

Integrability of the conformal loop ensemble

Morris Ang
MIT

Xin Sun
University of Pennsylvania

Abstract

We demonstrate that the conformal loop ensemble (CLE) has a rich integrable structure by establishing exact formulas for two CLE observables. The first describes the joint moments of the conformal radii of loops surrounding three points for CLE on the sphere. Up to normalization, our formula agrees with the imaginary DOZZ formula due to Zamolodchikov (2005) and Kostov-Petkova (2007), which is the three-point structure constant of certain conformal field theories that generalize the minimal models. This verifies the CLE interpretation of the imaginary DOZZ formula by Ikhlef, Jacobsen and Saleur (2015). Our second result is for the moments of the electrical thickness of CLE loops first considered by Kenyon and Wilson (2004). Our proofs rely on the conformal welding of random surfaces and two sources of integrability concerning CLE and Liouville quantum gravity (LQG). First, LQG surfaces decorated with CLE inherit a rich integrable structure from random planar maps decorated with the $O(n)$ loop model. Second, as the field theory describing LQG, Liouville conformal field theory is integrable. In particular, the DOZZ formula and the FZZ formula for its structure constants are crucial inputs to our results.

1 Introduction

The conformal loop ensemble (CLE) is a canonical conformally invariant probability measure on infinite collections of non-crossing loops, where each loop looks like a Schramm-Loewner evolution (SLE). CLE has been proved or conjectured to be the scaling limit of many important loops models in two dimensional statistical physics, such as percolation, Ising model, the $O(n)$ -loop model, and random cluster model. There has been an extensive literature on CLE since the fundamental work of Sheffield [She09] and Sheffield-Werner [SW12]; see e.g. [ALS20, BH19, CN08, GMQ18, KS16, KW16, Lup19, MSW14, MWW16, MWW15, MSW17, SSW09, WW13].

In this paper we demonstrate that CLE has a rich integrable structure by establishing exact formulas for two CLE observables. The first describes the joint moments of the conformal radii of loops surrounding three points for CLE on the sphere. Our formula agrees with the imaginary DOZZ formula [Zam05, KP07] up to normalization, which verifies the geometric interpretation of this formula proposed in [IJS16]. Our second formula is for the moments of the electrical thickness of CLE loops first considered by Kenyon and Wilson [KW04]. We will focus on the simple-loop regime $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$ and treat the non-simple loop regime $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ in a subsequent paper. See Sections 1.1 and 1.3 for the precise statements of our results.

Our proofs rely on two sources of integrability concerning CLE and Liouville quantum gravity (LQG). First, LQG surfaces decorated with CLE inherit a rich integrable structure from random planar maps decorated with the $O(n)$ loop model, as exhibited in [BBCK18, CCM20, MSW20]. Second, as the field theory describing LQG, Liouville conformal field theory (LCFT) is integrable. In particular, the DOZZ formula [KRV17] and FZZ formula [ARS21] for its structure constants are crucial inputs to our results. See Section 1.2 for a summary of our method.

This paper is part of our program exploring the connections between the integrabilities of SLE, LQG and LCFT. In Section 1.4 we discuss some future works and list some open questions.

1.1 Three-point correlation function for CLE and the imaginary DOZZ formula

For $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$, CLE_κ on a simply connected domain $D \neq \mathbb{C}$ can be characterized by the domain Markov property and conformal invariance [SW12]. In this case the loops are disjoint Jordan curves. The full plane CLE_κ can be obtained by sending $D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Viewed as a loop ensemble living on the extended complex plane $\hat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, the full plane CLE_κ is invariant under conformal transformations on $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ [KW16]. Hence we also call a full plane CLE_κ a CLE on the sphere.

Suppose Γ is a full plane CLE_κ . Fix three distinct points $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in \mathbb{C}$. There are infinitely many loops that separate z_1 and $\{z_2, z_3\}$. For each such loop $\eta \in \Gamma$, we let D_η be the simply connected component of $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \eta$ containing z_i . There exists a loop η_1 with the largest D_η , which we call the outermost loop separating z_1 and z_2, z_3 . For $i = 2, 3$, we similarly let η_i to be the outermost loop in Γ separating z_i and $\{z_1, z_2, z_3\} \setminus \{z_i\}$.

Given a simple loop η on $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ surrounding a point $z \in \mathbb{C}$ the conformal radius $\text{CR}(\eta, z)$ of η viewed from z is defined as follows. Let \mathbb{D} be the unit disk. Let D_η be the connected component of $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \eta$ containing z and let $\psi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow D_\eta$ be a conformal map such that $\psi(0) = z$. Then $\text{CR}(\eta, z)$ is defined by $|\psi'(0)|$. Given η_i and z_i defined above, we call the joint moment generating function $\mathbb{E}[\prod_{i=1}^3 \text{CR}(\eta_i, z_i)^{\lambda_i}]$ the *three-point correlation function* for CLE_κ on the sphere.

Lemma 1.1. *There exists a function $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \in (0, \infty]$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\prod_{i=1}^3 \text{CR}(\eta_i, z_i)^{\lambda_i}] = C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \prod_{i=1}^3 |z_i - z_{i+1}|^{\lambda_i + \lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_{i+2}}, \quad (1.1)$$

where we identify z_j with z_{j-3} and λ_j with λ_{j-3} .

Proof. This follows from the conformal invariance of full plane CLE_κ , the scaling property of conformal radius, and the fact that any triple of points on the plane are conformally equivalent. \square

We call $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ the *structure constant* for CLE_κ on the sphere. This terminology and the three-point correlation function above are inspired by Liouville conformal field theory (LCFT), which is the quantum field theory with Liouville action introduced by Polyakov [Pol81]. It was recently made rigorous in [DKRV16] and follow-up works [HRV18, DRV16, GRV19, Rem18]; see Section 2.2 for more background. For LCFT, the three-point correlation function on the sphere, which depends on three points z_1, z_2, z_3 on \mathbb{C} and three parameters $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \mathbb{R}$, is also of the factorization form (1.1) where the dependence on $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ is encoded in its structure constant. It was first proposed in theoretical physics [DO94, ZZ96] and then rigorously proved in [KRV17] that the structure constant has the following remarkable expression known as the DOZZ formula:

$$C_\gamma^{\text{DOZZ}}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = \left(\frac{\pi(\frac{\gamma}{2})^{2-\gamma^2/2} \Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})} \right)^{\frac{2Q-\bar{\alpha}}{\gamma}} \frac{\Upsilon'_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(0) \Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(\alpha_1) \Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(\alpha_2) \Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(\alpha_3)}{\Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2} - Q) \Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2} - \alpha_1) \Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2} - \alpha_2) \Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2} - \alpha_3)}. \quad (1.2)$$

where $\gamma \in (0, 2)$ is the coupling parameter for LCFT that determines its central charge, $\bar{\alpha}$ is given by $\sum \alpha_j$, and $\Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(z)$ is an explicit entire function called the Upsilon function. Here we have assumed the cosmological constant to be 1 for simplicity. See Theorem 2.6 for a precise statement.

Our first main result is an explicit formula for $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ which is closely related to the DOZZ formula. Indeed, under a certain parameter identification their product is factorized.

Theorem 1.2. For $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$, the structure constant $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) < \infty$ if and only if $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 > \frac{3\kappa}{32} - 1 + \frac{2}{\kappa}$. In this case, set $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$ and $Q = \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{2}{\gamma}$. Let α_i be a root of $\alpha(Q - \frac{\alpha}{2}) - 2 = \lambda_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then

$$C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^3 N_\gamma(\alpha_i)}{C_\gamma^{\text{DOZZ}}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)}. \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$N_\gamma(\alpha) = \left(-\pi \cos\left(\frac{4\pi}{\gamma^2}\right) \frac{\Gamma(\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 1)}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})} C_\gamma^{\text{DOZZ}}(\gamma, \gamma, \gamma)^{1/3} \right) \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma}{2}(\alpha - \frac{\gamma}{2}))}{\Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha)) \cos(\frac{2\pi}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha))} \left(\frac{\pi \Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})} \right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}}. \quad (1.4)$$

Let $\Delta_\alpha := \frac{\alpha}{2}(Q - \frac{\alpha}{2})$ be the so-called *conformal dimension* in LCFT. The right hand side of (1.3) is a function of $(\Delta_{\alpha_i})_{1 \leq i \leq 3}$, hence is indeed a function of $\lambda_i = 2\Delta_{\alpha_i} - 2$. This relation between λ and α is an instance of the Knizhnik-Polyakov-Zamolodchikov (KPZ) relation for random fractals coupled with Liouville quantum gravity [KPZ88, DS11, DKRV16].

Modulo the choice of normalization $N_\gamma(\alpha)$, the right hand side of (1.3) is the so-called *imaginary DOZZ formula* proposed by Zamolodchikov [Zam05] and independently by Kostov and Petkova [KP07] with a different normalization. It is obtained by solving Teschner's shift relations [Tes95] for the DOZZ formula with the shifts being imaginary. As observed in both [Zam05] and [KP07], the product of the imaginary DOZZ formula and the original one with parameters linked through the KPZ relation factorizes as shown in (1.3). The imaginary DOZZ formula, also known as the *timelike DOZZ formula*, is considered to be the structure constant of a family of conformal field theories that generalize the minimal models [BPZ84] and analytically continue LCFT to the central charge $c \leq 1$ regime. Understanding these conformal field theories remains an active topic in theoretical physics; see [HMW11, RS15, BDE19] and references therein.

Ikhlef, Jacobsen and Saleur [IJS16] proposed that the imaginary DOZZ formula can be expressed as the partition function of a CLE reweighted by the nesting statistics around three points, which after renormalization is precisely the joint moments of the conformal radii in $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$. (See [MWW15, MWW16] on the relation between the nesting statistics and conformal radii for CLE.) Therefore, our Theorem 1.2 is a rigorous justification of the CLE interpretation of the imaginary DOZZ formula in [IJS16]. Prior to [IJS16], it was argued in [DV11, ZSK11, PSVD13] that a special value of the imaginary DOZZ formula is related to the three-point connectivity function in Potts and random cluster models. See Section 1.4 for more discussion.

Theorem 1.2 immediately raises several questions such as the extension to the case when $\kappa \in (4, 8)$, or when there are more than three points. These questions will be discussed in Section 1.4. Theorem 1.2 should be compared to the formula of Schramm, Sheffield and Wilson [SSW09] on the law of the conformal radius of a single outermost loop of the CLE on the disk, which we recall in Appendix B. The formula in [SSW09] was proved using stochastic differential equations associated to SLE. In contrast, our method for proving Theorem 1.2 is based on the coupling of CLE with Liouville quantum gravity and the integrability of LCFT, which we summarize below.

1.2 The proof method based on CLE coupled with Liouville quantum gravity

Liouville quantum gravity (LQG) is the two dimensional random geometry with a parameter $\gamma \in (0, 2)$ induced by the exponential of various versions of Gaussian free field. See [DS11, DDDF20, GM21] for its construction. LQG describes the scaling limits of discrete random surfaces, namely random planar maps under conformal embeddings; see e.g. [HS19, GMS21]. We refer to the survey

articles [Gwy20, GHS19] for more background on LQG and its relation to random planar maps. Our proof of Theorem 1.2 relies on the coupling between CLE and LQG.

For $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$, set $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$. Then CLE_κ coupled with γ -LQG describes the scaling limit of random planar maps decorated by the $O(n)$ -loop model for $n = -2 \cos(\frac{4\pi}{\kappa}) \in (0, 2)$ in the dilute phase [CCM20, BCK18, MSW20]. Suppose the planar map has the spherical topology with three marked points, and is sampled from the critical Boltzmann distribution, then the corresponding γ -LQG surface is the so-called (three-pointed) *quantum sphere*, which we denote by QS_3 .

Consider a full-plane CLE_κ on the three-pointed quantum sphere. The three outermost loops separating the three marked points cut the quantum sphere into four pieces: one non-simply-connected piece and three simply connected ones; see Figure 1. Conditioning on the quantum lengths of these loops, these four pieces are conditionally independent γ -LQG surfaces. Moreover, the three simply connected surfaces, each of which contains a marked point, are *quantum disks* with an interior marked point. Here the quantum disk is the γ -LQG surface that describes the scaling limit of random planar maps on a disk in the γ -LQG universality class. This decomposition of quantum sphere is an instance of a *quantum zipper* result, which was pioneered by Sheffield [She16]. We prove this particular instance in Section 6.1 using the recent work of Miller, Sheffield and Werner [MSW20] on CLE coupled with the quantum disk, Theorem 1.3 below, and our quantum zipper results proved in [AHS20, AHS21] with Holden.




Figure 1: Cutting a quantum sphere and gluing a quantum pair of pants with quantum disks.

We call the non-simply connected surface obtained from cutting the quantum sphere a *quantum pair of pants*, since it is a natural LQG surface with the topology of a pair of pants. We also write the law of the quantum disk with one marked point as $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\gamma)$ where γ represents the magnitude of the log singularity at the marked point. It is proved in [AHS17, Cer19, AHS21] that if we conformally embed a sample from QS_3 on $\hat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \infty$ with the three marked points located at z_1, z_2, z_3 , then the corresponding variant of Gaussian free field is the so called *Liouville field* on the sphere [DKRV16, AHS21] with insertions of weight γ at z_1, z_2, z_3 , which we denote by $\text{LF}_{\hat{\mathbb{C}}}^{\gamma, \gamma, \gamma}$. Similarly, if we conformally embed $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\gamma)$ on \mathbb{H} with i as the marked point and fix the remaining degree of freedom in the conformal embedding uniformly at random, then the resulting field is the Liouville field $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\gamma, i)}$ on \mathbb{H} with a γ -insertion at i [HRV18, ARS21]. (In stating both results we omitted a γ -dependent scaling constant in front of LF.)

Now we can reverse the sphere-cutting procedure above and conclude that if we glue together a quantum pair of pants with three independent quantum disks appropriately, and conformally embed to $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, e^{i\pi/3})$ (see Figure 1), then the law of the resulting field is $\text{LF}_{\hat{\mathbb{C}}}^{\gamma, \gamma, \gamma}$. This gluing procedure is an example of *conformal welding* which we review in Section 2.3. In [ARS21], with Remy we considered a generalization $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha)$ of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\gamma)$ for generic $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that if a sample from $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha)$ is embedded to (\mathbb{H}, i) as in the previous paragraph, then the law of the resulting random field is $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}$. Our key observation is that if we glue together the quantum pair of

pants with three samples from $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha_i)$ with $i = 1, 2, 3$, and conformally embed the spherical surface to $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, e^{i\pi/3})$, then the law of the resulting field is $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3}$ where $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ is as in Theorem 1.2. Let A be the total quantum area of the resulting sphere after gluing. Then using the relation between $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3}$ and the DOZZ formula as we recall in Theorem 2.6, we can conclude that the average of e^{-A} equals $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \times \frac{1}{2} C_\gamma^{\text{DOZZ}}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$.

In order to get $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ it suffices to compute the average of e^{-A} in terms of the quantum pair of pants and $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha_i)$. The area and length distribution for $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha)$ is encoded by the so-called FZZ formula for LCFT, which we proved in [ARS21] with Remy. A substantial effort of this paper is devoted to computing the joint area and length distribution for the quantum pair of pants. Two key ingredients of our computation are: 1. the LQG lengths of outermost loops of a CLE on a quantum disk can be described by the jump sizes of a stable Levy process; 2. the surfaces encircled by these outermost loops are independent quantum disks given their boundary lengths. These facts are consistent with the assertion that CLE coupled with LQG describes the scaling limit of $O(n)$ -loop model decorated random planar maps, and are extracted from [MSW20, CCM20, BBCK18] as we summarize in Appendix A. As an intermediate step towards solving the quantum pair of pants, we compute the joint length and area distribution of the *quantum annulus*, which is the LQG surface between the disk boundary and an outermost loop for CLE on a quantum disk. This argument so far gives Theorem 1.2 for $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$. We obtain the case $\kappa = 4$ by a limiting argument.

The loop lengths distribution of CLE on quantum disk crucially relies on the mating of trees theory for LQG coupled with SLE and CLE, which was developed by Duplantier, Miller and Sheffield [DMS14]; see [GHS19] for a survey. The idea of using conformal welding, mating of trees, and LCFT to get integrable results is also applied to a variant of SLE called chordal $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho_-; \rho_+)$ in our recent work with Holden [AHS21]. Moreover, conformal welding and mating of trees are used in our recent proof with Remy [ARS21] of the FZZ formula. In the next subsection we present yet another result based on this idea.

1.3 SLE loop measure and the electrical thickness

For $\kappa \in (0, 4]$, Kontsevich and Suhov [KS07] conjectured that up to a multiplicative constant there exists a unique measure on simple loops on $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ with conformal symmetry and a certain restriction property indexed by κ . This conjecture is inspired by Malliavin's work [Mal99]. We call loop measures satisfying this conjecture a *Malliavin-Kontsevich-Suhov (MKS) loop measure*. For $\kappa = \frac{8}{3}$, the existence and uniqueness of the MKS loop measure was proved by Werner [Wer08] where the construction is via the Brownian loop measure.

Kempainen and Werner [KW16] introduced the loop intensity measure of simple CLE, which gives an example of an MKS loop measure for $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$. Let Γ be a full plane CLE_κ with $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$. Let η be a loop chosen from the counting measure over the set of loops in Γ . The *loop intensity measure* $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ for CLE_κ is the distribution of η ; this is an infinite measure on simple loops. By the conformal invariance of CLE_κ , the measure $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ is conformally invariant. Recently, for all $\kappa \in (0, 4]$, Zhan [Zha21] constructed a MKS loop measure $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$, which we will recall in Section 2.3. As an intermediate step towards our integrability results, we will show in Section 5 that for $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$, the measures $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ and $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ agree up to a multiplicative constant, which is consistent with the uniqueness conjecture on the MKS loop measure.

Theorem 1.3. *For each $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$, there exists $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}} = C \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$.*

Although the SLE loop measure is infinite, we can define a probability measure that describes the law of its shape modulo scaling and translation. One way to express this shape measure

is the following. Given a simple loop on \mathbb{C} that surrounds 0, let $R_\eta = \inf\{|z| : z \in \eta\}$ and $\hat{\eta} = \{z : R_\eta z \in \eta\}$. Namely, $\hat{\eta}$ is the rescaling of η such that $\hat{\eta}$ surrounds \mathbb{D} and touches $\partial\mathbb{D}$. Now suppose η is sampled from $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ restricted to the event that η surrounds 0. By the conformal invariance of $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$, the law of $\log R_\eta$ is translation invariant on \mathbb{R} , hence a constant multiple of the Lebesgue measure. Moreover, the conditional law of $\hat{\eta}$ conditioning on R_η does not depend on the value of R_η , which gives a probability measure on loops that surround \mathbb{D} and touch $\partial\mathbb{D}$. We denote this probability measure by \mathcal{L}_κ and call it the *shape measure* of $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$.

Our next result is an exact formula for the so called electrical thickness for a sample from \mathcal{L}_κ .

Theorem 1.4. *For $\kappa \in (0, 4]$, let η be sample from \mathcal{L}_κ . Let $\bar{\eta}$ be the image of η under the inversion map $z \mapsto z^{-1}$. Let $\vartheta(\eta) = -\log \text{CR}(\eta, 0) - \log \text{CR}(\bar{\eta}, 0)$. Then $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}] < \infty$ if and only if $\lambda < 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8}$. Moreover,*

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}] = \frac{\sin(\pi(1 - \kappa/4))}{\pi(1 - \kappa/4)} \frac{\pi\sqrt{(1 - \kappa/4)^2 + \lambda\kappa/2}}{\sin(\pi\sqrt{(1 - \kappa/4)^2 + \lambda\kappa/2})} \quad \text{for } \lambda < 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8}. \quad (1.5)$$

We call $\theta(\eta)$ the *electrical thickness* of η . It only depends on the shape of η . It is non-negative and equals 0 if and only if the loop is a circle around 0. This concept was introduced by Kenyon and Wilson [KW04] as a way of describing how much the shape of a loop differs from a circle. Viewing the complex plane as a homogeneous electrical material, the electrical thickness measures the net change in the effective resistance between 0 and ∞ when the loop η becomes a perfect conductor.

Theorem 1.4 settles a conjecture of Kenyon and Wilson on the electrical thickness of CLE loops for $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$. Consider the shape measure $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$ of $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ defined in the same way as \mathcal{L}_κ . Theorem 1.3 implies that $\mathcal{L}_\kappa = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$. Let $(\eta_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be the sequence of loops of a CLE_κ on the unit disk, ordered such that η_n surrounds η_{n+1} . It is proved in [KW16] that the law of the rescaled loop $\hat{\eta}_n$ converges weakly to $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$. Since $\vartheta(\eta_n) = \vartheta(\hat{\eta}_n)$, we see that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta_n)}]$ equals $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}]$ in Theorem 1.4. Kenyon and Wilson [KW04] conjectured a formula for $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta_n)}]$, as recorded in [SSW09, Eq (14)]. Their formula agrees with the right hand of (1.5) after κ is replaced by $16/\kappa$. Thus our Theorem 1.4 shows that the conjectural formula is false but only off by this flip.¹ This conjecture was made for the entire range $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 8)$. In a subsequent work we will prove that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta_n)}]$ converge to the right hand side of (1.5) for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ as well.

Our proof of Theorem 1.4 also relies on the conformal welding of LQG surfaces and the integrability of LCFT. This time we glue together two quantum disks with an interior point to obtain a two-pointed quantum sphere with a loop separating them. It was shown by us and Holden in [AHS21] that the law of the resulting loop is $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$. From this conformal welding result and a similar idea as outlined in Section 1.2, we can express $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}]$ in Theorem 1.4 using the FZZ formula and the reflection coefficient for LCFT on the sphere [KRV17, RV19]. A new difficulty arises as the measure $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ is infinite, even after restricting to loops that separate 0 and ∞ . Overcoming this is the technical bulk of our proof of Theorem 1.4 in Section 8.

1.4 Outlook and perspectives

There are two natural directions one could pursue from our work. First, our Theorem 1.2 could serve as the starting point to compute high order correlators in two dimensional random cluster and loop models using the so-called *conformal bootstrap* method in conformal field theory (CFT) [BPZ84]. With the DOZZ formula established in [KRV17] as an input, the conformal bootstrap for the

¹As discussed in private communication with Kenyon and Sheffield, the formula should blow up as $\kappa \rightarrow 8$. But [SSW09, Eq (14)] gives a finite limit hence cannot be correct.

LCFT was recently carried out in [GKRV20]. However, the CFTs corresponding to random cluster and loop models are less well understood than LCFT, and remain an active topic in physics; see e.g. [PRS16, LJS19, HJS20]. Another natural direction is to employ the interplay between different types of integrability of SLE, CLE, LQG, LCFT to obtain results that are inaccessible within a single framework. The potential of this program was also demonstrated in our recent papers [AHS21] with Holden and [ARS21] with Remy. We refer to the introductions of those papers for more results and problems in this direction.

Here we conclude our introduction by mentioning three problems that we will pursue in subsequent works and listing three concrete open questions.

1. In a forthcoming paper we will extend our method to prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.4 for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ using the coupling of CLE_κ with $\sqrt{16/\kappa}$ -LQG from [MSW21].
2. In the random cluster models, the connectivity functions $P_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ are given by the probabilities that n points belong to the same finite cluster [KSZ06]. It was first proposed in [DV11] and later substantiated in [ZSK11, PSVD13] that at criticality in the continuum limit, the ratio $P_3(x_1, x_2, x_3)/\sqrt{P_2(x_1, x_2)P_2(x_1, x_3)P_2(x_2, x_3)}$ converges to a universal constant only depending on κ , which can be expressed by the imaginary DOZZ formula at a special value. In particular, for percolation this constant is ≈ 1.022 . We plan to rigorously justify this proposal based on results and methods in our paper, assuming the CLE scaling limit.
3. LQG surfaces with non-simply connected topology such as the quantum pair of pants and quantum annulus mentioned in Section 1.2 are crucial to our proof of Theorem 1.2. We plan to establish two general facts on non-simply connected LQG surfaces which are supposed to be the scaling limit of natural decorated random planar maps with the same topology. First, conditioned on their conformal structure, their random fields are Liouville fields. Second, they behave nicely under conformal welding. Beyond their intrinsic interests, we believe that proving these results will be instrumental to answering Questions 1.6 and 1.7 below.

Question 1.5. *Can one prove Theorem 1.2 without relying on LQG? The imaginary DOZZ formula can be characterized by Teschner's shift relations for DOZZ formula [Tes95] with imaginary shifts. One natural idea is to use the strategy in [KRV17] for the proof of the DOZZ formula for LCFT, which is based on CFT ideas including the BPZ equation and operator product expansion. Carrying this out for CLE would represent a big step in the first direction mentioned above.*

Question 1.6. *What is the law of the random modulus for our quantum annulus conditioning on its two boundary lengths? This question is naturally related to the extremal distance between CLE loops, which is well understood for CLE_4 [ALS20] using the level line coupling with Gaussian free field but not known for other κ .*

Question 1.7. *Can the imaginary DOZZ formula in (1.3) for $\kappa \in (0, 8/3]$ be realized as an SLE_κ observable? For Theorem 1.4, although it was originally only considered for CLE_κ [SSW09], we have shown that it is indeed a formula for the SLE_κ loop when $\kappa \in (0, 8/3]$. Thus one natural idea is to generalize the quantum zipper result in Section 1.2 to a certain measure on triples of curves defined via the SLE_κ loop.*

Organization of the paper. In the rest of the paper, we first provide background on LQG, LCFT and their coupling with SLE and CLE in Section 2. In Section 3 we introduce the quantum annulus and determine its length distribution. In Section 4 we compute the joint area and length

distribution of the quantum annulus. In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.3. In Section 6 we introduce the quantum pair of pants and compute its joint area and length distribution. In Section 7 we carry out the outline in Section 1.2 to prove Theorem 1.2. In Section 8 we prove Theorem 1.4.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Nina Holden, Rick Kenyon, Matthis Lehmkuehler, Scott Sheffield and Wendelin Werner for helpful discussions. M.A. was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1712862. X.S. was supported by the NSF grant DMS-2027986 and the NSF Career grant DMS-2046514.

2 Preliminaries

We assume basic familiarity with SLE and CLE in the simple curve regime and refer to [SW12] for more background. In this section, we review the inputs for our proofs from Liouville quantum gravity, Liouville conformal field theory, and their interplay with SLE and CLE.

2.1 Measure theoretical background

We will frequently consider infinite measures and extend the probability terminology to this setting. In particular, suppose M is a σ -finite measure on a measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) . Suppose $X : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (E, \mathcal{E})$ is an \mathcal{F} -measurable function taking values in (E, \mathcal{E}) . Then we say that X is a random variable on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) and call the pushforward measure $M_X = X_*M$ on $(E, \sigma(X))$ the *law* of X . We say that X is *sampled* from M_X . We also write the integral $\int f(x)M_X(dx)$ as $M_X[f]$ or $M_X[f(x)]$ for simplicity. For a finite measure M , we write $|M|$ as its total mass and write $M^\# = |M|^{-1}M$ as the probability measure proportional to M .

Given (Ω, \mathcal{F}, M) as above, let $X : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (E, \mathcal{E})$ and $Y : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (E', \mathcal{E}')$ be two random variables. A family of probability measures $\{\mathbb{P}(\cdot|e) : e \in E\}$ on (E', \mathcal{E}') is called the (regular) *conditional law of Y given X* if for each $A \in \sigma(Y)$, $\mathbb{P}(A|\cdot)$ is measurable on (E, \mathcal{E}) and

$$M[Y \in A, X \in B] = \int_B \mathbb{P}(A|e) dM_X \text{ for each } A \in \sigma(Y) \text{ and } B \in \sigma(X)$$

We also need the concept of *disintegration* in the case $(E, \mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{R}^n$ for a positive integer n .

Definition 2.1 (Disintegration). *Let M be a measure on a measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) . Let $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a measurable function with respect to \mathcal{F} , where \mathbb{R}^n is endowed with the Borel σ -algebra and Lebesgue measure. A family of measures $\{M_x : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) is called a disintegration of M over X if for each set $A \in \mathcal{F}$, the function $x \mapsto M_x(A)$ is Borel measurable, and*

$$\int_A f(X) dM = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x)M_x(A) d^n x \text{ for each non-negative measurable function } f \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (2.1)$$

When (2.1) holds, we simply write $M = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} M_x d^n x$.

Lemma 2.2. *In the setting of Definition 2.1, suppose M is σ -finite and X satisfies $M[X \in B] = 0$ for each Borel set $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with zero Lebesgue measure. Then the disintegration of M over X exists. Moreover if $\{M_x : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ and $\{M'_x : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ are two disintegrations of M over X , then $M_x = M'_x$ for almost every x .*

Proof. When M is a probability measure, since the law M_X of X is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, we can and must set $|M_x|$ to be the Radon-Nykodim derivative

between the two measures. Since \mathbb{R}^n is Polish, we can and must set $\{M_x^\#\}$ to be the regular conditional probability of M given X . This gives the desired existence and uniqueness of $M_x = |M_x| M_x^\#$. By scaling this gives Lemma 2.2 when M is finite. If M is infinite, consider $\Omega_n \uparrow \Omega$ with $M(\Omega_n) < \infty$ Applying Lemma 2.2 to $M|_{\Omega_n}$ and then sending $n \rightarrow \infty$ give the general result. \square

2.2 Liouville quantum gravity and Liouville conformal field theory

In this section we review the precise definition of some γ -LQG surfaces and Liouville fields mentioned in Section 1.2. For more background, we refer to [GHS19, Var17] and references therein, as well as the preliminary sections in [AHS21, ARS21].

2.2.1 Gaussian free field, Liouville field, and the DOZZ formula

Let \mathcal{X} be the complex plane \mathbb{C} or the upper half plane \mathbb{H} . Suppose \mathcal{X} is endowed with a smooth metric g such that the metric completion of (\mathcal{X}, g) is a compact Riemannian manifold. (We will not distinguish \mathcal{X} with its compactification for notational simplicity.) Let $H^1(\mathcal{X})$ be the Sobolev space whose norm is the sum of the L^2 -norm with respect to (\mathcal{X}, g) and the Dirichlet energy. Let $H^{-1}(\mathcal{X})$ be the dual space of $H^1(\mathcal{X})$. Then $H^1(\mathcal{X})$ and $H^{-1}(\mathcal{X})$ do not depend on the choice of g .

We now recall two basic variants of the *Gaussian free field* (GFF). Consider the two functions

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\mathbb{H}}(z, w) &= -\log|z - w| - \log|z - \bar{w}| + 2\log|z|_+ + 2\log|w|_+, & z, w \in \mathbb{H} \\ G_{\mathbb{C}}(z, w) &= -\log|z - w| + \log|z|_+ + \log|w|_+, & z, w \in \mathbb{C}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $|z|_+ := \max\{|z|, 1\}$ so that $\log|z|_+ = \max\{\log|z|, 0\}$. Let $h_{\mathcal{X}}$ be a random function taking values in $H^{-1}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $(h_{\mathcal{X}}, f)$ is a centered Gaussian with variance $\int f(z)G_{\mathcal{X}}(z, w)f(w)d^2z d^2w$ for each $f \in H^1(\mathcal{X})$. Then $h_{\mathbb{C}}$ is a *whole plane GFF* and $h_{\mathbb{H}}$ is a *free-boundary GFF* on \mathbb{H} , both of which are normalized to have mean zero along $\{z \in \mathcal{X} : |z| = 1\}$. We denote the law of $h_{\mathcal{X}}$ by $P_{\mathcal{X}}$.

We now review the Liouville fields on \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{H} following [AHS21, Section 2.2].

Definition 2.3. *Suppose (h, \mathbf{c}) is sampled from $P_{\mathbb{C}} \times [e^{-2Qc}dc]$ and set $\phi = h(z) - 2Q\log|z|_+ + \mathbf{c}$. Then we write $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}$ as the law of ϕ and call a sample from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}$ a Liouville field on \mathbb{C} .*

Suppose (h, \mathbf{c}) is sampled from $P_{\mathbb{H}} \times [e^{-Qc}dc]$ and set $\phi = h(z) - 2Q\log|z|_+ + \mathbf{c}$. Then we write $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}$ as the law of ϕ and call a sample from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}$ a Liouville field on \mathbb{H} .

We also need Liouville fields on \mathbb{C} with three insertions and those on \mathbb{H} with one bulk insertion.

Definition 2.4. *Let $(\alpha_i, z_i) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, where $m \geq 1$ and the z_i 's are distinct. Let (h, \mathbf{c}) be sampled from $C_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, z_i)_i} P_{\mathbb{C}} \times [e^{(\sum_i \alpha_i - 2Q)c}dc]$ where*

$$C_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, z_i)_i} = \prod_{i=1}^m |z_i|_+^{-\alpha_i(2Q-\alpha_i)} e^{\sum_{i < j} \alpha_i \alpha_j G_{\mathbb{C}}(z_i, z_j)}.$$

Let $\phi(z) = h(z) - 2Q\log|z|_+ + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i G_{\mathbb{C}}(z, z_i) + \mathbf{c}$. We write $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, z_i)_i}$ for the law of ϕ and call a sample from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, z_i)_i}$ a Liouville field on \mathbb{C} with insertions $(\alpha_i, z_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$.

Definition 2.5. *For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z_0 \in \mathbb{H}$, let (h, \mathbf{c}) be sampled from $(2\text{Im } z_0)^{-\alpha^2/2} |z_0|_+^{-2\alpha(Q-\alpha)} P_{\mathbb{H}} \times [e^{(\alpha-Q)c}dc]$. Let $\phi(z) = h(z) - 2Q\log|z|_+ + \alpha G_{\mathbb{H}}(z, z_0) + \mathbf{c}$. We write $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, z_0)}$ for the law of ϕ and call a sample from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, z_0)}$ the Liouville field on \mathbb{H} with insertion (α, z_0) .*

The measure $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, z_i)_i}$ formally equals $\prod_{i=1}^m e^{\alpha_i \phi(z_i)} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}$. In fact, after a regularization and limiting procedure, we will arrive at Definition 2.4; see [AHS21, Lemma 2.8]. In the same manner we have $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, z_0)} = e^{\alpha \phi(z_0)} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}$; see [ARS21, Lemma 2.2].

Fix $\gamma \in (0, 2)$, we now recall the quantum area and quantum length measure in γ -LQG. Suppose h is a GFF sampled from $P_{\mathcal{X}}$ for $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{C}$ or \mathbb{H} . For $\varepsilon > 0$ and $z \in \mathcal{X} \cup \partial\mathcal{X}$, we write $h_\varepsilon(z)$ for the average of h on $\partial B_\varepsilon(z) \cap \mathcal{X}$, and define the random measure $\mu_h^\varepsilon := \varepsilon^{\gamma^2/2} e^{\gamma h_\varepsilon(z)} d^2z$ on \mathcal{X} , where d^2z is Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{X} . Almost surely, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the measures μ_h^ε converge weakly to a limiting measure μ_h called the *quantum area measure* [DS11, SW16]. For $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{H}$, we define the *quantum boundary length measure* $\nu_h := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{\gamma^2/4} e^{\frac{\gamma}{2} h_\varepsilon(x)} dx$, where $h_\varepsilon(x)$ is the average of h on $\partial B_\varepsilon(x) \cap \mathbb{H}$. The definition of quantum area and boundary length can clearly be extended to other variants of GFF such as the Liouville fields, possibly with insertions.

We now review the DOZZ formula that gives the Laplacian transform of the quantum area under $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, z_i)_i}$. Following [KRV17, Section 1.2], we recall that $\Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}$ is an analytic function on \mathbb{C} such that

$$\log \Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(z) = \int_0^\infty \left(\left(\frac{Q}{2} - z \right)^2 e^{-t} - \frac{(\sinh((\frac{Q}{2} - z)\frac{t}{2}))^2}{\sinh(\frac{t\gamma}{4}) \sinh(\frac{t}{\gamma})} \right) \frac{dt}{t} \quad \text{for } 0 < \text{Re}(z) < Q.$$

Moreover $\Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}$ satisfies the following shift relations first observed by Teschner [Tes95]:

$$\Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\left(z + \frac{\gamma}{2}\right) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma}{2}z)}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma}{2}z)} \left(\frac{\gamma}{2}\right)^{1-\gamma z} \Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\left(z + \frac{2}{\gamma}\right) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}z)}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{2}{\gamma}z)} \left(\frac{\gamma}{2}\right)^{\frac{4}{\gamma}z-1} \Upsilon_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(z).$$

Theorem 2.6 ([KRV17]). *Suppose $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ satisfy the Seiberg bounds*

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 \alpha_i > 2Q, \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_i < Q \text{ for } i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (2.2)$$

Let $(u_1, u_2, u_3) = (0, 1, e^{i\pi/3})$. Then with $\mu > 0$ and $C_\gamma^{\text{DOZZ}}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ defined in (1.2), we have

$$\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, u_i)_i} [e^{-\mu \mu_\phi(\mathbb{C})}] = \frac{1}{2} C_\gamma^{\text{DOZZ}}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) \mu^{\frac{2Q - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{\gamma}}.$$

Here, the Seiberg bounds ensure that $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, u_i)_i} [e^{-\mu \mu_\phi(\mathbb{C})}]$ is finite, and the points u_1, u_2, u_3 are chosen such that $|u_1 - u_2| = |u_2 - u_3| = |u_3 - u_1| = 1$ for convenience. Moreover, as remarked in [KRV17, Footnote 6], the factor $\frac{1}{2}$ is included to match with the physics literature normalization.

2.2.2 Quantum surface and quantum sphere

A *quantum surface* is an equivalence class of pairs (D, h) where D is a planar domain and h is a generalized function on D . For $\gamma \in (0, 2)$, we say that $(D, h) \sim_\gamma (\tilde{D}, \tilde{h})$ if there is a conformal map $\psi: \tilde{D} \rightarrow D$ such that

$$\tilde{h} = h \circ \psi + Q \log |\psi'|. \quad (2.3)$$

We write $(D, h)/\sim_\gamma$ as the quantum surface corresponding to (D, h) . An *embedding* of a quantum surface is a choice of its representative. Both quantum area and quantum length measures are intrinsic to the quantum surface thanks to (2.3) as shown in [DS11, SW16].

We can also consider quantum surfaces decorated with other structures. For example, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathcal{I} be an at most countable index set, consider tuples $(D, h, (\eta_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}, z_1, \dots, z_n)$ such that D is a domain, h is a distribution on D , η_i are loops on D and $z_i \in D \cup \partial D$. We say that

$$(D, h, (\eta_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}, z_1, \dots, z_n) \sim_\gamma (\tilde{D}, \tilde{h}, (\tilde{\eta}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}, \tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_n)$$

if there is a conformal map $\psi : \tilde{D} \rightarrow D$ such that (2.3) holds, $\psi(\tilde{z}_i) = z_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $\psi \circ \tilde{\eta}_i = \eta_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. We call an equivalence class defined through \sim_γ a *decorated quantum surface*, and likewise an embedding of a decorated quantum surface is a choice of its representative.

We now recall the two-pointed quantum sphere defined in [DMS14] following the presentation of [AHS20, AHS21]. Consider the horizontal cylinder \mathcal{C} obtained from $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 2\pi]$ by identifying $(x, 0) \sim (x, 2\pi)$. Let $h_{\mathcal{C}}(z) = h_{\mathbb{C}}(e^z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{C}$ where $h_{\mathbb{C}}$ be sampled from $P_{\mathbb{C}}$. We call $h_{\mathcal{C}}$ the GFF on \mathcal{C} normalized to have mean zero on the circle $\{\operatorname{Re} z = 0\} \cap \mathcal{C}$. The field $h_{\mathcal{C}}$ can be written as $h_{\mathcal{C}} = h_{\mathcal{C}}^1 + h_{\mathcal{C}}^2$, where h^c is constant on vertical circles $\{\operatorname{Re} z = u\} \cap \mathcal{C}$ for each $u \in \mathbb{R}$, and h^ℓ has mean zero on all such circles. We call $h_{\mathcal{C}}^2$ the *lateral component* of the GFF on \mathcal{C} .

Definition 2.7. For $\gamma \in (0, 2)$, let $(B_s)_{s \geq 0}$ be a standard Brownian motion conditioned on $B_s - (Q - \gamma)s < 0$ for all $s > 0$, and let $(\tilde{B}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ be an independent copy of $(B_s)_{s \geq 0}$. Let

$$Y_t = \begin{cases} B_t - (Q - \gamma)t & \text{if } t \geq 0 \\ \tilde{B}_{-t} + (Q - \gamma)t & \text{if } t < 0 \end{cases}.$$

Let $h^1(z) = Y_{\operatorname{Re} z}$ for each $z \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $h_{\mathcal{C}}^2$ be independent of h^1 and have the law of the lateral component of the GFF on \mathcal{C} . Let $\hat{h} = h^1 + h_{\mathcal{C}}^2$. Let $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}$ be sampled from $\frac{\gamma}{2} e^{2(\gamma-Q)c} dc$ independent of \hat{h} and set $h = \hat{h} + \mathbf{c}$. Let QS_2 be the infinite measure describing the law of the decorated quantum surface $(\mathcal{C}, h, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$. We call a sample from QS_2 a *two-pointed quantum sphere*.

The un-pointed and three-pointed quantum spheres are defined from QS_2 as follows.

Definition 2.8. Suppose the decorated quantum surface $(\mathcal{C}, h, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is sampled from $\mu_h(\mathcal{C})^{-2} \text{QS}_2$. We let QS be the law of the quantum surface $(\mathcal{C}, h)/\sim_\gamma$. Suppose $(\mathcal{C}, h, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is sampled from $\mu_h(\mathcal{C}) \text{QS}_2$. Let z be sampled from the probability measure proportional to μ_h . Then we let QS_3 be the law of $(\mathcal{C}, h, z, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$.

It is proved in [DMS14] that QS_2 can be obtained from QS by adding two marked points according to the quantum area measure. Namely QS_2 is invariant under re-sampling of its two marked points according to the quantum area. We can similarly define QS_n for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by adding quantum typical points to QS but we only need QS_2 and QS_3 in this paper.

It is shown in [AHS17, AHS21] that the embedding of QS_3 in \mathbb{C} gives a Liouville field on \mathbb{C} with three γ -insertions modulo an explicit multiplicative constant.

Theorem 2.9 ([AHS21, Remark 2.30]). Let ϕ be sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, u_1), (\gamma, u_2), (\gamma, u_3)}$ where $(u_1, u_2, u_3) = (0, 1, e^{i\pi/3})$. Then the law of the decorated quantum surface $(\mathbb{C}, \phi, u_1, u_2, u_3)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\frac{2(Q-\gamma)^2}{\pi\gamma} \text{QS}_3$.

Although QS_2 has two marked points, it also has a nice Liouville field description on the cylinder.

Definition 2.10. Let $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ be the law of the GFF on the cylinder \mathcal{C} defined above Definition 2.7. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Sample (h, \mathbf{c}) from $P_{\mathcal{C}} \times [e^{(2\alpha-2Q)c} dc]$ and let $\phi(z) = h(z) - (Q - \alpha)|\operatorname{Re} z| + \mathbf{c}$. We write $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\alpha, \pm\infty)}$ as the law of ϕ .

Theorem 2.11 ([AHS21, Theorem 2.22]). Let h be as in Definition 2.7 so that the law of $(\mathcal{C}, h, +\infty, -\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is QS_2 . Let $T \in \mathbb{R}$ be sampled from the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} independently of h . Let $\phi(z) = h(z + T)$. Then the law of ϕ is given by $\frac{\gamma}{4(Q-\gamma)^2} \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}$.

2.2.3 Quantum disk and the FZZ formula

We first recall the law of the quantum boundary length under $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}$ obtained in [Rem20] following the presentation of [ARS21, Proposition 2.8].

Proposition 2.12 ([Rem20]). *For $\alpha > \frac{\gamma}{2}$, the law of the quantum length $\nu_\phi(\mathbb{R})$ under $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}$ is*

$$1_{\ell>0} \frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}} \bar{U}(\alpha) \ell^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(\alpha-Q)-1} d\ell$$

where

$$\bar{U}(\alpha) = \left(\frac{2^{-\frac{\gamma\alpha}{2}} 2\pi}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})} \right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha)} \Gamma\left(\frac{\gamma\alpha}{2} - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}\right). \quad (2.4)$$

Let $\{\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}(\ell) : \ell\}$ be the disintegration of $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}$ over $\nu_\phi(\mathbb{R})$. Namely for each non-negative measurable function f on $(0, \infty)$ and g on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{H})$,

$$\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}[f(\nu_\phi(\mathbb{R}))g(\phi)] = \int_0^\infty f(\ell) \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}(\ell)[g(\phi)] d\ell. \quad (2.5)$$

Although the general theory of disintegration only defines $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}(\ell)$ for almost every $\ell \in (0, \infty)$, the following lemma describes a canonical version of $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}(\ell)$ for every $\ell > 0$.

Lemma 2.13 ([ARS21, Lemma 4.3]). *Let h be a sample from $P_{\mathbb{H}}$ and $\hat{h}(\cdot) = h(\cdot) - 2Q \log|\cdot|_+ + \alpha G_{\mathbb{H}}(\cdot, z)$. The law of $\hat{h} + \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \frac{\ell}{\nu_{\hat{h}}(\mathbb{R})}$ under the reweighted measure $2^{-\alpha^2/2} \frac{2}{\gamma} \ell^{-1} \left(\frac{\ell}{\nu_{\hat{h}}(\mathbb{R})} \right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(\alpha-Q)} P_{\mathbb{H}}$ is a version of the disintegration $\{\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}(\ell) : \ell > 0\}$.*

We now recall the quantum disk with one generic bulk insertion mentioned in Section 1.2.

Definition 2.14 ([ARS21]). *Fix $\alpha > \frac{\gamma}{2}$ and $\ell > 0$. We let $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$ be the law of $(\mathbb{H}, \phi, i)/\sim_\gamma$ where ϕ is sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}(\ell)$.*

The quantum disk with quantum typical marked points introduced in [DMS14] are defined similarly as QS_n in Definitions 2.7 and 2.8. We will not recall these definitions but record the following theorem from [ARS21] as the working definition.

Theorem 2.15 ([ARS21, Theorem 3.4]). *Fix $\ell > 0$. Let $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)$ be the law of the quantum disk with boundary length ℓ and with one interior marked point defined in [DMS14]. Then*

$$\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell) = \frac{\gamma}{2\pi(Q-\gamma)^2} \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\gamma; \ell).$$

Similarly as in the sphere case, we can define the following variants of the quantum disk by adding or removing points from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)$.

Definition 2.16. *For $\ell > 0$. Let $(D, h, z)/\sim_\gamma$ be sampled from $\text{QD}(\ell)$. Then we let $\text{QD}(\ell)$ be the law of $(D, h)/\sim_\gamma$ under $\mu_h(D)^{-1} \text{QD}(\ell)$, Let $(D, h, z)/\sim_\gamma$ be sampled from $\ell \text{QD}(\ell)$ and sample $p \in \partial D$ from the probability measure proportional to quantum boundary length measure. Then we define $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell)$ to be the law of $(D, h, z, p)/\sim_\gamma$.*

The FZZ formula is the analog of the DOZZ formula for $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, z)}$ proposed in [FZZ00] and proved in [ARS21]. We record the most convenient form for our purpose, which uses the modified Bessel function of the second kind $K_\nu(x)$ [DLMF, Section 10.25]. One concrete representation of $K_\nu(x)$ in the range of our interest is the following [DLMF, (10.32.9)]:

$$K_\nu(x) := \int_0^\infty e^{-x \cosh t} \cosh(\nu t) dt \quad \text{for } x > 0 \text{ and } \nu \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.6)$$

Theorem 2.17 ([ARS21, Theorem 1.2, Proposition 4.19]). *For $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$ and $\ell > 0$, let A be the quantum area of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$. The law of A under $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; 1)^\#$ (i.e. the probability measure proportional to $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; 1)$) is the inverse gamma distribution with density*

$$1_{x>0} \frac{(4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{-\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha)}}{\Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha))} x^{-\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha)-1} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4x \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}}\right).$$

Moreover, recall $\bar{U}(\alpha)$ from in Proposition 2.12. Then for $\mu > 0$ we have

$$\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)[e^{-\mu A}] = \frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}} \bar{U}(\alpha) \ell^{-1} \frac{2}{\Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha))} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\sin(\pi\gamma^2/4)}}\right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha)} K_{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha)}\left(\ell \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\sin(\pi\gamma^2/4)}}\right).$$

The following integral identity of $K_\nu(x)$ is crucial in our computation of $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$.

Lemma 2.18. *For any $c > 0$ and $\nu \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, let $K_\nu(x)$ be the modified Bessel function of the second kind as in Theorem 2.17. Then*

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{y}} e^{-cy} K_\nu(cy) dy = \frac{\pi^{3/2}}{\sqrt{2c} \cos(\pi\nu)}.$$

Proof. We will prove the $c = 1$ case; the general case then follows from a change of variables.

Recall the integral definition of $K_\nu(x)$ in (2.6). Using $1 + \cosh t = (\cosh t/2)^2$ and the fact that \cosh is even, we can express $\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} e^{-x} K_\nu(x) dx$ as

$$\iint_0^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} e^{-x(1+\cosh t)} \cosh(\nu t) dx dt = \sqrt{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{\cosh(\nu t)}{\sqrt{1+\cosh t}} dt = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\pi/2} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{\cosh(\nu t)}{\cosh(t/2)} dt.$$

We interpret this as a contour integral bounding \mathbb{H} . The function $z \mapsto \frac{\cosh(\nu z)}{\cosh(z/2)}$ has residues $(-1)^{k+1}(e^{(2k+1)\nu\pi i} + e^{-(2k+1)\nu\pi i})i$ at $(2k+1)\pi i$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, so by the residue theorem

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{\cosh(\nu t)}{\cosh(t/2)} dt = \sum_{k=0}^\infty 2\pi i \cdot (-1)^{k+1}(e^{(2k+1)\nu\pi i} + e^{-(2k+1)\nu\pi i})i = 2\pi \left(\frac{e^{\nu\pi i}}{1 + e^{2\nu\pi i}} + \frac{e^{-\nu\pi i}}{1 + e^{-2\nu\pi i}} \right).$$

This is equal to $2\pi \left(\frac{2}{e^{\nu\pi i} + e^{-\nu\pi i}} \right) = \frac{2\pi}{\cos \pi\nu}$, yielding the lemma for $c = 1$ as was needed. \square

2.3 SLE loop measure and the conformal welding of quantum disks

We first recall the definition of Zhan's loop measure $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ from [Zha21] (see Theorem 4.2 there). Although we only need the fact that it is a conformally invariant infinite measure on unrooted simple loops that satisfies Theorem 2.20 below, we include its definition for completeness. Given two distinct points $p, q \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\kappa \in (0, 4]$, the *two-sided whole plane* SLE_κ , which we denote

by $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{p=q}$ is the probability measure on pairs of curves (η_1, η_2) on \mathbb{C} connecting p and q where η_1 is a so-called whole-plane $\text{SLE}_\kappa(2)$ from p to q and η_2 conditioned on η_1 is a chordal SLE_κ in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \eta_1$. Forgetting p and q , $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{p=q}$ can be viewed as a measure on loops on \mathbb{C} . Given a loop η sampled from $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{p=q}$, let $\text{Cont}(\eta)$ be the $(1 + \frac{\kappa}{8})$ -dimensional Minkowski content, which exists a.s. by [LR15].

Definition 2.19. *The SLE loop measure $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ is the infinite measure on loops on \mathbb{C} given by*

$$\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}} = \text{Cont}(\eta)^{-2} \iint_{\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}} |p - q|^{-2(1 - \frac{\kappa}{8})} \text{SLE}_\kappa^{p=q}(d\eta) d^2p d^2q. \quad (2.7)$$

We now review the conformal welding result established in [AHS21, Theorem 1.3] for $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$.

We first recall the notion of *conformal welding*. For concreteness, suppose S_1 and S_2 are two oriented Riemann surfaces, both of which are conformally equivalent to a planar domain whose boundary consists of finite many disjoint circles. For $i = 1, 2$, suppose B_i is a boundary component of S_i and ν_i is a finite length measure on B_i with the same total length. Given an oriented Riemann surface S and a simple loop η on S with a length measure ν , we call (S, η, ν) a *conformal welding* of (S_1, ν_1) and (S_2, ν_2) if the two connected components of $S \setminus \eta$ with their orientations inherited from S are conformally equivalent to S_1 and S_2 , and moreover, both ν_1 and ν_2 agree with ν .

We now introduce uniform conformal welding. Suppose (S_1, ν_1) and (S_2, ν_2) from the previous paragraph are such that for each $p_1 \in B_1$ and $p_2 \in B_2$, modulo conformal automorphism there exists a unique conformal welding identifying p_1 and p_2 . Now let $\mathbf{p}_1 \in B_1$ and $\mathbf{p}_2 \in B_2$ be independently sampled from the probability measures proportional to ν_1 and ν_2 , respectively. We call the conformal welding of (S_1, ν_1) and (S_2, ν_2) with \mathbf{p}_1 identified with \mathbf{p}_2 their *uniform conformal welding*.

Fix $\kappa \in (0, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa} \in (0, 2)$. Recall the measures QS and QD(ℓ) for $\ell > 0$ from Section 2.2 that correspond to variants of the quantum sphere and disk in γ -LQG. Let \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 be quantum surfaces sampled from QD(ℓ) \times QD(ℓ). By Sheffield's work [She16], viewed as oriented Riemann surfaces with the quantum length measure, almost surely the conformal welding of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 is unique after specifying a boundary point on each surface. We write $\text{Weld}(\text{QD}(\ell), \text{QD}(\ell))$ as the law of the loop-decorated quantum surface obtained from the uniform conformal welding of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 .

Theorem 2.20 ([AHS21, Theorem 1.3]). *Let \mathbb{F} be a measure on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{C})$ such that the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h)/\sim_\gamma$ is QS if h is sampled from \mathbb{F} . Let $\text{QS} \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ be the law of the decorated quantum surface $(\mathbb{C}, h, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$ when (h, η) is sampled from $\mathbb{F} \times \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$. Then there exists a constant $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that*

$$\text{QS} \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}} = C \int_0^\infty \ell \cdot \text{Weld}(\text{QD}(\ell), \text{QD}(\ell)) d\ell.$$

Theorem 2.20 implies that the law of the quantum length L of the loop in $\text{QS} \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ is $C\ell|\text{QD}(\ell)|^2 d\ell$, and conditioned on L the two quantum surfaces cut out by the loop are independent samples from $\text{QD}(L)^\#$.

2.4 The independent coupling of CLE and LQG on the disk

In this section we review some recent results on CLE_κ coupled with γ -LQG disks, where $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa} \in (\sqrt{8/3}, 2)$. Suppose (D, h) is an embedding of a sample from QD. Let Γ be a CLE_κ on D which is independent of h . Then we call the decorated quantum surface $(D, h, \Gamma)/\sim_\gamma$ a CLE_κ decorated quantum disk and denote its law by $\text{QD} \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. By the conformal invariance of CLE_κ , the measure $\text{QD} \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ does not depend on the choice of the embedding of $(D, h)/\sim_\gamma$.

Fix $a > 0$. Recall the probability measure $\text{QD}(a)^\# = |\text{QD}(a)|^{-1}\text{QD}(a)$ that corresponds to the quantum disk with boundary length a . We define the probability measure $\text{QD}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ in the same way as $\text{QD} \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ with $\text{QD}(a)^\#$ in place of QD . We can similarly define measures such as $\text{QD}_{1,0} \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ and $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$.

Let (D, h, Γ) be an embedding of a sample from $\text{QD}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Given a loop η in Γ , let D_η be the bounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta$, namely the region encircled by η . A loop $\eta \in \Gamma$ is called *outermost* if it is not contained in any $D_{\eta'}$ for $\eta' \in \Gamma$. Let $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the collection of the quantum lengths of the outermost loops of Γ listed in non-increasing order. Two crucial inputs to our paper are the law of $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ and the conditional law of the quantum surfaces encircled by the outermost loops conditioned on $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$. We summarize them as the two propositions below.

Proposition 2.21 ([MSW20, BBCK18, CCM20]). *Set $\beta := \frac{4}{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2} \in (\frac{3}{2}, 2)$. Let $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a β -stable Lévy process whose Lévy measure is $1_{x > 0}x^{-\beta-1}dx$, so that it has no downward jumps. We denote its law by \mathbb{P}^β . Let $\tau_{-a} = \inf\{t : \zeta_t = -a\}$. Let $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the sequence of the sizes of the upward jumps of ζ on $[0, \tau_{-a}]$ sorted in decreasing order. Then the law of $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ defined right above equals that of $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ under the reweighted probability $\frac{\tau_{-a}^{-1}\mathbb{P}^\beta}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]}$.*

Proposition 2.22 ([MSW20]). *Conditioning on $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$, the conditional law of $\{(D_\eta, h)/\sim_\gamma : \eta \text{ is an outermost loop of } \Gamma\}$ is given by independent samples from $\text{QD}(\ell_i)^\#$. Here for each domain $U \subset D$, we write $(U, h|_U)/\sim_\gamma$ as $(U, h)/\sim_\gamma$ for simplicity.*

Proposition 2.22 is precisely Theorem 1.1 in [MSW20]. It was pointed out at the end of [CCM20, Section 1] that Proposition 2.21 can be extracted from [MSW20, BBCK18, CCM20]. The reason is that $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ and $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ are two ways of describing the scaling limit of the outermost loop lengths of an $O(n)$ -loop-decorated planar map model. The former follows from [BBCK18, MSW20] and the latter follows from [CCM20]. We explain this in more detail in Appendix A.2.

We also need the following quantum zipper result for a CLE outermost loop on the a quantum disk. Recall the measure $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a)$ from Definition 2.16 which corresponds to the quantum disk with one interior marked point and boundary length a . Recall the probability measure $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ defined at the beginning of this subsection. For a CLE_κ sample Γ on D and a domain $U \subset D$, we write $\Gamma|_U$ for the subset of loops that lie in U .

Proposition 2.23. *For $a > 0$, let (D, h, Γ, z) be an embedding of a sample from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Let η be the outermost loop of Γ surrounding z . Let D_η and A_η be the two connected components of $D \setminus \eta$ where $z \in D_\eta$. Let ℓ_h be the quantum boundary length measure on η . Conditioning on (h, Γ, η, z) , let w be a point on η sampled from the probability measure proportional to ℓ_h . Now consider the joint distribution of (D, h, η, z, w) . Then conditioning on $\ell_h(\eta)$, the decorated quantum surfaces $(D_\eta, h, z, w)/\sim_\gamma$ and $(A_\eta, h, \Gamma|_{A_\eta}, w)/\sim_\gamma$ are conditionally independent, and the conditional law of $(D_\eta, h, z, w)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell_h(\eta))^\#$.*

Proposition 2.23 is essentially proved in [MSW20], see Appendix A.1 for more details.

3 Quantum annulus

In this section we introduce a quantum surface of annular topology which we call the *quantum annulus*. It is an intermediate step towards understanding the quantum pair of pants that we will use to prove Theorem 1.2 as outlined in Section 1.2. The quantum annulus will also be crucial to our proof of Theorem 1.3 for the SLE loop.

We assume $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$ throughout this section. Fix $a > 0$. Suppose (D, h, z) is an embedding of sample from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a)$. Let Γ be a CLE_κ on D independent of h . Recall that $\text{QD}_{1,0} \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ is the law of the decorated quantum surface $(D, h, \Gamma, z)/\sim_\gamma$. Let η be the outermost loop of Γ surrounding z . Let \mathfrak{l}_η be the quantum length of η . To ensure the existence of the disintegration of $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ over \mathfrak{l}_η , we check the following fact.

Lemma 3.1. *For a Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ with zero Lebesgue measure, $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa[\mathfrak{l}_\eta \in E] = 0$.*

Proof. Let $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the quantum lengths of outermost loops in a sample from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$, ordered such that $\ell_1 > \ell_2 > \dots$. By the explicit law of $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ from Proposition 2.21, for each $i > 0$ we have $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa[\ell_i \in E] = 0$. Since $\{\mathfrak{l}_\eta \in E\} \subset \cup_i \{\ell_i \in E\}$, we conclude the proof. \square

Given Lemma 3.1, we can define the disintegration of $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ over \mathfrak{l}_η , which we denote by $\{\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa(\ell) : \ell \in (0, \infty)\}$. We now define the quantum annulus.

Definition 3.2 (Quantum annulus). *Given (D, h, Γ, η, z) defined right above, let A_η be the non-simply-connected component of $D \setminus \eta$. For $a, b > 0$, let $\widetilde{\text{QA}}(a, b)$ be the law of the quantum surface $(A, h)/\sim_\gamma$ under the measure $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa(b)$. Let $\text{QA}(a, b)$ be such that*

$$b|\text{QD}_{1,0}(b)|\text{QA}(a, b) = \widetilde{\text{QA}}(a, b) \quad (3.1)$$

We call a sample from $\text{QA}(a, b)$ a quantum annulus.

Remark 3.3 (No need to say “for almost every b ”). *Using the general theory of regular conditional probability, for each $a > 0$ the measure $\text{QA}(a, b)$ is only well defined for almost every $b > 0$. The ambiguity does not affect any application of this concept in this paper because we will take integrations over b ; see e.g. Proposition 3.4 below. On the other hand, at the end of Appendix A.1, we explain that there exists a canonical version of $\text{QA}(a, b)$ that is continuous in (a, b) in an appropriate topology. For these reasons we omit the phrase “for almost every b ” in statements concerning $\text{QA}(a, b)$.*

Similarly as in $\text{Weld}(\text{QD}(a), \text{QD}(a))$ from Theorem 2.20, given a pair of independent samples from $\text{QA}(a, b)$ and $\text{QD}_{1,0}(b)$, we can uniformly conformally weld them along the boundary component with length b to get a loop-decorated quantum surface with one marked point. We write $\text{Weld}(\text{QA}(a, b), \text{QD}_{1,0}(b))$ for the law of the resulting decorated quantum surface. Then Proposition 2.23 can be reformulated as follows.

Proposition 3.4. *For $a > 0$, let (D, h, Γ, z) be an embedding of a sample from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Let η be the outermost loop of Γ surrounding z . Then the law of the decorated quantum surface $(D, h, \eta, z)/\sim_\gamma$ equals $\int_0^\infty b\text{Weld}(\text{QA}(a, b), \text{QD}_{1,0}(b)) db$.*

Proof. From Proposition 2.23 and the definitions of $\widetilde{\text{QA}}$ and uniform welding, the law of $(D, h, \eta, z)/\sim_\gamma$ under $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa(b)$ is $\text{Weld}(\widetilde{\text{QA}}(a, b), \text{QD}_{1,0}(b)^\#)$. By (3.1), this measure equals

$$\text{Weld}(b|\text{QD}_{1,0}(b)|\text{QA}(a, b), \text{QD}_{1,0}(b)^\#) = b\text{Weld}(\text{QA}(a, b), \text{QD}_{1,0}(b)). \quad \square$$

The reason we consider QA instead of $\widetilde{\text{QA}}$ in Definition 3.2 is because it is in some sense more canonical. In particular, the total measure $|\text{QA}(a, b)|$ has the following simple and symmetric form. This will be used to prove Theorem 1.3, where we will also show that $\text{QA}(a, b) = \text{QA}(b, a)$.

Proposition 3.5. *There exists a constant $\mathfrak{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that*

$$|\text{QA}(a, b)| = \frac{\mathfrak{C}}{\sqrt{ab}(a+b)}.$$

The rest of the section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 3.5. In Section 3.1, we reduce Proposition 3.5 to the setting of Proposition 2.21. In Section 3.2, we prove Proposition 3.5 using the Levy process in Proposition 2.21. The same Levy process will be used to get the area distribution of $\text{QA}(a, b)$ in Section 4.

3.1 Reduction of Proposition 3.5 to the setting of Proposition 2.21

In this section we reduce Proposition 3.5 to the setting of Proposition 2.21 in order to use the Levy process defined there. Recall that setting where (D, h, Γ) is an embedding from a sample of $\text{QD}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ for some $a > 0$. Sample a loop η from the counting measure on Γ , and let \mathbb{M}_a be the law of the decorated quantum surface (D, h, Γ, η) . In other words, consider $((D, h, \Gamma)/\sim_\gamma, \mathbf{n})$ sampled from the product measure $(\text{QD}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa) \times \text{Count}_\mathbb{N}$ where $\text{Count}_\mathbb{N}$ is the counting measure on \mathbb{N} . Let $\eta \in \Gamma$ be the outermost loop with the \mathbf{n} th largest quantum length. Then \mathbb{M}_a is the law of $(D, h, \Gamma, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$. The following proposition is the analog of Proposition 3.4 for \mathbb{M}_a .

Proposition 3.6. *Under \mathbb{M}_a , the law of $(D, h, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$ is*

$$\frac{1}{|\text{QD}(a)|} \int_0^\infty b \text{Weld}(\text{QA}(a, b), \text{QD}(b)) db.$$

Proof. Let \mathbb{F} be a measure on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{D})$ such that the law of $(\mathbb{D}, h)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}(a)$ if h is a sample from \mathbb{M} . We write $\text{CLE}_\kappa(d\Gamma)$ as the probability measure for CLE_κ on \mathbb{D} . Write $\text{Count}_{\Gamma^\circ}(d\eta)$ as the counting measure on the set of outermost loops in Γ . Then we have the following equality on measures:

$$(1_E \text{Count}_{\Gamma^\circ}(d\eta)) \mu_h(d^2z) \mathbb{F}(dh) \text{CLE}_\kappa(d\Gamma) = \mu_h|_{D_\eta}(d^2z) \text{Count}_{\Gamma^\circ}(d\eta) \mathbb{F}(dh) \text{CLE}_\kappa(d\Gamma), \quad (3.2)$$

where D_η is the simply-connected component of $\mathbb{D} \setminus \eta$, and $E = \{z \in D_\eta\}$.

If (h, Γ, η, z) is sampled according to the left hand side of (3.2), then the law of $(\mathbb{D}, h, \Gamma, z)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ and η is the outermost loop around z . Therefore we are in the setting of Proposition 3.4 hence the law of $(\mathbb{D}, h, \eta, z)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\int_0^\infty b \text{Weld}(\text{QA}(a, b), \text{QD}_{1,0}(b)) db$.

If $(h, \Gamma, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$ is sampled from $\text{Count}_{\Gamma^\circ}(d\eta) \mathbb{F}(dh) \text{CLE}_\kappa(d\Gamma)$, then the law of $(D, h, \Gamma, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$ is $|\text{QD}(a)| \cdot \mathbb{M}_a$ by the definition of \mathbb{M}_a . If we then weight by $\mu_h(D_\eta)$ and sample a point z from $(\mu_h|_{D_\eta})^\#$, then the law of (h, Γ, η, z) is given by the right hand side of (3.2), so the law of $(D, h, \eta, z)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\int_0^\infty b \text{Weld}(\text{QA}(a, b), \text{QD}_{1,0}(b)) db$. Unweighting by $\mu_h(D_\eta)$ and forgetting z , we see that the law of $(D, h, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$ under $|\text{QD}(a)| \cdot \mathbb{M}_a$ is $\int_0^\infty b \text{Weld}(\text{QA}(a, b), \text{QD}(b)) db$. Dividing by $|\text{QD}(a)|$, we conclude the proof. \square

Proposition 3.5 immediately follows from its counterpart under \mathbb{M}_a .

Proposition 3.7. *The law of the quantum length of η under \mathbb{M}_a is*

$$\frac{\mathfrak{C} 1_{b>0} b |\text{QD}(b)| db}{\sqrt{ab}(a+b) |\text{QD}(a)|} \quad \text{for some constant } \mathfrak{C} \in (0, \infty) \text{ not depending on } a. \quad (3.3)$$

We now explain how Proposition 3.7 yields Proposition 3.5 and then prove it in Section 3.2

Proof of Proposition 3.5 assuming Proposition 3.7. By Proposition 3.6, the law of $\ell_h(\eta)$ under \mathbb{M}_a is $\frac{1}{|\text{QD}(a)|} \int_0^\infty b |\text{QA}(a, b)| |\text{QD}(b)| db$. Comparing this to Proposition 3.7 yields $|\text{QA}(a, b)| = \frac{\mathfrak{C}}{\sqrt{ab}(a+b)}$. \square

3.2 Distribution of the loop length: proof of Proposition 3.7

We first reduce Proposition 3.7 to a problem on the Levy process in Proposition 2.21. Let

$$\beta = \frac{4}{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{4}{\gamma^2} + \frac{1}{2}. \quad (3.4)$$

Let \mathbb{P}^β be the probability measure on càdlàg processes on $[0, \infty)$ describing the law of a β -stable Lévy process with Lévy measure $1_{x>0}x^{-\beta-1}dx$. Let $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a sample from \mathbb{P}^β . Let $J := \{(x, t) : t \geq 0 \text{ and } \zeta_t - \zeta_{t-} = x > 0\}$ be the set of jumps of ζ . Given J , let $(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) \in J$ be sampled from the counting measure on J . Namely (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) is chosen uniformly randomly from J similarly as η from the outermost loops of Γ . Let M^β be the law of $(\zeta, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t})$, which is an infinite measure. For each $a > 0$, let $\tau_{-a} = \inf\{t : \zeta_t = -a\}$ and $J_a = \{(x, t) \in J : t \leq \tau_{-a}\}$. Let M_a^β be the restriction of the measure M^β to the event $\{\mathbf{t} \leq \tau_{-a}\}$. Let $\widetilde{M}_a^\beta = \frac{\tau_{-a}^{-1}}{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]} M_a^\beta$, where \mathbb{E}^β is the expectation with respect to \mathbb{P}^β . Then by Proposition 2.21 we have the following.

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose (D, h, Γ, η) and \mathbb{M}_a are as in Proposition 3.6. Let $\ell_1 > \ell_2 > \dots$ be the quantum lengths of the outermost loops in Γ and $\ell_h(\eta)$ be the quantum length of the distinguished loop η . Then the joint law of $\{\ell_i : i \geq 1\}$ and $\ell_h(\eta)$ under \mathbb{M}_a equals the joint law of $\{x : (x, t) \in J\}$ and \mathbf{b} under the measure \widetilde{M}_a^β defined right above.*

Proof. Under the measure \widetilde{M}_a^β , the jump (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) is chosen uniformly from J_a . Now Lemma 3.8 follows from Proposition 2.21 and the fact that η is chosen uniformly among all outermost loops of Γ . \square

Given Lemma 3.8, Proposition 3.7 immediately follows from the proposition below.

Proposition 3.9. *The law of \mathbf{b} under \widetilde{M}_a^β is*

$$\frac{\mathfrak{C} 1_{b>0}}{(a+b)} \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{\beta+1} db \quad \text{for some constant } \mathfrak{C} \in (0, \infty) \text{ not depending on } a. \quad (3.5)$$

Proof of Proposition 3.7 given Proposition 3.9. By Definition 2.16 and Proposition 2.12, we have

$$|\text{QD}(b)|/|\text{QD}(a)| = (a/b)^{\frac{4}{\gamma^2}+2} = (a/b)^{\beta+\frac{3}{2}}.$$

By Lemma 3.8 and Proposition 3.9, the \mathbb{M}_a -law of the quantum length of η is

$$\frac{\mathfrak{C}}{(a+b)} \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{\beta+1} db = \frac{\mathfrak{C} b |\text{QD}(b)| db}{\sqrt{ab(a+b)} |\text{QD}(a)|} \quad \text{with } \mathfrak{C} \text{ in (3.5)}. \quad \square$$

We now prove Proposition 3.9. We first use Palm's Theorem for Poisson point process to give an alternative description of the measure M^β . See Figure 2 for an illustration.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\widetilde{\zeta}_t = \zeta_t - 1_{t \geq \mathbf{t}} \mathbf{b}$. Then the M^β -law of (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) is $1_{b>0, t>0} b^{-\beta-1} db dt$. Conditioning on (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) , the conditional law of $\widetilde{\zeta}_t$ under M^β is \mathbb{P}^β . Equivalently, the joint law of (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) and $(\widetilde{\zeta}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the product measure $(1_{b>0, t>0} b^{-\beta-1} db dt) \times \mathbb{P}^\beta$.*

Proof. By the definition of Levy measure, the jump set J of ζ is a Poisson point process on $(0, \infty)^2$ with intensity measure $1_{x>0, t>0} x^{-\beta-1} dx dt$. Since (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) is chosen from the counting measure on J , by Palm's theorem (see e.g. [Kal17, Page 5]), the M^β -law of (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) is the same as the intensity measure of J , which is $1_{b>0, t>0} b^{-\beta-1} db dt$. Moreover, conditioning on (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) , the conditional law




Figure 2: Illustration of Lemma 3.10 and 3.11. The measure M^β is \mathbb{P}^β with a uniformly chosen jump (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) . Conditioned on (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) , removing (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) and concatenating the two pieces of (ζ_t) before and after \mathbf{t} gives a sample $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of \mathbb{P}^β . The event $\{\mathbf{t} < \tau_{-a}\}$ for ζ becomes $\{\mathbf{t} < \tilde{\tau}_{-a}\}$ for $\tilde{\zeta}$.

of $J \setminus \{(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t})\}$ is given by the original Poisson point process, which is the \mathbb{P}^β -law of J . Note that $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{0 \leq t < \mathbf{t}} = (\zeta_t)_{0 \leq t < \mathbf{t}}$ is measurable with respect to the jump set $\{(x, t) \in J : t < \mathbf{t}\}$. Therefore, the conditional law of $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{0 \leq t < \mathbf{t}}$ conditioning on (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) is the \mathbb{P}^β -law of $(\zeta_t)_{0 \leq t < \mathbf{t}}$. Similarly, conditioning on (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) and $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{0 \leq t < \mathbf{t}}$, the conditional law of $(\tilde{\zeta}_{t+\mathbf{t}} - \tilde{\zeta}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under M^β is \mathbb{P}^β . Concatenating $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{0 \leq t < \mathbf{t}}$ and $(\tilde{\zeta}_{t+\mathbf{t}} - \tilde{\zeta}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ we see that the conditional law of $\tilde{\zeta}_t$ under M^β is \mathbb{P}^β . \square

Proposition 3.9 is an immediate consequence of the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.11. *Recall the expectation \mathbb{E}^β for \mathbb{P}^β . The law of \mathbf{b} under \tilde{M}_a^β in Proposition 3.9 is*

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}/\tau_{-a-b}]}{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]} b^{-\beta-1} \mathbf{1}_{b>0} db.$$

Proof. We start from $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) under M^β . Let $\tilde{\zeta}_t = \zeta_t - \mathbf{1}_{t \geq \mathbf{t}} \mathbf{b}$ as in Lemma 3.10. Let $\tilde{\tau}_{-\ell} = \inf\{t : \tilde{\zeta}_t = -\ell\}$ for each $\ell > 0$. Then $\tau_{-a} = \tilde{\tau}_{-a+\mathbf{b}}$. Moreover, both the events $\{\mathbf{t} \leq \tau_{-a}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{t} < \tilde{\tau}_{-a}\}$ are the same as $\inf\{\zeta_t : t \in (0, \mathbf{t})\} > -a$, hence are equal. Now the measure \tilde{M}_a^β can be described as

$$\frac{\tau_{-a}^{-1}}{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]} M_a^\beta = \frac{\tau_{-a}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{t} < \tau_{-a}}}{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]} M^\beta = \frac{\tilde{\tau}_{-a-\mathbf{b}}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{t} < \tilde{\tau}_{-a}}}{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]} M^\beta. \quad (3.6)$$

Integrating out \mathbf{t} and $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on the right side of (3.6) and using the joint law of (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) and $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ from Lemma 3.10, we see that the \tilde{M}_a^β -law of \mathbf{b} is $\frac{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}/\tau_{-a-b}]}{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]} b^{-\beta-1} \mathbf{1}_{b>0} db$ as desired. \square

Lemma 3.12. *Let $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be sampled from \mathbb{P}^β and $\tau_{-a} = \inf\{t : \zeta_t = -a\}$ for each $a > 0$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}/\tau_{-a-b}] = \frac{a}{a+b} \text{ for each } a, b > 0.$$

Proof. Let $I_t = \inf\{\zeta_t : s \in [0, t]\}$. It is well-known that $(\zeta_t - I_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a Markov process and we can consider its excursions away from 0. See e.g. [DLG02, Section 1]. We write \underline{N} for the excursion measure, which is a measure on non-negative functions of the form $e : [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $e(0) = e(T) = 0$. The excursions of $(\zeta_t - I_t)_{t \in [0, \tau_{-a-b}]}$ can be viewed as a Poisson point process $\text{Exc}_{a+b} = \{(e, s) : s \leq a+b\}$ with intensity measure $\underline{N} \times \mathbf{1}_{s \in [0, a+b]} ds$. For $(e, s) \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}$, let σ be

the time when $(\zeta_t - I_t)_{t \geq 0}$ starts the excursion corresponding to e . Then $s = -I_\sigma$. Let $T(e)$ be the duration T of e . Then $\tau_{-a-b} = \sum_{(e,s) \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}} T(e)$ and

$$\tau_{-a} = \sum_{(e,s) \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}} T(e) \mathbf{1}_{s \leq a}.$$

By a general property of Poisson point processes, conditioning on $\{e : (e, s) \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}\}$, the conditional distribution of $\{s : (e, s) \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}\}$ are a collection of uniformly distributed random variables in $(0, a+b)$. Let \mathbb{E}_{a+b} represents the conditional expectation given $\{e : (e, s) \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}\}$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}_{a+b}[\tau_{-a}] = \sum_{(e,s) \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}} T(e) \mathbb{E}_{a+b}[\mathbf{1}_{s \leq a}] = \frac{a}{a+b} \tau_{-a-b}. \quad (3.7)$$

Since τ_{-a-b} is measurable with respect to $\{e : (e, s) \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}\}$, we have $\mathbb{E}_{a+b}[\tau_{-a}/\tau_{-a-b}] = \frac{a}{a+b}$. Further taking the expectation over $\{e : (e, s) \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}\}$ we conclude the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.9. With respect to \mathbb{P}^β , we have $\tau_{-a} \stackrel{d}{=} a^\beta \tau_{-1}$ by the scaling property of β -stable Lévy processes. Therefore $\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}^{-1}] = \mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-1}^{-1}] a^{-\beta}$. Combined with Lemmas 3.11 and 3.12 we get (3.5) with $\mathfrak{C} = 1/\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-1}^{-1}]$. \square

We conclude this section with three facts which are by-products of our proof of Proposition 3.7. They will be needed in Sections 4 and 6.2. The first one is a description of the quantum lengths of all the outermost loops in Γ except η .

Proposition 3.13. *For $a > 0$, let (D, h, Γ, z) be an embedding of a sample from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Let $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the quantum lengths of the outermost loops in Γ and $\ell_h(\eta)$ the quantum length of the loop η surrounding z . Then conditioned on $\ell_h(\eta)$, the conditional law of $\{\ell_i : \ell_i \neq \ell_h(\eta), i \geq 1\}$ equals the \mathbb{P}^β -law of $\{x : (x, t) \in J_{a+\ell_h(\eta)} \text{ for some } t\}$. Moreover, conditioned on $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$, the quantum surfaces cut out by these outermost loops apart from η are independent quantum disks with boundary lengths $\{\ell_i : \ell_i \neq \ell_h(\eta), i \geq 1\}$.*

Proof. Suppose we are in the setting of Proposition 3.9. By Lemma 3.10 and the discussion above (3.6), under the measure $\widetilde{\mathbb{M}}_a^\beta$, the conditional law of $J_a \setminus \{(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t})\}$ conditioning on \mathbf{b} is given by the \mathbb{P}^β -law of $J_{a+\mathbf{b}}$. By Lemma 3.8, we get the following. In the setting of Proposition 3.6, let $\ell_1 > \ell_2 > \dots$ be the quantum lengths of the outermost loops in Γ and $\ell_h(\eta)$ be the quantum length of the distinguished loop η . Under \mathbb{M}_a conditioned on $\ell_h(\eta)$, the conditional law of $\{\ell_i : \ell_i \neq \ell_h(\eta), i \geq 1\}$ is given by the \mathbb{P}^β -law of $\{x : (x, t) \in J_{a+\ell_h(\eta)} \text{ for some } t\}$. Moreover, further conditioning on $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$, the quantum surfaces cut out by the outermost loops apart from η are independent quantum disks with boundary lengths $\{\ell_i : \ell_i \neq \ell_h(\eta), i \geq 1\}$ by Proposition 2.22. By Propositions 3.4 and 3.6, the same holds with \mathbb{M}_a replaced by $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ hence Proposition 3.13 holds. \square

The second fact is a simple corollary of Proposition 3.13 and Lemma 3.10.

Lemma 3.14. *In the setting of Proposition 3.13, conditioning on (D, Γ, h, z) , sample $\hat{\eta}$ from the counting measure on the outermost loops of Γ except η . Let $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the lengths of the outermost loops of Γ except η and $\hat{\eta}$, ranked in decreasing order. Then for $b, c > 0$, the disintegration of the law of $\{x_i : i \geq 1\}$ over $\{\ell_h(\eta) = b, \ell_h(\hat{\eta}) = c\}$ is the law of $\{\ell : (\ell, t) \in J_{a+b+c} \text{ for some } t\}$ under*

$$\frac{\mathfrak{C}}{\sqrt{ab}(a+b)} b | \text{QD}_{1,0}(b) | c^{-\beta-1} \tau_{-a-b} d\mathbb{P}^\beta(d\zeta).$$

Proof. By Propositions 3.4 and 3.5, the disintegration of the law of $\{\ell_i : \ell_i \neq \ell_h(\eta), i \geq 1\}$ in Proposition 3.13 is the law of $\{\ell : (\ell, t) \in J_{a+b} \text{ for some } t\}$ under

$$\frac{\mathfrak{C}}{\sqrt{ab}(a+b)} b | \text{QD}_{1,0}(b) | d\mathbb{P}^\beta(d\zeta).$$

Since we further remove the loop $\hat{\eta}$ chosen from counting measure, by Lemma 3.10, we get the additional factor $c^{-\beta-1}\tau_{-a-b}$ and the change from J_{a+b} to J_{a+b+c} for the jump set. \square

The last fact we record is an extension of Lemma 3.12.

Lemma 3.15. *Let $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be sampled from \mathbb{P}^β as in Lemma 3.12. Let $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the set of jumps in ζ before τ_{-a-b} . Let f be a non-negative measurable function on $(0, \infty)$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-a} \prod_{i \geq 1} f(x_i)] = a \mathbb{E}[\prod_{i \geq 1} f(x_i)] \int T(e) \prod_{x \in J_e} f(x) \underline{N}(de),$$

where $\underline{N}(de)$ is the excursion measure in the proof of Lemma 3.12, and for a sample e from $\underline{N}(de)$, $T(e)$ means the duration of e and J_e means the set of jumps in e .

Proof. Let $F(e) = \prod_{x \in J_e} f(x)$. As in the proof of (3.7),

$$\mathbb{E}_{a+b}[\tau_{-a} \prod_{i \geq 1} f(x_i)] = \mathbb{E}_{a+b}[\tau_{-a} \prod_{e \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}} F(e)] = \frac{a}{a+b} \tau_{-a-b} \prod_{e \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}} F(e).$$

Therefore $\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-a} \prod_{i \geq 1} f(x_i)] = \frac{a}{a+b} \mathbb{E}[\tau_{-a-b} \prod_{e \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}} F(e)]$. Now Lemma 3.15 follows from

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-a-b} \prod_{e \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}} F(e)] = \mathbb{E}[(\sum_{e \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}} T(e)) \prod_{e \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}} F(e)] = (a+b) \mathbb{E}[\prod_{e \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}} F(e)] \int T(e) F(e) \underline{N}(de),$$

where the first equality uses $\tau_{-a-b} = \sum_{e \in \text{Exc}_{a+b}} T(e)$ and the second uses Palm's Theorem. \square

4 Area distribution of the quantum annulus

In this section we prove the analog of the FZZ formula (Theorem 2.17) for the quantum annulus $\text{QA}(a, b)$ from Definition 3.2. It is an intermediate step towards understanding the area distribution of the quantum pair of pants, which is crucial to the proof of Theorem 1.2. We assume $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$ throughout this section.

Theorem 4.1. *For $a > 0, b > 0$, let A be the quantum area of a sample from $\text{QA}(a, b)$. Then with \mathfrak{C} the constant from Proposition 3.5 we have*

$$\text{QA}(a, b)[e^{-\mu A}] = \mathfrak{C} \cdot \frac{e^{-(a+b)\sqrt{\mu/\sin(\pi\gamma^2/4)}}}{\sqrt{ab}(a+b)} \quad \text{for } \mu \geq 0.$$

Using results from Section 2.4 and Section 3, Theorem 4.1 follows from the proposition below.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\beta = \frac{4}{\gamma^2} + \frac{1}{2}$ and recall \mathbb{P}^β from Proposition 2.21. Let $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a stable Lévy process with index β sampled from \mathbb{P}^β . For $L > 0$, let $\tau_{-L} = \inf\{t : \zeta_t \leq -L\}$. Let $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the collection of sizes of the jumps of ζ on $[0, \tau_{-L}]$ sorted in decreasing order. Let $(A_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be independent copies of the quantum area of a sample from $\text{QD}(1)^\#$, which are also independent of $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\mu \sum x_i^2 A_i}] = e^{-L\sqrt{\mu/\sin(\pi\gamma^2/4)}} \quad \text{for } \mu \geq 0. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof of Theorem 4.1 given Proposition 4.2. Suppose we are in the setting of Definition 3.2 where we have (D, h, Γ, η) and the annulus A_η under the measure $\text{QD}_{1,0} \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. By Proposition 3.13, conditioned on $\ell_h(\eta) = b$, the quantum lengths of the remaining outermost loops in Γ has the law of $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ in Proposition 4.2 with $L = a + b$, and further conditioning on these lengths, the law of the enclosed regions are quantum disks with given boundary lengths. Note that the quantum area of a sample from $\text{QD}(x_i)^\#$ agrees in law with $x_i^2 A_i$. Therefore, under $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$, conditioning on $\ell_h(\eta) = b$, the conditional law of the quantum area of A_η is given by $\sum_{i \geq 1} x_i^2 A_i$ in (4.1) with $L = a + b$. This means that

$$\widetilde{\text{QA}}(a, b)^\# [e^{-\mu A}] = e^{-(a+b)\sqrt{\mu/\sin(\pi\gamma^2/4)}},$$

where $\widetilde{\text{QA}}(a, b)$ is from Definition 3.2. Since $\widetilde{\text{QA}}(a, b)^\# = \text{QA}(a, b)^\#$ by definition, and $\text{QA}(a, b) = |\text{QA}(a, b)|\text{QA}(a, b)^\#$, Proposition 3.5 gives the desired formula of $\text{QA}(a, b)[e^{-\mu A}]$ in Theorem 4.1. \square

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 4.2. Recall that the law of A_i 's are inverse gamma distributions [AG21, ARS21]. Therefore Proposition 4.2 is a statement about stable Lévy processes and inverse gamma distributions. But our proof crucially relies on LQG. We will first express $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\mu \sum x_i^2 A_i}]$ in terms of the quantum area of a weighted quantum disk in Section 4.1, and then finish the proof by linking the weighted quantum disk to the FZZ formula in Section 4.2.

4.1 Quantum natural measure on the CLE carpet

Given a CLE_κ on a domain with disk topology, its *carpet* is the set of points not surrounded by any loop. Fix $L > 0$. Suppose (D, h, Γ) is an embedding of a sample from $\text{QD}(L)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ and an open set $U \subset D$, let $N_{\varepsilon, h, \Gamma}(U)$ be the number of outermost loops of Γ contained entirely in U with quantum length greater than ε . By [MSW20, Theorem 1.3], the random measure $\varepsilon^\beta N_{\varepsilon, h, \Gamma}$ on D converges to a random measure supported on the carpet of Γ which we call the *quantum natural measure* on the carpet of Γ . Let Y be the total mass of this measure. By definition, Y is intrinsic to the decorated quantum surface $(D, h, \Gamma)/\sim_\gamma$. The following proposition reduces the proof of Proposition 4.2 to understanding $\text{QD}(L)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ weighted by Y .

Lemma 4.3. *Given a sample from $\text{QD}(L)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$, let Y be the total mass of the quantum natural measure on the CLE carpet and A be the total quantum area of the disk. Then $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\mu \sum x_i^2 A_i}]$ defined in Proposition 4.2 equals*

$$\frac{\text{QD}(L)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa [Y e^{-\mu A}]}{\text{QD}(L)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa [Y]}. \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. Consider $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ and $(A_i)_{i \geq 1}$ in Proposition 4.2 under the measure $\frac{\tau_{-L}^{-1} \mathbb{P}^\beta}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-L}^{-1}]}$ instead of \mathbb{P}^β . By Propositions 2.21 and 2.22, we couple $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ and $(A_i)_{i \geq 1}$ under $\frac{\tau_{-L}^{-1} \mathbb{P}^\beta}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-L}^{-1}]}$ with a sample from $\text{QD}(L)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ such that $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ are the quantum lengths of the outermost loops of CLE_κ sorted in decreasing order, and $x_i^2 A_i$ is the quantum area of the region surrounded by the loop with quantum length x_i . In this coupling the total quantum area A of the disk equals $\sum_{i \geq 1} x_i^2 A_i$. We now claim that $Y = \frac{1}{\beta} \tau_{-L}$ a.s. Given this claim, let \mathbb{E} and \mathbb{E}_L be the expectation over \mathbb{P}^β and $\frac{\tau_{-L}^{-1} \mathbb{P}^\beta}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-L}^{-1}]}$ respectively. Then we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\mu \sum x_i^2 A_i}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}_L[\tau_{-L} e^{-\mu A}]}{\mathbb{E}_L[\tau_{-L}]} = \frac{\text{QD}(L)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa [Y e^{-\mu A}]}{\text{QD}(L)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa [Y]}.$$

To prove that $Y = \frac{1}{\beta}\tau_{-L}$ a.s., recall the Levy process ζ sampled from \mathbb{P}^β in Proposition 4.2. For each $T > 0$, let $N_\varepsilon(T)$ be the number of jumps of ζ of size greater than ε in the interval $[0, T]$. Since the Levy measure of ζ is $1_{x>0}x^{-\beta-1}dx$, for each fixed T we have that \mathbb{P}^β -a.s.

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^\beta N_\varepsilon(T) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^\beta \mathbb{E}[N_\varepsilon(T)] = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^\beta \int_0^T \int_\varepsilon^\infty x^{-\beta-1} dx dt = \frac{1}{\beta}T.$$

Therefore \mathbb{P}^β -a.s. $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^\beta N_\varepsilon(\tau_{-L}) = \frac{1}{\beta}\tau_{-L}$, hence the same holds under $\frac{\tau_{-L}^{-1}\mathbb{P}^\beta}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-L}^{-1}]}$. In the above coupling of $\frac{\tau_{-L}^{-1}\mathbb{P}^\beta}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-L}^{-1}]}$ and $\text{QD}(L)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$, we have that $N_\varepsilon(\tau_{-L})$ is the number of outermost loops in the CLE_κ with quantum length greater than ε . By the definition of the quantum natural measure on the CLE carpet we have $Y = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^\beta N_\varepsilon(\tau_{-L}) = \frac{1}{\beta}\tau_{-L}$ a.s. \square

We record the following fact that will be used in Section 4.2, where we compute (4.2).

Lemma 4.4. *In the setting of Lemma 4.3, set $\beta = \frac{4}{\gamma^2} + \frac{1}{2}$. Then*

$$\text{QD}(L)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa[Y^p] < \infty \quad \text{for } 0 < p < 1 + \frac{1}{\beta}.$$

Proof. As explained in the proof of Lemma 4.3, the law of Y under $\text{QD}(L)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ is the same as the law of τ_{-L} under $\frac{\tau_{-L}^{-1}\mathbb{P}^\beta}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-L}^{-1}]}$ where the expectation \mathbb{E} in is over \mathbb{P}^β . Since the \mathbb{P}^β -law of $(\tau_{-t})_{t>0}$ is that of a $\frac{1}{\beta}$ -stable subordinator (see e.g. [Ber96, VI.1 Lemma 1]), the tail $\mathbb{P}^\beta[\tau_{-L} > x]$ is bounded by a constant multiple of $x^{-\frac{1}{\beta}}$. Therefore $\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-L}^q] < \infty$ for $0 < q < \frac{1}{\beta}$, hence τ_{-L} has moment for all positive $p < 1 + \frac{1}{\beta}$ under $\frac{\tau_{-L}^{-1}\mathbb{P}^\beta}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-L}^{-1}]}$. This concludes the proof. \square

4.2 FZZ formula and the quantum disk weighted by the carpet measure

Recall the quantum disk measure $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; L)$ from Definition 2.14 whose area distribution is given by the FZZ formula in Theorem 2.17. In this section we prove the following proposition, which will allow us to compute (4.2), hence prove Proposition 4.2, using the FZZ formula.

Proposition 4.5. *Fix $L > 0$, let (D, h, Γ) be a sample from the probability measure proportional to $Y\text{QD}(L) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ where Y is the total mass of the quantum natural measure on the carpet of Γ . Conditioning on (D, h, Γ) , let z be a point sampled from the probability measure proportional to the the quantum natural measure on the carpet of Γ . Then the law of $(D, h, z)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; L)^\#$ with $\alpha = \frac{\gamma}{4} + \frac{2}{\gamma}$.*

Proof of Proposition 4.2 given Proposition 4.5. By Lemma 4.3 and Proposition 4.5, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\mu \sum x_i^2 A_i}] = \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; L)^\#[e^{-\mu A}],$$

where A is the quantum area of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; L)^\#$. By Theorem 2.17 and the fact that $K_{\frac{1}{2}}(x) = \sqrt{\pi/2}x^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-x}$ [DLMF, (10.39.2)], we get $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; L)[e^{-\mu A}] = CL^{-1/2} \exp(-L\sqrt{\mu/\sin(\pi\gamma^2/4)})$ for some γ -dependent constant $C > 0$. Setting $\mu = 0$, we get $|\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; L)| = CL^{-1/2}$. Therefore $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; L)^\#[e^{-\mu A}] = \exp(-L\sqrt{\mu/\sin(\pi\gamma^2/4)})$ hence Proposition 4.2 holds. \square

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 4.5. We will work with the embeddings of $\text{QD}(L)$ on the upper half plane \mathbb{H} . Recall the Gaussian free field measure $P_{\mathbb{H}}$ and the Liouville field measure $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}$ from Section 2.2.1. Sample h from $P_{\mathbb{H}}$ and let Γ be a CLE_{κ} independent of h . For $\varepsilon > 0$ and an open set $U \subset \mathbb{H}$, let $N_{\varepsilon,h,\Gamma}(U)$ be the number of outermost loops of Γ contained entirely in U with quantum length greater than ε as in the beginning of Section 4.1. Then by absolutely continuity considerations, $\varepsilon^{\beta} N_{\varepsilon,h,\Gamma}$ converges almost surely to a random measure $M_{h,\Gamma}$ which we call the quantum natural measure on the carpet of Γ induced by h . Suppose h is coupled with a continuous function ξ on \mathbb{H} , we can similarly define $M_{h+\xi,\Gamma}$.

We write $\text{CLE}_{\kappa}(d\Gamma)$ as the probability measure for CLE_{κ} on \mathbb{H} . Let \mathbb{L} be the space of loop ensembles in \mathbb{H} , on which CLE_{κ} is a probability measure. We consider the measure $\sigma(d^2z, d\Gamma)$ on $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{L}$ such that for each Borel set $B \subset \mathbb{H}$ and non-negative measurable function g on \mathbb{L} , we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{L}} 1_U(z) g(\Gamma) \sigma(d^2z, d\Gamma) = \mathbb{E}[M_{h,\Gamma}(U) g(\Gamma)],$$

where the expectation \mathbb{E} is taken over $P_{\mathbb{H}} \times \text{CLE}_{\kappa}$. The following lemma ensures that the measure σ is locally finite.

Lemma 4.6. *Sample h from $P_{\mathbb{H}}$ and let Γ be a CLE_{κ} independent of h . For any compact set $U \subset \mathbb{H}$, we have $\mathbb{E}[M_{h,\Gamma}(U)] < \infty$.*

We postpone the proof of Lemma 4.6 and outline the idea for our proof of Proposition 4.5. First, the measure $\text{CLE}_{\kappa}(d\Gamma) P_{\mathbb{H}}(dh) M_{h,\Gamma}(d^2z)$ should be thought of as $: e^{\alpha h(z)} :$ $\sigma(d^2z, d\Gamma) P_{\mathbb{H}}(dh)$ with $\alpha = \frac{\gamma}{4} + \frac{2}{\gamma}$. where $: e^{\alpha h(z)} :$ corresponds to a regularization procedure. Then by the Girsanov theorem and the relation between $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}$ and $P_{\mathbb{H}}$, we can relate $\text{CLE}_{\kappa}(d\Gamma) \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}(d\phi) M_{\phi,\Gamma}(d^2z)$ with $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,z)}$; see Proposition 4.10. Using the relation between $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}$ and QD we will get Proposition 4.5. We start by proving an effective version of our first assertion involving $: e^{\alpha h(z)} :$.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\alpha = \frac{\gamma}{4} + \frac{2}{\gamma}$. Let h be sampled from $P_{\mathbb{H}}$ and ξ be a continuous function on \mathbb{H} . Then*

$$M_{h+\xi,\Gamma}(d^2z) = e^{\alpha \xi(z)} M_{h,\Gamma}(d^2z) \quad \text{almost surely as measures on } \mathbb{H}. \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. If ξ is a constant, by the scaling property of quantum length, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $N_{\varepsilon,h+\xi,\Gamma}(U) = N_{e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}\xi\varepsilon,h,\Gamma}}(U)$. Recall that $\beta = \frac{4}{\gamma^2} + \frac{1}{2}$ hence $\alpha = \frac{\gamma}{2}\beta$. Therefore

$$M_{h+\xi,\Gamma}(U) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{\beta} N_{\varepsilon,h+\xi,\Gamma}(U) = e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}\beta\xi} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}\xi\varepsilon})^{\beta} N_{e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}\xi\varepsilon,h,\Gamma}}(U) = e^{\alpha\xi} M_{h,\Gamma}(U).$$

If ξ is not a constant, we can bound it from above and below by piecewise constant functions and take a limit. We leave the detail to the reader. See [DMS14, Lemma 6.19] for a similar argument. \square

Both our proofs of Lemma 4.6 and Proposition 4.5 rely on the uniform embedding of quantum surfaces introduced in [AHS21]. Let $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbb{H}}$ be a Haar measure on the conformal automorphism group $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ of \mathbb{H} . Namely, if \mathbf{g} is sampled from $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbb{H}}$, then for each $f \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ both the law of $f \circ \mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{g} \circ f$ are $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbb{H}}$. The Haar measure on $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ is unique up to a multiplicative factor. Given a field $\phi_0 \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{H})$, the law of the field $\phi_0 \circ \mathbf{g}^{-1} + Q \log |(\mathbf{g}^{-1})'|$ only depends on the quantum surface $(\mathbb{H}, \phi_0) / \sim_{\gamma}$, which is called the *uniform embedding* of $(\mathbb{H}, \phi_0) / \sim_{\gamma}$ via $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbb{H}}$. We refer to [AHS21, Section 2.5] and [ARS21, Section 3.1] for further background on $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbb{H}}$ and the uniform embedding. Recall from Lemma 2.13 the Liouville field measure $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}(L)$ on \mathbb{H} with boundary length $L > 0$. Then $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}(L)$ is the uniform embedding of a sample from $\text{QD}(L)$, up to a multiplicative constant:

Proposition 4.8 ([AHS21]). *Let \mathbb{F} be a measure on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{H})$ such that the law of $(\mathbb{H}, \phi_0)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}(L)$ if ϕ_0 is sampled from \mathbb{F} . Now sample (ϕ_0, \mathbf{g}) from $\mathbb{F} \times \mathbf{m}_{\mathbb{H}}$. Then the law of the field $\phi_0 \circ \mathbf{g}^{-1} + Q \log |(\mathbf{g}^{-1})'|$ is $\text{CLF}_{\mathbb{H}}(L)$ for some constant $C > 0$.*

Proof. This is [AHS21, Theorem 1.2] after disintegrating by quantum boundary length. \square

We now give a variant of Proposition 4.8 for decorated surfaces.

Lemma 4.9. *Fix $p \in \mathbb{R}$. Sample (ϕ, Γ) from the measure $(M_{\phi, \Gamma}(\mathbb{H}))^p \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}(L) \text{CLE}_\kappa(d\Gamma)$. Conditioning on (ϕ, Γ) , sample \mathbf{z} from the probability measure proportional to $M_{\phi, \Gamma}$. Then the joint law of $(\mathbb{H}, \phi, \Gamma, \mathbf{z})/\sim_\gamma$ and \mathbf{z} is the product measure $[Y^p \text{QD}(L) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa] \times [1_{z \in \mathbb{H}} \frac{C}{\text{Im}(z)^2} d^2 z]$ for some constant C .*

Proof. If \mathbf{g} is sampled from $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbb{H}}$, then the law of $\mathbf{g}(i)$ is $\text{Im}_{z \in \mathbb{H}} \frac{C}{\text{Im}(z)^2} d^2 z$ for some $C > 0$; see e.g. [ARS21, Lemma 3.6]. By the invariance property of the Haar measure and fact that any two points on \mathbb{H} can be related by a conformal map, for any $u \in \mathbb{H}$ the law of $\mathbf{g}(u)$ is $\text{Im}_{z \in \mathbb{H}} \frac{C}{\text{Im}(z)^2} d^2 z$.

Now let (ϕ_0, \mathbf{g}) be sampled from $\mathbb{F} \times \mathbf{m}_{\mathbb{H}}$ as in Proposition 4.8 and let $\phi = \phi_0 \circ \mathbf{g}^{-1} + Q \log |(\mathbf{g}^{-1})'|$. By Proposition 4.8, we can choose $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbb{H}}$ such that the law of ϕ is $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}(L)$. Condition on (ϕ_0, \mathbf{g}) , sample a CLE_κ Γ_0 on \mathbb{H} , and then sample a point z_0 from the probability measure proportional to quantum natural measure on the carpet of Γ_0 induced by ϕ_0 . Let Γ be the image of Γ_0 under \mathbf{g} and $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{g}(z_0)$. Then the law of $(\phi, \Gamma, \mathbf{z})$ is as in Lemma 4.9 with $p = 0$. On the other hand, by the previous paragraph, the joint law of $(\mathbb{H}, \phi_0, \Gamma_0, z_0)/\sim_\gamma$ and \mathbf{z} is $[\text{QD}(L) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa] \times [1_{z \in \mathbb{H}} \frac{C}{\text{Im}(z)^2} d^2 z]$. Since $(\mathbb{H}, \phi_0, \Gamma_0, z_0)/\sim_\gamma = (\mathbb{H}, \phi, \Gamma, \mathbf{z})/\sim_\gamma$, we get Lemma 4.9 with $p = 0$.

For $p \neq 0$, since $Y = M_{\phi, \Gamma}(\mathbb{H})$, weighting everything by $M_{\phi, \Gamma}(\mathbb{H})^p$ is the same as weighting by Y^p . This gives the general case. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.6. Let $(\phi, \Gamma, \mathbf{z})$ be as in Lemma 4.9. Then by Lemma 4.9, the mass of the event $\{\mathbf{z} \in U\}$ is given by

$$\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}(L) \times \text{CLE}_\kappa \left[\frac{M_{\phi, \Gamma}(U)}{M_{\phi, \Gamma}(\mathbb{H})} \times M_{\phi, \Gamma}(\mathbb{H})^p \right] = \text{QD}(L) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa[Y^p] \times \int_U \frac{C}{\text{Im}(z)^2} d^2 z. \quad (4.4)$$

Suppose $p \in (1, 1 + \frac{1}{\beta})$. Then by Lemma 4.4, the right hand side of (4.4) is finite. Therefore

$$\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}(L) \times \text{CLE}_\kappa[M_{\phi, \Gamma}(U)^p] \leq \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}(L) \times \text{CLE}_\kappa[M_{\phi, \Gamma}(U)M_{\phi, \Gamma}(\mathbb{H})^{p-1}] < \infty.$$

By the definition of $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}(L)$ in Lemma 2.13, we have

$$\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}(L) \times \text{CLE}_\kappa[M_{\phi, \Gamma}(U)^p] = \frac{2}{\gamma} L^{-\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 2} \mathbb{E}[M_{\hat{h} + \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \frac{L}{\nu_{\hat{h}}(\mathbb{R})}, \Gamma}(U)^p \nu_{\hat{h}}(\mathbb{R})^{\frac{4}{\gamma^2} + 1}],$$

where the expectation is taken over (h, Γ) sampled from $P_{\mathbb{H}} \times \text{CLE}_\kappa$, and $\hat{h} := h - 2Q \log |\cdot|_+$. Now we choose p such that $\frac{4}{\gamma^2} + 1 - \frac{2}{\gamma} \alpha p = 0$ with $\alpha = \frac{\gamma}{4} + \frac{2}{\gamma}$. By Lemma 4.7, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[M_{\hat{h} + \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \frac{L}{\nu_{\hat{h}}(\mathbb{R})}, \Gamma}(U)^p \nu_{\hat{h}}(\mathbb{R})^{\frac{4}{\gamma^2} + 1}] = L^{\frac{2}{\gamma} \alpha p} \mathbb{E}[M_{\hat{h}, \Gamma}(U)^p \nu_{\hat{h}}(\mathbb{R})^{\frac{4}{\gamma^2} + 1 - \frac{2}{\gamma} \alpha p}] = L^{\frac{2}{\gamma} \alpha p} \mathbb{E}[M_{\hat{h}, \Gamma}(U)^p],$$

Since this choice of p satisfies $p \in (1, 1 + \frac{1}{\beta})$, we have $\mathbb{E}[M_{\hat{h}}(U)] \leq \mathbb{E}[M_{\hat{h}}(U)^p] < \infty$. Since $-2Q \log |\cdot|_+$ is bounded on the compact set $U \subset \mathbb{H}$, using (4.3) we get $\mathbb{E}[M_{h, \Gamma}(U)] < \infty$. \square

We now relate $\text{CLE}_\kappa(d\Gamma) \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}(d\phi) M_{\phi, \Gamma}(d^2 z)$ and $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, z)}$ by adapting an argument in [Sha16]. The additional complication here is that the base measure σ involves randomness from CLE.

Proposition 4.10. *As measures on triples $(\phi, \Gamma, z) \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{H}) \times \mathbb{L} \times \mathbb{H}$, we have*

$$M_{\phi, \Gamma}(d^2 z) \text{CLE}_{\kappa}(d\Gamma) \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}(d\phi) = \left(\frac{2 \text{Im}(z)}{|z|_+^4} \right)^{\alpha^2/2} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, z)}(d\phi) \sigma(d^2 z, d\Gamma). \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. Let U be a bounded Borel set such that $\bar{U} \subset \mathbb{H}$. Let g be a non-negative measurable function on \mathbb{L} . Let ρ is a smooth compactly supported function on \mathbb{H} and let $\xi(z) = \int_{\mathbb{H}} \rho(y) G_{\mathbb{H}}(y, z) dy$ where $G_{\mathbb{H}}$ is the covariance kernel for $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{H}}$. Let \mathbb{E} be the expectation over $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{H}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{L}} 1_U(z) g(\Gamma) e^{(h, \rho)} M_{h, \Gamma}(d^2 z) \text{CLE}_{\kappa}(d\Gamma) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{(h, \rho)} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{L}} 1_U(z) g(\Gamma) M_{h + \xi, \Gamma}(d^2 z) \text{CLE}_{\kappa}(d\Gamma) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{(h, \rho)} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{L}} 1_U(z) g(\Gamma) e^{\alpha \xi(z)} M_{h, \Gamma}(d^2 z) \text{CLE}_{\kappa}(d\Gamma) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{(h, \rho)} \right] \int_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{L}} 1_U(z) g(\Gamma) e^{\alpha \xi(z)} \sigma(d^2 z, d\Gamma) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{L}} 1_U(z) g(\Gamma) e^{(h + \alpha G_{\mathbb{H}}(\cdot, z), \rho)} \sigma(d^2 z, d\Gamma) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the first step follows from Girsanov's theorem, the second step follows from (4.3), the third step uses the definition of σ , and the last uses Fubini's theorem.

Therefore for any non-negative measurable function F on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{H}) \times \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{L}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{L}} F(h, z, \Gamma) M_{h, \Gamma}(d^2 z) \text{CLE}_{\kappa}(d\Gamma) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{L}} F(h + \alpha G_{\mathbb{H}}(\cdot, z), z, \Gamma) \sigma(d^2 z, d\Gamma) \right]. \quad (4.6)$$

Here we used the finiteness in Lemma 4.6 and the fact that finite measures on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{H})$ are characterized by the averages over $e^{(h, \rho)}$. By (4.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{L}} F(h - 2Q \log |z|_+ + c, z, \Gamma) e^{\alpha(-2Q \log |z|_+ + c)} M_{h, \Gamma}(d^2 z) \text{CLE}_{\kappa}(d\Gamma) \right] e^{-Qc} dc \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{L}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}[F(h + \alpha G_{\mathbb{H}}(\cdot, z) - 2Q \log |z|_+ + c, z, \Gamma)] e^{(\alpha - Q)c} dc |z|_+^{-2Q\alpha} \sigma(d^2 z, d\Gamma), \end{aligned}$$

By Definitions 2.3 and 2.5 for $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}$ and $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, z)}$, the two sides of the above equation equal the integral of F over the two sides of (4.5), respectively. This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.5. By Proposition 4.10 and the $p = 1$ case of Lemma 4.9, if we sample $(\phi, \Gamma, \mathbf{z})$ from the right side of (4.5), then the joint law of $(\mathbb{H}, \phi, \Gamma, z)/\sim_{\gamma}$ and \mathbf{z} is $[Y\text{QD}(L) \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa}] \times [1_{z \in \mathbb{H}} \frac{C}{\text{Im}(z)^2} d^2 z]$. Disintegrating over \mathbf{z} and forgetting about Γ , we see that if ϕ is sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, z)}(L)^{\#}$, the law of the quantum surface $(\mathbb{H}, \phi, z)/\sim_{\gamma}$ is the probability measure proportional to $Y\text{QD}(L) \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa}$ regardless of z . By the definition of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; L)$, we conclude the proof. \square

5 Equivalence of two definitions of the SLE loop

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3, namely $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}} = C \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ for some $C \in (0, \infty)$, where $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ is Zhan's loop measure from Section 2.3, and $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ is the loop measure obtained from choosing a loop in a full-plane CLE_{κ} from the counting measure. Theorem 1.3 yields the following variant of Theorem 2.20. It will be used in Section 6 to prove the conformal welding result for the quantum pair of pants and quantum disks.

Theorem 5.1. *Let \mathbb{F} be a measure on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{C})$ such that the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h)/\sim_\gamma$ is QS if h is sampled from \mathbb{F} . Now sample (h, Γ, η) from $\mathbb{F}(dh)\text{Count}_\Gamma(d\eta)\text{CLE}_\kappa^\mathbb{C}(d\Gamma)$, where $\text{CLE}_\kappa^\mathbb{C}(d\Gamma)$ is the law of a full-plane CLE_κ and $\text{Count}_\Gamma(d\eta)$ is the counting measure on a sample Γ from $\text{CLE}_\kappa^\mathbb{C}(d\Gamma)$. For $\ell > 0$, let $\text{Weld}(\text{QD}(\ell) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa, \text{QD}(\ell) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa)$ be the quantum surface decorated by a loop ensemble and a distinct loop obtained from uniformly welding a pair of CLE-decorated quantum disks sampled from $[\text{QD}(\ell) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa] \times [\text{QD}(\ell) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa]$. Then the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h, \Gamma, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$ is*

$$C \int_0^\infty \ell \cdot \text{Weld}(\text{QD}(\ell) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa, \text{QD}(\ell) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa) d\ell \quad \text{for some } C \in (0, \infty).$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1 given Theorem 1.3. This immediately follows from Theorems 1.3 and 2.20, combined with the following property of full-plane CLE_κ from [KW16].

Proposition 5.2 ([KW16]). *Sample (Γ, η) from $\text{Count}_\Gamma(d\eta)\text{CLE}_\kappa^\mathbb{C}(d\Gamma)$. Then conditioning on η , the conditional law of $\Gamma \setminus \{\eta\}$ is given by two independent CLE_κ 's on the two components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta$. \square*

Recall from Section 1.3 the probability measures \mathcal{L}_κ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$ that describe the shapes of $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ and $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$, respectively. Namely, given a loop η on \mathbb{C} surrounding 0, we have $R_\eta = \inf\{|z| : z \in \eta\}$ and $\hat{\eta} = \{z : R_\eta z \in \eta\}$. Suppose η is a sample from $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ restricted to the event that η surrounds 0. Then the law of $(\hat{\eta}, \log R_\eta)$ is a constant multiple of the product measure $\mathcal{L}_\kappa \times dt$, where dt is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} . The same holds for $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$ when $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$. By definition Theorem 1.3 is equivalent to $\mathcal{L}_\kappa = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$.

The main device for the proof of $\mathcal{L}_\kappa = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$ is a natural Markov chain with stationary distribution $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$. We still describe it in the cylinder coordinate for convenience. Consider the horizontal cylinder $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R} \times [0, 2\pi]$ with $x \in \mathbb{R}$ identified with $x + 2\pi i$. We also include $\pm\infty$ in \mathcal{C} so that \mathcal{C} is conformally equivalent to a Riemann sphere. Let $\psi(z) = e^{-z}$ be a conformal map from \mathcal{C} to $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ with $\psi(+\infty) = 0$ and $\psi(-\infty) = \infty$.

Definition 5.3. *Fix $\kappa \in (0, 4]$. Let η be a sample from $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ restricted to the event that η surrounds 0, hence $\psi^{-1}(\eta)$ is a loop on \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$. We let $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$ be the law of $\psi^{-1}(\eta)$. We also write $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) := (\psi^{-1})_*\mathcal{L}_\kappa$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) := (\psi^{-1})_*\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$.*

Let $\text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ be the set of simple loops η on \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$ such that $\max\{\text{Re } z : z \in \eta\} = 0$. The relation between $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is the following.

Lemma 5.4. *Let η be a sample from $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$. Then η can be uniquely written as $\eta^0 + \mathbf{t}$ where $\eta^0 \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}$. The law of (η^0, \mathbf{t}) is $C\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) \times dt$ for a constant $C \in (0, \infty)$, where dt is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} .*

Proof. If η is a sample from $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ restricted to the event that η surrounds 0, the law of $(\hat{\eta}, \log R_\eta)$ is a constant multiple of $\mathcal{L}_\kappa \times dt$. Therefore Lemma 5.4 follows from mapping \mathbb{C} to \mathcal{C} . \square

Now we are ready to describe the Markov chain. By definition, we see that $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is a probability measure on $\text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$. Given $\eta^0 \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$, let $\mathcal{C}_{\eta^0}^+$ be the connected component of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \eta^0$ containing $+\infty$. Sample a CLE_κ on $\mathcal{C}_{\eta^0}^+$ and translate its outermost loop surrounding $+\infty$ to an element $\eta^1 \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$. Then $\eta^0 \rightarrow \eta^1$ defines a Markov transition kernel on $\text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$.

Lemma 5.5. *Fix $\eta^0 \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ and let $(\eta^i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the Markov chain starting from η^0 . Then the law of η^n tends to $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ in total variational distance. In particular, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is the unique stationary probability measure of the Markov chain.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of [KW16]; see Proposition B.4 for details. \square

The start point of our proof of $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is the following conformal welding result for $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$. Fix $a > 0$. Similarly as in $\text{Weld}(\text{QD}(a), \text{QD}(a))$ from Theorem 2.20, given a pair of independent samples from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a)$, we can uniformly conformally weld them to get a loop-decorated quantum surface with two marked points, since each sample from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a)$ has an interior marked point. We write $\text{Weld}(\text{QD}_{1,0}(a), \text{QD}_{1,0}(a))$ as the law of the resulting loop-decorated quantum surface with two marked points.

Proposition 5.6. *Fix $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$. Let \mathbb{F} be the law of h as in Definition 2.7, so that the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h, +\infty, -\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is the two-pointed quantum sphere QS_2 . Now sample (h, η) from $\mathbb{F} \times \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$ and write $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ as the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h, \eta, +\infty, -\infty)/\sim_\gamma$. Then*

$$\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}} = C \int_0^\infty a \cdot \text{Weld}(\text{QD}_{1,0}(a), \text{QD}_{1,0}(a)) da \quad \text{for some } C > 0. \quad (5.1)$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 3.6. Let \mathbb{F}_0 be a measure on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{C})$ such that the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h)/\sim_\gamma$ is the unmarked quantum sphere QS if h is a sample from \mathbb{F}_0 . Let (h, η, z, w) be sampled from $\mu_h(d^2z) \mu_h(d^2w) \mathbb{F}_0(dh) \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}(d\eta)$. Let E_{sep} be the event that η separates z, w . Then the law of (h, η, z, w) restricted to E_{sep} can be obtained in two ways:

1. Sample (h, z, w) from $\mu_h(d^2z) \mu_h(d^2w) \mathbb{F}_0(dh)$; then sample η from $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ on \mathbb{C} and restrict to the event that η separates z, w .
2. Sample (h, η) from $2\mu_h(D_\eta) \mu_h(D'_\eta) \mathbb{F}_0(dh) \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}(d\eta)$, where D_η, D'_η are the connected components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta$; then sample (z, w) from the probability measure proportional to

$$\mu_h|_{D_\eta}(d^2z) \mu_h|_{D'_\eta}(d^2w) + \mu_h|_{D'_\eta}(d^2z) \mu_h|_{D_\eta}(d^2w).$$

Recall Theorem 2.20 and the definitions of QS_2 and $\text{QD}_{1,0}$ from Section 2.2.2. The law of $(h, \eta, z, w)/\sim_\gamma$ restricted to E_{sep} , from the first sampling, equals $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$. From the second sampling, the same law equals $C \int_0^\infty a \cdot \text{Weld}(\text{QD}_{1,0}(a), \text{QD}_{1,0}(a)) da$ for some $C \in (0, \infty)$. \square

In the rest of this section we consider the setting where Lemma 5.4 and Proposition 5.6 apply. For $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$, let (h, η) be a sample from $\mathbb{F} \times \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$. Then η can be uniquely written as $\eta^0 + \mathbf{t}$ where $\eta^0 \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}$. By Lemma 5.4, the law of (η^0, \mathbf{t}) is $C\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) \times dt$. Conditioning on (h, η) , sample a $\text{CLE}_\kappa \Gamma^+$ in \mathcal{C}_η^+ , where \mathcal{C}_η^+ is the component of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \eta$ containing $+\infty$. Let $(\eta_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the set of loops in Γ^+ separating $\pm\infty$ ordered from left to right. We write $\eta_i = \eta^i + t_i$ where $\eta^i \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ and $t_i \in \mathbb{R}$. See Figure 3 for an illustration.




Figure 3: **Left:** Illustration of η_i and t_i . **Right:** Illustration of η^i .

To prove $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$, consider the decorated quantum surface $S_0 = (\mathcal{C}, h, \eta, \pm\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ and $S_i = (\mathcal{C}, h, \eta_i, \pm\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ for $i \geq 1$. If $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ holds, then the stationarity of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ gives the

stationarity of $(S_i)_{i \geq 0}$. Although we cannot show this directly before proving $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$, we will prove using Proposition 3.4 that the law of the subsurface of S_i on the right side of η_i indeed does not depend on i . This is the content of Section 5.1. In Section 5.2 we use Lemmas 5.5 and ?? to show that as $i \rightarrow \infty$ the law of S_i converges to $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ in a suitable sense, where $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ is defined as $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ in Proposition 5.6 with $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ in place of $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$. This convergence would be immediate in the total variational sense if the law of S_i were a probability measure instead of being *infinite*. To handle this subtlety we will prove some intermediate results that will also be useful in Section 8.

Once the two steps in the previous paragraph are achieved, we will have that the right subsurface of $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ has the same law as that of $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$. Then by left/right symmetry we can conclude that $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}} = \text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$, hence $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$. We carry out these final steps and complete the proof of Theorem 1.3 in Section 5.2. In Section 5.3 we supply a technical ingredient in the proof coming from the fact that $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ is an infinite measure.

5.1 Stationarity of the subsurfaces on the right side of the loops

Consider (h, η) and $(\eta^i)_{i \geq 0}$ as defined in and below Proposition 5.6. Let $S_0 = (\mathcal{C}, h, \eta, \pm\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ and $S_i = (\mathcal{C}, h, \eta_i, \pm\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ for $i \geq 1$ as discussed right above Section 5.1. For $i \geq 0$, let $\ell_h(\eta_i)$ be the quantum length of η_i .

Lemma 5.7. *The law of $\ell_h(\eta_i)$ is the same as that of $\ell_h(\eta)$ in Theorem 2.20 for all $i \geq 0$.*

Proof. By definition the law of $\ell_h(\eta_0)$ is the same as that of $\ell_h(\eta)$ in Theorem 2.20. It remains to show that the law of $\ell_h(\eta_i)$ does not depend on $i \geq 0$. By Theorem 2.20 and Proposition 3.4, the joint law of $\ell_h(\eta_0)$ and $\ell_h(\eta_1)$ is given by

$$C |\text{QD}_{1,0}(a)| |\text{QA}(a, b)| |\text{QD}_{1,0}(b)| da db \quad \text{for some } C \in (0, \infty).$$

Since $|\text{QA}(a, b)| = |\text{QA}(b, a)|$ by Proposition 3.5, the laws of $\ell_h(\eta_0)$ and $\ell_h(\eta_1)$ are the same. By Proposition 3.4, and the fact that Γ^+ restricted to $\mathcal{C}_{\eta_i}^+$ is still a CLE_κ , the conditional law of $\ell_h(\eta_i)$ given $\ell_h(\eta_{i-1})$ does not depend on i . Since $\ell(\eta_0)$ and $\ell_h(\eta_1)$ have the same law, so do $\ell_h(\eta_i)$ and $\ell_h(\eta_{i+1})$ for all $i \geq 1$. \square

Lemma 5.8. *For $i \geq 0$, conditioning on (h, η_i) , let z_i be a point on η_i sampled from the probability measure proportional to the quantum length measure. Let $S_i^+ = (\mathcal{C}_{\eta_i}^+, h, +\infty, z_i)/\sim_\gamma$. Let $\mathcal{C}_{\eta_i}^-$ be the component of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \eta_i$ containing $-\infty$ and $S_i^- = (\mathcal{C}_{\eta_i}^-, h, -\infty, z_i)/\sim_\gamma$. Then the conditional law of S_i^+ given S_i^- is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell_h(\eta_i))^\#$ for all $i \geq 0$.*

Proof. When $i = 0$, this follows from Theorem 2.20. The $i \geq 1$ case follows iteratively using Proposition 3.4. \square

From Lemmas 5.7 and 5.8, we see that the law of S_i^+ is a quantum disk whose law does not depend on i . Moreover, conditional on $\ell_h(\eta_i)$, S_i^+ and S_i^- are conditionally independent and S is obtained from the conformal welding of S_i^+ and S_i^- .

5.2 Convergence of S_i and the proof of Theorem 1.3

We retain the setting in Section 5.1. For $z \in \mathcal{C}$, let $\phi^0(z) = h(z + \mathbf{t})$ and $\phi^i(z) = h(z + t_i)$ for $i \geq 1$. By definition, $(\mathcal{C}, \phi^i, \eta^i)/\sim_\gamma$ is an embedding of the decorated quantum surface S_i for $i \geq 0$. By Theorem 2.11, we immediately have the following description of the law of (ϕ^i, η^i) .

Lemma 5.9. *Recall the Markov chain in Lemma 5.5 and the Liouville field $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}$ from Definition 2.10. Let $P_0 = \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C})$. For $i \geq 1$, let P_i be the distribution of the i -th step of this Markov chain on $\text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ with the initial distribution P_0 . Then the law of (ϕ^i, η^i) is $\text{CLF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)} \times P_i$ for all $i \geq 0$, where $C \in (0, \infty)$ is a constant not depending on i .*

Proof. By definition the law of (h, η^0, \mathbf{t}) is $\mathbb{F} \times P_0 \times [C dt]$, where \mathbb{F} is the law of h in Definition 2.7. By the definition of P_i and the translation invariance of $[C dt]$, the law of (h, η^i, t_i) is $\mathbb{F} \times P_i \times [C dt]$. Finally, Theorem 2.11 yields the result. \square

From now on we write the measure $\text{CLF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}$ in Lemma 5.9 as $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}$ for simplicity so that the law of (ϕ^i, η^i) is $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i$. Suppose μ and ν are two measures on a measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) . Recall that the total variational distance $d_{\text{tv}}(\mu, \nu)$ is defined by $d_{\text{tv}}(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{F}} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)|$. From Lemma 5.5 we know that $d_{\text{tv}}(P_i, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C})) \rightarrow 0$. We would like to say that $d_{\text{tv}}(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i, \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}) \rightarrow 0$ as well, but since $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is an infinite measure we need a truncation. Recall that the quantum length $\ell_h(\eta)$ is a measurable function of (ϕ^0, η^0) [She16]. We write this as $\ell_h(\eta) = \ell(\phi^0, \eta^0)$. Then $\ell_h(\eta_i) = \ell(\phi^i, \eta^i)$ a.s. for each $i \geq 0$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, consider the event $E_{\varepsilon} = \{\ell(\phi, \eta) > \varepsilon\}$. Then by Lemma 5.7 we have

$$\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i(E_{\varepsilon}) = \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_0(E_{\varepsilon}) \quad \text{for each } i \geq 0 \text{ and } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (5.2)$$

We claim that the total variational convergence holds after restriction to E_{ε} .

Lemma 5.10. *For each $\varepsilon > 0$, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{\text{tv}}(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i|_{E_{\varepsilon}}, \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C})|_{E_{\varepsilon}}) = 0$.*

The proof of Lemma 5.10 is not hard but technical so we postpone it to Section 5.3. We proceed to finish the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 given Lemma 5.10. Let $(\phi, \tilde{\eta})$ be a sample from $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C})$. Conditioning on $(\phi, \tilde{\eta})$, let $z \in \tilde{\eta}$ be sampled from the probability measure proportional to the quantum length measure of $\tilde{\eta}$. Recall the decorated quantum surfaces S_i^+ and S_i^- from Lemma 5.8. We similarly define $\tilde{S}^+ = (\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\eta}}^+, \phi, +\infty, z)/\sim_{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{S}^- = (\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\eta}}^-, \phi, -\infty, z)/\sim_{\gamma}$, where $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\eta}}^+$ (resp. $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\eta}}^-$) is the component of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \tilde{\eta}$ to the right (resp., left) of $\tilde{\eta}$. By Lemma 5.10, restricted to the event E_{ε} , the law of (S_i^+, S_i^-) converge in total variational distance to that of $(\tilde{S}^+, \tilde{S}^-)$. Since ε can be arbitrary, by Lemmas 5.7 and 5.8 and Equation (5.2), the joint law of $\ell(\phi, \tilde{\eta})$ and \tilde{S}^+ under $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C})$ is the same as that of $\ell(\phi, \eta)$ and S_0^+ in Lemma 5.8. Moreover, conditioning on $\ell(\phi, \tilde{\eta})$, the decorated quantum surfaces \tilde{S}^+ and \tilde{S}^- are conditionally independent.

Now we use the additional observation that both $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C})$ are invariant under the mapping $z \mapsto -z$ from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{C} (in the case of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}$ we also translate the reflected loop so it lies in $\text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$). Therefore $(\tilde{S}^+, \tilde{S}^-)$ must agree in law with $(\tilde{S}^-, \tilde{S}^+)$. Hence $(\tilde{S}^+, \tilde{S}^-)$ agrees in law with (S_0^+, S_0^-) in Lemma 5.8. Namely, if we uniformly conformal weld \tilde{S}^+ and \tilde{S}^- , the resulting decorated quantum surface is $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}}$ from Proposition 5.6.

The conditional law of $(\phi, \tilde{\eta})$ given $(\tilde{S}^+, \tilde{S}^-)$ is obtained by conformally welding \tilde{S}^+, \tilde{S}^- then embedding the decorated quantum surface in $(\mathcal{C}, -\infty, +\infty)$ in a rotationally invariant way around the axis of the cylinder. The same holds for (ϕ^0, η^0) and (S_0^+, S_0^-) . Consequently $(\phi, \tilde{\eta})$ and (ϕ^0, η^0) agree in distribution, i.e. $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C})$ where $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C})$ is the law of (ϕ^0, η^0) by Lemma 5.9. Therefore $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa} = \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}$ as desired, hence $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}} = C \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ for some constant C . This proves Theorem 1.3 for $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$. For $\kappa = 4$, we can take the $\kappa \uparrow 4$ limit as explained in Lemmas B.5 and B.6 to get $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4 = \mathcal{L}_4$ and conclude the proof. \square

Remark 5.11 (Symmetry of the quantum annulus). *As a byproduct of our proof, we can upgrade Proposition 3.5 to $\text{QA}(a, b) = \text{QA}(b, a)$. Indeed, let A_{η_0, η_1} be the annulus bounded by η_0 and η_1 . Then the probability measure $\text{QA}(a, b)^\#$ is the conditional law of the quantum surface $(A_{\eta_0, \eta_1}, h)/\sim_\gamma$ given $\ell_h(\eta_0) = a$ and $\ell_h(\eta_1) = b$. Given Theorem 1.3, we see that the law of (h, η_0, η_1) is invariant under the mapping $z \mapsto -z$ of the cylinder. Therefore $\text{QA}(a, b)^\# = \text{QA}(b, a)^\#$ hence $\text{QA}(a, b) = \text{QA}(b, a)$.*

5.3 Convergence in total variation: proof of Lemma 5.10

We first make a simple observation.

Lemma 5.12. *For $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $(\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}))[E_\varepsilon] \leq (\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}))[E_\varepsilon] < \infty$.*

Proof. We consider a coupling $\{\eta^i : i \geq 0\}$ of $(P_i)_{i \geq 0}$ such that for each $i \geq 1$, $\mathbb{P}[\eta^i \neq \eta^0]$ achieves the minimum among all couplings of P_i and P_0 . Then in this coupling we can find a subsequence i_k such that $\mathbb{P}[\eta^{i_k} \neq \eta^0] \leq 1/k^2$ hence by Borel-Cantelli lemma $\eta^{i_k} = \eta^0$ a.s. for large enough k . Now we take the product measure of $\text{LF}_\mathcal{C}$ and this coupling. Then by Fatou's lemma we have $(\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}))[E_\varepsilon] \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times P_{i_k})[E_\varepsilon]$. On the other hand, by Lemma 5.7, $(\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times P_i)[E_\varepsilon] = (\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times P_0)[E_\varepsilon] = (\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}))[E_\varepsilon]$ for all $i \geq 0$. This concludes the proof. \square

Given $\eta \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$, let \mathcal{C}_η^+ be the connected component of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \eta$ containing $+\infty$. Let $f : \mathcal{C}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_\eta^+$ be a conformal map such that $f(+\infty) = \infty$, where $\mathcal{C}_+ := \{z \in \mathcal{C} : \text{Re } z > 0\}$ is the half cylinder. By standard conformal distortion estimates (e.g. [MS19, Lemma 2.4]), there exists a positive constant C_0 not depending on η such that $|f(z) - z| < \frac{C_0}{3}$ and $|f''(z)| < \frac{1}{2} < |f'(z)| < 2$ for $\text{Re } z > \frac{C_0}{3}$ (these are quantitative versions of the facts that $\text{CR}(\exp(-\eta), 0) \approx 1$ and $\lim_{z \rightarrow +\infty} f'(z) = 1$). We need the following estimate for embeddings of $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)^\#$ on \mathcal{C}_η^+ that is uniform in $\eta \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$.

Lemma 5.13. *Suppose $\eta \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ and ϕ is such that the law of $(\mathcal{C}_\eta^+, \phi, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)^\#$ for some $\ell > 0$. Suppose g is a smooth function on \mathcal{C} supported on $\{z \in \mathcal{C} : \text{Re } z \in [C_0, C_0 + 1]\}$ such that $\int g(z) d^2z = 1$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}[(\phi, g) \notin (-K + \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \ell, K + \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \ell)] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } K \rightarrow \infty$$

where the convergence rate only depends on g , but not on η , ℓ or the precise law of ϕ .

Proof. If $(\mathcal{C}_\eta^+, \phi, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is a sample from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)^\#$ then $(\mathcal{C}_\eta^+, \phi - \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \ell, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is a sample from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(1)^\#$. Therefore it suffices to prove that if the law of $(\mathcal{C}_\eta^+, \phi, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,0}(1)^\#$, then

$$\mathbb{P}[(\phi, g) \notin (-K, K)] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } K \rightarrow \infty \tag{5.3}$$

where the convergence rate only depends on g .

To prove (5.3), let $f : \mathcal{C}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_\eta^+$ be a conformal map such that $f(+\infty) = +\infty$ and set $\phi_0 = \phi \circ f + Q \log |f'|$. Then $(\mathcal{C}_+, \phi_0, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma = (\mathcal{C}_\eta^+, \phi, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$, hence its law is $\text{QD}(1)^\#$. Let S be the collection of smooth functions ξ that are supported on $\{\text{Re } z \in [\frac{2}{3}C_0, \frac{4}{3}C_0 + 1]\} \subset \mathcal{C}_+$ and satisfy $\|\xi\|_\infty \leq 4\|g\|_\infty$ and $\|\nabla \xi\|_\infty \leq 8(\|g\|_\infty + \|\nabla g\|_\infty)$. By the definitions of C_0 and f , we see that $|f'|^2 g \circ f \in S$. Let $Y = \sup_{\xi \in S} |(\phi_0, \xi)|$. Since ϕ_0 is almost surely in the local Sobolev space of index -1 , we have $Y < \infty$ a.s. Note that $\|f'(z)1_{\text{Re } z \in [C_0, C_0+1]}\|_\infty \leq 2$ so

$$|(\phi, g)| = |(\phi_0 \circ f^{-1} + Q \log |(f^{-1})'|, g)| \leq |(\phi_0, |f'|^2 g \circ f)| + Q \log 2 \leq Y + Q \log 2.$$

Since the law of ϕ_0 is unique modulo rotations around the axis of \mathcal{C} , the law of Y does not depend on η or the precise law of ϕ . Therefore, $\mathbb{P}[(\phi, g) \notin (-K, K)] \leq \mathbb{P}[Y + Q \log 2 > K] \rightarrow 0$ as $K \rightarrow \infty$, as desired. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.10. Let g be a smooth function on \mathcal{C} as in Lemma 5.13. For $K > 0$, define

$$S_K = E_\varepsilon \cap \{(\phi, \eta) \in H^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) \times \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C}) : (\phi, g) \in (-K + \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \ell(\phi, \eta), K + \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \ell(\phi, \eta))\}.$$

Then $d_{\text{tv}}(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i|_{E_\varepsilon}, \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa|_{E_\varepsilon})$ is bounded from above by

$$d_{\text{tv}}(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i|_{S_K}, \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa|_{S_K}) + (\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i)[E_\varepsilon \setminus S_K] + (\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa)[E_\varepsilon \setminus S_K]. \quad (5.4)$$

Since $(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa)[E_\varepsilon] < \infty$ by Lemma 5.12 and $\bigcap_{K>\infty} (E_\varepsilon \setminus S_K) = \emptyset$, we see that

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} (\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa)[E_\varepsilon \setminus S_K] = 0. \quad (5.5)$$

On the other hand, conditioning on the boundary length being ℓ , the conditional law of $(\mathcal{C}_{\eta^i}^+, \phi^i, \infty) / \sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)^\#$. Since $\eta^i \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$, by Lemma 5.13, we have

$$(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i)[E_\varepsilon \setminus S_K] \leq (\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i)[E_\varepsilon] \times o_K(1)$$

where $o_K(1)$ is a function converging to 0 as $K \rightarrow 0$ uniform in $i \geq 0$. Since $(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i)[E_\varepsilon]$ does not depend on i by (5.2), we have

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i \geq 0} (\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i)[E_\varepsilon \setminus S_K] = 0. \quad (5.6)$$

It remains to handle the first term in (5.4). Let $F_K = \{\phi \in H^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) : (\phi, g) > -K + \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \varepsilon\}$. Then $S_K \subset F_{\varepsilon, K} \times \text{Loop}_0$. We claim that $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}[F_{\varepsilon, K}] < \infty$. Assuming this, since $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{\text{tv}}(P_i, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa) = 0$, we have $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{\text{tv}}(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}|_{F_{\varepsilon, K}} \times P_i, \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}|_{F_{\varepsilon, K}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa) = 0$ hence $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{\text{tv}}(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i|_{S_K}, \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa|_{S_K}) = 0$. Thus the quantity (5.4) tends to 0 as $i \rightarrow \infty$ then $K \rightarrow \infty$, as desired.

By the definition of $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}$ from Definition 2.10, our claim $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}[F_{\varepsilon, K}] < \infty$ follows from the fact that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[G > -c] e^{(2\gamma - 2Q)c} dc < \infty$ if G is a Gaussian random variable. \square

6 Quantum pair of pants

In this section we introduce and analyze the quantum pair of pants similarly as what was done for the quantum annulus in Section 3. We assume $\kappa \in (\frac{3}{8}, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$ throughout the section.

Suppose $(\mathbb{C}, h, z_1, z_2, z_3)$ is an embedding of a sample from QS_3 . Let Γ be the whole-plane CLE_κ on \mathbb{C} independent of h . We write $\text{QS}_3 \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ as the law of the decorated quantum surface $(\mathbb{C}, h, \Gamma, z_1, z_2, z_3) / \sim_\gamma$. For $1 \leq i \leq 3$, let η_i be the outermost loop separating z_i from the other two points as defined in Theorem 1.2. Let \mathfrak{l}_i be the quantum boundary length of η_i . In light of Lemma 2.2, the following lemma ensures the existence of the disintegration over $\mathfrak{l}_1, \mathfrak{l}_2, \mathfrak{l}_3$.

Lemma 6.1. *For a Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with zero Lebesgue measure, $\text{QS}_3 \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa[(\mathfrak{l}_1, \mathfrak{l}_2, \mathfrak{l}_3) \in E] = 0$.*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 5.1 combined with the same argument as in Lemma 3.1. \square

We now define the quantum pair of pants in the same way we defined the quantum annulus.

Definition 6.2. Let $\{\text{QS}_3 \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3) : (\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3) \in (0, \infty)^3\}$ be the disintegration of $\text{QS}_3 \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ over (ℓ_1, ℓ_2, ℓ_3) . Let $P_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3}$ be the non-simply-connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus (\cup_{i=1}^3 \eta_i)$. For $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3 \in \mathbb{R}_+^3$ where $\mathbb{R}_+ = (0, \infty)$, let $\widetilde{\text{QP}}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$ be the law of the quantum surface $(P_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3}, h)/\sim_\gamma$ under $\text{QS}_3 \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$. Let

$$\text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^3 \ell_i |\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell_i)| \right)^{-1} \widetilde{\text{QP}}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3).$$

We call a sample from $\text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$ a quantum pair of pants.

For ℓ_1, ℓ_2, ℓ_3 all distinct, given quantum surfaces sampled from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell_1) \times \text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell_2) \times \text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell_3) \times \text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$, we can uniformly conformal weld them, by identifying cycles with the same length, to produce a quantum surface decorated with three loops and three points. We write its law as

$$\text{Weld}\left(\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell_1), \text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell_2), \text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell_3), \text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)\right) \quad (6.1)$$

Similarly as in the case of $\text{QA}(a, b)$, although $\text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$ is only well-defined modulo a measure zero set, we will only integrate it over \mathbb{R}_+^3 in applications. So we can consider it as canonically defined and omit saying “for almost every ℓ_1, ℓ_2, ℓ_3 ” every time. For the same reason, although we only specify the meaning of (6.1) for distinct ℓ_1, ℓ_2, ℓ_3 , this is sufficient for our applications.

The main results of this section are the following analogs of Proposition 3.4 and Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 6.3. Sample $(\mathbb{C}, \phi, \Gamma, z_1, z_2, z_3)/\sim_\gamma$ from $\text{QS}_3 \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$, and let η_i be the othermost loop of Γ around z_i separating it from the other two points for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then the law of the decorated quantum surface $(\mathbb{C}, \phi, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, z_1, z_2, z_3)/\sim_\gamma$ is

$$\iiint_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 \text{Weld}\left(\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell_1), \text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell_2), \text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell_3), \text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)\right) d\ell_1 d\ell_2 d\ell_3. \quad (6.2)$$

Theorem 6.4. Let A be the total quantum area of a sample from $\text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$. Then there is a constant $C \in (0, \infty)$ only depending on γ such that for all $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, \mu > 0$

$$\text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)[e^{-\mu A}] = C \mu^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{2}{\gamma^2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3}} e^{-(\ell_1 + \ell_2 + \ell_3) \sqrt{\mu / \sin(\pi \gamma^2 / 4)}}.$$

In contrast to $\text{QA}(a, b)$, the measure $\text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$ is infinite, as can be seen from sending $\mu \rightarrow 0$ in Theorem 6.4. On the other hand, $\text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)[A < C] < \infty$ for $C > 0$ so it is still σ -finite.

We will prove Theorem 6.3 in Section 6.1 based on Theorem 5.1. Then in Section 6.2 we prove Theorem 6.4 based on Theorem 4.1. Readers who are mainly interested in the proof of Theorem 1.2 can safely skip the rest of this section at the first reading.

6.1 Conformal welding of QP and QD: proof of Theorem 6.3

Suppose we are in the setting of Definition 6.2 and Theorem 6.3. For $i = 1, 2, 3$, let D_{η_i} and $D_{\eta_i}^c$ be the two components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta_i$ where D_{η_i} contains z_i . Let l_i be the quantum length of η_i .

Proposition 6.5. Given $(h, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3)$, let p_3 be a point sampled from the probability measure proportional to the quantum length measure of η_3 . Then conditioned on $(D_{\eta_3}^c, h, \eta_1, \eta_2, z_1, z_2, p_3)/\sim_\gamma$, the conditional law of $(D_{\eta_3}, h, z_3, p_3)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(l_3)^\#$.

Proof. Suppose we are in the setting of Theorem 5.1 where \mathbb{F} is a measure on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{C})$ such that the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h)/\sim_\gamma$ is QS if h is sampled from \mathbb{F} . Now sample $(h, \Gamma, \eta, z_1, z_2, z_3)$ from $1_E \prod_{i=1}^3 \mu_h(d^2 z_i) \mathbb{F}(dh) \text{Count}_\Gamma(d\eta) \text{CLE}_\kappa^\mathbb{C}(d\Gamma)$, where E is the event that η separates z_3 from $\{z_1, z_2\}$. Let ℓ be the quantum length of η . Let p be sampled on η from the probability measure proportional to the quantum length of η . Let D_η and D_η^c be the two components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta$ where D_η contains z_3 . By Theorem 5.1, conditioned on $(D_\eta^c, h, \Gamma|_{D_\eta^c}, z_1, z_2, p)/\sim_\gamma$, the conditional law of $(D_\eta, h, z_3, p)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell)^\#$.

In this sample space we still define η_1, η_2, η_3 in terms of Γ, z_1, z_2, z_3 as in Proposition 6.5. Let F be the event that z_1 and z_2 are surrounded by distinct outermost loops of $\Gamma|_{D_\eta^c}$. Then $E \cap F$ occurs if and only if $\eta = \eta_3$. Therefore under $1_F \cdot 1_E \prod_{i=1}^3 \mu_h(d^2 z_i) \mathbb{F}(dh) \text{Count}_\Gamma(d\eta) \text{CLE}_\kappa^\mathbb{C}(d\Gamma)$ the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h, \Gamma, z_1, z_2, z_3)/\sim_\gamma$ is simply $\text{QS}_3 \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ as in Proposition 6.5. Since F only depends on $(D_\eta^c, h, \Gamma|_{D_\eta^c}, z_1, z_2, p)/\sim_\gamma$, even under the further conditioning on F , the conditional law of $(D_\eta, h, z_3, p)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell)^\#$. Since under this conditioning $\eta = \eta_3$, we conclude the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.3. Note that Proposition 6.5 still holds if D_{η_1} is replaced by D_{η_2} or D_{η_3} . Recall $\widetilde{\text{QP}}$ from the disintegration in Definition 6.2. By repeatedly applying Proposition 6.5, we see that the law of $(\mathbb{C}, \phi, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, z_1, z_2, z_3)/\sim_\gamma$ is

$$\iiint_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \text{Weld}\left(\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell_1)^\#, \text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell_2)^\#, \text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell_3)^\#, \widetilde{\text{QP}}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)\right) d\ell_1 d\ell_2 d\ell_3.$$

Now Theorem 6.3 follows from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell) = |\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)|\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)^\#$. \square

Finally, we give a welding result analogous to Proposition 3.6 we need in the next section.

Lemma 6.6. *Let $(D, h, \Gamma, \eta, \hat{\eta}, z)$ be as in Lemma 3.14. Namely, for $a > 0$, sample $(D, h, \Gamma, z)/\sim_\gamma$ from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ and sample $\hat{\eta}$ from the counting measure on the outermost loops of Γ except the loop η surrounding z . Then for some constant $C = C(\gamma)$ the law of $(D, h, \eta, \hat{\eta}, z)/\sim_\gamma$ is*

$$C \iint_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} bc \text{Weld}(\text{QD}_{1,0}(b), \text{QD}(c), \text{QP}(a, b, c)) db dc.$$

Proof. We retain the notations in the proof of Proposition 6.5. Sample $(h, \Gamma, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, z_1, z_2)$ from $\text{M} := 1_G \mu_h(d^2 z_1) \mu_h(d^2 z_2) \mathbb{F}(dh) \text{Count}_\Gamma(d\eta_1) \text{Count}_\Gamma(d\eta_2) \text{Count}_\Gamma(d\eta_3) \text{CLE}_\kappa^\mathbb{C}(d\Gamma)$, where G is the event that η_1, η_2, η_3 are distinct, η_1, η_2, z_1, z_2 all lie on the same side of η_3 , and in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta_3$ the outermost loops around z_1, z_2 are η_1, η_2 respectively.

We first show that the M-law of $(\mathbb{C}, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, z_1, z_2)/\sim_\gamma$ is

$$\iiint_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} abc \text{Weld}(\text{QD}_{1,0}(a), \text{QD}_{1,0}(b), \text{QD}(c), \text{QP}(a, b, c)) da db dc. \quad (6.3)$$

Indeed, by Theorem 6.3, if we sample $(h, \Gamma, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, z_1, z_2)$ from $\mu_h|_{D_3}(d^2 z_3) \text{M}$ where D_3 is the component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta_3$ not containing z_1, z_2 , then the law of $(\mathbb{C}, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, z_1, z_2, z_3)/\sim_\gamma$ is (6.2). Forgetting the point z_3 and unweighting by $\mu_h(D_3)$, we get (6.3).

On the other hand, by Proposition 5.6 applied to the loop η_1 and the two-pointed quantum sphere $(\mathbb{C}, h, z_1, z_2)/\sim_\gamma$, we see that the M-law of $(\mathbb{C}, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, z_1, z_2)/\sim_\gamma$ is

$$C \int_0^\infty a \text{Weld}(\text{QD}_{1,0}(a), \tilde{\text{M}}(a)) da,$$

where $\tilde{\text{M}}(a)$ is the measure described in Lemma 6.6. Comparing this to (6.3), we conclude that $C\tilde{\text{M}}(a) = \iint_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} bc \text{Weld}(\text{QD}_{1,0}(b), \text{QD}(c), \text{QP}(a, b, c)) db dc$. \square

6.2 Area distribution of the quantum pair of pants: proof of Theorem 6.4

Our proof still crucially relies on the Levy process as in Section 3.2.

Lemma 6.7. *Let \mathbb{P}^β be the probability measure describing the law of the β -stable Lévy process with Lévy measure $1_{x>0}x^{-\beta-1} dx$ with $\beta = \frac{4}{\gamma^2} + \frac{1}{2}$. For a sample $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ from \mathbb{P}^β , let $\tau_{-\ell} = \inf\{t : \zeta_t = -\ell\}$ for each $\ell > 0$. Let $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the jumps of ζ in $[0, \tau_{-a-b-c}]$. Let $(A_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be independent copies of the quantum area of a sample from $\text{QD}(1)^\#$ which are also independent of ζ . Then there is a constant $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for any non-negative measurable function f and $a, b, c > 0$, we have*

$$\text{QP}(a, b, c)[f(A)] = \frac{C}{\sqrt{abc(a+b)}} \mathbb{E}[\tau_{-a-b} f(\sum_i x_i^2 A_i)], \quad (6.4)$$

where A on the left side means the quantum area of a sample from $\text{QP}(a, b, c)$.

Proof. In the setting of Lemma 6.6, Lemma 3.14 gives the law of the quantum lengths of the outermost loops. By Proposition 2.22, conditioning on the lengths, the quantum surfaces surrounded by the outermost loops are independent quantum disks. Therefore combining Lemmas 6.6 and 3.14 we have that for a non-negative measurable function F on \mathbb{R}_+^3 ,

$$\begin{aligned} & C \iint_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} bc |\text{QD}_{1,0}(b)| |\text{QD}(c)| \text{QP}(a, b, c)[F(A, b, c)] db dc \\ &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \frac{\mathfrak{C}}{\sqrt{ab(a+b)}} b |\text{QD}_{1,0}(b)| c^{-\beta-1} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\tau}_{-a-b} F(\sum_i x_i^2 A_i, b, c)] db dc. \end{aligned}$$

for some $C \in (0, \infty)$ not depending on a, b, c . Since $|\text{QD}(c)| \propto c^{-\beta-\frac{3}{2}}$, by possibly changing C and performing a disintegration, we get (6.4). \square

Proof of Theorem 6.4. Let $g(x) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\mu x^2 A_1}]$ where A_1 is the quantum area of a sample from $\text{QD}(1)^\#$. Then by Lemma 6.7,

$$\text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)[e^{-\mu A}] = \frac{C}{\sqrt{\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 (\ell_1 + \ell_2)}} \mathbb{E}[\tau_{-\ell_1 - \ell_2} \prod_{i \geq 1} g(x_i)],$$

where the expectation is with respect to \mathbb{P}^β and $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ is the set of jumps until $\tau_{-\ell_1 - \ell_2 - \ell_3}$. By Lemma 3.15,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-\ell_1 - \ell_2} \prod_{i \geq 1} g(x_i)] = C(\mu)(\ell_1 + \ell_2) \mathbb{E}[\prod_{i \geq 1} g(x_i)].$$

where $C(\mu) = \int T(e) \prod_{x \in J_e} g(x) \underline{N}(de)$ with $\underline{N}, T(e), J(e)$ as in Lemma 3.15. By Proposition 4.2,

$$\mathbb{E}[\prod_{i \geq 1} g(x_i)] = e^{-(\ell_1 + \ell_2 + \ell_3) \sqrt{\mu / \sin(\pi \gamma^2 / 4)}}.$$

We write $X \propto_\gamma Y$ if $X = C_\gamma Y$ for some γ -dependent constant $C_\gamma \in (0, \infty)$. Then we have

$$\text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)[e^{-\mu A}] \propto_\gamma \frac{C(\mu)}{\sqrt{\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3}} e^{-(\ell_1 + \ell_2 + \ell_3) \sqrt{\mu / \sin(\pi \gamma^2 / 4)}} \quad (6.5)$$

It remains to show that $C(\mu) \propto_\gamma \mu^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{2}{\gamma^2}}$. Recall Theorem 6.3, where $(\mathbb{C}, \phi, z_1, z_2, z_3) / \sim_\gamma$ has the law of QS_3 . It is easy to check from the definition of QS_3 that $\text{QS}_3[e^{-\mu \mu_\phi(\mathbb{C})}] \propto_\gamma \mu^{\frac{2Q-3\gamma}{\gamma}}$. On

the other hand, we can also use (6.2) to evaluate $\text{QS}_3[e^{-\mu\mu_\phi(\mathbb{C})}]$. Since we know $\text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)[e^{-\mu A}]$ from (6.5), together with the FZZ formula in Theorem 2.17 for the area of quantum disks, we have

$$\text{QS}_3[e^{-\mu\mu_\phi(\mathbb{C})}] \propto_\gamma C(\mu) \prod_{i=1}^3 \int_0^\infty \mu^{\frac{1}{\gamma}(Q-\gamma)} K_{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\gamma)} \left(\ell_i \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\sin(\pi\gamma^2/4)}} \right) \cdot \frac{e^{-\ell_i \sqrt{\mu/\sin(\pi\gamma^2/4)}}}{\sqrt{\ell_i}} d\ell_i.$$

By Lemma 2.18 we have $\int_0^\infty y^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-cy} K_\nu(cy) dy = \frac{\pi^{3/2}}{\sqrt{2c \cos(\pi\nu)}}$ for $c > 0$ and $\nu \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. Therefore $\text{QS}_3[e^{-\mu\mu_\phi(\mathbb{C})}] \propto_\gamma C(\mu) \left(\mu^{\frac{1}{\gamma}(Q-\gamma)-\frac{1}{4}} \right)^3$ hence $C(\mu) \propto_\gamma \mu^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{2}{\gamma^2}}$. \square

7 The three-point correlation function via conformal welding

In this section we finish our proof of Theorem 1.2 based on the outline from Section 1.2. We recall the setting from Section 1.1. Let Γ be a whole plane CLE_κ with $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$. We fix $(u_1, u_2, u_3) = (0, 1, e^{i\pi/3})$ for the convenience of using our formulation of the DOZZ formula (Theorem 2.6). Let η_i be the outermost loop of Γ separating z_i from the other two points.

We write \mathfrak{m}_3 for the law of the triples of loops (η_1, η_2, η_3) and let $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Let $\lambda_i = -\frac{\alpha_i^2}{2} + Q\alpha_i - 2$. Let $\mathfrak{m}_3^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3}$ be the following reweighting of \mathfrak{m}_3 :

$$\frac{d\mathfrak{m}_3^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3}}{d\mathfrak{m}_3}(\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3) = \prod_{i=1}^3 \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{CR}(\eta_i, z_i) \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_i^2}{2} + Q\alpha_i - 2}. \quad (7.1)$$

By definition, the total mass of $\mathfrak{m}_3^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3}$ is

$$|\mathfrak{m}_3^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3}| = \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i=1}^3 \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{CR}(\eta_i, z_i) \right)^{\lambda_i} \right] = \frac{C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)}{2^{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3}}. \quad (7.2)$$

As outlined in Section 1.2, we set $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$ and consider the Liouville field on the sphere with three insertions $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, u_i)_i}$. Then by (7.2) we have

Lemma 7.1. *For $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ satisfying the Seiberg bound (2.2) in Theorem 2.6, we have*

$$\left(\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, u_i)_i} \times \mathfrak{m}_3^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3} \right) [e^{-\mu_\phi(\mathbb{C})}] = 2^{-\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - 1} C_\gamma^{\text{DOZZ}}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3). \quad (7.3)$$

Proof. Theorem 2.6 yields $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, u_i)_i} [e^{-\mu_\phi(\mathbb{C})}] = \frac{1}{2} C_\gamma^{\text{DOZZ}}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$. Now (7.2) gives (7.3). \square

In Section 7.1, we will show that the product measure $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, u_i)_3} \times \mathfrak{m}_3^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3}$ can be obtained from conformally welding the quantum pair of pants $\text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$ and $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha_i; \ell_i)$ as in Theorem 6.3. In Section 7.2, we compute the right side of (7.3) using the area distributions of $\text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$ and $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha_i; \ell_i)$ from Theorem 6.4 and the FZZ formula, which gives $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$.

7.1 Conformal welding with generic insertions

In this section we prove the following conformal welding result. Recall $(u_1, u_2, u_3) = (0, 1, e^{i\pi})$.

Theorem 7.2. Let $\alpha_i \in (Q - \frac{\gamma}{4}, Q)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Let $(\phi, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3)$ be sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, u_i)_i} \times \mathfrak{m}_3^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3}$. Then the law of the decorated quantum surface $(\mathbb{C}, \phi, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, u_1, u_2, u_3) / \sim_{\gamma}$ is

$$\frac{\gamma^2}{4\pi^4(Q - \gamma)^4} \int \int \int_0^{\infty} \ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 \text{Weld} \left(\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha_1; \ell_1), \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha_2; \ell_2), \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha_3; \ell_3), \text{QP}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3) \right) d\ell_1 d\ell_2 d\ell_3.$$

Here Weld means uniform conformal welding in the same sense as in Theorem 6.3.

We fix the range $(Q - \frac{\gamma}{4}, Q)$ in Theorem 7.2 for concreteness since this is the range we will use to prove Theorem 1.2. Since $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa} \in (\sqrt{8/3}, 2)$, we have $\gamma \in (Q - \frac{\gamma}{4}, Q)$. We first observe that Theorem 6.4 is the special case of Theorem 7.2 where $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \gamma$.

Lemma 7.3. Theorem 7.2 holds for $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \gamma$.

Proof. By the relation between $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, u_i)_3}$ and QS_3 from Theorem 2.9 and the relation between $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)$ and $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\gamma; \ell)$ from Theorem 2.15, we see that Lemma 7.3 follows from Theorem 6.3. \square

We first explain how to go from $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \gamma$ to the following case.

Proposition 7.4. Theorem 7.2 holds for $\alpha_1 = \alpha \in (Q - \frac{\gamma}{4}, Q)$ and $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \gamma$.

We will prove Proposition 7.4 from Lemma 7.3 by a reweighting procedure. By the definition of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$, if we sample a field X from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell)$, then the law of $(\mathbb{H}, X, i) / \sim_{\gamma}$ is $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$. We now recall a fact from [ARS21] about the reweighting of $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell)$ by “ $e^{(\alpha - \gamma)X}$ ”.

Lemma 7.5 ([ARS21, Lemma 4.6]). For any $\ell > 0, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and for any nonnegative measurable function f of $X|_{\mathbb{H} \setminus B_{\varepsilon}(i)}$ we have

$$\int f(X|_{\mathbb{H} \setminus B_{\varepsilon}(i)}) \times \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^2 - \gamma^2)} e^{(\alpha - \gamma)X_{\varepsilon}(i)} d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\gamma, i)}(\ell) = \int f(X|_{\mathbb{H} \setminus B_{\varepsilon}(i)}) d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell),$$

where X is a sample in $H^{-1}(\mathbb{H})$ and $X_{\varepsilon}(i)$ means the average of X on the boundary of the ball $B_{\varepsilon}(i) = \{z : |z - i| < \varepsilon\}$.

The key to the proof of Proposition 7.4 is the following reweighting result on $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, u_1), (\gamma, u_2), (\gamma, u_3)}$.

Lemma 7.6. Let η be a simple loop separating u_1 from u_2 and u_3 . Let D_{η} be the connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta$ containing u_1 . Let p be a point on η and let $\psi : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow D_{\eta}$ be the conformal map with $\psi(i) = u_1$ and $\psi(0) = p$. For $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$, let $\mathbb{C}_{\eta, p, \varepsilon} = \mathbb{C} \setminus \psi(B_{\varepsilon}(i))$. For ϕ sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, u_1), (\gamma, u_2), (\gamma, u_3)}$, let $X = \phi \circ \psi + Q \log |\psi'|$ so that $(\mathbb{H}, X, i, 0) / \sim_{\gamma} = (D_{\eta_1}, \phi, u_1, p) / \sim_{\gamma}$. Then for a fixed $\alpha \in (Q - \frac{\gamma}{4}, Q)$ and for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and any nonnegative measurable function f of ϕ depending only on $\phi|_{\mathbb{C}_{\eta, p, \varepsilon}}$ we have

$$\int f(\phi) \times \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^2 - \gamma^2)} e^{(\alpha - \gamma)X_{\varepsilon}(i)} d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, u_1), (\gamma, u_2), (\gamma, u_3)} = \int f(\phi) \left(\frac{\text{CR}(\eta, u_1)}{2} \right)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2} + Q\alpha - 2} d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha, u_1), (\gamma, u_2), (\gamma, u_3)}.$$

Proof. Let θ_{ε} be the uniform probability measure on $\partial B_{\varepsilon}(i)$ and $\widehat{\theta}_{\varepsilon} := \psi_{*}\theta_{\varepsilon}$. Since ψ' is holomorphic, $\log |\psi'|$ is harmonic so $(X, \theta_{\varepsilon}) = (\phi \circ \psi + Q \log |\psi'|, \theta_{\varepsilon}) = (\phi, \widehat{\theta}_{\varepsilon}) + Q \log |\psi'(i)|$. Therefore, since $|\psi'(i)| = \frac{1}{2}\text{CR}(\eta, 0)$,

$$e^{(\alpha - \gamma)X_{\varepsilon}(i)} = \left(\frac{\text{CR}(\eta, 0)}{2} \right)^{(\alpha - \gamma)Q} e^{(\alpha - \gamma)(\phi, \widehat{\theta}_{\varepsilon})}. \quad (7.4)$$

Since $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{4}$, the measure $\widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon$ is supported in the unit disk so $(\log |\cdot|_+, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon) = 0$. Moreover, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}_{\eta,p,\varepsilon}$ the function $w \mapsto \log |z - \psi(\cdot)|$ is harmonic on $B_\varepsilon(i)$ so $(\log |z - \cdot|, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon) = (\log |z - \psi(\cdot)|, \theta_\varepsilon) = \log |z|$. Finally, since $\widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon$ is the harmonic measure on $\eta_\varepsilon := \psi(\partial B_\varepsilon(i))$ viewed from 0, it is well known that $(\log |\cdot|, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon) = \log \text{CR}(\eta_\varepsilon, 0) = \log \frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta, 0)}{2}$. Therefore, recalling $G_{\mathbb{C}}(z, w) = -\log |z - w| + \log |z|_+ + \log |w|_+$ from Section 2.2.1, we have $(-2Q \log |\cdot|_+ + \sum_j \gamma G_{\mathbb{C}}(\cdot, u_j), \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon) = -\gamma \log \frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta, 0)}{2}$. For a GFF h sampled from $P_{\mathbb{C}}$ let $\widetilde{h} := h - 2Q \log |\cdot|_+ + \sum_{j=1}^3 \gamma G_{\mathbb{C}}(\cdot, u_j)$. By Definition 2.4,

$$\int f(\phi) \times e^{(\alpha-\gamma)(\phi, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)} d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, u_1), (\gamma, u_2), (\gamma, u_3)} = \left(\frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta, 0)}{2} \right)^{-(\alpha-\gamma)\gamma} \int \mathbb{E}[e^{(\alpha-\gamma)(h, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)} f(\widetilde{h}+c)] e^{(\alpha+2\gamma-2Q)c} dc. \quad (7.5)$$

Define $G_{\mathbb{C}}^\varepsilon(z, 0) := (G_{\mathbb{C}}(z, \cdot), \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)$; from earlier computations we have $G_{\mathbb{C}}^\varepsilon(\cdot, 0)|_{\mathbb{C}_{\eta,p,\varepsilon}} = G_{\mathbb{C}}(\cdot, 0)|_{\mathbb{C}_{\eta,p,\varepsilon}}$. By Girsanov's theorem and the fact that $f(\phi)$ depends only on $\phi|_{\mathbb{C}_{\eta,p,\varepsilon}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int \mathbb{E}[e^{(\alpha-\gamma)(h, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)} f(\widetilde{h}+c)] e^{(\alpha+2\gamma-2Q)c} dc &= \mathbb{E}[e^{(\alpha-\gamma)(h, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)}] \int \mathbb{E}[f(\widetilde{h} + (\alpha-\gamma)G_{\mathbb{C}}^\varepsilon(\cdot, 0) + c)] e^{(\alpha+2\gamma-2Q)c} dc \\ &= \mathbb{E}[e^{(\alpha-\gamma)(h, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)}] \int \mathbb{E}[f(\widetilde{h} + (\alpha-\gamma)G_{\mathbb{C}}(\cdot, 0) + c)] e^{(\alpha+2\gamma-2Q)c} dc. \end{aligned}$$

Now $\text{Var}((h, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)) = (G_{\mathbb{C}}^\varepsilon(\cdot, 0), \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon) = -\log \frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta, 0)}{2}$. Hence $\mathbb{E}[e^{(\alpha-\gamma)(h, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)}] = \left(\frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta, 0)}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha-\gamma)^2}$, and using Definition 2.4, we get

$$\int \mathbb{E}[e^{(\alpha-\gamma)(h, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)} f(\widetilde{h}+c)] e^{(\alpha+2\gamma-2Q)c} dc = \left(\frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta, 0)}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha-\gamma)^2} \int f(\phi) \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha, u_1), (\gamma, u_2), (\gamma, u_3)}. \quad (7.6)$$

Combining (7.4), (7.5) and (7.6), and collecting the prefactors via

$$\left(\frac{\text{CR}(\eta, 0)}{2} \right)^{(\alpha-\gamma)Q} \left(\frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta, 0)}{2} \right)^{-(\alpha-\gamma)\gamma} \left(\frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta, 0)}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha-\gamma)^2} = \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^2-\gamma^2)} \left(\frac{\text{CR}(\eta, 0)}{2} \right)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}+Q\alpha-2},$$

we conclude the proof. \square

We also need the following fact when dealing with uniform weldings that involves $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$.

Lemma 7.7. *For $\alpha > \frac{\gamma}{2}$ and $\ell > 0$, let (D, h, z) be an embedding of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$. Given (D, h, z) , let p be a point sampled from the harmonic measure on ∂D view from z , then the law of $(D, h, z, p)/\sim_\gamma$ equals that of $(\mathbb{H}, X, i, 0)/\sim_\gamma$ where X is sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell)$.*

Proof. We assume that $(D, h, z) = (\mathbb{H}, h, i)$ where h is a sample from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell)$. Let $\psi_p : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ be the conformal map with $\psi_p(i) = i$ and $\psi_p(p) = 0$ and set $X = h \circ \psi_p^{-1} + Q \log |(\psi_p^{-1})'|$. Then by the coordinate change for Liouville fields on \mathbb{H} from [ARS21, Lemma 2.4], the law of X is also $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\gamma, i)}(\ell)$. Since $(D, h, z, p)/\sim_\gamma = (\mathbb{H}, X, i, 0)/\sim_\gamma$ we are done. \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition 7.4. For notational simplicity for $\ell > 0$ we let \mathfrak{M}_ℓ be the measure on decorated quantum surfaces corresponding to

$$\frac{\gamma^2}{4\pi^4(Q-\gamma)^4} \iint_0^\infty \ell_2 \ell_3 \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\gamma; \ell_2), \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\gamma; \ell_3), \text{QP}(\ell, \ell_2, \ell_3)) d\ell_2 d\ell_3,$$

so that the relevant integral for Proposition 7.4 is $\int_0^\infty \ell \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell), \mathfrak{M}_\ell) d\ell$. We sample a decorated quantum surface from

$$\int_0^\infty \ell \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell), \mathfrak{M}_\ell) d\ell \quad (7.7)$$

and let $(\mathbb{C}, \phi, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, u_1, u_2, u_3)$ be its embedding; since we specify the locations of the three marked points, the tuple $(\phi, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3)$ is uniquely specified by the decorated quantum surface. Let D_{η_1} and $D_{\eta_1}^c$ be the connected components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta_1$ such that D_{η_1} contains u_1 . Let $p \in \eta_1$ be a point sampled from the harmonic measure of ∂D_{η_1} viewed from u_1 and set $\mathcal{D}_1 = (D_{\eta_1}, \phi, u_1, p) / \sim_\gamma$. Let $X \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{H})$ be such that $\mathcal{D}_1 = (\mathbb{H}, X, i, 0) / \sim_\gamma$. Let \mathcal{D}_1^c be the decorated quantum surface $(D_{\eta_1}^c, \phi, \eta_2, \eta_3, u_2, u_3, p) / \sim_\gamma$. Then the law of (X, \mathcal{D}_1^c) is described by the following lemma.

Lemma 7.8. *Given a decorated quantum surface \mathcal{S} sampled from \mathfrak{M}_ℓ , we write \mathcal{S}^\bullet as the decorated quantum surface obtained by further sampling a point on the boundary of \mathcal{S} according to the probability measure proportional to its quantum boundary length measure. Let $\mathfrak{M}_\ell^\bullet$ be the law of \mathcal{S}^\bullet . Then the law of (X, \mathcal{D}_1^c) defined right above is $\int_0^\infty \ell \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell) \times \mathfrak{M}_\ell^\bullet d\ell$.*

Proof. By the definition of uniform welding, conditioning on \mathcal{D}_1 , the conditional law of \mathcal{D}_1^c is $\mathfrak{M}_\ell^\bullet$ with ℓ being the boundary length of \mathcal{D}_1 . Since the marked boundary point of \mathcal{D}_1 is sampled from the harmonic measure, Lemma 7.7 now yields Lemma 7.8. \square

Proof of Proposition 7.4. For $(\phi, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, p)$ defined above Lemma 7.8 with $\alpha = \gamma$, by Lemma 7.3 the law of $(\phi, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, p)$ is $\text{Harm}_{u_1, \eta_1}(dp) \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, u_1), (\gamma, u_2), (\gamma, u_3)}(d\phi) \mathfrak{m}_3(d\eta_1, d\eta_2, d\eta_3)$ where $\text{Harm}_{u_1, \eta_1}$ means the harmonic measure on η_1 viewed from u_1 . For (X, \mathcal{D}_1^c) in Lemma 7.8, since $(\phi, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, p)$ and (X, \mathcal{D}_1^c) determine each other, Lemma 7.8 with $\alpha = \gamma$ can be written as

$$\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, u_1), (\gamma, u_2), (\gamma, u_3)}(d\phi) \text{Harm}_{u_1, \eta_1}(dp) \mathfrak{m}_3(d\eta_1, d\eta_2, d\eta_3) = \int_0^\infty \ell \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\gamma, i)}(\ell) \times \mathfrak{M}_\ell^\bullet d\ell. \quad (7.8)$$

Recall the notations in Lemma 7.6. For $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$, for any nonnegative measurable function f of $\phi|_{\mathbb{C}_{\eta_1, p, \varepsilon}}$, and any nonnegative measure function g of (η_1, η_2, η_3) , we get from (7.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int f(\phi|_{\mathbb{C}_{\eta_1, p, \varepsilon}}) g(\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3) \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^2 - \gamma^2)} e^{(\alpha - \gamma)X_\varepsilon(i)} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, u_1), (\gamma, u_2), (\gamma, u_3)}(d\phi) \text{Harm}_{u_1, \eta_1}(dp) \mathfrak{m}_3(d\eta_1, d\eta_2, d\eta_3) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \left(\int f(\phi|_{\mathbb{C}_{\eta_1, p, \varepsilon}}) g(\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3) \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^2 - \gamma^2)} e^{(\alpha - \gamma)X_\varepsilon(i)} \ell \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\gamma, i)}(\ell) \times \mathfrak{M}_\ell^\bullet \right) d\ell. \end{aligned} \quad (7.9)$$

By Lemma 7.6, the left side of (7.9) equals

$$\int f g \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{CR}(\eta, u_1) \right)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2} + Q\alpha - 2} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha, u_1), (\gamma, u_2), (\gamma, u_3)}(d\phi) \text{Harm}_{u_1, \eta_1}(dp) \mathfrak{m}_3(d\eta_1, d\eta_2, d\eta_3).$$

Here we write $f = f(\phi|_{\mathbb{C}_{\eta_1, p, \varepsilon}})$ and $g = g(\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3)$ to ease the notation.

By Lemma 7.5, the right side of (7.9) equals

$$\int_0^\infty \left(\int f g \ell \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell) \times \mathfrak{M}_\ell^\bullet \right) d\ell.$$

Recall that $\mathfrak{m}_3^{\alpha, \gamma, \gamma} = \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{CR}(\eta, u_1) \right)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2} + Q\alpha - 2} \mathfrak{m}_3$. Comparing the two integrals above, we get in the same sense as in (7.8) that

$$\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha, u_1), (\gamma, u_2), (\gamma, u_3)}(d\phi) \text{Harm}_{u_1, \eta_1}(dp) \mathfrak{m}_3^{\alpha, \gamma, \gamma}(d\eta_1, d\eta_2, d\eta_3) = \int_0^\infty \ell \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell) \times \mathfrak{M}_\ell^\bullet d\ell.$$

Forgetting about the point p we get Proposition 7.4. \square

Proof of Theorem 7.2. The case $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = (\alpha, \gamma, \gamma)$ was proved in Proposition 7.4 by reweighting from the (γ, γ, γ) case. The exact same argument in Lemma 7.6 gives the following extension:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int f(\phi|_{\mathbb{C}_{\eta,p,\varepsilon}}) \times \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^2 - \alpha_1^2)} e^{(\alpha - \alpha_1)X_\varepsilon(i)} d\mathbf{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_1, u_1), (\alpha_2, u_2), (\alpha_3, u_3)} \\ &= \int f(\phi|_{\mathbb{C}_{\eta,p,\varepsilon}}) \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{CR}(\eta, u_1) \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_1^2}{2} + Q\alpha_1 - 2} \mathbf{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha, u_1), (\alpha_2, u_2), (\alpha_3, u_3)}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying this argument twice at u_2 and u_3 yields the general result. \square

7.2 Matching the quantum area: proof of Theorem 1.2

We start by proving the following counterpart of Lemma 7.1.

Proposition 7.9. *There is a constant $C = C(\gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ such that for $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in (Q - \frac{\gamma}{4}, Q)$ and $\mu > 0$, with notation as in Theorem 7.2 and writing ϕ for the random field from $\mathbf{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, u_i)_i}$,*

$$\left(\mathbf{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, u_i)_3} \times \mathfrak{m}_3^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3} \right) [e^{-\mu\phi(\mathbb{C})}] = C \prod_{i=1}^3 \frac{2\alpha_i^{2/2 - Q\alpha_i} \Gamma(\frac{\gamma\alpha_i}{2} - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha_i)) \cos(\frac{2\pi}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha_i))} \left(\frac{\pi\Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})} \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_i}{\gamma}}.$$

Proof. Recall $\mathbf{QP}_3(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)[e^{-A}]$ from Theorem 6.4. Recall $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha_i; \ell_i)[e^{-A_i}]$ from Theorems 2.17, where A_i is the quantum area of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha_i; \ell_i)$. By Theorem 7.2, for some γ -dependent constants C_1, C_2 we have that $\left(\mathbf{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, u_i)_3} \times \mathfrak{m}_3^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3} \right) [e^{-\mu\phi(\mathbb{C})}]$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} & C_1 \iiint_0^\infty \ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 \mathbf{QP}_3(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)[e^{-A}] \prod_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha_i; \ell_i)[e^{-A_i}] d\ell_1 d\ell_2 d\ell_3 \\ &= C_2 \prod_{i=1}^3 \frac{\bar{U}(\alpha_i) (4 \sin(\frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}))^{\alpha_i/\gamma}}{2\alpha_i^{2/2 - Q\alpha_i} \Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha_i))} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell_i}} e^{-\ell_i \sqrt{\frac{1}{\sin(\pi\gamma^2/4)}}} K_{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha_i)} \left(\ell_i \sqrt{\frac{1}{\sin(\pi\gamma^2/4)}} \right) d\ell_i, \end{aligned}$$

where \bar{U} is as in (2.4). Expanding $\bar{U}(\alpha_i)$ and using Lemma 2.18 to simplify the integral on the second line, this is equal to

$$C \prod_{i=1}^3 \frac{2\alpha_i^{2/2 - Q\alpha_i} \Gamma(\frac{\gamma\alpha_i}{2} - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha_i)) \cos(\frac{2\pi}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha_i))} \left(\frac{\sin(\frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}) \Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})^2}{\pi^2} \right)^{\frac{\alpha_i}{\gamma}}.$$

The identity $\Gamma(z)\Gamma(1-z) = \frac{\pi}{\sin(\pi z)}$ then yields the result. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We divide the proof into four cases depending on the parameter range.

Case I: $\kappa < 4$ and $\lambda_i \in (\frac{3\kappa}{32} - 1 + \frac{2}{\kappa}, \frac{\kappa}{8} - 1 + \frac{2}{\kappa})$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3$. In this case we can find $\alpha_i \in (Q - \frac{\gamma}{4}, Q)$ satisfying $\lambda_i = -\frac{\alpha_i^2}{2} + Q\alpha_i - 2$ for each i . Comparing Lemmas 7.1 and 7.9 yields for some γ -dependent constant C that

$$C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = \frac{C}{C_\gamma^{\text{DOZZ}}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)} \prod_{i=1}^3 \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma\alpha_i}{2} - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha_i)) \cos(\frac{2\pi}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha_i))} \left(\frac{\pi\Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})} \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_i}{\gamma}}.$$

The constant C is recovered by setting $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \gamma$, for which $\lambda_i = 0$ and $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(0, 0, 0) = 1$. This gives (1.3) for $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ and (1.4) for the factor $N_\gamma(\alpha)$.

For the next three cases we need the following monotonicity. Since the distance between u_i and η_i is less than 1 by our choice of u_1, u_2, u_3 , by the Koebe 1/4 theorem we have $\frac{1}{4}\text{CR}(\eta_i, u_i) \leq 1$. Therefore $\mathbb{E}[\prod_{i=1}^3 (\frac{1}{4}\text{CR}(\eta_i, u_i))^{\lambda_i}] \geq \mathbb{E}[\prod_{i=1}^3 (\frac{1}{4}\text{CR}(\eta_i, u_i))^{\tilde{\lambda}_i}]$ for any real $\lambda_i, \tilde{\lambda}_i$ such that $\lambda_i \leq \tilde{\lambda}_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, hence

$$4^{-\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3} C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \geq 4^{-\tilde{\lambda}_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_2 - \tilde{\lambda}_3} C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{\lambda}_3). \quad (7.10)$$

Case II: $\kappa < 4$ and all $\lambda_i > \frac{3\kappa}{32} - 1 + \frac{2}{\kappa}$. By (7.10) $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ is finite, hence analytic, on $\{(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : \text{Re } z_i > \frac{3\kappa}{32} - 1 + \frac{2}{\kappa} \text{ for } i = 1, 2, 3\}$. On the other hand, the right hand side of (1.3) is a meromorphic function. Since Case II includes Case I, we see that (1.3) holds in Case II.

Case III: $\kappa < 4$ and $\lambda_i \leq \frac{3\kappa}{32} - 1 + \frac{2}{\kappa}$ for some i . We will show that $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = \infty$ in this case. By the monotonicity (7.10) and symmetry, it suffices to prove $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = \infty$ for $\lambda_1 \leq \frac{3\kappa}{32} - 1 + \frac{2}{\kappa}$ and $\lambda_2, \lambda_3 > \frac{3\kappa}{32} - 1 + \frac{2}{\kappa}$. For $\tilde{\lambda}_1 > \frac{3\kappa}{32} - 1 + \frac{2}{\kappa}$ we have

$$4^{-\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3} C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) > 4^{-\tilde{\lambda}_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3} C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3),$$

By the explicit formula for $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ in (1.3) we get $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\tilde{\lambda}_1 \downarrow \frac{3\kappa}{32} - 1 + \frac{2}{\kappa}$; indeed, writing $(\tilde{\alpha}_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) \in (Q - \frac{\gamma}{4}, Q)^3$ for the parameters corresponding to $(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$, as $\tilde{\alpha}_1 \downarrow Q - \frac{\gamma}{4}$ we have $\lim_{\tilde{\alpha}_1 \downarrow Q - \frac{\gamma}{4}} N_\gamma(\tilde{\alpha}_1) = \infty$ while $C_\gamma^{\text{DOZZ}}(\tilde{\alpha}_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ remains positive since $(\tilde{\alpha}_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ satisfies the Seiberg bounds (2.2). Therefore $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = \infty$ as desired.

Case IV: $\kappa = 4$. This follows from Lemma B.7 via the continuity as $\kappa \uparrow 4$. \square

8 Electrical thickness of the SLE loop via conformal welding

In this section we prove Theorem 1.4. Recall from Section 5 the cylinder $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R} \times [0, 2\pi]$ with $x \in \mathbb{R}$ identified with $x + 2\pi i$, and that $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is the pullback of the loop shape measure \mathcal{L}_κ under the map $z \mapsto e^{-z}$. Thus $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is a probability measure on loops η in \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$ and satisfying $\max_{z \in \eta} \text{Re } z = 0$. For a loop η sampled from $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$, we write $\vartheta(\eta)$ for the electrical thickness of $\exp(\eta)$. Then Theorem 1.4 is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}] = \begin{cases} \frac{\sin(\pi(1-\kappa/4))}{\pi(1-\kappa/4)} \frac{\pi\sqrt{(1-\kappa/4)^2 + \lambda\kappa/2}}{\sin(\pi\sqrt{(1-\kappa/4)^2 + \lambda\kappa/2})} & \text{if } \lambda < 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8}. \\ \infty & \text{if } \lambda \geq 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8}. \end{cases} \quad (8.1)$$

Consider $\alpha < Q$ and set $\lambda = \frac{\alpha^2}{2} - Q\alpha + 2$. Let $\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha$ be defined by the following reweighting of $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$.

$$\frac{d\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha}{d\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})}(\eta) = \left(\frac{1}{4}\text{CR}(\exp(\eta), 0)\text{CR}(\exp(-\eta), 0)\right)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2} + Q\alpha - 2} = 2^{2\lambda} e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}, \quad (8.2)$$

Thus proving Theorem 1.4 amounts to computing the total mass $|\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha|$. We will achieve this using the same strategy as in the proof of Theorem 1.2 in Section 7: first establish a conformal welding identity and then evaluate an observable in two ways.

Sample a pair (η, \mathbf{t}) from $\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha \times dt$ (where dt is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}), and let $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ be the law of the translated loop $\eta + \mathbf{t}$. Then $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ is an infinite measure on loops on \mathcal{C} separating

$\pm\infty$. Note that $\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\gamma = \mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$. According to Lemma 5.4, $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep},\gamma}$ is a constant multiple of the measure $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$ from Section 5.

To prove Theorem 1.4, we consider a generalization of the loop decorated two-pointed quantum sphere $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ from Proposition 5.6, where marked points have α -singularities. We first recall the α -generalization of QS_2 from [DMS14] and its relation to LCFT following [AHS21, Section 2].

Definition 8.1. For $\gamma \in (0, 2)$, let $(B_s)_{s \geq 0}$ be a standard Brownian motion conditioned on $B_s - (Q - \alpha)s < 0$ for all $s > 0$, and $(\tilde{B}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ an independent copy of $(B_s)_{s \geq 0}$. Let

$$Y_t = \begin{cases} B_t - (Q - \alpha)t & \text{if } t \geq 0 \\ \tilde{B}_{-t} + (Q - \alpha)t & \text{if } t < 0 \end{cases}.$$

Let $h^1(z) = Y_{\text{Re } z}$ for each $z \in \mathcal{C}$. Let h_c^2 be independent of h^1 and have the law of the lateral component of the GFF on \mathcal{C} . Let $\hat{h} = h^1 + h_c^2$. Let $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}$ be sampled from $\frac{\gamma}{2}e^{2(\alpha-Q)c}dc$ independent of \hat{h} and set $h = \hat{h} + \mathbf{c}$. Let $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha)$ be the infinite measure describing the law of the decorated quantum surface $(\mathcal{C}, h, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$.

Recall the unit-volume reflection coefficient for LCFT on the sphere [KRV17, RV19]

$$\bar{R}(\alpha) := - \left(\frac{\pi\Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})} \right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha)} \frac{1}{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(-\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q-\alpha))}{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q-\alpha))\Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha))}. \quad (8.3)$$

Lemma 8.2. The law of the quantum area of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha)$ is

$$1_{a>0} \frac{1}{2} \bar{R}(\alpha) a^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(\alpha-Q)-1} da.$$

Proof. For $0 < a < a'$ with \hat{h} as in Definition 8.1, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha)[\mu_{\hat{h}+c}(\mathcal{C}) \in (a, a')] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{e^{\gamma c} \mu_{\hat{h}}(\mathcal{C}) \in (a, a')} \frac{\gamma}{2} e^{2(\alpha-Q)c} dc \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_a^{a'} \frac{\gamma}{2} \left(\frac{y}{\mu_{\hat{h}}(\mathcal{C})} \right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(\alpha-Q)} \frac{1}{\gamma y} dy \right]$$

where we have used the change of variables $y = e^{\gamma c} \mu_{\hat{h}}(\mathcal{C})$. By [KRV17, Theorem 3.5] and [RV19, (1.10)–(1.12)], for $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$ we have $\mathbb{E}[\mu_{\hat{h}}(\mathcal{C})^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha)}] = \bar{R}(\alpha)$. Interchanging the expectation and integral gives the result. \square

Fix $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$. Let \mathbb{F} be the law of h as in Definition 8.1, so that the law of $(\mathcal{C}, h, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha)$. Now sample (h, η) from $\mathbb{F} \times \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep},\alpha}$ and write $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ as the law of $(\mathcal{C}, h, \eta, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$. Recall the Liouville field with α -insertions $\text{LF}_\mathcal{C}^{(\alpha, \pm\infty)}$ on \mathcal{C} from Definition 2.10. We have the following description of $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$.

Proposition 8.3. If (ϕ, η) is sampled from $\text{LF}_\mathcal{C}^{(\alpha, \pm\infty)} \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha$, the law of $(\mathcal{C}, \phi, \eta, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is

$$C(Q - \alpha)^2 \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep},\alpha} \quad \text{for some constant } C = C(\gamma) \in (0, \infty). \quad (8.4)$$

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of the definition of $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep},\alpha}$ and Theorem 2.11 of [AHS21, Theorem 2.11], which says the following: let h be the field in Definition 8.1, so the law of $(\mathcal{C}, h, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha)$. Let $T \in \mathbb{R}$ be sampled from Lebesgue measure independently of h , and set $\phi := h(\cdot + T)$. Then ϕ has law $\frac{\gamma}{4(Q-\alpha)^2} \text{LF}_\mathcal{C}^{(\alpha, \pm\infty)}$. \square

We now present the conformal welding result needed for the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Proposition 8.4. *For $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$ and for some constant $C = C(\gamma)$ we have*

$$C(Q - \alpha)^2 \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}, \alpha} = \int_0^{\infty} \ell \cdot \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell), \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)) d\ell.$$

We postpone the proof of Proposition 8.4 to Section 8.1 and proceed to the proof of Theorem 1.4. Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we would like to compare the area of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ using Propositions 8.3 and 8.4 to obtain $|\mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha}|$ and hence prove Theorem 1.4. But $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}, \alpha}[e^{-A}] = \infty$. Therefore we need to find a finite observable to compute. Note that $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ is a measure on quantum surfaces decorated by two marked points and a loop separating them. The loop separates the quantum surface into two connected components. For $0 < \varepsilon < \delta$, let $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ be the event that the connected component containing the first marked point has quantum area at least 1 and the loop has quantum length in (ε, δ) . The size of $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ is easy to compute using Proposition 8.4.

Lemma 8.5. *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$. With C from Proposition 8.4, $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}, \alpha}[E_{\delta, \varepsilon}]$ equals*

$$\frac{1}{C(Q - \alpha)^2} \times \frac{(1 + o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) \log \varepsilon^{-1}}{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha) \Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha))} \left(\frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}} \bar{U}(\alpha) \right)^2 \left(4 \sin \frac{\pi \gamma^2}{4} \right)^{-\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha)},$$

where the error term $o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)$ satisfies $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1) = 0$.

Proof. Let A be the quantum area of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$. By Proposition 8.4, to prove Lemma 8.5, it suffices to prove

$$\int_{\varepsilon}^{\delta} \ell \cdot \left| \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell) \right| \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)[A > 1] d\ell = \frac{(1 + o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) \log \varepsilon^{-1}}{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha) \Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha))} \left(\frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}} \bar{U}(\alpha) \right)^2 \left(4 \sin \frac{\pi \gamma^2}{4} \right)^{-\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha)}. \quad (8.5)$$

since the left side of (8.5) is the mass of $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ under $\int_0^{\infty} \ell \cdot \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell), \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)) d\ell$. By the scaling of quantum area and boundary length, we have $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)^{\#}[A > 1] = \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; 1)^{\#}[A > \ell^{-2}]$. By Theorem 2.17 the quantum area law of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; 1)^{\#}$ is inverse gamma with shape $a = \frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha)$ and scale $b = (4 \sin \frac{\pi \gamma^2}{4})^{-1}$. Let $\underline{\Gamma}$ be the lower incomplete gamma function; this satisfies $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{\underline{\Gamma}(a; y)}{y^a} = \frac{1}{a}$. By the tail asymptotic property of the inverse gamma distribution, as $\ell \rightarrow 0$,

$$\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)^{\#}[A > 1] = \frac{\underline{\Gamma}(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha); \ell^2 / 4 \sin \frac{\pi \gamma^2}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha))} = \frac{1 + o_{\ell}(1)}{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha) \Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha))} \left(\frac{\ell^2}{4 \sin \frac{\pi \gamma^2}{4}} \right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha)}.$$

By Proposition 2.12 we have $|\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)| = \frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}} \bar{U}(\alpha) \ell^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(\alpha - Q) - 1}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\varepsilon}^{\delta} \ell \cdot \left| \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell) \right| \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)[A > 1] d\ell &= \int_{\varepsilon}^{\delta} \ell \left(\frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}} \bar{U}(\alpha) \ell^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(\alpha - Q) - 1} \right)^2 \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)^{\#}[A > 1] \\ &= \frac{1 + o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)}{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha) \Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha))} \left(\frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}} \bar{U}(\alpha) \right)^2 \left(4 \sin \frac{\pi \gamma^2}{4} \right)^{-\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha)} \int_{\varepsilon}^{\delta} \ell^{-1} d\ell. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We can also compute the size of $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ using Proposition 8.3 in terms of $|\mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha}|$ and $\bar{R}(\alpha)$.

Proposition 8.6. For $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$, with the error term in the same sense as in Lemma 8.5,

$$(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha})[E_{\delta, \varepsilon}] = (1 + o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) \frac{\bar{R}(\alpha)}{2(Q - \alpha)^2} |\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha| \log \varepsilon^{-1}.$$

We postpone the proof of Proposition 8.6 to Section 8.2 and proceed to the proof of Theorem 1.4 using Lemma 8.5 and Proposition 8.6.

Proposition 8.7. For some constant $C = C(\gamma)$ and all $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$ we have

$$2^{-\alpha^2 + 2Q\alpha} |\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha| = C \frac{\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q - \alpha)}{\sin(\frac{\gamma\pi}{2}(Q - \alpha))}.$$

Proof. In this proof, we write C for a γ -dependent constant that may change from line to line. By Proposition 8.6 and Lemma 8.5 we get

$$(Q - \alpha)^2 \frac{\bar{R}(\alpha)}{2(Q - \alpha)^2} |\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha| = \frac{C}{\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q - \alpha) \Gamma(\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q - \alpha))} \left(\frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}} \bar{U}(\alpha) \right)^2 \left(4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4} \right)^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q - \alpha)}.$$

Using the definitions of $\bar{R}(\alpha)$ and $\bar{U}(\alpha)$ in (8.3) and (2.4) and cancelling equal terms gives

$$\left(\frac{\pi \Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q - \alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma}{2}(\alpha - Q))}{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q - \alpha))} |\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha| = \left(\frac{\pi^2}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})^2 \sin(\frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q - \alpha)} C 2^{\alpha^2 - 2Q\alpha} \Gamma(1 + \frac{\gamma}{2}(\alpha - Q))^2$$

The identity $\Gamma(z)\Gamma(1 - z) = \frac{\pi}{\sin(\pi z)}$ gives equality of the first terms on the left and right hand sides, so rearranging and using $\Gamma(z + 1) = z\Gamma(z)$ and $\Gamma(1 - z)\Gamma(z) = \frac{\pi}{\sin(\pi z)}$ gives the desired identity:

$$2^{-\alpha^2 + 2Q\alpha} |\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha| = C \frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{\gamma}{2}(\alpha - Q))}{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma}{2}(\alpha - Q))} \Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma}{2}(Q - \alpha)) \Gamma(\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q - \alpha)) = C \frac{\gamma}{2}(\alpha - Q) \cdot \frac{\pi}{\sin(\frac{\gamma\pi}{2}(Q - \alpha))}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We break the proof of (8.1) hence Theorem 1.4 into three cases.

Case I: $\kappa < 4$ and $\lambda \in (1 - \frac{\kappa}{8} - \frac{2}{\kappa}, 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8})$. Let $\alpha = Q - \sqrt{Q^2 - 4 + 2\lambda} \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$, so $\lambda = \frac{\alpha^2}{2} - Q\alpha + 2$. By (8.2) and Proposition 8.7 we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}] = 2^{-2\lambda} |\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha| = C \frac{\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q - \alpha)}{\sin(\frac{\gamma\pi}{2}(Q - \alpha))} = C \frac{\sqrt{(1 - \frac{\kappa}{4})^2 + \frac{\lambda\kappa}{2}}}{\sin(\pi\sqrt{(1 - \frac{\kappa}{4})^2 + \frac{\lambda\kappa}{2}})}$$

for some constant $C = C(\gamma)$. Since $\kappa \in (0, 4)$, we have $0 \in (1 - \frac{\kappa}{8} - \frac{2}{\kappa}, 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8})$. Thus we can obtain the value of C by considering $1 = \mathbb{E}[e^0] = \frac{C(1 - \kappa/4)}{\sin(\pi(1 - \kappa/4))}$. This yields (8.1) in this case.

Case II: $\kappa < 4$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\vartheta(\eta) \geq 0$ a.s. the function $\lambda \mapsto \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}]$ is increasing. Thus for $\lambda < 0$ we have $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}] \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{0 \cdot \vartheta(\eta)}] = 1$, and since $1 - \frac{\kappa}{8} - \frac{2}{\kappa} < 0$ we can use analytic continuation to extend the result from $(1 - \frac{\kappa}{8} - \frac{2}{\kappa}, 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8})$ to $(-\infty, 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8})$. Finally, taking a limit from below, we have for any $\lambda \geq 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8}$ that $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}] \geq \lim_{\lambda' \uparrow 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8}} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda'\vartheta(\eta)}] = \infty$, where the limit follows from the explicit formula obtained in Case I.

Case III: $\kappa = 4$. For $\lambda < \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain the result by taking $\kappa \uparrow 4$ as follows. Let η_κ be sampled from \mathcal{L}_κ , then $\vartheta(\eta_\kappa) \rightarrow \vartheta(\eta_4)$ in law as $\kappa \uparrow 4$ by Lemma B.6. Fix $\lambda < \lambda' < 1 - \frac{4}{8}$. For κ sufficiently close to 4 the family $\{e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta_\kappa)}\}$ is uniformly integrable, since Theorem 1.4 gives a uniform bound on $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda'\vartheta(\eta_\kappa)}]$ for κ close to 4. Therefore $\lim_{\kappa \uparrow 4} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta_\kappa)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta_4)}]$. Now, for $\lambda \geq \frac{1}{2}$, the monotonicity argument of Case II gives $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}] = \infty$. □

We now proceed to prove Propositions 8.4 and 8.6 in Sections 8.1 and 8.2, respectively.

8.1 Conformal welding of two quantum disks with generic insertions

The goal of this section is to prove Proposition 8.4. Our argument closely follows that of Theorem 7.2.

Suppose η is a simple curve in \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$ with two marked points $p^-, p^+ \in \eta$. Let D_η^\pm be the connected components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta$ containing $\pm\infty$, and let $\psi_\eta^\pm : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow D_\eta^\pm$ be the conformal maps sending $(i, 0)$ to $(\pm\infty, p^\pm)$. We need the following analogue of Lemma 7.6.

Lemma 8.8. *Let η be a simple curve in \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$ with two marked points $p^-, p^+ \in \eta$. For $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$, let $\mathcal{C}_{\eta, p^\pm, \varepsilon} = \mathcal{C} \setminus (\psi_\eta^-(B_\varepsilon(i)) \cup \psi_\eta^+(B_\varepsilon(i)))$. For ϕ sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}$, let $X^\pm = \phi \circ \psi_\eta^\pm + Q \log |(\psi_\eta^\pm)'|$. Then for a fixed $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$ and for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ and any nonnegative measurable function f of $\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_{\eta, p^\pm, \varepsilon}}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int f(\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_{\eta, p^\pm, \varepsilon}}) \times \varepsilon^{\alpha^2 - \gamma^2} e^{(\alpha - \gamma)(X_\varepsilon^-(i) + X_\varepsilon^+(i))} d\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)} \\ &= \int f(\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_{\eta, p^\pm, \varepsilon}}) \left(\frac{1}{4} \text{CR}(\exp(\eta), 0) \text{CR}(\exp(-\eta), 0) \right)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2} + Q\alpha - 2} d\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\alpha, \pm\infty)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We reparametrize in \mathbb{C} and apply the argument of Lemma 7.6 twice. Let $g : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be given by $g(z) = \frac{z}{z-1}$ and let $G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be given by $G = g \circ \exp$. By [AHS21, Lemma 2.13], if ϕ is sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}$ then $\hat{\phi} := \phi \circ G^{-1} + Q \log |(G^{-1})'|$ has law $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, 0), (\gamma, -1)}$, and the same is true when γ is replaced by α . Let $(\hat{\eta}, \hat{p}^-, \hat{p}^+) = (g(\eta), g(p^-), g(p^+))$. Since $G'(0) = 1$ and $\frac{d}{dz}(G(\frac{1}{z}))|_{z=0} = 1$, we see that $\text{CR}(\exp(\eta), 0) = \text{CR}(\hat{\eta}, 0)$ and $\text{CR}(\exp(-\eta), 0) = \text{CR}(\hat{\eta}, -1)$. Thus, it is equivalent to show that if $\mathbb{C}_{\hat{\eta}, \hat{p}^\pm, \varepsilon} := \mathbb{C} \setminus (G(\psi^-(B_\varepsilon(i))) \cup G(\psi^+(B_\varepsilon(i))))$ and \hat{f} is a function of $\hat{\phi}|_{\mathbb{C}_{\hat{\eta}, \hat{p}^\pm, \varepsilon}}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \hat{f}(\hat{\phi}|_{\mathbb{C}_{\hat{\eta}, \hat{p}^\pm, \varepsilon}}) \times \varepsilon^{\alpha^2 - \gamma^2} e^{(\alpha - \gamma)(X_\varepsilon^-(i) + X_\varepsilon^+(i))} d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, 0), (\gamma, -1)} \\ &= \int \hat{f}(\hat{\phi}|_{\mathbb{C}_{\hat{\eta}, \hat{p}^\pm, \varepsilon}}) \left(\frac{1}{4} \text{CR}(\hat{\eta}, 0) \text{CR}(\hat{\eta}, -1) \right)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2} + Q\alpha - 2} d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha, 0), (\alpha, -1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, Lemma 7.6 shows that

$$\int \hat{f}(\hat{\phi}) \times \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^2 - \gamma^2)} e^{(\alpha - \gamma)X_\varepsilon^-(i)} d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, 0), (\gamma, -1)} = \int \hat{f}(\hat{\phi}) \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{CR}(\hat{\eta}, 0) \right)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2} + Q\alpha - 2} d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha, 0), (\gamma, -1)},$$

and applying the argument of Lemma 7.6 again to change the insertion at -1 yields the result. \square

For a curve η in \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$, we let $\text{Harm}_{-\infty, \eta}$ (resp. $\text{Harm}_{+\infty, \eta}$) be the harmonic measure on η viewed from $-\infty$ (resp., $+\infty$).

Lemma 8.9. *There is a constant $C = C(\gamma)$ such that the following holds. Suppose $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$. Sample (ϕ, η, p^-, p^+) from the measure*

$$C \cdot \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\alpha, \pm\infty)}(d\phi) \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha(d\eta) \text{Harm}_{-\infty, \eta}(dp^-) \text{Harm}_{+\infty, \eta}(dp^+).$$

Let $X_{\pm} = \phi \circ \psi_{\eta}^{\pm} + Q \log |(\psi_{\eta}^{\pm})'|$. Let τ be the quantum length of the clockwise arc from p^- to p^+ in D_{η}^+ . Then the law of (X^-, X^+, τ) is

$$\int_0^{\infty} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell) \times \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell) \times [1_{\tau \in (0, \ell)} d\tau] d\ell.$$

Proof. We first prove the case $\alpha = \gamma$, namely

$$C \cdot \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}(d\phi) \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}(d\eta) \text{Harm}_{-\infty, \eta}(dp^-) \text{Harm}_{+\infty, \eta}(dp^+) = \int_0^{\infty} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\gamma, i)}(\ell) \times \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\gamma, i)}(\ell) \times [1_{\tau \in (0, \ell)} d\tau] d\ell, \quad (8.6)$$

where with abuse of notation we view the left hand side as a measure on triples $(X^-, X^+, \tau) \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{H}) \times H^{-1}(\mathbb{H}) \times [0, \infty)$. Indeed, (8.6) is an immediate consequence of Proposition 5.6 and Lemma 7.7.

Now, let $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ and $\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon} := \mathbb{H} \setminus B_{\varepsilon}(i)$. Let f be a nonnegative measurable function of $(X^-|_{\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon}}, X^+|_{\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon}}, \tau)$, then reweighting (8.6) gives

$$\begin{aligned} C \int f(X^-|_{\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon}}, X^+|_{\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon}}, \tau) \varepsilon^{\alpha^2 - \gamma^2} e^{(\alpha - \gamma)(X_{\varepsilon}^-(i) + X_{\varepsilon}^+(i))} \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}(d\phi) \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}(d\eta) \text{Harm}_{-\infty, \eta}(dp^+) \text{Harm}_{-\infty, \eta}(dp^+) \\ = \int_0^{\infty} \left(\int f(X^-|_{\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon}}, X^+|_{\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon}}, \tau) \varepsilon^{\alpha^2 - \gamma^2} e^{(\alpha - \gamma)(X_{\varepsilon}^-(i) + X_{\varepsilon}^+(i))} \ell \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\gamma, i)}(\ell) \times \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\gamma, i)}(\ell) \times [1_{\tau \in (0, \ell)} d\tau] \right) d\ell. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 8.8, the left hand side equals

$$C \int f(X^-|_{\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon}}, X^+|_{\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon}}, \tau) \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\alpha, \pm\infty)}(d\phi) \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha}(d\eta) \text{Harm}_{-\infty, \eta}(dp^-) \text{Harm}_{+\infty, \eta}(dp^+).$$

By Lemma 7.5, the right hand side equals

$$\int_0^{\infty} \left(\int f(X^-|_{\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon}}, X^+|_{\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon}}, \tau) \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell) \times \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell) \times [1_{\tau \in (0, \ell)} d\tau] \right) d\ell.$$

Since the above two expressions agree for every ε and f , we obtain the result. \square

Proof of Proposition 8.4. In Lemma 8.9, the law of $(\mathcal{C}, \phi, \eta, \pm\infty)/\sim_{\gamma}$ is $C(Q - \alpha)^2 \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ by (8.4), and the joint law of $((\mathbb{H}, X^-, i)/\sim_{\gamma}, (\mathbb{H}, X^+, i)/\sim_{\gamma}, \tau)$ is $\int_0^{\infty} \ell \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell) \times \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell) \times [1_{\tau \in (0, \ell)} \ell^{-1} d\tau] d\ell$. Since $[1_{\tau \in (0, \ell)} \ell^{-1} d\tau]$ corresponds to the uniform conformal welding, the law of $(\mathcal{C}, \phi, \eta, \pm\infty)/\sim_{\gamma}$ is $\int_0^{\infty} \ell \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell), \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)) d\ell$. \square

8.2 Proof of Proposition 8.6

We first reformulate Proposition 8.6 by embedding in the cylinder. Sample the field h as in Definition 8.1 so that the law of $(\mathcal{C}, h, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_{\gamma}$ is $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha)$. Now we restrict to the event $\{\mu_h(\mathcal{C}) > 1\}$ and set $\phi := h(\cdot - a)$, where $a \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\mu_h((-\infty, a) \times [0, 2\pi]) = 1$. Let M be the law of ϕ under this restriction.

Lemma 8.10. *Let $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha)|_{\{A > 1\}}$ be the restriction of $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha)$ to quantum surfaces with quantum area greater than 1. If we sample $(\phi, \mathbf{t}, \eta^0)$ from $M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha}$ where dt is Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} and set $\eta = \eta^0 + \mathbf{t}$, then the law of $(\mathcal{C}, \phi, \eta, \pm\infty)/\sim_{\gamma}$ is $(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha)|_{\{A > 1\}}) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$.*

Proof. This is immediate from the definitions of M and $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$. \square

For a field and curve (ϕ, η) , writing D_{\pm} for the connected components of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \eta$ containing $\pm\infty$, we define the event $E_{\delta, \varepsilon} = \{(\phi, \eta) : \varepsilon < \nu_{\phi}(\eta) < \delta\}$ and $\mu_{\phi}(D_-) > 1\}$. This is the same event as that of Proposition 8.6, but phrased in terms of the embedded field and curve. By Lemma 8.10, Proposition 8.6 is equivalent to

$$(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha})[E_{\delta, \varepsilon}] = (1 + o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) \frac{\bar{R}(\alpha)}{2(Q - \alpha)^2} |\mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha}| \log \varepsilon^{-1}, \quad (8.7)$$

where the error term $o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)$ satisfies $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1) = 0$.

To prove (8.7), we use the following description of the law of $\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_+}$ when ϕ is sampled from M . For $t \geq 0$ let X_s be the average of ϕ on $[s, s + 2\pi i]/\sim$.

Lemma 8.11. *Conditioned on $\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_-}$, we have $\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_+} \stackrel{d}{=} \phi_0 + \mathfrak{h} - (Q - \alpha) \operatorname{Re} \cdot$, where ϕ_0 is a zero boundary GFF on \mathcal{C}_+ and \mathfrak{h} is a harmonic function determined by $\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_-}$ whose average on $[s, s + 2\pi i]/\sim$ is constant as $s > 0$ varies. In particular, conditioned on X_0 , the conditional law of $(X_s)_{s \geq 0}$ is Brownian motion with initial value X_0 and downward drift of $-(Q - \alpha)$.*

Proof. This is the sphere analog of [AG21, Lemma 2.11], and the proof is identical so we omit it. \square

Define for $x, y > 0$ the random times

$$\sigma_x = \inf\{s > 0 : X_s < \frac{2}{\gamma} \log x\} \vee 0, \quad \tau_y = \sup\{s > 0 : X_s > \frac{2}{\gamma} \log y\} \vee 0.$$

Lemma 8.12. *$M^{\#}$ -a.e. the field ϕ satisfies $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sigma_y}{\log y^{-1}} = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tau_y}{\log y^{-1}} = \frac{2}{\gamma(Q - \alpha)}$.*

Proof. Given Lemma 8.11, this is a straightforward Brownian motion fact. \square

For $C > 0$ define the event

$$F_{x, y, C} = \{(\phi, \mathbf{t}, \eta^0) : \mathbf{t} \in (\sigma_x - C, \tau_y)\}. \quad (8.8)$$

We first bound $(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha})[E_{\delta, \varepsilon}]$ from above by comparing $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ to $F_{\delta^{1-\zeta}, \varepsilon^{1+\zeta}, C}$.

Lemma 8.13. *For fixed $x > 0, C \geq 0$ we have as $y \rightarrow 0$*

$$(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha})[F_{x, y, C}] = (1 + o_y(1)) |M| |\mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha}| \frac{2 \log y^{-1}}{\gamma(Q - \alpha)}, \quad (8.9)$$

Moreover,

$$(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha})[E_{\delta, \varepsilon}] \leq (1 + o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) |M| |\mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha}| \frac{2 \log \varepsilon^{-1}}{\gamma(Q - \alpha)}. \quad (8.10)$$

Proof. Note that (8.9) is equivalent to $M^{\#}[\tau_y - \sigma_x + C] = (1 + o_y(1)) \frac{2 \log y^{-1}}{\gamma(Q - \alpha)}$. The upper bound follows from standard Brownian motion facts. Indeed Lemma 8.11 states that the field average process X_s has random starting value X_0 and then evolves as Brownian motion with drift $-(Q - \alpha)$, so letting Y_s be Brownian motion with starting value $\frac{2}{\gamma} \log x$ and drift $-(Q - \alpha)$, and letting $T > 0$ be the time Y_s first hits $\frac{2}{\gamma} \log y$, we have $M^{\#}[\tau_y - \sigma_x] \leq \mathbb{E}[T]$, and it is well known that $\mathbb{E}[T] = (1 + o_y(1)) \frac{2 \log y^{-1}}{\gamma(Q - \alpha)}$. The lower bound follows from Lemma 8.12. This gives (8.9)

For (8.10), it suffices to show that there exists some $C > 0$ such that for any fixed $\zeta > 0$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ then $\delta \rightarrow 0$,

$$(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[F_{\delta^{1-\zeta}, \varepsilon^{1+\zeta}, C} | E_{\delta, \varepsilon}] = 1 - o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1), \quad (8.11)$$

since this and (8.9) imply

$$(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E_{\delta, \varepsilon}] \leq (1 + o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1))(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[F_{\delta^{1-\zeta}, \varepsilon^{1+\zeta}, C}] = (1 + o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1))|M||\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha| \frac{(1 + \zeta) \frac{2}{\gamma} \log y^{-1}}{Q - \alpha},$$

and we can send $\zeta \rightarrow 0$ to conclude. Sample $(\phi, \mathbf{t}, \eta^0)$ from $M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha$ and condition on the quantum length of η^0 being $\ell > 0$. We will show that the conditional probability of $F_{\ell^{1-\zeta}, \ell^{1+\zeta}, C}$ is $1 - o_\ell(1)$ where $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow 0} o_\ell(1) = 0$; this clearly implies (8.11).

Let $\mathcal{C}_{\eta^0}^+$ be the connected component of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \eta^0$ containing $+\infty$. By Lemma 8.10 and Proposition 8.4 the conditional law of the quantum surface $(\mathcal{C}_{\eta^0}^+, \hat{\phi}, \eta^0, +\infty)$ is $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)^\#$, where $\hat{\phi} := \phi(\cdot - \mathbf{t})$. Although Lemma 5.13 is stated for embeddings of $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)^\#$, the same argument holds for embeddings of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)^\#$. Therefore, there is a constant C not depending on ℓ such that, for a fixed smooth function g with support in $\{z \in \mathcal{C} : \text{Re } z \in [C, C + 1]\}$ which is constant on vertical lines and satisfies $\int g(z) dz = 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[(\hat{\phi}, g) \in ((1 + \zeta) \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \ell, (1 - \zeta) \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \ell)] = 1 - o_\ell(1).$$

Therefore, with probability $1 - o_\ell(1)$ there is some $s \in [C, C + 1]$ for which the average of $\hat{\phi}$ on $[s, s + 2\pi i]$ lies in $((1 + \zeta) \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \ell, (1 - \zeta) \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \ell)$, i.e. $X_{\mathbf{t}+s} \in ((1 + \zeta) \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \ell, (1 - \zeta) \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \ell)$. This inclusion implies $\mathbf{t} + s \in (\sigma_{\ell^{1-\zeta}}, \tau_{\ell^{1+\zeta}})$, so $\mathbf{t} \in (\sigma_{\ell^{1-\zeta}} - C - 1, \tau_{\ell^{1+\zeta}})$. Thus, $F_{\ell^{1-\zeta}, \ell^{1+\zeta}, C+1}$ occurs with probability $1 - o_\ell(1)$. \square

Now, we obtain the lower bound for $(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E_{\delta, \varepsilon}]$ by coupling ϕ with a GFF.

Lemma 8.14. *We have $(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E_{\delta, \varepsilon}] \geq (1 - o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1))|M||\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha| \frac{(1-\zeta) \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \varepsilon^{-1}}{Q-\alpha}$.*

Proof. We first construct a coupling h sampled from $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ with ϕ sampled from $M^\#$ such that

$$\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_+} = h_2|_{\mathcal{C}_+} + X_{\text{Re} \cdot} + \hat{\mathfrak{h}}$$

where h_2 is the projection of h to $\mathcal{H}_2(\mathcal{C})$, X_s is the average of ϕ on $[s, s + 2\pi i]/\sim$, $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}$ is a random harmonic function on \mathcal{C}_+ which has average zero on $[s, s + 2\pi i]/\sim$ for all $s > 0$, and h_2 is independent of $(X_s)_{s \geq 0}$. Indeed, [MS17, Proposition 2.8] says that h can be decomposed via $h|_{\mathcal{C}_+} = h_0 + \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ where h_0 is a zero boundary GFF on \mathcal{C}_+ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ is a harmonic function on \mathcal{C}_+ whose average on $[s, s + 2\pi i]/\sim$ is zero for all $s > 0$. Similarly, Lemma 8.11 gives a decomposition $\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_+} = \phi_0 + \mathfrak{h} - (Q - \alpha) \text{Re} \cdot$ where ϕ_0 is a zero boundary GFF on \mathcal{C}_+ and \mathfrak{h} is a harmonic function on \mathcal{C}_+ whose average on $[s, s + 2\pi i]/\sim$ is the same for all $s > 0$. We couple h with ϕ so that $h_0 = \phi_0$, then the above properties are satisfied. Independently sample η^0 from $(\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)^\#$. We write \mathbb{P} to denote the probability measure on (ϕ, h, η^0) and \mathbb{E} for the expectation over \mathbb{P} .

Let $\zeta > 0$ be a parameter we send to zero at the end. The properties of $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}$ guarantee that a.s. $\sup_{\text{Re } z > 1} |\hat{\mathfrak{h}}(z)| < \infty$, hence $\mathbb{P}[\sup_{\text{Re } z > 1} |\hat{\mathfrak{h}}(z)| < \zeta \cdot \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \delta^{-1}] = 1 - o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)$. Also, setting $I := ((1 + 3\zeta) \frac{2}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)} \log \delta^{-1} + \delta^{-1}, (1 - 3\zeta) \frac{2}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)} \log \varepsilon^{-1})$, by Lemma 8.12 we have $I \subset (\tau_{\delta^{1+2\zeta}} + \delta^{-1}, \sigma_{\varepsilon^{1-2\zeta}})$ with probability $1 - o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)$. Finally, $\mathbb{P}[\inf_{z \in \eta^0} \text{Re } z > -\delta^{-1}] = 1 - o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)$. Let G

be the intersection of these three good events, so $\mathbb{P}[G] = 1 - o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)$. On G , if $t \in I$, then $X_{\text{Re } z} + \widehat{h}(z) \in ((1 - \zeta)\frac{2}{\gamma} \log \varepsilon, (1 + \zeta)\frac{2}{\gamma} \log \delta)$ for all z in a neighborhood of $\eta^0 + t$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (M^\# \times dt \times (\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)^\#)[E_{\delta,\varepsilon}] &\geq \mathbb{E}[1_G \int_I 1_{\nu_\phi(\eta^0+t) \in (\varepsilon,\delta)} dt] \geq \mathbb{E}[1_G \int_I 1_{\nu_{h_2}(\eta^0+t) \in (\varepsilon^\zeta, \delta^{-\zeta})} dt] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[\int_I 1_{\nu_{h_2}(\eta^0+t) \in (\varepsilon^\zeta, \delta^{-\zeta})} dt] - o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)|I|. \end{aligned}$$

In our coupling, h_2 and η^0 are independent, and $h_2 \stackrel{d}{=} h_2(\cdot - t)$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, so

$$\mathbb{E}[\int_I 1_{\nu_{h_2}(\eta^0+t) \in (\varepsilon^\zeta, \delta^{-\zeta})} dt] = |I| \mathbb{P}[\nu_{h_2}(\eta^0) \in (\varepsilon^\zeta, \delta^{-\zeta})] - o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)|I| = (1 - o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1))|I|,$$

hence

$$(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E_{\delta,\varepsilon}] \geq (1 - o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1))|M| |\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha| |I| \geq (1 - o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1))|M| |\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha| (1 - 4\zeta) \frac{2 \log \varepsilon^{-1}}{\gamma(Q - \alpha)}. \quad \square$$

Proof of Proposition 8.6. By Lemmas 8.13 and 8.14, we have

$$(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E_{\delta,\varepsilon}] = (1 + o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1))|M| |\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha| \frac{2 \log \varepsilon^{-1}}{Q - \alpha}.$$

By Lemma 8.2, we have $|M| = \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{2} \overline{R}(\alpha) a^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(\alpha-Q)-1} da = \frac{\gamma \overline{R}(\alpha)}{4(Q-\alpha)}$. Therefore we have (8.7). \square

A Background on CLE coupled with LQG

In this section we explain how Propositions 2.21 and 2.23 follow from existing literature.

A.1 Proof of Proposition 2.23

Proposition 2.23 can be easily reduced to the following statement.

Proposition A.1. *In the setting of Proposition 2.23, we can find a random point $p \in \eta$ such that, conditioning on $(A_\eta, h, \Gamma|_{A_\eta}, p)/\sim_\gamma$, the conditional law of $(D_\eta, h, z, p)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell_h(\eta))$.*

Proof of Proposition 2.23 given Proposition A.1. Suppose (h, Γ, p, z) satisfies Proposition A.1. Conditioning on (h, Γ, p, z) , let U be a uniform random variable on $(0, 1)$. Let w be the point of η such that the counterclockwise arc on η from p to w is of ℓ_h -length $U \ell_h(\eta)$. By definition, w is sampled from the probability measure proportional to $\ell_h(\eta)$. By Proposition A.1 and the re-rooting invariance of $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell_h(\eta))$, conditioning on $(A_\eta, h, \Gamma|_{A_\eta}, p)/\sim_\gamma$ and U , the conditional law of $(D_\eta, h, z, w)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell_h(\eta))$. Since $(A_\eta, h, \Gamma|_{A_\eta}, w)/\sim_\gamma$ is determined by $(A_\eta, h, \Gamma|_{A_\eta}, p)/\sim_\gamma$ and U , we are done. \square

To find the desired p in Proposition A.1, we use the *conformal percolation interface* (CPI) within a CLE carpet introduced by Miller, Sheffield and Werner [MSW17]. Suppose Γ is a CLE_κ on a Jordan domain D (i.e. ∂D is a simple curve) for some $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$. Given two boundary points x, y , a (chordal) CPI for Γ from x to y is a random curve from x to y coupled with Γ that does not enter the interior of any region surrounded by a loop of Γ (but it can touch the loops). We also need to specify how a CPI proceeds upon hitting a loop of Γ on its way from x to y . We require that it always leaves the loop to its right. In the terminology of [MSW17], this corresponding to CPI with

$\beta = 1$. The marginal law of a CPI is $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ on D from x to y where $\kappa' = 16/\kappa$ [MSW17, Theorem 7.7 (ii)] and the force point is on the right of x . In particular, a CPI is a non-simple curve. Intuitively, the chordal CPI describes the chordal interface of a percolation on a CLE carpet. It is characterized by certain conformal invariance and Markov properties which are consistent with this intuition; see [MSW17, Definition 2.1]. We will not review the full details but will rely on an analogous Markov property that CPI satisfies on a quantum disk background. This was established in [MSW20], which we review now.

Fix $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$. For $L_0, R_0 > 0$, suppose (D, h, Γ, x) be an embedding of a sample from $\text{QD}_{0,1}^\#(L_0 + R_0) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Let y be the point on ∂D such that the quantum length of the counterclockwise arc from x to y is R_0 . Conditioning on (h, Γ, x, y) , sample a CPI η' within the carpet of Γ from x to y . Since the law of η' is a $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$, there is a quantum natural time parametrization for η' with respect to h [DMS14, Section 6], which we use throughout. Under this parametrization η' has a finite duration T . For a fixed time $t > 0$, on the event that $t \leq T$, let $\tilde{\eta}'_t$ be the union of $\eta'[0, t]$ and all the loops of Γ touched by $\eta'[0, t]$. If $t < T$, let D_t be the simply connected component of $D \setminus \tilde{\eta}'_t$ which contains y on its boundary. For a fixed t , both D_t and the interior of $D \setminus D_t$ are Jordan domains a.s. We write the interior $D \setminus D_t$ as U_t . The interface between D_t and U_t are SLE_κ types curves, on which there is a well defined quantum length measure.




Figure 4: We color D_t blue and U_t green. **(a)**: At all but countably many times t , we have $D_t = D_{t-}$. To simplify (b)–(d) we omit their loops. **(b)**: A loop discovery time. **(c)**, **(d)**: A splitting time. At times when the left boundary length L_t has a downward jump, there are two possible topologies; we do not illustrate the similar cases when the split is to the right.

The following Markov property of CPI on quantum disks was proved in [MSW20], although it was not explicitly stated.

Proposition A.2 ([MSW20]). *For a fixed $t > 0$, on the event that $t < T$, let L_t and R_t be the quantum lengths of the clockwise and counterclockwise arcs from $\eta'(t)$ to y of ∂D_t . Conditioning on the decorated quantum surface $(U_t, h, \Gamma|_{U_t}, \eta'|_{[0,t]})/\sim_\gamma$ and (L_t, R_t) , the conditional law of $(D_t, h, \Gamma|_{D_t}, y)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{0,1}^\#(L_t + R_t) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$.*

Proof. This proposition is essentially [MSW20, Proposition 5.1], except that we condition on more information than they explicitly stated. But the argument carries over directly to our setting. \square

The point p in Proposition A.1 that we will find is a point where a CPI hits a loop. Therefore we need a stronger variant of the Markov property in Proposition A.2 at certain random times which we now define. For each $t \in (0, T)$, let D_{t-} be the interior of $\cap_{s < t} D_s$. According to [MSW20], for each fixed time t , on the event that $t < T$, almost surely $D_{t-} = D_t$; see Figure 4 (a). But there exist countably many times where $D_{t-} \neq D_t$. In this case, there are two scenarios:

1. The point $\eta'(t)$ is on a loop of Γ . In this case the interior of $D_{t^-} \setminus D_t$ is the Jordan domain enclosed by the this loop. But D_t is not a Jordan domain since $\eta'(t)$ corresponds to two points on ∂D_t . See Figure 4 (b). We call t a loop discovery time.
2. The point $\eta'(t)$ is not on a loop of Γ . In this case, both D_t and $D_{t^-} \setminus D_t$ are Jordan domains, and their boundaries intersect at the single point $\eta'(t)$. See Figure 4 (c)–(d). We call t a splitting time.

In both cases, we let \mathcal{B}_t be the interior of $D_{t^-} \setminus D_t$ and U_{t^-} be the interior of $D \setminus D_{t^-}$. Then $\partial \mathcal{B}_t \setminus \partial D$ is an SLE_κ type curve. By definition, $\partial \mathcal{B}_t$ is a loop in Γ if and only if t is a loop discovery time. Recall (L_t, R_t) from Proposition A.2. If t if it is a loop discovery time, then R_t has an upward jump. If t is a splitting time, then either L_t or R_t has a downward jump. In both cases, the size of the jump equals the quantum length of $\partial \mathcal{B}_t$, which we denote by X_t . We now state the stronger version of Proposition A.2.

Proposition A.3. *Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and a positive integer n . Let τ be the n -th time such that $D_{t^-} \neq D_t$ and the quantum length X_t of $\partial \mathcal{B}_t$ is larger than ε . If this time never occurs, set $\tau = \infty$. Conditioning on $\tau < \infty$, the decorated quantum surface $(U_{\tau^-}, h, \Gamma|_{U_{\tau^-}}, \eta'|_{[0, \tau]})/\sim_\gamma$, the indicator $1_{\{\partial \mathcal{B}_\tau \text{ is a loop}\}}$, and the quantum lengths X_τ of $\partial \mathcal{B}_\tau$ and L_τ, R_τ of the two arcs on D_τ , the conditional law of $(D_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{D_\tau}, y)/\sim_\gamma$ and $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$ is given by independent samples from $\text{QD}_{0,1}(L_\tau + R_\tau)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ and $\text{QD}_{0,1}(X_\tau)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$, respectively.*

Proof. For a fixed $t > 0$, on the event that $t \leq T$, consider the ordered collection of decorated quantum surfaces $\{(\mathcal{B}_s, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_s}, \eta'(s))/\sim_\gamma : s \leq t \text{ and } D_{s^-} \neq D_s\}$. It was proved in [MSW20] that conditioning on $(D_t, h, \Gamma|_{D_t}, \eta'(t), y)/\sim_\gamma$, and the ordered information of the quantum lengths of their boundaries and whether their times are loop discovery or splitting, the conditional law of these decorated quantum surfaces are independent CLE_κ decorated quantum disks with given boundary lengths. To see why this assertion follows from [MSW20], we note that Propositions 3.1 and 3.5 of [MSW20] yield the corresponding assertion for the analogous case of CLE on the quantum half-plane. The pinching argument of [MSW20, Proposition 5.1] then gives this assertion.

We claim that conditioning on $\tau < \infty$, $(U_{\tau^-}, h, \Gamma|_{U_{\tau^-}}, \eta'|_{[0, \tau]})/\sim_\gamma$, $1_{\{\partial \mathcal{B}_\tau \text{ is a loop}\}}$, and X_τ, L_τ, R_τ , the conditional law of $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{0,1}(X_\tau)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Fix a large $k > 0$. Let s_k be the largest integer multiple of 2^{-k} smaller than τ . Let $\mathcal{U}_t = (U_t, h, \Gamma|_{U_t}, \eta'|_{[0, t]})/\sim_\gamma$ and $\mathcal{D}_t = (D_t, h|_{D_t}, \Gamma|_{D_t}, y)/\sim_\gamma$. For a fixed j , by Proposition A.2, conditioning on $\mathcal{U}_{j2^{-k}}$ and $(L_{j2^{-k}}, R_{j2^{-k}})$, the conditional law of $\mathcal{D}_{j2^{-k}}$ is $\text{QD}_{0,1}(L_{j2^{-k}} + R_{j2^{-k}})^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Note that $\{s_k = j2^{-k}\}$ is determined by $\mathcal{U}_{j2^{-k}}$ and the quantum lengths of the boundaries of elements in $\{(\mathcal{B}_s, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_s}, \eta'(s))/\sim_\gamma : j2^{-k} \leq s \leq (j+1)2^{-k} \text{ and } D_{s^-} \neq D_s\}$. Applying the assertion of the first paragraph to $\mathcal{D}_{j2^{-k}}$ with $T = 2^{-k}$, we see that conditioning on $\tau < \infty$, $\mathcal{U}_{s_k}, \{s_k = j2^{-k}\}, 1_{\{\partial \mathcal{B}_\tau \text{ is a loop}\}}, X_\tau, L_{s_k+2^{-k}}$ and $R_{s_k+2^{-k}}$, the conditional law of $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{0,1}(X_\tau)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Varying j , we can remove the condition $\{s_k = j2^{-k}\}$. Since almost surely $\mathcal{U}_{s_k} \rightarrow (U_{\tau^-}, h, \Gamma|_{U_{\tau^-}}, \eta'|_{[0, \tau]})/\sim_\gamma$ and $(L_{s_k+2^{-k}}, R_{s_k+2^{-k}}) \rightarrow (L_\tau, R_\tau)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have proved the desired claim.

It remains to show that conditioning on $\tau < \infty$, $(U_{\tau^-}, h, \Gamma|_{U_{\tau^-}}, \eta'|_{[0, \tau]})/\sim_\gamma$, $1_{\{\partial \mathcal{B}_\tau \text{ is a loop}\}}, X_\tau, L_\tau, R_\tau$ and $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$, the conditional law of $(D_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{D_\tau}, y)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{0,1}(L_\tau + R_\tau)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. This follows from a similar but easier argument: we consider the smallest multiple of 2^{-k} larger than τ and use the Markov property in Proposition A.2 at this time. We omit the details. \square

Proof of Proposition A.1. For $a > 0$, let (D, h, Γ, x) be an embedding of a sample from $\text{QD}_{0,1}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Now we reweight $\text{QD}_{0,1}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ by $\mu_h(D)$ and sample a point z according to the probability measure proportional to μ_h . This way, the law of (D, h, Γ, z, x) is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ as

in Propositions 2.23 and A.1. Let y be the point on ∂D such that both the two arcs between x to y have quantum length $a/2$, and sample a CPI η' from x to y , parametrized by quantum natural time. Let t_0 be the time such $z \in \mathcal{B}_{t_0}$ and set $p_0 = \eta'(t_0)$.

Consider τ and \mathcal{B}_τ as defined in Proposition A.3 with this choice of (D, h, Γ, x, y) . Then on the event that $t_0 = \tau$, namely $z \in \mathcal{B}_\tau$, conditioning on $(U_{\tau^-}, h, \Gamma|_{U_{\tau^-}}, \eta'|_{[0, \tau]})/\sim_\gamma$, $1_{\{\partial \mathcal{B}_t \text{ is a loop}\}}$, the quantum length X_τ of $\partial \mathcal{B}_\tau$ and $(D_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{D_\tau}, y)/\sim_\gamma$, the conditional law of $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, z, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(X_\tau)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$, where we have $\text{QD}_{1,1}$ instead of $\text{QD}_{0,1}$ because of area weighting. This means that conditioning on the quantum intrinsic information on $D \setminus \mathcal{B}_\tau$, the conditional law of $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, z, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$ is a CLE decorated marked quantum disk with given boundary length. By varying ε and n in Proposition A.3, the same holds with $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, z, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$ replaced by $(\mathcal{B}_{t_0}, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_{t_0}}, z, \eta'(t_0))/\sim_\gamma$.

If t_0 is a loop discovery time, then $\partial \mathcal{B}_{t_0}$ is the loop η surrounding z and $p_0 = \eta'(t_0)$ is the desired point we need for Proposition A.1. Otherwise, we set $D_1 = \mathcal{B}_{t_0}$ and construct t_1 , \mathcal{B}_{t_1} and p_1 as above with (D, h, Γ, x) replaced by $(D_1, h, \Gamma|_{D_1}, p_0)$. If $p_1 \in \eta$ then we are done by setting $p = p_1$. Otherwise, we iterate this procedure and construct p_2, p_3, \dots . We claim that there must be a finite k such that $p_k \in \eta$, hence we can set $p = p_k$ and conclude the proof.

To see the finiteness of the iteration, recall the set $(\tilde{\eta}'_t)_{t \geq [0, T]}$ defined from a CPI η' . We now require that once η' hits a loop, it first finishes tracing the loop counterclockwise and then proceeds in its own track. This turns $\tilde{\eta}'_T$ into the trace of a non-self-crossing curve sharing the same endpoints as η' . According to [MSW17, Theorem 7.7 (ii)], viewed as a curve the law of $\tilde{\eta}'$ is a chordal $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ as defined in [She09]. The curve η' is the so-called trunk of $\tilde{\eta}'$. By the target invariance of $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$, if we iterate the above chordal CPI exploration towards z and keep track of the chordal $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$'s along the way, we get a radial $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ on D from x to z . From the relation between the $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ exploration tree and CLE_κ in [She09], after finite many iterations we must reach the loop η at a point p , the place where the radial $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ starts exploring η . \square

We conclude this section by briefly explaining how to define a canonical version of $\text{QA}(a, b)$ for all $a, b > 0$, as promised in Remark 3.3. Suppose we are in the setting of the proof of Proposition A.1, and we assume we are in the setting where t_0 is a loop discovery time, so we are in the scenario of Figure 4 (b); the general case follows easily by iteration. In this case, let $x_{t_0}^-$ and $x_{t_0}^+$ be the left and right endpoints of $(\partial D) \cap (\partial U_{t_0})$, and let (a_1, a_2, a_3) be the quantum lengths of the three boundary arcs of $(U_{t_0}, h, x_{t_0}^-, x_{t_0}^+, \eta'(t_0))$ in clockwise order from $\eta'(t_0)$. Then the quantum annulus $(A_\eta, h)/\sim_\gamma$ in Proposition 2.22 is obtained by the conformal welding of $(D_{t_0}, h)/\sim_\gamma$ and $(U_{t_0}, h)/\sim_\gamma$, where the welding pattern is specified by (a_1, a_2, a_3) and the quantum length of $\partial \mathcal{B}_{t_0}$. On one hand, the conditional law of (a_1, a_2, a_3) given the quantum length of $\partial \mathcal{B}_{t_0} = b$ varies continuously in total variational distance as b varies. On the other hand, the conditional law of $(D_{t_0}, h)/\sim_\gamma$ given (a_1, a_2, a_3, b) is $\text{QD}(a + a_1 - a_2 + a_3 + b)^\#$. By [ARS21, Lemma 5.17], $\text{QD}_{0,1}(L)^\#$ and $\text{QD}_{0,1}(L + \varepsilon)^\#$ can be coupled with probability $1 - o_\varepsilon(1)$ outside a neighborhood of the marked point. Putting this together, we can couple the conditional laws of (A_η, h) given $\ell_h(\eta) = b$ and $\ell_h(\eta) = b + \varepsilon$ to agree outside any neighborhood of y with probability $1 - o_\varepsilon(1)$. By the definition of $\text{QA}(a, b)$, this gives a canonical definition of $\text{QA}(a, b)$ and shows that it varies continuously in b in a reasonable topology.

A.2 Scaling limit of $O(n)$ -loop-decorated planar maps: Proof of Proposition 2.21

The fact that $(b_i)_{i \geq 1}$ and $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ in Proposition 2.21 agree in law holds because they give two descriptions of the scaling limit of the same discrete model: loop lengths in the $O(n)$ -loop-decorated

quadrangulation. This was pointed out at the end of Section 1 of [CCM20]. In this section we give a more detailed justification by assembling results in [CCM20, BBCK18, MSW20].

We recall the loop-decorated quadrangulation from [CCM20]. A quadrangulation with boundary is a planar map where each face has degree four except a distinguished face which we call the external face. (Others faces are called internal faces.) The degree of the external face is called the perimeter. A (rigid) loop configuration on a quadrangulation with a boundary is a set of disjoint undirected simple closed paths in the dual map which do not visit the external face, and with the additional constraint that when a loop visits a face of \mathbf{q} it must cross it through opposite edges. Let \mathcal{O}_p be the set of pairs (\mathbf{q}, Γ) such that \mathbf{q} is a quadrangulation with boundary whose perimeter is $2p$, and Γ is a loop configuration on \mathbf{q} . Similar as for CLE, for each Γ on \mathbf{q} , there is a collection of outermost loops whose are not surrounded by any other loop in Γ .

We now recall a scaling limit result in [CCM20]. Recall $\beta = \frac{4}{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2}$, let $n \in (0, 2)$ be such that $\beta = \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{\pi} \arccos(n/2)$. For each $(\mathbf{q}, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{O}_p$, we let $|\mathbf{q}|$ be the number of faces of \mathbf{q} , let $|\Gamma|$ be the total length of all loops of Γ , and let $\#\Gamma$ be the number of loops in Γ . For $h > 0, g > 0$, assign weight $w(\mathbf{q}, \Gamma) = g^{|\mathbf{q}| - |\Gamma|} h^{|\Gamma|} n^{\#\Gamma}$ to (\mathbf{q}, Γ) . For some choices of (g, h) , this gives a finite measure on \mathcal{O}_p which can be normalized into a probability measure. Let \mathfrak{M}_p be a sample from this measure. Let $L_1^p \geq L_2^p \geq \dots$ be the lengths of the outermost loops of \mathfrak{M}_p in decreasing order.

Proposition A.4 ([CCM20, Proposition 3]). *There exists (g, h) such that as $p \rightarrow \infty$, the sequence $(\frac{a}{2p} L_i^p)_{i \geq 1}$ converges in law to $(b_i)_{i \geq 1}$, where $(b_i)_{i \geq 1}$ and $a > 0$ are as in Proposition 2.21.*

We refer to [CCM20, Definition 1] for a description of (g, h) such that Proposition A.4 holds. In the rest of the section we explain why the following proposition follows from [BBCK18, MSW20].

Proposition A.5. *For (g, h) satisfying Proposition A.4, $(\frac{a}{2p} L_i^p)_{i \geq 1}$ converges in law to $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$.*

We first describe $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ in terms of a growth fragmentation process considered in [MSW20] and [BBCK18]. We will not give the full description of the growth fragmentation but only provide enough information to specify the law of $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$. Our presentation is based on the treatment in [BBCK18]. The description of growth fragmentation process in [MSW20] is different in appearance. But as explained in [MSW20, Remark 6.2] they correspond to the same process.

For $\theta = \frac{4}{\kappa} \in (1, \frac{3}{2})$, let ν_θ be the measure on $(\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ defined by

$$\nu_\theta(dx) = \frac{\Gamma(\theta + 1)}{\pi} \left(\frac{1_{1/2 < x < 1}}{(x(1-x))^{\theta+1}} + \sin(\pi(\theta - \frac{1}{2})) \frac{1_{x > 1}}{(x(x-1))^{\theta+1}} \right) dx.$$

Let Λ_θ be the pushforward of ν_θ under the map $x \mapsto \log x$. For $\lambda > 0$, let

$$\Psi_\theta(\lambda) = \left(\frac{\Gamma(2-\theta)}{2\Gamma(2-2\theta)\sin(\pi\theta)} + \frac{\Gamma(\theta+1)B_{\frac{1}{2}}(-\theta, 2-\theta)}{\pi} \right) \lambda + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{\lambda y} - 1 + \lambda(1 - e^y)) \Lambda_\theta(dy),$$

where $B_{\frac{1}{2}}(a, b) = \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{a-1} (1-t)^{b-1} dt$ is the incomplete Beta function; see [BBCK18, (28)]. By [BBCK18, Theorem 5.1, Proposition 5.2], there is a real-valued Lévy process $(\xi(t))_{t \geq 0}$ whose law is described by $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda \xi(t)}] = e^{t \Psi_\theta(\lambda)}$ for all $\lambda, t > 0$. For $t \geq 0$, let $\tau_t = \inf\{r \geq 0 : \int_0^r e^{\theta \xi(s)} ds \geq t\}$. Then τ_t a.s. reaches ∞ in finite time. For $a > 0$, define

$$Y_t^a := a \exp(\xi(\tau_{ta^{-\theta}})) \quad \text{for } t \geq 0,$$

with the convention that $\xi(+\infty) = -\infty$. Then $(Y_t^a)_{t \geq 0}$ is nonnegative Markov process, with initial value $Y_0^a = a$ and a.s. hits 0 in finite time. Since ν_θ is supported on $(\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$, the downward jumps $y \rightarrow y - \ell$ of $(Y_t^a)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfy $\ell < \frac{1}{2}y$.

We now relate $(Y_t^a)_{t \geq 0}$ to the CPI on quantum disks reviewed in Section A.1. Suppose (D, h, Γ, x, y) are as in Proposition A.2 such that the law of $(D, h, \Gamma, x) / \sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{0,1}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. The chordal CPI from x to y can be viewed as an exploration of the carpet of Γ such that at any splitting time it goes into the domain with the target y on its boundary. Namely, it enters D_t instead of \mathcal{B}_t to continue. We can also alter the exploration rule at these splitting times, each of which defines a variant of CPI and corresponds to a branch in the so-called CPI branching exploration tree rooted at x . One particular variant of CPI is such that at any splitting time it enters the domain with the largest quantum boundary length. In the terminology of [MSW20], this is called the CPI with $(q = \infty)$ -exploration mechanism.

Let \tilde{Y}_t^a be the boundary length of the to-be-explored region at time t CPI with $(q = \infty)$ -exploration mechanism. Then by [MSW20, Theorem 1.2], for some constant $c > 0$ not depending on a , we have $(\tilde{Y}_{ct}^a)_{t \geq 0} \stackrel{d}{=} (Y_t^a)_{t \geq 0}$. Moreover, the upward jumps in \tilde{Y}_t correspond to times when the CPI discovers a loop, and downward jumps in \tilde{Y}_t correspond to times when the CPI splits the to-be-explored region into two. Iteratively applying this fact we get the following description the outermost loop lengths is as in Proposition 2.21.

Proposition A.6 ([MSW20]). *The lengths $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ equals in law with $(L_i)_{i \geq 1}$ sampled as follows. First sample $(Y_t^a)_{t \geq 0}$, and let U_1 and D_1 be the sets of the sizes of upward and downward jumps of $(Y_t^a)_{t \geq 0}$. Given D_1 , sample a collection of independent processes $S_2 = \{(Y_t^x)_{t \geq 0} : x \in D_1\}$, and let U_2 and D_2 be the sets of the sizes of all upward and downward jumps of processes in S_2 . Iteratively define S_i, U_i, D_i for all i , and finally set $U = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} U_i$. Rank the elements of U as $L_1 \geq L_2 \geq \dots$.*

Proof. The quantum lengths of loops discovered by CPI with $(q = \infty)$ -exploration mechanism correspond to the sizes of the upward jumps in \tilde{Y}_t^a , which has the same law as the upward jumps in Y_t^a . The analogous Markov properties in Propositions A.2 and A.3 still hold for this CPI. Now we continue this exploration mechanism to explore the rest of CLE carpet. Iteratively applying this relation the quantum length of the discovered loops and the upward jumps, we get Proposition A.6. \square

We now explain how Proposition A.5 follows from the scaling limit results for \mathfrak{M}_p proved in [BBCK18, Section 6].

Proof of Proposition A.5. Let \mathfrak{M}'_p be the planar map obtained from \mathfrak{M}_p by removing all the regions surrounded by outermost loops on \mathfrak{M}_p . For (g, h) satisfying Proposition A.4, \mathfrak{M}'_p is the so-called critical non-generic Boltzmann planar map considered in [BBCK18, Section 6]. The map \mathfrak{M}'_p is the discrete analog of the CLE carpet on the LQG background. The discrete analog of CPI exploration for CLE carpet is considered in [BBCK18, Section 6.3] which is called the branching peeling exploration. The exact analog of the CPI with $(q = \infty)$ -exploration mechanism is considered in [BBCK18, Section 6.4], where the exploration is always towards the component with the largest perimeter when there is splitting. It was shown in [BBCK18, Proposition 6.6] that the rescaled lengths of the loops discovered by this peeling process converge in law to the sizes of the upward jumps in Y_t^a . Iterating the exploration in both discrete and continuum we get the desired convergence. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.21. Combining Propositions A.4 and A.5, we conclude the proof. \square

B Continuity of CLE_κ as $\kappa \uparrow 4$

In this section we supply the continuity in κ needed to extend Theorems 1.2 and 1.4 from $\kappa < 4$ to $\kappa = 4$. We start with a monotonicity statement for CLE_κ proved in [SW12].

Lemma B.1 ([SW12]). *There exists a coupling of CLE_κ on the unit disk \mathbb{D} for $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$ such that a.s. each outermost loop of CLE_{κ_1} is surrounded by an outermost loop of CLE_{κ_2} if $\kappa_1 < \kappa_2 \leq 4$.*

Proof. By [SW12, Theorems 1.5, 1.6], the law of the boundaries of outermost loop clusters in a Brownian loop soup with intensity $c_\kappa = (3\kappa - 8)(6 - \kappa)/2\kappa$ is given by the outermost loops of CLE_κ . Now the monotonicity of c_κ in $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$ yields the desired monotonicity in Lemma B.1. \square

We recall the formula from [SSW09] for the conformal radii of CLE.

Theorem B.2 ([SSW09]). *For $\kappa \in (8/3, 8)$, let η_κ be the outermost loop surrounding 0 of a CLE_κ on \mathbb{D} . Let $\text{CR}(\eta_\kappa, 0)$ be the conformal radius of the region surrounded by η_κ viewed from 0. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{CR}(\eta_\kappa, 0)^\lambda] = \frac{-\cos(\frac{4\pi}{\kappa})}{\cos\left(\pi\sqrt{\left(1 - \frac{4}{\kappa}\right)^2 - \frac{8\lambda}{\kappa}}\right)} \quad \text{for } \lambda > -1 + \frac{\kappa}{8}.$$

Recall that the Hausdorff distance between two closed sets E_1, E_2 on a metric space (X, d) is given by $\max\{\sup_{x \in E_1}\{d(x, E_2)\}, \sup_{x \in E_2}\{d(x, E_1)\}\}$. Lemma B.1 and Theorem B.2 yield the following continuity result.

Lemma B.3. *Suppose we are in the coupling in Lemma B.1. For each $z \in \mathbb{D}$, let $\eta_\kappa(z)$ be the outermost loop around z of the CLE_κ . For any fixed z , viewed as closed sets, $\eta_\kappa(z)$ converges almost surely to $\eta_4(z)$ in the Hausdorff metric as $\kappa \uparrow 4$.*

Proof. By the conformal invariance of CLE_κ we assume $z = 0$ because the same argument will work for a general z . In this case we simply write $\eta_\kappa(0)$ as η_κ . Since η_{κ_1} is surrounded by η_{κ_2} if $\kappa_1 < \kappa_2 \leq 4$, we see that $\text{CR}(\eta_\kappa, 0)$ is increasing in κ . By the explicit formula in Theorem B.2, we have $\lim_{\kappa \uparrow 4} \mathbb{E}[\text{CR}(\eta_\kappa, 0)] = \mathbb{E}[\text{CR}(\eta_4, 0)]$. Thus we must have $\lim_{\kappa \uparrow 4} \text{CR}(\eta_\kappa, 0) = \text{CR}(\eta_4, 0)$ a.s.

Let D_κ be the region surrounded by η_κ and $D_{4-} = \cup_{\kappa < 4} D_\kappa$. The conformal radius of D_{4-} must be between $\lim_{\kappa \uparrow 4} \text{CR}(\eta_\kappa, 0)$ and $\text{CR}(\eta_4, 0)$, hence equals $\text{CR}(\eta_4, 0)$ a.s. This means that $D_\kappa \uparrow D_4$ a.s. hence $\eta_\kappa \rightarrow \eta_4$ a.s. in the Hausdorff metric in the coupling in Lemma B.1. \square

Recall the loop measures $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$, $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$, \mathcal{L}_κ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$ from Section 5. We first give a quantitative version of Lemma 5.5 and then prove the continuity in κ for these measures.

Proposition B.4. *Lemma 5.5 holds. Moreover, the convergence is exponential with a uniform rate near $\kappa = 4$. That is, there exists a constant $a(\kappa) \in (0, 1)$ depending on κ such that the total variation distance between the law of η^n and $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is at most $a(\kappa)^n$, and in addition, $\sup\{a(\kappa) : \kappa \in [\kappa_0, 4]\} < 1$ for $\kappa_0 \in (8/3, 4]$.*

Proof. Fix $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$. [KW16, Section 3.1, Fact 4] shows that there exists $a(\kappa) \in (0, 1)$ such that regardless of the initial states, the Markov chain in Lemma 5.5 couples in one step with probability $1 - a(\kappa)$. Moreover, inspecting that argument, we see that $\sup\{a(\kappa) : \kappa \in [\kappa_0, 4]\} < 1$ for $\kappa_0 \in (8/3, 4]$. This gives Proposition B.4. \square

Lemma B.5. *We have $\lim_{\kappa \uparrow 4} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_4$ weakly with respect to the Hausdorff metric.*

Proof. By the domain Markov property of CLE_κ and iteratively applying Lemma B.3, we see that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the law of η^n as $\kappa \rightarrow 4$ converge weakly to the law of η^n for $\kappa = 4$. Now the uniformly exponential convergence in Proposition B.4 gives $\lim_{\kappa \uparrow 4} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_4(\mathcal{C})$. Transferring from the cylinder to the disk gives $\lim_{\kappa \uparrow 4} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_4$. \square

Lemma B.6. *We have $\lim_{\kappa \uparrow 4} \mathcal{L}_\kappa = \mathcal{L}_4$ weakly with respect to the Hausdorff metric.*

Proof. We only explain that under the natural parameterization chordal SLE_κ converges to SLE_4 as $\kappa \uparrow 4$. Once this is done we get that the two-sided whole plane SLE_κ curve $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{p=q}$ converges to $\text{SLE}_4^{p=q}$ under natural parametrization as well, since the two-sided curve is characterized by its re-sampling property: conditioned on one of the curve segments between p and q , the conditional law of the other is SLE_κ in the complementary domain. From this and the definition of $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ we reviewed in Section 2.3, we get the convergence of \mathcal{L}_κ .

We now show that the law of chordal SLE_κ on \mathbb{H} from 0 to ∞ under natural parametrization is continuous as $\kappa \uparrow 4$. We first recall that this family of measures is tight in the local uniform topology of parametrized curves thanks to their Hölder regularity established by Zhan [Zha19]. On the other hand the natural parametrization of SLE_κ is characterized by a conformal invariance and domain Markov property considered by Lawler and Sheffield [LS11]. Therefore all subsequential limits of the chordal SLE_κ measure agree with SLE_4 . \square

Lemma B.7. *Suppose Theorem 1.2 holds for $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$. Then it holds for $\kappa = 4$ as well.*

Proof. The right hand side of (1.3) is continuous as $\kappa \uparrow 4$. Therefore $\{\text{CR}(z_i, \eta_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq 3}$ for $\kappa < 4$ converges in law as $\kappa \uparrow 4$ and the moment generating function of the limit is given by $C_\kappa^{\text{CLE}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ with $\kappa = 4$. It remains to show that the limit is given by $\{\text{CR}(z_i, \eta_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq 3}$ with $\kappa = 4$.

Fix a small $\varepsilon > 0$. Let S be the set of simple loops in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ separating z_1 from $\{z_2, z_3\}$. Let $S_\varepsilon = \{\eta \in S : \text{CR}(z_1, \eta) > \varepsilon\}$. Let Γ be the full-plane CLE_κ which the η_i are chosen from. Now conditioning on the event that $\Gamma \cap S_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$, we uniformly choose a loop η^ε from the finite set $\Gamma \cap S_\varepsilon$. Then the conditional law of η^ε is the probability measure proportional to the restriction of $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ to S_ε . Let D^ε be the connected component of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \eta^\varepsilon$ not containing z_1 . By Proposition 5.2, conditioning on η^ε , the law of $\Gamma|_{D^\varepsilon}$ is a CLE_κ in D^ε . Moreover, η_1, η_2, η_3 are the outermost loops in $\Gamma|_{D^\varepsilon} \cup \{\eta^\varepsilon\}$ separating z_1, z_2, z_3 .

By Lemma B.5, the conditional law of η^ε conditioned on $\Gamma \cap S_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$ for $\kappa < 4$ converges weakly to the same conditional law when $\kappa = 4$. By Lemma B.3, the same continuity holds for the conditional law of (η_1, η_2, η_3) given $\Gamma \cap S_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$. Since $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}[\Gamma \cap S_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset] = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}[\text{CR}(z_1, \eta_1) > \varepsilon] = 1$ uniformly for $\kappa \in (\kappa_0, 4]$ for a fixed $\kappa_0 \in (8/3, 4)$, we can remove the conditioning and conclude that as $\kappa \uparrow 4$ the law of (η_1, η_2, η_3) converges weakly in the Hausdorff metric to the same law when $\kappa = 4$. This gives the desired continuity in κ . \square

References

- [AG21] M. Ang and E. Gwynne. Liouville quantum gravity surfaces with boundary as matings of trees. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 57(1):1 – 53, 2021.
- [AHS17] J. Aru, Y. Huang, and X. Sun. Two perspectives of the 2D unit area quantum sphere and their equivalence. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 356(1):261–283, 2017, 1512.06190. MR3694028
- [AHS20] M. Ang, N. Holden, and X. Sun. Conformal welding of quantum disks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.08389*, 2020.
- [AHS21] M. Ang, N. Holden, and X. Sun. Integrability of SLE via conformal welding of random surfaces. *ArXiv e-prints*, Apr 2021, 2104.09477.

- [ALS20] J. Aru, T. Lupu, and A. Sepúlveda. Extremal distance and conformal radius of a CLE_4 loop. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2004.13570, April 2020, 2004.13570.
- [ARS21] M. Ang, G. Remy, and X. Sun. FZZ formula of boundary Liouville CFT via conformal welding. *ArXiv e-prints*, Apr 2021, 2104.09478.
- [BBCK18] J. Bertoin, T. Budd, N. Curien, and I. Kortchemski. Martingales in self-similar growth-fragmentations and their connections with random planar maps. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 172(3-4):663–724, 2018. MR3877545
- [BDE19] T. Bautista, A. Dabholkar, and H. Erbin. Quantum Gravity from Timelike Liouville theory. *JHEP*, 10:284, 2019, 1905.12689.
- [Ber96] J. Bertoin. *Lévy processes*, volume 121 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996. MR1406564 (98e:60117)
- [BH19] S. Benoist and C. Hongler. The scaling limit of critical Ising interfaces is CLE_3 . *Ann. Probab.*, 47(4):2049–2086, 2019, 1604.06975. MR3980915
- [BPZ84] A. A. Belavin, A. M. Polyakov, and A. B. Zamolodchikov. Infinite Conformal Symmetry in Two-Dimensional Quantum Field Theory. *Nucl. Phys.*, B241:333–380, 1984. [,605(1984)].
- [CCM20] L. Chen, N. Curien, and P. Maillard. The perimeter cascade in critical Boltzmann quadrangulations decorated by an $O(n)$ loop model. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré D*, 7(4):535–584, 2020. MR4182775
- [Cer19] B. Cerclé. Unit boundary length quantum disk: a study of two different perspectives and their equivalence. *ArXiv e-prints*, Dec 2019, 1912.08012.
- [CN08] F. Camia and C. M. Newman. SLE_6 and CLE_6 from critical percolation. In *Probability, geometry and integrable systems*, volume 55 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 103–130. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2008, math/0611116. MR2407594 (2009h:82032)
- [DDDF20] J. Ding, J. Dubédat, A. Dunlap, and H. Falconet. Tightness of Liouville first passage percolation for $\gamma \in (0, 2)$. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 132:353–403, 2020. MR4179836
- [DKRV16] F. David, A. Kupiainen, R. Rhodes, and V. Vargas. Liouville quantum gravity on the Riemann sphere. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 342(3):869–907, 2016, 1410.7318. MR3465434
- [DLG02] T. Duquesne and J.-F. Le Gall. Random trees, Lévy processes and spatial branching processes. *Astérisque*, (281):vi+147, 2002. MR1954248
- [DLMF] *NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions*. <http://dlmf.nist.gov/>, Release 1.1.0 of 2020-12-15. F. W. J. Olver, A. B. Olde Daalhuis, D. W. Lozier, B. I. Schneider, R. F. Boisvert, C. W. Clark, B. R. Miller, B. V. Saunders, H. S. Cohl, and M. A. McClain, eds.
- [DMS14] B. Duplantier, J. Miller, and S. Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity as a mating of trees. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2014, 1409.7055.

- [DO94] H. Dorn and H.-J. Otto. Two- and three-point functions in Liouville theory. *Nuclear Physics B*, 429:375–388, October 1994, hep-th/9403141.
- [DRV16] F. David, R. Rhodes, and V. Vargas. Liouville quantum gravity on complex tori. *J. Math. Phys.*, 57(2):022302, 25, 2016, 1504.00625. MR3450564
- [DS11] B. Duplantier and S. Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity and KPZ. *Invent. Math.*, 185(2):333–393, 2011, 1206.0212. MR2819163 (2012f:81251)
- [DV11] G. Delfino and J. Viti. On three-point connectivity in two-dimensional percolation. *J. Phys. A*, 44:032001, 2011, 1009.1314.
- [FZZ00] V. Fateev, A. B. Zamolodchikov, and A. B. Zamolodchikov. Boundary Liouville field theory. 1. Boundary state and boundary two point function. 1 2000, hep-th/0001012.
- [GHS19] E. Gwynne, N. Holden, and X. Sun. Mating of trees for random planar maps and Liouville quantum gravity: a survey. *ArXiv e-prints*, Oct 2019, 1910.04713.
- [GKRV20] C. Guillarmou, A. Kupiainen, R. Rhodes, and V. Vargas. Conformal bootstrap in Liouville Theory. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2005.11530, May 2020, 2005.11530.
- [GM21] E. Gwynne and J. Miller. Existence and uniqueness of the Liouville quantum gravity metric for $\gamma \in (0, 2)$. *Invent. Math.*, 223(1):213–333, 2021. MR4199443
- [GMQ18] E. Gwynne, J. Miller, and W. Qian. Conformal invariance of CLE_κ on the Riemann sphere for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. *International Math Research Notices*, to appear, 2018, 1811.00514.
- [GMS21] E. Gwynne, J. Miller, and S. Sheffield. The Tutte embedding of the mated-CRT map converges to Liouville quantum gravity. *The Annals of Probability*, 49(4):1677–1717, 2021.
- [GRV19] C. Guillarmou, R. Rhodes, and V. Vargas. Polyakov’s formulation of $2d$ bosonic string theory. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 130:111–185, 2019. MR4028515
- [Gwy20] E. Gwynne. Random surfaces and Liouville quantum gravity. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 67(4):484–491, 2020. MR4186266
- [HJS20] Y. He, J. L. Jacobsen, and H. Saleur. Geometrical four-point functions in the two-dimensional critical Q -state Potts model: The interchiral conformal bootstrap. *JHEP*, 12:019, 2020, 2005.07258.
- [HMW11] D. Harlow, J. Maltz, and E. Witten. Analytic Continuation of Liouville Theory. *JHEP*, 12:071, 2011, 1108.4417.
- [HRV18] Y. Huang, R. Rhodes, and V. Vargas. Liouville quantum gravity on the unit disk. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 54(3):1694–1730, 2018, 1502.04343. MR3825895
- [HS19] N. Holden and X. Sun. Convergence of uniform triangulations under the Cardy embedding. *ArXiv e-prints*, May 2019, 1905.13207.
- [IJS16] Y. Ikhlef, J. L. Jacobsen, and H. Saleur. Three-point functions in $c \leq 1$ liouville theory and conformal loop ensembles. *Physical review letters*, 116(13):130601, 2016.

- [Kal17] O. Kallenberg. *Random measures, theory and applications*, volume 77 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham, 2017. MR3642325
- [KP07] I. K. Kostov and V. B. Petkova. Non-rational 2-D quantum gravity. I. World sheet CFT. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 770:273–331, 2007, hep-th/0512346.
- [KPZ88] V. Knizhnik, A. Polyakov, and A. Zamolodchikov. Fractal structure of 2D-quantum gravity. *Modern Phys. Lett A*, 3(8):819–826, 1988.
- [KRV17] A. Kupiainen, R. Rhodes, and V. Vargas. Integrability of Liouville theory: proof of the DOZZ Formula. *Annals of Mathematics*, to appear, 2017, 1707.08785.
- [KS07] M. Kontsevich and Y. Suhov. On Malliavin measures, SLE, and CFT. *Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova*, 258(Anal. i Osob. Ch. 1):107–153, 2007. MR2400527
- [KS16] A. Kemppainen and S. Smirnov. Conformal invariance in random cluster models II: Full scaling limit as a branching SLE. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08527*, 2016.
- [KSZ06] P. Kleban, J. J. H. Simmons, and R. M. Ziff. Anchored Critical Percolation Clusters and 2-D Electrostatics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 97:115702, 2006, cond-mat/0605120.
- [KW04] R. Kenyon and D. B. Wilson. Conformal radii of loop models. 2004. Manuscript.
- [KW16] A. Kemppainen and W. Werner. The nested simple conformal loop ensembles in the Riemann sphere. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 165(3-4):835–866, 2016, 1402.2433. MR3520020
- [LJS19] J. Lykke Jacobsen and H. Saleur. Bootstrap approach to geometrical four-point functions in the two-dimensional critical Q -state Potts model: A study of the s -channel spectra. *JHEP*, 01:084, 2019, 1809.02191.
- [LR15] G. F. Lawler and M. A. Rezaei. Minkowski content and natural parameterization for the Schramm-Loewner evolution. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(3):1082–1120, 2015, 1211.4146. MR3342659
- [LS11] G. F. Lawler and S. Sheffield. A natural parametrization for the Schramm-Loewner evolution. *Ann. Probab.*, 39(5):1896–1937, 2011. MR2884877
- [Lup19] T. Lupu. Convergence of the two-dimensional random walk loop-soup clusters to CLE. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 21(4):1201–1227, 2019. MR3941462
- [Mal99] P. Malliavin. The canonic diffusion above the diffeomorphism group of the circle. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 329(4):325–329, 1999. MR1713340
- [MS17] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Imaginary geometry IV: interior rays, whole-plane reversibility, and space-filling trees. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 169(3-4):729–869, 2017, 1302.4738. MR3719057
- [MS19] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity spheres as matings of finite-diameter trees. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 55(3):1712–1750, 2019, 1506.03804. MR4010949
- [MSW14] J. Miller, N. Sun, and D. B. Wilson. The Hausdorff dimension of the CLE gasket. *Ann. Probab.*, 42(4):1644–1665, 2014, 1403.6076. MR3262488

- [MSW17] J. Miller, S. Sheffield, and W. Werner. CLE Percolations. *Forum Math. Pi*, 5:e4, 102, 2017, 1602.03884. MR3708206
- [MSW20] J. Miller, S. Sheffield, and W. Werner. Simple Conformal Loop Ensembles on Liouville Quantum Gravity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05698*, 2020.
- [MSW21] J. Miller, S. Sheffield, and W. Werner. Non-simple conformal loop ensembles on Liouville quantum gravity and the law of CLE percolation interfaces. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, pages 1–42, 2021.
- [MWW15] J. Miller, S. S. Watson, and D. B. Wilson. The conformal loop ensemble nesting field. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 163(3-4):769–801, 2015, 1401.0217. MR3418755
- [MWW16] J. Miller, S. S. Watson, and D. B. Wilson. Extreme nesting in the conformal loop ensemble. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(2):1013–1052, 2016, 1401.0218. MR3474466
- [Pol81] A. M. Polyakov. Quantum geometry of bosonic strings. *Phys. Lett. B*, 103(3):207–210, 1981. MR623209 (84h:81093a)
- [PRS16] M. Picco, S. Ribault, and R. Santachiara. A conformal bootstrap approach to critical percolation in two dimensions. *SciPost Phys.*, 1(1):009, 2016, 1607.07224.
- [PSVD13] M. Picco, R. Santachiara, J. Viti, and G. Delfino. Connectivities of Potts Fortuin-Kasteleyn clusters and time-like Liouville correlator. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 875:719–737, 2013, 1304.6511.
- [Rem18] G. Remy. Liouville quantum gravity on the annulus. *J. Math. Phys.*, 59(8):082303, 26, 2018, 1711.06547. MR3843631
- [Rem20] G. Remy. The Fyodorov-Bouchaud formula and Liouville conformal field theory. *Duke Math. J.*, 169(1):177–211, 2020. MR4047550
- [RS15] S. Ribault and R. Santachiara. Liouville theory with a central charge less than one. *JHEP*, 08:109, 2015, 1503.02067.
- [RV19] R. Rhodes and V. Vargas. The tail expansion of Gaussian multiplicative chaos and the Liouville reflection coefficient. *Ann. Probab.*, 47(5):3082–3107, 2019. MR4021245
- [Sha16] A. Shamov. On Gaussian multiplicative chaos. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 270(9):3224–3261, 2016, 1407.4418. MR3475456
- [She09] S. Sheffield. Exploration trees and conformal loop ensembles. *Duke Math. J.*, 147(1):79–129, 2009, math/0609167. MR2494457 (2010g:60184)
- [She16] S. Sheffield. Conformal weldings of random surfaces: SLE and the quantum gravity zipper. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(5):3474–3545, 2016, 1012.4797. MR3551203
- [SSW09] O. Schramm, S. Sheffield, and D. B. Wilson. Conformal radii for conformal loop ensembles. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 288(1):43–53, 2009, math/0611687. MR2491617 (2010g:60218)
- [SW12] S. Sheffield and W. Werner. Conformal loop ensembles: the Markovian characterization and the loop-soup construction. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 176(3):1827–1917, 2012, 1006.2374. MR2979861

- [SW16] S. Sheffield and M. Wang. Field-measure correspondence in Liouville quantum gravity almost surely commutes with all conformal maps simultaneously. *ArXiv e-prints*, May 2016, 1605.06171.
- [Tes95] J. Teschner. On the Liouville three point function. *Phys. Lett. B*, 363:65–70, 1995, hep-th/9507109.
- [Var17] V. Vargas. Lecture notes on Liouville theory and the DOZZ formula. *ArXiv e-prints*, Dec 2017, 1712.00829.
- [Wer08] W. Werner. The conformally invariant measure on self-avoiding loops. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 21(1):137–169, 2008. MR2350053
- [WW13] W. Werner and H. Wu. On conformally invariant CLE explorations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 320(3):637–661, 2013, 1112.1211. MR3057185
- [Zam05] A. B. Zamolodchikov. Three-point function in the minimal liouville gravity. *Theoretical and mathematical physics*, 142(2):183–196, 2005.
- [Zha19] D. Zhan. Optimal Hölder continuity and dimension properties for SLE with Minkowski content parametrization. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 175(1-2):447–466, 2019. MR4009713
- [Zha21] D. Zhan. SLE loop measures. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 179(1-2):345–406, 2021. MR4221661
- [ZSK11] R. M. Ziff, J. J. H. Simmons, and P. Kleban. Factorization of correlations in two-dimensional percolation on the plane and torus. *J. Phys. A*, 44:065002, 2011, 1011.1101.
- [ZZ96] A. Zamolodchikov and A. Zamolodchikov. Conformal bootstrap in Liouville field theory. *Nuclear Physics B*, 477:577–605, February 1996, hep-th/9506136.