_ρ be the set of vertices $w \in W^\dagger$ so that there is a path from u to w in H^\dagger with all vertices of this path in the open disk of radius ρ centered at 0. Let $H[\sigma_\rho]$ be the subgraph of H whose vertices and edges make up the boundaries of the faces containing w for each $w \in \sigma_\rho$. The graph $H[\sigma_\rho]$ is

connected and contained in D_R . Let f_ρ^{out} be the outer face of $H[\sigma_\rho]$, which contains the complement of D_R . Let K be the boundary of f_ρ^{out} , which is a connected subgraph. One can check that all of the edges in K are ρ -edges. Further, we note that the edges in K are either in ∂H , or within distance ϵ of C_ρ , the circle of radius ρ centered at 0. The former situation can happen when C_ρ extends into the outer face of H . However, when an arc of C_ρ is contained entirely within the interior of H , then there will be edges of K within distance ϵ of this arc.

Let γ_x denote the path in H from x to $\cup S_k$ whose vertices are all in X , let γ_y denote the path in H from y to $\cup S_k$ whose vertices are all in Y , and let γ_{xy} denote the path in H from x to y that is contained in D_r . Since $\gamma_x \subset X$ is disjoint from $(\cup S_k) \cap D_R \subset Y'$, we must have that γ_x connects x to a point in ∂H that is outside D_R . Hence γ_x must cross the annulus $D_R \setminus D_r$. For the sake of simplicity, assume that γ_y connects to a vertex in S_2 (otherwise renumber the boundary paths.) Then $\gamma_y \cup S_2$ must also cross the annulus $D_R \setminus D_r$, since $S_k \cap D_R^\epsilon \neq \emptyset$. Further γ_x and $\gamma_y \cup (\cup S_k \cap D_R)$ must be disjoint within D_R , since the vertices of the former are in X and the vertices of the later are in Y' . Hence we can find a cycle J composed of three disjoint arcs: (1) an arc contained in γ_{xy} within D_r , (2) an arc is contained in γ_x that crosses $D_R \setminus D_r$, and (3) an arc that crosses $D_R \setminus D_r$ and whose intersection with D_R is contained in $\gamma_y \cup (\cup S_k)$.

Now the interior of J is contained in the interior of H by construction. Further it contains an arc of C_ρ . Hence there must be a path contained in K that crosses the interior of J from a vertex in γ_x to a vertex in $\gamma_y \cup (\cup S_k)$. This path could potentially contain some edges in ∂H , but the only way for this to happen is for the path to contain edges from γ_x or $\gamma_y \cup (\cup S_k)$. Hence, we can shorten the path by starting at the last vertex it encounters in γ_x and ending at the first vertex it encounters in $\gamma_y \cup (\cup S_k)$. Then all the edges in the path are strictly within the interior of J and hence in the interior of H . This gives us the desired path. □

Since Lemma 25 follows from Lemma 26 by the same logic as in [8], we will only give a brief sketch.

Proof outline of Lemma 25.

- Modify G^\bullet and G° to create graphs that are planar dual graphs.
- Use the discrete maximum principle to show the existence of the needed paths, i.e. a path from x to $\cup S_k$ whose vertices are all in X and a path from y to $\cup S_k$ whose vertices are all in Y .
- Apply Lemma 26 to obtain a path in the modified graph from X to Y' that consists of ρ -edges.
- Verify that the path is in fact in G^\bullet and the edges are ρ -edges in G^\bullet . This will follow since the path we obtain does not contain any edges from the topological boundary which was the only part affected by the modification. □

4.2 Proof of Theorem 3

The proof of Theorem 3 follows the same structure as in [8]. We give an outline of the overall logic below and then conclude by establishing Claims 27-31.

The first step is to show that the desired bound holds near the boundary arcs A and B .

Claim 27. *The bound (15) holds for all $z \in V^\bullet \cap \bar{\Omega}$ such that $\text{dist}(z, A \cup B) \leq 2\lambda^{1/4}$.*

For the rest of the proof, we will assume that there are $z \in V^\bullet \cap \bar{\Omega}$ with $\text{dist}(z, A \cup B) > 2\lambda^{1/4}$. Since $\text{diam}(\Omega) = 1$, this will imply that $2\lambda^{1/4} \leq 1$. This is equivalent to $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{16}$ or $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{8}\lambda^{1/4}$, which we will use at times.

The following construction and claim will provide us with a sub-orthodiagonal map, as in [8]. Let P be the set of all inner faces Q of G such that $\text{dist}(Q, A \cup B) \geq \lambda^{1/4}$, and let $G[P]$ be the subgraph of G that is the union of the boundaries of the faces in P .

Claim 28. *The set P is nonempty. The inner faces of $G[P]$ are precisely the elements of P , and every point p on the boundary of the outer face of $G[P]$ is either in $T_1 \cup T_2$ or satisfies*

$$\text{dist}(p, A \cup B) \leq \frac{5}{4}\lambda^{1/4}. \quad (18)$$

Each $z \in V^\bullet \cap \bar{\Omega}$ with $\text{dist}(z, A \cup B) > 2\lambda^{1/4}$ is a vertex of a unique block of $G[P]$. If H is a block of $G[P]$, then the inner faces of H are all elements of P and every point p on the boundary of the outer face of H is either in $T_1 \cup T_2$ or satisfies (18).

Claim 28 implies that each block of H of $G[S]$ is a sub-orthodiagonal map. Fix $z_0 \in V^\bullet \cap \bar{\Omega}$ with $\text{dist}(z_0, A \cup B) > 2\lambda^{1/4}$, and let G_1 be the block of $G[P]$ containing z_0 . Note that if the topological boundary ∂G_1 does not intersect $T_1 \cup T_2$, we are in the situation of [8] and the rest of the proof follows as in their proof. Hence we will assume that ∂G_1 does intersect $T_1 \cup T_2$. We take ∂V_1^\bullet to be the points from V_1^\bullet that are in $\partial G_1 \setminus (T_1 \cup T_2)$ and $\text{Int}(V_1^\bullet) = V_1^\bullet \setminus \partial V_1^\bullet$.

Claim 29. *Let \tilde{G}_1 denote the union of the convex hulls of the closures of the inner faces of G_1 . Then*

$$\|\nabla h_c\|_{\infty, \tilde{G}_1} \leq C\lambda^{-1/4} \quad \text{and} \quad \|Hh_c\|_{\infty, \tilde{G}_1} \leq C\lambda^{-1/2}.$$

Define $h_d^{(1)} : V_1^\bullet \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be the solution to the discrete Dirichlet problem on $\text{Int}(V_1^\bullet)$ with boundary data h_c on ∂V_1^\bullet . Then

$$|h_d(z_0) - h_c(z_0)| \leq |h_d(z_0) - h_d^{(1)}(z_0)| + |h_d^{(1)}(z_0) - h_c(z_0)|. \quad (19)$$

Claim 30. *The first term of (19) is bounded as follows:*

$$|h_d(z_0) - h_d^{(1)}(z_0)| \leq \frac{C}{\log^{1/2}(1/\lambda)}.$$

It remains to bound the second term of (19). Set $f = h_d^{(1)} - h_c$, and note that $f = 0$ on ∂V_1^\bullet . Let $D_{4\epsilon}$ be the disk of radius 4ϵ centered at z_0 .

Claim 31. *The set $D_{4\epsilon}$ is disjoint from ∂V_1^\bullet , and for $y \in V_1^\bullet \cap D_{4\epsilon}$*

$$|f(z_0) - f(y)| \leq \frac{C}{\log^{1/2}(1/\lambda)}.$$

Proposition 22 and Claim 29 imply that

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\bullet(f) \leq C [M^2\epsilon^2 + L^2\lambda] \leq C\lambda^{1/2},$$

where $L = \|\nabla h_c\|_{\infty, \tilde{G}_1}$ and $M = \|Hh_c\|_{\infty, \tilde{G}_1}$. Applying Proposition 23 yields a unit flow θ in G_1^\bullet from $V_1^\bullet \cap D_{4\epsilon}$ to ∂V_1^\bullet such that

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\bullet(\theta) \leq C \log(1/\lambda).$$

Then $-\theta$ is a unit flow from ∂V_1^\bullet to $V_1^\bullet \cap D_{4\epsilon}$. Applying Proposition 4.11 in [8] to f and $-\theta$ shows that

$$\text{gap}_{\partial V_1^\bullet, V_1^\bullet \cap D_{4\epsilon}}(f) \leq \mathcal{E}_1^\bullet(-\theta)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}_1^\bullet(f)^{1/2} \leq C\lambda^{1/4} \log^{1/2}(1/\lambda),$$

where $\text{gap}_{X,Y}(f) := \min_{y \in Y} f(y) - \max_{x \in X} f(x)$. Note that Proposition 4.11 only applies in the case that the gap is nonnegative, but the inequality is immediate in the other case. Since $f = 0$ on ∂V_1^\bullet , there is $y \in V_1^\bullet \cap D_{4\epsilon}$ so that

$$f(y) \leq C\lambda^{1/4} \log^{1/2}(1/\lambda).$$

Then combining this with Claim 31, we obtain

$$f(z_0) = f(y) + [f(z_0) - f(y)] \leq C\lambda^{1/4} \log^{1/2}(1/\lambda) + \frac{C}{\log^{1/2}(1/\lambda)} \leq \frac{C}{\log^{1/2}(1/\lambda)}$$

Applying the same argument to $-f$ yields that

$$|f(z_0)| \leq \frac{C}{\log^{1/2}(1/\lambda)}.$$

All that remains is to establish Claims 27-31. Two of these, Claims 28 and 30, follow the arguments of the corresponding results, Claims 8.2 and 8.4, in [8] with only minor changes of constants. As a result, we omit those proofs here.

Proof of Claim 27. Let $z \in V^\bullet \cap \bar{\Omega}$ such that $\text{dist}(z, A \cup B) \leq 2\lambda^{1/4}$. Choose $u \in A \cup B$ such that $|z - u| \leq 2\lambda^{1/4}$. Then there is $v \in S_1 \cup S_2$ such that there is a path γ_{uv} from u to v in \hat{G} with length at most δ . Further by following the edge containing v to its endpoint in V^\bullet , there is $w \in \partial V^\bullet$ such that $|v - w| \leq \epsilon$ (and let γ_{vw} be the path from v to w along the edge). Then $|z - w| \leq 2\lambda^{1/4} + \delta + \epsilon \leq 4\lambda^{1/4}$.

Since $h_d(w) = h_c(u)$, we have

$$|h_d(z) - h_c(z)| \leq |h_d(z) - h_d(w)| + |h_c(u) - h_c(z)|.$$

From Proposition 15,

$$|h_c(u) - h_c(z)| \leq C|u - z|^{1/4} \leq C\lambda^{1/16} \leq \frac{C}{\log^{1/2}(1/\lambda)}.$$

Thus it remains to bound $|h_d(z) - h_d(w)|$.

Our goal will be to use Proposition 24, and so we must find a path from z to w in G^\bullet . Since Ω is a linearly connected domain (with constant K), there is a path γ_{zu} in $\bar{\Omega} \subset \hat{G}$ from z to u so that

$$\text{diam}(\gamma_{zu}) \leq K|z - u| \leq 2K\lambda^{1/4}.$$

Therefore $\gamma_{zw} = \gamma_{zu} \cup \gamma_{uv} \cup \gamma_{vw}$ is a path from z to w in \hat{G} with

$$\text{diam}(\gamma_{zw}) \leq 2K\lambda^{1/4} + \delta + \epsilon \leq (2K + 2)\lambda^{1/4}.$$

Now the path γ_{zw} can be converted into a path γ in G^\bullet as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 in [8] (see their Figure 4), so that $\text{dist}(\gamma_{zw}, \gamma) \leq \epsilon$. Thus

$$\text{diam}(\gamma) \leq \text{diam}(\gamma_{zw}) + 2\epsilon \leq (2K + 4)\lambda^{1/4}.$$

Now a disc centered at $\frac{1}{2}(z + w)$ will contain γ if its radius is at least

$$\frac{1}{2}|z - w| + \text{diam}(\gamma) \leq 2\lambda^{1/4} + (2K + 4)\lambda^{1/4} = (2K + 6)\lambda^{1/4}.$$

Set $r = (2K + 6)\lambda^{1/4}$ and $R = (4K + 15)\lambda^{1/8}$. Note that, by taking λ small enough,

$$2r + 3\epsilon \leq R \leq \frac{1}{4}\hat{d},$$

where $\hat{d} := \min\{\text{dist}(T_1, T_2), \text{dist}(S_1, S_2)\}$ and

$$\frac{R}{r + \epsilon} = \frac{(4K + 15)\lambda^{1/8}}{(2K + 6)\lambda^{1/4} + \epsilon} \geq \lambda^{-1/8}.$$

The fact that $R \leq \frac{1}{4}\hat{d}$ means that D_R , the disc of radius R centered at $\frac{1}{2}|z + w|$ can intersect at most one of S_1 or S_2 . Because h_d is constant equal to 0 on $S_1 \cap V^\bullet$ and constant equal to 1 on $S_2 \cap V^\bullet$, the term κ from Proposition 24 will be zero. Therefore Proposition 24 gives

$$|h_d(z) - h_d(w)| \leq \frac{C \mathcal{E}^\bullet(h_d)^{1/2}}{\log^{1/2}(1/\lambda)}.$$

To complete the proof, it remains to bound $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(h_d)$. We reflect ψ over τ_1 and τ_2 , so that ψ is conformal in an open set \mathcal{O} containing Ω . Define $\mathcal{O}_{\text{mid}} = \{z \in \mathcal{O} : 1/3 \leq \psi(z) \leq 2/3\}$. Consider the distance between $\tau_k \cap \mathcal{O}_{\text{mid}}$ and $\partial\mathcal{O}$. By taking λ small enough, we may assume that $3\lambda < \text{dist}(\tau_k \cap \mathcal{O}_{\text{mid}}, \partial\mathcal{O})$. Then the boundary of any connected component of $\hat{G} \setminus \mathcal{O}_{\text{mid}}$ will intersect exactly one of $\psi^{-1}(\{\text{Re}(z) = 1/3\})$ or $\psi^{-1}(\{\text{Re}(z) = 2/3\})$. Let \hat{G}_{left} be the union of all components whose boundary intersects $\psi^{-1}(\{\text{Re}(z) = 1/3\})$, and similarly define \hat{G}_{right} as the union of components whose boundary intersects $\psi^{-1}(\{\text{Re}(z) = 2/3\})$. Define the continuous function f on \hat{G} as follows:

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } z \in \hat{G}_{\text{left}} \\ 1 & \text{if } z \in \hat{G}_{\text{right}} \\ 3h_c(z) - 1 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Then by Proposition 4.8 in [8],

$$\mathcal{E}^\bullet(h_d) \leq \mathcal{E}^\bullet(f).$$

Form G_{mid} from all the quadrilaterals that intersect \mathcal{O}_{mid} . Note that the only quadrilaterals in G that contribute to $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(f)$ are those in G_{mid} . Further, for these $Q = [v_1, w_1, v_2, w_2]$ in G_{mid} , we have that

$$|f(v_1) - f(v_2)| \leq 3|h_c(v_1) - h_c(v_2)|.$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{E}^\bullet(f) \leq 9\mathcal{E}_{\text{mid}}^\bullet(h_c),$$

where the energy on the right is with respect to the graph G_{mid} . Since G_{mid} is contained within \mathcal{O} , Proposition 5.2 in [8] implies that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{mid}}^\bullet(h_c) \leq 2 \int_{\hat{G}_{\text{mid}}} |\nabla h_c|^2 + 2 \text{area}(\hat{G}_{\text{mid}})(10LM\epsilon + 8M^2\epsilon^2),$$

where $L = \|\nabla h_c\|_{\infty, \hat{G}_{\text{mid}}}$ and $M = \|Hh_c\|_{\infty, \hat{G}_{\text{mid}}}$. The constants L and M depend on Ω but are independent of ϵ and δ . Since \mathcal{O} and the extended ψ are defined by reflection, $\psi(\mathcal{O})$ is contained in the rectangle $[0, 1] \times [-m, 2m]$ and $\int_{\hat{G}_{\text{mid}}} |\nabla h_c|^2 \leq 3 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla h_c|^2$. However, $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla h_c|^2 = m$ the modulus of curves in R from $\{\text{Re}(z) = 0\}$ to $\{\text{Re}(z) = 1\}$. Thus we have shown that $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(h_d)$ is bounded by a constant (which depends only on Ω). \square

Proof of Claim 29. Note that $\sup_{y \in \Omega} |h_c(y)| \leq 1$, since h_c is the real part of the conformal map ψ onto $[0, 1] \times [0, m]$.

We reflect ψ over τ_1 and τ_2 , so that ψ is conformal in an open set \mathcal{O} containing Ω . Let z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 be the four ‘‘corners’’ of Ω , i.e. where the arcs A, B and τ_1, τ_2 meet. Since the curves A, B, τ_1, τ_2 are smooth, there is an $r_k > 0$ so that for $z \in D_{r_k}(z_k) \cap \bar{\Omega}$, $\text{dist}(z, \partial\mathcal{O}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(z, A \cup B)$. Set $D = \cup_{k=1}^4 D_{r_k}(z_k)$. Then $(\tau_1 \cup \tau_2) \setminus D$ is contained compactly within \mathcal{O} , and we may assume that

$$\text{dist}((\tau_1 \cup \tau_2) \setminus D, \partial\mathcal{O}) \geq \lambda^{1/4} \tag{20}$$

by taking λ small enough.

We wish to show that for all $p \in \hat{G}_1$

$$\text{dist}(p, \partial\mathcal{O}) \geq \frac{5}{16} \lambda^{1/4}. \tag{21}$$

Let $p \in \hat{G}_1$. If the closest point to p in $\partial\mathcal{O}$ is in $A \cup B$, then (21) holds since $\text{dist}(p, A \cup B) \geq \lambda^{1/4}$. So we will assume that the closest point to p in $\partial\mathcal{O}$ is not contained in $A \cup B$. First consider the case that $p \in \bar{\Omega}$. The line segment connecting p to a closest point in $\partial\mathcal{O}$ must cross out of Ω at some point $z_0 \in \tau_1 \cup \tau_2$. We have two possible cases: (1) $z_0 \in (\tau_1 \cup \tau_2) \setminus D$ or (2) $z_0 \in (\tau_1 \cup \tau_2) \cap D$. In case (1), we use (20) to obtain

$$\text{dist}(p, \partial\mathcal{O}) \geq \text{dist}(z_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) \geq \lambda^{1/4}.$$

In case (2),

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{dist}(p, \partial\mathcal{O}) &\geq \text{dist}(p, z_0) + \text{dist}(z_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} [\text{dist}(p, z_0) + \text{dist}(z_0, A \cup B)] \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(p, A \cup B) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{1/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we assume that $p \notin \Omega$. Then there is some $w_0 \in \tau_1 \cup \tau_2$ so that $\text{dist}(p, w_0) \leq \delta$. If $w_0 \notin D$, then

$$\text{dist}(p, \partial\mathcal{O}) \geq \text{dist}(w_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) - \delta \geq \lambda^{1/4} - \delta \geq \frac{7}{8} \lambda^{1/4},$$

where we used that $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{8} \lambda^{1/4}$. If $w_0 \in D$, then

$$\text{dist}(w_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(w_0, A \cup B) \geq \frac{1}{2} [\text{dist}(p, A \cup B) - \text{dist}(w_0, p)] \geq \frac{1}{2} (\lambda^{1/4} - \delta) \geq \frac{7}{16} \lambda^{1/4},$$

and so

$$\text{dist}(p, \partial\mathcal{O}) \geq \text{dist}(w_0, \partial\mathcal{O}) - \text{dist}(w_0, p) \geq \frac{7}{16} \lambda^{1/4} - \delta \geq \frac{5}{16} \lambda^{1/4}.$$

This establishes (21).

For all $q \in \tilde{G}_1$,

$$\text{dist}(q, \partial\mathcal{O}) \geq \frac{5}{16} \lambda^{1/4} - \epsilon \geq \frac{3}{16} \lambda^{1/4}. \quad (22)$$

Proposition 3.7 of [8] and (22) imply that

$$\|\nabla h_c\|_{\infty, \tilde{G}_1} \leq C\lambda^{-1/4}.$$

We obtain the Hessian bound $\|Hh_c\|_{\infty, \tilde{G}_1} \leq C\lambda^{-1/2}$ from Proposition 3.7 of [8] and (22) exactly as in the proof of Claim 8.3 in [8]. \square

Proof of Claim 31. Recall that we have $z_0 \in V_1^\bullet$ with $\text{dist}(z_0, A \cup B) > 2\lambda^{1/4}$. From Claim 2, we know that every point $p \in \partial G_1$ satisfies $\text{dist}(p, A \cup B) \leq \frac{5}{4} \lambda^{1/4}$. Thus the distance from z_0 to ∂V_1^\bullet is at least $2\lambda^{1/4} - \frac{5}{4} \lambda^{1/4} = \frac{3}{4} \lambda^{1/4} \geq 6\lambda$, since $\lambda^{1/4} \geq 8\lambda$, and this implies that $D_{4\epsilon}$ cannot intersect ∂V_1^\bullet .

Let $y \in V_1^\bullet \cap D_{4\epsilon}$. Then

$$|f(z_0) - f(y)| \leq |h_d^{(1)}(z_0) - h_d^{(1)}(y)| + |h_c(z_0) - h_c(y)|.$$

Our next step is to get a path from z_0 to y in \hat{G}_1 with length bounded by $C\lambda$. Then by Claim 3, we will have that

$$|h_c(z_0) - h_c(y)| \leq \|\nabla h_c\|_{\infty, \hat{G}_1} \cdot C\lambda \leq C\lambda^{3/4}.$$

Since y may not be in $\bar{\Omega}$, we will choose w in $\bar{\Omega}$ so that there is a path γ_{wy} from w to y in \hat{G}_1 with the length of γ_{wy} bounded by δ . Since Ω is a linearly connected domain (with constant K), there is a path γ_{z_0w} in $\bar{\Omega} \subset \hat{G}_1$ from z_0 to w so that

$$\text{diam}(\gamma_{z_0w}) \leq K|z_0 - w| \leq K(|z_0 - y| + \delta) \leq 4K\lambda.$$

Therefore $\gamma_{z_0y} = \gamma_{z_0w} \cup \gamma_{wy}$ is a path from z_0 to y in \hat{G}_1 with

$$\text{diam}(\gamma_{z_0y}) \leq (4K + 1)\lambda.$$

It remains to bound $|h_d^{(1)}(z_0) - h_d^{(1)}(y)|$. Propositions 4.8 and 5.1 of [8] give

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\bullet(h_d^{(1)}) \leq \mathcal{E}_1^\bullet(h_c) \leq 2 \int_{\hat{G}_1} |\nabla h_c|^2 + 2\text{area}(\hat{G}_1) (10LM\epsilon + 8M^2\epsilon^2)$$

where (using Claim 29)

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \|\nabla h_c\|_{\infty, \hat{G}_1} \leq C\lambda^{-1/4}, \\ M &= \|Hh_c\|_{\infty, \hat{G}_1} \leq C\lambda^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Claim 27,

$$\int_{\hat{G}_1} |\nabla h_c|^2 \leq 3 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla h_c|^2 = 3m,$$

where m is the continuous modulus of the family of curves from A to B in Ω . Thus,

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\bullet(h_d^{(1)}) \leq C.$$

We will utilize Proposition 24 to finish the proof, and so we must verify that its hypotheses are satisfied. The path γ_{z_0y} from above can be converted into a path γ in G_1^\bullet as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 in [8] (see their Figure 4), so that $\text{dist}(\gamma_{z_0y}, \gamma) \leq \epsilon$. Thus

$$\text{diam}(\gamma) \leq \text{diam}(\gamma_{z_0y}) + 2\epsilon \leq (4K + 3)\lambda.$$

Thus a disc centered at $\frac{1}{2}(z_0 + y)$ will contain γ if its radius is larger than

$$\frac{1}{2}|z_0 - y| + \text{diam}(\gamma) \leq \frac{3}{2}\epsilon + (4K + 3)\lambda \leq (4K + 5)\lambda.$$

Set $r = (4K + 5)\lambda$ and $R = \frac{1}{4}\lambda^{1/4}$. We have chosen λ to be small enough so that $2r + 3\epsilon \leq R$. Note further that since the distance from z_0 to ∂V_1^\bullet is at least $\frac{3}{4}\lambda^{1/4}$, the distance from $\frac{1}{2}(z_0 + y)$ to ∂V_1^\bullet is at least $\frac{3}{4}\lambda^{1/4} - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{1/4}$ (using that $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{8}\lambda^{1/4}$). Thus D_R does not intersect ∂V_1^\bullet and so the term κ in Proposition 24 is equal to zero. Therefore Proposition 24 implies that

$$|h_d^{(1)}(z_0) - h_d^{(1)}(y)| \leq \frac{C \mathcal{E}_1^\bullet(h_d^{(1)})^{1/2}}{\log^{1/2}[R/(r + \epsilon)]} \leq \frac{C}{\log^{1/2}(1/\lambda)}.$$

□

References

- [1] AHLFORS, L. V. *Conformal invariants: topics in geometric function theory*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-Düsseldorf-Johannesburg, 1973. McGraw-Hill Series in Higher Mathematics.
- [2] ALBIN, N., BRUNNER, M., PEREZ, R., POGGI-CORRADINI, P., AND WIENS, N. Modulus on graphs as a generalization of standard graph theoretic quantities. *Conform. Geom. Dyn.* 19 (2015), 298–317. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/ecgd/287>.
- [3] ALBIN, N., CLEMENS, J., FERNANDO, N., AND POGGI-CORRADINI, P. Blocking duality for p -modulus on networks and applications. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)* 198, 3 (2019), 973–999. <https://doi-org.er.lib.k-state.edu/10.1007/s10231-018-0806-0>.
- [4] ALBIN, N., AND POGGI-CORRADINI, P. Minimal subfamilies and the probabilistic interpretation for modulus on graphs. *The Journal of Analysis* (2016), 1–26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s41478-016-0002-9>.
- [5] ALRAYES, N. *Approximation of p -modulus in the plane with discrete grids*. PhD thesis, Kansas State University, 2018.
- [6] BADGER, M. Beurling’s criterion and extremal metrics for Fuglede modulus. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* 38, 2 (2013), 677–689.
- [7] ERIKSSON-BIQUE, S., AND POGGI-CORRADINI, P. On the sharp lower bound for duality of modulus. *Unpublished* (2021). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2102.03035.pdf>.

- [8] GUREL-GUREVICH, O., JERISON, D. C., AND NACHMIAS, A. The Dirichlet problem for orthogonal maps. *Adv. Math.* 374 (2020), 107379, 53.
- [9] HINKKANEN, A. Modulus of continuity of harmonic functions. *J. Analyse Math* 51 (1988), 1–29.
- [10] LYONS, R., AND PERES, Y. *Probability on trees and networks*, vol. 42 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2016.
- [11] POMMERENKE, C. *Boundary behavior of conformal maps*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1992.
- [12] ROGERS, L. C. G., AND WILLIAMS, D. *Diffusions, Markov Processes, and Martingales*, 2 ed., vol. 1 of *Cambridge Mathematical Library*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [13] SCHRAMM, O. Square tilings with prescribed combinatorics. *Israel J. Math.* 84, 1-2 (1993), 97–118.
- [14] SHEWCHUK, J. R. Triangle: Engineering a 2D Quality Mesh Generator and Delaunay Triangulator. In *Applied Computational Geometry: Towards Geometric Engineering*, M. C. Lin and D. Manocha, Eds., vol. 1148 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer-Verlag, May 1996, pp. 203–222. From the First ACM Workshop on Applied Computational Geometry.
- [15] SKOPENKOV, M. The boundary value problem for discrete analytic functions. *Adv. Math.* 240 (2013), 61–87.
- [16] SKOPENKOV, M. The boundary value problem for discrete analytic functions. *Adv. Math.* 240 (2013), 61–87.
- [17] WERNES, B. Discrete analytic functions on non-uniform lattices without global geometric control. *arXiv: Complex Variables* (2015).